

Reception Theorists Neglect Virgil's First Reception:  
Theatrical Propaganda & the *Bucolics* Performed

John B. Van Sickle

Brooklyn College & the Graduate School,  
City University of New York

I take as my operating agenda a set of questions posed by Michael Reeve at a conference on scholarship and theory in classics, held at Corpus Christi College in 1997 and edited by Stephen Harrison as *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics* (Oxford 2001).<sup>1</sup> We must ask, says Reeve, does our reading “explain things in the [text] that had seemed puzzling? Does it reveal things that no one had noticed? In short, where does it lead?”<sup>2</sup> Answers, indeed the very questions, suppose attentive study of prior reception, fulfilling, too, an ideal of scholarly community, described by Reeve as “less intellectual than moral,” that rewards priority with “credit given where credit is due,”<sup>3</sup> in keeping with the honor accorded “first,” to say nothing of scholarly desire to avoid the embarrassment of claiming to “discover the wheel” or of neglecting evidence that may impair or reinforce one’s case. Also, facing Reeve’s “fundamental question why [still today receive such works],” reception studies must reopen texts to contemporary conversation, demonstrating in other words what is often called relevance. By questioning views that have long constrained discussion, receptionists could help revitalize reading.

---

In practice, the present inquiry began with *Virgil and the Augustan Reception* (Cambridge 2001), where Richard F. Thomas delineates what he calls the “Augustan reading” of Virgil, which he proceeds to deconstruct.<sup>4</sup> Thomas emphasizes actual focus on texts, seeking with J. M. Ziolkowski “a middle ground between the deconstructive aims of some theory and the reconstructive project of all philology.”<sup>5</sup> He aims to free Virgil of

tralaticious incrustations, making the text seem less familiar,<sup>6</sup> and to freshen conversation through rereading. The goal is welcome and the achievement considerable, which makes all the more disconcerting his shortfall in the most fundamental case.

Thomas's eclectic blend of theory with philology succeeds for the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* only to slight Virgil's first work; for the categories of reception theory such as "implied reader" and "reader response" assume the library and study; and his focus on "establish[ing] an 'original' climate of reading" pays too little heed to his own requirement that interpretation be "historically plausible in terms of the culture that produced the text."<sup>7</sup> In short, Thomas neglects the ancient testimony for Virgil's initial success in the public media of his time.

(1.a) Actual reception. The Suetonian-Donatan life of Virgil reports: *Bucolica eo successu edidit ut in scena quoque per cantores crebro pronuntiarentur* (§ 26: "Virgil put out the *Bucolics* with such success that also on the stage by performers they were frequently read forth"). The report has passed its most recent muster with no less a critic than Nicholas Horsfall, who cites it in his *Virgil Companion* along with other evidence for the poet's "fame in his own lifetime and immediately after his death."<sup>8</sup> The report, although ignored, by Thomas, does get casual though uncredited notice from the arch-receptionist Charles Martindale in his *Virgil Companion*, inferring a bit more and much less than the text implies: "in antiquity some of the poems (which indeed are indebted to mime and show some interest in characterisation) were performed on stage as miniature dramas."<sup>9</sup> Ignoring the initial success and frequent performances, Martindale also neglects Horsfall's evidence from graffiti that the *Bucolics* figure in Virgil's popular notoriety disproportionately to their length.<sup>10</sup>

(1.b) Cultural Matrix. Wishing to reconstruct Virgil's cultural matrix by means of philologico-historical methods, we first have to deconstruct the dismissive and reductive account in Thomas:

What, first of all, do we know of the period in which Virgil wrote, roughly speaking, the period in which the voices of Caesar and Cicero have fallen silent, before the time of Velleius, and in a world where Livy's contemporary history is available only in epitome?<sup>11</sup>

Against this counsel of despair, one might relate the report, *eo successu edidit*, to well documented cultural practices at Rome, where the elites had long shared texts among themselves, both orally and in writing, in private and public contexts, as Horsfall himself and Mario Citroni, among many others, have observed;<sup>12</sup> Virgil's friend Asinius Pollio made a point of reciting his own works before an invited audience, setting a fashion that later even Augustus would feel constrained to humor.<sup>13</sup> Success in recitations, then, might catch the interest of those able and eager to promote frequent repetitions, also in the theater: *in scaena quoque crebro*.

On the theater's role as a political medium for the *Bucolics*, provoking public opinion and seeking to sway it, I myself have written in three books (1978, 1986, and 1992, the latter amplifying my 1966 dissertation, which now is accessible on my web site).<sup>14</sup> Also in 1992 Richard Beacham reminded readers that in the late Republic "politicians looked to the theater as a platform both for impressive display and for mass communication and manipulation of popular feeling."<sup>15</sup> Likewise Peter Wiseman in 1995 wrote that "in republican Rome, the theater was the arena for the 'making and remaking' of the community's myths."<sup>16</sup> Beacham noted that Pompey completed Rome's first permanent theater in 55 BCE providing a new venue for crowd manipulation and propagandistic display, which Julius Caesar promptly exploited to celebrate his final defeat of Pompey.<sup>17</sup> Beacham, then, in 1999 would devote an entire chapter to the "Statecraft and Stagecraft of Augustus," documenting how the young Caesar deliberately and persistently used public spectacles in the theater and games to play on public opinion, how he capitalized on his status as *divi filius*, "son of the deified one."<sup>18</sup> The latter theme of course figured especially

in Octavian's coinage, to ingratiate and define himself with the public, as Paul Zanker had shown.<sup>19</sup> Moreover, in the years between 46 and 29 BCE propaganda had to deal with an audience that included some of the several hundred thousand persons who had suffered loss of their lands to veterans of the civil wars, as Keith Hopkins has pointed out.<sup>20</sup> Consequently, in Zanker's words,

The uncertainties of the present and the capriciousness of politics in Rome, along with the absence of any concrete or realistic expectations of what the future might bring, provided fertile soil for seers and soothsayers, irrational longing for a saviour, and predictions of a new and blessed age.<sup>21</sup>

Also, in the 1989 *Journal of Roman Studies* Andrew Wallace-Hadrill treated with exemplary theory and practice what he described as "the whole matter of new mythology and cultural innovation in the Augustan age."<sup>22</sup> The audiences were volatile, primed to spot allegory and gossip, the opinion makers alert and wary, as we know from Cicero, who anxiously monitored the theater's mercurial moods.<sup>23</sup> He himself was said to have told young Caesar of dreaming that a miraculous youth was sent down on a golden rope from heaven and honored by the gift of a whip from Capitoline Jove (Suetonius, *Div. Aug.* 94.9).

(1.c) Features fitting the matrix and favoring response. These reminders of Virgil's cultural matrix should prompt receptionists to try a fresh look at his first work, in search of features apt to strike that susceptible public, whether we suppose it assembled in some great atrium, library hall, or the vast, unruly theater, not in any case just a solitary reader curled up with a scroll. As potential allegory, however, Thomas cites only three passages, that possibly refer to Octavian:<sup>24</sup> "*Ecl.* 1.6-10, Tityrus, unnamed *deus* the salvation of Tityrus, with *Ecl.* 1.42-5, Tityrus, unnamed *iuvenis* allows Tityrus to herd"; also, but with a question mark, "*?Ecl.* 8.5-13, Virgil, unnamed *tu* to be subject of future song." Thomas then infers "a single and dominant function to all of these passages: each one creates a close identity between Octavian and Jupiter...."<sup>25</sup> This line of reasoning might have led to the

coins, reported by Zanker, that identify the young Caesar with the Dioscuri and Jupiter himself.<sup>26</sup> Further research might also have led to the rest of the *Bucolics*, considered for their stage potential as a construct at once dramatic, rhetorical, and ideological, since Thomas believes, at least in theory, “that Virgil’s oeuvre is ideologically complete and susceptible to interpretation.”<sup>27</sup>

A convenient platform from which to stage a fresh look at the *Bucolics* comes from Beacham’s account of the art of pantomime, seen as probably an Augustan development from mime. He quotes Lucian:<sup>28</sup>

”To sum it up, [the pantomime] will not be ignorant of anything that is told by Homer and Hesiod and the best poets, and above all by tragedy”; and Beacham elaborates:

This individual silent performer was backed by musicians playing such instruments as the tibia, cymbals, drums, cithara, and *scabellum* (a clapper operated by the foot) and accompanied by either a single actor or a chorus that sang the part and provided the narrative continuity, during which the pantomime impersonated all the characters, male and female, in a series of interlinked solo scenes consecutively arranged.

Beacham goes on to report:

Quintilian notes that there could be two *pantomimi* “contending with alternate gestures” and says that Augustus called one of them *saltator* (dancer) and the other *interpellator* (interrupter) (*Inst.* 6.3.65). The task of the performers was to give an impression of the whole ensemble and the relationship of one character to another while preserving the sense of the plot and creating graceful and expressive movements and gestures.

From such a standpoint, the first eclogue seems brilliantly calculated to prompt the actor and captivate the turbulent crowd. Credit must go to Norman Wentworth DeWitt who in 1923 saw the theatrical excitement and propagandistic effect of the clash of pronouns and

contrastive themes in the opening words of the persona called *Meliboeus*: the famous *tu, Tityre...* at rest making music as opposed to *nos...*, *nos patriam fugimus...*, which dramatizes the ideological divide between beneficiaries and victims of the revolution, only to be overshadowed by the ensuing triple run of three third person demonstratives -- *ille...*, *illius...*, *ille...*-- that virtually direct the actor's gestures towards the young Caesar in the front row as a present benefactor and savior, which was a preferred theme of Octavian's propaganda, as Zanker underlines.<sup>29</sup> The savior theme recurs with increased emphasis towards the poem's center: *nec tam praesentis alibi cognoscere divos* (B. 1.41: "nor elsewhere than at Rome could I know such saving gods"). Then at the very center, Virgil makes his *Tityrus* aver that in Rome for the first time he met the savior who delivered the oracle that determined his happy fate:

*hic mihi responsum primus dedit ille petenti:*

*'pascite ut ante boues, pueri. summittite tauros'* (B. 1.45)

here (sc. at Rome) that one first gave me the oracle as I petitioned:

'graze cattle as before, boys; bring up bulls.'

The image of the saving, present divine force invites comparison with the Dioscuri on the coinage.<sup>30</sup> However, the message of return to business as usual, doing things as before, does not address the petitions of a *Tityrus*, represented as motivated by the cause of Liberty to go to Rome (*Quae causa...? Libertas*, 1.26-27). The theme of return to things as they were, *ut ante*, seems rather calculated to assuage if not mystify those elements of the crowd represented in the opening speaker, *Meliboeus*, portrayed as a citizen land-owner dispossessed by barbaric soldiery. The supplementary message, "bring up bulls," suggests not merely restoration of the past but new development, albeit along traditional lines. (What could be more traditional yet innovative than more bulls?) Thus the oracle, promulgating a program of restoration augmented by growth in a traditional manner, formulates and encapsulates what will become the Augustan political and cultural

program, even as, through self-reflexive metonymy, it articulates Virgil's program in poetics: return to bucolic tradition but with augment. Much of this I did point when Angus Bowie invited to give a theoretical paper at Oxford in 1982:<sup>31</sup> "How DO we read ancient texts: Codes and Critics in Virgil, Eclogue One."<sup>32</sup> That paper took issue with the labored historicism of Ian DuQuesnay and subsequently was published in *Materiali e discussioni* by Biagio Conte.

From ideological clash, centered on Caesar and closing with a mystifying image of the peaceful end of a country day, as Alfonso Traina has remarked,<sup>33</sup> Virgil's dramaturgy shifts to the hot son and restless passion of *Corydon* for the master's darling, *Alexis*, which provoked allegory to the poet's erotic vicissitudes and captivated scribblers of graffiti, to say nothing of the inscription over a portal in Via Monserrato at Rome of "TRAHIT SVA QVEMQUE VOLVPTAS" (*B.* 2.65, "Each man's pleasure leads him on"). The monologue winds down by evoking alternatives to passion in pressing georgic work and more available love, after which the dramaturgy switches back to dialogue and stirs excitement about work, sex, and song, giving actors plenty of by-play before rising to a majestic center that projects fertility in every tree and field at the height of spring. The formal exchange opens by invoking Jove and Apollo, two deities associated with the young Caesar in propaganda and offering actors further opportunities for gesture:

ab Ioue principium musae, Iouis omnia plena:

ille colit terras, illi mea carmina curae. *B.* 3.60-61)

(From Jove our muse begins; of Jove all things are full:

that one cares for lands, that one for our songs cares.)

This Jupiter seems at once more comprehensive and more immediately present than the Zeus in Theocritus' seventh Idyll to whose throne report of one singer reached (*Id.* 7.93) or than the Zeus evoked by Aratus (*Ph.* 1-5).

The ensuing rapid fire exchanges dictate their own form of dramatic intensity, larded with tidbits of names recognizable by the crowd. Closure comes on a note of proverbial lore and satisfaction, sententious as in mime (love whether bitter or sweet deserves reward, meadows have drunk their fill). In abrupt contrast, then, the dramaturge calls for greater things and consular scope, putting love and satisfaction behind in the reach for Rome: strong clues to actor and audience of the departure about to unfold in eclogue four, which alone among the eclogues gets singled out by Zanker and Beacham for the currency of its prophetic motifs, to mention only here *ultima Cumaei uenit iam carminis aetas* (4, “now Cumaean song’s last age has come”); *iam noua progenies caelo dimittitur alto* (7, “now a new line is being sent down from heaven on high”). The latter shares the conceit of Cicero’s reported dream about the youth let down by a golden rope and honored by Jupiter. The story smacks of political etiology even as philosophically it counters Lucretius. He had denied a Stoic allegory on Homer concerning the descent of human life from heaven on a golden rope.<sup>34</sup>

Also in eclogue four, we find the gods important for Octavian’s propaganda:<sup>35</sup> *tuus iam regnat Apollo* (10, “already now your Apollo reigns”) and *magnum Iouis incrementum* (49, “Jove’s great scion”), the latter a ponderously spondaic, Roman adaptation of poetic praise from the seventh idyll: “a sprig from Zeus fashioned all for truth” (*Id.* 7.44). The tenor and effect of such language can be gauged from the contemporary poem clearly engaged at a comparable level, whether before or after, namely Horace’s sixteenth epode, in which the poet identifies himself as *uates*, public poet, prophet, bard (*Epod.* 16.66).

If the fourth eclogue, then, may be said to found Virgil’s reputation as a *uates*, the role would only be enhanced by the fifth, where the twin epitaphs for the dead Daphnis would inevitably put the theater crowd in mind of the dead and deified Julius: *extinctum... crudele funere* but then *candidus insuetum miratur limen Olympi* (*B.* 5.20, 56: “snuffed out by a cruel death” but “shining he marvels at the unfamiliar threshold of



Olympus”), an impression of vatic scope reinforced by an echo of the first eclogue, again with its gestural demonstrative: *’deus, deus ille’ Menalca* (64).

After the vatic climax of eclogues four and five, resonant with themes of Caesarian propaganda, the dramaturgy in eclogue six takes a striking turn of its own, introducing the notorious shift of key that has prompted so many aberrant scholarly receptions, which I reviewed and criticized in a paper for the old *Liverpool Classical Monthly* under the aegis of the good John Pinsent and now available on my web site.<sup>36</sup> The so-called “Song of Silenus” meditated in the first instance by Apollo and mediated by Arcadian Eurotas, laurels, the Pierian Muses and *Tityrus redux* stands out as vatic in scope but minus the positive historical force of Rome. Then in eclogue seven the strain of vatic poetics gets represented and further reduced in the defeat of *Thyrsis*, the self-styled swelling poet and would-be *uates*, where the adjective “golden” qualifies not a returning race but a prospective image of Priapus (7.36) and Jove figures only as a soaking rain (60).

The vatic strain undergoes further retrenchment in eclogues eight and nine, where two further motifs of Caesarist propaganda occur in apostrophes that are tangential to the main thrust of these poems and this sequence in the book.

In eight, the narrative turns aside from contrastive songs of tragic intensity to hail an unnamed figure associated with the book’s structure, its opening and prospective close, and described as worthy of the tragic buskin and a laurel crown:

a te principium, tibi desinam: accipe iussis  
 carmina coepta tuis, atque hanc sine tempora circum  
 intra uictricis hederam tibi serpere lauros. (*B.* 8.11-13)  
 (“from you my start, for you will I desist: receive these songs  
 begun by your commands and let this ivy creep  
 among victorious bays around your brow”)

Again, the ideological language provides a gestural cue to the actor and audience. Among the perquisites granted the young Caesar was the right to wear a wreath of laurel at all times,<sup>37</sup> one that reinforced his emblematic association with Apollo; and the laurels also feature in his coinage.<sup>38</sup> Then, too, within the framework of the book, the young Caesar figured at the *principium*, at the start, as the saviour evoked by *Tityrus*' narrative of his journey to Rome.

In the ninth eclogue, then, Virgil imagines a fragment of scarcely remembered song in which an old *vates* named *Moeris* had once in happier days evoked the *Caesaris astrum* ("Caesar's star"), which was one of the earliest and most prominent motifs in young Caesar's propaganda.<sup>39</sup> Here, to be sure, no demonstratives direct attention to the front rows; but the retreat from vatic poetics and the Italian scene once mastered by *Menalcas* leaves Virgil free in eclogue ten to transfer his field of operations from Italy to Arcadia, bringing back *Menalcas* as an Arcadian, joined with Pan on his home ground where he invented the bucolic pipe.

In eclogue ten, with the figure of Gallus dying of unrequited love, the dramatist gives the actor and gossipy public a climactic mix of tragic posturing and local gossip, after the tragic *Damon* and demonic enchantress of eclogue eight, the scabrous *Pasiphaë* in six, enamoured of bucolic matter, and in two the histrionic *Corydon*: all erotic dramas that tickle popular fancy and feed graffiti, while the historico-mythopoetic flights mystify political consciousness and promote identification between the future princeps and his poet-prophet, *Vergilius vates*. Some such development must lie behind two pieces of evidence for Virgil's public status in his own day. The Suetonian-Donatan life reports: *si quando Romae, quo rarissime commeabat, viseretur in publico, sectantis demonstrantisque se subterfugeret in proximum tectum* (39-40: "if ever he was seen in public at Rome, where he most rarely traveled, he would take refuge from the pursuing and cheering crowds under the nearest roof"); but also, Tacitus, in the *Dialogue on orators*, who makes the poet Maternus recall that Virgil lacked neither favor with Augustus nor notice by the public,

testis iste populus, qui auditis in teatro Vergili versibus surrexit universus et forte praesentem spectantemque Vergilium veneratus est sic quasi Augustum (“witness that public of yours, which in the theater having heard some verses of Virgil’s, who happened to be present among the spectators, rose all together and paid him homage almost as if he were Augustus himself”).<sup>40</sup>

In closing, then we may echo Richard Tarrant, who wrote of “Poetry and Power” in Martindale’s *Companion*, that “Virgil can be said to have fashioned a literary myth to support the political myth of the principate.”<sup>41</sup> But where Tarrant says this about the *Aeneid*, our evidence brings it home to the *Bucolics*, where “Virgil can be said to have fashioned complementary literary and political myths. These prompted the young Caesar to promote frequent theatrical presentations, which inspired popular response and helped create and communicate the meaning of the regime, meanwhile casting the poet as its prophet or *vates*, thus gaining for himself quasi mythic status as the regime consolidated its position.” The whole dynamic of the unfolding and varying spectacle eludes theoretical radar too exclusively fixed on eclogues taken separately, thereby remiss in its duty to make evidence (philological, historical) interrogate even (especially) familiar habits handed down.

In focusing on the literary myth of *Vergilius vates*, we have neglected the other literary myth that Virgil created here: Arcadia as the originary locus of bucolic song. Details of the argument appear in the works available on my web site. Suffice it here to remark that scholars of the receptionist persuasion have ignored the time and place parameters of the tenth eclogue and their metapoetic implications. Virgil, by inventing a prequel to the first idyll, consolidated his own myth as a literary founder, bidding to displace Theocritus by returning to the mythic source, capping and supplanting the first idyll. All of which has escaped the notice of interpreters like Richard Jenkyns (nevertheless claimed space in the same volume of *JRS* as Wallace-Hadrill),<sup>42</sup> or Martindale in his *Companion*, and now Thomas, all of whom as a result purvey inevitably reductive versions of pastoral and the *Liber Bucolicon*.

## Notes

1. Michael Silk, "Pindar Meets Plato: Theory, Language, Value, and the Classics," in *Texts, Ideas, and Classics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 44.
2. Michael Reeve, "Reception/History of Scholarship: Introduction," in *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 249. Of course "explain," "reveal," and "lead" as metaphors for the hermeneutic process must be interrogated: cf. other papers in the same volume: Susanna Morton Braund, "(Genre) Introduction," in *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 139; Alessandro Barchiesi, "The Crossing," in *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 148; and Marcus Wilson, "Seneca's *Epistles* Reclassified," in *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 185; likewise a paper from the 2002 meeting of the American Philological Association by Mary Whitlock Blundell on Plato's metaphors.
3. Reeve, "Reception," 245; Richard F. Thomas, *Virgil and the Augustan Reception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), xx, citing Heinze: "honour where honour is due."
4. Thomas, *Augustan Reception*, passim.
5. J. M. Ziolkowski quoted approvingly by Thomas, *Augustan Reception*, xvi.
6. For "defamiliarization" (*Entfremdung*) see Thomas, *Augustan Reception*, xvi, describing a critic's complaint at his *Georgics* commentary, "This is not the poem that I have been reading and rereading," as in fact "quite heartening, since that was really my aim.."
7. Thomas 2001. Thomas, *Augustan Reception*, xvii, occluding documented reception via success in recitation that led to stage performance.
8. Nicholas Horsfall, *A Companion to the Study of Virgil* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 249 Cf. Nicholas Horsfall, "Aspects of Virgilian Influence in Roman Life," in *Atti del Convegno di*

*Studi Virgiliani*, II (Milano: Mondadori, 1984), 51-52, on the disproportionate presence of the *Bucolics* in popular media, by contrast even with the *Aeneid*, to say nothing of the largely ignored *Georgics*.

9. Charles Martindale, "Green Politics: The *Eclogues*," in *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 119.

10. Cf. above, note 8.

11. Thomas, *Augustan Reception*, 27.

12. Nicholas Horsfall, "Poet and Patron Reconsidered," in *Ancient Society* (Macquarie, 1983), 1-3; Mario Citroni, *Poesia e Lettori in Roma Antica. Forme Della Comunicazione Letteraria* (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 1995), 3-56.

13. Seneca, *Controv.* 4, praef. 2, *Pollio Asinius...primus...omnium Romanorum advocatis hominibus scripta sua recitavit*; Suetonius, *Aug.* 89, *recitantes et benigne et patienter audit*; cf. Llewelyn Morgan, "Creativity Out of Chaos: Poetry Between the Death of Caesar and the Death of Virgil," in *Literature in the Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 80, "in the first instance this was Pollio's work, but the practice was picked up by others and became a central institution of Roman aristocratic life in the imperial period."

14. John Van Sickle, *A Reading of Virgil's Messianic Eclogue* (New York: Garland, 1992), 15-36; John Van Sickle, *Poesia e Potere. Il Mito Virgilio* (Roma: Laterza, 1986), 17-25; John Van Sickle, *The Design of Virgil's Bucolics* (Roma: Ateneo, 1978), 9-10.

15. Richard C. Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992), 156.

16. T. P. Wiseman, *Remus A Roman Myth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 132. Cf. Cicero, *pro Sestio* 118-124, *ad Atticum* 2.19 and 14.3, *de orat.* 2.240-43, *Phil.* 2.65, 67; Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 2.7.1-9.

17. Beacham, *Roman Theater*, 160-62.

18. Richard C. Beacham, *Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 92-108.
19. Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, tr Alan Shapiro (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988), 35-39.
20. Keith Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 67.
21. Zanker, *Image Power*, 44.
22. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, "Rome's Cultural Revolution," *JRS* 79 (1989): 156-64, cited by Van Sickle, *Messianic Eclogue*, 148, n. 19.
23. Beacham, *Spectacle*, 92-108.
24. Thomas, *Augustan Reception*, 41.
25. Idem 42. Thomas sees *B.* 8.11 as the only time in the *Bucolics* that Virgil addresses Octavian. He cites *Iupiter in caelis, Caesar regit omnia terris* (Anth. Lat. 813R, attributed to Virgil) as well as Aratus 1, & Theocr. 17.1 and *B.* 3.60, "at the beginning of amoebeans which end possibly with a riddle on Aratus' poem. A secondary reference, close in rhythm, to Homer, *Iliad* 9.97 (ἐν σοὶ μὲν λήξω, σέο δ' ἄρξομαι) seems to complicate by bringing in Agamemnon, but the words that follow make it clear that even here Zeus is very much in the air...." Cf. the formula of beginning and ending with the Muses, Hesiod, *Theog.* 34: σφᾶς δ' αὐτὰς πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν ἀείδειν.
26. Zanker, *Image Power*, 38, 54-56.
27. Thomas, *Augustan Reception*, xvii.
28. Beacham, *Spectacle*, 143, citing Lucian (*De Salt.* 37-71
29. Norman W. DeWitt, *Virgil's Biographia Letteraria* (Toronto: Victoria College Press, 1923), 129-30, cited in a critique of readers who have ignored the clashing ideologies by Van Sickle, *Poesia e Potere*, 20-22, "Dal mimo al mito."
30. Cf. above note 33.

31. John Van Sickle, "How Do We Read Ancient Texts? Codes & Critics in Virgil, Eclogue One," *Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi Dei Testi Classici* 13 (1984): 107-28.

32. f. Ernst A. Schmidt, "Freedom and Ownership: A Contribution to the Discussion of Vergil's First *Eclogue*," *Proceedings of the Leeds International Latin Seminars* 10 (1998): 185-201, deconstructing I. M. Le M. Du Quesnay, "Vergil's First *Eclogue*," *Proceedings of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3 (1981): 29-182. The latter was the object of my critique at Oxford in 1982.

33. Alfonso Traina, "La Chiusa Della Prima Ecloga Virgiliana," *Lingua e Stile* 3, no. 1 (1968): 45-57; John Van Sickle, "Dawn & Dusk as Motifs of Opening & Closure in Heroic & Bucolic Epos (Homer, Apollonius, Theocritus, Virgil)," in *Atti del Convegno di Studi Virgiliani*, I (Milano: Mondadori, 1984), 132.

34. Van Sickle, *Messianic Eclogue*, 69-70.

35. Cf. note \*\*\*.

36. <http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/classics/jvsickle/file:/bb6midst.htm>, from LCM 2 (1977) 107-8.

37. Zanker, *Image Power*, 41.

38. Zanker, *Image Power*, 42.

39. Zanker, *Image Power*, 35-37.

40. *Dial.* 13, following an account of the origins of eloquence (12, *primordia eloquentiae*), a golden age (*aureum saeculum*) before oratory rife with poet prophets (*poetis et vatibus*), no lawyers but Orpheus and Linus, Apollo: cf. *B.* 4: 8-9, *gens aurea*; 56-57, *Orpheus, Linus, Apollo*; also 4, *Cumaei carminis*, 47, *concordes stabili fatorum numine Parcae*, which raise the level of the poem to that of prophetic, vatic speech. Cf. Van Sickle, *Messianic Eclogue*, 150.

41. Tarrant, "Poetry & Power," 169-78.

42. Richard Jenkyns, "Virgil and Arcadia," *Journal of Roman Studies* 79 (1989): 26-39,

criticized by Van Sickle, *Messianic Eclogue*, 153, n. 42.



## Bibliography

- Anderson, William S. "Poetic Arrangement from Vergil to Ovid." In *Poems in Their Places. The Intertextuality and Order of Poetic Collections*, 44-65. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. "The Crossing." In *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics*, 142-63. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Beacham, Richard C. *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- . *Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Braund, Susanna Morton. "(Genre) Introduction." In *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics*, 137-41. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Citroni, Mario. *Poesia e Lettori in Roma Antica. Forme Della Comunicazione Letteraria*. Roma-Bari: Laterza, 1995.
- DeWitt, Norman W. *Virgil's Biographia Letteraria*. Toronto: Victoria College Press, 1923.
- Du Quesnay, I. M. Le M. . "Vergil's First Eclogue." *Proceedings of the Liverpool Latin Seminar 3 (1981)*: 29-182.
- Hopkins, Keith. *Conquerors and Slaves*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. "Aspects of Virgilian Influence in Roman Life." In *Atti del Convegno di Studi Virgiliani*. II, 46-63. Milano: Mondadori, 1984.
- . *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "Poet and Patron Reconsidered." In *Ancient Society*, 1-3. Macquarie, 1983.
- Jenkyns, Richard. "Virgil and Arcadia." *Journal of Roman Studies* 79 (1989): 26-39.
- Martindale, Charles. "Green Politics: The *Eclogues*." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, 107-24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

- Morgan, Llewelyn. "Creativity Out of Chaos: Poetry Between the Death of Caesar and the Death of Virgil." In *Literature in the Roman World*, 75-118. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Patterson, Annabel. *Pastoral and Ideology From Virgil to Valéry*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987.
- Reeve, Michael. "Reception/History of Scholarship: Introduction." In *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics*, 245-51. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Schmidt, Ernst A. "Freedom and Ownership: A Contribution to the Discussion of Vergil's First *Eclogue*." *Proceedings of the Leeds International Latin Seminars* 10 (1998): 185-201.
- Silk, Michael. "Pindar Meets Plato: Theory, Language, Value, and the Classics." In *Texts, Ideas, and Classics*, 26-45. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Tarrant, R. J. "Poetry and Power: Virgil's Poetry in Contemporary Context." In *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, 169-87. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Thomas, Richard F. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Traina, Alfonso. "La Chiusa Della Prima Ecloga Virgiliana." *Lingua e Stile* 3, no. 1 (1968): 45-57.
- Van Sickle, John. "Dawn & Dusk as Motifs of Opening & Closure in Heroic & Bucolic Epos (Homer, Apollonius, Theocritus, Virgil)." In *Atti del Convegno di Studi Virgiliani*. I, 124-47. Milano: Mondadori, 1984.
- . *The Design of Virgil's Bucolics*. Roma: Ateneo, 1978.
- . "How Do We Read Ancient Texts? Codes & Critics in Virgil, *Eclogue One*." *Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi Dei Testi Classici* 13 (1984): 107-28.
- . *Poesia e Potere. Il Mito Virgilio*. Roma: Laterza, 1986.
- . *A Reading of Virgil's Messianic Eclogue*. New York: Garland, 1992.

- . "Virgil Vs Cicero, Lucretius, Theocritus, Callimachus, Plato, & Homer: Two Programmatic Plots in the First *Bucolic*." *Vergilius* 46 (2000): 21-58.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. "Rome's Cultural Revolution." *JRS* 79 (1989): 156-64.
- Wilson, Marcus. "Seneca's *Epistles* Reclassified." In *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics*, 164-88. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Wiseman, T. P. *Remus A Roman Myth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Zanker, Paul. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Tr Alan Shapiro. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1988.