Vergil's Eclogues

Vergil's Eclogues:

A Study of the Greek and Roman Literary Sources

By

George C. Paraskeviotis

For Evi and Zoe,

the loves of my life

«…να μη φοβάσαι να πιαστείς απ' τα όνειρά σου,
να μη φοβάσαι, η ζωή είναι μπροστά σου…»
Μίλτος Πασχαλίδης «*Βυθισμένες Άγκυρες*»

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

This monograph is a revised version of my PhD dissertation written at the University of Leeds in 2006-2009, but unexpected circumstances and serious family matters forced me to delay its revision and publication. It is my great pleasure to acknowledge my debts to many friends and colleagues for their help and support given to me during the preparation of this book.

I am especially indebted to the supervisor of my work, Prof. Robert Maltby, whose incisive criticism, prodigious knowledge and untiring academic guidance saved me from many errors throughout my efforts and lightened the burden of my hard research. Words fail me as I express my warmest gratitude to him for his moral encouragement which, along with his kind character, made our collaboration really enjoyable. My deepest gratitude also goes to (†) Dr. Kenneth Belcher, who read certain parts of this work at an early stage and contributed several helpful comments and suggestions. I am obliged to both for being so helpful throughout my stay at Leeds and for believing in me and my work from the early days of my studies at the university. Special thanks go to my examiners Prof. Bruce Gibson and Assoc. Prof. Regine May, who provided me with various comments, criticisms and valuable suggestions that significantly strengthened the main arguments of this book. Finally, particular thanks go to the members of staff of the School of Classics at the University of Leeds for making Leeds such a pleasant and enjoyable place to work in.

Particular thanks are owed to Prof. Andreas N. Michalopoulos and Asst. Prof. Charilaos N. Michalopoulos, who stood by me through the

years and never failed to offer me academic guidance, encouragement and above all their friendship. I also owe a special debt to Prof. Andreas N. Michalopoulos, Asst. Prof. Charilaos N. Michalopoulos, Dr. Gabriel Evangelou and especially Prof. M.C.J. Putnam and Prof. Stephen Harrison (who kindly accepted to read certain parts of this work, although I have not had the pleasure of meeting them yet), who all found time among their numerous occupations to read through and comment upon parts of this book. Nonetheless, despite the generous assistance received from the aforementioned people, this book contains deficiencies and errors for which I take complete and sole responsibility; hence kindness and forbearance is all I ask of the gentle reader.

I cannot begin to express my gratitude to my parents, whose unfailing love, faith and support, both emotional and financial, made all this possible for me.

Finally, it is with great love and gratitude that I dedicate this book to my wife, Evi Gontosidou, and to our daughter, Zoe. Evi's true love, care and emotional support helped me to surpass several hardships in times of troubled anxiety, standing by my side with understanding even when she really needed to take care of herself and of our daughter. I will always be grateful to her for her belief in my work as well as for her valuable comments and observations, since she is always the first, and the most critical, reader of my writings. The dedication of this book to her and to our daughter for everything they have done and do every day for me is an entirely insufficient way of acknowledging their deep understanding, their patience and their warmest support throughout these years.

George C. Paraskeviotis

Nicosia, 01/04/2019

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION:
INTERTEXTUALITY AND VERGIL'S *ECLOGUES*

Between 42 and 39 BC[1] Vergil composed the first Roman pastoral collection entitled *Eclogues*,[2] consisting of ten literary pieces, in the form it has come down to us.[3] Vergil's *Eclogues* continue to receive a great deal of scholarly and critical attention[4] that has peaked during the late 20th and early 21st century.[5] These years have seen the publication of

---

[1] This is the conventional temporal period during which Vergil's pastoral collection is believed to have been composed, while the exact date of its composition is still a matter of discussion among scholars. On the dating of the *Eclogues* see Bowersock 1971, 73-80, Schmidt 1974, Coleman 1977, 14-21, Bowersock 1978, 201-202, Tarrant 1978, 197-199, Mankin 1988, 63-76, Farrell 1991b, 204-211, Perutelli 1995, 28-31, Hardie 1998, 24f., Korzeniowski 1999, 115-136, Seng 1999, 57-107 and Luther 2002.

[2] On the title of the collection (i.e. *Bucolica* or *Eclogues*), see Horsfall 1981, 108-109, Perutelli 1995, 27-28 and Cucchiarelli 2012, 27-28.

[3] Unfortunately, we are unable to know the exact title that Vergil gave to his pastoral compositions, which according to the ancient sources were in all probability entitled *Bucolica* or *Bucolicon Liber*. Both titles occur in all the oldest manuscripts (MSS *P*, *R*, *M* and *V*), Quintilian, Probus, the *Scholia Veronensia*, the *Scholia Bernensia*, Donatus, Servius, Philargyrius, *Vita Bernensia* and *Vita Phocae*. The term *Ecloga*, which first described a selection or an excerpt, was actually adopted later, when it started denoting any short composition (cf. Plin. *Epist.* 4.14.9 *Proinde, siue epigrammata siue idyllia siue eclogas siue, ut multi, poematia seu quod aliud uocare malueris, licebit uoces*). See also Horsfall 1981, 108-109.

[4] Coleiro 1979, 103-105 provides us with a brief summary of the scholarly approaches to the Vergilian collection that ranges from the period of its composition to the 19th century.

[5] For a detailed and extensive bibliographical catalogue of Vergil's *Eclogues*, see Donlan 1978, Briggs 1981, 1267-1357, Volk 2008, 1-15, Cucchiarelli 2012, 39-83 and the bibliography which is annually published in *Vergilius*. See also the more recent bibliography compiled by Niklas Holzberg, available online at

numerous books that have significantly advanced and developed the literary studies concerning Vergilian pastoral poetry. Therefore a brief, but not comprehensive, summary of those books in the introduction of this book, whose subject deals with Vergilian pastoral, is necessary. Nonetheless, it is hard for such a summary to include any book or article on Vergilian pastoral; as a result, it only deals with notable 20th and 21st century monographs and articles in order to show not only the interpretative issues that have already been covered by modern scholarship, but also that Vergilian pastoral still constitutes a fertile ground for research.

Leaving aside several books or articles that deal with allegorical, biographical, historical and political questions,[6] the first important step forward was by Rose 1942, who presents a thorough discussion of the *Eclogues*. His book contains a useful summary of earlier scholarship that has enabled subsequent commentators and scholars to examine Vergilian pastoral poetry with a fresh eye, while also paying attention to various significant fields of interest. The first of these fields deals with the landscape of the *Eclogues* which, according to Snell 1945, 26-31, is a fictional landscape created and called Arcadia by Vergil. Snell's suggestion is attacked by Schmidt 1975, 36-57, who argues that Snell retrojects Renaissance ideas of an idealised pastoral world in the *Eclogues* and that the Vergilian Arcadia is merely an anachronism (cf. also Jenkyns 1989, 26-39, a view also shared by Leach 1978a, 539-560; cf. also Leach

---

http://www.niklasholzberg.com/Homepage/Bibliographien_files/BiblVergBuc.docx
[6] Donlan 1978 and Briggs 1981, 1267-1357 provide bibliographical lists that contain crucial records and criticisms upon the Vergilian scholarship of the last century, where the reader can find studies on such questions. See also Briggs 1981, 1280-1339, Volk 2008, 10-12 and the first footnote of each of the ten following chapters.

1974). Nonetheless, the landscape of the *Eclogues* is still an attractive subject for scholars, who examine it extensively and almost exhaustively.[7]

   The Vergilian collection, its structure and the arrangement of the *Eclogues* is yet another central subject treated by several scholars who provide thorough structural and numerical analyses and investigations on the topic.[8] What is more, the chronology of the *Eclogues* causes scholarly debate, although there is no consensus. Bowersock 1971, 73-80[9] challenges the traditional identification of the addressee of *Eclogue* 8 by suggesting that the unnamed honorand is Octavian and not Pollio.[10] This suggestion is followed by Van Sickle 1981, 17-34, Köhnken 1984, 77-90, Schmidt 1987, 197-237, Mankin 1988, 63-76 and Clausen 1994, 233-237. Pollio's candidacy is supported by Coleman 1977, 253, Nisbet-Hubbard 1978, 17f., Tarrant 1978, 197-199, Mayer 1983a, 17-30, Farrell 1991b, 204-211, Green 1996, 232-235, Seng 1999, 64-75 and Thibodeau 2006, 618-623. Finally, Schmidt 1974, Perutelli 1995, 28-31, Meulder 1996, 815-828 and Korzeniowski 1999, 115-136 are concerned with the chronology of the collection, while Luther 2002 argues that the *Eclogues* were published around 28-27 BC, thereby transferring the date of the publication of the *Georgics* to the mid-twenties. This subject is closely related to the historical background and the references to contemporaries

---

[7] Barra 1952, 7-31, Jachmann 1952, 161-174, Pietzcker 1965, Flintoff 1974, 814-846, Kennedy 1987, 47-59, D'Anna 1998, 254-269, Connolly 2001, 89-106, Brandt 2005, Collin 2006, 92-122, Saunders 2008, Jones 2011 and Johnston/Papaioannou 2013, 133-144.
[8] Brown 1963, Otis 1963, 128-143, Skutsch 1969, 153-169, Berg 1974, 107-113, Rudd 1976, 119-144, Saint-Denis 1976, 7-21, Leach 1978b, 79-105, Van Sickle 1978, Skutsch 1980, 95-96, Van Sickle 1980a, 5-42, Van Sickle 1980b, 576-603, Roberts 1982/1983, 39-47, Meillier 1986, 34-47, Lindahl 1994, 161-178, Seng 1999, Breed 2006b, 333-367, Ucciero 2007, 263-276 and Steenkamp 2011, 101-124
[9] See also Bowersock 1978, 201-202.
[10] Hanslik 1955, 5-19, Wimmel 1960, 208-226 and Büchner 1982, 231-235.

that can be identified throughout the collection. Most scholars argue that the honorand in *Eclogue* 8 is Asinius Pollio,[11] while Liebs 2010, 32-52 and Voisin 2010, 321-344 find further references to historical characters in the collection such as Alfenus Varus.

The language and style of the *Eclogues* constitute two more significant subjects that are examined by scholars who direct their attention to linguistical, syntactical and metrical features throughout the collection.[12] Leaving aside these subjects and moving to the content of the corpus, Schmidt 1972b, 107-119 claims that the *Eclogues* are poems about poetry, since they contain rustics who are singers-herdsmen rather than herdsmen-singers.[13] Schmidt's approach is representative of an influential development in scholarship concerning the *Eclogues*, according to which Vergilian pastoral is concerned either with poetry or with what it has to say about poetry (i.e. the metapoetic interpretation).[14] The metapoetic approach was later followed by several scholars who all concern themselves with the poetics of the collection or of a separate poem, suggesting that the *Eclogues* deal with a world that first cares for music and song, while they reflect on the historical reality that threatens its existence.[15]

---

[11] Levi 1966, 73-79, Tarrant 1978, 197-199, Mayer 1983a, 17-30, Farrell 1991b, 204-211, Green 1996, 225-236, Coppola 1998, 170-174, Thibodeau 2006, 618-623, Cairns 2008b, 49-79, Voisin 2010, 321-344 and Dzino 2011, 158-166.

[12] Holtorf 1959, 253-286, Fedeli 1972, 273-300, Kollmann 1975, 97-112, Offermann 1975, 275-290, Serbat 1989, 213-229, Nisbet 1991, 1-14, Wills 1993, 3-11, Horsfall 1995, 217-248, O'Hara 1997, 241-258, Rumpf 1999, 157-175, Lipka 2001, Courtney 2003/2004, 425-431, Najock 2004, Casanova-Robin 2007, 105-124, Babič 2008, 259-266, Gries 2008, 179-203 and Kraggerud 2012, 118-144.

[13] See also Davis 2012.

[14] Volk 2008, 6.

[15] Ross 1975, 18-38, Wright 1983, 107-160, Deremetz 1987, 762-777, Rutherford 1989, 42-50, Courtney 1990, 99-112, Glei 1991, 83-95, Pachalis 1994, 437-449,

The most attractive research field for modern scholars is intertextuality and the ways in which the *Eclogues* recall the earlier literary tradition.[16] This subject was first explored in several monographs and articles that examined Vergil's relationship to the Greco-Roman tradition generally, and their contributions are valuable.[17] Nonetheless, there are scholars who examine Vergil's intertextual relationship with a single Greek or Roman source such as the Theocritus collection (*Idylls* 1-18)[18] or the post-Theocritean tradition,[19] while there are also critics, although they are few, who are concerned with other Greek sources whose influence on the collection is considerable.[20] Callimachus is an exception given that his influence is related to his canons of poetry that are identified in the *Eclogues*.[21] On the contrary, Vergil's association with the Roman tradition begins with the Lucretian elements that are identified throughout

Papanghelis 1995, Rumpf 1996, Papanghelis 1999, 44-59, Loupiac 2001, 93-103, Delignon 2006, 38-50, Dion 2006, 82-102 and Henkel 2009.

[16] Papanghelis 1995, 16-17 has noticed a general rise of interest, especially among Anglophone scholars, in intertextuality during the last three or four decades of the 20th century.

[17] Farrell 1991a, 3-25 and 278-314, Monteleone 1994, Hubbard 1995, 37-67, Hubbard 1995/1996, 11-23, Thomas 1996, 22-46, Farrell 1997, 222-238, MacDonald 1997 and Hubbard 1998.

[18] Pöschl 1964, Klingner 1967, Posch 1969, Garson 1971, 188-203, Robertson 1970/1971, 8-23, Martin 1972, 187-199, Schmidt 1972b, 57-69, Du Quesnay 1976/1977, 18-41, Du Quesnay 1977, 25-99, Du Quesnay 1979, 35-69, Du Quesnay 1981, 36-53, Wright 1983, 107-160, Alpers 1990, 19-47, Segal 1987, 167-185, Wills 1993, 3-11, Faber 1995, 411-417, Rudd 1996, 53-77, Hatzikosta 2001, 105-110, Hunter 2001, 159-163, MacDonald 2005, 12-31, Kutzko 2007/2008, 141-161, Di Meo 2008, 209-222, Vox 2009, 305-330, Bernsdorff 2011, 187-194, Gagliardi 2011d, 676-696, Scholl 2014 and Kania 2016 *passim*.

[19] Schmidt 1972b, 69-92, Du Quesnay 1976/1977, 23-29, Paschalis 1995, 617-621, Acél 2007, 349-368 and Kania 2012, 657-685.

[20] Fernandelli 2008, 279-308 (Meleager), Prioux 2009, 309-317 (Aratus), Tartari Chersoni 2008, 91-103 (Aristophanes), Manuwald 2002, 150-174 and Gómez Gane 2003, 144-147 (Homeric Hymns).

[21] Wimmel 1960, 132-147, Clausen 1964, 181-196, Kenney 1983, 49-52, Wright 1983, 107-160, Cameron 1995, 454-483, Papanghelis 1995, Hunter 2006a and Meulder 2010, 311-319 all deal with Vergil's relationship to Callimachus.

the collection and constitutes a research field that has been almost exhaustively examined.[22] Finally, Vergil's relationship with the Neoterics is a subject that is nicely touched on in several studies[23] and is usually related to the tendency of scholars to suggest that Gallus' lost *Amores* also influenced the collection.[24]

Despite these advances in several interpretative questions, there is still no monograph that focuses on intertextuality in Vergilian pastoral poetry; on the contrary, it has already been mentioned that there are several articles whose contribution is valuable, but they examine this subject only in individual poems of the collection. There is no systematic study on intertextuality and its complexity in Vergil's *Eclogues*, which is a substantial research and bibliographical gap that this book aims to fill.

Further support for the increasing interest of scholars in the matter of intertextuality is provided by several books and articles that focus on a theoretical discussion of intertextuality. The term "intertextuality" was first coined by Julia Kristeva in 1967.[25] Nonetheless, its concept is hardly simple, encompasses several meanings[26] and is currently associated

---

[22] Farrington 1963, 87-94, Castelli 1966, 313-342 and 1967, 14-39, Mizera 1982, 367-371, Buchheit 1986a, 123-141, Chambert 2003, 247-264, Hardie 2006, 276-300, Fabre-Serris 2007, 141-159, Hardie 2009, 13-40, Scafoglio 2011, 247-263 and recently Gale 2013, 278-296.

[23] Otis 1963, 99-105 and Farrell 1991a, 278-314 and especially with Catullus by Klingner 1967, Du Quesnay 1977, 68-75, Michel 1990a, 140-148, Lefèvre 2000, 62-80, Gries 2008, 179-203, Rohacek 2008, 27-45, Gale 2013, 278-296 and Trimble 2013, 263-277.

[24] See Skutsch 1956, 198-199, Suerbaum 1968, 74-82 and 313-316, Grillo 1971, Ross 1975, Rosen & Farrell 1986, 241-254, Kennedy 1987, 47-59, Whitaker 1988, 454-458, Michel 1990b, 57-68, Perkell 1996, 128-140, Gagliardi 2003, Gagliardi 2012a, 52-73, Gagliardi 2012b, 147-163, Gagliardi 2013, 117-136, who are all concerned with this hypothesis.

[25] Kristeva 1967, 438-465.

[26] Van Erp Taalman 1994 provides a detailed account of the way in which the concept of intertextuality has been developed.

with various terms (such as "the imagination", "history" or "post-modernism"), which are underdetermined in meaning and overdetermined in figuration.[27] Kristeva attempts to combine Saussure's structuralistic semiotics (i.e. how signs derive their meaning within the structure of a text) with Bakhtin's "dialogism" (i.e. an examination of the multiple meanings, namely heteroglossia, in each text and word),[28] while also replacing the word "dialogism" with the term "intertextuality".[29] She argues that any literary text is a mosaic of quotations; in other words, the absorption of another, while the notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity and poetic language can be read at least as double.[30] Barthes transforms Kristeva's theory and concentrates its interest on similar ideas in far less technical language, thereby providing certain practical guidelines that can be used for the analysis of literary texts. Following Kristeva, he suggests that texts are made up of various antecedent or contemporary signifiers, echoes of other texts, cultural languages that clash and blend, allowing for potentially infinite complexity.[31] Thus, texts have multiple meanings, and these meanings are attributed to texts and do not derive from some author, who creates *de novo* and *ex nihilo*, but through the interplay between the reader and the

---

[27] Allen 2000, 2.

[28] Bakhtin, 1984. See also Irwin 2004, 228.

[29] Harris 1992, 176 argues that "dialogism" is actually narrower than "intertextuality" since it is only related to the use of language in contrast to intertextuality that extends to all discourse.

[30] Kristeva 1981, 66. See also Allen 2000, 39. Kristeva's original definition of the term "intertextuality" was later reformulated by herself as the "transposition" of one or more systems of signs into another which is also accompanied by a new articulation of the enunciative and denotative position (cf. Kristeva 1974, 49-50). See also Kristeva 1981, 15.

[31] Barthes 1977, 159-160.

text itself.[32] Moving from post-structuralist to structuralist theorists,[33] Riffaterre suggests that texts are not referential but have their meaning because of the semiotic structures that link up their individual words, phrases, sentences, key images, themes and rhetorical devices.[34] Genette uses the term "transtextuality" by which he denotes the various forms of interrelation between texts in which a textual model lies behind an original text.[35] Jenny considers intertextual fragments as a kind of superparole and the previous literary texts as a superlangue from which authors draw individual paroles even as they choose from the vocabulary of their language. Therefore, the reader has the choice to read the text either for itself or in terms of its intertextual relationships.[36] Finally, Leitch claims that the text is not an autonomous object but a set of relations with other texts whose language, grammar, and lexicon drag along numerous traces of history, thereby being a collection of incompatible ideas, beliefs and sources.[37]

These theoretical discussions of intertextuality by structuralist and post-structuralist thinkers can also be incorporated into literary criticism and especially into classical studies where texts are related to other texts. Jenny's theory is close to an interpretative method of Roman poetry, which was first developed by Pasquali.[38] His article deals with what he calls "arte allusiva", namely, with literary allusions to Greek and

---

[32] Barthes 1968, 12-17 = Barthes 2002, 3-7.
[33] Allen 2000, 92. It should be mentioned that the borders between structuralism and post-structuralism are often blurred or overlapping, because these terms do not refer to standard theoretical positions or ideas but to a series of broad approaches. See Jordaan 2016, 10.
[34] Riffaterre 1978.
[35] Genette 1982, 7-14.
[36] Jenny 1982, 44-45.
[37] Leitch 1983, 59.
[38] Pasquali 1951, 11-20. See also Hubbard 1998, 9.

especially Hellenistic sources in Neoteric and Augustan poetry, which were considered as a conscious interpretative method of bringing into the text an additional level of importance beyond the context of the allusion itself. Following Pasquali's suggestion, Thomas compiles a typology of allusive techniques, although the categories are more rhetorical than functional.[39] He distinguishes seven categories, using the term "reference" rather than "allusion":[40] i) "casual reference"; ii) "single reference", that is, a reference that recalls the content of the model; iii) "self-reference"; iv) "correction";[41] v) "window reference", that is, a simultaneous reference to the model's source as well as to the model itself; vi) "apparent reference", by which is meant a different actual model from the one that originally seems to be recalled; and finally vii) "conflation or multiple reference".[42] Conte rejects the authorial intention suggested by Pasquali and considers allusion in terms of a relationship between texts, or intertextuality, rather than imitation, although the presence of the author is still felt in his theory.[43] On the contrary, Hubbard examines intertextuality along with what he calls "literary filiation", which is the author's selection of a specific literary antecedent whose work stands in a special relation to his.[44] He owes much to Bloom, who believes that intertextuality reflects intersubjectivity in the sense that every author selects a literary father

---

[39] Hubbard 1998, 9 with n. 20.

[40] On a brief discussion about the use of the term "reference" instead of the term "allusion", see Hinds 1998, 21-25.

[41] See Giangrande 1967, 85-97, who examined the same interpretative method with the difference that he called it *oppositio in imitando*.

[42] Thomas 1986, 171-198.

[43] Conte 1986, and esp. 26-31. It should be mentioned that Conte focuses on the text and the relationships therein but continues to refer to the author by name and includes the author in the analysis of the text (cf. Conte 1986, 37), thereby confirming that the entire abstraction of the author is rare in classical scholarship.

[44] Hubbard 1998 11.

whose work is determinative in the younger author's self-fashioning as a creative literary agent.[45] Lyne criticises the use of the term "allusion" because it insists on the authorial involvement, encouraging us also to make unjustifiable assumptions concerning an author's intentions, which we have no evidence or right to form. He also suggests that the term "intertextuality" can describe such relationships between texts much better, admitting, however, that it is indeed very difficult to determine when an intertext is identifiable as an intertext.[46] Hinds prefers the term "allusion" over "reference", arguing also against what he calls "philological fundamentalism" according to which, instead of trying to classify an allusion by attributing to it particular properties, it is preferable to search for more than one possibility that can be considered in an interpretation.[47] Moreover, he rejects authorial intention, instead using the term "intertextualist fundamentalism", suggesting, however, that authorial intention does feature in some form in the intertextualist model of interpretation.[48] Edmunds disagrees with Hinds' view concerning the term "allusion" because, he claims, we cannot distinguish between an intertext and allusion, arguing also that, although no scholar is interested in a real authorial presence, Hinds' constructed authorial presence is only employed rhetorically as a matter of convention or persuasion.[49] He also uses the term "quotation" to refer to intertextual phenomena, thereby overlapping with the earlier definitions of "allusion" and arguing that the

---

[45] Bloom 1973, 1975, 1976 and 1982.
[46] Lyne 1994, 187-189.
[47] Hinds 1998, 13 and 17.
[48] Hinds 1998, 47-48.
[49] Edmunds 2001, 164-168.

prerequisite for the identification of the quotation resides in the capacity of the reader.[50]

From the above, it becomes evident that the terms "allusion" and "intertextuality" are not used consistently throughout the scholarship, nor are they used in ways that conform to more common definitions. Furthermore, the various ways in which scholars use these two terms and the way in which "allusion" is used in classical scholarship show that this term is not compatible with a theoretical framework of intertextuality. Following Lyne's, Edmunds' and Plett's views on the intertextual phenomena, I believe that the understanding of the relations between texts is partly based on the reader's knowledge, judgement and instinct. Hubbard observes that Greek and Roman audiences, having more complete literary texts at their disposal and being more accustomed to aural or oral reading out loud and learning long texts by heart, are likely to have been more competent in recognising an intertextual phenomenon than modern academic scholars and readers.[51] However, it is crucial to distinguish the conscious intertextual phenomena, which are associated with the author's intentions, from the unconscious intertextual, which can be described as merely verbal similarities. This distinction is hardly easy or simple, given the fact that either conscious or unconscious intertextual phenomena might well fulfil, in one way or another, the authorial intentions. In other words, intertextuality is a concept that presupposes not only a reader who is competent in recognising the intertextual phenomena,

---

[50] Edmunds 2001, 134. Edmunds' definition concerning the term "allusion" comes from Heinrich F. Plett (cf. Plett 1991). Plett 2010, 282 has argued that quotation is a text segment that is taken from a pre-text and inserted into a primary text. He also claims that the recognition of intertextual phenomena is closely associated with the literary expertise of the reader, thereby implying that a reader without such expertise is missing something.

[51] Hubbard 1998, 14.

but also a reader who would be competent in explaining the author's literary purposes that these phenomena serve.[52] This study aims to fulfil this goal because it is a literary commentary that also focuses on the notion of intertextuality and especially on the ways in which Greek and Roman sources are used in Vergil's *Eclogues*.[53]

This goal is not easy due to the various intertextual relationships that can be identified in the collection. Following Edmunds' terminology, I use the term "quotation" here rather than the more common "allusion", "echo", "reference", "reminiscence" or "transformation" in order to describe these intertextual phenomena.[54] These can be either "conventional quotations" in the sense that they typically recall some earlier source, or "unconventional quotations" in the sense that they recall some earlier source in an unusual and unorthodox way. The "conventional quotations" could also be described as "direct quotations", because the author recalls or refers to some earlier source in a direct way, thereby enabling even the unfamiliar reader to realise the source which he recalls. These "direct quotations" could be further divided into the following types or subcategories: i) "thematic quotations" that require a thematic relationship between model and imitation and are usually reinforced by

---

[52] Broich 1985, 33 and 43 provides a catalogue of "intertextual markers" which may facilitate the reader's ability to trace intertextual references.

[53] Following the classical scholars mentioned above, this study also rejects the author's intentionality and is entirely based on the text and the intertextual relationships therein, although the total abstraction of the author is rare in classical scholarship. For this reason, it should be mentioned that no action is ascribed to Vergil himself and I use the noun "Vergil" or the adjective "Vergilian" in order to refer to the *Eclogues*, while the noun "intention" is also associated with characters in the text (e.g. Thestylis' intention) or with the adjective "Vergilian" (e.g. the Vergilian intention) referring to the pastoral collection and not to Vergil himself.

[54] Edmunds 2001, 134

several structural, verbal or metrical correspondences;[55] ii) "linguistic quotations" that deal only with structural, verbal or metrical correspondences between model and imitation, either individually or in combination recalling a source, which, however, is now set in a completely different content and context; iii) "*oppositio in imitando*"[56] or "correction",[57] which is a quotation where the author indicates his source, reversing, however, its concept; iv) "double quotation", which is a technique according to which the author simultaneously recalls not only an earlier source but also its model, and where the author draws on those sources in terms of subject, structure, language or metre either individually or in combination, but also sets them in a new context; v) "multiple quotations" that follow the earlier subcategory in the sense that they recall several sources from which the author draws either subject, structure, language or metre individually or in combination, but places them in an entirely new situation; and vi) "self-quotations" that constitute quotations from the author's own work.[58] On the other hand, the "unconventional quotations" are quotations that are related to sources that are sometimes manipulated and used by Vergil in an unorthodox and unconventional way (*Eclogues* 4 and 6). Vergil's dependence on tradition is here not based on any thematic or verbal relationship between text and intertext. It has to do with literary subjects, mythological references, structure, style, metre, language and mostly common elements between Vergilian text and its sources; hence, it becomes evident that *Eclogues* 4 and 6 do not contain

---

[55] It is worth noting that the correspondences between model and imitation may also be, although quite rarely, etymological.

[56] Giangrande 1967, 85-97.

[57] Thomas 1986, 185.

[58] Thomas 1986, 182f., who uses the term "self-reference".

quotations from the Greek and Roman tradition but only similarities and analogies.

Before examining the sources that can be identified throughout the Vergilian collection, it will be useful to summarise briefly those Greek and Roman antecedents who have a strong influence on the collection. The summary attempted here includes the sources that have been regarded as Vergil's main models (Theocritus, Bion, Moschus, Meleager and pseudo-Moschus) because we have them or substantial parts of them. On the other hand, it should be mentioned that much Greek and Roman literature (especially Neoteric sources (Gallus), whose influence on Vergil has long been recognised as fundamental) has been lost, a fact which allows us to assume that the Vergilian innovations found in the *Eclogues* may have had more precedent than we are aware.[59] This attempt should begin with Theocritus, whose influence on the Vergilian collection is omnipresent. Nonetheless, before this summary, we should first try to give an answer to the following preliminary question: which *Idylls* were included in the Theocritean collection that was used by Vergil for the composition of the *Eclogues*?

Thirty poems, twenty four epigrams and a figured composition (*Syrinx*) are the production that has come down to us under the name of Theocritus. Furthermore, there are a few fragments of another poetic composition,[60] while five verses, which apparently derive from Theocritus' *Berenice*, are cited by Athenaeus.[61] The history of Theocritus'

---

[59] Coleman 1977, 17.

[60] Gow I 1952, 236-237.

[61] Cf. Athen. *Deipn*. 7.284 a-b Θεόκριτος δ' ὁ Συρακόσιος ἐν τῇ ἐπιγραφομένῃ Βερενίκῃ τὸν λεῦκον ὀνομαζόμενον ἰχθὺν ἱερὸν καλεῖ διὰ τούτων· κεῖ τις ἀνὴρ αἰτεῖται ἐπαγροσύνην τε καὶ ὄλβον,/ ἐξ ἁλὸς ᾧ ζωή, τὰ δὲ δίκτυα κείνῳ ἄροτρα,/ σφάζων ἀκρόνυχος ταύτῃ θεῷ ἱερὸν ἰχθύν,/ ὃν λεῦκον

textual transmission is a complicated issue that raises several questions that are not easily or always answered by modern scholars. Wilamowitz long ago suggested that the *Idylls* were actually not published by Theocritus in a collected pastoral edition, arguing that they were first published separately. Later, they were gathered in a corpus, which also included other pastoral compositions (Moschus' and Bion's poems), by the grammarian Artemidorus of Tarsus,[62] who flourished in Alexandria around the first half of the 1st c. BC.[63] Gow agrees that Artemidorus' collection was in all probability used by Vergil, criticising, however, Wilamowitz's view on the grounds that a pastoral collection could not contain non-pastoral, either Theocritean or non-Theocritean, compositions. In other words, he suggests that Artemidorus' corpus exclusively consisted of ten poems that were ascribed to Theocritus (*Id*. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11).[64] Gutzwiller, on the other hand, fairly rejects Gow's suggestion, observing that we could not specify the poetic compositions that Artemidorus' edition included. She argues that *Idylls* 2 and 13 were respectively described as Theocritean pastoral compositions by Apollonius Rhodius' scholiast and Aelian,[65] thereby reinforcing the suggestion for the inclusion of non-pastoral *Idylls* in Artemidorus' edition.[66]

καλέουσιν, ὁ γάρ θ' ἱερώτατος ἄλλων,/ καί κε λίνα στήσαιτο καὶ ἐξερύσαιτο θαλάσσης ἔμπλεα. See also Gow I 1952, 238-239.

[62] On Artemidorus see, *RE* II 1896, 1331-1332 and Van Sickle 1976, 28-31.

[63] Cf. Artemid. 26 Gow = *A.P.* 9.205 Βουκολικαὶ Μοῖσαι σποράδες ποκά, νῦν δ' ἅμα πᾶσαι/ ἐντὶ μιᾶς μάνδρας, ἐντὶ μιᾶς ἀγέλας. See also Wilamowitz 1905, iii-iv and *ibid* 1906, 102ff. On the possibility that Artemidorus' collection further included non-Theocritean poetry, see also Gallavotti 1946, xiv.

[64] Gow I 1952, lix-lxii.

[65] Cf. schol Ap. Rh. *Arg*. 1.1236 Θεόκριτος ἐν τοῖς Βουκολικοῖς ἐν τῷ Ύλᾳ and Ael. *NA* 15.19 Θεόκριτος ὁ τῶν νομευτικῶν παιγνίων συνθέτης.

[66] Gutzwiller 1996b, 123-124.

These hypotheses are in fact the basis for Coleman's, Clausen's and Cucchiarelli's commentaries. These commentators stress that Artemidorus' edition, which consisted of ten poems attributed to Theocritus, the so-called pastoral *Idylls* (*Idylls* 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11), was in all probability used by Vergil for the composition of the *Eclogues*.[67] Nevertheless, a thorough examination of the *Eclogues* indicates that Vergil's knowledge of the Theocritean collection in the form in which it has come down to us is much greater. My investigation reveals certain quotations that are also drawn from *Idylls* 2,[68] 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, 25 and 26, showing that Vergil was aware of these *Idylls* too. Thus, it enriches our knowledge about Vergil's relationship to Theocritus to know that his knowledge was not exclusively restricted to the so-called pastoral *Idylls*. Therefore, three theories are possible concerning which *Idylls* were included in the Theocritean corpus that was used by Vergil for the composition of the *Eclogues*: first, Wilamowitz long ago held that the *Idylls* were actually not published by Theocritus in a collected pastoral edition, but that they were first published separately; second, there was a Theocritean corpus with pastoral *Idylls* (*Idylls* 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11);[69] and finally, there was a more comprehensive Theocritean collection.[70] The first theory is the least probable, since it is not supported

---

[67] Coleman 1977, 14 with n. 1 and Clausen 1994, xx with n. 25.

[68] It should be mentioned that both Coleman and Clausen lay emphasis on Vergil's knowledge of the non-pastoral *Idyll* 2, which they explain by its Catullan translation, already attested from antiquity (cf. Plin. *NH* 28.19 *hinc Theocriti apud Graecos*, *Catulli apud nos proximeque Vergilii incantamentorum amatoria imitatio*) but now lost to us.

[69] The existence of a Theocritean collection consisting of *Idylls* 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 was suggested by Gow I 1952, lxi with n. 1.

[70] Wilamowitz 1905, iii-v with n. 3 further suggested that Artemidorus incorporated the *Idylls* into a comprehensive edition of pastoral poetry which consisted of *Idylls* 1-18, 22, 24, 26, and 30. See also Wilamowitz 1906, 102ff.

by the so-called Artemidorus epigram that confirms the existence of a pastoral collection. The validity of the second theory, on the other hand, is reinforced by ancient evidence (Artemidorus' epigram), but it fails to explain the non-pastoral *Idylls* that can be identified in the *Eclogues*. There remains the third theory, which is the most probable not only because it satisfies the aforementioned requirements but also because it can explain why the Vergilian collection contains pastoral and non-pastoral literary pieces.[71]

However, Vergil's dependence on Greek pastoral is not related only to Theocritus. Moschus, Bion and the anonymous author of the *Lament for Bion* are equally crucial. Moschus' surviving work includes *Europa*, Ἔρως δραπέτης and four passages from a collection entitled βουκολικά[72] by Stobaeus and composed in Doric hexameters. These are compositions of which only the first justifies the title βουκολικά. Bion's work consists of the *Lament for Adonis* and seventeen fragments which range from one to eighteen lines, also written in Doric hexameters; both the Doric dialect and dactylic hexameter confirm Moschus' and Bion's status in the canon of pastoral poets,[73] explaining the title given to the anthologised fragments.[74] Finally, the *Lament for Bion* is a Hellenistic

---

[71] It is worth mentioning that the manuscript tradition for Theocritus' poetry is unusually complex. Therefore, the early history of the circulation of the Theocritean compositions constitutes a subject which cannot be the object of a detailed examination here, where the scope is to examine which *Idylls* were available to Vergil during the composition of the *Eclogues*. See Gutzwiller 1996b, 119-148.

[72] Cf. Stob. 4.17.19 Ἐκ τῶν Μόσχου Βουκολικῶν. See also Stob. 4.20a.29, 4.20b.55.

[73] Cf. *Suid.* s.v. Θεόκριτος. ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τρεῖς γεγόνασι Βουκολικῶν ἐπῶν ποιηταί, Θεόκριτος οὑτοσί, Μόσχος Σικελιώτης καὶ Βίων ὁ Σμυρναῖος, ἔκ τινος χωριδίου καλουμένου Φλώσσης.

[74] Cf. Stob. 1.5.7 Ἐκ τῶν Βίωνος Βουκολικῶν. See also Stob. 1.8.39, 1.9.3, 3.29.52, 4.1.8, 4.16.14, 4.20a.7, 4.20a.26, 4.20b.57, 4.21a.3 and 4.46.17.

epitaph that was composed by an anonymous Greek poet who claims to be an Italian pupil of Bion (*Epit. Bion.* 93-97). The *Lament for Bion* shows very close parallels to the *Lament for Adonis* and to several Theocritean *Idylls*, among which *Idyll* 1 rightly has the dominant place. Quotations in the *Eclogues* from Moschus' and Bion's poetic fragments are notably scattered and sporadic, but are enough to show that Vergil was aware of them. Nevertheless, of far greater importance are the *Laments*, not only because Vergil composes a pastoral lament (*Eclogue* 5), but because especially the *Lament for Adonis* is an inspirational source whose influence on Roman literature has long been noticed by modern scholars.[75]

On the contrary, Vergil's dependence on the Hellenistic epigrammatic tradition is less complicated. Meleager's *Garland* was compiled around the beginning of the 1st c. BC. However, its exact date is indeed hard to define. Beckby and Webster place the collection near the end of the first half of the 1st century, in 70 or 60 BC.[76] Gow and Page place the publication of Meleager's anthology between Antipater of Sidon's death[77] and the publication of Philodemus' epigrams (around 80 BC). They considered the initial years of the 1st century as the most plausible date of publication, based on the lemmatist (1 G-P = *A.P.* 4.1) who set Meleager's *floruit* in the reign of Seleucus VI Epiphanes Nicator (96-95 BC).[78] Cameron, though, dates the *Garland* to between 102 and 90 BC,[79] following Day's suggestion that the *Garland* came to Rome along

---

[75] Reed 1997, 60f. with further references.
[76] Beckby I 1957-1958, 63 and Webster 1964, 208.
[77] They place it around 125 BC but it seems possible for it to be later, even around 90 BC or later. See Gutzwiller 1998, 236 n. 20.
[78] Gow-Page I 1965, xiv-xvii and esp. xvi.
[79] Cameron 1993, 49-56 observes a series of notable parallels between the erotic epigrams of the *Garland* and some early Latin epigrams written by Valerius Aedituus, Porcius Licinus and Q. Lutatius Catulus (cf. Gel. 19.9.10-14).

with the poet Archias.[80] Finally, Ross significantly deviates from this last assumption, a fact which confirms the general disagreement on the exact publication date of Meleager's anthology.[81] Despite the lack of scholarly consensus, Meleager's *Garland* was actually in circulation at Rome from around the beginning of the 1st c. BC and was thus available for consultation by any educated Roman of that period.

Nevertheless, Vergil's relationship with the Greek tradition is certainly not restricted to these sources. It also extends to any Greek and/or Roman source that can be identified in the collection and is used in order to serve the Vergilian literary goals either in each *Eclogue* in particular or in the whole corpus in general. This is the main aim of this study that consists of twelve chapters, ten of which analyse a separate *Eclogue*. Each of these chapters begins with an introductory section that provides the reader with a brief summary of the poem along with Coleman's, Clausen's and Cucchiarelli's views on the sources used by Vergil in each *Eclogue*. The sources identified by these commentators come from the brief synopsis which they set after and before the analysis of each *Eclogue*.[82] Coleman, Clausen and Cucchiarelli trace further sources cited in the analysis of each *Eclogue*, which, however, because they are included in commentaries alone, are discussed only briefly. Through line by line analyses, these scholars provide the sources on which the Vergilian text may be based. However, due to the commentary format, they do not supply the reader with the thematic, structural and verbal correspondences between the Vergilian text and its source(s)[83] and, most

---

[80] Day 1984, 104.
[81] Ross 1969, 143.
[82] Coleman 1977, 89-91 and Clausen 1994, 29-33.
[83] Though not always, since there are cases where such thematic, structural, metrical and verbal correspondences are noticed by these commentators.

importantly, they do not supply the reader with a further discussion concerning the literary goals that Vergil's dependence on those sources serves. These limitations are overcome by this monograph, which is a literary commentary where the reader can find the Greek and Roman sources used by Vergil along with thorough discussions on the role that these sources play and their relative importance, first for the composition of each *Eclogue* and second for that of the whole collection. In other words, Coleman, Clausen and Cucchiarelli recognise sources with primary and secondary significance, whereas this book evaluates the importance of the combination of Greek and Roman sources, stressing the importance that the understanding of this intertextual texture has for the interpretation of each individual poem and the collection as a whole.

This significance of the sources apparently emerges through the line by line analysis of each *Eclogue*. Here, there is the examination of the relationship between the Greek and/or Roman source(s) and the Vergilian text in terms of subject, a relationship further reinforced by structural, metrical and verbal correspondences. This relationship to earlier Greek and Roman literature can also be concerned with those matters, thereby confirming that the Vergilian interest is not only in the subject but in any aspect of the original text. This can explain Vergil's combined dependence on more than one source or on sources that are sometimes recalled for their symbolic significance (e.g. Callimachus) as well, and it can further justify the Vergilian alterations used in order to transform the original Greek or Roman text into an entirely new composition. However, this blending of Greek and Roman sources in the *Eclogues* cannot be merely identified with the typical way in which Roman literature was written in the 1st c. BC, as it is also a dynamic literary method used to define the