Chapitre de livre | 2010   Published version | Open Access

- -

Vergil's library

- -

Nelis, Damien Patrick

How to cite

NELIS, Damien Patrick. Vergil's library. In: A companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its tradition. Farrell, J. ; Putnam, M.C.J. (Ed.). Malden, MA : Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. p. 13–25. (Blackwell companions to the ancient world)

This publication URL: https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:116718

CHAPTER ONE

Vergil's Library

Damien P. Nelis

Throughout the whole of *Aeneid* 3, Aeneas' account of his wanderings after the fall
of Troy is modeled on Odysseus' version of his wanderings in *Odyssey* 9–12. Near the
end of the book, the Trojans find themselves on Sicily. There, they encounter a Greek
left behind by Odysseus at the moment of his flight from the Cyclops (*Aen.* 3.588–
654). Despite the fact that this man, who is named Achaemenides, is nowhere men-
tioned by Homer, the two texts are here operating in strikingly close interaction
(Knauer 1964a, 187–96). And so, when the Trojans sail away from Polyphemus and
make their way westward around the southern coast of Sicily, Achaemenides is able to
act as a guide, since he had only recently sailed in the opposite eastward direction with
Odysseus:

> ecce autem Boreas angusta ab sede Pelori
> missus adest: vivo praetervehor ostia saxo
> Pantagiae Megarosque sinus Thapsumque iacentem.
> talia monstrabat **relegens errata retrorsus**   690
> litora Achaemenides, comes infelicis Vlixi.

> … when the North Wind comes blowing from the narrow strait of Pelorus.
> Past Pantagia's mouth with its living rock I voyage – past the Megarian bay
> and low-lying Thapsus. Such were the coasts pointed out by Achaemenides,
> comrade of the luckless Ulysses, **as he retraced his former wanderings**.
> (Trans. Fairclough and Goold)

The verb *relegens* has been translated by "retrace" with remarkable consistency (cf.
Day Lewis, Mandelbaum, Fitzgerald, Fagles, Ahl; all are refining Dryden's "tracing"),
but it is hard to believe that in this context of remarkably close imitation of Homer
Vergil's choice of word (this is the only time he uses it) is unassociated with his read-
ing and rewriting of the *Odyssey*. As we follow Aeneas' westward voyage, we are read-
ing a new version of Homer's narrative of Odysseus' wanderings through the same

waters (Barchiesi 1996, 231; Nelis 2001, 22 n.2). Vergil's use of the verb *relego* implies that in order to understand the *Aeneid* we must all be, like the poet himself, readers of the *Odyssey*.

That the composition of the *Aeneid* is based on long and detailed engagement with the Homeric epics is well known, just as it is clear that the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* contain the fruits of prolonged engagement with many texts, both Greek and Latin, from Hesiod and Theocritus to Lucretius, Catullus, and Gallus. But any simple enumeration of the well-known names of authors commonly cited as Vergil's models raises practical questions that are very difficult to answer. What kind of text of Homer did Vergil have? What kind of editions of Theocritus and Hesiod did he work with? Where did he acquire them? And how did he use them? Did he compose with scrolls open on his desk? Did he have a desk? Did he rely on his memory? Or did slaves check up passages for him? Did he dictate to a scribe? How many texts other than the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are crucial to the composition of the *Aeneid*? And what kind of editions of these works could Vergil use? Furthermore, when these questions are asked, the tentative answers we are in a position to propose open up a whole series of further questions about Vergil's reading practices, his compositional techniques and their importance for the ways in which his poetry is in turn read and interpreted. A rapid survey of some recent literature on the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid* produces a long list of authors directly imitated by Vergil (see appendix), and even if it is not the result of exhaustive research, it helps make an obvious point concerning assumptions made by modern scholars about the connections between Vergilian allusion, the richness of his library, and the extent of his reading.

Right from the time of its first publication, Vergil's poetry has given rise to a massive amount of scholarship, and a very considerable portion of this has been devoted to elucidating complex relationships between the poet's work and the books he is assumed to have read. Whether thinking in terms of and using the vocabulary of plagiarism, imitation, variation, rewriting, influence and anxiety, allusion or intertextuality, Vergilian scholarship has always seen in this aspect of the poet's technique an essential element of his literary art (see, for example, Horsfall 1991a, 29–53; Farrell 1997; Hinds 1998, 155 index s.v. "Virgil"). Of course, this approach has not been restricted to Vergil, and the very nature of Latin literature's relationship to Greek literature demands a comparative method (e.g., Schiesaro 1998; Farrell 2005b; Feeney 2005; Hunter 2006; essential background in Rawson 1985; Ferrary 1988; Gruen 1992). G. Pasquali's famous and fundamental piece on "Arte allusiva" (1942) emphasized the essentially bookish nature of the process of literary creation in Latin poetry, and R. Thomas (1988, 59), in a review of a book about Latin poets and Roman life that was intended as a criticism of an overtly bookish approach to literary creativity ("it is striking how little the poets have to say about the Library," Griffin 1985, 5 n.30), wrote: "to imagine Ovid writing the *Metamorphoses* at an uncluttered desk is impossible" (for the practicalities implied by this image in terms of handling scrolls and note-taking see Small 1997, 167–9; Dorandi 2000, 27–75). Those interested in biographical criticism, therefore, should be ready to include in their reconstructions images of Roman poets spending long hours reading scrolls. Catullus (68.33–6; cf. Horace, *Satires* 2.3.11–12; Marshall 1976, 252–3) memorably states

the inextricable link between access to books and literary composition, when he laments that composition is impossible at Verona because of the lack of books. In fact, his complaint is on one level rather odd, because there is a substantial body of evidence to show that Romans could have considerable private collections in their country villas, and we know also that a lot of borrowing could go on between learned friends. One did not have to be in Rome to find books, and at least in the early first century the most famous collections seem to have been outside the city (Rawson 1985, 41–5). Various sources help us to imagine some aspects of book collection and circulation among the Roman élite (accessible surveys in Marshall 1976; Kenney and Clausen 1982, 15–32; Casson 2001, 61–79; Houston 2009) even if it is necessary to admit that there are vast gaps in our knowledge about Roman libraries in general and, to an even greater extent, about any personal library in particular.

From the beginning, of course, literary creation in Latin is inseparable from questions about access to books. Livius Andronicus seems to have been able to use Homeric scholia while translating the *Odyssey* into Latin (Fränkel 1932). The numerous plays of Plautus and Terence imply relatively easy access to a considerable corpus of Greek comedy (Goldberg 2005, 49), and the impressive education acquired by men like them, and the very existence of a bilingual élite, whatever the actual extent of bilingualism (Adams 2003, 1–15), tend to imply the relatively unproblematic circulation of books, as well as the presence of Greek teachers and men of letters (Feeney 2005, 228f.; and, in general, T. Morgan 1998). Obviously, many Greek books were available in Italy long before Roman conquest in the east is needed to explain the arrival of large and prestigious Greek collections. Aemilius Paullus acquired the royal Macedonian library after the Battle of Pydna in 168 BCE and brought it back home (Plutarch, *Aem. Paull.* 6.5, 28.6), and this collection probably passed to Scipio Aemilianus. Just under a century later, Sulla's taking of Athens led to the acquisition of Aristotle's library, while Lucullus built his collection from the booty won in his campaigns in Asia Minor, and made it accessible to many (Strabo 13.609; Plutarch, *Luc.* 42; see Barnes 1997 on the story of Aristotle in Rome). Cicero visited it regularly, and on one occasion he found Cato deep in books on Stoicism (*De Fin.* 3.2.7–8). By the middle of the first century, therefore, it is clear that considerable collections of books were established in Italy, and not just in Rome (see Casson 2001, 61–79 for an elegant survey). But gradually, Rome would come to assume central importance. Suetonius records Julius Caesar's plans for the establishment of a great library, and Pollio actually opened the city's first public library in 39 BCE (Suetonius, *Iul.* 44; Pliny, *NH* 7.115; Isidore 6.5). There followed Octavian-Augustus' two libraries, one in the Porticus Octaviae, and the other on the Palatine, part of the whole complex including the temple of Apollo. Subsequent emperors follow his example, Trajan's library (together with the scroll of his column) being the most famous, and by the fourth century it has been claimed that there were as many as twenty-eight (Marshall 1976, 261 n.56; in general see Dix and Houston 2006). Ownership of a large collection of books brought with it the onerous tasks of organizing and cataloguing, copying, recopying, correcting and repairing, lending, borrowing, and protecting (Casson 2001, 73–9; Rawson 1985, 39–45; Marshall 1976; on the initial circulation and "publication" of literary works, see Starr 1987; Small 1997, 26–40; and the exchange between Fowler 1995 and White 1996).

Overall, it is remarkable to note (with Rawson 1985, 44) that "we meet no complaints in the surviving literature that a particular book is impossible to track down."

From the archaeological point of view, of course, the identification of libraries is not easy (Hanoune 1997; on Vitruvius' instructions about building one (6.4.1, 5.2) see Small 1997, 160–2; on the layout of the Palatine library and the organization of the two collections, Greek and Latin, see Dix and Houston 2006; Iacopi and Tedone 2005–6; Corbier 2006, 173–4; see also Horsfall 1993). There was no fixed form, and usually only the discovery of the presence of *armaria*, the box-like shelves in which the rolls were stocked, can lead to confident conclusions. By far the most spectacular case is the library of Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus at Herculaneum, the destruction of which by the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 CE left behind the charred remains of hundreds of texts. Around 1,800 scrolls have been discovered there, and recent developments in computerized imaging mean that previously indecipherable scraps can now be transcribed and interpreted. Much work remains to be done, and it is to be hoped that further excavations will lead to yet more discoveries of lost texts, but the fragments we have are tantalizing. Vergil's name appears in three surviving papyri, along with those of Plotius Tucca, Varius Rufus, and Quintilius Varus. This evidence obviously locates him in the intellectual currents involving Philodemus and Epicureanism (see esp. Gigante in Armstrong et al. 2004, and Armstrong et al. 2004 in general), and it also makes it easy to imagine him actually working in the library itself. Other evidence links Vergil to the Epicurean teacher Siro (*Catal.* 5 and 8; *Vita Focae* 63; cf. Servius *ad Ecl.* 6.13; *Aen.* 6.264; see Armstrong et al. 2004, 1–2, with the skepticism of Horsfall 1995b, 7–8, and Stok's chapter in this volume) and informs us that Vergil spent little time in Rome, preferring the calm of Campania and Sicily (*Vita Donati* 13). Given that all of the library has yet to be excavated, Piso obviously had a very considerable collection of books at his disposal. If Vergil ever went there, what books could he have found? And how would he have worked? The *Life* of Donatus describes Vergil dictating lines to his scribe Eros, completing half-lines and asking for the two additions to be written down (*Vita* 34), and there is no reason to doubt that he could have worked in this way. He no doubt had a fantastic memory, but he will also have had slaves at hand to fetch scrolls and check up particular passages. Certainly, at Herculaneum he would have been able to read many Epicurean texts, much as Cicero saw Cato surrounded by Stoic writings. The remarkable work of scientists and papyrologists over many years enables us to picture in some detail the villa's meticulously organized collection. Its texts were annotated with titles, book numbers, line numbers, column numbers; they were carefully checked and corrected; the average height of the rolls is around 21–2 cm, with many having columns about 18 cm high and 5–6 cm in width. One can go so far as to suggest that when Vergil unrolled a scroll as he read, he would at any given time have visible in front of his eyes around 40 cm of papyrus revealing six columns of text (Delattre 2006, chap. 4; on scroll formats see also W. A. Johnson 2004, 3–13). In something like this form Vergil would almost certainly have been able to consult there all thirty-seven books of Epicurus' *On Nature* and the complete works of Philodemus. One can only try to imagine the interest with which he perused the latter's *De bono rege*, *De pietate*, and *De ira* (see the contributions by Indelli, Fish, Johnston, and Obbink in Armstrong

et al. 2004). Latin texts were also present, and writings of Caecilius Statius, Ennius, and Lucretius have been identified. The intensity and complexity of engagement with the writings of others that one senses in all his poetry suggest that a huge amount of direct personal study of the texts went into his writing. To borrow the formulation of R. Thomas, it is impossible to imagine that the *Aeneid* was composed at an uncluttered desk, whether at Herculaneum or elsewhere. But it is necessary also to try to make the connection between attempts at imagining the physical world of Vergil as a reader and the ongoing task of trying to interpret his poetry.

At *Aeneid* 10.24 there is a doubt about the text. Did Vergil write at the end of the line *inundant sanguine fossas* ("they were flooding the ditches with blood") or *inundant sanguine fossae* ("the ditches were flooding with blood")? It is likely (see Conte 2007, 212–18) that we should prefer the latter reading, because Vergil probably had in mind a Homeric formula (*Iliad* 4.451 = 8.65, in each case at the end of the hexameter), "and the earth ran with blood." His *fossae* must be in the nominative case, in correspondence with the Homeric "earth." The parallel between the two texts takes on further importance at *Aeneid* 11.382, when Vergil repeats the same line-ending, thus reproducing Homer's double use of his formula. Obviously, this example illustrates Vergil's remarkably detailed awareness of Homer's repetitive style, and in doing so it raises the question of the ways in which Roman readers may have reacted to this particular aspect of texts which today we are used to interpreting in terms of oral poetics and formulaic composition. How did Vergil interpret verbal and thematic patterns of repetition in Homer? What did he make of them, given that his own epic style, no doubt partially under the influence of the example set by Apollonius Rhodius, eschews formulaic repetition? It seems reasonable to assume that appreciation of the densely intratextual and self-referential nature of the *Aeneid*, those aspects of the text which were so receptive to the application of New Critical readings in the middle of the twentieth century (see Putnam 2001), must begin from full realization of the importance of Vergil's study of and reaction to Homeric technique. In this particular case, use of the Homeric text as evidence for helping to choose the correct reading in Vergilian manuscripts implies acceptance of the fact that Vergil read Homer so closely as to know that he used a particular formula on only two occasions and that this knowledge led him to employ his own version of that formula only twice.

At this point, it is necessary to face up to the objection that modern researchers are too willing to make Vergil one of their own, too ready to see in the scholar-poet of antiquity a subtle postmodernist critic. Such a warning needs to be taken seriously, but certain factors concerning the traditions of scholarship in the ancient world must also be taken into account.

By the Augustan age, Homer had been the subject of study for centuries, and Vergil's debt to the various traditions of Homeric scholarship is very great (as is emphasized by Hexter's chapter in this volume). Behind his meticulous reworking of the formulaic "and the earth ran with blood" stands the work of Aristotle, Zenodotus, Philetas, Aristarchus, and many others, all students of Homer and Homeric language, interested in the collecting and detailed investigation of rare words and their meanings, the exact sense of unusual or outmoded technical terms, and the establishment of reliable editions of the poems. The Hellenistic age was one which saw the systematic

collection and study of vast numbers of books, and Roman access to Greek literature came via the labors of scholars working in the great centers of learning that were Alexandria and Pergamum (in general see Pfeiffer 1968). Latin poets were educated in the complexities of Hellenistic poets and were fully aware of the importance of the traditions of Homeric scholarship for their creative efforts (Rengakos 1993). Vergil's library shelves, therefore, may have given pride of place to Homer, but the scrolls containing the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* will not have stood alone. Perhaps the most obvious illustration of this approach is the proposition that Vergil may have read all subsequent Greek and Latin literature as an imitation of or reaction to Homer, the primal Ocean from which all literary streams took their source. Again, a detailed example will give rise to broader considerations.

At the beginning of the second half of the *Odyssey*, the Phaeacians finally bring Odysseus back to Ithaca. Somewhat ironically, Homer, in lines (13.89–92) which recall the prologue of *Odyssey* 1, has Odysseus sleep at this crucial moment in the story, which takes place at dawn (13.93–5). Vergil likewise, at the beginning of the second half of his epic, has Aeneas arrive in the Tiber, at dawn (7.25–30). The two narratives of epic journeys coming to a close are obviously working in parallel. But Vergil was aware of another epic poet who had also structured his narrative of an epic voyage on the Odyssean model. Apollonius' Jason, right in the middle of his epic, arrives at his goal, Colchis. He arrives at night, but Apollonius brings the second book of his four-book poem to a close with a final line describing the arrival of dawn (*Arg.* 2.1285). Apollonius' next line (3.1.) reads, "Come now, Erato, stand beside me.…" Vergil, following his account of the arrival in the Tiber, invokes exactly the same Muse, *Nunc age,… Erato…* (7.37). These connections help illustrate something of the care with which Vergil studied the narrative structures of his models. In doing so, of course, he was also studying carefully the use of the book as a unit of composition within a larger whole. One result of these efforts is the extraordinarily complex and polished book structure of the *Aeneid* (Harrison 1980; see more generally Hutchinson 2008, 1–41). But a further essential lesson to be drawn is that Vergil is not only reading Apollonius as a privileged model at the beginning of *Aeneid* 7, he is also reading Apollonius as a preexisting imitation of Homer. This process is in operation throughout the *Aeneid*, as Vergil consistently reads the *Argonautica* against the background of its Homeric models (see Nelis 2001). If more of Ennius' *Annales* had survived, it seems very likely that we would be able to chart the same process in detail. In theory, we could do so for every text (Farrell 2005b, 106–7). Further surviving texts can certainly be brought into the picture. For example, in *Aeneid* 4, the way in which Vergil models Dido on Apollonius' Medea shows that he also has detailed awareness of the importance of Euripides' *Medea* as a key model for Apollonius, and also for the Medea of Ennius, and for the Ariadne of Catullus 64, the latter in turn also being a close imitation of the *Argonautica*. It would of course be nice to know more of how Aeneas left Dido in Naevius, but ultimately, it is Odysseus' departure from Calypso which provides the essential Homeric framework and ensures the coherence of the epic pattern (see Nelis 2001, 159–66). Similarly, throughout the whole of the second half of the *Aeneid* Vergil is reading the cyclic *Nostoi*, Apollonius Rhodius, and numerous Roman historians with an eye to how he can fit the story of Trojans in Italy into a fundamentally

Homeric narrative structure. The most important lesson to be drawn from all this material is that even if Vergil's reading was vast, it was in no way haphazard. He read with an eye for the connections between texts, in doing so establishing patterns and traditions that are reflected in the densely intertextual nature of his poetry. To a remarkable extent, what Vergil does is to trace or create connections which enable him to connect aspects of every text he read all the way back to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the two poems that provide the basis of the scaffolding for the structure of the *Aeneid*.

A further important aspect of Vergil's relationship to Homer lies in the fact that he was acutely aware of many aspects of the history of the reception of Homer. In recent decades, a considerable body of research has shown that not only did Vergil study the Homeric texts themselves in great detail, he also read commentaries on them. For example, the song of Iopas in Dido's palace at the end of *Aeneid* 1 reworks the songs with which the blind bard Demodocus entertains the guests in Alcinous' palace in *Odyssey* 8. The fact that Iopas sings about natural science suggests that Vergil was aware of the allegorization of Demodocus' song about Ares and Aphrodite in terms of Empedoclean physics, seeing the adulterous divinities as the cosmic forces of Strife and Love. (Nelis 1992, 2001, 96–112 shows that Apollonius had already imitated Homer in the same way in his Empedoclean song of Orpheus in the first book of the *Argonautica*.) Similarly, scientific allegories based on the shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18 have been shown to form the basis for Vergil's creation of the shield of Aeneas in *Aeneid* 8 (Hardie 1986, 336–76; again, Nelis 2001, 345–59 studies Apollonius' role as intermediary), and the Aristaeus episode in *Georgics* 4 has also been explained in terms of allegorical interpretations (Farrell 1991; Morgan 1999). Moral allegories also influenced Vergil in his adaptations of Homeric models, as he reacts to many of the different ways in which Greek scholars commented on different aspects of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. For example, it has been shown how Vergil's characterization of the Trojans and Rutulians in the Nisus and Euryalus episode attests his awareness of the fact that commentators were keenly interested in Homer's characterization of Greeks and Trojans in the Doloneia (Schmit-Neuerburg 1999, 23–65; Casali 2004b). A more detailed example will show the attention Vergil paid to Homeric criticism. Many scholars have noted (e.g., Knauer 1964a, 373 and 436) that the opening simile of the *Aeneid*, in which Neptune's calming of the storm raised by Juno is compared to the calming of a riotous mob by a single man of outstanding *pietas*, is related to the second simile of the *Iliad* 2.144–8, in which a speech by Agamemnon that stirs up the Greeks is likened to the effect of strong winds on waves and fields of grain crops. Given that scholiasts on the Homeric simile commented on it as an image of disorder and noisy confusion, it is striking that Vergil's version highlights just these aspects of the riotous scene, using the strong terms *seditio* and *furor* and thus establishing the latter as a leitmotif for the whole epic (Schmit-Neuerburg 1999, 66–82). Finally, it has been shown that Vergil's whole approach to the combination of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in the *Aeneid* owes a great deal to ancient discussions about the relationship between the two Homeric poems (Cairns 1989, 177–214). Once again, therefore, it is important to realize that we are not dealing here with a level of complexity which is in some sense beyond control. Vergil works in a highly systematic way, in which he reads the *Odyssey* back onto the *Iliad* and then reads the *Argonautica* of Apollonius

back onto both epics, while at the same time consulting scholia on all three works and adopting an approach to reading which then enables him to bring numerous other texts into the picture (as shown above, Euripides, Ennius, Catullus, the Roman historians, etc.). This reconstruction of his creative vision and insistence on his ability to find and imagine transgeneric, thematic patterns suggest that there is validity in a holistic approach to Vergilian *imitatio* in the *Aeneid* which in the end traces every path back to Homer. But in doing so, one must avoid a schematic or procrustean reading that is centered on Homer alone as a consistently primary model, and one must never deny the presence and importance of the traces of many other texts. This point deserves illustration, and there are numerous examples of the way in which Vergil reads books in connecting patterns in order to combine different source texts. We will look at one from each of Vergil's three works, in order to show that this approach has validity for the Vergilian œuvre as a whole and to suggest that the undertaking of systematic work of this kind remains a major desideratum in Vergilian scholarship for the years ahead.

The opening of the *Eclogues* contains a poetic program for Vergilian bucolic, and in the way it reflects Vergil's reading of earlier texts it may be seen as fundamental in establishing the connectedness of his reading process and the resultant patterns of allusion (see Van Sickle 2000). Again, our study and appreciation of the way allusion works cannot be separated from the way Vergil reads texts.

The two opening lines of the *Eclogues* begin with the name of Tityrus and end with *avena*, the reed or pipe which accompanies his song (*Musam*, 2). At line 10, Tityrus explains why he has the leisure to sing, and his words *ludere…calamo* ("play on my rustic pipe") pick up Meliboeus' *meditaris avena* ("practice on your reed"). The scholia on Theocritus 3.2, a poem in which a goatherd leaves his flock in the care of Tityrus and sings his love for Amaryllis, record several etymologies of the name Tityrus, one of them linking it to the word *kalamos*. There can be little doubt that Vergil was reading his Theocritus with scholia and that the learned reader may be expected to pick up on the connections between Tityrus, *avena*, and *calamus* (F. Cairns 1999, 291–2; Hunter 1999, 111; see also on Vergil and Theocritean scholia Courtney 1990, 103; Hunter 2006, 127–8). In fact, he was probably using the edition of the bucolic poets put together by Artemidorus of Tarsus, which included ten *Idylls* ascribed to Theocritus, and probably also the commentary of his son Theon (F. Cairns 1999, 292–3). The procedure may be thought complex enough, but in fact there is much more going on. When a reader pronounces the opening line of the poem (*Tityre tu patulae*) s/he is recreating the sound of *Idyll* 1.1f. (*hadu ti to…hadu de kai tu*; cf. also *fagi/pagaisi*; *Meliboee/poimen…melos*). But even as Vergil engages so closely with Theocritus, there are good reasons for thinking that the name Tityrus comes also from Philetas (F. Cairns 1999, 289 n.1). Furthermore, the opening ten lines also show the impact of Callimachus, Meleager, and Lucretius, and probably also of Ennius, as Vergil draws attention to the "familiar textual world" he is introducing to his readers and creates an interpretive background shaped from earlier poetry about singing and about the countryside in relation to which his own pastoral song must be read (Hunter 2006, 118). It is this integrative aspect of the process that is so vitally important. Vergil's allusive practice is the result of an approach to earlier texts that is based on a keen appreciation of their interrelationships which permits him to focus on

associative patterns and thematic connections. As a result, our reading must pay close attention to verbal texture in order to be in a position to trace intertextual links, but it is also vital to develop an instinct for identifying the thematic choices that may lie behind and explain any particular verbal reference to any particular text or texts, in order to be able to appreciate the full complexity of Vergil's technique. Consistently, the intricacies of individual intertextual moments can and must be related to much broader patterns of influence and imitation. The reader learned and alert enough to see that Vergil's second verse, ***silvestrem** tenui **Musam** meditaris avena* ("wooing the woodland Muse on slender reed," trans. Fairclough and Goold), reworks Lucretius, *DRN* 4.589, *fistula **silvestrem** ne cesset fundere **Musam*** ("that the panpipes may never slacken in their flood of woodland music," trans. Rouse and Smith), will probably also have recalled its original context, a passage which explains the phenomenon of the echo and the ways in which countryfolk imagine isolated rural places to be inhabited by satyrs, fauns, and Pan, making music with strings and pipe, and so brings us directly into an evocation of rural folk and their songworld. Certainly, Vergil seems to have noticed that a line from this passage, *tibia quas fundit digitis pulsata canentum* (*DRN* 4.585, "which the pipe sends forth touched by the player's fingers," trans. Rouse and Smith), reappears at *DRN* 5.1385, a passage in which Lucretius explains the origins of music and song, *per loca pastorum deserta atque **otia** dia* (*DRN* 5.1387, "amid the solitary haunts of shepherds and the peace of the open air," trans. Rouse and Smith). Vergil was no doubt reading both Theocritus and Lucretius in tandem (Breed 2000), since pastoral *otium* is, of course, exactly the context in which we find Tityrus as Vergil originates his own bucolic song: *O Meliboee, deus nobis haec **otia** fecit* (*Ecl.* 1.6, "O Meliboeus, it is a god who gave us this peace," trans. Fairclough and Goold).

Moving on to the *Georgics*, a reading of the close of the work will help to highlight further aspects of Vergilian technique.

> Haec super arvorum cultu pecorumque canebam
> et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum   560
> fulminat Euphraten bello victorque volentes
> per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olympo.
> Illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
> Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
> carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuventa,   565
> Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.

> So much I sang in addition to the care of fields, of cattle, and of trees,
> while great Caesar thundered in war by deep Euphrates and bestowed
> a victor's laws on willing nations, and essayed the path to Heaven. In
> those days I, Virgil, was nursed by sweet Parthenope, and rejoiced in the
> arts of inglorious ease – I who toyed with shepherd's songs, and, in youth's
> boldness, sang of you, Tityrus, under the canopy of a spreading beech.
>
> (Trans. Fairclough and Goold)

These lines reflect the influence of Ennius, Callimachus, and Rhianus, but most obviously they evoke the reading of the *Eclogues*, as the last line famously echoes the first line

of the earlier work, *Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi* ("You, Tityrus, lie under the canopy of a spreading beech"). Just as Vergil situates the writing of the *Georgics* in Naples, he refers, in contrast to the thundering in war of Caesar, his own rejoicing in the "arts of inglorious ease," *studiis ignobilis oti*. In doing so, he includes a telestich, with the word *oti* running both horizontally and vertically (Schmidt 1983, 317):

> per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olymp**o**.
> Illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis aleba**t**
> Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis **oti**,

On the one hand, this kind of wordplay is indeed the fruit of leisured study, but mention of *otium* adds another connection to the opening of *Eclogue* 1, where *deus nobis haec **otia** fecit* (cf. also *lusi* in line 565 and *ludere* in *Ecl*. 1.10). The thematic importance of *otium* in both passages, when related to the explicit citation of *Eclogues* 1.1 at *Georgics* 4.566, suggests that the telestich is not accidental. Furthermore, its presence helps us to appreciate the fact that seeing it depends on careful study of a written text; such phenomena privilege textuality over orality, and their presence has important implicatons both for the way we should read Vergil and the way he himself read. As is well known, he was so keenly aware of the presence of an acrostic in Aratus that he imitated it with one of his own. At *Phaenomena* 783–7 the worked *lepté* runs both horizontally and vertically in the text, in a passage about weather signs. When Vergil writes about weather signs at *Georgics* 1.424–37, he includes his full name (**Pu**blius **Ve**rgilius **Ma**ro) in coded fashion (429, 431, 433):

> Si uero solem ad rapidum lunasque sequentis
> ordine respicies, numquam te crastina fallet   425
> hora, neque insidiis noctis capiere serenae.
> luna reuertentis cum primum colligit ignis,
> si nigrum obscuro comprenderit aera cornu,
> **ma**ximus agricolis pelagoque parabitur imber;
> at si uirgineum suffuderit ore ruborem,   430
> **ue**ntus erit: uento semper rubet aurea Phoebe.
> sin ortu quarto (namque is certissimus auctor)
> **pu**ra neque obtunsis per caelum cornibus ibit,
> totus et ille dies et qui nascentur ab illo
> exactum ad mensem pluuia uentisque carebunt,   435
> uotaque seruati soluent in litore nautae
> Glauco et Panopeae et Inoo Melicertae.

In doing so he flags up the acrostic to the reader twice, with the words *sequentis ordine respicies* ("[the moons] that follow in order you will inspect," 424–5) and *is certissimus auctor* ("this is the surest indication," but also "this is quite definitely the author," 432). The practice is neither unique in Vergil (cf. the Mars acrostic at *Aeneid* 7.601–4 signaled by the words *prima movent Martem*) nor particularly uncommon even in sub-literary epigrams (see Feeney and Nelis 2005 for discussion). Related also is the way in which Vergil not infrequently draws attention to the question of literary

sources by the use of what has become known as "the Alexandrian footnote." Perhaps even more directly related to actual reading practices and the format of ancient texts available to Vergil is the fact that *Georgics* 4.400 imitates very closely *Odyssey* 4.400, showing that Vergil worked with numbered texts of Homer and illustrating his sense of the importance of structure and placement (see Morgan 1999, 223–9 for full discussion). Perhaps the best example of the latter phenomenon is the striking and much-discussed placing of the name Euphrates six lines from the end of *Georgics* 1 and 4 and *Aeneid* 8, in imitation of a reference to the river six lines from the end of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* (Scodel and Thomas 1984; cf. Wills 1996, 22).

This element of Callimachean allusion at the end of the *Georgics*, when added to the citation of the *Eclogues*, draws attention to a further much-discussed aspect of Vergil's technique, that is, the way in which he constructs the image of a coherently structured poetic career. The sphragis of the *Georgics* unites the poet's career up to this point as a unified whole devoted to the poetry of the countryside. He does so in lines which look back directly to the prologue to *Georgics* 3, a passage in which he had set out his plans for a future epic poem. Discussion of these famous lines (*Geo.* 3.1–48) has tended to center on the question of whether the poem there outlined is in fact the *Aeneid*. Intense scholarly disagreement on this question may best be read as a reflection of the fact that the text can be read as a meditation on the epic tradition and a revelation of Vergil's study of the poetic options open to him as he began planning the composition of a Roman epic. The prologue offers a perspective on the translation of Greek poetic traditions to Italy and the whole process of the creation of a literature in Latin, on Aristotelian and Callimachean criticism of the epic cycle, on generic boundaries, definitions of *epos*, and the choice between writing an historical epic in the Ennian tradition and the construction of a new historical vision based on Homer and the exploitation of Hellenistic etiological narratives (see Nelis 2004). Having completed the *Georgics*, as readers of the *Aeneid*, we do not have to wait very long for confirmation that such considerations are indeed at the center of Vergil's mind:

> hic tibi (fabor enim, quando haec te cura remordet,
> longius et volvens fatorum arcana movebo)
> bellum ingens geret Italia, populosque feroces
> contundet, moresque viris et moenia ponet,

> This your son – for, since this care gnaws at your heart, I will
> speak and, further unrolling the scroll of fate, will disclose its
> secrets – shall wage a great war in Italy, shall crush proud nations
> and for his people shall set up laws and city walls, …
> (Trans. Fairclough and Goold)

In his note on line 262, R. Austin (1971) notes that "*volvens* is probably a metaphor from the unrolling of a book," providing the image of Jupiter reading either the book of fate or a book of Roman history, depending on one's temporal viewpoint. Certainly, Jupiter's speech has a strongly teleological thrust; it is a narrative of Roman history which owes more to Ennius than we can tell, and it also owes debts to Lucretius in passages where it is easy to imagine Ennius as a direct model. At the same time, the

differences between Jupiter's vision and the *Aeneid* are worth pointing out: the latter famously jumps *in medias res* and avoids chronological narrative order; Vergil does not directly relate the founding of Rome and the city's subsequent history (Anchises and Vulcan do that in books 6 and 8 respectively); Vergil does not describe the ultimate caging of *Furor*, as his poem ends with an act based on *furor*. In a strong sense, Jupiter is reading an alternative version of the story, a narrative path Vergil could have taken, one he presented as an option in the prologue to *Georgics* 3, but one he in the end rejected. Of course, as readers of the *Aeneid* we do in fact end up reading about the working out of *fatum*, and Rome's destiny. And it is by no means by accident that the act of reading is once again thematized at what is in many ways the climax of both the scroll Jupiter is reading and of the *Aeneid*, the moment when Aeneas looks at the great shield made by Vulcan, on which the god has depicted the whole history of the city of Rome, from Romulus, Remus, and the wolf to the Augustan triple triumph of 29 BCE. As Aeneas first ponders the shield, we are told that it is a *non enarrabile textum* (*Aen*. 8.625, the shield's ineffable fabric), and as he stops "reading" it and puts it on his shoulder, he admires its beauty but fails to grasp its historical trajectory or comprehend its ideological thrust (*rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet*, *Aen*. 8.730, "and though he knows not the events, he rejoices in their representation"). Obviously, as readers of the poem we are here implicated in a revealing moment of metapoetic reflection, but perhaps we should also pause to consider the ways in which this scene presents to us Vergil's reflection of his own role as a reader. At the end of *Aeneid* 8, at what is the end of the poem's historical narrative, we are no doubt meant to imagine him reading his own poem, like Aeneas pondering the artwork of the shield. He too is caught up in thinking about the horrible reality of violence and its aesthetical representation in verse, and about the ways in which art can be put to use to make some sense of the tragedy of history or simply to justify what in the short term may be seen as its predetermined end. In a sense, it may be true to say that in terms of our attempts to get a glimpse into Vergil's library, we may imagine that the last book he ever read was his own epic. And maybe, in harmony with the double image of the resentful Araxes and Turnus (cf. *pontem* **indignatus** *Araxes* at 8.728, "Araxes **chafing** at his bridge," and *fugit* **indignata** *sub umbras* at 12.952, "his life fled **resentfully** to the shades below"), we are left at the end with a reflection of a deeply troubled spirit.

APPENDIX

Accius, Aeschylus, Alcaeus, Alcman, Apollonius Rhodius, Aratus, Aristotle, Bacchylides, Bion, Callimachus, Cassius Hemina, Cato, Catullus, Cicero, Calvus, Choerilos of Samos, Cinna, Empedocles, Ennius, Epic Cycle, Epicurus, Eratosthenes Euphorion, Fabius Pictor, Furius Antias, Gallus, Herodotus, Hesiod, Homer, Homeric Hymns, Horace, Laevius, Leonidas of Tarentum, Livius Andronicus, Livy, Lucilius, Lucretius, Lycophron, Meleager, Moschus, Naevius, Nicander, Orphic texts, Pacuvius, Parthenius, Phanocles, Philetas, Philodemus, Pindar, Plato, Plautus, Pollio, Polybius, Propertius, Pindar, Pythagorean texts, Rhianus, Sallust, Sappho, Sophocles, Sophron, Stesichorus, Terence, Thucydides, Theocritus, Theophrastus, Tibullus, Tyrtaeus, Theocritus, Varius, Varro Atacinus, Varro Reatinus.

FURTHER READING

For further information on Roman books and libraries some standard works are Birt (1882), Boyd (1915), and Kleberg (1967). There are useful surveys also in French by Salles (1992) and Valette-Cagnac (1997). On the epic tradition, Foley (2005) offers a rich and wide-ranging collection of studies. On intertextuality, Conte (1986), Pucci (1998), and Edmunds (2001) are central contributions. On Vergil's working methods, Horsfall (1991) is fundamental. Those interested in the format of papyrus scrolls should consult W.A. Johnson (2004).