XV.—The Characters in the *Eclogues*

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

The characters in the *Eclogues* are vivid and alive. Some represent real people. Arguments are advanced in favor of certain widely held but contested views, namely, that the *iuvenis* in 1 is Octavian, the *puer* in 4 is Julia, Daphnis in 5 is Julius, Silenus in 6 is Siro. The following represent Vergil: Chromis or Mnasyllus, both Tityrus and Menalcas (differing from each other in that Tityrus is a slave and Menalcas is free, often associated with each other), but not Corydon. Characters that appear in different *Eclogues* are fairly consistent, but not invariably or completely so; those that sometimes represent a real person do not always do so. Some develop both in age and in other ways. This last detail involves a preliminary study of the chronology of the *Eclogues*, in connection with which Vergil's changing attitude toward the pastoral is proposed as a criterion. The roles of the three contemporaries who play an important part under their own names are examined: Varus, at least in 6, is Quintilius, not Alfenus; tributes to Pollio in 8 and to Gallus in 6 are perhaps dedicatory interpolations in special copies. On the basis of observation of the characters, it is concluded that the *Eclogues* are arranged in three triads, followed by one final poem which reflects all the others.

The *Eclogues* present riddles at once fascinating and baffling. So much has been written in an attempt to solve these problems,[1] and so little has been accomplished in this direction, that any further discussions may seem at once superfluous and futile. Yet I cannot

[1] See the enormous bibliography provided by Herrmann fifteen years ago (pp. 175–194). I have myself examined exhaustively the books and articles which seemed to me at once most relevant and most important so far as my special topic goes, namely: A. Cartault, *Étude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile* (Paris, 1897); Giovanni Costa, "Vergilio e Melibeo," *A&R* 9 (1906) 243–252; Tenney Frank, *Vergil* (New York, 1922); Léon Herrmann, *Les Masques et les Visages dans les Bucoliques de Virgile* (Brussels, 1930); Alfred Körte, "Augusteer bei Philodem," *RhM* N. F. 45 (1890) 172–177; Ewaldus Krause, *Quibus Temporibus Quoque Ordine Vergilius Eclogas Scripserit* (Berlin, 1884); Casimirus Felix Kumaniecki, "Quo Ordine Vergilii Eclogae Conscriptae Sint," *Eos* 29 (1926) 69–79; Friedrich Leo, "Vergil und die Ciris," *H* 37 (1902) 14–55; H. Nettleship, *Ancient Lives of Vergil with an Essay on the Poems of Vergil in Connection with His Life and Times* (Oxford, 1879); Eduard Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Leipzig, 1924); Carolus Pascal, "De Quintilio Varo Cremonensi Poeta Disputatio," *RFIC* 17 (1889) 145–176; Alfredus Przygode, *De Eclogarum Vergilianarum Temporibus* (Berlin, 1885); H. J. Rose, *The Eclogues of Vergil* (Berkeley, 1942); Franz Skutsch, *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (Leipzig, 1901); René Waltz, "La I^re^ et la IX^e^ Bucolique," *RBPh* 6 (1927) 31–58; Wilhelm Weber, "Der Prophet und sein Gott," *Beihefte zum Alten Orient*, Heft 3, 1925. The foregoing are all referred to throughout the article simply by the last names of their authors. All Latin passages cited are from the *Eclogues* unless specifically assigned to some other source. References to Suetonius are to his life of Vergil unless some other indication is given.

resist at least considering some of the characters depicted, mainly by dint of trying to examine the *Eclogues* afresh in their own light.[2] We cannot put complete confidence in the ancient biographers and scholiasts, whose information might be valuable, were it not so frequently conflicting, and at times so obviously based on what they themselves get out of—or read into—Vergil's own lines; so that to depend upon them for interpretation of Vergil or for solution of the questions that he raises, involves one in a vicious circle. As for modern commentators, many of them are stimulating and persuasive, but for the most part they are better at refuting their predecessors' opinions than at proving their own.[3]

In the first place, I want to protest emphatically against the widely current view—more or less established by Conington in his Introduction to his edition of the *Eclogues*,[4] and persisting despite the comments of some more perceptive critics, notably Cartault nearly half a century back, and Rose [5] just a couple of years ago [6] —that Vergil's shepherd world is utterly vague, confused, and unreal. There is a certain fusing at times of incongruous elements, and the geography of the *Eclogues* is, in my opinion, as impossible to straighten out with complete logic as the chronology of the *Aeneid;* and certainly the poet of the *Eclogues* is not so vivid and vigorous as Theocritus. But Vergil's personages are alive and differentiated to a greater degree than many of his critics realize.

Take for instance the beginning of *Eclogue* 5:

> ME. Cur non, Mopse, boni quoniam convenimus ambo,
> tu calamos inflare levis, ego dicere versus,
> hic corylis mixtas inter consedimus ulmos?

[2] The method proposed by Waltz (31) seems to be sound: "On se mettra directement en face des textes. On les interprétera par eux-mêmes. On se laissera influencer le moins possible par les multiples travaux auxquels ils ont donné lieu, tant dans l'antiquité que de nos jours." But the difficulty is that different persons following this method arrive at quite different conclusions.

[3] Another difficulty involved is the question whether, and if so how far, it is safe to use the *Appendix Vergiliana* to interpret the undisputed works of Vergil, as does for instance Tenney Frank (*passim*). To me this seems extremely dangerous, and I therefore propose to disregard the *Appendix* altogether.

[4] Conington[4], revised by Nettleship, 1.2–19 (however, I do not consider Conington so contemptible a critic as Rose does; cf. note 5); also Page, xi–xii.

[5] Rose pays tribute to Cartault (249, note 38; 259, note 73); but seems to me (despite my own strictures above) to be unduly contemptuous of Conington (cf. 26; 224, note 7; 228, note 2; 248, note 12; 249, note 38).

[6] Also Waltz has some sensitive comments on the personages of Tityrus and Meliboeus in 1, and Moeris in 9.

MO. Tu maior; tibi me est aequum parere, Menalca,
sive sub incertas Zephyris motantibus umbras,
sive antro potius succedimus. aspice, ut antrum
silvestris raris sparsit labrusca racemis.
ME. Montibus in nostris solus tibi certat Amyntas.
MO. Quid si idem certet Phoebum superare canendo?
ME. Incipe, Mopse, prior, si quos aut Phyllidis ignis
aut Alconis habes laudes aut iurgia Codri.
incipe: pascentis servabit Tityrus haedos.
MO. Immo haec, in viridi nuper quae cortice fagi
carmina descripsi et modulans alterna notavi,
experiar: tu deinde iubeto ut certet Amyntas.
ME. Lenta salix quantum pallenti cedit olivae,
puniceis humilis quantum saliunca rosetis,
iudicio nostro tantum tibi cedit Amyntas.
sed tu desine plura, puer; successimus antro.

The two singing shepherds here as a rule are casually and cursorily described as being courteous in contrast with those of *Eclogue* 3.[7] But really they are sharply differentiated from each other. The elder, Menalcas, is gracious and urbane throughout. Mildly he makes his suggestion, "Why don't we sit down right here under the hazels and elms?" Mopsus pretends that since Menalcas is older, he should, and presumably will, obey him, but he slips in his own preference very adroitly: "Whether under the zephyrs that move the uncertain shadows,[8] or whether we go on to the grotto." And he then proceeds to point out the grotto's superior charms.

[7] See, e.g., the introductions to the commentaries on this *Eclogue* in Conington (1.59–60) and Page (131), and even the usually more acute Cartault (150 and note 4).

[8] So far as I know, *sub* is always taken as introducing *umbras*, *sub umbras* being equivalent in construction to *antro*; but then the point is completely destroyed, since Menalcas wanted to *stay* in the shade where they were, not to *go on* to a shady place at a distance. Indeed, the tense of *consedimus* seems to imply (as Page says *ad loc.*) that they might have sat down already, obviously where they were. Syntacticians of the school that likes to "supply" words may say that *sumus* is "understood" after the first *sive*, but the coordination of a phrase and a clause is by no means unexampled in Vergil, and we have a close parallel in *Aen.* 11.660–662: pictis bellantur Amazones armis,/ seu circum Hippolyten seu cum se Martia curru/ Penthesilea refert; cf. too *ibid.* 2.34: sive dolo seu iam Troiae sic fata ferebant. The order might normally seem to favor the interpretation "under the shadows made uncertain by the breezes that move (them)" rather than "under the breezes that move the uncertain shadows;" but I believe Vergil may have deliberately interwoven his words in an unnaturally complex way, to suggest the chequered patterns formed by the shadows of the leaves as the fitful breezes sway them. There are plenty of parallels in Vergil for the use of seemingly confused word order (as well as other stylistic devices) to suit a special situation: e.g., *Aen.* 6.448–449, 9.813–814, 12.583; cf. too Horace *Serm.* 1.5.72 and Morris *ad loc.* (I have discussed these and a number of other passages in *Coordination of Non-Coordi-*

Menalcas, probably not wishing to press the issue, turns the matter aside with what is surely a graceful compliment, that no one can be compared with Mopsus except Amyntas,[9] but Mopsus insults both Amyntas and Menalcas by his churlish resentment of what was meant for praise. Menalcas again avoids trouble by asking Mopsus to begin his song, and makes some suggestions as to subject; Mopsus ignores these, preferring once again to follow his own head, and rather maliciously reverting at the end to Menalcas' tribute to Amyntas, which evidently still rankles. Menalcas, now seeing that there is no way of dodging Mopsus' constant opposition, appeases him by assuring him he *is* better than Amyntas; and then ensues the final proof of Menalcas' graciousness, slipped in so casually that it is a triumph of urbanity. "Successimus antro," says he (19), echoing Mopsus' earlier proposal, "sive antro potius succedimus" (6). Without any ado about the matter, he has left the grove of hazels and elms where he wanted to sit down, and walked on to the grotto (though possibly as an older man he was tired and would have been glad to rest sooner); in other words, he has quietly let Mopsus have his way. Fortunately, his tolerance and generosity are rewarded, for Mopsus relaxes his earlier perversity and obstinacy, and finally becomes courteous and laudatory in his turn (81–84, 88–90).

This one instance of Vergil's very real power of sketching clearly in his miniature portraits must suffice as an example of all; and I pass to another consideration, whether the figures depicted by Vergil are so real to him that they are consistent from *Eclogue* to *Eclogue*, and that they not only live but grow. The latter point demands a rapid examination of the chronology of the *Eclogues*.

In regard to this, I suppose no two people would agree completely. Nettleship's brief discussion of the matter in Conington 1 (1881) 17–18 seems to me on the whole as sound and sensible as any. Krause's dissertation in 1884 was fundamental but not definitive;[10] Przygode's dissertation on much the same subject, which followed it a year later, adds little to the problem. Kumaniecki's article in 1926, in which he tries to establish relative dates

nate Elements in Vergil [New York, 1930] 120, note 485; but at the time of writing I did not realize that in *Ecl.* 5 the context *demands* that *sub* govern an ablative and not an accusative, although I realized the possibility that this *might* be the case.)

[9] This is a high tribute if the Menalcas of 5 is the same one as the one of 3 (note 3.66, 74, 83). Cf. *infra*, 227.

[10] Cartault uses Krause to a considerable extent.

on the basis of Vergil's quotations from himself, is, as Rose says (252), ingenious but too subjective to be wholly cogent; his tabular recapitulation (79) of five conflicting opinions published earlier perhaps should dissuade any one else from entering the field today. There are certain factors of which every one takes cognizance. In the first place, some *Eclogues* clearly quote or echo others;[11] thus 2 and 3 must precede 5,[12] and 5 in turn must precede 9.[13] And certain *Eclogues* can be dated on historical grounds, though in almost every case there are reservations to be made: 5 has been assigned to 43 or 42 by those who connect it with the death of Julius Caesar (but *does* it refer to Caesar?); 6 to 41, when Alfenus Varus is supposed to have succeeded Pollio (but does it refer to Alfenus Varus?); 9 is said by Nettleship[14] not to be later, and 1 not to be earlier, than 40, the year following Vergil's loss of his farm (but is 9 earlier than 1?[15]). 4 surely belongs to 40, the year of Pollio's consulship; and 10 probably to 37, the year of Agrippa's campaigns when "Lycoris" abandoned Gallus. This makes the *Eclogue* which stands last in the collection, and which professes to be the last,[16] actually the last in point of time. Except for this, it is clear that the arrangement of the *Eclogues* has no connection with the order of composition.[17]

[11] Apart from such verbal reminiscences, there is no internal relationship between any two *Eclogues* except 1 and 9; and here though most critics agree that the two are on more or less the same theme, they are far from agreed which is the earlier. To this problem I shall revert later (221).

[12] 5.86 and 87 cite the opening lines of 2 and 3 respectively.

[13] 9.19–20 is surely an echo of 5.40.

[14] In Conington 1.17. On the other hand Cartault, who places 9 after 1, would put the events of 9 as late as 39 (69).

[15] Cf. note 11.

[16] It is so described in both its introduction and its conclusion—two eight-line passages (in each case with the third line ending in *Gallo*) which enclose the *Eclogue* proper like a frame. Clearly the closing lines serve at once as a conclusion to this particular *Eclogue* and as an epilogue to the entire group of *Eclogues*, just as the closing lines (also eight in number) of the fourth *Georgic* serve as an epilogue to all four books of the *Georgics*, while recalling the *Eclogues* as well. One wonders whether the second epilogue is meant specifically to recall the first one: there are a few verbal echoes, such as *haec* opening both, a form of *cano* in the first line of each, *dum* in the second line of each; each has a direct personal touch (*mihi* in *Ecl.* 10.73, *me* in *Georg.* 4.563); and each pays a special tribute to a great patron, the earlier passage to Gallus, the later one to Octavian.

[17] Herrmann tries to show that the order is chronological (14); see his discussion (12–15) and his table of dates (174) in which he distinguishes between the "date of action" and the "date of composition"; but as usual some of his points are trivial, many are forced, and the whole argument—to me at least—is utterly unconvincing. Cf. *infra*, note 50.

I would suggest the following order for the *Eclogues:* 2, 3, 7, 8, 5, 9, 6, 1, 4, 10. In this connection I propose as a criterion Vergil's attitude toward his art. In 2, generally believed to be the earliest *Eclogue*, Corydon's strains are *incondita* (2.4), an epithet which may refer to the uncouthness of the naïf speaker depicted with real power by the already skillful poet, but which may also represent a delicate deprecation of his own first attempt by one who was always prone to underrate himself.[18] This interpretation is perhaps rendered more probable by his use of *condere* in 6 as something beyond him (others may *condere* Varus' achievements in war but he cannot),[19] whereas on the other hand in 10, when the admired poet Gallus speaks of adapting to the pastoral reed the elegies which have already been composed by him, *these* verses are described as *condita*.[20] In 3 he again speaks deprecatingly of his muse as *rustica*, but, such as his verses are, Pollio likes them.[21] By 7 Corydon, who I believe is the same Corydon as the one in 2, is no longer uncouth, but is accepted as champion, thanks to his victory over Thyrsis;[22] but the contest between the two is still described as mere *ludus* in opposition to the serious business of looking after one's flocks.[23] In 8 we see that the shepherd's rustic flute, as well as the goats that he tends, is a source of scorn to his lady-love,[24] and the thought that Tityrus—who I believe is Vergil—could rank with Orpheus or Arion is an absurdity, an *adynaton*.[25] In 9 his pastoral songs have gained sufficient reputation among

[18] We recall his deathbed desire to destroy his masterpiece, the *Aeneid*.

[19] 6.6–7: namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,/ Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella.

[20] 10.50–51: Chalcidico quae sunt mihi condita versu/ carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor avena.

[21] 3.84: Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, musam.

[22] 7.69–70: haec memini, et victum frustra contendere Thyrsim./ ex illo Corydon Corydon est tempore nobis.

[23] 7.17: posthabui tamen illorum mea seria ludo. We may compare his use in 6.1 of *ludere versu* and in 1.10 of *ludere calamo agresti* for the writing or the rendering of pastoral: apparently *ludo* in Latin, unlike our English *play* for performing on an instrument, always implies a light performance (see further Horace, *Serm.* 1.10.37, *Carm.* 1.32.2 and 4.9.9; possibly also *Ep.* 1.1.10, 2.1.148, and 2.2.142, *A.P.* 226). Cf. Cartault 65 and note 1. But to press the words *ludus* and *ludo* with Herrmann (17 and note 4) so as to interpret the *Eclogues* as a *ludus* in the sense of a *jeu*, a *mascarade littéraire*, seems to me indefensible.

[24] 8.33–34: dumque tibi est odio mea fistula, dumque capellae/ hirsutumque supercilium promissaque barba.

[25] 8.55–56: certent et cycnis ululae, sit Tityrus Orpheus,/ Orpheus in silvis, inter delphinas Arion.

his fellow shepherds to be quoted by them—not merely by their author, as in 5—with admiration;[26] the grand verb *cano*, to which I shall revert directly, is used of them twice (19 and 26), and the fact that they avail nothing amid the weapons of war is not thought of as a disgrace (11–12). In 6 he still speaks somewhat deprecatingly of his early performance: his muse did not blush—as previously she might have done—to live in the woodlands and *ludere versu*,[27] and he would have liked to write epic:

cum canerem reges et proelia (3)—

here he uses the grander verb *cano*, which he is going to employ of his performance in producing the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*[28] (it is significant that at the end of the *Georgics* [4.565–66], surveying his *Bucolics* in retrospect, he uses of them not only *lusi* but *cecini* too). However, already in *Eclogue* 6 he uses *cano* of his pastorals also, for he asserts proudly (6.9): *non iniussa cano*. He is not singing

[26] But I believe that 9 contains an at least pretended excerpt from a considerably earlier poem of Vergil's (cf. *infra*, note 183) in which he assumes a much more modest tone—perhaps by way of gracefully softening the possibly almost arrogant assurance of the whole *Eclogue* in general, and of line 29 in particular, where he implies that the "singing swans" (*cantantes cycni*) certainly include himself, whereas in 36 he claims merely "to cackle among the musical swans like a goose." The lines are 32–36, which I would punctuate as follows:

incipe, si quid habes: "et me fecere poetam
Pierides, sunt et mihi carmina, me quoque dicunt
vatem pastores: sed non ego credulus illis.
nam neque adhuc Vario videor nec dicere Cinna
digna, sed argutos inter strepere anser olores."

Then this passage, which otherwise does not seem to have any connection with the rest of the poem (cf. Waltz 47 and 57, note 1), becomes another quotation from Menalcas, embodying, as do two of the others (23–25 and 39–43), an echo of Theocritus (respectively 7.37–41, 3.3–5, 11.42–49), whom Vergil imitated most frequently in his earlier poems. This interpretation has the advantage of accounting for *incipe* in 32, otherwise rather senseless, since Moeris had already given one quotation; it is the *beginning* of *this* special poem that Lycidas wants (that he has forgotten it, is made clear by his starting in the middle of a line). Moeris' *id* in the following passage (37) also acquires new meaning: "this song is precisely the one I'm trying to recall in my own mind, if only I could remember it." But apparently he fails, and so goes off to another well-known song in its stead, the one about Galatea, several lines of which he does succeed in recalling. Here again I would propose a new punctuation, as follows: id quidem ago et tacitus, Lycida, mecum ipse voluto,/ si valeam meminisse. neque est ignobile carmen:/ "huc ades, o Galatea. . . ." (The punctuation proposed by Leo, *H* 38.15—parentheses around *neque est ignobile*—is no longer necessary now that the difficulty which troubled him concerning *id* is obviated.)

[27] I spoke of this use of *ludere* above, note 23.

[28] *Georg.* 1.5, 12; 2.2, 176; 3.1; 4.119, 559; *Aen.* 1.1. He uses the kindred verb *canto* of Hesiod in *Ecl.* 6.71 (cf. 9.29).

without an order; his is a command performance, directed not by Varus, as some have thought he means,[29] but by Apollo himself. Consequently he is going to continue to woo a rustic muse on a humble reed:

agrestem tenui meditabor harundine musam (6.8).

This modest phrase recurs in 1, the *Eclogue* that I would put next in order:

silvestrem tenui musam meditaris avena (1.2);

but here the player may well take pride in his achievement, for he has accomplished, doubtless through his poems, what the singer of 9 could not: he has won the favor of a greater than Varus, Octavian himself. And so in 4, when he truly sounds a grander strain, he no longer, as in 6, dreams wistfully of a loftier form of poetry: he can *sing* (the verb *cano* occurs twice in the first three lines[30]) of the woodlands, too; let them be woodlands worthy of a consul—such as once he might have fancied no woodlands could be. He still, then, keeps to pastoral, but now he seems to be envisaging the writing of epic, which in 6 he feared he must renounce; he hopes to write of his miraculous babe's achievements, and if he does, he will surpass not only the pastoral god Pan, but Linus and Orpheus as well[31]—yes, even Orpheus, who in an earlier *Eclogue* (8) had been thought so far removed from Tityrus that their equation was considered as an utter reversal of nature.[32] In 10 he again *sings*, and to no deaf ears; the woodlands echo, and there is no longer in their mention any hint of deprecation;[33] his *carmina* are for Gallus, and are worthy to be read by the fastidious Lycoris; just as he ends his prologue, so he begins his epilogue with this same word *cano*.[34] As for the woodlands, Gallus himself will live in them; the author is not ashamed of his flock, and Gallus need not be, either; Gallus himself will turn from elegies to pastorals, and he will play a Sicilian reed:

carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor *avena* (51),

[29] Even so acute a critic as Rose fails to get this point (87).

[30] 4.1–3: Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora *canamus*!/ non omnis arbusta iuvant humilesque myricae;/ si *canimus* silvas, silvae sint consule dignae.

[31] 4.55–56: non me carminibus vincet nec Thracius Orpheus,/ nec Linus.

[32] 8.55–56, quoted above, note 25.

[33] 10.8: non canimus surdis, respondent omnia silvae.

[34] 10.70: haec sat erit, divae, vestrum cecinisse poetam.

which is no longer as in 1.2 characterized by the derogatory, or at least deprecatory, epithet *tenui*.[35]

In this attempted chronology I am not overlooking the fact that 8, which I am placing fairly early, is dated next to the last by the indisputable reference [36] to Pollio's triumph over the Parthini which took place in 39 B.C. But this reference is in a dedicatory passage which by no means seems an integral part of the poem. All Vergil's other dedications come at the opening of the *Eclogues*, and serve as genuine dedications thereto. 4 is dedicated to Pollio,[37] and is really connected with Pollio; 10 is dedicated to Gallus,[38] and is all about Gallus. 6, to be sure, is harder, because Gallus is glorified here, too (64–73), and yet the dedication is to Varus (1–12),[39] but at least the poem is so constructed that we cannot remove the dedication without damaging the structure: there would no longer, without this preliminary explanation, be any sense in the ensuing *pergite, Pierides* (13). But this dedication to Pollio is definitely peculiar in that it comes in second place, which, despite Cartault's acceptance of Vahlen's attempt to justify it by parallels from other authors,[40] is certainly unusual in Vergil, and in that it has no connection whatsoever with the subject matter of the poem, but seems rather to constitute an extraneous interpolation. It may have been provided for a particular copy of the *Eclogue* that was being sent to Pollio [41]—or possibly for a group of *Eclogues*, perhaps with 8 as the first, and 4 as the last, a supposition which would account for the much-discussed *a te principium, tibi desinet* (4.11).[42] The order in which these were arranged need not corre-

[35] Cf. *Georg.* 4.6; also Horace's use of the same word, to denote both light verse (*Carm.* 1.6.9 and 2.16.38, also perhaps 2.20.1; and cf. *A.P.* 203) and humble circumstances (*Serm.* 2.2.53 and 70, 2.4.9, 2.6.117; *Carm.* 2.16.14; *Ep.* 1.7.56, 1.20.20).

[36] 8.6–7: tu mihi seu magni superas iam saxa Timavi,/ sive oram Illyrici legis aequoris. Cf. Horace *Carm.* 2.1.15–16.

[37] 4.3; note: silvae sint consule dignae.

[38] Note especially 10.2–3 and 6.

[39] On this problem see below, 236.

[40] Cartault 289. Vahlen's work, referred to by him (289, note 2) as *Disputat. Vergil.*, I have not been able to see.

[41] Cf. the similar suggestion made below, 238, with regard to Gallus.

[42] However, perhaps this is not meant to be pressed. Cf. Theognis 1–4:

> ὦ ἄνα, Λητοῦς υἱέ, Διὸς τέκος, οὔποτε σεῖο
> λήσομαι ἀρχόμενος οὐδ' ἀποπαυόμενος,
> ἀλλ' αἰεὶ πρῶτον τε καὶ ὕστατον ἔν τε μέσοισιν
> ἀείσω· σὺ δέ μοι κλῦθι καὶ ἐσθλὰ δίδου.

spond either with the order of composition, or with the places ultimately given them in the whole collection.

Assuming as a working hypothesis the chronological order of the ten *Eclogues* suggested above, we are ready to consider not only the question whether the same name denoted the same person throughout the *Eclogues*,[43] but whether, in instances where this is clearly the case, any character development in a given personage may be traced from *Eclogue* to *Eclogue*. Tied up with this question is an even harder one, the question whether the pastoral figures represent real people.[44] The extreme proponent of this point of view is Herrmann, who in *Les Masques et les Visages dans les Bucoliques de Virgile* endeavors to prove not only that all the pastoral figures are *masques* but that he can recognize the true *visages* behind them. This is certainly dangerous doctrine, especially as it rests upon two untenable assumptions: (1) that the *Eclogues* as published are in chronological order (p. 14) [45]; (2) that there is a one-to-one correspondence between pseudonym and real individual (pp. 7–8).[46] Frank too, who does something of the same sort in his *Vergil*,[47] I find tempting but unconvincing. On the other hand, I would not go so far as Rose does in refusing to admit certain identifications just because they do not fit in all details: for instance, Tityrus in 1 cannot be Vergil because Tityrus is old and Vergil is young (p. 49); Daphnis in 5 cannot be Julius Caesar because Daphnis is a boy and Caesar is not (p. 133), and because Daphnis introduced the rites of Bacchus and Caesar did not (pp. 131–133). Surely a Vergilian parallel does not have to correspond point for point, any more than a Homeric simile; for instance, Aeneas is

[43] For an epitome of some views of this sort, see Herrmann 8, note 4.

[44] I certainly do not think they represent abstractions, as that in 1 Galatea and Amaryllis respectively stand for Mantua and Rome (Servius on 1.29) or the old regime and the new (Trapp *apud* Conington, Introduction to *Ecl.* 1, 1.22) or Antony's party and Octavian's (Norman Wentworth DeWitt, *Virgil's Biographia Litteraria* [Toronto, 1923] 124).

[45] Cf. *supra*, note 17.

[46] Thus if Menalcas is Vergil, as Herrmann believes he is, Tityrus or Meliboeus or Corydon cannot be Vergil (cf. 8, note 3; 47). But Tityrus simply must be Vergil in 6.4; and Herrmann's effort (41) to get out of this difficulty, which would destroy his entire thesis at one blow, is weak in the extreme (cf. *infra*, note 163). However, Rose's attempt at refutation (229, note 12) based on the usage of Theocritus is also weak, inasmuch as Herrmann's theory is applied only to Vergil.

[47] See especially 96–100, 115–118; also, for Horace, his article "On Horace's Controversies with the New Poets," in *Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps* (Princeton, 1936) 159–167.

undoubtedly meant to make us think of Augustus when he does certain things that Augustus is to do later, such as instituting the Actian games or the *ludus Troiae;*[48] but he does many other things which have no connection with Augustus.[49]

Hardly any one doubts[50] that the youth of 1 is Octavian; and I would assert categorically that if the babe of 4 is a mortal babe,[51] and Daphnis of 5 a mortal man, the one must be Octavian's child, and the other his adopted father; of no other human being does Vergil write in such extreme terms,[52] but parallels for the adulation of 4 and 5 may be found whenever it is a question of Julius or Augustus.[53] Perhaps it is not mere chance that we have allegorically depicted three successive generations of the imperial family: Octavian's father in the dead hero of 5, Octavian himself in the living *iuvenis* of 1, and Octavian's child in the still unborn *puer* of 4; I believe, furthermore, that the three poems were written in precisely this order.

I think we may safely dismiss the suggestion[54] that the child of 4 is Pollio's. Pollio's connection with the poem is that the birth is to take place during his consulship[55]—a signal honor indeed, especially in view of the Roman custom of naming a year from its

[48] See *Aen.* 3.280 and 5.602 respectively.

[49] Frank (75) actually thinks he may be Julius in Book 4. But in general he is purely the ideal hero; any parallelism with Augustus simply lends dignity to Augustus as a replica of the ideal hero rather than to Aeneas as a prototype of Augustus.

[50] Herrmann does (27, 43–44); he maintains that Tityrus' *deus* is Julius, not Octavian (44). But this is tied up with his surely untenable theory that the *Eclogue* that stands first in the edition was also first in order of composition (13–14), a view which he bases on utter trivialities: e.g., (13) 1 must precede 2 because in 1 Amaryllis is Tityrus' "compagne" (1.30) and Tityrus has chestnuts (1.81), whereas in 2.52 we hear that Amaryllis "used to like" chestnuts (52). As a matter of fact, if we are going to interpret so woodenly, a shrewish and fastidious person such as Amaryllis is represented to be (2.14–15) would have been most unlikely to fancy a dish which her husband could provide in abundance! But of course such refining is absurd.

[51] And if he is, I think he must be a particular one even though unspecified, not an undetermined one as Weber believes (79, note 1; see too Robinson *AJPh* 62.369).

[52] Note especially 4.15–16, 48–52; 5.56–57, 64–66, 79–80.

[53] For Julius, cf. *Ecl.* 9.46–49; *Georg.* 1.466–488; *Aen.* 6.834–835, perhaps 8.681 (cf. note 95). For Augustus, *Ecl.* 1.6–8, 42–43; *Georg.* 1.24–42, 498–504, 3.16–18; *Aen.* 1.286–290 (which doubtless, despite Servius, refers to Augustus rather than to Julius; cf. Conington *ad loc.*), 6.791–805, 8.678–681. (The glory of Augustus is likewise celebrated in *Georg.* 2.170–172, 3.46–48, 4.560–562, *Aen.* 8.714–728; but in terms suiting a human, not necessarily a divine, being.)

[54] Servius Dan. on *Ecl.* 4.11; for a list of later adherents of this view, see Cartault 231, note 1. Any one who feels that a refutation is needed is referred to Rose 197–200.

[55] 4.11–12. Cf. also *te duce* in 13.

consuls; Pollio's immortality is assured, since it will be said for all time that this miraculous baby was born *consule Pollione.* But there is no hint that he is the father.[56]

The claims of Marcellus to be the child are, as Rose says (p. 200), even weaker. The principal supporter, Herrmann,[57] is extremely unconvincing. He sets out with the indisputable assumption that the *Eclogue* shows the influence of Catullus 64, and from this proceeds to the absurd deduction that therefore the child of the *Eclogue* must be a complete parallel to the one of Catullus 64, namely Achilles (pp. 83–96).[58] Thus, because Achilles had a divine mother and a human father, Vergil's *puer* must have the same (p. 84). Julia is excluded, because she had a divine father and a human mother (p. 89); the child of Marcellus and Julia is excluded,[59] because *both* its parents are divine (p. 89).[60] But Marcellus fits the conditions perfectly.[61] It does not matter that his father was unimportant, for so was the father (Peleus) in Catullus 64, and so is the father in *Eclogue* 4 (pp. 94–95). (In saying this Herrmann ignores 17:

pacatumque reget patriis virtutibus orbem,

[56] Cartault (228) thinks Vergil intentionally left the matter vague, as a prophet ought to do; that if he had wanted to say *unequivocally* that Pollio was the father he would have written *tuis* instead of *patriis* in 17: pacatumque reget patriis virtutibus orbem; but that none the less *patriis* fits Pollio, for *pacatum* must refer to the peace of Brundisium. "Si donc Virgile n'a pas dit les choses clairement, c'était pour donner à sa prédiction des apparences mystérieuses; mais en même temps il s'est arrangé pour qu'on ne pût se méprendre sur ses intentions." This last statement is its own refutation: the diversity of interpretations proves that if such was really Vergil's aim he failed abjectly!

[57] For a list of earlier supporters, see Cartault 231, note 2.

[58] He reinforces this claim by showing (95–96) that the passage at the end of *Aen.* 6, which unquestionably refers to Marcellus, also has verbal echoes of Catullus 64; it does not occur to him that the same line of argument would force us to recognize in Marcellus the counterpart not only of Achilles but also of Catullus' brother, since surely in *Aen.* 6.884–886 we must recognize the influence of Catullus 101.3–4.

[59] This thesis, which is that of Schaper, is of course untenable on wholly different grounds; see Cartault 232.

[60] It will be noted that Herrmann calls any member of the Julian gens divine—Octavia, Julia, Marcellus. He explains this divinity with special reference to Octavia on the ground that she is descended from Jupiter through Venus (93). Cf. note 61.

[61] Herrmann (93, note 2) states that Horace in *Carm.* 1.12 also celebrates the deification of the young Marcellus; this statement is definitely wrong, for Horace in this *Ode*, as he specifically tells us in the first three lines, has a three-fold subject, men, demigods, and gods, and the reference to Marcellus (45–46) is in the part devoted to men, as is evident even in the case of Augustus himself, who is definitely a mortal *under* Jupiter (51–52: secundo Caesare, 57: te minor) and needing his care (50–51), not a god disguised as a mortal, as he is in 1.2 (41–52). Surely in the eyes of both Vergil and Horace, only the emperors are *divi*, not the other members of their family (cf. note 60).

and also 26–27:

> at simul heroum laudes et facta parentis
> iam legere et quae sit poteris cognoscere virtus.[62])

Neither does it matter (p. 94) that the birth of Octavian's nephew should be celebrated in such glowing terms when Octavian was expecting a child of his own, inasmuch as Octavian was himself Julius' nephew. (That is utterly irrelevant, since Julius had no son to put ahead of Octavian.) And the fact that Marcellus' mother married Antony, who thus became his adopted father,[63] brings Antony into the picture and thus makes the *puer* "the living symbol" (pp. 93–94) of the reconciliation of Octavian and Antony achieved by the Peace of Brundisium. (But surely this reconciliation is adequately emphasized by the prominence given to Antony's emissary and agent Pollio, who had more to do with the actual pact than Antony himself.)

Finally, even granted—what I cannot grant—that the above arguments in favor of taking Marcellus as the *puer* have weight, Marcellus is out of the picture because, having died in 23 [64] at the age of twenty, he must have already been three years old at the time of this poem which supposedly celebrated his birth. Herrmann chooses to accept Servius' testimony [65] that he was in his eighteenth year when he died rather than that of Propertius [66] that

[62] Herrmann has a particularly puerile comment on this passage (103–104): he suggests that the child's stepfather Antony—or his adopted father, as Herrmann calls him rather prematurely—will talk only about himself, and Octavia will not dare tell the child openly about his own father, so the boy will have to have recourse to *reading* about the (practically non-existent!) exploits of the latter. Aside from the sin of imputing to Vergil the tastelessness and tactlessness of suggesting a domestic feud of this sort, Herrmann is guilty of the still greater sin of absolutely failing to appreciate the exquisite way in which Vergil depicts the successive stages of the child's development: as a baby, he receives beautiful flowers (charming *munuscula* charmingly described) for his amusement and milk in abundance for his nourishment, and is protected against the dangers of poisonous plants and snakes that menace the unwary ignorance and curiosity of an infant (18–25); as a boy, old enough to read about deeds of courage, he will be spared the drudgery of distasteful agricultural "chores," but there still exists the opportunity for heroic adventure such as he has learned about eagerly in books (26–36); as a mature man he will live in a thoroughly civilized world (as Vergil professes to see it) free of commerce between nations and presumably of wars, as well as of the need for agriculture of any kind or arts and crafts (37–45).

[63] Cf. note 62.

[64] Herrmann himself regards this date as certain (99; see the references cited by him, *ibid.*, note 2).

[65] On *Aen.* 6.861: hic sexto decimo anno incidit in valetudinem et periit octavo decimo.

[66] 3.18.15: occidit, et misero steterat vicesimus annus.

he was in his twentieth, but surely he is wrong in assuming (p. 99) that the testimony of a long-subsequent commentator is as valuable as that of a contemporary—especially when the contemporary is a court poet like Propertius, who surely must have been writing with the bereaved imperial household in view, and would not have been guilty of a careless disregard for accuracy that under the circumstances could not but seem both callous and insulting.[67]

There have also been attempts to identify the *puer* with a real child, not a stepchild, of Antony's;[68] but I think that Rose is right in rejecting these (p. 207)[69] on the ground that Vergil belonged to Octavian's party and would not even after the reconciliation have hailed Octavian's rival Antony as "the beneficent master of the world."

Rose believes, as I do,[70] that the baby's father is Octavian, but he thinks the baby's mother is left uncertain (pp. 211–212). This would seem singularly tactless, since Octavian was certainly married to Scribonia in the latter part of the year of Pollio's consulship,[71] when we are probably to date the poem.[72] Rose thinks Julia could not have been born or even conceived as early as the poem was written (p. 210), or indeed at any time in the year 40, since

[67] In view of such specific and surely authentic testimony on Propertius' part, Herrmann's elaborate attempt to prove that Marcellus was younger than Tiberius (100–102) becomes irrelevant and futile.

[68] See Rose 204–208 for a rapid survey of these.

[69] So, much earlier, Nettleship 47.

[70] Cf. *supra*, 206. Proponents of the view that the baby is Julia are listed by Cartault 231, note 3 and by Herrmann 89, note 2.

[71] *Vid. infra*, note 82.

[72] Most critics assume that the poem followed the Peace of Brundisium, which probably was made in September (see Kromayer, *H* 29.560–561). Rose, who thinks it did not, believes with Norden (6–7) that it was written before January, 40, in time for the beginning of Pollio's consulship (179); to be sure, he offers as an alternative date one nine or ten months later (187), but considers the later date doubtful because Vergil "speaks as if a good deal of Pollio's consulship was still to pass, and Pollio, it is well known, retired before the year was up" (188). Aside from the fact that Vergil, despite his role of prophet, could hardly have foreseen the retirement, I question any indication in the poem to support Rose: Vergil puts the birth of the child in Pollio's consulship (11), and this is treated as imminent (note *aderit iam tempus* in 48, as well as the earlier use of *iam* in 6 and 7). Furthermore, Rose's emphasis on the fact that "Pollio, it is well known, retired before the year was up" is misleading, since the very passage in Dio, 48.32.1–2, that he cites as authority therefor (259, note 76) makes it clear that the enforced retirement of praetors and consuls, and their replacement by others, took place very near, indeed only "a few days" before, the end of the year (a dead aedile was replaced on the very last day of the year, *ibid.* 3). Note 32.1: *τούς τε στρατηγοὺς καὶ τοὺς ὑπάτους, καίπερ ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ ἤδη τοῦ ἔτους ὄντος, παύσαντες ἄλλους ἀντικατέστησαν, βραχὺ φροντίσαντες εἰ καὶ ἐπ' ὀλίγας ἡμέρας ἄρξουσι.*

he sets October, 39 as the earliest possible date for her birth. His line of reasoning is as follows (p. 264, note 162): Scribonia's divorce on the day (*αὐθημερόν*) of Julia's birth [73] was followed directly (*statim*) by Octavian's marriage to Livia,[74] and that could not have been before November 16, 39 B.C., inasmuch as it was supposed to have taken place when Tiberius, born November 16, 42,[75] was three years old.[76] As a matter of fact, there is evidence in Dio, which it is strange Rose did not cite, that the marriage took place very early in 38; it is the first event recorded for that year.[77] But if we are to trust Dio at all, we must assume that either his own *αὐθημερόν* or Suetonius' *statim* or both cannot be taken literally; [78] for the break with Scribonia is reported almost equally early among the events of 39.[79] Unless Dio, in mentioning this when he does, is anticipating to an unusual degree, the divorce was at or near the beginning of 39; then Julia's birth, if *αὐθημερόν* is not stressed, may have occurred at the close of 40, and in any case so early in 39 [80] as to justify Vergil's expectation that it would or might take place in 40 under Pollio.[81] The question next arises, whether the marriage

[73] Dio 48.34.3: *τὴν Σκριβωνίαν τεκοῦσάν οἱ θυγάτριον ἀπεπέμψατο αὐθημερόν.*

[74] Suetonius *Aug.* 62: mox Scriboniam in matrimoniam accepit. . . . cum hac quoque divortium fecit, . . . ac statim Liviam Drusillam matrimonio Tiberi Neronis et quidem praegnantem abduxit.

[75] Suetonius *Tib.* 5: natus est Romae in Palatio XVI. Kal. Dec. M. Aemilio Lepido iterum L. Munatio Planco consulibus per bellum Philippense.

[76] Velleius Paterculus 2.94.1: Ti. Claudius Nero, quo trimo . . . Livia . . . Caesari nupserat.

[77] Dio 48.44.1: *ταῦτά τε οὖν τότε ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ Καῖσαρ τὴν Λιουίαν ἔγημεν.* This date is regularly accepted. See, e.g., Alfred von Domaszewski, *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiser* 1.114; Guglielmo Ferrero, *The Greatness and Decline of Rome* (tr. by Zimmern and Chaytor) 3.281 (Ferrero puts the divorce in 38 too, without explaining why); M. P. Charlesworth, *Cambridge Ancient History* 10.57 (Charlesworth actually assigns a precise date for the marriage, Jan. 17; in this he is following Carcopino, *Revue Historique* 161.225); *RE* 13.902.

[78] Perhaps they are merely prompted by sensationalism (cf. Skutsch 157), or by the sort of moral indignation that occasioned Hamlet's "the funeral baked meats/ Did coldly furnish forth the marriage tables."

[79] We hear that the senate ratified the acts of the triumvirs and imposed taxes, apparently in part to provide for the entertainment in honor of Octavian's shaving off his beard, and that after that he remained clean shaven, because he was beginning to be in love with Livia, as a result of which he divorced Scribonia after Julia's birth (48.34.1–3).

[80] The date regularly given, e.g., Hermann Schiller, *Geschichte der Römischen sKaiser* 1.183, note 2: Ferrero (*op. cit.*, note 77) 4.179; V. Gardthausen, *Augustus und eine Zeit* 2.368, 1096, 1098; *RE* 10.896.

[81] The actual fact that Pollio did not continue as consul throughout 40 (cf. note 72) is as unpredictable and therefore irrelevant as the fact that Julia proved to be a *puella* and not a *puer*.

to Scribonia took place early enough in 40 to make this possible. Rose, without giving his reasons or authorities, assigns this marriage to the *summer* of 40 (p. 210)—so, too, Weber (p. 79, note 1)—, but Skutsch argues for setting it in the *spring* (p. 157); [82] and if this is correct, Julia's birth, or at least the expectation of it, can be assigned to the same year.

Her sex would not matter; any prophet describing the birth of a child before the event, as Vergil clearly was doing,[83] has to take an even chance on that; and *puer* includes both sexes, just as do French *enfant* and English *baby* and *child*. Nor would her later ill-conduct matter; certainly Marcellus would much better have fulfilled the promise of the *Eclogue* than his notorious cousin and wife, but once more we can hardly expect Vergil to be so true a prophet.

Norden's theory (pp. 14–46) that the wonder-baby is Aion is indeed, as Rose says (p. 178), ingeniously and learnedly expounded; and I am quite willing to believe that Vergil actually did have cognizance of some mystic Oriental myths and beliefs, and introduced their imagery into his poem.[84] But I think he was applying

[82] Ancient historians being so chary of precise dates, modern ones have naturally hesitated to commit themselves. Of those that I have consulted, only Ferrero (*op. cit.*, note 77) hazards a guess as to the month; he suggests August (3.251). But we really have no adequate data. Appian (*Bel. Civ.* 5.52) tells us that Antony set out from Alexandria in the spring (ἦρι) of 40. What happened thereafter was as follows, according to Appian *ibid.* 5.52–53 (Dio 48.15–16 is similar but less detailed): Antony went to Tyre and then to Athens, where he met his wife Fulvia and his mother Julia, and on hearing their stories came out on Sextus Pompey's side; Octavian, on hearing this, was much concerned, especially as Antony and Pompey had the sea power that he lacked; and to win back Pompey he asked Maecenas to arrange his marriage with Scribonia, the sister of Libo, Pompey's father-in-law. Presumably this was done quickly, since Libo was also eager for the match, according to 5.53: ὁ Λίβων ἐπέστελλε τοῖς οἰκείοις ἐγγυᾶν αὐτὴν τῷ Καίσαρι προθύμως. How rapidly had the previous events moved? Appian (5.53) dates Octavian's concern as following his return from Gaul, and Kromayer (*H* 29.562) puts Octavian in Gaul as late as July; but the latter according to Skutsch (157) believes that Octavian must have begun to worry as early as the fall of Perusia in February.

[83] Note especially the future tenses *desinet, surget, inibit, incipient* (4.9–12). In 8–10, *nascenti puero . . . fave Lucina* can of course refer to the future quite as well as to the present. The later imperatives, in lines 48, 50, 52, and 60, are a little different, for here the prophet seems to be seeing in his mind's eye that which has not yet happened; but that it has not yet happened is proved, in my opinion, by *aderit iam tempus* (48), which shows that the birth, though thought of for the moment as imminent (cf. note 72), is still only prospective.

[84] This would of course account for the parallels with the Old Testament Messianic predictions, which would ultimately go back to the same Oriental sources. Cf. Rose's very sensible discussion, 194.

them to the case of a real baby that he had in mind. Rose holds the mother is too human to suit Norden's theory (p. 209); I am not sure of that, for divine mothers are often presented as very "human" in classical mythology and literature.[85] But what seems to me really significant is the reference to the father who has brought the world *peace* (4.17); surely the one who did that in that year is Octavian. Brundisium in 40 B.C. must have brought to huge numbers the same relief and joy—with as little realization of their vanity—as did Munich in 1938 A.D.; [86] and the reconciliation of Octavian and Antony would be hailed by Vergil in a poem that united Antony's representative as a leader—note *te duce* (13) as well as *te consule* (11)—and Octavian himself as the sire of divine offspring.[87] If we recall the yearning with which Anchises in the *Aeneid* implores Julius Caesar to take the initiative in making peace with Pompey,[88] we can understand Vergil's feelings here toward Octavian who actually did meet his rival halfway.

As for Daphnis, he is much too similar to Octavian [89] to be a mere mortal, even a mortal very dear to Vergil such as his close

[85] Skutsch is troubled by the mother's physical suffering during her pregnancy (150). But I think Herrmann is right in discounting this difficulty (92, note 5); he cites the case of Thetis, and might have mentioned that of Leto (note especially Theognis 5–6).

[86] Rose, with unusual lack of acumen, belittles the importance of the Peace: "it is by no means plain that the pact, when signed, was greeted with much enthusiasm, since it did not result in the peace that had been hoped for, at least in the most welcome effect of peace, a fall in the price of food in Italy, for the activities of Sextus Pompeius went on as vigorously as ever" (188). But I agree rather with Cartault, who says of the Peace (213): "on serait tenté à distance de n'y voir qu'un fait de médiocre importance, qui régla pour un temps les rapports d'Octave et d'Antoine et recula de neuf années le choc inévitable. Les contemporains en jugèrent autrement; ils crurent à une pacification définitive." The failure of the pact could not have been evident immediately; and indeed Dio, whom Rose cites as authority (260, note 77) for the opinion just quoted, tells us specifically (48.31.2) that the people were pleased at the reconciliation of Antony and Octavian though distressed that the war with Pompey continued.

[87] Cf. *supra*, 208. But I still insist that we expect the child to be Octavian's and not Antony's (cf. *supra*, 209).

[88] *Aen.* 6.834–835: tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo,/ proice tela manu, sanguis meus!

[89] Note especially the impressive repetition of *deus* in 5.64 and 1.6–7; the association with this *deus* of *otia* in 5.61 and 1.6; the provision of altars and the promise of sacrifice in 5.65–71 and 1.7–8 and 42–43; the pledge of eternal remembrance by means of an illustrative series, *dum . . . dum . . . dum . . . dum* in 5.76–78, *ante . . . ante . . . quam* in 1.59–63 (observe also *semper* in 5.74 and 1.7, as well as *quotannis* in 5.79 and 1.42). We may also compare 5.80: damnabis tu quoque votis, with *Georg.* 1.42: votis iam nunc adsuesce vocari, and *Aen.* 1.290: vocabitur hic quoque votis (of Augustus).

friend Quintilius Varus or his own brother, or a mortal endowed with poetic gifts such as Catullus or Cornificius.

The first two identifications, which are mentioned respectively by Servius (on *Eclogue* 5.20) and by Suetonius (14), are probably due respectively to the confusion of Horace's poem of mourning on Quintilius [90] with this one, and of Horace himself with Vergil's brother.[91] Actually, Quintilius died much too late; [92] and no obscure brother of Vergil's, even if he had one named Flaccus, could justify such extravagant language.[93]

The identification with Catullus comes from Herrmann, who, as often, is ingenious in his attempt to prove his point (e.g., in his suggestion [p. 113] that the lines to Daphnis in *Eclogue* 9 [94] constitute at once an allusion to Catullus' references to stars and an appeal to him to make peace with Caesar [95]), but so overanxious to do so that he employs desperate expedients to bolster up a cherished but really quite untenable theory. Thus he strives to harmonize chronology by trying to prove (pp. 113–116), by means of really plausible arguments, that Catullus lived till 47, which he considers the "date de l'action" of *Eclogue* 5 (p. 174): but since in accordance with another cherished principle of his, [96] the "date de composition" cannot be earlier than 39, we have the anomaly of a supposedly heartfelt threnody written eight years after the death that it is intended to commemorate. An even greater difficulty results from another *idée fixe* of his: [97] if the Daphnis in 5 is Catullus, so must be

[90] *Carm.* 1.24. Cf. *infra*, note 208.

[91] This is the ingenious suggestion of Rose 125.

[92] 24 B.C. according to Jerome (*vid. infra*, note 218).

[93] E.g., being placed beside Phoebus, 66.

[94] 9.46–47: Daphni, quid antiquos signorum suspicis ortus?/ ecce Dionaei processit Caesaris astrum.

[95] This implies that at least this quotation from Menalcas is an excerpt from a real poem actually written by Vergil—something which is possible but lacking in evidence (cf. *infra*, note 148). It also requires the assumption (Herrmann 116–117 and 117, note 1) that *Caesaris astrum* is not necessarily the comet that appeared after Caesar's death (cf. *Georg.* 1.488; also Suetonius *Jul.* 88 and Plutarch *Caes.* 69.3) but the planet Venus. This again is possible. The epithet *Dionaei*, while it may merely be meant to refer to Caesar's divinity, none the less certainly suits the planet better than the comet, as does *Idalio* in Propertius 4.6.59: at pater Idalio miratur Caesar ab astro; *Iulium sidus* in Horace *Carm.* 1.12.47 can refer to either; so too *patrium sidus* in *Aen.* 8.681, where it will mean "his father's star" if it refers to the comet, perhaps rather "his fathers' star" if it refers to the planet.

[96] That the *Eclogues* are arranged in chronological order. Cf. *supra*, notes 17 and 50.

[97] That the same name always refers to the same person. Cf. *supra*, note 46.

the one in the second part of 8. He tries to prove this (p. 113) first, by the fact that Alphesiboeus' song uses refrains as Catullus did in 62 and 64, which is utterly irrelevant, as Damon's song does too; and second, by the fact that Catullus also imitated the *Simaetha* of Theocritus. But, even granted that he did so, that is not enough: if Daphnis is Catullus, then the enchantress cannot be merely the subject of a poem by Catullus, she must be a real woman who loved, lost, and won back Catullus, or Herrmann's whole theory crashes, as he should have realized. Did Lesbia, too, then live on till 47,[98] and did she at that late date have a change of heart and set about winning back her quondam lover? Or is this some successful female successor of hers?

The identification with Cornificius is a suggestion of Frank's (pp. 116–118). His attempt to prove his theory is less objectionable than Herrmann's, simply because he does not try so hard, but merely sets it forth without involving himself in a mesh of arguments that usually cannot be proved and that often can be disproved. Rose, who finds the theory attractive, none the less concludes that "the lack of any positive evidence for it" constitutes an objection (p. 126).

Rose himself believes [99] that Daphnis is simply Daphnis, the ideal shepherd. In this connection we may note a detail which at first sight seems to support him: namely, that Theocritus also has a lament for Daphnis, the ideal shepherd (1.64–142). This is possibly significant, because in general Vergil either borrows a name from Theocritus with a change of personage, or borrows a personage from Theocritus with a change of name.[100] However, Theocritus' Daphnis is really far more Vergil's Gallus in *Eclogue* 10 than his Daphnis in *Eclogue* 5; the latter rather resembles Adonis in *Idyll* 15 (and also in Bion 1). The Daphnis of *Eclogue* 5, like Adonis and unlike the Daphnis of *Idyll* 1, is the type of the Oriental vegetation-

[98] Herrmann's "date de l'action" of 8 as well as of 5 (174).

[99] 134–138. So, earlier, Cartault 178–179.

[100] This statement is borne out by a study of Cartault's interesting analysis of names in Theocritus and Vergil, 409–424, which confirms my rule though it does not formulate it. The only possible exception would seem to be Amaryllis (Cartault 416–417), and here the parallelism is by no means close. The parallels in *Ecl.* 9 (Amaryllis and Tityrus in 22–25, borrowed from *Id.* 3.1–5, and Galatea in 39, borrowed from *Id.* 11.42) do not count, for these are mere studies obviously designed as translations, and need not represent independent songs at all. Herrmann is certainly right in his acceptance of the view that Vergil uses Theocritus' names *ad suum arbitrium* (8, note 1).

god who dies and is reborn. This may have a bearing on the question of the possible identification of Daphnis with Caesar, since it makes natural the reference to another divinity of the same sort, namely Bacchus (5.30–31),[101] and that plays an important part in the controversy.[102] Bacchus is suitably introduced on other grounds also, for even if not a strictly pastoral deity, he is a rural one; he and Ceres appear again jointly in *Georg.* 1.7 [103] as the patrons of the rustics, and in *Eclogue* 5 we hear that the farmers are to worship Daphnis just as they do Bacchus and Ceres (79–80). Herrmann (p. 108) and Rose (pp. 131–133) believe this reference to the rites of Bacchus is an insuperable obstacle to an identification of Daphnis with Caesar, because they deny that Caesar had anything to do with such rites. Very likely Caesar had little direct connection with Bacchus; on the other hand Augustus is often compared with Bacchus because of his beneficent aid to man,[104] and the same might apply to Caesar. But, at all events, if the introduction of Bacchus adds something to the picture of Daphnis, as I think it does, then in my opinion it is sufficiently accounted for, even if it had no parallel at all in the case of Caesar. (Cf. *supra*, 205.)

Rose is also troubled because Daphnis is a boy and Caesar a mature man (p. 133); Herrmann (p. 108) and Frank (p. 116) also think that the prototype of Daphnis must be a poet, and Herrmann (p. 108) insists on his being handsome as well; and all three of them object to the introduction of Daphnis' mother because Caesar's is dead.[105] Daphnis' youth, beauty, and poetic gifts are mere embellishments inseparable from him and not necessarily to be applied to Caesar; but the introduction of another figure in the person of his mother may cause difficulties if she has no parallel in the allegory. However, surely she has: Daphnis' mother is a nymph; and just as the boy Daphnis is raised to a higher plane in becoming the *imperator* Caesar, so is the nymph elevated into a goddess, Venus herself. Herrmann and Rose [106] both refer to this possible way out, Herrmann rejecting it, but Rose admitting that it is not

[101] Also to the Armenian tigers (29), who may stand simply for the East in general, and to the Punic lions (27), who may suggest the Carthaginian and thus the Phoenician Astarte, so intimately connected with Adonis.

[102] Cf. *supra*, 205, and *infra*, 218.

[103] Cf. their juxtaposition in *Georg.* 2.229 also.

[104] Note especially *Aen.* 6.804–805; and compare Horace *Carm.* 1.12.21–22, 3.3.13–15.

[105] Herrmann 109, Frank 116, Rose 130–131.

[106] *Loc. cit.*, note 105.

impossible. Indeed, he is fair enough to point out that the mother of Daphnis behaves as the mistress of Adonis does in Bion 1, and she is Aphrodite.[107] Now this seems to me of tremendous importance. It was well known that Aphrodite loved Adonis; why should Vergil change the relationship of the sorrowing female in his model or models from lover to mother if there were not a special point in the new connection? [108] Any reader familiar with Theocritus and Bion—as, of course, Vergil could presume his readers to be—would expect this female figure to be Venus; if she suddenly has shifted to a mother, it can only be because the departed is Venus' son, and there Vergil has with his usual delicacy and subtlety given us the key to the whole poem! The clew is strengthened by the fact that Caesar's statue had been placed in the temple of Venus Genetrix. Thus what seemed to the commentators cited above a difficult if not irrefutable argument against the identification of Daphnis and Caesar, really becomes, if I am right, a most cogent piece of evidence in its favor.

There is another reason for taking *Eclogue* 5 as symbolic, and that is its juxtaposition with, and its similarity to, *Eclogue* 4, which all critics agree is symbolic, even if they are not agreed as to what it symbolizes. The two poems jointly constitute a complete cycle: first the birth and life of a divine being, then his death and resurrection.[109] That the two songs of *Eclogue* 5, one on the death and the other on the resurrection of Daphnis, are pendants, is of course universally recognized, but that each also is in close relationship with *Eclogue* 4, I think has not been specifically pointed out.[110] The description of Daphnis' death is in clear contrast, not

[107] But Rose (135) himself takes the mother as just a nymph, and declares that the gods she reproaches (5.23) specifically include Aphrodite and Eros, which would of course be out of the question if she herself actually was the former. Reproaches to Amor if not to Venus are common enough in the *Eclogues* (see 8.47–50, 10.28–30), but it is significant that neither divinity is named here; and I feel sure that by *deos* as by *astra* Vergil is referring merely to the whole group of ruling powers that determined Daphnis' sad end. (Presumably those who attribute responsibility to the one group will deny it to the other if they are logical, but a bereft mother is not supposed to be logical.)

[108] It might be argued that Venus, having caused Daphnis' death in *Id.* 1, can hardly be represented as mourning for him, but Vergil has no hint of this story; cf. note 180.

[109] This may help account for the order in which the two *Eclogues* stand in the edition, which is assuredly not the order of composition.

[110] They are even of about the same length, the part of *Ecl.* 4 devoted specifically to the *puer* (i.e., with the introductory address to Pollio excluded) consisting of 49 lines, and the two Daphnis songs jointly of 50; but this may be pure chance.

only with that of his resurrection, but with that of the birth of the *puer*: compare the mother smiling at her new-born baby or comforted by his smile [111] (4.60–63) and the mother weeping over her dead son (5.22–23); the return of the gods (4.6) and their departure (5.35); the spread of flowers, the growth of grapes on brambles, and finally full production, all without cultivation (4.18–20, 29, 39–41), and the replacement of cultivated crops by sterile plants and thorns (5.36–39); also note the use of *decus* to describe both the *puer* and Daphnis (4.11; 5.34). But Daphnis' resurrection completes the cycle and brings us back to the happy conditions that prevail at the baby's birth: peace and security among animals, and therefore presumably ultimately among men (4.22; 5.60–61); and joyous participation by the whole world of nature in the glorious celebration, set forth in two of the grandest passages Vergil ever wrote (4.50–52 and 5.62–64 [112]). Also note the personal touch in both: a direct and specific seven-line reference to the poet's own part in the glorification (4.53–59; 5.67–73); and a direct personal appeal for favor:

incipe, parve puer, risu cognoscere matrem (4.60)

and

sis bonus o felixque tuis (5.65).

All this is pure chance if the *puer* is Pollio's child or Aion, or if Daphnis is Catullus or Cornificius or just Daphnis: but it gains tremendous cumulative power if both are members of Octavian's immediate family, one his child, and the other his adopted father. Indeed, since the glorification of the child is later than that of the father, it is almost as if the older generation were being revived and renewed in the younger one.

In any consideration of *Eclogues* 4 and 5, account must also be taken of 6. Here, too, we have a miraculous and magical world, peopled by superhuman beings and semihuman beasts: Silenus and Aegle instead of Apollo and Lucina of 4, or of Apollo and Pales, Pan and the Dryads of 5; wild creatures that dance in time to music instead of goats that come home of their own accord in 4, and lions that roar their grief in 5.[113] To be sure, there is now

[111] Depending on the reading of 62.

[112] There are even verbal parallelisms in these—*laetentur* (4.52) and *laetitia* (5.62); effective repetition, *aspice . . . aspice* in 4, *ipsi . . . ipsae . . . ipsa* in 5.

[113] The specific references are to 4.10, 21–22; 5.35, 59, 27; 6.14, 20–22, 27–28. Cf. too the talking and rejoicing woods of 5 (28, 58) and the nodding trees of 6 (28).

gaiety instead of grandeur, so that, following as it does the solemn chants of birth, death, and resurrection in 4 and 5, 6 gives the effect of a satyr-play after a tragic trilogy; but it still has its own moments of elevation and exaltation in its Lucretian account of the creation of the world (31–40). If it can be shown, as I think it can, that Silenus as well as the wonder-child and Daphnis is the symbolization of a real human being, we have still another point of contact for the three *Eclogues*.[114]

I am quite willing to accept the identification, as old as Servius and as recent as Tenney Frank, of Siro with Silenus.[115] This is made even more likely by the fact not only that the two names begin with the same sound but that the one occurrence of Silenus' name in the *Eclogue* (line 14) is in the form *Silenum*, the single case in which the two names also end with the same sound as well as being metrical equivalents.[116] The roisterous, lustful,[117] drunken old satyr, mild and charming though he is, seems at first sight hardly a parallel for the revered philosopher; but after all in this fairyland sylvan world [118] of nymphs and fauns [119] where garlands serve as fetters and trees and wild beasts keep time to music, the only suitable representative of the austere teaching profession is precisely Silenus, tutor of the woodland deity Bacchus.[120] Also, there is the additional circumstance that for Vergil's readers, as

[114] It is argued below (239–240) that the three constitute a triad framed by the two strictly pastoral triads 1–3 and 7–9.

[115] Servius on *Ecl.* 6.13: vult exsequi sectam Epicuream, quam didicerant tam Vergilius quam Varus, docente Sirone; et quasi sub persona Sileni Sironem inducit loquentem, Chromin et Mnasyllon se et Varum vult accipi. Frank 96. Herrmann's objection that Siro cannot be Silenus because he is not a poet (129) is on a par with his similar objection in regard to the identification of Caesar with Daphnis (cf. *supra*, 215).

[116] In general Vergil's pseudonyms, if pseudonyms they be, do not correspond metrically with the originals; but there is no other parallel that seems to me so marked, or so clearly intended to be pressed, as this one.

[117] Note line 26.

[118] Observe that Vergil has at the outset (*silvas* in line 2) definitely localized his scene in the woodlands.

[119] Note *faunos* in 27. Some have thought that Chromis and Mnasyllus are also young satyrs rather than shepherds; but their timidity (20), while possibly meant to be a very distant representation of the respect Siro's pupils felt for him, suggests that they are mere mortals. Also, Leo (23), probably with justice, takes the close of the *Eclogue* (lines 85–86) as applying to them, and proving that they are shepherds.

[120] Cf. Ovid *Met.* 11, where Silenus is the *altor* (101) and Bacchus the *alumnus* (99). This incidentally gives the poem another point of contact with *Ecl.* 5 (cf. *supra*, 215).

for us, mention of Silenus is dignified by literary associations with a greater teacher and philosopher than Siro.[121]

If Silenus is Siro, then presumably Chromis and Mnasyllus are Varus [122] and Vergil; Aegle we cannot hope to identify, but doubtless she did not lack for counterparts. And Frank's suggestion that the song of Silenus represents an Epicurean lecture of Siro heard by Varus and Vergil (p. 97) [123] seems to me a singularly happy one, inasmuch as it aptly reconciles the seeming disparity of the two divisions of the song, scientific and mythological.[124] Frank (pp. 98–99) thinks each myth corresponds to one of Siro's philosophical themes, but in that case the description of the creation of the world in straightforward Epicurean language, with no recourse to the cosmogonic and theogonic tales that certainly were ready to hand, seems unsymmetrical, and I would rather propose that the particular myths were introduced for the sake of the ridiculous, repulsive, or cruel element that is prominent in each—as Lucretius chose the tragic Iphigenia story to prove his point:

tantum religio potuit suadere malorum.[125]

But Vergil's natural grace and tenderness lead him to beautify the ugly, soften the harsh, and refine the savage, so that we get a sympathetic and poetic picture rather than the unpleasant impression which a hostile Epicurean critic might have desired to convey.[126]

[121] Plato *Symp.* 215 B.

[122] I.e., Quintilius Varus, Vergil's fellow-student under Siro. Cf. *infra*, 233–236.

[123] To insist that the prototype of Aegle must have listened to the lecture too would be a piece of mechanical-minded absurdity—but I think no worse than the commentators' insistence on finding a parallel in Caesar's life for introducing Bacchic rites or driving teams of tigers!

[124] This disparity has troubled critics, e.g., Conington on 6.41–60 and Page on 6.41. Conington adds that "there seems to be no principle in the choice of the legends." Similarly Cartault, having presented two early attempts to find unity in the poem only to refute them (267–269), after giving an analysis of the song concludes that it has no "pensée maîtresse" (285). And Skutsch says of the myths (31): "vergebens sucht der Leser zunächst nach ihrer inneren Verknüpfung" (he, however, has a unifying theory of his own, to which I shall revert later, 236–238). Herrmann's view, that the cosmogonic part merely serves as an introduction to the legends (131), seems to me utterly wrong and singularly imperceptive.

[125] This explanation does not account for the Gallus part, which I find troublesome. Cf. *infra*, 236 and 238.

[126] In somewhat the same way years later he doubtless meant to present Dido and Turnus as reprehensible menaces to his hero's divine mission, but finishes up, perhaps in spite of himself, by making the average reader more inclined to sympathize with them than with the menaced hero (cf. Hahn, *TAPhA* 56 [1925] 204–212).

In 6, then, Vergil is Chromis or Mnasyllus. He has also been thought to be Corydon, Tityrus, and Menalcas.

The identification with Corydon [127] is based on the tradition that Vergil was in love with the young slave Alexander,[128] whom he represents as Alexis the beloved of Corydon in 2 and 7. Alexis may be Alexander,[129] but I doubt that Corydon in either poem is Vergil. Corydon in 2, the uncouth swain based on the still more uncouth Cyclops of *Idylls* 6 and 11, is a joke: note particularly his probably false boasts of great wealth (19–22), his naive description of his own good looks (25–27),[130] his doubtless vain attempt to arouse the scornful Alexis' jealousy (43–44), his descent from his initial threat of suicide (7) to a final decision to live and love another day (73). It is part of the skill of both Theocritus and Vergil that they make their unhappy lovers pathetic as well as amusing; but still I question whether, if Vergil had really at the time of writing participated in the passion that he attributed to Corydon, he could have reached sufficient detachment to realize and represent so clearly the humorous side of his own behavior.[131] On the other hand Corydon in 7 is perhaps too successful; if Vergil would not make himself as funny as the earlier Corydon, neither would he have made himself as triumphant as the later, reigning supreme as undisputed victor forevermore.[132]

On the other hand Tityrus and Menalcas both seem to me to be Vergil.

The best point to begin a study of these two figures is with the two *Eclogues* in which they figure most prominently, respectively 1 and 9. This requires a consideration of the obviously close but none the less uncertain relationship of these two particular poems to each other.

[127] Herrmann's argument against it (47–48), that Corydon at the close of *Ecl.* 2 (69–73) is addressed by Vergil and therefore cannot be Vergil, seems to me worthless. Certainly Corydon is talking *to* himself there precisely as he does above in 56–57 (so, too, Meliboeus in 1.73), while in 65 he talks *of* himself. These rapid changes of person conform well with his mood. Herrmann's assertion (48) that "en se résignant à changer d'Alexis, Corydon démentirait les vers où il vient de proclamer sa passion sans limite" shows an utter failure to get the humor of the situation.

[128] Suetonius 9, Servius on *Ecl.* 2.15. Cf. also Martial 6.68.5–6, 8.55.11–12, 8.73.10.

[129] In that case might *domini* in line 2 be Vergil? But cf. *infra*, 230.

[130] Such a boast is even more ludicrous, of course, when put into the mouth of the monster Polyphemus (Theocritus 6.34–38).

[131] Horace could do it (*Epod.* 15, *Carm.* 1.5), but only after the affair was over.

[132] Cf. *supra*, note 18.

Scholars are divided as to which of the two is the earlier. One group believes that at the time of writing 1 Vergil thought that he had saved his farm, but at the time of writing 9 he had learned that he had hoped too soon.[133] The other group [134] believes that, having failed to persuade the local authorities as related in 9, he then appealed to Octavian himself, with greater success, as related in 1. The latter view seems to me far more plausible. If the *iuvenis* of 1 is Octavian,[135] it seems incredible that any lesser official would have dared upset his decisive ruling:

pergite ut ante boves, pueri: summittite tauros (1.45).

Surely we may assume with Meliboeus:

ergo tua rura manebunt (1.46)

that this edict is binding and permanent. Even if Tityrus is not Vergil, still somebody's land is safe in 1, whereas in 9 apparently nobody's is! [136] But I think, as I have already said, that Tityrus *is* Vergil.

It seems to me that the circumstances are as follows. A stranger (*advena* [9.2]) has claimed the farm belonging to Menalcas (i.e., Vergil); Menalcas at first thought he had saved the property by his verses, probably some poetic appeal that we do not possess,[137] though 9.27–29 *may* constitute part of it; but his optimism was premature, indeed his very life was in danger, and only an opportune warning against starting the struggle afresh [138] saved him from

[133] See Cartault 352–358. A particularly thoughtful and thorough exposition of this view is presented by Waltz (see especially 44). He believes that in 1 Vergil celebrates the supposed "conservation" of his property, whereas in 9, having lost it, he requests its "restitution" (57; cf. Cartault 339–340). One of his points, however, I cannot follow at all, namely, the argument (56, note 1) that in 1 Octavian is merely Tityrus' private god (cf. Cartault 326, note 3), whereas in 9 he is on the way to general deification: I find no hint of this in 9, even if we should take *Caesaris* in 47 of Octavian rather than Julius.

[134] Among its earlier members may be mentioned Nettleship 42–45 (see also his *Excursus* in Conington 1.108–109); among the most recent ones, Rose 67–68, so far as the relative dates of the two *Eclogues* go.

[135] Cf. *supra*, 206.

[136] An additional argument for taking 9 as earlier than 1 is that the reassuring promise of 9.50: insere, Daphni, piros, is echoed with bitter irony in 1.73: insere nunc, Meliboee, piros. The addition of *nunc* is noteworthy, and would not be so effective if the line in which it occurs were the earlier of the two.

[137] Cartault (361) interprets *carmina* as referring to the *Eclogues* in general. Presumably he means only the earlier ones.

[138] I would not interpret *lites* in 14 of an actual law-suit. See Cartault 356.

death (14–16). However, apparently the hostile claimant has not entered into actual possession of the property, for he is still in town and Menalcas' faithful old retainer Moeris is still on the farm.[139] This is made clear by the fact that Moeris is clearly, as Lycidas supposes,[140] on his way to the town—presumably Mantua; by the end of the poem he has completed half the journey [141] and is sure of arriving sooner or later.[142] The purpose of Moeris' journey is made clear: "we are sending him [143] these kids, bad cess to him," he says.[144] Of course "we" means the whole *familia*, for the faithful slaves are touchingly identified with their master Menalcas—*vestrum Menalcan*, as Lycidas calls him (10).[145] And the way the household "sends" the kids is by having Moeris carry them.

The former master himself, however, is not necessarily on the farm with the slaves. I am inclined to interpret *venerit* in the last line:

carmina tum melius, cum venerit ipse, canemus (9.67)

as equivalent to *revenerit* or *redierit*. Has Menalcas-Vergil already set out on the journey to Rome,[146] the successful completion of which is celebrated by Tityrus-Vergil in 1? [147] And in that case does

[139] Or does the new owner intend to remain an absentee landlord, and work the farm through Moeris and the other slaves?

[140] 9.1: quo te, Moeri, pedes? an quo via ducit, in urbem?

[141] 9.59: hinc adeo media est nobis via.

[142] 9.62: hic haedos depone, tamen veniemus in urbem.

[143] Page's explanation *ad loc.*, "we are sending the kids *for him*," probably "to market," seems an unnatural interpretation of the Latin. Page assumes the stranger is already on the farm, and he wonders why in any case Moeris should be sending kids to him. Why not as food? The kids are probably already butchered; at all events Moeris is carrying, not driving them (cf. 62: haedos depone, and 65: hoc te fasce levabo).

[144] 9.6: hos illi (quod nec vertat bene) mittimus haedos.

[145] Cf. the similar use of *nostras* in 9.22: cum te ad delicias ferres Amaryllida nostras. To interpret *ad delicias nostras* as meaning Lycidas' sweetheart would inject an element of rivalry into the passage which does not belong there. Cf. *infra*, 232.

[146] Waltz (54–55) also believes Vergil has gone to Rome, and is trying to get Octavian's attention there. But he does not equate this with Tityrus' journey; in fact he does not equate Vergil with Tityrus.

[147] Possibly 9.23–25: Tityre, dum redeo (brevis est via) pasce capellas,/ et potum pastas age, Tityre, et inter agendum/ occursare capro (cornu ferit ille) caveto,/ though it merely echoes a passage of Theocritus (3.3–5) and though as applied to Menalcas it clearly dates from an early period and refers to a quite different mission on his part, may (as may also 27–29) have at least some slight reference to the present situation. Then *dum redeo* would balance *cum venerit ipse;* Tityrus would suggest Moeris; and possibly the admonition to beware the dangerous he-goat may be a warning in line with that conveyed by the *cornix* of 15.

melius in 9.67 imply that there is still some hope in Moeris' heart after all?

Everybody so far as I know, from Quintilian (8.6.47) on, agrees that Menalcas in 9 is Vergil. To be sure, the excerpts from Menalcas' songs there quoted are not to be found in any extant poems of Vergil's,[148] but 9.19–20 [149] is a distinct echo of 5.40.[150] On the other hand, there is considerable difference of opinion with respect to Tityrus.[151] The identification is categorically asserted by Cartault (p. 61), and categorically denied by Herrmann (p. 19, note 2).[152] Frank (pp. 128–129) and Rose (pp. 49, 65–67) regard Tityrus as representing the servile tenant-farmers who have been saved, while Meliboeus represents those who have been evicted. Costa (pp. 248–249) and Waltz (pp. 39–40) go further, and maintain not only that Tityrus is not Vergil but that Meliboeus is; Waltz thinks that Vergil never did get his farm back (p. 40), and further he concludes that Meliboeus is more like Vergil than Tityrus is (p. 39)—a view which he bases on a very subtle and sensitive analysis of the two characters showing that Meliboeus is really far finer than Tityrus (pp. 35–36). I agree with Waltz (pp. 37–38) that Tityrus is not particularly sympathetic,[153] and with Frank (p. 129) that the real

[148] Indeed it is quite probable that they were really written for the occasion, and the supposed quotation in merely a device for introducing them.

[149] quis caneret Nymphas? quis humum florentibus herbis/ spargeret aut viridi fontis induceret umbra?

[150] spargite humum foliis, inducite fontibus umbras. And for the singing of the Nymphs, cf. the reference to the Nymphs in 5.20. These lines are actually uttered by Mopsus, not Menalcas, but things that the impersonal author Vergil represents one of his characters as causing to be done, are now spoken of as being done by the author—just as Silenus in 6 is said to raise alders from the ground (63) because he sings of how this happens.

[151] Servius (on 1.1) makes the sensible comment that the identity is not complete, and is to be accepted *tantum ubi exigit ratio*. This seems to me much more satisfactory than Rose's insistence (49) that the young freeman cannot be represented by an old slave (cf. *supra*, 205). I believe the best is to admit candidly (with Conington 1.21–22 and Cartault 340–343) that the situation in *Ecl.* 1 is confused; I would not even try to bring order into it as Waltz does (35) by offering the explanation that the slave Tityrus went to Rome to find his master and met Octavian, for I think Octavian's role diminishes in importance if he was not the direct object of Tityrus' visit.

[152] Of course having once accepted the view that Menalcas is Vergil, he cannot admit that Tityrus is too.

[153] I wrote almost twenty years ago (*TAPhA* 56 [1925] 185, note 4): "The very last lines have to me always had rather a coldblooded ring. Tityrus can well afford to offer to share with the ill-fated Meliboeus *for a single night* the prosperity that has been secured to *him* forever: there is, I think, a certain smugness about his enumeration of his blessings, apples, chestnuts, and cheese—and above all hearth and home." I now think I see a reason for this supposed smugness which I did not perceive at the time.

purpose of the poem is precisely to express sympathy with the group represented by Meliboeus; but none the less I still believe that Tityrus is Vergil. The poet was in a very difficult position. He is deeply indebted to Octavian (and that Octavian had to be handled with a certain amount of care is suggested by Horace under all the banter of *Serm.* 2.1.18–20 and *Ep.* 1.13), so he cannot risk seeming unappreciative by representing himself as other than profoundly grateful and completely happy; he dare not say, "Thank you very much for what you have done for me, but I am still not satisfied; I want you to do more." So Tityrus praises Octavian, enumerating his own blessings, and does not utter a word of pity for Meliboeus; but the same Vergil who creates this picture of gratitude and contentment is also the Vergil who creates Meliboeus in his poignant despair. In other words, the poet Vergil is greater than the character who parallels the man Vergil; he is back of Mopsus as well as of Menalcas, so that the authorship of Mopsus' verses can be assigned to Menalcas; [154] he is back of Thyrsis as well as of Corydon, so that it is hard to prove that Corydon at every point is the superior of Thyrsis; and he is back of Meliboeus as he is of Tityrus. *Barbarus has segetes* is a tacit reproach and appeal to Octavian, even if the crops of Tityrus-Vergil are still safe; and it is there if anywhere that the daring lies [155] to which he refers years later at the close of the *Georgics*. The latter passage provides me with fresh conviction that Tityrus is the principal character in *Eclogue* 1, in other words, Vergil; if he were not, the direct address to him in the very last line [156] would have much less point.

It may be asked why, if the figures of Menalcas and Tityrus both represent Vergil, they are not in these two related poems given the same name. Possibly it was because Menalcas of 9

[154] Cf. *supra*, note 150.

[155] Cartault (66) on the one hand, and Costa (247) and Waltz (42–43) on the other, agree in regard to this, though they disagree in regard to the identity of Tityrus, Cartault's view being much more like the one that I have advocated just above. Cartault (66) thinks the Vergil of the *Georgics* would no longer take such a liberty: if he is right, the tone of self-respecting apology is a little like that of the later Horace with regard to Philippi (*Carm.* 2.7.9–12, 3.14.27–28; in the latter note especially *calidus iuventa* as a parallel to Vergil's *audax iuventa* in *Georg.* 4.565). But I am not sure that Vergil recanted at all; he still expresses pity for Mantua in the *Georgics* (2.198). On the other hand it is possible that we are pushing *audax* too far; it may simply be a sort of expression of modesty such as we have in *Georg.* 1.40: audacibus adnue coeptis.

[156] *Georg.* 4.566: Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.

failed in his undertaking that Vergil, in writing 1, chose to start afresh. There is also another consideration. The slave's identification of himself with his master in 9 has already been referred to;[157] some of the farms lost in the proscription were probably freehold, while others were occupied by servile tenants. Vergil with typical sympathy wishes to plead the cause of slave and free alike, and identifies himself with both; but he none the less distinguishes between them. I think Tityrus-Vergil is regularly a slave, and Menalcas-Vergil is regularly a freeman;[158] at least whenever Tityrus is referred to, it is in terms that befit, or at least do not misfit, a slave, while similarly Menalcas may always be a freeman. Thus Tityrus in 1 is, of course, clearly a slave (note especially 27–30); in 3 he receives imperious directions from both Menalcas (20) and Damoetas (96), and in 5.12 it is again assumed that he will follow orders; in 6.4 he is a shepherd feeding flocks, who may or may not be free, but perhaps the poet's modesty is enhanced if he is assumed to be a mere slave; in 8.55–56 he is treated as a very humble singer, as far removed as possible from Orpheus and Arion; in 9.23–4 he is once more given orders. On the other hand, Menalcas in 9 is clearly a freeman, the master of slaves (twice called *ipse:* 16 and 67); in 2.15, where he is suggested as a beloved for Corydon, he may be a slave, but need not be;[159] in 3 he is clearly free, unlike the hireling Damoetas (1–2), for he is taking care of a flock that belongs not to a master but to his parents (33), and his order to the *pueri* in 98 may point in the same direction; in 5 the extremely urbane Menalcas[160] is surely a freeman; in 10.20, despite the unwonted realism

[157] This is a common phenomenon, here very touching, though used at times for humorous effect, as when Corydon boasts of wealth (2.19–22) which in all probability belongs to his master (cf. *supra*, 220), and Damoetas pledges a heifer (3.29–31) which presumably is actually Aegon's property. (We hear of a flock of sheep in 3.3, but the use of *hanc vitulam* in 29 shows that she was on hand too, and it seems to me more likely that she was Aegon's than that Damoetas had an animal of his own along with the sheep, especially in view of Menalcas' answer, 32: de grege non ausim quicquam deponere tecum).

[158] This is a more satisfactory explanation, I think, than that of Cartault (352), who says that Tityrus is both Vergil and a slave, and is represented in 9 by two different persons, Menalcas (Vergil) and Moeris (slave), so that to give one of these the name Tityrus would cause confusion.

[159] There is no proof that Alexis is a slave: *domini* in 2.2 may refer to the master of Corydon and of Corydon only. If it is said that the slave Corydon would be extremely presumptuous in aspiring to free youths, the answer can be made that this would merely serve to increase both the humor and the pathos of the poem (cf. *supra*, 220).

[160] Cf. *supra*, 198–199.

with which the dirty work in which he is engaged is depicted, probably the one herdsman mentioned by name, as distinguished from the *opilio* and the *subulci* (19), is not a slave. If my thesis is correct, it is doubtless significant that the person who gives orders to Tityrus is regularly Menalcas (note 3.20,[161] 5.12, 9.23–24); thus the two are closely associated, and may be but two different aspects of the same person.

I have just suggested that Tityrus is always a slave and Menalcas is always a freeman. I have not, however, desired to commit myself to the view that either is *always* indubitably Vergil.[162] In 6 I have not the slightest doubt that Tityrus is Vergil, for Apollo addresses the poet thus [163] in commanding him not to attempt epic but to stick to light verse, *deductum carmen* (5). In 8 he is still a minor poet, not comparable to Orpheus or Arion (55–56). Elsewhere Tityrus is not clearly Vergil, but he is an assistant to the shepherds, who cooperates with them in their tasks, thus giving them leisure to sing, which in a sense is equivalent to the task of the poet who rehearses—really composes—their songs.[164] Thus in 3 he is bidden to collect the flock and to drive the goats out of the stream (20, 96); in 5 he watches the kids so that Mopsus and Menalcas are free to sing (12), and in 9 he feeds the goats while Menalcas goes singing to court Amaryllis (23–25).

As for Menalcas, in 5 he must be Vergil, for earlier lines of Vergil's are quoted and assigned directly to him.[165] I think that the Menalcas of 10 is also Vergil; the other herdsmen who gather around Gallus are, like their prototypes around Daphnis in Theocritus 1.80–81, anonymous, but the one specifically called by name is probably the poet. However, the Menalcas of 2 and 3 can scarcely be the poet. Doubtless Vergil would not have hesitated any more than his contemporaries, Horace and Tibullus, to play the part of Corydon in 2,[166] but that he would have been willing to

[161] To be sure, in *Ecl.* 3 Damoetas gives him an order too (96), but this may be but an echo of the earlier passage.

[162] On Menalcas see below, 226–227, and cf. note 182 on Daphnis.

[163] The arguments given by Herrmann (41) and Rose (48–49) against identifying Tityrus here with Vergil seem to me extremely lame.

[164] Cf. note 150.

[165] Cf. *supra*, 200. In a sense it might be said that Mopsus is Vergil too, for his words are echoed in 9 (see notes 149 and 150); but there it is rather a question of Vergil composing than of Mopsus conversing.

[166] See the references cited in note 128.

claim the role assigned to Menalcas in both 2 [167] and 3 [168] seems highly dubious. Besides, Menalcas throughout 3 seems too quarrelsome to be our gentle poet. Perhaps Vergil at the time he wrote 3 had not thought of identifying himself with Menalcas, but chose to keep the name for one of the two speakers in the next dialogue, 5, simply by way of contrast. If Menalcas really is the same person in both (as he might conceivably be, even though he did not symbolize Vergil in both [169]), he has certainly developed amazingly in both manners and morals.[170] Similarly Corydon develops in poetic talent, advancing from uncouthness in 2 to championship in 7. There is some consistency in the portrayal of the two Menalcas's and the two Corydon's: Menalcas is the admirer of Amyntas in both 3 and 5, and Corydon is the lover of Alexis in both 2 and 7.[171]

Of the other shepherds who actually appear in the *Eclogues*, some figure in only one *Eclogue*, so that there can be no question of either consistency or development in their treatment. These are Palaemon in 3, Thyrsis in 7, Chromis and Mnasyllus in 6.[172] Those who, in addition to appearing in one *Eclogue*, also are presented, or at least referred to, in another are Meliboeus in 1 and 7, Damoetas in 3, Mopsus in 5, Damon and Alphesiboeus in 8, Moeris and Lycidas in 9.

Probably the most prominent of these is the melancholy Meliboeus of 1. A shadowy Meliboeus has been referred to in 3; all that we learn of him is that he was *not* the owner of the sheep neglected by Damoetas (1–2). But in 7 he is important, being the narrator of the Corydon-Thyrsis contest. Here he himself neglects his goats because he wants to hear the singing-match; he is an Epicurean and not a Stoic in his desire to put sport above duty (17).

[167] 2.15–16. Of course those who think Corydon is Vergil in this *Eclogue* (cf. *supra*, 220) cannot assume that Menalcas is. Herrmann adduces the swarthiness of Menalcas, referred to in 2.16, as a proof that he is Vergil (19), but this quality seems hardly significant: it is assigned to Amyntas in 10.38, and both passages are in all probability merely literary echoes (cf. Theocritus 10.27–29).

[168] 3.8–9.

[169] Cf. note 162.

[170] Also in age. In 2 he is presumably a contemporary of the *puer delicatus* Alexis, and in 3 he is definitely the younger of the two shepherds (note Damoetas' indignant *viris* in 3.7, and see also Cartault 109), whereas in 5 he is the older of the two (note Mopsus' *tu maior* in 5.4).

[171] Cf. *infra*, 230.

[172] Reasons for regarding Chromis and Mnasyllus as shepherds have been given above, note 119.

Would it be far-fetched to see an element of poetic justice in the sad fate that befalls him and his goats in 1?[173] If so, there is already developing in the formerly Epicurean Vergil that Stoic strain that is to become more marked in the *Georgics*, where work and not love conquers everything,[174] and absolutely dominant in the *Aeneid*.

Of the others, Damoetas is consistently a talented singer who is treated as a meet companion for the leading figures of several *Eclogues:* he gives Corydon a flute in 2 (37), ties with Menalcas in 3 (108–109), and sings to Menalcas in 5 (72): they have made up their quarrel![175] The headstrong Mopsus of 5 is Damon's successful rival in 8;[176] here Damon represents him as a monster (26–28), but we must allow for the bitterness of disappointed love. This Damon is uniformly unlucky: we hear in 3 that Menalcas had beaten him in a singing contest, and he had not been able to pay the goat that he owed, so Menalcas stole it (16–24); but at least by the time of 8, presumably later than 3, he has developed into a fine singer, listened to by beasts and streams, like Orpheus (1–5). So, too, Alphesiboeus in the same *Eclogue*, who in the next *Eclogue* (5) is going to do a satyr dance for Menalcas, while others sing for him (73); perhaps Alphesiboeus excels in mimetic performances, for in 8 his song is purely dramatic, purporting, as it does, to come from a love-sick girl.[177]

Finally in 9 we have Lycidas and Moeris. Lycidas is young (66), as he is also in 7, in which he is a youth beloved of Thyrsis

[173] This of course does not prevent our being extremely sorry for him, as we are for the wrong-headed Dido and Turnus in the *Aeneid*. Cf. note 126.

[174] Contrast *Ecl.* 10.69: omnia vincit Amor, and *Georg.* 1.145: labor omnia vicit.

[175] However, there is one grave difficulty. In 2, which is probably earlier than 3 and surely earlier than 5 (cf. note 12), he is already dead! This detail alone suffices to show that complete consistency in the *Eclogues* is not to be expected or sought. Herrmann (174) evades this difficulty by assuming that though 2 was written before 3 or 5, the date of its action is later than that of either of the others—for which there is no proof whatsoever, aside from his own hypothesis.

[176] Or the rival of Damon's hero, who may not be Damon. Alphesiboeus' song in 8 is clearly not self-expressive, and accordingly Damon's need not be either. Cartault (296–297) and Herrmann (121) are quite right in pointing this out, but I think they are wrong in assuming that the suicide threat with which the song closes proves that the singer is not identified with his subject. Corydon threatens suicide too (2.7) but in the end plans to console himself with another love (73); and, though Gallus is represented as "dying of love" (10.10), this too is mere hyperbole, since he is evidently expected to survive at least long enough to benefit by the poetic account of his sufferings (2–3).

[177] His connection with Daphnis in both *Eclogues*, noted by Herrmann (112), does not seem especially significant.

(67–68); Moeris on the other hand, who imparts information to his less well-informed comrade (11–16, and *passim*), is an elderly man who grieves over his inability to sing as once he did (51–54). In 8 too, he may well have been elderly; at all events there, too, he is the instructor of youth, for he gave the enchantress material for her spells (95–96). Now in 9 at a later stage he still lives in an underworld of superstition (14–16), but apparently he no longer has his old cunning, for the wolves saw him first, and so he has lost his voice and his memory (53–54). His state is all the more pathetic if he is the once accomplished wizard who could turn himself into a wolf and work other wonders (8.97–99).

There are also a number of other shepherds whom we hear of but never see.

Of course of all these the chief is Daphnis, the ideal shepherd. It is perhaps significant that, as already noted (214), he is the one Theocritean figure whom Vergil presents under the same name. If my theory as to the order of composition is correct (*vid. supra*, 201), Daphnis really develops and grows up.[178] In 2 he is a youth whom the absurd Corydon thinks he can vie with in looks (26–27); doubtless Daphnis is much younger as well as much handsomer than Corydon. In 3 he is still a boy[179] whose bow and arrows envious Menalcas breaks (12–15). In 7, where he light-heartedly encourages Meliboeus to put pleasure before business, he is probably still an adolescent. In 8 he is grown to manhood, and is the lover of the enchantress.[180] In 5 he is the god, dead and resurrected.[181] In 9 the chronological order seems to break down, for he is alive and is bidden to contemplate the star of Caesar;[182] but it must be noted that here the poet is singing in retrospect;

[178] Like Menalcas; *vid. supra*, note 170.

[179] To be sure, Herrmann (111, note 7) takes *puero* of another person to whom Daphnis' bow and arrows have been given; but I believe a reading of the passage (3.12–15) without any preconceived notions does not yield this impression.

[180] Daphnis' yielding is inconsistent with the picture of him in Theocritus 1, where he is presented as a second Hippolytus who defies and denies Aphrodite; but Vergil nowhere has a hint of this. Cf. *supra*, note 108.

[181] He is still but a youth, however (note *puer* 5.54), so perhaps the Daphnis of 8 is to be regarded as a different figure.

[182] On this see note 95. The reference in *Caesaris* is adduced by Herrmann (109) as proof that Daphnis himself cannot be Caesar. But the fact that Daphnis in his final stage of development symbolizes Caesar need not force us to identify him with Caesar elsewhere; obviously the Daphnis of 8, for instance, could not be Caesar, but neither in my opinion could he be Catullus, as Herrmann thinks (cf. *supra*, 214).

old Moeris is recalling a song written by Menalcas that may be supposed to have antedated 8.[183]

Alexis and Amyntas are beautiful youths like Lycidas. Alexis is the darling of Corydon in both 2 (*passim*) and 7 (55–56). Amyntas, at least according to Corydon himself, is jealous of Corydon's talents in 2 (35, 39), but elsewhere he is more successful, being Menalcas' beloved in 3, where he figures in three couplets (66–67, 74–75, 82–83), and in 5 Menalcas still admires his prowess in singing (8), though when Mopsus resents his praise he drops the matter (15–18); in 10 he seems to symbolize male charms for Gallus as Phyllis does female ones (37, 41).[184] Aegon, on the other hand, is an active lover, who courts Neaera in 3, leaving his flock to the tender mercies of Damoetas (2–6); in 5 he is associated with Damoetas again, as both sing to Menalcas (72). Iollas in 2 is also a lover; Corydon cannot vie with him in his gifts to Alexis (57), so presumably he is wealthy, and almost certainly he is the master (whether of Corydon, or Alexis, or both) whose darling Alexis is (2). His wealth does not prevent—indeed it probably rather induces—teasing by the shepherds; he is made the butt of ridicule by both Damoetas and Menalcas in 3 (76–79).[185] Micon is some one whose trees and vines get hacked in 3 (10–11); he is possibly a little pathetic, being called *parvus* (in keeping with his name) in 7 (29–32). We hear of Alcon and Codrus in 5, where Mopsus is offered as subjects for song

> aut Phyllidis ignis
> aut Alconis . . . laudes aut iurgia Codri (10–11).

I believe the genitives are all objective, so that Alcon is to be

[183] Probably by a not inconsiderable period, for the purported quotations in 9 seem to be given in inverse order so far as the date of their composition goes. Note for the first *nuper* (21), and for the second the imperfect *canebat* (26) in opposition to the pluperfect *te canentem audieram* (44–45) of the last, which is the one referred to here. There is no such clear evidence for the time of the third (32–36; cf. *supra*, note 26) or the fourth (39–43); but the modesty of the third seems to put it earlier than the assurance of the second (on this point cf. again note 26, and observe especially the force of *neque adhuc* in 35).

[184] I shall revert to her later, 231.

[185] This makes absurd Herrmann's identification of him with Maecenas (53–54, 57, note 2). To take *Ecl.* 2.57 (following as it does the statement that gifts are of no avail with Alexis) as praise of Maecenas' generosity (54), and 3.78–79 (which is surely in a jeering tone like the preceding couplet) as a tribute to Maecenas' beauty (*formose* may not even agree with *Iolla*; if it does, it is probably ironical) and as "une magnifique glorification" of Phyllis' love for him (*ibid.*), is surely to misread Vergil.

praised and Codrus abused, though some have thought of them as poets who do the praising and abusing. Codrus certainly is a poet, and probably a good one, since in 7 the great Corydon yearns to imitate him (21–24); but the less agreeable Thyrsis hopes he will burst with envy (25–28), so here we have an example of abuse of Codrus. In 5 we hear of Stimichon, who admires Menalcas' singing (54–55), and of Antigenes, who wants Mopsus' staff (89); but they, like Alcon, do not appear elsewhere. Alcimedon in 3 is an artist, perhaps a real one (37, 44);[186] and Conon, introduced in the same passage (40), is of course a real astronomer.[187] Varius [188] and Cinna in 9 (35), and perhaps Anser just below (36), if this involves a pun, are real poets.[189] Bavius and Maevius in 3 (90–91) are unquestionably pseudonyms for real poetasters,[190] as is revealed by Horace's attack on Maevius in *Epod.* 10.[191]

The female figures are much less important. The only ones who appear directly are the mischievous Aegle, comrade and abettor of Chromis and Mnasyllus in 6; and the unnamed enchantress, who appears vicariously as the supposed singer of Alphesiboeus' song in 8. But no female ever talks for herself, and that is one reason why I believe that, as I have already said (230), in *Phyllidis ignis* (5.10) *Phyllidis* is an objective genitive. Love for Phyllis is a very wide-spread emotion; she seems to stand for the universally coveted female, and no one else has so many wooers. In 3 Damoetas loves her (76) as well as Galatea (72), and Menalcas loves her (78) as well as Amyntas (74); in 7 Meliboeus regrets that he has no Alcippe or Phyllis to help him (14); and in 10, as I have already said (230), Gallus yearns for her ministrations (37 and 41) as well as for those of Amyntas (*ibid.*). In fact she is like Amyntas in being the universal darling,[192] and also in having practically no

[186] Cf. Conington *ad loc.*

[187] One of the very few persons introduced by their real names: it is to be noted that he is not in any way a participant in the action but is merely a well-known personage appropriately referred to by a shepherd. Quite different is the part played by the three important contemporary figures also introduced by their real names—Pollio, Varus, and Gallus. These will be discussed at length below (233–238).

[188] Cf. *infra*, 234.

[189] There are also specific references to earlier poets, legendary or historical: Orpheus (4.55, 6.30, 8.55–56), Linus (4.56, 6.67), Arion (8.56), Hesiod (6.70). These references are in a class with the one to Conon (on which see note 187).

[190] They are contrasted with Pollio. Cf. *infra*, 233 and note 201.

[191] Frank makes out a rather good case for identifying the unnamed defamer in Horace, *Epod.* 6 with Bavius; see "On Horace's Controversies" (*op. cit.*, note 47) 163–165.

[192] Cf. *supra*, 230.

other distinctive features whatsoever. On the other hand, just as Alexis and Lycidas are more specifically portrayed, so too are Amaryllis and Galatea. They are wayward, coquettish, and charming. Corydon in 2 is tempted to endure the bitter wrath and proud contempt of Amaryllis rather than the affronts of Alexis (14–15); he speaks of her wistfully as once *mea Amaryllis* (52) in the days when he gave her presents. In 3 Damoetas too speaks of her wrath (81), as well as of the mischief and coquetry of Galatea, who pelts him with apples and runs away, but wants to be seen first (64–65), and who makes him promises that she apparently has no intention of keeping (72–73). In 9 Lycidas speaks of Amaryllis as "our darling" (22), which I think simply means that she is a charming person belonging to the same *familia* as he (cf. note 145); her lover is Menalcas.[193] In 1 Galatea is Tityrus' first love, Amaryllis his second and more helpful one (27–35);[194] apparently her quick temper veiled more real stability than Galatea's flirtatiousness and extravagance. In 7 (37) and probably in 9 (39) Galatea seems to be a sea-nymph,[195] as she is in Theocritus, and in 8 Amaryllis is the enchantress' assistant (77–78 and 101); these may be different figures, though possibly Amaryllis is conceived of as a pendant to her *contubernalis* Tityrus in universal helpfulness.[196]

Other females, like the males enumerated above (231), appear once only. Neaera,[197] whom Milton couples with Amaryllis,[198]

[193] I take *tibi* in 21 and *te* in 22 not of old Moeris but of Menalcas, who is directly addressed just above (17–18).

[194] If, as I believe (cf. *supra*, 226), Tityrus and Menalcas are but different aspects of the same personage, then consistency is brought into the love-life of Amaryllis. Cf. further note 195.

[195] Herrmann (144–145) holds she is *always* a shepherdess whom Vergil merely compares to a naiad. Apart from the minor detail that I would not call a sea-nymph a naiad (Herrmann probably does so only because he wants to identify her with the *candida Naïs* of 2.46), I think he may be right. Doubtless both passages are meant to suggest the sea-nymph Galatea of Theocritus: in 7 the speaker is Corydon, who in 2 corresponds to her Theocritean lover Polyphemus; while in 9 the poet is definitely paraphrasing Theocritus (cf. *supra*, note 26). But in the second passage at least, it would be rather neat to regard Galatea as a girl that Menalcas loved before Amaryllis (note that, if note 183 above is correct, the song to her belongs to a period antedating the courtship of Amaryllis), since we then have a fresh parallel between the Menalcas of 9 and the Tityrus of 1; see note 194.

[196] Cf. *supra*, 226.

[197] Herrmann's treatment of Neaera (144) is typical of his insensibility. He uses Horace *Carm.* 3.14.27–28 to prove that she must have been *à la mode* in 42 B.C. *consule Planco* (a date which Horace of course introduces to show his change of heart toward Augustus since Philippi, not to give us data concerning Neaera).

[198] *Lycidas* 68–69. (Milton deals freely with Vergil's names just as Vergil does with those of Theocritus; cf. note 100.)

figures in 3, as Aegon's beloved (3–4); Nysa in 8, as Damon's, who abandoned him for Mopsus (18, 26). Thestylis, the cook in 2 (10–11), may be in love with Corydon, or at least he likes to think she is (43). Alcippe is mentioned by Meliboeus in 7 (14) together with Phyllis. Delia in 3 is rather puzzling: she may be the beloved of Menalcas, whose dogs know her so well (67); but she may be the goddess Diana as in 7 (29), where Delia is worshipped by the hunter Micon. Is she, as Conington suggests, Diana the huntress, known to the hunting-dogs (the gods often join these fairyland shepherds)? Or is she possibly—though I have not seen this suggestion anywhere—Diana as Luna, whom the dogs recognize by baying the moon? Page, *ad loc.*, calls the first notion absurd, and perhaps the second is too; yet to introduce here beside Amyntas another human figure, nowhere else heard of, is not quite satisfactory.[199] Lycoris in 10 (*passim*) is unquestionably a real person, the actress Cytheris,[200] whose true name was supposedly Volumnia.

It is now time to turn to the three real persons who under their own names play an important part in the *Eclogues*. These are Pollio, Varus, and Gallus.

Pollio's part in *Eclogues* 4 and 8 has already been discussed (*supra*, 206 and 204). His appearance in 3 (84, 86, 88), where he figures as a critic and poet, and as a foil to the poetasters Bavius and Maevius,[201] presents no problem. But the roles of Varus and Gallus involve difficulties.

The case of Varus is complicated by the fact that we cannot be sure whether he is Alfenus or Quintilius. Rose in his categorical statement (p. 229, note 10) that Varus in the *Eclogues* is always Alfenus Varus probably represents the majority opinion,[202] but I think no one has successfully refuted Pascal's attempt (in 1889) to prove that he is Quintilius Varus.[203] Of more recent defenses of this view, I find particularly convincing Frank's discussion (pp. 96–100; cf. 126 and 140) of *Eclogue* 6, in which he maintains that Varus here is Quintilius Varus, Vergil's fellow-student at Naples

[199] Cf. Cartault 119, note 4.

[200] The use of the metrical equivalent (cf. *supra*, note 116) *Lycoris* for *Cytheris* seems to be due not to Vergil but to Gallus (cf. Ovid *Tris.* 2.445).

[201] Cf. note 190. This furnishes an additional reason for believing that the two are real persons, even though not presented under their own names. *Vid. supra*, 231.

[202] And the oldest: cf. Suetonius 19, Probus, and Servius on *Ecl.* 6.6 (though this is not his only suggestion; see note 216).

[203] However, I do not agree with him in every detail, as I shall show below.

under Philodemus and Siro, the latter represented by Silenus.[204] For Vergil's early association with Quintilius in an Epicurean group,[205] we have the testimony of Probus,[206] and the still better authority of the rolls of Philodemus.[207] That this intimacy continued is indicated by Horace.[208] Vergil's tribute [209] would seem to apply primarily to a poet or a critic of poetry; Quintilius was assuredly the second,[210] and he may have been the first as well.[211] Pascal upholds the latter view, and would actually read *Varo* rather than *Vario* in *Eclogue* 9.35 (p. 156) [212] and *Varus* rather than *Varius* in Horace *Serm.* 1.10.44 (p. 174). Though I find Pascal's study in general convincing, I cannot go along with him here. To be sure, in *Eclogue* 9.35 *Varo* as a cognomen would prove a better parallel for *Cinna* than the nomen *Vario*, but the Romans seem far from consistent in their use of names; [213] it is true that there is MS evidence for the reading *Varo* here, but this may be due to the influence of *Varo* and *Vare* just above (26 and 27); some may feel that there is much better connection between the two speeches if Varus is referred to in both, but there need be no connection if I am right in my view that the two are isolated quotations from Menalcas (see note 26). As for Pascal's contention (p. 174) that

[204] Cf. *supra*, 218–219.

[205] This group is referred to by Servius also (on *Ecl.* 6.13; quoted above, note 115); but as he speaks merely of *Varus*, without a cognomen, his testimony is not helpful.

[206] Vixit pluribus annis liberali in otio, secutus Epicuri sectam, insigni concordia et familiaritate usus Quintili Tuccae et Vari.

[207] These exhibit the names Κοϊντίλιε, Οὐάριε, and Οὐ. . . . . (very likely Οὐεργίλιε). See Körte 172–177, and cf. Frank 52 and note 5. In view of this evidence, I do not see how Rose can interpret Servius' statement (mentioned in note 205 above, and quoted in note 115) as referring to Alfenus Varus (87 and 238, note 79). Körte (175–176) shows Alfenus cannot have been Vergil's fellow-student; he does, however, take the Varus of the *Eclogues* as Alfenus, not Quintilius (176).

[208] *Carm.* 1.24.9–10: multis ille bonis flebilis occidit,/ nulli flebilior quam tibi, Vergili.

[209] *Ecl.* 6.11–12: nec Phoebo gratior ulla est/ quam sibi quae Vari praescripsit pagina nomen.

[210] Cf. Horace *A.P.* 438–441, where he pays tribute to Quintilius' critical acumen and candor—the latter also suggested by *nuda Veritas* in *Carm.* 1.24.7.

[211] Cf. Acro and *Comm. Cruqu.* on *A.P.* 438. Servius in a silly story on *Ecl.* 3.20 speaks of *Varus tragoediarum scriptor;* but as the same MS later has *Varius*, as have also the rather similar though not consistent versions of the story in Suetonius 10 and in Porphyrio on Horace *Ep.* 1.4.3, we cannot put much reliance in this testimony.

[212] So too Herrmann, 167, note 7.

[213] Why, for instance, are Plautus, Pollio, Maecenas, and Messalla regularly referred to by their cognomina rather than their nomina? Note, e.g., Horace's use of the first in *A.P.* 54, of the second in *Serm.* 1.10.42, and of all the last three in *Serm.* 1.10.81 and 85 (so, too, *Bibule* in 86), in each case beside a long list of nomina.

the epic poet in Horace is Varus not Varius, this seems nullified by *Carm.* 1.6.1, where the meter does not permit the alteration of *Vario* into *Varo*. Nor do I agree with Pascal (p. 156) that Varus is addressed only as a poet, not as a warrior, in *Eclogue* 6.6–7.[214] The *bella* here must, I think, be *bella tua* as the *laudes* are *laudes tuas* (*tristia* need not prevent this, as Pascal believes; any wars to Vergil, even those bringing glory to a friend, are *tristia*); the phrase *laudes tuas et bella* here corresponds to *reges et proelia* in 3 above, or, in inverse order, to *arma virumque* in *Aeneid* 1.1. We have no evidence of martial exploits on Quintilius' part, but this does not prove that *Eclogue* 6 could not refer to him, since any able-bodied man in those troubled times might easily have been involved in military activity;[215] nor is there sure proof that Alfenus Varus was a soldier either.[216] Pascal (p. 171)[217] believes the Varus of *Eclogue* 9.27–29 is likewise Quintilius. This is certainly not impossible: Quintilius was a native of Cremona,[218] and might well be interested in the fate of this unhappy city and its equally unhappy, though less guilty, neighbor Mantua. Still, it is quite conceivable[219] that the Varus of 9 is Alfenus and the Varus of 6 is Quintilius.[220] What I cannot believe is that the Varus of 6 is Alfenus. Since it appears impossible to separate the fate of Mantua from that of Cremona, Alfenus, himself a native of Cremona,[221] would seem to have been nothing but a quisling in his vicious attack on his luckless victims, for which Vergil's friend Gallus rebuked him;[222] and I feel it is out of the question that a man like Vergil should have written in such laudatory tones to a man like Alfenus (and surely the introduction to 6, implying that he would like to praise Varus but is

[214] Namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,/ Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella.

[215] Cf. the vivid picture of the swelling tide of battle sweeping a citizen out to sea in Horace *Carm.* 2.7.15–16.

[216] Servius on *Ecl.* 6.6 asserts that he had conquered the Germans; but as he offers as an alternative suggestion the absurd one that he was the Varus who died in Germany with three legions, I think we may discount his testimony.

[217] So too Herrmann 137–138.

[218] Jerome (entry on 24 B.C.): Quintilius Cremonensis Vergili et Horati familiaris moritur; Porphyrio (on Horace *A.P.* 438): hic erat Quintilius Varus Cremonensis amicus Vergili eques Romanus.

[219] Despite Herrmann's objection (137 and note 3).

[220] This is the opinion of Frank (125–126).

[221] According to Porphyrio (on Horace *Serm.* 1.3.130): urbane . . . Alfenum Varum Cremonensem deridet. So too Acro, *ibid.*

[222] Servius on *Ecl.* 9.10.

not equal to such a lofty theme, *is* laudatory [223]). I welcome Frank's protest (pp. 122–123) against taking such an *Eclogue* as 6 as a "bread and butter" poem written in gratitude for value received.[224] Rose argues (p. 104) that it was really a rebuke to begin with Varus and then turn aside to Gallus; [225] but a rebuke so ambiguous that its readers, including the subject himself, could hardly be depended on to get the point (and indeed no one apparently did get the point for almost 2000 years!) is too subtle to be effective. He thinks (pp. 89, 104) there is a rebuke in 9.26 too, but *necdum perfecta* seems to me hopeful rather than reproachful; for the latter, we would have to have *non perfecta*.

The problem of Varus is tied up with that of Gallus. I have just indicated that I consider unsatisfactory Rose's attempt to account for the introduction of both in *Eclogue* 6. Frank's suggestion (pp. 99–100) that Gallus may have been a fellow-student of Vergil and Varus under Siro makes the dedication to Varus of a poem glorifying Gallus less puzzling; but unfortunately it is a mere guess.[226] In any case, Gallus' appearance in the middle of Silenus' catalogue of myths [227] is troublesome; Rose's explanation (pp. 103–104) that he and the particular figures of myth chosen are alike in being affected for good or ill by the gods' influence, is unsatisfactory, because the figures in practically all myths are so affected.

Skutsch holds that Silenus' song in *Eclogue* 6 is a catalogue of Gallus' epic-didactic poetry (pp. 39–40 and 48), precisely as Gallus' monologue in *Eclogue* 10 is a catalogue of his elegiac-bucolic poetry (pp. 18 and 48).[228] This is the view of a very learned and intelligent man, but it is not completely convincing. Skutsch's main reason for viewing *Eclogue* 10 as a catalogue poem is the incoherence that

[223] Precisely as are Horace's similar tributes: *Carm.* 1.6.1–12, 2.12.9–20, 4.2.25–48, 4.15.1–4; *Serm.* 2.1.12–15.

[224] Rose has some assumptions of the sort (82, 84–86, 88–89) that jar on me, despite his tribute to Vergil's honesty (92–93).

[225] On this *vid. infra*, 238.

[226] In the commentary attributed to Probus we find (p. 6, 1 K): insinuatus Augusto per Cornelium Gallum, condiscipulum suum, promeruit, etc.; but in the Life, Probus names Gallus as one of Vergil's benefactors (with Alfenus and Pollio; cf. *supra*, note 202) and lists as his fellow-students Quintilius, Tucca, and Varius (at least I suppose Varius is designated by the genitive *Vari*; see the text, quoted above in note 206) with no mention of Gallus.

[227] Cf. *infra*, 238.

[228] See Skutsch's entire first chapter (2–27) on *Ecl.* 10, and his second (28–49) on *Ecl.* 6.

otherwise pervades it (pp. 7–12), but surely that is completely suitable in a lover's lament; precisely the same rapid shift in mood and viewpoint can be found in Corydon's soliloquy in *Eclogue* 2.[229] Furthermore, Gallus is not so unreasonable as he thinks: for instance, Skutsch asks (p. 5) with reference to 10.44–45,[230] "Ja, ist denn Krieg in Arkadien?" But of course Gallus has left the field of battle for the nonce to come to Arcadia, which, being here rather a magic land of make-believe like the scene of *Eclogue* 6,[231] is accessible to any region. He also asks (*ibid.*) why, since Gallus himself is in Arcadia, he objects to Lycoris' being *procul a patria* (10.46), but he ignores the main point here, which is to be found in *me sine sola* (10.48); it was Gallus' absence from Rome, in response to the call of war, that led the deserted Lycoris to go off with another suitor. "Was würde es ihm denn helfen," asks Skutsch (p. 5), "wenn sie im Vaterland wäre, da er ja selbst fern von Italien weilt?" But of course it would help him a great deal to know that she was awaiting him loyally at home, instead of wandering off with some one else. Skutsch is also troubled by *interea* in 55,[232] and asks (p. 10), "Inzwischen? Also bis die Baüme wachsen?" Surely, not *till* they grow, but *while* they are growing: *interea* is a sort of transitional word like our *meanwhile*. However, even though I would not go so far as Skutsch in pronouncing *Eclogue* 10 a catalogue poem and nothing else, I do agree, particularly in view of the testimony of Servius on 10.46,[233] that Vergil enhances his tribute to Gallus by actually echoing some of Gallus' verses; and I would add that he may have found it an intriguing *tour de force* to turn Gallus' elegiacs into hexameters, just as Horace obviously did to turn Terence's trimeters (*Eunuchus* 46–49, 57–63) into hexameters (*Serm.* 2.3.262–271).[234]

But there is not much evidence for even partially accepting Skutsch's theory with regard to *Eclogue* 6. We know that Gallus

[229] Cf. *supra*, notes 127 and 176.

[230] Nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis/ tela inter media atque adversos detinet hostis.

[231] Cf. *infra*, 240.

[232] See 10.52–56: certum est in silvis inter spelaea ferarum/malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores/arboribus: crescent illae, crescetis, amores. /interea mixtis lustrabo Maenala Nymphis,/aut acris venabor apros.

[233] Hi autem omnes versus Galli sunt, de ipsius translati carminibus.

[234] It is then really Vergil who does what he makes Gallus say he will do. This is the reverse of the process noted in note 150.

wrote elegies but we do *not* know that he wrote *epyllia*.[235] Besides, Skutsch's treatment of Silenus seems to add, rather than remove, an element of that confusion of which he complains. He says (p. 48) that Silenus too is met in a poem of Gallus'. But why should a *character* of Gallus sing of other characters of Gallus, and among them Gallus himself? And Skutsch, like the other critics, leaves wholly unexplained Gallus' appearance *in the middle* of Silenus' song (cf. *supra*, 236); one would at least expect to find him at the beginning or the end, instead of sandwiched in between Phaethon's sisters and Scylla.

In view of this last point I am tempted, though not without misgivings, to offer a suggestion of my own. A simple way out of the difficulty involved in the seemingly divided interest of the *Eclogue* would be to propose that lines 64–73 constitute a special quasi-dedicatory passage added to the copy of the poem sent to Gallus.[236] The passage can be spared perfectly well; but if it is to be interpolated as it stands, then the only place for it is the one that it occupies, *tum canit* of 64 echoing and continuing *tum canit* of 61; it could not be introduced after the hurried enumeration beginning *quid loquar* of 74.[237]

One thing at least seems certain: 10 is somehow tied up with 6. But it is also in a sense tied up with 5, since the laments for Daphnis and for, or rather of, Gallus both have elements in them of the

[235] Skutsch tries to show (61–102) that he is the author of the *Ciris*, but this cannot be proved, and I think it is pretty well disproved by Leo (see further on this J. Wight Duff, *A Literary History of Rome* 486, note 3). Also, *one* epyllion would not suffice; and the objection of Leo (28–29) and Rose (101) that Gallus was too young to have written so much is probably well taken (Skutsch anticipates this argument, 47–48, but, as they say, not adequately). Another objection of Leo's (28) seems to me even more cogent, namely, that the *Eclogue* ceases to be a tribute to the person to whom it is dedicated (Varus) if it is *all* about somebody else.

[236] Cf. the similar suggestion made above—with more confidence—concerning the dedication to Pollio in *Ecl.* 8 (204). This suggestion might have a second as a corollary, namely that, just as this passage was added for Gallus' benefit in the copy meant for him, so lines 1–12 were added for Varus' benefit in the passage meant for him. These lines cannot be spared as the poem stands (cf. *supra*, 204), but perhaps *pergite, Pierides* (13) was originally *dicite, Pierides* (found in 8.63), or there may have been some other introductory passage which dropped out when the lines for Varus were inserted. Then eventually both dedications, though meant for independent versions, became embedded in the final copy. However, such a Box-and-Cox arrangement would seem rather perilous, and not quite worthy of Vergil; and I do not really like the idea that our poet made a practice of providing removable and replaceable dedications as the ladies of the Empire, eager to be in style, provided removable and replaceable coiffures for their statues.

[237] Almost a Ciceronian *praeteritio!*

Theocritean lament for Daphnis. And it has already been shown that 5 is closely connected with 4 (p. 216), and that indeed 4, 5, and 6 form an intimately associated group (pp. 217–218).

This leads me to a digression on the arrangement of the *Eclogues*. It is a commonplace that this involves the alternation supposedly dear to the Muses,[238] the odd-numbered *Eclogues* being dialogues, i.e., dramatic, and the even-numbered ones monologues, i.e., narrative or self-expressive.[239] But I believe there is another system at work also, which consists of grouping the *Eclogues* into three Triads followed by a single separate one that completes and concludes the whole.[240] The middle one of the three Triads is, as I have shown (pp. 217–218), on a plane definitely higher than either of the others. Its three members, though each of them has a pastoral introduction, and the central one has pastoral interludes as well, are not strictly pastorals; they deal, as has been pointed out (p. 217), with divine beings, not with shepherds.[241] Thus in a sense they are the least personal of all the *Eclogues*, though in another sense, with the possible exception of 1 and 9, they are the most personal, if I am right in thinking it can be proved that their central characters represent real persons (cf. pp. 206–219). They are flanked by two other Triads which are not only strictly pastoral throughout, but which in addition correspond to the central Triad and to each other in an interesting way. The first and third Triads, like the second one, have a central poem in which one or more shepherds sing at great length: Corydon in 2, Damon and Alphesiboeus in 8, just like Mopsus and Menalcas in 5.[242] They are flanked in each case, not as 5 is by poems in which the author talks directly, but by dialogues of the

[238] 3.59: amant alterna Camenae.

[239] Just so, the odd-numbered books of the Aeneid are lighter, the even-numbered ones heavier, in tone, at least in the first half of the work: Conway believes the same principle prevails in the last half also, and he may be right, though the point is debatable (see Robert Seymour Conway, *Harvard Lectures on the Vergilian Age* [Cambridge, 1928] 129–149).

[240] The effect is rather like that of *Ecl.* 8, where a single line used as a refrain follows groups of lines which, though not uniform, are three in number more often than anything else.

[241] Recall that even Chromis and Mnasyllus have been thought to be fauns rather than shepherds (*supra*, note 119).

[242] Because Mopsus and Menalcas in 5 talk to each other, while Damon and Alphesiboeus in 8 do not, being introduced by the author as Corydon is in 2, 5 counts as a dialogue for the alternate arrangement and the other two do not; but none the less 5 with its strictly strophic and antistrophic plan has a closer relation to 8 than to the two amoebean contests, 3 and 7.

most complete type, consisting throughout of constant give and take such as occurs only in the beginning of 5. And here there is a one-to-one correspondence in inverse order. *Eclogue* 3 in Triad 1 (i.e., 3) and *Eclogue* 1 in Triad 3 (i.e., 7) present amoebean contests, consisting of successive unrelated pairs of couplets or quatrains. *Eclogue* 2 in each Triad deals with unrequited love: Corydon (in 2) and Damon (in 8), though I find comic touches in Corydon that are lacking in Damon, are close parallels, but of course the introduction of the enchantress in 8 brings a new element into the latter. And finally *Eclogue* 1 in Triad 1 (i.e., 1) and *Eclogue* 3 in Triad 3 (i.e., 9) are closely connected, both consisting of dialogues on the subject of the dispossession of the unhappy Mantuans, with Vergil himself probably playing a part (whether on stage or off stage) in both. Thus each Triad becomes increasingly personal and poignant as it moves away from the central one; it is as if Vergil wanted to remove his own personal cares and troubles as far as possible from the grander, more cosmic themes of the central Triad.

Finally, 10, the most complex and, if one will, confused of all the group, ties up all the threads together. Here for the first time the gods of Triad 2 and the shepherds of Triads 1 and 3 freely mingle. Here we have the realism of Triads 1 and 3 in the person of Menalcas dripping with mast (20), and the fantasy of Triad 2 in the weeping laurels and tamarisks (13). Here we have the effect of dialogue in the brief successive questions and comments of all the bystanders, and then in response a long monologue on the part of Gallus. This monologue on the theme of unrequited love, jealousy, and despair at once recalls Corydon of the central *Eclogue* in Triad 1,[243] and Damon of the central *Eclogue* in Triad 3,[244] while at the same time the dying Gallus [245] lamented by nature and the gods recalls the dead Daphnis of the central *Eclogue* in Triad 2.[246]

[243] For specific parallels note the verbal echo of 2.6: nihil mea carmina curas, in 10.28: Amor non talia curat; the imitation of *Idyll* 10.28 on the dark hyacinth (cf. *supra*, note 167) in 2.18 and 10.39; the wistful expression of a vain wish in 2.28: o tantum libeat, etc., and 10.33: o mihi tum, etc.; the desire to live *in silvis* (2.31, 10.52); the pastoral series (2.63–65, 10.29–30).

[244] Here again (cf. note 243) we have a parallel for 10.28 in 8.35: nec curare deum credis mortalia quemquam, and for 10.29–30 in 8.27–28 and 52–56; note also the reproaches in both songs to Love, who is called *saevus* and *improbus* in 8.47 and 49, *crudelis* in 10.29, and the references in defensive terms to the flock (8.33–34, 10.16–17).

[245] Not literally dying, but "dying of love" (10.10). Cf. note 176.

[246] Cf. the lament of the Nymphs over Daphnis (5.20–21) and his mother's reproach to the gods and the stars (5.22–23), with the reproach to the Naiads for neglecting

Did Vergil intend his final *Eclogue* thus to knit together the features of all the preceding ones? Does this perhaps account better than Skutsch's theory for the confusion and incoherence that the commentators find in it? [247] It would at least justify the sense of fulfilment even to repletion that rings in both the opening and closing lines of the epilogue: *haec sat erit* (10.70), and *ite domum saturae, venit Hesperus, ite capellae* (10.77).

Gallus (10.9–12) and the sympathy of Apollo, Silvanus, and Pan (10.21–30); the series 5.32–34 with the already twice-mentioned series (see notes 243 and 244) 10.29–30; and the pathetic effect of the repetition in the closing line of each song, 5.44: formosi pecoris custos, formosior ipse, and 10.69: omnia vincit Amor; et nos cedamus Amori (note also the similar cadence to 10.69 of 5.52: Daphnim ad astra feremus: amavit nos quoque Daphnis).

[247] See, e.g., the introduction to the commentary on this *Eclogue* in Conington 1.110, and cf. what has already been said (236–237) with regard to Skutsch's view of the poem.