

The Language of Hardness and Softness in Virgil's *Ecl.* 10: A Legacy of Gallus?

Author(s): Paola Gagliardi

Source: *Phasis. Greek and Roman Studies* 19 (2016): 58-87

ISSN: 1512-1046

E-ISSN: 2346-8459

Published by: The Institute of Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies of the Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48614/phasis.19.2016.58-87>

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

**THE LANGUAGE OF HARDNESS
AND SOFTNESS IN VIRGIL'S *ECL.* 10:
A LEGACY OF GALLUS?**

PAOLA GAGLIARDI

Abstract. The analysis of three adjectives (*mollis*, *tener*, and *durus*) in Virgil's *Ecl.* 10 reveals a particular usage which differs from that in the other eclogues. In *Ecl.* 10, Virgil conforms to an elegiac usage where these adjectives acquire a literary connotation, and when attributed to a person, reflect the elegiac sensibility; such usage is unique in the whole bucolic *liber*. It gives the poem an elegiac atmosphere which may well reflect imitation of Gallus' poetry. A comparison with passages of Propertius seems to confirm that the specific occurrences and connotations of these adjectives in Virgil's *Ecl.* 10 originated in Gallus.

The aim of the present paper is the analysis of three adjectives, *mollis*, *tener*, and *durus*, in Virgil's *Ecl.* 10, in which they seem to be employed in a different way from that used in earlier Latin poetry and in the other eclogues. The fact that the dedicatee and the main character in this poem is the love elegist Cornelius Gallus, and the frequent occurrence of the language of hardness and softness in Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid's elegiac production, can suggest

that the three terms were used with an erotic sense in his poetry, and that it was Gallus who introduced this particular feature of the elegiac language and attitude.

The last eclogue is the most unusual in all of Virgil's *Bucolics*. With its dedication to a learned poet, the *inventor* of the Latin love elegy,¹ and its apparent aim to "explore" generic boundaries between bucolic and elegiac poetry,² the poem surely reflects features of amatory elegy, thematically (the long monologue of Gallus abandoned by his beloved and unable to escape subjection to Love) and linguistically: even more so, if we assume, as the testimony of *Serv. Dan. ad 46* authorizes us to do,³ that the text contains allusions, echoes, and perhaps actual quotations of Gallus' poetry. The language of the eclogue has a number of unique features, as compared to the rest of the *Bucolics*. Among these, we should surely recognize many rare and exotic words, especially geographical names and adjectives,⁴ which can easily be explained as an affinity with the scholarly geography of the neoteric poets, influenced by Parthenius of Nicaea,⁵ who likely also influenced Gallus, given their close relationship. Also some typically elegiac words and themes, destined to find favour in Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid (which, therefore, may have originated in Gallus) should be noted: consider, for example, *cura* and *furor* used in an erotic sense; also the intense recurrence, within the compass of a small number of

¹ So he is named in Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.53-4 and Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.93.

² See Conte ²1984, 25-34.

³ *Hi versus omnes Galli sunt, ex ipsius translati carminibus*. On this Servian affirmation, see *infra* n. 40.

⁴ See, for example, *Sicanos* at 4; *Parnasi* and *Pindi* at 11; *Aonie Aganippe* at 12; *Menalus* and *Lycaei* at 15; *Alpinas* and *Rheni* at 47; *Parthenius* at 57; *Hebrum* at 65; *Sithonia* at 66; *Partho* and *Cydonia* at 59; *Aethiopum* at 68.

⁵ See Scarcia 1987, 988. The same predilection for a learned geography is also in Euphorion (see Watson 1982, 100-1), the *auctor* of Gallus: on Gallus' relationship with the poetry of Euphorion, see Cusset and Acosta-Hughes 2012, XIV-XV; see also Weber 2016, 177-84.

verses, of the pathetic interjection *a* (46-9); the adjective *mollis*, a “technical” term definitive of elegiac poetry, and particularly the adverb *molliter*, a word which Gallus’ followers favoured, are used conspicuously in *Ecl.* 10; *tener*, too, with 3 occurrences in this eclogue (out of eleven occurrences in the whole *liber*), is used with a different connotation from its usage in the rest of the collection. The same goes for its opposite *durus*, a relatively rare term in the *Bucolics*, which appears twice in *Ecl.* 10, with a psychological connotation absent from its other occurrences. Taking into consideration that *durus* is the epithet which Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.93) uses to characterize Gallus’ style and that Ovid (*Rem. Am.* 765) connects it, in another sense, with Gallus’ poetry (*quis poterit lecto durus discedere Gallo?*), we should rightly suspect that *durus* was a key Gallan term,⁶ especially since in *Ecl.* 10 its appearance is associated, closely or otherwise, with adjectives that indicate softness, a contrast typical of Latin elegy. The investigation of this lexical and semantic sphere, therefore, is likely to give interesting results (suggestive, if not definitive).⁷ We will see that the usage of the three adjectives, *mollis*, *tener*, and *durus*, connotes different shades of meaning in the other *Bucolics* as compared to *Ecl.* 10. In *Ecl.* 10,

⁶ As affirmed by Ross (1975, 62), Cairns (1984), and Fabre-Serris (2013).

⁷ I find very interesting the analysis of the three adjectives in Catullus. They mainly have a physical or obscene sense (*molliculus*, 16.4 and 8; *duros lumbos*, 16.11; *durius faba*, 22.21; *mollis*, 25.1; *languidior tener ... sricula beta*, 67.21), referring to various subjects (*tener* is referred to *vitis*, 62.2; *manus*, 61.218; *digitis*, 63.10; *mollis* to *spica*, 19.11; *complexu matris*, 64.88; *flumine*, 67.33; *fronde*, 64.294; *lana*, 64.312 and 319; *quiete*, 63.38 and 44; *somno*, 68.5; *veste*, 65.21; *durus* to *mente*, 60.3; *sola*, 63.40), sometimes in erotic context (*mollibus medullis*, 45.16; *teneram ad virum virginem*, 61.3; *teneris papillis*, 61.105; *tenerum femur*, 69.2; *mollis pede*, 6.8.70), and often in the *carmina docta*, namely, a stylistic level far from the *genus humilis* of Latin elegy and bucolic. Only *tener* at 35.1 (*Poetae tenero meo sodali*), and *mollis*, in the varied form *molliculus* at 16.4 and 8, have a metapoetic meaning, alluding to the “tenderness” of love poetry (see *infra* n. 20); but *molliculi versiculi* has also an obscene sense.

Virgil can be seen to have adapted his bucolic poetic vocabulary to the domain of elegy,⁸ doubtless as a tribute to Gallus, and perhaps reflecting Gallus' own diction.⁹ A review of the use of these three adjectives in the rest of the *Bucolics* will make clear the different use of language in *Ecl.* 10 and its specific nuances there.

Mollis

From the quantitative point of view, with the exception of *mollis*, the three adjectives we are examining are employed more often in *Ecl.* 10 than in the other poems of the *Eclogues*. In *Ecl.* 10 alone, we find 3 occurrences of *tener* and 2 of *durus*; *mollis* appears once, but this eclogue also has the only occurrence of the adverb *molliter* in Virgil, in a very particular context. The first interesting consideration we can make is that *mollis* has usually a negative implication in Latin, linked to the concepts of weakness, passivity, effeminacy,¹⁰ but this is not the normal usage in Virgil's eclogues. In fact, *mollis* in the *Bucolics* typically connotes "soft" in a physical sense (perhaps, more delicate than *tener*): it is used as an epithet for plants (*Ecl.* 3.45), flowers (*Ecl.* 2.50, 5.38, 6.53), fruits (*Ecl.* 1.81), leaves (*Ecl.* 5.31), ears (*Ecl.* 4.28), grass (*Ecl.* 3.55), sometimes with a hint of sensuality and rest, for example, in relation to sleep (*Ecl.* 7.45) or soft surfaces to lie upon (*Ecl.* 3.55). More specifically, *mollis*

⁸ I do not think that the analogies between bucolic (Virgilian) and elegiac language can be attributed to the shared interest of the two poets in the theme of love, or to the presence in Gallus' poetry of a strong pastoral element. Firstly, we have no evidence, except *Ecl.* 10, about an alleged pastoral element in Gallan elegy; and, secondly, Virgil finds the erotic theme in Theocritus and in Greek bucolic tradition: what he shares with Gallus is, in my opinion, the treatment of this topic, and in *Ecl.* 10, dedicated to that elegist, the features of the erotic discourse inevitably take inspiration from him.

⁹ Cairns 1984, *passim*, makes a number of points which are highly supportive of the argument that *durus/mollis* were key to Gallus' poetic diction.

¹⁰ Consider, for example, the pejorative sense the term has in Catullus (11.5, 25.1). On the contrast *durus/mollis* in Catullus and in Latin attitude, see Selden 2007, 534-7 and notes.

means “flexible,” of plants (*Ecl.* 2.72), and is a traditional attribute of wool at *Ecl.* 8.64. Exceptional are the instances at *Ecl.* 9.8, in a beautiful description of hills softly sloping to a river (*qua se subducere colles / incipiunt mollique iugum demittere clivo*, 7-8), and *Ecl.* 7.45, in which the grass, reworking a Theocritean phrase,¹¹ is defined *somno mollior*.

Compared to this overview, the usage in *Ecl.* 10 is very different. The use of the adjective is interesting: when Gallus invites Lycoris to share the idyllic pleasures of country life (*hic gelidi fontes, hic mollia prata, Lycori; / hic nemus; hic ipso tecum consumerer aevum*, 42-3), *mollis* is applied to meadows, and contributes in portraying the scenery of the *locus amoenus* in which the lover dreams of spending his whole life with his beloved. It is seemingly a normal use of the adjective, consistent with both its use elsewhere in the *Bucolics*,¹² where it is often an attribute of plants, flowers, or grass, and normal poetical usage, with the frequent association of *mollis* to beds or soft surfaces to lie on, and by extension to sleep.¹³ Some considerations, however, make this occurrence worthy of special attention. First, the phrase *mollia prata* never appears in Latin before this

¹¹ See Lipka 2001, 48.

¹² In fact, Virgil will use this phrase in the *Georgics*. See *mollibus in pratis* at *G.* 2.384, and *non mollia possunt prata movere animum* at *G.* 3.520-1; cf. also *Ov. Ars Am.* 1.279: *Mollibus in pratis admugit femina tauro*.

¹³ A special case can be the occurrence of *mollis* at *Ecl.* 6.53 (*ille, latus niveum molli fultus hyacintho, / ilice sub nigra pallentis ruminat herbas*, 53-4). Here, in the erotic context of the story of Pasiphae, the adjective, connected to the “bed” of the bull, can receive an erotic connotation from the point of view of Pasiphae. Of course, we can suspect that the phrase *molli hyacinto* is a quotation from Calvus’ *Io* (see Cucchiarelli 2012 ad loc., 353), and this would be a further link of the erotic sense of *mollis* with the neoteric context in which Gallus’ poetic taste formed and his love poetry was born. So his likely usage of the term in his production can be traced back to the Hellenistic elegy and to its spread in Latin poetry made by the neoteric poets.

poem,¹⁴ and the hypothesis, proposed by W. V. Clausen,¹⁵ that it may be the invention of Virgil himself or Gallus, seems justifiable, given the importance of *mollis* in the language of Latin elegy. The suspicion that Gallus lies behind this expression, however, comes not just from its novelty in Latin and from the fact that Virgil chooses to make Gallus himself speak the phrase, but also from the characteristic usage of the term in the elegists, as a contrast to the idea of hardness. In the verses immediately following, the idyllic setting proposed by Gallus, gives way to a bleak landscape of war and danger in which *durus* is an attribute of Mars. The frequency of the opposition between *mollis* and *durus* in later elegy¹⁶ gives good reason to suspect that the phrase *mollia prata* in *Ecl.* 10.42 originated with Gallus.¹⁷ Moreover, the phrase occurs in a section of the monologue which seems to show the direct influence of Gallus' poetry more particularly than the rest of the poem¹⁸ and where this opposition has extended importance.

Another hint which reinforces the suspicion that the expression *mollia prata* is Gallus' own phrase is its verbatim repetition at Prop. 3.3.18 (*mollia sunt parvis prata terenda rotis*): as is well known, the

¹⁴ See *TLL*, s. v. *mollis*, 1370, 73.

¹⁵ See Clausen 1994 ad loc.

¹⁶ See, for example, Prop. 1.7.4-6, 2.22.11-3, 3.1.19-20, 3.7.48, 3.11.20, 3.15.14-6 and 29; Tib. 1.1.63-4, 2.6.28-30; *Corp. Tib.* 3.4.76; Ov. *Amor.* 1.4.44, 1.12.22-4, 2.1.22, 2.4.23-4, 3.4.1.

¹⁷ Actually, the idea of softness was linked to the elegy much earlier than Gallus: think of Hermesian. fr. 7 Pow., 36, who described as *μαλακός* the rhythm of the pentameter. It is likely that Gallus found this characterization in the Hellenistic elegists this definition and appropriated it, inaugurating its use in the Latin elegiac vocabulary.

¹⁸ The problem of circumscribing the lines to which *Serv. Dan. ad* 46 refers has led scholars to propose different hypotheses: Bardon (1949, 224) and D'Anna (1989, 43) think of 44-5 and 42-3; Luiselli (1967, 80ff.) extends the information to 50-69, and others include the whole monologue. See a bibliography in Monteleone 1979, 38-9 n. 29, and Courtney 1993, 268-9.

importance of Propertius in any attempt to reconstruct the Gallan poetry is crucial, especially where he overlaps with Vergil in the *Eclogues*.¹⁹ In this passage, of course, the adjective *mollis* takes on a different meaning, typically elegiac, almost as a technical term, indicating the soft and voluptuous tone of elegy and even specifically the rhythm of the pentameter and thus the tender *color* of the elegiac couplet, imitating the Greek term *μαλακός*.²⁰ In this particular sense, *mollis* has programmatic significance²¹ which is often used as a contrast to the hardness of war, of military life, or epic

¹⁹ According to the method inaugurated by Skutsch 1901 and 1906 (contra Leo 1902, 14ff.; Jahn 1902, 161ff.), and followed by many scholars. Among them, see, for example, Ross 1975 and Cairns 2006.

²⁰ In Hermesian. fr. 7 Pow., 36 the rhythm of the pentameter is defined as *μαλακός*, but cf. already Catull. 16.4 and 8 (*quod sunt molliculi, parum pudicum ... si sunt molliculi ac parum pudicum*: to mean “effeminate verses?”) and, of course, Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.44, who refers to Vergil’s own pastoral verse as *molle atque facetum* (in contradistinction to Varius’ tragic/epic). Perhaps Gallus appropriated a pre-existing stylistic judgment to his love elegy. It should also be noted that *mollitia* is a concept in substance inimical to the idea of Roman *robur* (cf., e.g., Vell. Pat. 2.88: *Maecenas ... otio ac mollitiis paene ultra feminam fluens*) and often used to characterize the “hedonistic” East in contradistinction to Roman values. So not only does *mollitia* strike a metapoetic note, but it also strikes a counter-cultural note: the life of the poet-lover as opposed to the Roman soldier.

²¹ See *mollem componere versum* (Prop. 1.7.19); *molles elegi* (Ov. *Pont.* 3.4.85); *mollia carmina feci* (Ov. *Tr.* 2.349). In many metaphoric uses in the elegists to describe their poetry, *mollis* is attributed to *chori* (Prop. 2.34.42), *serta* (Prop. 3.1.19), *liber* (Prop. 2.1.2), *lucus* (Prop. 4.6.71), *costum* (Prop. 4.6.5), *umbra* (Prop. 3.3.1), and of course *prata*. Sometimes these phrases are opposed to epic poetry, described as *dura* (Prop. 2.1.41, *duro versu*; 2.34.44, *dure poeta*; 3.1.20, *dura corona*), and to tragedy (Ov. *Am.* 3.1.45, *duro cothurno*). In general, on *mollis* in Latin love language, see Pichon 1966, s. v., 204ff. According to Cairns (1984, 218-9), the contrast between “hard” and “soft” in a literary sense does not seem to belong to Hellenistic poetry; it seems rather a Roman concept.

poetry,²² as in the case of Propertius' *recusatio* at 3.3. Of course, we can not be absolutely certain that Gallus actually used the adjective *mollis*, but the presence of the same expression *mollia prata* in Virgil and Propertius, in opposition to "hardness," is at least a clue suggesting the presence of *mollis* in Gallus' own poetry. Moreover, the presence in *Ecl.* 10 of the analogous *tener* in a programmatic context (53), most likely derived from Gallus, may suggest that the first elegist had already used *tener* and *mollis* in a programmatic sense to define his genre. Propertius maybe later follows him on this path, and it is tempting to imagine that Virgil, in quoting the phrase, returned it to its literal context, that is, a description of beautiful scenery, well suiting the bucolic setting and atmosphere.

Moreover, the hypothesis that *mollis* and its lexical family were already part of Gallus' poetic vocabulary is reinforced by the presence, noteworthy in many respects, of the adverb *molliter* in *Ecl.* 10 (*o mihi tum quam molliter ossa quiescant / vestra meos olim si fistula dicat amores*, 33-4). It is a ἀπαξ in the entirety of Virgil's work, and this implies that it does not belong to the *usus scribendi* of the poet and may therefore descend from Gallus. The context in which *molliter* is used is particularly striking, since it is unusual in Virgil but common in elegy: Gallus' almost voluptuous yearning for his own death at the opening of his monologue. Moreover, in our evidence *molliter* appears here for the first time in a funerary context,²³ in a phrase that will become common later in burial language.²⁴ But it is the later usage in Ovidian elegy that is particularly interesting.

²² See, for example, Prop. 1.7.1-8 and 1.8.5-8 (this last passage has an almost certain Gallan source, as we will see *infra*). On the elegiac programmatic use of *mollis*, see Wyke 2007, 168-9; McKeown 1998, *ad Am.* 2.1.3-4; Fedeli 1980, *ad* 1.7.19.

²³ *TLL*, s. v., 1380, 83; Norden, *ad Aen.* 6.328. Of course, this can be a mere accident of survival, but at the present state of our knowledge of funerary inscriptions we have *Ecl.* 10.33 as the first occurrence of the term in this context.

²⁴ For its presence in inscriptions, see, for example, *CLE* 773, 1, 1192, 9.

There the phrase *molliter ossa cubent* is found three times,²⁵ with the implication that it may be the concluding hemistich of a Gallan pentameter,²⁶ adapted by Virgil to the bucolic hexameter as part of the poetic dialogue with his friend in the final eclogue. In this verse, Virgil's Gallus expresses a lugubriousness and almost pleasure at the thought of his end, which we recognize in the later elegists, and that may therefore have already been present in the *inventor* of this genre. It is possible that Virgil, with consummate skill, reproduced the characteristic *color* of Gallus' poetry.²⁷ If this is true, the use of the two terms *mollis* and *molliter*, standing out so conspicuously from the other eclogues, illuminate each other and assist in attributing to Gallus their singular connotations in this poem as compared to Virgil's use of *mollis* elsewhere in the eclogues.

Tener

As compared to *mollis*, the use of *tener* is more uniform in the *Bucolics*; it always has a physical sense, as an attribute of plants (*Ecl.* 7.6), fruits (*Ecl.* 2.51),²⁸ grass (*Ecl.* 8.15), and animals (*Ecl.* 1.8 and 21, 3.103). With the meaning "young, recent," it refers to the newly created world at *Ecl.* 6.34, to lambs recently born at *Ecl.* 1.8 and 21, and 3.103, while at *Ecl.* 7.12 it takes the sense of "flexible," applied to reeds. At least two of the three occurrences of *tener* in *Ecl.* 10 differ from this picture: the use at 7 (*dum tenera attendent simae virgulta*

²⁵ *Am.* 1.8.108; *Her.* 7.162; *Tr.* 3.3.76. Cf. also, before Ovid, *Tib.* 2.4.50: *placideque quiescas, / Terraque securae sit super ossa levis.*

²⁶ According to Barchiesi 1981, 162-3.

²⁷ The suspicion can be strengthened by the contorted *ordo verborum* of 33-4, unusual in the style of Virgil, but most likely peculiar to Gallus, according to the well known definition of Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.93: *durior Gallus*). On this point, see *infra* n. 35.

²⁸ An interesting element is the presence of *mollis* (50) and *tener* (51) in *Ecl.* 2.45-55, a piece noteworthy for its Alexandrian elegance, to which the two adjectives contribute to give a languid and soft tone. For the remarkable affinities between *Ecl.* 2 and Gallus, see Gagliardi 2011.

capellae), applied to shoots grazed by goats, accords with the use elsewhere in the eclogues; however, its function here may be to anticipate the character of the verses which follow and to evoke the atmosphere of elegy, even with the stylized and conventional image of goats grazing grass. Noteworthy is the *ordo verborum*, with the interlocking word order *tenera ... simae virgulta capellae*, a refinement which would surely have been well appreciated by an accomplished poet like Gallus. More significant, however, than this occurrence of *tener* are the other two, both in Gallus' monologue: the one at 53 (*certum est in silvis inter spelaea ferarum / malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores / arboribus*, 52-4) has a prevalent literary sense in a passage which is intensely poetical and presents difficulty in interpretation:²⁹ the line illustrates Gallus' just proclaimed decision to "rewrite" in bucolic manner the poems he had composed *Chalcidico versu* (50-1). The illustration which follows is the image of the tender bark of young trees on which the poet wants to carve his *amores* (or *Amores*?³⁰). The overall interpretation of the passage, a perennial *crux* of scholarship, is not easy, but the most plausible interpretation seems to involve an evocation of a necessary transition from actual, experienced pain (like the *sollicitus amor* of Gallus) to an externalized representation entrusted to poetry, and thus alienated from the anguished lover himself. This is the consolatory idea of poetry in which real sufferings are transformed into song and no longer inflict pain, a process which Gallus at-

²⁹ On these complex verses (50-4), see Gagliardi 2014 ad loc., 197-212.

³⁰ The hypothesis that this word can be an allusion to the title of Gallan elegiac production (see *Serv. Dan. ad 1: amorum suorum de Cytheride scripsit libros quattuor*) has been proposed by Skutsch (1901, 21-4), and generally accepted by scholars: see Jacoby 1905, 71-3; Conington 2007, ad 53, 123; Coleman ^s2001, ad 6, 266-7; Lipka 2001, 110; Cucchiarelli 2012, ad 6, 485; see contra Pohlenz 1965, 210 n. 2; on the debate *de re*, see Monteleone 1979, 48-9, with bibliography. The hypothesis is strengthened by all the occurrences of the plural *amores* in the eclogue. On the remarkable common features of these occurrences, see Gagliardi 2017.

tempts from the start of his monologue, in wanting to entrust to Arcadian singers the task of singing his *amores* (or perhaps even here *Amores*), but in which he fails. The attempt to break away from this pain (that is, from poetry like elegy, in which pain is subjectively represented and therefore not objectified) will fail even this time, and Gallus will have to admit, in the last words he utters (*omnia vincit Amor, et nos cedamus amori*, 69),³¹ the invincibility of *Amor*. In Virgil's process of "exploring" the boundaries not only of love elegy but also of bucolic poetry, which he vainly offers to Gallus as a remedy for his pains, a significant role is played by an allusion, right at 53-4, to Callimachus' Acontius and Cydippe episode.³² The *raison d'être* of this reference is not entirely clear: it may be a tribute to Gallus, who in turn possibly alluded to that episode,³³ or may have translated or imitated it,³⁴ or possibly, it is a direction to Gallus suggesting a more detached and objective way to write elegy. However, an allusion to Callimachus is unquestionably present, and *teneras*, attributed to the bark of trees, comes within this allusion, in a line constructed with a refined *ordo verbo-*

³¹ The verse may come from a Gallan pentameter. See Grondona 1977, 26-7 and Cairns 2006, 107-8.

³² The description of the lover alone in nature, who carves the bark of trees with the name of his beloved, obviously recalls Callim. *Aet.* fr. 73 Pf., and cf. Arist. *Ep.* 1.10. The hypothesis that Gallus could have inserted the Callimachean Acontius and Cydippe in his poetry has been discussed by Skutsch 1906, 164-5; Jacoby 1905, 58-60; Ross 1975, 71-3, 88 n. 2; Rosen and Farrell 1986, 243 n. 11, 254; Hollis 2007, 235.

³³ Ross (1975, 73, 89-91) hypothesizes that Gallus may have translated or reworked the Callimachean episode. See also Rosen and Farrell 1986, 241-54; Morgan 1995, 79ff.; Lipka 2001, 110-1.

³⁴ Some other passages in the eclogue seem to testify to the interest of Gallus in Callimachus and to his actual imitation of Callimachean passages. See, for example, the verses 52-61, and Rosen and Farrell 1986, *passim*. Lipka (2001, 110-1) thinks that Gallus may have introduced the story of Acontius in Latin poetry (although the episode is already referenced at Catull. 65).

rum using chiasmus and enjambment (*teneris meos amores ... / arboribus*): knowing the attention that Gallus himself paid to word order,³⁵ and given the likelihood that Gallus treated the Acontius and Cydippe episode, we might infer specific reference to Gallus in this passage. *Teneris* in particular is used with great finesse, because it assumes a double meaning, implying the concept of “softness” in a physical sense, referring to the barks of the trees still young, but also symbolically characterizing in a recognizable way the *Stimmung* of the poetry that Gallus aims to carve on the trees, his *Amores*. In this way, Virgil’s procedure in this passage can be seen to be analogous to the instance of *mollis* at 42. There, by reference to the Propertian allusion at 3.3.18, the use of *mollis* can likely be traced back to Gallus, possibly with corresponding literary connotations, but Virgil gives it a concrete sense, in all probability part of Virgil’s adaptation of this use to a bucolic setting. Similarly, here too, with Virgil’s *tener*, we can intuit a programmatic meaning, that is, a reference to love poetry. It is not possible to determine whether this originated in Gallus or Vergil. But if Vergil is, indeed, reworking a passage of Gallus’ poetry, he has taken care to present *tener* in a context which harmonizes with the bucolic setting in which he places the monologue.³⁶ The undertone of the adjective,

³⁵ His only known pentameter before the papyrus from Qaşr İbrîm (*uno tellures dividit amne duas*, fr. 1 Morel) showed *ad abundantiam* the care of Gallus for a refined word order. See Van Sickle 1976-1977, 327. Subsequently, the verses from Qaşr İbrîm confirmed this impression: think, for example, of 2-3 (*Fata mihi Caesar, tum erunt mea dulcia quom tu / maxima Romanae pars eris historiae*), with their changes between first and second person, or of the most debated 5 (*fixa legam spolieis devitiora tueis*), “contorted to the point of the obscurity” according to Nisbet 1979, 149, in confirmation of the judgement of Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.93. On the care of Gallus for the *ordo verborum*, see Somerville 2009, 106-13.

³⁶ The idea that Vergil “normalizes” the metapoetic references of Gallus chimes well with Henkel 2011 and 2014 in which he seeks to demonstrate a Vergilian strategy of rendering poetic statements of his predecessors in concrete terms, or to take the point to its obverse but natural corollary: even in his pure narra-

the concept of “poetic softness,” its use by the elegists, and its presence in an imitation of Callimachus promote the suspicion that *tener* was, indeed, a word originally present in Gallus (perhaps among other features of the verses in question). Such a suspicion receives not inconsiderable support from Propertius, who, in an analogous scene, depicting the lover alone with nature, uses the same word *tener* at 1.18.21 (*a quotiens teneras resonant mea verba sub umbras*), in a poem which also alludes to the Callimachus’ Acontius and Cydippe episode. As elsewhere, the correspondences between Virgil and Propertius are strong indications of common Gallan models, but here the conspicuous and singular use of *tener* gives rise to strong suspicions. It is by no means impossible that Callimachus used a similar epithet in the same context.³⁷ If so, both Gallus and then Propertius will have translated Callimachus, but, of course, Propertius will have taken account of Gallus’ treatment, perhaps citing it in turn or alluding to it. And perhaps Propertius’ *tener* is a specific actual instance of a reference to Gallus’ diction, given that the attribution of *tener* to *umbrae* is unusual: it seems possible that Propertius took this particular epithet from Gallus but applied it to a different word to make the quotation recognizable, while at the same time stressing his own originality with a remarkably unusual combination: this would be typical of the process of the “radicalization” of Gallus’ poetry which Propertius seems to adopt frequently.³⁸

tive, Vergil intends metapoetical statements. Also important is Vergil’s ability to adapt his models to his generic context: in the eclogues in particular, the presence of Theocritus does not preclude the idea that Vergil simultaneously incorporates reference to other (Latin) poetry.

³⁷ Acontius seems to have spoken to the trees as if they were alive in Callimachus, to judge from Aristaenetus *Ep.* 1.10.55ff.

³⁸ See, for example, 1.8.1-8 (which I will analyze infra), 2.1.1-2, 2.10, 2.13.11-4, 3.4. See Cairns 2006, 404-3.

Confirmation (obviously, not definitive) of my reconstruction of Virgil's procedure seems to be provided by the third, and perhaps most interesting, occurrence of *tener* in *Ecl.* 10. It appears in the so-called *propemptikòn Lycoridis* of 46-9 (*Tu procul a patria (nec sit mihi credere tantum) / Alpinas, a! dura nives et frigora Rheni / me sine sola vides. a, te ne frigora laedant! / a, tibi ne teneras glacies secet aspera plantas!*),³⁹ part of a group of verses which, according to *Serv. Dan. ad 46*, have been *translati* from Gallus' poetry. Leaving aside the difficulty of interpreting right what Servius here means,⁴⁰ the testimony is important in indicating that it is here, more than anywhere else in the eclogue, that one should expect Virgil to have faithfully conveyed aspects of the actual poetry of Gallus. Indeed, 46-9 are rather unusual in many respects. Conceptually they express a vision of love alien to that of Virgil, who elsewhere judges negatively an excessive submission to feelings, seeking a balance in the passions; the attitude shown in these verses is rather that of a devotion to the beloved so great as to "overcome infidelity:"⁴¹ so the lover, although betrayed and abandoned by the woman who has fled with another, still worries for her and the risks she will run in the Alpine snows. This is an extreme manifestation of the elegiac *servitium amoris*, the complete submission of the lover to the will of his woman and his willingness to accept any treatment from her.⁴² Even from a stylistic point of view, 46-9 appear different

³⁹ The expression *propemptikòn Lycoridis* can denote both these four verses in *Ecl.* 10 and the Gallan poem which Virgil echoes.

⁴⁰ The most important questions are the exact meaning of *translati* and the number of lines to which Servius refers. Among the studies on this point, see Bardon 1949, 223ff.; Luiselli 1967, 80ff.; Ross 1975, 88-9, 100; Kelly 1977, 17-20; Yardley 1980, 48-51; Cupaiuolo 1981, 55 n. 22; D'Anna 1989, 60ff. In any event, 46-9, which we are examining, must have been included.

⁴¹ According to the definition of Nicastrì 1984, 26.

⁴² The suspicion that *servitium amoris* was already a feature of Gallan elegy, proposed by Stroth (1971, 117ff., 204-6, 219, 228-30) on the basis of these verses (see contra Lyne 1979, 121ff., who assigned this innovation to Propertius), has

from Virgil's *usus scribendi*: in his poetry are unusual the high pathos, mainly created by the close repetition of the particle *a* (which is usually used sparingly by Virgil), and the inverted *ordo verborum* (*me sine; te ne; tibi ne*) which is at the same time embellished by refined constructions such as the elaborate chiasmus at 49,⁴³ with *tener* opposing to *aspera* in a significant contrast between the hardness of ice and tender feet of Lycoris. The desperate and passionate tone of Latin erotic elegy is felt strongly in this short passage, where the detail of the tender feet cut by ice, representing the hardships of the *puella*, adds a touch of Alexandrian elegance.⁴⁴ Also significant is the reaction of the elegiac lover: he imagines his absent *puella* (a detail emphasized by *me sine sola*); he knows that she is with the rival, but he describes her as alone, because, in the elegiac vision, the pair of lovers embodies an indissoluble unity (which Lycoris has broken). Another interesting element is the evocation of the *propemptikòn*, a genre known to have been treated by Latin poets right at this time, under the influence of Parthenius of Nicaea,⁴⁵ whose relationship with Gallus is attested to by the dedication to the ἐρωτικά παθήματα. Gallus' interest in this genre is demonstrated by verses 2-5 of the Qaşr İbrîm papyrus, which can

been confirmed by the verses from Qaşr İbrîm, in which Lycoris' *nequitia* and the epithet *domina* are mentioned. See Barchiesi 1981, 165-6; Nicastrì 1984, 25-6; Conte ²1984, 37-8; Magrini 1981, 1-14; Évrard 1984, 35; Morelli 1985, 176-7. Only Pinotti (2002, 64) does not agree with this opinion. For a general analysis of the *servitium amoris*, see McCarthy 1998.

⁴³ Here the chiasmic order of *teneras plantas* and *glacies aspera* is intersected with the parallelism of adjective/noun, adjective/noun, producing a refined arrangement *aBbA*, that could belong to the taste of Gallus for the word order.

⁴⁴ On the Alexandrian procedure of describing something from the details to the whole, see Nicastrì 1984, 130.

⁴⁵ According to Cairns (2006, 413), Parthenius brought to Rome the genre of the *propemptikòn*: the evidence is that Parthenius wrote a poem entitled προπεμτικόν (fr. 26 Lightfoot) and Cinna wrote a *Propemptikon Pollionis* (fr. 2-6 Hollis). So from these sources Gallus could adapt this genre to love elegy.

be categorized as a particular kind of *propemptikòn*. So it seems likely that he introduced this genre to Latin erotic elegy.⁴⁶ Moreover, the so-called *propemptikòn Lycoridis* of *Ecl.* 10 shows some significant differences compared to the usual treatment of the *topos* in Hellenistic poetry imitated by Roman poets. In *Ecl.* 10, Lycoris parts to a cold destination on land, which differs from Hellenistic *propemptikà*, in that they usually depict sea voyages in warm climates and seasons.⁴⁷ Thus, it is plausible to assign such an innovation to Gallus, who appears to have been an original and pioneering poet so far as our scarce information permits us to tell.

There is an accumulation, therefore, of many striking elements which suggest that the style of these verses may originate in Gallus' poetry and that they have been reworked by Virgil, probably in order to adapt elegiac couplets to the hexametric rhythm of bucolic verse. The adjective *tener* particularly stands out in this context, suggesting the specific influence of Gallus' own poetry. It brings a strong elegiac flavour, being affectionately applied to the delicate feet of the *puella*, wounded by Alpine ices.⁴⁸ Its presence is made more significant by its opposition to a term that indicates hardness, *aspera*, and by the singular occurrence of *durus* two lines earlier, at 47. There are in fact many elements that should suggest with some confidence that there is a Gallan source for this occurrence of the adjective. Here, just as for *mollis*, and *tener* at 53, this hypothesis is strengthened by reference to Propertius: in this case, to a strikingly close correspondence to the text of *Ecl.* 10.46-9. At

⁴⁶ The affinity for geographical epithets (*Alpinas, Rheni*) may come from the teaching of Parthenius, whose inclination to learned geography is well known. See *supra* n. 5.

⁴⁷ See Nicastrì 1984, 160-2; Fedeli 1980, 203-7.

⁴⁸ The motif of the tender feet wounded by asperities reappears in later elegists. See Prop. 1.8.7; *Corp. Tib.* 3.9.10; *Ov. Met.* 1.508-9.

1.8.1-8,⁴⁹ Propertius describes an exactly analogous scene (the departure of the beloved to cold places with a rival),⁵⁰ and employs the same image of Cynthia's tender feet on ice, also in an unusual style, showing the same anguished questions, the verbatim repetition of *sine me* and the identical use of *dura* in opposition to *tener* in relation to the *puella*.⁵¹ The striking similarity of this Propertian passage with *Ecl.* 10.46-9 makes this one of the texts in which we can recognize the two poets' imitation of Gallus with most confidence.⁵² Particularly the presence of *tener* and its antonym *durus* stands out here. These two instances increasingly suggest the likely use of the two adjectives in Gallus in an erotic context.

Moreover, the analysis of these two passages seems to confirm the "normalizing" trend in Virgil, compared to the bolder usage of Gallus (and of Propertius in his wake). We have seen that with *mollia prata* Virgil prefers to apply the phrase to the description of actual scenery, while Propertius uses the epithet in a daringly metaphorical sense (a Gallan imitation?); for *tener* at 53, Virgil employs

⁴⁹ *Tune igitur demens, nec te mea cura moratur? / an tibi sum gelida vilior Illyria? / et tibi iam tanti, quicumque est, iste videtur / ut sine me vento quolibet ire velis? / tune audire potes vesani murmura ponti / fortis, et in dura nave iacere potes? / tu pedibus teneris positas fulcire pruinas, / tu potes insolitas, Cynthia, ferre nives?*

⁵⁰ In the Propertian poem, however, Cynthia has not departed yet, and the text is Propertius' attempt to dissuade her, an attempt destined for success in the final part of 1.8 or, for those who read in the text two different elegies, in 1.8b (on this debate, see Fedeli 1980, 202-8; Nicastrì 1984, 156-7 n. 6). On the reasons for this difference of Propertius by Gallus, see Gagliardi 2012.

⁵¹ *Tener* contributes to conspicuous word patterning (polyptoton of *tu* together with repetition of *tene*) in both *Ecl.* 10.48-9 and Prop. 1.8.1-8, reinforcing the suspicion that *tener* was a word used by Gallus in this context (together with the *tu* word-patterning; note that the exact sequence *tu... te... tibi* appears both at *Ecl.* 10.46-9 and Prop. 1.8.1-2).

⁵² See, for example, the studies of Pasoli 1976, 587-91; 1977, 106 (but also Pohlenz 1965, 110); see also Monteleone 1979, 46-8 and n. 54; Fedeli 1980, 204-5; Nicastrì 1984, 175-6; D'Anna 1989, 58-9; Fabre-Serris 2008, 48-84, especially 62-9; Gagliardi 2012.

the same procedure: he assigns the epithet to the bark of trees, although here he also keeps a literary connotation which perhaps originated in Gallus. Propertius, on the other hand, in repeating the adjective, enhances its conspicuousness by applying it unusually to *umbrae*. In the present instance too, Virgil seems to “normalize” the verb, preferring the more straightforward (though hard) *secet* to the unusual *fulcire* of Propertius (the latter perhaps reflecting more exactly the Gallan original, given its eccentricity).⁵³

Durus

The strong impression that *mollis* and *tener* belong to Gallus’ elegiac vocabulary is further enhanced by an analysis of the opposite *durus*, which often appears in contrast in the later elegists. *Durus* is a word which is not congenial to the delicate tone of Virgil’s *Bucolics*. In fact, there are only 5 occurrences in the eclogues, of which 2 are in *Ecl.* 10:⁵⁴ it too always has, in the other eclogues, a physical denotation, describing the hardness of rocks (*Ecl.* 8.43) or oaks (*Ecl.* 4.30, 8.52-3).⁵⁵ On the other hand, there are two conspicuous occurrences in *Ecl.* 10, in close proximity to each other, within the complex passage at 42-9, in which the stylistic and conceptual influence of Gallan elegy seems strongest. The first point of difference from the other uses in the *Eclogues* is the application of *durus* to a deity in the psychological sense of “strong, robust” at 44,⁵⁶ or, in 47, to a person in the sense of “ruthless, cruel.” This reflects a frequent usage in Latin love elegy, where *durus* is commonly attributed to the

⁵³ According to the judgement of Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.93), confirmed by the verses from Qaṣr Ibrîm, Gallus’ style indulged in boldness unusual in Virgil’s language. See Gagliardi 2014 ad loc., 195.

⁵⁴ The adjective is, of course, used much more frequently in the *Aeneid* (about 60 occurrences), but not in an erotic context, unlike *Ecl.* 10.

⁵⁵ More particular seems *durescere* at *Ecl.* 8.80. Here, in addition to the physical sense (the verb refers to mud), a sexual meaning has been suggested by Katz and Volk 2006.

⁵⁶ Of course, *Martis* can be a metonymy for “war.”

puella who is insensitive to the prayers and sufferings of the poet in love.⁵⁷ Further, both occurrences of *durus* in *Ecl.* 10 appear more or less directly in contrast with a term for softness, namely *mollis* at 42 with *durus* at 44, and *tener* at 49 with *durus* at 47 and *asper* at 49.⁵⁸ This is a common elegiac opposition, as we have seen,⁵⁹ and therefore Virgil's treatment may well reflect a model in Gallus, to make his tribute to the dedicatee of the poem recognizable.

The first occurrence of *durus* in *Ecl.* 10.44 refers to war, personified as Mars: *nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis / tela inter media et adversos detinet hostis* (44-5). This is one of the most difficult passages of the poem on a textual and conceptual level. Its oddity comes not only from its abrupt juxtaposition with the idyllic scene described by Gallus to Lycoris when inviting her to join him in a bucolic setting, but also from the contradiction that Gallus has previously been described as alone in *Arcadia sola sub rupe* (14) but now is incongruously presented as being in a military camp in the midst of enemies. The text, as it reads, raises the question whether *duri Martis* depends on *insanus amor* or by *in armis*,⁶⁰ and the correct interpretation of the overall sense of 44-5 is problematic.⁶¹ To overcome some of these difficulties some scholars have suggested correcting *me* to *te*, to refer the lines to Lycoris, who will be represented soon after as present in a military camp (46-9),⁶² but even this

⁵⁷ See Prop. 1.1.10, 1.7.6, 1.17.16, 2.1.78, 2.22.11 and 43, 2.24.47, 4.2.23; Tib. 1.8.50, 2.6.28; Ov. *Am.* 1.9.19, 2.4.23.

⁵⁸ *Asper* can be considered as a synonym of *durus*, since this is the word chosen to contrast with Lycoris' soft feet.

⁵⁹ See *supra* n. 16.

⁶⁰ The prevailing opinion of scholars is that *duri Martis* depends upon *insanus amor*. See Conington 2007; Forbiger; Leo, 17; Büchner, 297; Stégen, 122-3; Conte 1984, 24 n. 19; Cucchiarelli 2012 ad loc., 501.

⁶¹ See Gagliardi 2014, ad 44-5, 175-80.

⁶² This is a proposal of Heumann, accepted by Heyne 1830 ad loc., 244; Cartault 1897, 399; D'Anna 1989, 40-6; Hollis 2007, 221-2, 237.

solution raises many doubts.⁶³ The discussion which arises from this complex passage may be endless (the difficulties of interpretation are, in my opinion, in large part attributable to our ignorance of a specific Gallan text that is quoted or alluded to here). Nevertheless, the lines give an instance of the attribution of *durus* to a person, which is important for the present investigation since it is absent from the other eclogues. The context is the sphere of war: the later elegists found particularly attractive this opposition between the weapons of Mars and those of Amor.⁶⁴ It is perhaps no coincidence that here *durus Mars* is juxtaposed with *insanus amor*, although the relationship between the two phrases is not clear, and it is unclear to what *amor* should be attributed (is it the passion for war or passion for Lycoris?). Similarly, the conjunction with *mollia*, which just before, at 42, characterizes the *locus amoenus* of the bucolic landscape, is frequent in the successors of Gallus. This juxtaposition can, therefore, be reasonably ascribed to Gallus. Furthermore, if Gallus too used *mollis* to define elegy, as does Propertius (3.3.18) with the same *mollia prata, duri Martis* might in some respect be connected with epic poetry, just like the Propertian *carminis heroi... opus* (3.3.16). If so, again Virgil will have brought the adjective back to a more concrete sphere, just as he had with *mollia prata*. But this is highly speculative and the only evidence is Prop. 3.3.18.

However, the assumption that adjectives for “hard” and “soft” were important aspects of Gallus’ poetic diction appears to be confirmed by the last and most significant occurrence of *durus*, applied to Lycoris at 47.⁶⁵ The epithet is in the *propemptikòn Lycoridis* and is

⁶³ See Gagliardi 2014, *ad* 44-5, 177-8.

⁶⁴ Tib. 1.10, 2.1.81-2, 2.5.105-12, 2.6.15-8; Prop. 2.12, 3.5; Ov. *Am.* 1.9.

⁶⁵ The attribution of *dura* to *frigora*, as proposed by Cucchiarelli 2012, *ad* 47, 502, is not impossible (but is certainly less attractive); but the lack of any conjunction between *Alpinas* (sc. *nives*) and *dura* (sc. *frigora*) makes the proposal implausible.

used to characterize the purpose, but also the boldness of the woman, who is not afraid to face the hardships of military life, and especially the Alpine cold in order to follow her new lover.⁶⁶ The choice of the word is particularly effective in relation to the cold and frozen scenery, and the daring of Lycoris seems to reflect the harshness of the winter frost.⁶⁷ In this sense, *durus* is otherwise completely absent from Virgil's poetic vocabulary, but it reflects a distinctive and widespread use in the Latin elegists, who often so define an insensitive or hard person,⁶⁸ and especially the *puella*.⁶⁹ Again here, *durus* appears in close proximity with a term of sweetness, *teneras* at 49, emphasizing again the relationship between the two spheres, which in the context gives an unmistakably elegiac *color* to the whole passage. The likelihood that these verses closely reflect the actual diction of Gallus makes them invaluable in ascribing to Gallus the τόπος of hard and soft; here too, further confirmation comes from Propertius. Closely imitating this passage in 1.8.1-8, Propertius employs also *durus*, reinforced by *fortis*, in opposition to Cynthia's *teneris pedibus*, as in the eclogue. Interesting, however, is the shift made by Propertius in attributing *dura* to the ship on which the woman dares to embark, while for her boldness he uses *fortis*. The unusual combination of *dura* with *navis*, rather than with Cynthia, is reminiscent of *tenerae umbrae* at Prop. 1.18.21, where likewise the adjective would have made more sense related to *verba*. This perhaps sheds light on Propertius' strategy when

⁶⁶ According to Fabre-Serris (2013, 220), this is "le seul exemple que nous ayons où *dura* qualifie une *puella* dans un contexte de souffrances endurées aux côtés d'un amant et/ou pour le séduire."

⁶⁷ For a similar relationship between human beings and landscape, see Hor. *Carm.* 1.3.9ff., and especially the frozen landscape in which Orpheus vainly sings at Verg. *G.* 4.508-9 and 517-9, a text, as is well known, linked in many ways to the figure and perhaps to the poetry of Gallus.

⁶⁸ See Prop. 1.3.14, 1.14.18, 2.25.11, 3.15.29, 3.20.3; *Corp. Tib.* 3.2.3, 3.4.92; *Ov. Am.* 1.6.62, 1.15.17, 3.4.1, 3.8.31.

⁶⁹ See supra n. 57.

referring to Gallus: he reworks and makes recognizable the model but, at the same time, is astute to stamp his originality on it, by highlighting particular words used by Gallus but associating them in striking new collocations. The frequency of *dura* to describe the insensitivity or the ruthlessness of the *puella* in all the elegies, including Propertius himself, suggests in fact that this reflects Gallus' own diction, inherited by his successors.

Other clues, related not only to *Ecl.* 10, feed the suspicion that *durus* was a key term in the Gallus' poetic lexicon. Apart from the well-known judgment of Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.1.93), who, maybe not by chance, defines Gallus' elegy with exactly this epithet,⁷⁰ Ovid (*Rem. am.* 765) makes an interesting combination when he uses *durus* of the reader who is not moved to read of Gallus' verses. But above all it is again Propertius, in connection with *Ecl.* 10, which supports our reconstruction, since he defines Atalanta as *dura* (whom he identifies by *Iasidos*)⁷¹ at 1.1.10, in a description of Milanion's *servitium amoris* to win her love.⁷² There are many similarities between this *exemplum* of Prop. 1.1.9-16 and *Ecl.* 10.52-60: Milanion and Gallus very much resemble each other in their attitudes and in the activities they perform (the *obsequium* to the beloved, the hunt⁷³), while there is a remarkable coincidence in vocabulary with the presence in both texts of the only two occurrences of the adjective *Parthenius* throughout the pre-Augustan and Augustan poetry, an element which, given the known relationship of Gallus with the

⁷⁰ Fabre-Serris (2013, 210-1) thinks that the choice of *durus* in Quintilian could be explained just with the importance of this word in Gallan vocabulary.

⁷¹ *Milanion nullos fugiendo, Tulle, labores / saevitiam durae contudit Iasidos* (9-10).

⁷² Here we can be especially confident that *dura* was Gallus' epithet, since it etymologizes Atalanta (α-ταλαντα). See Ross 1975, 62.

⁷³ Actually, the hunt has a double implication in Latin elegy, because sometimes it connotes conquering the restive *puella*, but other times it connotes a remedy for an unhappy love. See Conte ²1984, 31-4; Gagliardi 2014, *ad* 52-3, 208; *ad* 55-60, 213-27.

Greek scholar, may suggest a Gallan origin of the adjective, perhaps used to pay homage to the poet of Nicaea. Scholars have thoroughly analyzed the relationship between these two passages and have recognized in the similarities between them the near certain presence of a Gallan source,⁷⁴ noting also the differing style of these verses compared to the rest of the poem, characterized by an archaizing and artificial tone and by the frequent use of lexical, syntactic, and stylistic Grecisms, perhaps reflecting Gallus' style.⁷⁵ So, in this exact instance, the adjective *dura* appears in Propertius, with its typical elegiac connotations, applied to a ruthless girl whom the lover tries to conquer with his efforts and daring. Once again, therefore, the comparison between Propertius and *Ecl.* 10 allows us to reconstruct an aspect of Gallus' elegy, and maybe even thereby allows us to glimpse the relationship between the two poets: Virgil adapts the Gallan original to his bucolic context while paying attention to the distinctive features of love poetry, which are conspicuous in this eclogue. Propertius too, when he imitates Gallus in the same literary genre, aims to affirm his own originality, especially with the transpositions of epithets and perhaps their meanings. In this way he draws attention to his use of Gallan diction, intended to be recognized as such by his audience, and showcases his own skill in giving it new and unusual meanings.

To conclude, we can summarize the results of our investigation. We can never be definitive, due to the unfortunate loss of Gallus' poetry, which makes any reconstruction circumstantial only. However, the analysis of the adjectives for "hard" and "soft" in *Ecl.* 10 reveals a usage very different from the rest of the eclogues and a

⁷⁴ See Ross 1975, 60-70; Nicastrì 1984, 19; Cairns 1986, 29-38; 1987, 377-84.

⁷⁵ Ross 1975, 61; Fedeli (1980, 61), however, attributes the elevated tone to the mythological theme of the section; the unusual style of these verses has been investigated several times by Cairns (1974, 94-8; 1986, 29-38; 1987, 377-84), who highlights the exquisitely Greek features of syntax and vocabulary.

usage which is characteristically elegiac, as demonstrated by its successful employ in the later amatory elegists. It is not difficult to find the reason for this difference in the imitation of Gallan poems by Virgil and in his desire to evoke the ambience of Gallus' poetry when he makes Gallus a character in his eclogue. To the extent that *Ecl.* 10 aims to compare bucolic and elegiac poetry, Virgil does not restrict himself only to reproducing the style and *color* of Gallan poetry, but he succeeds in adapting these features to the context and the characteristics of his own genre, perhaps softening the daring use of language which seems to characterize Gallus' style, as revealed by the couplets of the Qaṣr Ibrîm papyrus. Virgil often plays on the ambiguity and multiple meanings of *mollis*, *tener*, and *durus*, sometimes reproducing the languid tone of erotic elegy (in the case of *teneras* at 7), and in other cases to contribute to the dreamy atmosphere of the poem and to bring out certain specifically elegiac motifs (such as Gallus' pleasure in imagining his own death, with the unique *molliter*). Sometimes, where Gallus seems to have used an adjective in a metaphorical sense (if we can trust Prop. 3.3.18), Virgil brings it back to a concrete meaning and adapts it to the idealized landscape of the bucolic world (this is the case with *mollia prata* at 42, and perhaps with *tener* at 53); *dura* maintains, on the other hand, its original ambiguity between "strong, able to endure" and "cruel, merciless." Virgil even seems to preserve another feature which was present in Gallus (and became characteristic in the later Latin elegists), namely, the combination of contrasting terms of softness and hardness. Unfortunately, we are unable to establish whether Gallus employed these terms, with metapoetical connotations, as Propertius and Ovid often do. Nor is Virgil of any help in this regard, because, as we have seen, he prefers to give these adjectives a concrete meaning. Only occasionally (at 53) does Virgil give them a literary connotation, perhaps imitating Gallus. At 44-5, however, the combination of *insanus amor* and *duri Martis* seems to mirror the predilection of the

following elegists for the contrast between weapons of war and weapons of love, or between military life and lover's life.⁷⁶

The analysis of the three adjectives and their combinations in *Ecl.* 10 seems to establish their Gallan origin with a degree of certainty, and further confirmation comes from comparison with Propertius, Gallus' most immediate follower, as shown by his frequent references to the verses from Qaşr Ibrîm.⁷⁷ For more than a century, the consonance between *Ecl.* 10 and Propertian elegies has been seen to be a way of developing an idea of Gallus' poetry.⁷⁸ Here too, in the investigation of adjectives for "hard" and "soft," the same method proves to be useful: almost all (or at least the most important) occurrences of *mollis*, *tener*, and *durus* in *Ecl.* 10 are in fact unexpectedly and accurately reflected in key Propertian texts. We find the Gallan usage reflected in the *exemplum* of Milanion at 1.1.9-16, used programmatically to begin Propertius' elegiac work, following, but also moving beyond, Gallus; the opening words of Prop. 1.8, where the striking similarity with the *propemptikôn Lycoridis* of *Ecl.* 10.46-9 should leave no doubt about its Gallan origin; 1.18, remarkable not only for its unusual setting in nature, but also because it evokes (perhaps also imitating Gallus) a refined Callimachean model; 3.3, with its programmatic *recusatio* that is at the same time the affirmation of the peculiar elegiac sensibility. All these passages, influenced by Gallus, share with *Ecl.* 10, dedicated to him, occurrences of the adjectives we have studied: this is a strong indicator, I think, not only of their Gallan origin, but also of the importance that these epithets had in his poetry, perhaps even in a literary and metaphorical sense. Their reception by his

⁷⁶ The most obvious example is Ov. *Am.* 1.9.

⁷⁷ "It is constantly becoming clearer that of the three (sc. elegists), Propertius was the one most powerfully influenced by Gallus." See Cairns 1984, 221.

⁷⁸ It is a line of investigation started by the studies of Skutsch (1901; 1906) and followed by many scholars: among the most important ones, Tränkle 1960, Ross 1975, and Cairns 2006.

successors then reveals the impression that the work of Gallus left on the genre which he “invented.” And Virgil, with the attention that he devotes to this new language in his last eclogue, shows his understanding and considerable esteem for the novelty of Gallan love elegy; for us, this is proof of the invaluable importance that this eclogue, dedicated to a friend and a poet, may have for those who try to know something of Gallus’ poetry.

University of Basilicata, Italy

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Robert D., Peter J. Parsons, and Robin G. M. Nisbet. 1979. “Elegiacs by Gallus from Qaṣr Ibrîm.” *JRS* 69: 125-55.

Barchiesi, Alessandro. 1981. “Notizie sul nuovo Gallo.” *AeR* 26: 153-66.

Bardon, Henri. 1949. “Les élégies de Cornélius Gallus.” *Latomus* 8: 217-28.

Cairns, Francis. 1974. “Some Observations on Propertius 1.1.” *CQ* 24: 94-8.

——— 1984. “The Etymology of *Militia* in Roman Elegy.” *Estudios Clásicos* 26.2: 211-22.

——— 1986. “The Milanion / *Atalantae exemplum* in Prop. 1, 1: *videre feras* (12) and Greek Models.” In *Hommages à Jozef Veramans*, ed. Freddy Decreus and Carl Deroux, 29-38. Brussels: Collection Latomus.

——— 1987. “AP 9, 588 (Alcaeus of Messene) and *nam modo* in Prop. 1, 1, 11.” In *Filologia e forme letterarie: studi offerti a F. Della Corte*, 377-84. Urbino: QuattroVenti.

——— 2006. *Sextus Propertius. The Augustan Elegist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cartault, Augustin. 1897. *Étude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile*. Paris: Armand Colin et Cie Éditeurs.

Clausen, Wendell V., ed. 1994. *Virgil. Eclogues*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Coleman, Robert, ed. 2001. *Virgil. Eclogues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conington, John, and Henry Nettleship. 2007. *The Works of Vergil, with a commentary*, vol. I, *Eclogues*, fifth edition revised by F. Haverfield, with a new general introduction by Philip Hardie and an introduction to the *Eclogues* by B. W. Breed. Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press.

Conte, Gian Biagio. 1984. *Virgilio. Il genere e i suoi confini*. Milano: Garzanti Libri.

Courtney, Edward, ed. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cucchiarelli, Andrea, ed. 2012. *Publio Virgilio Marone. Le Bucoliche*. Roma: Carocci.

Cupaiuolo, Fabio. 1981. "La decima ecloga di Virgilio, un problema sempre aperto." *Cultura e scuola* 20: 50-9.

Cusset, Christophe, and Benjamin Acosta-Hughes, eds. 2012. *Euphoriôn. Œuvre poétique et autres fragments*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres Collection.

D'Anna, Giovanni. 1989. *Virgilio. Saggi critici*. Roma: Lucarini.

Évrard, Étienne. 1984. "Aux origines de l'élegie romaine. Quelques distiques de Gallus récemment découverts." *ÉtCl* 52: 25-35.

Fabre-Serris, Jacqueline. 2008. *Rome, l'Arcadie et la mer des Argonautes: Essai sur la naissance d'une mythologie des origines en Occident*. Ville-neuve d'Ascq: Presses Universitaires du Septentrion.

— 2013. "Genre et Gender: usage e enjeux de l'emploi de *durus* chez les élégiaques." *EuGeStA* 3: 209-39.

Fedeli, Paolo, ed. 1980. *Sesto Propertio. Il primo libro delle elegie*. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki.

Gagliardi, Paola. 2011. "L'Ecl. 2 di Virgilio tra Teocrito e Gallo." *Latomus* 70: 676-96.

— 2012. "Virgilio, Properzio e il *propemptikòn Lycoridis*. Virg. *Ecl.* 10, 46-49 e Prop. 1, 8." *RÉL* 90: 147-63.

— 2014. *Commento alla decima ecloga di Virgilio*. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms.

— 2017. "Sollicitos Galli dicamus amores: amor e amores nell' *Ecl.* 10 di Virgilio." *Pallas* 103: 313-25.

Grondona, Marco. 1977. "Gli epigrammi di Tibullo e il congedo delle elegie (su Properzio e Virgilio)." *Latomus* 36: 3-29.

Henkel, John. 2011. "Nighttime Labor: A Metapoetic Vignette Alluding to Aratus at *Georgics* 1.291-296." *HSCP* 106: 179-98.

— 2014. "Vergil Talks Technique: Metapoetic Arboriculture in *Georgics* 2." *Vergilius* 60: 33-66.

Heyne, Christian G., and Georg Wagner P. E, eds. 1830. *P. Virgilii Maronis opera in tironum gratia perpetua annotatione illustrata a Chr. Gottl. Heyne, editio quarta: curavit Ge. Phil. Eberard Wagner*. Vol. I: *Bucolica et Georgica*. Leipzig-London: Verlag Hahn / Black, Young & Young.

Hollis, Adrian S., ed. 2007. *Fragments of Roman Poetry, c. 60 BC – AD 20*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Jacoby, Felix. 1905. "Zur Entstehung der römischer Elegie." *RhM* 60: 38-105.

Katz, Joshua T., and Katharina Volk. 2006. "Erotic Hardening and Softening in Vergil's Eighth *Eclogue*." *CQ* 56: 169-74.

Kelly, Stephen T. 1977. "The Gallus Quotation in Virgil's Tenth *Eclogue*." *Vergilius* 23: 17-20.

Lipka, Michael. 2001. *Language in Vergil's Eclogues*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Luiselli, Bruno. 1967. *Studi sulla poesia bucolica*. Cagliari: Fossataro.

- Lyne, Oliver A. M. 1979. "Servitium amoris." CQ 29: 117-30.
- Magrini, Paola. 1981. "Cornelio Gallo tra neòteroi ed elegiaci." *Anazetesis* 4-5: 1-14.
- McCarthy, Kathleen. 1998. "Servitium amoris: amor servitii." In *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*, ed. Sandra R. Joshel and Sheila Murnaghan, 174-92. London: Routledge.
- McKeown, James C. 1998. *Ovid. Amores. A Commentary on Book Two*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
- Monteleone, Ciro. 1979. "Cornelio Gallo tra Ila e le Driadi (Virgilio, Properzio e una controversia letteraria)." *Latomus* 38: 28-53.
- Morelli, Alfredo M. 1985. "Rassegna sul nuovo Gallo." In *Disiecti membra poetae. Studi di poesia latina in frammenti*, ed. Vincenzo Tandoi. Vol. II: 140-83. Foggia: Atlantica.
- Morgan, Llewelyn. 1995. "Underhands Tactics: Milanion, Acontius and Gallus P. Qaşr Ibrîm." *Latomus* 54: 79-85.
- Nicastri, Luciano. 1984. *Cornelio Gallo e l'elegia ellenistico-romana. Studio de nuovi frammenti*. Napoli: M. D'Auria.
- Norden, Eduard. 1976. *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch VI*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Pasoli, Elio. 1977a. "Gli Amores di Cornelio Gallo nell'ecloga X di Virgilio e nell'elegia 1, 8 di Properzio: riconsiderazione del problema." *RCCM* 19: 587-91 (= *Miscellanea di studi in onore di M. Barchiesi*, 2).
- 1977b. "Poesia d'amore e *metapoesia*: aspetti della modernità di Properzio." In *Atti del Colloquium Propertianum*, 101-21. Assisi: Accademia Propertiana del Subasio.
- Pichon, René. 1966. *Index verborum amatoriorum*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Pinotti, Paola. 2002. *L'elegia latina. Storia di una forma poetica*. Roma: Carocci.

Pohlenz, Max. 1930. "Das Schlussgedicht der *Bucolica*." In *Studi Virgiliani*, 205-25. Mantova.

Rosen, Ralph M., and Joseph Farrell. 1986. "Acontius, Milanion and Gallus: Vergil, *Ecl.* 10, 52-61." *TAPA* 116: 241-54.

Ross, David O. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Scarcia, Riccardo. 1987. "Partenio di Nicea." In *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, III: 987-8. Roma: Istituto dell' Enciclopedia Italiana.

Selden, Daniel L. 2007. "Ceveat lector: Catullus and the Rhetoric of Performance." In *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Catullus*, ed. Julia Haig Gaisser, 490-539. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Somerville, Ted. 2009. "The Literary Merits of the New Gallus." *CP* 104: 106-13.

Skutsch, Franz. 1901. *Aus Vergils Frühzeit*. Leipzig: Teubner.

— 1906. *Gallus und Vergil*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Stroh, Wilfried. 1971. *Die römische Liebeselegie als werbende Dichtung*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.

Tränkle, Hermann. 1960. *Die Sprachkunst des Properz und die Tradition der lateinischen Dichtersprache*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Van Sickle, John. 1976-1977. "Et Gallus Cantavit: A Review Article." *CJ* 72: 327-33.

Watson, Lindsay. 1982. "Cinna and Euphorion." *StIt* 54: 93-110.

Weber, Clifford. 2016. "Propertius as Cantor Euphorionis in 2.1.12." *CP* 111: 177-84.

Wyke, Maria. 2007. *The Roman Mistress: Ancient and Modern Representations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yardley, John C. 1980. "Gallus in *Eclogue* 10: Quotation or Adaptation?" *Vergilius* 26: 48-51.