

CHRIS ECKERMAN

## Freedom and Slavery in Vergil's Eclogue 1

*Summary* – Scholars generally assume that Vergil portrays Tityrus as a literal slave in Eclogue 1, but I argue that it is preferable to interpret Tityrus as a metaphorical slave. *libertas* (27) may refer to the liberty that is won when Tityrus leaves his home and thereby escapes the metaphorical slavery of his mistress, Galatea, as well as to the liberty that is won when Tityrus is able to keep his property, in the context of land confiscations, and thereby have the liberty to enjoy *otia* (6). *libertas* (27), then, is a capacious term, but it need not have anything to do with literal slavery. The image of male slavery to a mistress, the *servitium amoris* trope, is particularly associated with the Augustan elegists, but the modern reader may choose to assume that Vergil introduces the trope in Eclogue 1, via an allusion to Theocritus' Idyll 14.

Scholars align Eclogue 1, like Eclogue 9, with the historical land-redistribution that occurred in northern Italy after Antony, Octavian, and Lepidus removed Italians from Cremona, Mantua, and other territories to hand them over to veterans who had fought on their behalf at the Battle of Philippi against Brutus and Cassius.<sup>1</sup> Since antiquity, scholars have regularly aligned Tityrus with Vergil, in one way or another,<sup>2</sup> and have further suggested that, with this poem, Vergil, via Tityrus, offers thanks to Octavian for allowing him to keep his land outside Mantua, after the confiscations.<sup>3</sup> Most scholars assert that Vergil portrays Tityrus as a slave and that the purpose of Tityrus' trip to Rome (27 – 45) is for Tityrus to receive manumission; and it is in this context that they interpret *libertas* (27). They assert, furthermore, that Tityrus' manumission allows Tityrus the opportunity to purchase and remain on the land on which he pastured his cows as a slave.<sup>4</sup> The interpreta-

---

<sup>1</sup> For specific studies, see Wimmel 1998, Keppie 1981, Winterbottom 1976, Wilkinson 1966. In general, see, e. g., Jones 2011, 53, 151, Saunders 2008, 90, Breed 2006, 101, Clausen 1994, 30, Coleman 1977, 89–91.

<sup>2</sup> As early as Servius (*et hoc loco Tityri sub persona Vergilium debemus accipere; non tamen ubique, sed tantum exigit ratio*). The allegorical approach is adopted by Quintilian (8, 6, 46). For further discussion of the relationship between Tityrus and Vergil, see, e. g., Osgood (with reference to further bibliography) 2006, 112/113, Hardie 1998, 18–20, Martindale 1997, Wright 1983, 112, Du Quesnay 1981, 32–36, Coleman 1977, 89/90.

<sup>3</sup> For discussion, see e. g. Schmidt 1989, 199, Du Quesnay 1981, 32/33, 97–138.

<sup>4</sup> E. g. Cucchiarelli 2012, 149/150, Hubbard 2008, 85, 92, Galinsky 2006, 6, Osgood 2006, 114–127, Clausen 1994, 30/31, Schmidt 1989, Wright 1983, 113, DuQuesnay 1981,

tion of Tityrus as a slave leads to various scholarly disagreements regarding Tityrus' legal status, since, if Tityrus is a slave, it is neither clear why Tityrus needs to go to Rome for manumission nor is it clear what 'Octavian' offers Tityrus when in Rome, since Octavian does not say anything relevant to slavery.<sup>5</sup> The assumption that Tityrus is a literal slave, then, is not unproblematic when Eclogue 1 is read within its literary context. Furthermore, as Clausen notes, "slaves in the country were rarely if ever emancipated."<sup>6</sup> The literal-slave thesis, then, is also not unproblematic within the poem's historical context. I suggest here that *libertas* (27) may be construed in relation to the liberty that is won when Tityrus leaves his home and thereby escapes the metaphorical slavery of his lover, Galatea, and that it may be construed in relation to the liberty that Tityrus wins by being able to keep his land and thereby have the liberty to enjoy *otia* (6), which connotes the pursuit of arts, including Tityrus' music making.<sup>7</sup> I suggest that it is because Tityrus' liberty has been interpreted in relation to Tityrus being a literal slave that scholars have suggested "a bewildering variety of conflicting and incompatible reconstructions of Tityrus' story."<sup>8</sup> It is not obvious that Vergil's audience would be familiar with the *servitium amoris* trope, since, as far as we are aware, it only develops in Roman love elegy after Vergil composed the Eclogues. But, Vergil does enough to position Tityrus' need for freedom within an amatory frame, and Vergil's intended audience would recognize that Tityrus sees himself as suffering from his relationship to Galatea. Accordingly, even if they were not familiar with Vergil's possibly remarkable imagery of slavery, used as a way to express Tityrus' perceived state of subordination in his relationship with Galatea, Vergil's intended

---

Williams 1968, 307–312, Leo 1903, 5–19.

<sup>5</sup> For various iterations of the 'slave' thesis (all with reference to further discussion), see, e. g., Galinsky 2006, Wimmel 1998, Clausen 1994, 30/31, Schmidt 1989, Du Quesnay 1981, Coleiro 1979, 180–184 (an overview of readings of Eclogue 1 with ample reference to preceding scholarship), Coleman 1977, 89–91, Winterbottom 1976, Dick 1970, 285, Leo 1903.

<sup>6</sup> 1994, 45; cf. White 1970, 352/353.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. e. g. Coleman 1977, 74.

<sup>8</sup> DuQuesnay 1981, 30; see too his similar remarks on scholarly *aporia* at 1981, 115; several references to scholarly *aporia* could be cited, e. g. Clausen, "in this ambiguous, charged word (*libertas*) lies the principal difficulty of the poem" (1994, 30). Coleiro, "the admixture of the Tityrus = Vergil allegory (for the thanksgiving to Octavian) with the new allegorical picture of Tityrus being a slave and gaining his freedom has appeared to many highly incongruous and has racked the minds of scholars to no inconsiderable extent," 1979, 182. Von Albrecht asserts, "Die Ekloge ist schwierig und reizvoll," 1995, 137.

audience would have been able to make sense of Vergil's metaphorical language.

I reproduce the relevant passage here, since I shall refer to it frequently:<sup>9</sup>

- M: *Et quae tanta fuit Romam tibi causa videndi?*  
 T: *Libertas, quae sera tamen respexit inertem,*  
*candidior postquam tondenti barba cadebat,*  
*respexit tamen et longo post tempore venit,*  
 30 *postquam nos Amaryllis habet, Galatea reliquit.*  
*namque (fatebor enim) dum me Galatea tenebat,*  
*nec spes libertatis erat nec cura peculi.*  
*quamvis multa meis exiret victima saeptis*  
*pinguis et ingratae premeretur caseus urbi,*  
 35 *non umquam gravis aere domum mihi dextra redibat.*  
 M: *Mirabar quid maesta deos, Amarylli, vocares,*  
*cui pendere sua patereris in arbore poma;*  
*Tityrus hinc aberat. Ipsae te, Tityre, pinus,*  
*ipsi te fontes, ipsa haec arbusta vocabant.*  
 T: 40 *Quid facerem? Neque servitio me exire licebat*  
*nec tam praesentis alibi cognoscere divos.*  
*hic illum vidi iuvenem, Meliboeae, quotannis*  
*bis senos quos nostra dies altaria fumant,*  
*hic mihi responsum primus dedit ille petenti:*  
 45 *'pascite ut ante boves, pueri, summittite tauros.'*

When ambiguity is introduced through a word such as 'liberty,' the mind will try to clarify the ambiguity so that it knows in what context to interpret the word, and, as Jones notes, "as regards the Eclogue-book, either a performance of the poems or an individual reader's act of reading takes the words in the order in which they come."<sup>10</sup> After Meliboeus asks Tityrus why he went to Rome (*Et quae tanta fuit Romam tibi causa videndi?*, 26), Tityrus introduces his love interests Amaryllis and Galatea and relates that his relationship with Galatea was detrimental to his well being: he had neither hope of liberty (*spes libertatis*) nor care for his property (*cura peculi*) while he was with her, and, though he had substantial resources, he never returned home from the city with a hand full of money. Accordingly, Tityrus introduces his *libertas* (27), *cura peculi* (32), and *servitium* (40) within the con-

<sup>9</sup> For text I follow Clausen 1994.

<sup>10</sup> 2011, 13.

text of his relationship with Galatea, and he thereby seems to encourage the reader to interpret these key terms, at least partially, in relation to his love life, rather than in relation to his status as possible slave.

The terms *libertas*, *servitium*, and *cura peculi* are all important terms in relation to literal slavery, and Tityrus can be interpreted as a literal slave. It is up to the reader, then, to decide whether Virgil introduces these terms in order to construct Tityrus as a literal slave or in order to describe Tityrus' subordination to Galatea in an emphatic manner. If Meliboeus knows that he is speaking to Tityrus, a landowner, then Meliboeus should know that Tityrus is referring to a need for Tityrus to receive 'liberty' from Galatea by removing himself from her, since Tityrus begins speaking about Galatea. If Meliboeus knows that Tityrus is a slave, he may be surprised that Tityrus begins talking about his love relationship, after Tityrus mentions that he went to Rome for the sake of liberty. I suggest that, as the poem continues, the scale tips in favor of interpreting Tityrus as a metaphorical slave, for we hear that Tityrus was a member of a group that petitioned 'Octavian' and we know that the people who were petitioning Octavian at this time were petitioning on behalf of keeping possession of their land as landowners (i. e. they were not petitioning on behalf of receiving freedom from slavery). Furthermore, given that Meliboeus and Tityrus seem to speak to one another as members of a similar class in this poem and that Meliboeus does not seem to be a slave, Meliboeus' language too corroborates an argument that Tityrus is not a slave. Meliboeus exhibits a strong emotional connection to the land that is being confiscated, referring to it as *patriae finis* (3), *dulcia arva* (3), *patriam* (4), *patrios finis* (67), and *mea regna* (69). These terms would not sit comfortably within the mouth of a slave.<sup>11</sup> Finally, I shall argue that Idyll 14 is an important source text for Eclogue 1 and that readers familiar with Idyll 14 will be encouraged to interpret Tityrus' slavery as I suggest here. The particular importance of Idyll 14 as a source text for Eclogue 1 has not been previously recognized. For several reasons, then, it is best that we interpret Tityrus as a metaphorical slave.

Vergil expects his readers to come to his poem well versed in the Greek bucolic tradition,<sup>12</sup> and those familiar with Greek bucolic poetry will not be surprised that Tityrus mentions the anguish brought about by his relationship

<sup>11</sup> These are all value-laden terms that connote a strong bond of legitimacy between Meliboeus and his 'paternal' soil. Meliboeus' use of the phrase *civis miser* (71/72) further corroborates an argument that Meliboeus is not a slave. As Coleman notes, "a slave could not technically have a *patria*," 1977, 72.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. e. g. Du Quesnay 1981, 31, 36.

with Galatea. They will also be familiar with the idea that a way to find respite from a problematic affair is to leave home and the mistress. In Theocritus' Idyll 14, 52 – 55, emotional hardships encourage disenchanted lovers to leave their homes in search of emotional fortitude abroad. Aeschinas tells his interlocutor, Thyonichus:

χῶτι τὸ φάρμακόν ἐστιν ἀμηχανέοντος ἔρωτος,  
οὐκ οἶδα· πλὴν Σίμος, ὁ τὰς ἐπιχάλκῳ ἐρασθεῖς,  
ἐκπλεύσας ὑγιῆς ἐπανῆνθ', ἐμὸς ἀλικιώτας.  
πλευσεῦμαι κήγων διαπόντιος.<sup>13</sup>

“And what may be the cure for helpless love, I do not know. Except that Simus, who fell in love with that brazen girl, went abroad and came back heart-whole – a man of my age. I too will cross the sea.”

Aeschinas notes parallels between himself and Simus: Simus is a man of similar age and Simus found himself suffering from a ‘helpless love’ (ἀμηχανέοντος ἔρωτος) in a relationship with a ‘brazen’ (ἐπιχάλκῳ) girl.<sup>14</sup> Aeschinas further remarks that Simus’ time abroad allowed him to return home ‘healthy’ (ὕγιης). Following the example of Simus, Aeschinas too will leave home to find the cure (τὸ φάρμακον) for his painful eros. I suggest that Vergil follows Theocritus and has Tityrus leave home to find respite from Galatea. Vergil, then, reworks a specific Theocritean source text, as he does time and time again in the Eclogues.<sup>15</sup>

Vergil does not clarify for his readers that Tityrus is going to Rome to escape Galatea, however, and, for some readers, Vergil may seem to be too demanding by expecting them to know Idyll 14 well enough to recognize an allusion to Idyll 14 in Eclogue 1. But, I would suggest that Vergil signposts for his reader that Tityrus’ ‘liberty’ may be interpreted within an amatory frame, since, as noted above, Tityrus mentions his liberty within his exposition of his relationship with Galatea. Accordingly, it is not imperative that Vergil’s reader recognize the parallels between Eclogue 1 and Idyll 14 in order for the reader to be able to interpret Tityrus’ liberty in relation to Tityrus’ love life.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Text and translation are those of Gow 1952.

<sup>14</sup> For ‘brazen’ as a reference to Cyniska’s personality, see Gow 1952, 258.

<sup>15</sup> On Vergil’s reworking of Theocritean source texts, see, e. g., Saunders 2008, 15, Farrell 1991, Garson 1971, Posch 1969.

<sup>16</sup> As discussed below, as the poem continues, the reader should recognize that Tityrus’ liberty can also be interpreted in relation to Tityrus having the ability to remain on his land. The reader, then, will be encouraged to interpret Tityrus’ *libertas* (27) first in rela-

Tityrus describes his relationship of subordination to Galatea in multiple manners. First, Tityrus uses the verb *tenebat* (31). With the imperfect indicative, Tityrus emphasizes the ongoing control to which he was subjected while Galatea was holding him (*dum me Galatea tenebat*, 31). This leads Tityrus to assert that he had neither hope of liberty (*nec spes libertatis erat*, 32) nor care for his property (*nec cura peculi*, 32) while he was with Galatea. This second use of *libertas* at line 32, then, corroborates the suggestion that Tityrus' use of *libertas* in line 27 may be read in relation to Tityrus' relationship with Galatea. After Tityrus uses a verb that constructs himself as under the control of Galatea (*tenebat*) and he explains that he, accordingly, had no hope of liberty, he further clarifies his inability to take action during his tenure under Galatea by saying that 'it was not permitted' for him to exit his 'slavery' (*neque servitio me exire licebat*, 40). The use of the impersonal *licere* emphasizes that Tityrus had no agency in the affair; accordingly, I suggest that Tityrus' *servitium* should be read in relation to Tityrus' affair with Galatea rather than in relation to a hypothesized personal status as literal slave. Tityrus speaks of himself as an object similarly in his current relationship with Amaryllis (*postquam nos Amaryllis habet*, 30), and, as Clausen notes, '*habet*' (l, 30) is usually used with a male in the nominative, as the subject of power, and a female in the accusative, as the object held;<sup>17</sup> Tityrus' language leads Clausen to conclude, rightly, that 'Tityrus seems to have been remarkably passive.'<sup>18</sup> By inverting gender expectations through grammar, then, both in his relationship with Amaryllis (*habet*) and in his relationship with Galatea (*tenebat*), Tityrus stresses his 'servile' status in his relationships.<sup>19</sup> It is important to note, then, that it is not being a 'slave to love' generally that bothers Tityrus but rather being a slave to Galatea specifically (Tityrus seems to be perfectly content with the fact that Amaryllis now 'holds' him).<sup>20</sup>

There are multiple ways to interpret line 30 (*postquam nos Amaryllis habet, Galatea reliquit*), but they similarly conclude with Tityrus being in a state of freedom from Galatea and in a state of amatory connection with

---

tion to Tityrus' love life, but the reader should, as the poem continues, realize that Tityrus had more in mind when he mentioned *libertas*.

<sup>17</sup> At Eclogue 7, 14, Meliboeus, using the 'standard' grammatical construction, says *neque ego Alcippen nec Phyllida habebam*, while referring to not having a female partner at home.

<sup>18</sup> 1994, 44.

<sup>19</sup> Clausen 1994, 45.

<sup>20</sup> I thank an anonymous referee for bringing this important point to my attention.

Amaryllis. Tityrus says, “now that Amaryllis holds us [i. e. me], Galatea has left.”<sup>21</sup> Amaryllis is not Tityrus’ literal owner; accordingly, the phrase “now that Amaryllis holds us” must refer to Tityrus being an emotional ‘captive’ of Amaryllis and not a literal ‘captive’ (i. e. the phrase must contain metaphor). It is important to note this because the interpretation of this phrase will determine how the reader interprets the following phrase, *Galatea reliquit*. The reader may interpret the phrase literally and conclude that Galatea has left Tityrus spatially. Given the preceding *postquam nos Amaryllis habet*, however, the reader may interpret *reliquit* metaphorically, since *habet* must be interpreted metaphorically. If the reader interprets the phrase “Galatea has left” metaphorically, the phrase would mean Galatea has left Tityrus’ mind, and Tityrus would be using the two clauses in this line to describe his emotional attachments to Amaryllis and Galatea. A literal interpretation of *reliquit* gives Tityrus no agency in freeing himself from Galatea, but the argument of the poem suggests that Tityrus took action to free himself from his deleterious relationship with Galatea; thus, although the reader may interpret *reliquit* literally, it is unlikely that Vergil intended *reliquit* to be taken literally. Furthermore, as the poem proceeds, the reader may infer that the reason that Galatea has left Tityrus’ mind is both because Tityrus has had the opportunity to clear his mind of Galatea by going to Rome and because he is now ‘held’ (i. e. emotionally preoccupied) with Amaryllis.

There is disagreement among scholars as to what comprises Tityrus’ *peculium*. Some, leaning on Plautus (*Asinaria* 540ff.) and Varro (*De Agricultura* 1, 19, 3), assume that Tityrus’ *peculium* (l, 32) refers to the money that would be saved by a slave to purchase his freedom,<sup>22</sup> while others assert that it was the ‘piece of land’ occupied by a slave on sufferance (*precario*) and that the slave could work the land and provide a certain amount of its profit to the owner, until, having worked hard enough, he could save enough money to purchase his freedom and his *peculium*.<sup>23</sup> But, as others have already noted, *peculium* may simply refer to assets that have no relation to slavery.<sup>24</sup> It is noteworthy that *peculium* remains such a contested term in the interpretation of this poem.

<sup>21</sup> For *postquam* with the present indicative, see OCD s. v. *postquam* (3), Woodcock 1959, 146.

<sup>22</sup> See, all with reference to further bibliography, Cucchiarelli 2012, 151/152, Clausen 1994, 31, Du Quesnay 1981, 123/124, Coleman 1977, 79.

<sup>23</sup> Osgood 2006, 114/115, building on Leo 1903, 17.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. e. g. Coleman 1977, 79, OLD s. v.

I note that *peculium* etymologically refers to property as valued in a *pecus*, ‘herd, farm animals, livestock’, and I suggest that this is relevant to the interpretation of the noun in its literary context, since Tityrus is a herdsman.<sup>25</sup> I suggest that Vergil alludes to Idyll 11 with his use of *peculium* in Eclogue 1. In Idyll 11, Polyphemus suffers from a lovesickness, for his own Galatea, that leads him to neglect his herd:

ἦρατο δ' οὐ μάλοις οὐδὲ ρόδοι οὐδὲ κικίννοις,  
 ἀλλ' ὀρθαῖς μανίαις, ἀγεῖτο δὲ πάντα πάρεργα.  
 πολλάκι ταῖ δῖες ποτὶ τούλιον αὐταὶ ἀπῆνθον  
 χλωρᾶς ἐκ βοτάνας

“He [Polyphemus] was in love not with apples nor with a rose nor with locks, but with pure madness. He considered everything else to be of secondary importance. Often his sheep went back to the fold of their own accord from the green pasture, 10 – 13.”

Were we to translate Theocritus’ statement into Latin, we could say that Polyphemus literally has no *cura pecoris*, and, given the similarities between Tityrus and Polyphemus, I suggest that Vergil makes an allusion to Theocritus with the similar phrase *cura peculi* in Eclogue 1.<sup>26</sup> Vergil does not construct Tityrus as being literally neglectful to his flocks, but Tityrus’ assets suffer while Tityrus is with Galatea, just as Polyphemus’ assets suffer while Polyphemus is with his own Galatea. As Farrell remarks, “most of the individual Eclogues – particularly poems 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 10 – borrow structural elements and translate passages from the Idylls without openly acknowledging their source.”<sup>27</sup> Such is the case with this passage. In Theocritus’ Idylls 6 and 11, Galatea serves as the love interest to Polyphemus, and Vergil’s choice of Galatea as Tityrus’ problematic love interest in Eclogue 1 encourages the reader of Eclogue 1 to recollect the role of Galatea in Polyphemus’ own troubled love life. When readers familiar with Idyll 11 hear Tityrus say *nec cura peculi*, then, they may be reminded of Polyphemus’ lack of attention to his herd, due to his problematic relationship with his own Galatea.<sup>28</sup> Servius too notes that there are discrete interpretations for

<sup>25</sup> Walde-Hofmann (s. v.) gloss *peculium* as ‘das (ursprgl. in Vieh bestehende) Vermögen; Sondergut.’

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Du Quesnay 1981, 38.

<sup>27</sup> 1991, 58.

<sup>28</sup> Tityrus and Polyphemus resemble one another in other respects. At the end of Idyll 11, now disenchanted with Galatea, Polyphemus expresses optimism that he will find another girl (75–79), and, in Eclogue 1, Tityrus has his happy relationship with Amaryllis now that his relationship with Galatea is in the past. Galatea, then, plays a

*peculium* in this passage and he too suggests that Vergil may have chosen the word *peculium* without any connection to slavery (*'peculi' autem aut antique dixit, quia omne patrimonium apud maiores peculium dicebatur a pecoribus, in quibus eorum constabat universa substantia, unde etiam pecunia dicta est a peculio*). Accordingly, following Servius, the Theocritean intertext, and other uses of *peculium* in Latin literature, I suggest that we should interpret *peculium* in a manner that has no relation to literal slavery. It is precisely because *peculium* regularly is used within contexts of literal slavery, however, that the noun has such great force in this passage, for readers who are familiar with *peculium* being used in relation to literal slavery will realize that Tityrus' language further makes Tityrus 'slavelike' in his relationship with Galatea. We err, however, when we conclude that Vergil's use of *peculium* provides evidence for Tityrus being a literal slave.

Tityrus laments his lack of resources while with Galatea, and, given the immediately preceding materials, readers may infer that Galatea was the cause of Tityrus' poor financial condition. Tityrus says, *quamvis multa meis exiret victima saeptis / pinguis et ingratae premeretur caseus urbi, / non umquam gravis aere domum mihi dextra redibat* ("although many a fat victim was exiting out from my pens and cheese was pressed for the ungrateful city, not ever was my right hand returning home heavy with bronze," 33 – 35). Tityrus notes that he earns an income in the city; the problem is that he is not able to return home with any wealth after his trip. Osgood notes, "Tityrus, apparently, squandered his earnings in town,"<sup>29</sup> and Clausen refers to Galatea as a 'spendthrift.'<sup>30</sup> Following Theocritus, Vergil constructs a bucolic world, as many have recognized, that is steeped in erotic themes that will become most prominently associated with Latin love elegy,<sup>31</sup> and the reader familiar with elegiac and bucolic tropes may infer that Galatea has been the cause of Tityrus' self-proclaimed penury in the city.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, the fact that Tityrus has the wherewithal to spend money on Galatea in the city corroborates the argument that he may not be

---

negative role in the love lives of both Polyphemus and Tityrus, but Tityrus, and possibly Polyphemus, will move on. For further discussion of *peculium* in Eclogue 1, see Schmidt 1989, 193–195.

<sup>29</sup> 2006, 115.

<sup>30</sup> 1994, 31.

<sup>31</sup> On elegy in Vergil's bucolic, cf., e. g., Jones 2011, 23/24, Kenney 1983, Ross 1975, 18–38, 85–106.

<sup>32</sup> Contrast Clausen, "Tityrus' master may be imagined as residing in the nearby town to which Tityrus brings his lambs for sale on market-days," 1994, 31.

envisioned as a slave in this poem, since he might otherwise not be envisioned to have the freedom to spend money on a lover while in the city. The trope of the female's depletion of the male's resources is as old as Semonides (fr. 7) and it will be further developed as a standard part of the *servitium amoris* motif in the hands of the Augustan elegists.<sup>33</sup> Vergil, then, may be constructing Tityrus as a man who has the means to fund the whims of a *puella* while lamenting the financial strain that she causes.<sup>34</sup> Although it is unclear how wealthy we are to imagine Tityrus to be, Tityrus encourages us to envision him as relatively well off, since he says that 'many a fat victim' were coming from 'his' pens. His language suggests that his money comes from personal resources.

If we choose to follow the metaphorical-slave thesis, then, we may suggest that Tityrus explains the difficulty he had in ending his relationship with Galatea by using five words, phrases, or ideas that stress how long it took him to exit the relationship. He says that his *libertas* came late (*sera*, 27) and that it came upon him being *inertem* (1, 27). *Inertem*, then, would not refer to Tityrus' work habits as a slave.<sup>35</sup> Rather, if we follow the metaphorical-slavery thesis, Tityrus would be stressing that he did not have the fortitude to exit the relationship with Galatea. Tityrus seems to stress the idea of belatedness in a third manner, when he mentions that his freedom came at an age when his beard had whitened (*candidior postquam tondenti barba cadebat*, 28). This passage participates in the *topos* that, with old age, one is able to escape the amatory passions that take hold of a man in his younger years.<sup>36</sup> Thereafter, Tityrus says concretely that his *libertas* came

<sup>33</sup> Wimmel suggests that Tityrus was not able to save a substantial *peculium* to purchase his freedom while with Galatea, but that he is able to save enough money to purchase his freedom with Amaryllis, 1998, 349.

<sup>34</sup> Vergil does not fully develop the cause of Tityrus' lack of funds when he returns from the city. In the Latin elegiac tradition, Gallus may have developed the trope before the extant Augustan elegists, and Vergil may be drawing on Gallus here in addition to drawing on the wide spread use of the trope in Greco-Roman literature and history. On Gallus in Vergil, see Ross 1975 and Gagliardi 2003.

<sup>35</sup> Contrast Osgood, "[Meliboeus] does seem a more observant and harder-working character than Tityrus, who is by nature lazy" (2006, 118), Clausen, "Tityrus was shiftless and lazy," 1994, 44, Coleman, "Tityrus' emancipation had been delayed not only by his own *inertia* (27) but also by the spendthrift habits of his former wife. As a slave he could not of course contract any legal marriage; his *coniunx* would be technically *contubernalis*. It is clear now that part of Amaryllis' attraction lay in her domestic efficiency," 1977, 78.

<sup>36</sup> It is noteworthy that Tityrus does not see himself as being subject to the same sort of intense erotic passion with Amaryllis (although he is beholden to Amaryllis) as he was subject to while he was with Galatea and beholden to Galatea.

'after a long time' (*longo post tempore*, 29). Although all these phrases and concepts need not be interpreted *prima facie* in relation to Tityrus' love life, the amatory context in which they occur encourages the reader to interpret these phrases in relation to Tityrus' love-life.<sup>37</sup> Following the metaphorical-slavery thesis, then, Tityrus may be interpreted as having experienced a relationship that brought him financial and emotional hardship. This would provide adequate motivation for Tityrus' desire to leave Galatea and go to Rome to "clear his head."

It is not obvious when Tityrus develops a romantic connection with Amaryllis, and this may have caused us confusion with regard to Tityrus' motivation for going to Rome. Tityrus may have already developed a relationship with Amaryllis before leaving for Rome because Amaryllis pines for Tityrus while he is gone (36/37). If this is the case, it might seem that Tityrus would not have to go to Rome since he would already be in a non-problematic relationship with Amaryllis. Even if Tityrus is imagined to be in a relationship with Amaryllis before leaving for Rome, however, further time away from Galatea and the possibility of financial gain from Octavian may encourage Tityrus to leave Amaryllis and go to Rome. Moreover, there is no reason to assume that there could not be sexual and / or emotional overlap in Tityrus' relationships with both Amaryllis and Galatea. Thus, the reader may imagine that Tityrus has already developed a connection to Amaryllis when he leaves for Rome, but that he still feels that time away from Galatea will do him good. Alternatively, the reader may postulate that Tityrus and Amaryllis have not yet developed a romantic connection when Tityrus leaves for Rome but that his absence, nonetheless, causes Amaryllis lovesickness because she already has strong emotions for him. In favor of this interpretation, we note that Meliboeus says that Amaryllis left her apples hanging on the boughs of trees while Tityrus was away (*mirabar, quid maesta deos, Amarylli, vocares, / cui pendere sua patereris in arbore poma / Tityrus hinc aberat*, 36 – 38).<sup>38</sup> In bucolic poetry, lovers use apples as love tokens: either they give them to their beloveds as gifts or they throw them at their beloveds as a form of flirtation.<sup>39</sup> According to generic expectations, since Amaryllis has not yet plucked the apples from the trees, she has not yet had the oppor-

<sup>37</sup> Note Tityrus' emotional interjection *fatebor enim* (31), which occurs before Tityrus explains his poor state while Galatea was his mistress.

<sup>38</sup> I translate *poma* as apples for the sake of convenience. On the semantic range of *poma*, cf. Coleman 1977, 79, *OLD* s. v.

<sup>39</sup> At *Idyll* 6, 6, for example, Galatea flirts with Polyphemus by throwing apples at him. On apples as love gifts, cf. e. g. Dick 1970, 287.

tunity to use them to flirt with Tityrus, either by giving him the apples or by pelting him with them. Bucolic *topoi*, then, may encourage the reader to infer that Tityrus has not yet begun a relationship with Amaryllis both because Tityrus leaves for Rome to distance himself from Galatea (this is an inference based on the harm that Tityrus has said that Galatea caused him and an inference based on an analogous situation in Idyll 14) and because Amaryllis has not used her apples to show Tityrus that she is interested in him.<sup>40</sup>

The introduction of both Amaryllis and Galatea at line 30 introduces the reader to a good and a bad relationship in Tityrus' life, and this structure resonates with Idyll 14. By introducing two lovers into Tityrus' life, Vergil responds to the three lovers present in Idyll 14. Therein, Aeschinas is subject to lovesickness because his beloved, Cyniska, is in love with another man, Lycus ('Wolf'). As is characteristic of his allusive style, then, Vergil reworks Idyll 14 in a manner that shows both an engagement with a fundamental theme in his source text (love triangle, in this case) as well as a twist on the source text (there are still three love interests and the protagonist suffers in love, but Tityrus does not suffer from being a jealous lover). Just as Simus returned home 'healthy' (ὕγιης) from his trip to Egypt in Theocritus' Idyll 14 and Aeschinas hopes to do likewise, so too Tityrus will return home healthy and sing *formosa Amaryllis* (5).

After he has explained his relationship with Galatea to Meliboeus, Tityrus turns to relate his interaction with Octavian at Rome. Vergil does nothing to refer to Tityrus' second reason for visiting Rome until lines 40 and 41, however, when he uses the parallel conjunctions (*neque – nec*), which articulate two discrete reasons for Tityrus' visit to Rome, as Von Albrecht has previously noted.<sup>41</sup> In the first clause (*neque servitio me exire licebat*, 40), Tityrus explains his state of servitude (but does not clarify whether the servitude is metaphorical or literal), and, in the second clause, he explains his need for divine aid; since he was not able to find gods elsewhere (*nec tam praesentis alibi cognoscere divos*, 41), he needed to go to Rome. In the beginning of the

---

<sup>40</sup> One could postulate, alternatively, that Amaryllis has had opportunities to show her affection for Tityrus previously, just not with these apples. It is noteworthy, however, that Vergil only constructs an image of Amaryllis not having an opportunity to give Tityrus love gifts. Amaryllis too appears in Theocritus (Idylls 3 and 4), but there she is not associated with particularly negative love, and it is for this reason (i. e. her name has a respectable Theocritean pedigree devoid of negative connotations), presumably, that Vergil chose her as Tityrus' beloved. On Amaryllis in Eclogue 1, see too Du Quesnay 1981, 86–90.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Von Albrecht 1995, 141.

poem, Tityrus already explained that he met, at Rome, someone who had served as a god for him (*deus nobis haec otia fecit / namque erit ille mihi semper deus*, 6/7), and, in the second half of the parallel construction, when Tityrus says that he was not able to find gods to aid him elsewhere (i. e., outside Rome), the reader will recollect that Tityrus met a god at Rome and will contrast this with Tityrus' lack of divinities outside Rome (*alibi*, 41).<sup>42</sup> As noted below, Vergil here follows Theocritus' Idyll 14 by providing two discrete reasons for Tityrus leaving home. The literal-slave thesis does not adequately account for there being two discrete reasons for Tityrus to go to Rome.<sup>43</sup>

We turn now to the second reason for Tityrus to go to Rome, and the reader familiar with Roman history, with Greco-Roman religion, and with Idyll 14 should recognize Tityrus' *iuvenis* as Octavian.<sup>44</sup> Scholars generally assume that 'that young man' (*illum iuvenem*, 42) whom Tityrus meets in Rome is to be equated with Octavian, but there is not unanimous agreement on this point.<sup>45</sup> Vergil seems to encourage the connection between the *iuvenis* and Octavian by referring to the person Tityrus meets as a *iuvenis*,<sup>46</sup> by referring to the monthly celebrations that are held in honor of the young man [i. e. a reference to Hellenistic ruler cult],<sup>47</sup> by positioning this poem in relation to the historical land confiscations over which Octavian administrated,<sup>48</sup> and by alluding to Idyll 14, in which a leading political figure, Ptolemy, plays an analogous role to the role played by the *iuvenis* in Eclogue 1.

Vergil's depiction of Tityrus' visit to Rome should be read within the historical context of the land confiscations and free landowners' visits to

<sup>42</sup> For discussion of Tityrus' depiction of Octavian as a *deus*, see, with reference to further bibliography, Du Quesnay 1981, 101–115.

<sup>43</sup> Schmidt (1989, 191) notes Vergil's parallelism and critiques Du Quesnay for providing an argument that does not respect Vergil's parallelism.

<sup>44</sup> Wright 1983 suggests that Vergil provides signposts in the text that encourage the reader to equate Octavian with Apollo and to interpret the interaction between Tityrus and Octavian as a poetic initiation scene.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Cucchiarelli 2012, 13, 154/155, Osgood 2006, 116, Breed 2006, 103, Wimmel 1998, 350, Von Albrecht 1995, 143, Clausen 1994, 47/48, Coleman 1977, 80, Wright 1983, 118–123, Gordon Williams 1968, 311/312; Du Quesnay 35, 133/134, Dick 1970, 279. Grisart (1966) argues against construing the *iuvenis* with Octavian.

<sup>46</sup> On Octavian as a *iuvenis* in Roman literature and culture, cf., e. g., Du Quesnay 1981, 133, Coleman 1977, 80.

<sup>47</sup> *quotannis / bis senos cui nostra dies altaria fumant*, 41/42; cf. Clausen 1994, 48/49, with the reference to further bibliography.

<sup>48</sup> On Octavian's involvement in the distributions of land, see Osgood 2006, 108–151, Clausen 1994, 30, Keppie 1981.

Rome to plead on their own behalf. Appian provides a vivid account of these travels: “They came to Rome in crowds, young (νέοι) and old (γέροντες), women (γυναῖκες) and children (παιδία), to the forum and the temples, uttering lamentations, saying that they had done no wrong for which they, Italians, should be driven from their fields and their hearthstones, like people conquered in war” (BC 5, 12, tr. H. White in the Loeb Classical Library). Appian does not mention slaves seeking manumission or correlative rights to land in these historical travels to Rome. The historical context of Eclogue 1, then, provides further corroborative evidence for the metaphorical-slavery thesis because slaves were not travelling to Rome at this time in search of emancipation and because Vergil positions the events of Eclogue 1 within the context of historical land confiscations.

It is important to note that Vergil does not clarify whether Tityrus ‘spoke’ to ‘Octavian.’ Vergil says that Tityrus ‘petitioned’ (*mihi petenti*, 44), and this may only mean that Tityrus joined in a group of people who were petitioning together. Accordingly, Tityrus may never have spoken to ‘Octavian’ since someone else may be imagined to be petitioning on behalf of a group that Tityrus is imagined to be in as a petitioner. Thus, it would make good sense that ‘Octavian’ would respond in the plural, to the group as a whole, in response to Tityrus petitioning, grammatically, in the singular. In response to Tityrus’ petitioning, a response comes from Octavian to multiple ‘*pueri*.’ Octavian tells the *pueri* to pasture their cows, as before, and to care for animal husbandry:

*pacite ut ante boves, pueri, summittite tauros.*

“Pasture your cows as before, children, [and] rear your plough oxen.”

The use of the vocative *pueri* (1, 45) by Vergil / Octavian has elicited various interpretations, and several scholars suggest that *pueri* refers to ‘slaves’ who have gathered to beseech Octavian for their freedom.<sup>49</sup> But, as noted above, the travels to Rome (as described by Appian) had nothing to do with people travelling to Rome for manumission, and the historical context of Eclogue 1 demands that the eclogue be interpreted within the context of land confiscations. Furthermore, the *ut ante* describes a continuity of state rather than a change of state and, if the *pueri* were slaves, Octavian, one might expect, would say something that would release them from servitude

<sup>49</sup> See, with reference to further scholarship, Coleman 1977, 81, Du Quesnay 1981, 135, Osgood 2006, 116.

rather than tell them to go back to caring for livestock.<sup>50</sup> In terms of pragmatics, furthermore, Meliboeus' response to Tityrus' explanation of his visit to Octavian suggests that we are to envision Tityrus petitioning on behalf of his land and not on behalf of his personal freedom, since, when Meliboeus responds to Tityrus' narration, Meliboeus notes Tityrus' good fortune in terms of his preservation of his land (*ergo tua rura manebunt*, 46), not in terms of his change in status. If the land were not Tityrus' already, it would make little sense for Meliboeus to say *'tua' rura manebunt*. Meliboeus says nothing that encourages the reader to assume that Tityrus has undergone a change of status with regard to his use of the land (e. g. that he went from holding the land as a slave to holding it as an owner).<sup>51</sup> Thus, for several reasons, the suggestion that *pueri* refers to slaves is unattractive.

Why, then, does 'Octavian' refer to the people petitioning him as 'children'? Schmidt has suggested, 'This may ... be the first vestige of the later

<sup>50</sup> Following this reasoning, DuQuesnay (a proponent of the literal-slave thesis) infers that Tityrus did not receive the formal manumission for which he came to Rome, and that Octavian sends Tityrus back to north Italy without full manumission. Schmidt has criticized Du Quesnay's thesis and, although Schmidt (also a proponent of the literal-slave thesis) is right to critique Du Quesnay's thesis, Du Quesnay's thesis at least addresses the difficulties in interpreting Octavian's pronouncement in relation to literal manumission, since Octavian says nothing relevant to slavery or manumission (1998, 186/187).

<sup>51</sup> Some scholars assume that with *'pueri'* Vergil ('Octavian') refers to Tityrus in the poetic plural. Hanslik suggests that Vergil chooses the poetic plural here because he makes an allusion to Hesiod's Theogony, when the muses first speak to Hesiod ("Inhaltlich liegt diese Hesiodstelle natürlich auf ganz anderer Ebene als Ecl. 1, 44f.; aber gleich ist ein auffälliges formales Element: an beiden Stellen sprechen göttliche Wesen zu einem Hirten – auch an der Hesiodstelle sind andere Hirten nicht erwähnt – und richten ihre Worte doch an eine Mehrzahl von ποιμένες, bez. pueri," 1955, 68. So too, cf. e. g. Dick 1970, 288, Clausen 1994, 49): Τόνδε δέ με πρότιστα θεαί πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπον, / Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο / "ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι ..." (And this was the word that the goddesses, Olympian Muses, daughters of aegis-bearing Zeus, spoke to me: "Shepherds of the field ..."). I do not find Hanslik's suggestion helpful. Given that Octavian addresses several 'children' and given that we know that large groups came to Rome historically in response to the land confiscations, I think it likely that we are to envision Tityrus as petitioning Octavian as a member of a larger group, hence the plural. Furthermore, when Vergil uses the poetic plural in the Eclogues, he uses it with firstperson pronouns unaccompanied by finite verbs; it would be unparalleled for Vergil to develop a construction wherein a poetic plural (*pueri*) would be accompanied by two, second-person-plural, finite verbs (*pascite, summittite*). Thus, it is unlikely that Vergil - Octavian uses *pueri* as a poetic plural. Moreover, when Vergil uses *puer* elsewhere in the Eclogues, it never means slaves (Cf. 2, 17, 2, 45, 3, 93, 3, 98, 3, 111, 4, 18, 4, 60, 4, 62, 5, 19, 5, 49, 5, 54, 6, 14, 6, 24, 8, 49/50, 9, 66.). Thus, comparanda also suggest that it is unlikely that *pueri* here means slaves.

Augustan notion of the *princeps* as *pater patriae*.<sup>52</sup> I think that Schmidt is correct. Like a good father should, Octavian listens to the request of his ‘children’ and responds appropriately. Vergil thereby positions Octavian in an august literary tradition, since one is reminded of scenes in Greco-Roman literature, such as the supplication of Zeus by Thetis in the *Iliad* (1, 503 – 510) and the supplication of Zeus by Artemis in Callimachus’ Hymn to Artemis, in which the supplicated divinity performs a benefaction. Such scenes afford the supplicated divinity an opportunity to offer his good will to the suppliant, and these literary parallels provide further reason to explain why Tityrus says ‘he will always be a god to me’ (*erit ille mihi semper deus*, 7);<sup>53</sup> not only does Octavian grant Tityrus his wish, but Octavian behaves like his divine literary predecessors.<sup>54</sup> With Octavian responding to Tityrus and his fellow free landholders as ‘children,’ Vergil constructs Octavian as a leader who has the same relationship with his people as a caring father does with his children, and by having Octavian refer to Tityrus as a *puer* while Meliboeus refers to Tityrus as a *senex*, Vergil develops Octavian as a *pater* to all his people, regardless of their age. It is programmatically purposeful, then, for Octavian to refer to Tityrus and others as *pueri*.

Although it has previously gone unrecognized, it is important to note that Vergil’s introduction of Octavian in *Eclogue* 1 resonates with Theocritus’ introduction of Ptolemy Philadelphus in *Idyll* 14.<sup>55</sup> After Aeschinas has decided to go abroad to separate himself from his problematic love interest, Cyniska, his interlocutor, Thyonichus, exhorts Aeschinas to go to Ptolemy in Egypt since he will receive the best financial reward from working for Ptolemy as a mercenary:

ΘΥ. ὄφελε μὲν χωρεῖν κατὰ νῶν τεόν, ὧν ἐπεθύμεις,  
 Αἰσχίνα. εἰ δ’ οὕτως ἄρα τοι δοκεῖ ὥστ’ ἀποδαμεῖν,  
 μισθοδότας Πτολεμαῖος ἐλευθέρῳ οἷος ἄριστος,  
 60 ΑΙ. τᾶλλα δ’ ἀνὴρ ποῖός τις; ...  
 ΘΥ. ... τοισιν ἄριστος  
 εὐγνώμων, φιλόμουσος, ἐρωτικός, εἰς ἄκρον ἀδύς,  
 εἰδῶς τὸν φιλέοντα, τὸν οὐ φιλέοντ’ ἔτι μᾶλλον,  
 πολλοῖς πολλὰ διδούς, αἰτεύμενος οὐκ ἀνανεύων

<sup>52</sup> 1989, 188.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Clausen on the importance of the qualifying *mihi*: 1994, 39.

<sup>54</sup> For further discussion of salvation by a ‘father’ figure in classical literature and society, cf. Schmidt 1989, 188, with further references.

<sup>55</sup> On Ptolemy Philadelphus in *Idyll* 14, see Gow 1952, 246/247, 258–260.

65 οἷα χρῆ βασιλῆ': αἰτεῖν δὲ δεῖ οὐκ ἐπὶ παντί,  
 Αἰσχίνα. ὥστ' εἴ τοι κατὰ δεξιὸν ὤμον ἀρέσκει  
 λῶπος ἄκρον περονᾶσθαι, ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροις δὲ βεβακῶς  
 τολμασεῖς ἐπιόντα μένειν θρασὺν ἀσπιδιώταν,  
 ἧ τάχος εἰς Αἴγυπτον.

“Thyonichus: I wish your desires had run to your liking, Aeschinas; but if you are really so minded as to leave the country, then Ptolemy is the best pay-master for a free man. Aeschinas: And what's he like in other ways? Thyonichus: The very best – kindly, cultured, gallant, as pleasant as may be; knows his friend, and knows his enemy even better. As a king should be, he's generous to many, and doesn't refuse when asked; but you mustn't always be asking, Aeschinas. So if it's your fancy to clasp your cloak-end on the right shoulder, and if you can stand firm on both your feet to meet a stout man's charge, then off with you to Egypt.”<sup>56</sup>

This depiction of Aeschinas travelling to Egypt to Ptolemy in Idyll 14 corroborates the argument made above in favor of interpreting Tityrus' trip to Rome in relation to amatory distress,<sup>57</sup> since the more parallels that we ascertain between Eclogue 1 and Idyll 14, the more likely it is that Vergil intended his audience to recognize the parallels in the two poems. Furthermore, Aeschinas' trip abroad will lead Aeschinas to the most important monarch in Theocritus' world, just as Tityrus' trip will lead Tityrus to the most important monarch in Vergil's world. By having Tityrus travel to Rome and to Octavian, just as Aeschinas, presumably, will travel to Egypt and to Ptolemy, Vergil meaningfully interweaves Idyll 14 into the interpretation of Eclogue 1; we cannot read the reference to Tityrus' Octavian without realizing that Vergil wants us to draw parallels between his Octavian and Theocritus' Ptolemy. For Vergil, one great payoff of making these allusions to Idyll 14 is that he can thereby appropriate Theocritus' catalogue of Ptolemy's virtues (61 – 65) into his readers' characterization and interpretation of Octavian. This is a good example of the manner in which Vergil can conceive of “his imitation and its original as interdependent.”<sup>58</sup>

With these allusions to Idyll 14 in mind, it is worth returning to Eclogue 1's introduction of *servitium* (40). Tityrus introduces the term *servitium* after his and Meliboeus' introduction of amatory themes, and, given pragmatics,

<sup>56</sup> Text and translation are those of Gow 1952.

<sup>57</sup> Thyonichus stresses that Aeschinas, as a freeman, would be undertaking work that best befits his status as a freeman (ἐλευθέρῳ, 59). Given that Vergil, in some respects, models Tityrus off Aeschinas, it could be jarring for some readers to find Tityrus a slave in Eclogue 1 (if Vergil were modeling a 'slave' Tityrus off the 'free man' Aeschinas).

<sup>58</sup> The quotation is taken from Farrell (1991, 75), who uses the quote in relation to Vergil's engagement with Hesiod's Works and Days in the Georgics.

Vergil's reader is encouraged to interpret Tityrus' *servitium* in relation to the preceding amatory material, as noted above. Moreover, Tityrus' introduction of the coordinating *neque ... nec* construction encourages the reader to recognize that two concerns preoccupy Tityrus and motivate his travel to Rome, just as two concerns motivate Aeschinas' presumed travel to Egypt in Idyll 14. If they have not yet drawn the amatory thematic parallels for themselves between Eclogue 1 and Idyll 14, then, Vergil may expect his readers to do so once he introduces the financial benefit that Tityrus will receive at Rome, since readers who are familiar with bucolic poetry will recollect that in Idyll 14 Aeschinas similarly will receive financial benefit from a political leader after travelling away from home, partially in response to needing time to clear his head of amatory distress. Eclogue 1 has seemed to some readers to be ungainly in relation to its parts, but once we recognize that Idyll 14 plays two particularly important roles in Eclogue 1 (1: have the protagonist flee the problematic mistress; 2: have the protagonist go to the most powerful leader in the world for financial benefit), we appreciate how Vergil has interwoven fundamental themes of Idyll 14 into Eclogue 1 in a new and interesting manner.

In previous scholarship, Tityrus has seemed to be a fragmented character, portrayed in some respects as a free landowner and in other respects as a slave,<sup>59</sup> but, if we follow the metaphorical-slave thesis, Tityrus becomes a coherent character. In addition to the passage discussed above (in which Tityrus references the wealth he has to take to the city), later in the poem we learn that Tityrus has other forms of wealth. Tityrus refers to his agricultural abundance (80/81) when he tells Meliboeus what he would offer him if he could stay. Though chestnuts, apples, and cheese are by no means symbols of opulence, the reader may infer that Tityrus owns the resources whence these goods may be drawn (Vergil does nothing to encourage us to think otherwise). Furthermore, Tityrus is a cowherd, and cows were the herding animals of the greatest socio-economic status.<sup>60</sup> Tityrus, then, may not be fragmented in terms of his status (he is a man of some means), but he is somewhat peculiar as both a cowherd and as a proto-elegiac lover, who seems to be able to fund the whims of a *puella*. Vergil does not clarify for us how wealthy Tityrus is, but we are beginning to see the type of man (dare I say urban man?), who has the *otium* and resources to dedicate time and

<sup>59</sup> For discussion, with reference to further bibliography, see Du Quesnay 1981, 32.

<sup>60</sup> Cows appear infrequently in the Eclogues, only twice outside Eclogue 1 (5,25, with illustrious Daphnis, 6, 58). On *boves* in the Eclogues, see too Jones 2011, 39.

energy to a problematic affair with a *puella*.<sup>61</sup> Such a *persona* will become a stock one in the hands of the Augustan elegists. In terms of reception, the reader who is familiar with Augustan love elegy should have little difficulty in being able to envision Tityrus as a slave to Galatea.

For those readers who would like to align Tityrus and the historical Vergil, on one level or another, the suggestion that Tityrus is not a slave but rather a free landowner brings Tityrus and Vergil closer together. Winterbottom asserts, "Tityrus ... is an old freedman, no proper counterpart for the young Virgil,"<sup>62</sup> but if the reader chooses to interpret Tityrus as a free landowner, this is not the case. Furthermore, by constructing Meliboeus as not subject to envy and by constructing Tityrus as a man who has not been self-serving so much as 'lucky,' Vergil encourages his fellow north Italians to look upon him in similar fashion.<sup>63</sup> The *ut ante* clause in Octavian's pronouncement to Tityrus is relevant to the biographic tradition, furthermore, since Vergil had his lands removed from him before he petitioned to have them given back to him as before (i. e. *ut ante*).<sup>64</sup> Just as Tityrus may continue to have control over his *rura*, so too may Vergil continue to have control over his own land near Mantua. Accordingly, Vergil, the poet, creates a marked similarity between Tityrus, the character, and Vergil, the historical person, but he does not develop a one-to-one correspondence, and this is characteristic of his poetics.<sup>65</sup>

The introduction of 'slavery' to a particular mistress may be Vergil's peculiar innovation, since neither does previous Greco-Roman literature construct the image of a man being enslaved to a particular woman nor does the Theocritean intertext use the language of *servitium*.<sup>66</sup> Lyne suggests that the

<sup>61</sup> Tityrus refers to his *otium* at line 6 (*deus nobis haec otia fecit*). Therewith see my comments below and Coleman's remarks 1977, 74.

<sup>62</sup> 1976, 56.

<sup>63</sup> Contrast Wright, who suggests that "Meliboeus' denial of envy is designed on the psychological level both to conceal from himself his manifest feelings of envy and to deprive Tityrus of the satisfaction of being envied," 1983, 111.

<sup>64</sup> On the dangers of the biographical approach, note Coleman's salutary remark, "That [Vergil] suffered personally from the confiscations may reasonably be inferred from Eccl. 9, but it is doubtful whether the somewhat confused accounts in the ancient commentaries and *Vitae* are based on much more than inference from the two poems concerned and the desire to reconcile them." 1977, 89.

<sup>65</sup> Contrast Clausen, who suggests, "Vergil's sympathies are usually engaged on the side of defeat and loss; and here, in a poem praising Octavian, it is rather the dispossessed Meliboeus than the complacent Tityrus who more nearly represents Virgil." 1994, 32.

<sup>66</sup> Copley remarks, "there is extant no Greek precedent for the use of *servitium amoris* as a synonym for *amor*, especially as the term is used by Propertius, with full consciousness

*servitium amoris* motif developed “not out of Latin literary tradition, nor out of Greek literary tradition,” but that the motif is first found in Propertius’ *monobiblos*.<sup>67</sup> We see now, however, that Vergil, as an intermediary between the Greek bucolic and Latin elegiac tradition, introduces the vocabulary of *servitium* to a mistress in Eclogue 1. We would not be surprised, however, to find that the *servitium amoris* motif was present in the poetry of Gallus or in amatory Hellenistic poetry. Accordingly, Vergil may have been familiar with the imagery of *servitium* to a mistress in sources that are no longer extant.

As we read through Eclogue 1, the *libertas* of line 27 becomes more and more capacious. When we meet Tityrus at line 1, Tityrus is a man of ‘liberty,’ reclining at ease and making music. In fact, it is the opportunity to live life in this ‘free’ fashion that Tityrus seems to have in mind when he introduces the term *libertas* at line 27, but the reader will only come to realize this once he or she has worked through the poem and learned what Tityrus has had to do to experience this fortuitous state of liberty.<sup>68</sup> Tityrus explains his state as one of *otia* (6) brought about by a benefactor who granted (*permissit*, 10) him his freedom.

Tityrus explains that he needed *libertas* (27) when Meliboeus asks Tityrus why he went to Rome, but it is not obvious to the reader who has not finished reading the poem that the free state of living that Tityrus is described as enjoying, early in the poem, relates to the *libertas* that he mentions to Meliboeus at line 27. And the narrative will have to unfold at some length before the reader begins to realize that the *libertas* mentioned at line 27 may be interpreted in relation to the life of *otium* that we see Tityrus enjoying at the beginning of the poem. We hear that Tityrus’ liberty came late in life and only after Tityrus freed himself from Galatea; thus, at lines 27 – 30, the reader is encouraged to interpret the *libertas* of line 27 as liberty gained by Tityrus no longer being in a relationship with Galatea, and it is within that frame that I discussed the *libertas* of line 27 above. When Tityrus continues to explain his situation, however, after Meliboeus’ interjection (36 – 39), he opens up his experience in such a manner that his *libertas* (27) can now be read within a wider frame, namely within the frame of liberty that he enjoys due to being able to keep his land (40 – 45).

---

of all its romantic-sentimental connotations ... It is clear, therefore, that the concept of *servitium amoris* as it is found in Roman elegy, is almost entirely the invention of the Roman writers themselves, the fruit of their own imagination, the outgrowth of their own conception of the nature of the literary love affair.” 1947, 300.

<sup>67</sup> Lyne gives Propertius credit for introducing the motif into Latin, 1979, 123–125.

<sup>68</sup> I thank one of the anonymous referees for bringing this important point to my attention.

Tityrus' liberty, then, is explained in a circular manner. Vergil begins by showing us Tityrus experiencing and performing 'liberty' when the poem opens. Thereafter, he takes us through specific events that offered Tityrus the liberty to live with Amaryllis and to enjoy the liberty to play music and to sing song (i. e. the liberty that Tityrus experiences and enjoys at the beginning of the poem). We may conclude that Vergil has constructed Eclogue 1 in such a way that Tityrus may be envisioned as a man of some means who will continue to enjoy 'liberty' as a landowner who is free to pursue artistic interests, thanks to Octavian, and as a man of leisure who will enjoy 'liberty,' thanks to his time away from Galatea.<sup>69</sup>

Tityrus' liberty emerges as an existential wellbeing that allows Tityrus the opportunity to pursue poetic and musical pursuits. In this respect, Tityrus' *libertas* and *otium* resonate with the life of literary *otium* that Vergil describes in his *sphragis* at the end of the Georgics:<sup>70</sup>

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

Vergil here speaks of his life of literary production as being intertwined with 'ignoble *otium*', alluding to the fact that it is made possible by *magnus Caesar* (560) and Caesar's 'noble' labor. Vergil refers here to the beginning of the Eclogues, in which Tityrus experiences similar artistic liberty and

---

<sup>69</sup> A few final points may be made. Vergil's sensitivity to ring-composition and to the structure of the Eclogue book has been addressed extensively (See, e. g., van Sickle 1978 (2<sup>nd</sup> edn. 2004), Seng 1999, Otis 1964, 128–143, Maury 1944), and, with the suggestion that Tityrus leaves town partially to escape from Galatea, we recognize greater thematic ring composition within the Eclogues as a poetry book, since Eclogue 10 revolves around Gallus and elegiac themes (On Gallus and elegiac themes in Eclogue 10, see, with reference to further bibliography, Conte 2008). Scholars regularly refer to Amaryllis as Tityrus' wife, but, given that she is a love interest in the bucolic/elegiac genre, this is unclear; Eclogue 1 gives no clear indication that the reader should consider her Tityrus' wife/*conserva*/*contubernalis*. (Scholars who refer to her as Tityrus' wife, *conserva*, or *contubernalis* include Cucchiarelli 2012, 151, Hubbard 2008, 84, Osgood 2006, 115, Schmidt 1989, 188, 197, Du Quesnay 1981, 38.)

<sup>70</sup> I supply the text of Thomas 1988.

*otium* that derives from the same benefactor.<sup>71</sup> In the *Georgics*, Vergil places greater emphasis on the labor of Caesar, which makes literary *otium*, such as his and Tityrus', possible.

When we turn to consider the concept of liberty in Idyll 14, we find that the Idyll contains similarities in relation to the concept of liberty as portrayed in Eclogue 1, but we also note that Vergil has reworked the concept of liberty in a noteworthy way.<sup>72</sup> Eclogue 1 begins with the protagonist experiencing liberty, while Idyll 14 begins with the protagonist not yet experiencing liberty, for Idyll 14 begins with Aeschinas suffering from lovesickness (4 – 10). We do not know if Aeschinas ever received 'liberty' from his lovesickness and we do not know if Aeschinas received the financial gains from Ptolemy that would allow him the sort of capacious liberty that Tityrus enjoys at the beginning of Eclogue 1. Moreover, Vergil makes Tityrus be the source of volition for his own travels to 'Octavian' whereas Aeschinas receives encouragement from Thyonichus to travel to Ptolemy. Furthermore, Aeschinas does not seem to have interest in the poetic and musical activities that Tityrus' liberty and *otia* afford Tityrus. The artistic character of Tityrus, then, is a Vergilian innovation on the source text. As Farrell observes, "[Vergil] uses allusion more or less constantly throughout [the Eclogues and the Aeneid] in order to create a complex intertextual relationship between model and imitation. By exploring this relationship, the reader participates in a creative dialogue, through which the essential themes and ideas of the original work take on new meaning as they are analyzed and reintegrated into a new poetic structure."<sup>73</sup> I hope to have shown that familiarity with Idyll 14 does much to open Eclogue 1 in interesting new ways.<sup>74</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Thomas 1988, 241.

<sup>72</sup> We should not be surprised that we do not find allusion at the level of individual words and phrases to Idyll 14 in Eclogue 1, since it is well recognized that Vergil alludes not only through individual words but also "through whole episodes of narrative or exposition, and even entire books or poems," Farrell 1991, 69.

<sup>73</sup> 1991, 62/63.

<sup>74</sup> Savage and Dick have suggested that Tityrus performs *servitium amoris* in Eclogue 1, but they have not recognized the Theocritean intertexts, introduced here, that allow us to interpret Tityrus as a metaphorical slave, rather than as a literal slave. Furthermore, they have still read Tityrus as a literal slave and they have used the concept of *servitium amoris* in notably different ways than I introduce it here. Savage, for example, suggests that Tityrus performs *servitium amoris* to both Galatea and Amaryllis (1952, 20) and that he goes to Rome to redirect his *servitium* toward Octavian. Following Savage, Dick (1970, 286) says that one can read Tityrus as being a 'slave' to his passion during his relationship with Galatea, but he does not read any of the crucial terminology (*libertas*, *servitio*, *cura peculi*), discussed above, in relation to metaphorical slavery, for he thinks that these terms

## Bibliography

- Breed, B. 2006. *Pastoral Inscriptions: Reading and Writing in Virgil's Eclogues* (London)
- Clausen, W. 1994. *Virgil: Eclogues* (Oxford)
- Coleiro, E. 1979. *An Introduction to Vergil's Bucolics with a Critical Edition of the Text* (Amsterdam)
- Coleman, R. 1977. *Vergil: Eclogues* (Cambridge)
- Conte, G. B. 2008. An Interpretation of the Tenth Eclogue, in: Volk, K. (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Vergil's Eclogues* (Oxford), 216–244
- Copley, F. O. 1947. *Servitium amoris in the Roman Elegists*, *TAPhA* 78, 285–300
- Cucchiarelli, A. 2012. *Publio Virgilio Marone: Le Bucoliche* (Rome)
- Dick, B. 1970. Vergil's Pastoral Poetic: A Reading of the First Eclogue, *AJP* 91, 277–293
- Du Quesnay, I. 1981. Vergil's First Eclogue, *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3, 29–182
- Farrell, J. 1991. *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History* (Oxford)
- Gagliardi, P. 2003. *Gravis cantantibus umbra: Studi su Virgilio e Cornelio Gallo* (Bologna)
- Galinsky, K. 2006. Vergil's Uses of Libertas: Texts and Contexts, *Vergilius* 52, 3–19
- Garson, R. W. 1971. Theocritean elements in Virgil's Eclogues, *CQ* 21, 188–203
- Gow, A. S. F. 1952. *Theocritus*. 2 vols. 2nd edn. (Cambridge)
- Grisart, A. 1966. Tityre et son dieu: des identifications nouvelles, *LEC* 34, 115–142
- Hanslik, R. 1955. Nachlese zu Vergils Eclogen 1 und 9, *WSt.* 68, 5–19
- Hardie, P. 1998. *Virgil: New Surveys in the Classics* (no. 28) (Oxford)
- Holzberg, N. 2006. *Virgil: Der Dichter und sein Werk* (Munich)
- Hubbard, T. 2008. Allusive Artistry and Vergil's Revisionary Program: Eclogues 1–3, in: Volk, K. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Vergil's Eclogues* (Oxford), 79–109
- Hunter, R. 1999. *Theocritus: A Selection* (Cambridge)
- Jones, F. 2011. *Virgil's Garden: The Nature of Bucolic Space* (London)
- Kenney, E. 1983. Virgil and the Elegiac Sensibility, *ICS*, 8, 44–59
- Keppie, L. 1981. Vergil, the Confiscations, and Caesar's Tenth Legion, *CQ* 31, 367–370
- Klingner, F. 1961. Das erste Hirtengedicht Virgils, in: *Römische Geisteswelt* (4th ed.) (Munich) 312–326
- Leo, F. 1903. Vergils erste und neunte Ekloge, *Hermes* 38, 1–18, reprinted in Leo, F. (1960), 2, 11–28
- Leo, F. 1960. *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*. 2 vols. (Rome)
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. 1979. *Servitium amoris*, *CQ* 29, 117–130

---

refer to Tityrus being a literal slave. Accordingly, scholars who have suggested that Tityrus performs *servitium amoris* have not made a notable impact in relation to the literal-slave thesis because they believe that Tityrus is a literal slave, who happens also to be 'enslaved' to his passions. This interpretation is unsatisfying because it does not allow us to integrate the second half of the Eclogue, in which Tityrus, as a free man, petitions Octavian on behalf of his land, into the imagery of the first half of the Eclogue, in which the language of slavery is used in relation to amatory distress. – For helpful comments on a previous version of this paper, I would like to thank Sander Goldberg, an audience at the University of Michigan (including Basil Dufallo, Ruth Scodel, and Donald Sells), an audience at the 2014 CAMWS Annual Meeting (including Carole Newlands and Jim O'Hara), the editor of the journal, and the anonymous referees.

- Martindale, C. 1997. Green Politics: the Eclogues, in: Martindale, C. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Vergil* (Cambridge), 107–124
- Maury, P. 1944. Le secret de Virgile et l'architecture des Bucoliques, *Lettres d' Humanité* 3, 71–147
- Osgood, J. 2006. *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge)
- Otis, B. 1964. *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford)
- Payne, M. 2007. *Theocritus and the Invention of Greek Fiction* (Cambridge)
- Posch, S. 1969. *Beobachtungen zur Theokritnachwirkung bei Virgil* (Innsbruck)
- Ross, D. O., Jr. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge)
- Saunders, T. 2008. *Bucolic Ecology: Virgil's Eclogues and the Environmental Literary Tradition* (London)
- Savage, J. J. H. 1952. *Virgil's Musing Tityrus*, II, CB 28, 19/20
- Schmidt, E. A. 1987. *Bukolische Leidenschaft oder Über antike Hirtenpoesie (Studien zur klassischen Philologie 22)* (Frankfurt am Main - Bern - New York)
- Schmidt, E. A. 1998. Freedom and Ownership: A Contribution to the Discussion of Vergil's First Eclogue, *Papers of the Leeds International Seminar* 10, 185–201
- Seng, H. 1999. *Vergils Eklogenbuch: Aufbau, Chronologie und Zahlenverhältnisse* (Hildesheim)
- Thomas, R. 1988. *Virgil. Georgics. Volume II, Books III/IV* (Cambridge)
- Van Sickle, J. 1978 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 2004). *The Design of Vergil's Bucolics* (Rome)
- Volk, K. 2008. Introduction: Scholarly Approaches to the Eclogues since the 1970s, in: Volk, K. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Vergil's Eclogues* (Oxford), 1–15
- von Albrecht, M. 1995 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). *Römische Poesie: Texte und Interpretationen* (Tübingen)
- Walde, A. and J. B. Hofmann, 1982. *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Heidelberg)
- West, M. L. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford)
- White, K. D. 1970. *Roman Farming* (London)
- Wilkinson, L. P., 1966. Vergil and the Evictions, *Hermes* 1994, 320–324
- Williams, G. 1968. Tradition and originality in Roman poetry (Oxford)
- Wimmel, W. 1998. Vergils Tityrus und der perusinische Konflikt: Zum Verständnis der 1. Ecloge, *RhM* 141, 348–361
- Winterbottom, M. 1976. Vergil and the Confiscations, *G&R* 23, 55–59
- Wright, R. G., 1983. Virgil's Pastoral Programme: Theocritus, Callimachus and Eclogue 1, *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 29, 107–160

Chris Eckerman  
 University of Oregon  
 311 Susan Campbell Hall [SC]  
 1267 University of Oregon  
 Eugene, OR 97403-1267