

MYRICAE

Text of a lecture read to the Virgil Society
18th October, 1969.

by Mrs. Carlotta Griffiths, M.A.

The Augustan Age in Latin literature, witness any handbook, begins with Virgil's Eclogues. Ages, of course, whether contemporary or posthumous creations, have to be treated circumspectly; they may only be labels which conveniently codify a rather tiresome continuity, particularly at the outer edges. Are there then any reasons why Virgil's Eclogues should belong to the poetry of the Augustan Age rather than to Republican or more precisely Neoteric poetry? Chronologically, after all, these poems were written between about 44 B.C. and 38 B.C., when the Pax Augusta was hardly even in sight. True, the same poet went on to write two of the most important and representative works of the Augustan Age, but that is not quite relevant to our question, in spite of a natural reluctance to chop a poet in two: would the Eclogues still belong to Augustan poetry if Virgil had died in 38 B.C.? On the face of it, the choice of pastoral as a genre is a purely neoteric one. Thus, if the Eclogues really are a new poetry, we should try to explain not only how Virgil's poetry differed from that of the neoterics in spite of his choice of genre, but also why he chose to develop that particular genre; there were after all plenty to choose from, as Eclogue VI testifies. These have long been absorbing problems, and I must immediately state that I shall not, because I cannot, offer a comprehensive review of them, much less any proper solutions. What I shall try to do in this paper is to explore some of the language which Virgil uses to describe poetry in the Eclogues, and to see if this can tell us anything about Virgil's conception of pastoral and what he was trying to do with it. As so often with Virgil, every point seems to grow out of another and it is difficult to decide where one could logically begin, and so it is perhaps best if I abandon logic and start with the question which happened to lead me on to this inquiry.

Eclogue IV begins with three solemn statements in the first person:

Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus.
non omnis arbusta iuvant humilesque myricae.
si canimus silvas, silvae sint consule dignae.

Though this is perhaps the least debated passage in the poem, it is rather odd. Virgil invokes Theocritus' Muses only to invite them to do something quite un-Theocritean, to sing in a loftier strain. Not everyone, he says, likes trees and lowly tamarisks, that is, humble bucolic poetry, as we have been told ever since the ancient commentators (Philarg. ad loc. id est humiliora carmina cf. Serv. ad VI.10 nam per myricas et nemora bucolica significat). Now in the next line, some critics take silvae to be distinct from arbusta and myricae, representing Virgil's loftier pastoral as opposed to his lowly Theocritean pastoral. Three objections militate against this view: it suggests that Virgil could refer metaphorically to 'loftier pastoral' as a pre-existing recognisable option; secondly, in the preface to Eclogue VI, where again

Virgil speaks in the first person about his poetry, both silvae and myrica are used and no such distinction is possible; but most important, it does not seem to me to make sense to say 'not everyone likes X; if we sing Y, let Y be worthy of a consul'. Logically, si canimus silvas must have concessive force: 'not everyone likes pastoral; if (though) I write pastoral, let it be (such as to be) worthy of a consul'. In fact, I think that this line presents us with the same paradox as line 1: consuls in the woods are as odd as Theocritus' Muses singing lofty poetry. Virgil is, I think, intentionally mystifying the reader as to what is going to follow; it is to be something new, a reconciliation of what at first sight would appear to be opposites.

Now if we look more closely at Virgil's metaphor in these lines, it seems quite natural that arbusta and silvae, and nemus (VI.11.) for that matter, should stand for pastoral, just as reges et proelia (VI.3.) stand for epic; they are at least the general background, if not the main subject, of Virgil's pastoral poetry. But why myrica? It seems strange to mention a specific plant, and only one, unless it has some specifically relevant associations. As far as I can see, no one other than Virgil uses tamarisks as a literary symbol, not even Calpurnius or Nemesianus, which suggests that they did not understand it. Moreover, in spite of the vast range of literary metaphors developed by the Hellenistic poets and the Romans after them, names of plants to stand for different types of poetry is not one that seems to have been much developed; ^{1a} in Meleager's preface the plants are merely associated with individual poets and mostly without any discernible symbolism or even relevance. The only exception might be the contrast between the oak and δμνια θεσμοφόρος in line 10 of Callimachus' Aetia prologue, but this depends on Housman's conjecture δρῦν at the beginning of the line, and even if true it would be borrowing a ready-made symbolism from fable (cf. Babrius 36). So although it may be natural that a plant should be used to symbolize pastoral poetry, there is nothing in the tradition of literary metaphor to help us explain why Virgil should have chosen myrica in particular. Nor does Theocritus help us very much, I think. Tamarisks appear in two places, 1.13 and 5.101, but the line is in fact the same: ὡς τὸ κύπελλον τοῦτο γαίλοπον αἰ τε μυρῖκαι. In the first case Thyrsis tells the goatherd, in the second Comatas tells his kids, to come 'here by this sloping knoll and the tamarisks'. Neither the repetition of the line (see Gow on 1.106), nor the fact that in the first instance Thyrsis is inviting the goatherd to come and pipe by the tamarisks, is really a sufficient explanation of Virgil's choice of tamarisks as a symbol. Exactly the same could be said of line 106 of the first idyll,

τηνεὶ δρῦες ἠδὲ κύπερος
αἰ δὲ καλὸν βομβεῦντι ποτὶ σμάνεσσι μέλισσαι

which we find again at 5.45 describing a place to sit and have a singing contest. On the face of it κύπερος the galingale (Latinized by Varro R.R.3.16.13), more humilis than the tamarisk and equally associated by Theocritus with singing-contests between shepherds, metrically equivalent moreover, would have been just as good a choice. However, it might be argued that unlike κύπερος, Theocritus' μυρῖκαι appear early on in the first idyll, in a typically pastoral context and on their own, and so impressed themselves on Virgil's mind, and that this is a sufficient explanation. This

may well be so, and, as the old commentators used to say, si cui placebit, non pugnabo.

Nevertheless, I think we should at least try to discover whether myricae could have had any other associations for Virgil which might have influenced his choice, bearing in mind how often in the Eclogues we find ideas and allusions which cannot be traced to Theocritus. Now the tamarisk is quite a common plant in the Mediterranean, Theophrastus frequently mentions it though he does not give it particular treatment. It appears already in Homer, and indeed Theocritus must have got it from the list of trees at Il.21.350, for the scansion myricae only appears there before him. Its uses are miscellaneous, from building Egyptian boats in Herodotus to weaving sandals for Hermes in his Homeric hymn. They appear to have no very special characteristic, not even that of being particularly humilis.⁽²⁾ But in his note on our passage Conington says that the tamarisks 'were moreover sacred to Apollo, who was called μυρικαῖος and μυρίκινος⁽³⁾ being represented with a branch of one in his hand, so that they are naturally associated with poetry here as in 6.10, 10.13.' This is misleading. The evidence behind this statement is a very interesting passage of Nicander, Ther.612 foll.. In the course of a complicated recipe, Nicander says you should

καὶ μυρίκης ἀζοιο νέον πανακαρπέα θάμνον,
μάντιν ἐνὶ ζωῶσι γεράσιμιον, ἢ ἐν Ἀπολλῶν
μαντοσύνας Κοροπαῖος ἐθήκατο καὶ θέμιν ἀνδρῶν.

'take a young frond of the tamarisk that bears no fruit, an honoured prophet among mortals, which Apollo of Corope endued with prophetic properties and authority over men.' (Gow). Let me say straight away that this passage, together with the scholion on it, constitutes the entirety of our evidence, as far as I have been able to discover, for the association between Apollo and the tamarisk. Moreover, the association is localised, it applies to the Apollo of Corope,⁽⁴⁾ and the scholiast adds, on the authority of a poem by Alcaeus, that it was also true of the Apollo at Lesbos, but it is not just common knowledge about Apollo. So we should first note that if Virgil's myricae are supposed to recall Apollo, the allusion for him, as for Nicander, is a learned one in the hellenistic vein; none the worse for that, but we must recognize it as such. More important, the tamarisk is sacred to Apollo of Corope not as god of poetry but as god of prophecy: it is a μάντις⁽⁵⁾ (and the personification is a striking one), Apollo has endowed it with μαντοσύνας, the arts of divination. Not that I want to put poetry and prophecy into water-tight compartments, the whole purpose of this paper is to do just the opposite; but I would emphasize that if the Nicander passage interested and influenced Virgil in his choice of myricae as a symbol, it was because of their association with prophecy: their association with poetry would be his own.

Now of course it may be a pure coincidence that the Nicander passage is the only extant reference to myricae which gives interesting enough connotations for it to justify Virgil's choice of the plant as a symbol. Though it is perfectly reasonable to suppose that Virgil had read Nicander, we have to admit that he gives us no hint that he is in fact thinking of

Nicander here (Virgil's latinization follows the Theocritean scansion). I would suggest, however, that the Nicander passage had already been picked up by a pastoral poet before Virgil, and was therefore a little more likely to have been influential. The argument for this hypothesis is admittedly precarious and complicated. I give it here for what it's worth. At A.A.I.747, Ovid says 'if you hope that your best friend will leave your girl alone, you may as well hope that tamarisks will bear fruit, and look for honey from the middle of a river.' :

si quis idem sperat, iacturas poma myricas
speret et e medio flumine mella petat.

We have here a couple of adynata of a rather *recherché* kind, unlikely to have been invented out of the blue. The adynaton-theme 'Let X plant bear (inappropriate) fruit' is, naturally enough, a peculiarly pastoral one, and we find both this and honey in a river in a series of adynata at Theocritus 5.124 foll:

- A. 'Ἰμέρα ἀνθ' ὕδατος ρείτω γάλα, καὶ τὸ δέ, κρᾶσι,
οἴνῳ πορφύροις, τὰ δέ τοι σῖα καρπῶν ἐνεύχαι.
B. ρείτω χά Συβαρτίτις ἐμὴν μέλι

There was at the time some discussion about σῖα as it had been conjectured into Homer by Ptolemy Euergetes no less (Schol.e.ad Theoc.5.125, Athen. 61c). In addition the scholiasts comment : σῖον βοτάνη τίς ἐστίν ἀκαρπός and ἀνθύλλιιά εἴσι παντελῶς ἀκαρπα.

When Virgil imitates this passage, he takes the same two elements as Ovid in spite of the change of speaker, and of course changes the plant (III.89):

mella fluent illi, ferat et rubus asper amomum.

Why should Ovid have chosen myricae as the barren plant? Now myricae again appear in a series of adynata at E.VIII.52 foll.:

nunc et ovis ultro fugiat lupus, aurea durae
mala ferant quercus, narcisso floreat alnus,
pinguia corticibus sudent electra myricae

We know from the context that the passage which Virgil principally had in mind here was Theocritus 1.132 foll., but again there are no myricae in that passage; granted that he may have invented the 'amber' conceit as a variation on 'bearing fruit/flowers', ⁽⁶⁾ it is unlikely that he and Ovid quite independently brought myricae into an adynaton. Nor is it likely that Ovid is here drawing from Virgil, simplifying what Virgil had first expressed in an elaborate form and conflating it with a different passage of Theocritus. While it is of course Virgil's constant technique in the Eclogues to conflate different pastoral elements from Theocritus and elsewhere, this would be rather surprising in the Ars Amatoria. A common source seems the most probable solution. What kind of common source? I would guess it was a poet imitating Theoc.5.124 foll. who shied off the controversial σῖα and substituted 'let tamarisks bear fruit' (with the Theocritean scansion, of

course). This would then have been borrowed whole and plain by Ovid, picked out, embroidered and conflated by Virgil. Why should he have chosen tamarisks? Perhaps because as he was looking for a barren plant he remembered Nicander's

καὶ μυρίκης ἄζωιο νέον πανακαρπέα θάμνον

The assumption that the tamarisk is barren is an essential condition for its presence in the adynaton, yet the Nicander passage is (I think) the only one in extant Greek literature that suggests this, for the good reason that it isn't true. ⁽⁷⁾ Nicander himself probably did not mean this: exact syntax and comparison with the similar context at Serenus Sammonicus 480-1

nec non iungenda est utero nova virga myricae

would suggest that he meant 'a branch which has never born fruit', not 'the tamarisk that bears no ⁽⁸⁾fruit'. But πανακαρπής is hapax legomenon, probably a coinage in fact, and as such open to interpretation for a hellenistic poet, who might construct an adynaton on the basis of it. How much of the context in Nicander, the prophetic element, this poet may have included in his adynaton, even I would not care to guess, perhaps none. All I am trying to argue here is that there is a little independent evidence to suggest that a pastoral poet had already picked up Nicander's tamarisk description, making it more likely that Virgil would remember it or be led back to it.

Leaving this labyrinth of conjecture, I will return to my main point. It is at least a possibility that Virgil chose myricae as a symbol because they implied not only pastoral but also prophecy. Why should he do this? And first of all, have we any other evidence that Virgil wanted to associate his pastoral with ideas of prophecy? After all, if the link was at all important to him, he would hardly confine it to a single learned allusion, even in a key symbolic word. One could of course answer that Eclogue IV as a whole is large enough testimony to Virgil's interest in linking pastoral and prophecy. ^{8a} But it is not clear why he should have written and included such a poem as Eclogue IV in his pastoral collection unless some affinity between the idea of prophecy and pastoral was already in his mind. Now it has long been noticed that it is Virgil in the Eclogues who establishes the word vates in the sense of 'poet'. ⁽⁹⁾ It does not matter for our purposes whether Ennius in the famous lines (ann.213 foll.)

scripsere alii rem
versibus quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant

intended vates to mean 'poets' or 'prophets, soothsayers' or both; nor whether Virgil in adopting the word to mean 'poet' was actually reverting to an ancient usage or merely thought that he was. What does matter is that in Virgil's time vates currently meant 'prophet', and the meaning 'poet', whether old or new, had to be explained: Varro (L.L.7.36) says antiquos (-qui edd.) poetas vates appellabant, and in both the occurrences of vates in the Eclogues (VII.25-8, IX.32-4) we find poeta syntactically parallel in the

same sentence, as a kind of gloss to put the reader on the right lines of interpretation. So Virgil is here deliberately innovating. The importance of this innovation for later Augustan poetry, a new concept of the poet's function, which might be rejected but could not be ignored, has been amply illustrated.⁽¹⁰⁾ The vates is the serious poet of the high style, involved in public issues. Propertius, for instance, first uses the word in the programmatic poem II.10, addressing Augustus (19-20) :

haec ego castra sequar; vates tua castra canendo
magnus ero: servent hunc mihi fata diem!

This would seem to be that natural implication of the word: the poet-prophet must be a dignified figure with a responsibility towards society. But what did Virgil mean when he first introduced the idea in the Eclogues? Pastoral is after all deductum carmen, nor was there yet any poetically decent alternative (Annales Volusi ...). Let us look more carefully at the more explicit of the two passages where Virgil uses the word (IX 32 foll.):

et me fecere poetam
Pierides, sunt et mihi carmina, me quoque dicunt
vatem pastores; sed non ego credulus illis.

This being arte allusiva, it is important to remember the model, Theocritus 7.37 foll. :

καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Μοισᾶν χαυρὸν στόμα, κῆμ' ἔλεγοντι
πάντες δοῖδόν ἄριστον· ἐγὼ δέ τις οὐ ταχυχειρῆς
οὐ Δᾶν.

As usual it is the modification rather than the borrowing which is really significant. The two clauses have been made syntactically similar so that we have the two juxtaposed objects, poetam and vatem (the latter emphatically placed at the beginning of the line in enjambement). By comparison with vates, poeta has the air of a Fremdwort.⁽¹¹⁾ This impression is strengthened by localising the muses as Pierides. Finally, the general πάντες has become the specific pastores, who again have strongly Roman associations. The result of these changes is that Virgil is saying something quite different from Theocritus. Theocritus is here concerned to align pastoral on the Callimachean side of the debate against epic (cf. vv. 45-50); In Virgil the Callimachean, neoteric alignment is taken as basic (notice that Virgil in no way rejects the poeta cf. X.70.), but pastoral is very subtly distinguished from this as containing a further possibility expressed in Latin terms; and that possibility lies in seeing a prophetic element as integral to the pastoral ideal and hence to pastoral poetry. Later, as we have seen, Virgil's vates was extracted from the firmly pastoral context (N.B. the close collocation vatem pastores) and associated with the more elevated genres of poetry, especially epic. This fact is indicative of the ambiguous literary standpoint which Virgil's pastoral presented, but what it reveals is a reaction: it should not make us forget that initially vates is not an isolated forecast of the Aeneid but an integral part of the Eclogues, and needs to be explained as such.

I think there is another aspect of the language which Virgil uses about poetry, which, though less clear-cut and less obvious than the introduction of the new word vates, nevertheless tells something of the same story. Eclogue VI begins :

Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu
nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalea.
cum canerem reges et proelia

On canerem La Cerda comments: opponit hoc praecedenti ludere. est alterum heroicum, alterum bucolicum. This is merely derived from the context, but the point is worth investigating. ludere is not of course specifically bucolic; it is a typically neoteric word for composing poetry in a lighter vein -

hesterno, Licini, die otiosi
multum lusimus in meis tabellis.....

Moreover we know, as La Cerda could not, that the preface to Eclogue VI echoes Callimachus' rejection of epic in the prologue to the Aetia, almost the sacred text of Alexandrianism in Rome. So ludere in the first line must be polemical, and opposition to canerem is in the context inevitable. Now at first sight this is rather odd, because Callimachus in his prologue emphatically uses the verb ἀείδειν to describe his own poetic activity (fr. 1.29, 33) and canere ought to be its equivalent. Why does Virgil, in imitating that very prologue, use canere to describe the poetry of the opposite camp, heroic epic? (12)

I think the answer must be that canere had connotations in Latin quite different from those of ἀείδειν in Greek; connotations which a poet as sensitive as Virgil to the native reverberations of words could not ignore. The 'basic' meaning of the two words is of course 'to sing'. But would the associations of singing be the same for a Roman as for a Greek? For a Greek, singing begins with μῆνιν ἀείδε θεῶ and the Iliad; for a Roman it begins with divum empta cante and the sub-literary ritual of the Carmen Saliare. I need hardly say that this is a gross simplification. But it is I think true that ἀείδειν established itself as the word for a poet's activity at a time when poetry was in fact largely communicated, if not actually composed, by singing or chanting, frequently with musical accompaniment; and so it remained the standard word even when poetry was more usually written and read. (13) Indeed it has been suggested that the word was emphasised by Callimachus and his school in order to infuse a new lyricism into the highly literary poetry of the day. But even if this is so, it is clear that ἀείδειν and its cognates never became strictly identified with any one genre or school: the quarrel between Callimachus and the Telchines was whether the poem should be ἔν and διηνεχέζ not about its being an ἀεῖσμα. The important point, however, is that, though ἀείδειν might still bear the literal sense of 'singing', even as such one of its principal associations was poetry and all kinds of poetry. Now as far as I can see, the history of cano, and consequently the effect of

the word when it comes to be used by Virgil, are quite different. Originally in fact, the word seems to mean not so much to 'sing' as to make a loud, and therefore usually public and formal, noise, whether the subject be a person or an instrument. Thus tubae canunt, bellicum or classicum canere, receptui canere, for giving signals in battle, bucina canit of the night watches. More important, as we saw above, cano is from very early on the appropriate word for hymns:

Dianam pueri integri
puellaeque canamus

is the only certain instance where Catullus uses the word in the first person. Other typically formal contexts in which we find cano are weddings, funerals and triumphs. ⁽¹⁴⁾ Frequently too, cano means to 'prophecy': the gods, oracles, the parcae, oscines aves, and vates all canunt. ⁽¹⁵⁾ Of course the word is also used meaning simply to sing a song; the point is that for the Romans song is much more closely associated with public, religious and social life than with poetry. Nor is this surprising; Roman poetry (pace the Lays of Ancient Rome) was essentially literary right from the beginning, based on books both for its inspiration and for its diffusion, even though poets might give recitals of their works as well. And so we find that even when cano is associated with poetry, the emphasis is on the recital, not on the content or composition. All the instances in Cicero, for instance, imply either by the context (e.g. epulis) or by the mention of an instrument, that performance and not composition is meant. ⁽¹⁶⁾ This is not to say that the Greek ἀειθεῖν never exerted any influence on the development of cano, the question is when, and how much. The only instance of the word in Ennius refers to the vates, but it may be that in spite of this (because of the Greek usage and because as an experimenter he could not afford to be as nice in his choice of words as later poets) he used the word either in his own person or in Homer's in the Dream at the beginning of the *Annales*: both Lucretius (1.117) and Propertius (3.3.7) use cecinit of him with reference to the Dream. ⁽¹⁷⁾ At any rate, when Lucilius uses it, it is the word for epic in the context of a recusatio as it is in Virgil: (620-1)

hunc laborem sumas, laudem qui tibi ac fructum ferat:
percrepa pugnam Popili, facta Corneli cane.

The only other poet who uses the word in a properly literary sense before Virgil is Lucretius; here we find it in a semi-formulaic phrase of the Greek poets (2.600 = 5.405 = 6.754), once of poets generally but with Greek epic in mind (5.327), once as we have seen of Ennius, and twice of his own task in the course of his exposition (5.509, 6.84). He nowhere uses it in the contexts where he is talking of his poetry, where he has a variety of other expressions: pangere versus or carmina (1.25, 5.8, Ennian) pertexere dictis (6.42) condere carmen (5.1.) It looks as if Lucretius picked up the literary cano from Ennius, but shied off using it emphatically of his own poetry because it was connected with the narrative poets of myth and legend, whom he is concerned to refute (2.644-5, 5.406, 6.753-5.). It may be no more than chance that there is no instance of cano in the miserable fragments

of neoteric poetry before Virgil; but I think it is significant that Catullus only uses the word in contexts which fit its Latin associations: apart from the hymn, we find it in a wedding (62.9), of Attis' ecstatic utterances (63.11, 27) and of the Parcae prophesying (64.383); he never uses it meaning just to compose poetry, in spite of the wealth of literary discussion in his work. I think we can conclude from all this that while the Latin poets were of course perfectly aware of the Greek use of ἀείδειν they hesitated to use cano as its equivalent because they could not help feeling in it the reverberations of formal religion and prophetic song which the word had, and continued to have, in Latin, in spite of increasing Greek influence. So it is not after all surprising that in the context of a recusatio Virgil should choose cano to represent high-flown epic. But if this is typical of the neoteric position, we must recognise that the Eclogues as a whole, in which cano occurs another 18 times, must have had a rather peculiar resonance for Virgil's readers. Of course the shepherds and Silenus are supposed to sing their songs, not metaphorically but out loud, and to that extent the use of cano is obvious and natural. Moreover there is no doubt that in the Eclogues Virgil was trying to follow Theocritus in creating a peculiarly musical poetry, and a number of different verbs play their part in contributing to this effect. In Theocritus μελίζειν and σφρίζειν are typically pastoral alternatives to ἀείδειν. Virgil had largely to create alternatives: so he vocalises meditor, which originally meant to think out, practice or reflect; he transfers modulor from its rather technical literal sense of tuning or adjusting, to the broader meaning of composing songs, with carmina as object, so that again after him the word came to be associated with poetry. He also wins canto for poetry; it had none of the solemn associations of cano, it usually applied to professional singers who were of dubious respectability anyway, and tended towards pejorative meanings, like cantilena. Virgil never uses it outside the Eclogues, and never of himself, but his shepherds invested it with a new lyricism (cf. esp. IX.64-5, X.31-3) so that later it was frequently associated with poetry and indeed Horace can start his Roman Odes with Musarum sacerdos / virginibus puerisque canto. Nevertheless I think it is important that it is cano, with its particular background of associations, which we find gently transferred from the shepherds to Virgil himself, sometimes with the fiction that Virgil is a shepherd while composing the Eclogues (X.70-1).

haec sat erit, divae, vestrum cecinisse poetam,
dum sedet et gracili fiscellam textit hibisco

but also strongly in propria persona -

Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus.

A similar heightening of tone may also have been felt in the frequent re-echoing of the word carmen through the poems, well over 40 times, often repeated within the line. The Romans connected the word with Carmentis the prophetic goddess, and it had many of the same prophetic and magical associations as cano. It seems that Ennius had tried to substitute poema for it, without great success. But it is indicative that Catullus for instance only uses

carmen in the longer poems, while poema and versus are used in the lighter poems. I do not think it is being over-subtle to believe that Virgil was aware of these shades of meaning, and that he expected his readers to be: precisely in this group of words, we find that it is Virgil in the Eclogues who reawakens a number of ancient usages, which then become common after him. Thus in VIII 67-70, carmina is used in the sense of 'spells', only attested before him in the XII Tables; similarly at VIII.71 cantando is used absolutely meaning 'by casting spells', extending an association found in Cato's de agricultura and once in Lucilius. It is Virgil who finally brings back the long-exiled Camēnae (III.59 and Catal. 5.11-12) and connects them closely with his pastoral: alternis dicetis: amant alterna Camēnae (cf. Hor. Sat.1.10.45) and the Camēnae were of course connected with carmen and cano (Varro L.L.VII.27). And, though this is not uncommon, it is interesting that he does use carmen to mean simply 'a prophecy' (IV.4.). And let me repeat that cano is the appropriate word for the vates. We of course have to discover the connotations of these words from scanty references in a fragmentary literature: for Virgil the words would bring their echoes with them, perhaps indefinitely; the important point is that it was words with such echoes that he chose to emphasize. (18)

If the above is correct, it may not be illegitimate to conclude that as he was writing the Eclogues Virgil was concerned to enlarge and ennoble the idea of poetry by using language which was fraught with ancient religious and prophetic reverberations, a language which was moreover deeply rooted in the earliest Roman tradition. It need hardly be said that the association of prophecy and poetry, in itself, is clearly to be found in early Greek literature, and Virgil would of course be aware of this. Moreover the kind of prophecy involved is not exclusively concerned with the future. Hesiod's Muses, like Calchas (Il.1.70), are the ones who know (Theog.38)

τά τ'έόντα τά τ'έσσόμενα πρό τ'έόντα

And so Virgil says of Proteus (G.IV.392)

novit namque omnia vates,
quae sint, quae fuerint, quae mox ventura trahantur.

It is a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the world, (19) which gives the prophet both authority and responsibility among men. Nicander's tamarisk, if you remember, receives from Apollo not only μαντοσύνας but also θέμις ἀνδρῶν. But although this idea of the poet-prophet who is important to the community is a very old one, it had by Virgil's time long lost any meaning even in Greece; Aristophanes is already pointing this out in the Frogs (e.g.1418 foll.). The Alexandrian poet depended on the powers that be for patronage, but his responsibility is limited accordingly, even when he borrows semi-prophetic language from Pindar: (Theoc.17.115)

Μουσάων δ'ὑποφῆται δαίδοντι Πτολεμαῖον
ἀντ' εὐεργεσίης.

As for the community, Callimachus' σιखाίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια is significant beyond its immediate context. The neoterics of course were in a

different position, and Catullus like Calvus takes an interest in political events, but still for him the poet is the learned artist who is if anything at loggerheads with the establishment:

Vivamus mea Lesbia atque amemus,
rumoresque senum severiorum
omnes unius aestimemus assis.

We are so delighted by the impetuosity of Catullus the lover, that it's easy to forget that this is also the political attitude of Catullus the poet, a declaration of independence for his values and his poetry. So what is new in Virgil's Eclogues is not only that he dwells on political themes in a genre which was not traditionally concerned with politics; he also suggests that the poet's activity is integral to the community and bound up with it: when the community is shattered by the brutality of war, poetry is destroyed with it:

sed carmina tantum
nostra valent, Lycida, tela inter Martia, quantum
Chaonias dicunt aquila veniente columbas. (IX.11-13.)

The prophetic doves of poetry lose their power, a helpless prey to the eagle of war. Again, poetry is a part of the peace and security which Tityrus receives from his god (I.6 foll.)

O Meliboee, deus nobis haec otia fecit
ille meas errare boves, ut cernis, et ipsum
ludere quae vellem calamo permisit agresti.

while Meliboeus, uprooted in the dislocation of war, says: carmina nulla canam. Now it is often said that Virgil raised Theocritean pastoral to a higher plane, to a new dignity and more Roman involvement with political issues. This is doubtless objectively true, but it suggests that Virgil's innovations were intended as a response to Theocritus, a case of aemulatio within the genre, as if Virgil in the first place decided (or was fated?) to write Theocritean pastoral, and then found that certain changes were necessary, including a new idea of poetry. It seems to me more likely that Virgil in the first place wanted to express a new idea of poetry and that, after experiment no doubt, he decided that pastoral would be the best vehicle for it, for reasons which we shall try to see later. In short, I think that when Virgil in the Eclogues presents us with an archaic prophetic idea of poetry, a poetry vitally involved with the community, this is, however subtly, polemical; a polemic not against Theocritus so much as against the poets of his own time, the neoterics. Let me say straight away that I am not for a moment suggesting that Virgil rejects the neoteric achievement: that he admired it and absorbed its lessons down to the tiniest detail is indisputable, and his sympathy with many of its aims is evident in everything he wrote to the end of his life. It was after all the poetry with which he grew up. So what was his attitude to neoteric poetry? It seems reasonable to suppose that if an answer is to be found anywhere, we should find it in Eclogue VI. As we saw, the poem opens with what seems to be an unambiguous declaration of faith in the neoteric code,

the Callimachean instructions from Apollo adapted to suit pastoral, but with the same emphasis on unpretentious refinement, deductum dicere carmen, and (golden line !) agrestem tenui meditabor harundine musam; and here alone in the Eclogues, Virgil uses ludere of his own poetry. The main part of the poem is taken up, as has been shown, with a list, poetically elaborate of course, of typically neoteric (hellenistic) themes. They are presented to us as the poetry of Silenus, who first appears

inflatum hesterno venas, ut semper, Iaccho,

but by the end of the paragraph has been transformed into an Orpheus figure, whose song casts a spell over the wild beasts and the trees, and he begins his song just as Orpheus did in Apollonius' Argonautica. Nor is it just the subject-matter of his song which recalls neoteric poetry; the loose concatenation of myths, the allusive and selective manner of referring to them, the 'inset' narrative, the emphasis on psychology and emotion, the Dichterweihe, as well as many minor stylistic features, perfectly convey the characteristics of neoteric poetry as if it had been developed from Callimachus to Catullus and probably Gallus. And in fact Silenus' song is by no means new, it is

omnia, quae Phoebus quondam meditante beatus
audiit Eurotas iussitque ediscere lauros.

Phoebus singing to Hyacinthus, an exquisitely hellenistic scene. There can be no doubt, then, that the poem is a tribute to neoteric poetry, a token of admiration for its achievement. I would suggest, however, that it does not follow from this that the poem represents Virgil's own poetic aims. It remains a fact that Virgil did not himself write any poetry of the kind which he so perfectly describes: it was not he who wrote a Hylas or a Ciris. And I do not think that to describe a kind of poetry is the same as to compose it. If Virgil devotes an Eclogue to describing a kind of poetry which he never wrote it would be at least strange that admiration should be his only motive. I think it was not only admiration, but also regret: that while he ranged himself wholeheartedly on the side of the neoterics in their loathing for the uncouth and bombastic, in their concern for perfection, that while he realised that no poetry could successfully ignore what they had achieved, he nevertheless felt, rightly or wrongly, that the day when poetry could concentrate on a private world of strange and fascinating myth had come to an end. In Eclogue VI, Silenus continues his song

cogere donec ovis stabulis numerumque referre
iussit et invito processit Vesper Olympo.

Why invito? Heyne explains: quod caelum aegre ferebat, nocte ingruente carmen finiri. At the risk of sounding fanciful, I would suggest that Virgil too, aegre ferebat carmen finiri, but for him that song, however beautiful, was no longer enough.

Perhaps there is some slight support for this idea in Eclogue IV. It is of course clear that Eclogues IV and VI form a pair, linked by their positions in the book, by their divergence from even a minimal pastoral form, probably

also in date. Whatever Eclogue IV as a whole may mean, towards the end of the poem Virgil seems to suggest what the ideal poetry of the future is to be like:

o mihi tum longae maneat pars ultima vitae,
spiritus et quantum sat erit tua dicere facta'

spiritus and tua dicere facta imply some kind of epic; in a neoteric context one would expect this to be followed by a withdrawal, on the lines of 'but alas I am only a shepherd and must sing a deductum carmen'. Instead, what follows is absolutely positive:

non me carminibus vincet nec Thracius Orpheus
nec Linus

Even the great poets of Greece, who both appeared in Eclogue VI, will not defeat him. What follows this is even more surprising:

Pan etiam, Arcadia mecum si iudice certet,
Pan etiam Arcadia dicat se iudice victum.

It seems that the new poetry, which is to be in some ways like epic, is nevertheless not to be incongruous with Arcadia, (20) it is not opposed to Arcadia in the way one would expect epic to be opposed to pastoral, as it is in Eclogue VI. Precisely how Virgil imagined this new poetry is indeed mysterious; but it is clear enough that it lies beyond the limits of the poetry described in Eclogue VI. And if it is true that Virgil is already in the Eclogues introducing the idea of a prophetic poetry, the poetry of the vates, then it is hard to resist the conclusion that the poetry of the future will be a development of this, and hence a development of a pastoral idea, of Arcadia.

Arcadia as a 'spiritual landscape' for pastoral was Virgil's creation. A great deal has been written on the sources which may have inspired this idea: Polybius' description of the Arcadians' love of music (IV.20), the story of Evander and his colony of Arcadians bringing the cult of Pan to the Palatine, the passages of Lucretius where a bucolic landscape is sketched (4.580 foll., 5.1379 foll.), the poems of Anyte of Tegea and perhaps other Greek bucolic epigrams; the sheer remoteness of Arcadia and the fact that its most important god was Pan, god of the shepherds and inventor of the syrinx; it is always very hard to say what might not have influenced Virgil, and it is indeed highly probable that several different factors contributed to one complex idea. All I shall attempt to do here is to see whether Virgil's Arcadia, given these associations, can be related to the idea of a prophetic pastoral poetry. It would perhaps be foolish even to look for an explicit statement of such a relationship in poems as elusive and deliberately ambiguous as the Eclogues; at any rate, I can only offer a rather loose association of ideas which is admittedly speculative.

It is probable that already by Virgil's time there was some debate about the origin of pastoral poetry; ⁽²¹⁾ the most popular theories which have come down to us refer to historical or mythical events at Sparta, Tyndaris or Syracuse as the starting point for bucolic poetry, encouraged perhaps by the idea that Doric was its natural dialect and by the fact that Theocritus was a Syracusan. But there is one account which we know interested Virgil because he echoes some of its language, and that is Lucretius 5.1379 - 1411. Lucretius is explaining how men came to learn singing and playing by imitating birds and observing the sound of the wind through reeds. This theory of the origin of *μουσική* can indeed be traced back to Democritus; ⁽²²⁾ but Lucretius in his description highlights the pastoral context of the invention:

inde minutatim dulcis didicere querelas
tibia quas fundit digitis pulsata canentum,
avia per nemora ac silvas saltusque reperta,
per loca pastorum deserta atque otia dia.

And so the poetry of these primitive shepherds appears not simply as the earliest poetry, but specifically as bucolic poetry: agrestis enim tum musa vigebat.(v.1398): far from being invented at any one time or place, pastoral poetry is the primeval poetry of early man. Now already in the time of Herodotus there was discussion about who were the oldest people and Arcadia became one of the claimants. When Apollonius Rhodius wants to convey the extreme antiquity of Egyptian Thebes, he does so by saying that the only other people in existence were the Arcadians. True, they were not living in a flourishing city like the Egyptians, they ate acorns up in the mountains. But they had been there since before the moon, *ἄροισέλα γένος* they were called (A.R.4.263 foll.). We do not know exactly how far back this tradition goes, except that it is pre-Aristotelian, but what is important for us is that it was popular in the Alexandrian period (cf. also Call. fr. 191, 56., Lyc. 482), and indeed the works of Hippys of Rhegium which was the reputed source of the idea have been thought to be a forgery of the late 4th or early 3rd century. ⁽²³⁾ Anyway, there is no need to doubt that Virgil would have been familiar with the idea, even though our earliest testimony in Latin is Ovid (Fasti 1.469, 2.289). Therefore if Virgil wanted to give a name to Lucretius' primeval shepherds, it would be natural for him to call them Arcadians. And of course although the Greeks never, as far as we know, credited the Arcadians with the invention of pastoral poetry, there was a tradition that Pan, their 'most ancient and most honoured god' (Dion. Hal. 1.32), had invented the Syrinx, its most typical instrument, and he is very much the shepherds' god in Theocritus although none of the poems are set in Arcadia. Pan was on occasion a prophetic god; Pausanias (8.37.11) tells us that near Lykosoura (which incidentally was the most ancient city of all 'the first that the sun saw, from which the rest of mankind learnt to build cities' Paus. 8.38.1.) there was a temple of Pan where 'it is said that in even more ancient times this god would give oracles' through the nymph Erato, some of whose oracles Pausanias read. There are a few other references to Pan as a prophet, notably the story that he taught Apollo the mantic art, ⁽²⁴⁾ but it certainly was not one of his main characteristics. Therefore, as far as the Greek tradition goes, all that Virgil really gained by making his shepherds Arcadians was a closer connection

with the shepherds' god, and an aura of extreme antiquity, suggesting that pastoral poetry was the poetry of the earliest men, a poetry which only they really knew - solī cantare periti, Arcades. But of course Arcadia had strong associations for the Romans as well. Already in the 3rd century, the story of Evander and his Arcadians emigrating to the West was integrated with the history of early Rome, Evander it was who settled on the Palatine hill. As an Arcadian, Evander's chief god was Pan,

transtulit Evander silvestria numina secum.

It was said that he founded on the Palatine a festival of Pan Lycaeus which was the Lupercalia, the festival of Faunus. In Ovid's account (F.2.267 foll.) we find the pre-lunar antiquity of the Arcadians, their primitive simplicity of life, their arrival in Latium with Evander and the identification of Pan with Faunus, all combined. (25) How many of these connections could have been in Virgil's mind when he wrote the Eclogues, it is very difficult to say. In particular, the account in Aeneid VIII may be very misleading. In a heroic epic context, Evander can indeed lead a life of austere and virtuous simplicity, but he cannot with any historical or literary appropriateness be directly associated with an absolutely primitive pastoral life, he must have an army to send and a sense of mission as Romanae conditor arcis. And in fact Virgil there clearly distinguishes three periods in the history of Latium before Evander's arrival; first (VIII.314 foll.)

haec nemora indigena Fauni Nymphaeque tenebant
gensque virum truncis et duro robore nata,
quis neque mos neque cultus erat

This is the age corresponding to Lucretius' early shepherds who invented song, the silvestre genus terrigenarum (5.1411), and Virgil's description is very similar to Ovid's description of the Arcadians (F.2.291 foll.). After them, says Evander, came Saturn and the golden age, then a decolor aetas of war, and finally himself. Similarly, in Aeneid VIII the prophetic Faunus cannot be identified with Pan Lycaeus of the savage Lupercalia, indeed Virgil reduces Evander's connection with this to naming the Lupercal cave, and Faunus becomes the father of Latinus. I would suggest that when Virgil wrote the Eclogues his idea of Evander's Arcadians would have been less historical and more like that which we find in Ovid, a primitive pastoral people living not after but among the native fauns and nymphs, a people whose silvestria numina were not only Pan, the Satyrs and Naiads but also Silvanus, Pales, the Camenae and the Fauni, and perhaps he already connected Evander with Carmentis. Virgil does not, like Ovid, identify the Roman gods with the Greek but unites them in one community, thus keeping the individual associations of each, though he might transfer their external characteristics. This world full of all kinds of woodland spirits had already been sketched by Lucretius, in language very similar to the passages mentioned earlier.

At Book IV 572 foll., Lucretius scientifically explains why strange reverberations and echoes may be heard in uninhabited places; but, he says,

haec loca capripedes satyros nymphasque tenere
finitimi fingunt et faunos esse loquantur

and simple peasants imagine they hear Pan wildly piping,

fistula silvestrem ne cesset fundere musam.

Now although Lucretius mentions the satyrs, nymphs and Pan, it was actually the Latin Fauni whose special characteristic it was to utter sounds in the woods, sounds which were moreover thought to be prophetic. In Ennius the Fauni are linked with vates, and Varro derives their name from fari.⁽²⁶⁾ The Fauni represent nature talking directly to man; of all the country deities to whom Virgil appeals at the beginning of the Georgics, it is the Fauni who are agrestum praesentia numina. In Theocritus it is only the mythical Daphnis who is directly in touch with gods and nature. In the Eclogues, Naiads and Nymphs bring flowers for Alexis, the shepherds Chromis and Mnasyllus join with a Naiad to capture Silenus, all nature stops to listen to the songs of Damon and Alpheus, Virgil himself sees Pan; non canimus surdis: respondent omnia silvae. Lucretius' genus agricolae hear, like a distant echo, the mysterious music of Pan and the Fauni which for the Romans was prophetic; in Virgil's Arcadia the shepherds share in that music, which is at once song, magic and prophecy, and embodies their ideal. Now Lucretius gives an interesting reason for the peasants' fancies:

cetera de genere hoc monstra ac portenta loquuntur
ne loca deserta ab divinis quoque forte putentur
sola tenere.

The presence of the gods is reassuring because, as is well known, the gods desert mankind when corruption and wrong-doing prevail. This was the theme which framed Catullus' Peleus and Thetis, a poem which we know Virgil studied deeply when he wrote the Eclogues, because Eclogue IV echoes not only its language but even its rhythms and verse-technique. When Jupiter himself consents to the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, of mortal and goddess, Catullus exclaims: (64.22 foll.)

o nimis optato saeculorum tempore nati
heroes, salvete, deum genus!

Then in the strange coda to the poem this is the moral which is drawn (64.384 foll.):

praesentes namque ante domos invisere castas
heroum, et sese mortali ostendere coetu,
caelicolae nondum sprete pietate solebant.

The blissful age when the gods attended Peleus' wedding, when gods would come to the aid of heroes in battle, gives place to an age of civil war and moral perversion and the gods turn away. This moral is to say the least surprising when we look back over the poem as a whole. The felicis carmina of the Parcae predict a life of heroism for Achilles. But witnesses to that heroism will be the Phrygian plains running with Trojan blood, the mothers broken with grief mourning their sons slain by Achilles, the Scamander

cuius iter caesis angustans corporum acervis
alta tepefaciet permixta flumina caede,

and the brutal sacrifice of Polyxena

alta Polyxenis maeffient caede sepulcra

described in great detail over two stanzas. The Greeks do not even have a moral claim, for Agamemnon is referred to as periuri Pelopis tertius heres. If this is the heroic past with which the gods were pleased to associate themselves, the moral that Catullus draws is ambiguous indeed, and the ambiguity is if anything increased by the story of Theseus and Ariadne, who after all belong to the same heroic age.⁽²⁷⁾ Virgil doubtless understood Catullus' poem better than we can, but precisely what he thought about it we shall never know. I would only suggest that Catullus demonstrates, as in a way Eclogue VI also demonstrates, that poetry on mythological themes could not then offer a political alternative, it could not provide an ideal world for a sophisticated man to contrast with the actual world. The Alexandrians had further developed the use of myth as a vehicle for exploring individual psychology, but this very realism reduced its capacity to provide a relevant ideal. Even when a poet takes such liberties with heroic myth as Callimachus did in the Hecale, the moral of the story (how far Callimachus expressed it we in any case do not know) is that humble poverty and devotion are as worthy as great deeds or even more so. As a comment on heroic poetry this is a tour-de-force; if we were to seek in it a comment on Ptolemaic Alexandria we would be disappointed. For Callimachus, the only possible form of poésie engagée is panegyric. When Virgil came to write the Eclogues, in an Italy torn apart by civil war, all that myth might offer beyond the private world of emotion and character would be what we find in Catullus, a prototype of the brutality of war, which could by then be no more powerful than the actual horror around. I think that one of the reasons why Virgil chose to write pastoral was that the convention it provided was tied to no one place or time, to no one individual or story, but to the idea of a community, the community of shepherds. No other genre could offer such a thing. In Virgil this community is given a name, Arcadia; its origins lie beyond computable time, it contains gods and men, past, present and future, and yet it is not a world of portents and great events, only of rustic tasks such as all shepherds do, in peace and harmony with nature; and it lives for its poetry. Of course it is a dream, but it is not the safe dream of the escapist; it may be a dream of timeless ideals, but it is a dream for Italy in the civil war. The shepherds' countryside is ravaged, they are silenced and dispossessed; only in Rome, now, can Tityrus find praesentis divos to save him, but he is alone, the community could not be saved even by Menalcas' poetry, and for Meliboeus there is only exile. Through the very beauty of the dream we are made to realize all the more clearly en quo discordia civis produxit miseros, and this is indeed a new poetry.

NOTES

I would like to thank Miss M.E.Hubbard and Professor A.D.Momigliano for generous and helpful criticism of this paper.

1. So J.H.Voss, Marx (NJbb.I.1898.p.111), Conington, Holtorf; only Voss is consistent enough to read sunt for sint. It is in any case unlikely that silvae should be used for a specific and unprecedented symbolic

contrast, given its vast variety of senses in the Eclogues, cf. Cartault Etude sur les Bucoliques p.454 foll.

- 1a. Miss M.E.Hubbard points out to me that roses and ivy appear with different Muses at Prop.3.3.35-6. Roses are already associated with poetry by Sappho fr.55; for the ivy cf. Hor.c.1.1.29 and Nisbet-Hubbard ad loc. Neither plant, however, is as specific or as odd as the tamarisk.
2. Both in Theophrastus (1.9.3, 1.10.4.) and in Pliny (16.80) the tamarisk is included in the lists of trees, not in the lists of shrubs that follow.
3. There seems to be no evidence for $\mu\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\chi\iota\nu\alpha$ as an epithet of Apollo: Conington is diluting La Cerda's note on X.13 (quoted by Voss), which in turn is a corruption of an earlier note; Germanus Valens on IV.2. has it right.
4. A busy oracle in late hellenistic times, see L.Robert, Hellenica V, p.16 foll.
5. Also in Nicander, fr. 85, of the cabbage; of the bay, Anth.Epigr.Gr.III ed. Cougny VI.122, cf. Pap.Mag.Gr. ed.Preisendanz I.p.26. Note that the bay, prophetic plant par excellence, and the tamarisk are associated by Virgil, X.13 illum etiam lauri, etiam flevete myricae.
6. Perhaps he knew that certain types of tamarisk produce manna, though the only ancient reference to this is Hdt.7.31.
7. My argument depends on the likelihood that the adynata in Virgil and Ovid derive from a Greek poetic source, given the contexts. There was a Roman belief that the tamarisk was an arbor infelix: Pliny (13.116, 24.67) tries to reconcile this belief with his scientific source (cf. Diosc.1.87) and similarly at 16.108 he adds to Theophrastus' list of barren trees(3.4.2.) the tamarisk and the alaternus; the latter we know from Macrobius (Sat.3.20.3.) was one of the arbores infelices listed by Tarquitiu Priscus, so perhaps the tamarisk was as well (cf. Thulin, Die etrusk. Disziplin, III.p.94 foll.). Strictly speaking the characteristic of the Etruscan arbor infelix was not barrenness but dark leaves or berries and connection with the underworld (tamarisk as funeral plant Leonidas of Tarentum A.P.VI.298 = HE 2307, explained by Schol. Lucan. 9.917) but given the root sense of infelix the confusion is natural (perhaps the quotation of Cato in Paul.Fest.p.92 was originally intended to point a distinction?) Presumably Serv. auct. and Philarg. ad IV.2. also derive from this tradition, and perhaps Coripp.6.572 who mentions steriles myricae together with the oleaster, called infelix by Virgil (G.2.314). I have so far been unable to discover the source of St. Jerome's remarkable comments on the tamarisk (ad Esai.17.1-3 Corp.Christ.p.183, 268, and refs. there given, cf. Isid.17.7.49.) At any rate, if Virgil knew of this tradition, his choice of the plant as a symbol is very weird indeed; if he did not know of it, it cannot explain his and Ovid's adynata.

8. Cf. also in Nicander, all hapax : παναεργής, πανάκτειος, παναλήτης, πανάπαστος.
- 8a. If I am right in my interpretation of IV.2-3, the fact that E.IV is prophetic does not exclude prophetic associations for the myricae: the distinction between this poem and humiles myricae lies in the wish sint consule dignae; humble prophecy may be raised to a cosmic and Roman theme, and to an epic tone.
9. For discussion and full bibliography see W.Suerbaum, Untersuch. zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter, Spudasmata XIX, Hildesheim, 1968, p.257 foll. and Index III s.v. Dichter-Terminologie.
10. J.K.Newman, The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry, Coll. Latomus 89, Bruxelles, 1967.
11. Note that fecere also emphasises the Greek etymology of poeta, cf. A.P. XI.127 (Pollianus): (the Erinyes) αἴ σε κοίουςι ποιητῆν and see R.Scarcia, Latina Siren p.29 n.18.
12. This point (valid also for the interpretation of Lucilius 620) is ignored by J.K.Newman who argues (Latinitas 13. 1965 p.86 foll.) that canere was rejected by Ennius and became 'quasi poetarum novorum tessera': to my mind the only evidence really supporting this would be Valgius Rufus fr.2., but this is surely influenced by the Eclogues, cf. fr.5.
13. Cf. Strabo 1.2.6., Schmid, Der Atticismus III.p.229. So dicere can translate both δείδειν and λέγειν cf. Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor.c.1.21.1.
14. In Pl. and Ter. only canto is used for singing, always of professional girls or tibicines. If canam is the right reading at Cat.65.12, the context is mourning, cf. Cic. Arat.147 Baehr., Prop.2.34.90. Even in the Augustan period, hymns (Hor.c.1.10.5., 4.6.37., Prop.3.15.41., Tib. 1.7.13,27., Ov.F.3.260) and triumphs (Hor.epod.9.18., c.4.2.47., Tib.2.5.118., Ov.Am.1.2.34) remain prominent contexts, in spite of increasing use of the word in a literary sense; even the latter refers in the vast majority of cases to heroic themes (e.g. Hor.sat.1.10.43., Prop.2.1.19,28,31.) or with mock-heroic tone (Prop.3.3.48., Ov.am.1.1.24.) A notable exception to this is the repeated tu canis at Prop.2.34.67,77., significantly of Virgil's Eclogues and Georgics, cf. Valgius Rufus fr.2.
15. For prophetic cano see TLL III.271-2.
16. E.g. Cic. de orat.2.352.
17. Cf. also Ov.Trist.2.423.
18. For an interesting discussion of Livy's use of carmen and vates see F.Altheim, Gesch. d.lat. Sprache p.452 foll.

19. Cf. also Plato Rep. 392d, 617c.
20. This point is well put by K.W.Gransden, Arethusa 3.1970.p.109:
'The exceptional nature of Virgil's fourth or messianic eclogue lies in the fact that it looks forward to a time when the pastoral will be the truly heroic. The tone and language are epic; the vision is pastoral.'
21. The evidence is conveniently collected in C.Wendel, Scholia in Theocritum Vetera, Prolegomena.
22. Vors. 55.B.154 D-K. cf. Chamaeleo fr.46 Wehrli.
23. Jacoby, Fr.Gr.Hist. 554.F.6,7., Lyr. adesp.985 PMG ed Page.
24. Apollod.1.22., Schol. in Pind.Pyth.hyp., cf. Nonnus 14.90.
25. Plut. Aet.Rom. 76 directly connects the Arcadians as with Evander.
26. So in the Aeneid (7.81-2) Faunus is purely a prophet with an oracle. Calpurnius in his first 'Eclogue makes simpler and more explicit this connection between pastoral and prophecy which I think is implicit in Virgil; there Faunus, identified with Pan (v.9), in a pastoral context, is the giver of a great national prophecy.
27. I am indebted to the interpretation of Catullus 64 by Mr. John Bramble, who very kindly sent me the typescript of his paper due to appear in PCPhS 196.1970.