

THE "DYING GALLUS" AND THE DESIGN OF *ECLOGUE* 10

CHRISTINE G. PERKELL

I PROPOSE A NEW or, to be more precise, a more sustained reading than I have come upon of Vergil's allusion in *Eclogue* 10 to the "Dying Daphnis" of Theocritus' *Idyll* 1. The proposed reading of the allusion will be seen to be the starting point for a rather positive (if not to say "optimistic") reading of this difficult and seductive eclogue.¹ I do not claim to "correct" the readings of this poem by the many scholars to whose work I am indebted. Rather, I write to offer another, as I think, "coherent reconstruction" (to use Conte's phrase²) of *Eclogue* 10. This poem, like any literary text, has "gaps"³ or interpretive spaces, which make possible uncertainty and require interpretation of the reader. More than one kind of reading might well account for the text of any poem and therefore serve as a "coherent reconstruction" of the text.

Much work on allusion has observed that allusion signifies through difference as well as through similarity.⁴ For the purposes of this essay, I use the term *imitatio* to denote imitative allusion and *aemulatio* to denote ironic allusion. Through *imitatio* an author establishes a relationship of similarity and affinity to a prior text, thereby creating a degree of authority for his new text. Once similarity has been established, the author may choose to deviate significantly from his model text, thus creating difference or ironic allusion—exploiting his reader's assumed familiarity with the model text to claim, implicitly, independence from or superiority to the

I wish to thank the Editor and readers of *CP* for their careful suggestions, which greatly improved the argument presented here.

1. Lee 1989, 97: "the most baffling of them all"; Klingner 1967, 166: "Das zehnte der Hirtengedichten ist das seltsamste, so seltsam, dass sich die Ausleger zum guten Teil darüber vergeblich den Kopf zerbrochen haben."

2. Conte 1979, 381: "Riproduzione coerente" as purpose of interpretation.

3. Iser 1978, 166–69, 225, on gaps. See Iser 1978, e.g., 178–79 also on "indeterminacy." See Fish 1980, 16: "... there is no single way of reading that is correct or natural, only 'ways of reading' that are extensions of community perspectives." Interpretive communities share strategies for interpreting experience, but these are neither "monolithic" nor "stable" (343). See "What Makes an Interpretation Acceptable?" (338–55) and "Demonstration vs. Persuasion: Two Models of Critical Activity" (356–73).

4. Conte 1979, 384: "... è chiaro che nessuna opposizione può realizzarsi se non si innesta in un fascio di tratti comuni che autorizzino a stabilire un rapporto di omologia (di congiunzione)." For an overview of the history of interpretation of allusion in Vergil, see Farrell 1991, 4–25: "On Vergilian Intertextuality." On *oppositio in imitando*, see Conte 1971, esp. 330–32; Van Sickle 1978, 90 n. 8; 1980, 590 n. 40; Claus 1993, 5–10 and nn. 9–25.

model text. Through different—that is, through significant deviation from a model text,⁵ an author may create an emphatically new meaning in his own text. Such deviation has been called *aemulatio*⁶ or irony, if we understand irony as a function of difference.⁷ The new meaning resulting from ironic use of allusion might involve changes of merely intellectual play⁸ or significant thematic elements.⁹ I propose that reading the Daphnis allusion in *Eclogue* 10 as ironic rather than as purely imitative makes possible a new understanding of significant thematic elements of the poem.

In *Eclogue* 10, *imitatio*, or the modeling of the Gallus figure on the "dying Daphnis" of Theocritus' *Idyll* 1, has long been recognized because of the following "imitations": (1) both figures are perishing from passion, (2) the nymphs are absent, and (3) three gods approach and variously question, interpret, or exhort each poet figure (Daphnis/Gallus). As Conte, for example, asserts: "The song of the dying Daphnis-Gallus begins."¹⁰

To resume briefly, in Theocritus' *Idyll* 1, the shepherd-poet Thyrsis sings of the death of Daphnis. Although the circumstances remain obscure,¹¹ Daphnis is wasting away even to death, because he refuses to yield to Aphrodite. The nymphs were inexplicably absent during his travail. Three gods, Priapus, Hermes, and Cypris/Aphrodite, arrive to query and exhort Daphnis about his passion. They have mutually inconsistent "readings" of his predicament. Priapus seems to indicate that Daphnis is loved and need only give in to the passion of his pursuer. Aphrodite's utterances seem to suggest that Daphnis swore to be immune to passion, but now finds that he is not. (Other versions in other poems indicate that Daphnis was unfaithful to a

5. Van Sickle 1980, 597 n. 61. Conte 1986, 36: "The allusion may be an attempt to compete with the tradition recalled." See also 36 n. 7.

6. Farrell 1991, 5. *Aemulatio* is a term used by the ancients to denote deviation (usually of an arcane sort) from a model phrase; *oppositio in imitando*, coined by later scholars, also refers to an author's deviation from his model. (See, e.g., Farrell 1991, 13–14.) Neither term denotes the ironic use of allusion in the precise contemporary sense I intend here. Ironic use of allusion for substantive thematic purposes was not explicitly treated by the ancients.

7. Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.6.54: "In eo vero genere quo contraria ostenduntur ironia est . . ." In this kind of instance Farrell, 1991, 10 for example, can speak of the "ironic element made possible by allusion."

8. Thomas 1986, 197–98.

9. This latter phenomenon is illustrated in Clausen 1966: "An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*." In the case of this famous article, Clausen shows how the first speeches of Aeneas in *Aeneid* 1, with their clear allusions to speeches of Odysseus in *Odyssey* 5 and 12, suggest for the knowledgeable reader (1) by omission (of Odysseus' longing for glory) and (2) by contrast (to Odysseus' self-confidence and dispassionate calculation) the essentially sentimental, retrospective state of mind of Aeneas at this point, his indifference to glory, and his lack of confidence in his own fortunes. Here, "this [difference] is the meaning of the allusion" (76). This characterization of Aeneas, achieved incisively through *aemulatio*, so different from the Odyssean heroic paradigm, has critical significance for interpretation of the *Aeneid* and Vergil's purposes in the text as a whole.

10. Conte 1979, 382: "canzone su Dafni-Gallo morente." Clausen 1994, 288: "a close and sustained imitation of Theocritus' First *Idyll*."

11. See Gow 1952 for the many passages in this poem that pose interpretive difficulties. Walker 1980, 39 sees Theocritus as "deliberately raising questions, withholding answers . . ." Where were the nymphs? For whom was his passion? Why is he avoiding the girl (κῶρα 82)? Alpers 1979, 223: "We cannot tell what Daphnis' experience has been, but the power of love is somehow at the heart of his sense of identity and his defiance of the gods." *Idyll* 7.72–76 also has an account of the death: Daphnis, in love with Xenea, wasted away like melting snow, while nature broke out in lamentation. In both *Idylls*, Daphnis is silent while nature laments. In *Idyll* 1 Daphnis' attitude to Aphrodite is insulting and combative, although she does not respond, and the poet says she would have forgiven him. Putnam 1970, 357 thinks that Daphnis remains faithful to a vow of Artemis-like purity and that he goes to the stream of Arethusa, not Hades.

nymph and was therefore punished.) The circumstances of the dramatic situation remain obscure (is Daphnis himself in love? or, rather, is he the object of another's love?), although it appears that Aphrodite would allow Daphnis to save himself if he wished. He, however, is represented as a proud, intransigent figure, who is insolent to Aphrodite (the only god to whom he responds), and who chooses to die rather than to give in to passion. Pan, invoked, presumably arrives to receive the syrinx from Daphnis' dying hand as he says, "For now defeated by Eros, I go down to the stream [of Hades]." He becomes a heroized figure of sorts; all of nature grieves responsively at his death. In *Eclogue* 10 Gallus, the elegiac poet and soldier, friend of Vergil, is in a parallel position. Gallus is represented as having a disabling passion (*indigno amore*) for Lycoris, who has gone off "through snows and rough camps" with another man. Again, the nymphs are absent. Apollo, Silvanus, Pan, and various rural figures (Menalcas, shepherd, swineherds) come to question Gallus about his passion and to urge him to transcend it, since it is hopeless. The terms *peribat* ("conventional metaphor of the lover's condition"¹²) and *ossa quiescant* (Servius ad 10.33 "nam se dicit moritutum") imply that, like Daphnis, Gallus is dying as a result of his passion. (In Gallus' case, clearly, his passion is unrequited.) Laurels and tamarisks lament for him, as do Mt. Maenalus and frozen rocks.

If a reader considers only the resemblances between Daphnis and Gallus (allusion as *imitatio*), s/he will then likely find plausible the widely accepted reading of the experience of Gallus in *Eclogue* 10 as a portrait of his defeat by love, his failure and virtual death, and his consequent recognition of the impotence of poetry, particularly pastoral, to manage passion. If one then further equates the experience of Gallus with the meaning of the poem as a whole, one arrives at the familiar pessimistic reading of the poem overall: pastoral cannot save Gallus from unworthy passion (his yielding to passion is equivalent to defeat and death); the *Eclogue* poet, whose own defeat is likely paralleled in Gallus', abandons pastoral as well. Van Sickle writes that *Eclogue* 10 ends on a "somber note, defeat and death through love, then threatening shadows, cold."¹³ David Ross strongly develops the theme of the impotence of poetry in his study of the tenth *Eclogue*. He con-

12. Coleman 1977 ad loc. with references.

13. Van Sickle 1980, 596, 597: "the insatiable dying lover." Van Sickle 1978, 35: "sympathy for fatal, private love." Lee 1984, 99 considers this a pessimistic end to the collection as a whole. Otis 1964, 130: "*Eclogues* 6–10 . . . are neoteric, ambiguous or polemic, concerned with the past and emotively dominated by *amor indignus*, love which is essentially destructive and irrational and is implicitly inconsistent with (if not hostile to) a strong Roman-patriotic orientation." Damon 1961, 288: "In the tenth [*Eclogue*], Gallus' 'solliciti amores' bring into Arcadia an elegiac despair which will not yield to easy solutions like Corydon's 'invenies alium'. Moeris' 'omnia fert aetas' and Gallus' 'omnia vincit amor' both admit an imperative larger than pastoral *otium*." Boyle 1975, 33: "This [irrational passion] is why the failure in *Eclogue* 10 of Gallus, the poet-teacher of *Eclogue* 6, is so significant an indicator of the extent of Virgil's pessimism. For Gallus is a teacher who cannot teach himself, a poet who succumbs to the forces of irrational passion, to sexual and martial *amor*, and finds his own poetic art no cure for his madness." Contrast Veyne 1988, 103: "I do not for an instant believe that, with this epilogue, Virgil meant to deliver a 'message' to us, to draw melancholy conclusions about 'the final failure of poetry', unable to purge the passions."

Many look for real life experiences of Gallus and/or Vergil in this eclogue: (1) Gallus is having a real personal or artistic crisis; Vergil recommends writing pastoral as a cure; (2) Gallus was experimenting (or thinking of doing so) with pastoral. Yet Schmidt 1972, 121, among others, points out forcefully the naiveté of looking for Vergil's life in his eclogues.

cludes that *Eclogue* 10 "ends with the realization of failure: there is no theme more Virgilian than this."¹⁴

This pessimistic reading of the eclogue results, I believe, from partial reading of the Daphnis allusion, only to the point of *imitatio*. That is, many commentators refer to Gallus as the "dying Gallus," as if he were wholly parallel to the dying Daphnis. Yet this parallel is not precise, it seems to me, and may obscure the main point of the allusion, for there is an important difference between Daphnis and Gallus that commentators often ignore,¹⁵ an instance, I propose, of *aemulatio* or irony. It is this difference, I further suggest, that constitutes the meaning of the allusion. Unlike Daphnis, Gallus does not die, but chooses rather to yield to love and hence to live. In Gallus' vigorous *et nos cedamus amori*, in fact, one may read not death and defeat, but an affirmative yielding, even, one might argue, a manly, decisive choice.¹⁶ Thus the fates of Daphnis and of Gallus are not parallel, but rather precisely opposed. Although speaking paradoxically in the language of defeat, Gallus, in fact, compelled by love of Lycoris, abandons his pursuit of death and chooses life. The *Eclogue* poet, by contriving this difference from his Theocritean model text, throws emphasis on Gallus' decision to live, to love, to engage vitally even in difficult experience.¹⁷ Therefore, the substance of this allusion to Theocritus is that Gallus forsakes heroic pastoral death and divinization and chooses life, because love of Lycoris is so compelling that he prefers it even to the glory of proud death. I propose that from this reading of Vergil's allusion to Daphnis as ironic flows a more positive understanding of the poem as a whole than is currently conventional.

Lycoris is the explicitly announced target reader of the poem ("quae legat ipsa Lycoris" 10.2). The poem is a gift to Gallus, but for Lycoris to read.¹⁸ We must then read the poem from her perspective if we wish to appreciate

14. Ross 1975, 106.

15. Pohlenz [1930] 1965, 108 is an exception: "... Gegensatz zwischen Gallus und dem wahren Daphnis." In Pohlenz' reading, Gallus cannot become Daphnis because he is, in his very essence, an elegiac and not a pastoral sort. (See further n. 40 below.) Cf. Klingner 1967, 168. Putnam 1970 seeks subtle differences throughout.

16. Putnam 1970, 378 has another way of putting it: "Gallus is returning to his wonted sphere of love by preference. . . ." Pohlenz [1930] 1965, 104 notes Gallus is in life: "Wie der todbereite Daphnis hat Gallus begonnen . . . und unvermerkt hat sich der liebessieche Gallus wieder in sein Leben zurückgefunden, freilich in ein Leben voll Schmerzen und hoffnungsloser Liebe."

17. Leach 1974, 168: Gallus' final gesture is heroic in his resolution to abandon pastoral consolations for the world of experience and in his commitment to the chaos of love.

18. Why does the *Eclogue* poet ask "Quis neget carmina Gallo?" which allows the inference that Gallus solicited a poem from Vergil? Pohlenz [1930] 1965, 110, assumes that Gallus, arrogant about the value of elegy and mocking the inefficacy of pastoral in love and life, has asked for a poem from Vergil, an elegiac-erotic poem that a woman/Lycoris might read: "Die ganze Tendenz des Gedichtes drängte Vergil förmlich dazu, Gallus mit seinen eigenen Waffen zu schlagen, ihm neckisch aus seinen eigenen Gedichten zu zeigen, dass er am wenigsten Anlass habe hochmütig auf die bukolische Dichtung herabzusehen, weil sie nicht zum Liebesglück ver helfe." Conte 1979, on the other hand, believes Gallus has asked Vergil for a poem to solace his pain—there is no humor or wit at all here—and that Vergil responds with this poem to save him. Conte thinks Vergil is trying to redeem Gallus, to bring about his recovery (385): "la dafnizzazione di Gallo è il dono di Virgilio all'amico, dono di salvezza"; (386): "salvarlo vuol dire salvarlo dall'elégia." The cure will be the rewriting of elegiac motifs in the bucolic register. (Thus do readers fill "gaps" differently.)

Lycoris is named as the mistress of Gallus in Prop. 2.34.91–92, Ov. *Am.* 1.15.30. Recent scholars have largely gone in search of Gallus (see p. 134 below), certainly an interesting "gap" for contemporary scholars, to the neglect of Lycoris' role as the poem's specific reader and of the significance of her status for interpretation. Pohlenz [1930] 1965, (e.g., 99, 112) considers the possibility of an effect of the poem on Lycoris.

its meaning. If we do read the poem from the perspective of Lycoris, we see that *Eclogue* 10 functions as a subtle and extravagant love poem. Gallus is, for some verses, indeed parallel to the dying Daphnis of *Idyll* 1, as he resists the power of his passion and looks for some alternative, some solace; but then, for love of Lycoris, Gallus rejects the Daphnis paradigm, gives up being a hero¹⁹ (which he otherwise pursues in his literary and military careers), gives up immortal death, and yields to love of Lycoris. Thus the poem, in its representation of Gallus' vulnerability to his passion for Lycoris, is flattering to Lycoris and seductive on Gallus' behalf. (Of course, ironically in this context, he becomes famous in Vergil's poem precisely for renouncing fame as he exhorts: "omnia vincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori.") If this reading is legitimate, Vergil has written as a gift for Gallus (10.2), not just any poem, but specifically a poem of seduction to Gallus' lady,²⁰ an elegy, that is, although in a pastoral mode and with a pastoral ethos and ethic.

Vergil creates the characteristically elegiac fiction that Gallus wishes to leave Lycoris but cannot—despite a certain expressed wish to do so—transcend or give up his passion for her. Thus the passion is stronger than the rational will and the desire for fame. In itself this position is seductive and flattering to Lycoris. The ironic allusion to Daphnis illuminates both what Gallus sacrifices for Lycoris in terms of glory and also the warmer humanity that engenders his decision (within the genre of elegy, in which the speaker²¹ is usually wholly self-absorbed), thus intensifying the appeal of Gallus' passion. Vergil writes an elegy of a pastoral kind. Servius says that Vergil is showing that he can write better love poetry than Gallus ("et allegoricos ostendit Vergilius quantum ei praestet amorem eius canendo"), and this seems plausible.²² The longing that Gallus cannot transcend is a pretext for the poem of seduction. But what makes this elegy pastoral, and unique, is that it is a love poem animated by pastoral values: it is a love poem on behalf of another, not on behalf of the self. Therefore it is generous, a true gift. Elegiac poetry, of which Gallus may be the founder in Latin, is characterized

Coleman 1977, ad loc., says Vergil could not have seriously believed that this poem would influence her. This, however, is not the question. The issue is how Lycoris, given her perspective, would read ("quae legat ipsa Lycoris") Gallus' yielding to love. If we think of real probabilities, we must be persuaded by Veyne 1988, 103, who argues that it is not credible that Gallus would have publicized his "intimate setbacks." Veyne takes the whole genre of elegy as witty construct, not sincere confession.

19. Putnam 1970, 361: "Gallus would undoubtedly enjoy being considered a figure . . . like Daphnis, the handsome hero who dies of love and whose tomb . . . would be the focal point for the sylvan world." Alpers 1979, 207 on Daphnis as hero: "Theocritus' Daphnis is a hero not simply because all nature mourns for him . . . , but also because of his resolute self-assertion and his defiance of the gods who gather around him." See also Leach 1974, 164.

20. For the positive effect on Lycoris, see Pohlenz [1930] 1965, 112: ". . . das Ganze durfte sie doch als Triumph ihrer Schönheit entgegennehmen." Conte 1979 has also noted that this poem serves as an instance of "werbende Dichtung," courting poetry (401–2 and n. 36), although this insight is peripheral to the central thrust of his reading and for reasons unrelated to the (as I claim) ironizing allusion to Theocritus. He reads the poem primarily as an effort (1) to set off the generic oppositions between pastoral and elegy and also (2) to redeem Gallus from suffering or from a bad existential choice (although he says biographicalism is a vice).

21. See, for example, Veyne 1988, 85–115 and Kennedy 1993, 91–100.

22. Veyne 1988, 102 also reads the poem as competition under the guise of homage.

by the *servitium amoris* motif; elegiac passion is represented in this poem and in the elegiac tradition generally as disabling and self-centered. Pastoral love, on the other hand, envisioning an alternative ethical world, is generous and enabling.²³ It is represented as selfless enough to move the poet to write a love poem on behalf of one whom he loves ("Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas/ quantum vere novo viridis se subicit alnus" 10.73–74), precisely as that loved one pursues another. So, in the first instance this poem is seductive as elegy in terms of its specified target reader (Lycoris) in that it expresses Gallus' passion for her; on a second level, it is seductive as well in its effect on Gallus, since it reveals the *Eclogue* poet as a generous friend and admirer; and, finally, it is seductive of the implied and the actual readers (us), if we, like Gallus, are charmed by Vergil's pastoral feeling for Gallus and moved by his pastoral generosity. The poem would then construct us as readers of pastoral sentiment resembling the poet's. The announced farewells to pastoral that signify on the surface as renunciations or defeats in fact function as powerful strategies of seduction of, in turn, Lycoris, Gallus, and readers. It is precisely the announced vulnerability of the renunciations or farewells that is the source of their emotional power. In this poem Gallus ostensibly and explicitly concedes the weakness of pastoral, while the *Eclogue* poet implicitly concedes its weakness, by leaving pastoral behind. But *Eclogue* 10 is a powerful poem if it seduces Lycoris and/or Gallus and readers. It does not exemplify a failure of poetry if it is a successful seductive strategy.

Seduction of Gallus and of other readers is achieved by the pastoral ethos and ethic of this unique elegy. The *Eclogue* poet's love and generosity towards Gallus are a pervasive motif in the poem, expressed in several ways: (1) in the mere gift of the poem itself to Gallus, (2) in the implicit seduction of Lycoris on Gallus' behalf, and (3) in permitting Gallus to "sing" in the poem, which may include extensive quotations of Gallus' work, if the hypothesized allusions to Gallus' poetry are well founded.²⁴

23. Alpers 1979, 228: "To imagine yourself as your friend is not a merely esthetic exercise, but fulfills one of the offices of friendship, one that is close to Virgil's stated purpose of singing a song for Gallus."

24. Servius ad 10.46: "hi autem omnes versus Galli sunt de ipsius translatis carminibus." On elegiac resonance of "omnia vincit amor" see Conte 1979, 400 and n. 34. Further on elegiac tropes and vocabulary, see Klingner 1967, 172–73; Putnam 1970, 369–70; Coleman 1977 ad 46ff. Hunting images, like cold mountains and desolate cliffs, are thought by some not to be traditional pastoral (e.g., Coleman 1977 ad loc.), and may reflect experimental work on Gallus' part with pastoral elegy. Ross suggests a detailed reconstruction of Gallus' work, in which *Eclogue* 10 reflects the history of his development as an elegiac poet, from Hellenistic, learned, Alexandrian, neoteric, Parthenian, to something more subjective and personal. He thinks 46–69 all derive from Gallus, not just 46 ff., as Servius indicated. See Ross 1975, 85–106: "Gallus and the Tenth *Eclogue*." To Van Sickle 1978, 597 n. 61 the two types of poetry, representing two different genres, are (1) Arcadian (related to Hesiodic epos, exemplifying order and containment) and (2) bucolic, Theocritean, correlating with passion, ambition, Daphnis. Clausen 1994 ad 10.50 accepts that Gallus wrote two kinds of poetry: epyllia in the style of Euphron and love-elegies. (Probus ad 10.40 indicates that "Chalcidico versu" refers to Euphron of Chalcis, the "color" of whose works Gallus followed.) For the most recent speculations on Euphron and Gallus, see Dix 1995, 262: "Gallus will turn his verse in the manner of Euphron into pastoral and give his elegies (*amores*) a pastoral setting." Gallus would be most significantly Vergil's predecessor in the creation of Augustan poetry, the "new poetry" that he pioneered: aetiological, pastoral, erotic, metamorphic (ibid.).

Let us consider first the gift itself. In pastoral the relationship between speakers is often agonistic: they embody values in conflict, although without necessarily contesting formally. *Eclogues* 3 and 7 contain formal contests; 5 and 8 two separate speeches; 1 and 9 two speakers expressing contrasting perspectives. In an inversion of the pastoral convention of amoebaeon song (in which the singers try progressively to top each other as in *Eclogues* 3 and 7), the *Eclogue* poet freely grants (from friendship and without any contest) another poet the gift of the poem itself. Thus, in this last pastoral poem, the giving of the gift precedes and supplants the contest, a gesture ideally expressive of pastoral love and community. By contrast, *Idyll* 1, which *Eclogue* 10 explicitly recalls, suggests an agonistic relationship between its speakers, with initial and recurrent talk of prizes or gifts (e.g., 1, 3, 5, 9, 25, 60), allusion to another contest (1.24), and the implied acknowledgment by the first singer (the unnamed goatherd) that the second (Thyrsis) is superior and merits the reward he ultimately demands (1.143).

Second, the gift is selfless since it is composed to seduce Lycoris on Gallus' behalf and to the potential detriment of Gallus' relationship with other loves of whatever sort: with the *Eclogue* poet himself, for example.

Third, this gift is not a pipe or a goat, but contains what must be construed as a supreme gift, namely, to sing in Vergil's own poem, thus to be immortalized. Giving Gallus the power to sing in his own final pastoral poem must be read as a generous action on the part of the *Eclogue* poet. This generosity is perhaps even greater if the verses in question are not merely an imitation of Gallus' style, but actual phrases and subjects from Gallus. Servius tells us that "All this is taken from Gallus." He does not specify precisely what verses he means, nor does he give the referenced verses from Gallus. Much scholarly discussion aims at reconstruction of the lost work of Gallus, based largely on this poem of Vergil's and on other possible allusions to Gallus in Ovid, Tibullus, and Propertius.²⁵ The truth is, scholars can only surmise the extent of Gallan quotations or motifs. Nevertheless, this puzzle has fascinated scholars to the extent that they have tended to neglect the rest of the poem as an artistic whole in itself and, most seriously, they have equated its meaning with their exclusively literal interpretation of the speech and experience of Gallus.²⁶ Scholars have become fascinated by what we do not have (Gallus' poetry) while neglecting what we do have, namely, the tenth *Eclogue* itself. Although much of the

25. Skutsch 1901 proposed that *Eclogues* 6 and 10 are catalogues of Gallan works that have not come down to us. Klingner 1967, 169–71 concurred. Van Sickle 1978, 221 challenges the notion that *Eclogue* 10 reflects specific content of what Gallus wrote: "Elegy, then, from the imagined viewpoint of the end of the eclogue book, is perceived, no doubt, simplified, and to a degree parodied and misread, through the operative myth of the poet-lover." Cf. Leach 1974, 161: the kind of poetry Gallus actually wrote is "a subject of speculation."

26. Ross, for example, reads the poem as about Gallus and his poetic development and also concludes that the meaning of the poem is the necessary failure of poetry due to passion. I suggest that such a reading conflates the meaning of the whole poem with Gallus' utterances. I suggest that the poem is not about Gallus only, but about the relation between Gallus and the *Eclogue* poet and their variously represented choices to move beyond pastoral. Both of these figures are subjects, from the perspective of the zero-degree voice. Somewhat analogously on the first *Eclogue*, Schmidt 1972, 147: "Nicht *umbra* und *otium* des Tityrus sind die erste Ekloge, sondern der Dialog des Tityrus und des Meliboeus. Der letztere ist mit demselben Recht wie Tityrus Figur der vergilischen Bukolik."

relevant scholarly argument is circular, inferring conclusions from its own hypotheses, it nevertheless seems plausible that, at the very least, "omnia vincit amor" derives from a poem of Gallus, since it fits elegiac pentameter so resonantly. Other phrases and possibly the themes of Gallus' utterances in this eclogue may also be taken from Gallus' own poetry. But whether or not Gallus' *Loves* in this poem refers to his elegies (in whatever style they may have been written), or to an unhappy turn in his affair with Lycoris (if there was a real love affair or a real Lycoris), need not affect the reader's understanding of the ethical dynamic of this poem, which is that the poet of the eclogue gives to another poet, Gallus, the gift of the poem of seduction and the gift of speaking in the poem.

Important theoretical insights into the nature of pastoral are suggested in the work of Harry Berger, Leo Marx, and Paul Alpers. From their studies one may be persuaded that there is a difference between what I now propose calling the "pastoral vision," on the one hand, and the "pastoral design" (this latter term is from Marx), on the other. The "pastoral vision" may be defined as the description of an individual speaker's longed-for ideal. The "pastoral design," on the other hand, denotes the composition of the whole poem, conceived as a meaningful structure.

The "pastoral vision" is characterized by music, poetry, repose, a sustaining and responsive natural environment, and a perceived community of man and nature in song. It is a powerfully attractive picture of life without pain or danger, focused on aesthetic fulfillment.²⁷ The poet creates an idealized, aestheticized, alternative world, in which to ignore temporarily the sorrows of the present world of his acquaintance.²⁸ This vision is so powerful, so attractive, so moving to some readers that it can overwhelm the poem and lead to a reading out of scale, a real misreading, if such a concept is allowable.²⁹ I call this a misreading, for one cannot, it seems to me, legitimately identify the meaning of the speech of one speaker with the meaning of the poem as a whole. A reading of Vergil's pastoral poems reveals that the "pastoral vision" is uttered by a speaker who has no hope of attaining the pastoral vision, which is always perceived by the speaker as out of his reach, contrary to fact, or defining someone else's situation. Famous pieces of pastoralism in the *Eclogues* (i.e., verses of Meliboeus in *Eclogue* 1, of Corydon in 2, of Gallus in 10) illustrate this observation. That is to say, within the eclogue as a whole, the "pastoral vision" is perceived or represented as unattainable. The idealized "pastoral vision" stands in opposition, therefore, to some larger reality that the poem constructs in various ways—through the utterances of the pastoral dreamer's interlocutor, for example, or, in the instance of *Eclogue* 10, through the speaker's own developing self-awareness and consequent rejection of the "pastoral vision."

27. See Patterson 1987, 2 on the indebtedness of the pastoral tradition to the opening verses of *Eclogue* 1.
28. This vision is what many people understand to be pastoral. Those like Snell 1960, 281–310, who read the pastoral vision as identical with the meaning of pastoral poetry, therefore read pastoral as genuinely escapist. Contrast Leach 1974, 24, importantly: the desire to escape from reality belongs to some of Vergil's speakers, but not to the *Eclogue* poet himself.

29. For Stanley Fish there really are no wrong readings.

The meaning of the poem as a whole is a function of the "pastoral design," which comprehends the utterances of all the speakers as well as, most critically, the perspective of their creator. The pastoral design contains within it some expression of the pastoral vision, the idealized locus or circumstance; but it also contains what Leo Marx calls the "counterforce," the alien reality that obtrudes upon the imagined ideal and signals its imaginary status.³⁰ In Marx's study the counterforce most often appears as technology, a sign of unwelcome "progress" like the clanging, intrusive, brazen steam engine that interrupts the poet's rural reverie. In Vergil's pastoral, larger realities such as confiscation, political and military struggle, unrequited passion, or the passage of time, emerge from the utterances of various speakers and obtrude upon the pastoral vision. When the effect of the poem is ultimately to illuminate for the reader the distance that exists between the imagined ideal and whatever reality the counterforce represents, we then have what Berger calls strong pastoral and what Marx calls ironic pastoral. Strong pastoral undercuts or ironizes the imagined ideal, reveals its imaginary status. The opposite of these, pastoral that creates, in some sense, flight from reality, Berger calls weak (and Marx calls sentimental) pastoral.

I would claim that Vergil's pastoral is strong pastoral.³¹ It gives voice to a pastoral vision, but within an overall pastoral design that calls attention to the impossibility of the pastoral vision. The creator of the pastoral design, that is, the poet of the whole poem, who offers the various speakers and their dilemmas to readers, has a vision that transcends the limitations of the individual speakers. The poet of the whole poem, then, is not to be identified wholly with any of his individual speakers, including the *Eclogue* poet himself.³² The relationship between the poet of the whole poem and the individual speakers is one of difference or distance, and therefore of irony.³³ Berger calls the poet of the whole poem, who operates at an ironic distance from his speakers and implicitly addresses readers, the zero-degree voice, and it is this voice that is the locus of the poem's meaning.³⁴ Therefore, the meaning of the poem lies beyond the oppositions³⁵ that the individual

30. Marx [1964] 1981, 25.

31. Schmidt 1972, 141–42 dismisses as inappropriate to Vergil the notion that pastoral is defined by *Landlich-Idyllische, das Natürliche, das Ursprüngliche, Unschuld, Frömmigkeit*, etc. On irony and pastoral design, also see Perkell 1990b, 50–53 and notes.

32. Leach 1974 is most important on the characterization of the first person speaker/the *Eclogue* poet in the eclogue collection. She observes the elusiveness of this first person speaker, who does not indulge in personal revelations, but rather is interested in the new Roman poetry (246); the *Eclogue* poet has a sophisticated perspective superior to his characters (247); he restricts his personal comments to literary theory and stylistic endeavor, while it is only the characters who talk on political themes; other speakers have deep involvement in political themes and, for them, poetry is an image of human action, but for the *Eclogue* poet it is intellectual endeavor (261); the *Eclogue* poet is a composer of introductions and an inventor of pastoral fictions; he has a sophisticated literary perspective and high aspirations; thus neither the *Eclogue* poet nor any other figure in the *Eclogues* is a definitive spokesman for Vergil (262).

33. See n. 5, above.

34. Cf. Spofford 1981, 47: the poet is the "locus of true taste."

35. Empson 1935 conceived of pastoral in terms of "dialectic" and "balancing of opposites." Cf. Halperin 1983, 65: pastoral regularly includes "oppositions, by the set of contrasts, expressed or implied, which the values embodied in its world create with other ways of life." Van Sickle 1978 pursues the motif of dialectic throughout.

speakers embody; it exists rather in whatever suspension, contradiction, or reconciliation of these oppositions emerges for the reader from the implied perspective of the zero-degree voice/Vergil.

The understanding that the poet of the whole poem is larger than both his speakers (and should be identified wholly with neither) means that neither the pastoral vision as voiced by Gallus nor his renunciation of poetry and his yielding to love is identical with the meaning of the poem, but must be interpreted as a constituent part of the larger design. Gallus as a speaker in the tenth *Eclogue* is made initially to conceive himself as the central figure in a version of the pastoral vision,³⁶ an idyllic emotional escape from pain, but he imagines it as future less vivid, modulating into contrary to fact (33–43):

o mihi tum quam molliter ossa quiescant,
vestra meos olim si fistula dicat amores!
atque utinam ex vobis unus vestrique fuissem
aut custos gregis aut maturae vinitor uvae!
certe sive mihi Phyllis sive esset Amyntas
seu quicumque furor (quid tum, si fuscus Amyntas?
et nigrae violae sunt et vaccinia nigra),
mecum inter salices lenta sub vite iaceret;
serta mihi Phyllis legeret, cantaret Amyntas.
Hic gelidi fontes, his mollia prata, Lycori,
hic nemus; hic ipso tecum consumerer aevo.

Even before he concludes this pastoral effusion, the counterforce—in the name of Lycoris (42)—intrudes,³⁷ to be followed by an admission of yet another counterforce from within Gallus himself (44–45):³⁸

nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis
tela inter media atque adversos detinet hostis.

Real love and real war are more powerful for Gallus than pastoral visions. Through the utterances of the Gallus figure, the poem acknowledges limitations of poetic fictions: passion is greater than pastoral, or even than elegy too (69):

"omnia vincit Amor: et nos cedamus Amori."

However, this famous verse of Gallus, literally negative concerning the power of pastoral to manage passion, must be read in its complete context. As I hope to have shown, the renunciation of heroic death subserves the

36. Putnam 1970, 365: 10.35–43 are the "happy center of ideal pastoral, the otium of love, leisure, and song."

37. Pohlenz [1930] 1965, 103: "Vergeblicher Wunsch! Nur geeignet, ihn aus seinen Traum zu erwecken und ihm den Gegensatz zwischen Wunschland und Wirklichkeit zum Bewusstsein zu bringen." Contrast Clausen 1994 ad loc.: "Suddenly and rather awkwardly intruded into his dream of pastoral felicity. Here, it may be, Virgil begins to imitate one of Gallus' elegies more consistently, with scant regard, however, to the preceding lines. . . ." I am suggesting rather that such an intrusion into the pastoral vision is a significant motif in the *Eclogues*.

38. See Coleman 1977, Clausen 1994 ad loc., and Ross 1975, 99 n. 1 for other readings of these verses.

larger purpose of seduction—of Lycoris on Gallus' behalf and of Gallus and readers on the *Eclogue* poet's behalf. The literal meaning of Gallus' speech is at variance with its true function. From the perspective of the zero-degree voice, Gallus' defeat is part of the poem's multi-tiered strategy of seduction.

The zero-degree voice, in his distance from his speakers, creates a critical perspective on his speakers' experience in the larger world. For the zero-degree voice, both Gallus and the *Eclogue* poet are subjects, and the pastoral design encompasses their relationship and parallel yet disparate fates. As Conte argues, the defining oppositions of this eclogue are Elegy (in the figure of Gallus) and Pastoral (in the figure of the *Eclogue* poet), the elegiac ethos vs. the pastoral ethos, poetry vs. the real world (of city, passions, politics, war). Gallus is the elegist who is made to consider experimenting with writing pastoral. As an elegist, he is a slave to passion, pursuing in an egoistic, if urbane, fashion an unattainable love. Pastoral, on the other hand, as represented by the *Eclogue* poet in this poem, is generous and enabling. Its ethos, as Alpers has argued, is the singing of the other's song, the sharing in the other's experience.³⁹ Gallus will pursue life and love, the *Eclogue* poet his new georgic themes. Thus both poets leave pastoral behind, not in a gesture of withdrawal, but rather in a gesture of engagement—with no conviction of a positive outcome—in the larger world. This larger world is seen to intrude upon the *Eclogue* poet's undertakings just as it does upon Gallus'. Shadows, cold, and darkness, for example, are made to close his eclogue book. The coming of evening is a strong closure that signifies at least in part the larger realities that shape all human lives. By undermining facile oppositions between the poets, the zero-degree voice reveals their fundamental similarity, and this identity undermines the agonistic potential of their relationship and implicitly reinforces the pastoral ethos of community exemplified in this final poem.⁴⁰ With his announcement that this is the last poem in the collection, the *Eclogue* poet bids farewell to pastoral and acknowledges through Gallus' experience the limitations of pastoral by showing that it cannot cure love or war. At the same time, he offers the poem itself, which, in its loving generosity, is proof of the moral and emotional power of pastoral. From the perspective of the zero-degree voice, the poem closes with the kind of suspension of oppositions—simultaneously validating pastoral and subverting it—that in other instances has been seen to characterize Vergilian pastoral.⁴¹ Pastoral is both weak and strong, apparent defeat may be read as a triumph of subtle seduction, and the *Eclogue* poet both loves and rivals Gallus.

In conclusion, then, I propose that the allusion to Daphnis in *Eclogue* 10 be read as ironic. In Gallus' difference from the Daphnis model and in his

39. Alpers 1979, 216 on singing each other's song: "no one sings a song purely his own."

40. By contrast, Pohlenz [1930] 1965, 112–15 sees the mocking quality of the eclogue dissolve at the close into an emphatic opposition between the two poets: Gallus is unregenerate in his surrender to passion and pain, while "Vergil" [the *Eclogue* poet] values rural simplicity, innocence, and peace.

41. See Segal 1965, 243–44; 1967, 302; Alpers 1979, 65, 96–103, 245, and 97 nn. 4–6 for other references. Alpers 1979, 245: "The essence of Virgil's pastoral suspensions is the poet's capacity to render and acknowledge truths and relations, but not to claim the power to resolve them." On suspension, see also Perkell 1990a, 179–81.

pursuit of love and life the text first reveals its strategy of seduction and hence its own true power. Although the Gallus figure claims to perceive pastoral as impotent, the tenth *Eclogue* in fact worked its powerful seduction with its first readers as it does with us, its current readers, now.

Emory University

LITERATURE CITED

- Alpers, Paul. 1979. *The Singer of the "Eclogues": A Study of Virgilian Pastoral*. Berkeley.
- Berger, Harry. 1984. The Origins of Bucolic Representation: Disenchantment and Revision in Theocritus' Seventh *Idyll*. *CA* 3:1–39.
- Boyle, A. J. 1975. A Reading of Virgil's *Eclogues*. *Ramus* 4: 187–203.
- . 1986. *The Chaonian Dove: Studies in the "Eclogues," "Georgics," and "Aeneid" of Vergil*. Leiden.
- Clausen, Wendell. 1994. *A Commentary on Virgil, "Eclogues."* Oxford.
- . 1966. An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*. In *Virgil: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. Steele Commager, 75–88. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.
- Clauss, James J. 1993. *The Best of the Argonauts*. Berkeley.
- Coleman, Robert, ed. 1977. *Vergil/"Eclogues."* Cambridge.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. 1971. Memoria dei poeti e arte allusiva. *Strumenti Critici* 16: 325–33.
- . 1979. Il genere e i suoi confini: Interpretazione dell' *Egloga* Decima di Virgilio. In *Studi di poesia latina in onore di Antonio Traglia*, vol. 1, 377–404. Roma.
- . 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca and London.
- Damon, Philip. 1961. Modes of Analogy in Ancient and Medieval Verse. *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 15: 261–334.
- Dix, T. Keith. 1995. Vergil in the Grynean Grove: Two Riddles in the Third *Eclogue*. *CP* 90: 256–62.
- Empson, William. 1935. *Some Versions of Pastoral*. London.
- Farrell, Joseph. 1991. *Vergil's "Georgics" and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History*. New York and Oxford.
- Fish, Stanley. 1980. *Is There a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Gow, A. S. F. 1952. *Theocritus*. Cambridge.
- Halperin, David M. 1983. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven.
- Iser, Wolfgang. 1978. *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore and London.
- Kennedy, Duncan. 1993. *The Arts of Love: Five Studies in the Discourse of Roman Love Elegy*. Cambridge.
- Klingner, F. 1967. *Virgil. "Bucolica," "Georgica," "Aeneis."* Zürich.
- Leach, Eleanor Winsor. 1974. *Vergil's "Eclogues"; Landscapes of Experience*. Ithaca and London.
- Lee, M. Owen. 1989. *Death and Rebirth in Virgil's Arcadia*. Albany, N.Y.
- Marx, Leo. [1964] 1981. *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*. Reprint, Oxford.
- Otis, Brooks. 1964. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford.
- Patterson, Annabel. 1987. *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry*. Berkeley.
- Perkell, Christine. 1990a. On *Eclogue* 1.79–83. *TAPA* 120: 171–81.
- . 1990b. Vergilian Scholarship in the Nineties: *Eclogues*. *Vergilius* 36: 43–55.
- Pohlenz, Max. [1930] 1965. Reprint, *Das Schlussgedicht der Bucolica. Kleine Schriften II*: 97–115. Hildesheim.

- Putnam, Michael C. J. 1970. *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the Eclogues*. Princeton.
- Ross, David O. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Schmidt, Ernst A. 1972. *Poetische Reflexion: Vergils Bukolik*. Munchen.
- Segal, C. P. 1965. *Tamen Cantabitis, Arcades: Exile and Arcadia in Eclogues One and Nine*. *Arion* 4: 237–66.
- _____. 1967. Vergil's *Caelatum Opus*: An Interpretation of the Third *Eclogue*. *AJP* 88: 279–308.
- Skutsch, F. 1901. *Aus Vergils Frühzeit*. Leipzig.
- Snell, Bruno. 1960. *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought*, tr. T. G. Rosenmeyer, New York.
- Spofford, Edward W. 1981. *The Social Poetry of the Georgics*. Salem, N.H.
- Thomas, R. F. 1986. Vergil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference. *HSCP* 90:171–98.
- Van Sickle, John. 1978. *The Design of Virgil's "Bucolics"*. Rome.
- _____. 1980. Reading Virgil's *Eclogue* Book. *ANRW* 31: 576–603.
- Veyne, Paul. 1988. *Roman Erotic Elegy: Love, Poetry, and the West*, tr. David Pellauer, Chicago.
- Walker, Steven. 1980. *Theocritus*. Boston.