REVIEW ARTICLE

John Van Sickle

A Theoretically Challenged Reader Wonders: "Where's the Book?"

A Review of Brian W. Breed, *Pastoral Inscriptions. Reading and Writing Virgil's* Eclogues

Classical Literature and Society (Duckworth: London, 2006). Pp. [i]-vii, 1-199. ISBN 0-7156-3449-6.

Brian Breed (hereafter BB) invokes a wide range of scholarly voices, among them mine, with a freshness & energetic involvement that put me in mind of first coming to the *Book of Bucolics* myself more than forty years ago, remind me too that only provocative new turns will keep this age-old colloquy alive. BB enunciates a distinctive strategy & theoretical view. He emphasizes & interrogates the role of voice in a poetry that professes (so to speak) to be song yet hints at its own nature as text getting written & read.[1] His approach authorizes, even provokes, an inveterate reader to go back, pick out – revisit & review – occasions where the ten elusive pieces style, in a manner of speaking, themselves communicative in one or another wise – by mentioning vocal & audible or legible, to be sure, but also other kinds of perceptible & signiferent crafts.[2]

----

[1]To write "poetry professes" is to employ the voice metaphor (or is it metonymy – a trope of selection by moving within a domain or frame [a] towards more general & comprehensive instantiation or [b] towards more isolated, limited, & particular instantiatons via mental processes of exclusion or compression) that we often employ to indicate the field or cognitive frame of interpretative communication whether spoken or written. For a systematic analysis & anatomy of these & other figurational processes in cognition, see Gilles Fauconnier, Mark Turner, *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities* (New York: Basic Books, 2002).

[2]Again it proves convenient to use the vocal figure of speech & thought, "said" & "speak of," instead of alternative tropes (sc., Greek 'turns' – metaphoric from the common metaphor of discourse as a movement or journey forward along one plane), tropes such as "refer to" ('carry back') or "depict" ('paint from') or "contain terms [sc. 'fixed markers, boundaries'] that can be thought to reflect ['bend back, mirror'] upon" : tropes, in any event, that could perhaps be styled metaphoronymic, since they may be said to transfer focus either within a domain (metonymy) or across domains (metaphor), depending where one draws one's

This new quest draws me back to familiar & prominent spots where the crafts imputed to one or another eclogue number singing & song (*canere*, *carmen*), above all, whether orational, oracular or incantatory – meant to sway, compel, or charm – or too resinging & echoing (*cantare, resonare*); likewise pointing up or out with speech both declarative & authoritative (*dicere*) & once even local talking (*loqui*), which in the light of this recollective investigation suddenly looms even more than it did as peculiar – isolated & framed by layered figurations of other kinds of verbal acts.

The quest too makes me scour the book for spots (or moments, if you prefer a temporal metaphor) where (or when, then) eclogues may be said to define themselves in terms that imply exercise – preparative, illustrative, instructive, recollective, transmutative – mental, vocal, scribal (*meditari, docere, ludere, meminisse, modulari*).

Pressing on, beyond the shows of herdsmen variously descanting, cursing, kvetching, the quest breaks through to sites where eclogues picture (another common metaphoronymy) themselves as special kinds of writing (*describere, praescribere,* not to mention *incidere* that evokes the root meaning of Greek *graphein*, 'to scratch, carve'). It becomes more than ever salient to note how words may be envisaged scratched on a papyrus scroll atop a little space called *pagina*, which is a term drawn by metaphor, scil. carried over, transferred, from country work. On the farm it denotes a plot pegged off (*pagus*) as property to farm, although we now refer to these narrow vertical 'fields' on scrolls as 'columns' (metaphor from the domain of architecture?).[3] It follows that the image of scratching verses ('turns') onto a *pagina* might hint at turns of plowing on a pegged off field – a metapoetic hint of writing epic verse in the georgic range (the middle range in theme & style between the lower & higher ranges identified respectively as bucolic & civic-heroic) – the middle where V. archly collocates & defines the sixth

demainial lines or splits one's hairs: metaphor, metonymy, & their congeners interpreted as types or degrees of Conceptual Integration by *Fauconnier & Turner: Blending*, 144.

[3]But does column share rootage with colony & cultivate?

eclogue, which pivots on a tale of erotic reversal: love flowing from high to low – queen wild on hills pursuing calmly cloistered bull.[4]

Not least, the quest draws on to eclogues where V. imagined their words as things that could get overwritten, superimposed (*superaddite*) on a burial mound or get scratched onto trees (scil. on bark, *liber*, which by metonymy means book), also hints of getting written down as texts available to a reader or readers (*lector, legere, leget, legat*) – among the latter potentially I & you.

Yet further, although here BB heeds less the dictates of his own method, the quest finds hints of other ways to see what this poetic art is up to: e.g., motifs of pruning, spinning, weaving, storing up in a wicker mold, but also herding, driving, breeding livestock, with sacrifice & vatication, omens read, prophetic sight, as well as mentions of ordering, threading, making texture, context: all coloring poetic work as interconnective & developmental in a made – scil. fabricated – books with sociopolitical privileges, obligations & powers.

The divers hints of orality & textuality BB would have us take as characterizing by means of self-reflexive metonymy the work where they occur – as clues, in other words, to guide investigation of V.'s metapoetic designs – traces for tracking his notions of poetics by positing, so to speak, a kind of heautometaphoronymy.[5] The very range of motifs leads BB to argue – blending metaphors of cartage, heft, & theater – that the *Bucolics* were "written in full awareness of textuality as the vehicle for the author's relationships with audiences, weighing both the strengths & the weaknesses of reading & writing for performing that function" (p. 3).

This inferential metapoetics unfolds through eight chapters: (1) "Orality and Textuality in the *Eclogues*" (cases in eclogue nine); (2) "Other

----

[4]John Van Sickle, *The Design of Virgil's Bucolics* (London: Duckworth, 2004 (Second Edition)), 146–58.

[5]All of our interpretations of Latin terms for song and speech must now be revised, updated as they say, in the light of trenchant study of their semantic and cultural fields by Thomas Habinek: *The World of Roman Song* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), e.g. song vs speech (p. 61); *cantare* as reperformance (pp. 64-70, cf. p. 199), *dicere* vs *loqui, vox* as sound; poetics of play (pp. 119, 133, 159).

People's Voices" (eclogues two & eight); (3) "Dialogue and Textuality" (eclogues three, five, and seven); (4) "*Imago vocis*: Echoes, Ecphrasis and the Voice as Source" (eclogue six); (5) "Pastoral Origins in *Eclogue* 1"; (6) "Site Translation" (pun for V.'s transfer of the bucolic locus from Theocritean Sicily to Arcadia, the latter upgraded by V. & emphasized as the originary bucolic place & time authenticated by an imagined sight of *Pan* at his home site in eclogue ten);[6] (7) "*Eclogue* 4: The Voice of the Author"; & (8) "Reading the *Eclogues.*"[7]

Even a reader theoretically challenged may recognize what BB speaks of as the "speech-writing divide" remarked of late by Walter Ong yet rooted, like so many other theoretical considerations about language, in Plato's *Phaedrus* (p. 3). BB glances at other instances of "mimetic voice" in various eclogues then sketches a critical history of the concept. He recalls how Derrida derided platonic privileging of spoken over written language in order paradoxically to affirm the irreducible slippage inherent in language of both sorts – the gap between sign & referent. Thus he would have us recognize "the persistence of voice in literature, whether as a phenomenon of representation or as a metaphor for critical description or even just as a sense of possibility of connecting written words to other realities" (p. 7). After all is said & done, voice is "one of the 'metaphors we live by'," he reminds us, alluding to the influential work by Lakoff & Johnson;[8] & he evokes the wide use in modern Virgilian studies of the metaphors of "voice" & "further voice," which posit "a human presence

----

[6]An extreme instance of combining features from wildly disparate frames into a cognitive blend that we as readers easily "run" – the term of art proffered by Fauconnier-Turner (n. 1).

[7]BB regularly uses *Eclogues* as a name for Virgil's book, a practice called "unfortunate" by Don and Peta Fowler, *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1999³), arguing that Virgil used *Bucolics* to credit Theocritus; cf. also Richard Hunter, *Theocritus A Selection. Idylls 1, 3,4, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 13* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 5 .

[8]George & Mark Johnson Lakoff, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003). Further developments in this important area, e.g. Gilles Fauconnier, *Mappings in Thought and Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997) & Gilles Fauconnier, Mark Turner, *Fauconnier & Turner: Blending*, n. 1.

behind the words on the page" yet elude definitive attribution to a source (p. 11).

Wielding his theoretical gear against essentialistic simplisticisms that typify talk about pastoral qua genre, BB goes on to tell of ways in which both voicing & writing figure in various eclogues, despite genericists' claims that writing does not fit "the pastoral" (pp. 14-15). Although he too sometimes slips into essentialistic genericism (betrayed by "the" definite article too easily deployed), he does allow that "at the time of their creation the *Eclogues* do not fully correspond to any one clearly established genre" (p. 15). On this theme, he concludes that "the intertextual relationship between V. & Theocritus ... creates pastoral, & ... is as close as any in the ancient world" (p. 16). He describes this crucial literary crossing as "close" & closeness turns out to be the premise & controlling concept for his whole handling of the intertextual net that does in some sense "create" the literary – scribal if not scriptural – past we style with latent paradox pastoral.

A reader alerted to self-reflexivity in language may come to wonder whether BB himself (perhaps unconsciously) seeks in his manner of speaking (scil. writing) to palliate the sometimes abstruse, elusive, esoteric ways of theory, which risk becoming so self-involved as to lose touch not only with mere texts but with an audience like the readers of *Vergilius* that though academic still expect scholarly discourse to respect some oral (performative & narrational) roots – i.e., be readable out loud. An unconsciously palliative wish, we were saying, may have drawn BB to muster evidence from the texts by means of a familiar story-telling manner – paraphrase. To support his theoretical points he uses what may be called perhaps (for lack of apter tropes) paraphrastic personification or dramatic literalism, cousins to vocalization, e.g. almost from the first (pp. 1-2)

> Moeris and Menalcas, a poet of local renown, have lost their land and nearly their lives.... Moeris' equation of his loss of memory for songs with the loss of voice itself illustrates a metonymy that is of broad significance for the *Eclogues*.

Paraphrase ingratiates, entertains yet may divert from close accountability to texts. Readers will have to keep in mind the actual Latin lurking behind the fictitious persons & engaging tales.

For instance some might wonder what BB wants to convey by means of a trope like "equation … illustrates" & might try to unpack the personification into something like, e.g., "V. here equates loss … with the loss … making a metonymy ….." Others, eager to relate the textual signs to further contexts in literature & life, might not just unpack but stretch, e.g., "V. imagines the figure of a displaced old goatherd & hapless *vates*, which he endows with the thematic name *Moeris* & depicts as driven to despair – a sentiment signaled by means of the common metonymy that equates song & voice with life itself. The imagined emotive extreme serves well to suggest not only aging & forced exit from property, with loss of a traditional way of life (themes communicative in the political sphere – fate of many in Rome's civil war, among them V.'s Mantuans, & resonant down through history as the plight of refugees), but also suggest the final phase of a book (themes communicative in the metapoetic sphere – fate of any literary construct to get finished via closural motifs: a figural need served perfectly here by forgetful age & exile forced)."

Pursuit of voicing draws BB, however, away from immediate book structure in search of "broad significance":

> The voice of the singer <u>is equated</u> (*) with the song. And yet there are ironies. At the same time <u>as Moeris complains</u> (**) of losing his memory for songs, <u>he is</u> **in a sense** <u>remembering</u> (**) a famous poem, the Heraclitus epigram of Callimachus (*Anth. Pal.* 7.80.1-3) …. Moeris' forgetfulness <u>is contradicted</u> (*) by the 'poetic memory' of <u>verses that in fact affirm</u> (**) the indelibility of poetry ….

Verbs in passive voice (*) hide (occlude, as some theorists put it, 'shut up') the active equating agent – equated, that is to say, by whom? Dramatic literalism (**) resumes, used now to evoke the notorious disconnect between mimetic surface (illusion of real herdsmen fixated by some critics) & literary subtext that pervades both V. & Theocritus, though hardly confined to them & therefore hardly unique to "the pastoral."[9] BB has *Moeris* doing the complaining & the remembering, although, with "in a sense," he

----

[9] A disconnect that may indeed represent – figuring forth – the general & irriducible gap between sign & substance which is the original sin & salvation of language (bringing to mind the gap – mostly negligible, sometimes fatal – between car & platform on our Long Island trains).

tacitly allows that it is V. or at least the text (whatever is cloaked by further metonymy set off in single quotes as "'the poetic memory'") that sets off multiple resonances in our minds.

The created figure of a hapless *vates* in Cisalpine Gaul serves to make us reflect on similarities & differences, contradictions if you will: [1] the surface image of an old bard (*Moeris*) forgetting song, executed in epic hexameters by [2] Italian-Roman V. himself pillaging motifs [3] from an old Greek epigram (Callimachus, *Epigr.* 2 Pfeiffer), with its motif of remembering [4] a still older Greek poet's restful conversation – *lesche*, [5] itself derived metonymically from the final resting place, bier, tomb – & the claim that the final rest in death cannot silence [6] poetic voices – "nightingales" – that stand by metphoronymy both for the older poet [4] & for the epigram that mentions them [3], so glancing off V.'s [2] local image of forgetfulness [1]. The restless interplay of layers might well make one linger, savor, wonder how & why such effects come so close to closing a complex book even as they exemplify & enact the power of cognitive blending mentioned above.

Be all that as it may, BB presses forward in purposeful pursuit of his theoretical quarry:

> If the Heraclitus epigram represents (**) an ideal that the written text can act as a replacement or supplement for the absence of a person, in the pastoral world of the *Eclogues* that is an ideal that is only inconsistently realized (*). When <u>Moeris</u> <u>presents</u> (**) poetry as not just dependent on voice, but even identified with it, <u>he</u> <u>would</u> <u>seem</u> <u>to</u> <u>deny</u> (**) outright the possibility that poetry could exist in separation from a human voice & the human presence of a singer.

Reading through the dramatic literalism, running the blend as Fauconnier & Turner would say, one can doubt the very positing of an "ideal" of text as supplement, yet find that V. in *Moeris* embodies or, so to speak, incorporates & conveys extreme notions about poetry & actual presence. But a reader – wishing to inquire more deeply into reasons for dramatizing such a reduction of poetic power – might prefer to infer that V. cooked up his disconsolate *vates* to represent not merely some broad & generic poetological position but also, even primarily, a localized – contextually contingent – disposition. This would connect – tie in – with thematic

threads drawn down through the book & that now here get a new twist at the book's penultimate turn.

Following this line of thought, the lament of *Moeris* would be read in two ways. It would serve to mystify public attention (even mitigate & deflect if no longer wholly defer a political polemic muted in eclogue one, which offered praise for a new Roman god & mystified, occluded, his revolutionary violence by reserving blame for his troops described as godless & barbarian, hence distant & detached from any god at Rome). Here the god & new Roman myth fade from view; blame mitigated & diffused gets transferred to 'Chance' & a local usurper rather than godless barbarian soldier.

At the same time through metapoetical metaphoronymy, the lament at this moment would be read as winding down, even cutting off, the thread of vatic poetics in the book. Vatic poetics, whether projected in the rush of performance or implied in the subtler histrionics of the unrolling scroll, could be seen to grow in the first five eclogues. First was the etiological tale of a lucky old herdsman *Títyrus* vouchsafed an oracle by a beneficent new deity at Rome. From this seed the positive propaganda swelled to the totalizing vatic scope of the fourth eclogue & allegorical mythology of the fifth. Abruptly then V. staged a strategic retreat through the second half book – diminishing vatic ambition step by step:

(ecl. 6) rebuke drawing *Tityrus* down & back from the highest thematic range;

(ecl. 7) defeat of ambitious, would-be *vates*;

(ecl. 8) vatic voice split into extremes – project to deliver heroic-tragic praise at some future moment but memory of vatic spells triply removed from the present framer & filtered through intermediary female voices.

In the aftermath of this step by step dismantling, the defeat of old *vates Moeris* marks a further phase – definitive & conclusive – as V. pilots his new bucolic venture away from its Siculo-Italic background & Roman ambition toward its final Arcadian future masked as distant past (i.e. the "site translation" that BB acknowledges as a culminating motif in the book).

Taking stock, a reader never beguiled by genre theory has to admit that generic thinking, positing genre groups, emerges from the work of

Fauconnier, Lakoff, et al.,[10] as one of the most persistent & essential cognitive functions, though like other cultural tools, like pharmaka, it cuts both ways, so that the pastoralists for all their cognitive & cultural justification, inevitability, & necessity end up so often barking up wrong trees – rueful reminders that all of our interpretative quests operate under the ineluctable rule that insight won in one wise makes for blindness in some other.

The rest of this review will move from theory & its disconnects to practical reading, remarking how the quest for voicing can highlight & illuminate, but also neglect & misread – not only intertexture but above all intratexture – both the inner fabric of the *Liber Bucolicon* & its bold positing & reshaping of tradition through audacious blends of disparate frames & fields: in short addressing readers – impatient if theory seem to labor the obvious – who wonder, "Where's the beef?", i.e. "Where's the book?" but also "What became of the emulative spirit that made V. imagine challenging & defeating *Orpheus, Calliope, Linus, Apollo*, even *Pan* in Arcadia even?" Why embrace similarity, closeness, only to banish *oppositio in imitando* from this latest interpretational round?

<center>* * *</center>

First Eclogue

The first eclogue has provoked readings so diverse as to betray its readers' contradictory ideologies & habitual misprisions,[11] which BB dignifies through a rather bold metonymy when he infers that the readerly confusion casts doubt on "the nature and the capacity of pastoral itself" (p. 95), where by "pastoral" he seems to mean the essentialistic concept dear to genre theorists & elsewhere deconstructed by himself. He approaches this palpable touchstone for theory with further personifications (**):

> The first *Eclogue* is <u>a</u> <u>poem</u> <u>highly</u> <u>conscious</u> <u>of</u> <u>its</u> <u>status</u> (**) as an
> introduction.... <u>Allusion</u> <u>plays</u> <u>a</u> <u>specific</u> <u>role</u> (**)... offering a means

----

[10]Cf. n. 1.

[11]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: theoretical & synthetic perspective on divers sorts of hermeneutic carelessness & recklessness by readers.

for the poem to reflect (**) on beginnings, on its own relationship to the past, & on the origins of pastoral poetry" (p. 95).

In this scenario, allusion, too, becomes an actor & facilitator helping one text to get more like another: e.g.,

allusions to Theocritus and to Lucretius thematize beginnings because V. alludes to passages ... concerned with generic origins and even the origins of music.... V.'s allusions ... sketch (**) a narrative of the origins of his poem and its genre (pp. 95-96).

Privileging closeness over difference, BB argues that merely recalling texts concerned with origins makes beginning a theme. He largely ignores pointed differences by which V. stamps his initiative as Roman & bids to expropriate, overshadow, rectify & supplant the Greek.[12]

Above all BB totally omits V.'s most ambitious expropriation & revision: taking & altering the metapoetic plot of an encounter that authorizes a poetic line. V. gives newly political & Roman force to Theocritus' causal tale, which had its own differentiated similarity with respect to other authorization tales:

{*Tityrus* to Rome, authorized by new (scil. Roman) god for poetic & political program 'as before but more'} (ecl. 1)

{*Simichidas* to country, confirmed by goatherd *Lykidas* for poetic program not to scale Homeric heights, scil. 'as before but less'}[13] (id. 7)

{Hesiod authorized by *Muses* on Mount Helicon for song echoing to homes of gods} (*Theog.*)

{*Odysseus* meeting his treacherous goatherd on the road outside of town}

{Archilochus losing a cow to the *Muses* but gaining voice}.

Likewise BB numbers among V.'s origin texts Lucretius yet again neglects dynamic difference. V. represented his protagonist *Meliboeus* as an

----

[12]However, in n. 62, p. 112, he remarks Virgil's shift of the quality of sweetness from bucolic woods to georgic fields, citing John Van Sickle, "Virgil *Vs* Cicero, Lucretius, Theocritus, Callimachus, Plato, & Homer: Two Programmatic Plots in the First *Bucolic*," *Vergilius* 46 (2000): 43–45.

[13]John Van Sickle, "Epic and Bucolic (Theocritus, Id. VII / Virgil, Ecl. I)," *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 19 (1975): 45–72.

exiled citizen, farmer, goatherd, & silenced singer (thus associated in a complex blend with republican Roman epic tradition). He made *Meliboeus* deprecate the new bucolic venture of *Tityrus* as 'wildwood music' (*silvestris musa*, ecl. 1.2), meaning on the surface 'rough, crude' while also reminding alert readers that Lucretius debunked pastoral mythology as self-deceptive fiction, arguing that hill folk heard their own voices echoing & naively called it *Pan* & 'wildwood music' (Lucr. 4.580-89). In V., the phrase crackles with self-referential (metapoetic) irony; for he thus styles his own bucolic venture a mythopoeic fiction & mystification, as Damon long since showed.[14]

Only through the responding figure of *Tityrus* does V. offer a contrasting & more positive frame for his innovation, which he now characterizes as a state of leisure made by a powerful god at Rome (*deus nobis haec otia fecit*, ecl. 1.6). This venture then V. imagines obligated to pay material sacrifice to its authorizing force (lamb's blood, a pointed metapoetic irony) but also allowed to play at will with 'fieldland reed' (*ludere … agresti calamo*, ecl. 1.10). Here V. takes the motifs of 'leisure' & 'fieldland reed' from a very different moment in Lucretius: the anthropology of original music taught by nature to primitive humanity (Lucr. 5.1379-87). Also, Lucretius had framed his argument by invoking the philosopher Epicurus as a god (Lucr. 5.8),[15] which V. replaces with his new political mythology – a mythic frame not just for his new bucolic stint but for his projected climb into higher epic ranges.

Later then, in the sixth eclogue, when V. brings *Tityrus* back for a programmatic revision & retreat from overtly political mythology (scil. from the heroic-civic reach of vatic poetics), he will link the revision to the 'fieldland muse' (*agrestis musa*) of Lucretius' originary idyl & situate the resulting mid-range epic at the top of the *pagina* – the metaphoric farm-plot in the book, as remarked above.

Where V. carefully counterposed contrasting views of poetic origin, BB treats the idyl from book five as the sole idea relevant to eclogue one.

----

[14]Philip Damon, *Modes of Analogy in Ancient and Medieval Verse*, University of California Publications in Classical Philology (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961), 285–90.

Ignoring Damon's insight into the poetological ironies of echoic mythopoeia, BB glosses them over with a dismissive "what amounts to another pre-existing history of pastoral music on which to draw" (p. 98). Both "what amounts" & "on which to draw" resemble "in a sense" above by betraying where the argument most strays. In short, BB does not distinguish either V.'s initial & contrastive frames for his new bucolic enterprise (ecl. 1: *Meliboeus⁻* vs *Tityrus⁺*) or the contrast between expansive & reductive programs from eclogues one to six (ecl. 1 vs ecl. 6: *Tityrus⁺* vs *Tityrus⁻*). BB can even say that "strictly speaking" Lucretius described the origin of music as not a woodland but a fieldland muse, although we have just recalled how Lucretius offered the two diverse accounts with which V. made poetological hay. "Strictly speaking" joins "what amounts" & "in a sense" as a hint for critical buyers to beware.

Similar slack vitiates discussion of the putative subject of the new version of the bucolic range, 'well-shaped Amaryllis' (*formosam Amaryllida*, ecl. 1.5), where BB notes well known echoes of Theocritus without reporting disconnects or tracing the imagery of the eye-catching beloved back to its roots in *Phaidros* if not beyond:[16] typically reductive he can say, "V.'s poem repeats its Theocritean model" (p. 99).

Overall, BB proceeds as if generic similitude determines meaning without regard for specific differences between the related texts. Differentiation though has struck most modern readers as the engine of meaning – *oppositio in imitando* puts meat on the skeleton of any genre or tradition,[17] to think only of V.'s Roman *Odyssey* & *Iliad*, Derek Walcott's Caribbean *Odysseus*, Dante, V.,[18] or bucolic V. weaving his own intricate web of generic similarities & emphatic differences into a distinctive new fabric of threads from drama & epic, Roman & Greek[19] – a cultural artifact too

----

[16]"Two Programmatic Plots," 48–50.

[17]*Design*, 254, s.v. *oppositio in imitando*.

[18]John B. Van Sickle, "Virgilian Reeds – A Program Cue in Derek Walcott's *Omeros*," *Vergilius* 51 (2005): 32–61.

[19]"Two Programmatic Plots," 21–58; John B. Van Sickle, "Virgil, *Bucolics* 1.12 & Interpretive Tradition: A Latin (Roman) Program for a Greek Genre," *Classical Philology* 99 (2004b): 336–53.

varied & nuanced to fit the simplistic & denatured nostrums of pastoralistic theory.[20]

More careful reportage marks the ensuing survey of modern critical discussion of the contrasting characters of *Tityrus* & *Meliboeus*, ultimately mapping the latter onto recurrent Virgilian concerns as far as the *Aeneid* itself (pp. 102-05). Although dramatic literalisms still jar, e.g., saying that "the two speakers are very much able to hear one another," as if anything were there to hear & tell (p.105),[21] usefully BB catalogues critical perspectives en route to noting that "pastoral tradition itself was inaugurated with a song about suffering," scil. the *algea* of the bucolic hero *Daphnis* (p. 107): the emphasis suddenly jogs me to realize that *algea* were the theme too of both the *Iliad* (1.2) & the *Odyssey* (1.3), thus linking the bucolic with the heroic range within the frame of epic tradition, while extending thematic reach to tragedy as well.[22].

BB goes on to infer, correctly in my view, that V. incorporates motifs associated with Theocritean *Daphnis* in both *Meliboeus* & *Tityrus* (pp. 107-110); here BB's theoretical perspective enables an interesting inference when it leads him to see what some readers have called failed dialogue as an ultimate etiology "for V.'s pastoral as poetry invested in writing, textuality, and the experiences of readers" (p. 110, cf. 115) A reader willing to work through further stretches of dramatic literalism (run further blends, in the lingo of F & T) can share with BB a profitable remediation of traces of both the first & the seventh idylls in the eclogue's plots & landscapes (pp. 108-114).

In the final analysis, however, BB's theoretical focus blinds him to two salient facts about the figure this poem cuts. Its thematic structure starts by subordinating its version of the bucolic hero to new Roman authority, places the new Roman voice & foundational myth at the center in an oracle with political & metapoetic import (*responsum*, 'as before but

----

[20]Critique of pastoralistic peaks, *Design*, xx

[21]Another case in which BB produces an audacious blend, in the sense defined by Fauconnier & Turner: blending the domain of social encounter with that of fictional representation.

[22]Activating those further blends in readers' minds.

more' – an oracle for & interpreted by *Títyrus* as fortunate & effective *uates*), then closes with a positive image of new order both bucolic and expansively georgic:[23] structural features that must have contributed to the clamorous success of the eclogues in their repeated theatrical performances & ought to be recognized even when interrogated by readers far from the crude fervor of Pompey's theater.[24] Yet the ideological & propagandistic illusion with its performative impact suffers neglect by BB because of his theoretical focus on allusive voice. When Roman audiences acclaimed the poet, they crudely & efficaciously identified him with the voices in his texts.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

Second Eclogue

Building on the frame of *Tityrus* & its reach across the thematic ranges of bucolic, georgic, & civic-heroic matters, V. opens the second eclogue with an established framing voice, which he locates implicitly in the city or at least endows with an urbane perspective, making it report on matters in a distant countryside imagined as divided between regular georgic work & restless bucolic passion, the latter personified in *Córydon* – configured as a singer moved by love for an urban master's darling & contrasted with georgic discipline. In the figure of the passionate singer, V. reclaims the lost poetic power of *Meliboeus*, which he imagines now as motivated by the power of love not Rome.

The frame BB glosses over as a kind of afterthought focusing instead on *Córydon* as a "confessional speaker who makes (**) himself known through his voice" (p. 29). Only later does BB turn to the gap between framing & framed voices & he now cites clarifying concepts: Harry Berger Jr. on the "gap between represented speech of characters and a superior

----

[23]Alfonso Traina, "La Chiusa Della Prima Ecloga Virgiliana," *Lingua e Stile* 3, no. 1 (1968): 45–57; *Design*, 118–25.

[24]John Van Sickle, "How Do We Read Ancient Texts? Codes & Critics in Virgil, Eclogue One": theoretical & synthetic perspective on divers sorts of carelessness by readers. Eclogue one fits the theoretical model of a "double scope network ...with different (and often clashing) organizing frames as well as an organizing frame for the blend that includes parts of each of those frames and has emergent structure of its own": Gilles Fauconnier, Mark Turner, *Fauconnier & Turner: Blending*, 131.

representing discourse" along with Kathryn Gutzwiller's distinction between "mimetic reading" and "analogical reading," the former close to the dramatic literalism of BB, the latter more like my own approach (p. 33) – two theoretical tools that might have steered discussion from the start.

Again neglecting intertextual difference, BB reports the linkage between V.'s *Corydon*. & the Theocritean and Homeric versions of *Polyphemus*. He worries about the learned allusions woven into the bucolic lover's speech without considering that blending with tragic & bucolic mythology would have been intelligible to the Roman theater audience (if more strange to us) & would help to reinforce the generic status of bucolic mime as a latter-day satyr drama – off-beat cousin of tragedy. BB concludes that the second eclogue "raises the question of who is in control of the language of the text only to reinforce the futility of attempting to isolate control when voice is represented in a context of framing, intertextuality, and the multiplication of possible speakers" (pp. 35-36), or again, "the presence of Corydon's voice has been replaced by the absence of text" & "the poem refers all potential gaps between the speaker and his voice less to dramatic impersonation and more to the disseminating effect of textuality" (ibid.). Amen.

Against dissemination, V. in the eclogue's last five lines draws the distraught singer up & back to a viewpoint more like that of the initial framing voice. He represented the framer as looking down on bucolic passion from an urbane standpoint; now he imagines the erotic singer himself. putting down bucolic fervor in favor of georgic chores – the thematic range that V. employed throughout as a foil to *Córydon's* bucolic passion. The emergent blend of georgic discipline with bucolic ardor & skilled song represents a new developmental stage in the progress of the book & poetic mind. From it will stem the dialogue of the ensuing eclogue, where V. imagines a youthful figure associated with control & property (*Menálcas*) accosting a more senior figure of energetic innovation (*Damoétas*). Through their contrastive themes of propriety, property, & eventually poetics, V. will build a signal advance over the distant & disdainful framer of the second eclogue: he will in fact frame the latter part of the third eclogue with a figure (*Palaémon*) described as a neighbor & approving arbiter of song not only erotic but didactic, apotropaic, & enchanting, hence more integrated with a conjoint, enlarged, & varied bucolic-georgic range.

<center>* * *</center>

Third Eclogue

The enhancement & amplification of the framing voice in eclogue three marks a significant development that gets neglected by BB, who even goes so far as to deny differences between the two singers, misled in this regard by the most reductive & dismissive – bereft of imaginative flair – among recent commentators – "as Clausen says, [the two singers are] 'virtually indistinguishable'." (p. 54).[25] The pair get differentiated by V. in ways that mesh with complementary threads in the book: *Menálcas* of propertied class, protective, endowed with cup engraved with Alexandrian learned craft, homosexual, protegé of Apollo; but *Damoétas* working class, hired hand if not slave & in any case making free with property of others, endowed with cup engraved with *Orpheus* & poetic power, heterosexual, protegé of Jove – god evoked as ruling over all, associated with new Caesar on coins, augmenting book's vatic thread. Dismissing such signiferent polarities, BB harps on "thoroughness of ... similarities" before reaching the conclusion that "repetition and responsiveness are not markers only of extemporaneous orality: they can and do characterize the relationship of one text to another as well" (p. 55). Goes without saying, but not if differentiation gets ruled out.

Although denying metapoetic point to character difference, BB does highlight a theme that validates & enlarges the book's vatic thread: V. makes the rakish *Damoétas* claim to have won a billy-goat, "won, that is, a 'goat-song', a *trag-ôidia*" & BB recalls that goat prizes & sacrifices had already figured "Theocritean bucolic as a new kind of *tragôidia*, with a ritual origin and a history parallel to ... the origin of tragedy" (p.65; cf. BB's fruitful emphasis on tragic *algea*, p. 107). In keeping with this hint, V. will stretch this particular thread to make *Damoétas* claim a tragic poet for a reader, as BB acutely notes. The theme of Pollio as reader pointedly undercuts the dramatic fiction of spontaneous orality by positing a written version of these songs existing at another time & place. It also reinforces the generic cousinship between bucolic & satyr drama that will figure remarkably in eclogue six.

----

[25]For further evidence that *nomen omen* in this widely advertized commentary, see John Van Sickle, "A Review Article: The End of the Eclogues," *Vergilius* 41 (1995): passim.

* * *
Fourth Eclogue

       V. treats the newly amplified & extended framing voice – emergent
blend – of the third eclogue as both platform & foil for the still more
ambitious voicing of the fourth, which BB interprets "both as a mimesis of
an author in performance and as a reflection of pastoral textuality" (p. 136).
The largely monologic utterance of eclogue four draws BB into continuous
engagement with the structure of the eclogue. He notes that "the multi-
plication of addressees … makes the illusion of a dramatic monologue tied
to a performance on a particular occasion hard to maintain," yet he rightly
rejects Clausen's only too typically arbitrary & reductive dismemberment of
the piece, arguing that "rapid shifts" define its style (p. 137) & he aptly
warns that "markers of time … are not sure pointers towards some external
occasion or performative context, even as they project the presence of the
speaker as a witness to the events he relates" (p. 138). Aptly then he com-
pares the projected presence of the speaker also by Theocritus (id. 16) &
Catullus (c. 64) as negotiating "new poetic space for epic encomium" (p.
140).

       Yet BB also again blurs differences between V. & his sources, not
only Lucretius but also now the pointedly programmatic reversals of
Catullus.[26] BB can write that both 'traces of our sin' & 'traces of ancient
crime' "must refer to the civil wars, but they are also the traces and tracks
of the model text" (p. 140). Yet the former, called 'our', scil. contemporary
historical, & imagined as erased by the leadership of Pollio, relate to the
civil conflict that Pollio's diplomacy temporarily averted (40 BCE), while
the latter relate to the myth of Iron age civilization inaugurated by the
'ancient', scil. mythical, Promethean deceit & that must gradually give way
to the Golden age. BB cites only part of the Catullan intertexture & ignores
a host of pointed variations: where Catullus spoke of traces of Prometheus'
penalty (scil. scars), V. speaks of the traces of his trick (scil. civilization).

       When all is said & done however, BB's perspective can rattle the
teapot in interesting ways, e.g.,

----

[26]John Van Sickle, *A Reading of Virgil's Messianic Eclogue* (New York: Garland, 1992), 37–
64 [available on line – http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/classics/jvsickle/bbvtch2.pdf].

By staging the back-story to the Trojan War, Catullus 64 (**) evokes a world that is not only pre-Homeric, but also pretextual. The record of Achilles' deed at Troy is foreseen not as written epic, but as the funeral laments that will be sung by the mothers of Achillles' victims" (p. 142)

Not to mention *Achilles* himself singing *klea andrôn*. Yet BB hardly credits the originality with which Catullus blended heroic myths, a blend that V. took but reversed even at the level of stylistic mannerism (ecl. 4.34-36). Also BB joins other commentators in missing Virgilian polemics with tradition, e.g. *talia saecla* , arguably, 'centuries such as these projected here & not such as those' scil. in Catullus.

Emphasis on voicing leads BB to single out the moment where "the poet of *Eclogue* 4 speaks most fully of his own project" (ecl. 4.53-59) in terms that suggest "an individualized speaker" yet "the more concrete point of reference ... is the poem's generic identity" (ibid.), by which BB means V.'s imagined challenge to poetic founders & powers in an "amoebean contest ... invoked in its guise as the oral essence of pastoral itself" (pp. 147). Yet amoebean itself contains a kernel of kinship of a different order, linking the dialogues of bucolic to those of heroic epic, where speech gets exchanged metaphorically like coin (cf. *apameibomenos*) so that amoebean speech reinscribes the bucolic range into the ampler fold of epic tout court.

In V.'s ambitious challenge to poetic powers, he rounds up, so to speak, & corrals the entirety of epic tradition (all) into the fold of bucolic song: BB identifies *Pan* (scil., 'all') merely as "the generic founder figure," where his use of "the" distorts the record. This definite article occludes the fact that V. here radically reshapes mythology – excluding some motifs & augmenting others – to confer programmatic import on *Pan* as part of the process of shifting bucolic ground away from Sicily towards Arcadia (which BB recognized in his pun on "site translation").[27] Given BB's repeated assertion that the *Bucolics* rewrite the history of pastoral, his omission of this prime example of mythology recast particularly puzzles. At the same time, the whole discourse of "generic identity" invites reinterpretation as an audacious & selective, focused, blending of domains: disparate myths of

----

[27]John Van Sickle, "Clausen Review," 131–32.

poetic origins, models of rustic competition, epic as praise poetry, V.'s future life & career.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

Fifth Eclogue

From the vatic pose of present public utterance stretching the newly Romanized bucolic frame of *Títyrus* to universal reach, V. in eclogue five moves (in a sense withdraws) from the highest thematic range to an amplified variant on heroical-bucolic 'exchange' – its voicing still vatic though now professing political & public allegory less openly than in the fourth eclogue & claiming to control an amplified & blended bucolic-georgic range. As a sign of both continuity & development in the book, V. brings back a character already twice employed, *Menálcas*, only now described as 'greater' (*maior*, cf. *maiora* for the incrementative program, ecl. 4.1). For a countering & innovative voice V. draws a singer pictured as younger, contentious, & recent writer of a song on fresh beech bark – *Mopsus*, name known at least by ancient cognoscenti, since identified by Servius (on ecl. 6.72) as belonging to the victor in a vatic competition with the Homeric seer Chalcas in an Asian grove sacred to Apollo: described in a short Greek epic by Euphorion of Calchis that had lately been redrawn in Latin by a friend of V.'s, Cornelius Gallus.[28]

The entire opening dialogue offers metapoetic hints for intratextual readers. They remember that V. has already used 'beech' to signal developments in the new bucolic range through eclogues one, two, & three;[29] they know too that bark by metonymy in Latin implies book. Thus they are primed to infer that the image of *Mopsus* inscribing new song makes metapoetic reference to the fourth eclogue: an inference confirmed in *Mopsus'* song, which reverses themes from the fourth, e.g. mother weeping for dead son rather than new son smiling at mother.

Topping even this retrospective & recursive advance, V. to compose the song of *Menálcas* draws themes from all four preceding eclogues, not

----

[28]May well underlie the challenge to older bards (ecl. 4); underlies the riddle contest of ecl. 3: T. Keith Dix, "Vergil in the Grynean Grove: Two Riddles in the Third Eclogue," *Classical Philology* 90 (1995): 256–62

[29]John Van Sickle, *Design*, 248, s.v. beech.

now reversed but if anything reaffirmed – hailing the dead *Daphnis* as a new god in terms that recall the god at Rome of *Títyrus*. Here V. brings back & amplifies such foundational motifs as 'leisure' & 'pleasure' & 'god' – an intratextual reach that explains the metapoetic point of calling this version of *Menálcas* 'greater'. The thematic function of the complementary figures should be a warning also to readers who ask themselves if this "person" is the same as that one: they would do better to take each variant of person or voice as a metapoetic index of the particular moment in the book.

Looking from intratexture to intertexture & bucolic tradition, V. draws up the song of *Mopsus* grieving *Daphnis* dead as a direct sequel to the dying *Daphnis* of the first idyll – a sequel implicitly Romanized & rendered vatic as an allegory of Caesar's death. V. further draws the song of *Menálcas* raising the dead oxherd to the stars as a supplement to the post-Theocritean tradition of bucolic lament for a dead poet – this too now Romanized & vatic as allegory for Caesar's apotheosis.

Neglect of this basic intratextual & intertextual nexus exposes much of what BB says about eclogue five to charges of arbitrary fancy if not velleity – new extremes of dramatic literalism (e.g. pp.57-58). Yet his approach still helps to[30]underscore the interplay of song & writing in the eclogue. Commenting on the charge of a tombal epigram for *Daphnis*, BB notes:

> Much as in a collection of Hellenistic epigrams the <u>text</u> <u>of</u> <u>the</u> <u>book</u> becomes the true location for epigrammatic 'embedding' in the absence of a performative context or a 'real' object for an inscription, so in *Eclogue* 5 the <u>page</u> stands in for the object. (p. 62)

For "page" it would have been more consistent with his other arguments, e.g. about eclogue four, to say "the text of the book" & to exploit the analogy between Hellenistic books and the *Book of Bucolics*.[31]

The close of eclogue five forces BB to give fuller attention to the matter of the book & finally to V.'s use of the traditional scene of initiation, which figured in the first eclogue, although occluded by BB there. Now he

----

[30]John Van Sickle, "The Book Roll & Some Conventions of the Poetic Book," *Arethusa* 13 (1980): 5–42.

[31]Cf., e.g., my two articles: "Roll & Book" just cited & "Reading Virgil's Eclogue Book," *ANRW* 31 (1980): 576–603.

brings to the fore hints of writing & textuality & opposes pastoralist essentialism when he says that "V.'s cross references ... do not so much proclaim that the individual poems join together to create a unified picture of an imagined world as they join together to proclaim 'this is a book'." (p. 69) In a further shot at the pastoralists, BB affirms: "Even at its most oral, V.'s pastoral does not hide the fact that pastoral was always, essentially, a phenomenon of books, meant to be encountered by readers" (p. 73). Here "essentially" smacks of genre theory as if to dismiss the reported success of the *Bucolics* on the Roman stage & the terms of positioning & gesturality (demonstrative adjectives & adverbs of time & place) that might be read as metadramatic hints for the stage, markedly in the framing segments of the several poems.

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

Sixth Eclogue

The bookish exchange of gifts closing eclogue five leaves on stage *Mopsus* – the ambitious vatic figure derived from Gallus & Greek epic – but blended with the 'hemlock' V. describes as having taught to 'greater' *Menálcas* the second and third eclogues ('hemlock' must be another metaphoronymic hint of textuality, scil. the written book, since a pipe cannot 'teach', scil. demonstrate or show, song's words). Out of this intratextual & quintessentially recursive blend V. fashions the new version of *Tityrus* that he programs once again, as in the center of the first eclogue, by introducing a divine utterance – no longer retroactive & expansive like the Roman god to *Tityrus* ('as before but more' – hence , potentially vatic & Roman); instead now a prospective & restrictive ruling from *Phoebus* (song not heroic-civic, Roman vatic, but drawn down a notch to middle range, getting up a fieldland muse – shades of the Lucretian idyl cited above in connection with eclogue one).

BB intuits aptly in my view that V. in this eclogue imagines a chain of echoes "potentially to a point of origins, perhaps even to an original source for pastoral" (p. 75). Yet the chain (if that is the apt metaphor for ricocheting echoes) has more links & leads to sources beyond what BB allows, viz. [1] *Tityrus* (drawn down by *Phoebus*) said to invoke [2] *Pierian* (scil. Hesiodic, middle range) *Muses* supposed to describe [3] *Silenus* cajoled to sing & his song's Orphic effects & themes, including a cosmology & cultural history without Roman civic-heroic purpose, but then [4] his

apostrophe to *Pasiphaë* (reported as direct address) as well as [5] a pathetic apostrophe to nymphs to hunt & catch for the queen the bull she loves (reported as direct address & imaginable as emanating from anywhere along the vocal escalier from the fervid queen to *Silenus*, the female *Pierians, Tityrus*, the shadowy *eclogue poet*, or V.), [6] editorial voice picking what further report to give (*quid loquor*, 'what do I place next?' – where 'I' & 'place' also disseminate & dissemble vocal source) – all that [7] *Phoebus* once upon a time 'got up' (*meditante*, [8] imitating the music of the spheres out of pain at loss in love][32] & [9] laurels were told to learn by [10] Eurotas, a river with its source in Arcadia – a step in the gradual shift already remarked ("site translation") of bucolic grounding towards Arcadia.

It goes without saying that such a layered construct disseminates voice, as BB would say: outsources, so to speak. Yet BB shows so little regard for the order in which V. displays the panoply of voice & viewpoints that this reader is left in the last analysis confused, even while persuaded & instructed by BB's insistence that V. incorporates the old epical ecphrastic mode in representing *Silenus* as if actively engaged in producing song. Suffice it here to assign further reading into the way that each of the ten voicings makes metapoetic points both intratextual & intertextual, among them appropriations from satyr drama (*Silenos*), Apollonius & Catullus (intertwining tragic & heroic myths), Callimachus, Lucretius, & Varro of Atax, all of which want reading with eyes peeled for the audacious blends & emulative differences so underrated by BB in this most riotous & rambunctious, Dionysian & heady, of V.'s works not for nothing with metapoetic point imagined mediated by an old sot.

<center>* * *</center>

Seventh Eclogue

A further challenge to read through surface to book poetics marks the seventh eclogue. V. turns from the recursive tinkering with *Títyrus* that opened eclogue six & now recycles *Meliboéus* – the figure met as the book's protagonist & initial framing voice, embroidered as it was, cobbled together from links & pointed contrasts to Callimachus, Theocritus, & Lucretius: shown as displaced from traditional domains & highly ambivalent about the new bucolic scene that occasioned & localized, afforded a novel if

----

[32]*Design*, 235: allusion to *Chorographia* by Varro of Atax (Morel p. 97).

momentary frame that shattered & silenced traditional Roman epic even as it launched a Roman campaign to despoil & expropriate, to fleece, the epic tradition of Greece.[33] In the seventh eclogue then, V. brings back & represents again *Meliboéus* as a framing figure displaced from elsewhere & happening onto a bucolic scene. Only now V. motivates the displacement as motion between secure domains (pursuit of a billy-goat, a *tityrus*, strayed from one peaceful situation to another) rather than political exile & he puts together the scene with motifs drawn & transmuted not so directly from Lucretius & the seventh, third, & first idylls as from earlier in his own book.

Little wonder if a context where every detail prompts metapoetic reflection on the book should focus on a revisited figure of *Daphnis* (drawn down – *deductus* – from the vatic expansion of the bucolic hero figure in eclogue five). Likewise suiting such a situation are the imagined processes of remembering (*meminisse*) & sifting out through competition (*certamen magnum*): metapoetic signals for the process of reviewing & sorting the accomplishments & contrasting threads of the previous eclogues.

Given the marked recursive thrust, one expects a clear comparison & contrast with the third eclogue, where V. represented songs as exchanged because *Camenae* love songs exchanged. Here then V. again represents exchange, but now of verses because *Muses* want to remember exchanges. The hints of metapoetic difference with implications for different phases of textuality could not be more urgent: Latin *Camenae* / Greek *Musae*, resonant songs / formal work in verses, initiatory declare / nostalgical recall, positive love / recollective wish.

Neglecting difference, BB falls into the trap of reducing it all to generic pastoral. Nor does BB deal with the quite concrete differences between the two contestants, one a boastful, wannabe *vates* endowed with a Bacchic name & represented as defeated, but the other a restrained singer preferred & absorbed into the framing voice, although both get introduced as *Arcadians* – itself a capital hint of metapoetic development towards the eventual "site translation," that here BB forgets.

<div align="center">* * *</div>

----

[33]Here I always remember the aperçu of Jean Bayet, who evoked "l'ébranlement initial, à partir duquel s'organisa la 1ère Bucolique": cited in *Design*, 124, n. 60.

Eighth Eclogue

Continuing the frame of mind established through bringing back the figure of the displaced old singer *Meliboéus* & blending it with a reformed & restrained version of the passionate young singer *Córydon*, V. reformulates in new & drastic terms his by now familiar tension between restraint & forceful ambition. But before fleshing out this extreme bucolic polarization, he pauses to take stock. Once again, as when opening the sixth eclogue, he looks back to beginning the book (cf. "first," ecl. 6.1 & ecl. 1.44); but now with still greater emphasis on book structure, he also & for the first time looks to the close. He recalls the new political myth that gave the book its original impetus (ecl. 1.44) & that grew by mentions of Jove (ecll. 3 & 4), with the hint too of tragic scope ('goat song' of *Damoétas*, songs for Pollio). He also represents the young Caesar as meriting poetic service at the highest level of style, represented expressly now by the tradition of Sophocles. The shift in focus from heroic epic to drama (cf. *Silenus* & the hint of satyr drama) comes with the developing context of the book & its challenge to bucolic tradition; for now V. is intensifying & amplifying the tragic strain within the bucolic range itself, before closing & moving on to higher epic ranges.

In his move to new extremes, V. represents the bucolic range as disposed no longer into reciprocal dialogue as in the seventh, fifth, or third eclogues but into two sharply contrasted strains that connect only in the framing mind, which they polarize: Arcadian verses that convey fatal powerlessness to defeat love but then songs cast in the form of magical spells that draw a disloyal lover back from the city: the reported verses embody a tragic plot & the songs incorporate tragic motifs that reach beyond the bucolic range & would have struck familiar chords of memory in the theater crowd.

The desire to praise heroic action in higher style links this framing voice with the fourth eclogue, as BB notes. However, he rejects temptation to identify the two & refer them both to "the voice of V. the author, or even of a fictional character" & he denies "the singular identity of all the represented authorial voices of the collection," citing as proofs of "non-identity of the framing voice" the recycled *Títyrus* & *Meliboéus* that serve to frame eclogues six & seven (p. 146).

BB thus turns the concept of identity into a stumbling block, repeating the very personification & dramatic literalism that has characterized his reading throughout. Personalism keeps him from noting how V. develops & varies the framing figures at successive stages, adapting each further configuration as a clue to book poetics. V. makes the framers embody metapoetic hints not merely of textuality as some abstract generic essence but of the successive & distinct stages in making this book. A framing figure is always a framing figure, yet progressively varied in step with development in the book: e.g., distant & disdainful of the bucolic (ecl. 2); close bucolic-georgic neighbor (ecl. 3); even more disdainful & upward reaching to vatic heights (ecl. 4); drawn partly down from vatic reach to a middle range both bucolic & georgic (ecll. 6); drawn into bucolic play from georgic work beyond & affirming retreat from vatic ambition (ecl. 7); & now this framer located expressly between the bucolic & the highest range, evoking the book's first source & projecting its close, then employed to frame a tragic loss & contrasting show of vatic power embodied in the sorceress's spells (ecl. 8). BB cites scholarship on impersonation & "playing the other" in tragedy, which is precisely the generic range towards which V. in the eighth eclogue aspires.

* * *

Ninth Eclogue

The eighth eclogue's closing voice, distanced from the framer, represented a vatic power of song in the form of magical spells to draw a object of desire (*Daphnis* – the emblematic bucolic figure drawn yet further down) from the city (scil., civic-heroic range). This in metapoetic terms was the last version of the vatic poetics that V. pushed in the first half book & gradually draws back from in the second. The vatic sorceress (ecl. 8) cited bucolic & georgic spells of one *Moeris*, a name assigned now in the ninth eclogue to a *uates* represented as defeated & driven from the Italic-Roman version of the bucolic-georgic scene.[34] Indeed, the spells' repeated refrain, 'from the city', now gives way to the emphatic opening motif, 'to the city' (ecl. 9.1), which keys a narrative of forced exit from the Italian countryside. V. thus bids farewell to the ambitious bucolic mode of the first five eclogues clearing the way for the "site translation" he will effect in the final eclogue.

----

[34]For *Moeris* as *uates*: *Design*, 187, n. 80.

Within this larger frame, at once deconstructive & anticipatory, the displacement & defeat of *Moeris* & the powerful *Menálcas* acquire their metapoetic point – *Menálcas* a key figure in stitching together the first half book, here dissociated from that book's ideological frame & thus freed for reuse in the tenth eclogue as one of the Arcadians, hence still as before a measure of continuity & change within the book.

The ninth eclogue's process of deconstruction & anticipation also accounts for the singularities of displaced voicing with which BB opened his study. He collected & described problems with voicing that required to be properly understood from the vantage point of sequential & transmutational book poetics.

In the ninth eclogue, V. once again provokes us to look back to the first & to think again of how he imagined *Títyrus* leaving the bucolic range to journey to Rome & getting the programmatic oracle – both conservative & expansive – that framed this entire revision of Theocritus. V. described the resultant version of the bucolic-georgic range as free to play whatever it would, but also obligated to offer regular sacrifice to its authorizing power ('each year on twice six days our offerings send up smoke': ecl. 1.43). The idea of sacrifice owed as pay-back to authority grew into the crowning theme of the new frame at the climax of the first half book (ecl. 5.65-80).

In the ninth eclogue, now, V. imagines yet another journey to the city with obligations to sacrifice, but without the freedom to make music. Here animals for sacrifice must be provided to a new power, with no hint of return to the country. Or if return may be inferred, it must be not to freedom but to forced service & continual sacrifice to power portrayed now as usurping. V. represents the new power, moreover, not as a distant though benevolent 'god' (*deus*) but as an 'intrusive squatter' (*advena possessor*) on the land. Instead of a divine oracle in the city authorizing return to an enhanced status quo in the country, V. now locates in the country a brusque command from the newcomer who has seized control of the familiar bucolic-georgic range, thus giving voice to what in the first eclogue appeared generically as 'godless soldier, barbarian' (*impius miles, barbarus*).

* * *

Tenth eclogue

The eloquent closure in eclogue nine of the neo-Theocritean vatic frame sets up V.'s Hail Arethusa passage to his Arcadian frame. Here BB with his distinctive viewpoint by turns deploys & deplores arguments from the likes of Alpers, Conte, Jenkyns, Ross, Servius, Van Sickle, Snell. More than any other, this chapter generated marginalia such as "NB" & "yes" but also specific queries to spark further conversation.

The margins registered approval at the opinion that both eclogues ten & one draw "aetiological force" from the first idyll, of which the role in forming "Theocritean bucolic is diffused (*) across the collection of the *Eclogues*" (p. 118). Yet the passive "is diffused" & generic "the collection" set off alarms in view of my own study in *Vergilius* of etiological relations between the first eclogue & Theocritus, not just the first idyll but also the third & seventh.[35] Scrutiny showed that BB omitted relevant texts & glossed over precise differences leaving readers prey to facile generalizations. He neglected the change of cause from angst over love (id. 1) to stable love (ecl. 1.1-2: *Títyrus*) but new angst over political upheaval (ecl. 1.3-4: *Meliboeus*). As remarked above, he ignores the politicization of the bucolic hero, even as he flattens the contrast between 'woodland' & 'fieldland' poetics.

That said, I do welcome BB's adoption of my point that V.'s address to *Arethusa* before her departure for Sicily confounds "strict literary-historical chronology" (p. 120). I profit too from his observation that V.'s claim to sight *Pan* "contrasts with the hymnic distance from Pan that characterizes Daphnis" (p. 121). I have sometimes mused that Theocritus portrayed the goatherd & shepherd in the idyll's dramatic present as conditioned by the imminence in their Sicilian landscape of *Pan*, his noon nap not to be disturbed by goatherd piping though apparently not supposed to be shaken by shepherd singing. "Hymnic distance" may be the key: *Thyrsis'* song cast in a higher epic mode.

I certainly share BB's reckoning that V. "stakes a notional claim to temporal authority vis-à-vis Theocritus" (p. 121) & thus through the figure of *Gallus* offers "an alternative aetiology for the genre to compete with Sicilian songs about Daphnis." Yet I demur when he calls the troubled loves of the elegist more specifically erotic than "the more vague Theocritean

----

[35]John Van Sickle, "Two Programmatic Plots," passim.

algea." After all, Theocritus represented the bucolic hero as wrestling with love & fugitive from an eager female; V. instead distributes motifs associated with the bucolic hero into multiple figurations – *Títyrus* endowed with a pipe but saved from wasteful love & happily enmeshed with a female (ecl. 1); then after successive stages in the book, *Gallus* desiring a fugitive female. We have already underlined that V. also gave his bucolic hero an etiological base in Roman public myth, hence the ideoetiological growth that culminates in eclogue five (with *Daphnis* dead & deified in Caesaristic celebration). Yet when BB seeks to retrace "the figure of Daphnis" in the book (p. 122), he omits its signal & emblematic down-sizing in the seventh eclogue. In short, he lacks an articulated concept of development stage by stage that would help him deal with multiple variants & recurrences. V. rings more far-reaching changes on the *Daphnis* figure than BB's accounting reckons (p. 122).[36]

Still, focusing on the issue of voice, BB makes his theoretical case that the voice of *Gallus* in the eclogue "is in some sense no longer his own"; BB can thus rule out the old notion that "Gallus' experience in Arcadia was best understood as reflection of some real incident in the life of Cornelius Gallus" (p. 123).[37] He can also undercut those, like Ross, who seek to individuate actual Gallan verses in the eclogue. He raises awareness that critics deploy "metaphors for describing relationships between texts," e.g., his insight that Servius speaking of *uersus translati* from Gallus' songs may metaphorically imply that "V. despoiled Gallus of his voice" (p. 126).

BB's theoretical approach also leads him to adapt the critical metaphors of the eclogue as a location or a container (p. 127), yet it may be his very involvement with the likes of Kristeva, Culler, Empson that keeps him from finding confirmation for his argument in V.'s culminating & most

----

[36]"Two Programmatic Plots," 249, sv. 'Daphnis' ... type figure ... growth ... reduction.

[37]BB traces this "misdirected historicism" & "critical naïveté" to Leo, but it still infects contemporary Italian scholarship, as I document in an opening critique of Mario Citroni, although the article mainly deconstructs Biagio Conte's egregious misprision of Gallan presence in the eclogue: J. Babcock Van Sickle, "Quali Codici d'Amore Nella Decima Egloga di Virgilio? L'Eloquio Elegiaco Contestualizzato Nel Bucolicon Liber," *Giornate Filologiche "F. Della Corte"* III (2003): 32–33.

explicit metaphor interpreting the book as a containing form produced by craft in a climactic outburst of metapoetics: "enough for your poet to have sung | while he sits & weaves with slender mallow a wicker form" (*sedet et ... fiscellam texit*, ecl. 10.70-71).

Disregard for V.'s words becomes if possible more worrisome when BB can write of "the dual presence of elegiac and pastoral language, ideas, codes" (p. 137) in the construction of *Arcadia*, without considering V.'s pointed reuse with variation of motifs from earlier in the book: to cite only the perhaps most emblematic, transfer of the figure of *Menálcas* to Arcadia after its utility for the construction of the first half book (ecll. 2, 3, 5) & deconstruction of the vatic-bucolic range (ecl. 9).

A like disregard for detail undercuts much of what BB has to say about a notoriously metapoetic declaration attributed to the elegist in shepherd guise:

> ibo et Chalcidico quae sun mihi condita versu
> carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor avena.
> certum est in silvis inter spelaea ferarum
> malle pati tenerique meos incidere amores
> arboribus: crescent illae, crescetis, amores.
>
> (ecl. 10.50-54)
>
> I'm going to go & measure songs that I've set down
> in verse of Chalcis with the Sicilian grazer's oat:
> it's been decided to prefer to suffer in woods
> among the wild beasts' lairs & carve on tender trees
> my loves: the trees will grow; you also, loves, will grow.

BB paraphrases: "Gallus himself imagines (**) engaging in an activity of transposition ... between written text and oral performance ... imagining himself into the role of pastoral poet"; yet BB also sees the passage as reflecting on "the activity of *Eclogue* 10, which is itself (**) adapting the poetry of Gallus in its own generically distinctive mode" even though "Gallus ... imagines himself into the performative fictions of pastoral, not into the textual reality ... avoiding even the hint of a possible combination of the two represented by Mopsus" (pp. 129-30).

However, the verb translated as 'measure' (*modulari*) described writing by *Mopsus* (ecl. 5.13-14) & V. imagines *Gallus* as about to carve, scil. write, his loves on trees, hence far from "avoiding even the hint" of writing.

Indeed rhetorically, resolve to write on trees comes as a restatement as if to elucidate & explain, to unpack, the densely metapoetic program 'measure songs set down in verse of Chalcis with Sicilian grazer's oat'. The motif of writing loves on trees does reflect the fact that "Gallus' words have been inscribed, written into the text of *Eclogue* 10" (p. 132), i.e., that V. has already brought elegiac poetry into the bucolic range. The promised growth of trees & loves points up the augmentative force of bringing elegiac & bucolic love together, raising both to the level of tragedy.

Still more wrinkles lurk in V.'s metapoetic language: "songs set down in verse of Chalcis" points not merely to Gallus' "own poems, presumably his elegies" (p. 130) but to his translation from Euphorion of Chalcis – the etiological epic authorized, so to speak, in eclogue six & described by Servius (ecl. 6.72). Thus the image of subjecting such songs to "Sicilian grazer's oat" refers metapoetically to V.'s own uses of *Gallus* in the book. First he drew on Gallus' translation of the short epic, with its competing seers, for both the idea of vatic competition & the figure of *Mopsus* as a competitive *uates* challenging an older master (ecl. 5), & then the image of *Gallus* redeemed from erotic wandering (scil. elegy) & raised to write etiological epic (ecl. 6). Now V. imagines the epical etiologist shifting back from his etiological to his erotic vein. It is the elegist that can be turned into a paratragic Roman substitute for the old bucolic hero: useful in V.'s design of replacing Sicilian (scil. Theocritean) bucolic with his own new Arcadian mode.

The imagined instrument of the transposition, "Sicilian grazer's oat," also embodies a metapoetic code: "Sicilian grazer" refers to the Theocritean threads in V.'s work, but Latin "oat" (ecl. 1.2) imposed in place of Greek *kalamos*,[38] Latin *calamus* (ecl. 1.10) or *harundo* (ecl. 6.8) signals & represents V.'s Latin (Roman) transformation of Theocritus. Thus the whole phrase telegraphs the fact that V. in the tenth eclogue has turned from Gallus as translator of etiological epic back to Gallus the erotic elegist transforming him into a Roman version of the bucolic hero fatally infected by love to replace Sicilian *Daphnis* with a tragic voice. By making his dying *Gallus* overshadow & replace the dying *Daphnis* of Theocritus, V. completes the challenge to bucolic tradition outlined above: that in the fifth

----

[38]For detailed discussion of these materials & their metapoetics: "*B*. 1.1–2," passim.

eclogue he created a sequel to the first idyll with the lament for *Daphnis* dead, which itself replaced & overshadowed the post-Theocritean tradition of poetic laments.

BB's further remarks on the tenth eclogue prompt particular irony, when he comes close to grasping major metapoetic hints dropped by V. that here a book gets made – woven, grown. BB underlines the closing motif that the poet's love for *Gallus* will grow like a tree in spring; & he interprets the motif of loves carved on trees & both growing to suggest that the eclogue itself will grow as if "carved on the tree's bark," which leads him to infer that the springing tree "stands for the page on which V.'s poem is written" (p. 132).[39] Instead of "page" read "book" & the metapoetic reading emerges, thanks to the Latin metonym mentioned above, by which 'bark' (*liber*) comes to mean 'book'. A hint of the metonymy lurked already when V. made *Mopsus* boast of inscribing a new song on green beech bark – that palpable metapoetic sign of the novelty of the fourth eclogue in a book for which one measure of development was various states of beech. Once the metonymy surfaces, it also becomes possible to read as a sign of impending closure in the book the motif of withering bark (ecl. 10.67).

When V. projects the series of desperate appeals by the dying elegiac lover,[40] he raises his own bucolic range to the level of tragic style that he hinted & partially realized in eclogues two, three, six, & above all eight. Close attention to his language shows that he achieves this heightened intensity by reprising & weaving together his own bucolic-georgic motifs, including a final reprise of those already drawn down from previous eclogues, distilled & recomposed in the vignettes of remembered song in eclogue nine. He transforms the matter & manner of earlier vignettes into the substance of his vision of Arcadia that will become an influential touchstone for literary & visual imagination in western culture.

----

[39]*Design*, 248, sv. 'beech'; cf. 'bark'; bucolic, symbols of.

[40]The human brain is wired for three types of what gets called love, i.e., "Lust, Romance, Attachment": Helen Fisher, "Why We Love: The Nature and Chemistry of Romantic Love" (2004), passim. Of the three, the Romantic-fixated phase appears in *Gallus,* eclogue eight's two lovers & *Córydon* (ecl. 2); lust in *Silénus'* hint to *Ægle* (ecl. 6.26); attachment, then, perhaps in the pair of *Tityrus* with *Amarýllis* or other hints of reciprocal love in eclogues three, five, & seven..

After the finale comes a coda, also recursive but more broad, for here V. recapitulates & writes *fine* both to this last eclogue & still more explicitly to the book entire. His metapoetic allegory invokes meager style, as Servius remarked, but also other concepts in poetics: the epic ambition implicit in the verb "to sing" & the craft of designing a book, expressed metaphorically as weaving by the composers of epigram books.

Hinting at epic ambition, V. hails the *Pierians* as "goddesses" in the manner of Homer. With a polite command, couched in future tense, he urges one further, great effort: to make these songs the greatest for *Gallus*. The future tense once again, as already in this eclogue at other decisive junctures, conveys what the poet is making or has made. In this case, V. has made his shift from the etiological epic of *Gallus* to the elegies, translated the elegiac lover into a fresh version of the old bucolic hero, & managed to amplify both elegy & bucolic epic to the level of tragedy – accomplishing the ambition foreshadowed in the proem to eclogue eight. In the process, he has shifted the time & scene of bucolic action from Theocritean Sicily to an Arcadia depicted at an imaginary moment prior to the first idyll. Meanwhile he has populated this purportedly ancient place & time with motley motifs from his own book cast as company for Arcadian *Pan*.

Reaffirming devotion to the elegiac figure that has served as his vehicle for victory over Theocr., V. offers the comparison of his love for *Gallus* to an alder springing upwards green. The image of freshly positive energy clashes with the surrounding motifs of winter with which V. closes down his book. Yet the alder's energetic upward thrust evokes memory of the story of how it arose from the grief of *Pháëthon's* sisters via the powerful singing (ecl. 6.62-63). Thus it mingles negative & positive traces: the hint of irreparable loss but also of remediating song.

In a final variant of his first principle, "as before but more," V. recurs to the perhaps most basic constituent of the bucolic range & transforms "shade" through repetition & negative connotation from its positive earlier values (e.g., ecl. 1.1-4) into a definitive closural motif.

By way of ending, then, he harks back to the desperate farewell of the displaced *Meliboéus* & transforms it into an orderly command. Goats themselves never get enough, in this respect like lovers, as we were warned in a blunt & pithy priamel from the myth of *Pan* (ecl. 10.30) – as before

from the mouth of *Córydon* (ecl. 2.63-65), though here more absolute as suits a tragic plot & style. But the framing voice can impose measure, enough for now; & the motif of satisfaction & possibility of getting home at end of day complete the assimilation of the old order singer & goatherd figure to the newly invented mythic frame in which the newly posited literary & ethical ideal of Arcadia emerges as the final & fullest realization of the founding principle – as before but more.

BB, having amply undercut the theoretical pretense that "the pastoral" must be essentially oral & reminded us, if we thought otherwise, that writing & the expectation of reading are woven into V.'s texts, devotes a final meditative chapter to weighing the respective impacts implied for audiences in order to vindicate above all the value of reading. Amen, though I have to lodge a mild demurrer from his report of my scholarship as urging that "the reality of performance" promises "a unique way for the *Eclogues* to affect society" (p. 156). Not so much unique as perhaps primordial & ever influential, since their initial impact in the theater laid groundwork for a cultural legend that, reinforced by the *Aeneid* & Roman prestige, would affect every readerly reception & cultural impact in the European schools, libraries, & courts along with the other traces & trickles of Rome in the mind & imagination of the West, down even to these our latest lucubrations burning what may what prove the last oil before these time-worn lamps go out.[41]

Appendix

Having used "frame" all along as a metaphor to posit ideological structures linking world & word in the poet's mind, I find myself pressed by BB's focus on signs of writing & the elusive status of voice to pull together what we have been noting about the book's sequential weave of shifting voices & mythic frames. There at the start was V. using that first voice to figure his mind's loss of a traditional Roman political & epic frame (*Meliboeus*: exiled citizen farmer, failed *uates*, silenced singer). Yet paradoxically V. voiced this crisis via the new mythic frame that represented an

----

[41]Ironic that scholars who have been turning receptionism into a cottage industry persistently occlude the evidence for Virgil's clamorous first reception by the public at Rome: *Design*, xxi-xxxvi.

ambitiously Romanized version of Theocritus (*Títyrus* aged but happy lover, active singer, & successful seer with his oracle from the god at Rome: 'as before but more'). Retracing has also caught V. expanding this new mythic frame up to the vatic climax of the fourth & fifth eclogues with their powerful songs, his mind boldly recovering & adapting – expropriating & disproportionately swelling, if you prefer more loaded metaphors – the traditional powers of song represented as lost with the frame & figure of *Meliboeus* but then reclaimed & amplified through the energetic songs & singers of the second, third, fourth, & fifth eclogues, only to get drawn down in the sixth, to say nothing of its ensuing revisionary (georgic-bucolic) aftermath.

In this line of reckoning, the sixth & seventh eclogues recovered their metapoetic mission as tools for tinkering with frames. In six V. revised his neo-Theocritean frame, pulled back from Roman vatic ambition & reasserted the causal force of love (which had been suspended as an etiological force in the portrait of *Títyrus* as settled with *Amarýllis*). In seven he brought back *Meliboéus* & the broader epic perspective disrupted then expropriated for the Roman bucolic of *Títyrus*. At the same time though in eclogue seven V. also revised the Meliboean frame, shifting its etiological emphasis from socio-political suffering ("our fatherland we flee," ecl. 1.4) to poetics ("I put my serious matters after those two's play," ecl. 7.18), a shift manifest in successive variants of the framing voice: ecl. 7 (rejecting the neo-Theocritean *Thrysis*, would-be *uates*); ecl. 8 (pushing Arcadian verses to tragic heights, leaving vatic songs=spells to other voices), & ecl. 10 (cajoling *Arethusa* through love for a poet ("Gallus, for whom my love grows hour-by-hour…," ecl. 10.73). Meanwhile, in a complementary shift, V. revised the Tityran frame from its vatic confidence (ecll. 1-5/6, e.g., "Look how all'd enjoy the century that's to come," ecl. 4.52) to the vain thrusts of neo-Theocritean *Thyrsis* (ecl. 7); the neo-Theocritean magic retailed by Alphesibœus & the Pierians (ecl. 8); vatic defeat in the civic-heroic range ("chance turns over all," ecl. 9.5); & the final peak of bucolic suffering – tragic derangement caused by love ("All things Love defeats. Let us, too, give way to Love," ecl. 10.69).

Brooklyn College & the Graduate Center, City University of New York
jvsickle@brooklyn.cuny.edu

Bibliography

Damon, P. 1961. *Modes of Analogy in Ancient and Medieval Verse*. University of California Publications in Classical Philology, 261–334. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dix, T. K. 1995. Vergil in the Grynean Grove: Two Riddles in the Third Eclogue. *Classical Philology* 90:256–62.

Fauconnier, G. & M. Turner. 2002. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.

Fauconnier, G. 1997. *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Habinek, T. 2005. *The World of Roman Song*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hunter, R. 1999. *Theocritus A Selection. Idylls 1, 3,4, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 13*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, G. &. M. Johnson. 2003. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Traina, A. 1968. La chiusa della prima ecloga virgiliana. *Lingua e Stile* 3(1):45–57.

Van Sickle, J. 1975. Epic and Bucolic (Theocritus, Id. VII / Virgil, Ecl. I). *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 19:45–72.

------. 1980. The Book Roll & Some Conventions of the Poetic Book. *Arethusa* 13:5–42.

------. 1980. Reading Virgil's Eclogue Book. *ANRW* 31:576–603.

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

------. 1992. *A Reading of Virgil's Messianic Eclogue*. New York: Garland.

------. 1995. A Review Article: The End of the Eclogues. *Vergilius* 41:114–33.

------. 2000. Virgil *vs* Cicero, Lucretius, Theocritus, Callimachus, Plato, & Homer: Two Programmatic Plots in the First *Bucolic*. *Vergilius* 46:21–58.

------. 2003. Quali codici d'amore nella decima egloga di Virgilio? L'eloquio elegiaco contestualizzato nel *Bucolicon liber. Giornate Filologiche "F. Della Corte"* III:31–62 [http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/ classics/jvsickle/codici-B10.pdf].

------. 2004 (Second Edition). *The Design of Virgil's Bucolics*. London: Duckworth.

------. 2004. Virgil, *Bucolics* 1.12 & Interpretive Tradition: A Latin (Roman) Program for a Greek Genre. *Classical Philology* 99:336–53. .

------. 2005. Virgilian Reeds – A Program Cue in Derek Walcott's *Omeros*. *Vergilius* 51:32–61.