A better solution is cited by Essler himself, who quotes Beate Beer as noting the presence of *tum* instead of the first *cum* in a part of the transmission, an easy mistake.[6] If this is right, we have a parallel construction, with *primum*, as expected, taken up by the following *tum*,[7] with the mode of reception (a) balanced against the origin and flow of the images (b). It is worth noting that *tum* appears instead of the second *cum* in C and B^1. This reading is sometimes adopted but still would require attaching Schoemann's *-que* to the preceding *cum* in order to achieve coordination with *primum*, a result that can be achieved more economically by replacing the prior *cum* with *tum*.[8] The variations *cum/tum* in this passage suggest that scribes were confronted by both forms in the transmission but confused as to the correct insertion point for *tum*.[9]

Los Angeles ANDREW R. DYCK
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000707

TYRTAEUS IN VIRGIL'S FIRST ECLOGUE*

The first eclogue opens with an exposition, put in the mouth of Meliboeus (1.1–5):

> Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
> siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena;
> nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arua.
> nos patriam fugimus; tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra
> formosam resonare doces Amaryllida siluas.

These five lines receive two and a half pages in Coleman's commentary, five in Clausen's, six in the recent commentary by Cucchiarelli, and eighteen in Paraskeviotis's unpublished thesis on the *Eclogues*' sources.[1] Yet on the central line and a half (3–4a), in which Meliboeus speaks about himself rather than Tityrus, only

[6] Essler (n. 3), 76. The tradition of the 'Leiden corpus', to which *Nat. D.* belongs, has been studied in detail by P.L. Schmidt, *Die Überlieferung von Ciceros Schrift 'De legibus' im Mittelalter und Renaissance* (Munich, 1974); cf. also J.G.F. Powell (ed.), *Ciceronis De re publica, De legibus, Cato maior de senectute, Laelius de amicitia* (Oxford, 2006), xxxii-xlviii. Beer's reading is not cited in Ax's apparatus; one will have to await details of her discovery (a humanist conjecture?).

[7] Essler (n. 3), 76 n. 41, citing *Dom.* 8, *Fin.* 4.72, *Att.* 12.18a.2, *QFr.* 1.2.2.

[8] This possibility is rejected by Essler (n. 3), 104 on grounds that a temporal sequence is not wanted since the images flow continuously. But *cum ... tum* can be read as setting the points in parallel ('not only … but also'); cf. R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 2. Teil: Satzlehre* (Hannover, 1966 [reprint of 1962^4]), 2.350-2.

[9] This treatment replaces text and interpretation at A.R. Dyck (ed.), *Cicero, De Natura Deorum Book I* (Cambridge, 2003), 35 (where *cumque* is to be replaced by *tum* in §49) and 125. I would like to thank the journal's anonymous reader for a helpful suggestion.

* I should like to thank *CQ*'s anonymous reviewer and *CQ*'s editor for their comments and suggestions.

[1] R. Coleman, *Vergil Eclogues* (Cambridge, 1977), 71–3; W. Clausen, *Virgil Eclogues* (Oxford, 1994), 33–9; A. Cucchiarelli, *Publio Virgilio Marone: Le Bucoliche* (Roma, 2012), 136–42; G. Paraskeviotis, 'Vergil's use of Greek and Roman sources in the *Eclogues*' (Diss., University of Leeds, 2009), 18–35.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000483 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Cucchiarelli spends more (but only slightly more) than half a page. For lines 1–2 and 4b–5, focussed on Tityrus, numerous intertexts have been suggested: Theocritus 1.1–3 and 7.88–9, Lucretius 4.589 and 5.1398, Meleager, *AP* 7.196.2, Callimachus, *Aetia* fr. 73 Pfeiffer, to list the most important ones.[2] No allusion seems to have been detected in 3–4a.

This intertextual vacuum can arguably be filled by two similar contexts in Tyrtaeus' fragments. It seems no coincidence that Meliboeus speaks of his exile in such a way as to evoke, firstly, Tyrtaeus' account of the fate of the Messenians after the first Messenian war (fr. 5 West):

> ἡμετέρῳ βασιλῆι, θεοῖσι φίλῳ Θεοπόμπῳ,
> ὃν διὰ Μεσσήνην εἵλομεν εὐρύχορον,
> Μεσσήνην ἀγαθὸν μὲν ἀροῦν, ἀγαθὸν δὲ φυτεύειν·
> ἀμφ' αὐτὴν δ' ἐμάχοντ' ἐννέα καὶ δέκ' ἔτη
> νωλεμέως αἰεὶ ταλασίφρονα θυμὸν ἔχοντες
> αἰχμηταὶ πατέρων ἡμετέρων πατέρες·
> εἰκοστῷ δ' οἱ μὲν **κατὰ πίονα ἔργα λιπόντες**
> **φεῦγον** Ἰθωμαίων ἐκ μεγάλων ὀρέων.

In a sense, the pronounced opposition of Tityrus (*tu*) and Meliboeus (*nos*)—the former continuing to enjoy the bucolic world, the latter leaving it—can be read against that of the victorious Spartans and the conquered Messenians: the agricultural paradise of Messenia is gained by the former while lost by the latter (fr. 5.2–3 West). Secondly, Meliboeus' words are paralleled in a passage warning against the same fate that now, as the second Messenian war is fought, threatens in turn the Spartans (Tyrtaeus, fr. 10.1–6 West):[3]

> τεθνάμεναι γὰρ καλὸν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι πεσόντα
> ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν περὶ ᾗ **πατρίδι** μαρνάμενον·
> τὴν δ' αὐτοῦ **προλιπόντα** πόλιν **καὶ πίονας ἀγροὺς**
> πτωχεύειν πάντων ἔστ' ἀνιηρότατον,
> πλαζόμενον σὺν μητρὶ φίλῃ καὶ πατρὶ γέροντι
> παισί τε σὺν μικροῖς κουριδίῃ τ' ἀλόχῳ.

The two Tyrtaean contexts clearly parallel each other.[4] Virgil combines elements specific to either of them: the hendiadys *patriae finis et … arua* is closer to the wording of fr. 10.3 πόλιν καὶ … ἀγρούς, whereas *fugimus* corresponds to fr. 5.8 φεῦγον.

Moreover, both fragments elicit further resonances in the rest of the eclogue. Most conspicuously, just as the annexation of the Messenians' fertile lands was not a mere by-product of the war, but the expressed goal (fr. 5.2–3 West), so Meliboeus' well-cultivated farm is not just abandoned, but confiscated in favour of a barbarous soldier (1.70–3):

> impius haec tam culta noualia miles habebit,
> barbarus has segetes. en quo discordia ciuis
> produxit miseros: his nos conseuimus agros!

[2] In addition to the commentaries, see e.g. B.W. Breed, *Pastoral Inscriptions: Reading and Writing Virgil's* Eclogues (London, 2006), 95–101.

[3] Cf. W.J. Verdenius, 'Tyrtaeus 6–7 D: a commentary', *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969), 337–55, at 339.

[4] Note that πίονα ἔργα and πίονας ἀγρούς are allomorphs of the same formula; cf. *Od.* 8.560–1 πόλιας καὶ πίονας ἀγροὺς | ἀνθρώπων and *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 93 ἀνθρώπων πόλιας καὶ πίονα ἔργα.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000483 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Since in the first eclogue non-bucolic themes intrude, it is hardly surprising that Virgil should look for intertexts in other genres.[5] But the appearance of Tyrtaeus may require some explanation. To begin with, it is not clear how much of his poetry was available to Virgil.[6] Yet, while it can be doubted that Virgil had access to the complete corpus of Tyrtaeus' works,[7] the circulation in the first century B.C. of a single-book collection,[8] or at least of an anthology including elegies by Tyrtaeus, does not seem unlikely. Horace is the only classical Latin poet who explicitly refers to Tyrtaeus (*Ars P.* 401–3 *post hos insignis Homerus | Tyrtaeusque mares animos in Martia bella | uersibus exacuit*). While the context in the *Ars Poetica* does not betray first-hand acquaintance with Tyrtaeus' poetry, points of contact with the surviving fragments have been suggested in Horace's ode 3.2.[9] Most relevantly, line 13 *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* is arguably modelled on the first couplet of fr. 10, a fragment that likewise appears to be alluded to in the eclogue: if Horace knew it, Virgil is likely to have known it as well.

But why does Virgil choose Tyrtaeus? Is Tyrtaean elegy a mere inert source of motifs and imagery, or is it meant to have a recognizable voice in the *Eclogues*' intertextual polyphony? Apart from the obvious fact that dispossession of agricultural land is at issue in both texts, two reasons make Tyrtaeus a particularly relevant intertext. First, there is possibly a geographical connection. In an epic-like passage, Virgil heavily emphasizes the geography of exile: Africa, Scythia and Britain are likely destinations for Meliboeus and the likes of him (1.61–6). By contrast, though this information is absent from the extant fragments of Tyrtaeus, among the places that sheltered the Messenian exiles were Arcadia and Sicily.[10] The Messenians, as it were, take refuge in Virgil's bucolic world, which Meliboeus is about to leave. In a sense, the penetrability of geographic borders mirrors that of generic boundaries.[11] Second, and perhaps more importantly, the Roman civil wars find a much closer analogue in the conflict between Sparta and Messenia than, for instance, in the Trojan war. It is against this similarity of situations that the difference between Virgil's and Tyrtaeus' attitudes becomes especially pointed.

For Tyrtaeus, there are two sides in the conflict, with no prospect of reconciliation: the victory of one side means exile or enslavement for the other. Moreover, Tyrtaeus is no impartial observer: his aim is to stir up the Spartans against the Messenians, even though he is able to see that the same fate awaits either side in the case of defeat. Virgil's world is more complex. Both Meliboeus and Tityrus belong to the defeated side, though neither was directly involved in the civil war. Both could lose their land, but it is only Meliboeus who actually does. Tityrus, on the contrary, is able not only

[5] On the engagement with non-bucolic genres in the *Eclogues*, see especially S.J. Harrison, *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace* (Oxford, 2007), 34–74, and F. Jones, *Virgil's Garden: The Nature of Bucolic Space* (London, 2011), 17–24.

[6] Cf. in general R. Hunter, 'One verse of Mimnermus? Latin elegy and archaic Greek elegy', in T.D. Papanghelis, S.J. Harrison, S. Frangoulidis (edd.), *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations* (Berlin, 2013), 337–49, speaking (at 341) of the 'general Roman silence about archaic Greek elegy, a silence for which there is all but certainly more than one reason, including the relative unfamiliarity of texts'.

[7] Suda, s.v. Τυρταῖος, speaks of five books.

[8] Such a single-book edition is often postulated for the fourth century B.C.; cf. M. Meier, 'Tyrtaios – Die Entstehung eines Bildes', *A&A* 49 (2003), 157–82, at 170.

[9] L.I. Lindo, 'Tyrtaeus and Horace *Odes* 3.2', *CPh* 66 (1971), 258–60.

[10] See e.g. Paus. 4.23.1–9.

[11] On bucolic and non-bucolic geography in the *Eclogues*, cf. Jones (n. 5), 17–18 and *passim*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000483 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to keep his land, but also to leave slavery.[12] While Tyrtaeus' ideological stance is more than straightforward, Virgil's position towards his characters is notoriously ambiguous.

The 'two voices' paradigm, initially used to interpret the *Aeneid*, has been fruitfully applied to the first eclogue: Tityrus' optimistic and Meliboeus' pessimistic voices clearly form a relationship of counterpoint.[13] A further, more specific extrapolation seems possible. It has been suggested that each of the *Aeneid*'s two voices can be associated with a particular genre.[14] Likewise, in the first eclogue Tyrtaean motifs do not create a neutral intertextual background, but primarily contribute to shaping the part of one character, Meliboeus.[15] It is Meliboeus who, like Tyrtaeus, thinks in polarities,[16] and lives in a world in which the loser loses everything. It is Meliboeus who, in accordance with Tyrtaeus' warning, goes into exile, where he is to be followed—the fragment goes on—by all manner of misfortune (fr. 10.7–10 West):

ἐχθρὸς μὲν γὰρ τοῖσι μετέσσεται οὕς κεν ἵκηται,
χρησμοσύνῃ τ' εἴκων καὶ στυγερῇ πενίῃ,
αἰσχύνει τε γένος, κατὰ δ' ἀγλαὸν εἶδος ἐλέγχει,
πᾶσα δ' ἀτιμίη καὶ κακότης ἔπεται.

Indeed, on top of everything, Meliboeus has just been forced to abandon two new-born kids, *spem gregis* (1.15). Yet, eventually the Tyrtaean paradigm, established at the eclogue's very beginning, is broken. For Tyrtaeus, the exile will be unwelcome to everyone he encounters (fr. 10.7 West): as if to refute this, the eclogue closes with Tityrus inviting Meliboeus to stay overnight with him (1.79–81).[17]

University of Leeds BORIS KAYACHEV
boriskayachev@gmail.com
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000483

[12] Tityrus' servitude to Galatea, during which he could make no profit from selling his farm products and therefore was unable to buy himself free (1.33–5), can perhaps be compared with the enslavement and heavy quitrent imposed on the Messenians (fr. 6.2–3 West δεσποσύνοισι φέροντες ἀναγκαίης ὕπο λυγρῆς | ἥμισυ πάνθ' ὅσσων καρπὸν ἄρουρα φέρει).

[13] See Breed (n. 2), 101–16.

[14] See V. Panoussi, *Greek Tragedy in Vergil's "Aeneid": Ritual, Empire, and Intertext* (Cambridge, 2009), 2–3, who speaks of 'resolving the controversy of the "two voices" of the *Aeneid* by grounding it in the tension between two generic models, epic and tragic'. This is arguably an oversimplification, but Panoussi's general intuition that the *Aeneid*'s polyphony of ideas in some way correlates with its intertextual polyphony is no doubt correct.

[15] Note that Meliboeus denounces his former bucolic voice (1.77): *carmina nulla canam*.

[16] See M. von Albrecht, *P. Vergilius Maro: Bucolica – Hirtengedichte* (Stuttgart, 2001), 100–2.

[17] It has, of course, been disputed whether Tityrus' invitation is sincere, whether it is an adequate response to Meliboeus' misfortunes, and whether it will be accepted. For a positive reading, see G. Davis, 'Consolation in the bucolic mode: the Epicurean cadence of Vergil's first eclogue', in D. Armstrong *et al.* (edd.), *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans* (Austin, 2004), 63–74. Cf. also von Albrecht (n. 16), 102: 'So regt Tityrus gerade durch seine »Unbeweglichkeit« Meliboeus an, den Bannkreis der Antinomien, in dem er sich bewegt, zu verlassen. Tityrus' einladende Geste könnte den anderen, wenn auch nur vorübergehend, in die eigene Welt einbeziehen: ein Ansatz zu problemlösendem Verhalten.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000483 Published online by Cambridge University Press