Proceedings of the Virgil Society 20 (1991) 1–14
© 1991

The Style of Virgil's *Eclogues*

The style of a poet is the most important thing about him, the element that cannot be translated, without which nobody but a scholar could endure to read him. But it is also the hardest part to characterise, which is why we all prefer to talk about other matters. Lists of vocabulary and metrical statistics provide useful raw material, but they may communicate very little; a count of dactyls does not tell us what the *Eclogues* are actually like. I believe that here as elsewhere the best approach is to concentrate on particular passages where the idiosyncrasy of the poet appears in its most undiluted form. Such passages give a flavour to the whole, but this quality is easily dissipated in a statistical treatment; after all in most works of literature, including even the *Eclogues*, there are many lines that could have belonged somewhere else.

Virgil in the *Eclogues* set out to do a Theocritus in Latin, that is to say to transfer the charm and precision of a very individual poet to his own slow-footed language. Partly of course he does the trick by specific imitations, and commentators have collected a store of more or less parallel passages, which for the most part will be omitted here. Such parallels are most evocative when they preserve the movement of the original; thus at 8.41 *ut vidi, ut perii,* 'when I saw, then I was lost' the use of the second *ut* as a correlative[1] strains the possibilities of Latin, but it recalls the Theocritean prototype χὡς ἴδον ὡς ἐμάνην (2.82). Then there is the notorious case of 8.58 *omnia vel medium fiat mare,* 'let everything become mid-ocean'; Theocritus had said πάντα δ' ἔναλλα γένοιτο, 'let everything become contrary' (1.134), and by a process of free association more characteristic of modern than classical poetry Virgil represents ἔναλλα, 'contrary', as if it were ἐνάλια, 'in the sea'. But quite apart from parallel passages there is a more indirect imitation of style that cannot be associated with any single model. This type of imitation is really the more subtle, though it is harder to pin down; in the same way

the best parodies are not the sort most common in antiquity, where a well-known line is modified by some ridiculous adaptation. The really clever parodies suggest the idiom of the original in an absurd way without referring to any particular passage; such is Calverley's skit on Browning, 'The Cock and the Bull', or the hexameter of Persius that catches the quintessence of the old Roman tragedians, *Antiopa aerumnis cor luctificabile fulta* (1.78).

The *Eclogues* deal with what Milton called 'the homely slighted shepherd's trade', and so they affect a simplicity that is an accomplishment of art. That is why Tityrus at the beginning of the book plays on a thin oat, *tenui avena*, with reference to the style of the poems as well as the shape of the instrument; in the same way Virgil at the end of the last eclogue says that he has been weaving a basket from slender hibiscus, *dum sedet et gracili fiscellam texit hibisco.* Words for rustic objects like *avena*, 'oat', and *fiscella*, 'basket' give a suggestion of simplicity; however natural oats and baskets may have been in the context, the ancient sensitivity to levels of diction was such that they must have seemed to lower the style. Just as Theocritus talks of onions and snails, and the more realistic Greek epigrammatists describe cottage utensils and artisans' implements, so Virgil flavours his bucolics with thyme and garlic, chestnuts and cheese. Theocritus had one great advantage: by writing in a kind of Doric, however bogus it often was, he produced a whiff of the countryside, and because of the dialect's poetic status he could do this without seeming prosaic or banal. In view of the very different literary traditions of Latin, Virgil could not go to the backwoods for poetic expressions. His efforts in this direction were very limited: we may note the archaic *nec vertat bene for ne vertat bene* (9.6), perhaps *his* for *hi* in a passage whose interpretation is disputed (3.102 *his certe—neque amor causa est—vix ossibus haerent*), most notoriously *cuium pecus* for 'whose flock?' (3.1). That provoked the well-known retort *dic mihi, Damoeta: cuium pecus anne Latinum?* (Vita Donati 43), and Virgil did not venture again on what Catullus would have called the language of goat-milkers (*caprimulgi*).

Apart from words for rustic objects, the most striking thing about the vocabulary of the *Eclogues* is the number of diminutives. There are only three proper diminutives in the whole of the *Aeneid*, *palmula* (5.163), *sagulum* (8.660), and most memorably *parvulus Aeneas* (4.328). In the *Eclogues*, on the other hand, there are a dozen diminutives, words like *agellus, gemellus, luteolus, munusculum, novellus*, with no fewer than

thirteen instances of *capella*, 'a nanny-goat'; this is out of line with other serious poetry apart from Catullus and elegy. Other instances of unpoetical words are not very common; *suavis*[2] occurs 4 times and *formosus* 16 times, though they were avoided in the *Aeneid* and most other epic. In spite of the sprinkling of rusticity, there is plenty of stylistic heightening; the Latin poetic vocabulary is freely used, words like *amnis* (5.25), *pontus* (6.35), *ratis* (6.76), poetic plurals like *otia* (1.6, 5.61) or the notorious *hordea* for barley (5.36), forms like *arbos* (3.56) or *risere* (4.62), infinitives like *suadebit inire* (1.55), retained accusatives like *suras evincta* (7.32), Grecisms like *suave rubenti* (4.43). It is true that Tityrus mentions *caseus* or cheese (1.34), not a word that could be found in epic, but when he invites Meliboeus to supper he turns to a more dignified periphrasis, *pressi copia lactis* (1.81). It is this blend of the commonplace and the exquisite that gives the *Eclogues* some of their characteristic quality.

'The most prominent single characteristic of Theokritos' style is his repetition or partial repetition of words': I quote Dover's commentary (p. xlv), and I base my analysis partly on his. The repetition of a single word is too common to need much illustration, but one may note in particular the *geminatio* of a proper name (2.69 *a Corydon, Corydon*, Theoc. 11.72 ὦ Κύκλωψ Κύκλωψ). More typical[3] are lines like 1.74 *ite meae, felix quondam pecus, ite capellae*, where a word in the first foot is repeated in the fifth; by a rather mannered distribution *meae* is attached to the first *ite* and *capellae* to the second. The same pattern can be seen in Theocritus: cf. 1.64 ἄρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοισαῖ φίλαι, ἄρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς. Another type can be seen at 6.20 f. *addit se sociam timidisque supervenit Aegle,* | *Aegle Naiadum pulcherrima*; here the subject is repeated with some expansion, though the figure does not permit a second verb. Such epanalepsis is in no way particularly bucolic, but significantly is found at Theocritus 1.29 f. μαρύεται ὑψόθι κισσός, | κισσὸς ἑλιχρύσῳ κεκονιμένος. A more characteristically bucolic idiom occurs when a whole clause is repeated with slight modifications: *Daphninque tuum tollemus ad astra:* | *Daphnin ad astra feremus; amavit nos quoque Daphnis* (5.51 f.). So in Theocritus βουκολιάζεο Δάφνι· τὺ δ' ᾠδᾶς ἄρχεο πρᾶτος, | ᾠδᾶς ἄρχεο, Δάφνι, ἐφεψάσθω δὲ Μενάλκας (9.1 f.).

That leads us to more complex repetitions where we shall take as prototype Theocritus 1.4 ff., which must have derived particular prominence from its place in the early editions:

αἴ κα τῆνος ἕλῃ κεραὸν τράγον, αἶγα τὺ λαψῇ·
αἴ κα δ' αἶγα λάβῃ τῆνος γέρας, ἐς τε καταρρεῖ
ἁ χίμαρος· χιμάρω δὲ καλὸν κρέας, ἔστε κ' ἀμέλξῃς.

'If he chooses the horned goat you will take the she-goat, and if he takes the she-goat for his prize, the kid falls to you; a kid's flesh is fine until you milk her'. Here words for 'take', 'she-goat' and 'kid' reappear at different places in the line, sometimes in a different tense or case; the lines derive their charm from the ringing of the changes. The pattern is not confined to bucolic poetry, and is found also in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* (2.9 ff.):

ὡπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαείνεται, ἀλλ' ὅτις ἐσθλός·
ὅς μιν ἴδῃ, μέγας οὗτος, ὃς οὐκ ἴδε, λιτὸς ἐκεῖνος·
ὀψόμεθ', ὦ Ἑκάεργε, καὶ ἐσσόμεθ' οὔποτε λιτοί.

'Apollo does not appear to everybody but to him that is good. Who sees him, he is great; who has not seen him, he is lowly. We shall see you, Apollo, and we shall never be lowly.' Virgil must have felt the movement as typically bucolic, and so we find similar juggling with words in the eighth eclogue when he assesses the relative guilt of Medea and Cupid (8.48 ff.):

crudelis tu quoque, mater.
crudelis mater magis, an puer improbus[4] *ille?*
improbus ille puer; crudelis tu quoque, mater.

Commentators are offended by the pointlessness of it all: Heyne wished to delete the last two lines, and Coleman finds the triple repetition of *crudelis* and *mater* very jejune. In fact Virgil is using a pattern that he regarded as particularly Theocritean; no doubt this pattern has its origin in the jingles of shepherds, but in the hands of a poet the artlessness is contrived.

The same movement is found in the bucolics of Calpurnius, and it has been observed also by modern imitators. Tennyson's 'Come down o maid from yonder mountain height' is a beautiful pastoral poem, and everybody knows 'the moan of doves in immemorial elms', reflecting Virgil's onomatopoeic *nec gemere aeria cessabit turtur ab ulmo* (1.58). Less attention

is paid to what goes before: 'and sweet is every sound, Sweeter thy voice, but every sound is sweet'; here in a line and a half Tennyson shows that he has caught one of the most characteristic features of the bucolic idiom. The point has not been lost on so gifted a verse-composer as J.B. Poynton; see his rendering of Shakespeare's 'In such a night as this':[5]

> *advenit, ecce, leo, Thisbe nec viderat ipsum.*
> *umbra est, quam vidit; visa tamen aufugit umbra.*

Another form of balance is found in the poetic competitions where one shepherd caps the song of another, naturally in the same number of lines; the movement is familiar not only from Theocritus but from the rival choruses of Catullus' epithalamium. The pattern must have its antecedents in popular poetry: Dover quotes the Greek children's song where one speaker says: 'Where are my roses, where are my violets, where is my beautiful parsley?' and the other replies: 'Here are the roses, here are the violets, here is the beautiful parsley.'[6] The possible complexities of the pattern may be seen from the end of Virgil's seventh eclogue (61 ff.):

> Corydon: *Populus Alcidae gratissima, vitis Iaccho,*
> *formosae myrtus Veneri, sua laurea Phoebo;*
> *Phyllis amat corylos: illas dum Phyllis amabit,*
> *nec myrtus vincet corylos nec laurea Phoebi.*
> Thyrsis: *Fraxinus in silvis pulcherrima, pinus in hortis,*
> *populus in fluviis, abies in montibus altis:*
> *saepius at si me, Lycida formose, revisas,*
> *fraxinus in silvis cedat tibi, pinus in hortis.*

Here we should observe the degrees of correspondence not only between one speaker and another but within each separate quatrain and often within single lines. We may notice in particular the paratactic comparison, most simply illustrated from the opening of Theocritus 1; instead of saying 'your piping is as sweet as the whisper of the pine' we find instead 'sweet is the whisper of the pine-tree and sweet too is your piping'. Another bucolic pattern may be seen very clearly in the second of these two stanzas: the statement of the first two lines 65–6 is followed by the hypothesis, *saepius at si me, Lycida formose, revisas*, which leads to the

conclusion in the last line. For the same movement we may compare Theocritus(?) 8.41 ff.:

> παντᾷ ἔαρ, παντᾷ δὲ νομοί, παντᾷ δὲ γάλακτος
> οὔθατα πιδῶσιν καὶ τὰ νέα τράφεται,
> ἔνθα καλὰ Ναὶς ἐπινίσσεται· αἰ δ' ἂν ἀφέρπῃ
> χὠ τὰς βῶς βόσκων χαἰ βόες αὐότεραι.

> 'Everywhere is spring, and everywhere pastures, and everywhere udders gush with milk and younglings are fattened where fair Nais comes; but if she goes away, the cowherd and the cows dry up.'

The shepherds' monologues, as well as their dialogues, seem to be influenced by popular poetry. This is seen most clearly with the repeated refrains, which tend to break speeches into snatches; but even when there is no refrain, there may be a lack of orderly progression. Stories are not told in any systematic way; the narrative about the capture of Silenus (6.14 ff.) is quite exceptional. In Damon's love-song (8.17 ff.) the reader has to piece together what is going on,[7] a natural consequence of the broken-up character of the bucolic style; the same is true to some extent with Corydon in 2 and Gallus in 10, though in the latter case the fluctuating movement of Gallus's own elegies seems to play a part. Tityrus in the first eclogue cannot give a coherent account of himself; though this is meant to suggest the rustic wiseacre's garrulity and love of mystification, Virgil may have been influenced in his strategy by the inherent bittiness of shepherds' songs. As T.E. Page pronounces on *modulans alterna notavi* (5.14), 'You cannot sing and play a pipe at the same time.'

Another kind of disjointedness in bucolic arises from the frequency of parenthesis. Sometimes this involves quite a long hyperbaton; for a possible instance see 9.37 f. *id quidem ago et tacitus, Lycida, mecum ipse voluto | si valeam meminisse neque est ignobile carmen.* Here editors usually regard *id* as the object of *voluto*, but this does not combine satisfactorily with the idiomatic *id ago*, 'I am busy with that'; it might be more elegant to take *voluto* with *carmen* and to mark off the intervening phrases with dashes. Sometimes a parenthesis gives an impression of spontaneity, which is of course achieved by art; cf. 3.93 *frigidus. o pueri—*

fugite hinc—latet anguis in herba, where the disruptive *fugite hinc* indicates the speaker's sudden alarm. See also 8.109 *parcite—ab urbe venit—iam parcite, carmina—Daphnis*; here the separation of *venit* from *Daphnis* is highly mannered, but at the same time it indicates the excitement of the speaker and produces a climax with the lover's name. For an even longer hyperbaton see 9.2 ff.:

> *o Lycida, vivi pervenimus, advena nostri*
> *(quod numquam veriti sumus) ut possessor agelli*
> *diceret 'haec mea sunt; veteres migrate coloni'.*

Here the long separation of *nostri* from *agelli* puts great emphasis on the possessive, and the parenthesis helps to suggest the breathless indignation of Moeris.

Ellipse is another feature that is colloquial at least in origin. It is found in the clipped civilities of Theocritus (14.1 f.):

> χαίρειν πολλὰ τὸν ἄνδρα Θυώνιχον—ἄλλα τοιαῦτα
> Αἰσχίνᾳ. ὡς χρόνιος—χρόνιος—τί δέ τοι τὸ μέλημα;

'A very good day to friend Thyonichus. —The same to Aeschinas. It's a long time. —A long time. —What's the trouble?' So too the beginning of the third eclogue (a passage directly imitated from Theocritus (4.1 ff):

> *Dic mihi, Damoeta, cuium pecus? an Meliboei?*
> *Non, verum Aegonis.*

Sometimes the ellipse is more mannered than genuinely colloquial. *quo te, Moeri, pedes?* (9.1) may look idiomatic, but it is not what anybody would actually say; it is as artificial as 'whither away?'. So too when Menalcas forgets an astronomer's name, the interrupted construction gives an illusion of spontaneity: *in medio duo signa Conon—et quis fuit alter | descripsit radio totum qui gentibus orbem . . . ?* (3.40). Ellipse may also be used for euphemistic reasons; Virgil would not dream of imitating the rustic obscenities of Theocritus, still less the unimaginable bad language of real *pastores*, a rough body of men, so he contents himself with the discreet impropriety of *novimus et qui te* (3.8).

A marked feature of the Theocritan style is the number of appositions,

which suggest the disjointed afterthoughts of colloquial discourse; cf. 15.19 f. ἑπταδράχμως κυνάδας, γραιᾶν ἀποτίλματα πηρᾶν, | πέντε πόκως ἔλαβ' ἐχθές, ἅπαν ῥύπον, ἔργον ἐπ' ἔργῳ ('yesterday he bought five fleeces, seven-drachma dog-skins, pluckings of antiquated haversacks, nothing but filth, one job after another'). Appositions in the *Eclogues* are much less conspicuous, but there is one notable type that is mannered rather than colloquial; this is the appositional sandwich as in 1.57 *raucae, tua cura, palumbes*. This pattern is not paralleled in Theocritus. but is attested in Archilochus and the Greek epigram.[8] Otto Skutsch has commented on the resemblance between *raucae, tua cura, palumbes* and a line in Propertius *et Veneris dominae volucres, mea turba, columbae* (3.3.31); he plausibly suggests a common source in Gallus,[9] and has named the construction the 'schema Cornelianum'. The word-order appears intermittently in later Latin poetry, and Juvenal still uses it for sardonic effect (7.120 *veteres, Maurorum epimenia, bulbi*, 'old onions, the rations of Moors'); no extant work favours it so much as the *Eclogues*, but it must be regarded as a neoteric rather than a bucolic feature.

Some of the elements that I have been mentioning are brought together in a concentrated form in a passage in the ninth eclogue (23 ff.):

> *Tityre, dum redeo—brevis est via—pasce capellas,*
> *et potum pastas age, Tityre, et inter agendum*
> *occursare capro—cornu ferit ille—caveto.*

This is an isolated snatch of song, typical of the bittiness to which I have referred. The passage is broken up by two parentheses (*brevis est via* and *cornu ferit ille*) that hint at the disorganised character of colloquial speech, though once again Virgil's disorganisation is deliberately organised. We may also note the repeated repetition of key words to produce the traditional bucolic jingle: *Tityre Tityre, pasce pastas, age agendum*. And there is a distinctive metrical point that I have not yet dealt with, the so-called bucolic diaeresis.

A diaeresis occurs when a word ends at the end of a foot, and the bucolic diaeresis is sometimes defined as any word-break at the end of the fourth foot; thus on this definition there would be a bucolic diaeresis after *cornu ferit*. Such word-breaks are notably common in Theocritus, and more common in the *Eclogues* than in Virgil's other hexameters; but a more restrictive definition brings out more clearly a distinguishing

characteristic of bucolic poetry. According to this a bucolic diaeresis occurs when there is not only a word-break but a pause in sense at the end of the fourth foot, as after *brevis est via* in the passage under discussion; by the normal rules of the Latin hexameter this pause is preceded by a dactyl, often produced by a pyrrhic word of two short syllables (as here *via*). The bucolic diaeresis in this strict sense is much more common in the *Eclogues* than in Virgil's other works: I have counted 62 cases in the *Eclogues* compared with 4 in *Aeneid* II (including one incomplete line). If we look at the distribution of these 62 cases the effect is even more striking: the early third eclogue has 10, the early seventh eclogue has 12, and though the first eclogue has only 4, 3 of these occur in the first eleven lines, where the characteristic tone is being established. It is also worth noting that the grander manner of the fourth eclogue allows no place for a bucolic diaeresis in the strict sense (i.e. followed by a pause).

Other metrical points may be mentioned more summarily. One feature with a higher incidence than in the *Aeneid* is a line like *Daphnin ad astra feremus: amavit nos quoque Daphnis* (5.52); here after *feremus*, that is to say after the trochee in the third foot, there is not only a word-break but a pause. This so-called feminine caesura is often found with Greek words, as at 2.6 *o crudelis Alexi*; significantly there are three of these caesuras in the first seven lines of the early second eclogue. Then again the runs without strong punctuation at the end of the line are shorter than in the *Aeneid*, even if the statistics are exaggerated by the short snatches of dialogue between the shepherds. The relatively frequent elision of long vowels that is so characteristic of the *Aeneid* is much less common in the *Eclogues*; but such a feature is too negative to give us much sense of the tone of the poems.

I shall mention briefly a few metrical abnormalities. Quadrisyllabic endings may be noted at 2.24 *Actaeo Aracyntho*, 6.53 *fultus hyacintho*, 10.12 *Aonie Aganippe*; in all these cases the last word is Greek, and the Greek effect is underlined by a preceding hiatus or in one instance by an irrational lengthening; metrical licences often come two by two. Sometimes there is a shortening of a long final vowel before another vowel, again in the Greek manner; the abnormality is encouraged by the Greek name at 2.65 *o Alexi*, though not at 8.108 *an qui amant, ipsi sibi somnia fingunt?* The effect is more typically bucolic when the licence is combined with a bucolic diaeresis, as at 6.44 *ut litus 'Hyla Hyla' omne sonaret*.

Here the first final *a* is long by Greek accidence, and the second is shortened by Greek correption before the vowel; the scansion of the same word in two different ways, a favourite Hellenistic trick,[10] here gives hints of an echo. So again at 3.78 f.:

> *Phyllida amo ante alias: nam me discedere flevit*
> *et longum 'formose, vale vale' inquit 'Iolla'.*

The final *e* of the second *vale* is shortened before *inquit*, suggesting that the speaker is moving into the distance. Perhaps in passing I may give my version of the situation, which is different from the usual account. Phyllis wept that Menalcas was going, and said 'goodbye, goodbye my beautiful'. One naturally assumes that she is going to say 'my beautiful Menalcas', but then by a surprise she adds 'Iolla'; it transpires that she is going off with Menalcas, and that the farewells are being addressed to the other man.

Some of the features that I have been discussing are not specifically bucolic, and we must look for further antecedents. Horace described the style of the poems as *molle*, soft;[11] of course that is one side of Theocritus, but as a Hellenistic poet he could also be crisper and spikier than the *Eclogues* ever are. Virgil must have owed much to Catullus and no doubt Gallus for his emotional sentimentality, harmonious resonances, bright colouring, and elaborate word-patterns. If this paper deals only incidentally with these aspects it is because I wish to isolate the more purely bucolic elements, but a full analysis of the style would recognise an element of neoteric *mollitia* that is not really Theocritean. When Horace characterised the Eclogues he combined *molle* with *facetum*; as Quintilian saw (6.3.20), *facetum* refers not to humour, though there is humour in the *Eclogues*, but to a neatness and elegance that may be distinguished from the lush sensuousness of the neoterics proper.

Here it must be emphasised that in spite of a dominant tone, ancient poetry-books are not necessarily written in a uniform style. Theocritus himself shows a considerable variation between the purely bucolic idylls and the mime-like *Adoniazusae* (15), and Virgil introduces elements that properly belong to different types of poem; in such cases Kroll talked of the crossing of the genres,[12] but where the abnormality is incidental Francis Cairns's term 'inclusion'[13] seems more appropriate. For a single instance see the beginning of the song of Silenus (6.31 f.):

namque canebat uti magnum per inane coacta
semina terrarumque animaeque marisque fuissent.

Here *uti* is clearly Lucretian, particularly at that place in the line, and so is some of the vocabulary, though not the use of *que*. I have already referred to the subsequent lines on Hylas (6.43 f.)

his adiungit Hylan nautae quo fonte relictum
clamassent, ut litus 'Hyla Hyla' omne sonaret.

Here a neoteric effect is produced not only by the scansion of *Hyla Hyla* but by the learned allusiveness of *quo fonte*. Another style is found in a snatch of song by Corydon at 7.29 f.:

saetosi caput hoc apri tibi Delia parvus
et ramosa Micon vivacis cornua cervi.

That is the manner of dedicatory epigram, even if it is written in two hexameters rather than an elegiac couplet. Then again, at 8.80 *limus ut hic durescit et haec ut cera liquescit* the rhyming jingle suggests a magic spell. For a more thorough-going conflation of styles one may turn to the tenth eclogue, where the bucolic themes give way to a pastiche in hexameters of the love-elegies of Gallus:

a te ne frigora laedant!
a tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas!
ibo et Chalcidico quae sunt mihi condita versu
carmina pastoris Siculi modulabor avena. (10.48 ff.)

Here one may note the sentimental *a*, the sentimental theme of the ice taken from Gallus by Propertius,[14] followed by the resolute *ibo*, suggesting (as Gallus himself must have done) the fluctuating moods of the lover.

The most persistent change of style is in the fourth eclogue, where Virgil himself describes his matter as *paulo maiora*, 'somewhat grander':

ultima Cumaei venit iam carminis aetas;
magnus ab integro saeclorum nascitur ordo;
iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,
iam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto.
tu modo nascenti puero, quo ferrea primum
desinet ac toto surget gens aurea mundo,
casta fave Lucina,[15] *tuus iam regnat Apollo.* (4 ff.)

This resonant passage is intended to suggest a sacred chant, though it is more resonant than the Jewish Sibylline oracles to which Virgil owes so much of his content. We may note the almost entirely end-stopped lines and the formal patterning in groups of 2+2+3; groups of 7 are in fact attested in the Jewish prototypes. But the most striking feature is the incantatory rhyming of *o*: *integro, ordo, virgo, caelo, alto, puero, quo, toto, mundo, Apollo.*[16]

The fourth eclogue has a manner of its own in other respects. One may note *saeclorum*, a molossus without elision in the centre of the line; there are 10 instances of this neoteric pattern in 63 lines, a greater incidence than in the other *Eclogues* and considerably greater than in the *Aeneid*. The artistic distribution of adjective and noun, again in imitation of Catullus 64, is also more marked than usual, even if there is only one 'golden' line in the strict sense: 28 *incultisque rubens pendebit sentibus uva*. Then there is the grandiloquent address to the baby himself (48ff)

adgredere o magnos (aderit iam tempus) honores,
cara deum suboles, magnum Iovis incrementum.

Here *incrementum* at the end of the line produces a spondeiazon almost unique in the *Eclogues*, though found occasionally in Theocritus; the rustic word is given dignity by its position, producing an ambiguity characteristic of this oracular poem. In the following lines we meet some more resonant rhymes (50 ff.), again quite unlike the normal style of the *Eclogues*:

aspice convexo nutantem pondere mundum,
terrasque tractusque maris caelumque profundum;
aspice, venturo laetentur ut omnia saeclo.

As the poem nears its end the tone suddenly changes (55 ff.):

> *non me carminibus vincet nec Thracius Orpheus*
> *nec Linus, huic mater quamvis atque huic pater adsit,*
> *Orphei Calliopea, Lino formosus Apollo.*
> *Pan etiam, Arcadia mecum si iudice certet*
> *Pan etiam Arcadia dicat se iudice victum.*

Coleman calls attention to the apparently pointless repetitions, which he regards as a possible indication of textual corruption. I believe that his observation could be explained in a different way: Virgil is changing gear and reverting in a rather exaggerated way to his normal bucolic idiom. In much the same way Catullus in his eleventh poem, after using the Sapphic metre inappropriately for cynical gibes at his friends and tasteless invective against his lady, reverts in his last stanza to a genuinely Sapphic image, the flower broken by the ploughshare.

I conclude with the last lines of the tenth eclogue: evening appropriately closes the poem and the book:

> *surgamus: solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra,*
> *iuniperi gravis umbra; nocent et frugibus umbrae.*
> *ite domum saturae—venit Hesperus—ite capellae.*

Here we have the same jingling repetition that we found at the beginning of Theocritus 1: *gravis, gravis, umbra, umbra, umbrae.* At *iuniperi gravis umbra* there is the enanalepsis that has already been mentioned, for it is surely wrong to understand *est*; that would disrupt the correspondence with the next clause, where *et frugibus* balances *cantantibus*. It may also be suggested that *gravis umbra* is a delicate oxymoron of the sort familiar in sophisticated Roman poetry: a shade in all its senses is naturally *levis*. In the penultimate line we have the soft feminine caesura after the trochee in the third foot, and in the last line the even more typical bucolic diaeresis, the break after *Hesperus*. Also characteristic are the parenthesis *venit Hesperus*, the repetition of *ite* in the first and fifth feet, the artificial distribution by which *saturae* is combined with the first *ite* and *capellae* with the second; there seems also to be a whimsical implication that the audience like the animals now have had their fill. The poem closes with a Grecism for the Evening Star (*Hesperus*), and a

diminutive for the humble nanny-goats (*capellae*), the word that is found in the *Eclogues* thirteen times; the blend of the poetic and the familiar that is so typical of these poems is here given special emphasis. Virgil has ended the book with his bucolic signature-tune, and if I am asked to define the bucolic style I can only point to these lines and say 'That is what it is like.'

Corpus Christi College, Oxford **R.G.M. NISBET**

NOTES

1. S. Timpanaro, *Contributi di Filologia e di storia della lingua latina* (Rome 1978) 219 ff., citing (p. 274) Cat. 62.45 *sic virgo, dum intacta manet, dum cara suis est*, 62.56.
2. B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter* (Lund 1945) 35 ff.
3. R. Gimm, *De Vergilii stilo bucolico quaestiones selectae*, Diss. Leipzig 1910, 80 ff.
4. In view of the following line I take *improbus* to be predicative, not attributive.
5. J.B. Poynton, *Versions* (Oxford 1936) 100, translating Shakespeare, *Merchant of Venice*.
6. PMG 852 ποῦ μοι τὰ ῥόδα, ποῦ μοι τὰ ἴα, ποῦ μοι τὰ καλὰ σέλινα; | ταδὶ τὰ ῥόδα, ταδὲ τὰ ἴα, ταδὶ τὰ καλὰ σέλινα.
7. B. Otis, *Virgil, A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford 1964) 105 ff.
8. An authoritative treatment of the figure is provided by J. Solodow, *HSCPh* 90 (1986) 129 ff.
9. O. Skutsch, *RhM* 99 (1956) 198 f.; he also cites *Ecl.* 10.22 *tua cura Lycoris*.
10. Nisbet-Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1.32.11; N. Hopkinson, *Glotta* 60 (1982) 162 ff.
11. Hor. Serm. 1.10.44 f. *molle atque facetum* | *Vergilio annuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae*.
12. W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart 1924) 202 ff.
13. F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh 1972) 158 ff.
14. Prop. 1.8.7 f. *tu pedibus teneris positas fulcire pruinas,* | *tu potes insolitas, Cynthia, ferre nives*.
15. Against the general opinion I put a comma after *Lucina* and interpret 'provided that Lucina favours the birth, Apollo is already as good as reigning' (*BICS* 25 [1978] 62).
16. This was pointed out in an early article by R.G. Austin, *CQ* 21 (1927) 100 ff.