Title
Quoium Pecus: Representations of Italian Identity in Vergil's Eclogues and Georgics

Author
Moch, Kevin Edholm

Publication Date
2019

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

Quoium Pecus: Representations of Italian Identity in Vergil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics*

By

Kevin E Moch

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Classics

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Ellen Oliensis, Chair
Professor Kathleen McCarthy
Professor Dylan Sailor

Fall 2019

Quoium Pecus: Representations of Italian Identity in Vergil's Eclogues *and* Georgics

Abstract

Quoium Pecus: Representations of Italian Identity in Vergil's Eclogues *and* Georgics

by

Kevin E Moch

Doctor of Philosophy in Classics

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Ellen Oliensis, Chair

While Vergil is often treated as the quintessential Roman poet, it is frequently overlooked that he originated from the province of Cisalpine Gaul in what is now northern Italy, a region granted Roman citizenship and incorporated into Italy in the 40s BCE, well into the poet's adulthood. This dissertation project illuminates the ways in which a local, specifically non-Roman Italian identity informs the works of the poet Vergil in the first century BCE. Building on recent archaeological and cultural historical work on Roman Italy, the project brings a more Italocentric approach to Vergil's poetry by shifting the point of entry from one privileging Roman and Augustan considerations to one emphasizing regional identity and experience. This perspectival shift opens a space to explore the changes and tensions in local identities in this period—to track ever more closely how these identities were diminished, fortified, or otherwise impacted by Roman encroachment and Roman ideas of a unified Italy. Beginning from Vergil's references to Mantua and Cicero's discussion of the "two fatherlands" (*duae patriae*) of Roman municipal citizens, in the introductory chapter I situate the study amid the ongoing acculturation of Roman Italy in the first century BCE; I then propose that modern psychological and sociological theories of acculturation can be beneficial in understanding the negotiation of local, Roman, and panethnic Italian identities that is a central concern of Vergil's corpus. In the second chapter, through a close study of Vergil's use of linguistic indexicals signifying inclusion or exclusion in relation to various ethnic or civic communities, I show that there exists an ideological gap between the municipal Italian and Roman civic perspectives in Vergil's *Eclogues*; the creation of this gap between identities allows the poet to illustrate vividly the creation and breaking up of cultural communities in the wake of Roman encroachment. In the third chapter, I argue that the constant interplay between nature and culture in the *Georgics* deliberately reflects the tension between local origin and acquired Roman civic identity, the integration of which the poem repeatedly attempts to imagine through its exploration of grafting and transplantation as potential metaphors for social acculturation, culminating in Vergil's narration of Jupiter and Juno's pact in the twelfth book of the *Aeneid*. The fourth and final chapter explores the figure of the cow, bull or calf as an identifiable symbol of Italian identity and resistance that is explicitly separated from the idea of Rome, suggesting an implicit commentary on Roman exploitation and destruction of Italian landscape and resources. The act of *bugonia* thus represents the culmination of the nature-culture contrast, with the bovine herd animals representing the *germana patria* being sacrifices for the continued proliferation of the strangely Roman civilization of bees, whose society resembles the Ciceronian *patria communis*. In the epilogue, I return briefly to Cicero's discussion of the *duae patriae* to demonstrate the utility of Vergil's exploratory representations of Italian identity. This project is innovative in its commitment to approaching Vergil's poetry *not* as a project of Roman identity building, but as work driven primarily by the tension between local Italian and Roman civic identities as one of the unifying themes of the work.

nescia fallere vita

— Vergil, *Georgics* 2.467

For my family

Contents

Acknowledgments

While researching and writing this dissertation, I have benefitted from the generosity and help of a number of individual, communities, and institutions. I am happy to acknowledge them here.

I would like to thank my committee members for their constant support, encouragement, and belief in my project. I am unfathomably grateful to Nelly Oliensis, who has spent the most time with this project aside from myself, and whose detailed written and verbal comments have made this dissertation immeasurably better; I regret only that I couldn't incorporate even more of her thoughtful suggestions. I count myself as a special kind of lucky for having emerged so many times from our meetings more confident about my work and progress than when I had gone in. I must also thank deeply Kathleen McCarthy and Dylan Sailor, both of whom provided helpful and thoughtful comments from the project's inception to its finish; I thank them both especially for discussions early on while preparing my statement of intended research, while preparing for oral examinations, and during both semesters of the dissertation colloquium: the early encouragement and direction provided there truly helped to shape the project. While not a committee member officially, I must also mention here Maurizio Bettini, whose courses brought an intellectual thrust and disciplinary awareness without which I do not believe I could have conceived of this project as it stands; I thank him not only for patiently reading work at several points in this project, but also for invigorating discussions of Roman literature and culture, as well as for a happy semester spent researching this project in Siena.

The Department of Classics at the University of California, Berkeley has been a gracious and generous support system throughout my graduate career, and I am thankful for all of the interactions and support, large and small, which enabled this work. In addition to the faculty listed above, I must thank Mark Griffith, Carlos Noreña, and Duncan Macrae for useful and rewarding conversations around the topic of this dissertation and related topics, as well as Andrew Stewart and Chris Hallett for a Stronach seminar on Art and Luxury in the Bay of Naples which allowed me to examine the ideas contained here from an entirely different perspective. More generally, I am extremely grateful to the department for the bestowal of travel and research funds, including semesters of support for research, as well as the opportunity to teach in a truly great department. I am thankful to the university, as well, for both my initial support as a graduate student, as well as the funds provided for dissertation completion which allowed a semester's research in Siena and in Berkeley.

The final years of this project benefitted from the financial support of the American Academy in Rome, the Phi Beta Kappa Chapter of Northern California, and the Mabelle McLeod Lewis Memorial Fund; I am, again, inexpressibly grateful for this support and this confidence in my work. Spending the antepenultimate years of this project researching and writing in Rome was an invaluable and incredible – etymologically – experience, and my project benefitted from many conversations. I would like to thank Lindsay Harris, Lauren Donovan Ginsberg, Michelle Berenfeld, Cate Bonesho, Bea Peruzzi, and Liana Brent – my fellow Ancient Studies fellows – for conversations and advice; Raymond Carlson for interesting conversations on Dante and Dante's Vergil which reminded me of the passages that begin the project's first chapter; and to the many dear friends who made the Academy feel like home: Beverly McIver, Abigail Deville, Ashley Fure, Brandon Clifford, Jo Lobdell Clifford, Taylor Beck, Leslie Cozzi, Jamie Atkinson, Jess Peritz, Mitch Dvoracek, Suzanne Farrin, and many others.

I was lucky enough to give a number of talks at a number of institutions while finishing up this project,

which provided the opportunity to have many useful and rewarding conversations on these and other matters. I am thankful to the Vergilian Society's Symposium Cumanum, where in summer 2016 I presented a paper on competition in the *Eclogues* stemming from this research, originally intended to be published as part of this project; it became instead an article in the Society's journal *Vergilius* in 2017; I am extremely thankful to Christine Perkell and Timothy Moore for their immense help in preparing that project, which inevitably influence the project as a whole. While in Rome, I was fortunate to give talks at the Intercollegiate Center for Classical Studies, the British School of Rome, and at the Academy itself, as well as during the Vergilian Society's affiliated panel during the 2019 Annual Meeting of the Society for Classical Studies in San Diego. I am thankful for the conversations and interactions I had with many during these events, but especially Richard Thomas, John Van Sickle, Kresimir Vukovic, and others.

I could never have embarked upon this journey without the excellent training and wonderful experiences I had as an undergraduate in the Department of Classics at Princeton University. I still hold especially dear the seminar on Vergil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics* which I took with my eventual thesis advisor – on Lucan's *Bellum Civile* – Yelena Baraz, who most likely never suspected the student who, outside Chancellor Greene one afternoon, questioned how the *Georgics* could be poetry at all, would go on focus on the poem in a Ph.D. dissertation. My experience was also deepened and enriched by other faculty and graduate students in the department, including Joshua Katz, Andrew Feldherr, Leah Whittington, Jason Pedicone, Ted Champlin, and Froma Zeitlin, as well as my fellow undergraduates in Classics, including Jonathan Giuffrida, Coleman Connelly, and Yujhán Claros.

I am thankful to the many friends and supporters I have had over the years at Berkeley, Princeton, Rome, at home in North Dakota, and elsewhere. Most of all, I am extremely grateful for the friendship of my cohort mates at Berkeley, who have been and remain steadfast and lifelong friends: Kelsey Turbeville, Morgan King, and Caroline Cheung. Meals and drinks together provided me more sanity in these years than I care to admit. I feel lucky and grateful to have been able to travel to Siena and Syracuse with Morgan, in addition to our many study dates in Berkeley and San Francisco, and I am inexpressibly grateful to the universe that my time in Rome was so beautifully enriched by the presence of Caroline (and Sven Wiegand, too). One does not expect to find both a *jiejie* and a Roman agricultural co-conspirator in an Angeleno archaeologist, but the fortuitous and unexpected does indeed happen. I am thankful, too, for all of the other friends and fellow graduate students who have enriched my education and my life in the past almost decade: Erin Lam, Lauren Miller, Michiko Arai, Aaron Brown, Andrew Young, Bri Huber, George Thampy, Sameer Mishra, Corrie Loeffler, Jorge Alcantar, and innumberable others. I am grateful, too, to have had my Edholm family nearby during my time at Berkeley: James Barter and Martha Anderson. I am truly grateful for their support.

Lastly, I am overwhelmed daily by the support and love of my family. Words cannot begin to express my gratitude for their support, love, and encouragement. And finally, to Vincent, who more than anyone has seen the ups and downs in this difficult process, and will celebrate with me at its completion.

Chapter One

Introduction

Rispuosemi: 'Non omo, omo già fui,
e li parenti miei furon lombardi,
mantoani per patrïa ambedui.
Nacqui *sub Iulio*, ancor che fosse tardi,
e vissi a Roma sotto 'l buono Augusto
nel tempo de li dèi falsi e bugiardi.

— Dante, *Inferno* 1.67-72

Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere, tenet nunc
Parthenope; cecini pascua rura duces.

— Tomb of Vergil (Aelius Donatus, *Life of Vergil* 36)

Mantua dives avis, sed non genus omnibus unum:
gens illi triplex, populi sub gente quaterni,
ipsa caput populis, Tusco de sanguine vires.

— Vergil, *Aeneid* 10.201-203

In the opening canto of the *Divina Commedia*, as Dante's character flees from the three terrifying beasts that block his way, the poet comes suddenly upon the shade of Vergil, who is soon to guide him through Hell and Purgatory. Dante's choice of Vergil as guide in these two *cantiche* has been linked to the classical poet's character fulfilling two primary functions for the Italian poet: to stand, first, as an allegorical embodiment of human reason,[1] and, second, as a predecessor and model for Dante's poetic project, one he seeks to emulate and surpass.[2] That Dante envisions Vergil filling these roles is clear enough from the poet-character's first address to Vergil, when he realizes he has encountered the poet who sang "di quel giusto figliuol d'Anchise che venne di Troia" (1.73-4).[3] In the span of three tercets Dante's character calls Vergil "my teacher and my author," "that font that pours out so great a river of speech," and "light and

[1] E.g.: Schoder 1949: 414-16; Corbett 2015: 15. Schoder sees Vergil's "symbolic role as personified human reason" (415) as closely connected to the "human intelligence" he shows in his poetry (414); Corbett links Vergil's ability "to represent, if only at an allegorical level, human reason" to the fact of his paganism (15)—that is, his distance from Christian wisdom by virtue of his own death's occurrence prior to Christ's birth.
[2] Schoder 1949: "...whom he looked on as his model, teacher, inspiration" (414); Forni 2009: "His devotion to antiquity ... does not prevent him from looking at the *Aeneid* in a spirit of emulation" (55). For Forni, Dante writes at least partially "[i]n order to become the Virgil of [his] modern times" (58).
[3] The Italian text throughout is that of Petrocchi 1967, accessed via the *Mapping Dante* Project (Gazzoni 2019).

honor of other poets," not passing over either the "the long study and great love that made me search through your volume" and crediting Vergil alone with "the beautiful style which has given me honor".[4]

Considering the importance of Vergil's poetic career for Dante in his decision to feature him so prominently in the *Commedia*, it is striking that the first words the poet gives to Vergil's character in the poem are not the lines on his poetic identity,[5] but instead two *terzine* that foreground Vergil's origin in northern Italy. Dante, after pleading for mercy from the yet-unknown figure—"whatever you are, whether shade or true man!"[6]—goes on to record Vergil's response:[7] "I am not a man, but man I once was; my parents were Lombards, both Mantuans by their native place (*patrïa*). I was born *sub Iulio*, though late; I lived at Rome under the good Augustus, in the time of false and lying gods".[8] Dante gives prominence to Vergil's geographical origins as a north Italian (via the anachronistic label *lombardi*) and as a native of the region of Mantua specifically, a connection given both a hereditary dimension (*li parenti miei*, 1.68) and a patriotic one (*per patrïa*, 1.69). Vergil's Mantuan identity is further emphasized elsewhere in the poem. In *Inferno* 2, Vergil recalls to Dante how Beatrice addressed him as "polite Mantuan spirit",[9] and the poet is addressed as '*Mantoano*' in ante-Purgatory by the minstrel Sordello, a fellow native of Mantua who boasts that he is "from your own land" ('*de la tua terra*', *Purg.* 6.75).[10] *Inferno* 20, meanwhile, centers on the story of the seer Manto, the founder of Mantua according to Dante,[11] in an account narrated by Vergil involving

4 *Inf.* 1.85: '*Tu se' lo mio maestro e 'l mio autore*'; 1.79-80: '*Or se' tu quel Virgilio e quella fonte che spandi di parlar sì largo fiume?*'; 1.82: '*O de li altri poeti honore e lum*e'; 1.83-4: '*vagliami 'l lungo studio e 'l grande amore che m'ha fatto cercar lo tuo volume*'; 1.86-7; '*tu se' solo colui da cu' io tolsi lo bello stilo che m'ha fatto onore*.' A desire for emulation, meanwhile, seems apparent in the "shameful brow" (*vergognosa fronte*, 1.81) with which Dante responds to Vergil, perceiving his present insufficiency to match his model and rival.

5 *Inf.* 1.73-75: '*Poeta fui, e cantai di quel giusto figliuol d'Anchise che venne di Troia, poi che 'l superbo Ilïon fu combusto*' ("A poet I was, and I sang of that just son of Anchises who came from Troy, then when high Ilion was consumed in flames.")

6 *Inf.* 1.66: '*qual che tu sii, od ombra od omo certo!*'

7 *Inf.* 1.67-72. The Italian text forms the first epigraph to this chapter above.

8 Some aspects of Vergil's biography are misrepresented by Dante here. Vergil's birth in 70 BCE, for example, is still significantly prior to Julius Caesar's rise to power, thus hard to understand as *sub Iulio*; furthermore, Vergil famously spent most of his adult life not in Rome, but in Naples (Don. *Vit. Verg.* 11). Corbett 2015 sees these kinds of small errors as purposefully executed by Dante in order to more closely align Vergil with the concerns of Augustus' Imperial Rome, a potential ancient model for Dante's contemporary Florence: "Temporally, Dante massages the historical facts in order to make Virgil's life-span the birth-pangs of Imperial Rome from Caesar ('*sub Iulio*') to his nephew Augustus ("*l buono Augusto*'). [...] Vocationally, Virgil identifies himself as the poet of Roman Empire ('*cantai di quel giusto figliuol d'Anchise*'). Why *specifically* the pagan Virgil? Because Virgil lived in Rome at the time of Augustus, and because Dante treats Virgil's *Aeneid* as if it were the divinely revealed text of Imperial power" (Corbett 2015: 16).

9 *Inf.* 2.58: '*O anima cortese mantoana*'.

10 Dante-as-poet goes on (*Purg.* 6.76-84) to contrast the immediate goodwill between Vergil and Sordello as compatriots of Mantua with the neverending wars being fought at that time in Italy. For Vergil's positive treatment of Mantua compared to other Italian cities, see De Vito 1951: "Mantua enjoys respect and good-will on the part of Dante, undoubtedly because it is the native city of the greater master, Virgil" (4-5).

11 Dante here directly contradicts Vergil's own story of the founding of Mantua at *Aen.* 10.198-203, where it is not Manto/Mantus who founds Mantua, but her son by the river Tiber, Ocnus. Barolini 2018 sees this fabricated "self-correction" by the Vergil-character in the *Commedia* as contributing to a "programmatic undermining of the *Aeneid*" wherein it is understood that "the *Aeneid* is a text that—like the false prophets of this *bolgia*—is capable of defrauding the truth" (Barolini 2018, citing Barolini 1984: 217). There is also most likely an element of poetic *aemulatio* operating in Dante's contradiction of Vergil's earlier narrative here.

an in-depth description of Mantuan geography featuring several local toponyms from the *vates*' own poetry, including Lake Garda, the rivers Mincio and Po, and Mantua itself.[12] To Dante in the 14th century, then, Vergil's identity as a native of Mantua was of singular importance: the juxtaposition in Vergil's opening speech of a *terzina* on his northern Italian origins with a second on Roman imperial power—the historical and political context of his writing—paints the picture of a poet who is Mantuan first and Roman second, possessed of an identity derived from both local allegiance and Roman and Augustan loyalties.[13]

A millennium earlier, Aelius Donatus' fourth-century *Vita Vergilii*, its own biographical material derived largely from a second-century *vita* of Suetonius—now lost—gives an account of Vergil's life likewise emphasizing his Mantuan origins, while also placing special emphasis on the idea of *place*, and especially *Italian* places, in Vergil's biography. This focus is encapsulated in the distich Donatus records as marking Vergil's tomb, an epigram that still decorates the so-called Tomb of Vergil in the Piedigrotta distict of Naples: "Mantua bore me; the Calabrians stole me away; now Naples holds my remains. I sang of pastures, the countryside, generals".[14] The epigram (anonymously authored in Donatus' *Vita*, but reputedly written by Vergil himself just before death in later interpolated versions)[15] foregrounds Mantua as Vergil's place of birth—*Mantua me genuit*—while also making clear the importance of other Italian sites to the poet's biography. The three locations named—Mantua, Calabria,[16] and Naples, all mentioned in Vergil's poetry[17]—form a triangle of territory that encompasses the whole of peninsular Italy, itself the primary setting of Vergil's writings on *pascua*, *rura*, and *duces*.[18] Nor is this epigram the only emphasis given to northern Italian locales in Donatus' *Vita*. Vergil's ancestral connection to Mantua is the first detail Donatus

[12] Lake Garda (Benaco): *Inf.* 20.63, 74, 77 ~ *G.* 2.160, *Aen.* 10.205; the river Mincio: *Inf.* 20.77 ~ *Ecl.* 7.13, *G.* 3.15, *Aen.* 10.206; the river Po: *Inf.* 20.78 ~ *G.* 1.482, 2.452, 4.372, *Aen.* 9.680, 11.457; Mantua: *Inf.* 20.93, 20.98 (*la terra mia*) ~ *Ecl.* 9.27-8, *G.* 2.198, 3.12, *Aen.* 10.200-201. See also the following section.

[13] Dante's emphasis on Vergil's Mantuan patriotism is certainly linked to his perception of the earlier poet as a model for his devotion to his own *patria*, Florence; cf. Schoder 1949: "[Vergil] was, besides, Italy's glory [...] and therefore to the patriotic Dante a most worthy choice for guide" (414). If Vergil's Mantua serves as a model for the beloved *patria*, Vergil's Rome can be taken as a historical exemplar for the establishment of Florentine empire: "The Rome that was and the Florence that might have been are what keeps the civic idealism of the poem going" (Marchesi 2016: 93); thus "Dante's idealization and his denouncement of his fatherland" (ibid.).

[14] Ael. Don. *Vit. Verg.* 36; the Latin text forms the second epigraph at the start of this chapter. The Latin given is that of Henderson 1997. See also: Brummer 1912; Brugnoli and Stok 1997; Wilson-Okamura 1996.

[15] Wilson-Okamura 1996 ad *Vit. Verg.* 36 n. 1. Most major interpolations are from Bodleian MS can. lat. 61.

[16] *OCD4* s.v. *Calabria*: "[Calabria] in antiquity referred to the Sallentine peninsula of SE Italy. It did not acquire its modern meaning of SW Italy (ancient Bruttium), until after the Lombard invasion of AD 700."

[17] Calabria receives mention in the third *Georgic* as notable for infestation by snakes (*ille malus Calabris in saltibus anguis*, 3.425); it was also the region of Tarentum, mentioned (along with Mantua) as good for pasturage at *G.* 2.195-98, and itself the setting of the digression on the old man of Tarentum at *G.* 4.116-148. Vergil mentions Naples as the location of his composition of the *Georgics*, referring metonymically to the city with the name of the Siren Parthenope supposedly buried there, as also in the epitaph (*G.* 4.563-4): *illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti*. For Mantua in Vergil's poetry, see note 12 above.

[18] Dante also connects Vergil to the idea of Italy as a political whole—as, for example, at *Inf.* 1.106-8, where the Greyhound (*'l veltro*, 1.101) will be the savior of "that lowly Italy for which died the virgin Camilla, Euryalus and Turnus, and Nisus of their wounds" (*'di quella umile Italia fia salute per cui morì la vergine Cammilla, Eurialo e Turno e Niso di ferute*')—a specifically Vergilian formulation of *umile Italia*; and at *Purg.* 6.76-84, where Dante, upon witnessing the camaraderie between Sordello and Vergil as fellow citizens of Mantua, laments the lack of unity among the cities of Italy at present: *Ahi serva Italia, di dolore ostello, nave sanza nocchiere in gran tempesta, non donna di province, ma bordello! ... e ora in te non stanno sanza guerra li vivi tuoi, e l'un l'altro si rode di quei ch'un muro e una fossa serra* (*Purg.* 6.76-78, 82-84); see also note 10, above.

provides in the account—*P. Vergilius Maro Mantuanus parentibus modicis fuit*—and his education until at least age 15 is located in the nearby cities of Cremona[19] and Milan, until his departure for Rome some time after.[20] North Italy pops up again as Donatus discusses Vergil's reason for writing the *Eclogues*—namely, that "most of all he might celebrate the praises of Asinius Pollio, Alfenus Varus, and Cornelius Gallus, because they had been sure to arrange that he sustained no loss in the distribution of lands among veterans which was undertaken across the Po at the order of the triumvirs after the victory at Philippi".[21] While any attribution of Vergil's composition of the *Eclogues* to his own fortunes in the land redistribution is surely based on an overly biographical reading of that poem,[22] the impetus to connect the genesis of Vergil's poetry closely with issues of Italian places and landscapes is as clear in Donatus' account as it would later be in Dante's.

I begin with this brief foray into Vergilian reception to demonstrate the extent to which Vergil's status as Italian partisan and native of Mantua emerged for Vergil's early readers as a linchpin of the poet's personal identity and literary program, as the patriotic native simultaneously navigating the contingencies of empire. To a certain extent, such an interpretation should be unsurprising, considering that Mantua and its environs are mentioned in each of Vergil's works,[23] while Italy provides the material for the ultimate encomium in the second georgic and the most prominent setting of all three of his poems. Even so, readings of Vergil's work that center the poet's local and Italian identities remain remarkably infrequent: for most modern critics Vergil remains the quintessential *Roman* and *Augustan* poet, often to the detriment of other potentially productive approaches to Vergil's poetry, while work on local and regional Italian identities remains largely cloistered within archaeology and cultural history.[24] This often hyperextended focus on Rome and Augustus in Vergilian criticism is ubiquitous:[25] an extremely recent example is a 2019

19 Cf. *Ecl.* 9.27-28: *superet modo Mantua nobis, Mantua vae miserae nimium vicina Cremonae.*

20 Don. *Vit. Verg.* 6-7: *Initia aetatis Cremonae egit usque ad virilem togam, quam XV anno natali suo accepit. ... Sed Vergilius a Cremona Mediolanum et inde paulo post transiit in urbem.* The translation of Wilson-Okamura 1996 understands *in urbem* at section 7's end to be in apposition to *Mediolanum*, but the structure makes it clear that Vergil transitioned from Cremona to Milan, then shortly after (*et inde paulo post*) to Rome; cf. the translation of Henderson 1997: "Virgil, however, moved from Cremona to Mediolanum, and shortly afterwards from there to Rome" (451).

21 Don. *Vit. Verg.* 19: *ad Bucolica transiit, maxime ut Asinium Pollionem, Alfenum Varum et Cornelium Gallum celebraret, quia in distributione agrorum, qui post Philippensem victoriam veteranis triumvirorum iussu trans Padum dividebantur, indemnem se praestitissent.* Cf. *Vit. Verg.* 20, where Donatus similarly aetiologizes the *Georgics* as written in return for Maecenas' aid against the violence of a veteran trying to seize his land—clearly a biographical reading of *Ecl.* 9: *Deinde scripsit "Georgica" in honorem Maecenatis, qui sibi mediocriter adhuc noto opem tulisset adversus veterani cuiusdam violentiam, a quo in altercatione litis agrariae paulum afuit quin occideretur.*

22 As also for the assumption that Pollio, Varus, and Gallus served in any official role as *triumviri agris dividendis* to save Vergil's property: Stok 2013, in the course of a recent article reviewing the various versions of the loss/restoration of Vergil's land and the role that Pollio, Varus, and Gallus played in each, shows convincingly that the three men likely had no role in a story of Vergilian land restoration, but that this role was assimilated into the biographical tradition in several different guises throughout the centuries; in truth, there were no *triumviri agris dividendis* at this time, a misunderstanding of the confiscations happening *triumvirorum iussu*—that is, at the order of Antony, Lepidus, and Octavian, the members of the so-called Second Triumvirate.

23 For Mantua, see note 12, and the next section. Mantua remains strongly associated with Vergil for centuries, the poet often referred to simply as *Mantuanus*; see: Ov. *Am.* 3.15.7; Ps.-Verg. *Cat.* 8.6; Apul. *Apol.* 10; Mart. 1.61.2; Stat. *Silv.* 4.7.27; Sil. *Pun.* 8.595; Min. Fel. *Oct.* 19; Mart. Cap. 2.212; Macr. *Sat.* 1.16, 5.1; Sol. *Coll.* 46.

24 Cf. Dench 2005: "[T]he 'power' of local identities outside Rome belongs on the whole to specialist archaeological publications on Italian regional culture rather than to the mainstream of Roman history" (198). This is equally true of the mainstream of Roman/Latin literary (and even cultural) studies.

25 One may consider such small but highly influential examples as the most recent edition of the *Oxford Classical*

call-for-papers on the topic of "Imperial Virgil" put out by the Vergilian Society, beginning as follows: "Whether one emphasizes his ambivalence or his applause, Virgil was unquestionably the poet of the nascent Roman empire".[26] Even recent studies of the *Aeneid* that boast identity and identity formation as one of Vergil's central themes focus almost solely on constructions of *Roman* identity. J. D. Reed, for example, in his 2007 book *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*, aims to examine "the way the *Aeneid* offers the readerly subject a national identity—which the teleology of the poem invites us to read as Roman".[27] Reed argues that identity and ethnicity in the *Aeneid* are "always provisional and perspectival": "Roman identity—always reducible to some other nationality—emerges as a synthesis [...] of other national identities".[28] Despite the consideration of other ethnicities and national identities, it is ultimately Roman identity—"an ambiguous figure, a *problema* without a solution"—that Reed is concerned to address.[29] K. F. B. Fletcher, meanwhile, in his 2014 book *Finding Italy: Travel, Colonization, and Nation in Vergil's Aeneid*, ultimately articulates his aim as examining "the ways in which the *Aeneid* explores and contributes to the idea of Roman nationalism".[30] Indeed, Fletcher makes it clear in the introduction that the Italy referenced in the title is a specifically *Roman* Italy, one that is, for all intents and purposes, functionally interchangeable with Rome.[31] Thus even Fletcher and Reed, whose works are the latest in a relatively recent trend toward ethnicity and identity studies in Vergilian scholarship, operate within the long-established presupposition that Vergil's poetic project must reflect a distinctly *Roman* and *Augustan* enterprise. This is surely not *in*correct—yet one cannot help but feel that, by repeatedly privileging perspectives that center around Rome, Roman identity, and Augustus, Vergilian scholarship regularly undervalues the importance that local and regional identity held for Vergil and his poetry, ultimately leading to a reductive conceptualization of both Vergil's oeuvre and of the lived experience of those claiming local and regional Italian affiliations

Dictionary (4th ed.) beginning its entry on Vergil (s.v. 'Virgil') with the two-word summary "Roman poet."

[26] "Imperial Virgil." Call-for-papers for the Vergilian Society's Affiliated Group panel at the 2020 Society for Classical Studies Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., Jan. 2-5, 2020. https://classicalstudies.org/annual-meeting/2020/151/imperial-virgil. Accessed Feb. 14, 2019. The document goes on to give a double justification for understanding Vergil as "imperial"—specifically, "as a commentator on the Roman world being transformed by Augustus and as a kind of poetic doppelgänger for the *princeps* himself." This is *not* to say that organizations such as the Vergilian Society have not recently engaged with newer strands of criticism such as identity studies—far from it, considering the 2019 Vergilian Society panel at the SCS held the title "What's in a Name: Race, Ethnicity, and Cultural Identity in the Poetry of Vergil"—but merely to demonstrate that such an approach continues to be popular enough to serve as topic for a major panel at the field's annual convention.

[27] Reed 2007: 1.

[28] Reed 2007: 2.

[29] Reed 2007: 3. Indeed, Reed goes out of his way to mention that his reading of the poem will not try to piece together Vergil's attitude toward Roman identity vis-à-vis his own origin in Mantua: "Moreover, the *Aeneid*'s creation of a multiple Roman identity out of other nationalities is at the fore of our discussion; the bestowal of Roman identity out of other nationalities is not. This precision will vex some readers, I know, as will *the related omission of anything to do with Mantuan Virgil's own stance toward the Roman*" (14; my italics).

[30] Fletcher 2014: 4. Cf.: "Augustan Rome is the destination, and Aeneas' trip to Italy represents the first steps of this journey" (26); "the definitive formulation of Roman national identity" (252).

[31] Consider, for example, the following excerpts from Fletcher (my italics throughout): "By the time Vergil is writing ... there is a clear sense that Italy *is unified and Roman*" (2); "In turn, these directions offer Vergil's audience a view of what Italy can become and provide a glimpse of the imagined community *that Italy will be under Augustus*" (11); "Vergil is presenting *a concept of Italian unity* that underlies *a new sense of Roman identity* (246); "*the bond between Rome and Italy* throughout the poem" (250).

alongside Roman ones in the latter half of the first century BC.[32]

It is the aim of this study to remedy this imbalance in scholarship by examining closely the ways in which the integration of the different aspects of local, Italian, and Roman identities are manifested and negotiated in Vergil's poetry, with a particular focus on his earlier poetry, the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*. Through a culturally and historically embedded close reading of Vergil's earlier two poems, and drawing on recent work from sociology and psychology on the subjective experience of bicultural individuals, I propose to illuminate how issues of Italian acculturation and bicultural identity manifest in literature of this period, approaching the changes or tensions within local identities at this time for their own sake, rather than merely as steps within a project of Roman identity building. Ultimately, I hope to show that approaching Vergil as a poet driven by a desire to explore the successful or failed integration of local and regional Italian identities into Roman civic identity can help to elucidate ever more closely the effects of Roman encroachment on Italy and how local identity was diminished, fortified, or otherwise impacted by its interactions with Rome, Roman identity, and Roman conceptions of a unified Italy.

Mantua me genuit: Vergil and Local Identity

Publius Vergilius Maro was born on 15 October 70 BC, in a small village called Andes near Mantua,[33] in the Transpadane region of Cisalpine Gaul—the part of Gaul-on-this-side-of-the-Alps located across-the-river-Po. This is a significant and oft unacknowledged fact in Vergilian criticism. While *Mantova* today is situated within the Italian administrative region of *Lombardia*, at the time of Vergil's birth Mantua was an administrative district not of Italy, but of *Gallia Cisalpina*, itself a separate province until 42 BC, when the border of *Italia* was legally extended to the Alps.[34] This means, of course, that neither Vergil nor the region of his upbringing were officially recognized as Italian until nearly the end of the poet's third decade[35]—nor did this reclassification of *Cisalpina* as a part of Italy occur simply or without its own baggage. The legal incorporation of the region into Italy came only after more than two centuries of colonization, campaigns, and gradual political enfranchisement, during which time the region was completely transformed within the Roman cultural imaginary from a part of barbarian Gaul, inhabited by itinerant and aggressive populations of Boii, Cenomani, Insubres, Ligurians, and Venetians,[36] into what

[32] Cf. Dench 2005: "Despite long recognition of the fact that the vast majority of Latin authors have *origines* outside the city of Rome, to the extent that this is something of a cliché in modern textbooks, surprisingly little attention has been given to the complex issues of gaze and voice raised in such works" (179).

[33] Ael. Don. *Vit. Verg.* 2.

[34] Chilver 1941: 7-15; Toll 1997: 36; Ando 2016: 283. A stark reminder that Cisalpine Gaul remained legally external to Italy in the 40s BCE is the fact that the start of the civil war in 49 BCE was occasioned by Caesar's bringing his army into Italy *not* by crossing the Alps, but by crossing the river Rubicon, which extends just 50 miles between the Apennines and the eastern coast of the Italian peninsula just south of Ravenna. As the legal boundary between *Cisalpina* and *Italia* at the time, the Rubicon marked the official geographical end of the proconsular authority granted to Caesar by the Senate over *Gallia Cisalpina, Gallia Transalpina*, and *Illyricum*.

[35] Toll 1997: 36; Ando 2002: 136; Cooley 2016b: 105.

[36] Cf. Cicero's berating of Piso for his Transpadane/Insubrian origin: *neque huius urbis, sed Placentini municipii, nequi paterni generis, sed braccatae cognationis dedecus* (*Pis.* 53); ... *fractum, humile, demissum, sordidum, inferius etiam est, quam ut Mediolanensi praecone, avo tuo, dignum esse videatur* (*Pis.* 62). Cf. *Pis.* 34; frr. 4, 6, 7; and Jenkyns 1998: 91.

Cicero would in 44 BC term the *flos Italiae*,[37] a civilized and fully incorporated extension of Rome's most favored territory. "Gaul was now Italy".[38]

A further "important and badly neglected factor" in Vergilian criticism[39] bears a certain similarity to the Mantuan poet's belated acquisition of Italian identity: namely, the strong likelihood that Vergil was not born a Roman citizen. In the aftermath of the Social War in the 80s BC, most of what was then Italy had been granted the Roman citizenship through the passage of two laws: a *lex Iulia* in 90 BC,[40] which gave the Roman franchise to allies who had remained loyal or surrendered quickly at the start of the war, and another law (or laws) at war's end, which bestowed citizenship *cum suffragio* upon the defeated allies resident in Italy.[41] Not officially part of Italy, Vergil's native region of *Transpadana* was treated separately, and another law, a *lex Pompeia* of 89 BC, granted Roman citizenship to the region's old Latin colonies, but bestowed the *ius Latii* upon the native towns.[42] As Katharine Toll notes, "If we knew whether Vergil was born in a *colonia*, or whether the franchise had been obtained *viritim* by his family, we would know whether he was citizen-born. If he was not, he received the Roman citizenship only at the age of about twenty-one, with the passage of a law sponsored by a Caesarian tribune in 49".[43] As it is, there is no existing evidence that Mantua was a Roman colony[44]—the likes of which in Cisalpine Gaul included Ariminum, Cremona, Bononia, and Aquileia[45]—and Strabo, a contemporary of Vergil, even lists Mantua as one of the cities of the Insubres,[46] a perhaps pre-Celtic people named by Salmon as "the most powerful people in Cisalpine Gaul".[47] In the end, the exact timeline of Vergil's enfranchisement is largely moot: even if Vergil *did* happen to be a Roman citizen at the time of his birth, his youth and early adulthood in *Transpadana* would certainly have acquainted him with those who were not, those who would not gain Roman enfranchisement until the Caesarian *lex Roscia* of 49 BC, nor become Italian until Augustus extension of Italy in 42 BC.[48]

[37] Cic. *Phil.* 3.13.

[38] Ando 2016: 283. See Ando's article for an excellent and in-depth discussion of the legal, demographic, and cultural changes in Cisalpine Gaul from the beginnings of Roman involvement in the third century BCE down to its incorporation into *Italia* in 42 BCE; cf. also Haeussler 2013 and 2018. For the development of the "Idea of Italy", see Dench 2005: 152-220, as well as the discussion in the following section.

[39] Toll 1997: 36. While Toll lists the fact that "it is not clear whether Vergil was born a Roman citizen" as being specifically relevant to "considering how Vergil came to shape the *Aeneid* as he did", I would suggest that such a question is equally relevant to Vergil's composition of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*.

[40] That is, the *lex Iulia de civitate Latinis et sociis danda* introduced by L. Iulius Caesar (cos. 90), the uncle of the dictator: Cic. *Balb.* 21; App. *Bell. Civ.* 1.49.211-15; cf. Pallottino 2014: 157; Ando 2016: 283.

[41] Bispham 2016: 87. The name of this law is often given as the *lex Plautia Papiria de civitate sociis danda*, introduced by the tribunes M. Plautius Silvanus and C. Papirius Carbo, as mentioned by Cicero at *Arch.* 4.7. This identification has been questioned in recent years, however—as, for example, by Edward Bispham, who notes that the scope of the *lex Plautia Papiria* "cannot be shown to have been anything more than a law to deal with those who were honorary citizens of allied cities, and wished to gain Roman citizenship now that the granting city had been enfranchised" (*ibid.*)—in which case the actual name of the final law is likely lost to us.

[42] Ando 2016: 283; also Chilver 1941; Toll 1997. Ando further notes that "non-urbanized, non-Romanizing peoples were administratively and legally subordinated" to these Transpadane colonies, and that it seems probable that "the same law granted citizenship to all those in Cispadana who did not already have it."

[43] Toll 1997: 36. See also: Ando 2002: 136; Ando 2016: 284.

[44] Brunt 1971's list of Roman *coloniae* north of the Po by 90 BCE does not include Mantua (167).

[45] Ando 2016: 275-280. See Brunt 1971: 167 for a more comprehensive list.

[46] Ando 2016: 279, citing Strab. *Geo.* 5.1.6.

[47] *OCD*4 s.v. *Insubres*, which notes that archaeological evidence suggests a correlation with Golasecca culture.

[48] Dio Cas. 41.36.3, 48.12.5; App. *BCE* 5.3.12, 20.79-80, 22.86-87. Cf. Ando 2016: 283; Crawford 1996, no 16.

However Vergil understood his identities as Italian and Roman to intersect with his identity as a native of Transpadane Mantua—a question whose complexities will return continuously throughout this study—what is certainly clear whenever Mantua and its surroundings turn up in his hexameters is "the poet's affection for the region of his birth".[49] The green banks of the river Mincius, which snakes around Mantua as it descends from Lake Garda in the Alpine foothills to empty into the Po further south, provide the setting for the amoeboean poetic contest in *Eclogue* 7,[50] while in *Eclogue* 9 the displaced goatherd Moeris laments his lost fields' location in Mantuan territory near Cremona, a region suffering greatly in the land confiscations post-Philippi;[51] it should be noted that these references to Mincius, Mantua, and Cremona are the *only* times in the *Eclogues* that Vergil connects the pastoral landscape of the poems to actual geographical locations, aside from the story of Tityrus' journey to Rome in *Eclogue* 1.[52] Mantua's lost land is mentioned again in *Georgics* 2 as ideal for pasturage,[53] and, in the proem to the third book, Mantua and the Mincius are made the site of Vergil's promised poetic temple and triumph.[54] Most interesting of *Transpadana*'s appearances in Vergil's oeuvre is the inclusion of Mantua in the catalogue of Etruscan troops in *Aeneid* 10, where the poet goes out of his way to include his native city as the only non-coastal trans-Apennine member of the catalogue.[55] The description of Mantua Vergil gives at this point in the epic is one that shows the poet to be extremely attentive to both the possibilities and complexities of ethnic identity: "Mantua, rich in ancestors, but not all of a single kind: the city has a race[56] threefold, and under each race four peoples, of which Mantua herself is the foremost, her strength drawn from Tuscan blood".[57]

[49] Harrison 1991: 124 ad *Aen.* 10.200.

[50] *Ecl.* 7.12-13: *hic viridis tenera praetexit harundine ripas Mincius*. Coleman 1977 ad *Ecl.* 7.4 notes how Vergil's pastoral landscape, in passages like this, can "become identified for the time being with some particular part of of the real countryside that was within the poet's experience or had some special emotional appeal to him—the Mantua of his boyhood, [or] the unspoiled parts of rural Italy" (209).

[51] *Ecl.* 9.27-28: *superet modo Mantua nobis, Mantua vae miserae nimium vicina Cremonae*. Note Coleman 1977 ad *Ecl.* 9.fin.: "Clearly Vergil's own experience provided much of the inspiration" (274-5)—a point meant generally, considering his (correct) assertion that "Servius' explicit identifications [...] of the land described in 9.7-10 with Vergil's farm are untenable" (274 ad *Ecl.* 9.fin.).

[52] *Ecl.* 1.19, 25. But even Rome is located emphatically *outside of* the landscape of that poem; see Chapter 2. Flintoff 1974 is the first to point out that it is *only* Italian places that are located in the poem's actual landscape.

[53] *G.* 2.198: *et qualem infelix amisit Mantua campum*. See Thomas 1988a ad loc: "the pathos of *amisit* takes the reader back to V.'s native town in the *Eclogues* and to the indications that his fellow townsmen lost their land as a result of Octavian's settling soldiers there" (194). See Chapter 2 for a more in-depth discussion of this passage.

[54] *G.* 3.12-15: *primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas, et viridi in campo templum de marmore ponam propter aquam, tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat Mincius et tenera praetexit harundine ripas*. Note Thomas 1988a ad *G.* 3.14-15: "this tributary of the Po, which flows from L. Benacus through V.'s native Mantua, was dear to his heart" (41).

[55] Harrison 1991: 108-11. Harrison gives an in-depth discussion of the possible criteria and sources of the Etruscan catalogue here. Since Vergil is writing a ship-catalogue, location along the coast emerges as perhaps the most important factor, a criterion unmet only by Mantua and Clusium in the catalogue—"both of which are recognizably special cases" (108), Mantua as Vergil's birthplace, and Clusium as the home of Lars Porsenna, "the most famous Etruscan of them all in Roman eyes" (109). Harrison also suspects Mantua is included because of "a desire to include Transappennine Etruria" (109).

[56] I give 'race' as the translation of *gens*, as also Harrison 1991, Fairclough 1918. A better sense-translation might well be 'ethnicity', though it introduces a certain anachronism into the text. On *gens* and *populus*, cf. Harrison 1991 ad *Aen.* ad 10.202-3: "The *gens*/*populus* distinction recalls Greek ethnographical distinctions such as ἔθνος/γένος and ἔθνος/πόλις, *gens* usually indicating a race or tribe, *populus* a community belonging to it" (124).

[57] *Aen.* 10.201-203: *Mantua dives avis, sed non genus omnibus unum: gens illi triplex, populi sub gente quaterni, ipsa caput populis, Tusco de sanguine vires.* This quote also serves as the third quotation in the epigraph to this chapter.

As Harrison notes, the division into twelve *populi* (three *gentes* each made up of four *populi*) is likely connected to the idea that the Po Valley in Transapennine Etruria was home to twelve Etruscan cities, themselves intended to reflect the more well-known group of twelve Etruscan cities south of the Apennines.[58] At the same time, the *gens triplex* Vergil attributes to Mantua likely does not refer only to Etruscans, but to a threefold ethnic division of the area, mostly likely between those of Etruscan, Gallic,[59] and Venetic descent.[60] Passing over the exact identification of the three *gentes* and the twelve *populi*—a question which will surely remain a subject of debate, as perhaps Vergil intended, considering his vagueness here—what is remarkable is the subtlety with which the poet paints the ethnic make-up of his native city. While Vergil portrays Mantua as a city with a long history—*dives avis*, an atypical use of *avi* in the general sense of 'ancestors'[61] (rather than *patres*) serving to emphasize the chronological depth of its past—it is a city homogenous neither in its history nor its present, *non genus omnibus unum* ambiguously proclaiming the variety either of Mantua's *avi* or its present population, at least upon first reading. The subsequent clarification—*gens illi triplex*—grants the assurance that the city's diversity does not entail disunity: "*gens triplex* is used rather than *tres gentes* to express both racial diversity and political unity".[62] Particularly interesting is Holland's suggestion that Vergil's emphasis on Mantua as triracial[63] is meant to recall his predecessor Ennius' claim to have a trifold Greek, Oscan, and Latin cultural heritage, preserved by Aulus Gellius: *Quintus Ennius tria corda habere sese dicebat, quod loqui Graece et Osce et Latine sciret*.[64] This is an attractive proposal, and it suggests that part of the appeal of *gens illi triplex* may be an endless possibility of ethnic replaceability considering different times and subjects: a city of Etruscan, Gallic, and Venetic descent might from another's perspective be made up of subdivisions of Etruscans or Gauls, or, from a later temporal perspective, might possess a specifically Cisalpine, Roman, or pan-Italian identity in place of or in addition to other identities. In any case, a preliminary look at this passage suggests that Vergil understands personal and ethnic identity as no simple matter, but as one whose complexities are ripe for exploration.

Considering this background, it is perhaps surprising that it is only in the past two or three decades that scholars have begun to engage seriously with the possibility of Vergil's poetry—and most often the *Aeneid*—interacting with a specifically Italian identity. In a pair of articles from 1991 and 1997, Katharine Toll proposed a new ideology for approaching the *Aeneid* that aims to reconcile the division between readings of the poem that are politically optimistic or propagandistic and those that undermine or push

58 Livy 5.33.7-11, and Ogilvie 1965 ad 5.33.8. Cf.: Banti 1973: 5-6, and the *Scholia Veronensia* ad *Aen.* 10.200. Vergil includes only three of the twelve Cisapennine Etruscan cities—Caere, Clusium, and Populonia—a fact Harrison 1991:108 attributes to the fact that most "were inland cities and therefore unsuitable" in the catalogue.
59 Harrison 1991 ad *Aen.* 10.202-3 suggests specifically the Cenomani, "said by Ptolemy in the second-century AD to occupy the region of Mantua" (125). Cf. Ando 2016: 279 on Mantua's Insubrian background.
60 So Harrison 1991: 125 ad *Aen.* 10.202-3, following Palmer 1970: 39-40; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 3.130. Contrast Bengston 1982: 38, which "less plausibly" (Harrison ad loc.) suggests Umbrians in place of Gauls in Mantua's division.
61 So Harrison 1991: 124 ad *Aen.* 10.201; *TLL* s.v. *avus* (2.1611.73ff.).
62 Harrison 1991: 124 ad *Aen.* 10.202-3.
63 A detail which also has precedent in Homeric epic in the description of the Rhodians in the catalogue of ships in the *Iliad*: *Il.* 2.668: τριχθὰ δὲ ᾤκηθεν καταφυλαδόν; see Harrison 1991: 124 ad *Aen.* 10.202-3. Harrison further notes (124-5) the possibility of influence on Vergil here a passage from Varro's *Res humanae* on the division of the Salentini in Illyria, quoted in Probus ad *Ecl.* 6.31: *gentis Salentinae nomen tribus e locis fertur coaluisse, e Creta, Illyrico, Italia ... in tres partes divisa copia in populos duodecim*. While each passage highlights both threefold division (τριχθὰ; *tribus e locis*) and the separation according to ethnicity/race (καταφυλαδόν; *in tres partes divisa*), neither passage communicates the same sense of "unity in diversity" as exists in Vergil's passage.
64 Gell. *NA* 17.17.1; Holland 1935: 204; Harrison 1991: 205 ad *Aen.* 10.202-3.

against such optimistic or pro-Augustan interpretations.[65] In her 1991 article, Toll suggests looking at the *Aeneid* as "a poem of Italian national character", a move that should also entail "changing the focus of inquiry about the *Aeneid*'s ideology from Augustus to Italy".[66] Citing the fact that unification of Italy was "recent and unsteady" at the time of Vergil's composition, as well as the abovementioned uncertainty as to Vergil's status as a Roman citizen, Toll sees the *Aeneid* as representing two inter-related searches for Italian identity, one focusing on histories and origins—"whence Italian identity came and to where it is going"—the other committed to articulating a new potential for Roman-Italian unity in the Augustan present: "The *Aeneid* is not a backward-looking work of commemoration, but a forward-looking one, of healing and wary encouragement".[67] Toll further develops this stance in a later article, arguing that Vergil's own background put him "in an excellent position to see that Roman-ness and Italian-ness were not inevitably the same thing" and, thus, also "to contibute to his people's already on-going processes of review and adjustment, helping Romans and Italians to think about who they had become, in their new conjunction".[68] Focusing largely on the representation of Antony and his followers in the depiction of Actium in *Aeneid* 8, Toll argues that the *Aeneid* provides a model for the incorporation of Italians and future outsiders into the Roman citizenship, introducing "the long view of Roman-ness from whose perspective all *externi* are potential partners, and all war is civil war".[69] By emphasizing the embryonic state of the Romanness of Italians and of the notion of a unified Roman Italy, Toll succeeds in making apparent both the newness of Vergil's vision of Italy in the *Aeneid*, as well as the importance of considering separately ideas of personal, Italian, and Roman identity.

In a somewhat overlooked 2001 article arising independently of Toll's work, W. R. Johnson similarly highlights the "hybridity" of many of the naturalized Romans of the late 1st century BC, including Vergil and the Umbrian Propertius, both dually constituted subjects who likely "had some memory of their Italian (that is, non-Roman) heritage", and who "were the site, at some level of their being, in some corner of their consciousness, of a struggle between an old and a new sign-system".[70] While Johnson, like Toll, recognizes that the *Aeneid* does, in passages like Jupiter and Juno's agreement in *Aeneid* 12, help to imagine a new Roman-Italian unity—"the construction of a new Roman subjectivity into which non-Roman Italians will have been blended"[71]—Johnson is, in general, more prepared to recognize both the ambivalence and heterogeneity of attitudes toward national identity in the *Aeneid* and in its readers: "The dialectics of hybridity function variously. Some immigrants become wholly assimilated (the massive purity of the recent convert), but some remain, in some degree, émigrés".[72] This acknowledgement of the marked indeterminacy of feeling among the dually constituted ethnic subject—a truth that that applies to both

[65] This division itself can be traced originally to the important article of Adam Parry, who locates "two voices" in Vergil's *Aeneid*: "a public voice of triumph and a private voice of regret" (Parry 1963: 79).
[66] Toll 1991: 3.
[67] Toll 1991: 6-7.
[68] Toll 1997: 40-1.
[69] Toll 1997: 50. Cf. Pogorzelski 2009: "By projecting Italian unity onto the ancient past, the *Aeneid* erases and overwrites a historical conquest ... with the tragedy of fratricide" (263); "Fratricidal war in the *Aeneid* is reassuring for Romans because it naturalizes Italian unity, because it obscures the conquest of Italy, and because the deaths of heroes on both sides of the war become keystones for Roman collective identification" (ibid.).
[70] Johnson 2001: 8.
[71] Johnson 2001: 12.
[72] Johnson 2001: 7.

Vergil's and his readers' experiences as a naturalized Roman citizens[73]—is, to my mind, one of the greatest boons of Johnson's article over Toll's more teleological reading. Johnson's treatment is cursory, however, and in the end it does not constitute a full treatment of these themes in Vergil's poetry, but merely gestures towards them in order to demonstrate the pressing need for "a history of Roman literature that searches for traces of such conflictedness, such indeterminate feelings, in all the Roman writers who are émigrés".[74]

The exhortations of Toll and Johnson to examine Vergil's poetry from a more "Italian" lens, with full acknowledgment of the unsettled nature of Roman and Italian identities in 1st century Italy, have set the stage for a number of further studies of Vergil's relationship to his local and Italian identities. In an important 2002 article, Clifford Ando, likewise recognizing the unique interrelationship between Roman and Italian identity in the first century BC,[75] distinguishes between two distinct models for understanding the nature of the community that now existed on the Italian peninsula: the Ciceronian and the Vergilian. In Ando's formulation, Cicero's writings construct an idea of a racially and ethnically diverse Italy, itself necessitated by the diversity of Italy's climate and geography, according to the tenets of the ancient geographical determinism Ando rightly sees working in works such as the *De lege agraria*.[76] It is in response to this natural diversity of Italian *patriae natales*, as Ando sees it, that Cicero some years later would propose his scheme of *duae patriae* (on which, see the next section), in which shared citizenship in the Roman state provided the most important basis for Italian unity and shared identity. Ando's Vergilian model for Italian unity, on the other hand, apparently rejects such intra-peninsular diversity, arguing that Vergil "label[s] Italy a single region with a single climate" and "insist[s] on the unity of the Italian people".[77] Ando's identification of these two modes for approaching a concept of Italian unity is astute and incredibly useful, but the creation of such a stark distinction between "Ciceronian" and "Vergilian" praxis is, to my mind, an oversimplification of both authors' works based on a *pars pro toto* reading of only a few passages from each author's large and largely heterogeneous corpus.[78] In reality, both Cicero and Vergil make use of both

[73] "[L]ike many (most?) of his "naturalized" (ex-non-Roman, Italian) contemporaries, poets and non-poets alike, he may well have been deeply conflicted; may have hailed the fusion, and yet, so strong was the pull of birthplace and homeland, so bitter too were the memories or recent slaughter and oppression and humiliation, he may also have experienced confusion and grief, an ugly sense of a wrong ending, of annihilation of something dead and fragile and irrecoverable: his childhood, the memories of his (non-Roman) ancestors and the multinational homeland they shared ... Roman Italy was something both to be loved and hated. That—not Augustus or the empire he inherited from his Republican predecessors and bequeathed to his imperial successors—is where the pain is" (15). Johnson's reading here thus also passes over pro- or anti-Augustanism as the primary thematic engagement of Vergil's poetry.

[74] Johnson 2001: 7. Cf. Habinek 1998: 88: "It is disappointing to have to remark that, despite the abundance of modern discussion of the relationship between Augustan literature and Augustanism, relatively little has been written about the relationship between Augustan literature (or any period of Latin literature, for that matter) and the problem of the integration of Rome and Italy."

[75] Ando 2002: 123: "At the end of the Roman Republic, in the aftermath of the Social War, all Italians were Romans, but not all Romans were Italians." See also Ando 2002: 136 for Ando's own citation of Toll.

[76] *Agr.* 2.56ff., especially 86-96; Ando 2002: 131-134.

[77] Ando 2002: 138, and 136-140 on his "Vergilian model" more widely.

[78] Ando's reading of Vergil, for example, is based almost entirely on two extremely complex and idiosyncratic Vergilian passages—the *laudes Italiae* of *Georgics* 2 and the description of the shield of Aeneas in *Aeneid* 8—purple passages often assumed to speak *pars pro toto* for their respective works; cf. Thomas 1988a: 179-80 ad *G.* 2.136-76 on the *laudes Italiae*: "In the study and the classroom they tend to be read in isolation from the rest of the poem, and that in part accounts for the inadequate interpretation they have received: the passage must be considered within the fabric of the poem of which it is a part."

of Ando's models for Italian unity, depending on the needs and requirements of the work or passage; a wider study of these issues is needed, one that allows for the "intricate spectrum of origins, perspectives, sympathies, desires, [and] values" that Vergil's texts allow.[79]

If Ando follows Toll in proposing that Vergil takes an active role in advocating for the ethnic and cultural unity of Italy, other scholars have clove more closely to Johnson's comparatively open-ended critique, arguring for an even more complex and polyvalent intention behind Vergil's text. Alessandro Barchiesi, in a 2008 article presaging the concerns of his 2011 Sather Lectures at the University of California, Berkeley,[80] identifies the conflict between (Italian) localism and global (that is, Roman) identity in Vergil's construction of the idea of a unified Italy in the *Aeneid*.[81] Paralleling the above scholars in contextualizing the *Aeneid* in the ongoing unification of Italy in the aftermath of the Social War,[82] Barchiesi identifies in Vergil's Italians "una funzione ambigua":[83] against the Italians' function of inaugurating a new political state from a melting pot of local origins Barchiesi juxtaposes the many images of violence enacted against the native people and their culture. Ultimately, he concludes that the local populations of Italy are evaluated in the poem both in terms of their potential contributions to Roman cultural unity as well as in their capacity for disorder and violent political and martial resistance.[84] Following a similar trajectory, W. J. Dominik, in a 2009 article on "Vergil's Geopolitics," suggests reading Vergil's three poems as a supertext[85] that examines "not only ... political activity that takes place in a geographical space but also causal relationships that exist between political power and imperial space".[86] Dominik explores how this "intrusion of political issues and themes"[87] operates in three main respects in the Vergilian supertext: in the repeated destruction of the natural environment of Italy; in the intrusion of the "ever-encroaching"

79 Johnson 2001: 8, speaking specifically on the heterogeneity of Vergil's readers ("the original audience").
80 "The War for *Italia*: Conflict and Collective Memory in Vergil's *Aeneid*." University of California, Berkeley, Spring 2011; see Barchiesi 2011 in the bibliography. I was unfortunately unable to attend these lectures, as my time at Berkeley began in the fall of 2011.
81 Barchiesi 2008: "Il conflitto fra localismo e identità 'globale' è un aspetto importante della storia narrata da Virgilio" (246); "Il poema dà un forte impulso alla costruzione di un'idea di Italia, e persino di unificazione italica: ma lo fa per un clamoroso e colossale secondo fine. L'Italia deve esistere e soffrire perché Roma debba affermarsi e diventare un impero mondiale" (244-45).
82 "Ma l'impatto emotivo di questa strategia è più chiaro se si ripensa al trauma collettivo del *bellum italicum*" (253); "il suo significato non è quello di rappresentare un processo ormai concluso, l'Italia unificata da i Romani sotto Augusto, ma è quello di essere parte attiva in un processo di trasformazione che per i primi lettori del poema è ancora in corso" (260). For another recent account that sees the Social War as "an apt analogue for the wars of *Aeneid* 7-12" (188), see Marincola 2010: "The assumption that these issues [that had arisen from the Social War] were dead or settled, however, underestimates, on the one hand, the reluctance with which the Romans integrated the Italians and, on the other hand, the persistence of local patriotism and local memory amongst the peoples of Italy ... *the process was hardly complete in Virgil's own lifetime*" (191; my italics).
83 Barchiesi 2008: 248. Cf. 246: "Il poema ... si apre con una sorta di atto di speranza nella capacità di superare le proprie origini e di aderire a una nuova patria; ma si chuide anche con una serie di immagini di violenza, che mostrano il prezzo da pagare e la soffrenza inflitta alle comunità locali."
84 "La prospettiva di Virgilio, concludendo, è più complessa e contraddittoria. I popoli italici nel poema sono visti e rivalutati nel loro potenziale contributo a Roma, ma anche nel loro terribile potenziale di resistenze e disordine" (258).
85 "It is scarcely surprising that there is a strong sense in which these three works [the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*] can be viewed narratologically as a supertext, that is, as a single work that can be read intertextually and holistically" (Dominik 2009: 113); cf. also "the Vergilian supertext" (131, et *passim*).
86 Dominik 2009: 111.
87 Ibid.

politico-military and urban world of Rome into the Italian countryside;[88] and, finally, in the constantly changing associations of *umbra* in the Vergilian text, a "shifting pattern of light and darkness, optimism and pessimism" that reflects an overall tendency in the works themselves:[89] "Vergil never presents a univocal stance in his composite text: his narrative, like the world he depicts, oscillates and presents different and conflicting points of view".[90] Thus, for Dominik, as for Barchiesi and Johnson, Vergil's "geopolitics" are concerned largely with giving voice to a local or Italian viewpoint that is not consonant with or equivalent to the Roman one, but which is conceived, if not in contradistinction to the Roman perspective, then in its interstices—in the potentialities forgone upon its intrusion.

While other recent Vergilian scholarship has also touched upon the issues of Italy, ethnicity, and identity, the majority remains concerned with the explication of those topics through the lens of the Roman and Augustan, as already mentioned above.[91] What emerges from the above studies is that there is much to be explored—and especially in Vergil's early works—regarding, in Johnson's words, the "dialectics of hybridity" in Vergil's poems. If we are to acknowledge, along with Johnson (in an earlier work) that Vergil's poetry can be seen to consist of overlapping layers of "multiple and interdependent allegories",[92] then my proposal here is that one of the more prominent themes with which Vergil's poetry engages is the struggle of multi-cultural individuals—in the case of Vergil and his fellow *Cisalpini*, as natives of a formerly "barbarian" province who finally "became" Roman and, soon after, "Italian"—the struggle, that is, to measure and weigh the value and cost of each identity in turn, both singly and against the others; to navigate in tandem the separate and separately constituted strands of these devotions (*terna triplici diversa colore licia*)[93]; and, finally, to determine where amidst such intertwining threads of identity—if anywhere—ultimately resides the self, from moment to moment, or from one circumstance to the next. More simply put, what will concern us in this study we might call the "dialectics of acculturation" in Vergil's poetry, to not stray far from Johnson's own formulation. Yet, it must be acknowledged that the presence of such a dialectic (in literature as well as experience) is not unique to Vergil alone, nor to the Cisalpine-turned-Roman-Italian, but is characteristic more broadly of enfranchised Italian municipals of the first century BC—"naturalized" Romans, in Johnson's parlance.[94] With that in mind, it is beneficial and necessary to contextualize Vergil's poetry more widely in the realities of local, Italian, and Roman acculturation on the Italian peninsula in the last centuries of the Roman Republic, and following the Social War in particular. To that we now turn.

88 Dominik 2009: 112, and 122-127.

89 Dominik 2009: 129. Cf. Dick 1968: "[T]he Virgilian *umbra* mirrors a human emotion. The eclogue begins, or so it seems, on a note of joy, with a picture of serenity: Tityrus in the shade. But as the shepherds enact their drama, the shade changes to shadow, yet both are really manifestations of the same natural phenomenon in addition to being the same word; both are part of a cosmic force that can change forms to suit a human mood, by becoming shade when man is at peace, shadow when he is oppressed" (35).

90 Dominik 2009: 114.

91 Thus Reed 2007, Pogorzelski 2009, Reed 2010, von Albrecht 2010, Fletcher 2014, Nelsestuen 2016. Cf. Bettini 2006, which examines closely the implications for both Italian and Roman identity of Jupiter and Juno's agreement on the future integration (assimilation?) of the Trojans and Latins in *Aen.* 12.

92 Johnson 1976: 20.

93 *Ecl.* 8.73-4.

94 Johnson 2001: 15.

Duae Patriae: Cicero, Roman Italy, and Formulations of Bicultural Identity

At the start of the second book of Cicero's *De Legibus*,[95] Cicero and his interlocutors, having grown tired walking along the river Liris, decide to change locations and hold the second part of their discussion seated on a small island in the middle of the nearby Fibrenus river. On their approach, Cicero's companion Atticus remarks upon the beauty of the region, surprised that Cicero ever stays elsewhere when he is not in Rome. In response, Cicero confirms the loveliness of the place, and then reveals an additional circumstance which draws him to it, one which might not be apparent to Atticus (2.3):[96]

> Quia, si verum dicimus, haec est mea et huius fratris mei germana patria; hic enim orti stirpe antiquissima sumus, hic sacra, hic genus, hic maiorum multa vestigia. quid plura? hanc vides villam, ut nunc quidem est, lautius aedificatum patris nostri studio […] sed hoc ipso in loco, cum avus viveret et antiquo more parva esset villa, ut illa Curiana in Sabinis, me scito esse natum. quare inest nescio quid et latet in animo ac sensu meo, quo me plus hic locus fortasse delectet, siquidem etiam ille sapientissimus vir, Ithacam ut videret, inmortalitatem scribitur repudiasse.
>
> To tell you the truth, this is really my own fatherland, and that of my brother; for here is our descent from a very ancient family; here are our ancestral sacred rites, here the origin of our race; here are many memorials of our forefathers. What more need I say? Yonder you see our homestead as it is now—rebuilt and extended by my father's care … Nay, it was on this very spot, I would have you know, that I was born, while my grandfather was alive and when the homestead, according to the old custom, was small, like that of Curius in the Sabine country. For this reason a lingering attachment for the place abides in my mind and heart, and causes me perhaps to feel a greater pleasure in it; and indeed, as you remember, that exceedingly wise man is said to have refused immortality that he might see Ithaca once more.

Cicero's address to Atticus is an incredible expression of attachment and devotion to one's native home, one's *germana patria*, as Cicero calls it. The importance of the place arises first of all from its connection to family, not only in a synchronic sense relating to figures like brother and father (*fratris mei*; *patris nostri*), who share a lived experience of the land, but also as diachronically connected to the generations that came before (*maiorum*; *avus*). The deep antiquity of his family's interaction with the land is apparent in Cicero's specification that he and his brother were "born of very ancient family/stock" (*orti stirpe antiquissima*) and that both the inherited religious rites of his family (*sacra*) and the physical reminders of his ancestors (*genus*; *maiorum multa vestigia*) are located "in this place", the importance of the location signaled strongly by the quadruple anaphora: *hic … hic … hic … hic ….*[97] This deep sense of generational history bound to locality provides for Cicero the ability to re-imagine the past and one's relationship to it; moreover, it is an attachment that, though expressed through people, institutions, and memories, is in the end embedded in place: it is "in this very place" (*hoc ipso in loco*) that Cicero was born, "this place" that he loves more than

[95] Probably composed sometime in the 50s BCE; Carlà-Uhink 2017: 262 gives the composition as 53-51 BCE.
[96] Text and translation are those of Keyes 1928, with only slight modifications in the translation.
[97] The significance of local and familial history through time is emphasized in a different way in the generational change in the place itself represented by the growth and change of the family *villa* from its earlier smallness and simplicity in the time of Cicero's grandfather, to its more lavish expansion (*aedificatum lautius*) by Cicero's father in the subsequent generation (*patris nostri studio*) that accounts for its current form (*ut nunc quidem est*).

others (*plus hic locus fortasse delectet*).[98] The emotions which the place inspires in Cicero leave him nearly speechless: *inest nescio quid et latet in animo ac sensu meo*. "There lies in it a certain *je ne sais quoi*, nestled deep within my heart and mind".[99] The ineffability of the feeling inspires Cicero to draw a comparison with Odysseus, whose love for his native Ithaca could not be forgotten even in the face of Calypso's offer of immortality should he stay on Ogygia. Cicero's elision of any mention of Penelope, Telemachus, or Odysseus' household summarizes the plot of the *Odyssey* in such a way that Ithaca is made attractive as a place in itself, as well as in its function of standing symbolically for family and other attachments.

In response, Atticus also expresses his delight in the place where his friend was born—yet Atticus, who did not himself hail from an Italian *municipium*, but came from a family with deep roots in the city of Rome itself, is left confused by Cicero's use of the phrase *germana patria* in particular (2.5):

> Atticus: Sed illud tamen quale est, quod paulo ante dixisti, hunc locum, id enim ego te accipio dicere Arpinum, germanam patriam esse vestram? numquid duas habetis patrias? an est una illa patria communis? nisi forte sapienti illi Catoni fuit patria non Roma, sed Tusculum.
>
> Cicero: Ego mehercule et illi et omnibus municipibus duas esse censeo patrias, unam naturae, alteram civitatis, ut ille Cato, cum esset Tusculi natus, in populi Romani civitatem susceptus est; ita, cum ortu Tusculanus esset, civitate Romanus, habuit alteram loci patriam, alteram iuris; ut vestri Attici, prius quam Theseus eos demigrare ex agris et in astu, quod appellatur, omnis se conferre iussit, et sui erant iidem et Attici, sic nos et eam patriam ducimus, ubi nati, et illam, a qua excepti sumus. sed necesse est caritate eam praestare, qua rei publicae nomen universae civitatis est; pro qua mori et cui nos totos dedere et in qua nostra omnia ponere et quasi consecrare debemus. dulcis autem non multo secus est ea, quae genuit, quam illa, quae excepit. itaque ego hanc meam esse patriam prorsus numquam negabo, dum illa sit maior, haec in ea contineatur . . . habet civitates set unam illas civitatem putat.
>
> Atticus: But what did you really mean by the statement you made a while ago, that this place, by which I understand you to refer to Arpinum, is your own fatherland? Have you then two fatherlands? Or is our common fatherland the only one? Perhaps you think that the wise Cato's fatherland was not Rome but Tusculum?
>
> Cicero: Surely I think that he and all natives of Italian towns have two fatherlands, one by nature and the other by citizenship. Cato, for example, though born in Tusculum, received citizenship in Rome, and so, as he was a Tusculan by birth and a Roman by citizenship, had one fatherland which was the place of his birth, and another by law; just as the people of your beloved Attica, before Theseus commanded them all to leave the country and move into the city (the *astu,* as it is called), were at the same time citizens of their own towns and of Attica, so we consider both the place where we were born our fatherland, and also the city into which we have been adopted. But that fatherland must

[98] Cf. Carlà-Uhink 2017: "[I]t is significant that Cicero adopts a vocabulary whose language is loaded and recalls not only the semantic sphere of love, but also underscores his geopiety and the strong, affective component of such a belonging" (259).

[99] Cf. Jenkyns 1998 on this moment in the text: "Cicero seems to be trying to reach vaguely beyond the idea of 'a poor thing but mine own'. The phrases that he uses—'nescio quid', 'nescio quo pacto'—hint that there is something mysterious about this kind of emotion, something not readily put into words" (96).

> stand first in our affection in which the name of republic signifies the common citizenship of all of us. For her it is our duty to die, to her to give ourselves entirely, to place on her altar, and, as it were, to dedicate to her service, all that we possess. But the fatherland which was our parent is not much less dear to us than the one which adopted us. Thus I shall never deny that my fatherland is here, though my other fatherland is greater and includes this one within it; [and in the same way every native of an Italian town, in my opinion,] has [two] citizenships but thinks of them as one citizenship.

Atticus, who has only ever known Rome as *patria* in any sense,[100] questions Cicero's use of the phrase *germana patria*—"true fatherland"; was it not the case that their shared fatherland in Rome, their *patria communis*, was their only fatherland? Cicero's subsequent explanation of the interrelationship between the *germana patria*, one's fatherland by birth, and the *patria communis*, one's adopted fatherland of citizenship, is one of the most interesting and complex expressions of the contours of bicultural identity in the ancient Roman world.[101] While Cicero's insistence that the adopted fatherland of citizenship demands a greater affection and devotion (*caritate praestare*; *dum illa sit maior*) than one's place of origin is a rightly and frequently emphasized feature of this passage, just as interesting are the different sets of associations that Cicero develops in the formulation of each type of fatherland:

germana patria :	*natura/ortus/ genus/stirps*	*nascere/oriri/ gignere*	*locus/sacra/maiores (avus/pater/frater)*	*germanus*
patria communis :	*civitas/ res publica*	*suspicere/excipere*	*ius*	*communis / universus*

As has already started to become clear in our discussion of the first part of this passage, the *germana patria* or *origo* is connected most closely with the ideas of birth, family, and place: thus Cicero and Quintus are born (*orti*; *natum*) in Arpinum, just as Cato and other municipals are born in (*natus*; *ortu*; *nati*) or borne by (*genuit*) their *germana patria*. The notion of birth also lies etymologically at the center of *natura* (from *nascere*) and *germanus* (from *gignere*; cf. *germen* "seed"),[102] each of which relates in its own way to the notions of family (*maiores*; *avus*; *pater*; *frater*), descent (*genus, stirps*) and place (*locus*; *hic*) emphasized elsewhere in Cicero's description. Cicero's concept of Rome as the *patria communis*, on the other hand, is centered around an entirely different set of ideas. Rather than being defined by birth, nature, or place, the *patria communis* is a fatherland of citizenship (*civitas*) and law (*ius*), a feature emphasized also in Cicero's naming it that fatherland "in which the name of republic signifies the common citizenship of all of us" (*qua rei publicae nomen universae civitatis est*). This definitional emphasis on state, legality, and citizenship is expressed largely through the language of sharing and commonality (*communis*; *universus*; *publicus*), rather than through the terminology of family or place—and, indeed, the *patria communis* is not represented by Cicero as being replicated through the functions of birth and descent,[103] as is the *germana patria*, but instead the result of

[100] For an excellent discussion of Atticus' unique perspective here ("...that rarest of creatures in Latin culture: a native Roman, Roman by birth, or, as the phrase goes, 'a Roman of Rome'" [25]), see Farrell 2001: 19, 25-26.
[101] "The double fatherland is surely not dual citizenship, famously forbidden" (Carlà-Uhink 2017: 271).
[102] E.g. Paul. Fest. 95: *germen est, quod ex arborum surculis nascitur; unde et germani, quasi eadem stirpe geniti*; cf. Serv. ad *Aen.* 5.412: *germanus ... de eade genetrice manans, non ut multi dicunt, de eodem germine, quos tantum fratres Varro vocat*. Both *germen* and *germanus* arise from dissimilation of an earlier **gen-men-* (< *gignere*); cf. *carmen* < **can-men* (< *canere*).
[103] While Roman citizenship could of course be inherited, the point here is Cicero's representation of Roman citizenship as something *into which* one is taken or received. Cf. Lomas 1997: 4: "In Rome, citizenship was more a matter of senatorial grant and legal status than of birth or descent, a process which reached its logical

processes of reception or adoption: *suscipere*; *excipere*. In Cicero's formulation, then, the *germana patria* is defined more through natural or naturally occurring features or relationships—place and landscape, birth, family, and descent—whereas the *patria communis* maintains its existence through artificial or man-made cultural systems or institutions—law, citizenship, nationhood—in which individuals are incorporated into the resultant political or civic totality, one which must be prioritized in affection and devotion over one's *patria* of birth. "What is most striking here is the way in which the entire conversation, despite the interlocutors' occasional protests to the contrary, systematically privileges the claims of culture over those of nature".[104] We will return to this tension between nature and culture when discussing the *Georgics*.

It is widely recognized that Cicero's formulation of the theory of the municipal Roman's *duae patriae* seen here ultimately stems from the naturalized citizen's "need to reconcile local cultural and ethnic identity with the new status of Roman citizenship".[105] What was an earlier tendency to see the coexistence of the local and shared fatherlands in Cicero's text as unproblematic[106] has been supplanted in recent years with theories embracing more realistic interpretations of the dynamics of local identity during this period. Andrew Feldherr, for example, sees Cicero here "at pains to define the relationship between his native place and the Roman *res publica*", ultimately classifying Cicero's articulation of his *duae patriae* as "less a schematized resolution of this possible conflict of loyalties than a diagnosis of an abiding tension in the construction of each individual's civic identity".[107] Filippo Carlà-Uhink also sees Cicero as eager to define a very personal tension between Roman and Arpinate identities, one "he claims had been, and still was, felt by anyone in his position".[108] Yet, Carlà-Uhink cautions, this does not mean that the theory of the two fatherlands should be read as some sort of identity-based "schizophrenia", but instead as an active step in achieving one of the primary aims of Cicero's wider political agenda, namely, a reformulation of the understanding of Roman-Italic bicultural identity, itself a necessary step in the creation of a pan-Italic elite

conclusion in 90/89 BCE when Roman citizenship was extended to all Italians."

[104] Farrell 2001: 21. Farrell's discussion (esp. 18-23) highlights how this systematic "privileg[ing]" of culture over nature is present also in parts of this scene not discussed here, particularly in Atticus's viewing Cicero's act of "acculturating nature" (by making the Fibrenus a seat of philosophical discussion) as positive, while seeing others' act of "counterfeiting nature" (by decorating their villas with naturalistic features) as negative, as well as in Atticus' description of the Fibrenus' island being loaded with "overdetermined cultural markers" (22).

[105] Lomas 1997: 4. Some of the many more recent discussions of this passage include: Sherwin-White 1973; Y. Thomas 1996; Feldherr 1998: Ch. 4; Jenkyns 1998: 91-97; Farrell 2001: 18-26; Dyck 2004; Farney 2007: 5-11; Dolganov 2008; Krebs 2009; Dench 2013; and Carlà-Uhink 2017.

[106] E.g. Nicolet 1980 (esp. 44-47), who is characterized by Feldherr 1998 as arguing "that the new allegiance to Rome presented no conflicts for the new citizens because it existed 'on a different level' from the previous citizenship to the native state" (Ch. 4: § I; unpaginated). Sherwin-White 1973 recognizes the importance of both local and legal fatherland for Romans of Italy ("so strong were the forces of local patriotism", 154), but does not seem to understand this local patriotism as creating any sort of tension with Roman loyalty; municipal Italians were "men to whom both *patriae* are real" (173; cf. more broadly 153-173).

[107] Feldherr 1998: Ch. 4, § I; unpaginated. Feldherr sees the attachment to the local and legal fatherlands as having no qualitative difference, but differing only in the fact that the larger legal fatherland of Rome requires a greater amount of *caritas* than the *germana patria*; here Feldherr follows Bonjour 1975: "Il est évident que le *de legibus* (2.5) ne fait qu'une différence quantitative, et non qualitative dans la *caritas* selon qu'elle se rapporte à la grande ou à la petite patrie" (64). Fletcher 2014 likewise sees this passage as drawing attention to the existence of a tension between the two *patriae* ("Cicero realizes that the existence of two *patriae* creates a problem: how to choose between them when the need arises", 6); Fletcher ultimately characterizes Vergil's goal in the *Aeneid* as a resolution of this tension by exploring "the challenge of developing this love of one's greater *patria*" (ibid.).

[108] Carlà-Uhink 2017: 261.

that could act as a strong and unified force in Roman politics:[109] "The idea and ideal of Italy—and of the necessary engagement of the Italian elites in the Roman imperial project—that he developed in this context was one of the most relevant products of his entire life and activity".[110] Emma Dench, meanwhile, also contextualizing the *De legibus* against Cicero's broader literary output, casts light on how Cicero's various self-representations in his writings fluctuate between emphasizing his 'newness' and his 'nobility', between highlighting his 'foreignness', on the one hand, and his exemplarity as a specimen of Roman virtue, on the other.[111] Cicero's complex self-representations "reveal highly significant (and ultimately influential) choices about the relative positions of Rome and local *patriae*".[112]

Such complex and varied navigation of the space between municipal, Roman, and pan-Italic identities as we see in Cicero's writing is certainly best understood in the context of "the identity crisis that characterized the central part of the 1st century BC in the aftermath of the Social War".[113] Yet the Social War, too, deserves contextualization, and it will benefit us here to briefly consider the history the history of Roman and Italic relations prior to the first century BC. The early history of Rome, as any reader of Livy's first three pentads will be reminded, is unquestionably the story of the defeat of the Italic peoples,[114] with some of the earliest events of Livy's legendary first book—Aeneas' initial conflict with the Aborigines, the Sabine *raptus* and subsequent wars, Tullus Hostilius' emptying and razing of Alba Longa[115]—serving as a fitting prelude to this history of encroachment and subjugation. In historical time, struggles with the Latins, Etruscans, and Samnites occupied a great deal of Roman attention in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE, their outcomes setting the tone for Roman-Italian interaction in the coming centuries. At the end of the Latin War in 493, the Cassian Treaty created the expectation that Roman allies would provide troops and military assistance to Rome and established the rights of intermarriage, commerce, and intermigration, yet did not enfranchise the Latins or allow them an active role in Roman politics.[116] The defeat and annexation of the territory of Etruscan Veii in 396, meanwhile, doubled the size of the *ager Romanus*, and the expansion of Roman territory afterward became, if not a goal of Roman hegemony on the peninsula, then a significant and noticeable effect: by 286, little over a century later, the *ager Romanus* stretched all from Rome on the Tyrrhenian coast to the colony of Hadria on the Adriatic.[117] After 338, when Roman victory in the Second

[109] Carlà-Uhink 2017: 263, 269. On the essence of this integration, see ibid. 276: "It was well known that Ennius himself in his *Annales*, had written about his condition in the verse *nos sumus Romani, qui fuvimus ante Rudini*. Cicero would have approved: these words did not mean that Ennius now "rejected" his previous hometown—he was simply emphasizing his new citizenship."

[110] Carlà-Uhink 2017: 279.

[111] Dench 2013: 130, and *passim*.

[112] Dench 2013: 137.

[113] Carlà-Uhink 2017: 262; see also ibid. 260, 279. Cf. also Sherwin-White 1973: 153-155. Y. Thomas 1996; Feldherr 1998: Ch. 4: intr., § I; Jenkyns 1998: 91-97; Farrell 2001: 25-26; Ando 2002; Farney 2007: 5-11.

[114] Cf. Scopacasa 2016: "[I]n many ways the Roman expansion was an Italian phenomenon, in the sense that Italian communities and institutions had a decisive impact on the development of Roman hegemony from the outset" (35).

[115] Conflict with Latinus and the Aborigines: 1.1-2; rape of the Sabines and wars with Caeninenses, Crustumini, Antemnates, and Sabines: 1.9-13; war and destruction of Alba Longa: 1.22-29.

[116] Scopacasa 2016: 36-7. For the following discussion I am especially endebted to this article of Scopacasa's.

[117] Scopacasa 2016: 37, 42. As blatant proof of "hegemonic intent" among the Romans, Scopacasa cites the Romans' second treaty with the Carthaginians in 348, which gave the Carthaginians allowance to attack Latin cities that were disobedient to Rome, so long as control was subsequently handed over to the Romans (Polybius 3.24; Scopacasa 2016: 39).

Latin War brought about the dissolution of the so-called Latin League, the Roman encroachment upon Italy entered a new phase. On the one hand, Latin cities including Lanuvium, Aricium, and Nomentum were made into *municipia* and given full citizenship, an act which gave special privilege to many of the Latin cities;[118] on the other hand, the Romans began to award more frequently the so-called *civitas sine suffragio*, a "citizenship" which allowed its holder the rights to trade, intermarriage, and commerce, but did not promise eventual access to full political rights, and obligated the communities to provide Rome with military support.[119] Rome's new practice at this time of binding Italian communities to themselves by extensions of citizenships and alliances, as well a more sweeping of colony foundation as a strategy for maintaining control of the peninsula, as Rafael Scopacasa suggests, were both "mostly about controlling Roman manpower": "Generally speaking, the various political agreements between Rome and the Italians can be seen as different means to that end, since the one thing Italians had in common was the obligation to provide troops for Rome".[120]

The fourth through second centuries found an increasing Roman presence and power on the peninsula, with the final campaigns against the Samnites and increased military activity in Magna Graecia and across the Apennines to the north.[121] The result of all this expansion and, to an extent, extension of political rights to Italians was a marked closing of the citizenship ranks in the second century, as well as an increasing focus on restricting the access of Italians and foreigners to the city of Rome itself.[122] A *lex Claudia de sociis* in 177 expelled Latins and Italians from Rome, foreshadowing similar laws banishing foreigners and Latins during the Gracchan conflicts of the late second century,[123] in the midst of which Rome's Italian allies were repeatedly cheated of a potential amelioration of their situation. In 133, Tiberius Gracchus' land redistribution law reappropriated land from Italian allies, but passed over them as recipients of this new public land, and when M. Fulvius Flaccus' proposal to extend citizenship to at least some subset of the Italian allies failed in 125, the Latin colony of Fregellae revolted against Rome, and in consequence was raised to the ground, replaced by the colony of Fabrateria Nova a year later.[124] Flaccus and C. Gracchus attempted unsuccessfully to push the question of Italian enfranchisement again in 123,

118 Livy 8.14; Scopacasa 2016: 40. On the so-called "municipalization" of Italy, see Bispham 2007 and 2016b.

119 Livy 8.14.10-11; Scopacasa 2016: 40, 43-44. For communities receiving the *civitas sine suffragio* after 338, Scopacasa lists Capua, Suessula, Cumae, Fundi, Formiae, Acerrae, and Privernum. Against the earlier idea (e.g. Humbert 1978) that the *civitas sine suffragio* was "an intermediary stage in the enfranchisement of the Italians", Scopacasa cites the evidence that the only examples of full enfranchisement of communities that previously had the *civitas sine suffragio* is that of Fundi, Formiae, and Arpinum in 188 BCE (Livy 38.36.7-8; Scopacasa 2016: 44.). Instead, as Scopacasa argues, the *civitas sine suffragio* represented a number of different political relationship with Rome among different communities, in most cases mutually beneficial to Romans and Italians, with local communities for the most part remaining politically autonomous throughout their interaction with Rome.

120 Scopacasa 2016: 44. See also: Broadhead 2008.

121 Second (326-304) and Third (298-290) Samnite Wars; Pyrrhic/Tarentine War (280-275), itself involving Samnites, Lucanian, Bruttians, and Greek cities of the Italian south; and the Gallic War with the Boii and Insubres (225-222), in addition to smaller conflicts and the wider chaos brought on by the Hannibalic War.

122 Farney 2007: 4. Cf. Brunt 1988: 105: "But if promotions occurred in the second century, they must have raised hopes of enfranchisement elsewhere, which were frustrated only because Rome departed from that liberality with the citizenship which had earlier been a mark of her policy."

123 A *lex Iunia de peregrinis* was proposed by the tribune M. Iunius Pennus in 126 (Val. Max. 9.5; Appian 1.21, 1.34), while a *lex Fannia* on the expulsion of Latins and Italians from the city was put forward by the consul C. Fannius in 122 (Plutarch, *C. Gracch.* 12.1); for the *lex Claudia de sociis*, see Livy 41.8-9.

124 App. *BCE* 1.21; Val. Max. 9.5.1; Plutarch *C. Gracch.* 3.1; Badian 1958: 391-93; Mouritsen 1998: 112-13; Marincola 2010: 188-89; Kent 2018: 265-66.

inciting retaliation from the consul C. Fannius, and in 95 the consular *lex Licinia Mucia* penalized all Italian *peregrini* who were illegally enjoying the privileges of Roman citizenship and drove all unenfranchised Italians from the city, a step which "did more than anything to provoke the Social War".[125] The last failed push to extend citizenship to the Italians would come in 91 from the tribune M. Livius Drusus, whose proposed legislation included a *lex de sociis* meant to enfranchise the allies; the bill went unpassed, and soon afterward Drusus was murdered, finally driving the Italians to rebel against Rome.

The conflict that ensued—called the Marsic War, Italian War, or, later, the Social War—is one of the most significant events of the first century,[126] and certaintly the most important in the ongoing negotiation between Roman, Italian, and local identities, one that necessitated "a complete reshaping and renegotiation of the structures and concepts of identity throughout Italy".[127] Yet it is only recently that scholars have begun to draw attention to how much the importance and impact of this war have been overlooked in previous studies.[128] These conceptual advances consist generally in the recognition of two significant facts. First off is the argument put forward most strongly by Henrik Mouritsen, but entertained to various extents by a number of other scholars, that the aim of the Italian coalition in the Social War was not citizenship, but independence from Rome in the form of their own autonomous state or some kind of structure of shared power.[129] Indeed, the allies' formation of a government "explicitly parallel and

125 *OCD*, s.v. *lex (2)*: *lex Licinia Mucia*, referencing Cic. *Off.* 3.47 and Asconius 67-8C; cf. Marincola 2010: 189, Tweedie 2012, Dart 2014: 61-64. Bispham 2016 suggests that the law came as a response to the census of 97, wherein "large numbers of well-to-do Italians decided to take advantage of the nature of the census (simply turning up and making a declaration to the censors of name, wealth, tribe, and domicile) in order to pass themselves off as Roman citizens" (86).

126 Indeed, Diodorus Siculus, who himself lived through the civil wars later in the century, called the Marsic War the "greatest war" in human history (μέγιστον ... πόλεμον, 37.1), one that was "greater than all those that came before" (μείζονα πάντων τῶν προγεγονότων, 37.2); *pace* Santangelo 2018: 249-50.

127 Carlà-Uhink 2017: 268. Cf. Lomas 2004, on how the Social war "created an intense debate among the Italian nobility about the nature of regional identity" (97-8); and Santangelo 2018: "The war had far-reaching ranging economic and financial consequences for the whole of Italy" (246).

128 Carlà-Uhink 2017: "Recent scholarship has demonstrated that the Social War represented a much greater, and much more relevant, trauma for Rome than was thought previously, but the full extent of the war and its aftermath remain underappreciated" (268). Cf. Thomas 1996, Ando 2002, Barchiesi 2008, Dench 2013.

129 Mouritsen 1998; also Sherwin-White 1973: 144-149, De Sanctis 1976, and Pobjoy 2000, the last focusing on liberty *from* the Romans as one of the Italians' main goals. Both Mouritsen and Pobjoy challenge the standard view of full enfranchisement as the Italians' goal as earlier stated in Salmon 1962, Brunt 1965 (reprinted in Brunt 1988), and Salmon 1982; cf. Cic. *Phil.* 12.27, Ando 2002: 127. See Ridley 2003: 34-55, Dart 2014: 9-21, and Santangelo 2018 for good overviews of scholarship on this issuue. Galsterer 1976 (esp. 189-99) demonstrates the variety of perspectives and aims among the Italians in the war. Gabba 1994, following Gabba 1976, suggests that Italians sought the Roman citizenship in order that those in the commercial class might enjoy the same economic benefits as the Romans; cf. Bispham 2016a: 82-3. Farney 2007: 1-5 acknowledges Mouritsen's argument (p. 3 n. 6), but focuses himself on the possibility that the reports of Velleius Paterculus (2.15.2), Appian (*BCE* 1.34), and Florus (*Epit.* 2.6.1-2) that the Italian allies sought partnership in empire might stem from allied propaganda at the time of the war. Bispham 2016a provides an excellent discussion of the different issues involved, ultimately summarizing the citizenship issue as follows: "Citizenship was sought; when it was repeatedly denied, usurped, and then revoked, it became clear that this avenue to the benefits sought was closed off as far as Romans are concerned. ... [T]his was more than revolt, it was an attempt to establish a new order" (86); see also Bispham 2007. Santangelo 2018 agrees in a general sense with the Mouritsen camp that "the degree of mistrust generated among the Allies by decades of arbitrary inaction on the part of the Roman elite created the momentum for an offensive that had the ambition to redefine the balance of power across the Italian peninsula" (237). See also: Nagle 1973; Millar 1995; Schultz 2006; Harris 2007; Dart 2009; Kendall 2012.

opposed to that of Rome", with a capital located in the Paelignian metropolis of Corfinium, renamed Italica, as well as the creation of coinage clearly representing aspirations for the Romans' complete defeat, both align more fittingly with hopes for political independence than for incorporation.[130] The awarding of citizenship that did occur—first, in 90 for the loyal and quick-to-surrender allies via the *lex Iulia*, then later in 89 for any individual enrolled and residing in an allied community through the *lex Plautia Papiria*[131]—was as much a calculated move to weaken Italian resolve and unity as it was a Roman admission that it was no longer possible any longer to deny allied Italians full participation in and incorporation into the Roman state.[132] By that act, then, all of Italy below the Apennines became Roman—yet it must not be looked over that it was in the process of this war that the idea of *Italia* as a collective political entity and the concept of "Italian" as a kind of pan-ethnic identity first emerged: "Italy and Italian therefore become a political unity and an ethnic category for the first time in 90 BCE, and they were defined in the first instance by their exclusion of Rome".[133] Rome's defeat and enfranchisement of the allied forces headed off the possibility of a unified pan-Italian identity conceived in contradistinction to Roman identity, yet the Romans would soon seize hold of this newly formulated, but unrealized—"*incompiuta*"[134]—spirit of a collective Italian identity in order to channel and transform it into their own version of Italian unification: *Roman* Italy.[135]

And yet—and here is the second important acknowledgement by recent scholarship on the legacy and significance of the Social War—the unification and incorporation of Roman Italy was far from instantaneous. Late twentieth-century scholarship displayed a tendency to overlook this fact, treating the unification of Roman Italy as fully complete upon the conclusion of the Social War in 89 BC.[136] Since the late 1990s, however, Vergilian scholars in particular have begun to re-emphasize what was already clear to Syme at the end of the 40s, that the effects of the Social War were felt not for years, but for decades, and

[130] Bispham 2016a: 86, Santangelo 2018: 237; cf. Johnson 2001: 14; Ando 2002: 127; Tataranni 2005: 2. For more on the Social War coinage referenced here, see Chapter 4 ('*Vítelii*'), herein.

[131] Bispham 2016a: 87; Santangelo 2018: 242-44. While Santangelo asserts that the *lex Plautia Papiria* was indeed the law that extended the possibility of enfranchisement to any resident and enrolled in allied cities, Bispham maintains that we do not have the name of the law in question, the *lex Plautia Papiria* dealing with "ancillary categories of a new citizen" (87). Cf. Brunt 1988: 107-8; Gabba 1994: 126; Bispham 2007: 162-72; Mouritsen 1998: 155-56. See also the discussion of laws earlier in this chapter, as well as nn. 39 and 40, above.

[132] As, for example, Santangelo 2018: "The Social War ended with a comprehensive military victory for Rome, but by the time it was over the Roman elite had come to the conclusion that there was no alternative to the inclusion of the Allies into the citizen body" (248).

[133] Ando 2002: 127. Cf. Jenkyns 1998: "Italy first became a political idea and a focus for emotional attachment as late as 90 BCE, with the Social War; and even then the insurrection left much of the peninsula unaffected. The allies issued coins showing a bull, symbol of Italy, trampling the Roman wolf" (79).

[134] Giardina 1997 (*L'Italia romana: storie d'identità incompiuta*). Cf. Barchiesi 2008; Santangelo 2018: 249-50.

[135] Cf. Johnson 2001: "[T] here had been another moment when Italy's unification seemed about to take place. This unification was not Italy's with Rome but Italy's with itself" (14).

[136] E.g. Lomas 1997: "The vast majority of authors are writing in the late republic or principate, *long after* the conquest of the peninsula *even after the political unification brought about by the Social War*" (4; my italics); Bradley 1997: "The Social War was the last political and military action taken by the allies as ethnic groups. The consequence of their success in gaining the concession of citizenship from Rome was that such groups became politically redundant" (60); and Fletcher 2014: 2—see note 30, above. Cf. Dench 2005: "[T]he continued and *largely unquestioned* use of the term 'unification' to describe Roman Italy *after the Social War* tends to encourage the equation between ancient ideology and the ideology of the modern nation-state" (152); and Marincola 2010: "[S]cholars sometimes envision the effects of the Social War as long settled by Virgil's time, with Italy integrated and unproblematically on Octavian's side" (187).

that the subsequent process of incorporating the Italians into the Roman state lasted for much longer than previously recognized.[137] The slowness of this social and political incorporation is apparent in the history of post-Social War Italy. First of all, though the laws and concessions of 89 BC mark the end of the greatest part of the conflict with the allies, the fighting continued in southern Italy into the late 80s: "In fact, the Social War was never properly finished off, and the Samnites and Lucanians were left to a de facto independence, having suffered no definitive defeat, until Sulla's return from the East in 83 BC".[138] After his victory in the late 80s, Sulla punished the Italian towns which had sided with the Marians by imposing colonies on them or stripping them of their citizenship (Volaterrae, Arretium), by dispossessing them of land to settle veterans (Pompeii, Faesulae), and otherwise taking a "genocidal interest" in the Samnites in particular, whose resistance had lasted for the longest.[139] At the same time, though the *leges Iulia* and *Plautia Papiria* had created the legal possibility of Italian enfranchisement, this could not happen in actuality until the Italians were registered officially through the *census*, which wasn't successfully undertaken until 70/69, two full decades after the end of the war—and the year of Vergil's birth.[140] Indeed, it is more than likely that "there must have also been a deliberate attempt to delay the full inclusion of the new citizens".[141] This entire "complex of psychological, institutional, religious, social and economic trauma" brought on by Sulla created Italian unrest down through the late 60s and beyond.[142] In 78, the consul Lepidus capitalized on the dissatisfaction of the dispossessed Italians at Faesulae in an attempt to bring about revolution at Rome; Catiline in 63 likewise marshalled the Italian dispossessed to support his cause against Rome;[143] and in the late 40s following the victory at Philippi, the eighteen wealthiest cities of Italy were made into colonies to settle Octavian and Antony's veterans, causing upheaval and distress in Vergil's own Cisalpine Gaul, as well as in Umbrian Perusia. This last conflict, the Perusine War between Octavian and Antony's

137 Syme 1939: "After a decade of war, Italy was united, but only in name, not in sentiment ... There could be no reconciliation until a long time had elapsed" (88). Cf. Toll 1997: "The newly enfranchised had little reason to feel that they had become full members of the Roman state" (38); Dench 2005: "This ability to portray Italians as foreigners [in Livy] is to my mind a reminder of the difficulty of incorporating Italy after the Social War: Italy was actively having to be written into Roman history, even and especially during the Augustan and Tiberian periods" (23); and Marincola 2010: "It would be all too easy to see the issues that had arisen from the Social War as being dead by Virgil's time. ... The assumption that these issues were dead or settled, however, underestimates, on the one hand, the reluctance with which the Romans integrated the Italians and, on the other hand, the persistence of local patriotism and local memory amongst the peoples of Italy. The process of the Romanization of the peninsula was hardly straightforward, and ... the process was hardly complete in Virgil's own lifetime" (191). Cf. also Roselaar 2002: 12.

138 Bispham 2016a: 87. Indeed, the reason for the abandonment of the war's southernmost campaigns was the outbreak of conflict between Sulla and Marius in Rome; in the conflicts of the following decade, the *Mariani* appealed specifically to the separatist Samnites and Lucanians who, at the battle of the Colline Gate in 82 BCE, would "[intervene] as autonomous players against Sulla" (Bispham 2016b: 92). Interpretations like Santangelo's, namely that "it is misguided to regard the civil conflict between Sulla and Mariani as a continuation of the Social War" (Santangelo 2018: 244) are, on the surface, true. Nevertheless, it is equally misguided to see the Samnites' and Lucanians' participation in the Sullan civil wars as an indication that their desire for political freedom from Rome had disappeared; Santangelo himself points clearly to the continuation of these tensions at pp. 246-49.

139 Bispham 2016b: 93-96; p. 94 for Sulla's "genocidal interest in the Samnites", and Bispham 2016a: *passim*. See Santangelo 2018: 248 on the enfranchisement of the Samnites/Lucanians in 84 BCE; also Livy *Per.* 84.2.

140 Bispham 2016b: 91-2, 96-7; Patterson 2016: 489; Santangelo 2018: 248.

141 Santangelo 2018: 248. Santangelo cites "concerns over the possible impact of a revision of the senatorial roll" as a potential cause. See also: Wiseman 1969: 65; Dart 2010: 103-104; and Dart 2014: 185-187, 209-212.

142 Bispham 2016b: 95.

143 Faesulae: Sallust, *Hist.* 1.57 (McGushin); Granius Licinianus 36.36-7C. Catiline: Sallust, *Cat.* 24, 27-28, 30.

brother Lucius, is often spoken of as part of the civil wars of this period, yet it came on the heels of serious mistreatment of the Italians by the Romans, and, whatever the conflict meant to the Romans who waged it, Appian reminds us that the Italians supporting Lucius did so since "they believed that he was fighting for them against the new colonists",[144] the Italians stirred into action specifically by the wrongs done them by the Romans.[145] This summary of the continued struggle for Italian rights after the end of the Social War is by no means meant to be comprehensive;[146] it is, however, meant to show that the close of the Social War was not the flipping of some magic switch that effected the social and political incorporation of Italians into the Roman state, but merely the start of decades of political and sometimes violently expressed contention that was by no means complete by Vergil's day.

These larger political struggles of the first century were accompanied, meanwhile, by smaller-scale acts of offense or discrimination directed toward those of Italian municipal origins, of the kind that according to modern theory would be classified as "microaggressions", or specifically "microinsults".[147] One frequent recipient of this kind of treatment was, unsurprisingly, Cicero, who, despite his hometown of Arpinum having been enfranchised since the early second century, was often attacked for his *novitas* to the Roman political scene, in many ways the paragon of the put-upon "new man".[148] During the trial for P. Cornelius Sulla in 62, Cicero as defender was attacked by the prosecutor L. Manlius Torquatus as being "the third foreign king of Rome" (*tertium peregrinum regem*) following Numa and Tarquinius; when pressed about his meaning, Torquatus responded, "What I mean by this, is that you are from a *municipium*".[149] Sallust, meanwhile, has Catiline in his *Bellum Catilinum* criticize the upstart Cicero as "a resident alien in the city of Rome" (*inquilinus civis urbis Romae*), implying that his outsider status made him an ill-suited adviser to the Senate and the republic as whole.[150] It is this same argument that is replicated in the pseudo-Sallustian *In Ciceronem*, in which the author says that "M. Tullius defends the laws, courts, and republic as if he were the sole survivor of the family of the illustrious Scipio Africanus, and not a foundling citizen,

144 Appian *BCE* 5.27, trans. White (1913); also Bispham 2016b: 100. Appian continues: "Not only the cities that had been designated for the army, but almost the whole of Italy rose, fearing like treatment" (5.27). Cf. *BCE* 5.19: "[Lucius] alone received kindly, and promised aid to the agriculturists who had been deprived of their lands and who were now the suppliants of every man of importance; and they promised to carry out his orders."

145 Habinek 1998 characterizes the conflict as follows: "In the Perusine War of the late '40s, the then Octavian directed the destruction of a movement that represented itself as a revival of the early first-century concept of *tota Italia*: that is, all of Italy and to hell with Rome" (91).

146 One might include, e.g., Sulla's law *de proscriptiorum filiis* that kept any descendants of proscribed citizens from holding the citizenship until 49 BCE, or the *lex Papia de Peregrinis* that is mentioned in Cicero's *Pro Archia*, or the decline in the speaking and writing of local Italian languages through the 1st century BCE (e.g. Lomas 2016).

147 *Microaggression* are defined by Torino et al. 2019b as "derogatory slights or insults directed at a target person or persons who are members of an oppressed group" and which "communicate bias" (3). *Microinsults* are defined by Torino et al. as "unintentional behaviors or verbal comments that convey rudeness or insensitivity or demean a person's racial heritage/identity, gender identity, religion, ability, or sexual orientation identity" which "are characterized by an insulting hidden message" (4).

148 The standard work on *novi homines* or "new men" in Roman politics remains Wiseman's 1971 *New Men in the Roman Senate*; the usage of *novus homo* which Wiseman makes use of in this book is "a senator whose forebears had been of equestrian status and had not entered the Senate at all" (1). On the Social War, Wiseman notes that in the post-war period there "opened up a huge new potential membership of the Senate among the local aristocrats of the newly enfranchised Italian states" (6).

149 "'*Hoc dico,' inquit, 'te esse ex municipio*". Both this and Torquatus' accusation are recorded at Cic. *Sull.* 22.

150 Sall. *Cat.* 31; cf. Dench 2013: 125.

called in, recently grafted upon this city," later calling him *Romule Arpinas*, "the Romulus from Arpinum".[151] Examples of these types of microagressions, of course, are by no means limited to those received or promulgated by Cicero. Valerius Maximus records Pompey the Great as attacking a certain Helvius Mancia of Formia as "a municipal man, reeking of ancestral servitude" (*municipali homini, servitutem paternam redolenti*), and also relates the story of P. Scipio Nasica losing a campaign for the curule aedileship after shaking the farmwork-hardened (*rustico opere duratam*) hand of a constituent and jokingly asking whether he made a habit of walking around on his hands, a comment which those of the district judged to be Scipio mocking them for their poverty (*paupertatem sibi ab eo exprobratam iudicantes*).[152] Tacitus, meanwhile, relates in his *Annals* that Livilla, in her affair with Sejanus, had "defiled herself, her ancestry, and her posterity, with a market-town adulterer (*municipali adultero*)", and later remarks that it was was a *maeror* that Drusus' daughter Julia had married Rubellius Blandus, a *novus homo* with origins in Tibur.[153] Such evidence of abuse directed at those of Italian municipal origin even in Tacitus' histories of the early empire make abundantly clear how drawn out the process of the social and political Italian incorporation into the Roman state truly was.

A further interesting aspect of Italian discrimination is the fact that those who suffered this sort of abuse were often just as guilty of perpetrating it against others. We may again take Cicero as an example, who often made use of this type of rhetoric when it served his purposes, especially in the case of those whose origins from towns further afield from the Roman center than Arpinum might make them seem less worthy of the identity label "Roman".[154] Thus, in 57, Cicero berates Piso for his Transpadane origin—*neque huius urbis, sed Placentini municipii*—and Insubrian ancestry—*braccatae cognationis dedecus*;[155] in the *Brutus*, he claims that Italian and provincial orators are as a rule inferior to Roman ones, since "their oratory lacks a certain urbane coloring", *urbanitatis color*, a feature Cicero can't explain, but tells Brutus he will understand when he travels to Cisalpine Gaul;[156] and in the *Pro Fonteio*, Cicero's entire defense of that governor of *Gallia Narbonensis* involves painting a picture of his accusers as untrustworthy, human-sacrificing barbarians, providing "an example of how Roman notions of civilization might form the basis of discrimination".[157] These cases represent Cicero's more extreme examples of this type of stereotyping; in

[151] Ps.-Sall. *In Cic.* 1: *M. Tullius leges, iudicia, rem publicam defendit ... quasi unus reliquus e familia viri clarissimi, Scipionis Africani, ac non reperticius, accitus, ac paulo ante insitus huic urbi civis*; ibid. 7: *Romule Arpinas*; for a discussion of grafting (as in *insitus* here) and other metaphors of acculturation in Roman thought, see Chapter 3 of this study. The text here is that of Shackleton Bailey 2002, as is the translation, with small changes. Carlà-Uhink 2017 describes this passage as "suggest[ing] that even in 62 a Roman from the Urbs could still imagine gaining support among jurors and the wider public by lamenting the consequences of the Social War" (267). Cf. too Clodius' insinuation of Cicero's unsophisticated origins recorded at *Att.* 1.16.10: *'quid' inquit 'homini Arpinati cum aquis calidis*?'

[152] Val. Max. 6.2.8 and 7.5.2, respectively. Cf. *Vir. Ill.* 58.8, where P. Scipio Aemilianus attacks the supporters of the Gracchi "for whom Italy was not a mother, but a stepmother" ('*quibus Italia noverca, non mater est*').

[153] Tac. *Ann.* 4.3.4 and 6.27.1, respectively.

[154] This sort of intra-group discrimination could be argued to stem from Cicero's internalized oppression as a municipal Italian and his occasional privilege of "passing" as an assimilated Roman citizen. On "internalized oppression" and "passing," see David & Derthick 2014 and Ginsberg 1996, respectively.

[155] *Pis.* 53.

[156] *Brut.* 170-1: *'quod non est eorum urbanitate quadam quasi colorata oratio.'* [171] *Et Brutus: 'Qui est, inquit, iste tandem urbanitatis color?'* [*Cicero*:] *'Nescio, inquam; tantum esse quendam scio. Id tu, Brute, iam intelleges, cum in Galliam veneris.'*

[157] Woolf 1998: 62, and 61-63 for the *Pro Fonteio* and its strategy more broadly; also Coşkun 2005 on the different institutionalized or speech-based forms of inclusion and exclusion in Cicero's speeches. Indeed, Cicero calls upon the notion of "barbarism" frequently in the extant portions of the fragmentary oration: *Pro Font.* 4 (*planius se confirmare crimen libidine barbarorum quam nostrorum hominum litteris arbitretur*?), 23 (*an vero vos id in testimoniis hominum barbarorum dubitabitis quod persaepe et nostra et patrum memoria sapientissimi iudices de clarissimis nostrae civitatis viris*

more self-conscious or defensive moments, he reveals his own awareness that arguments of this kind were fallacious, especially as they applied to enfranchised Italians. In the same passage from his defense of Sulla cited above, Cicero responds to Torquatus' jibe that his Arpinate origins made him a *peregrinus* by pointing out that the same argument could apply to Torquatus: "for he himself on his mother's side is a municipal (*municipalis*), of the most honorable and noble kind, to be sure, but from Asculum all the same (*sed tamen Asculani*)". Therefore, Cicero says, unless Torquatus would claim that only the *Picentes* were not foreigners, he should be glad that Cicero didn't consider his own heritage higher than Torquatus' (*gaudeat suo generi me meum non anteponere*), implying that Arpinum's nearness to Rome made it far less "foreign".[158] Cicero executes the same move at *Philippics* 3.15ff., though in defense of Octavian, whom Antony had attacked for his mother's municipal origins in Aricia:

> "A mother from Aricia. You might think he were saying from Lydian Tralles or Ephesus. Do you see how much he looks down upon all of us from the *municipia*—that is to say, essentially *all of us*; for what number of us is not? ... But, if you do not approve of an Arician wife, then how is it you boast of one from Tusculum? ... What foolishness it is, then, that he say anything about the disgracefulness of wives, whose own father married Numitoria from Fregellae, daughter of a traitor...".[159]

While these examples do not explicitly point out the invalidity of such arguments—for it is certainly clear that Cicero intends the reputations of those he attacks to be harmed by such rhetoric—the hypocrisy revealed by the fact that almost any Roman could have their civic validity brought down by charges of municipal association does point toward the recognition that discrimination based on local Italian origins was not strictly justified.

It is likely for this reason that an equally strong, if not stronger, thread in Cicero's works in which "Cicero stresses that one's local origin constitutes an important element of identity construction and of identification"[160]—thus Cicero's emphasis on Arpinum as his *germana patria* in the *De Legibus* and elsewhere; his arguments in favor of Italian and provincial citizenships in orations like the *Pro Balbo* and *Pro Archia*; and his willingness to take up the mantle of *novitas* and so justify his *Romanitas* through it, since, as Emma Dench has argued, "[t]o a considerable degree, assuming the figure of the 'new man' naturalizes the 'foreignness' of the individual with a place of origin outside the city of Rome".[161] More often than not, however, Cicero's argument for municipal belonging was not based in the promotion of individual local identities, but rather in the promotion of a sense of pan-Italian identity of the sort noted to have developed among Rome's allies during the Social War. This is the idea of *tota Italia* so often called upon by Cicero, which Augustus would adopt for his own propaganda in the lead-up to the Battle of Actium in the late

dubitandum non putaverunt?), 31 (*quis enim ignorat eos usque ad hanc diem retinere illam immanem ac barbaram consuetudinem hominum immolandorum?*), 44 (*isti immani atque intolerandae barbariae resistemus*), etc.

158 Cic. *Sull.* 25: *a Torquato tamen hoc vitium sileretur; est enim ipse a materno genere municipalis, honestissimi ac nobilissimi generis, sed tamen Asculani. Aut igitur doceat Picentis solos non esse peregrinos aut gaudeat suo generi me meum non anteponere. Qua re neque tu me peregrinum posthac dixeris, ne gravius refutere*.

159 *Phil.* 3.15-17: *Aricina mater. Trallianam aut Ephesiam putes dicere. Videte, quam despiciamur omnes, qui sumus e municipiis, id est omnes plane; quotus enim quisque nostrum non est? ... Sed, si Aricinam uxorem non probas, cur probas Tusculanam? ... Quae porro amentia est eum dicere aliquid de uxorum ignobilitate, cuius pater Numitoriam Fregellanam, proditoris filiam, habuerit uxorem.*

160 Carlà-Uhink 2017: 269.

161 Dench 2013: 130. On this "glide between 'newness' and 'nobility'" as an increasingly relevant idea in the early principate, see also: Earl 1961: 28-40; Wiseman 1971; Brunt 1982; Flower 1996: 61-70; and Dugan 2005.

30s, as evidenced also by his claim in the *Res Gestae* that "All of Italy swore an oath to me of their own accord, and demanded me as general in the war I won near Actium".[162] Cicero first makes use of the slogan in 70 BC during his prosecution of Verres, asserting that he would assure a quick settlement came to the case, before the departure of "the crowd of all Italy (*totius Italiae*), which came together from all sides at the same time for the elections, the games, and the census";[163] this is a notable and opportune time to inaugurate such a phrase since, as mentioned above, the census of 70/69 was actually the first to be completed after the extension of citizenship to the Italians following the Social War. Cicero's invocations of "the whole of Italy" became more and more frequent as his career goes on. During his attack on Catiline, Cicero represents the conspirator as "calling the whole of Italy (*Italiam totam*) to waste and destruction",[164] and describes himself in that speech and later ones as saving that same *tota Italia*.[165] After his return from exile in 57, Cicero would often claim that he had been called back at the will of all of Italy, and in the *Philippics* Cicero repeatedly claims that the whole of Italy is opposed and armed against Antony.[166] Indeed, it does not seem overstated, as Filippo Carlà-Uhink has recently argued, that the development of this idea of *tota Italia* as way to "close the gap between the old and new citizens" after the Social War was the central project of Cicero's work as a writer, advocate, and politician.[167]

Considering all this, it is interesting to reconsider Cicero's formulation of the *duae patriae* in the *De Legibus*. As a new man from an Italian *municipium* whose political rivals would clearly not let him forget it, Cicero could not simply ignore his origin from Arpinum, despite a clear preference for his Roman identity, as a survey of his broader use of *patria* in his corpus shows: *patria* in Cicero referes unequivocally to Rome in the overwhelming majority of cases, and one may read his assertion in the *De Legibus* that the shared Roman *patria* must remain the greater as a specifically Ciceronian injunction, one that reflected his own desire to be completely assimilated into the Roman state. Unable to ignore his municipal identity as a native of Arpinum, but recognizing too that he shared this problem with a great number of men from throughout Italy, he developed a very specific idea of an Italian unity specifically defined by their shared Roman citizenship.[168] Thus the most important feature of the idea of *tota Italia* as Cicero formulates it is its *Romanitas*, and it emerges most prominently as a tool for his own an other Italians' political integration—

[162] *Res Gestae* 25.2: *Iuravit in mea verba tota Italia sponte sua, et me belli quo vici ad Actium ducem depoposcit.*

[163] Cic. *Verr.* I.54: *haec frequentia totius Italiae Roma ... quae convenit uno tempore undique comitiorum ludorum censendique causa.* Cf.: Dench 2013: 128; Carlà-Uhink 2017: 270. That this idea of *tota Italia* is based in a kind of Social War unification is clear from one of two other occurrences of the phrase in the Verrines, wherein Cicero speaks of the inauguration of Sicily as a province '*tum cum bello sociorum tota Italia arderet*' (*Verr.* II.5.8).

[164] *Cat.* 1.12: *Italiam totam ad exitium et vastitatem vocas*. Cf. 4.13: *totam Italiam vastandum diripiendamque Catilinae*.

[165] *Cat.* 4.2: *totam Italiam ex bello et vastitate eriperem*. Cf. *Pis.* 23: *cum civis is quem hic ordo assentiente Italia cunctis que gentibus conservatorem patriae iudicarat*.

[166] Cicero's recall from exile by all of Italy: *De Dom. Su.* 5: *cedere coegisti, quem a senatu, quem a bonis omnibus, quem a cuncta Italia desideratum, arcessitum, revocatum conservandae rei publicae causa confiteris*; *Pis.* 34: *mei capitis conservandi causa Romam uno tempore quasi signo dato Italia tota convenit*; et *passim* in all works *post*-57. On Italy's opposition to Antony: *Phil.* 13.39: *cuncta contra te Italia armata est*; et *passim* elsewhere in the *Philippics*. *Tota Italia* or *cuncta Italia* occurs frequently in the *De Domo Sua* (5, 26, 30, 57, 75, 82, 89 132, 147), *De Lege Agraria* (1.16, 1.17, 2.34, 2.75), *In Pisonem* (3, 11, 34, 51, 64), and *Philippics* (2.58, 3.32, 4.9, 5.44, 6.18, 7.13, 7.23, 8.6, 10.7, 10.19, 10.21, 11.39, 12.7, 12.16, 13.5, 13.23, 13.39); these are only a portion of Cicero's use of the phrase. See also Horsfall 1997, 2001.

[167] Carlà-Uhink 2017: 279. Cf. Q. Cic. *Pet.* 54: *Roma est, civitas ex nationum conventu constituta*; cf. Farney 2010: 10.

[168] As also Ando 2002: "Cicero has here crafted a completely different basis for Italian unity, namely, shared citizenship in the Roman state. In turning away from ethnicity or culture, he has chosen to expand the traditional parameters of *civitas* and *patria*" (134). Cf. too Dench 2005: "The idea of Italy, like new man ideology, becomes an alternative way of thinking about *Roman* ideals" (185). Cf. Cicero's praise of the citizenship at *Balb.* 31.

even assimilation—into the Roman state; as such, I would argue that Cicero's inclusion of Arpinum in the *De Legibus* is calculated *less* as an ode to the sweetness of native place than as a political argument for Italian belonging in Roman politics and society.[169] As Emma Dench points out, in Cicero, "[a]lthough there are hints of a different story that would put greater emphasis on local allegiance and regionalism, a keenly Romanocentric perspective on political and social life dominates".[170] Yet Cicero's formulation remains just one of many possible ways for local Italians to negotiate their Italian origins with their Roman identities, and the assimilationist aims one gleans in Cicero do not, for example, seem to match Vergil's practice in the *Aeneid* or elsewhere, in which the poet's Mantua or his characters' *origines* hold significance themselves apart from Rome, and sometimes *even despite* Rome or its Trojan avatar. Nor is Vergil's idea of a *tota Italia* the same as Cicero's. The idea of a unified Italy that emerges in the *laudes Italiae* or in the second half of the *Aeneid* has a less straightforward relationship to Roman or Trojan power than Cicero's *duae patriae*, one oftentimes conceived in contradistinction to it, nor is this unity imagined as the only possibility: in the Italian books of the *Aeneid* especially, but likewise elsewhere in his *oeuvre*, pan-Italian solidarity emerges of necessity, in response to outside encroachment or violence, in the face of real or potential loss or destruction. This Vergilian conception of Italy is permeated with the oft-cited Vergilian melancholy, and it is present in all three of his works: in the vain attempts of Meliboeus and Tityrus to relate with one another after the former's farm has been reappropriated by a Roman soldier; in the final turn of the second *Georgics*'s eulogy of rustic life, when its utopian delights are revealed to be relegated to the Italian past; in the Trojan uprooting of Faunus' sacred *oleaster* in the *Aeneid*, in the death of Volscian Camilla or Rutulian Turnus or countless others. The poignant desire for that which is lost is foreign to Cicero's *tota Italia*, even if both aim to construct a similar kind of pan-ethnic unity. In order to fully pick apart the difference, to understand fully how the dynamics of acculturation opering in Cicero and in Vergil are expected outcomes of one and the same struggle, it will be necessary to introduce some final tools from the anthropological and psychological studies of ethnicity, multiculturalism, and acculturation.

Theories of Roman Biculturalism and Acculturation

Scholars have only begun to seriously approach the study of ethnicity in the ancient world from the lens of anthropology since the late 1990s, which saw the publication of Jonathan Hall's *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* and the volume *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy* edited by Kathryn Lomas and Tim Cornell, both in 1997. Hall, in the related field of Greek ethnic identity, successfully showed that the study of ancient ethnicity is not a "gratuitous and anachronistic exercise," but that there is value in modern anthropological approaches to ethnicity which understand it as not as a monolithic biological category, but instead as a discursive social category consisting in "the operation of socially dynamic relationships which

[169] Dench 2005 calls this "the idea of Italian worthiness" (183). Such an interpretation as that given above also explains other, less favorable characterizations of Arpinum elsewhere in Cicero's *corpus*, as *Att.* 2.11; 15; 16, in which Cicero "uses Arpinum as a rustic foil for the Roman centre, 'rugged Arpinum', his Ithacan homeland peoples by country bumpkins" (Dench 2013: 133).

[170] Dench 2013: 129. Cf. Dench 2005: 179: "Cicero's writings are highly Romanocentric: this is to some extent surprising, given that his own 'newness' was frequently the subject of vitriolic comment amongst the older Roman elite. Although he was perfectly capable of playing the 'new man' card for himself when the occasion suited him, he frequently places himself in the Roman 'centre' and looks outwards at 'Italians'."

are constructed on the basis of a putative shared heritage".[171] Wanting to move beyond the dichotomy between "primordialist" understandings of ethnicity as a "basic and natural unit of history" (as in emic formulations by those internal to ethnic groups) and "instrumentalist" views that constructions of ethnicity take advantage of a perceived shared heritage in order to advance political or economic interests (as in etic formulations common to outside observers such as anthropologists), Hall proposes an approach which understands ethnic identity as a constantly renegotiated, discursive social construct that nevertheless is very much real in the perception of the subjects who understand themselves to possess or belong to it,[172] one which "[focuses] on the conceptual and ascriptive boundary by reference to which category membership is defined".[173] In discussing these ascriptive boundaries, Hall makes reference to the six characteristics of an ethnic group proposed by British sociologist and ethnosymbolist Anthony Smith (a collective name; a common myth of descent; a shared history; a distinctive shared culture; an association with a specific territory; a sense of communal solidarity),[174] but singles out the connection with a specific territory and the common myth of descent as especially in defining an ethnic consciousness.[175] For the individual subject, however, the significance that one attaches to one's membership in a social group is an immensely personal decision. A subject's decision to give significance to ethnic membership constitutes one's "social identity", an identity that exists alongside a "personal" identity, itself the result of genetically and familially determined values; each individual might choose in different situations to choose from any number of social personas, drawing more or less on different aspects of social or personal identity.[176]

Later the same year, Tim Cornell and Kathryn Lomas published *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*, itself less a delineated formal study of Italian or sub-Italian ethnic identities, but instead a collection of papers meant to "give some indication of possible approaches ... and hopefully to stimulate further debate".[177] Largely following Smith and Hall's model of ethnic groups as based on a shared name, culture, history and more, Cornell and Lomas both point out "the interplay between different forms of organisation and its impact on self-identity and ethnicity",[178] acknowledging along with Hall how any Italic individual had to reconcile any number of differing self-identifications, whether to a city, state, ethnic group, or to Rome itself. "Neither *Romanitas* nor local identities were static concepts, but were constantly evolving, and the relationship between them was one of shifting emphases".[179] This idea that the identities of Roman

171 Hall 1997: 1, 16; and 1-16 more generally for Hall's justification in studying ancient Greek ethnicity.
172 Hall 1997: 17-19. For *emic* and *etic* as concepts of anthropology, and especially cultural anthropology, see: Pike 1967; Goodenough 1970; Harris 1976; Harris 1979; Kottak 2017. On the dangers of maintaining too stark a divide between *emic* and *etic* perspectives, see Hall's comments: "There is currently a growing awareness among anthropologists that the distance set up between the etic observer and the emic subject, together with the value judgements exercised by the former about the latter, may simply be assumptions predicated on western cultural arrogance. [...] The danger of the emic-etic dichotomy in the study of ethnic identity lies in the possibility of establishing a sterile debate between ethnic truth and ethnic fiction" (Hall 1997: 18-19).
173 Hall 1997: 24.
174 Hall 1997: 25, and Smith 1986 (in particular pp. 21-32). It is also worth noting the "bases" and "recurrent factors" that Smith identities as "[helping] to maintain *ethnie* and ethnic identity", different from the "features" or "dimensions" he sees as distinguishing it from other social collectivities: the trauma of sedentarization and nostalgia for place and former life; organized religion; and inter-state warfare (Smith 1986: 32-41).
175 Hall 1997: 25.
176 Hall 1997: 30.
177 Cornell & Lomas 1997: 8.
178 Ibid. 5.
179 Ibid. 4-5.

subjects depended on an ever-shifting interrelationship between Roman and local cultural values finds resonance with the ideas of Greg Woolf's book, published the following year, on the provincialization of Roman Gaul, especially in one approach that Woolf takes rather seriously, that being "the idea that Roman culture is a product of a tension between Romanization and Resistance to it".[180] Woolf goes on to show that even this paradigm of Romanization versus resistance is too simplistic, and he, like Hall in his discussion of Greek ethnic identity, also ultimately identifies as the prime locus of the tension between Roman and local cultural definitions the person struggles of the individual subject caught between the two systems:[181] "Becoming Roman was not a matter of acquiring a ready made cultural package, then, so much as joining the insiders' debate about what that package did or out to consist of at that particular time".[182] One way of entering that debate, of course, was by writing literature, as Tom Habinek made clear in *The Politics of Latin Literature*, also in 1998; there, in a chapter focusing on Horace and the interplay between Roman and Italian identity, Habinek rightly argues that one of the overlooked social functions of Latin literature is "its role in the negotiation of conflicted cultural and ethnic identity".[183]

In the twenty years since, a number of scholars have put forward increasingly well-thought-out accounts of ancient Italian biculturalism; I will mention just a few here. Greg Farney, in his 2007 *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*, while not engaging per se with current anthropological and sociological approaches to Italic ethnicity, does explore how Italic families of the Roman nobility emphasized and interacted with their own Italian ethnic backgrounds in Rome's own social and political climate through an exploration of elite self-representation on coins, in architecture, and in literature. Also treating Cicero's discussion of his *duae patriae* early in his discussion, Farney argues that the "professions and anxieties of a plural identity" in Romans such as Ennius and Cicero were not unique to only the recently incorporated, but that it was a feeling engaged even by "Roman nobles of the most antique origins"[184]—a fact that did not stop the older aristocrats from attacking municipal men for their Italian origins, as we have seen above.[185] Farney himself identifies three basic strategies that these disenfranchised groups adopted in overcoming negative aspects associated with their social identity—assimilation, redefinition, and invention[186]—strategies which we will return to in our discussion of modern sociological theories of acculturation, below.

One of the most important books in the discussion of cultural identity in Roman Italy is Andrew Wallace-Hadrill's *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, published the year after Farney's *Ethnic Identity*. Drawing from the idea of *code-switching* from the field of linguistics, Wallace-Hadrill proposes a model of Roman cultural identity in which the identities of Roman subjects are defined by "cultural triangulation" between Roman, Greek, and local Italian cultural systems. Wallace-Hadrill's suggestion that scholars' theories of cultural

[180] Woolf 1998: 19.
[181] Ibid. 22.
[182] Ibid. 11.
[183] Habinek 1998: 89. Cf. also: "The conflicts between elites in the late Republic, with the jockeying for power between Romans and Italians, found expression in the cultural realm in debates over literary and cultural chronologies and canons. Resolution of the question, whose culture? in the form of an uneasy alliance of Roman and Italian allowed, or perhaps forced, another question to emerge: what sort of culture?" (*ibid.* 101).
[184] Farney 2007: 8.
[185] "Although all Romans had a dual origin, this does not mean that municipal men—even Latin ones—were let off the hook for their "newness" to the Roman political scene or for their innate duality. Quite the contrary, bluer-blooded aristocrats lorded their "aboriginal" status over *municipes*" (*ibidem* 8).
[186] Farney 2007: 13.

formation and redefinition ought to move away from models of pure 'fusion' or 'hybridity' to something more akin to cultural bi- or multi-lingualism, wherein cultural systems are not opposed but "two closely interrelated aspects of the same phenomenon",[187] is a deft one, and it is certainly preferable to theories of pure fusion or hybridization where the valence or specificity of a prior cultural identity is completely or partially lost. The specific issue of local Italian identity, however, is really not Wallace-Hadrill's focus, and it becomes clear that the model of multi-lingualism, while doubtless extremely valuable for thinking about the lived reality of Roman Italian subjects, is for Wallace-Hadrill meant to explicate most deeply the relationship between Roman and Greek cultural systems, less so for the third member of his triangle, the local. In particular, Wallace-Hadrill's focus on Roman multicultural identity as a type of 'code-switching' ignores one of the most interesting facts about the inter-relationships between Roman and local cultures, the fact of the disappearance or change of local cultures and languages, to whatever small extent, as a consequence of Roman expansion.[188] Wallace-Hadrill's model of a multi-cultural 'code-switching' is invaluable, but it would be an oversight to suggest that, in the case of local culture and language at least, there was no sort of cultural power differential between local and Roman: in reality, it was undeniable that affiliation with Roman resulted in cultural (and linguistic) change, a fact which assuredly added another layer to Roman and Italian cultural interactions—and one which could not be true in most case for a purely cultural Greek identity that was itself already understood to be adopted or secondary.

An invaluable advancement was Saskia Roselaar's *Processes of Integration and Identity Formation in the Roman Republic*, which proposed to move beyond arguments over definitions to take the real situations of local individuals as their starting points, seeing Italians as "active agents, who created their own cultural identity, rather than passive recipients of Roman culture".[189] A further important aspect of Roselaar's work is its focus on the sociological idea of *integration* as the center of its study, a concept Roselaar defines in the introduction as "the bringing into equal membership of a common society those groups or persons previously discriminated against on racial or cultural grounds".[190] Importantly, Roselaar acknowledges that the resolution of the Social War in 89 BCE did not mark the end of cultural difference and complete cultural integration between Romans and local Italians, but instead was "the trigger that started these processes, rather than a culmination point".[191] The interrelationship between Roman cultural hegemony, Hellenic cultural influence, and local Italian identity is thus, Roselaar argues, much more complex than has been previously argues, since the local Italians were actively navigating these different cultural systems in order to project a personal identity of their own choosing. Roselaar ends his introduction to the volume by arguing that the term Romanization is still value "when applied to the political, legal, and administrative status of the Italian communities, as well as possibilities for economic exchange that were opened up by Roman imperialism";[192] truly understanding what this process of change in culture and identity looked like, however, would require studying "acdtual interacion between Romans and Italians", rather than continue to argue over ever more fine-tuned definitions of what should or should not be deemed *Romanization*.

187 Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 26.
188 One might consider, for example, the fact that non-Latin Italic languages are provably in the process of dying out in the period Wallace-Hadrill discusses; see, e.g., Wallace 2004 in the 'Sabellian Languages' chapter of the *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Languages*, here talking about Oscan: 'Most of the inscriptions belong to the period between 300 and 89 BCE, the latter being the date of the final Sabellian uprising against Rome."
189 Roselaar 2012: 3. Cf. Keay and Terrenato 2001; Terrenato 1998.
190 Roselaar 2012: 2.
191 *Ibid.* 12.
192 *Ibid.* 14.

Blackwell's *A Companion to Roman Italy*, edited by Alison Cooley, is an even more recent volume that brings together a number of author's who seem to follow Roselaar's lead in focusing on the reality of local Italian experience for understanding the interrelationship between Roman and local Italian culture. Rafael Scopacasa, writing on 'Rome's Encroachment on Italy', explores the ways in which the Romans exploited the natural and human resources of Italy, as best exemplified by Rome's capitalizing upon Italian manpower for its armies, while showing that Italians also sometimes played just as active a role in their own so-called Romanization. Meanwhile, in two consecutive articles,[193] Edward Bispham explores the Social War and the consequent 'municipalization' of Italy, which Bispham understands as the process of individual communities negotiating the interrelationship between local and Roman rights and identities, rather than as simply the acquisition of Roman cultural and civic qualities. Finally, Alison Cooley, in her own contribution on "Coming to Terms with Dynastic Power", recognizes that by the first century CE, the relationship between Rome and Italy had become harmonious, while the kind of prejudice that had necessitated Cicero's own statement of the *duae patriae* had transferred itself from the Italians to the provincials, as those of an Italian background became absorbed into the center and periphery gradually moved itself outwards. Overall, the volume's focus on municipalization, Roman encroachment, and the changing ascriptive boundaries of "Roman" identity reveal the importance of looking at individual cases of Italian acculturation in order to further elucidate the broader processes of so-called "Romanization".

Bispham's focus on 'municipalization', Roselaar's discussion of 'integration', and Farney's mentioning of 'assimilation', 'redefinition', and 'invention' as potential Italian responses to negative cultural attention, all reveal in their use of quasi-sociological and anthropological lingo the potential usefulness of bringing in the conclusions of recent sociological literature on acculturation and bi- and multi-cultural identity. Modern sociological literature accords well with the literature seen so far on cultural change in Roman Italy in recognizing that the fact of cultural interaction does not in itself mean that that one or the other cultural stream must be lost as a result; such a theory of "culture shedding", while a feature of many earlier theories of acculturation, has been criticized in literature of recent decades,[194] and the majority of contemporary acculturation theory "acknowledge that receiving-culture acquisition and heritage-culture retention represent separate dimensions of acculturation".[195] Modern sociological literature also stands in agreement with the above-examined recent accounts of Roman Italy in recognizing that acculturation is a complex and interactive process, best understood as "an interaction between migrants and the sociocultural contexts in which they have settled, rather than a property of the migrants themselves".[196] Another important point, one which accords well with theories like Wallace-Hadrill's model of cultural code-switching, is the fact that acculturation is multidimensional and multicomponent, operating in different domains (practices, values, identifications) simultaneously, and differing too depending on whether the culturally adopted has been taken into the host-culture voluntarily or involuntarily: this kind of model, wherein there are several simultaneous levels of acculturation at any given time for any individuals, suggests that it is misleading to speak of acculturation as simply "complete" or "incomplete"—or of Italians as "Romanized" or "not Romanized"—as to do so is, at best, a massive simplification.[197]

The theory and model of acculturation followed by the majority of contempoary sociologists is

193 Bispham 2016a, 2016b. Cf. Torelli 1999, also important in developing this more local approach.
194 Phinney 2003, Schwartz & Unger 2017b.
195 Schwartz & Unger 2017b: 2.
196 *Ibid.* 5-6.
197 *Ibid.* 3.

that of John Berry, who has defined acculturation as "the dual process of cultural and psychological change that takes place as a result of contact between two or more cultural groups and their individual members".[198] Important to Berry's definition is twofold nature of acculturation on, first, the level of the cultural group—involving "changes in social structures and institutions and cultural norms"—and, secondly, on an individual psychological level, regarding changes in individuals' "behavioral repertoires (including their food, dress, language, values, and identities)".[199] In examining these cultural and psychological adaptations, it becomes important to understand not only the features of each cultural group prior to contact, but also the nature and purpose of their contact, whether it be because of migration, colonization, economics, political dominion etc.[200] Berry identifies three dimensions along which the situations of acculturating groups and individuals can be distinguished: voluntary-involuntary (whether contact with the new culture is sought out voluntarily or the result of external pressure); sedentary-migrant (whether the acculturating subjects remain in their home territory, or are expelled from it); permanent-temporary (whether the contact situation is understood be to short- or long-term). Berry also notes that refugees and asylum seekers, sometimes called "forced migrants", often have the greatest hurdles to face.[201]

The core of Berry's model comes in his articulation of the different "acculturation strategies" that acculturating groups and individuals adopt toward their own process of acculturation: assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization. These strategies differ from one another in their behaviors and attitudes toward "cultural continuity" (maintenance of one's prior-existing cultural practices and identity) and "contact" (preference for engaging with the new culture into one is acculturating), and depend too on "power", i.e. the relative power of the acculturating group and whether they have a choice in how to approach their own acculturation. I copy here Berry's own summaries of assimilation, separation, integration, and marginalization:

> From the point of view of nondominant ethnocultural groups, when individuals do not wish to maintain their cultural identity and [instead] seek daily interaction with other cultures, the ***assimilation*** strategy is defined. In contrast, when individuals place a value on holding on to their original culture, and at the same time wish to avoid interaction with others, then the ***separation*** alternative is defined. When there is an interest in both maintaining one's original culture and having daily interactions with other groups, ***integration*** is the option [...]; here, there is some degree of cultural integrity maintained, while at the same time the individual seeks, as a member of an ethnocultural group, to participate as an integral part of the larger society. Finally, when there is little possibility of, or interest in, cultural maintenance (often for reasons of enforced cultural loss), and little interest in having relations with others (often for reasons of exclusion or discrimination), then ***marginalization*** is defined.[202]

Defined, then, in terms of attitudes toward heritage-culture continuity and adoptive-culture contact, *assimilation* is characterized by low interest in heritage continuity, and high interest in cultural contact;

198 Berry 2017: 15, expanding on ideas first articulated in Berry 1990. Berry also gives the oft-quoted definitions of Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits 1936, and the Social Science Research Council 1954, in the "Report from the Social Science Research Council Summer Seminar on Acculturation."
199 Berry 2017: 15.
200 Berry 2017: 18-19.
201 *Ibid.* 19-20.
202 *Ibid.* 23 (my bolding).

separation is opposite, with high interest in prior heritage and little in contact with the new society; *integration*, meanwhile, maintains a high interest in both maintaing heritage culture and developing a relationship to the new culture, while *marginalization* refers to the failure of both heritage-culture continuity and assimilation/integration into the new culture. While these four terms describe the attitudes of groups or individuals toward acculturation, they are limited by the strictures of the dominant group in the receiving society: thus, integration and assimilation are constrained by the openness or non-openness of said society toward accepting the acculturating group, a factor often depending on "passing"—the ability to be seen unproblematically as a member of the group being assimilated into—and on the meeting of "acculturation expectations", such as, for example, limiting oneself to private expressions of other cultural identities.

Of the four strategies, it has been shown that *integration* strategy produces the most favorable long-term psychological and sociocultural outcomes for individuals[203]—but it is also the most difficult to attain because of the number of societal preconditions that must exist in order for it to be possible: widespread acceptance of cultural diversity, relatively low levels of prejudice, positive attitudes among all ethnocultural groups, a sense of attachment to the larger society by all individuals, and a shared desire of an individual's broader ethnocultural group to maintain their prior heritage while integrating the new cultural stream.[204] If integration, or even assimilation, is desired by a group, but they are prevented from doing so by other individuals or the larger society, this will often be the cause of "acculturative stress" for the individual: feelings of anxiety and uncertainty; depression, "usually associated with a sense of loss" deriving from a loss of contact with one's heritage culture; as well as psychosomatic symptoms such as disruptions in digestion and sleep. In the most extreme cases, this may result in "reactive identification", wherein individuals from minority backgrounds suffering discrimination in larger society actively resist acculturating because they are not fully recognized as members of society.[205] Successful integration, meanwhile, has been shown to result in positive well-being, self-esteem, a consolidated sense of identity, and successful sociocultural adaptation.

Those who succeed in integrating heritage-culture and adoptive culture may be termed "bicultural"—or, in relevant situations, "multicultural." It should not come as a surprise that there are multiple ways in which bi- or multi-culturalism can be expressed, depending, for example, on the ease or fluidity with which a subject moves between the two cultural streams, on the strength or depth of the endorsement of each cultural stream, as well as the amount of incompatibility that same subject perceives to exist between the different identities or cultural streams.[206] Earlier attempts to explain these variations resulted in the proposal of the categories of "blended biculturals" (those who easily integrate their two cultural streams) and "alternating biculturals" (those who emphasize one cultural stream or the other,

[203] Schwartz, Birman, Benet-Martínez, & Unger 2017: 31.
[204] Berry 2017: 23.
[205] Verkuyten 2005; Schwartz, Birman, Benet-Martínez, & Unger 2017: 31.
[206] Schwartz, Birman, Benet-Martínez, & Unger spell out these potential variations in a more concretely drawn example: "There may be one variant of biculturalism where individuals endorse both cultural streams strongly and are able to move fluidly between them, another type where both cultural streams are endorsed strongly but the person perceives some incompatibility between them, a third type where at least one cultural stream is not strongly endorsed but the person is able to move fluidly between streams, and a fourth type where one or more cultural streams is not strongly endorsed and the person is not able to move fluidly between them. An important issue to consider is the extent to which these variants represent concrete "types" versus "degrees" of expressing different cultural orientations" (32).

depending on the situation);[207] a study by Schwartz & Zamboanga, meanwhile, observed classes of individuals who seemed to exhibit features of both integration and assimilation, wherein the individuals endorsed both cultural streams, but exhibited a preference for one over the other.[208] The resolution of these two different measures of bicultural integration is achieved in the concept of "bicultural identity integration", or BII, first proposed by Benet-Martínez et al. in 2002 as "a unitary construct capturing the degree to which bicultural individuals perceive their heritage and receiving cultural identities as compatible and integrated versus oppositional and in conflict".[209] Bicultural Identity Integration, as a measure of "the ability to synthesize one's heritage and receiving culture into an individualized mosaic"[210] turns out to be quite valuable as a concept and a tool for distinguishing between types of biculturalism: an individual with a high BII understands the separate cultural streams that make up their identity to be harmonious and not in conflict, whereas those with a low BII have difficulty blending or integrating those streams, compartmentalizing or keeping distance between them.

Even this cursory summary of recent trends in the psychological and sociological literature of acculturation should make clear its usefulness for the discussion of bicultural identity in Roman Italy of the first century BC. Relegated to a place of overt marginalization prior to the Social War, the Italic response in 91 transitions instead, if one believes that the Italic tribes sought to form their own polity separate from Rome, to a cultural policy of separation involving rejection of the Roman cultural stream. The granting of citizenship to the Italians in the war's aftermath would only have changed slightly the cultural context into which Italians were received (i.e. slightly more acceptance of "Roman" cultural diversity); prejudice and negative stereotypes still existed, as has been shown, and the attitude toward acculturation of individuals and individual sub-groups would have taken time to change, and, in any case, would not have changed uniformly across the peninsula. Meanwhile, Berry's acknowledgement that acculturation is both a cultural *and* an individual psychological process reveals a disadvantage of theorizing the acculturation of Roman Italy solely off archaeological and historical evidence: the multiplicity and variety of individual responses is lost—a great shame, considering Berry's assertion that "both the cultural and psychological levels of acculturation need to be studied in any comprehensive examination of how groups and individuals change following intercultural contact".[211] Looking back at Cicero, meanwhile, it becomes clear that native of Arpinum epitomizes the *assimilation* strategy, rather than the *integration* strategy, considering, as we have seen, how Cicero's discussions of Arpinum arise mostly as a tool to justify his own inclusion in the Roman state;[212] elsewhere, he does not shy away from enjoy his own "passing privilege" as a Roman from Latium in order to attack other Italians for their municipal origins. Even at his most integrationist, in the proposal of the paradigm of the *duae patriae* from the *De Legibus*, Cicero endorses a version of biculturalism that scores low on the scale of bicultural identity integration: *sed necesse est caritate eam praestare, qua rei publicae nomen universae civitatis est*. For Cicero, Rome must always be foremost.

What of Vergil, then, and his own engagement with—as stated above—the "dialectics of acculturation"? If Cicero is seen above all to promote an attitude of Italian *assimilation* into Roman culture,

[207] LaFramboise et al. 1993.
[208] Schwartz & Zamboanga 2008.
[209] Schwartz, Birman, Benet-Martínez, & Unger 2017: 35, summarizing Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris 2002.
[210] Schwartz, Birman, Benet-Martínez, & Unger 2017: 35.
[211] Berry 2017: 16.
[212] Cf. Dench 2013: "At other times, Cicero's assimilation of himself to the old nobility is so complete that any indication of 'newness' disappears altogether" (131-32).

I would argue that Vergil's work does not quite promote, but fully and deeply explores the possibilities and problematics entailed in the process of a complete and successful Roman and Italian *integration*. What this means practically is that Vergil's *oeuvre* is able to capture situations and moments from across Berry's spectrum of acculturation strategies and explore their successes, failures, and potential pitfalls—from the juxtaposition of the happily incorporated, perhaps assimilated Tityrus with the disenfranchised and marginalized Meliboeus in *Eclogue* 1, to Jupiter and Juno's proposed policy of Roman-Italian integration in *Aeneid* 12, where the surrounding episodes force the reader to question whether the celestials' idealized proposal has been successfully executed. Such an exploration of Vergil's works through his engagement with the *dialectics of acculturation* will reveal a Vergil who is not best classified as either 'optimistic' or 'pessimistic', but who is deeply concerned with the ways in which these multiple aspects of one's identity interact with one another, and how they can variously be seen to peacefully and unproblematically coexist with one another, to completely contradict one another or threaten each other's primacy or validity, or to occupy some more subtle place between those two poles—a Vergil who recognizes the benefits of full Italian and Roman integration, but who fears it may not be possible, that something may be irreversibly lost in the process. Vergil's work was composed amidst great uncertainty—uncertainty as to the future of Roman cultural hegemony, as to Italian and local cultural erasure, as to the possibility of Roman cultural pluralism—and it is the texture of this uncertainty belonging to the dually or multiply constituted subject—the acculturative stress of the Italian subject—that Vergil's own *dialectics of acculturation* seek to address.

The remainder of this study will be divided into three chapters, and an epilogue. In the second chapter ("*Alternis Versibus*"), I establish not only that separate local (municipal) and civic (Roman) perspectives co-exist in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, but that these two poems are overwhelmingly constructed from a point of view that privileges the Ciceronian *germana patria*, or place of origin. I begin with an in-depth examination of the politically significant term *patria*, revealing that the term is used in the poems specifically to refer to the local Italian landscape, and sometimes nonspecifically in order to emphasize the diversity of different localess. In the *Eclogues*, this use of *patria* to indicate the surrounding countryside is accompanied by an externalization of Rome, both by its placement on the edges of the landscape and by its alienation through such foreignizing terms as *barbarus* and *advena*. The ideological gap this creates between the local countryside and Rome is mapped onto the contrast between urban and rural in the rest of the collection of *Eclogues*, with the urban overwhelming being represented as either destructive of or unconcerned with rural life. The chapter ends with a closer look at the creation and dissolution of community within the *Eclogues*, and how these features of the collection align with the anxieties of bicultural identity negotiation. Ultimately, I show that oppositions between urban and rural and between community building and unbuilding reveal the poems' status as acculturative scripts, each character and poem providing various models for attempting to integrate members of a divided cultural community.

In the third chapter ("*Cultus*"), I explore Vergil's *Georgics* through an exploration of a number of recurring thematic refrains in the didactic work, all centered around the apparent opposition between nature and culture, itself standing in for a similar tension between "natural" (that is, local) origin and "adoptive" (that is, Roman civic) citizenship in the municipal subject. The first section continues the exploration of the local Italian and the Roman civic perspectives by analyzing places in the text of the *Georgics* where mentions of Rome occurs in proximity to Italian geographical and ethnographical terms. I next examine another recurring thematic is Vergil's propensity for a vocabulary of spontaneous and cultivated growth that resembles ethnographical and anthropological accounts of identity, origin, and emigration. To end the chapter, I look closely at the frequent use of metaphors of grafting and

acculturation to explore the change and continuity of identity in Italian municipal subjects. In particular, I propose that the constant variations in focalization reveal the acculturative stress, in sociological terms, involved in the reconciliation of local and state identity at this period, particulary as imagined in a subject torn over what kind of acculturative strategies bodes best for an integration Roman and Italian future.

The fourth and final chapter ("*Vitelii*") finishes the study with an in-depth look at the use of bovine imagery of bulls, cows, and calves in Vergil as a potential image of Italian individualism, or "separation" in Berry's terms. Through all three of Vergil's poems, bovine language and imagery becomes strongly associated with local Italian culture and with the pre-Roman, pre-Trojan residents of the peninsula. This connection becomes especially poignant considering not only Roman etymological explanations of Italy's name, but also because of the use of the image of a bull as a symbol of Italian unity and resistance against the Romans on coinage of the Social War. The constant reoccurrence of this imagery, especially as the *Aeneid* approaches its apparently integrative conclusion, leaves open the possibility of Italian resistance and separation, itself revealing the unresolvable uncertainty of the Italian subject's attitude toward Roman integration. In the epilogue, I briefly revisit Cicero's discussion of the *duae patriae*.

Chapter Two

Alternis Versibus

'dic mihi, Damoeta: '*quoium pecus*' anne Latinum?'
'Non. Verum Aegonis nostri, sic rure loquuntur.'

— Numitorius, *Antibucolica* (parodying *Ecl.* 3.1-2)[1]

It emerges that *communitas* is the totality of persons united not by a "property" but precisely by an obligation or a debt; not by an "addition" but by a "subtraction": by a lack, a limit that is configured as an onus, or even as a defective modality for him who is "affected", unlike for him who is instead "exempt" or "exempted". Here we find the final and most characteristic of the oppositions associated with (or that dominate) the alternative between public and private, those in other words that contrast *communitas* to *immunitas*. If *communis* is he who is required to carry out the functions of an office — or to the donation of a grace — on the contrary, he is called immune who has to perform no office, and for that reason he remains ungrateful. ... Therefore the community cannot be thought of as a body, as a corporation in which individuals are founded in a larger individual. ... It isn't the subject's expansion or multiplication but its exposure to what interrupts the closing and turns it inside out: a dizziness, a syncope, a spasm in the continuity of the subject.

— Roberto Esposito, *Communitas*[2]

At first blush, the suggestion that Vergil's *Eclogues* participate in anything like a *dialectics of acculturation*, especially one concerned with untangling the various strands of local, Italian, and Roman identity might seem somewhat unexpected. First of all, by most recent accounts, the *Eclogues* are primarily a metaliterary text—"poetry about poetry";[3] as such, many treatments of the *Eclogues* from the past half-century have been concerned specifically with the collection's style,[4] structure,[5] and genre,[6] with some of the most recent specifically addressing themes of fictionality,[7] song exchange,[8] and the interplay of writing and orality in the poems.[9] That said, there exist a number of more ideological approaches toward the poem that aim to consider the social, political, and cultural background to the collection's composition in their readings, but the conclusions they present almost inevitably veer towards Augustus and the specificities of Roman

1 Recorded in Aelius Donatus, *Vita Vergilii* 43.
2 Esposito 2010: 6-7 (trans. T. Campbell).
3 A translation of Schmidt 1972's "Dichter der Dichtung" (108); see also Volk 2008: 6-7.
4 Nisbet 1991, O'Hara 1996, Rumpf 1999, Lipka 2001.
5 Rudd 1976: 119-44, van Sickle 1978, Seng 1999, Breed 2006a.
6 Muecke 1975, Halperin 1983, Alpers 1990, Alpers 1996, Hubbard 1998, Fantuzzi & Papanghelis 2006 *passim*.
7 Kania 2016.
8 Karakasis 2011.
9 Breed 2006b.

politics,[10] and rarely considered, until somewhat recently, the relationship of Vergil's *Eclogues* to Italy, Italians, or Italian identity.[11]

One reason for this overlooking of Italy with regard to the *Eclogues* is the fact that it is only recently that scholarship has begun to truly acknowledge the possibility of a specifically Italian setting of the poems. The greatest obstacle to this development was the long-standing insistence that the setting of the collection was Arcadia, a conclusion suited for the post-Vergilian development of the genre following Jacopo Sannazaro and Sir Philip Syndney in the 16th century, but demonstrably untrue for the *Eclogues* themselves, where Arcadia appear in only three *Eclogues*, never as an explicit indication of setting.[12] This impression had won wide acceptance after the important study of Bruno Snell in 1945, who proposed that the setting of the collection was the "spiritual landscape" (*geistige Landschaft*) of Arcadia, itself an ideal dreamscape untethered to any real spatio-geography.[13] Snell's view exerted a substantial influence until the work of E. A. Schmidt, who demonstrated that Snell had misleadingly projected Renaissance ideals of an ideal bucolic Arcadia back into the *Eclogues*, creating an anachronistic understanding of Vergil's poem.[14] At about the same time, E. Flintoff likewise challenged Snell's theory, arguing that behind Vergil's landscape lay the real landscape of northern Italy, noting that it is only *Italian* places which the poet locates within the actual geography of the poem as explicit settings frequented by Vergil's characters.[15] Since the work of Schmidt and Flintoff, and others like Jenkyns,[16] scholarship has been much more eager to recognize the collection's Italian setting, and important progress has begun to be made in identifying the importance of Italy and Italian geography to the overall meaning of the *Eclogues*, and Vergil's corpus more broadly.[17]

Yet, I think, we can go further than merely identifying the presence and importance of Italy to the *Eclogues*, as well as to the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*. In particular, I would like to claim that not only do these poems present a specifically Italian geography, but that the work goes out of its way to represent primarily a local Italian point of view, one that actively separates itself from the dominant, Roman viewpoint. This

[10] So, for example: Korenjak 2003, Nauta 2006, Weeda 2015.
[11] If it is considered, it is usually brief and not further pursued—e.g. Putnam 1970: 76 (on *Ecl.* 1).
[12] *Ecl.* 4.58, 59 (*Arcadia*); *Ecl.* 7.4, 26 (*Arcades*); *Ecl.* 10.26 (*Arcadiae*); 10.31, 33 (*Arcades*).
[13] Snell 1953, translation of Snell 1945; for the history of Snell's idea, see Schmidt 1975/2008 (translation).
[14] Schmidt 1975; see Schmidt 2008 (included in Volk 2008) for an English translation of the original German.
[15] Flintoff 1974. Flintoff cleverly and successfully demonstrates two different functional uses of places names and adjectives derived from place names in the *Eclogues*, the *geographical* and the *typological*: the *geographical* usages point to actual places located within the landscape of the poem, while the *typological*, or *associative*, are used in order to recall the symbolic resonances of geographical locations without introducing them as a setting (as *Arcades* to refer, through association with Pan, to the typological characteristic of being skilled in singing rustic songs. "At the geographical level, the only time that Virgil handles geographical place names and adjectives in the realistic way one might expect him to is when he uses Italian place names" (Flintoff 1974: 844).
[16] Jenkyns 1989 and 1998. Jenkyns occupies a middle ground between Schmidt and Flintoff: he, too, discusses in depth Snell's anachronistic retrojecting of Renaissance developments into Vergil, but differs from Flintoff in seeing the setting of the *Eclogues* as an "imaginary world," one that is "fluctuating and elusive", but that nevertheless momentarily solidifies around the real Italian landscape at certain moments (as in the location of *Ecl.* 7's poetic contest along the banks of the Mincius), an action which puts "a rather special sort of Italian landscape sharply and immediately before our eyes" (Jenkyns 1989: 32).
[17] Two recent examples include Dominik 2009 and von Albrecht 2010. Dominik, in his discussion of Vergilian "geopolitics", takes as an initial assumption the fact that "the setting of the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and the second half of the *Aeneid* is Italy," further nothing that, in the case of the *Eclogues*, "Arcadia, in fact, is mentioned specifically only a half dozen times" (111). von Albrecht similarly takes as him aim the demonstration of the presence and importance of Italy to all three poem of the Vergilian corpus, starting from the *Eclogues*.

local perspective is exactly that explored as the *germana patria* in Cicero's discussion of the *duae patriae*, or that connected to Vergil's own Mantuan identity; this local identity should be distinguished, however, from a broader "Italian" identity, itself a "panethnic" or group identity of the sort developed by antagonists to Rome during the Social War, wherein different local ethnocultural groups de-emaphasized their differences in order to muster martial and political power.[18] It is the struggle of the local-Italian-become-Roman subject to properly negotiate the value and meaning of each of these separate strands of identity—association with one's local *germana patria*; devotion to the possibility of pan-ethnic "Italian" solidarity; and the necessary and strongly felt patriotism towards Rome defined in the Ciceronian *patria communis*—that the poetry of the *Eclogues*—and the *Georgics* after it—finds itself enmeshed in. Vergil's collection of eclogues, then, through not only its characters but its own verbal and thematic conceits, is a literature actively involved in exploring the *dialectics of acculturation* of the municipal subject, documenting through fictional representations the psychological and interpersonal attempts of Romano-Italian subjects to position themselves between multiple multivalent identities, each with their own social, cultural, and sentimental associations, as well as their own allocation (or dearth) of cultural privilege and power.

The goals of this chapter, then, are twofold: first, to demonstrate that the perspective of the *Eclogues* is one that is rooted primarily in local experience and identity, and that this local perspective is purposely disassociated from the idea of Rome; second, to show that the *Eclogues*' thematic obsession with duality, competition, and rural-urban oppositions are a result of the text's attempts to navigate the pull of several different cultural identities—the *acculturative stress* of the multicultural subject, in sociological terms. I begin with a close examination of the use of the word *patria* in the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*, showing clearly that *patria* is employed primarily not to reference Rome as the *patria communis* or *patria iuris*, but instead refers to the immediate landscape in its role as the *germana patria*, as the *origo* of the various characters and voices throughout the poem. I then turn to an in-depth discussion of *Eclogues* 1 and 9, focusing in particular on how the entrance of the figures of the *barbarus* and the *advena* contribute to the externalization of the idea of Rome; this exploration of ideas of nativism and foreignization leads to a discussion of the ideological gap between urban and rural in the rest of the collection, one which leans toward urban encroachment upon—even destruction of—the rural landscape. What becomes clear is that each poem maintains its own attitude toward the integration of inside and outside, of local Italian and Roman. In that vein, this chapter ends with an even closer look at the formation or dissolution of community within the collection and what it can say about the anxieties connected to Italian-Roman identity negotiations. Ultimately, the poems can be understood as a kind of *acculturative script*, each character and poem providing various models for navigating acculturative stress and attempting to integrate members of a divided cultural community, foreshadowing even more involved explorations of complex cultural identities in the *Georgics*.

[18] I borrow the term "panethnic" from the introduction of Philip 2007's study of Asian American identities, where she discusses the development of "Asian American", itself a group or "panethnic" term, from the 1960s: "The allocation of resources and the nature of affirmative action laws necessitated that culturally distinct ethnic-specific groups unite under a larger panethnic (this term is synonymous with "racial") label to gain a larger political platform ... Thus, rather than acknowledging the unique aspects of different ethnic-specific and cultural groups in the United States, communities of color had to de-emphasize their differences and come together as an organized bargaining unit" (7).

Patria as *germana patria* in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*

Vergil's first *Eclogue* opens upon the conversation of two herdsmen, one sitting happily beneath a tree performing pastoral music, the other on his way into exile, one of many driven from their homes by an influx of outsiders who have come to resettle their land (*Ecl.* 1.1-5, 70-72). The first, the shepherd Tityrus, has recently traveled to Rome and, by the good will of a godlike young man there, received permission to keep his flocks and his ancestral lands (1.6-10, 40-45); the second, the goatherd Meliboeus, has not fared nearly as well, and his land and little homestead have been repossessed and redistributed to outsiders by order of the same (1.64-78). The exchange between the two rustics vacillates between extremes: Tityrus' grateful admiration for the divine youth is counterpoised by the sombre melancholy of Meliboeus, creating an emotional divide between the two that continues to the end of the poem, where Tityrus' offer to share his blessings for the night is not able to offset Meliboeus's loss of his home, his fields, and his country.[19] That Meliboeus understands his own situation to be defined by his separation from his fatherland—and Tityrus', in contrast, by his ability to remain on his land—is clear from the poem's start (1.1-5):

M. Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi 1
silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena;
nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arva.
nos patriam fugimus; tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra
formonsam[20] resonare doces Amaryllida silvas. 5

Melib.: Tityrus, you, reclining 'neath the cover of a wide-spreading beech, 1
you mull your woodland Muse on a fine oaten pipe.
We're leaving the bounds of fatherland and our sweet fields.
We're leaving, exiled from our country, while you, Tityrus, lounging in the shade,
teach the trees to echo back your pretty Amaryllis.[21]

Much has been said about these, the opening lines of the initial poem of Vergil's first-published collection of poetry. Scholars have noted the assonance of *t*- and *u*-sounds to describe the carefree music-making of the herdsman Tityrus, alluding to the gentle whispering of Vergil's bucolic progenitor, Theocritus, at the

[19] As, e.g., Segal 1965 ("Thus despite the temporary effort toward calm and rest the tensions between sadness and peace, settledness and dispossession are unresolved," 243-4), and Putnam 1970, who sees Tityrus' invitation as "courteous but with a touch of dubiety" (29); cf. Breed 2006b: 106. Perkell 1990 instead sees Tityrus' final generosity as a "new voice" of pastoral emerging from the tensions between the positive, propertied Tityrus and the negative, exiled Meliboeus; cf. Perkell 1996, 2001. For other large-scale interpretations of Ecl. 1, see also: Alpers 1979: 65-95; Wright 1983; Breed 2000; Saunders 2008: 73-101; Davis 2012: 17-40.

[20] I follow Coleman 1977 in the spelling *formonsus* for *formosus* here and throughout the *Eclogues*, a choice for which there is manuscript support at each of its occurrences in the collection (1.5; 2.1, 17, 45; 3.57, 79; 4.57; 5.44 (x2), 86, 90; 7.38, 55, 62, 67; 10.18). This is one of the many colloquial and rusticizing tendencies Vergil shows in the *Eclogues* (cf. 3.1 *quoium*; 3.102 *his* (for *hi*); 5.36 *hordea* (for singular); see Coleman 1977's index s.v. *colloquialism*. Vergil's tendency toward colloquialism and rusticism can be seen to contribute to the non-dominant socio-political perspective in which I show the *Eclogues* to be grounded in in this chaper.

[21] The text of the *Eclogues* is that of Coleman 1977, with occasional divergences pointed out in the footnotes (mostly taken from Clausen 1994). All translations are my own.

beginning of his own collection;[22] they have recognized the nod to Callimachean poetics nestled in *tenui avena*,[23] as well as the gesture to Lucretius' own woodland musings with Vergil's quotation of the earlier poet's *silvestrem Musam*.[24] Critics have observed the chiastic arrangement of contrasting subjects in the lines—*Tityre, tu* (1) … *nos* (3) … *nos* (4) … *tu, Tityre* (4)—a chiasmus which strengthens the antithesis between the unworried leisure of Tityrus and the unhappy exile of Meliboeus.[25] Tityrus' exile, meanwhile, has been recognized since antiquity to take place against the background of the Italian land redistributions following the Battle of Philippi in 42 BCE.[26] The mentions of the confiscations here and in *Eclogue* 9 constitute another reason modern critics like those mentioned in the introduction to this chapter understand the setting of the *Eclogues* to be inspired by the real landscape of Italy, perhaps especially northern Italy.[27]

Despite all this, that Meliboeus explicitly refers to his *patria* in the opening lines of the poem remains an aspect of this opening address which has been underdiscussed in literature on the *Eclogues*. The word is undeniably given prominence here: *patria* is repeated in the same metrical position in lines 3 and 4, both occurrences in difference cases following the emphatic pronoun *nos*. The concept of *patria*, meanwhile, is, as mentioned above, central to both Meliboeus' self-definition and his understanding of Tityrus' situation. Meliboeus' current plight is his fleeing—or, to employ the second tier of meaning lurking not far below the surface of the text, being driven in exile from—"the bounds and sweet fields of fatherland" (*patriae finis et dulcia … arva*, 3); he will wander the far reaches of the world, perhaps never to see his fields again (64-72), and he will sing no more songs (*carmina nulla canam*, 75), a fact which more than any other illustrates his imminent alienation from his ancestral community and the lifestyle he knows.[28] Tityrus, meanwhile, is able to relax in leisure (*recubans*, 1; *lentus in umbra*, 4)[29] and continue to compose pastoral song (*Musam meditaris*, 2; *resonare doces*, 5)[30] on his former estate,[31] all at the allowance of the god-like *iuvenis* in Rome (*permisit*, 10).[32] The present and future circumstances of both characters, then, are

[22] Coleman 1977: 71; Wright 1983: 117ff.; Clausen 1994: 29; Hubbard 1995: 41ff.; Breed 2000; Hunter 2006: 116ff. The aural similarity is to *Id.* 1.1-3: ΄Αδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἁ πίτυς αἰπόλε τήνα ἃ ποτὶ ταῖς παγαῖσι μελίσδεται, ἁδὺ δὲ καὶ τὺ συρίσδες.

[23] Coleman 1977: 176-7, Clausen 1994: 175; see also Wright 1983. Hunter 2006 is, of course, indispensable for any discussion of Callimachean poetics in Roman poetry of this period (esp. Ch. 4 on the *Eclogues*).

[24] Breed 2000: 8ff. is a recent account of the Lucretian resonances of line 2 which includes a summary of recent accounts of Lucretian influence on Vergil (p. 8-9, n. 8); see also: Coleman 1977: 71 ad 1.2, and Clausen 1994: 35 ad 1.2. The relevant lines are Lucretius 4.589 (*fistula silvestrem ne cesset fundere Musam*) and 5.1398 (*agrestis enim tum Musa vigebat*); for the latter, cf. also *Ecl.* 6.8: *agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam*.

[25] Coleman 1977: 73 ad 1.5.; Clausen 1994: 28, note 3. The antithesis between Tityrus and Meliboeus is one of the most commented upon aspects of this poem; see the earlier notes. For the idea of broader tensions or polarized voices in the *Eclogues* more broadly, see: Segal 1965: 252-4; Putnam 1975b: 163; Van Sickle 1978; Patterson 1987; Batstone 1990, 10; Connolly 2001, 92.

[26] Coleman 1977: 80, 89-91; Clausen 1994: 30 n.4; cf. Saunders 2008: 90. The first significant modern texts are Wilkinson 1966 and Winterbottom 1976.

[27] Consider, too, the fact that the beech, *fagus* (*sub tegmine fagi*) is native to North Italy: Clausen 1994: 35 ad 1.1.

[28] Karakasis 2011 calls the singing of rustic song the "exemplary activity" of characters in pastoral poetry.

[29] Cf. 1.6, in Tityrus' own words: *deus nobis haec otia fecit*. See Clausen 1994 ad loc. on the leisurely—and, in fact, luxurious—overtones of *recubans*.

[30] Cf. Tityrus at 1.9-10: *ille meas errare boves, ut cernis, et ipsum ludere quae vellem calamo permisit agresti.*

[31] It is clear from Meliboeus' address at 1.46-58 that Tityrus remains on land which was already in his possession before his trip to Rome: *tua rura manebunt* (46); *hic inter flumina nota* (51); *quae semper* (53); cf. *ut ante* (45).

[32] Cf. 1.44-45: *hic mihi responsum primus dedit ille petenti: 'pascite ut ante boues, pueri, submittite tauros*.'

determined by their relationship to the *patria* of which Meliboeus speaks here.[33]

The notion of *patria*, of course—"fatherland; country; nation"—is a curiously subjective one, requiring as it does the focalization of a definite, defined subject who feels themself to belong to a certain community or geographical affiliation.[34] The commentators are disappointingly tacit on the double appearance of *patria* here. Coleman mentions *patria* only to point out that he believes it does not belong, calling it one of many "intrusions from the non-pastoral world" in the collection, though he does call the repetition "very expressive".[35] Clausen notes that the "love for a native place, [and] profound sorrow for its loss" expressed by these lines are "Roman sentiments" which are found in Homer but not in Theocritus, thus understanding Meliboeus' movement from his *patria* to reflect Vergil's "Romanization" of the Greek bucolic genre.[36] Indeed, when *patria* here is treated or translated, most often the problem of the exact referentiality of *patria* is passed over; in those cases where indication seems to be given, it is usually assumed that *patria* reflects a generalized *Roman* patriotism or a flavorless reference to the local countryside.[37]

Yet the *patria* so emotionally summoned by Meliboeus in these lines is decidedly *not* Rome; indeed, Vergil goes to great lengths to emphasize the distance and difference between Rome and the landscape which the reader sees the herdsmen inhabiting.[38] This is first evident in Tityrus' response to Meliboeus at line 19, after Meliboeus has questioned Tityrus as to the identity of the so-called god who has granted him the leisure he now enjoys (19-25):

[33] Meliboeus' use of the term *patria* makes him legally a *civis*, a word used by him at 1.71. As concerns Tityrus, commentators sometimes take the references to acquired *libertas* at lines 27-35 to mean that Tityrus himself is a former slave, who "could not technically have a *patria*" (Coleman 1977: 72 ad 1.3-4). Yet one wonders if readers are meant to take *libertas* necessarily as the *manumissio* of a former slave, or whether Tityrus' references a broader definition of *libertas* as the assumption and enjoyment of full political rights, a meaning that would square well against the background of north Italian enfranchisement and land confiscation; cf. Clausen 1994: "'Freedom' (*libertas*) and 'slavery' (*servitium*) were established political metaphors … Virgil deliberately confuses the private with the public sense of *libertas*" (31). In any case, as in the *Georgics*, I do not think that Vergil is striving here for absolute technical precision, bur rather a "mood"; see Jenkyns 1998: 69ff.

[34] One of the best studies of the concept of *patria*, including the distinctions made between *patria communis*, place of *origo*, and place of birth, see Y. Thomas 1996.

[35] Coleman 1977: 72 ad 3-4. Coleman goes on to add *arva* (3), *urbem* (19), *libertas* (27), *peculium* (32), *servitium* (40), *limes* (53), and *miles/novalia* (70) as further "intrusions". Such narrowness of generic expectation in the scholarship on the *Eclogues* is sadly quite common; again, see Schmidt 1975, Jenkyns 1989, and Jenkyns 1998.

[36] Clausen 1994: 32 note 16. Saunders 2008 (Ch. 4) more explicitly identifies the use of *patria* here as a reference to the Theocritean bucolic tradition; in Saunder's formulation, Meliboeus' exile from the *patria* thus represents Vergil's movement away from the Greek generic precedent of Theocritus. Hunter 2006 (Ch. 4) differs slightly in seeing Roman pastoral coming in (as the *barbarus*, 1.70) to displace Theocritean bucolic, with Meliboeus thus representing one of the dispossessed affected by this transfer of the genre from Greece to Rome.

[37] Segal 1965: "Vergil's problem in adapting … Theocritean pastoral for the Roman scene" (262); Wright 1983: "The word *patria* itself introduces a concept which is alien to Theocritus' herdsmen but of immense significance for a Roman" (119). See, too, Saunders 2008: "[the *Eclogues*] is a redrawing of the geopolitical map which [Meliboeus and Tityrus'] other *patria*, Rome…" (93-4: "other" is used here by Saunders to mark difference from a Theocritean pastoral representing the *literary* "fatherland" of the *Eclogues*; see the previous note).

[38] I am not here implying that Meliboeus understands himself to be leaving the physical location of Rome. In describing his upcoming exile, Meliboeus sees himself as leaving *Roman Italy*, predicting that he and the others will have to travel to Africa, Scythia, and Britain (*Ecl.* 1.64-66: the first is a Roman province, the others not even Roman territory). As the collection of quotes in the previous note seems to indicate, scholars have focused almost entirely on the Roman half of this equation, not at all on the Italian half. The intriguing fact here is not that *patria* in this passage is not Rome, but that it is an Italian *municipium explicitly distanced from* Rome.

Urbem quam dicunt Romam, Meliboee, putavi
stultus ego huic nostrae similem, quo[39] saepe solemus
pastores ovium teneros depellere fetus.
sic canibus catulos similes, sic matribus haedos
noram, sic parvis componere magna solebam.
verum haec tantum alias inter caput extulit urbes
quantum lenta solent inter viburna cupressi.

The city which they call Rome, Meliboeus—stupidly, I thought it
similar to our town here, the one from which we herdsmen
often are accustomed to drive our flocks' tender lambs.
By that reasoning, I had recognized that pups resembled dogs, and kids
their mothers; in just that way I was used to comparing great things with small.
But this one has raised its head up to such a great extent among the other cities
as cypress trees are accustomed to tower above the pliant guelder-roses.

What is immediately apparent from Tityrus' interpretation of Rome is its distance from his own city, as well as its surprising deviation from his expectations. Tityrus' and Meliboeus' everyday existence is so far removed from Rome that it becomes a rumor that must be affirmed, a story which the shepherds have only ever heard others tell: "the city which they call Rome" (*urbem quam dicunt Romam*, 19); the hearsay of the third-person verb only increases the disconnect between Rome and the here and now. The city called Rome is also completely unlike any city Tityrus has ever seen. It is not at all similar to "this city of ours" (*huic nostrae*, 20), the nearest urban center from which the herdsmen often drive their lambs, and likely the same as the "ungrateful city" (*ingratae…urbi*, 34) where Tityrus fails to catch a fair price for cream cheese. Nor is Rome simply a larger manifestation of this nearby town, as dogs are grown versions of puppies, and she-goats kids in a larger form, but something completely different and overshadowing. The emphatic *verum* (24) makes it clear that such a customary comparison of large to small does not, *cannot* apply in this situation. Instead, if the local town is a pliant guelder-rose bush, a simple hedge plant, Rome itself is a towering cypress, reaching unexpected heights and seeming to dominate completely whatever lies beneath it, existing on an entirely different order of magnitude.

What's more, the likening of Rome to the cypress within the simile is noticeably ominous, a fact which adds to the disconnect between Rome and the nearby towns and introduces a sort of antagonism between Rome and the local countryside as it raises its head high above the other cities there (*tantum alias inter caput extulit urbes*, 24). The cypress was, of course, sacred to Pluto and usually carried funereal associations,[40] a symbolism present elsewhere in Vergil's corpus.[41] The gloomy associations of the cypress

[39] I follow Clausen 1994 in printing *quo* as opposed to Coleman 1977's *quoi*, a reading which depends on taking *depellere* in line 21 in its simpler sense of "drive" rather than the more specialized sense of "to wean"—in the latter sense, as Clausen points out, "the verb is always a perfect passive participle" (Clausen 1994: 44 ad 1.21).
[40] Varro, quoted by Servius ad *Aen.* 6.216; Pliny *Nat.* 16.139. Coleman 1977 recognizes the "sombre associations" (78 ad loc.) of the tree, but claims that they "do not seem relevant"—but see the following note.
[41] *Aen.* 3.64 (adorning the altars at the renewed funeral rites of Polydorus); *Aen.* 6.216 (laid upon Misenus' pyre). Connors 1992 argues convincingly for seeing associations of death in the cypress tree beside the *tumulus* outside Troy at *Aen.* 2.714, and suggests that the mention of Silvanus carrying an uprotted cypress at *G.* 1.20 recalls the

paint a dark aura about the simile here, the resulting image a Rome encroaching minaciously upon the surrounding countryside. There is an interesting comparandum for the dramatic prominence of the cypress here, though in a distant time and medium—specifically, in Vincent van Gogh's inclusion of cypresses in many of his later paintings. Van Gogh had a particular fascination for the cypress' great height and dark green color, calling it at one point "the dark spot in a sun-drenched landscape".[42] Cypresses appear in several of his paintings, including *The Starry Night* (1889), in which the dark, almost-black cypress in the foreground stands in sharp contrast to the bright blues and yellow of the village and night sky behind it. One of van Gogh's very final works is especially poignant in this regard, entitled *Cypresses and Two Women* (1890).[43] The painting features a single large cypress in swirling strokes of dark green, brown, and red, rising up from a field of yellow to the very top of the canvas, losing its top off the upper edge of the canvas. Two women dressed in white stand in the central foreground, distant enough that their faces are featureless, positioned in front of the towering tree. From the viewer's perspective, the cypress' dark colors completely envelope the light-colored figures of the women, while blocking the sky and countryside behind it from view. The only other white in the painting is the cloud around the cypress, making the women the only bright figures in the lower-half of the canvas, a feature which imparts an impression of isolation, of the women's being overwhelmed by the tree's dark splendor.[44] Something like this quality of the cypress—as if some pastoral black hole—is present in the poem here, and in Vergil's simile the trees metaphorically suggest some destruction or loss, as they do also in the *Aeneid* when cypress bedecks the altars of Polydorus' renewed funeral rites (3.64) and Misenus' funeral pyre (6.216). These somber associations of Rome-as-cypress stress even more that the *patria* Meliboeus feels so connected to cannot be this otherwordly Rome, but must instead be the "sweet fields" (*dulcia…arva*, 3) surrounding, the description of which is provided for the reader by Meliboeus' voice alone.[45] It becomes clear that the referent of *patria* is the local Italian landscape, understood as *separate* and *removed* from Rome; it is this ancestral *germana patria*, the town specified by *huic nostrae* (20) and *ingratae urbi* (34), to which Meliboeus directs his entire patriotic devotion.[46]

A wider inspection of Vergil's corpus reveals that this local valence of *patria* is not unique to this passage, but that the poet quite often effects a similar gap between Roman and local Italian space and identity by calling upon the notion of the *patria* (and the related adjective *patrius*), in the process revealing the complex relationship between Rome and the local sites of Italy.[47] One such passage is the opening of

mythical story of Cyparissus, a lover of Silvanus (or Apollo) who was tranformed into the tree after accidentally killing a beloved pet dear; cf. Silvia at *Aen.* 7.475-510. Connors in fact briefly suggests in her conclusion that the same funereal associations exist here in *Ecl.* 1, indicating "the great cost" (17) of guaranteeing Rome's rise.

[42] From a personal letter to his brother, ca. June 25, 1889: "The cypresses still preoccupy me. I'd like to do something with them … because it astonishes me that no one has yet done them as I see them. It's beautiful as regards lines and proportions, like an Egyptian obelisk. And the green has such a distinguished quality. It is the dark patch in a sun-drenched landscape" (Jansen et al. 2009: no. 783).

[43] Currently on display in the van Gogh Museum in Amsterdam.

[44] Cypresses are also featured prominently in van Gogh's *Cypresses* (1889) and *Wheat Field with Cypresses* (1889).

[45] *Ecl.* 1.11-17, 36-39, 47-58, 75-78. Cf. Segal 1965: "All the descriptions of the country are put into the mouth of the exiled Meliboeus" (242).

[46] von Albrecht 2010 is one of the few recent scholars to suggest that *patria* refers explicitly to an Italian setting *as separate from* Rome. Putnam 1970 also briefly raises the same possibility, but leaves the point there: "It becomes clear as the poem progresses that the way Meliboeus uses the word *patria* may give it a more general meaning than the mere acres he once called his own. His *patria* is Virgil's *patria*—Italy and its land" (76).

[47] This particular feature of Vergil's use of the terms *patria* and *patrius* is not something that, to my knowledge, that has been discussed by other scholars.

Vergil's third *Georgic*, the so-called "proem in the middle",[48] where the poet describes the great marble temple he plans to build in honor of Octavian, should time allow (*G.* 3.10-18):

primus ego in patriam mecum, modo vita supersit,
Aonio rediens deducam vertice Musas;
primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas,
et viridi in campo templum de marmore ponam
propter aquam, tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat
Mincius et tenera praetexit harundine ripas.
in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit.
illi victor ego et Tyrio conspectus in ostro
centum quadriiugos agitabo ad flumina currus.

I will be the first, provided the course of my life endures, to return from the
Aonian Mount and lead back the Muses with me into my own fatherland;
I will be the first, Mantua, to carry back to you the Palestinian palms,
and to set up upon your green plain a temple all of marble
near the water's edge, where with slow-crawling coils the great
Mincius meanders and befringes its banks with pliant reed.
In the middle I will place Caesar, and he will command the temple.
Victorious, admired in Tyrian purple, in his honor I will drive
a hundred four-horse chariots beside the flowing waters.[49]

The temple and the triumphal imagery (*deducam*; *palmas*; *victor*; *Tyrio…in ostro*; *centum quadriiugos...currus*) refer metaphorically to a future work Vergil will compose in Octavian's honor, a clear reference to the epic *Aeneid*, which must have been in its nascence.[50] What is interesting in this passage is the fact that the temple and triumphal parade, ostensibly intended to celebrate the victories of Roman Caesar, will not be located in Rome, but on the banks of the river Mincius in northern Italy near Vergil's native Mantua. Indeed, even before mention of Caesar (16) or the temple (13), Vergil's ancestral home has already been given primacy—literally, in the repetition of *primus*—by being mentioned first as the recipient of the Heliconian Muses and the victory palms. Just as in *Eclogue* 1, the word *patria* appears here in a prominent—even programmatic—place near the beginning of one of Vergil's poems, but with even less ambiguity of reference: the address to *Mantua* two lines later, with the repeated *primus* and future-tense verbs, leave it more than clear that it is the poet's Cisalpine home which is referred to by "fatherland"—not Rome.

The use of *patria* here has not been given the treatment it deserves.[51] Scholars do recognize that the setting of this passage must be in some sense Italian due to the appearance of Mantua and the river Mincius. Yet even after admitting so, it is an Italian setting that they easily equate with Rome,[52] making the

[48] See, e.g., Conte 1992.
[49] The Latin text of the *Georgics* is that of Thomas 1988a. All translations, unless otherwise specified, are my own.
[50] Also the opinion of Thomas 1988a: 36-7, 41.
[51] The use of the word *patria* here is not mentioned by Thomas 1988a or Mynors 1990, though the setting of the passage is clearly recognized by them as being in rural Italy.
[52] Thomas 1988a, for example, switches seamlessly between mention of the poem's "Italian setting" (p. 39 ad

prime mode of opposition in the passage between Greece on the one hand, and Rome/Italy on the other. While this opposition is certainly important for the Hesiodic and Callimachean programmatic assertions in these lines (e.g. *Aonio rediens deducam uertice Musas*),[53] focusing on it alone ignores the conceptual distance the text creates between the northern Italian location of the temple and Rome, which does not appear in the passage at all except for metonymically through her champion, Caesar. Indeed, the specifically *Italian* (rather than Roman) association of these lines is clear in both the Lucretian model for these lines and the later Augustan emulations of it by Propertius and Horace. Lucretius, speaking of Ennius,[54] says that the poet was "the first (*primus*) to bring down from pleasant Helicon the crown of victory, a thing renowned among the Italian races of men (*per gentis Italas hominum*)".[55] Propertius, in an equally programmatic first poem of his own third book, states, "I, a priest from the pure font, am first to enter to celebrate Italian (*Itala*) rites through Greek choruses".[56] Horace, too, in the third book of his *Odes*, claims that "I, first of all, will claim to have spun (*deduxisse*) an Aeolian song to Italian strains (*Italos modos*)".[57] It is notable that all four authors, despite the opposition being drawn between Greek and Latin poetry, ultimately associate their literary production with a translation to Italian peoples and spaces, not Roman ones.[58]

In a way, then, the bringing back of the Hesiodic and Callimachean poetic traditions from Greece, alongside the parade of Greek, Eastern, and European peoples and places in the imagined triumphal procession (19-39),[59] can be seen to be building up the fame of the very specific region around Mantua and the Mincius, the endpoints toward which all the motion and celebration in the passage are directed. This motion is mediated by the figure of Caesar, who stands in the middle of Vergil's temple (*in medio*, 16) and is the culmination toward which the entire passage builds (*Caesar*, 48). It is Caesar who makes this celebration possible through his military exploits, bringing back the strength and marvels of the world to build up the fame of the Mincius and Mantua by way of Rome. Of course, there is something striking about the removal of the triumph and games from their usual locale in Rome to the middle of the Mantuan countryside, the winding route from the Campus Martius to the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline here replaced by a procession along the twists and turns (*flexibus*, 14) of the Mincius to Vergil's temple to Caesar. The idyllic natural background comes to be overshadowed by the shining accoutrements of this victory: the marble temple (*templum de marmore*, 15) with its chryselephantine doors (*ex auro solidoque elephanto*, 26) and accompanying statuary (*Parii lapides, spirantia signa*, 34); the procession of a hundred four-horse chariots (*centum quadriiugos…currus*, 18) and theatrical performances (*scaena*, 24)

3.10-15) and their description as "Roman poetry" (p. 40 ad 3.11). Hardie 2008 speaks in the same paragraph of the "Italian countryside" and the "Roman themes" (179). Cf. Wilkinson 2008: "for Rome … to Italy" (184).

53 See Thomas 1983, and Thomas 1988a ad loc.

54 Cf. Ennius' claim to possess "three hearts" in his speaking of Greek, Latin, *and* Oscan (Gellius *NA* 17.17.1).

55 Lucretius *DRN* 1.117-9: *qui primus amoeno detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam per gentis Italias hominum quae clara clueret*.

56 Propertius 3.1.3-4: *primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros*.

57 Horace, *Odes* 3.30-10-14: *dicar … princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos deduxisse modos*.

58 Cf. also Catullus' address of his dedicatee Cornelius Nepos at *c.* 1.1.5-6 as "the only one of the Italians (*unus Italorum*) who dared to unravel all of time in three volumes" (trans. Habinek 1998: 94), as well as Habinek 1998's comments on that passage: "Moreover, the work was Italian, as opposed to exclusively Roman, in outlook, relating the history of the Italian peninsula, rather than just the city of Rome ... Nepos, a newcomer from across the Po, a man honored in poetry by a fellow transpadane [i.e. Catullus], takes his place as historian of and about the Italians..." (95).

59 Greek: *Alpheum* (19), *Molorchi* (19), *Graecia* (20); Eastern: *Gangaridum* (27), *Nilum* (29), *Asiae* (30), *Niphaten* (30), *Parthum* (31); European: *Britanni* (25—actually depicted on the theatre curtains which close the performance).

brought to a close by purple tapestries woven with scenes of empire (*purpurea intexti…aulaea Brittani*, 25). The triumphal golds, purples, and marbles stand out conspicuously against the green field and reed-skirted banks of the river with which the description of the procession begins (*viridi in campo*, 13; *tenera praetexit harundine ripas*, 15) and the "untouched woods and groves" (*silvas saltusque…intactos*, 39-40) with which it ends. On the one hand, the adornment which Mantua and the Mincius receive by way of Rome can be seen as building up the region into a new sort of hybrid of the local landscape and Rome, a victorious reality built on the advances of Roman power and the incorporation of the region into the province of Roman Italy. On the other hand, the location of the temple and procession on the Mantuan plain can be seen as a very real manifestation of Rome's encroachment upon the natural Italian landscape, populating the green fields and lazy river banks with monumental architecture, parades, and sacrifices (*caesosque … iuvencos*, 23). One is reminded of Rome as the towering cypress of *Eclogue* 1, dominating the lesser guelder-rose bushes: here, too, the green fields, flowing rivers, and untouched groves are slowly populated and overwhelmed as the passage shifts from them to the "name of Caesar" in the last lines of the proem (*Caesaris … nomen*, 47; *Caesar*, 48). *Patria* emerges as aligning more closely here with Mantua and Vergil's native home, again revealing an ambivalent relationship between Rome and rural Italian locales.

A further striking usage of *patria* occurs less than fifty lines before, but across the book boundary, in the "praises of rustic life" at the end of *Georgics* 2. The general theme, begun initially at line 458 with an expression of admiration for the farmers who recognize their own fortune (*o fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint, agricolas*, 458-9), is restated at 493: "Happy too is he who has come to know the rustic gods" (*fortunatus et ille deos qui nouit agrestis*). This line initiates two sections on this theme, the first elevating rustic life through an enumeration of the negative aspects of city life, the second touting the countryside's virtues for their own sake. At the point of transition between these two sections, the notion of *patria* is called upon twice in close succession, once in both the urban and rural sections (3.510-515):

> gaudent perfusi sanguine fratrum,
> exsilioque domos et dulcia limina mutant
> atque alio patriam quaerunt sub sole iacentem.
> agricola incurvo terram dimovit aratro:
> hinc anni labor, hinc patriam parvosque nepotes
> sustinet, hinc armenta boum meritosque iuvencos.
>
> [Men in the city] rejoice in being soaked with the blood of their brothers,
> and in exile they change their homes and their sweet abodes, and
> seek out some fatherland spread out beneath a different sun.
> The farmer, on the other hand, divides the earth with curved plow:
> from this comes his year-round toil; from this he sustains his fatherland and
> young grandchildren, from this his herds of cattle and deserving bullocks.

The contrast between the situation of the urbanite and country man is striking. The city folk are described as embroiled in a civil conflict which leads to the citizens' exile and a search for a new nation and a new home; the farmer, meanwhile, continues in his yearlong toil, toil through which he nonetheless supports his family, country, and herds. The divergence between the two groups is most apparent in their divergent relationships with family and fatherland. The city-dwellers rejoice in the slaughter of those close to them (*gaudent*, 510), specifically in the brothers they are implied to have murdered (*sanguine fratrum*, 510). In the

countryside, meanwhile, providing for his young grandchildren (*parvosque nepotes*, 514) serves as one of the farmer's motivations for his neverending labor; a few lines later, Vergil will describe how the farmer's "sweet children hang upon his kisses" (*dulces pendent circum oscula nati*, 523), the immediate presence of the youths' sweetness drawing a striking parallel with the sweet lands (*dulcia limina*, 511) the urban exile must presently leave. Moreover, whereas the farmer's *patria* is fixed and unchanging, and notionally connected with his descendants and herds, that of the city dwellers is far from constant. Just as they have no familial constancy—nor indeed constancy of any other sort, "influenced" (*flexit*, 496) as they are by power (*fasces*), wealth (*purpura*), conflict (*discordia*), and conspiracy (*coniurato…Dacus ab Histro*) and "seized" (*corripuit*, 510) by popular praise (*plausus*)—so these men also have no constancy of patriotic feeling, since they are forced by civil strife to "change" (*mutant*, 511) their home, leave behind what is familiar, and seek another *patria* somewhere far off "beneath another sun" (*alio … sub sole*, 512). The exilic wanderings of the citizens here are poignantly reminiscent of Meliboeus' flight in the first *Eclogue*, in both situation and language: the *dulcia limina* left behind here recall the *dulcia arva* Meliboeus must abandon, and both are driven by the evils of the city to foresake their previous *patria* and seek one anew.[60]

Yet these two vignettes do not merely contrast urban and rural existence, but, as in *Eclogue* 1 and *Georgic* 3, draw a comparison between Rome as urban center and the individual peoples scattered throughout Italy. This is clear in the rustic's rejection of the urban-aligned "Roman affairs and kingdoms destined to fall" (*res Romanae perituraque regna*, 498) at the beginning of the passage, in the inclusion of specifically Roman vocabulary (*fasces*, 495; *forum*, 502; *tabularia*, 502; *rostris*, 508) and of the quintessentially Roman theme of civil war (*infidos agitans discordia fratres*, 496; *sanguine fratrum*, 510). The praise of country life which follows this urban sectios, meanwhile, culminates by linking the happy country life just described precisely to the life of the scattered populations of pre-Roman Italy (*G.* 2.532-4):

> hanc olim veteres vitam coluere Sabini, 532
> hanc Remus et frater; sic fortis Etruria crevit
> scilicet et rerum facta est pulcherrima Roma. 534
>
> This is the life that the ancient Sabines once cultivated, 532
> this the life of Remus and his brother; so did Etruria grow strong
> and in this way, to be sure, Rome was made the most beautiful of all. 534

It is striking that the happy rustic life described by the poet is both associated with individual Italian locales and also relegated to time past. The sudden break from repeated present-tense verbs to the perfect tense in this passage (*coluere*; *creuit*; *facta est*), potentially ambiguous but for the aoristic *olim* in line 532, paints this joyful sustaining of herds, grandchildren, and one's local *patria* as a relic of an unrecoverable past, as does the formulation *Remus et frater*, blissfully unaware as it is of blood fraternal and civil strife to come: this is a picture of time before the founding of Rome, when the twins, natives of Alba Longa, were raised in the Italian countryside. Rome, too, can be imagined as one of these individual Italian places, and its inclusion

[60] The possibility that a contrast exists between the two occurrences of *patria* here goes unnoticed by the commentators. Thomas 1988a's only interaction with the word is to translate it "nation" in his translation of 2.514-5 ("this is the source of his toil, the soure of sustenance for nation and family"). Mynors 1990 discusses it briefly to assert that it was indeed possible for farmers to provide for their "country" (translating *patria*) "with their daily bread", as opposed to the earlier commentators' view that "a man could support his *patria* only by paying taxes and by military service" (172 ad 2.514), understanding Rome. Italy is not mentioned in either case.

at the end of this catalogue of Italian peoples and places suggests as much. But Rome's appearance in the last line also seems to strike the temporality of past and present: whereas the "ancient" (*veteres*) Sabines and Remus are no longer alive, and Etruria is no longer "strong" (*fortis*), Rome both became the most beautiful city and remains so in Vergil's time. The true perfect in *facta est* thus draws a continuous temporal line between Rome-just-founded, one among many small settlements upon the peninsula which will become Italy, and *Roma pulcherrima*, the most beautiful and last-standing, subduer of Sabines and Etruscans alike. The poignant double inclusion of *patria* between the critique of urban life and the praises of the country thus helps to delineate the contrast between these two concepts of patriotism: the contentment and locally-situated gratification of the farmer, a characteristic easily aligned with individual Italian locales such as Etruria and pre-imperial Rome set in contrast against the precariousness and endlessly reproducible greed, strife, and dislocation of Rome present. Such a close juxtaposition of these two different conceptions of *patria* itself serves to question whether the advent of Roman encroachment and the accoutrements of modern urban life have relegated devotion to local *patria* and culture also to the past.

These passages from *Eclogue* 1 and *Georgics* 2 and 3 showcase Vergil's preference for using the term *patria* in the sense of one's local *origo* while simultaneously setting up Rome as *patria communis* as a suggestive contrast; however, Vergil shows a preference for the *germana patria* sense (and the adjectival form *patrius*) also in passages with much lower stakes from throughout his corpus. Thus, in *Georgics* 1, Pan is found leaving the groves of Lycaeon, his "ancestral grove" (*nemus patrium*, 16) as he leaves Greece for Vergil's Italy; in *Georgics* 3, Epirus is the *patria* of horse who "traces back Neptune's lineage to its very origin" (*Neptunique ipsa deducat origine gentem*, 122); and Aristaeus looks back upon his *patria* Pallene in *Georgics* 4 (390-91). In the *Aeneid*, *patria* and *patrius* for the Trojans most often refer to Troy, less often to the Italy that will become their new *patria*;[61] the same words are used four times to refer to Tyra as Dido's fatherland,[62] while Carthage is never called Dido's *patria*. Meanwhile, *patria* is used frequently to indicate characters' places of origin both *outside* of Italy—including Argos, Ithaca, Arcadia, and Thrace—and from *within* in the Italian peninsula itself: thus Pallanteum is twice called Pallas' *patria*, the Etruscan city Agyllae is the *patria* of Mezentius; Camilla's *patria* is Privernum, her killer Arruns' *patria* is Etruscan Soracte, and in book 12 Turnus, preparing for combat in Laurentum, laments that his father is now kept apart from him in *patria Ardea*.[63]

Yet what these two terms, *patria* and *patrius*, achieve more often in Vergil's poetry is the demonstration of their own undeniable subjectivity—their dependence upon the focalization of a specific subject in order to achieve meaning. This is most clear in passages such as *Georgics* 2.116: *diuisae arboribus patriae*, "Trees have their allotted *patriae*," or, alternatively, "*Patriae* can be distinguished on the basis of their trees", the emphasis in both cases on the wide diversity of locales serving as *patriae* for both trees and humankind; this statement makes it sufficiently clear that the term *patria*, without a focalizing subject, is but an empty signifier. The same effect is produced at *Georgics* 1.51-2: *praediscere morem cura sit ac patrios cultusque habitusque locorum*, "Let care be taken to learn beforehand the disposition of places and the care

[61] Troy: 2.2.41, 2.280, 2.291, 2.702, 2.717, 3.8, 3.281, 3.297, 3.325, 4.598, 5.61, 5.601, 5.624, 5.632, 6.509, 7.230, 9.247, 9.674, 9.786, 10.59. Italy: 1.380, 4.347, 7.122, 11.26.

[62] 1.357, 1.620, 4.632, 4.680.

[63] Argos: 2.137, 2.152; Ithaca: 3.613; Arcadia: 8.333; Thrace: 10.351; Pallanteum: 10.374, 10.437; Agyllae: 10.853; Privernum: 11.594; Soracte: 11.797; Ardea: 12.43. Rome, meanwhile, is in the future as far as the poem's action is concerned; nevertheless, it is referred to as (*communis*) *patria* three times in the epic, all in the parade of heroes in *Aen.* 6: Tullus Hostilius is he "who will break the peace of his *patria*" (813-14); Brutus will be driven by love of *patria* and eagerness for praise to execute his sons for the safety of the Republic (823); and Anchises implores Pompey and Caesar not to direct their strength against their *patria*'s own vitals (832-33).

and keeping particular to their own ancestral practice (*patrios*)." The natural differences between regions and types of soils produce a huge diversity of methods for cultivation and care, unique methods which must be mastered beforehand in order to guarantee agricultural success in any individual place—*patrius* only gains meaning when attached to a specific location.[64] This distributive use of *patria*, which fully admits to its subjectivity, is present in the *Aeneid* in two groups Aeneas encounters in the Underworld: the group of those who "sold their fatherland for gold", *vendidit hic auro patriam* (6.621), and the *manus ob patriam pugnando volnera passi* (6.660)—those injured in battle while fighting on their fatherland's behalf. In these last two examples, *patria* could just as well refer to the political fatherland of law and citizenship: in this case, it is not just the variety of *patriae* that is emphasized, but also their changeability. *Patria*, then, is all about perspective.

While this has not been a complete summary of Vergil's usage of *patria* and *patrius* in his works, it has been comprehensive enough to be able to remark upon a general strategy of the poet. Not only does Vergil's preference for using *patria* to indicate the *germana patria* rather than the *patria communis* demonstrate his interest in exploring the dynamics of a specifically *local* identity, his frequent creation of textual *loci* that exploit the tensions between these two conceptions of the *patria* reveal ongoing attempts to disentangle the strands of local, Italian, and Roman identity. The tendency to revert toward identification with the *germana patria* reveals the difficulty of true integration with the *patria communis*, just as Vergil's imaginary construction of a Mincian temple vacillates between representing a triumphal celebration of local excellence, meaningfully removed from Roman influence, and, at other times, standing for Rome's encroachment and even dominion over local Italian landscapes. The successful integration of the local and Roman, if ever realized, is short-lived; these flucuations in the text reflect the acculturative stress of the bicultural subject, the struggle to achieve a balanced integration of multiple cultural identities. As we will see, the difficulty of this integration is one of, if not *the* main theme of Vergil's *Eclogues*.

***Barbarus*, *Advena*: The Externalization of Rome in *Eclogues* 1 and 9**

Returning to *Eclogue* 1, we can now see that Vergil's alignment of *patria* in the opening lines with Meliboeus' and Tityrus' local landscape, as well as his distancing of Rome from that same landscape, is not a feature of this poem alone, but part of a larger trend in the early part of his *corpus*. But the separation and externalization of Rome become even more poignant—and distressing—in Meliboeus' last and longest speech in the poem, without a doubt the emotional climax of the eclogue. It is here that the ideological gap which exists for Meliboeus between his ancestral *patria* and Rome becomes most clear (1.67-72):

> en umquam patrios longo post tempore finis
> pauperis et tuguri congestum caespite culmen,
> post aliquot, mea regna, videns mirabor aristas?
> impius haec tam culta novalia miles habebit,
> barbarus has segetes. en quo discordia civis
> produxit miseros; his nos consevimus agros.

[64] Austin 1971: "*patria* is not general, but relative...it postulates citizens to whom it belongs" (176 ad 1.540).

Ah! Shall I ever, even a long time hence, look upon my ancestral lands, 67
and the sod-piled roof of my humble earthen lodge? Shall I ever,
afterwards, look and marvel at—my kingdom!—so many beards of grain?
These fallow fields, so many times cultivated, an irreverent soldier will possess; 70
a foreigner will have these fields of grain. Look to what end discord has
driven pitiable citizens: it is for these new ones that we've sown our fields.

Meliboeus laments that he may never again see his lands, his hut, or his flourishing fields of grain, before bitterly prophesying that some *impius miles*, some *barbarus* will take possession of the fields that he has sown. The *patriae finis* of line 3 have returned here as Meliboeus' *patrios…finis* (67), drawing a thematic strand from the poem's beginning to its end and reaffirming that the retreat from his *patria* is the driving force of Meliboeus' melancholy. The poignancy of these lines is underscored by their intratextuality. The phrase *longo post tempore* (67) is reproduced verbatim from an earlier speech of Tityrus, where it appears in the same place in the line: Tityrus describes *libertas* as coming to him *longo post tempore* (28), whereas Meliboeus is unsure whether he will ever (*umquam*, 67) look upon his ancestral lands again, even after a great amount of time has passed. The repetition serves to emphasize yet again the contrast between Meliboeus' and Tityrus' situations. The humble *tugurium*, meanwhile, which Meliboeus is about to lose is reminiscent of Tityrus' *tegmen* at the poem's beginning—the ancients considered both words to have been formed from the verb *tegere*, "cover".[65] Vergil assigns Meliboeus a *pauper tegmen* made of sod, which he cannot even keep, to contrast with the protective covering of the beech Tityrus enjoys now and into the future.

Meliboeus' expression of deep fondness for his land is followed by the bitter realization that some person foreign to this landscape—one who is a *miles*, a soldier, but also a *barbarus*, a foreigner, one who "would know nothing of the local Italian *pietas*"[66]—will soon have possession of his land. The epithet *barbarus*, as we saw with *patria*, is less straightforward than it would seem, for *barbarus* also requires the subject's assumption of a particular perspective, alignment with a community or in-group of some sort in order to define itself as being located *outside* of that group. There is, of course, the possibility that *barbarus* here simply means "barbarous, cruel" in the non-literal sense, being simply a repetition of the idea in *impius* one line earlier.[67] Yet *Eclogue* 1 has already explicitly used the term *patria* to evoke the Ciceronian idea of affection for one's place of origin—including just three lines before *barbarus*' occurrence here; it would thus be surprising, in the middle of just such an exploration of the dynamics of identity and belonging, to have Vergil expect us to overlook the ideologically loaded implications of the word *barbarus*.

Commentators have rightly understood Vergil's use of *barbarus* here in the context of the redistribution of Italian land after Philippi in 42 BCE, usually taken quite literally to refer to "either a foreign mercenary or a provincial auxiliary".[68] It is clear that the soldier's foreignness, his lack of belonging to the land, significantly raises Meliboeus' choler, yet something about the explanation that *barbarus* simply references a foreign mercenary doesn't sit right—for why should the soldiers of Octavian and Antony, in what has always been emphasized as a *civil* conflict (*civis*, 1.71), be marked out here by their foreignness? It makes far more sense that soldiers arriving in the local landscape from a *Roman* civil conflict would remind

65 Coleman 1977: 86. See, e.g., Martianus Capella *De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* 3.233.
66 Coleman 1977: 87 ad 1.70-71.
67 This is the interpretation of Clausen 1994 (58 ad 1.71), who notes that *barbarus* is "not a foreign mercenary", and that "the contrast is between soldier….and civilian."
68 Coleman 1977: 87. Hunter 2006 sees *barbarus* as referring to Rome as "foreign" to Greek pastoral.

Meliboeus not of some other province or nation, but of Rome itself. In that case, the apposition of *miles* and *barbarus* leads to a fascinating possibility: the word *barbarus* is being used here by the distinctly "Italian" shepherd Meliboeus to refer disparagingly here not to Greeks or Persians or Scythians or Gauls, but to *Romans*. The *barbarus miles* invoked by Meliboeus, who will soon take his land, is a Roman soldier.

The use of the originally Greek word *barbarus* to refer to a Roman citizen by a local Italian involves an interesting triangulation of identities. In particular, as mentioned above, a word like *barbarus* can only attain meaning when focalized from a specific viewpoint and directed against a perceived Other. Originally, Latin *barbarus* was used identically to the Greek word βάρβαρος, from which it derives—that is, to mean "non-Greek", though after the Persian Wars of the early fifth century the Greek word was used most commonly to refer to Medes and Persian.[69] When *barbarus* was taken into Latin, the word of course retained the meaning of "non-Greek", but understandably also gained the meaning of "non-Roman"; thus, *barbarus* became the quintessentia term for identifying external, culturally inferior groups against the dominant socio-cultural hegemony of the Greeks and Romans.[70] Thus, while it was most often used to refer to peoples on the periphery of the Roman Empire—Persians, Scythians, Germans, Africans—it was also used to differentiate the Romans from those nearer the center, such as the Gauls, Veneti, and Raeti of northern Italy.[71] The use of *barbarus* to refer to a Roman by a resident of further Italy who has chosen to disassociate himself from Rome, then, involves a reappropriation of a term that had been deployed against those of the same region, as well as the adoption of the culturally privileged (Greco-)Roman perspective.[72]

Yet in *barbarus*' earliest occurrence in Latin, it is used to refer to to the Romans, and *only* the Romans. This is the usage most common in the comedies of Plautus, where the Romans are set up as *barbari* against the perspective of the Greek characters who feature in the *fabulae*. At *Asinaria* 10-11, Plautus' narrator states: "This play is named *The Ass-Driver* in Greek; Demophilus wrote the original, but Maccus translated it into barbarian"[73]—*huic nomen Graece Onagost fabulae; Demophilus scripsit, Maccus vortit barbare*—that is, into Latin, the joke working primarily because it forces the Romans to imagine themselves from a Greek perspective, from which they are merely "barbarians" or "foreigners" like any others.[74] Plautus similarly refers to the Roman poet Naevius as *poeta barbarus* at *Miles Gloriosus* 211, and to a hypothetical low-class Roman workman as *pultiphagus opifex barbarus* at *Mostellaria* 828, both times playing games with the Greek perspective of the *palliatae*.[75] Perhaps the most interesting instance of *barbarus* being used to refer to Romans, however, comes from a text that is roughly contemporary with Plautus' comedies: an excerpt from the Elder Cato's *Praecepta ad Filium*, quoted by Pliny the Elder in his *Naturalis Historia*:[76]

> iurarunt inter se Graeci barbaros necare omnis medicina. … nos quoque dictitant barbaros et spurcius nos quam alios Opicon appellatione foedant.

[69] *OCD*[4] s.v. 'barbarian'; cf. *LSJ online* s.v. βάρβαρος, I, 1.
[70] *TLL* 2.0.1735.69-70 s.v. *barbarus* I, B: "*a Romanis omnes nationes dicuntur barbarae praeter Graecos Romanosque, opp.* Graecus, Latinus, Romanus."
[71] In the *Pro Fonteio*, for example, Cicero's main defense of M. Fonteius against charges of misgovernment is painting the people of Gallia Narbonensis as wild *barbari* whose accusations cannot be taken seriously against the word of a Roman citizen; see Coşkun 2006. *Barbarus* seems not to be used of those south of the river Po.
[72] See Dench 1995 (esp. the Introduction and Ch. 1) on the use of the word *barbarus* by the Romans and Italians.
[73] Or "translated it barbarously," i.e. did a terrible job of it; the ambiguity adds to the joke.
[74] The same joke is used at *Trinummus* 19.
[75] Cf. *Curculio* 150 and *Stichus* 193.
[76] *Nat. Hist.* 29.13-14.

> The Greeks have vowed among themselves to kill all *barbari* with their poison. … Us, too, they repeatedly call *barbari*, and they insult us more offensively than others with the name of *Opicoi*.

These lines are excerpted from the Elder Cato's famous warning to his son on the negative influence of the Greeks and the corruption they might introduce into the Roman state. Here, as in Plautus, the Romans can only be called *barbari* when a Greek perspective is assumed, a perspective which Cato devalues in his description of their corrupt *mores*, earlier calling them "a wholly worthlesss and unteachable race" (*nequissimum et indocile genus*).[77] Cato attempts to dislocate the focalization of *barbarus* from its original Greek perspective and realign it with a Roman viewpoint; in the process, he turns the *Greeks*, not the Romans, into the *barbari*, and appropriates for the Romans the socio-cultural hegemony the Greek term assumes.

Especially interesting in this passage is Cato's reference to the Greek term Opicoi, an apparently quite offensive (*spurcius ... foedant*) term used by the Greek to distance and foreignize Romans and Italians. Ὀπικοί was the Greek term for the *Osci*, i.e. the prehistoric inhabitants of southern Italy speaking Oscan (*Osca lingua*), a group which incuded the Samnites, Campani, Apuli, Lucani, Bruttii, and Mamertini, and others, including Ennius from Messapian Rudiae. The word refer to Campanians in Thucydides and Aristotle with no negative connotations, but is clearly used disparagingly in a poem of Philodemus from the *Greek Anthology* which ends: "But if she is *Opikē* and called Flora and doesn't know her Sappho, still: even Perseus fell in love with Indian Andromeda".[78] Here, the recognizably Italian Flora's failure to know Sappho's poetry make her just another uneducated barbarian who nevertheless captures Greek affection. This alienating and disparaging usage of *opicus*—"rude, ignorant, foolish"[79]—is the one employed by Cato and by later authors such as Gellius, Fronto, and Ausonius, who use the word to refer to uneducated Romans or Italians unfamiliar with Greek and Greek literature, often in a self-conscious display of humility.[80] In Juvenal, the impoverished Roman Cordus in *Satire* 3 stores his few Greek books in an old chest, where "barbarian (*opici*) mice would gnaw upon the divine poems",[81] the uncultured Italian mice unable of appreciating the sophisticated Greek texts; in *Satire* 6, meanwhile, the poet complains of the learned woman who corrects her husband's Latin, saying she should instead "chastise the speech of her

[77] Cf. Cicero *De Re Publica* 1.58, where, in a discussion of whether Romulus was a *barbarus*, Cicero abandons the literal meaning of *barbarus* as "non-Greek" and reinterprets it in its transferred metaphorical sense, "strange; rude; uncultivated": *si, ut Graeci dicunt omnis aut Graios esse aut barbaros, uereor, ne barbarorum rex fuerit; sin id nomen moribus dandum est, non linguis, non Graecos minus barbaros quam Romanos puto*. For this transferred sense: *L&S* s.v. *barbarus* II ("Transf., *foreign, strange,* in mind or character") and II.A ("In mind, *uncultivated, ignorant; rude, unpolished*"; *TLL* s.v. *barbarus* II ("*translate*: … truculentus inquinatus contaminatus … *incultus, ferus*"). Cf. similarly Ovid *Ex Pont.* 5.10.37: *barbarus hic ego sum, qui non intelligor ulli*.

[78] *AP* 5.132.6-7: εἰ δ᾽ Ὀπικὴ καὶ Φλῶρα καὶ οὐκ ᾄδουσα τὰ Σαπφοῦς, καὶ Περσεὺς Ἰνδῆς ἠράσατ᾽ Ἀνδρομέδης.

[79] *L&S* s.v. *opicus* I ("*clownish, rude, stupid, ignorant, foolish*"); *TLL* 9.2.702.80ff., *s.v.* opicus ("*significat aliquid abhorrens a doctrina vel urbanitate hominum eruditorum*"), I.1 ("*fere i. q. barbarus, rudis*"), I.3 ("*spurcus*").

[80] Gellius 2.21.4 (of Roman etymologists asked to explain the etymology of the constellation *Septentriones* [the Big Dipper] in the face of the Greek name ἅμαξα, "The Wagon"), 11.16.7 (of a man unacquainted with Greek), 13.9.4 (of Roman etymologists who think Greek *Hyades* is derived from ὗες "swine" rather than ὕειν "to rain"); Fronto *Ep.* 2.2.8 (of himself, asking Marcus Aurelius to look over his Greek so that the reader doesn't think him an *opicus*), and *Ep.* 2.11.2, 3.6.29 (of Fronto's fascination with, but non-mastery of, Greek). Cf. Ausonius *Ep.* 87.1 (of Campanian Eunus). Strabo makes use of the term, but without any disparagement: *Geo.* 5.4.3.

[81] *Sat.* 3.207: *divina opici rodebant carmina mures*.

country-bumpkin (*opicae*) girl friend",[82] pointing to the perceived substandard Latin of those outside Rome.[83] That the word *opicus*, with its origin in an Italian ethnic and geographical name,[84] came to stand for the Romans as an insult insinuating lack of culture, education, or erudition—and with knowledge of *Greek* culture often as the determining factor—represents the figuring of the rural Italian as the disparaged Other in counter-distinction to urbane Greco-Roman culture, a contempt already observed in the disdain directed against Italian municipal citizens during the late Republic in the Introduction.

The fact of *opicus*' use as an insulting term against Italians by Greeks (and then Romans) makes Meliboeus' use of the Greek-derived *barbarus*—an equivalent outward-facing term that ironically had been applied to the Romans from an (albeit comic) Greek perspective—especially striking here. Meliboeus' reference to the *barbarus miles* who will occupy his fields can be seen to be used in a fashion complementary to the use of *opicus*—to refer to the Romans in a way that isolates and separates them out from the identity of the speaker. In this case, the speaker is not *Greek*, but a herdsman inhabiting a local Italian landscape; Meliboeus coopts the Greek word and turns it back against the Romans, who in turn become militant barbarians invading the herdsmen's homeland; in doing so, Meliboeus ironically becomes aligned with the Greeks through his shared deployment of the disdainful term *barbarus* against the Romans.

This externalization of Rome and othering of the Roman soldier in Meliboeus' speeches in *Eclogue* 1 allows Vergil to isolate and put further strain on tensions that exist at the very center of the concept of *duae patriae*. Namely, once one realizes that that the *barbarus miles* here must be associated with Rome, it introduces a certain deictic chaos into lines 71-72—*en quo discordia civis produxit miseros; his nos consevimus agros*—in that there are multiple possible referents for both *civis* and *his* in line 72. Should *civis* be taken to refer to *Roman* citizens; to citizens of the local *municipium*; or to citizens understood according to the Ciceronian ideal of the *duae patriae*? Does *his* refer to the arriving soldiers; to the same referent as *civis*; or even more immediately to the crowd of exiles that stand around Meliboeus? The most obvious interpretation, and the one Vergil certainly intends to be closest to the surface, is that *civis* refers to Roman citizens, and *his* to the soldiers who will now occupy the land: "Look to what end discord has driven pitiable Roman citizens; it's for these newcomers that we've sown our fields". Yet one could also read *civis* to refer to the municipal citizens of Meliboeus' *germana patria*, since the discord, even if Roman, has certainly caused these local citizens also to become *miseri*—much more so, in fact, than the *milites* who are now rewarded with their land; if *his* is taken at the same time to refer to these local citizens, the final clause becomes a bitter protestation: "Look where discord has driven us citizens *here*, miserable as we now are; it was (*supposed to be*) for *these* (men around me) that we've sown our fields (– *not* for the soldiers)." It is in the space cleared between these two centrifugal interpretations of the referentiality of *civis* and *his* that one begins to see the difficulty in both soldiers and herdsmen belonging to the same group of Roman citizens à la Cicero's *duae patriae*. Though Tityrus, Meliboeus, and the soldier all hold some share in some Roman civic identity, there is inequality of status and a clash of interests, since the soldier's land rights are recognized while Meliboeus' are not; Tityrus' are respected only because his land is inferior to begin with.

[82] *Sat.* 6.455-6: *opicae castiget amicae verba.*

[83] Cf. Cicero *Brutus* 170-71; and Pollio's critique of Livy's *Patavinitas* (Quint. 1.5.56, 8.1.3).

[84] Even among the Romans, the common origin of the originally Greek *opicus* and the Latin *Oscus* was recognized; e.g. Festus 204.25 (*et in omnibus fere antiquis commentariis scribitur Opicum pro Obsco, ut in Titi[n]ni fabula Quinto: 'Qui Obsce et Volsce fabulantur, nam Latine nesciunt*), 234.29 ('*Oscos' quos dicimus ait Verrius Opscos ante dictos teste Ennio cum dicat*). Ennius preserves the intermediate form *Opscus* (*Ann.* fr. 289 *ap.* Festus 234.29: *de muris rem gerit Opscus* (regarding the events of the siege of Capua in 211 BCE).

These competing interests lead to insuperable internal divisions within the class of *cives*, such that one subject, Meliboeus, not only enacts a psychological distance from Rome based on its clear physical distance from his own *origo*, but also enacts this distancing so effectively that the Roman soldier becomes a *barbarus* in his eyes, in the process breaking apart any unified category of Roman *civis* than can unproblematically contain all three characters.

That this passage speaks to some possibility of internal division within the class of *cives Romani*, who should be unified, can be seen in a poem from Propertius which surely recalls it. The poem, the sphragis to Propertius' first book, is constructed as a response to the question of a certain Tullus (1.22):[85]

Qualis et unde genus, qui sint mihi, Tulle, Penates,
  quaeris pro nostra semper amicitia.
si Perusina tibi patriae sunt nota sepulcra,
  Italiae duris funera temporibus,
cum Romana suos egit discordia cives—
  sic mihi praecipue, pulvis Etrusca, dolor,
tu proiecta mei perpessa's membra propinqui,
  tu nullo miseri contegis ossa solo—
proxima suppositos contingens Umbria campos
  me genuit terris fertilis uberibus.

You ask, Tullus, on account of our long friendship, what rank of man
  I am and of what race, and which are my household gods.
If the Perusian graves of the fatherland are known to you,
  those funeral rites of Italy during harsh times,
when Roman discord drove on her own citizens—
  as such, Etruscan dirt, it was especially painful for me
that you allowed to be scattered the limbs of one close to me,
  that you cover that poor one's bones with no soil—
Umbria, nearest to there, touching upon the fields below,
  that country bore me, rich with its fertile earth.

The poem foregrounds the notion of identity from the very beginning: "You ask, Tullus, on account of our long friendship, what rank of man I am and of what race, and which are my household gods" (1-2). But as in *Eclogue* 1, the answer to Tullus' question seems to be spoken not from a Romanocentric viewpoint, but from one that privileges a local, specifically *Umbrian* identity. While this is stated explicitly in the final lines of the poem (*Umbria … me genuit*, 9-10), it is also expressed earlier in the mention of Umbrian Perusia and its Italian graves: "If the Perusian graves of the *patria* are known to you, those funeral rites of Italy during harsh times" (3-4). As in *Eclogue* 1, it is possible to read both *patria* and *Italia* as spoken from a Roman perspective—*patria* referring to Rome as *patria communis*, *Italia* as the province unified by Octavian in 42 BCE—but, on second reading, such an interpretation is not the most immediate or most obvious. Indeed, the most natural reading is that the *patria* referred to here, with its Perusian graves, is actually *Umbria*, the Italian locality in which ancient Perusia was located,[86] with Umbria itself finally presented in

[85] Probably the nephew of L. Volcacius Tullus, consul in 33 BCE.
[86] It is also possible to read *patria* here in sense of a collective *Italian* identity that is *distinct* from a Roman one,

the penultimate line of the poem. It is only in line 5 that Rome enters the poem at all—*cum Romana suos egit discordia cives*—the very line which clearly recalls Vergil: *en quo discordia civis | produxit miseros* (*Ecl.* 1.71-2). Both poems place *discordia civis/cives* at line-end and express equivalent ideas, though Propertius is far less ambiguous: the elegist gives *discordia* the specific epithet *Romana*, making explicit what we have identitified as implicit in Vergil's text. Moreover, Propertius seems to solve the ambiguous reference of *ciuis* seen in *Eclogue* 1 by the addition of *suos*— "her own"—identifying a specifically *Roman* conflict which drives on *her own* citizens (*suos … ciues*).[87] Yet by solving the ambiguity—by identifying Rome's own citizens as those suffering the ills of Roman discord—Propertius's text reveals unambiguously the unfairness of the treatment of local Italians in both the Mantuan redistributions and the Perusian conflict: if these *municipales* were also Rome's own citizens, what justifies Perusia's violence or the disparity of rights seen after Philippi? It is not Roman soldiers or Romans in Rome who suffer most from this *discordia*, but the local Italians (*Perusia … sepulcra*, 3; *Italiae … funera*, 4; *suppositos*[88] *contingens Umbria campos*, 9). Propertius' message is clear: Roman discord drove Roman citizens to terrible lengths for Roman means, confiscating Italian lands and creating conflict with the locals, who should instead be given the rights of any other citizens.

We can now begin to comprehend more clearly the effect of Vergil's externalization of Rome from the pastoral landscape in *Eclogue* 1. Rome is not portrayed as an integrated part of the bucolic setting of the *Eclogues*, but is aligned with the far-away *iuuenis* and the non-native soldier, whose imminent entrance upon the scene will displace Meliboeus from his *dulcia arua* and his *patriae fines*; this emphasis on place and ancestry[89] gestures to the Ciceronian *germana patria* of place and birth, as opposed to the legal *patria communis* that is Rome. Indeed, Meliboeus' perspective, at least, is not aligned with Rome at all: *patria* in his perspective is the nearby *municipium* where he drives his lambs, the town around which he and Tityrus care for their lands, flocks, and fields—land whose geography is transformed into pastoral perfection by the love felt for it by its possessors.[90] The first *Eclogue* establishes the book's setting as deep in a local Italian landscape, far from Rome, promising a perspective that is situated not in the heart of the growing empire, but on the line between center and periphery, the shadow zone between citizen and barbarian, between Roman and local Italian.

Eclogue 9, at nearly the other end of the collection, shares a number of themes with *Eclogue* 1. Here again two characters, Lycidas and Moeris, meet each other in the countryside and have a discussion of things lost—land, to be sure, but also the poet Menalcas, who has disappeared from the landscape, whose songs the herdsmen spend much of the poem attempting to recall. As in *Eclogue* 1, one of the characters is experiencing the loss rather more keenly than the other. Moeris is not only the one to complain bitterly of the loss of his land and his flock (9.2-6), he is also more familiar with the countryside's suffering than

such as that adopted by the allied rebels during the Social War. For more on this possibility, see the discussion of the *laudes Italiae* in the second *Georgic* in the following chapter. Modern Perugia remains the capital of Umbria.

87 Propertius and Vergil do not refer to the same conflict: Vergil speaks of Mantuan land confiscations, and Propertius the bloody Perusian War. Instead, Propertius takes advantage of Vergil's language describing a conflict between Romans and Italians to describe further Italian suffering at Roman hands. See Breed 2009.

88 *Suppositos … campos* here is often translated simply "the fields lying below." *Supponere*, however, can also mean "to make subject to" or "to substitute", both meanings potentially pointing to the reality of the land distributions: "the subjected fields," or "the fields substituted (with new inhabitants)".

89 *Patrios…fines* (67); also, line 73 (*insere nunc, Meliboee, piros*), which looks forward to *Ecl.* 9.50, where the same action of planting pear trees is linked to generational succession via the reference to the grandchildren (*nepotes*) who will pick their fruit: *insere, Daphni, piros: carpent tua poma nepotes*. Cf., too, *G.* 2.514.

90 As when, for example, the rocky swamp-scape of *Ecl.* 1.47-50 becomes suddenly idyllic at lines 51-8.

Lycidas (11-16) and is the one to finally succumb to loss of poetic memory (51-55), refusing in the final lines of the song to sing (66-7), just as Meliboeus states the end of his own singing (1.78). Lycidas, on the other hand, does not know of Menalcas' failure to save the land (7-10), and is cheery enough to suggest, despite Moeris' failed memory, that the two of them sit down, rest, and sing (56-65), a proposition abruptly shut down by Moeris. As with *Eclogue* 1, it is apparent from the beginning of the *Eclogue* that this poem, too, is centered and experienced around dislocation from the local home the characters hold dear (9.1-6):

Lycidas Quo te, Moeri, pedes? an, quo via ducit, in urbem?

Moeris O Lycida, vivi pervenimus, advena nostri
– quod numquam veriti sumus—ut possessor agelli
diceret: 'haec mea sunt; veteres migrate coloni.'
nunc victi, tristes, quoniam fors omnia versat,
hos illi—quod nec bene vertat—mittimus haedos.

Lycidas Where are your feet taking you, Moeris? Where the road leads—to the city?

Moeris O Lycidas, we've lived to see ourselves come to this, that an outsider
—a thing we never feared—as the possessor of our dear land
might say: 'These are mine; go elsewhere, you old inhabitants.'
Now conquered, and sad, since chance overturns everything,
we are driving these he-goats for him—may it turn out poorly.

It is apparent that we are again not in the city, but outside of and at a distance from it: the entire dramatic action occurs as Moeris and Lycidas are traveling *in urbem*. Nor have they reached that destination by the end of the poem, but have only reached halfway (*hinc adeo media est nobis via*, 59), their arrival in the city still a future event (*tamen veniemus in urbem*, 62). What's more, the landscape is strongly reminiscent of that in *Eclogue* 1, suggesting strongly the continuity of an Italianate landscape between both poems: the old beeches (*veteres … fagos*, 9), though damaged with the passing of time (*iam fracta cacumina*, 9), recall the beech tree providing Tityrus with shade in *Eclogue* 1 (*sub tegmine fagi*, 1.1),[91] whereas Lycidas' suggestion that they sing among the farmers pruning overgrown foliage (*hic, ubi densas agricolae stringunt frondis, hic, Moeri, canamus*, 60-1) recalls the singing trimmer of Meliboeus' imagined pastoral *locus amoenus* in the first poem (*hinc alta sub rupe canet frondator*, 56). In contrast to the local Italianate setting, we get little information about the *urbs* towards which the two herdsmen travel; nonetheless, these final two occurrences of *urbs* in the *Eclogues* (9.1, 9.62) can't help but recall the first instance of the word in the poem at 1.19: *urbem quam dicunt Romam*, "the city they call Rome." *Eclogue* 9, then, also privileges a local perspective to a Roman one, aligning itself with the countryside depicted, and pushing the *urbs*—pushing Rome—to the periphery of its vision.

Eclogue 9 also centers around loss of land to an unsympathetic outsider, recalling the *barbarus miles* to whom Meliboeus loses his land in *Eclogue* 1. The imposition of distance between the new occupant of the land and the old tenant, Moeris, occurs first in the use of the term *advena* (2), "newcomer, foreigner". The word itself, etymologically derived from *advenire*, "to come to, arrive at", in its very composition stresses the new possessor's foreignness to this landscape, functioning similarly to *barbarus* in the first *Eclogue*. The newcomer's possession of the fields is made the more bitter by the fact that these lands have

[91] The beeches (*fagi*) reoccuring through the *Eclogues* help to create continuity of place: 2.3; 3.12, 35; 5.13; etc.

recently, and for a long time, belonged to Moeris. Moeris' emotional attachment is clear in his unwillingness to give up possession of the land, referring to it still as "my dear field" (*nostri … agelli*, 2-3), though it is no longer his own: the noun itself, as Clausen notes, is "a truly affectionate diminutive",[92] and functionally it acts as an equivalent to Meliboeus' *dulcia* (1.3) or *mea regna* (1.69)—"my kingdoms". The drama of this repossession is packed tightly into Moeris' proposopoeia of the newcomer in line 4: "These things are mine; go elsewhere, you old inhabitants" (*haec mea sunt; ueteres migrate coloni*). *Haec mea sunt* is short and caustic, succinctly capturing the suddenness of Moeris' loss and exposing the falsity of *nostri* above it: despite the deep psychological attachment Moeris has for it, he no longer possesses his old land.[93]

That with *advena* Vergil summons the idea of an outsider, similarly to the use of *barbarus* in *Eclogue* 1, is evidenced by not only by *advena*'s serving as a mark of ethnic alterity quite often in Latin literature,[94] but also by the word's usage in the rest of Vergil's corpus. *Advena* only appears here in the entirety of the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*, but occurs five times in the *Aeneid*—four times in reference to Aeneas and the Trojans[95]—with each occurrence bringing the idea of ethnic difference to the fore. *Advena* first occurs in Book 4, when Dido uses the term to refer to Aeneas just as he prepares to leave Carthage: "For Jove's sake! Will this one go and—a foreigner! (*advena*)—make a mockery on our kingdom?"[96] While earlier in the book Vergil describes the Trojans and Carthaginians in terms that speak to the possibility of their unification,[97] here, when Dido's hope of restraining Aeneas has been lost, she explicitly identifies him as unintegrated with (*advena*) and in fact hostile to (*inluserit*) her kingdom and people. The next occurrence of *advena* occurs during the narrator's invocation of Erato in Book 7, as he describes the Trojans' approach to Italy: "Come now, Erato: which kings there were, what moments in history, and what the state of ancient Latium, when first that foreign army (*advena … exercitus*) drove its fleet toward Ausonians shores, let me now recount".[98] To be sure, Aeneas and his army are literally *advenientes*, "coming to" the shores of Latium, but in the martial context implied by *exercitus* and *pugna*, it is hard to imagine that the implication of ethnic difference is not intended, as it certainly is in Book 12, when the Rutulian augur Tolumnius encourages a pan-Italian group of Rutulians, Laurentines, and Latins to break treaty with the Trojans, since it was them "whom the wicked foreigner (*improbus advena*) terrifies constantly with war like helpless birds, devastating your shores with violence (*litora vestra vi populat*)".[99] The qualification of *advena* as *improbus* and the inclusion of the possessive pronoun *vestra* draw a separating line between the Italians and invading Trojans, bringing attention to ethnic difference and invasion by an outsider as some of the motivations for taking up arms. Two final occurrence of *advena* both occur within fifty lines of one another in Book 10 with a clear intratextual relationship existing between the two. At 10.461-2, just before he is killed, Pallas calls upon the god Hercules for aid, remembering "the banquets you came to as an outsider (*mensas quas advena*

92 Clausen 1994: 270 ad loc.
93 The *mea* of *haec mea sunt* here occupies the same place in the line as the *mea* of *mea regna* at *Ecl.* 1.69, with each reifying the strong emotional aspects of possession, but from opposing perspectives—former and new owner.
94 E.g. Cicero, *Tusc.* 5.11: *Zeno Citieus advena* (from Citium on Cyprus); Ovid, *Fasti* 2.68: *advena Thybris* (because it flows from Etruria; see next chapter); Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 1.176: *amor advena* (love of a foreign maiden), etc.
95 *Aen.* 4.591; 7.38; 10.516: 12.261.
96 *Aen.* 4.590-1: '*pro Iuppiter! ibit hic' ait 'et nostris inluserit aduena regnis?'*.
97 Reed 2007: 87-95.
98 *Aen.* 7.37-40: *nunc age, qui reges, Erato, quae tempora rerum, quis Latio antiquo fuerit status, aduena classem cum primum Ausoniis exercitus appulit oris, expediam*.
99 *Aen.* 12.261-63: '*o miseri, quos improbus aduena bello territat inualidas ut aves et litora uestra ui populat*.'

adisti)",[100] calling on Hercules' status as a Greek and non-resident of Italy, a fact well-illustrated in the story of Hercules and Cacus in *Aeneid* 8.[101] This half-line on Hercules is clearly recalled about fifty lines later, when news of Pallas' death comes to Aeneas at 10.515-17, and the Trojan remembers the banquets in Pallanteum he was present at also as an outsider: "Pallas, Evander—all these things are before his eyes, as well as those first banquets to which he came then as an outsider (*mensae quas advena primas tunc adiit*)".[102] The reoccurrence of *mensae/-as quas advena* with a form of *adsum* in each case stresses the parallel between Aeneas' foreignness to the site of Pallateum, as both a Trojan and a non-Italian, and Hercules' own original status as an outsider. *Advena*, then, is a word associated for the poet with ethnic difference and ethnic differentiation, a fact which strengthens the parallel with the use of *barbarus* in *Eclogue* 1.

The newcomer's address of Moeris and his companions as *veteres … coloni* is also worth noting. The valence of *coloni* is notoriously difficult to pin down, and the word attracts a fair amount of attention from the commentators. *Colonus*, in the first place, is commonly used as a synonym for *agricola*;[103] yet there is also present here the second meaning of *colonus* as a member of a Roman *colonia*, one of the Roman settlers sent out to populate (often recently defeated) communities in Italy and further abroad; also relevant is a third meaning, "tenant farmer," referring to one who cultivated land not owned, but rented from another. While the lack of clarity as to the exact situation described here might potentially cause scholarly frustration, the inseparability of the three meanings in the text draws attention again to the necessity of perspective in deciding upon or attaining meaning. This knot is made all the more inextricable by putting "*coloni*" in the mouth of the *advena*, yet only as quoted by Moeris, who is sure to be a less than reliable narrator in this particular situation. Thus, whereas the *advena* is most certainly a *colonus*, an outsider who has come in to settle land that was not originally his own, his address of Moeris and his kin as *veteres coloni* is hardly fitting, and, as Coleman notes, the use of the word here must be "either a deliberate insult or the result of his ignorance".[104] Whether it be the former of the latter, the new possessor's use of *colonus* is a speech act intended in its utterance to divest Moeris, Menalcas, and others of the ancient (cf. *veteres*) emotional (cf. *agelli*) connection to their land, reinterpreting them not as *incolae* but merely an earlier set of *coloni*, thus nullifying any claims to possession by invalidating the premise—longstandingness—upon which it was based. The *pathos* of this situation increases all the more when one recognizes that the quasi-didactic quotation of an outsider on a matter of pastoral (dis)continuity represented by *ueteres migrate coloni* is strikingly similar to another recollection of an extra-pastoral character's speech from *Eclogue* 1, the unnamed *iuvenis*' command to Tityrus to continue to graze his land as before: '*pascite ut ante boves, pueri, submittite tauros*' (1.45). Whereas the *iuvenis*' speech act is that which guarantees that Tityrus is able to continue to have some sort of pastoral existence, to stay on his former land and play bucolic song on his pipes, '*haec mea sunt; ueteres migrate coloni*' serves as the "quasi-legal"[105] reappropriation of Moeris' land by the *advena*. In both cases, the representative of Rome—the *iuuenis* who remains there, or the *miles* or *advena* who represents her power and concerns—claims the authority to decide whether the old inhabitants of the Italian countryside may conintue to enjoy their existence, or whether they must cease.

[100] *Aen.* 10.461-2: '*per patris hospitium et mensas, quas advena adisti, te precor, Alcide, coeptis ingentibus adsis*.'
[101] *Aen.* 8.184-279. N.B. such formulations as *adventumque dei*.
[102] *Aen.* 10.515-17: *Pallas, Evander, in ipsis omnis sunt oculis, mensae quas advena primas tunc adiit*.
[103] As often in the *Georgics*: 1.125, 299, 498; 2.385; 3.288.
[104] Coleman 1977: 257 ad loc.
[105] Clausen 1994: 270 ad loc.: "**haec mea sunt**: a quasi-legal phrase, with a hint of violence." Cf. Coleman 1977: 256 ad loc.: "**haec mea sunt** may allude to an *actio in rem*, in which the *possessor* as part of his *uindicatio rei* pronounced the formula *ex iure Quiritium meum esse aio* (Gaius, *Inst.* 4.16)."

In this particular case, the ambiguity of *coloni* between "farmers" and "colonizing inhabitants" is utilized by the newcomer to dispossess Moeris and others of their land; as a result, they become "tenant farmers"—the third above-mentioned definition of *coloni*—who ironically must herd for the new owner (*illi*, 6— "for that one") goats they no longer possess, on land that once belonged to them, but does no longer. While Moeris' situation can be compared to Meliboeus', there is a way in which Moeris' fate is much more bitter, a much crueler one than that of his counterpart in *Eclogue* 1. Meliboeus, driven from his land, will wander to far off places, from the "parched Africans" (*sitientis … Afros*, 1.64), to the "Britons, set apart from the entire world" (*toto diuissos orbe Britannos*, 1.66), wondering whether he will ever again look upon his ancestral lands (*patrios … finis*, 1.67). But Moeris, whose land has likewise been confiscated, *will* look upon his ancestral home, day in and day out, only to be reminded repeatedly that it is no longer his *agellus*, that he is no longer *possessor*, but that he has become a mere *colonus*, transformed by the outsider's speech act into a mere tenant farmer *living* the same life, but under an entirely different set of circumstances. Instead of the happy freedom of Tityrus, Moeris and his ilk are "conquered, miserable" (*uicti, tristes*, 5), figured as losers in a war over possession of their land, as they face an endlessly repeatable future of service (*hos illi … mittimus haedos*, 6) for which there is little hope of a change or reversal of fortune.

Eclogue 9, then, draws its drama not solely from the fact that land is lost to Moeris, Menalcas, and others, but also from the clear placement of the action in the Italian countryside, away from Rome, and from the struggle over control and enjoyment of Italian space between its inhabitants and representatives of the Roman world. The poem describes a pastoral landscape that seems to be changing (*iam fracta cacumina*, 9), one which the interlocutors attempt to hold on to by the recitation of their own and Menalcas' songs (23-5; 27-9; 39-43; 46-50)—yet the memory of these songs, too, are slipping away (*si ualeam meminisse*, 38; *numeros memini, si uerba tenerem*, 45; *nunc oblita mihi tot carmina*, 53), and with it the certainty that the two characters' relationship to the landscape will remain the same after such violent change. The uncertainty about the future of this bucolic home is also punctuated by reminders of the Roman state which exists outside and above it. The simile of the eagle and the doves (9.11-13), for example, continues an antagonism between the local Italian landscape and Rome, recalling the simile of Rome-as-cypress from *Eclogue* 1: the eagle threatening the doves stands in for the weapons of war (*tela ... Martia*) invading the pastoral landscape, recalling the eagle standards of the Roman army and reinforcing the link between the *advena* and Rome.

Of course, if the alignment of the poem's perspective with rural Italy was at all unclear, lines 26-36 reaffirm this without a doubt. These lines contain Moeris' recollection of Menalcas' verses to Varus, telling him that swans will carry his fame to the stars, "so long as Mantua remains for us—Mantua, ah! too close to miserable Cremona" (*superet modo Mantua nobis, Mantua vae miserae nimium vicina Cremona*, 27-8). Alfenus Varus, according to the scholiasts,[106] was one of the men in charge of distributing lands in Transpadane Gaul; additionally, he was a native of Cremona according to a scholiast on Horace's *Satires*,[107] and thus, like Vergil, a native of Transpadance Gaul. Nor is Varus the only Italian to appear in this poem, for, only a few lines later, Lycidas mentions the poets C. Helvius Cinna and L. Varius Rufus. We know that Cinna, the prominent neoteric author of the *Zmyrna*, hailed from Brescia in Cisalpine Gaul, less than 100 km from Mantua, and was a close friend of Catullus,[108] also a Cisalpine Gaul from Verona. The origin of Varius, another member of Maecenas' circle and Vergil's close friend and posthumous editor, is unknown; one wonders whether he, too, might be of northern Italian ancestry. It is impossible to know,

106 Servius Auctus on *Ecl.* 9.10; Iunius Philargyrus II on *Ecl.* 6.7. See also Broughton 1960 (v. 2): 377ff.
107 Porphyrio on Hor. *Sat.* 1.3.130.
108 Cat. *C.* 10.29-30: *meus sodalis Cinna est Gaius*. Cf. Cat. *C.* 95.

yet even so, the fact remains that the appeal for Mantua and lament for Cremona—a complaint that might have come from the mouth of many a resident of either town in the late 40s—is couched between the names of fellow natives of Cisalpine Gaul; the perspective of the poem is clearly one that takes seriously local and regional Italian identities, as also *Eclogues* 1 and 7. Yet Varus, as a representative of Rome vested with the power of extending or taking away possession of land, is ideologically removed from the land, corresponding somewhat to the *iuuenis* of *Eclogue* 1, just as the *aduena* here balances the *barbarus miles* in that poem. The poems for Varus left unfinished (*necdum perfecta*, 26) emphasize this uncertain nature of the landscape's future. Will these incomplete songs soon be finished, bringing with their completion new hope for Mantuan land—or have they been abandoned, unfinished because there is no faith in their efficacy? There is no way to know. The reappearance of Menalcas is shrouded in similar mystery. The two brief mentions of his return, the first in the future tense (*referet*, 55), the second in the future perfect in the poem's last line (*cum uenerit ipse*, 67), leave the reader unsure whether the characters speak of this future with conviction or uncertainty. So, too, are the futures of Italian locales under Roman encroachment.

Rusticus es, Corydon: **Town and Country in the *Eclogues***

We have just seen that both *Eclogue* 1 and *Eclogue* 9 privilege a local perspective by associating the immediate, rural landscape with the idea of local origin and the *germana patria*, while Rome's urban perspective is relegated to the periphery by the alienation and externalization of Rome and her agents. The references to Rome, Mantua, Cremona, and the land confiscations, meanwhile, make explicit that this local landscape is an Italian one, a setting that radiates down through the rest of the collection, especially considering how *Eclogues* 1 and 9 form an encompassing ring around all the poems but *Eclogue* 10.[109] But it is not only through the structural bookending of the collection that *Eclogues* 1 and 9 create a contrast between the concerns of the local *origo* and the legal *patria communis*: these poems also formulate an opposition between the Italian countryside and the city of Rome, an opposition that often manifests as a more general dialectic between rural and urban. In the first and ninth *Eclogues*, this is achieved primarily through the externalization of Rome (1.19, 26) and the *Urbs* (1.19, 9.1), while the more present landscape of the poems are the fields (*agris*, 1.12; *agelli*, 9.3) and natural beauty of the countryside, with the strong opposition painted between the concerns of the two.

In other pairs of poems, the contrast is more subdued. *Eclogues* 3 and 7, for example, both consisting of song contests undertaken by rustic characters, are firmly placed in an Italian setting, with only brief indications of the Roman world that exists outside of it. In *Eclogue* 7, this is accomplished through the explicit setting along the banks of the Mincius' river near Mantua—*hic viridis tenera praetexit harundine ripas Mincius* (7.12-3)—alongside the omission of *any* mention of a city, town, or other urban environment: the eclogue places rural concerns above the urban by not mentioning the latter at all. Its concentric pair, *Eclogue* 3, also takes the pastoral countryside as its central and most present reality, though with two brief glimpses of an external, non-pastoral world. The first and most explicit occurs near the end of the poem,

[109] For the theoretical studies of the *Eclogues*' structure and architecture, see especially Rudd 1976 and van Sickle 1979. Relevant here is the long-recognized concentratic arrangement of *Eclogues*, wherein one can see within the *Eclogues* a series of thematically related pairs radiating out concentrically from *Eclogue* 5—thus, *Eclogue* 1 and 9, 2 and 8, 3 and 7, and 4 and 6, with the relationship between *Eclogue* 5 and 10 variously constructed.

when the singer Damoetas calls upon Pollio[110] to note that '*Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam*' (3.84)—"Pollio loves our poetic Muse, even though it's a rustic one". Pollio, with his origins from *Teate Marrucinorum* in central Italy, might have easily served as a representative of the countryside in Vergil's poem; nonetheless, he appears here as the consummate Roman soldier and politician, as is clear from concessive clause *quamvis est rustica*. The implication that Damoetas' (or Vergil's) poetry is rustic, and that that quality might count against its worthiness or quality, introduces suddenly an outside perspective not aligned with the perspective the poem has taken thus far, one potentially contrary to, even judgmental of local poetry and identity. This idea of poetic verse being judged as inferior or "rustic" from an external, urban perspective is especially interesting considering Quintilian's preservation of Pollio's own judgment of Livy's rustic *Patavinitas*,[111] and becomes even more striking with the mention of Bavius and Mevius a few lines later (3.90). These two obscure poets are also credited with conservative pedanticism, in this case directed at Vergil himself—specifically, in the use of *hordea* at *Georgics* 1.210 to mean barley as a crop, rather than to signify individual grains of barley. Vergil's usage there incurs the criticism of both Quintilian ('*barbarismus*') and Servius ('*usurpative ait*'), the latter linking this criticism to the poets Bavius and Mevius.[112]

These three intrusions into *Eclogue* 3's pastoral setting by Roman figures with histories of criticism toward poetic and linguistic rusticism stands out all the more when one considers the number of intentional rusticisms Vergil includes in this eclogue. One such rusticism has already been seen. Damoetas's concessive *quamvis est rustica* (3.84) requires by normal usage the subjunctive—the meter would allow *sit*—and there is only one example of *quamvis* plus the indicative extant in classical prose;[113] the use of the indicative here gives the line "a hint of the colloquial".[114] The usage is surely intentional: in Catullus' twelfth poem, the earlier poet makes use of the same colloquialism—*hoc salsum esse putas? fugit te, inepte: quamvis sordida res et invenusta est* (12.4-5)—to criticize the crudeness of none other than the *brother* of the same Pollio mentioned here, addressed at the beginning of that poem with a name that recalls his specific Italian origin, *Marrucine Asini*, "Marrucinian Asinius". Both *sordida* and *rustica* point to the haughty judgment of a person or thing deemed socially or culturally inferior, and the colloquialism with *quamvis* in both cases, while poetic, is clearly intended on a sociolinguistic level as well.[115] This example numbers just one among many lexical (*numquam hodie*, 49), morphological (*his*, 102, for nom. pl. *hi*), orthographic (*hirquis*, 8, for *hircis*; *curvos*, 42,

110 C. Asinius Pollio, patron of Vergil, and possible dedicatee of *Ecl.* 4 and 8; see Coleman 1977: 121 ad 3.84.
111 Quint. 1.5.56, 8.1.3.
112 Serv. Auc. ad *G.* 1.210: *sane reprehensus Vergilius dicitur a Bavio et Mavio hoc versu 'hordea qui dixit superest ut tritica dicat'*. Note Quintilian's comment on this usage of *hordea*: '*absurdum forsitan videatur dicere, barbarismum, quod est unius verbi vitium, fieri per numeros aut genera sicut solecismus:* scala *tamen et* scopa *contraque* hordea *et* mulsa*, licet litterarum mutationem, detractionem, adiectionem habeant, non alio vitiosa sunt, quam quod pluralia singulariter et singularia pluraliter efferuntur*' (1.5.16-17). See also Coleman 1977: 163 ad 5.36. It is possible that Bavius and Mevius are linked to this criticism of Vergil because of their cryptic and not-quite-flattering appearance in this eclogue—"He who hates not Bavius, let him love your poems, Mevius, and may the same man yoke foxes and milk he-goats" (*qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina, Mevi, atque idem iungat volpes et mulgeat hirquos*); in that case, it is still striking that the it is through criticism of *nonstandard or incorrect language* that they are connected to Vergil in the wider tradition.
113 Nep. *Milt.* 2.3; see Coleman 1977: 121 ad *Ecl.* 3.84.
114 Coleman 1977: 121 ad loc.
115 See Uden 2011 for one account that specifically links Catullus 12 to codeswitching, linguistic politics, and debates on linguistic purity in the mid-first century BCE.

for *curvus*; *formonsissimum*, 57, for *formosissimum*; etc.),[116] and syntactic (7-9, 24, 25, 28-30, 40, 50, 52, 93, 94)[117] colloquialisms in the poem. Perhaps the most prominent is Menalcas' *quoium pecus* in the first line—*Dic mihi, Damoeta, quoium pecus? an Meliboei?*—where the shepherd makes use of the adjectival *cuius*—complete with the archaizing/colloquializing spelling *quoium*—frequent in comedy and in popular speech, but too much a colloquialism to be considered proper for literary Latin.[118] We have evidence that this particular usage was interpreted as subliterary and colloquial by Vergil's contemporaries in Numitorius' satirical parody of these lines recorded in Donatus' *Life*: ""Tell me, Damoetas, is '*quoium pecus*' actual Latin?' 'No, but that's how Aegon says it: they talk that way in the countryside! (*sic rure loquuntur*)"".[119] Numitorius' identification of *quoium pecus* as a rural dialecticism, as well as Damoetas' own self-conscious reference to Pollio thinking his verse "rustic", suggest that Vergil in *Eclogue* 3 intentionally employs sociolinguistic features of less respected dialects of Latin in order to draw attention to same kinds of social and cultural arrogance demonstrated towards local Italians that were evidenced in the Introduction. This is a less explicit or measurable devaluation of local Italians than that represented in *Eclogues* 1 and 9, but one that points to a sociocultural judgment that would have affected local Italian integration into Rome nonetheless.

The relationship between inside and outside is equally subtle in *Eclogues* 4, 5, 6, and 10, but each of them involves some attempt to integrate elements unoriginal to the pastoral environment into their landscape, whether it be consuls and Roman politics, deification, or the separate genres of cosmogony and elegy. The enigmatic *Eclogue* 4 begins by stating its intention to sing "things somewhat greater" (*paulo maiora canamus*, 4.1), since groves and humble tamarisks—avatars for the pastoral genre itself[120]—are not pleasing to everyone (4.2): "If we are to sing of woods, let those woods be worthy of a consul" (*si canimus silvas, silvae sing consule dignae*). The poem that follows, with its innumerable influences and prediction of a savior child, is, presumably, a pastoral redefined—greater, more worthy—in order to make such a humble genre worthy of such a lofty Roman magistrate. *Eclogue* 4's concentric pair, *Eclogue* 6, introduces its equally unpastoral cosmogony for a similar reason. Though Vergil had begun to write a poetry of kings and battles, one that presumably might have praised the deeds of Vergil's dedicatee Varus, Apollo chastens him, for it is better for a herdsman to sing a refined song, *carmen deductum* (6.5)—yet, though Vergil asserts that the poem that follows is a meditation on "a rustic Muse with a slender reed" (*agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam*), the poem becomes a sort of cosmogony through pastoral themes, itself also a hybrid between the epic originally intended for Varus and the pastoral that his collection purports to contain. In the same way, *Eclogue* 5 is a pastoral that incorporates the blatantly Roman concept of human deification, perhaps with shades of Julius Caesar, and *Eclogue* 10 blends the rural pastoral with the consummately urban genre, elegy, likewise bringing in the actual figure of elegiac poet Gallus. If *Eclogues* 1, 2, 8, and 9 imagine that the incorporation of urban and rural is impossible, the four poems imagined above demonstrate that integration is possible, but not without some kind of shift or transformation of identity in the process.

[116] See Coleman 1977: 37-40 on Vergil's orthography and intentional colloquialism. I give above only examples from *Ecl.* 3 that have strong manuscript authority; see Coleman ad loc. for each.
[117] 3.7-9: ellipsis of verb following *qui* and parenthetic *sed ... risere* in the middle of its clause; 24: simple infinitive *posse* as complement to a verb of saying; 25: ellipsis of *vicisti* and the ablative use of the gerund; 28-30: paratactic use of *experiamur* with interjected *ne* clause, and possibly *vitulam* for *iuvencam* (but see Chapter 4, herein); 40: *quis fuit alter*; 50: *audiat haec tantum vel qui venit*; 52: *si quid habes*; 93: displacement of *frigidus* from *anguis*; 94: simple infintive *procedere* as a complement to *parcite*; see Coleman 1977 ad loc. for each.
[118] Coleman 1977: 109 ad 3.1. For *cuius* in comedy, see, for example: Pl. *Rud.* 745; Ter. *Eun.* 321; etc.
[119] Don. *Vit.* 43: *dic mihi Damoeta, 'quoium pecus' anne Latinum? | non, verum Aegonis nostri; sic rure loquuntur.*
[120] Coleman 1977 ad loc.

The most explicit contrast between urban and rural, however, occurs in *Eclogues* 2 and 8, where the focus is not, as in the other poems, intrusion upon the local landscape, but instead on characters in the immediate pastoral landscape who thinking of, even trying to summon, characters who are outside of—missing from—that same landscape. *Eclogue* 2, for example, paints a picture of the spurned herdsman Corydon as he laments his absent beloved, Alexis, who seems to have abandoned the countryside for a life outside of it with their master, Iollas.[121] The first sign that Alexis is not simply absent, but may have actually retreated to *outside of* the countryside, comes in line 19, when Corydon claims that he is despised by Alexis (*despectus tibi sum*), who does not care for the abundance of his flocks or cheese (19-21), or for the quality of his milk, song, or appearance (22-27). This disdain is explicitly connected to Corydon's inhabiting the countryside becomes apparent immediately afterwards, as Corydon wishes for Alexis to live along with him: "O! should it only be pleasing to you to inhabit the squalid country (*sordida rura*) and live in humble cottages, to hunt deer and drive together the flock of kids with a green marsh-mallow switch".[122] The entire wish seems articulated with the expectation of Alexis' refusal, with *sordida* expressing not Corydon's own view, but a temporary focalization through Alexis' perspective. That this is almost certainly the case is confirmed at the end of the section, when Cordyon laments that Thestylis will certainly eventually take the wild kids he has saved for Alexis, "because my gifts are filthy to you" (*quoniam sordent tibi munera nostra*, 45). The repetition of *sordida/sordent* at the beginning and end of the section seem to recall some slight or insult that the reader does not have access to, but that almost certainly involved a rejection of Corydon or his gifts for being too lowly, not meeting some sociocultural standard of expected worthiness.

That this is the case is only fully stated near the end of the poem, when Corydon finally articulates Alexis' unattainability as brought about by his own rusticity and Alexis' scorn for that very fact (2. 56-9):

> Rusticus es, Corydon; nec munera curat Alexis 56
> nec, si muneribus certes, concedat Iollas.
> heu heu, quid volui misero mihi? floribus Austrum
> perditus et liquidis inmissi fontibus apros. 59
>
> You're a country boy, Corydon; Alexis doesn't care for your gifts, 56
> nor, if you could compete in gift-giving, would Iollas ever yield.
> Ah, what have I brought upon myself, miserable me? Ruined, I have let
> the south-wind into the flowers, drive wild boars into flowing fountains. 59

It is specifically because Corydon is *rusticus*—rustic, boorish—that Alexis rejects him; these lines make explicit the hint that has been growing ever stronger throughout the poem. The introduction of Iollas, meanwhile, clearly the *dominus* from the poem's opening, draws an explicit contrast between the successful master and the abandoned Corydon: Alexis cares not for Corydon's gifts, because Corydon is from the countryside. This point is driven home in lines 58-9 in Corydon's use of an unfamiliar "rustic proverb",[123]

[121] *Eclogue* 2 is based most closely on on the Theocritean *Idyll* 3, in which an anonymous goatherd attempts to woo the maiden Amayllis from outside her cave, and *Idyll* 11, Polyphemus' well-known address to the sea-nymph Galatea; it differs from both of them in locating the absent beloved *outside of* the pastoral landscape.

[122] *Ecl.* 2.28-30: *O tantum libeat mecum tibi sordida rura atque humilis habitare casas et figere cervos haedorumque gregem uiridi compellere hibisco.*

[123] Coleman 1977 ad loc. Cf. Hesiod *Theogony* 35 (ἀλλὰ τί ἦ μοι ταῦτα περὶ δρῦν ἢ περὶ πέτρην;), the little understood proverb the poet uses to transition from his description of the Muses' gifting him a staff as Helicon.

expressing his own self-destruction in terms of "sending the south-wind into the flowers and the boars into flowing fountains"; the very fact that these vivid metaphors from country life provide the vehicle through which Corydon expresses himself is that which condemns him in Alexis' eyes. That Iollas is an urbanite, meanwhile, becomes obvious a few lines later, when Corydon entreats Alexis to "let Pallas inhabit the strongholds (*arces*) she herself built, but let the woods (*silvae*) please us most of all".[124] The contrast is between urban and rural, as similarly in *Eclogue* 1 immediately preceding, with Corydon the *rusticus* inhabiting the same Italian fields as Meliboeus and Tityrus, and Alexis and Iollas removed to realm of the nameless soldier and young man.[125] Ultimately, then, following on *Eclogue* 1, the second *Eclogue* also describes a character embedded in a local Italian countryside who is contemplating his relationship with characters outside of that landscape, an outside that the first poem has already connected to Rome.

Eclogue 8 also maintains Rome's distance from the pastoral, Italian landscape. The poem begins with a description of the setting in which the the herdsmen Damon and Alphesiboeus are about to compete in a song contest, before being interrupted by the dedication to Pollio in lines 6-13. The description of the landscape Pollio occupies—either "passing the rocks of the great river Timavus" (*magni superas … saxa Timavi*, 6) or "skirting the shore of the Adriatic Sea" (*oram Illyrici legis aequoris*, 7)—is vastly different from the standard pastoral landscape, including the surrounding description of the setting of the poetic contest. This contrast between inside and outside primes the reader for an exploration of things present in and absent from the pastoral landscape it describes, just as in *Eclogue* 2, and this theme is carried on into the two songs that make up the remainder of the poem. In the first of these, we learn of Damon, who has been "deceived by the fickle love of Nysa" (*indigno Nysae deceptus amore*, 18). It is only in the fifth stanza[126] that the actual reason for the speaker's failure to hold the attention of his beloved Nysa is given (32-5):

> o digno coniuncta uiro, dum despicis omnis
> dumque tibi est odio mea fistula dumque capellae
> hirsutumque supercilium promissaque barba,
> nec curare deum credis mortalia quemquam.
>
> O you joined to a worthy husband, as you look down on everyone,
> and as you hate my pipe, and hate my she-goats,
> my shaggy brow and my long-hanging beard,
> you don't believe that any of the gods care for human affairs.

Nysa, like Alexis in *Eclogue* 2, seems to deride and look down on her admirer for his rusticity and uncultivated appearance, implying that her betrothed Mopsus is, contarily, urban and sophisticated. *Despicis*

[124] *Ecl.* 2.61-62: *Pallas quae condidit arces ipsa colat; nobis placeant ante omnia silvae*.

[125] This continuity between the first and second *Eclogue* is seen also in the continuity of landscape between them. The *densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos* (2.3) at the beginning of this eclogue recall the *fagus* in whose shade (*in umbra*, 1.4) Tityrus sits at the beginning of *Eclogue* 1, while the "mountains and forests" to which Alexis casts his complaints recall the *siluae* (*siluestrem*, 1.2; *siluas*, 1.5) and *montibus* (1.83) of the first *Eclogue*, creating a strong sense of continuity. Other points of continuity include the repetition of *arbusta* (1.39; 2.13), *Amaryllis* (1.5; 2.14), *rura* (1.46; 2.28), and *frigus captare* (1.52; 2.8) between the poems.

[126] Both the songs of Damon and Alphesiboeus in *Ecl.* 8 make use of a refrain which is repeated exactly every two to six lines, except the last line of each song, where it is changed slightly. In what follows, I will consider the lines intermittent between each repeated line to make up a stanza, with each song made up of ten stanzas.

repeats the sentiment and vocabulary of Corydon's *despectus tibi sum* (2.19), and Nysa's condescending attitude toward the shepherd's pipe, goats, and unkempt façade parallel Alexis' disdain for the unclean countryside (*sordida rura*, 2.28) and the ill-received gifts of Corydon (*sordent tibi munera nostra*, 44). Nysa's haughty attitude is present also in the speaker's use of *digno* to describe Mopsus, especially when set beside Nysa's *indigno amore* from line 18: it is from Nysa's perspective that the speaker of the poem is unworthy of her love (*indigno*), whereas the more urbane Mopsus clearly meets the girl's standards (*digno*…*viro*, 32).

Nysa's rejection of the speaker's affection because of his rusticity is even more painful when one learns that the two of them grew up on the same land, wandering the same orchard together (8.37-41):

> saepibus in nostris paruam te roscida mala
> – dux ego uester eram—uidi cum matre legentem.
> alter ab undecimo tum me iam acceperat annus,
> iam fragilis poteram a terra contingere ramos.
> ut uidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error!
>
> In our orchards I saw you as a girl—I was your guide –
> picking dew-covered fruit with your mother.
> At that time my twelfth year had already received me,
> already I could reach to touch the trees' tender branches from the ground.
> When I saw you, how I perished, how devastated error stole me away!

The memory of this first meeting, a detail modeled on *Id.* 11.25-8, adds greatly to the *pathos* of the speaker's situation. Nysa is not merely some girl the narrator has fixated on from afar, but his childhood love. But though this early connection saw the both of them in the countryside, Nysa has clearly moved on, and her choice of the more urbane Mopsus speaks to a rejection of the rural aspect of her own history and identity. Nysa not only rejects the speaker as rustic, but nullifies the importance of rural experience to her own personal history and identity in the process. It is no wonder then that the narrator, with both his own self and his entire world rejected by his beloved, is left at the end of the poem about to end his life by throwing himself from high cliff in to the sea. His final address to the landscape—"*vivite silvae*" (58)—becomes in this context ambiguous: it is not only his closing farewell to the landscape that bore and raised him, but a bitter wish that that landscape might live on after he has gone: "Live on, woods…".

This absence of a character from the countryside and the conflict between the urban and rural that ensues is even more apparent in the second song of *Eclogue* 8, in which Alphesiboeus sings as a woman performing magic rites to bring her beloved back to her. Based closely on Theocritus' second *Idyll*, Vergil's main innovation is to transfers the action from the city to the countryside and change the named of the beloved from Delphis to Daphnis, bucolic singer *par excellence* in *Idyll* 1, thereby refocusing the originally urban plot around rural characters in a rustic setting. Yet the city does not disappear from this poem, but, as in *Eclogue* 2, acts as the attractive power from which the woman tries to pry her beloved with her magical arts, as clear from he woman's magical refrain: "Lead home from the city, o my songs, lead my Daphnis" (*ducite ab urbe domum, mea carmina, Daphnin*—68 *et passim*). The refrain is based on the first refrain from *Idyll* 2, which includes the notion of home but lacks any contrast between city and country: "Wryneck, draw ye home that man of mine" (Ἴυγξ, ἕλκε τὺ τῆνον ἐμὸν ποτὶ δῶμα τὸν ἄνδρα, *Id.* 2.17 *et passim*). Vergil's addition of *ab urbe* to the refrain not only invites the reader to think of the poem in terms of a struggle between the city and the country, it also explicitly associates the surrounding rural landscape with "home" (*domum*), a

connection made also in *Eclogues* 1, 3, 4, 7, and 10.[127] Indeed, all the occurrences of *domus* in the *Eclogues* refer to a "home" within the rural landscape, never outside of it, reinforcing the fact that the collection takes a local Italian perspective as its primary perspective, rather than an urban Roman one. Taken together, the woman's attempt to draw Daphnis back to the countryside from the city and Nysa's derision towards the first singer for his rustic nature, combined with the dedication to Pollio as he travels abroad, set up a tension between the urban and the rural, wherein the rural perspective aligns with the setting of the poem's frame and its two songs, while the city acts to draw significant characters—Pollio, Nysa, Daphnis—to the outside of the landscape, leaving an absence felt by the characters remaining in it.

What this study of the relationship between urban and rural in the remainder of the *Eclogues* demonstrates is that the attempts to disentangle the perspectives of the *germana patria* and the *patria communis* are not limited to just *Eclogue* 1 and 9, but constitute a reoccuring thematic concern of Vergil's pastoral. Yet the various eclogues approach this acculturation of local into Roman in vastly different ways. *Eclogues* 1 and 9, with their vision of Italian land repossessed from locals and unequal treatment among citizens, suggest a complete failure of social and cultural integration, except perhaps in the cases of Tityrus and Lycidas, who would nevertheless represent assimilation into Roman cultural identity, rather than a balanced integration. *Eclogues* 2 and 8 also feature a failure of integration, but place more of a focus on the loss that can come in the throes of acculturation: the absent figures of Alexis, Nysa, and Daphnis depict the centrifugal pull of the city, and the ever-present potential for loss that any attempt at acculturation might bring. Almost in response, *Eclogues* 3 and 7, which ignore the existence of Rome and any reality outside the pastoral landscape, paint the picture of a kind of Italian separation: the inhabitants of the landscape will continue with their own customs, songs, and quarrels, denying any importance to those outside their borders. The remaining *Eclogues* 4, 5, 6, and 10 all portray their own attempts at integration, but in each case, something originally foreign to both the pastoral landscape and genre—Roman politics, deification, the genres of cosmogony and elegy—enter into the poem and alter the generic make-up of pastoral itself. The message here, as with poems 2 and 8, seems to be that integration can only come at a cost, whether it be loss or indelible change. The dialectics of Italian acculturation into Roman society, as the *Eclogues* presents them, are concerned to explore the various successes and pitfalls of acculturation strategies, with the constant privileging of the local Italian perspective in the poems speaking to the value of strategies that preserve the essence of local identity: integration at best, separation at worst. The question that remains through these explorations is whether a new community can be formed; to that question we now turn.

Making and Breaking Community in the *Eclogues*

In this chapter so far, we have examined various different dualities—between *germana patria* and *patria communis*, between rural and urban—and the way that these oppositions are figured as facets of identity that one might seek to integrate during social, cultural, or ethnic acculturation; in this formulation, each individual eclogue can almost be taken as the bi- or multi-cultural subject in microcosm, the

[127] *Ecl.* 1.35: *non umquam gravis aere domum mihi dextra redibat* (contrasted with *ingratae urbi* at 1.34); 3.33: *est mihi namque domi pater, est iniusta nouerca*; 4.21-2: *ipsae lacte domum referent distenta capellae ubera*; 7.14-5: *nec Phyllida habebam depulsos a lacte domi quae clauderet agnos*; 7.44: *ite domum pasti, si quis pudor, ite iuvenci*; 10.77: *ite domum saturae, uenit Hesperos, ite capellae*.

oppositional dynamics displayed an avatar for a subject's own cultura or psychological incorporation of distinct aspects of their personal identities. Yet the *Eclogues,* a great number of which are figured as interactive dialogues between characters within the same landscape, also provide another opportunity to examine the process of integration—that is, from the wider community viewpoint, the isolated opposition or integration of characters within a single eclogue representing one possible outcome of the attempted integration and acculturation of local Italian municipals within the wider Roman citizen community.[128] It is perhaps because of the *Eclogue*'s involvement in questions of acculturation and community creation that the work itself is so clearly obsessed with duality,[129] competition, and possession[130]—for the problem of bicultural identity integration, as well as of the cultural integration of one group into another, is precisely that of achieving unity from duality.

The vision of community presented in each individual *Eclogue* is often closely intertwined with the relationship that poem has painted between rural and urban, between *germana patria* and *patria communis*. *Eclogues* 2 and 8, for example, consist entirely in the songs sung by Corydon, Damon, and Alphesiboeus, each one a soliloquy by a single character pining for a character outside the landscape. As such, there is no community to speak of in any of their songs, only isolation. In *Eclogue* 2, Corydon wanders alone (*solus*, 4), his only hope for community of any sort the prospect that he will, sometime in the future, "find another Alexis" (*invenies alium ... Alexin*, 73). There is little more community in *Eclogue* 8. Damon's protagonist sings only to the non-responsive stars, the woods, and his pipe, and any chance of community is lost with his self-inflicted death at the end of the song (*extremum hoc munus morientis habeto*, 60). Alphesiboeus' lovesick woman fares hardly better: although she addresses a certain Amaryllis (78, 101), there is no dialogue, no response, and her focus remains her doomed attempts to bring Daphnis back from the city. The closest thing we have to community are the singers themselves, Damon and Alphesiboeus, thrice named in the same line (1, 5, 62)—but, even so there is no indication of any conversation outside of their singing, represented as a competition (*certantis*, 3) rather than shared song.

Eclogues 3 and 7 likewise demonstrate the difficulty of community integration, with a focus not on the destructive aspects of isolation, but on the potential failure of social integration even in a community which appears easily unified. *Eclogue* 3 opens upon the herdsmen Menalcas and Damoetas, who immediately berate and chide one other with accusations of theft, sexual humiliation, and poetic incompetence. They are forced to settle their dispute with a poetic competition (*vis ergo inter nos quid possit uterque vicissim experiamur*? 28-9), judged by the neutral Palaemon (50-54). In the final judgment, however, Palaemon cannot decide between the two singers: "It is not my place to settle such great disputes between you; both you and he are worthy of this prize *vitula*" (*non nostrum inter vos tantas componere lites: et vitula tu dignus et hic*, 108-9). Menalcas and Damoetas are unable to be differentiated on a narrative level, nor by the poetic contest; their determination to establish themselves superior over the other, despite their apparent indifferentiability, speaks to the difficulty of integration within a single subject or community, even when both sides are equally valuable. *Eclogue* 7 presents the opposite scenario. Corydon and Thyrsis, with their audience of Daphnis and Meliboeus, are the picture of a united community at the beginning of the poem:

128 For the theoretical scholarship on Roman and Italian integration and acculturation, see the Introduction.
129 This focus is most readily apparent in the *Eclogues*' preference for depicting dialogues and the characteristic amoebaean song contests, as well as in the hyper-frequent occurrence of language of doubling and reduplication: *duo, ambo, bini, bis, duplicare, gemelli, alius, alter, alternus*, etc.
130 I have begun to discuss the issues of competition and duality in the *Eclogues* , as well as its relation to and basis in Theocritean intertextuality in Moch 2017.

they have driven their flocks together into one (*compulerantque ... in unum*, 2); they are both in the prime of their youth (*ambo florentes aetatibus*, 4) and both equally skilled at song and response (*et cantare pares et respondere parati*, 5). Their balanced alternation is stressed again as they begin to sing, when the narrator Meliboeus recalls that "they began to compete with verses spoken in turn; the Muses wanted to remember balanced alternation" (*alternis igitur contendere versibus ambo coepere; alternos Musae meminisse volebant*, 18-19). With such a strong focus on balance and equality, one might guess that this contest would be the one to end in a draw—yet, when we arrive at poem's end, we find that there is indeed a single winner, Corydon, with no explanation given as to why: "I remember these things, and that Thyrsis was defeated, competed in vain. From that time is has been Corydon, Corydon for us" (*haec memini, et victum frustra contendere Thyrsin. ex illo Corydon, Corydon est tempore nobis*, 69-70). What is noticeable is the sudden jump to the present (*est*, 70) from the pluperfects that had introduced the scene (*consederat*, 1; *compulerant*, 2), and the uncertain reference of the pronoun *nobis*—us readers? us Italians? us Romans? One can't help but wonder whether the judgment made is related, if even in some small way, to the present Roman encroachment on the landscape, subtly threatening to dismantle the unity previously described as permeating the Italian landscape seen here.

Perhaps the most interesting poems to consider in the *Eclogues'* exploration of the formation of community, however, are *Eclogues* 1 and 9, to which we now briefly return. We have seen earlier in this chapter how Tityrus and Meliboeus find themselves in contrasting situations in this eclogue, the former able to continue to live as before through the mediation of Rome, the latter forced to leave his ancestral land and wander as an exile. What is most notable in this particular eclogue is how the poem itself constantly attempts to reunite these two characters back into a single community, both at the level of the poem's action and in the language itself. There is, however, no reconciliation in the end, even with the two characters spending the entire poem attempting to find common ground as, hopefully, still members of the same community. Their final inability to reunite serves to question the possibility of reconciliation between the older local identity represented by Meliboeus and the newer, integrated Roman seen in Tityrus.

The aspect of *Eclogue* 1 in which the struggle of Meliboeus' and Tityrus' to represent themselves as members of the same community is most apparent is at the micro-level of the language of the poem itself—specifically in the referentiality and clusivity of the 1st person plural, in the push and pull between inclusive and exclusive uses of the first-person plural throughout the poem. This is first apparent at the beginning of the poem, where Meliboeus addresses Tityrus with the second-person singular (*Tityre, tu*, 1; *tu, Tityre*, 4), but refers to his own situation with the first-person plural (*linquimus*, 3; *fugimus*, 4), complete with the emphatic pronoun *nos* at the beginning of subsequent lines (3, 4). While it is possible that *nos* here is used poetically by Vergil/Meliboeus for the singular, it seems likely that, as Coleman notes, "we can see the plural forms here as extending the catastrophe beyond [Meliboeus'] own personal sufferings".[131] That Meliboeus is joined in exile by some subset of the local citizenry is confirmed at lines 64-6, when he again uses the first-person plural pronoun (*nos*, 64) to refer to the present exiles, with "some" (*alii*, 64) going to Africa and "others" (*pars*, 65) to Scythia and far-off Britain, confirming that he refers in the opening lines not only to himself but to the greater community of local people affected by the confiscations and the influx of resettled soldiers. While we cannot know the identities of these other exiles, one thing is clear: Tityrus, who prior to this moment Meliboeus seems to have considered a local compatriot, cannot be included in the "we" which Meliboeus utters, by reason both of his separate address as a singular entity (*tu…tu…*) and, more importantly, by the fact that he is not going into exile like the others, but will be

[131] Coleman 1977 ad loc. 1.3-4, p. 72.

remaining on his old land. The poem itself, then, begins quite starkly with the formation of a schism within a community that, it would seem, was previous united.

Tityrus' response to Meliboeus—"A god has created this leisure for us" (*deus nobis haec otia fecit*, 6)—reinforces this break in the surrounding community by likewise playing with the referentiality of pronouns. It is unclear whether Tityrus' *nobis* here is meant to include others, including Meliboeus; if it does, its usage is insultingly optimistic, ignoring as it does the reality of Meliboeus' emigration and exile. Tityrus continues this ambiguously wide referentiality through line 8, referring to a lamb "from our sheepfolds" (*nostris ab ovilibus*), before breaking the façade of inclusivity in lines 9-10 as he finally clarifies what exactly his newfound leisure entails not with plural, but singular pronouns: "He (*ille*) has permitted my own cattle (*meas ... boves*) to graze—as you see (*cernis*)—and myself (*ipsum*) he has allowed to play whatever things I wish (*quae vellem*) on my country reed".[132] The fiction of the first-person plural is broken here, as it becomes obvious that, while *Tityrus* has the freedom to play what he likes and graze his own cattle (*meas; ipsum; quae vellem*), Meliboeus' participation in these *otia* is merely to witness the result of Tityrus' good luck (*ut cernis*), but not enjoy it for himself. Tityrus' *nobis* (6) and *nostris* (8) are revealed as a polite way for Tityrus to forego acknowledging Meliboeus' loss. If Tityrus' plurals refer to a larger community of locals who have fared better amidst the confiscations, it becomes clear that such a group does not overlap with Meliboeus' own first-person community.

Meliboeus, picking up on Tityrus' shift to the singular, launches into a description of his own personal situation, making use of first-person singular verbs to describe his wonder (*miror*, 11)—but not envy (*non equidem invideo*, 11)—at Tityrus' luck amidst the turmoil of the countryside (*totis…turbatur agris*, 11-12), and his own difficulty in driving his unwilling flocks (*aeger ago ... vix, Tityre, duco*, 13). Meliboeus' emphatic use of singular verbs in these lines communicates clearly to Tityrus that he does not enjoy the same carefree existence. Meliboeus now slips back into the first-person plural, recalling that the present disastrous situation had often been predicted by the lightning that struck the nearby oak trees, if only Meliboeus had been aware enough to notice it: *saepe malum hoc nobis, si mens non laeva fuisset, de caelo tactas memini praedicere quercus* (16-17). The use of *nobis* here is clearly the first use of the first-person plural in the poem which is inclusive of both Tityrus *and* Meliboeus, referring as it does to the time before the land confiscations, before Tityrus had journeyed to Rome or any *barbarus miles* had come to repossess Meliboeus' land, when the two men belonged to the same community. Almost by accident, Meliboeus reminds both interlocutors of their having recently belonged to the same group, of the unity that was once possible between them. The unity is broken, however, in Meliboeus' last line of this speech when he again uses *nobis* in a way that cannot be inclusive of Tityrus: "But tell us, nevertheless, Tityrus, who is this god of yours" (*sed tamen iste deus qui sit da, Tityre, nobis*, 18). *Nobis* here are Meliboeus and his fellow exiles, those who, unlike Tityrus, are uninformed of the goings-on in Rome.

This back-and-forth continues throughout the poem. Tityrus uses the first-person plural inclusively of Meliboeus when he refers to the small town they live near (*huic nostrae*, 20) and their shared livelihood as shepherds (*solemus pastores*, 20-21), yet he also uses forms of the first-person plural exclusive of his fellow herdsman, referring only to himself and others in his situation, as when he speaks of the altars that will burn for the Roman *iuvenis* in thanks (*nostra…altaria*, 43) and of the unlikelihood of the *iuvenis'* face ever fading from his memory (*nostro illius labatur pectore voltus*, 63). Meliboeus, on the other hand, is acutely aware that his situation differs from Tityrus' own, and thus avoids making use of a unifying "we" when

[132] *Ecl.* 1-9-10: *ille meas errare boves, ut cernis, et ipsum ludere quae vellem calamo permisit agresti*.

speaking to Tityrus, preferring to address him instead in the isolating second-person singular: *tibi* (26); *te…te…* (38-39); *tua rura* (46); *tibi* (47); *captabis* (52); *tibi* (53); *tua cura* (57). Indeed, Meliboeus completely avoids the first-person plural until his final lengthy speech, when it is abundantly clear that Tityrus is not included in the group Meliboeus is speaking of (64-66):

> at nos hinc alii sitientis ibimus Afros,
> pars Scythiam et rapidum cretae veniemus Oaxen,
> et penitus toto divissos orbe Britannos.

> But as for us, some of us will go from here to the thirsting Africans,
> Some of us will come to Scythia and the Oaxes, swirling with chalk,
> And to the Britons, separated off competely from the entire world.

As with *linquimus* and *fugimus* in the poem's opening lines, Meliboeus speaks solely from the perspective of local residents who have lost their land in the confiscations. Nominally Roman citizens, they have nevertheless been dispossessed of their farms and hereditary land, their citizenship not preventing their expulsion from their former community. Meliboeus imagines the eviction of himself and his fellows from their home as so disorienting as to feel as if they are being sent to distant places far removed from Italy or any sense of home or familiarity: the scorching deserts of Africa, with a climate so different from the north Italian one they have been accustomed to, or to Scythia or Britain on the very edges of the known world. Though it seems unlikely that Meliboeus and his fellows would actually end up so far away from their homes, the geographical remove he imagines reveals the incredible sense of emotional dislocation he feels. That Meliboeus recognizes the incredible distance between his own fate and Tityrus' is driven home in his final lines in the poem, where, after a bitter address to himself in the second person (*insere nunc, Meliboee, piros, pone ordine vites*, 73), he spends five lines mourning wistfully about the life he will lose, entirely in the first-person singular (*meae*, 74; *ego*, 75; *videbo*, 76; *canam*, *me pascente*, 77), shedding light not only on the singularity of his situation, but also the isolation he feels in his loss.

In the poem's last lines, Tityrus makes a final attempt to restore the sense of community that had formerly existed between himself, Meliboeus, and the others in their locality (79-83):

> Hic tamen hanc mecum poteras requiescere noctem
> fronde super viridi. sunt nobis mitia poma,
> castaneae molles et pressi copia lactis,
> et iam summa procul villarum culmina fumant
> maioresque cadunt altis de montibus umbrae.

> Still, you could have rested this night here with me here
> lying on leaves still green. We have ripe fruit,
> mealy chestnuts and an overabundance of cheese,
> and already the high roofs of the villas yonder sent up smoke
> and greater shadows are falling from the high mountains.

Whether or not this ending constitutes a worthy reconciliation between Tityrus and Meliboeus remains

highly contentious among scholars. Tityrus extends a polite—"somewhat apologetic"[133]—invitation to Meliboeus to join him for the night, but the use of the past tense verb *poteras* seems to imply some sort of unreality, as if the chance or opportunity for Tityrus' invitation to make any difference has passed. Even if Tityrus' invitation is heartfelt and Meliboeus were to spend one last night in the familiar ancestral landscape, it would only delay the inevitable for that a night, as Tityrus' specification of *hanc noctem* (79) makes clear. The use of *nobis*, meanwhile, remains as ambiguous as Tityrus' invitation. On the one hand, it seems to proffer the possibility of a final reconciliation between the two herdsmen, with the fruit, chestnuts and cheese a shared meal among compatriots. On the other, *nobis* could just as well refer to Tityrus and Amaryllis with the exclusion of Meliboeus, especially since chestnuts and *mala*, probably quinces, were favorites of an Amaryllis in *Eclogue* 2 (2.51-52). Indeed, *nobis* could just as well be used to refer to Tityrus himself, deployed here to conveniently pass over Meliboeus' state of exclusion once again, or to finally acknowledge it just before his ultimate exit from the landscape, as he does earlier in the poem. Whether there is indeed a reconciliation, even for a period as brief as a night, cannot be known: the poem ends with Tityrus' reflections on the day's end, and there is no chance to hear whether Meliboeus accepts or refuses Tityrus' offer. In any case, the morning will bring Meliboeus' retreat from his fields and his home.

As a commentary on a local Italian's navigation of their dual local and Roman identities, *Eclogue* 1 can be interpreted in a couple distinct ways. First of all, Tityrus and Meliboeus demonstrate two quite different responses to the influx of Roman settlers which themselves stand in for the importation of a new Roman identity. Tityrus embraces his new life in the countryside, one which resembles his old existence in that he continues to both herd cattle and play his country music, but which differs in the new religious devotion he feels for the *iuvenis* at Rome; his is a sort of cultural creolism, combining features of his old local and new Roman existence resulting in a novel sort of cultural reality. Meliboeus, on the other hand, suffers from and thus represents Italian marginalization and inequity at Roman hands; he thus has no choice to participate in any sort of local-Roman creolism or biculturalism, but must be marginalized and separated. On the level of its characters, then, *Eclogue* 1 denies that there is one single best response to Roman-Italian acculturation.

The second way that *Eclogue* 1 comments on the dual identity of local citizens is in the poem's repeated attempts to reunite Tityrus and Meliboeus into a single community, and the ultimate failure of those attempts. In the play of subjects and pronouns which constantly draws the two characters together and apart, Vergil seems to contemplate the possibility of a unified Roman community generally: is it possible, after the struggles of the Social and Civil Wars, that these newly unified "Romans", who differed enormously in their backgrounds and personal histories, could be united in such a way as for them to view themselves all as a part of a single community? Or were the differences in experience and privilege between the various members too great to allow for such a unification? Meliboeus, for one, never feels either the incorporation into the broader Roman community nor the reconciliation of disparate local and Roman identities that a character like Tityrus feels, and, as a result, he never moves on from identifying solely with his local identity, even once all the attributes of that identity have been lost to him. The poem's ending, with Tityrus' weak offer of community for a single night without any response from Meliboeus, refuses to give a final word on the possibility of the creation of a broader, unified Roman community. *Eclogue* 1, then, serves as a fitting introduction to Vergil's collection by demonstrating that there exists not merely one way of viewing the relationship between Rome and the individual localities of Italy: individuals may ultimately

[133] Coleman 1977 *ad loc.*

view their new dual local and Roman identity as either a positive or negative thing, with varying material results, but it is an acquisition which runs the risk of loss and of change.

The potential loss to a local community brought on by Rome's entrance onto the scene is even more apparent in *Eclogue* 9, which also highlights the divisions emerging in the Italian community under these new conditions. We have seen how Moeris has lost his land and his flocks to a "newcomer" (*advena*, 2), whereas Lycidas does not seem to have sustained any losses of his own in the struggle—though he is much more sympathetic to Moeris' plight than Tityrus is ever seen to be to Meliboeus'. That Lycidas himself does not suffer Moeris' same fate emerges, again, through the play of pronouns in the poem. Moeris' initial complain of his loss makes use exclusively of the first-person plural: "We have made it this far" (*pervenimus*, 2), he tells Lycidas, only for a stranger to become owner "of our little patch of land" (*nostri … agelli*, 2-3); now, he says "we drive these he-goats here for that stranger" (*hos illi … mittimus haedos*, 6). As with Meliboeus in *Eclogue* 1, Moeris begins the conversation inclusive of his interlocutor Lycidas, until Lycidas himself signals his exclusion from the same situation by switching to the singular—first, with *equidem audieram* (7) and then by his use of a second-person plural pronoun in line 10, when it becomes clear what exactly Lycidas had heard: "that *your* Menalcas had saved everything with his songs" (*omnia carminibus vestrum servasse Menalcan*, 10). Lycidas' use of the second-person plural possessive *vester* admits the existence of a larger community to which Moeris belongs, who surely have suffered a similar loss, while at the same time marking himself as somewhat removed from the situation, not fully feeling its effects. Lycidas, then, is one of the "lucky" ones.

Lycidas, however, is not so reluctant as Tityrus to acknowledge his fellow's plight, a fact reveals by Lycidas' impassioned lament upon receiving a fuller update on the situation from Moeris (9.17-18):

> Heu, cadit in quemquam tantum scelus? heu, tua nobis 17
> paene simul tecum solacia rapta, Menalca!
>
> Alas, can so terrible a crime fall upon anyone? Ah! The solace you provide, 17
> Was stolen away from us, Menalcas, at nearly the same time as you yourself!

Lycidas is just as affected by the loss of Menalcas as the others; he sees what has happened as a *crimen*, and considers Menalcas' loss to have robbed some potential solace from those who are suffering, recognizing the comfort available in Menalcas' songs. Most strikingly, Lycidas admits that Menalcas' poetic output served as a consolation to *all* of those in the community, made clear by the use of *nobis*, "from us". Lycidas' empathy continues to the end of the poem, where he attempts to bring Moeris out of melancholic longing for the return of Menalcas by encouraging his fellow traveler to sing together with him. Lycidas speaks of "our desire" for Menalcas (*nostros … amores*, 56), and states that "half of our journey is left" (*hinc adeo media est nobis via*, 59), allowing plenty of time for the two of them to stop and sing (*canamus*, 61); for "we will come into the city all the same" (*veniemus*, 62). Lycidas makes use of first-person plural verbs three more times in the next three lines (*veremur*, 63; *eamus*, 64; *eamus*, 65). Unlike Tityrus, whose use of an inclusive first-person plural seem to stem more from a willing ignorance of Meliboeus' plight than from any real belief in reconciliation, Lycidas, whatever his own situation, seems convinced that the preservation of the community between himself and Moeris is possible, and he actively works to build camaraderie by suggesting they sing country song, despite the grim circumstances. Lycidas stands as a persistently optimistic voice, convinced that the old way of life known to himself and Moeris can continue despite the

various positive and negative effects Rome's entrance upon the landscape has had on the local inhabitants.

Yet Moeris does not share Lycidas' optimism that life can continue as before, tied as he is to the way things used to be. He refuses Lycidas' offer to stop and sing, countering that the occasion will be better in the future, "when [Menalcas] himself has come" (*cum venerit ipse*, 67). The cessation of a previous existence is most apparent in the absence of the character of Menalcas who, though clearly an important member of the community, is now away from the landscape, supposedly to help regain lost land through his poetry (10). This absence, itself indicative of the pre-Roman cultural situation that has been lost to Moeris, Lycidas, and their ilk, also manifests, albeit differently, in Moeris' inability to remember the lyrics of songs he has previously sung or heard. At line 37, Moeris hesitates to begin singing a song of his own composition, struggling as he does to remember the words (*si valeam meminisse*, 38). Later, he calls upon Lycidas to sing another song for which he is only able to remember the general rhythm, but not the words (*numeros memini, si verba tenerem*, 45). Even after Lycidas has successfully recalled and sung this very song, Moeris laments the fact that "time carries off everything, even life itself" (*omnia fert aetas, animum quoque*, 51), since despite his constant singing of songs as a boy, by now he has forgotten so many of the songs he once knew (*nunc oblita mihi tot carmina*, 53)—even his voice has fled (*vox quoque Moerin iam fugit ipsa*, 53-54). Moeris' inability to remember his songs bespeaks the greater problem of the past fading away, becoming inaccessible. As with Meliboeus in *Eclogue* 1, all these absences replicate the greater sense that, in the importation of a broader Roman identity into the local landscape, something greater has also been lost, a thing whose absence is both profoundly perceived and difficult to describe, like a memory the details of which one begins to question as it slips gradually more and more from one's recollection.

Unlike Meliboeus, however, whose imminent exile has left him devoid of hope that his old life might return, Moeris seems to believe that the old order would be restored if only the poet Menalcas should return. Moeris' final assurance that "we will sing" when Menalcas has returned (*carmina tum melius, cum venerit ipse, canemus*), with its use of the first-person plural in the future tense, speaks to his belief that the restoration of the community and its old norms is possible. Though Moeris' memory of and connection to the past is becoming ever more tenuous, he remains stubbornly optimistic amidst his misfortune that the world he has lost will return again. Lycidas seems to be of the opposite opinion; he seems hesitant that they should hold their breath for Menalcas' return (*nostros in longum ducis amores*, 56), insisting that now (*nunc*, 57) is the appropriate moment, and here (*hic*, 60, 61, 62) the appropriate place for them to sing, before they arrive at the city. For Lycidas, this seems to involve a certain collaboration or camaraderie: he suggests they pass their journey singing together (*cantantes … eamus*, 64), since "the journey will pass more easily" (64). Neither Moeris nor Lycidas are completely despairing about the current situation, but their hope in the situation is expressed in different ways: Moeris looks forward to the return of Menalcas to the local landscape, believing the poet will have been able to restore the previous peace and undo the changes that have accompanied the Roman accession, whereas Lycidas, less affected by recent events as he is, champions the creation of a new sense of community as the solution to their current ills. In each case, the herdsman is forced to deal with the loss of what has come before, to cope with an acquisition of Roman identity that has been accompanied not by expanded rights, but by dramatic change and loss.

Eclogues 1 and 9 provide differing perspectives on how the individual local subject might approach the appending of a new, Roman identity onto an original, local one. Both Meliboeus in *Eclogue* 1 and Moeris in *Eclogue* 9 represent an incomplete incorporation of this new identity and reality, seeing its acquisition as a loss of one's old identity, and thus an insolvable contradiction. Both herdsmen stand for an attachment and devotion to local identity that refuses to accommodate a new identity or situation, differing only in

their relative optimism or pessimism about the possibility of a return to the past. Tityrus and Lycidas, meanwhile, both accept the new addition to their identity. Tityrus in *Eclogue* 1 is more than happy to assimilate in the new worship of the Roman *iuvenis* into his everyday life, including sacrificing from his own flock, in order to keep his old land and way of life. Lycidas, on the other hand, has not suffered the loss of Meliboeus and Moeris, nor the change of Tityrus, but is still able to observe the changes that Rome's encroachment has brought into the landscape. Both Lycidas and Tityrus remain confident that the local and the Roman aspects of their identities are able to co-exist, are able to be successfully navigated between—and both are willing to change and, to a certain extent, blind to the sufferings of their fellows. In these two *Eclogues*, far from delivering a single interpretation of the events of Italian-Roman cultural and ethnic integration, Vergil allows and maintains multiple perspectives, communicating clearly that each individual subject may respond to such complications of identity in a different way—indeed, that perhaps even within the same subject, attitudes may be multiple and even at odds with one another.

There are a variety of ways in which Vergil's *Eclogues*, then, engage in a dialectics of acculturation with regard to the incorporation of local Italians, and local Italian culture, into Roman legal and sociocultural hegemony, with the entire collection aligned most closely with a local perspective. *Eclogues* 1 and 9, in the huge distance they create between the local Italian landscape and Rome, demonstrate the marginalization and forced separation as an acculturative strategy in the characters of Meliboeus and Moeris as a result of displacement, whereas both Tityrus and Lycidas exhibit a more assimilative strategy, with Lycidas several degrees more aware of the suffering around him than the seemingly oblivious Tityrus. The assimilative strategy is successful for Tityrus and Lycidas, but placed alongside the forced separation of their peers, it is impossible for the former neighbors to be united again into a single cultural community. Contrasting with the marginalization and forced cultural separation of Meliboeus and Moeris, the soliloquizing lovers in *Eclogues* 2 and 8 all subscribe to a *voluntary* separative acculturation strategy—that is, one in which they choose to identify solely with a local identity while purposefully closing off any potential identification with an urban (and thus Roman) identity; this strategy does not emerge positively from these poems, as all three—Corydon and the lovers of Nysa and Daphnis—are left alone and lonely, with and uncertain future and no community to speak of, unhappy as a result of their separation. *Eclogues* 3 and 7, insofar as Roman and urban influence is essentially absent from their settings and narratives, would seem to also represent a voluntary—but successful—separative strategy favoring local identity, and their adherence to the expectations of the pastoral genre laid out by Thecritean precedent would suggest that little is lost in this process. But, as we have seen, even these poems have difficulty achieving a truly integrated community, with Menalcas' and Damoetas' hypercompetitive desire to distinguish themselves in *Eclogue* 3 and the ultimate favoring of Corydon in *Eclogue* 7, and it is hard to forget the heights of Rome lingering on the outskirts of the pastoral landscape (in Pollio, Bavius, and Mevius in *Eclogue* 3, and in the sudden jump to the present in *Eclogue* 7), the knowledge of its encroachment subtly affecting even in those landscapes it is not directly present in. While some characters emerge fortunate as their navigate between the pull of local and Roman cultural identities—Tityrus, Lycidas—ultimately the acculturative situations and strategies do not work well for those affecting them at all.

Is there, then, no representation of Italian acculturation in the *Eclogues* that is positive, that points toward the possibility of an *integrated*—rather than a marginalized, separated, or assimilated—community? Though *Eclogues* 4 and 6 seem to assimilate local, pastoral themes "successfully" to the more urban expectations of the consul Pollio and the general Varus, they amount essentially to an assimilation or creolization between rural and urban, local and Roman, pastoral and epic/cosmogony, one which either

transforms or loses something of the essential character of pastoral and its close connection to a local landscape. *Eclogue* 10, meanwhile, not only inserts Roman elegiac themes (and a Roman elegiac poet!) into the pastoral landscape, Gallus, as depicted, is abandoned and alone like the Corydon of *Eclogue* 2. What, though, of *Eclogue* 5. We have said something similar regarding *Eclogue* 5 above—that the poem inserts the peculiarlyRoman idea of deification into its narrative—but, in closing, let us take a closer look at this particular poem, to see whether a positive example might be hiding in it.

Eclogue 5, although its representation of a deified Daphnis that looks suspiciously like an allegory for Julius Caesar introduces a quintessentially Roman theme, does not, like *Eclogues* 4 and 6, become something generically unidentifiable as pastoral in the process. On the contrary, the poem is in many ways "conventional" and "can be read as a self-contained and homogeneous pastoral".[134] Moreover, its representation of community is also marked by unity and good will: though Mopsus and Menalcas speak of Mopsus' poetic vying with the herdsman Amyntas, the two singers depicted in this eclogue are eager to recognize each other's skill (4, 8, 18, 45-52, 81-84), and share their songs not in competition, but merely in order to share with one another. This unanimity and community is emphasized in the poem's opening, when Menalcas suggests that they sing "because we two good men have come together" (*boni quoniam convenimus ambo*), and guaranteed without a doubt in the happy exchange of gifts at the poem's end, Menalcas giving Mopsus his own pipe (85-87)—with which he seems to have composed the songs already sung in *Eclogues* 2 and 3—and Mopsus passing down a beautiful Hesiodic staff, almost as a bequeathal and recognition of poetic skill and primacy (88-90). This, if anything, is the picture of integration: a sense of community is fostered even amidst competitive tendencies, and the introduction of material "foreign" to pastoral's generic make-up does not change *pastoral*, but is accommodated to fit its new environment. Just as Menalcas and Mopsus sit "among elms intermixed with hazels" (*hic corulis mixtas inter consedimus ulmos*, 5.3), this eclogue, at least, seems to proffer the possibility of integration.

This chapter has introduced several places in Vergil's *Eclogues* where it becomes clear that Vergil intends to engage in his pastoral collection with a so-called *dialectics of acculturation*, to represent on the page the various struggles and successes that faced Italian-born Roman citizens as they attempted to integrate aspects of their local identities, associated with their place of birth, with a new-found Roman civic and legal identity. This is clear from the very beginning of the collection in *Eclogue* 1, where Meliboeus' concern with leaving the *patria* ushers a tension between the conerns of the Ciceronian *germana patria*—one's local *origo*—and the *patria communis*, Rome. The distance that is built up in the *Eclogues* between the local pastoral landscape and a towering Rome that threatens to encroach from without—especially through the constructions of nativity and alterity in the ideas of *patria*, *barbarus*, and *advena*—urge the reader to associate the primary perspective of the *Eclogues* with a local perspective, a concern for the smaller locales of Italy and their cultural identity as opposed to the cultural hegemony of Rome. One these tensions and oppositions are recognized, a reader of the *Eclogues* begins to be able to see that the individual poems read as acculturative scripts for the individual bicultural Italian-Roman subject, variously exploring the successes or failures of the different acculturative strategies introduced from Berry's psychological research in the Introduction: assimilation, separation, marginalization, and integration. Taken together, the representations of acculturation that the *Eclogues* provide demonstrate not only the difficulty of cultural integration and the overcoming of acculturative stress, they also demonstrate the almost limitless variety of different responses of those facing acculturation. It is the representation of this acculturative struggle –

[134] Coleman 1977: 172.

rather than any single solution to it—that Vergil is concerned to display: to create an understanding of the variety of possible experience of Italian acculturation, rather than to prescribe any sort of panacea to take the pain away.

Chapter Three

Cultus

My family's experience isn't fodder
for artwork, says Nature in btwn make outs

But you'll drink yourself to sleep?

Who is the "I" but its inheritances—Let's play a game

Let's say Halliburton is the San Diego Flume Company
and I am descended from a long line of wildfires
I mean tribal leaders

The Cuyamaca Flume transported mountain runoff and river water into the heart of San Diego. Construction began illegally, in secret, in the 1880s. The creek bed dried. The plants died. The very best citizens of San Diego called it "deluded sentimentality" to give Indians any land or water. As if these are *things*, stuff to be owned or sold off

I am missing many cousins, have you seen them?

The sadness is systematic. Suspicion is the lesson that sticks. I forget

When Pio was young, he tended sheep. The flock numbered a couple thousand strong, and he herded them across the four corners of San Diego County

Drought makes us restless, searching for nourishing territory

Ventura kept horses. He used them to ferry NDN ppl across the county's mountain trails, like the first reservation taxi driver. You cd say that, like his father, Ventura had a flock. They both went on to become chiefs

Sometime much later comes me

— Tommy Pico, *Nature Poem*[1]

At the beginning of the *Georgics*, Vergil gives a brief yet detailed summary of what is to come, listing the topic of each of the four upcoming books in turn within the poem's first four lines (*G.* 1.1-5):[2]

1 Pico 2017: 43-44.
2 The broad outline of the poem given in this opening précis has long been noted by scholars and critics of the *Georgics*, from Servius ('*et sciendum quattuor primis versibus textum sequentium quattuor librorum per ordinem*

Quid faciat laetas segetes, quo sidere terram 1
vertere, Maecenas, ulmisque adiungere vitis
conveniat, quae cura boum, qui cultus habendo
sit pecori, apibus quanta experientia parcis,
hinc canere incipiam. 5

What makes the crops flourish; what season to unsettle 1
the land, Maecenas, and to marry the vines to elms, as
custom calls; what care exists for oxen, what cultivation in
tending a flock, what learned skill midst thrifty bees—
from here I start to sing.[3] 5

As far as agricultural didactic goes, Vergil's professed areas of interest would seem to be fairly standard, even uninteresting: fertile crops (*laetas segetes*); plouging (*terram vertere*); the raising of vines and trees (*ulmisque adiungere vitis*); care of cows and flocks (*cura*; *cultus*); and beekeeping (*apibus ... experientia parcis*). Yet, as with the opening of Vergil's other poems, the proem to the *Georgics* goes beyond simply enumerating the various subjects the poem will treat: it also subtly introduces much deeper programmatic concerns,[4] issues that strike at the very core of Vergil's poem: the dialectic between productivity and happiness, the effect of changes on place and identity, and the inherent value of civilization and progress to human society—all of which, we will see, are intimately connected to the dialectics of Italian-Roman acculturation.

While all this might seem like a great deal to introduce in what is really a simple list of agricultural topics, Vergil sets up the thematic stakes of his poem through careful word choice, using a number of words and phrases—*laetus*, *terram vertere, cura, cultus*—whose broader social and cultural implications can't help but be read into the specialized agricultural meanings existing on the poem's surface. The opening indirect question, for example—*quid faciat laetas segetes*—brings immediately to the fore the question of the poem's ultimate goal and purpose, particularly in its use of the predicative *laetas*. *Laetas*, which Servius equates here with *pingues* and Servius Auctus glosses as *fertiles, fecundas*, is surely to be read principally in its agricultural meaning of "fruitful, abundant"—"its primary, though somewhat less common, meaning".[5] Even so, it is difficult to avoid importing into the text *laetus*' much more common affective meaning—"glad, joyful"—a sense of the word occurring frequently in the poem,[6] and one which, read here, gives a first hint of the personification of inanimate and non-human beings which will become so common in the

contineri", "and one should recognize that in the first four verses the structure of the four following books is delineated in sequential order", Serv. ad *G.* 1.1), to Thomas ("The four books are summarized in four lines", Thomas 1988a: 68 ad *G.* 1.1-4) and Nappa ("These verses have long been seen as providing a book by book summary of the poem", Nappa 2005: 23).

3 The text of the *Georgics* throughout is that of Thomas 1988a. All translations of the *Georgics* are my own.

4 This deeper thematic engagement of the proem is much less discussed in the scholarship than the more straight-forward summary of the book-by-book subject matter; nevertheless, see: Putnam 1979: 18; Miles 1980: 64-65; Spofford 1981: 1-4; Batstone 1988: 230-38; Jenkyns 1998: 323-31; Nappa 2005: 23-24.

5 Thomas 1988a: 69 ad 1.1. See also *TLL* s.v. *laetus*, I, A, 1: "*praevalet notio ubertatis ... proprie in re rustica ... in agro colendo*" (7.2.883.79-80). Cf. Serv. ad *G.* 1.74: *'laetus' prout res fuerit accipe, ut 'laetus homo' id est hilaris; 'laetum pecus', id est pingue; 'laetum legumen' ... fertile*.

6 E.g., for farmers and country folk: 1.301, 2.383, 3.320; sailors: 1.304; Scythians: 3.375, 3.379; other living beings: 1.412 (ravens); 1.423 (flocks); 2.520 (hogs); 4.55 (bees).

course of the poem. The tension between the two senses of *laetus*—"a word that connotes both biological fertility and emotional happiness"[7]—reproduces a greater uncertainty regarding the poem's status as, on the one hand, an agricultural handbook aiming at didactic utility and productivity and, on the other, a work concerned ultimately with affective, subjective experience.[8] *Experientia*, meanwhile, the mark of the frugal bees at list's end (1.4), exhibits a similar strain in meaning,[9] between the subjectively endured trials or attempts that lead to learning,[10] and the usable knowledge eventually gained from such experiences.[11]

Terram vertere, meanwhile—Vergil's periphrasis for ploughing[12]—also contains more than it would initially seem. Thrice used in place of *arare* in this book,[13] and perhaps masking references to both translation and a poetic signature by Vergil,[14] *terram vertere* might also be read more literally to mean "change territory", thereby signposting the dislocations of place and identity experienced as the local Italian subject works to situate themself between their various cultural identities. It is exactly the discontinuity and fragility of identity brought on by change of place that so distresses Meliboeus in *Ecl.* 1 and the political exile at the end of *Georgics* 2, both forced to leave their homeland and seek a new one. More broadly, the question of how to view and understand change is a prominent theme of the *Georgics*, whether it be the change Ceres effected from acorn-gathering to agriculture,[15] the changes to the herd when buying or selling,[16] or the changes to soil, plant, and identity that occur during grafting and transplantation.[17] These issues of change and identity as related to grafting are gestured at in Vergil's half-line summary of *Georgics* 2: *ulmisque adiungere vitis*. The phrase, itself referring to the so-called "marriage" of vines to supporting elm trees,[18] not only notionally and terminologically resembles the language of grafting in the poem,[19] it also looks ahead to passages in the *Aeneid* that thematize the blending and incorporation of peoples.[20]

7 Nappa 2005: 23.
8 As, for example, Putnam 1979.
9 Nappa 2005: 24 notes that *experientia*, *cura,* and *cultus* are "all words that have an agricultural dimension but can apply equally to human beings and the human condition". See below on *cura* and, especially, *cultus*.
10 *TLL* s.v. *experientia*, I: "*periclitatio, probatio, temptatio*" (5.2.1651.74).
11 *TLL* s.v. *experientia*, II: "*peritia, scientia, notitia sim. ex usu collecta*" (5.2.1652.14-15).
12 Serv. Auct. ad 1.2: *TERRAM VERTERE:* περιφραστικῶς *arare.* Also Erren 2003, ad loc.: "*terram vertere*, anschaulich für *arare*." Neither Thomas 1988a nor Mynors 1990 comment specifically on *terram vertere*.
13 In addition to here, the phrase is employed at 1.119 (*versando terram*) and 1.147 (*vertere terram*) in the poem.
14 See Katz 2008, esp. 112-116. Katz gives an in-depth discussion of the opening of the *Georgics*' debt to the Hellenistic poet Aratus and the opening of his *Phaenomena*, including of how *terram vertere*, via allusion to *Phaen.* 1-2, marks itself off as a translation of Aratus in the use of *vertere*, a technical term for translation (cf. *G.* 3.148: *oestrum Grai vertere vocantes*; *pace* Thomas 1988a ad loc., who rejects *vertere* as "translate"). Katz argues not only that Vergil signals his debt to Aratus through the circumlocution *terram vertere* (= *arare*, "whose past participle is, of course, *aratus*" [113]), but also hides a reference to his own gentilicial *Vergilius* in *vertere* at 1.2, the same point in the *Phaen.* where Aratus hides his own "unspoken" poetic signature in ἄρρητον (~ Ἄρατος).
15 *G.* 1.8: *Chaoniam pingui glandem mutavit arista*. Cf. 1.118-19 (*haec cum sint hominumque boumque labores versando terram experti*) and 1.147-49 (*Prima Ceres ferro mortalis vertere terram instituit, cum iam glandes atque arbuta sacrae deficerent silvae*); both passages are in Vergil's narrative of the aetiology of *labor*, the same mythohistorical moment from 1.7-9).
16 *G.* 3.69: *semper erunt quarum mutari corpora malis.*
17 *G.* 2.31-33: *et saepe alterius ramos impune videmus vertere in alterius mutatamque insita mala ferre pirum*; 2.49-50: *siquis inserat aut scrobibus mandet mutata subactis*. Cf. *G.* 2.265-68: *ac si quos haud ulla viros vigilantia fugit, ante locum similem exquirunt, ubi prima paretur arboribus seges et quo mox digesta feratur, mutatam ignorent subito ne semina matrem* (=*solum*).
18 Serv. Auct. ad *G.* 1.2: *hoc autem rustici maritare dicunt*. Cf. Thomas 1988a: 69 ad loc.
19 E.g.: *inserere* (2.33, 50, 73); *imponere* (2.73); *includere, inolescere* (2.77); *immittuntur* (2.80).
20 *Aen.* 7.7.236-38: *multae ... et petiere sibi et voluere adiungere gentes*. Cf. *Aen.* 7.56-57, where Amata desires Turnus to marry Lavinia (*Turnus ... quem regia coniunx adiungi generum miro properabat amore*), and *Aen.* 12.821-25, Juno's

The most significant thematic terms, however, lie at the center of this textual nexus: *cura* and *cultus*. Like *laetus* and *experientia* above, both terms cover wide enough a semantic field so as to maintain a noticeable ambiguity. *Cura* is most easily understood here in its technical meaning of the "care, charge, supervision" of cattle,[21] a "key notion" in Book 3,[22] where *cura* is the term used to describe the care proper to the raising of bovine/equine "mothers" and "fathers", calves, and dogs;[23] the word is also used in the poem for the care and growing of lentils, vines, willow groves, and gardens.[24] Yet *cura*'s semantic sphere, like that of *laetus*, also includes a strong affective dimension, a sense recorded in ancient etymologists as early as Vergil's contemporary Varro, who explains that *cura*'s form is as it is *quod cor urat*, "because it burns the heart".[25] In Vergil, this more emotive sense of *cura* is found pointing to a range of different referents, from an object of pleasant affection, as Tityrus' wood pigeons or wool as a potential agricultural product in *Georgic 2*;[26] to the focus of amorous of familial love, as Gallus' Lycoris or Aristaeus in the eyes of his mother Cyrene;[27] to the toils and anxieties of life with which Jupiter sharpens mortal hearts (from which winter is a brief respite), and which Cyrene invites Aristaeus to lay down at *Georgics*' end.[28] In the *Georgics*, these many senses of *cura* often blend and bleed into one another: thus, in a phrase such as *si tibi lanitium curae*, it can be difficult to decide whether wool is a "responsibility", "delight", or "trouble" to the reader. Likewise, when Arethusa identifies Aristaeus to Cyrene as *tua maxima cura*, she points out Aristaeus not only as the greatest object of his mother's love, but also the central locus of her responsibility, caretaking, and anxiety. *Cura*, then—like *laetus*—hides a strong affective dimension: Vergil will not sing only of what the raising and husbandry of cattle looks like, but also of the delight and affection that accompanies such care, and the potential anxieties and pitfalls one encounters in the process of effecting that *cura*.

Cultus is arguably an even more central concept to Vergil's didactic than *cura*—γεωργικά is really *agri cultura*, after all, as the title of Cato's earlier treatise on farming reminds us—as well as one with an even wider array of possible meanings. The first-listed meaning of *cultus* in the TLL, as an active verbal derivative of *colere* ("*actus colendi*"), is essentially homonymous with *cura*—"*curatio, tractatio, diligentia*"[29]—with all the various agricultural senses the first-listed (and thus primary) meanings under this wider umbrella of

final request to Jupiter that he *not* let the Latins' name, language or dress change once they've been joined in treaty with the Trojans: *cum iam conubiis pacem felicibus (esto) component, cum iam leges et foedera iungent, ne vetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos neu Troas fieri iubeas Teucrosque vocari aut vocem mutare viros aut vertere vestem*.

21 *TLL* s.v. *cura*, I ("*studium, labor, opera, industria, diligentia*", 4.0.1452.41-2); I, B, 2 ("*cultus, cultura, curatio, custodia*", 4.0.1464.20); and, in particular I, B, 2, a ("*in re rustica*", 4.0.1464.20-1).

22 Thomas 1988a ad 1.3.

23 *G.* 3.138-9: *cura patrum cadere et succedere matrum incipit*; 3.157: *post partum cura in vitulos traducitur omnis*; 3.404: *nec tibi cura canum fuerit postrema*.

24 *G.* 1.228: *nec Pelusiacae curam aspernabere lentis*; 2.397: *est etiam ille labor curandis vitibus alter*; 2.415: *incultique exercet cura salicti*; 4.118-9: *pinguis hortos quae cura colendi*.

25 *DLL* 6.46. Cf. Paul. Fest. 50: '*dicta est quasi coreda vel quia cor urat*,' "*cura* is so-called as if it were *coreda*, something that eats away at the heart, or because it burns the heart"; and ps.-Fronto *Gramm*. 7.528.1: '*cura animi est quae anxium facit hominem et tam honestae quam inhonestae rei est*,' "*cura*, with respect to the spirit, is a thing that makes a person anxious, and is spoken properly of an honorable thing as much as of a dishonorable one."

26 *Ecl.* 1.56: *raucae tua cura palumbes* (for the poetic word order here, variously termed parenthetical apposition, *schema Cornelianum*, and inserted apposition, see Solodow 1986); *G.* 3.384: *si tibi lanitium curae*.

27 *Ecl.* 10.22: *tua cura Lycoris*; *G.* 4.354: *tua maxima cura, tristis Aristaeus*.

28 *G.* 1.123: *curis acuens mortalia corda*; *G.* 1.302: *invitat genialis hiems resolvitque curas*; *G.* 4.531: *'nate, licet tristi animo deponere curas*'.

29 *TLL* s.v. *cultus*, I (4.0.1325.11) and I, A (4.0.1325.11-12). Cf. *OLD* s.v. *cultus*2, 2 & 4.

significations.[30] Another primary but notionally distinct definition of *cultus* is that which the TLL defines as *veneratio*, *officium*, *honos*: this *cultus* may be directed toward men or country,[31] but it most often points toward the Ciceronian *cultus deorum*, that ultimate mark of pious veneration of the gods.[32] *Cultus* also indicates the umbrella of designations covered by "personal care and maintenance", "style of dress or ornament", or "the state of being adorned":[33] thus the meaning most common in elegy and in scholarship on Roman dress, fashion, and hairstyles.[34] Finally, descended from all these more precise meanings comes the more general, yet extremely important, metaphorical senses, the series of significations that point to the ideas of personal cultivation, cultural development, and the progress of civilization: thus, *cultus* can be used to refer to the education of children or adults,[35] or more generally to "the refining or elaborating (of standards of living, etc.) ... the state of being refined, a civilized or sophisticated condition".[36] It is from this last-listed meaning of *cultus* that develops one privileged and rather circumscribed modern idea of "culture"—in particular, "the enlightenment and excellence of taste acquired by intellectual and aesthetic training : the intellectual and artistic content of civilization : refinement in manners, taste, thought".[37] *Cultus*, then, contains within it an essential ambiguity between the practical and objective, on the one hand—the care and raising of crops, trees, cattle, bees, etc.—and the experiential and subjective, on the other: the idea of *cultus* as culture or civilization, an assumption or bestowal of refinement or humanity more wholly dependent on contemporary cultural standards and norms than on objective measures of progress, civilization, or value.

The effect these ever-present ambiguities in the poem—*laetus, terram vertere, cura, cultus*—is to transform the poem into much more than simply an agricultural didactic: it becomes, in addition, a profound and urgent exploration of the relationship between origin and identity, between culture and progress, and of the value that each of these holds. These various constructions—productivity, change, civilization, culture—hold incredible relevance for Vergil's so-called dialectics of acculturation, the examination of the Italian-Roman bicultural subject's incorporation that we have already begun to explore in the previous chapter. Whereas the scenes laid out in the *Eclogues* serves as small-scale, narrative demonstrations of the possible playing out of various acculturative strategies—marginalization, assimilation, separation—the *Georgics* is an attempt to discover what a successful *integration* of Roman and local Italian might look like—that is, in Berry's acculturative terms, a Roman-Italian integration that preserves an attachment to both heritage culture and the adopted culture, where these cultural streams are equally balanced without marginalization, separation, or over-assimilation. In the *Georgics*, Vergil is ultimately concerned with the questions of whether this ideal integration of local Italian and Roman civic

[30] *TLL* s.v. *cultus*, I, A, 1, a ("*i. q. agricultura*", 4.0.1325.16ff.), I, A, 2 ("*de bestiis*", 4.0.1327.22ff.).
[31] *TLL* s.v. *cultus*, I, B ("*veneratio, officium, honos*", 4.0.1329.20) and I, B, 1 ("*de hominibus, patria, sim.*", 4.0.1329.22).
[32] *TLL* s.v. *cultus*, I, B, 2 ("*de deis*") Cf. Cic. *de Natura Deorum* 1.117: ... *religionem, quae deorum cultu pio continetur*. Cf. also 2.8: ... *religione, id est cultu deorum*. See also: *OLD* s.v. *cultus*2, 10 & 12.
[33] *OLD*, s.v. *cultus*2, 4 & 5 (with quoted definitions corresponding to 4a, 5b, and 5c, respectively). Cf. *TLL* s.v. *cultus* I, A, 3, b ("*corporis curatio, exornatio*", 4.0.1328.12ff); II, A, 2, b ("*corporis habitus, vestitus, ornatus sim.*", 4.0.1333.82ff.); and II, C ("*res quae cultui vel ornatui sunt*", 4.0.1337.59ff.) and II, C, 1, a ("*ornamenta, insignia*", 4.0.1337.61ff.).
[34] E.g. Toner 2015: "...*cultus*, that difficult umbrella term that related to all manner of adornment and refinement" (92). Cf. Edmonson & Keith 2008 (*passim*), Greco 2006, Ghiselli 2005, Watson 2001, Hälikkä 2001.
[35] *OLD*, s.v. *cultus*2, 3. Cf. *TLL* s.v. *cultus* I, A, 3, and especially I, A, 3, a ("*i. q. educatio*", 4.0.1327.66ff.).
[36] *OLD*, s.v. *cultus*2, 9. Cf. *TLL*. s.v. *cultus* II, B ("*status cultior, decor, elegantia, magnificentia*", 4.0.1336.56ff.), and especially II, B, 2 ("*hominis: i.q. vitae elegantia, humanitas*", 4.0.1337.39).
[37] Merriam-Webster's Unabridged Dictionary Online, s.v. *culture*, sense 4a. <unabridged.merriam-webster.com>

culture is possible, and what its successes and possible failures might look like. The thematic concerns laid out in the proem, meanwhile, occupy such a privileged place because they are the central issues upon which this successful integration depends: is it possible to combine the natural and the cultivated, the the local and the collective, in a way that preserves the original character of both, without incurring such great change that the original identities are lost? Do cultivation and civilization merely bring about betterment and increased productivity, or do they entail essential and unavoidable social and cultural changes?

These are the questions and issues in Vergil's *Georgics* that this chapter will begin to confront. The chapter begins by exploring those places where the ideas of Roman identity and local Italian identity are set down explicitly in the poem, and especially those passages where they occur in close range. These textual *loci* fill out the oppositions between urban and rural we began to explore in the *Eclogues* by making explicit the fact that that these tensions and polarities are those attached to real Italian locales with their own histories of interaction and even conlict with Rome. This discussion culminates in an exploration of the *laudes Italiae*, Vergil's most explicit extended exploration of what Roman-Italian integration might look like, and one that introduces, for the first time, the possibility of a type of collective identity unconnected to Rome, a pan-ethnic Italian identity pictures the various local populations of Italy as united through their identity as *Italians*, but not necessarily Italian *Romans*. From here, the chapter opens up onto a broader discussion of the interplay between cultivated (*cultus*) and uncultivated or natural (*incultus; natura*) growth in the *Georgics*, a polarity which saturates the poem and plays directly into the Ciceronian idea of *germana patria* as the natural, uncultivated place of origin, against the *patria communis* as a cultivated, engineered system which is not "natural" in the same sense, but a human-made system dependent on adoption and incorporation of individuals into a collective. This study of the natural and cultivated, of the *incultus* and *cultus*, culminates in a case-study on the figure of grafting in the *Georgics*, itself often used a metaphor for the integration of cultural streams in the bi- or multi-cultural subject. The consequences of this discussion are far-reaching, looking ahead even to the end of the *Aeneid*, as well as the even more in-depth study of symbolic indigeneity that will be the topic of the third and final chapter of this study.

Romana per oppida*: Roman-Italian Integration in the *Georgics

We have already seen above how Vergil, in the *Georgics*' proem, lays out key thematic elements—productivity, change, civilization—for analyzing the relationship between local and Roman elements in the poem. That the poet means for his poem to be divided equally between these two perspectives is also made clear in the work's opening, specifically in the invocation of various gods and Augustus into which Vergil immediately launches after the proem; I copy here select lines from the 38-line invocation (1.5-42):

hinc canere incipiam. vos, o clarissima mundi
lumina, labentem caelo quae ducitis annum;
Liber et alma Ceres, vestro si munere tellus
Chaoniam pingui glandem mutavit arista,
poculaque inventis Acheloia miscuit uvis;
et vos, agrestum praesentia numina, Fauni,
...
tuque adeo, quem mox quae sint habitura deorum

concilia incertum est, urbisne invisere, Caesar,
terrarumque velis curam, et te maximus orbis
auctorem frugum tempestatumque potentem
accipiat cingens materna tempora myro;
...
da facilem cursum atque audacibus adnue coeptis,
ignarosque viae mecum miseratus agrestis
ingredere et votis iam nunc adsuesce vocari.

... from here I begin to sing. You, o brightest lights
in the sky, who lead down the falling year from the sky;
Liber and nourishing Ceres, if by your office the earth
has exchanged the Dodonian acorn with rich head of wheat,
and mixed Achelous' cups with grapes' discoveries;
and you, Fauns, powers ever-present in our fields,
...
And you, too, whose upcoming place on the gods' councils
is still uncertain, Caesar: whether you wish to oversee the
cities and care of the lands, and the great world receives you
as increaser of its fruits and master of its seasons,
encircling your temples with a sprig of your mother's myrtle;
...
Grant an easy course and nod with favor upon bold beginnings,
and, pitying along with me the rustics, ignorant of the way,
set about your duties and even now grow used to prayer's entreaty.

This invocation is divided equally into two sections of 19 lines, the first addressed to a series of agricultural deities, the second to Augustus. The catalogue of twelve deities at 1.5-23, which begins with the sun and moon (5-6), then Liber and Ceres (7-9), is clearly modeled on Varro's catalogue of gods at the beginning of his first book of *De Re Rustica* (1.1.4-7), where these same deities constitute the second and third pairs of gods that Varro addresses.[38] What has passed unnoticed is that Varro introduces his own agricultural deities as an alternative, even in opposition, to the twelve "urban" gods (1.1.4-5):

> Et quoniam, ut aiunt, dei facientes adiuvant, prius invocabo eos, nec, ut Homerus et Ennius, Musas, sed duodecim deos Consentis; neque tamen eos urbanos, quorum imagines ad forum auratae sunt, sex mares et feminae totidem, sed illos XII deos, qui maxime agricolarum duces sunt.
>
> And since, as tradition holds, the gods help those who call upon them, I will first invoke them—not the Muses, as Homer and Ennius do, but the twelve councillor-gods; and I do not mean those urban gods, whose images stand around the forum, bedecked with gold, six male and a like number female, but those twelve gods who are the special patrons of husbandmen.[39]

[38] Thomas 1998 ad loc; Mynors 1990: 1 ad 1.1-42.
[39] The text and translation of Varro are from Hooper 1934.

Varro explicitly passes over first the Muses and the *Di Consentes*, the twelve major gods of the Romano-Etruscan pantheon, whom he identifies here with both the city (*urbanos*) and the forum; instead, he calls upon specifically rustic deities associated with farmers (*agricolarum*). Vergil's decision to begin his own agricultural treatise by alluding to Varro's opening is likely meant to position his own set of gods as counter-urban, a hypothesis supported also by Vergil's removal of two gods from Varro's catalogue who often appear in the standard Roman pantheon: Jupiter and Venus. Moreover, in Vergil's new ordering the first *named* deity is Liber, the poet using the specifically Italic appellation for Bacchus.[40] The remaining changes to Varro's list[41] seem to be primarily motivated by a desire for the catalogue to better reflect the coming poem's subject matter, seeing as Varro, in explaining the relevance of each pair, mentions only the cultivation of crops, vines, and trees.[42] Vergil, then, includes Pan, Silvanus, and the Fauns and Dryads to point to the topic of animal husbandry in the third book; Neptune to stand for the topic of horses in the same book; and the culture-hero Aristaeus to reference the art of beekeeping covered in the fourth book.

Vergil's invocation ends with another 19-line address to Octavian, who, in his appearance as the τρισκαιδέκατος θεός[43] in the list of invoked deities, "has virtually replaced the absent Jupiter".[44] This is the impression given also by the contemplation of the possible duties Octavian may assume on the gods' council (*tuque adeo, quem mox quae sint habitura deorum concilia incertum est*, 1.24-25), and by the final lines, which read as the culminating requests of a ritual prayer: *da facilem cursum ... adnue coeptis ... ingredere et uotis iam nunc adsuesce uocari* (40-42). Venus also returns in these lines, as we look forward to Octavian encircling his temples with myrtle, sacred to the mother of his line (*cingens materna tempora myrto*, 28); the myrtle was, of course, associated with Venus, who, as mother of Aeneas and grandmother of Iulus/Ascanius, stands in as "mother" of the entire Julian clan. Thus Jupiter and Venus, the two gods from Varro's invocation most associated with Rome, are transferred from the list of agricultural deities to the invocation of Octavian, who already stood in the first eclogue for the urban concerns of Rome against the concerns of local inhabitants. Octavian's alignment with the urban rather than the agricultural is demonstrated also in the fact that the first duty he might choose to take up is the oversight of the cities: *urbisne inuisere, Caesar, ... uelis* (25-6). Likewise, the request to "take pity on the rustics, ignorant of the way" (*ignarosque viae ... miseratus agrestis*, 40-1) positions Octavian somewhere above the residents of the countryside, a posturing which recalls vaguely the haughtiness of the urban Alexis, Nysa, and Daphnis in *Eclogues* 2 and 8. As a result, Vergil's partition of his opening invocation into 19 lines directed at expressly *non-urban* agricultural deities, headed by the Italian Liber and Ceres and rounded out by Silvanus, followed by an equal number of lines dedicated to Octavian, who is backed by Jupiter and Venus as the representative of the city of Rome, serves to divide the poem's attention equally between a local, Italian perspective and one privileging Rome as a shared and unified *patria communis*—a balance which sounds at first much like acculturative integration.

This integrative cointerpoise between the local Italian and Roman perspective proposed here is more than clear in another characteristic of the *Georgics* thematics, namely, in the poem's inability to leave the idea of Romanness or Rome unproblematized, whether it is the city or Octavian that is introduced.

[40] Thomas 1988a: 70 ad 1.7.
[41] Namely, the replacement of the gods Tellus, Robigus, Flora, Lympha, and Bonus Eventus.
[42] Cf. Peraki-Kyriakidou 2006, who sees similar metaliterary motivations in Vergil's list of gods.
[43] Mynors 1990: 2 ad 1.1-42.
[44] Thomas 1988a: 73 ad 1.24-42. Cf. Nappa 2005, who sees an extended association between Octavian and Jupiter such that all passages featuring the Jupiter may be read as didactic material intended for the future Augustus. It is unclear whether, in Nappa's reading, we are to assume Vergil had less clarity of vision for his agricultural didactic as he worked on the poem in the five or so years between roughly 36 and 31 BCE.

We began to explore this refusal of the *Georgics* to allow Roman superiority to remain unquestioned in the previous chapter, specifically in recognzing the multivalence of the significant term *patria* at the close of *Georgics* 2 and in Vergil's praise of Mantua in the proem to *Georgics* 3. The double invocation at the start of *Georgics* 1 is clearly another example, and this subversion and problematization of Rome's authority at the beginning of the book is, appropriately, balanced by another of Rome's juxtapositions with local or municipal perspectives at the end of the same book. At *Georgics* 1.463, Rome is mentioned for the first time since the opening invocation in a discussion of sun-signs, a passage that introduces the theme of Roman civil war and its destructive effects, a topic that will occupy the remainder of the poem (1.463-68):

> solem quis dicere falsum
> audeat? ille etiam caecos instare tumultus
> saepe monet fraudemque et operta tumescere bella;
> ille etiam exstincto miseratus Caesare Romam,
> cum caput obscura nitidum ferrugine texit
> impiaque aeternam timuerunt saecula noctem.
>
> Who would dare to call the sun false?
> The sun often gives warning even when unseen conflicts
> are nigh, when deceit and secret wars are brewing;
> he took pity on Rome, too, after Caesar was snuffed out,
> when he covered his shining head in purple gloom
> and irreverant ages feared everlasting night.

The introduction of Roman civil war for the first time in the *Georgics* recalls its intrusion into the narrative of *Eclogue* 1, where the Roman *barbarus miles* comes to repossess Meliboeus' land. That soldier was also called *impius*, in Vergil's only use of the word before this point; the adjective will return at the very end of Book 1 in the same context (*Mars impius*, 1.511) and at the end of Book 2 to describe the current reality of the Age of Iron (*impia ... gens*, 537). Each of these usages of *impius* reference not just any impiety, but wrongs brought about specifically by Roman civil conflict. Northern Italy, meanwhile, is one of the regions identified here in *Georgics* 1 as suffering civil war's ill effects: after Caesar's death, the Alps shake with unusual earthquakes (*insolitis tremuerunt motibus Alpes*, 1.475), and the Po, overflowing, rages down from the mountains and washes away forests, fields, and flocks (*silvas ... camposque per omnis ... armenta tulit*, 483). The poet makes it clear that it is not just Rome that suffers, but the sites of Italy as well.

This kind of perspectival split-vision between a Roman and a local viewpoint is most apparent in a second and final invocation just lines from the end of the book, when the poet calls upon a set of deities to make Augustus' presence a blessing for Rome and its citizens (1.498-501):

> di patrii Indigetes et Romule Vestaque mater,
> quae Tuscum Tiberim et Romana Palatia servas,
> hunc saltem everso iuvenem succurrere saeclo
> ne prohibete!
>
> Ancestral gods, *Indigetes*, and Romulus and mother Vesta,
> she who watches over the Tuscan Tiber and the Roman Palatine,

prevent not, at the very least, that this young man bring aid 500
to an overturned age.

Alongside the address of Rome's founder Romulus and preserving goddess Vesta—both consummately Roman figures—the poet also directs his address to the curious *di patrii Indigetes*. We have already seen that *patrius* is a significant word for Vergil,[45] ambiguous as it is—if used in reference to *patria*—as to whether it points to one's local origin or to Rome as a collective fatherland. Intriguing, too, is the use of the murky and much-debated term *Indigetes*, a reference to a set of deities whose origin and significance were already unclear in antiquity.[46] Whatever their original function and identity,[47] it is clear by the late Republic the *Indigites* were overwhelmingly understood to refer to "indigenous or native gods, as opposed to imported or foreign gods",[48] an interpretation helped along by a perceived etymological connection between the *Indigetes* and terms like *indigenus*.[49] It also seems clear from the text that *di patrii Indigetes* is meant to be

[45] See the discussion of *patria* and *patrius* in the previous chapter.
[46] Tarrant 2012: 292 ad *Aen.* 12.794. Cf. Mynors 1990: 96 ad loc.: "The original meaning of the word was lost by Varro's time, and is still under discussion".
[47] On the question of the identity and etymology of the *di Indigetes*, see, *inter alia*: Wissowa 1904; Koch 1933; Altheim 1938; Wagenvoort 1947: 83ff.; Latte 1960: 43-5; Dury-Moyaers 1981: 211ff.; Dumézil 1996: 94ff.; Oakley 1997 ad Livy 8.9.6; Myers 2009: 154-55 ad Ovid *Met.* 14.445ff.; Tarrant 2012: 292 ad *Aen.* 12.794; *OCD*4 s. v. *indigetes*. For the most comprehensive summary of the scholarship on this question, see Bömer's 1986 commentary on Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, ad *Met.* 14.445ff. For more recent scholarship (and a hypothesized etymology from PIE **Heyĝʰ/Hiĝʰ-* "desire", see Zavaroni 2006. Adkins & Adkins 1996 define *Indigetes* as a "collective term used by the Romans for a group of Roman deities" (107), perhaps mainly indicating deities of an extremely limited function, such as the early-childhood deities Cinxia (goddess of girdle-loosening), Abeona (goddess of children's first steps), and Edusa (god of early eating); the term in this sense is often connected to the *indigitamenta*, the lists of deities and their prescribed method of address and worship ascribed to Numa (Servius ad *G.* 1.21; cf. Tert. *Apol.* 25, Arn. *Adv. nat.* 2.73, Censorinus *DN* 3.2-3, Macrob. *Sat.* 1.18.4. Festus identified the *Indigetes* as "those gods whose names is it not allowed to speak openly" (*dii, quorum nomina vulgari non licet*, Lindsay 1913: 94.13 [=106-107M.]).
[48] Adkins & Adkins 1996: 107. Cf. Dumézil 1996: 95, n. 6. This interpretation is often justified by the juxtaposition of the *di Indigetes* with the *di Novensiles/Novensides*, a similarly opaque term that has sometimes been connected etymologically to *novum*, "new"; Dumézil sees the *di Novensiles* as "newer" gods, such as the Trojan gods brought by Aeneas mentioned at Ovid *Met.* 15.861 (*di, precor, Aeneas comites*), whereas the *di Indigetes* are older, native gods (Dumezil 1996). The *di Indigetes* in this collective sense are not individually identified, but usually included in a list of other collective deities: Livy 8.9.6, Ovid *Met.* 15.862, and here at *G.* 1.498. Cf. Festus (Lindsay 1913: 94.19-21). For the question of the etymology of *Indigetes* and *Novensiles/Novensides*: Wissowa 1904: 175ff.; Wissowa 1912: 18ff.; Vetter 1956; Sabbatucci 1988; Dumézil 1996; Ernout-Meillet 42001 s.v. *indiges*; & Zavaroni 2006. Vetter 1956 sees the root *agere* in *indigetes*, as does Wissowa 1904/1912, who proposes *indigetes* (< *indu-agere*) as equivalent in meaning to *indigeni*. Dumézil 1997/1996 and Ernout Meillet 42001 each propose a distinction between the *indigetes* as national or natural and the the *novensiles* (< *novum*) as foreign, new, or naturalized; so too Zavaroni 2006:194-5. For another passage that juxtaposes *patrii* and *indigetes* as here at *G.* 1.498, see Diomedes Grammaticus (Keils 476.17): *Numam Pompilium divina re praeditum hunc pedem pontificium appellasse memorant, cum Salios iuniores aequis gressibus circulantes induceret* et *spondeo melo patrios placaret indigetes*. Servius likewise reports that some considered there to be an equivalence between *di patrii* and *di indigetes*: *alii patrios deos indigetes dici debere tradunt* (Serv. Ad *Aen.* 12.794).
[49] As, for example, the glossarist Placidus' classification of the *di indigetes* as *naturales*, placed in opposition to the *di caelestes* (Plac. 27.19). A perceived etymological connection between *indiges* and *indigenus* also seems clear in the close juxtaposition of *Indigetem Aenean* (12.794) and *indigenas Latinos* (12.823) in Juno's prophecy of the integration of the Trojans and Latins in Aeneid 12, an episode upon which Richard Tarrant comments: "The

understood as a separate group from—that is, to not contain—the pair of Romulus and Vesta.[50] In that case, if one looks closer, one finds an interesting balance in the first two lines of the passage (1.498-9):

di patrii Indigetes	et Romule Vestaque mater,
quae *Tuscum Tiberim*	et Romana Palatia seruas

If we take Vergil to mean by the *di patrii Indigetes* some group of local or native deities that are closely connected to location, the phrase here is a sort of open reference pointing distributively to any number of local deities and sacral traditions, from the ancestral gods of the site of Rome, to those around the Latian Numicus, or Arpinum,[51] to those of Sicilian Agrigentum,[52] or Persia,[53] even Troy.[54] Whereas *di patrii Indigetes* gesture toward innumerable sets of local gods throughout Italy, Romulus and Vesta in the second half of the line are deities explicitly connected with Rome;[55] thus, depending on the deixis of *patrii*, the

transformation of A[eneas] into an Italian divinity anticipates the fusion of Trojan and native peoples ordained by Jupiter later in the episode" (Tarrant 2012: 292). Cf., too, Livy's story of Aeneas' transformation into *Iupiter Indiges* at the river Numicus, which stresses the incorporation of the *Aborigines* (1.1.5, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.4, 1.2.5) and the Trojan *advenae* (1.1.5, 1.1.7, 1.2.1) into a single Latin people (1.2.4: *Latinos utramque gentem appellavit*): The change of Aeneas into Jupiter *Indiges* upon the native Laurentian river Numicus marks his transformation from Trojan foreigner to native—aboriginal, indigenous—deity of the land. See also: Tib. 2.5.41-44, Ovid *Met.* 14.608, Lucan 1.556, Silius Italicus 8.39. The association of Aeneas with the Numican cult of *Sol/Jupiter Indigetes* seems to be the main reason for Servius' defining the *di indigetes* as properly referring to deified mortals (*indigetes proprie sunt dii ex hominibus facti*, ad *G.* 1.498; *vel certe indigetes sunt dii ex hominibus facti*, ad *Aen.*794), a definition he twice etymologizes as coming from *in diis agentes* (ibid.). In this vein, Vetter 1956: 29 proposes that the *di indigetes* were "Geister der Verstorbenen, *qui funere publico elati sunt et quibus publice inferiae mittuntur*," while Sabbatucci 1988: 258 claims they were deceased Roman kings worshiped as deities; see above note. In reality, this is just one of several clarifications (and etymologies) Servius gives for the *Indigetes*, including that they are simply "invoked" deities (*ab invocatione ... quod 'indigeto' est precor et invoco*, ad *Aen.* 12.794), and that *Indigetes* can refer to all gods (albeit catachrestically: *abusive*) because gods are "lacking for no thing" (*nullius rei egentes*, ad *G.* 1.498). The 8th-century glossarist Placidus connects the association with divine mortals and the etymology from *egere*, stating "*indiges* refers sometimes to demi-gods ... because they lack divinity" (*indiges dicitur interdum hemitheus ... ab indigendo divinitate*, Plac. 27.19); the same men are called *divini* when still men (*cum homines fuerint*, ibid.).

[50] Mynors 1994: 96 ad 1.498ff.:; also Richter 1957: 180 ad 1.498ff. Richter and Mynors both suggest that the *Indigetes* remain unnamed here, with Richter specifically indicating that "das folgende *et* beweist wenigstens für diese Stelle, daß Romulus-Quirinus nicht zum *Indigetes*-Kreis zählt". Thomas 1988a and Paratore 1947, on the other hand, suggest. that *di patrii Indigetes* refer to two groups of deities—"ancestral gods" (*di patrii*) and "heroes of the land" (*Indigetes*).

[51] Cf. Cicero's discussion of his *germana patria* at *De Leg.* 2.3: *hic sacra, hic genus, hic maiorum multa vestigia.*

[52] One of the only attestations of *di patrii* prior to Vergil is from Cicero's *Verrines*, where, after describing Verres' violent theft of a statue of Hercules from a temple in Agrigentum, the orator notes that there was an uproar throughout the town that the ancestral gods (*deos patrios*) were under siege: *interea ex clamore fama tota urbe percrebruit expugnari deos patrios* (*Verr.* II.4.94). Likewise, at *Verr.* II.1.7, Cicero's claim that the *di patrii* were seizing Verres for punishment (*rapiunt eum ad supplicium di patrii*) also seems to reference local gods, while also being non-specific enough to include the *Roman* gods, also vindictive towards Verres for his treatment of Roman citizens.

[53] Quintus Curtius Rufus, *History of Alexander* 4.10.34, where the Achaemenid king Darius III prays to his *di patrii* that no other man (including Alexander) should be made king of Asia: *'di patrii,' inquit, 'primum mihi stabilite regnum; deinde, si de me iam transactum est, precor ne quis potius Asiae rex sit quam iste tam iustus hostis, tam misericors victor.*'

[54] *Aen.* 2.702-3: *di patrii, servate domum, servate nepotem; vestrum hoc augurium, vestroque in numine Troia est*; *Aen.* 9.247: *di patrii, quorum semper sub numina Troia est*. These are the only other two occurrence of *di patrii* in Vergil.

[55] The cult of Vesta, of course, was reported to have come from Alba (Livy 1.20.3: *virginesque Vestae legit, Alba oriundum sacerdotium et genti conditoris haud alienum*), and before that from Troy (e.g. Ovid *Fasti* 6.227: *Iliaca ... Vesta*).

whole line can either refer to Rome, or be split between (non-Roman) local gods and Roman ones. Yet the following line favors this second interpretation—for it, too, is divided between a regional and a Roman reference: in the first half of the line to Tuscany and the river Tiber's origins there, and, in the second, to the Palatine hill in the middle of Rome. The Palatine, of course, was arguably the most Roman of the city's hills: the hill was not only associated with Romulus' early upbringing[56] and said to be the hill from which he participated in the famous augural contest with Remus,[57] but it is also called by Livy "the quarter of the original Romans".[58] The Tiber, on the other hand, despite being the river "which goes around the Campus Martius and the city",[59] is never specifically identified as "Roman," either in Vergil or in the extant literature from antiquity. Vergil sometimes calls it "Ausonian" (*Aen.* 5.83) or Laurentine (*Aen.* 5.797), but the most common descriptors for the river in Latin literature of this time refer to the river as Etruscan: *Tuscus, Tyrrhenus*, etc.[60] The classification of the Tiber as Etruscan arises on account of the river's source in Etruria, originating from two springs in the steeps of Mount Fumaiolo in modern-day Emilio-Romagna, ancient Etruria, and from the fact that in ancient times it constituted the Eastern border of the region of Etruria.[61] Yet the question of the so-called identity of the Tiber was actually much more complicated than this, as an ancient discussion of the Tiber's name from Varro's *De Lingua Latina* shows (5.29-30):

> Tiberis quod caput extra Latium, si inde nomen quoque exfluit in linguam nostram, nihil <ad> ἐτυμολόγον Latinum ... [30] Sed de Tiberis nomine anceps historia. Nam et suum Etruria et Latium suum esse credit, quod fuerunt qui ab Thebri vicino regulo Veientum dixerint appellatum, primo Thebrim. Sunt qui Tiberim priscum nomen Latinum Albulam vocitatum litteris tradiderint, posterius propter Tiberinum regem Latinorum mutatum, quod ibi interierit: nam hoc eius ut tradunt sepulcrum.
>
> The Tiber, because its source is outside Latium, if the name as well flows forth from there into our language, does not concern the Latin etymologist; ... [30] But about the name of the Tiber there are two accounts. For Etruria believes it is hers, and so does Latium, because there have been those who said that at first, from Thebris, the near-by chieftain of the Veians, it was called the Thebris. There are also those who in their writings have handed down the story that the Tiber was called Albula as its early Latin name, and that later it was changed on account of Tiberinus king of the Latins, because he died there; for, as they relate, it was his burial-place.[62]

The issues surrounding the origin of the Tiber's name stand in microcosm for the problems of complexed or mixed identities. Varro starts by admitting that, because the Tiber has its physical source outside of Latium, it is possible that the Tiber's name is not even Latin at all, but that "it flows forth from there into our language." Underneath this assertion, there can be seen an anxiety about transmigration and change of identity: does the Tiber's source outside Latium mean that the river remains "non-Latin," so to speak, or does its flowing "into our language" constitute a change of identity, a true mixing of original and

56 Livy 1.7.3: [*Romulus*] *Palatium primum, in quo ipse erat educatus, muniit*.
57 Livy 1.7.4: ... *ut dii, quorum tutelae ea loca essent, auguriis legerent, qui nomen novae urbi daret, qui conditam imperio regeret, Palatium Romulus, Remus Aventinum ad inaugurandum templa capiunt*.
58 Livy 1.33.2: *Palatium, sedem veterum Romanorum*.
59 Varro, *DLL* 5.28: *Tiberis amnis, quod ambit Martium Campum et urbem*.
60 E.g.: Vergil *Aen.* 7.242, 8.473, 10.199, 11.316; cf. Ovid *Met.* 14.610, *Fast.* 4.48; Lucan 1.381.
61 *OCD* s.v. "Tiber."
62 Text and translation are those of Kent 1938.

acquired identity? The double account (*anceps historia*) of the Tiber's name which Varro proceeds to give further emphasizes the ambivalence present in the name's origin, though in a way that stresses Latium and Etruria's separate claims to the Tiber, rather than allow for any reconciliation between them—for the first account gives an entirely Etruscan etymology of the name, while the second presents a wholly Latin history of the word. In the first story, the original name of the Tiber was *Thebris*, a name which it took from the name of a king of Veii, Rome's infamous Etruscan rival only 10 miles to the north, on the other side of the Tiber. The Latin name *Tiberis* is thus understood to be a bastardization or misunderstanding of the original name *Thebris*; the word's spelling with the non-native morpheme *th-* helps to emphasize the ultimate foreignness of the name and its inability to be explained as Latinate.[63] The second story follows a similar pattern, but adds an additional layer that stresses the greater antiquity of the Latin origin story. Here, too, a king provides the modern name of the river, this time the Latin Tiberinus; however, Varro tells us, before the river took the name of the Latin king, it had an original Latin name (*priscum nomen Latinum*): Albula, a word whose status as Latin is confirmed by its recognizable Latinate morphemes—*Alb-ula*, "the bright little stream." Though Varro, as usual, abstains from choosing one etymology over the other, he presents the *Albula* story as slightly stronger by virtue of its recognizing that the river must have had some name prior to the existence of whatever king it might be named after, Latin or Etruscan; since the only ancient name (*priscum nomen*) presented is Latin, rather than Etruscan, the account would seem to hold a greater antiquity. What is interesting, however, is that despite the *potential* for discussing the river's changing identity from Etruscan to Latin, the etymologist is compelled to present the two accounts as mutually exclusive: the origin of the name is either Etruscan or Latin. This contested identity is even more interesting considering that, as Livy tells us, the Tiber was the dividing line which separated Etruscan from Latin lands: *pax ita convenerat, ut Etruscis Latinisque fluvius Albula, quem nunc Tiberim vocant, finis esset*.[64]

The Tiber's status as Tuscan, even when flowing through the city of Rome, as well as its functioning as the dividing line between the lands of Latium and Etruria, bring to the fore not only the issue of non-Italian identity, but also the messy processes of mixed or dual identities. Vergil's invocation here, split as it is between half-lines focused on regional, non-Roman identity (*di patrii Indigetes*; *quae Tuscum Tiberim*) and those centered on Rome and its particular gods (*et Romule Vestaque mater*; *et Romana Palatia servas*), again telegraphs the poem's perspectival division between local and Roman points-of-view, just as the double address to rural gods and Augustus did at the start of the book. Indeed, this entire final section of the poem vacillates between commentary on Caesar and Rome on the one hand, and the *agricolae* in the fields of Italy on the other. Specifically, Roman war and local agriculture are represented as mutually exclusive at the end of *Georgics* 1, just as Varro's etymology of the Tiber's name could not maintain a Latin and Etruscan origin at the same time: Four lines on the Roman battle-lines (*Romanas acies*) at Philippi (1.489-492) quickly give way to the prediction of agriculture's return, the wars finally over (1.493-497). Yet the two concepts remain inseparably conflated: during the battles of Pharsalus and Philippi, it is said that "the fields grow rich" (*pinguescere campos*, 492), yet not in crops or profit, but *sanguine nostro*—"with our blood" (491). In contrast, the farmer of the future digs up not simply rocks or soil as he plows, but the

[63] Cf. the common name *Thybris* for the Tiber in the *Aeneid*, itself probably a reference to a river in Asia Minor: see Cairns 2006. On the naming and names for the Tiber in Vergil, see: Fowler 1916; Benario 1983; Meyers 2009. For the Tiber and Rivers in general, see: Momigliano 1966; Coarelli & Patterson 2008; Jones 2009; Campbell 2012; Purcell 2013.

[64] Livy 1.3.5. Cf. Horace *Odes* 2.1.13-16, where the identity of the river's right shore as "Etruscan" is strongly emphasized: *vidimus flavum Tiberim retortis litore Etrusco violenter undis ire deiectum monumenta regis templaque Vestae*... .

tools of war—rusty spears, helmets—and the bones of the fallen (495-7). Furthermore, the result of the wars is that no honor is given the plow (506-7), the fields have been abandoned (507), and scythes are melted down into swords (508). War and agriculture seem to not be able to exist at the same time, yet as each one thrives, it carries with it an indelible memory of the other. The mutual exclusion yet inextricability of both agriculture and war, of the local landsacape and Rome, and the anxiety that surrounds it reaches its peak in the double use of the ambiguous *sanguine nostro*, "our blood" (491, 501)—is this Roman blood? Local blood? Or the community of those who are able to recognize their two or multiple *patriae*? *Sanguine nostro* here carries all the ambiguity, anxiety, and enforcings of inclusion and exclusion seen in the discussion of *nos* and *noster* in the *Eclogues*: how one interprets it will depend on what any individual reader understands the exact referent of *noster* to be—an integrated multicultural community, or a splintered-off monoculture?

The struggle to fully integrate local and Roman cultural identities—as well as to successfully isolate and extricate their overlapping concerns from one another—is especially prominent in a famous passage from the second Book: the so-called *laudes Italiae*, one of the most famous passages of the poem, and, as such, one of the most difficult. After the book's opening on the variety of plants and their places of origins, the poet launches into the famous encomium of Italy's land, products, and people (1.136ff.):

> Sed neque Medorum silvae, ditissima terra, 136
> nec pulcher Ganges atque auro turbidus Hermus
> laudibus Italiae certent, non Bactra neque Indi
> totaque turiferis Panchaia pinguis harenis. 139
>
> But neither Median forest-land, that richest of earth, 136
> nor stunning Ganges and Hermus, muddy with gold,
> could vie with Italy in praise, nor Bactra, nor India
> and the whole of Panchaia rich with incense-bearing sands. 139

The poet follows this with the assertion that there are no fire-breathing bulls ploughing these lands with dragon's teeth, recalling the myth of Jason in Colchis. This is admittedly a strange way to start his ethnographic description of Italy.[65] That Italy lacks such clearly mythological happenings would seem clear, and to mention them at the beginning of this passage, though it is meant to elevate Italy's status among other regions, pushes the reader immediately into the realm of the unreal. It is in part in reaction to this unmotivated foregrounding of the unbelievable that many, including Richard Thomas,[66] have read skepticism in the rather exaggerated boons of Italy in the passage to come: the claim of continual spring and biannual harvests (149-150), and of the absence of poisonous plants and snakes (152-54). This setting up of Italy in contrast to the mythological traditions of far-off lands is followed by another claim that gives the reader pause: the assertion that in Italy "no crop of men bristle with helmets and densely-packed spears" (*nec galeis densisque virum seges horruit hastis*, 1.142). In fact, this "crop" (*seges*) of men, helmets, and spears bears a striking similarity to those uncovered by the unsuspecting farmers ploughing their fields at the end of *Georgics* 1: "the farmer, working the field with curved ploughshares, will find spears eaten away by scaly rust (*exesa ... scabra robigine pila*), or will strike empty helmets (*galeas ... inanes*) with their heavy mattocks, and

[65] Note that this is the only occurrence of any form of *Italia* or *Italus* in all of the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*.
[66] Thomas 1988a: 179-80 ad 2.136-76; cf. Putnam 1975a. The view of Mynors 1990 is overwhelming positive.

marvel at enormous bones wrenched from dug-out tombs".[67] While the narrative at this point in Book 1 technically takes place in Thessaly around Philippi, the lack of geographical specificity generally at the end of *Georgic* 1 encourages the vignette to be read generally in the context of the civil wars and other conflicts in and around Italy in the 40s and 30s BCE: *tot bella per orbem* (1.505); *saevit toto Mars impius orbe* (1.511). Thus, while Italy may be lacking the particular mythological manifestation of a crop of men, helmets, and spears from Jason's struggles in Colchis, the history of conflict on the peninsula, whether it be in the Social War or more recent struggles such as the Siege of Perusia, means that the possibility of a crop of bones and rusted weaponry à la the end of Georgics 1 is, in fact possible, giving yet another reason to approach this passage with at least a degree of skepticism.[68]

After mentioning products that Italy as a whole is known for—crops, wine, olives, and flocks (*fruges, Bacchi ... umor, oleae armentaque*, 143-44)—the poet expands on the last member of the list, *armenta*, with a formulation that draws attention to the problematic power structure that organizes the respective identities of "Italian" and "Roman" (2.145-48):

> hinc bellator equus campo sese arduus infert 145
> hinc albi, Clitumne, greges et maxima taurus
> victima, saepe tuo perfusi flumine sacro,
> Romanos ad templa deum duxere triumphos. 148
>
> From here [*i.e. Italy*] the lofty warhorse betakes himself to the field; 145
> from here, Clitumnus, bulls, the white herd and greatest
> victims,[69] bathed often in your sacred river,
> lead Roman triumphs to the temples of the gods. 148

At first sight, this passage simply continues the praises of Italy's products; on a second look these lines imply an uneven relationship between local places in Italy and Rome itself. The repeated *hinc* emphasizes the horse and bull's origin from Italy,[70] while the specific reference to the Clitumnus locates the reader for a moment in the region of the Umbrian river, known for a temple of the homonymous god and for the white bulls from the area often used in triumphal sacrifices in Rome, supposedly washed clean by bathing in its waters.[71] From this location around the Clitumnus, there is a movement in the passage out from the

[67] *G.* 2.494-97: *agricola incurvo terram molitus aratro exesa inveniet scabra robigine pila, aut gravibus rastris galeas pulsabit inanis grandiaque effossis mirabitur ossa sepulcris*.

[68] As far as I know, the verbal and conceptual similarity between this passage in the *laudes Italiae* and the uncovering of bones, helmets, and spears at the close of *Georgics* 1 has not been noted by scholars.

[69] Thomas 1988a: 183 ad 2.146-7. believes that *albi … greges et maxima taurus victima* is best taken as hendiadys, with the "white flocks" not understood as sheep, but the specific breed of white bulls associated with this region and used in Roman triumphal sacrifices.

[70] The anaphora of *hic* is reminiscent of passages in the *Eclogues* emphasizing the ideal pastoral qualities of a landscape; e.g. Meliboeus' idealizing description of Tityrus' farm in *Ecl.* 1 (*hic inter flumina nota* (51) ... *hinc tibi* (53) ... *hinc alta sub rupe* (56) ...), or the description of the setting along the Mincius in *Ecl.* 7 (*huc mihi* (6) ... *'huc ades, O Meliboee, ...'* (9) ... *huc ipsi* (11) ... *hic viridis tenera praetexit* (12) ...), and Lycidas description of the surrounding countryside in *Ecl.* 9 (*hinc adeo* (59) ... *hic, ubi densas* (60) ... *hic, Moeri, canamus* (61) ... *hic haedos depone* (62) ...).

[71] For the white bulls of the Clitumnus, cf. Propertius 2.19.25-26: *qua formosa suo Clitumnus flumina luco integit, et niveos abluit unda boues*; also at 3.22.23-24, Propertius' own "praises of Italy' which build upon Vergil's themes here, especially his praises of Italy's waters and refutation of mythological happenings in Italy.

Italian Clitumnus to the temples of Rome. In the context of Roman triumphs, meanwhile, the war-horse is surely one used to pull the chariot of the triumphant general, another product of Italy drawn upon to serve Roman martial needs. Indeed, if the *bellator equus* is taken as a synecdoche for soldiery and martial valor in general, this passage can easily be seen to comment on the long-standing Roman practice of requiring Italian allies to provide soldiery for Roman military campaigns without granting full citizenship or political representation; indeed, as seen in the Introduction, this kind of exploitation of Italian martial resources was one of the primary tensions motivating the break-out of the Social War in 91 BCE.[72]

Vergil's inclusion of the white, Clitumnan bull is even more troubling. While on the surface the passage reads as a praise of Italy's resources, as with the grain, wine, and olive oil immediately previous, the insinuations and implications contained within the passage paint a rather darker picture. In particular, the white bull being led from the Clitumnus to the temples of the gods in Rome is the white bull sacrificed to Jupiter at the culmination of the triumphal parade[73]—yet another local Italian resource appropriated and slaughtered for Roman ends, here to celebrate Roman victory over her enemies in war.[74] The link to both the violence of sacrifice and its orientation toward the conquered is signaled by *victima*, prominently enjambed at the beginning of line 147. Not only does the inclusion of *victima* in apposition to *taurus* make explicit that the bull will be sacrificed upon its arrival at Roman temples, the particular idea of this celebratory sacrifice coming about in response to the defeat of an enemy people is also latent in a popular Roman etymology for *victima* from *victus*, "conquered." Thus Ovid, in a discussion of Roman sacrifice in *Fasti* 1, states that "that one is called a *victima* which has been struck down by a victorious (*victrice*) right hand", whereas Isidore of Seville later makes a similar claim, noting that "*victimae* are the sacrifices which they slaughter after a victory (*victoriam*), once the enemies have been vanquished (*devictis*)".[75] Furthermore, the innocuous-looking phrase *tuo perfusi flumine sacro* (147) is eerily reminiscent of the formulation *gaudent perfusi sanguine fratrum* in the vituperation of city life at the end of the book (*G.* 2.510), with *perfusi* occupying the same position followed by a dactylic ablative singular in the fifth foot and a disyllable in the sixth. The effect is that the civil slaughter of *perfusi sanguine fratrum* is transferred into *perfusi flumine sacro* (especially in the context of *Romanos*, which begins the next line), making explicit through intratextual reference what is only implicit here in the word *victima*, that these bulls arising from an Italian region are about to be slaughtered in celebration of a Roman triumph. The entire growth of the passage from *hinc … hinc … Clitumne …* up to *Romanos … triumphos* reflects the similar movement at *G.* 3.10-48 from *primus ego in patriam … Mincius …* to *Caesaris et nomen … Caesar* in *Georgic* 3, and we are left—as we were there—with two somewhat contradictory interpretations. On the one hand, the contributions of the Italian warhorse and the sacred white bulls of Umbrian Clitumnus help to build up the glory of Rome, contributing to the spectacle of Roman victories and triumphal processions. On the other hand, the role of the bull as *victima* hints starkly at its imminent disappearance: the bulls currently leads the procession (*duxere*, 148), to be sure, but, as *victimae*, this will not hold true for long. There is an ambivalence of perspective in these lines, a bi-directional pull that leaves the reader suspended between viewing the melding of Roman and Italian as

[72] Cf. Vell. Paterc. 2.15.2: *quorum ut fortuna atrox, ita causa fuit iustissima; petebant enim eam civitatem cuius imperium armis tuebantur: per omnes annos atque omnia bella duplici numero se militum equitumque fungi neque in eius civitatis ius recipi quae per eos in id ipsum pervenisset fastigium ex quo homines eiusdem et gentis et sanguinis ut externos alienosque fastidire posset.*
[73] See Scheid 2007: 263-69.
[74] Cf. the discussion in the next chapter of Livy 1.45 of the story of the bull to be sacrificed at the Temple to Diana in Rome to guarantee Sabine hegemony, a plot foiled by the Roman priest's sacrifice of the animal.
[75] Ovid, *Fasti* 1.335: *victima quae dextra cecidit victrice vocatur*; Isid. *Etym.* 6.19.34: *victimae vero sacrificia quae post victoriam, devictis hostibus, immolabant.*

constructive, even as invigorating of one another—or viewing them as incompatible or mutually destructive, with Rome consuming Italian life and resources in the process of its imperialist expansion.[76]

The tension between the constructive and destructive potential of Roman-Italian integration is crystallized more fully in the following section, with the juxtaposition of two different ways of understanding Italy: as a unified cultural or political whole, or as a naturally diverse collection of individual locales. Vergil's claims that the whole of Italy lacks evils such as tiger, lions, poisonous plants and snakes, as well as his praise in Italy of "so many excellent cities and works of toil, so many towns built up by hand with rough-broken rock and rivers flowing beneath ancient walls",[77] creates a vision of the region as homogenous, a single image in broad strokes that unifies "so many excellent cities" (*tot egregias urbes*) into a larger whole, the province of *Italia*. There is a return in the following lines, however, to a focus on the localized and individual, particularly in the descriptions of four of Italy's great lakes: Lake Como (ancient *Larius*) and Lake Garda (ancient *Benacus*) in Transpadane Gaul, and Lake Avernus and the Lucrine Lake in Campania on the Bay of Naples, the latter both described as *portus*, "harbors." With this returning focus on individual places returns a renewed focus on Roman changes to those landscapes, especially in the descriptions of the Lucrine Lake and Avernus, neither of which, as Richard Thomas notes, were natural harbors, instead connected to the sea by Agrippa around 37 BCE.[78] The addition of a breakwater to the Lucrine is described by Vergil as the addition of barriers (*addita claustra*, 161), the sea reacting in anger (*indignatum*, 162) to being closed off (*ponte refuso*, 163) in the construction of the harbor and, similarly, to the building of a canal to connect Lake Avernus to the sea. The descriptions of these two unnatural harbors—*Iulia qua ponto longe sonat unda refuso Tyrrhenusque fretis immittitur aestus Avernis* (163-4)—emphasizes the clear separation between "Julian" waters and, at the same time, the mixing of "Etruscan" sea-water and the waves of Lake Avernus inland. The language used emphasizes this mixing, as well as its ambivalence: *immitto* is one of the words used Vergil's discussion of grafting earlier in the book (2.79-80: *feraces plantae immittuntur*), but is also a term with noticeable aggressive connotations (cf. *Aen.* 9.420; 12.331; 12.521).

The modification of the natural landscape in the creation of the Lucrine and Avernan ports, and the crossing of natural boundaries that ensues, is a change brought on by Roman effort, achieving a kind of domestication of wild nature, grooming and shaping it for Roman purposes of usefulness and productivity.

The final lines of the *laudes Italiae* encapsulate the tensions that have been present throughout the passage and the poem so far (2.167-176):

> haec genus acre virum, Marsos pubemque Sabellam
> adsuetumque malo Ligurem Volsciosque verutos,
> extulit, haec Decios Marios magnosque Camillos,
> Scipiadas duros bello et te, maxime Caesar,
> qui nunc extremis Asiae iam victor in oris
> imbellem avertis Romanis arcibus Indum.
> salve, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
> magna virum: tibi res antiquae laudis et artem

[76] Note the intratextuality with the contents of Aeneas' shield: *res Italas Romanorumque triumphos* (*Aen.* 8.626).
[77] 2.155-7: *adde tot egregias urbes operumque laborem, tot congesta manu praeruptis oppida saxis, fluminaque antiquos subterlabentia muros*.
[78] See Thomas 1988a: 186-7 ad 2.161-4n.

ingredior sanctos ausus recludere fontis, 175
Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen.

This land has borne a strong race of men: Marsi, and Sabellic manpower, 167
the Ligurian accustomed to hardship and Volscians with their short darts;
here are the Decii, the Marii, and the great Camilli;
the Scipiones, tough in war, and you, greatest Caesar, 170
who, victorious on the distant borders of Asia, now
keep back the unwarlike Indian from Roman citadels.
Hail, great parent of crops, land of Saturn,
great in men: for your sake I set out on a theme of ancient glory,
this craft of mine, daring to throw open the sacred fonts; 175
I sing an Ascraean song through Roman towns.

While the claim that Italian manpower was the key to Roman might is a standard claim both in Vergil and in the wider Latin literary canon,[79] the order of the peoples and families presented in the miniature catalogue here is meticulously presented. Vergil begins with two lines on the non-Roman Italian peoples who had by then been incorporated into the the Roman state (Marsi, Sabelli, Ligures, Volsci), before moving on to two more lines introducing famous families of Rome, first plebeian (Decii, Marii) and then patrician (Camilli, Scipiones), ending finally with Octavian as one of the *Caesares*. While on the surface this passage might seem to be merely a list of the great and powerful races of Italy (as the ring composition between *genus acre virum* in 167 and *magna virum* in 174 would seem to indicate), Vergil has not chosen these tribes and families at random. Rather, the poet's order is designed to drawn attention to not only the relative place each of these groups held in the Roman social hierarchy, but also the process of integration through which those previously excluded from the state could now claim to be Roman.

Consider, for example, the implications of Vergil's beginning this catalogue of Italian and Roman peoples with the Marsi and the Sabelli: *Marsos pubemque Sabellam*. The menion of Sabelli, "used in [Vergil] and [Horace] as an equialent for Samnite",[80] recalls not only Rome's bitterest Italic enemies, the Samnites,[81] but also shades of the Sabines, from whom the Sabelli had supposedly descended through an early sacred spring.[82] In one sense, the choice of Sabelli and Marsi could mark the long history of integration of Italian peoples into the Roman state, the Sabine forebears of the Sabelli being the first external Italic group incorporated into Rome after its founding, while the Marsi, though strong allies for the Romans through the wars with the Samnites and Carthaginians, were the last in peninsular Italy to receive Roman citizenship. But the recollection of both groups and their integration into Rome is also inseparable from their story of war and conflict with Rome, histories which are suggested by the poet's use of the word

79 *Aen*. 12.827. Cf. Cicero, *Phil*. 3.13, on *Gallia Cisalpine* as *flos Italiae* and *firmamentum imperii populi Romani*.
80 Mynors 1990: 123 ad 2.167-8, who cites Sonnenschein 1897.
81 Recall that it was the Samnites whose resistance lasted for the longest after the end of the Social War (Bispham 2016b: 93-96), and the Samnites in whom the Marians took a "genocidal interest" (*ibid*. 94, & Bispham 2016a).
82 DeRose Evans 1996: 202: "[T]he Sabines dedicated all the children born in one year to Mars; they were sent away as colonists, led by a bull. When the bull laid down in the land of the Opici, the Sabines saw this as a sign that they were to inhabit the land, and ejected the Opici, slaughtering the bull as a thank-offering to Mars. The new settlers were called the "Sabelli." Cf. Strabo 5.1.2, Plin. *HN* 3.110.

pubem, a word with strong military connotations.[83] In the case of the Marsi, the military conflict which Romans would most easily associate with this group was the Social War itself, a war for which one of the most popular designations was the *bellum Marsicum*, or "Marsic War." Clifford Ando has discussed the difficulty the Romans experienced in finding an appropriate name for this war. Roman wars prior to this conflict, almost without exception against enemies that were considered external at the time of conflict, were named for the peoples or cities against whom they were fought: *bellum Carthaginiense, bellum Corinthum*, etc. Yet the most obvious (and earliest used)[84] appellation for the war, *bellum Italicum*, was problematic precisely because it drew attention to the fact that the enfranchised Italians had but recently been *outside* of it as the objects of Roman aggression. The Romans eventually settled on *bellum Marsicum*, by which choice the Romans "thus avoided a designation that would embody and recall the bitterness of the war itself ... by creating a scapegoat".[85] This was possible, Ando remarks, since "the Marsi and the Samnites had been particularly stubborn during the war itself, the Marsi boasting that no Roman had ever triumphed for a war in which the Marsi had not fought".[86] Writing at about the same time as Vergil, Horace twice uses the Marsi to stand for the Social War itself: in a call for celebration in *Odes* 3.12, the poet asks his listener to find a cask of wine which "remembered the Marsic war" (*cadum Marsi memorem duelli*, 3.14.18). In *Epode* 16, meanwhile, Horace laments that Rome was destroying itself with civil conflict, itself a city "which neither the neighboring Marsi (*finitimi ... Marsi*) were able to destroy, nor the Etruscan band of menacing Porsenna".[87] Each of these passages show the lasting association of the Social War with the Marsi, showing a surprising willingness to alienate a local Italian tribe which was by this time as integrated into Rome as any of the others. The tenseness inherent in the Marsi's status as a result of this war can be heard in *finitimi* in *Epode* 16, the attribute reminding the reader of Marsian territory's proximity to Rome as well as their current incorporation as Roman citizens, and felt as well in the temporal juxtaposition of *Ode* 3.14's *Marsi memorem duelli*: here, the non-incorporation of the Italians and the previous hostility toward them is placed into a remembered past, but one close enough to contemporary times for wine produced in those years to still be obtained.[88] Vergil's placement of the Marsi first in his catalogue of great Italian men makes use of an ethnographical term reminiscent of the largest Roman-Italian conflict in recent memory, bringing into focus the minute processes of integration in the aftermath of such a conflict.

[83] 'Young men fit for arms' is the first meaning given for *pubes* in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*: *TLL* s.v. *pubes* (1) I, A, 1: "*multitudo puberum hominum ... bello aptorum, arma ferentium*" (10.2.2433.62-68).

[84] Often in both Cicero, and several times in Velleius Paterculus and Valerius Maximus: Cicero *Agr.* 2.80, *Har. resp.* 18; *Off.* 2.21, *Verr.* 2.2.5, 2.5.39 *Pis.* 87, *Phil.* 8.3, *Clu.* 21, *Arch.* 8, *Balb.* 50, *Ad fam.* 5.12.2; Vell. Pat. 2.15.1, 2.16.4, 2.17.1, 2.17.2; Val. Max. 5.4.7, 6.3.3. See also: Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.27.2.

[85] Ando 2002: 129.

[86] Ibidem. Ando notes that other choices included *bellum Asculanum*—"after the city in which the war started"—and *bellum Paelignum*, "after the tribe whose capitol had served as the capitol for the federation," in reference to Corfinium/Italica. The modern name, "Social War," began in the first century BCE as a general cateogory of armed conflict: *bellum cum sociis* (see Cicero *Agr.* 2.90). By the time of Pliny, over a century later in the mid-first century CE, *bellum sociale* had come to indicate what we now call the Social War (see, e.g., Pliny *NH* 3.70).

[87] *Ep.* 16.3-4: *quam neque finitimi valuerunt perdere Marsi minacis aut Etrusca Porsenae manus*. Cf. Horace *Od.* 1.2.39-40 (*acer et Marsi peditis cruentum vultus in hostem*), *Od.* 3.5.9-11 (*sub rege Medo Marsus et Apulus, anciliorum et nominis et togae oblitus aeternaeque Vestae*).

[88] There is a similar temporal play in Horace's uses of the form *duelli* (for *belli*): the deliberate archaism in the spelling of this word, recalling a sound change which had been complete since probably the fourth century, clashes with the comparatively shorter length of time—less than 70 years—since the war itself. For *duellum*, cf. the fifth-century *Duenos* inscription [where *duenos* ="*bonus*", with the same sound change from *du-* to *b-*].

Pubemque Sabellam is equally problematic. While *Sabellus* here is sometimes translated as "Sabine",[89] *Sabelli* to the Romans were emphatically not synonymous with the *Sabini*, as E. T. Salmon and T. W. Potter have shown.[90] Instead, Latin *Sabelli* referred broadly to speakers of Oscan and their descendants. Thus the Sabines were considered *Sabelli*, as were numerous other peoples throughout Italy, including the Samnites and the Frentani, as well as the ancestors of the Campanians, Lucanians, Apulians, and Bruttians who had come to those areas through a series of sacred springs. It is important to note, too, that the term *Sabelli* implied no political cohesion among these groups; rather, *Sabelli* was a Roman term used to distinguish those who had come from historically Oscan-speaking cities and regions of Italy. Some Italic peoples were associated with the broader term *Sabelli* more often than others, however, namely the Sabines and the Samnites,[91] the latter ethnonym being so associated with the speaking of Oscan that other Oscan-speaking peoples (as, for example, Campanians) were often identified somewhat erroneously as "Samnites".[92] The potential resonance of *pubemque Sabellam* here with both the Sabines and the Samnites makes the message of this short Italian catalogue even more complex. Granted full citizenship rights by the end of the third century BCE, the Sabines were an early story of successful incorporation of Italic peoples into the Roman polity, and a number of myths had grown up around the Sabines and their integration, including the rape of the Sabine women, the co-reign with Romulus of the Sabine king Titus Tatius, and the accession of two kings of Sabine origin, Numa Pompilius and his grandson Ancus Martius. The end result of the saga of the Sabine women was of course that a small contingent of Sabines were incorporated very early on into the Roman state—as Livy comments after the women's heroic interruption of the battle, the Romans and Sabines "not only brought about peace, but they made a single peoples out of two" (*non pacem modo, sed civitatem unam ex duabus faciunt*, 1.13.5)—but such a resolution did not erase the violence that was purported to have necessitated such a reconciliation in the first place. The stories of Titus Tatius, Numa, and Ancus Martius, meanwhile, all also carry ambivalent messages about the place of Sabine history within Rome. The co-rule of Romulus and Titus Tatius, for example, is clearly meant to stand as a symbol of the equality of Roman and Sabine influence at Rome;[93] in Livy's telling, however, this equality is undermined by Romulus' subsequent refusal to go to war with the Lavinians after their assassination of Tatius,[94] a detail which quietly implies the tiered ranking of groups within the hierarchy of "Romanness" which was true for much of Rome's history, here the preference for the historically significant Latin community of Lavinium over the Sabellic, Oscan-speaking Sabines. This anxiety of inequality becomes explicit again in Livy's history after the death of Romulus, when those Romans of Sabine origin, fearing that they are about to lose their equal share in the government, desire that a Sabine accede to the throne,[95] an idea which is abhorrent to the non-Sabines: "The original Romans scorned the thought of a foreign king" (*veteres Romani peregrinum regem aspernabatur*, 1.17.2). Their concern is repeated when Numa's name is put forward for the

89 E.g. Fairclough 1916. Greenough 1900 and Mackail 1934 both translate simply "Sabellian".
90 *OCD*4, s.v. *Sabelli*.
91 Dench 1995: 1: "...the comparatively late Latin *Sabellus*, a collective for Sabines and Samnites." For the Samnites, see also: Salmon 1967; Patterson 1987; and Patterson 1988.
92 Cf. Salmon 1982: 13: "The SAMNITES [Salmon's capitals] were the Oscan-speakers *par excellence*, so much so indeed that all and any who had Oscan as their mother-tongue, Sidicini, Campanian and others, were regularly called Samnites. A better generic would be Sabelli."
93 Livy 1.13.5: *regnum consociant*; notice the root of this word in *socii*, Rome's name for its Italian allies.
94 Livy 1.14.1-3.
95 Livy 1.17.2: *Oriundi ab Sabinis, ne, quia post Tati mortem ab sua parte non erat regnatum, in societate aequa possessionem imperii amitterent, sui corporis creari regem volebant*.

kingship—"The Roman senators, perceiving that power would shift to the Sabines should Numa be adopted as king..."[96]—but, in the absence of an alternative, Numa is unanimously chosen for the throne. The Sabinity of Numa and his grandson Ancus Martius are called upon again later in Livy's first book, both by Tanaquil, wife of the Etruscan-born king Tarquinius Priscus, to justify her husband's hope for success in Rome,[97] as well as by Tarquinius himself when canvassing for the kingship, aruging that "he was not seeking anything new, being not the first, but the third foreigner (*peregrinus*) to pursue kingship at Rome—and Tatius had been made king not just from a foreign (*peregrino*) people, but an enemy one (*hoste*)"[98] The Sabines' continued perception as foreign in Livy's narrative, despite their early enfranchisement, endows them with a certain ambivalence here.

Just as much as the Sabines, Romans hearing the phrase *pubemque Sabellam* would have thought of the Samnites, whose history of conflict with the Romans was much more established than the Sabines. Most well-known are the Samnite Wars, the series of three wars the Romans fought with the Oscan-speaking, war-loving Samnites confederacy, made up of the four tribal states of the Caraceni, Caudini, Hirpini, and Pentri, from the mid-fourth to the early third century.[99] In the course of these bitter wars, the Romans gained footing in Campania, Apulia, and Lucania, and prevented the Samnites from further extending their influence. The Samnites went on to fight against Rome during the Pyrrhic War, the Second Punic War, and the Social War, as well as against the Sullan faction in the civil conflicts of the 80s BCE. That the poet chooses to start his catalogue with references to the Marsi and the Sabines and Samnites, in a context that is actively examining the construction of Italy and Rome's place within it, foregrounds the violence and conflict that preceded their eventual integration.

The next line of the catalogue—*adsuetumque malo Ligurem Volscosque verutos*—expands upon the list of peoples whose incorporation into the Roman state was marked by violence and resistance, while also developing the sense of ethnographic alterity associated with these groups, a move which works contrary to this passage's general tendency to create a unity out of Italy's diversity, serving as it does to question the legitimacy of these groups' place within a larger Roman identity. The Ligurians, the indigenous occupants of the coast of the Mediterranean from the mouth of the Arno river near Pisa, Italy, to the mouth of the Rhône river near modern-day Arles, France, were allies of the Celts and are often called Celtic (or Celtoligurian) by the ancient sources.[100] In addition to this perceived ethnic alterity, the Ligurians also had a history of conflict with the Romans, including joining the Carthaginians as allies during the Second Punic War. After the end of that war, the Romans engaged in a series of wars to effect the Ligurians subjugation, with victories in 180s, 170s, 150s, and 120s until the creation of the province of *Gallia Transalpina* in 121,

96 Livy 1.18.5: *Audito nomine Numae patres Romani, quamquam inclinari opes ad Sabinos rege inde sumpto videbantur, tamen neque se quisquam nec factionis suae alium nec denique patrum aut civium quemquam praeferre illi viro ausi ad unum omnes Numae Pompilio regnum deferendum decernunt.*

97 Livy 1.34.6: *Roma est ad id potissima visa: in novo populo, ubi omnis repentina atque ex virtute nobilitas sit, futurum locum forti ac strenuo viro; regnasse Tatium Sabinum, arcessitum in regnum Numam a Curibus, et Ancum Sabina matre ortum nobilemque una imagine Numae esse.*

98 Livy 1.35.2-3: [*Tarquinius*] *orationem dicitur habuisse ... se non rem novam petere, quippe qui non primus ... sed tertius Romae peregrinus regnum adfectet; et Tatium non ex peregrino solum, sed etiam ex hoste regem factum, et Numam ignarum urbis non petentem in regnum ultro accitum.*

99 The commonly accepted dates are as follows: First Samnite War, 343-341 BCE; Second Samnite War, 327-321 and 316-304 BCE; Third Samnite War, 298-290 BCE. Salmon and Potter call the oft-repeated claim that the First Samnite War never actually occurred "unconvincingly reckoned"; see *OCD*4 s.v. *Samnium*.

100 E.g. Strabo 4.6.3. See also *OCD*4 s.v. *Ligurians*.

the final Roman victory over the Celtoligurian Salluvii in alliance with Greek Massilia.[101] Vergil's seemingly colorless *adsuetumque malo*, meanwhile, is a gesture to the existing ethnographical tradition surrounding the Ligurians, one in which, following contemporaneous racial theories of geographical determinism, the Ligurians were described as long-suffering, tough in war, and physically vigorous because of the rocky and mountainous terrain of the Alps and Apennines they inhabited.[102] Veril's contemporary Diodorus Siculus provides an example of this kind of environmental determinism in his own treatment of the Ligurians: "The Ligurians inhabit a land which is stony and altogether wretched (τραχεῖαν καὶ παντελῶς λυπράν), and the life they live is, by reason of the toils and the continuous hardships they endure in their labour, a grievous one and unfortunate (ἐπίπονόν τινα βίον καὶ ἀτυχῆ)".[103] The rocky, mountainous geography force the Ligurians to farm little, hunt often, and live in caves; moreover, they carry Gallic shields and wear wild animal pelts—though, Diodorus notes, many have changed these customs since being incorporated into the Roman state.[104] This gesture towards the cultural and ethnic difference of the Ligurians in Diodorus passes over one of the more unflattering qualities attributed to these tribes by the Romans: their untrustworthiness. The elder Cato, in the second book of his *Origines*, claims that "all Ligurians are deceitful",[105] and Vergil in the *Aeneid* several times notes the guile of the Ligurians with reference to their *astus*, *doli*, and *fraus*, as well as their propensity towards deception—*fallere*—a practice Vergil has the warrior Camilla call the "ancestral artform" (*patrias artis*) of the Ligurians.[106] With *adsuetumque malo*, then, Vergil gestures gently toward the existing negative stereotypes of an Italian subgroup already identified for their ethnic difference, in the midst of a passage purporting to sing the praises of an integrated *Roman* Italy. In doing so, Vergil does not mean to stereotype the Ligurians himself, but rather to show the lastingness of such stereotypes, the ease of their coloring cultural impressions, and the difficulty of integration amidst a history of martial conflict with Rome, and ethnic and cultural stereotyping by the Romans.

The following *Volscosque verutos* creates a similar effect, attributing an air of ethnographic otherness to a tribe whose history of conflict with Rome was well-documented. The Volsci frequently attacked Rome and its Latin allies throughout the fifth century, and the fourth century saw the Romans gradually conquering the Volsci, founding a series of Latin colonies throughout their territory;[107] the Volsci of southern Latium were fully conquered by 338, in the Liris Valley with the end of the Second Samnite War in 304. The Volscians, despite being much closer to Rome than the Ligurians, were also marked out for their cultural difference and their status as non-natives of Latium. Cato notes that the Volscians occupied land that had originally belonged to the *Aborigines*,[108] while a fragment of the early second-century

101 *OCD*4 s.v. *Ligurians*.

102 Diod. Sic. 5.39. For ancient racial theories on geographic and climatic determinism, see, among others, R. F. Kennedy et al. 2013: 35-52; McCoskey 2012: 35-80, especially 46-49; Isaac 2004: 55-168).

103 Diod. Sic. 5.39.1: οὗτοι γὰρ νέμονται μὲν χώραν τραχεῖαν καὶ παντελῶς λυπράν, τοῖς δὲ πόνοις καὶ ταῖς κατὰ τὴν λειτουργίαν συνεχέσι κακοπαθείαις ἐπίπονόν τινα βίον καὶ ἀτυχῆ ζῶσι. The text and translation are that of Oldfather 1939.

104 Diod. Sic. 5.39.7-8: σκεπάζει γὰρ αὐτοὺς παραμήκης θυρεὸς <u>εἰς τὸν Γαλατικὸν ῥυθμὸν</u> δεδημιουργ-ημένος καὶ χιτὼν συνειλημμένος ζωστῆρι, καὶ <u>περιτίθενται θηρίων δορὰς</u> καὶ ξίφος σύμμετρον· τινὲς δ᾽ αὐτῶν <u>διὰ τὴν ἐπιμιξίαν τῆς Ῥωμαίων πολιτείας μετεσχημάτισαν</u> τὸν ὁπλισμόν, <u>ἐξομοιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἡγουμένοις</u>.

105 Cato, *Orig.* Book 2, fr. 1: *Ligures omnes fallaces sunt*. Cf. Servius *ad* Aen. 11.700.

106 *Aen.* 11.715-77: *vane Ligus frustraque animis elate superbis, nequiquam <u>patrias</u> temptasti <u>lubricus artis</u>, nec <u>fraus</u> te incolumem <u>fallaci</u> perferet <u>Auno</u>*. Cf. 11.700-1: *Appenninicolae bellator filius Auni, haut Ligurum extremus, dum <u>fallere</u> fata sinebant*; 11.704-5: *<u>consilio</u> versare <u>dolo</u> ingressus et <u>astu</u> incipit haec*; 11.712: *iuvenis, vicisse <u>dolo</u> ratus, avolat ipse*.

107 Including, e.g., Circeii (393 BCE), Satricum (385 BCE), and Setia (382 BCE) (*OCD*4 s.v. *Volsci*).

108 On the Volscians' non-indigenous status as far as Latium, see Cato, *Origines* Book 1, fr. 4: *agrum quem Volsci*

comedian Titinius singles out a group of Oscan and Volscian speakers—the context is lost—because they do not also speak Latin: *qui Obsce et Volsce fabulantur: nam Latine nesciunt*. Whatever the context of this line, it seems clear that the quote should be taken as "a disparaging reference to non-Latin speakers".[109] In the *Aeneid*, the most prominent Volscian character is the warrior Camilla fighting alongside Turnus and the Latins, whose *aristeia* occupies most of the end of *Aen.* 11;[110] one scholar has proposed that Camilla's death must occur prior to the *Aeneid*'s finale, since it represents the historical defeat of the Volscians by the Romans—only after which Rome established domination over the rest of the Italy, represented in the *Aeneid* by the final defeat of Turnus.[111] Not only is Camilla's origin among the Volscians emphasized in the *Aeneid*,[112] she also inspires the creation of an almost political unity among the Italian tribes, as when the Laurentine women trapped in King Latinus' palace are moved to attack the Trojan soldiers from the walls after witnessing Camilla's death, thereby displaying *amor verus patriae*, as Vergil tells us (11.892)—"true love of fatherland". Combining the Volscians with the ethnographic epithet *verutos* here ("equipped with short darts"),[113] Vergil underscores the potential alterity of a people with whom the Romans already had a long history of conflict, rounding out a list of Italian peoples that, at the very least, emphasizes the complicated and somewhat recent history of Italian integration into the Roman state.

The list of prominent Roman families likewise speaks to the messy history of a unified Roman Italy.[114] Vergil lists two plebeian families—Decii, Marii—and two patrician families—Camilli, Scipiones. The plebeian families provide a fitting transition from Italian tribes to Roman families, considering that both gentilitial *nomina* are potentially of Oscan derivation: *Decius* is the Latinized form of the Oscan *Dekiis*, itself cognate with the Latin *Decimius* (from *Decimus*),[115] whereas *Marius*, while perhaps an originally Latin *nomen*, was at least cognate with the Oscan *praenomen Mara*.[116] Both families also had complicated histories with respect to Italian subjugation and incorporation. The most famous *Decii* were the two P. Decii Mures who, as consuls, sacrificed themselves as a *devotio* to the *Di Manes* during battle in order to ensure a Roman victory, the first in 340 BCE during the Latin War, and the second in 295 BCE during the Battle of Sentinum, the decisive final battle of the Third Samnite War.[117] These famous acts of *devotio* correspond surprisingly well with *pubemque Sabellam* and *Volscosque verutos* earlier in the catalogue, with the first P. Decius Mus devoting himself during the Latin War, in which the Volscians were prominent participants,[118] and the second undertaking *devotio* at the end of the final Samnite War.[119] The most famous figure of the *gens Maria*, of course, was Gaius Marius, not only "the man who did his best to tear apart the Roman republic," as Thomas notes,[120] but also a successful general during the Social War, or *bellum Marsicum*, of 91-88 BCE;

habuerunt, campestris plerus Aboriginum fuit.

109 Adams 2003: 122 n.53; also Harris 1971: 170; but cf. Prosdocimi 1989: 63.

110 *Aen.* 11.498-867.

111 M. F. Trundle 2003. Indeed, Roman struggles with the Volscians are constant throughout Livy's first decade.

112 E.g. 7.803; 11.423.

113 Thomas 1988a remarks that the epithet "is ethnographical in tone" (188 ad 2.168n.).

114 As Thomas 1988a remarks, all of the figures listed "are military figures" (188-89 ad 2.169-72n.).

115 Untermann 2000.

116 Chase 1897: 139.

117 For the story of these *devotiones*, see, respectively, Livy 8.9 and 10.28.

118 E.g. Livy 8.3.8-9. This Decius undertook the act of *devotio* in 340 BCE; the final subjugation of the Latins and Volscians, as noted above, occurred less than two years later, at the Battle of Antium in 338 BCE.

119 Recall that the Samnites were those most often associated with the term *Sabellus*.

120 Thomas 1988a: 189 ad 169-72n. Cf. Feeney 1986's comment on the sequence of Decii and Marii here (whom he understands as C. Marius and his homonymous son): "When a pair of exemplary relatives are immediately

Marios, then, conjures up a tension with the earlier *Marsos*, just as *Decios* does for *pubemque Sabellam* and *Volscosque verutos*: the passage praises the integration of certain Italic peoples to then immediately laud the generals who brought about their subjugation. A similar relationship may exist between *Scipiadas duros belli* and *adsuetumque malo Ligurem*: the mention of the *Scipiadas* is ambiguous between the two *Scipiones Africani*, *Maior* and *Minor*, and the two Scipiones who were consuls in 222 and 218, Gn. Cornelius Scipio Calvus and P. Cornelius Scipio, father of Scipio Africanus Maior.[121] Of these elder Scipios, Gn. Cornelius Scipio Calvus had worked with M. Claudius Marcellus to defeat the Insubres, a Cisalpine population created by the intermixing of Ligurians and Gauls, and otherwised secure Roman access to Liguria; his brother P. Cornelius Scipio, meanwhile, had fought against Hannibal in the early years of the war, specifically during the Roman defeats at the rivers Ticinum and Trebia, immediately after Hannibal had supplemented his troops with many of the Ligurian forces he had defeated upon his crossing into Italy; the Scipios can thus be connected to the story of the subjugation of the Ligurians. Finally, the reference to *magnosque Camillos*, "the great Camilli," points mostly to the dictator Marcus Furius Camillus, who was known for not only his great defeat and destruction of Etruscan Veii, but also for a campaign against the Volsci in 389 BCE.[122]

In four lines, Vergil does far more than simply fête the great men which Italian lands have produced. In the duple praise of the local Italians whose integration into the Roman state has helped to guarantee its current success and, at the same time, the successful generals who were complicit in the often violent defeat and subjugation of those peoples, the poet illustrates the true ambivalence of the role of local Italians within the Roman state—praise and recognition alongside a failure to acknowledge outright the violence and subjugation of an often forced incorporation. This ambivalent bent of the *laudes Italiae* is encapsulated well in its final line: *Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen*. *Ascraeum*, referencing Hesiod's hometown of Ascra, has rightly been read as pointing generically to both Hesiodic agricultural didactic and to Aratus and Callimachus as Vergil's Hellenistic models.[123] Yet *Ascraeum*, as a reference to the small hamlet to which Hesiod's father migrated from Cyme to settle and farm the land, might also be translated "rural",[124] or even be taken to refer to refer to Ascra as the hometown and birthplace—that is, *germana*

succeeded by a suspect father and a bad son, the panegyric doubles back upon itself" (6-7), ultimately revealing a "theme of sons falling short of their father's standards" (12) which Feeney sees reoccurring in Vergil's catalogue of future Roman heroes in *Aen.* 6.

121 Most commentators see these "Scipios" as referring straightforwardly to the Scipiones Africani; cf. Horsfall 2013 ad *Aen.* 6.842-3. Feeney 1986, however, suggests that the reference is ambiguous, possibly refering to the Scipiones Africani as well as to the earlier generation of Cornelii Scipiones, the twins Gnaeus and Publius who were respectively the uncle and father of Scipio Africanus Maior; this ambiguous conflation, Feeney argues, helps to collapse one generation of Romans into the other, a Roman tendency which is already present in the presentation of the *gens* during the funeral parade. Horsfall dismisses this possibility, but the reference to the elder Scipiones as a pair at Cic. *Balb.* 34, as well as Servius' identification of the *Scipiadas* at *Aen.* 6.843 as "*gemini fratres ... qui cum fortissime dimicarent in Hispania apud Carthaginem novam ... insidiis intertempti sunt*". Both that passage (*Aen.* 6.842-3: *geminos, duo fulmina belli, Scipiadas*) and the earlier scene of the Decii, Drusi, and Camillus (*Aen.* 6.824-5: *quin Decios Drusosque procul saevumque securi aspice Torquatum et referentem signa Camillum*) are in dialogue with the current passage from the *Georgics*: see Feeney 1986: 7ff.

122 Why the plural? Things become even more interesting if one suggests that Aeneas' creation *Camilla* in the *Aeneid*, is the second of the *Camilli* referenced here: if so, *Camillos* would, on its own, reference the great victor over the Etruscans and Volscians, it would also refer to a fictitious Volscian warrior who fought against the Romans' Trojan forebears to attempt to create an unified, *non-Roman* Italy.

123 Thomas 1988a: 190 ad 2.176.

124 Cf. Lewis and Short 1989, s.v. *Ascra* II, B, where *Ascraeum* in the present passage is given the meaning "rural".

patria—of Hesiod.[125] In the *Works and Days*, when Hesiod describes his father's migration from Cyme to Ascra during a discursus on the dangers of sailing, he describes Ascra as a "miserable village" (ὀιζυρῇ ... κώμῃ, 639),[126] κώμη being the Greek equivalent of Latin *oppidum* or *municipium*, opposed to the Greek πόλις or Roman *urbs*.[127] The common use of *Ascraeus* as a metonymy for Hesiod in Varro, Ovid, and Vergil,[128] meanwhile, is to define the man by his place of origin more than by any other identity marker.[129] The reference to Hesiod's agricultural didactic inserted here in *Ascraeum carmen* goes beyond merely noting the poem's generic identity: the particular formulation carries forward the poem's focus on local origins, both by defining Hesiod through the place of his birth and patrimony—his *germana patria*—and through its concentration on the smaller locality of the *kōmē* or the *oppidum* rather than the *urbs* or the *polis*.

Furthermore, the recognition of the strong local valence in *Ascraeum carmen* reveals in turn the difficulties inherent in the line's other member: *Romana per oppida*. The plural *oppida* must refer to all of the towns of Italy, mentioned briefly earlier in the passage (155-57), scattered throughout the peninsula. Here, at the end of the *laudes Italiae*, these Italian towns are explicitly called *Romana*, simultaneously closing and epitomizing the movement of the entire passage. On the one hand, the naming of these towns as *Romana* recognizes the (relatively new) status of *Italia* as a unified Roman province, and that of its residents as fully enfranchised citizens of the Roman state: Italy has become Roman, and Italians are being incorporated into Rome's empire. At the same time, the conceptualization of these "Roman towns" introduces the same problem as the "Roman triumphs" of line 148: just as the sacrifice of Italian-bred bulls for Roman triumphal ceremonies represents a consumption and deletion of Italian resources for the sake of Roman advancement, there is likewise an erasure of Italian identity at the end of this passage, where the "praises of Italy" transform into the singing of didactic verse through *Roman* towns. The juxtaposition of *Ascraeum* and *Romana*—the spectre of local identity against a state identity which seems at times to have usurped it—brings to a climax the *laudes Italiae*'s multi-layered exploration of the meeting of local Italian and Roman state identities, as contradictory and mutually reinforcing aspects of the Roman municipal citizen's identity.

The *laudes Italiae*, then, brings together tensions between individual Latin *municipia*, the *germanae patriae* of so many Romans, and Roman identity itself, the *patria communis* into which all are taken. It presents a vision of a unified Italy that redounds to Roman glory, but that has been united via the exploitation of natural resources, the subjugation of local tribes, and in the Romans' own selective historical memory. At the same time, there is an affection in Vergil's final address to this unified Italy, a pride in its greatness of men—*salve, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus, magna virum* (173-4)—and an earnest sincerity in the statement of his mission to praise this Italy—*tibi res antiquae laudis et artem ingredior sanctos ausus recludere fontis* (174-5). Vergil believes in the potential of *Italia*, in the greatness of the concept of Italy as a pancultural idea, perhaps brought together under Roman auspices, or perhaps, in a picture that begins to be painted in the second half of the *Aeneid*, as a unity effected through its own actions and intention. In either case, because such a conception structures identity in a way that shifts focus from the diversity of character of individual locales, to that which is shared—to those ways in which they can be understood as undistinguished units

125 Cf. *TLL*, s.v. *Ascra (-ē)*: "*vicus Boeotiae, Hesiodi patria*" (2.0.772.29).

126 Hesiod, *Works and Days* 639-40: νάσσατο δ' ἄγχ' Ἑλικῶνος ὀιζυρῇ ἐνὶ κώμῃ, Ἄσκρῃ, χεῖμα κακῇ, θέρει ἀργαλέῃ, οὐδέ ποτ' ἐσθλῇ.

127 Cf. the equivalency made between the *kōmē* and the Attic *dēmos* at Arist. *Po.* 1448a36.

128 Varro, *DRR* 1.1.9: *Hesiodos Ascraeus*; Ovid *Ars. Am.* 2.4: *Ascraeo Maeonioque seni* (cf. Statius *Silv.* 5.3.26), *Amores* 1.15.9: *vivet Maeonides ... vivet et Ascraeus*; Vergil *Ecl.* 6.70: *Ascraeo ... seni.*

129 Cf.: Statius *Silvae* 4.7.26: *famae ... Mantuanae*; Ps-Sallust. *In Ciceronem* 1: *Romule Arpinas*.

in a homogeneous or holistic unity—the question becomes whether such an integration can be effected without an essential change to the cultures as they existed pre-integration, especially in the face of pre-existing histories of contact, cultural hierarchies, and cultural or ethnic stereotypes. Central to this group of issues are the very natures of culture and civilization themselves—that is to say, how the line is drawn between that which is *cultus*—"cultivated, civilized, humane"—and that which is *incultus*—"uncultivated, uncivilized, feral"—a question the metaphor of agri-*culture* can at least attempt to answer.

Ab natura et humano cultu: Georgic Metaphors of Civilization and Culture

In the above discussion of the proem to the *Georgics*, it was observed that Vergil's stated themes—*laetas segetes, terram vertere, adiungere vitis*, etc.—were all centered around the unifying concept of *cultus*, "cultivation", itself a duality split between the practical and objective—planting, ploughing, grafting—and the experiential and subjective—cultivation as a metaphor for civilization, refinement, and cultural progress. In a poem that list *cultus* as one of its central concerns from the very start (*qui cultus habendo sit pecori*, 1.3-4); which proclaims for its readers the importance of "learning in advance the inherited cultivations of places" (*praediscere ... cura sit ... patrios cultusque ... locorum*, 1.51-2) and "the kinds of cultivation proper to each kind" (*proprios generatim discite cultus*, 2.35); and which almost identifies the king of the gods and lead cultural hero as *pater ipse colendi*, "the father of cultivation (civilization?) himself" (1.121), before the following line sets the grammar straight[130]—in a poem like that, it is imperative to understand exactly how a term such as *cultus* is functioning in both the *Georgics* and in wider Latin literature, and to what extent the original (nonmetaphorical) denotation bleeds into the (metaphorical) connotation of the word.[131]

As it turns out, one effect of this concatenation of meanings within the term *cultus* is that the original non-value-laden polarity *cultus/incultus*—"cultivated/uncultivated" or "educated/uneducated"—frequently imports into itself the value implications associated with the more subjective metaphorical dichotomizations: "civilized/uncivilized", "enlightened/ignorant", "humane/barbaric". Relevant to our consideation of the metaphor of cultivation in Vergil is the situation where *cultus*, used in its unmarked meaning of "cultivation/tillage" or "way of life", imports in context the implications of "culture", "civilization", or "sophistication". A pre-Vergilian example of this bleeding of significations is found in Sallust's *Bellum Iugurthinum*, in his account of the Battle at the river Muthul. Sallust's initial description of the battle site emphasizes its dryness, barrenness and emptiness of human or natural growth: the plain where the battle will occur is "deserted on account of its lack of water" (*deserta penuria aquae*) and the surround hills support only plants that flourish in dry and sandy soil (*quae humi arido atque harenoso gignuntur*).[132] Rising high above this lower landscape is a great mountain described as *vastus ab natura et humano cultu*—"naturally deserted and free from human cultivation". The clause is meticulously

[130] *G.* 1.121-22: *pater ipse colendi | haud facilem esse viam voluit.* "Father (Jove) himself by no means wanted the way of cultivation to be easy." ("Himself, the father (–) of cultivation, by no means easy did he wish the way to be.")
[131] As far as I have been able to tell, no largescale study of the metaphor of *cultus* in Latin has ever been undertaken; it is my guess that this is in part due to the monumental scale of such a project, considering the sheer number of sub-specialized applications of the metaphor: religion (*cultus deorum*), physical decoration and adornment (as in elegy; ~*ornatus*), philosophy (*cultus animi*), literature (*cultus litterarum*), civilization (*humanus cultus*).
[132] Sallust, *BJ* 48.3ff.

constructed:[133] it is clear that Sallust means to insinuate that the landscape lacks not only natural growth (*natura*) and the cultivation of crops by humans (*humano cultu*), but also *humano cultu* in the sense of human civilization or culture. This "uncultivated" landscape clearly parallels the nomadic and semi-barbaric character of the "uncultured" Numidians in Sallust's work, which repeatedly characterizes the natives as "anti-Roman" others who fail to meet Roman cultural norms.[134] Livy makes use of the same conflation of agricultural and cultural "cultivation" in his description of the descent of Hannibal's army from the lifeless Alps into Italy:[135] from the barren mountaintops (*nuda cacumina*) to the valleys, sunny hills, and forests further down (*valles ... apricos quosdam colles ... silvas*), the Carthaginians finally arrive at *humano culto digniora loca*—places more suitable *for* human habitation, to be sure, but also places that are more valuable or worthy by virtue of not only human tillage, but through the existence of culture and civilization more generally. Just as in Sallust, it is impossible to prevent *cultus*' slippage into metaphorical, value-laden signification.

Vergil himself takes advantage of this conflation in the *Aeneid*, notably in Evander's description of the earliest inhabitants of Rome in Book 8. Inhabiting the groves of Rome first were (*Aen.* 8.315-18):

> ... gensque virum truncis et duro robore nata, 315
> quis neque mos neque cultus erat, nec iungere tauros
> aut componere opes norant aut parcere parto,
> sed rami atque asper victu venatus alebat. 318
>
> ... a race of men born from trunks of trees and tough oak, 315
> who had neither custom nor cultivation, nor did they know
> how to yoke bulls, or to store surplus, or to preserve gains,
> but were nourished by the branch and hunting's tough fare. 318

More clearly here than in the above passages, *cultus* signifies to a "civilized or sophisticated condition" of living,[136] working in semantic as well as grammmatical parallel with *mos*. It is, however, an understanding

[133] The great ingenuity of this line is the dual interpretation of the parallel ablatives, each one a zeugma wherein one of the pairs strains the natural Latin grammar. In one understanding, *ab* is taken as a complement to *vastus*, a construction more suitable with *humano cultu*: "free from human cultivation, and from natural growth (*natura*)". In the second, *ab natura* is taken phrasally ("naturally"), with *humano cultu* something like an ablative of respect: "naturally deserted and (deserted) with respect to human cultivation". Sensewise, the most natural interpretation is a mixed reading, with a phrasal *ab natura*, "naturally", but *humano cultu* understood as a second object of *ab*, but taken as a complement to *vastus* rather than phrasally: "naturally deserted, and free from human cultivation." Vergil surely knew of this line, as he plays off of it at *Aen.* 8.8: *latos vastant cultoribus agros*. Servius ad *Aen.* 8.8 notes the parallel: '*abducendo cultores vastos et desertos efficiunt. Sallustius in Iugurtha: 'vastus ab natura et humano cultu*.'

[134] Morstein-Marx 2001: "[T]he Numidians are represented as archetypal "anti-Romans," parallel to the Romans as an imperial people but occupying the opposite cultural pole. The Jugurthine War is to be a clash not merely between two centers of power but between cultures—the civilized center versus the semibarbarous, seminomadic fringe" (195); "The [account] sets the Jugurthine conflict within a wider cultural context: this will be a war not merely between the Roman people and a particularly energetic and cunning African prince, but between Roman civilization and the mobile, treacherous, seminomadic "Other" whose dangerous intractability and capacity to erode the bases of civilized order were to be proven not for the last time in 112-105 B.C." (180).

[135] Livy 21.37.4-6.

[136] So the *OLD* classifies this usage: *OLD*, s.v. *cultus*2, 9. The *TLL* lists this passage at 4.0.1333.52-5, at *cultus*2, II, A, 2, a, β ("*quivis status, habitus, species ... hominis ... generatim i. q. vitae consuetudo, victus, apparatus ... de gentibus, civitatibus*")—that is, as the custom of life or way of living attributable to individual peoples or cities. The *OLD*

of culture or civilization in which knowledge of cultivation clearly stands for progress, considering *neque cultus erat* is almost immediately glossed as *nec iungere tauros aut componere opes norant*, not familiar with yoking bulls (for ploughing) or storing crops (the result of cultivation). In Evander's account, the earliest inhabitants of the site of Rome do not have established customs (*mos*) or a distinct way of living (*cultus*), nor do they have *cultus* in the sense of *agri cultura*, from which entails a lack of cultural sophistication or refinement: the various sense of *cultus* blend into one another here, as testified to by Servius' comments.[137]

This collapsing of the significations of *cultus* also occurs in passages where the primary intended meaning of *cultus* is "training" or "education"; in this case, *cultus* often becomes ideologically entwined with the positively valued humanistic results of traditional Greco-Roman pedagogy: *sapientia*, *eruditio*, *honestas*, *humanitas*, and familiarity with *studia liberalia*, *litterae*, and other *artes*. Thus, Cicero in the *De Finibus* can claim "that that the duty and function of Wisdom (*sapientiae*) is entirely centred in the work of perfecting man (*in hominis cultu esse occupatum*)",[138] while in a discussion of the good and the honorable in the *De Partitione Oratoria*, he comments that the pain of dishonor is a firm witness that "the human race was designed by nature for what is honourable (*ad honestatem natum*), although it has been corrupted by bad education (*malo cultu*) and erroneous opinions".[139] In the first passage, it is intimated that humanity's journey toward wisdom is a part of not only its education, but also its progress toward civilization and self-perfection; in the second, Cicero's claim that humankind has been corrupted by *malo cultu* implies that the goal of unmarked (i.e. *bonus*) *cultus* is honor, *honestas*, itself. This close implication between *cultus*-as-education and the kind of cultural advancement granted by knowledge of *studia liberalia* is likewise emphasized in Seneca: in the *De Beneficiis*, the philosopher claims "cultivation of the mind" (*animi cultum*) can be purchased from a teacher of *bonae artes*, while in the *Dialogi* he speaks of one "who has arrived at progress through liberal studies (*studiis liberalibus*) and the cultivation of knowledge (*sapientiae cultu*).[140] *Studia liberalia*, named for their fitness for *liberi*—"free-born men"—are equated with *animi cultus*, whose meaning bleeds from "education" into cultural "refinement", pursued to match the expected respectability of the free-born *nobilitas*.[141]

has judged slightly better, in this author's opinion. Cf. Serv. ad *G.* 1.3, for whom *cultus* here "*ad animam refertur.*"

137 Servius ad *Aen.* 8.316: "*NEQUE CULTUS ERAT id est nullam sui curam habebant. alii ad animum referunt, ut Sallustius "indocti incultique". alii ... hic 'cultum' legem, imperium dictum volunt*." The passage from Sallust to which Servius refers is *Cat.* 2.8, where he says the mass of men have "*indocti incultique vitam sicuti peregrinantes transiere*." Cf. Livy's discussion of the *pomerium* at 1.44.4-5, which the Romans have designated "in order that outside (the wall) there might lie open some stretch of ground untainted by human *cultus*" (*ut ... extrinsecus puri aliquid ab humano cultu pateret soli*), a qualification he then glosses by identifying the space as one "which it was lawful neither to inhabit nor to till" (*quod neque habitari neque arari fas erat*). Cf. also *Aen.* 5.730: *gens dura atque aspera cultu.*

138 *De fin.* 4.36: ... *omne officium munusque sapientiae in hominis cultu esse occupatum*. Cf. *Nat Deor.* 2.130. Text and English translation of the *De Finibus* is that of Rackham 1914.

139 *Part. orat.* 91: *quarum rerum dolor gravis est testis genus hominum ad honestatem natum, malo cultu pravisque opinionibus corruptum*; text and English translation that of Rackham 1942.

140 *De benef.* 6.15.2: *emis* [...] *a bonarum artium praeceptore studia liberalia et animi cultum*; *Dial.* 2.17.3: *cur is non possit qui studiis liberalibus et sapientiae cultu ad aliquem profectum pervenerit*.

141 Cf. Livy's uses of *cultus* in the story of L. Tarquinius Priscus' discovery of Servius Tullius: upon witnessing the omen of the flame upon the boy's head, Tanaquil pulls her husband and asks '*Viden tu puerum hunc ... quem tam humili cultu educamus?*', "Do you see this boy whom we are raising in such low circumstances?" Predicting that he will be a protector of their fortune and family, the royal pair decide to raise the boy as their own child: *inde puerum liberum loco coeptum haberi, erudirique artibus, quibus ingenia ad magnae fortunae cultum excitantur*, "and so it began that they raised the boy as one of their own children, and he was educated in those arts by which natural character is urged on to the cultivation of great fortune." While *cultus* is not precisely education here, the use of *erudirique artes*, *ingenia*, and, indeed, *liberum* in the same context points toward the education-adjacent meanings

Where this alignment *cultus* with civilization, progress, and the privileged emblems of Greco-Roman cultural cachet becomes more sinister is in the creation of a polarization between *culti* and *inculti*—between the idea of civilized, culturally advanced societies, and peoples that are uncivilized or barbaric by way of some perceived cultural deficiency. The creation of just such a polarity can be glimpsed in Seneca's *De Ira*.[142] Discussing the extreme actions undertaken in anger by the Persian kings Darius and Xerxes, Seneca feels justified to pass cultural judgment on the "barbarian" (*barbaris*) Persians on account of their lack of civilized learning gained through the "cultivation" of literature: "Such was the ferocity (*feritas*) of barbarian kings (*barbaris regibus*) in anger—men who had had no contact with learning (*eruditio*) or the culture of letters (*nullus litterarum cultus*)".[143] The implicit and polarized hierarchy Seneca creates between civilization (*eruditio*; *cultus*) and barbarity (*feritas*; *barbaris*) helps push the meaning of *cultus* from simply "learning" toward the a defining mark of civil society. *Barbarus*, as shown clearly in the second chapter, can be used both as a means of distancing from the dominant culture and of delegitimizing the cultural influence or capital the other might possess. *Feritas* does much the same work; by attributing this quality to the Persian kings because of their anger, Seneca imparts to them a markedly inhumane, animalistic character, considering the word's root in *ferus*—"wild, undomesticated". Darius and Xerxes are portrayed linguistically as feral beasts or uncouth barbarians, doomed to savagery because of their lack of learning.

This effect of differentiating, of distancing from established ideas of humanity and civil society is even more pronounced in those cases where the sense of *cultus* is closest to the modern sense of "culture". It is this sense of *cultus* that Caesar calls upon to explain the ferocity and martial skill of the Belgae, who are "the fiercest in war of all [in Gaul], on account of the fact that they are the furthest removed from the culture (*cultu*) and civilization (*humanitate*)[144] of our province [Gallia Narbonensis]".[145] Cicero also aligns *cultus* with *humanitas*, when he states in the *De finibus* that the *animi cultus* involved in writing philosophical treatises was for Demetrius of Phalerum "like a certain nourishment of the human condition" (*quasi quidam humanitatis cibus*).[146] In the *De Oratore*, meanwhile, Cicero follows Seneca in opposing "this civilized human culture" (*hunc humanum cultum civilem*) of his contemporary Rome to the "wild, uncouth life" (*fera agrestique vita*) of mankind's earlier stages of cultural advancement.[147] *Cultus*, then, served as both the distinction and the diagnostic of the sufficient or insufficient advancement of a group:[148] as a result, *cultus* is associated

of *cultus*. Cf. also: Livy 39.8.3; Horace *Carm.* 4.4.34.

142 *De Ira* 16.3ff.

143 *De Ira* 17.1: *haec barbaris regibus feritas in ira fuit, quos nulla eruditio, nullus litterarum cultus imbuerat*. I borrow the text and translation of Basore 1928.

144 *OLD*, s.v. *humanitas*, 2: "The quality distinguishing civilized man from savages or beasts, civilization, culture." The *OLD* lists the current passage as a usage example for this meaning.

145 "Our province" = *Gallia Narbonensis. BG* 1.1.3: *horum omnium fortissimi sunt Belgae, propterea quod a cultu atque humanitate provinciae longissime absunt.* The passage continues: ... *minimeque ad eos mercatores saepe commeant atque ea quae ad effeminandos animos pertinent important, proximique sunt Germanis, qui trans Rhenum incolunt, quibuscum continenter bellum gerunt. Cultus* thus probably carries a further association of "over-refinement" or "luxury" here (*OLD* s.v. *cultus*, 9c), though it does not change the main point: for Caesar, it is precisely the trappings of "civilization" or "culture" which are responsible for the failure of martial strength; thus, it is the Belgae's *distance* from "civilized" Roman society that keeps them strong in battle, as Caesar's point about their constant warring with the Germans shows. Cf. Hirtius, *BG* 8.25.2: *Treverorum civitas ... cultu et feritate non multum a Germanis differebat*.

146 *De fin.* 5.54: *animi cultus ille erat ei quasi quidam humanitatis cibus*.

147 *De orat.* 1.33: *quae vis alia potuit aut dispersos homines unum in locum congregare, aut a fera agrestique vita ad hunc humanum cultum civilemque deducere*.

148 Cf. Quintilian *Inst.* 2.5.23: "I should recommend reading both the older orators (because, if the solid,

with such "advanced" cultural qualities as *pietas*, *officium*, and *caritas*,[149] while those on the Roman periphery, such as the Libyans or tribes inhabiting the Alps, are called *inculti*.[150] This *culti-inculti* opposition is matched in Roman authors by another polarity, that between *cultus* and the rustic or provincial. We have already glimpsed this polarity in Cicero's opposition of a primitive *fera agrestisque vita* to contemporary *humanus cultus civilis*; in the *Pro Quinctio*, Cicero likewise describes a client's *rusticana et inculta parsimonia*—"rustic and uncultivated frugality"—here a boon, in opposition to luxury and licentiousness, themselves more negative effects of advanced civilization.[151] Perhaps the clearest expression of this polarity is in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*, when he rejoices in being born as late as he was, not because of the age's luxury, "but because now culture (*cultus*) is present, and rusticity (*rusticitas*), that leftover from our earliest grandsires, has not lasted until our current time".[152] While Ovid's claim that *rusticitas* is absent from his current day is a sure exaggeration—certainly he means a lack of civilized culture—what is abundantly clear is the division he has created, as had others, between a rustic, uncivilized past without culture, and a more advanced present with it.

Returning to the *Georgics*, this polarization between *inculta* and *culta* finds a striking parallel in the distinction the text repeatedly draws between *natura*, "nature", and *cultus*, both "cultivation" and "culture In its most basic form, this duality between *natura* and *cultus* concerns itself with the relationship and differences between two types of growth and production: in the first place, spontaneous, natural growth which requires no human intervention, a circumstance for which the untended abundance of the Golden Age is often presented as exemplar; and, secondly, the cultivated, interventional growth associated with humankind's agricultural *labor*, the reality of the farmer's world associated so often in the poem and its scholarship with the age of Jupiter. The poem's acknowledgement of these two modes—"natural" and "cultivated"—is established quite early in the poem, in the final lines of the 19-line invocation of Vergil's agricultural pantheon, immediately before beginning the second 19-line invocation of Augustus (1.21-23):

dique deaeque omnes, studium quibus arva tueri,	21
quique novas alitis non ullo semine fruges	
quique satis largum caelo demittitis imbrem.	23
All you gods and goddesses whose concern it is to watch over the fields,	21
both you who nourish new produce, grown from no seed,	
and you who release from above plentiful rain for planted crops.	23

Vergil turns what was an established and necessary feature of Roman religious procedure—the *generalis invocatio*, which ended a prayer with a catch-all invocation of all potentially relevant deities so that, according

masculine force of their genius can be acquired, but without the layer of uncouthness (*squalore*) incident to that primitive (*rudis*) age, our own more polished culture will shine with extra brilliance" (*suaserim et antiquos legere, ex quibus si adsumatur solida ac virilis ingenii vis deterso rudis saeculi squalore, tum noster hic cultus clarius enitesceat*). Text and translation are those of Russell 2002, with slight modification of the translation.

[149] Cicero, *Inv.* 2.161: *pietas est, per quam sanguine coniunctis patriaeque benevolum officium et diligens tribuitur cultus*; *Part. Or.* 88: *cum deorum tum parentum patriaeque cultus eorumque hominum qui aut sapientia aut opibus excellunt ad caritatem referri solet*.

[150] Sallust, *Iug.* 18.1: *Libyes asperi incultique*; Vell. Pat. 2.90.1: *Alpes feris incultisque nationibus celebres*.

[151] *Pro Quinct*. 92.

[152] *Ars. Am.* 3.127-8: *Sed quia cultus est, nec nostros mansit in annos Rusticitas, priscis illa superstes avis*.

to Servius, "one not leave out any divine power (*ne quod numen praetereat*)"[153]—into an opportunity to delineate one of the poem's most important dichotomies. While the divinities in Vergil's *generalis invocatio* are united by their oversight of agricultural production in general (*studium quibus arva tueri*, 21),[154] they are subsequently divided into two camps: those overseeing natural and spontaneous growth, a phenomenon represented here by the *non ullo semine fruges*, "crops from no seed", and those concerned with the anthropogenic growth of cultivated crops, trees, and plants—the "planted things" (*satis*, 23) of the final line which depend on god-sent rain. The placement of this initial statement of opposition between natural and artificial growth at the very end of the invocation of the twelve rural deities, just before the start of the separate address to the urban and Roman Augustus, serves to map this spontaneous-cultivated division onto the division between local and Roman concerns explored in an earlier section. In line 22, "*quique novas alitis non ullo semine fruges*" introduces the gods overseeing natural production as a kind of summarizing climax to the list of rural gods, while the call to gods who watch over cultivated growth in line 23—*quique satis largum caelo demittitis imbrem*—serves as a thematic introdution to the address of Augustus, who might be responsible for overseeing the fields (*terrarumque ... curam*, 26) in his role as increaser of agricultural production (*auctorem frugum*, 27). Augustus thus becomes one of the gods looking out for planted crops.

After the poet's call to Augustus to bless the undertaking and have pity on the farmers, Vergil begins the poem proper with what Christine Perkell has called agriculture's "primal moment"—the ploughing of a new field to begin the process of growing.[155] Yet before the poet can even get started, he breaks off to declare what the farmer should do beforehand: learn the natural dispositions of the place and its established customs of cultivation before even beginning to go abou raising a crop (1.50-63):

> ac prius ignotum ferro quam scindimus aequor, 50
> ventos et varium caeli praediscere morem
> cura sit ac patrios cultusque habitusque locorum,
> et quid quaeque ferat regio et quid quaeque recuset.
> hic segetes, illic veniunt felicius uvae,
> arborei fetus alibi atque iniussa virescunt 55
> gramina.
>
> And so before we plough through an unknown plain with iron, 50
> let care be taken to learn in advance the winds and the sky's changeful
> disposition, to learn the ancestral care and keeping of places:
> what each region might produce and what each one refuses to bear.

[153] Serv. ad *G.* 1.21: *post specialem invocationem transit ad generalitatem, ne quod numen praetereat*. N.B. D.Serv. ad loc.: *more pontificum, quoniam ritu veteri in omnibus sacris post speciales deos, quos ad ipsum sacrum quod fiebat necesse erat invocari, generaliter omnia numina invocabantur*. Cf. Thomas 1988a: 72 ad 1.21-23: "a good instance of the Roman sacral practice of 'covering oneself' by an all-inclusive invocation". Mynors 1990 argues that the structure of *...-que ...-que* here prevents these lines from having the appended nature of such an invocation, claiming that here "[t]he effect is not to add, but to sum up" (p. 7 ad 1.21); cf. Appel: 1909. While this type of generalizing formula does not come up in Varro, there is a famous example in a religious formula in Cato, *De Agri Cultura* 139: *lucum conlucare Romano more sic oportet: porco piaculo facito, sic verba concipito: si deus, si dea est, quoiium illud sacrum est, uti tibi...*

[154] A*rva*, etymologized by the Romans from *arare*, "to plough," and so sometimes narrowly defined as ploughed land (Varro, *LL* 5.39: *arvum, quod aratum nec dum satum est*), was nevertheless also used for other agricultural land: Prop. 4.9.19: *arva bovaria*; Paul. Fest. p. 25 Müller: *aut arvus est ager aut consitus aut pascuus aut florens*.

[155] Perkell 1989.

In this place crops, in that place grapes grow more productively;
elsewhere young trees and grasses grow green without compulsion. 55

Vergil's exhortation to learn ahead of time the *patrios cultusque habitusque locorum* is especially striking considering the focus we have identified so far on the importance of the *germana patria* and local identity in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. The phrase *patrios cultus* in particularly meaningful considering the earlier discussion: while I have translated *patrius* as "ancestral" above, the collocation of *patrios* with the genitive *locorum* pushes the an interpretation of *patrios cultus* as "each patria's particular methods of cultivation", a focus on diversity of place and produce that the poet clarifies with the following line: "which things each region can produce, and which things each one refuse to bear" (*quid quaeque ferat regio et quid quaeque recuset*, 1.53). Here at the beginning of the poem's technical material, Vergil reasserts the lesson of the first *Eclogue* and the *laudes Italiae*—the great diversity of production and population in Italy when one focuses on local character. This focus on the diversity of the world's products is emphasized later in this section, with India praised for ivory, Elis for its horses, etc.,[156] while later in *Georgics* 2 Vergil will focus on the variety of soils in different Italian locales, including Tarentum, Mantua, Capua, Vesuvius, Clanius, and Acerrae.[157]

In the process of restating the fact of different land's diverse characters and products, Vergil also returns to the opposition between spontaneous growth and agricultural intervention first proposed some twenty lines before: "Here planted crops (*segetes*) grow best, there grapes (*uvae*); in another place young trees (*arborei fetus*) and grasses grow green of their own accord (*iniussa*)". The earlier distinction between cultivated and natural growth re-emerges here in the opposition of, on the one hand, cultivated plants usch as the vine and *segetes*, "field crops" (which Varroe etymologizes as deriving from *serere*, "to plant", and *semen*, "seed"),[158] and, on the other hand, the young trees[159] and grasses which are said to grow *iniussa*, without human intervention.[160] The counterbalancing of cultivated and uncultivated growth pops up repeatedly in the remainder of Book 1. At line 69, Vergil recommends a light plowing in September "so that the grasses do not diminish the fertile crop's yield" (*officiant laetis ne frugibus herbae*), with the farmer needing to take care to remove the spontaneously growing grasses from around the fertile planted crops. Moreover, in the aetiology of *labor* soon after, the main difference between the current epoch and the Golden Age is precisely the replacement of spontaneous growth with the hard labor of cultivation.

The fullest treatment of the distinction between spontaneous and cultivated growth occurs at the beginning of *Gerogics* 2. The treatment to come is hinted at in the book's opening lines, where Vergil states he has so far sung of *arvorum cultus et sidera caeli* (1), but now will sing of the *nec non silvestria ... virgulta et prolem tarde crescentis olivae* (2-3), with an opposition between the *cultus* of the earlier book's crops and the products of the current book, both the naturally growing *virgulta*, defined by Columella as "those plants that grow without human attention, wild and untamed",[161] and the olive, which Vergil later proclaims to need no

156 1.56-61.
157 2.177-225.
158 *DLL* 5.37: "*Seges* comes from *satus* 'planting'—that is, from *semen* 'planted seed'" (*seges ab satu, id est semine*).
159 I follow Mynors in taking *arborei fetus* here not as the fruit of the trees, but as young trees: "here, since *alibi* introduces both *fetus* and *gramina*, it is awkward not to take both nouns as the subject of *virescunt*, and we must therefore think of 'young, growing trees', rather than of apples" (Mynors 1990: 12 ad loc.).
160 Cf. *G.* 1.22: *non ullo semine*. Indeed, in *G.* 2, the vine will emerge as the epitome of the cultivated product, while fruit trees, and the olive in particular, become associated strongly with natural, spontaneous growth.
161 Col. 3.1.2: *quae non ope humana giguntur, silvestres et ferae*. Cf. *nec non silvestria* here.

cultivation.[162] Yet it is with the start of Book 2's technical treatment of trees and vines that the poet is really able to flesh out his pictures of these two different types of growth, beginning with lines 9-82, a highly organized double-treatment of the themes of natural and agricultural propagation in trees:

2. 9-34:	*26 lines*	*First long section on natural vs. cultivated growth*
9-21	*13 lines*	*Natural growth*
22-34	*13 lines*	*Cultivated growth*
2. 35-46	*12 lines*	*"Second" proem: Growth differs by geographical location*
2. 47-72	*26 lines*	*Second long section on natural vs. cultivated growth*
47-62	*16 lines*	*"Natural" methods available to the cultivator* [163]
63-72	*10 lines*	*"Artificial" methods available to the cultivator* [164]
2. 73-82	*10 lines*	*Excurses on grafting and budding (artificial methods)*

This first technical section of the book contains two 26-lines sections (9-34, 47-72), each divided roughly evenly between discussions of natural versus interventional growth, and each followed by a shorter section, the first by the "second proem" (35-46) on the importance of adjusting cultivation for geographical location, and the second by an extended treatment of grafting as a method of artificial growth (73-82).[165]

That this entire passage will alternate between discussions of these different types of propagation is announced, meanwhile, in its opening line, where the poet asserts that "the nature of propagation among trees is varied" (*arboribus varia est natura creandis*, 2.9); this idea that a diversity of propagation exists among trees returns to the idea that cultivation differs from geographcal diversity in the previous book. From here, Vergil start in on his discussion of the different types of natural propagation: there are those tress that arise "of their own accord" (*ipsae*, 10; *sua sponte*, 11), trees that grow from seeds (*posito … de semine*, 14), and trees that send out new shoots from a former root (*pullulat ab radice*, 17). "These are the first methods nature (*natura*) granted", Vergil summarizes, "but there are others (*sunt alii*), which experience (*usus*) itself has discovered along the way".[166] The poet then enters upon another 13-line section that introduces several examples of interventional propagation: the planting of suckers (23-24) and of stems (24-25); propagation by layering (26-7) and cutting (28-9), and growth from a piece of trunk (30-1); and, finally, grafting, which receives the longest individual treatment (32-4). At this point, Vergil interrupts his theme with a second proem, exhorting his readers (*agricolae*, 36)[167] to "learn the cultivation that is appropriate to each kind of thing" (*proprios generatim discite cultus*, 35), and to address his patron Maecenas (39-46). Following this, Vergil

[162] *G.* 2.420: *contra non ulla est oleis cultura.*
[163] Mynors 1990: 107: "the three natural methods are made usable ... from the point of view of the cultivator."
[164] Ibid. 108: "... how to use the artificial methods of propagation."
[165] As Mynors 1990 notes, behind the division because natural and artificial growth here "lies the distinction in Theophrastus *c.p.* 2.1.1 between wild and cultivated" (101), but Vergil's structure creates great emphasis here.
[166] *G.* 2.20-2: *hos natura modos primum dedit, his genus omne silvarum fruticumque viret nemorumque sacrorum. sunt alii, quos ipse via sibi repperit usus.*
[167] Vergil never makes it clear whether his erstwhile addressee in the *Georgics*, the *agricola*, is meant to represent small subsistence farmers, the owner of substantial urban villas, or both (or neither). Thibodeau 2011 has recently argued that it is wealthy landowners who managed large estates, but would never undertake any of the physical labor themselves, that are overwhelmingly the intended audience of the *Georgics*; those places where it seems a smaller "subsistence"-type farmer is addressed, Thibodeau ascribes to Vergil's indulging the elite's desire to "play the farmer," i.e., imagine themselves as the ideal of the sedulous Roman farmer as a way of connecting more closely to their rural pursuits.

starts upon the second 26-line section, which recapitulates the types of natural and artificial propagation covered in the earlier section, echoing its themes and language,[168] but in way that makes the methods usable for the farmer, in roughly the same order: thus Vergil first discusses the natural methods of transplantation (47-52), the replanting of suckers away from their parent tree (53-6), and the disadvantages of trees and vines that grow from seeds (57-60). It is the disadvantages of the natural methods of growth, in particular, that one must channel labor into the artificial methods (*scilicet omnibus est labor impendendus*, 61), which are discussed in roughly the opposite order from the first section, with grafting again occupying the last and longest section (65-82). The final image of the section is particularly striking, the vivid personified description of a grafted tree "aghast at strange foliage and fruit not its own" (*miratastque novas frondes et non sua poma*, 82), that has been called a "chilling characterization of man's distortion of the natural world".[169]

One undeniable feature of this passage is the frequent personification with which the trees and vines discussed here are treated. Among the spontaneously growing trees, there are those which "come to be of themselves, of their own will" (*ipsae sponte sua veniunt*, 10-11) and "inhabit the fields and wide-curving rivers" (*camposque et flumina late curva tenent*, 11-12), which "rise up from a fallen seed" (*posito surgunt de semine*, 14) and "shoot up beneath the great shadow of their mother (*sub ingenti matris se subicit umbra*, 19); the active verbs paint the trees as people executing these actions by their own will. The initial descriptions of cultivated growth likewise make use of personification, though here the personified subjects have become objects violently acted upon by some unnamed, outside force: "This one has torn away suckers from the tender body of the mothers and placed them in furrows" (*hic plantas tenero abscindens de corpore matrum deposuit sulcis*, 23-24); "Other plants wait for their own progeny, bent over and pressed into the ground, to become living shoots in their own soil" (*silvarumque aliae pressos propaginis arcus expectant et viva sua plantaria terra*, 26-7); "The pruner doesn't hesitate to cut off its topmost part and bury it in the earth" (*summumque putator haud dubitat terrae reference mandare cacumen*, 28-29). The frequent personification makes it that much easier for a reader to read this as a catalogue not of plant information, but of human activity.

Furthermore, having already seen the tensions between local and Roman that exist in the *Georgics*—Vergil's appeal to *di patrii Indigetes et Romule Vestaque mater* at 1.498 is less than 100 lines before this passage, the *laudes Italiae* less than 100 lines after it—it is difficult to not see the same themes playing a role in this passage. Moreover, we saw in the Introduction how this same dichotomy between nature and culture was also present in the language Cicero used when discussing the difference between the *germana patria* and *patria communis*—namely, Cicero defined the *germana patria* mainly through natural or naturally occurring concepts such as nature (*natura*), place (*locus*; *solum*), birth (*nasci*; *procreari*; *oriri*), and descent (*pater*; *avus*; *maiores*; *stirps*; *genus*), while he associates the *patria communis* linguistically and notionally with artificial and man-made interventions such as citizenship and law (*civitas*; *ius*), collectivity (*communis*; *universa*; *publica*), and incorporation or integration (*suscipere*; *excipere*).[170]

The same clusters of concepts and linguistic themes from Cicero's discussion of the *duae patriae* also emerge in this passage, in such a way that Vergil's discussion of spontaneous growth aligns with the idea of the *germana patria*, and that of cultivated growth with the *patria communis*. In the first place, the language used to describe trees' natural growth coincides with prominent terms used in Cicero's

[168] See Thomas (1988) 165, ad 2.47-82n.

[169] Thomas 1988a: 271.

[170] Cf. Farrell 2001's comments on this passage, also quoted in the Introduction: "What is most striking here is the way in which the entire conversation, despite the interlocutors' occasional protests to the contrary, systematically privileges the claims of culture over those of nature" (21).

description of Arpinum as his *origo*, including mentions of *natura* itself. Cicero's initial formulation of the *duae patriae* sets the *natura* of one's native home against the *civitas* of the Roman *patria*: *duas esse censeo patrias, unam naturae, alteram civitatis* (*De Leg.* 2.5). The idea of birth that is etymologically central to *natura*, meanwhile, reoccurs throughout Cicero's discussion of the *germana patria* in the nearly ten occurrences of forms of *nasci, oriri, procreari*, and *gignere* in the passage.[171] In Vergil, references to *natura* bookend Vergil's initial survey of kinds of natural growth, beginning the entire passage with the assertion that "In the first place, the nature of trees' reproduction is varied": *principio arboribus varia est natura creandis* (9). After the poet's enumeration of three types of natural growth, he summarizes again by making reference to *natura*: "Nature provided these methods first of all" (*hos natura modos primum dedit*, 20). In the recapitulation of the kinds of natural growth in the second long section, meanwhile, the ability of certain trees to grow naturally is explained by Vergil as stemming from a natural force (*natura*) that exists in the very soil itself: *quippe solo natura subest* (49).[172]

Cicero's explanation of the *germana patria* and Vergil's discussion of natural growth also both prominently feature terms of relation and descent. Discussing the estate at Arpinum, Cicero tells Atticus that "in this place [my brother and I] have grown up from a very ancient stock (*stirpe*) … here is the origin of our family (*genus*)".[173] Both *stirps* and *genus* likewise appear in Vergil's discussion: the tree which grows as a sucker from another's roots is that *quae stirpibus exit ab imis* (53), "which rises out from the deepest roots"; this description is itself a restatement of the earlier description of the *silva* which *pullulat ab radice* (17), "sprouts out from the root," *radix* itself also often used to refer to the "root" or "origin" of a family.[174] *Genus* likewise appears in Vergil, as when the poet states that "every *genus* [of tree] flourishes in these ways" (*his genus omne … viret*, 20-21) at the close of the first discussion of naturally propagating plants. Both discussions also rely on specific familial relationships or histories to clarify the concepts of "true fatherland" and natural growth. In discussing Arpinum, Cicero makes reference to his father (*patris nostri*), grandfather (*avus*), and ancestors generally (*maiorum*), as well as Cicero's brother Quintus (*fratris mei*), who also features in the dialogue.[175] Such terms of descent are applied to plants and animals frequently in the *Georgics*, including three uses of the word *mater* in this passage to refer to the tree from which either shoots or suckers may be taken. At 2.18-19, Vergil says that the laurel, which propagates by sending up shoots, "thrusts itself up beneath the great shadow of its mother" (*sub ingenti matris se subicit umbra*, 19). This characterization leads to one of the more darkly expressed shortcomings of natural growth about 30 lines later, when "the lofty branches and foliage of the mother (*matris*) steal away fruit from the tree as it grows (*crescentique adimunt fetus*)".[176] Even more troubling is the image of the farmer removing suckers from growing trees in order to transplant them into their own soil: "This one tears away suckers from the tender body of their mothers and plants them in trenches" (*hic plantas tenero abscindens de corpore matrum deposuit sulcis*, 23-24). This violent imagery will return below; what is relevant here is the commonality of language of

171 *orti sumus*; *me … esse natum* (2.3); *in quo tu ortus et procreatus es*; *ubi tu es natus* (2.4); *cum esset Tusculi natus*; *ortu Tusculanus*; *ubi nati*; *quae genuit* (2.5); *quae te procrearit* (2.6). Recall that *germanus* is derived from *germen/gignere*.
172 *Solum*, "soil," is associated with the *germana patria* at *De Leg.* 2.4, when Atticus shares that knowing Cicero's Arpinate origin makes him more delighted (*amicior*) with *huic omni solo*, "this whole countryside" (Keyes 1928).
173 Cicero, *De Leg.* 2.3: *hic enim orti stripe antiquissima sumus, … hic genus*.
174 E.g. Cicero, *Pro Sestio* 50: *divinum illum virum atque ex isdem quibus nos radicibus natum ad salutem huius imperii, C. Marium*; Varro, *DRR* 2.8.1: *nam muli et item hinni … non suopte genere ab radicibus*; Pliny, *HN* 35.71: [*Parrhasius dixit*] *super omnia Apollinis se radice ortum et Herculem*.
175 *De Leg.* 2.3.
176 *G.* 2.55-6: *nunc altae frondes et rami matris opacant crescentique adimunt fetus*.

descent and family to both Cicero's explanation of the *germana patria* and Vergil's description of naturally propagating trees, shrubs, and vines.

The similarity between Cicero's idea of the *patria communis* and the farmer's methods of interventionist propagation is somewhat less obvious—yet a clear parallelism still exists, not least of all in the fact that both the (re-)classification of local Italians as Romans and the use of artificial agricultural propagation involve the imposition of anthropogenic, non-natural systems that change or at least affect original or naturally occurring identities. Thus, Cicero's description of Roman citizenship as it pertains to Italian municipals describes their civic duty and identity through the social and legal arrangements of Roman citizenship (*civitas*, *ius*, *res publica*, etc.), whereas Vergil's descriptions of grafting and transplantation, for example, involve the imposition of tried and tested agricultural techniques (*usus*, 2.22; *labor impendenus*, 2.61; *modus*, 2.73), with the result that trees or vines become changed (*vertere…mutatamque*, 2.33; *mutata*, 50), even strange and unfamiliar to themselves (*novas…non sua*, 2.82). Both "practices", then—of Roman enfranchisement and plant propagation through human intervention—involve the application of a man-made system or technique upon an earlier state, one which is quite often considered "natural" or "original", with the result that the natural or original identity is reworked or changed in some way.

Another more subtle similarity in the language between Cicero's explanation of the *patria iuris* and Vergil's description of artificial plant propagation comes in the fact that in both cases the subject, whether citizens or plant, is described as the passsive recipient of an action being performed by an agent, whether Rome or the farmer. In the *De Legibus*, the municipal Italian subject is described as *being received* or *taken into* the Roman state, with Rome the understood agent; thus, Cato was "taken up" into Roman citizenship (*in populi Romani cititatem susceptus est*, 1.5), and the *patria communis* is described in the same paragraph as both that fatherland "which has received us" (*quae excepit*) and that "by which we are received" (*a qua excepti sumus*). Only *suscipere* and *excipere* are used for this action of enfranchisement, with the newly minted citizen depicted as the object or receiver of the action in all cases. In the *Georgics*, whereas the depiction of trees' natural modes of propagation is rife with the language of activity and agency,[177] the sections on propagation by human intervention present the plants as the object acted upon, and often as the subject of a passive verb, just as with Cicero's enfranchised citizen. One farmer tears off suckers (*plantas…abscindens*, 23), another buries roots (*stirpes obruit*, 24), and a pruner doesn't hesitate to plant a tree-top in the earth (*putator haud dubitat terrae…mandare cacumen*, 28-29); meanwhile, plants and their various parts are pressed down (*pressos*, 26), cut (*sectis*, 30), thrust out (*truditur*, 31), changed (*mutatam*, 33; *mutata*, 50), grafted (*insita*, 33; *inseritur*, 69), driven together (*cogendae*, 62), and forced into domestication (*domandae*, 62). The sections on artificial propagation do contain examples of active verbs, especially in cases where the plants described are personified[178]—but even in these cases the active verb is connected to the personified plant suffering the effects of the farmer's actions: plants subjected to layering await (*expectant*, 27) the emergence of new shoots from their buried tops, which have been pressed down and buried (*pressos*, 26), whereas the various plants at 2.63-5 respond (*respondent*, 64) to instances of human intervention, including the planting of a

177 *nullis hominum cogentibus*, *ipsae* 2.10; *sponte sua*, 10-11, 47; *surgunt*, 14, 48; *se subicit*, 19; *se tollunt*, 47; *stirpibus exit ab imis*, 53; *se sustulit*, 57. In addition to these exceptionally vivid turns of phrase, the plants are likewise given a number of verbs in the active voice, thus emphasizing their agency: *veniunt* (11); *tenent* (12); *frondet* (15); *pullulat* (17); *viret* (21); *exuerint* (51); *sequentur* (52); *faciat* (54); *opacant* (55); *adimunt…uruntque* (56); *venit…factura* (58); *degenerant…oblita* (59); *fert* (60). In fact, throughout the entire discussion of natural propagation (9-21; 47-60), there are only three examples of passive verbs (*habitae*, 16; *mutata*, 50; *sit digesta*, 54), the final two examples of farmers improving natural growth through transplantation.

178 E.g.: *expectant*, 2.27; *respondent*, 2.64.

chopped-off trunk (*truncis*, 63), the burial of a part in layering (*propagine*, 63), the quartering or sharpening of a stem (*solido…de robore*, 64),[179] or the planting of suckers (*plantis*, 66). As opposed to the overwhelmingly active characterization of trees and vines in the sections on natural growth, it is passivity and submission which stand prominent in the sections on agricultural propagation, a passivity shared with the language in Cicero's discussion of the reception of Italian *municipales* into the Roman citizenship.

Having recognized these commonalities in the formulation of Cicero's theory of the *duae patriae* and Vergil's mini-treatise on spontaneous and artificial propagation, it is interesting to compare and contrast how each author characterizes the interrelationship between each side of the duality they describe. One will recall that for Cicero, while both the *germana patria* and *patria communis* were a source of affection for a *municeps*, it is the *patria communis* which should demand the greater affection and loyalty (*De Leg.* 2.5):

> sed necesse est caritate eam praestare, qua rei publicae nomen universae civitatis est; pro qua mori et cui nos totos dedere et in qua nostra omnia ponere et quasi consecrare debemus. … itaque ego hanc [i.e. Arpinum] meam esse patriam prorsus numquam negabo, dum illa sit maior, haec in ea contineatur ...
>
> But that fatherland must stand first in our affection in which the name of republic signifies the common citizenship of all of us. For her it is our duty to die, to her to give ourselves entirely, to place on her altar, and, as it were, to dedicate to her service, all that we possess. … Thus I shall never deny that my fatherland is here, though my other fatherland is greater and includes this one within it...[180]

Cicero, as discussed in the introduction, takes a wholly assimilationist perspective towards the adoption of Roman citizenship, and he is careful not to overstate his commitment to Arpinum—to leave it very clear that his dedication to Rome is foremost, and that it contains his dedication to Arpinum within in. Vergil, as is perhaps to be expected, allows for a more subtle and various interrelationship between the ideas of natural and cultivated growth. Vergil gives slightlly more space to discussions of artificial propagation in this passage as a whole, and at times even suggests that agricultural methods are superior to or more fruitful than natural ones. In the section on the farmer's improvement of natural propagation, trees that grow of their own accord are "flourishing and strong" (*laeta et fortia*, 48), but "fruitless" or "infertile" (*infecunda*); this latter characteristic can be changed by transplantation (*scrobibus ... mutata subactis*, 50) and "frequent cultivation" (*cultuque frequenti*, 51) to lose their wildness and become what the farmer wants (51-2). Trees that propagate from roots, meanwhile, are called "barren" (*sterilis*, 53) because the branches of the propagating "mother"-tree block shade from the shoots below and keep them from fruiting,[181] a quandary whose solution is also transplanation (*vacuos si sit digesta per agros*, 54). Finally, the poet claims that trees which reproduce from seeds are not only slow to grow and bear fruit (*tarda venit seris factura nepotibus umbram*, 58), but that the fruit also degrades and loses its taste through the generations (*pomaque degenerant sucos oblita priores*, 59), a problem that can be solved by grafting. It is the recognition of these failures that leads Vergil to state the famous maxim which begins the second section on methods of agricultural propagation: *scilicet omnibus est labor impendendus*. "Certainly it is clear that exertion must be expended on all things" (2.61).

179 Cf. 2.24-25, which describe comparable actions: *hic stirpes obruit arvo, quadrifidasque sudes et acuto robore vallos*.
180 I repeat the translation of Keyes 1928.
181 *G.* 2.55-6: *nunc altae frondes et rami matris opacant crescentique adimunt fetus uruntque ferentem*.

Artificial propagation can thus remedy the natural shortcomings of unaided, noninterventional growth.

Vergil, then, paints a rather ambivalent picture of the relationship between natural and cultivated growth. The poet's descriptions of spontaneously growing trees often paint a picture of self-sufficiency and strength, often in images that recall the pastoral idealism of the *Eclogues*,[182] where as the descriptions of agricultural interventions into propagation often involves violence language or imagery (*abscindens de corpore matrum*, 23; *omnes cogendae ... ac ... domandae*, 61-2; etc.). Yet natural growth can be fruitless (*infecunda*, 48), sterile (*sterilis*, 53), slow (*tarda*, 58), or degenerative (*degenerat*, 59), all faults which agriculture can ameliorate, resulting in plants that are more desirable—though they may also be changed (*mutatamque*, 33; *mutata*, 50). An interesting question, too, is what effects achieved through artificial propagation are, so to speak, more desirable or better. The underlying aim seems to be for agriculture to be as profitable as possible, a fact which becomes clear in the transformations that agriculture provides (*melius*, 63), especially in the practice of grafting. Thus, via grafting, the arbutus is able to rid itself of its "rough" berry (*horrida*, 2.69), a fruit which Pliny calls *inhonorum*, and replace it with the more widely valued walnut (*feti nucis*, ibid.);[183] likewise, plane trees are changed through grafting from being "fruitless" (*steriles platani*, 2.70) to producing "robust" or "valuable" apples (*malos gessere valentis*, ibid.). The productivity and fertility of grafting and budding are most apparent in the final image of lines 73-82, where the grafted tree is seen marveling at unfamilar leaves and fruit transposed onto its own branches: after being ingrafted with "fertile slips" (*feraces plantae*, 79-80), the tree itself "has risen, enormous, up toward the sky (*ingens exiit ad caelum*, 80-81) with "fruitful branches" (*ramis felicibus*, 81). The application of agricultural methods, and especially grafting, leads trees and vines toward that productivity which is painted as the main goal of agriculture by both Vergil, Varro, and even Cato.[184] Yet how should one think about the potential tradeoff—the change or loss of what was original or natural that threatens to occur in the midst of such cultivation? And what does this weighing of propagational options in Vergil tell us about the relationship between *origo* and Rome?

Taking Vergil's examination of these two types of growth as another facet of his dialectics of acculturation, it reveals an even more complex representation of the tradeoffs of different acculturative strategies, the most detailed exploration so far of different approaches to evaluating the value of separate cultural streams and identities of the local Italian *germana patria* and the legal Roman *patria communis*. Growth and identity based in the local and natural can seem self-sufficient and flourishing, but "cultural" intervention, in the form of a Roman "grafting" or "transplantation" of identity, can result in a more robust, fruitful, and productive crop of individuals and peoples, one which also has a greater temporal staying power—for these interventional systems are able to supersede the miracles of natural growth by removing those setbacks or imperfection that reduce productivity or fertility. Even so, it is hard to deny the occasional (to frequent) violence associated with both cultivated agricultural growth and its

182 So, 2.11-12: *sponte sua veniunt camposque et flumina late curva tenent, ul molle siler lentaeque genistae*. *Camposque et flumina late curva tenent* recalls *G.* 3.13-15 (*viridi in campo ... tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat Mincius et tenera praetexit harundine ripas*), which itself recalls the description of the banks of the Mincius at *E.* 7.11-13; *genistae* 'broom' is, like *myricae* 'myrtles', one of the "lowly" plants that stand for lower, non-epic genres like pastoral; cf. *G.* 4.434.

183 The Mediterreanean arbutus, or strawberry tree, is the *arbutus unedo*, whose species name was given by Linnaeus in 1753, after the alternate name for the tree giving by Pliny the Elder, *unedo*, which he etymologizes as coming *unum edo*, "I eat (only) one," since the fruit was so unremarkable as that only one taste was said to be satiating enough: *pomum inhonorum, ut cui nomen ex argumento sit unum tantum edendi* (*HN* 15.28.99).

184 Cf. Varro *RR* 1.1.2: *Quare, quoniam emisti fundum, quem bene colendo fructuosum cum facere velis...*; 1.4.1: *Hinc profecti agricolae ad duas metas dirigere debent, ad utilitatem et voluptatem. Utilitas quaerit fructum, voluptas delectationem; priores partes agit quod utile est, quam quod delectat.* Cf. also Cato the Elder, esp. *De Agri Cultura* pref., 1, 2, *passim*.

metaphorical analogue here, the integration of Italian municipals into the Roman citizenship; one recalls the long history of incorporation, down to the Social War, the Siege of Perusia, and the land confiscations, each one resultant in some sort of extraordinary violence or loss. Meanwhile, as has come up several times, there is also that constant threat or spectre of change inherent in this "cultivation", whether of people or of plants. Is the integrated municipal the same municipal that existed before integration? And whether there is or isn't, is this change one should even worry, or think, about? To fully answer this question, it is necessary to jump even deeper into one of the metaphors for acculturation Vergil introduces here, one that came with its own social, cultural, and literary baggage for the Romans, and which had been effectively used as a metaphor for acculturation in a broader culture and literature before Vergil: grafting.

Alterius ramos impune videmus vertere in alterius: Grafting and Cultural Integration

The notions of the grafting of trees and of their transplantation from one location to another were both used frequently in Roman imagination as metaphors for thinking about changes in identity, place, or affiliation. What these metaphorical "graftings" *say* when thinking through questions of the mutability or constancy of the individual subject in the face of various reconstitutions of identity and affiliation depends, of course, on what the status of grafting as a practice was in the Roman cultural imagination. With respect to literature on the *Georgics*, in particular, the discussion of grafting has been dominated in the past thirty years or so by the so-called "pessimistic" view of the Harvard school, and especially the work of Ross 1980 and Thomas 1988a/b. Ross was the first to argue that Vergil, in a catalogue of six grafts at 2.69-72 that includes four that are demonstrably impossible, "knew he was presenting the impossible and expected to be convicted of falsehood", a fact he sees evidenced in the grafted tree gazing in horror (*miratast*) at its unnatural (*novas*) foliage and fruit not its own (*non sua poma*).[185] Richard Thomas views grafting in the *Georgics* in a similar light, seeing Vergil's inclusion of the impossible grafts as "deliberate falsehoods" that serve to question the agricultural successes depicted in the *Georgics*,[186] interpreing the image of the tree marveling at its fruit as "a chilling characterization of man's distortion of the natural world", with the tree forced to undergo so extreme a transformation that it fails to recognize itself.[187]

These interpretations are often the first that come to mind when one thinks of grafting in the *Georgics*, but it is worthwhile to remember that Ross and Thomas' formulations were striking precisely because their "pessimistic" conclusions were so contrary not only to contemporary interpretations of the *Georgics*, but also to the Romans' own view of grafting as a natural and unremarkable part of agricultural practice. Such is the conclusion of Dunstan Lowe, whose exploration of the symbolic value of grafting has determined that "[s]uggestions that any Roman author was suspicious of grafting, whether on religious, moral, or symbolic grounds, have little basis in the literary evidence".[188] This point is perhaps overstated—as will become clear, anxiety exists behind some representations of grafting in Vergil and *after*—but it emerges distinctly from Lowe's study that no suspicion or anxiety existed around the discussion of grafting *before* Vergil, who was the first to shift attention "from pragmatic grafts ... to more experimental, and even

185 Ross 1980: 67-8, on *G.* 2.80-2: *et ingens exiit ad caelum ramis felicibus arbos, miratastque novas frondes et non sua poma*.
186 Thomas 1988a: 161 ad 2.32-4.
187 Thomas 1988b: 271-72.
188 Lowe 2010: 482.

gratuitous, fusions between *different* trees and plants".[189] Thus, Cato mentions grafting frequently as a normal agricultural activity, either explicitly paired with planting,[190] or in technical descriptions of *how* to execute a graft.[191] Varro in the *De Re Rustica* likewise spends a great deal of time on describing the exact methods of grafting,[192] also sometimes pairing it with forms of *serere*,[193] of which it was seen to be a natural extension: "In Latin, as in Greek, the very etymology of grafting places it under the umbrella of planting".[194] Indeed, Varro calls grafting "the fourth kind of planting (*seminis*), which goes over from one tree into another".[195] Varro *does* explicitly state that grafting between certain types of trees will not be successful: oaks will not receive pears, nor an apple a pear, but, so long as the trees are "of the same kind/genus" (*eiudem generis*), grafting may successfully bear new fruit.[196] Grafting, then, was "a useful part of agricultural practice at Rome",[197] and it isn't until Vergil that mention of intergeneric grafting occurs in Roman literature.[198] This is all to say, when approaching Vergil's treatment of grafting, we should be sure to note that there is no attested negative association with grafting for Romans *prior* to Vergil; its frequency afterwards suggest that Vergil may have been an important part of its changing cultural associations.

The suggestion, meanwhile, that the metaphors of grafting and transplantation might serve in Vergil's text as a vehicle for thinking anthropologically about the mixing or changing of identities, in particular with regard to the mixing of the cultural streams of the *germana patria* and the *patria communis*, is also borne out by the ancient evidence. In an important article from 2011, Emily Gowers has shown that Vergil uses the symbolic imagery of trees to explore Aeneas' "systematic extirpation of the House of Priam"; specifically, the metaphors of uprooting, truncating, pruning, and grafting in the *Aeneid* serve to explore and illustrate Aeneas' progressive elimination of the enemies that would keep him from carrying on the Trojan legacy, as well as his integration into Italian stock and the peoples of Evander and Latinus. Aeneas is effectively seen first "chopping down the family tree",[199] and then grafting himself more firmly

189 Lowe 2010: 465, who cites Ross 1987: 206.

190 7.3-4: *pira volaema, aniciana et sementiva ... tarentina, mustea, cucurbitiva, item alia genera quam plurima poteris serito aut* ***inserito***; 40.1.16: *in locis crassis et umectis ulmos, ficos, poma, oleas, seri oportet: ficos, oleas, mala, pira, vites* ***inseri*** *oportet luna silenti post meridiem sine vento austro*;

191 40.1-2: *oleas, ficos, pira, mala hoc modo inserito: quem ramum insiturus eris, praecidito, inclinato aliquantum, ut aqua defluat ...*; 40.3.7: *postea capito tibi surculum, quod genus inserere voles: eum primorem ...*; 40.3.10: *eo artito surculum, quem inserere voles*; 41.1ff.: *vitis insitio una est per ver, altera est cum uva floret ... vitem sic inserito ... tertia insitio est*; 45.1: *taleas oleagineas ... eas sic inserito: locus ....*

192 1.26.1: *quas inserunt, alternos ordines imponunt*; 1.39.2: *et cum pleraque vere quam autumno inserantur, circiter solstitium inseri ficos nec non brumalibus diebus cerasos*;

193 1.39.2: *itaque alia seruntur atque* ***inseruntur***; 1.39.2-3: *... pleraque vere quam autumno inserantur ... quare cum semina ...* . Cf. Lucr. 5.1361-6, where the *specimen sationis et insitionis origo* is "nature herself the creator" (*ipsa ... rerum ... natura creatrix*), who inspires the agricultural processes of both planting and grafting through natural events such as the falling of acorns or berries from trees.

194 Lowe 2010: 469. See also note 21, ibid.: "Cicero appears to have coined the word *consitio* for the purpose of expressing the parallel [with *insitio*] verbally. Cicero and Lucretius demonstrate that grafting was regarded merely as "planting" on the branch, a slightly more challenging permutation of planting in the ground, and not, as for us, a distinct concept" (469 n. 21).

195 1.40: *quartum genus seminis, quod transit ex arbore in aliam.*

196 1.40.5-6: *Non enim pirum recipit quercus, neque enim si malus pirum ... In quamcumque arborem inseras, si eiusdem generis est, dumtaxat ut sit utraque malus, ita inserere oportet referentem ad fructum*.

197 Lowe 2010: 468. Cf. Cic. *Sen.* 54: *... delectant ... insitiones, quibus nihil invenit agri cultura sollertius*.

198 Ross 1980: 67; cf. Pease 1933.

199 Gowers 2011: 91 and 91 n. 15.

into the Trojan bloodline and inheritance. Grafting and adoption, meanwhile, were parallel processes that could be used metaphorically for one another: "Whereas *insitus* is a metaphor adapted to humans from grafting, *adoptiuus* was transferred to plants from the human sphere";[200] "standard metaphors for grafting, splicing and pruning in the vegetable world drawn on the vocabulary of human abortions, adoptions, adulteries, and child murders".[201] Considering this use of the tree-related metaphors of cutting, pruning, and grafting in the *Aeneid*, Gowers returns at the end of her study to Vergil's descriptions of the miraculous grafts in *Georgics* 2, suggesting that "Virgil's account of grafting can indeed be seen more positively: despite the minor agonies of the transition, his vision is of a new kind of fertility in a world where "natural" trees run the risk of being sterile, *infelices*". [202] Gowers suggests that this positive depiction of grafting might point to adoption—the plant-equivalent of grafting—as the best strategy for Augustus to create heirs and preserve the Julian line.[203] Gowers, then, along with Lowe, views the representation of grafting in the second *Georgics* as relatively positive, as opposed to the interpretations of Thomas and Ross, and she likewise attests to the usefulness of metaphors of grafting for thinking through the mixing of identities.[204]

In Roman literature, there is a significant overlap between the language of grafting and transplantation and that of the anthropological consideration of foreignness, integration, and legitimacy. Moreover, such discussion of the integration of outsiders—into families, communities, or nations—also often utilizde this metaphor in an attempt to navigate difficult issues of the relatedness of two groups, or two identities within a single group or individual. It will be useful to get a sense of the wider use of this metaphor in Latin literature before returning finally to Vergil. So, for example, Ovid's *Remedia Amoris* suggests grafting as one of the pursuits a lover might take up to distract himself (195-96):

[200] Gowers 2011: 89 n. 9. Cf. "... what Andromache is doing, on her terms, is in line with the orthodoxies of both tree-grafting and its human equivalent, adoption" (ibid. 103).
[201] Gowers 2011: 90.
[202] Gowers 2011: 113-14.
[203] Gowers 2011: "But it is also possible to translate it into dynastic terms. On that level, it can be seen to be wrestling with a contemporary dilemma, an ideological clash between the virtues of nature and new technology, which reflects a further clash in the human sphere between the ideal of natural succession and the pragmatics of adoption. Virgil is actually more positive about artificial measures than, say, Pliny, because he is thinking about how best to package the survival strategy of the Julian house. Adoption, common enough among the Roman aristocracy but still dubious according to certain fundamentalist moralities, was not a crucial alternative to genetic reproduction, both to justify Augustus' succession and to maximize his potential heirs. However violent it was, however, incompatible with "nature" and with Virgil's own sympathies with uprooted ancient trees and jettisoned dead wood, was this the moment for grafting to be presented somehow as a miracle solution?" (114). While this final suggestion that Vergil's positive depiction of adoption points to a solution to Augustus' problem of succession, it should be remembered that at the time of the *Georgics* writing, Augustus was Octavian: far from being the undisputed post-Actian *primus inter pares*, Octavian was still very much in the midst of coming into his one-man rule, not yet solidifying its future. The idea that grafting explores the difficulties of understanding and navigating Roman-Italian bicultural identity, however, is one that would be relevant to Vergil from the very start of his writing the *Eclogues*, down to the end of his life.
[204] Cf. too Bretin-Chabrol 2012, which investigates the use of tree metaphors mainly in the relam of filiation and the family. For the use of grafting as a metaphor for the integration of peoples outside of Greco-Roman literature, see, e.g., the Bible's extended metaphor of grafting to imagine the relationships between Judaism, and Christianity: in Paul's letter to the Romans 11:16-36, God's Abrahamic convenants with the Israelites are imagined as the "root" of an olive tree representing the Judaeo-Christian tradition, wherein the Jews represents the natural branches of the olive that have been broken off, the Gentiles are imagined to be branches of wild olive grafted onto the good olive stock, with the possibility of the unbelieving Jews being grafted back into the tree. The Book of Mormon contains an even more involved metaphor of an olive tree at Jacob 5-6.

venerit insitio: fac ramum ramus adoptet, 195
stetque peregrinis arbor operta comis.[205]

Give grafting a try: make a branch adopt a branch, 195
and have the tree stand covered with foreign tresses.

Ovid's use of *peregrinus*, "foreign," to describe the branch which has been ingrafted on the tree is striking alongside the personification achieved by treating the tree's leafage as human chevelure (*comis*) and the identification of the stock's reception of the scion as "adoption" (*adoptet*). *Peregrinus*, far from being a general word for a foreigner, was a term with particular legal and political connotations. Around 244 BCE, a second praetorship was added alongside the *praetor urbanus* established in the 4th century, the newer roll called the *praetor inter peregrinos*, whose original responsibility was either to deal with court cases in Rome involving foreigners, or to hold some sort of military command abroad, perhaps as governor of Sicily.[206] Varro lists the *ager peregrinus* as one of the "five types of *agri*" (*agrorum genera quinque*), which he gives as *Romanus, Gabinus, peregrinus, hosticus,* and *incertus*, with *Gabinus* included as a subtype of *peregrinus*. Varro specifies the *ager peregrinus* as that which is *pacatus* "brought to peace"—that is, through war—then etymologizing *peregrinus* from *pergere* or *progredi*, "advance," asserting that this is "because it is to these places that the Romans first went forth (*progrediebantur*) from their own territory".[207] *Peregrinus*, then, occupies a strange middle ground, signifying a person who is certainly not Roman, but not quite so far along the Romans' scale of alterity so as to be classified as a *hostis*, a known enemy: *peregrini* are *hostes pacati*, enemies who have been subdued into a more peaceful relationship with Rome—essentially the incorporated Italian communities that have been the concern of this study so far. Ovid's application of the term *peregrinus* to the grafted branch cuts straight to the core of one of the great issues regarding Italian integration: even once an individual or group has been successfully incorporated into the receiving culture and begins to flourish, there remains the ever-present possibility of being called out for one's difference—in origin or in other perceptible ways. Yet this does not mean that the graft or integration is not successful, just as the common process of Roman adoption (cf. *adoptet* in line 295) is not invalidated by knowledge of the adopted subject's status outside the family. In two short lines, Ovid goes straight to the heart of the ontological issues involved in grafting and in integrating individuals into a greater national or family unity.

A very similar formulation is drawn up in the tenth book of Columella's treatise on agriculture, which takes the form of a hexameter didactic on horticulture—precisely the kind of work alluded to in Vergil's excursus on the Old Man of Tarentum in *Georgics* 4.[208] The author ends the summary of his topic

[205] The text is that of Mozley 1929.

[206] This understanding of the *praetor qui inter peregrinos ius dicit* (the formulation common from early inscriptions and later historians such as Livy) as conducting legal business concerned with foreign residents of Rome comes from an epitomist of Pomponius found in the *Digest*. T. Corey Brennan has recently questioned the reliability of this *epitome*, suggesting instead that one of the most significant duties of the early *praetor inter peregrinos* was to act as a governor of Sicily. See Brennan 2000, esp. 85ff.

[207] LL 5.33: *peregrinus ager pacatus, qui extra Romanum et Gabinum, quod uno modo in his servantur auspicia; dictus peregrinus a pergendo, id est a progrediendo: eo enim ex agro Romano primum progrediebantur: quocirca Gabinus quoque peregrinus, sed quod auspicia habet singularia, ab reliquo discretus.*

[208] See Gowers 2000 for a discussion of Columella's experimental Book 10 as a direct response to Vergil's apparent passing over a fifth book of the *Georgics* on gardening mentioned at *G.* 4.116-148.

with his intention to treat the season in which (10.38-39):

aliena stirpe gravata 38
mitis adoptatis curvetur frugibus arbos.

... weighed down by another's stock, 38
the mature tree is bent over from its adopted fruit.

Though not as strong as *peregrinus*, the adjective *alienus*, "belonging to another," serves again to mark off the ingrafted branches as not fully a part of their host tree, as different or alienated from the identity of the organism itself; the parallel to adoption is also brought up here with *adoptatis frugibus*. Yet here, too, integration of outside stock results in productivity and flourishing, demonstrated cleary here in the weighing down (*gravata*) and bending of the branches (*curvetur*) under the load of ripe (*mitis*) fruit. *Alienus* is used to dissociate the grafted or integrated individual by Ovid as well, in his account of Pomona and Vertumnus in *Metamorphoses* 14, a digression which Emily Gowers has read as an allegory of implantation, and especially as drawing attention to Aeneas' own grafting of himself into Priam's line.[209] "And now, splitting apart the bark, [Pomona] ingrafts a branch and provides sap to another's nursling" (*fisso modo cortice lignum inserit et sucos alieno praestat alumno*, 14.630-31). *Alieno* here again serves as as a reminder of the original foreignness of the incorporated part, which could serve to question the branch's integration, and *alumno* strikes an ambiguous note: the image is either of a smooth and cooperative integration *despite* foreignness, the host tree happily nourishing the graft, or of an ingrafted part benefitting from something that does not belong to it (*alieno*), bringing up the possibility at least of an unfair or unequal interrelationship.

Whereas these examples have been descriptions of grafting that nonetheless make comment on the process of cultural integration, grafting is likewise used as an explicit metaphor to add to accounts exploring the incorporation of foreign customs, knowledge, or populations into another. In the second book of Cicero's *De Re Publica*, in the course of Scipio's narration of the evolution of the Roman state, the general introduces Tarquinius Priscus, fifth king of Rome and son of the Corinthian Greek Demaratus, by noting that "it was at this time first of all that our state (*civitas*) seems to have been made more educated by a certain ingrafted (*insitiva*) teaching" (*sed hoc loco primum videtur insitiva quadam disciplina doctior facta esse civitas*, 2.34). Used to reference to the wave of Greeks bringing their teaching and skill to Rome at that time, the metaphor of grafting is able to simultaneously emphasize both foreignness and the possbility of incorporation into Rome. Livy's account of Tarquinius' reign also stresses the foreign status of the king, with the man variously called *peregrinus*, *advena*, and "not even of Italian stock" (*ne Italicae quidem stirpis*).[210] Cicero's narration, on the other hand, emphasizes the incorporation of Tarquinius rather than the foreignness: the newcomer "was easily received into citizenship on account of his refinement and education" (*facile in civitatem receptus esset propter humanitatem atque doctrinam*, *Rep.* 2.35). Still, he changes his

[209] Gowers sees the beginning of this extended allegory as being set off by the Ajax's sarcastic reference to Ulysses' claim to Achilles' arms at 13.3 (*qui ... inseris Aeacidis alienae nomina gentis*), and continuing throughout the episode with Pomona and Vertumnus, where "Pomona's innocent activity among her trees ... does not quite allow us to forget the first *alienus alumnus*, Aeneas himself, whose forced but successful grafting established these uneventful generations of hardy fruit" (Gowers 2011: 111).

[210] 1.34: *nam ibi* [i.e. *Tarquiniis*] *quoque peregrina stirpe oriundus erat*; 1.35: [*orationem habuit*] *se non rem novam petere, quippe qui non primus ... sed tertius Romae peregrinus regnum adfectet*; 1.40: *Anci filii duo ... pro indignissimo habuerant ... regnare Romae advenam non modo vicinae, sed ne Italicae quidem stirpis*.

name from Greek to a decidedly more Roman appellation, Lucius Tarquinius, "that he might seem to have imitated the custom of this people in every sense" (*ut in omni genere huius populi consuetudinem videretur imitatus*, 2.35). The language of Tarquinius' "reception" (*receptus esset*) into Roman citizenship mirrors that of the municipal Italians in the *De Legibus* (*susceptus est*; *excepti sumus*, 2.5),[211] which mirrors in turn the language of grafting (*recipit*, *accipit*, etc.).[212] Cicero's focus on successful assimilation would seem to match his own preference for that acculturative strategy discussed in the Introduction, as compared to Livy's more blatant identification of Tarquinius' foreignness. The slightest fear of illegitimacy still breaks through, however, in Cicero's explanation of Tarquinius' name change as his attempt not to "adopt" or "follow" Roman custom, but "to seem to have imitated" it (*ut ... videretur imitatus*); even an apparently successful assimilation or integration does not eliminate the possibility, either in an individual or in the wider culture, that the incorporation is not interpreted as feigned, insincere, or incomplete in some sense.[213] This sense that cultural incorporation can begin to muddle the definitions or authenticity of either the incorporated or receiving identity reappears in a letter of Pliny to the Roman Arrius Antoninus, who speaks Greek so well that "Athens itself is not so Attic."[214] Antoninus leaves Pliny wondering how expertly he must speak his native tongue (*sermone patrio*) when he is so skilled in speaking one that is, in his eyes, "grafted-on and foreign" (*insiticio et inducto*).

These examples begin to point to a post-Vergilian turn wherein the metaphors of grafting and transplantation are used in a more sinister sense to contrast the foreign with that which is regarded as more natural or honorable. A memorable example of this practice come in a passage from the twelfth book of the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius, in the philosopher Favorinus' exhortation to a woman of noble status (*nobili*, 12.1.*pref.*) to nurse her children with her own milk, rather than that of a wet nurse, since wet nurses were often foreigners or slaves. Favorinus, upon discovering that the mother planned to forego nursing the child herself, immediately criticizes the decision as being "against nature" (*contra naturam*, 12.1.6), as "an incomplete and half-attempted kind of motherhood (*inperfectum atque dimidiatum matris genus*). Favorinus justifies this superiority of the "natural" by using a comparison to the transplantation of plants (12.1.16):

> In arboribus etiam et frugibus maior plerumque vis et potestas est ad earum indolem vel detrectandam vel augendam aquarum atque terrarum quae alunt, quam ipsius quod iacitur seminis, ac saepe videas arborem laetam et nitentem, in locum alium transpositam, deterioris terrae suco deperisse.
>
> In trees and grain, too, the power and strength of the water and earth which nourish them have more effect in retarding or promoting their growth than have those of the seed itself which is sown; and you often see a strong and flourishing tree, when transplanted to another spot, die from the effect

211 Note also *recipiendis,* Cicero *Pro Balbo* 31: *illud vero sine ulla dubitatione maxime nostrum fundavit imperium et populi Romani nomen auxit, quod princeps ille creator huius urbis, Romulus, foedere Sabino docuit etiam hostibus recipiendis augeri hanc civitatem oportere*. Cf. *recipi* Vellerius Paterculus 2.15.2: [the allies] *neque in eius civitatis ius recipi quae per eos in id ipsum pervenisset fastigium ex quo homines eiusdem et gentis et sanguinis ut externos alienosque fastidire posset*.

212 Varro, *RR* 1.40: *non enim pirum recipit quercus, neque enim si malus pirum*; Ovid *Med. Fac.* 6: *fissaque adoptivas accipit arbor opes*; Pliny *HN* 17.121: *vitis non recipit emplastra*. Note, too: Vergil *G.* 2.77 *includunt*, and 2.80 *immittuntur*; Plutarch, *Quaest. Conviv.* 2.6.1: πλάτανοι μηλεῶν δεδεγμέναι.

213 In addition to these examples, cf. Pliny's description of the Greek language as a "graft" onto Roman culture (*Ep.* 4.3) in a letter to Arrius Antoninus (*Ep.* 4.3), a Roman who speaks Greek so well that "Athens itself is not so Attic" (*non medius fidius ipsas Athenas tam Atticas dixerim*, 4.3.5).

214 Pliny *Ep.* 4.3.5: *non medius fidius ipsas Athenas tam Atticas dixerim*.

of an inferior soil.[215]

If the mere transplantation of a tree to inferior soil can cause its ruin, is it not a terrible deed, Favorinus asks, to corrupt a young body and mind, "conceived from nobly/naturally-constituted beginnings" (*ingeniatis primordiis inchoatum*),[216] especially if they are nursed with "by the ingrafted (*insitivo*) and ignoble nourishment of another's milk" (*insitivo degenerique alimento lactis alieni*, 12.1.17), by one "of a foreign and barbaric nation" (*externae et barbarae nationis*). Where the usage of the image of grafting as a metaphor for incorporation in the previous examples were either positive or ambivalent—in line with the earlier, pre-Vergilian attitude toward grafting—by Gellius' time it is clear that grafting as a concept might also be used metaphorically to represents anxieties stemming from a discourse of naturalness and purity.[217]

The same sentiments are echoed in a passage of Livy, in a speech of the consul Gnaeus Manlius Vulso (cos. 189 BCE), commander of the forces against the *Gallograeci* or Galatians in the year of his consulship, a conflict often called the Galatian War. In convincing his troops to be eager for battle, he acknowledges that they may be wary of fighting against a people who are ethnically Gauls, who were renowned for their fierceness and vigor in war, before reminding them that one Manlius already had defeated an army of Gauls attepting to climb the Capitoline, referring to the semi-mythical expulsion of the Gauls from the citadel of Rome by Manlius Capitolinus in 387 BCE. Their ancestors, he goes on, had fought with *bona fide* Gauls, "Gauls by no means inauthentic, born in their own land" (*cum haud dubiis Gallis, in sua terra genitis,* 38.17.9). The Gauls they were about to fight, however, called *Gallograeci*, are "mixed" (*mixti*), and "degenerate" (*degeneres*), since "just as in crops and cattle, the seed does not have as much power to preserve a thing's inner nature (*indolem*) as the character (*proprietas*) of the earth and sky under which they are nourished have to change them".[218] Manlius provides as further examples of such "degeneration" (*degenerarunt*) the Macedonian transplants to Egypt and Syria and the men of Tarentum, who have lost the harsh discipline of their Spartan ancestors: "For that thing is more noble (*generosius*), whichever is born in the land that is original to it (*in sua sede gignitur*); but the thing that has been grafted into foreign soil (*insitum alienae terrae*) is corrupted (*degenerat*) into the thing in which it is nurtured, with its very nature changing (*natura vertente se*)".[219] In both this passage and that of Gellius, grafting (*insitivo; insitum*) and transplantation (*transpositam; alienae terrae*) are understood as manifestations of the same phenomenon,[220] with each one's argument calling for nourishment for a thing only in that *matrix* from

215 The Latin text and translation are those of Rolfe 1927.

216 *Ingeniatus*, while properly from *ingenium*, "inborn nature; character," would naturally have also conjured for the reader the associations of *ingenuus*, "free-born; noble; native, indigenous".

217 This rhetoric of purity as far as the Romans are concerned is not surprising; cf. Bettini 2001. However, the innovation that should be seen in this and the following passages is the accrual of this type of negative critique into the repertoire of situations for which grafting provides a suitable metaphor.

218 Livy 38.17.10-11: *sicut in frugibus pecudibusque non tantum semina ad servandam indolem valent, quantum terrae proprietas caelique sub quo aluntur mutat.*

219 Livy 38.17.13: *est generosius, in sua quidquid sede gignitur; insitum alienae terrae in id quo alitur, natura vertente se, degenerat*. The opposite argument is proffered in the immediately preceding book, when the Rhodian embassy to the Senate claims the inner nature of a people is unable to be changed by the character of the land in which they live: *Massilienses quos, si natura insita velut ingenio terrae vinci posset, iam pridem efferassent tot indomitae circumfusae gentes, in eo honore, in ea merito dignitate audimus apud vos esse, ac si medium umbilicum Graeciae incolerent* (37.54.21-22).

220 Cf. Plutarch *Quaest. Conviv.* 2.6.e-f (trans. Clement and Hoffleit 1969): "'Further,' he continued, 'it is quite clear that the stock to be grafted fulfils the function of soil for the scion; soil and stock must be fertile and productive, and so they select the most fruitful of plants and insert the scions in them, much like putting infants

which it was originally put forth, whether that be a parent tree, one's native soil, or a mother's womb; to do otherwise is not only to weaken the child, tree, or scion, but to act degenerately and "against nature." In terms of acculturative strategies, Gellius' Favorinus and Livy's Manlius are anti-assimilationist and anti-integration, espousing as they do a doctrine of ethnic purity that, in a dominant cultural imagination, does not provide a welcoming entry point for those of outside origin to incorporate themselves at all.

Grafting is also explicitly accessed as a metaphor in discussions of the specific topic that concerns us here, the incorporation of Latins, Italians, and other *socii* into the Roman state in the late Republic. A glimpse of this kind of discourse was given in Ovid's contrivance of the tree adorned with *coma peregrina*, and more strongly in Cicero's recollection of the "ingrafted teachings" (*insitiva ... disciplina*) of Tarquinius. The metaphor is further utilized in two texts from the Empire, the pseudo-Sallustian *Second Letter to Caesar* and the *Invective against Cicero*. The former, a school exercise in the form of a letter to Caesar at the outbreak of the civil war, advises Caesar that the efficacy of the senate should be improved by making the votes of all senators equal by instituting a secret ballot, thereby reducing the power of the nobles; for:

> ... cum illis [i.e. nobilibus] maiorum virtus partam reliquerit gloriam, dignitatem, clientelas, cetera multitudo pleraque insiticia sit—sententias eorum a metu libera; ita in occulto sibi quisque alterius potentia carior erit.
>
> ... the prowess of their ancestors has left the nobles a heritage of glory, prestige and patronage, while most of the remaining throng in the senate has been grafted on—free the votes of the latter from fear; thus each man, in a secret ballot, will value himself more highly than the political influence of another.[221]

Speaking to the dramatic date of 50/49 BCE, the author of the exercise identifies as a contemporary issue the difference in representation between senators of noble background, and those whose entrance into the body was more recent—*novi homines*, former *socii*, and the like. This latter group is referred to as "grafted on" (*insiticia*) to the Senate, while it is implied that they for the most part lack the "glory" (*gloriam*) and "prestige" (*dignitatem*) of the nobles, hinting at the struggle for full political legitimacy often forced on newcomers to the Roman Senate.[222] Indeed, though the description of senatorial functioning given here is a later re-imagining of the first century CE, the passage itself points to an inequality of influence or efficacy between the two groups, implying that the more recent "grafts" to the Senate were constrained by fear (*metu*) of the nobles and intimidation in the face of their great political influence (*potentia*). Though *insiticia* does not here imply the illegitimacy of the newer senators in and of itself (as, say, in the Gellius passage above), it does imply a tractable difference from the nobility—in reputation, influence, power, and antiquity—which must be overcome in order to create a stronger state (*maioribus opibus res publica*), a less powerful aristocracy (*minus potens nobilitas*), and a freedom equally shared by all (*libertas aequa omnium*, 2.11.2).

A decidedly more negative usage of the metaphor occurs in another work of the early empire: the pseudo-Sallustian *Invective Against Cicero*. While the author's approach is many-pronged, one prominent avenue of attack against Cicero is framing his municipal status as a source of political illegitimacy. This

out to nurse with women who have abundant milk.'" Plutarch in this passage does not have the same disdain for grafting, transplanting, or wet nurses, and is more concerned to discuss why certain trees don't accept grafts.

221 Ps.-Sall. *ad Caes.* 2.11. Text and translation taken from Ramsey 2015 (LCL 522).

222 See Farney 2007; also, Wiseman 1971, and the discussion in the Introduction.

argument is clearly inspired by a genuine line of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*, wherein Catiline, addressing the Senate, asks sarcastically what need he, a man of patrician rank (*patricio homini*), had of destroying the republic, when it was being "saved" (*servaret*) by such a man as Cicero, whom he calls an "imported citizen of the city of Rome" (*inquilinus civis urbis Romae*, 31.7). The idea that there is something about Cicero's zeal for serving the Republic that is out of line with his status as both a new man and municipal transplant is continued in the *Invective*, famously in the address of Cicero as "the Romulus from Arpinum" (*Romule Arpinas*),[223] as well as at the beginning of the text, where the speaker berates the Senate for believing they have any authority, when it is Cicero who defends the laws and the state

> quasi unus reliquus e familia viri clarissimi, Scipionis Africani, ac non reperticius, accitus, ac paulo ante insitus huic urbi civis. (*Inv.* 1)
>
> as if he were the sole survivor of the family of the illustrious Scipio Africanus, not a foundling citizen, called in, recently grafted upon this city.[224]

Here again, the recently politically integrated *novi homines* are described as grafted onto the city and the political order, with an explicit contrast drawn with the ancient hereditary aristocracy of the more established senatorial order represented by men such as the Scipios: whereas the pedigree of the Scipios is proven by the established glory of their ancestors (cf. Ps.-Sall. *ad Caes.* 2.11: *maiorum virtus partam reliquerit gloriam*), Cicero is an import, a non-native, "only recently grafted" (*paulo ante insitus*) into the city and its order.[225] Grafting is put to the same use here as in Favorinus' arguments against wet-nursing: the imported (*inquilinus*), the non-native (*Arpinas*), the grafted (*insitus*)—none are as legitimate as the noble and the patrician, who have the weight of time and tradition behind them. Grafting, then, as a metaphor for incorporation, while it may work ideologically as an argument for either legitimization or the removal of the same, provides a fitting vehicle for exploring the ontological problem of the outside that has become inside, the foreign that has become native; of whether true integration is possible, or never ultimately achievable. That the possibility of an incorporated or mixed identity as other or alienated was ultimately always close at hand can be seen in Varro's brief discussion of of mules and hinnies, whom he calls "of two breeds" (*bigeneri*) and "ingrafted" (*insiticii*) precisely because they are *non suopte genere ab radicibus* (RR 2.8.1)—"not from roots of their own kind".[226] The mixed animal is alienated even from itself and its own kinds, an impression strengthened in the subsequent assertion that mules and hinnies are "both useful for work, though neither brings profit by giving birth" (*uterque ... ad usum utilis, partu fructus neuter*, 2.8.2).

Before returning to Vergil's discussion of grafting in the *Georgics*, it is necessary to briefly touch upon another topic often compared to grafting and and used to define grafting itself: the social and legal institution of adoption among the Romans. Cicero, for example, in emphasizing in the *Pro Sestio* the lowly

[223] *Inv.* 7. Cooley 2016b calls this "the kind of prejudice toward Italian 'new men' that Cicero had met" (106).
[224] Ps.-Sallust *in Ciceronem* 1. Text and translation taken from Shackleton Bailey 2002 (LCL 462).
[225] The characterization of Cicero here as "recently grafted" looks forward in a sense to Ovid's assertion, in the *Ars Amatoria*, that the recently grafted branch can be dislodged from the tree by "any breeze you will" (*quaelibet aura*), with only the passage of time strenthening the bond, a situation Ovid compares to love's ability to better withstand small arguments as the relationship becomes stronger (2.649-52): *quod male fers, adsuesce, feres bene; multa vetustus leniet, incipiens omnia sentit amor. dum novus in viridi coalescit cortice ramus, concutiat tenerum quaelibet aura, cadet: mox eadem ventis, spatio durata, resistet, firmaque adoptivas arbor habebit opes.*
[226] I give the translation of Hooper and Ash 1934.

status of a certain Sextus Atilius Serranus before his adoption into the *gens Atilia*, states that the man was "not the great Serranus of the plow (*ab aratro*), but he who came from the deserted farm (*ex deserto ... rure*) of Gavius Olelus and had been ingrafted (*insitus*) by the Gavii into the Calatini Atilii".[227] Here again the metaphor of grafting (perhaps influenced by Serranus' rural origins) hints at illegitimacy, especially considering Sextus' origin from a "deserted farm" (*deserto ... rure*) when compared to the general Serranus from the First Punic War.[228] Similarly, in one of the elder Seneca's *Controversiae*, a young man who has been disowned by his father is offered adoption by a rich man outside his family. At the exercise's end, Seneca summarizes the opposing view by stating that "the adoption would be dangerous to him in a house desiring its own masters, with the entire family wanting to drive out the ingrafted (*insitivum*) heir".[229] This anxiety over an "ingrafted" heir looks forward to Tacitus' *Annals* (13.14.2), when Agrippina, trying to regain control over a distant Nero, threatens to end her support and champion Britannicus instead, who, as the "true and worthy heir (*stirpem*) of his father's power"[230] would be much preferred to Nero, who was exercising that power as "one grafted-in and adopted" (*insitus et adoptivus*).[231] As when they are used as metaphors for changes of place and identity, the concepts of grafting and transplantation can potentially point to the threat of illegitimacy amidst integration, as phrases from authors as diverse as Ovid, Valerius Maximus, and Pliny show: *inseris Aiacidis alienae nomina gentis*;[232] *adfirmantem ... neque oportere clarissimae familiae ignotas sordes inseri*;[233] *quae prohibuit inseri genti suae Laevinorum alienam imaginem*.[234]

227 *non ille Serranus ab aratro, sed ex deserto Gavi Oleli rure a calatis Gaviis in Calatinos Atilios insitus*. The text and translation are those of Gardner 1958. "*Gavi Oleli rure*" is Madvig's conjecture, which I give in instead of the incoherent text of the manuscript, which Gardner daggers: †gaviolaeliore. The other proposes suggestions (*Gaviorum oliveti area*, Koch; *Gavii Ofilii horto*, Bake) likewise draw a distinction between the more famous Gaius Atilius Serranus (cos. 257 BCE), who secured a victory over the Carthaginians off the Liparaean Islands during the First Punic War, and the rural provenance of Sextus.

228 Moreover, Mommsen suggests that in place of *calatis* "called into the *comitia calata*" one should read *Galatis* "Galatian; Gallic", to hint at Sextus' potential Gallic descent. This change would specifically attack Sextus' adoption not only on the grounds of his previous low-class status, but also his position as a foreigner.

229 Sen. *Contr.* 2.1.21: *et periculosam sibi futuram adoptionem in domo suos dominos desiderante, tota familia expellere insitivum heredem cupiente.*

230 *Ann.* 13.14.2: *veram dignamque stirpem suscipiendo patris imperio*.

231 Compare Tacitus' description in his *Histories* of the Gallic conspirator Julius Sabinus, who "on account of his ingrafted (*insitam*) vanity was delighting in the glory of false descent (*falsae stirpis*), claiming that his great-grandmother had proven pleasing in adultery to the divine Julius as he waged war through Gaul" (*Sabinum super insitam vanitatem falsae stirpis gloria incendebat: proaviam suam divo Iulio per Gallias bellanti corpore atque adulterio placuisse*, *Hist.* 4.55), where, though *insitam* may also signify "inborn" here, the word clearly plays on ideas of descent (*stirpis*) and legitimacy (*false*) that are relevant to adoption as a kind of "grafting."

232 Ovid *Met.* 13.33, during the contest for the arms of Achilles, when Ajax, cousin of Achilles, accuses Odysseus, "descended from Sisyphus and identical in fraud and theft" (*sanguine cretus Sisyphio furtisque et fraude simillimus illi*, 13.31-32), of trying to "graft/adopt the names of an outside race into the Aeacides" by his claim to possession of Achilles' arms as one outside of the descendants of Aeacus.

233 Valerius Maximus 9.7.2, in a discussion of violence and sedition, recalls a violent crowd's support of a certain L. Equitius, who had posed as a son of Tiberius Gracchus in order to illegally stand for the consulship in 100 BCE; the censor of the time, Q. Metellus, refused to accept Equitius' census as a son of Gracchus, asserting that all of Gracchus' true children were dead and that "it was not suitable that unknown filth should be inserted into the most notable families." Cf. Ch. 15 of the same book, whose title also addresses itself to the problem of those of lowly birth attempting to claim belonging in more noble families: *De iis qui infimo loco nati mendacio se clarissimis familiis inserere conati sunt* (9.15.*tit.*).

234 Pliny *HN* 35.2.8, on a speech of Messalla in which the famous patron criticized the insertion of *imagines* of

Returning to Vergil's discussion of natural and cultivated growth, the descriptions of grafting fully participate in this kind of two-way metaphorical seepage, with the language and images of ethnic and cultural incorporation being intermixed with the the terminology of grafting, making Vergil's in-depth narratives of grafting become allegorical explorations of cultural integration. That grafting as an agricultural concept provides the best hope of *integration*—as opposed to the more separatist, marginalizing, or assimiliationist strategies one can glean from the previous discussion of natural and cultivated growth[235]—is clear in the language of the poet's first lines on grafting (2.32-4):

et saepe alterius ramos impune videmus	32
vertere in alterius, mutatamque insita mala	
ferre pirum, et prunis lapidosa rubescere corna.	34
And often we see the branches of one kind	32
change into another's: the pear tree—changed—bears	
ingrafted apples, and stony cornels grow red on plum-trees.	34

The language of shifting identity, not present in the preceding descriptions of spontaneous and cultivated agricultural propagation, jumps to the fore. Change is emphasized: not only do the grafted branches change into (*vertere*) the branches of the other tree, but the tree which bears the grafted branch and fruit has also undergone a transformation (*mutatam*); grafting leaves the identity of neither the branch nor the tree unaffected. Yet the grafted branches inevitably hold on to their original identity in some sense, producing as they do the fruit of their original tree: apple branches still bear apples, even on the pear, and the branch of cornel still produces its original fruit even when grafted onto plum. The maintenance of the original identities of the grafted and that receiving the graft (cf. *alterius ... alterius*) recalls the tendency in the discussion above to assert that the grafted part is foreign or unnatural: *peregrinus*, *alienus, externus, barbarus*.[236] What is absent from Vergil's description here is that identification of the grafted part as alien or external: there is change in both branch and tree, but there is no indication that the integration itself is unsuccessful. In fact, the production of fruit as the end-product of this process speaks for the fruitfulness—and

lesser or unrelated families among a family's own; such an attitude led to his own refusal (above) to include an *imago* of the closely related *Laevini*—both belonged to the *gens Valeria*—and to his assertion that the adoption (*adoptione*) of members of the Salvittones into the Scipio family "was a disgrace to the name of Scipiones Africani" (*Africanorum dedecori ... Scipionum nomini*, 35.2.8), despite both families belonging to the *gens Cornelia*.

235 For example, one is tempted to read the spontaneously growing trees (*ipsae sponte sua veniunt*, 10-11) as pointing to a doctrine of autochthony; the plants that arise from seeds (*posito surgunt de semine*, 14) as migration; and the young plants that "shoot up beneath the great shadow of their mother" (*sub ingenti matris se subicit umbra*, 19) as natural inherited descent in one's family's *origo*. Meanwhile, in the discussion of artificial methods of propagation, the suckers torn from the mother's body (*hic plantas tenero abscindens de corpore matrum desposuit sulcis*, 23-24) sounds eerily like forced migration, especially that of the Sabine women abducted from their parents and reappropriated by the Romans; propagating by burying part of the plant (*silvarumquealiae pressos propaginis arcus expectant et vivia sua plantaria terra*, 26-27), meanwhile, could be taken as the practice of sending into colonies or being relocated, whereas pruning (*summumque putator haud dubitat terrae reference mandare cacumen*, 28-29) sounds like either general violence toward a population or growth under general duress.

236 *peregrinus*: Livy 38.17.18, Ovid, *Rem. Am.* 196; *alienus*: Livy 38.17.13, Ovid, *Met.* 13.33, 14.631, Columella *RR* 10.38; *externus, barbarus*: Aulus Gellius *NA* 12.1.17.

usefulness[237]—of grafting as a procedure of integration, with none of the suggestions of externality, spuriousness, or deterioration seen above. Grafting is not negative here, but instead somewhat miraculous.

Vergil further develops this vision in the next section on spontaneous and cultivated growth, which begins at line 47 after a 12-line address to Maecenas. The passage begins with a new account of spontaneously growing trees, clarifying the view of the changes grafting can provide (47-52):

> sponte sua quae se tollunt in luminis oras, 47
> infecunda quidem, sed laeta et fortia surgunt;
> quippe solo natura subest. tamen haec quoque, si quis
> inserat aut scrobibus mandet mutata subactis, 50
> exuerint silvestrem animum, cultuque frequenti
> in quascumque voces artis haud tarda sequentur. 52
>
> Those which lift themselves up into the regions of light of their own will 47
> are unproductive, yes, but they rise strong and flourishing—
> a natural strength lurks in their soil. Yet these ones, too, if anyone
> should graft or entrust them—now changed—to worked-over trenches, 50
> they will have shed their rustic spirit, and, through repeated cultivation,
> they will follow without delay into whichever arts you call them. 52

Whereas grafting in the previous passage was merely described as causing change (*vertere*, *mutatam*) "without penalty" (*impune*), it is more apparent here what exactly that change entails. The grafted or transplanted individuals—notice that there is no clear indication in the passage that Vergil is speaking of plants or trees—shed "their rustic spirit" (*siluestrem animum*), that is, lose entirely their original identity, one connected closely to the "natural power" (*natura*) existing in the soil itself (*solo*), and thus imagined as grounded in a local identity which is prior to the "cultivated" (*cultuque frequenti*) identity which the grafter will impart. Regarding *silvestris*, *silua* acts throughout the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* as a word closely tied to the idea of a local, non-urban identity: it appears numerous times in every poem of the *Eclogues* (except *Eclogue* 9),[238] and *siluestrem* itself appears as early as *Eclogue* 1.2, when Meliboeus describes Tityrus as meditating upon his woodland Muse on a slender oaten pipe (*siluestrem tenui Musam meditaris auena*). The grafted or transplanted plants are imagined to lose their local character, the spirit that connects them to their individual places throughout the Italian landscape. Moreover, this shedding is accomplished through "frequent cultivation" (*cultuque frequenti*), with *cultus* itself never losing its secondary yet more common connotation of "refinement" or "process of civilizing." The farmer, through this civilizing force, can bring the individuals "into whatever arts you call them" (*in quascumque voces artis*), a state so flexible and subjectively defined by the *cultivator* that is reveals the willingness to discard certain aspects of identity (including the *silestris animus*) of the "cultivated" plant or individual. This, then, is the state of the "changed" (*mutata*) individuals which have undergone grafting or transplantation: a potential loss of original local spirit, enacted in the name of increased productivity—for the the individuals in their original state are "unproductive" (*infecunda*). The original qualities of abundance and strength (*laeta et fortia*), a result of the natural power of the soil, are not

[237] The same focus on grafting as removing the useless and bringing in the fruitful or productive exists at Horace *Ep.* 2.19.13-14: *inutilisve falce ramos amputans feliciores inserit*.
[238] 1.2 (*siluestrem*); 1.5; 2.5; 2.31; 2.60; 2.62; 3.46; 3.57; 3.70 (*siluestri*); 4.3; 5.7 (*siluestris*); 5.28; 5.43; 5.58; 6.2; 6.39; 7.65; 7.68; 8.56; 8.58; 8.97; 10.8; 10.52; 10.63.

enough to ward off the intervention of the cultivator, whose bottom line is the harnessing of the natural into a greater productivity, certainly from the point of view of cultivator at least.

Yet there can be benefits for the *cultivated* from artificial propagation too, as the following lines demonstrate. Young plants that, growing in their mothers shadows (*rami matris opacant*, 55), would be deprived of shade and fail to provide fruit (*adimunt fetus*, 56), can be transplanted to improve their "sterility" (*sterilis*, 53). Similarly, trees that propagate from seeds take years and years to grow tall enough to provide shade—likely not until the next generation (*tarda venit seris factura nepotibus umbram*, 58)—and their fruit will eventually degenerate, finally providing only fodder for the birds (*avibus praedam*, 60). A solution to this particular problem is grafting, which allows the farmer to plant branches from thriving plants onto already established trees, eliminating the generation-long wait-time between the action of *(in)serere* and the enjoyment of fruit. Grafting is a miraculous solution to this problem—but perhaps too miraculous? So the famous problem of Vergil's "impossible" grafts, both in passages on grafting that follow next in the poem, and at the first mention of grafting earlier in this section.[239] Of the two grafts in lines 32-24, that of apple onto pear is possible, whereas the grafting of cornel onto plum is not viable. In the passage at 69-72, Vergil again intersperses possible and impossible grafts, though with the latter outnumbering the former three-to-two: the grafts of walnut onto arbutus, apple onto plane, and oak onto elm are not possible, whereas the grafts of beech onto chestnut and pear onto rowan are theoretically possible, since the trees lie within the same taxonomic family. More importantly, as mentioned above, "before Virgil there is no mention of grafting between different families, no mention of the wonderful products of intergeneric grafting related enthusiastically from Pliny to Palladius".[240] Vergil purposefully chooses grafts which are novel in terms of the previous tradition, and which more than likely would have been recognized as impossible or doomed to fail, and speaks positively about the possibility of their success.

The poem's treatment of grafting continues into a ten-line climax, which wraps up the opening section on spontaneous and natural growth. It is here that the elements of personification are at their strongest and the connection to the anthropological language of identity is most noticeable (2.73-82):

nec modus inserere atque oculos imponere simplex.
nam qua se medio trudunt de cortice gemmae
et tenuis rumpunt tunicas, angustus in ipso
fit nodo sinus; huc aliena ex arbore germen
includunt udoque docent inolescere libro.
aut rursum enodes trunci resecantur, et alte
finditur in solidum cuneis via, deinde feraces
plantae immittuntur; nec longum tempus, et ingens
exiit ad caelum ramis felicibus arbos,
miratastque novas frondes et non sua poma.

Nor is there a single method to grafting and budding.
For, where the buds push out from between the bark
and tear through their delicate tunics, a narrow hollow is created

[239] On the impossibility of these grafts, see Pease 1933, Ross 1980, Thomas 1988a & 1988b. It was mentioned above that Varro at *RR* 1.40.5-6 demonstrates ancient awareness that grafting need be intergeneric or -familial.
[240] Ross 1980: 67.

in the knot itself. Into this, men enclose the bud from another
tree and teach it to grow into the moist bark. Or, instead,
knotless trunks are cut back, and with wedges a way
is split deep into the solid wood, then productive
slips are inserted; nor does much time pass, and the huge 80
tree has reached the sky with its fruitful branches, and
marveled at unfamiliar branches and fruit not its own.

The process of grafting is described here in rather violent terms—*rumpunt*, *includunt*,[241] *resecantur*, *finditur*, *immittuntur*[242]—a feature which works against the positive representation of grafting referenced above. Furthermore, the personification in the passage is strong—and, in fact, so present as to cause the almost complete disappearance of the figure of the farmer, whose presence is hinted at only in the two subjectless verbs in line 77, *includunt* and *docent*. Otherwise, action is described either with passive verbs (*fit*, 76; *resecantur*, 78; *finditur*, 79; *immittuntur*, 80) or by making the buds or the trees the subjects of active verbs implying physical strength, movement, or human cognition (*trudunt*, 74; *rumpunt*, 75; *exiit*, 81; *miratast*, 82). The buds are also described as having tunics (*tunicas*), which they are capable of breaking through with apparent intention, and as being able to be taught (*docent*), again giving the impression of human cognition. The personification continues in the grafted tree at the scene's end, which is described as as marveling (*miratast*) at "unfamiliar branches and fruit not its own" (*novas frondes et non sua poma*). This passage has proven to be a crux of the poem, with some scholars arguing there is nothing troubling about the passage (Lowe 2010), while others are unsettled by the tree's fascination with its own unfamiliar fruit: "These fantastic unions conclude with a chilling characterization of man's distortion of the natural world".[243]

The description of the tree's new fruit as *non sua* seems particularly disassociative, almost equivalent to *peregrinus* or *alienus* seen elsewhere. That this was felt also by ancient readers can be seen in an imitation of this passage in Calpurnius' second *Eclogue* (*Ecl.* 2.42-3):

non minus arte mea mutabilis induit arbos 42
ignotas frondes et non gentilia poma.
ars mea nunc malo pira temperat et modo cogit
insita praecoquibus subrepere persica prunis. 45

No less by my skill does the changeable tree take on 42
unknown branches and fruit not born of itself.
My art now tempers pears with apple, now compels
grafted peaches to steal upon premature plums. 45

Vergil's *non sua* here is restated in the even more explicit *non gentilia*—"not of the same *gens*; foreign"—and the Vergilian tree's ambiguous *novas frondes* are explicitly re-identified as *ignotas*, "unknown." Calpurnius, in

241 *Includo* can mean "shut in," "confine," and even "imprison," and is used of men shut up in prison (*consule in carcere incluso*, Cic. *de Sen.* 21.77), of a bird held in a cage (*avis inclusa in cavea*, Cic. *Div.* 2.35.73), and of the spirit enclosed in the body (*animus inclusus in corpore*, Cic. *Rep.* 6.26), among other things.
242 *Immitto* is used often in military contexts, and frequently has the idea of sending, discharging, or throwing *against* another in attack or aggression.
243 Thomas 1988b: 271.

his imitation, chooses to emphasize a more unsettling reading of Vergil's grafted tree, emphasizing the element of non-belonging present in *novas* and *non sua*. Calpurnius' narration of specific instances of grafting also stresses the external control put upon the tree by the grafting farmer, a control implied in the (subjectless) violence in Vergil's own passage. When discussing the grafting of apples onto pears, the speaker describes the grafting as "tempering" (*temperat*, 44) the pear-trees, the restraint implied by the verb pointing to this external controlling of the tree by the farmer. Even more striking are the grafted peaches which sneak up upon (*subrepere*, 45) the immature plums: the peaches (whose foreignness is emphasized by their very name, *persica*—"Persian apples") are represented as secretly plotting and attacking the natural fruit, whose description as *praecoques* imparts a sense of defenselessness or lack of preparation. Not only are the peaches foreign, they are hostile, and have come to usurp the place of the original fruit.

While Vergil's text is nowhere near so explicit, Calpurnius' imitation makes it clear that the uneasiness with which scholars such as Thomas read *novas frondes* and *non sua poma* is justified; the passage clearly makes use of such diction in order to raise the possibility of the unnaturalness, even the foreignness, of the grafted branch upon the original tree. This impression is felt equally earlier in the passage, where Vergil explicitly makes use of the anthropological language familiar from other treatments of grafting: during his description of budding, Vergil states that "into this [opening], men enclose the bud from another tree (*aliena ex arbore*) and teach it to grow into the moist bark" (*huc aliena ex arbore germen includunt udoque docent inolescere libro*, 76-77). *Alienus*, as we have seen, is frequently used in humanizing, anthropological accounts of grafting in which the grafted tree is represented as foreign to the tree in which it is grafted upon. This sense of foreign versus native may be emphasized by an etymological play on *ingens* (*ingens ... arbos*, 80-81), a word which Vergil uses elsewhere in a double-sense, both as "huge" and as "native," (as if derived from *in* + *gens* or *in* + *gignere*).[244] In that case, the huge, native (*ingens*) tree marvels at fruit that is not natural, not its own (*non sua*), taken from another tree (*aliena ex arbore*). The pun may even have been picked up by Calpurnius, whose *non gentilia* [=**ingent-ilia*?] reads almost as an etymological correction on Vergil's implied derivation of *ingens*—for grafting changes the tree, as Vergil has shown us (*mutatam*, 33; *mutata*, 50), and which Calpurnius acknowledges (*mutabilis...arbos*, 42), so the tree can no longer be considered its original, natural (*ingen-s*) self.

It seems clear that Vergil's choice to concentrate on grafting is related to its productivity as a metaphor for thinking about the nature of a dual or mixed identity. Yet Vergil remains remarkably ambiguous on the moral status of grafting in this passage, and so also on the ethical dimension of mixing identities. Parts of Vergil's account of grafting seem to paint it as overwhelmingly positive. The assurance by the narrator on the productivity that grafting and transplantation can provide, for example, is read in the context of the passage as extremely desirable. The "unproductive" (*infecunda*, 48) nature of spontaneously growing plants can be remedied by these methods, offering the farmer the chance to compel the trees to whatever productivity they want (*in quascumque voces artes haud tarda sequentur*, 52). This is felt also in the following passage, when the sterile plane trees (*steriles*, 70) come to bear valuable apples (*malos valentis*), and the swine are able to feast on acorns beneath the otherwise fruitless elms (*glandemque sues fregere sub ulmis*, 72); so too the value-laden terms *feraces* (79) and *felicibus* (81) applied to the marveling tree a little later. This is the same positive focus on productivity that one sees in, for example, Horace *Epode* 2, where the money-lender Alfius imagines the rustic "cutting off the useless branches and grafting more productive ones" (*inutilisve falce ramos amputans feliciores inserit*, 13-14). Yet the comparison to Horace reveals that this

[244] For this kind of frequent etymological play on *ingens* in Vergil, see Mackail 1912, Salat 1983, Keith 1991.

particular "positive" attitude is, in fact, focalized: Alfius, who will forgo his plans to retire to the countryside once he collects his interest on this Ides (69), is in the end an urbanite who imagines escaping to the countryside during a tough time; it is telling that, even in his imagined vignette, Alfius imagines his farmstead as "rich" (*ditis...domus*, 65).[245] Indeed, when grafting is spoken of without any negative connotation, it is always from the perspective of making the tree or fruit more productive or palatable: Ovid argues for the benefit of grafting (defined as a kind of *cultus*) because it "improves bitter juices in fruits" (*in pomis sucos emendat acerbos*, *Med. Fac.* 5),[246] and Pliny the Elder asserts that through grafting fruit trees "have learned pleasing flavors" (*didicere blandos sapores*, *H.N.* 16.1.1).[247] Martial, meanwhile, in one of his epigrams gives voice to peaches who, valueless (*vilia*) on their original branches (*maternis ramis*), have become of great worth (*cara*) after grafting (*in adoptivis* [*ramis*]): *vilia maternis fueramus Persica ramis: nunc in adoptivis Persica cara sumus* (*Ep.* 13.46.1-2).

With that said, there is one feature of grafting that can be spoken of positively that is not necessarily related to monetary productivity: one's ability through grafting to benefit future generations. When discussing trees that propagate from seeds, Vergil states the disadvantages of growing solely from seeds, as he sees them: the trees grow too slowly, only creating shade "for late-coming generations" (*seris ... nepotibus*, 2.58), and the flavor of its fruit deteriorates over the generations (*pomaque degenerant sucos oblita priores*, 2.59). Grafting is thus ideal for slow-growing seed-trees as a means of both preserving high-quality fruit and speeding along its production on a mature tree; the shade of the full-grown tree is just another benefit. The idea of grafting as a task undertaken for one's descendants, serving as a kind of intergenerational bond, is already present in the *Eclogues*. In the ninth *Eclogue*, when Lycidas sings an excerpt of song on the appearance of the *sidus Iulium*, he ends the selection with the following address to Daphnis: "Graft your pears, Daphnis; future generations will pluck your fruit" (*insere, Daphni, piros; carpent tua poma nepotes*, 9.50). Not only does grafting allow the benefit of the present to continue to benefit men of the future, it is also a means for the present excellence to preserve itself into the future; thus, done correctly, grafting can serve the present and the future equally. It is for this same reason that a reference to grafting in *Eclogue* 1 serves so effectively for Meliboeus to mourn the land and identity he has lost: after lamenting the fact that the fields he has so often cultivated will be occupied by a Roman soldier (70-72), Meliboeus bitterly gives himself a command similar to the one Lycidas sings to Daphnis: "Graft your pears now, Meliboeus; plant your vines in their order" (*insere nunc, Meliboee, piros, pone ordine vites*, 1.73). The despair behind the sarcasm becomes clearer with a comparison to the line-end in *Eclogue* 9: *carpent tua poma nepotes*. Grafting is poignantly useless to Meliboeus not only because *he* must leave the land; his exile also entails that no descendants of his will exist on that land to reap the benefits of the shade, the vineyard, or the sweeter fruits that would result from the action. Here the possibility of intergenerational connection grafting might provide makes Meliboeus' loss all the harder to bear.

The more unsettling aspects of grafting or transplantation lurk just under the surface in Vergil's other references to the practices. We have already seen some of these negative aspects in the passages above, including the frequent use of violent vocabulary, the suggestion that the identities of grafted or grafted-upon tree are changed, and the hints at disassociation between graft and host. This potential

[245] Thibodeau 2011: 217-218. Cf. Ross 1987: 123-124, Fränkel 1957: 61.

[246] Ovid, *Med. Fac.* 5-7: *cultus et in pomis sucos emendat acerbos, fissaque adoptivas accipit arbor opes. culta placent.*

[247] Pliny Maior, *H.N.* 16.1.1: *Pomiferae arbores quaequae mitioribus sucis voluptatem primae cibis attulerunt et necessario alimento delicias miscere docuerunt, sive illae ultro sive ab homine didicere blandos sapores adoptione et conubio—idque munus etiam feris volucribusque dedimus—intra praedictas constant.*

discontinuity of identity, and the dangers it might pose, reoccurs in a short passage on transplanting later in the second *Georgic*. When transplanting, Vergil says, the exceptionally vigilant will first train vines in a place that is similar in soil type to the site of eventual transplantation (2.266-27); the reason for this is "to avoid the young plants suddenly failing to recognize their substitute mother" (*mutatam ignorent subito ne semina matrem*, 268). The plants' reactions here are reminiscent of the acculturative strategy of separation, where the subject rejects the host culture in favor of an original cultural identity: the unintegrable plant rejects its new soil—its "substitute mother (*mutatam ... matrem*)—out of yearning for its earlier environment, the implied original "mother." A more general discomfort with the idea of grafting seems to appear in *Eclogue* 8. During Damon's song in that poem, the narrator expresses the upheaval he feels at Nysa's marriage to Mopsus through a series of exhortations to the natural world to reflect the perversion he himself feels in his loss of Nysa (8.52-4):

nunc et ovis ultro fugiat lupus, aurea durae
mala ferant quercus, narcisso floreat alnus,
pinguia corticibus sudent electra myricae.

Now let the wolf flee the sheep of his own accord, let the hard
Oaks bear golden apples, let the alder-tree flower with narcissus,
And the tamarisks sweat rich amber out from their bark.

Here, an oak tree bearing apples is listed among several other *adynata*, including the alder-tree blossoming with narcissus flowers. The clear impression is that such an event is to be anticipated as impossible, an attitude clearly at contrast with the numerous and often impossible grafts related in *Georgics* 2. Yet it is not so surprising that the narrator of Damon's song would express such a pessimistic attitude toward the success of grafting. As we saw in the second chapter, central to this narrator's understanding of his rejection is the town-bred Nysa's disdain for a country-born man like himself—that is, an ultimate disbelief in the possibility of his being united with Nysa because of their different backgrounds. The narrator's yearning to bring together that which he perceives as separate stands out earlier in the poem, too, when he describes the depths of lovers' illusions: "What would we lovers not hope for? Griffins will lie with horses, and in the next age timid does will come to drink alongside dogs" (*quid non speremus amantes? iungentur iam grypes equis aeuoque sequenti cum canibus timidi ueniunt ad pocula dammae*, 26-28). The speaker's rejection is situated against a larger disbelief in the ability of the separate to be integrated, whether that be fruit onto another tree through grafting, or himself to city-born Nysa in marriage. Grafting becomes here an explicit means of expressing a lack of faith in integration, sociologically and otherwise, between urban and rural.

The grafting with the gravest consequence in the *Georgics* occurs later in the second book.[248] A list of prohibitions beginning at line 298 ("Don't plant vineyard on a west-facing hill"; "Don't plant the hazel among vines") culminates in a warning not to graft cultivated varieties of olive onto wild olive (302-314):

neve oleae silvestris insere truncos.
nam saepe incautis pastoribus excidit ignis,

[248] Cf. Lucretius 1.897-903: *At saepe in magnis fit montibus' inquis 'ut altis arboribus vicina cacumina summa terantur inter se validis facere id cogentibus austris, donec flammai fulserunt flore coorto'. scilicet et non est lignis tamen insitus ignis, verum semina sunt ardoris multa, terendo quae cum confluxere, creant incendia silvis.*

qui furtim pingui primum sub cortice tectus
robora comprendit, frondesque elapsus in altas
ingentem caelo sonitum dedit; inde secutus
per ramos victor perque alta cacumina regnat,
et totum involuit flammis nemus et ruit atram
ad caelum picea crassus caligine nubem,
praesertim si tempestas a vertice siluis
incubuit, glomeratque ferens incendia ventus.
hoc ubi, non a stirpe valent caesaeque reverti
possunt atque ima similes revirescere terra;
infelix superat foliis oleaster amaris.

And do not graft onto wild olive trunks.
For often a spark has fallen from careless herdsmen:
lurking stealthily at first beneath thick bark, it
gathers strength, and having crept to the high foliage
it sends a great roar to the sky; from there, spreading
through branches and lofty tree-tops it reigns victorious;
it engulfs the whole grove in flames and throws a dark
cloud up to the sky, thick with pitch-black obscurity,
especially if a storm has descended upon the grove from
above, and the wind spurs on and lumps together the flames.
In this case, the grafts lose the stock's strength, and, cut back,
they cannot regrow, nor regain their former vigor from the soil;
only the unproductive wild olive survives with its bitter leaves.

The prohibition to not graft domestic varieties of olive onto their wild counterparts gains a great deal of force with the description of the chance fire that breaks out and wipes out the productive branches. The terms in which this admonition is presented is especially interesting: *neve oleae silvestris insere truncos*. *Silvestris*, "wild; undomesticated," is used in reference to the fruit of the *oleaster* also at 2.183 (*bacis silvestribus*), where the tree indicates bitter soil; the word is also used at the beginning of Book 2, alongside the olive, to indicate the themes of the book: *te, Bacche, canam, nec non silvestria tecum virgulta et prolem tarde crescentis olivae* (2.2-3). More strikingly, in an earlier passage the poet stated that grafting and transplantation would cause wild, unproductive plants to "shed their wild spirit" (*exuerint silvestrem animum*, 51) through repeated cultivation (*cultuque frequenti*). From the perspective of the gain-minded grafter, *silvestris* is not a desirable trait, and it is the civilizing *agricola*'s objective to remove such characteristics.[249] This undesirability is emphasized in the final line: not only is the oleaster unproductive of good fruit (*infelix*), its lack of fruitfulness is repeated in the undesirability of the tree's bitter leaves (*foliis ... amaris*).

This passage is markedly anti-rustic. Whereas the earlier suggestion to compel wild trees into domestication was presented as a solution to the perceived economic disadvantages of spontaneously

[249] Vergil's prohibition about not grafting domesticated onto wild olive, here, repeats a similar prohibition in Varro to not graft domesticated pear trees onto wild ones: *Si in pirum silvaticam inserueris pirum quamvis bonam, non fore tam iucundam, quam si in eam quae silvestris non sit. In quamcumque arborem inseras ... meliore genere ut sit surculus, quam est quo veniat arbor.* (1.40.5-6).

growing trees, the prohibition here begins and ends abruptly, with a perceptible disdain toward the lesser tree. Unfavorable language adds to this impression: in addition to the decidedly negative *infelix* and *amaris* and the scornful *siluestris*, the shepherds and fire and described as conspiring enemies, working together with the wild olives—which will survive the conflagration—to remove the productive olive branches. The fire is described as stealthily (*furtim*) hidden beneath the bark (*sub cortice tectus*), a combination which suggests a joint effort between flame and oleaster—and, in fact, both will soon be described as victorious, with the fire "reigning victorious" (*victor...regnat*, 307) over the tree-tops, and the wild olive "surviving," but also "overcoming" (*superat*, 314). Meanwhile, it is the rustic herdsmen (and not the somewhat more civilized *agricolae*) who are ultimately responsible for the flames. The culprits are referred to with the curiously inspecific *incauti*, "careless; inconsiderate; audacious".[250] Yet fire-starting shepherds have a curious afterlife in the *Aeneid*. While addressing Pallas during his *aristeia* in *Aeneid* 10, immediately before his death, the poet uses a simile to describe how all Pallas' comrades came together to provide him aid (10.405-9): just as a shepherd (*pastor*), when the desired (*optato*) wind has arisen, drives a great blaze into the forests (*dispersa immittit siluis incendia*) to form one terrifying battle-line of fire (*una horrida ... acies Volcania*), then sits and watches in victory (*ille sedens uictor ... despectat*) while the flames rejoice along with him (*flammas ... ouantis*).[251] The collusion between shepherd and flames in the *Aeneid* provides a potential re-reading of the burning olives here, with the wild olive added in as possibly complicit, all conspiring to incapacitate the cultivated olive. While such a reading concretizes that which Vergil purposefully leaves unspecified, the tone of resentment required against the *oleaster* is certainly present, specifically in the narrator's complaint that the grafted olives lack the strength of a root (*non a stirpe ualent*, 312) and so are not able to grow back to their former splendor by drawing strength from the soil (*non ... reuerti possunt atque ima simile reuirescere terra*, 312-13); the wild-olive, with its well-planted trunk, will have no such issue.

Here the apparently positive focus on "productivity"—the idea that one should not graft a domesticated branch onto the trunk of a wild olive—leads the narrative perspective of the poem into territory that is critical of, judgmental of the wild olive to the point of its exclusion from the discourse of not only productivity, but desirability. Whereas the earlier passages allowed the recognition of difference alongside a belief in productivity, in the passage on grafting the *oleaster*, the wild cannot be integrated with the cultivated, but must be avoided at all costs: the recognition of the undesirability of the wild olive leads to a sort of bitter opposition between the poetic narrator, caring only for productivity and the *cultus* that will bring it about, and the features of the local landscape—wild olive, shepherd, weather, fire—that seem to be fighting against the *cultus* and productivity the narrative voice desires. There is no integration here, only opposition, and from the perspective of a dialectic of acculturation this passage would seem to demonstrate the coexistence of two different attitudes: first, a socially higher receiving culture that is not receptive at all, but expressive of an attitude of discrimination and condescension toward that deemed inferior or unworthy; and, secondly, the socially lower culture experiencing marginalization at the hand of

[250] Far from only meaning "incautious, negligent," the *TLL* lists several synonyms of the active sense—*non cavens, imparatus, temerarius; inopinans, nescius*—and notes that it sometimes appears "with the sense of boldness" (*c. sensu audaciae*; *TLL* 7.1.851.3-10). Servius defines this use as *negligentibus, circa alia occupatis*, which is certainly the easiest reading; the fact remains that Vergil is not forthcoming with more details.

[251] The other notable hersman-as-fire-spectator in the *Aeneid* is the shepherd who watches the fire devour the crops in shock, in the simile describing Aeneas as he looks out on the burning Troy from atop Priam's palace (*Aen*. 2.302-8): *excutior somno et summi fastigia tecti ascensu supero atque arrectis auribus asto: in segetem veluti cum flamma furentibus austris incidit, aut rapidus montano flumine torrens sternit agros, sternit sata laeta bovom que labores praecipites que trahit silvas; stupet inscius alto accipiens sonitum saxi de vertice pastor.*

the higher, and, as a result, choosing an oppositional, even violent, separative strategy of acculturation. The prohibition to mix wild and domesticated olive illustrates an environment unfriendly to acculturation.

Yet there is more to this prohibition than simply the conflict between domesticated and wild varieties of olive: there are direct implications here for the struggle to integrate Italian and Roman identities—for the *oleaster* in the *Aeneid* is directly connected to the native Italian forces. At *Aen.* 12.766, during the climactic battle between Turnus and Aeneas, the poet reveals in the landscape a wild olive tree that had been sacred to Faunus, only to reveal it is now only a stump, felled by the Trojans (12.766-83):

forte sacer Fauno foliis oleaster amaris
hic steterat, nautis olim venerabile lignum,
servati ex undis ubi figere dona solebant
Laurenti divo et votas suspendere vestis;
sed stirpem Teucri nullo discrimine sacrum
sustulerant, puro ut possent concurrere campo.
hic hasta Aeneae stabat, huc impetus illam
detulerat fixam et lenta radice tenebat.
incubuit voluitque manu convellere ferrum
Dardanides, teloque sequi quem prendere cursu
non poterat. tum vero amens formidine Turnus
'Faune, precor, miserere' inquit 'tuque optima ferrum
Terra tene, colui vestros si semper honores,
quos contra Aeneadae bello fecere profanos.'
dixit, opemque dei non cassa in vota vocavit.
namque diu luctans lentoque in stirpe moratus
viribus haud ullis valuit discludere morsus
roboris Aeneas.

By chance a wild olive sacred to Faunus, with bitter leaves,
had stood here, once timber revered by sailors, where those
saved from the waves were accustomed to fix gifts
to the Laurentine deity and hang garments they had vowed;
but the Trojans had laid low that sacred stock with indifference,
that they might be able to join in battle on a clear plain.
Here the spear of Aeneas was standing, here the force had
carried it down and held it fixed in the pliant root.
Aeneas leaned over, and meant to pluck out the spear-point
with his hand, and with it to attack the man he was not able
to catch in pursuit. But then Turnus, frantic with dread,
cried, "Faunus, I pray, have mercy, and you, honorable Earth,
hold the weapon, if always I have tended to your honor,
which Aeneas' men instead have desecrated with war.'
He spoke, nor did he call upon the god's aid in vain.
For though he struggled long, delayed by the clinging root,
not with any strength was Aeneas able to dislodge
the trunk's hold upon the spear.

Vergil paints a vivid picture here of the wild olive's religious importance to the local Italians he represents. Seen as sacred to Faunus, the oleaster is the site of some local rite whereby sailors saved from shipwreck dedicate gifts and votive offerings.[252] The power of the deity is real enough to Turnus that, sensing his imminent doom at Aeneas' hands, the Ardean calls for the god's aid, reminding the local deity of his past worship of him (*colui uestros si semper honores*), as is typical in such prayers. The god and the tree's local significance is stressed by Faunus' identity as the father of Latinus, as well as in Turnus' simultaneously calling upon *Terra*, the goddess of earth herself, to help him in the same prayer. The importance of the oleaster for local cult and religious belief makes the Trojan's act of cutting the tree down to a stump all the more impious and destructive, as Turnus himself points out when he informs the gods that "Aeneas' men have desecrated your honors with war" (*quos* [*honores*] *contra Aeneadae bello fecere profanos*, 779). Moreover, the Trojans' senseless felling of the "sacred stock" (*stirpem ... sacrum*), without any ability to judge its religious importance (*nullo discrimine*), reads in ethnographical terms as a Trojan extirpation of the Italians, literally felling Italian cultural inheritance in order to make room for their own stock. The Trojans' desire to clear out the native landscape in order "that they might join battle on a clear plain" (*puro ut possent concurrere campo*, 771), meanwhile, with its language of purity (*puro*), could be seen symbolically as either a Trojan play for ethnocultural purity, or, at the very least, a hope to come together (*concurrere*) with the local Italians without having to engage or acknowledge their own cultural history.

Considering all this, the image of the spear of Aeneas stuck in the clinging root of the felled oleaster becomes extraordinarily poignant. For one, the fixing (*huc impetus illam detulerat fixam*, 772-73) reads as another sort of forced grafting,[253] here by Aeneas and the Trojans upon unwilling Italians and their landscape; the forceful piercing of the once sacred stump is quite clearly one of many acts of unsolicited violence against the Italians. The spear remains entrenched in the tree, meanwhile, through the combined attention of Turnus, Faunus, and Terra, a sort of local Italian trifecta that conspire in order to prevent, at least for a moment, further violence from Aeneas, an act which reads as a powerful act of local resistance. The dichotomy here between native Italian locals and civilizing proto-Romans is reinforced by the use of the adjective *lentus* twice to describe the tree's root (*lenta radice*, 773; *lentoque in stirpe*, 781)—for this word, here in its last two occurrences in the poem, recalls the Italian *lenta viburna* compared to the Roman *cupressi* in the simile in the first *Eclogue*, at the other end of Vergil's corpus. Instead of weakness, the pliancy implied by *lentus* is the strength of the Italian *stirps* to continue to resist in this moment. The fact that a direct reference is made to the fire and rebirth of the oleaster at *Georgics* 2.302-14, allows the reader to understand the same dynamics between cultivator and cultivated here—a spirit of mutual resistance, with no intention or hope of integration. Further, the fact of the *oleaster*'s regrowth at *Georgics* 2.314, combined with the intimation at *Georgics* 2.30-1 that the olive can regrow even from a mutilated piece of trunk,[254] seems to point to the hope of Italian renewal, even amidst such violence and destruction. Lastly, returning to the fact of Aeneas' spear *remaining* embedded in the stump of the Italian *oleaster*: if this entering of the Trojan spear into the Italian *stirps* is a metaphor for ethnographic grafting, then the embeddedness points, despite the violence, to a continuing, longer-term ethnocultural "grafting" of the Trojans/Romans and Italians.

That graft does happen—both historically, and in the text of the *Aeneid*. Indeed, the passage

[252] Tarrant 2012 ad loc. suggests that this tree's significance for sailors saved from shipwreck makes the Trojans' destruction of it all the more insensitive, considering their survival of the storm in *Aen.* 1.
[253] Gowers 2011.
[254] *G.* 2.30-1: *quin et caudicibus sectis (mirabile dictu) truditur e sicco radix oleagina ligno*.

immediately following the sticking of Aeneas' spear in the Italian *oleaster* is Juno's request to Jupiter to end the conflict, but not allow the Latins to be subsumed within the Trojans (*Aen.* 12.819-828):

> 'illud te, nulla fati quod lege tenetur,
> pro Latio obtestor, pro maiestate tuorum:
> cum iam conubiis pacem felicibus (esto)
> component, cum iam leges et foedera iungent,
> ne vetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos
> neu Troas fieri iubeas Teucrosque vocari
> aut vocem mutare viros aut vertere vestem.
> sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula reges,
> sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago:
> occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia.'
>
> 'This boon, banned by no law of fate,
> I beg of you for Latium's sake, for your own kin's greatness:
> when soon with happy bridal rites—so be it!—they arrange peace,
> when soon they join in laws and treaties,
> do not command the native Latins to change their ancient name,
> nor to become Trojans and be called Teucrians,
> nor to change their language and alter their attire:
> let Latium be, let Alban kings endure through ages,
> let there be a Roman stock, strong by Italian valour:
> Troy is fallen, and fallen let her be, together with her name!'[255]

Jupiter immediately agrees, restating the terms in his own words (12.834-840):

> sermonem Ausonii patrium moresque tenebunt,
> utque est nomen erit; commixti corpore tantum
> subsident Teucri. morem ritusque sacrorum
> adiciam faciamque omnis uno ore Latinos.
> hinc genus Ausonio mixtum quod sanguine surget,
> supra homines, supra ire deos pietate videbis,
> nec gens ulla tuos aeque celebrabit honores.
>
> Ausonia's sons shall keep their fathers' speech and ways,
> and as it is now, so shall their name be: the Teucrians shall
> but sink down, merged in the mass. I will give them their sacred
> laws and rites and make them all Latins of one tongue.
> From them shall arise a race, blended with Ausonian blood,
> which you will see overpass men, overpass gods in loyalty,
> and no nation will celebrate your worship with equal zeal.[256]

[255] I have adapted slightly the translation of Fairclough 1918.
[256] As above, I have adapted slightly the translation of Fairclough 1918.

The langage of artificial propagation returns again here, for a final time. Juno's request to the king of the gods is summarized by line 827: *sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago*. "Let there be a Roman stock, strong by Italian valour." The particular method of propagation referred to here is the *propago*—the "layer" or "slip"—in which process the head or a part of a mature plant is bent down to the ground, buried, with the expectation that the covered-over part will form its own root system in a new patch of soil; once a firm root system has been established for the new part of the plant, the shoot or branch connecting the "new" plant to the "old" can either be maintained—or severed. Layering as a method of articificial propagation is mentioned, too, in the discussion of natural and cultivated propagation in *Georgics* 2, and it alone of the artificial methods seems to look forward to hopeful result (2.26-7):

> *silvarumque aliae pressos propaginis arcus expectant et viva sua plantaria terra* (*G.* 2.26-7)
>
> And some trees wait for the arc of their buried layers and their own shoots in living soil.

Different from either grafting *or* transplantation, in reality the process of layering that is identified so exactly with *propago* is a perfect metaphor for both the Trojans own journey to Italy to establish themselves there, as well as for local Italians who are learning to accept and navigate a Roman identity as well—for it is a metaphor that describes perfectly an ideal process of bicultural integration. In the case of the Trojans, their heritage plant is planted in Troy; making the horizontal journey to Italy, when they arrive, they "bury" themselves in the local soil, and, while drawing the majority if not all of their cultural strength early on from their priorly established roots in Troy, slowly they put down roots in Italy, drawing more and more power of culture and identity from these new roots as time goes on; eventually, new shoots grow from newly established roots, and the Trojan emigrants can survive on Italian soil with or without the strong association with their original Trojan roots—but this new Trojan shoot with its roots in Italy, the *Romana propago*, will only have grown strong and thrived because of the natural qualities of the soil it was able to set down new roots in—*potens Itala virtute*. The metaphor of the layer makes clear the continued importance of the new settlers' connection to their ancestral roots in Troy (the horizontal stretch of the actual layered shoot, with its first and firmest roots in Troy), as well as the process of setting down new roots in a new soil or environment—pre-Trojan Italy, the *viva terra* from Vergil's description of layering in *Georgics* 2.

Of course, the metaphor of the layer or *propago* applies also to the municipal Italians who have become Roman citizens. They are also a *Romana propago*, in that they have roots in the local places of Italy, but have been layered down into a new contex that is the soil of Roman citizenship; in this case, *Romama propago* is starkly reminiscent of the *Romana oppida* witnessed at the close of the *laudes Italiae*, where the redefinition of the local towns are *Romana* pointed to a potential erasure of the local in order to speak in terms of a new universal: the Roman. Yet the more exact metaphor of the *propago* here makes clear that such an erasure is not necessarily inevitable, as those passages concentrating on the more negative aspects of grafting have sometimes suggested: the image of the layered plant drawing strength from both its original root system and its new "artificial"—but equally real—root system in its new soil, growing stronger by the day, reveals the continued interrelationship between cultural origin and cultural destination that is ideal in a well-maintained integration of bicultural identity. In this case, *potens Itala virtute* works differently from the way it works as a metaphor for Trojan migration to Italy: rather than referring to the *new soil* of Italy which will make the Trojans strong, in the case of Italian-Roman integration, the *Itala virtute* stands

for the original system of roots, the connections to Italian-Roman individuals' scattered *origines* which will sustain them as they grow a new identity in soil that is geographically the same, but socially and culturally transformed into something Roman. It is only by maintaining a strong connection to those roots in the *germana patria*, this passage suggests, that the *patria communis* can or will ever be strong.[257]

[257] Cf. Bettini 2006 for the ways in which Roman identity does not "sink down" as Jupiter promises here.

Chapter Four

Víteliú

[W]hat people make of their places is closely connected to what they make of themselves as members of society and inhabitants of the earth, and while the two activities may be separable in principle, they are deeply joined in practice. If place-making is a way of constructing the past, a venerable means of *doing* human history, it is also a way of constructing social traditions and, in the process, personal and social identities. We *are*, in a sense, the place-worlds we imagine.

— Keith Basso, *Wisdom Sits in Places*[1]

Symbols can be so beautiful, sometimes.

— Kurt Vonnegut, *Breakfast of Champions*[2]

By now, it should be clear that the problem of defining community is one that is foundational to Vergil's poetry, especially as regards the multiplicity of possible avenues for achieving it. We have also been able to observe the gradual shift in perspectival orientation that is achieved by Vergil's poetry as he moves from the beginning to the middle and then end of his *oeuvre*: the *Eclogues* most of all an exploration of home's connection to place, the work clearly situated in a landscape left intentionally vague so as to be able to be read as any of a number of local Italian landscapes; the *Georgics* developing the *Eclogues*' emphasis on local specificity and regional variation while also exploring the unifying and universalizing perspective of a shared ethnic or civic identity, itself the centralizing point-of-view of Rome and her empire, a position which displays discovered commonality alongside reluctant erasure; and finally the *Aeneid*, where the concern of the familial, genetic, and local is constantly lost beneath the waves of homogenization accompanying Aeneas' (and, later, Augustus') attempts to create a pan-ethnic, non-genetic communal Italian (and subsequent Roman) identity. An exploration of the dialectics of acculturation does not disappear in the *Aeneid*; rather, Aeneas and the Trojans' attempts to establish a unifying, common identity encroach upon these other facets of identity formulation, until it finally emerges as dominant in the final agreement between Juno and Jupiter at the end of *Aeneid* 12. In this final chapter, I would like to further deepen the discussion of all these issues in the *Georgics* through an exploration of the poem in microcosm, through yet another individual element which, upon close examination, reveals the poet's constant engagement with the problem of the integration of local identity with both a pan-Italian and a pan-Roman identity—specifically, the poet's use of oxen and other bovine figures.

Animals of various sorts, both inside and outside of similes, are relatively common in Vergil. This

1 Basso 1996: 7.
2 Vonnegut 1973: 201.

is especially true of pastoral herd animals such as sheep and goats, and horses as animals related closely to war; also somewhat common are pigs, boars, wolves, and dogs. Yet despite the frequent appearance of these animals throughout Vergil's *oeuvre*, none appear quite so frequently as the cow or ox in its various manifestations of age and sex.[3] The 130 or so appearances of cattle in Vergil's text occur with the same relative frequency in the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*; in comparison, the horse, Vergil's second most commonly referenced animal, appears almost solely in the *Aeneid*, with only 16 of the word's 119 attestations in the first two poems, and only a single occurrence in the *Eclogues*.[4] These cows and oxen sometimes feature as background to the main action of the text (*Ecl.* 2.66), including often in similes or imagined vignettes (*Ecl.* 8.85; *Aen.* 2.224), but appear often also in the main narrative of the text (*Ecl.* 1.9; *G.* 1.45; *Aen.* 3.220), including in some of Vergil's most memorable and significant episodes: the battle of the bulls seized by *amor* (*G.* 3); the story of Hercules and Cacus (*Aen.* 8); and the simile describing the final confrontation between Aeneas and Turnus (*Aen.* 12), among others. Indeed, both its frequent appearance and its appearance in significant scenes in the poems suggest that the ox held a special place for Vergil.

The role which the bull, cow, or calf plays in Vergil's poetry also changes quite noticeably—and consistently—from poem to poem. In the *Eclogues*, bulls, cows, and their ilk are mainly found grazing,[5] their existence defined both by the shepherd's care for them and by the role each one plays in the flock, the *pecus* or *grex*, as a whole.[6] At a couple of points, the end of the rural day or the peace of the Golden Age is marked by the farmer's releasing his oxen from their yokes;[7] once, in the mythological *Eclogue* 6, *iuvencus* is used to refer to the steer whose union with Pasiphae produced the Minotaur.[8] The role of oxen shifts significantly, however, in the *Georgics*, where more than anything they are humankind's partner—and instrument—in agriculture's most basic act: ploughing.[9] The poem also mentions oxen with specific reference to other common agricultural tasks (breaking, calving, etc.), with a large concentration in the didactic passage on the care and breeding of herds in *Georgics* 3.[10] Occasionally, the grazing or lowing of cattle is mentioned in the *Georgics* in order to recall the pastoral world Vergil develops in the *Eclogues*.[11] These three actions—ploughing, breeding, and grazing—are those most commonly associated with oxen in the *Georgics*, a fact unsurprising in a poem which purports to teach its reader the ins-and-outs of

3 The most common terms for cattle in Vergil (*taurus, bos, iuvencus/-a, vitulus/-a*) occur a combined total of 130 times throughout the corpus: *taurus* (38x, plus 4x *taurinus/taureus*), *bos* (31x, plus 3x *bucula*), *iuvencus/-a* (41x), *vitulus/-a* (13x). Horses (*equus/-a*) occur nearly as often, with 119 total attestations, 103 in the *Aeneid*. After this, the most commonly occurring animals in the corpus are sheep (*ovis/aries/agnus*: 40 times), goats (*caper/haedus/hircus/capellus*: 38x), pigs and boars (*sus/porcus/aper* : 34x), dogs (*canis*: 30x), and wolves (*lupus/-a*: 27x).

4 An *adynaton* at Ecl. 8.27-8: *iungentur iam gryphes equis, aevoque sequenti cum canibus timidi venient ad pocula dammae.*

5 *Ecl.* 1.9-10; 1.45; 3.85; 3.87; 3.100; 5.25-6; 6.58; 7.11; 7.37; 7.44; 8.2.

6 *Ecl.* 1.45; 3.29-31; 6.45-6; 8.85-6. The three occurrences of *vitula* as the prize of the poetic contest in *Ecl.* 3 (3.29, 48, 109), for example, define the calf in a relational system with both herdsmen (as a kind of pastoral currency as the reward in a singing match) and *grex* (with the *vitula* as both nurturing mother and representative member of Damoetas' flock).

7 *Ecl.* 2.66; 4.41.

8 *Ecl.* 6.46; cf. *Aen.* 6.24ff.

9 *G.* 1.45-6; 1.65; 1.118-19; 1.210; 1.215-18; 1.325-6; 2.140-1; 2.205-6; 2.237; 2.356-7; 2.513-15; 3.50; 3.515-18.

10 *G.* 1.3-4; 1.285 (on breaking cattle); 2.195 (on best soils for grazing flocks); 3.51-2, 56, 58 (on the proper appearance of heifers); 3.153 (on the annoyance of the horsefly to cattle); 3.157, 164, 169 (on the care of calves and yearlings); 3.210-2 (on the isolation of bulls from the remaining herd); 3.418-19 (on the harmfulness of the snake to cattle).

11 *G.* 1.15-16; 2.374-5; 2.469-70; 3.219; 4.128; 4.434; 4.538-9.

agriculture. Less expected is another frequent trope surrounding oxen in the *Georgics*, one only hinted at in the *Eclogues*,[12] but which will later become one of the primary associations of bovids in the *Aeneid*: death, and specifically sacrifice.[13] These georgic deaths and sacrifices are all significant moments in the poem, each one looking forward in its own way to the role of cattle in the *Aeneid*. In that poem, the place occupied by cattle becomes overwhelmingly one of death, sacrifice, and conflict. Bulls and other bovids are most commonly presented as animals for sacrifice in the *Aeneid*;[14] they are elsewhere violently slaughtered in nonsacrifical contexts.[15] Vergil sporadically mentions cattle when he is constructing or responding to a blatantly pastoral or georgic context—contexts which, it should be noted, are usually damaged or destroyed by the end of their narrative section.[16] Aside from this, cattle occur in the *Aeneid* as prizes to the contests of the fifth book,[17] in mythological references or narratives,[18] or in important similes near the end of the poem, which will be discussed below.[19]

It is undeniable that this difference in the treatment of cattle in Vergil's three poems has something to do with the genre of each poem and the expectations derived therefrom: that is to say, there is a sense in which the generic expectations of pastoral, agricultural didactic, and epic can be seen to predetermine the cow's role as, respectively, a symbol of idyllic landscape, an integral actor in agricultural enterprise, or a tool for mediating man's relationship with the gods. However, in the context of this project's exploration of the dialectics of acculturation concerning the incorporation of local Italians into the Roman citizenship in the first century BCE, another possibility presents itself: that the bull, linked to stories and ideas of Italy

12 *Ecl.* 3.76-77: *Phyllida mitte mihi: meus est natalis, Iolla; cum faciam* ***vitula*** *pro frugibus, ipse venito.*

13 Death: 3.368-69 (cows die in Hyperborean cold); 3.494 (calves die during plague). Sacrifice: 2.146-48 (Clitumnam bulls sacrificed in Roman triumph); 2.536-37 (feasting upon cattle as marking end of the Golden Age); 3.22 (imagined sacrifice at the temple Vergil will build to Augustus); 3.532 (sacrifice during the plague); *Iunonis*; 4.284, 299-300 (the rites to restore the beehive); 4.538-43 (Cyrene instructs Aristaeus to sacrifice to restore his hive); 4.547 (Cyrene instructs Aristaeus to sacrifice a calf to Eurydice); 4.549-51, 555-56 (Aristaeus undertakes sacrifice to restore hive). The use of *taurinis follibus* at *G.* 4.171 implies the death and skinning of the bulls whose skins form the bellows.

14 1.633-36; 2.202; 2.223-24; 3.21; 3.118-19; 3.369; 5.59-62; 5.96-7; 5.101; 5.235-37; 5.329; 5.772-3; 6.38-39; 6.243-244, 252; 8.180-83; 8.719; 9.626-27; 11.197.

15 3.247 (Celaeno the Harpy curses the Trojans for slaughtering their herds); 5.473ff. (Entellus' killing of the steer he wins in the boxing contest against Dares); 11.809-11 (simile of a wolf in flight to describe Arruns after killing Camilla). The killing of cattle is also implied in the two references to leather used as a construction material: 5.405 (of the skin used to make the *caestus* of Entellus)**;** 11.679-80 (of Camilla's victim Ornytus).

16 For example, at *Aen.* 3.220, Aeneas and his men observe fields of cattle on the Strophades—*laeta* ***boum*** *passim campis armenta videmus*—only to slaughter them for food; Celaeno soon curses the Trojans for these slaughtered cattle and bullocks (*pro caede boum stratisque iuvencis*, 3.247). Likewise, at 8.314, Evander describes the future site of Rome as being inhabited previously by a race born of hard oak who did not know how "to yoke bulls" (*iungere tauros*), an action which is coincident with the start of the age of Jupiter in the *Georgics*. Cf. 2.306 (the simile describing Aeneas watching the burning of Troy to a shepherd watching a flood carry away *sata laeta boumque labores*); and 9.609-10 (Numanus Remulus tells of native Italians' goading of bullocks (*iuvenci*) with spears as evidence of their superior training, before being killed by Ascanius).

17 *Aen.* 5.247-8 (prize to Cloanthus for winning boat race is three steers). 5.366 (*victori velatum auro vittisque* ***iuvencum***) and 5.399 (*pretio inductus pulchroque* ***iuvenco***) both refer to the steer laid down as a prize for the boxing match between Entellus and Dares, which Entellus kills violently upon winning.

18 Namely: Pasiphae (6.24; cf. *Ecl.* 6.46); Io (7.790, on Turnus' shield); and the tale of Cacus' theft of Hercules' cattle (7.663; 8.204, 205, 207, 208, 215, 217, etc.).

19 *Aen.* 10.453ff. (Turnus as a lion who flies toward a bull in attack); 12.101ff. (Turnus as a bull preparing for battle); 12.715ff. (Aeneas and Turnus as bulls about to charge).

for centuries before Vergil is writing, stands in his poetry as a symbol of Italy and its local identities more broadly. The remainder of this chapter will show that this is indeed so, and demonstrate how the bull, cow, of calf as a symbol of Italy is used within Vergil's poetry to make Vergil's most important points about the interrelationship between local Italian and Roman state identities.

Italian Oxen and Roman Wolves

One of the more well-known ancient etymologies for *Italia* proposed that the name was derived from either a Latin word for "calf" or a Greek word for "bull." The antiquarian Varro in his *De Re Rustica*, a work completed in the decade before the *Georgics* and inarguably a model for Vergil's poem, gives both Latin and Greek etymologies for Italy's name. At the beginning of his second book, on the care of herd animals, Varro as a character in his own dialogue argues for the dignity of animal husbandry by enumerating a list of place whose name derived from herd animals; at the list's culmination, Varro etymologizes Italy as coming from the Latin word *vitulus*, "calf" (*DRR* 2.1.9):

> Nonne in terris multa [*ab pecuariis nominata*], ut oppidum in Graecia Hippion Argos? Denique non Italia a vitulis, ut scribit Piso?
>
> Are there not many places on land named from herd animals, as the town in Greece called "Horse-rearing" [*Hippion*] Argos? Finally, isn't the name of Italy taken from *vituli*, "calves", as Piso writes?[20]

A few sections later, Varro gives another bovine etymology of Italy, this time from a Greek word for bull, ἰταλός, as he warns the aptly named Vaccius to be diligent in describing the care of cattle (2.5.3):

> Nam bos in pecuaria maxima debet esse auctoritate, praesertim in Italia, quae a bubus nomen habere sit existimata. Graecia enim antiqua, ut scribit Timaeus, tauros vocabat italos, a quorum multitudine et pulchritudine et fetu vitulorum Italiam dixerunt. Alii scripserunt, quod ex Sicilia Hercules persecutus sit eo nobilem taurum, qui diceretur italus.
>
> For the cow should be in the highest esteem among herd-animals, especially in Italy, which is thought to take its name from oxen. For Greece of old, as writes Timaeus, called bulls *italoi*, and on account of the bulls' beauty and great number, and because of the great abundance of their calves (*vituli*), they so named Italy. Others have written that it is because Hercules chased to this land a noble bull, which was called *italus*.

Between these two passages, Varro makes clear his preference for an etymology of *Italia* derived from Latin *vitulus* or Greek ἰταλός; that is, Varro neglects to mention the other popular ancient etymology for the name of Italy, as derived from Italus, an early king of the Oenotrians in southwestern Italy.[21] Moreover,

[20] These lines of L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi are not extant, but only reported in Varro's text here. For a commentary and overview of possible etymologies (which overlaps with much of the discussion here), see Cornell & Bispham 2013: 195-96 (L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi **F1**); see also Maltby 1991 s.v.

[21] For this etymology, see Cato, *Orig.* 1.3 (Chassignet 1986); Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.35.1; Fest., s.v. *Italia* 94 (Lindsay 1913). See also the discussions of Prontera 1992: 131-133, Luraghi 2002: 58-59, and Carlà-Uhink 2017:

the fact that Varro states in his *De Lingua Latina* that the Latin word *vitulus* itself derives from the Greek ἰταλός[22] suggests that the writer considered the etymology of *Italia* from either *vitulus* or ἰταλός as essentially equivalent to one another, a replaceability of terms that reoccurs later in the etymologizing of Servius and Paul the Deacon's epitome of Festus.[23]

Nor is this etymology given as random, but instead understood to be motivated either by geographic reality or mythological history. *Italia* earns its name either because of the exceptional beauty and great abundance of its bulls and calves (*a quorum* [i.e. *taurorum*] *multitudine et pulchritudine et fetu vitulorum*, *DRR* 2.5.3), or because Hercules had pursued a bull or calf along the Tyrrhenian coast of Italy, apparently when driving the cattle of Geryon from the west toward Greece. Italy's abundance in oxen as etymological motivation for its name is likewise cited in Aulus Gellius (ἰταλοί ... *quorum in Italia magna copia fuerit*) and Servius (*Italiam a bubus quibus est Italia fertilis*), and hinted at in Columella.[24] Herculean mythology is presented as a possible motivation for Italy's naming also in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who cites the early fourth-century mythographer Hellanicus of Lesbos as a source for the story of Hercules' pursuit of a runaway calf down the coast of Italy and into Sicily—not, as in the above quotation from Varro, a bull called *italus*/ἰταλός—as he transferred Geryon's cattle from Spain to Argos. In a slightly different move, Dionysius cites Hellanicus as putting forward not a Greek etymology for the name of Italy, but instead a local Italian word for calf, οὐίτουλος-- that is, *vitulus* (Dion. Hal. 1.35.2-3):

> ἐρόμενον ἀεὶ τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους καθ᾽ οὓς ἑκάστοτε γίνοιτο διώκων τὸν δάμαλιν, εἴ πή τις αὐτὸν ἑωρακὼς εἴη, τῶν τῇδε ἀνθρώπων Ἑλλάδος μὲν γλώττης ὀλίγα συνιέντων, τῇ δὲ πατρίῳ φωνῇ κατὰ τὰς μηνύσεις τοῦ ζῴου καλούντων τὸν δάμαλιν οὐίτουλον, ὥσπερ καὶ νῦν λέγεται, ἐπὶ τοῦ ζῴου τὴν χώραν ὀνομάσαι πᾶσαν ὅσην ὁ δάμαλις διῆλθεν Οὐιτουλίαν. μεταπεσεῖν δὲ ἀνὰ χρόνον τὴν ὀνομασίαν εἰς τὸ νῦν σχῆμα οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν πολλὰ τὸ παραπλήσιον πέπονθεν ὀνομάτων. πλὴν εἴτε ὡς Ἀντίοχός φησιν ἐπ᾽ ἀνδρὸς ἡγεμόνος, ὅπερ ἴσως καὶ πιθανώτερόν ἐστιν, εἴθ᾽ ὡς Ἑλλάνικος οἴεται ἐπὶ τοῦ ταύρου τὴν ὀνομασίαν ταύτην ἔσχεν ...
>
> Hercules, following the calf, inquired of the inhabitants wherever he came if anyone had seen it anywhere, and when the people [*of the place]*, who understood but little Greek and used their own speech when indicating the animal, called it *vitulus* (the name by which it is still known), he, in memory of the calf, called all the country it had wandered over Vitulia. And it is no wonder that the name has been changed in the course of time to its present form, since many Greek names, too, have met with a similar fate. But whether, as Antiochus says, the country took this name from a ruler, which perhaps

97-100. Vergil himself references this etymology at *Aen.* 1.532-33: *Oenotri coluere viri; nunc fama minores Italiam dixisse ducis de nomine gentem*.

22 *DLL* 5.96: *ex quo fructus maior, hic est qui Graecis usus ... vitulus, quod Graece antiquitus* ἰταλός*, aut quod plerique vegeti, vegitulus* (Kent 1938).

23 Servius ad *Aen.* 1.533: *alii Italiam a bubus quibus est Italia fertilis, quia Graeci boves* ἰταλοὺς*, nos vitulos dicimus*; Paul. Fest. 106: *Italia dicta quod magnos italos, hoc est boves habeat; vituli enim ab Italis sunt dicti* [– i.e. *hoc modo, ut italos*]. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Rom. Ant.* 1.35.2: ...τῶν τῇδε ἀνθρώπων Ἑλλάδος μὲν γλώττης ὀλίγα συνιέντων, τῇ δὲ πατρίῳ φωνῇ κατὰ τὰς μηνύσεις τοῦ ζῴου καλούντων τὸν δάμαλιν οὐίτουλον [*vitulum*], ὥσπερ καὶ νῦν λέγεται, ἐπὶ τοῦ ζῴου τὴν χώραν ὀνομάσαι πᾶσαν ὅσην ὁ δάμαλις διῆλθεν Οὐιτουλίαν [*Vituliam*]; and Gell. *Noct. Att.* 11.1.1: *Italiam de Graeco vocabulo appellatam scripserunt, quoniam boves Graeca vetere lingua* ἰταλοί *vocitati sint, quorum in Italia magna copia fuerit, bucetaque in ea terra gigni pascique solita sint complurima*.

24 Gell. 11.1.1; Serv. ad *Aen.* 1.533. Cf. Col. 6.*pref.*7: *Nec dubium, quin, ut ait Varro, ceteras pecudes bos honore superare debeat, praesertim in Italia, quae ab hoc nuncupationem traxisse creditur, quod olim Graeci tauros* ***italos*** *vocabant*.

is more probable, or, as Hellanicus believes, from the bull ...[25]

Dionysius, perhaps following Hellanicus, goes out of his way to give οὐίτουλος—the word for calf (δάμαλις) using the "ancestral speech" (πατρίῳ φωνῇ) of the local inhabitants—as the word which inspires Hercules to name the country Οὐιτουλία, or *Vitulia* transliterated into Roman characters.[26] Dionysius, who began composition on his *Roman Antiquities* between 30 and 7 BCE[27]—that is, contemporaneously with Vergil's work on the *Aeneid* and after Varro's publication of the *De Re Rustica*—takes great pain to point out that the origin of Italy's name was from a local word, οὐίτουλος—a perfect Greek transliteration of Latin *vitulus*[28]—rather than from the Greek word ἰταλός. This is especially striking considering that Dionysius chooses to give the form of the region's name as Οὐιτουλία, rather than the regular transliteration into Greek, Ἰταλία. The form Οὐιτουλία, when transliterated into Roman characters—that is, *Vitulia*—is orthographically equivalent to the Oscan name for Italy, *Vítel(l)iú*, where the initial labial glide *v-* is still preserved.[29] Dionysius, then, not only points to a non-Greek Italic word as the origin of Italy's name (i.e. Latin *vitulus*; but cf. Umbrian *vitlu*, "calf"), but also seems to leave open the possibility that this word is not necessarily Latin, but from one of the non-dominant Italic languages. Varro's and Dionysius' discussions of the origin of Italy's name point to a cultural background in which cows and oxen are closely connected with the characterization of Italy, in an account that, in Dionysius' case, takes care to point to specifics of Italic regionalism.

The connection between bovines and Italy is not merely etymological: the bull or cow also sometimes stood as a visual symbol of Italy, even of Italy as *distinct* from Rome. The greatest evidence for this comes to us from coins of the last centuries BCE. In an article on the use of bull iconography on Republican and early Imperial coinage, Jane DeRose Evans traces the use of bull imagery on coins of the Italian peninsula from original mythic or religious associations[30] on coins from the Greek city-states of

25 Greek text and translation from Cary 1937. I have included a small change in square brackets.

26 Cary's translation of the Greek τῶν τῇδε ἀνθρώπων as "the people of the island" understands τῇδε to refer only to the locals of the destination, Sicily, thus suggesting οὐίτουλος to be Sicilian dialect; however, it is plausible that τῇδε refers to the place of the locals (τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους) involved in each instance of asking (ἑκάστοτε) before the final destination—i.e. the speakers of Italic languages along the Tyrrhenian coast. At *Bibl.* 2.5.10, Apollodorus states that *Italia* comes from *italos*, which he gives as the Etruscan (rather than Greek, Italic, or Sicilian) word for "bull": τὴν πλησίον χώραν διελθὼν τὴν ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνου κληθεῖσαν Ἰταλίαν (Τυρρηνοὶ γὰρ ἰταλὸν τὸν ταῦρον ἐκάλεσαν), ἦλθεν εἰς πεδίον Ἔρυκος.

27 *Rom. Ant.* 1.7.2.

28 Notice that even the Greek accentuation matches the expected initial stress in Latin *vitulus*.

29 While the orthography might make it seem that *Víteliú*/*Vítelliú* is more closely related to the Latin word *vitellus*—"calfling", but also "yolk"—this is actually not the case, and *vitulus*/*Italia* are the more closely responding forms: the double-*l* is an orthographical habit of Oscan when a consonant is palatalized before a high-vowel, here, *-i-*; thus, etymologically there is only one *l* in *Vítelliú*. Latin *–al-* and Oscan *–el-* are etymologically the same, each being its language's corresponding outcome of an earlier syllabic *l*. Lastly, the final *–ú* of the Oscan *Vítel(l)iú* is the regular Oscan orthography for the nominative singular of the noun-class corresponding to the Latin *a*-declension. Formally, then, Osc. *Vítelliú* ~ *Víteliú* ~*Vitaliú* ~ Latin *(V)italia*; cf. *Vitulia*. See Untermann 2000. Vergil never uses any form of the diminutive *vitellus*, likely in order to avoid the meaning "yolk".

30 Most bulls (or bull-headed anthropomorphic figures) with mythological associations on coins were references to the origin stories or colonial foundation stories of specific cities—i.e. Acheloos, Hercules, Europa, etc. Those with religious associations mostly made reference to Dionysus or Poseidon, to whom bulls were regularly sacrificed in Greek and Roman religious practice.

southern Italy, to its political repurposing by Romans and Italians as a symbol of southern Italy, Sicily, and of the Italians and Italy more generally.[31] Particularly interesting are a number of coins minted by the rebel Italic forces during the Social War, all of which utilize the image of a bull specifically as a symbol of the rebel Italic armies and the new socio-political entity they had formed in opposition to Rome. The most famous of these is a coin minted by Samnite rebel general C. Papius Mutilus around 89 BCE (Sydenham 628; Campana series 6a-6b),[32] featuring the head of Bacchus on the obverse and a scene of a charging bull goring a wolf on the reverse, with the identity of the minter written in Oscan script from the reverse to the obverse (C. PAAPI. MUTIL. EMBRATUR = C. Papius Mutilus Imperator):

Fig. 4.1[33]

A closely related type differs slightly: here, the head of Bacchus again faces right on the obverse, but the reverse differs not in the image, which remains the depiction of the bull goring a trampled wolf, but in the caption, which, again in Oscan, reads ***Vítelliú***—that is, the name of Italy in Oscan:

Fig. 4.2[34]

[31] While DeRose Evans 1996 does acknowledge that on several coins from the Social War "the bull is used as a symbol of Italy" (202), in general she is less concerned with the bull as a symbol of a collective Italy and more engaged with situating coins in specifically south Italian and Sicilian contexts. In a similar vein is Tataranni 2005, for whom the bull's eventual status as a symbol of the broader Italian forces in the Social War against Rome is not the main focus; instead, Tataranni's main argument is that the bull as Italian symbol was not "un'invenzione estemporanea" of the rebel Italian forces during the war, but instead a conscious innovation of specifically Sabellic generals (e.g. C. Papius Mutilus) inspired by the legendary "Samnite bull" which figured in the mythology of the "sacred spring" narratives of the Samnites—that is, "l'adattamento di un simbolo collettivo già esistente (il toro sannita) alle nuove istanze ideologiche sopravvenute in una fase avanzata del conflitto" (304). While acknowleding the importance of recognizing the inspiration of south Italian and Sicilian coin types (DeRose Evans) and the influence of a specifically Samnite identity (Tataranni) in the development of bull imagery on Social War coinage, I think it is important to admit that, whatever the origin of the symbol, the bull in these contexts has taken on new associations in the new political and social context of the Social Wars and other events of the 1st century.

[32] Sydenham 1952; Campana 1987.

[33] DeRose Evans 2005, no. 5. See also Rutter 2001: no. 427.

[34] Rutter 2001, no. 420.

The symbolism of the "Italian bull" goring the "Roman wolf" has long been recognized and frequently commented upon.[35] The origin of both symbols lies partially in local mythologies of origin. The wolf comes to stand for Rome on account of the myth of the young Romulus and Remus being raised by the *lupa*, "she-wolf," after their abandonment in the Tiber and before being found by the shepherd Faustulus.[36] The bull comes to stand for the Italic forces in the Social War partially on account of the etymological (*vitulus*; ἰταλός) and geographical (the beauty and abundance of Italy's cattle) associations discussed above, and partially on account of the story of the foundation of the Samnites in southern Italy from the Sabine rite of the *ver sacrum*, or sacred spring, wherein a group of Sabine youths (dedicated to Mars in the year of their birth in exchange for victory in a war against the Umbrians), upon reaching manhood, were sent away as colonists led by a sacred bull (understood as a totem for the god Mars) to finally settle in the land of the Opici (i.e., Osci), whom they slaughtered or ejected before sacrificing the sacred bull-guide to Mars.[37] On the above coins, where the head of Bacchus appears on the obverse, a connection is forged also between the god and the bull on the reverse, animals often sacrificed to the god and associated with his cult.[38]

The figuration of the Italic bull goring the Roman wolf on the reverse of these coins is extremely poignant in the context of the Social War; whatever the original intent of its minter, the bull comes to stand as a strong symbol of victory for the unified Italic tribes over the Romans, the symbol of whose origin is crushed in confrontation with the city's former allies. This sense of ethnic and cultural opposition to the Romans is underscored by the Oscan coins' differences from Roman mints, even considering their "heavy dependence on and sometimes outright imitation of Roman issues".[39] The general patterning of these rebel coins on Roman versions is clear: the head of Bacchus in profile on the obverse of both these coins, for example, follows the pattern of Roman coinage likewise featuring the right-facing profile of a

[35] Campana 1987: 85-89; DeRose Evans 1996: 203; Tataranni 2005 *passim*.

[36] Livy 1.4.6-8; Verg. *Aen.* 8.630-34; Strabo 5.3.2; et alibi. N.B. Velleius Paterculus 2.27.2, where the Samnite general Pontius Telesinus, before the Battle of Colline Gate against Sulla and his Roman followers in 82 BC, refers to the Romans as "those wolves, ravagers of Italian liberty": *raptores Italicae libertatis lupos*; cf. Rutter 2001 (*Historia Numorum*): 55. Consider also the so-called Capitoline Wolf in the Capitoline Museum in Rome, now agreed to be a medieval work of the 11th or 12th century CE (La Regina 2006, A.; cf. Dulière 1979; Carandini & Cappelli 2000; Carruba & De Masi 2006; Alföldi, Formigli, & Fried 2011), nevertheless based on a number of ancient statues of similar composition: cf. Cic. *Cat.* 3.19; *Div.* 1.20, Livy 10.23.11-12; Plin. *HN* 15.77. The wolf was also one of the symbols figured on Republican legionary standards as they were carried before the legions; see Plin. *HN* 10.16; Weinstock 1971: 119; DeRose Evans 1996: 201, n. 14.

[37] Strabo 5.4.12. See also: DeRose Evans 1996: 202; Tataranni 2005. Tataranni, emphasizing the Sabine origin of this particular story of *ver sacrum*, takes pains to underscore her belief that the bull could not have stood as a symbol for the unity of complex ethnic reality of Italy in the first two years of the Social War. While I greatly appreciate Tataranni's focus on origins, I find her further justification of this point—that "la scelta più naturale e spontanea" for the allied Italic tribes to elect as their symbol would be a calf ("vitello", i.e. *vitulus*) rather than a bull ("toro", i.e. *taurus*)—to be overstated, especially when one considers the doubly proposed etymology of *Italia* above from both Latin *vitulus*, "bullock," and Greek ἰταλός, "bull." Such an assertion also ignores the easy replaceability of old for young symbolically—bullock and bull are one and the same animal, after all—as well as the fact that, symbolically, an ungrown calf is hardly able to stand for the same unbridled martial strength that its fully matured counterpart naturally comes to portray; cf. Ovid *Ars Am.* 2.333: *quem taurum metuis, vitulum mulcere solebas*. For further on the analogy of the calf to the grown cow, consider Varro's example of the concept of analogy in animals during his discussion of *linguistic* analogy at *DLL* 9.28: *non <u>bos</u> ad bovem collatus similis et qui ex his progenerantur inter se <u>vituli</u>?* See Dench 1997 also on this *ver sacrum* story.

[38] *OCD*4 s.v. *Dionysus*; DeRose Evans 1996: 197, 199.

[39] DeRose Evans 1996: 202; cf. Sydenham 1952: 90.

god on their obverse; so too does the inclusion of the name of the moneyer printed from the exergue of the reverse (and continuing onto the obverse, if necessary).[40] Even so, the Italic coins mark strongly their difference and opposition to Roman issues, starting with the minting of legends not in Latin but Oscan, using not Roman characters, but the native Oscan alphabet adapted from the Etruscan (as was the Roman). The scene of the Italic bull goring the Roman wolf, meanwhile, corresponds to Roman reverses of a similar period featuring war-horses or Pegasuses charging or flying to the right, or imagery of the seated goddess Victory. These more abstract symbols of martial success are replaced on the Italic coin by a much more literal invocation of Italic defeat of Roman forces, with the symbol of Roman origins lying as a limp corpse beneath the charging Sabellian-become-Italic bull, the latter animal itself mimicking the quick rightward, upward motion of the horses and Pegasi on contemporary Roman issues. The design of the coin in Figure 4.2 makes the opposition to Rome all the more explicit, replacing the moneyer's legend with Oscan ***Vítelliú***, printing the name of the Italic confederacy in an indigenous language and script in the exergue of the reverse, a spot often reserved for the name of Rome on Roman issues of the same period.[41]

While these two coin types are the most obvious in establishing the bull as an Italic symbol of resistance against Rome, other Italic issues also feature the bull prominently as a emblem of the rebel Italic tribes. One rebel coin of the period features the bust of Italy accompanied by the Oscan inscription ***Víteliú*** on the obverse, with a reverse showing an armed soldier with his foot on an uncertain object—perhaps a wolf's pelt[42]—and a bull reclining on the left alongside the moneyer's legend.[43] Another issue keeps virtually the same iconography on obverse and reverse, but shifts the name of the issuer onto the obverse (***C. Paapii. C. Mutil.***; cf. Fig. 4.1), placing the legend ***Víteliú*** on the obverse accompanying the soldier and recumbent bull, reinforcing the thematic connection between the victorious Italians and their victorious etymological representative.[44] Nor was the symbolic association between the bull and the rebel Italic forces a short-lived one only recognized by the insurgents themselves. In 81 BCE, amidst the

[40] For example, consider a Roman struck silver denarius of 90 BCE, *RRC* 341/2 (Crawford 1974), which features the head of Liber/Bacchus on the obverse, and a right-facing Pegasus taking flight on the reverse with the name of the minter (**Q·TITI**) printed in Roman characters in the exergue; likewise, several Roman struck bronze quinarii of 89 BCE, *RRC* 343/2a and 343/2b, also featuring the (right-facing) head of Liber/Bacchus on the obverse (with a legend indicating the issuer (**M·CATO**), and a seated Victory on the reverse; as Crawford 1974: 349 comments: "the symbolism of Victory ... presumably reflects Roman successes in the Social War." Other gods on Roman obverses of this period include Apollo, Janus, Saturn, Minerva, and Hercules.

[41] E.g. *RRC* 337/2a (Crawford 1974), a struck silver denarius of 91 BCE, issued by D. Iunius Silvanus, with the head of Salus featured on the obverse and the goddess Victory riding in a chariot, facing right, on the obverse with the legend **ROM[A]**; or *RRC* 343/1a, a struck silver denarius of 89 BCE, issued by M. Porcius Cato, featuring the bust of Rome with legend **ROMA M·CATO** on the obverse and a seated victory with legend **VICTRIX** on the reverse. Cf. *RRC* 337/2b-2f; 337/3; 339/1a-1c, 2-3, 41-4d; 340/6b; 342/7b-7f; 343/1b-1c; 346/3; etc. (all from the years 91-88 BCE).

[42] Suggested by Campana 1987: 98 n. 9: "Il piede sinistro poggia sul cadavere disteso della lupa romana (?) [*sic*]." Quoted by Tataranni 2005.

[43] Campana 1987 *serie* 9a and 9b nos. 117-147; Crawford 1974: no. 410. Cf. Sydenham 1952: nos. 627, 631, 642; and Rutter 2001: no. 407.

[44] Campana 1987: *serie* 10 no. 148; Rutter 2001: no. 424; cf. Sydenham 1952: nos. 627, 631, 642. Similar is Campana *serie* 11 (= Rutter 2001: 409), where the bust of Mars replaces that of Italy on the obverse, and the same imagery on the reverse is accompanied not by Oscan *Víteliú*, but the Oscan legend *Safinim* (Latin *Samnium*) making more explicit the bull's connection to the story of the Sabine *ver sacrum* and the Sabellian bull. Campana *serie* 14 (Rutter 2001: no. 418) places the bust of Minerva, crowned by Victory, on the obverse, and replicates the iconography of the reverse, but adds a trophy composed of enemy arms and removing any written legend.

continuing struggle to quell holdover resistance from the Social War in southern Italy, the issuer A. Postumius Albinus struck a silver denarius featuring a bust of Diana crowned by a *bucranium* on the obverse, and, on the reverse, an oversized man on an outcropping of rock about to sacrifice a heifer at a burning altar:

Fig. 4.3[45]

It is commonly agreed upon[46] that the coin refers to the story of the establishment of the temple of Diana on the Aventine Hill by Servius Tullius in alliance with the nobles of the surrounding Latin communities.[47] Inspired by the Temple of Diana at Ephesus built jointly by the cities of Asia, Servius Tullius convinced the Latin nations to build, in concert with the Romans, a similar temple to Diana at Rome, not only as a mark of the hospitality and friendship (*hospitia amicitasque*) which Servius had cultivated among Romans and Latins, but also to indicate Rome's own primacy as *caput rerum*, "a point which had often been disputed by force of arms" (*de quo totiens armis certatum fuerat*).[48] Against the background of the shared plan to build the shrine to Diana, essentially a peace agreement among Romans and Latins, a Sabine man (given the name Antro Curiatius in Plutarch)[49] saw an opportunity for recovering empire (*fors ... imperii reciperandi*)[50] for the Sabines themselves: in Sabine country was born a heifer of extraordinary size and beauty (*miranda magnitudine ac specie*),[51] which seers claimed would bestow the power of empire on whichever city whose citizen was to sacrifice the animal at the new shrine. The Sabine man led the heifer to Rome, but, upon arriving at the shrine, was convinced by the priest that he must purify himself in the Tiber before the sacrifice. When the Sabine man had descended the Aventine, the priest seized the opportunity to sacrifice the heifer on behalf of the Romans, guaranteeing *imperium* for the Romans rather than the Sabines—"a fact which was extremely gratifying to the king and the populace" (*id mire gratum regi atque civitati fuit*).[52]

45 Crawford 1974: nos. 372/1, p. 389. Cf. nos. 335/9, pp. 335-36, & DeRose Evans 1996, no. 10, pp. 205-206.
46 Crawford 1974: nos. 372/1, p. 389; DeRose Evans 1996: 205-6. Cf. also Ogilvie 1965: 184.
47 For the story in the ancient sources, see Livy 1.45; Val. Max. 7.3.1; Plut. *Quaes. Rom.* 264c-d.
48 Livy 1.45.2-3: *eum consensum* [i.e., of the cities of Asia to build the temple of Diana at Ephesus] *deosque consociatos laudare mire Servius inter proceres Latinorum, cum quibus publice privatimque hospitia amicitiasque de industria iunxerat. Saepe iterando eadem perpulit tandem, ut Romae fanum Dianae populi Latini cum populo Romano facerent. Ea erat confessio caput rerum Romam esse, de quo totiens armis certatum fuerat.*
49 Plut. *Quaes. Rom.* 264 C-D. The man's *nomen*, Curiatius, recalls the Alban *Curiatii* of early Roman legend, the triplets chosen to fight in trifold combat against the Roman's own *trigemini*, the brothers Horatii; though the brothers *Curiatii* were Alban, and Antro Curiatius Sabine, both stories are similar in that they mark watershed moments that could have led to the stifling of Rome's growing power rather than than its further promotion.
50 Livy 1.45.3.
51 Livy 1.45.4; cf. Varro 2.5.3: *multitudine et pulchritudine et fetu vitulorum.*
52 Livy 1.45.7.

This story, shared by Livy as an example of Servius' propensity for using strategy or diplomacy rather than force of arms to increase Rome's power,[53] in the end turns out to be yet another narration of Rome's willingness to capitalize on local resources in order to secure power, even—or especially—if that advantage is secured through trickery and cunning. Its inclusion on Albinus' denarius, signified by the bust of Diana with the *bucranium* above it on the obverse and the docile heifer on the hill about to be sacrificed,[54] repurposes the rebel iconography of the Social War, turning it on its head in order to demean and demonize the remaining combatants in that conflict in southern Italy. The bull, either rampant and trampling the Roman wolf or calmly crouched beside a victorious rebel soldier on the Social War coinage, here stands unmoving beside the large Roman figure about to sacrifice it—willingly, without resistance. Not only has the bull been deprived of its vim and fighting spirit, no longer a threat, it stands complacently at its conqueror's side, waiting with indifference to be sacrificed. As DeRose Evans states, "[t]hus the Italian bull, used so effectively on Oscan rebel coinage, was tamed and brought under control of Rome, in accordance with the will of the gods".[55] Such a message, of course, could only succeed if the bull had come to stand already as a symbol for Italy and the Italians.[56] In the bull or calf, then, there existed for Vergil an already established symbol of Italic power against Roman might.

Tauri Ingentes: Oxen, Italy, and Italians in Vergil

In light of these manifold associations, it should not be surprising that bovids frequently show up in Vergil's corpus at moments when the text is engaged in exploration of the valence of local Italian identity. This is the case for many of the passages treated earlier in this study. In the first eclogue, for example, Tityrus' ability to continue to live upon and use his land is expressed by the godlike *iuvenis* specifically in terms of a continued ability to pasture and husband herds of cows and bulls: "*pascite ut ante boves, pueri: summittite tauros*".[57] In *Eclogue* 7, meanwhile, the poem most explicit about its setting in northern Italy along the river Mincius, Daphnis tells Meliboeus that "it is to this place that the bullocks (*iuvenci*) will come through the meadows to drink"[58]—seemingly apropos of nothing, since the animals of Daphnis,

[53] Through *consilia* rather than *arma*: *ne semper armis opes adquirerentur, consilio augere imperium conatus est* (Livy 1.45.1).
[54] The *bucranium*, as Livy tells us, is also associated for the Romans with this specific story since, after the heifer's sacrifice, its skull and horns were fixed on the wall of the Temple to Diana into posterity: *bos in Sabinis nata cuidam patri familiae dicitur miranda magnitudine ac specie; fixa per multas aetates cornua in vestibulo templi Dianae monumentum ei fuere miraculo* (1.45.4). See also Crawford 1974: p. 335-36 (no. 335/9); cf. ibid. 389 (no. 372/1).
[55] DeRose Evans 1996: 205-6.
[56] Interesting to consider here is the figure of the so-called "Tellus" panel on the south wall of the Ara Pacis. The right panel of the south wall has been identified iconographically as the figure of Rome sitting upon a pile of weapons from conquered enemies. The left panel is more complete than the right, but is more difficult to identity: a female figure is seated with twins on her lap, surrounded by flowering vegetation and various animal life, including, in the foreground immediately in front of the figure, a reclining horned cow. This figure has been variously identified as Tellus, Italia, Venus, or Peace; in all likelihood, the ambiguous identity of the figure is purposeful. Considering its status as a complement to the panel of Rome on the left side, and the figure of the mature cow reclining beneath the figure, an identification as *Italia* is especially interesting for the argument presented here. See de Grummon 1990.
[57] *Ecl.* 1.45. Tityrus also makes specific reference to cattle in his own expression of the boon which the *iuvenis* has granted him earlier in the poem (*Ecl.* 1.9-10): *ille meas errare boves ut cernis ... permisit*.
[58] *Ecl.* 7.11: *huc ipsi potum venient per prata iuvenci*; 7.12-13: *hic viridis tenera praetexit harundine ripas Mincius*.

Corydon, and Meliboeus are explicitly identified as sheep (*oves*, *agnos*) and goats (*capellas*; *caper*).[59] Cows and bullocks are also mentioned in the praises of rustic life at the end of *Georgics* 2, singled out as the only animals mentioned which are sustained by the farmer's labor, alongside his *patria* and his young grandchildren: *hinc patriam parvosque nepotes sustinet, hinc armenta boum meritosque iuvencos*.[60]

The connection is more explicit elsewhere. Consider another passage already discussed, from the praises of Italy in *Georgics* 2.[61] After boasting of the excellent production of grain, wine, and flocks on the Italian peninsula, the poet praises its production of horses and bulls: "From here the lofty warhorse betakes himself to the field; from here, Clitumnus, bulls (*taurus*), the white herd and greatest victims (*victima*), bathed often in your sacred river, lead Roman triumphs to the temples of the gods".[62] The image of the white Umbrian bulls leading the parade to their own sacrifice, connected in the previous chapter to Rome's magnifying the glory of Italian places while taking advantage of their resources, carries all the more weight when it is considered in light of the previously discussed silver denarius of A. Postumius Albinus (Fig. 4.3): the sacrificial bull leading the Roman procession without any resistance parallels surprisingly well the image of the Italian heifer standing complacently at the Roman priest's altar on the reverse of Albinus' issue. Also striking is the fact that this is the first bovine in the Vergilian corpus that is sacrificed or killed: in all their previous occurrences, *boves* of all types have mostly grazed and ploughed in Vergil's poems, but never perished. Read in this context, the white Umbrian bull in this passage becomes strongly inflected by and imbued with the history of Italic struggle with Rome upon the peninsula, and, considered alongside the catalogue of Italian tribes and Roman families later in the *laudes Italiae*, the historical tensions inherent in which I have examined in an earlier chapter, the entire praises of Italy passage can be seen to question what exactly Rome's role in achieving such laudatory status has been. Slaughtered bovines are even more explicitly connected to Roman triumph and Italian ambivalence elsewhere in Vergil's corpus. At the beginning of *Georgics* 3, Vergil notes how the Roman viewer "delights in seeing the bullocks slaughtered (*caesos ... iuvencos*) at the shrines" during the imagined triumph of Augustus along the Mincius.[63] In *Aeneid* 8, these same *caesi iuvenci* return: the description of the long line of conquered peoples on Aeneas' shield (*incedunt victae longo ordine gentes*, 8.722) is immediately preceded by slaughered heifers "strewn upon the ground before the altars" (8.719), and immediately before the description of the shield's central scene of Augustus leading the Italians into battle.[64] In this short stretch of *Aeneid* 8, the reader is given images of an apparent Roman-Italian unity (*hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar*) alongside an image of the symbolic representative of a unified Italy slaughtered—*caesi iuvenci*—these bovine "young ones" standing metonymically for the Italian *iuvenes*—the *genus acre virum* of *Georgics* 2.167—whose lives are similarly laid down to make way for Rome's rise.[65]

[59] *Ecl.* 7.3, 15; 7.7.
[60] *G.* 2.514-15.
[61] One may recall that the occurrence of *Italiae* at the start of the "Praises of Italy" passage (*G.* 2.138) is the *only* use of the geographical term *Italia* in the entirety of the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*.
[62] *G.* 2.145-48: *hinc bellator equus campo sese arduus infert, hinc albi, Clitumne, greges et maxima taurus victima, saepe tuo perfusi flumine sacro, Romanos ad templa deum duxere triumphos.* See the discussion in the previous chapter.
[63] *G.* 3.23: *ad delubra iuvat caesosque videre iuvencos*.
[64] *Aen.* 8.678: *hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar*; *Aen.* 8.714-16: *at Caesar, triplici invectus Romana triumpho moenia, dis Italis votum immortale sacrabat, maxima ter centum totam delubra per urbem*.
[65] See Dyson 1996 on the "moral ambiguity" of the slaughter of oxen, summoned "to symbolize both *pietas* and *impietas*" (177) in Vergil, especially as signified by the reoccuring phrase *caesi iuvenci*. Starting from the assertion that it "is commonly remarked about the *Georgics* that the boundaries between man and beast are fluid" (177),

Oxen are central also to Evander's narrated epyllion on the defeat of the monster Cacus by Hercules, another textual moment important to clarifying the relationship between local and outsider on Italian soil. This episode is important to the consideration of the importance of cattle to figuring Italian identity for several reasons. First of all, the moment at which Hercules' furious rout of Cacus occurs is given as Hercules' passage through Italy after his theft of the cattle of Geryon in the west (*Aen.* 8.201-4):

> nam maximus ultor 201
> tergemini nece Geryonae spoliisque superbus
> Alcides aderat taurosque hac victor agebat
> ingentis, vallemque boves amnemque tenebant. 204
>
> For that greatest avenger, 201
> haughty from the slaughter and spoils of triform[66] Geryon,
> Hercules was present and driving hither, victorious, bulls –
> enormous—and the cows spread over the valley and the river. 204

The herd of oxen Hercules drives through Italy and the site of Rome here is the very same herd from which a bull or bullock will escape, leading Hercules in pursuit, thereby giving Italy its name into posterity.[67] The placement of *tauros* and *boves* in the same metrical position in subsequent lines brings marked emphasis,[68] and a signpost for the bovid-Italy connection is the enjambed *ingentis* at the beginning of line 204, a word which, as seen in the previous chapter, Vergil often uses in the double sense of both "huge" and "native", playing on the word's superficial connection to words like *ingigno*, *ingenuus*, and *ingenium*.[69] While the expected denotation of *ingentis* adds a small and appropriate detail to the narrative—*huge* cattle stolen from a humongous monster by a larger-than-life hero—the word's oft-summoned connotation of

Dyson suggests Vergil at times means animal sacrifice in the *Georgics* to recall human sacrifice, arguing ultimately that the phrase *caesi iuvenci* at *Aen.* 8.715, alongside the *ter centum delubra* set up through the city, recalls Octavian's slaughter of 300 Italian knights and senators after the siege of Perusia during the Perusine War of 40 BCE.

66 I borrow the helpful translation of *tergemini* of Fratantuono & Smith 2018. Geryon was sometimes three-headed (e.g. Hesiod *Theog.* 287: τρικέφαλον Γηρυονῆα), sometimes three-bodied (e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 870: τρισώματος … Γηρυὼν); for discussion of the sources, see Frantantuono & Smith 2018: 324 n. 202.

67 Of the etymological accounts of *Italia* examined above, Dion. Hal. 1.35 and Apoll. *Lib.* 2.5.10 specifically locate the loss of the οὐίτουλος or ἰταλός (respectively) on Hercules' return from Spain to Greece with the cattle of Geryon. Varro *DRR* 2.5.3 connects the naming of Italy to a bull which Hercules chased to Italy from Sicily, called *italus*, but does not specifically identify this as one of the cattle of Geryon. Gell. *Noct. Att.* 11.1.1 gives ἰταλός as the etymon of Italy, but does not connect it to Hercules, noting only the *magna copia* of cows and bulls in Italy. Servius points to an etymology of Italy from both *vitulus* and ἰταλός (ad *Aen.* 1.533), but does not connect it to Hercules; note, however, Servius' derivation of the names of Campanian city Pompeii (< *pompa*, 'parade') and nearby Bauli (< *Boaulia*, i.e. βο-αυλ-ια, "cattle-halls") are linked to Hercules' return from Spain and travels through Italy with the cattle of Geryon (ad *Aen.* 7.662): *hunc Geryonem alii Tartessiorum regem dicunt fuisse et habuisse armenta pulcherrima, quae Hercules occiso eo abduxit. ... veniens autem Hercules de Hispania per Campaniam in quadam Campaniae civitate pompam triumphi sui exhibuit: unde Pompei dicitur civitas. postea iuxta Baias caulam bubus fecit et eam saepsit: qui locus Boaulia dictus est, nam hodie Bauli vocatur.*

68 Frantantuono & Smith 2018: "The key detail—the prize—is highlighted at the midpoint of the verse" (325 ad 8.203).

69 See the discussion on Vergil *G.* 2 and Calpurnius *Ecl.* 2 above in the previous chapter. This pseudo-etymological play on *ingens* is noted also by, e.g., Mackail 1912, Salat 1983, Keith 1991.

"native" or "indigenous" creates a a contradiction which inevitably points in the direction of Geryon's/Hercules' cattle as the etymon for the name of *Italia*; for the cows and bulls Hercules drives are not "native" to Italy, Latium, or the site of Rome which Cacus occupies, but from Spain in the west (as Vergil's identification of them as *Hiberas*, "Iberian," in *Aen.* 7 shows).[70] Yet these are the oxen which will *give* this region the name of Italy, and, in that sense, they are the originary "Italian" cattle, the "indigenous" cattle not which are born from this region, but which will give the region of Italy a name of its own and make it a united Italian region which it is even *possible* for anyone or anything to be from.[71]

It is not only the narrative placement of the story of Hercules and Cacus in the same period of Hercules' career—his return from Spain with the cattle of Geryon—that suggests a close relationship between the epyllion and the symbolic connection between cattle and Italy: certain details of the confrontation between Hercules and Cacus suggest that it functions in Vergil's narrative as a mythic doublet of Hercules' defeat both of Geryon and of Sicilian Eryx, who attempts to take possession of Hercules' stolen cattle in some version of the labor. Eschewing any actual description of Hercules' defeat of the monster Geryon, the narrative of Cacus is substituted into Vergil's story as a Geryonic monster (*huic monstro*, 7.198; cf. *semihominis*, 196, and *semiferi*, 267), in obvious contradiction of the figure's non-monstrous identity in other versions of the story.[72] Likewise, the reoccurrence of the number three in the passage—*ter* occurs thrice in three lines[73]—can be seen as substitute-formation for the tripleness of Geryon (*tergemini*, *Aen.* 8.202), whose actual defeat remains untold within the narrative. The story of Eryx can also be seen as a sublimation of the Geryon story, serving as a doublet of that myth and/or of the similar tale of Cacus. In Apollodorus—who makes no mention of Cacus—a bull breaks away from the Geryonic herd as Hercules is passing through Italy, and swims across the strait near Rhegium to Sicily; it is this bull for which Italy was named, says Apollodorus, since "the Tyrrhenians called the bull *italos*".[74] At this point, Eryx comes into possession of the bull, breeding it with his own herds; when Hercules demands it back, Eryx refuses to return the bull unless Hercules should defeat him in a wrestling contest. Hercules

[70] This brief evocation of the story of Hercules' capture of Geryon's cattle in *Aen.* 7 occurs during the catalogue of Italian troops, when Vergil comes to "handsome Aventinus, son of beauteous Hercules" (7.656-657: *satus Hercule pulchro pulcher Aventinus*), who is born to the priestess Rhea on the Aventine hill "after the victor from Tiryns reached Laurentine shores, with Geryon's life snuffed out, and washed Iberian cows in the waters of the Etruscan river" (7.661-663: *postquam Laurentia victor Geryone exstinto Tirynthius attigit arva, Tyrrhenoque boves in flumine lavit Hiberas*). These three lines from *Aen.* 7 show a remarkable attention to origin-as-identity—Hercules as raised in Tiryns (Serv. ad loc.: ... *a Tirynthe civitate ... in qua nutritus est Hercules*), the Tiber as originating in Etruria (cf. *G.* 1.499, and the discussion of that passage in the previous chapter), the "fields" themselves located near Laurentium—a concern which is shared in large part with the current passage.

[71] Note, too, Frantantuono & Smith 2018 ad *Aen.* 7.192, on *ingens*: "'Virgil's favourite adjective' (Eden, who notes that five of fourteen uses in Book 8 come during the Cacus narrative" (314). See Eden 1975 ad loc.

[72] Cacus in Livy's contemporaneous version of the tale is merely "a shepherd, a neighbor of the place" (*pastor accola eius loci*, 1.7.5), albeit one with ferocious strength (*ferox viribus*, ibid.) clever enough to drag the stolen cattle backwards by their tails in order to avoid discovery, stealing a trick of the Homeric Hermes (cf. *Hym. Herm.* 77-79); much the same is Dion. Hal. 1.39-40, where Cacus (in Dionysius, Κάκος; cf. κακός) is merely a robber (λῃστὴς). Cf. Diod. Sic. 4.21.1-4, where Hercules, upon reaching the settlement upon the Palatine, is greeted by two (nonconfrontational) natives, Pinarius and *Cacius*, the latter replacing Cacus as etymon of the *scalae Caci* upon the Palatine. In Propertius 4.9, Cacus is also a native of the future site of Rome (*incola*, 9), though he is also described as a "thief" (*raptor*, ibid.) with three separate heads (*tria ... ora*, 10). Ovid in his *Fasti* follows Vergil in calling Cacus a *monstrum* (1.554) and giving him the ability to vomit fire (1.572).

[73] 8.230-232: *ter totum fervidus ira lustrat Aventini montem, ter saxea temptat limina nequiquam, ter fessus valle resedit.*

[74] *Lib.* 2.5.10: Τυρρηνοὶ γὰρ ἰταλὸν τὸν ταῦρον ἐκάλεσαν.

overcomes him three times (τρὶς) and then kills him, taking back the bull and the entirety of Eryx' herd to join the rest of Geryon's herd in Italy.[75] Here Eryx takes the place of the cattle-thief whom Hercules must best, the number three likewise resurfacing in the telling.[76] Vergil's tale of Hercules' lost cattle, then, which stands as a narrative substitute for various stories of the naming of Italy that center around local knowledge being reinterpreted by outsider, sets the civilizing, "cultured" Greek Hercules again the indigenous Cacus—perhaps the "only true native of Latium".[77] Thus, the rites of the *advena* Evander on the site of Rome are based on the actions of another foreigner who had come to Rome and wiped out a native inhabitant, whose character is perhaps misrepresented by Evander's tale. The *patria communis* that Evander has built around the rites of Hercules, among others, is thus based on the destruction and reappropriation of native culture and landscape, as seen also in passages such as the *laudes Italiae*.

Bulls and cows also become closely linked to Italian identity through other significant Italian characters in the last half of the Aeneid. Consider, for example, the treatment of Turnus during the catalogue of Latin troops at the close of Book 7 (*Aen.* 7.783-792):

> ipse inter primos praestanti corpore Turnus
> vertitur arma tenens et toto vertice supra est.
> cui triplici crinita iuba galea alta Chimaeram
> sustinet Aetnaeos efflantem faucibus ignis;
> tam magis illa fremens et tristibus effera flammis
> quam magis effuso crudescunt sanguine pugnae.
> at levem clipeum sublatis cornibus Io
> auro insignibat, iam saetis obsita, iam bos,
> argumentum ingens, et custos virginis Argus,
> caelataque amnem fundens pater Inachus urna.
>
> Turnus himself went to and fro among the front-lines,
> distinguished in form, clutching weapons and taller than all by a full head.
> His high helmet, topped with a triple crest, held up a Chimaera,
> breathing out the fires of Aetna from its gaping jaws;
> so much more it roars, so much more fierce it is with sombre flames,
> as the battles grow the more savage with more blood spilled.
> But marking his light shield with horns raised was Io,
> fashioned from gold, already covered in bristles, already a cow –
> an immense complex of signs—and the maiden's guard, Argus,
> and her father, Inachus, pouring his river from the engraved urn.

[75] The story at *Diod. Sic.* 4.23.2-3 follows generally the same story, but with some additional details: Eryx is the son of Aphrodite and Butes, the king of the region; Eryx does not steal the cattle, but challenges Hercules to a wrestling match in which Eryx stakes his land, and Hercules stakes both Geryon's cattle *and* his immortality; once defeated, Hercules then turns the land won over to the natives. Lacking here is any idea of Eryx as thief, or the occurrence of the significant number three.

[76] Another commonality between the explanations of Italy's naming and the stories of Cacus' and Eryx' theft of Geryon's oxen is the emphasis on the size and beauty of the cattle: (in etymological explanations) Varro, *DRR* 2.5.3, Aul. Gell. *Noct. Att.* 11.1.1; (in stories of Cacus' theft): Verg. *Aen.* 8.203-4/207-8, Livy 1.7.4-5.

[77] Fletcher 2014: 234 n.28; see also Frantantuono & Smith 2018: 319 ad 198.

Here, near the end of book 7, in the midst of the poet's description of the Italian forces, we receive a brief description of Turnus and his arms—helmet and shield; the final stretch of book 8 will be an extended ecphrasis of Aeneas' own shield with Roman history in miniature figured upon it. The parallel placement of the descriptions of the iconographic programs of the shields of Turnus and Aeneas at the ends of books 7 and 8 confirm their dialogue with one another, while also drawing attention to the contrast between them; as David Quint has remarked, the shield of Turnus is remarkable for being "so incommensurate as it is to the shield of Aeneas",[78] receiving only four lines of description as compared to the hundred-some lines spent on the later ecphrasis.[79] The depiction of Io's transformation into a cow on Turnus' shield "attests to Turnus' Argolic ancestry (7.371-372) and to the power of Turnus' patron Juno".[80] At the same time, we are presented with the image of "Latium's Achilles"[81] among the front-lines (*inter primos*, 783) of the Italian forces parading none other than the image of a bovine animal with horns raised (*bos,* 790; *sublatis cornibus*, 789), an established symbol of Italian unity and resistance against Rome. This connection is reinforced by the description of Turnus as *praestanti corpore* (723), "distinguished in form"; this exact combination of words will return in the next book in none other than the description of the bulls which the monster Cacus steals from Hercules—*quattuor praestanti corpore tauros*[82]—a description which Vergil had first made use of in his fourth georgic to describe the "four choice bulls, of distinguished form" (*quattuor eximios praestanti corpore tauros*, 4.538, 4.550)[83] which Aristaeus is first instructed to choose, and then does choose, as a sacrifice in order to restore his lost hive.[84] Here, too, the significant word *ingens* returns—recall the *taurosque ingentes* in the discussion of the Cacus story, above (*Aen.* 8.203-4). The *argumentum* of Turnus' shield—that is, "the subject of [its] figural narration"[85]—is described as *ingens*, "huge" (791), never mind that the description takes up only four lines. Yet reading the potential pun with *ingignere/ingenuus/ingenium*, *argumentum ingens* might also be read as "a symbol of his origin" (here, both Argolic and Italic), or alternatively, "a mark of nativity"—"nativity" both in the sense of his *birth* within the Italian peninsula at Ardea, as well as of his being *native* to Ardea and the peninsula by virtue of that same birth.[86] We will explore two additional comparisons of Turnus to a bull below (12.103-6, 712-22).[87]

Turnus is not the only Italian who knowingly links his nativity of/to the Italian peninsula to oxen.

78 Quint 2018: 117.
79 103 lines: *Aen.* 8.626-728.
80 Quint 2018: 117.
81 *Aen.* 6.89: *alius Latio iam partus Achilles*.
82 *Aen.* 8.207-8: *quattuor a stabulis praestanti corpore tauros avertit, totidem forma superante iuvencas*.
83 *G.* 4.538-40: *quattuor eximios praestanti corpore tauros, qui tibi nunc viridis depascunt summa Lycaei, delige, et intacta totidem cervice iuvencas*; *G.* 4.550-51: *quattuor eximios praestanti corpore tauros, ducit et intacta totidem cervice iuvencas*.
84 The only other occurrence of the exact phrase *praestanti corpore* in Vergil is at *Aen.* 1.71, in Juno's description of the 14 nymphs she offers to Aeolus in exchange for his unleashing all his imprisoned winds upon Aeneas and the Trojans as they sail for Italy: *sunt mihi bis septem praestanti corpore nymphae, quarum quae forma pulcherrima Deiopea* ... (1.71-72). While somewhat of an outlier, *praestanti corpore* here shares with the passages of *G.* 4 its use in describing what can be seen as a sort of sacrificial offering put forward in order to achieve some further aim; cf. the discussion of *G.* 4 and the *bougonia* sacrifice, below.
85 Bettini 2011 notes one possible meaning of *argumentum* as "the subject of figural narration", citing this passage of Vergil as the prime example (248ff.).
86 That Turnus' Argolid ancestry is also recalled here among his placement in the catalogue of Italian troops, drawing attention to the fact of his family's once non-nativity to Ardea and its Italian environs, speaks to a hypocrisy in Turnus' own apparent opposition to the cultural mixing of Italians and outsiders.
87 On these similes, see below.

In a famous passage from book 9, Ascanius during his first foray into the battle encounters and kills the Italian Numanus Remulus, recently joined in marriage to Turnus' younger sister.[88] Before this, however, Numanus delivers a 22-line panegyric on the Italian race that doubles as a critique of Trojan orientalism, in which he enumerates those traditional *mores* which make the Italians great, including hunting, horse-riding, farming, and being submerged in cold water (9.603-608). He also speaks to the Italians' natural propensity for warfare, a fact he attributes to young Italians being naturalized to the weapons of war from a young age: "Every stage of life is worn down by iron, and we wear out our bullocks' flanks with the butt-end of a spear, nor does late-come old age sully our strength of mind and affect our eagerness" (*omne aevum ferro teritur, versaque iuvencum terga fatigamus hasta, nec tarda senectus debilitat viris animi mutatque vigorem*, 9.609-611). While the main point is that the realities of war are so omnipresent in the day-to-day life of Italy (*Italiam*, 601) that iron weaponry is used even for tasks outside the martial sphere, it is notable that the spear-goaded bullock is featured here as an emblematic feature of the native Italian experience, at least as Numanus conceives of it.

We might say more about a small detail in the above passage: *versaque ... hasta*, "with overturned spear" (609-10).[89] While the specification of the use of the tail-end of the spear would seem to just be a natural consequence of a desire to not injure the cattle (or, on Vergil's part, to achieve clarity of thought within his text), the detailed is not strictly necessary: the meaning of the verse would have been just as clear without the inclusion of *versa*, and whips and goads themselves prove successful in herding cattle precisely because of the threat of potential injury. Instead, the image of Numanus' Italians driving cattle with the butt of a spear comes to stand as a sort of symbolic proof of an Italian affection toward the bullock and his ilk: the point of the weapon is intentionally turned away from the animal, a figure of thought easily demonstrating that the bullocks, at least, are not the object of the Italians' well-instilled martial aggression. Relevant to this assertion is a curiosity of Latin behavior in the *Aeneid* which, to my knowledge, has gone unremarked upon by commentators: while bulls, heifers, bullocks, and calves are frequently sacrificed in the *Aeneid*—and by the Trojans in particular—the Latins and their allies are *never* seen to sacrifice bovids.

We have three instances of sacrifice by the Latins and their allies narrated in the poem. At his introduction in book 7, Latinus seeks advice from the oracle of his father Faunus at Albunea; this consultation is accompanied by the sacrifice of 100 sheep: *tum pater ipse petens responsa Latinus centum lanigeras mactabat rite bidentis*.[90] A hundred lines later, while noting the layout and routine of Latinus' palace at Laurentium, the poet gives a brief description of the ceremony followed during meetings of the Latin senate which involves the regular sacrifice of a ram: "This temple was their senate-house (*curia*), this the site (*sedes*) of their sacred feasts; here, after the sacrifice of a ram (*ariete caeso*), the elders (*patres*) were accustomed to sit together at neverending tables".[91] The last instance comes near the beginning of the epic's final book, when Aeneas and Latinus sacrifice together on the battlefield before holding pre-battle

[88] It might be noted that Numanus attracts Iulus' attention in the first place for "vociferously relating things worthy and unworthy" (*digna atque indigna relatu vociferans*, 9.595-6) and, specifically, "boasting loudly that he was *ingens*" (*et ingentem sese clamore ferebat*, 597). Considering that Numanus' speech is usually taken to be an encomium of the virtues of the "tough race" (*durum ... genus*, 603) of Italians against the foreign luxury of the Trojans (vid. 614-20), the potential play of *ingens* between "great" and "native" is likely operating here. Cf. Horsfall 1971.

[89] Isidore of Seville calls out this line—*versaque iuvencum terga fatigamus hasta*—as an instance of *cacosyntheton*, a "faulty/deficient collocation of words" (*vitiosa conposito verborum*, 1.34.12).

[90] *Aen.* 7.92-93. Cf. 7.87-8, where the skins placed upon the ground are also specifically indicated to be those of sheep: *caesarum ovium ... pellibus*.

[91] *Aen.* 7.174-176: *hoc illis curia templum, hae sacris sedes epulis; hic ariete caeso perpetuis soliti patres considere mensis*.

negotiations; the victims here are a piglet (*saetigeri fetum suis*, 12.170) and an unshorn sheep (*intonsamque bidentem*, ibid.).[92] By contrast, the Trojans are frequently seen to sacrifice bovids. In the second half of the poem alone, the Trojans and Arcadians sacrifice bulls during the rites to Hercules in *Aeneid* 8,[93] the Trojans and their allies sacrifice oxen as they burn the funeral pyres of their fallen comrades during the break in battle in *Aeneid* 11,[94] and slaughtered steers mark the altars in Vulcan's depiction of Augustus' triple triumph on the shield of Aeneas.[95] In the first six books of the poem, meanwhile, there are some fifteen instances of bovine sacrifice. Instead, the avoidance of the sacrifice of cows, bulls, and calves seems to be a concious characterization of the Latins and Italians by the poet. Indeed, whereas Trojans and Arcadians are sometimes said to have shields or armor of bull-leather,[96] the same is not true of the Latin and Italian protective gear which, when mentioned, is instead of bark, wolfskin, or low-quality hide.[97] In Vergil's Italy, oxen are mostly for working the land and helping the farmer, as in the case of Galaesus, for whom "five herds of ploughing-oxen returned from the fields, and he would work his land with a hundred ploughs" (7.538-539: *quina redibant armenta, et terram centum vertebat aratris*).[98] Interesting, too, is Vergil's description of Caeculus, the founder of Praeneste, and the troops from Praeneste and Gabii he leads (7.678-690): a son of Vulcan "born among the flocks" (*genitum pecora inter agrestia*, 679) leading an army of rustics who "wear tawny helmets of wolf's pelt as protection for their heads" (*fulvosque lupi de pelle galeros tegmen habent capiti*, 688-689), Caeculus reads as a sort of anti-Romulus, wearing the skin of the Roman founder's *nutrix*, the *lupa* in battle, just as the Trojans skin the flocks that nourished Caeculus for their own armor.[99]

Considering this—to return briefly to a passage discussed above—Ascanius' avowed sacrifice to

[92] *Aen.* 12.166-171: *hinc pater Aeneas, Romanae stirpis origo, sidereo flgrans clipeo et caelestibus armis et iuxta Ascanius, magnae spes altera Romae, procedunt castris, puraque in veste sacerdos saetigeri fetum suis intonsamque bidentem attulit admovitque pecus flagrantibus aris.*

[93] *Aen.* 8.179-183: *tum lecti iuvenes certatim araeque sacerdos viscera tosta ferunt taurorum, onerantque canistris dona laboratae Cereris, Bacchumque ministrant. vescitur Aeneas simul et Troiana iuventus perpetui tergo bovis et lustralibus extis.*

[94] *Aen.* 11.197-199: *multa boum circa mactantur corpora Morti, saetigerosque sues raptasque ex omnibus agris in flammam iugulant pecudes.*

[95] *Aen.* 8.719: *ante aras terram caesi stravere iuvenci*. Cf. the mention, during the rites to Hercules, of that hero's sacrificial slaughter of the Cretan bull: *tu Cresia mactas prodigia* (8.294-295).

[96] E.g. 9.706: *duo taurea terga*; 10.481-482: *clipeum, tot ferri terga, tot aeris, quem pellis totiens obeat circumdata tauri.*

[97] Bark (7.740-741). Wolfskin and low-quality hide (7.688-90): *fulvosque lupi de pelle galeros tegmen habent capiti; vestigia nuda sinistri instituere pedis, crudus tegit altera pero.* The *pero* was a type of footwear associated with country-folk and rustics (Isid. *Orig.* 19.34.13: *perones ... rustica calciamenta*; Servius ad *Aen.* 7.690: *rusticum calciamentum*; cf. Persius 5.102: *peronatus arator*), perhaps with the hair of the hide sometimes still attached (*Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* s.v.: *calcimenta pilosa*; cf. Sidon. *Ep.* 4.20.2: *persone saetoso*). Cato *Orig.* 111 states that those who won curule magistracies would wear either the *calcei mullei* (sewn shoes of a red or purple color) or the *perones*. The one exception is Etruscan Lausus, who fights on the side of the Italians, whose shield is made of bronze and three bullskins: *illa* [*hasta*] *per orbem aere cavum triplici, per linea terga tribusque transiit intextum tauris opus* (10.783-5).

[98] A common etymology connected *armenta* to *arare*, "plow," thus making *armenta*, "herds," most appropriately used for draught-cattle, and specifically oxen. See Varro *DLL* 5.96: "*Armenta*, 'herds,' are so called because farmers raised oxen for the purpose of selecting from them for ploughing; from this fact herds were called *arimenta*, 'plough-things,' and later on the third letter 'i' was removed" (*armenta, quod boves ideo maxime parabant, ut inde eligerent ad arandum; inde arimenta dicta, postea I tertia littera extrita*).

[99] Vergil supplies us with this kind of Romulus-substitute—or anti-Caeculus—later in the epic in the figure of Ornytus (11.677-689), an Etruscan (686: *Tyrrhene*) fighting as an ally of the Trojans, killed by Camilla, who wears the skin of a bullock as a cape on his shoulders, while "the gaping mouth and jaws of a wolf, with shining teeth, covered his huge head," Ornytus thus virtually becoming a wolf himself: *cui pellis latos umeros erepta iuvenco pugnatori operit, caput ingens oris hiatus et malae texere lupi cum dentibus albis* (679-681).

Jupiter should he overcome the boasting Numanus Remulus seems particularly culturally insensitive: "I shall place before your altars a snow-white bullock (*iuvencum*) with gilded forehead, as tall as its mother, which already attacks with his horns and scatters the sand with his hooves" (*statuam ante aras aurata fronte iuvencum candentem pariterque caput cum matre ferentem, iam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat harenam*, 9.627-629). Among a people who do not sacrifice oxen, to a man whose speech has just demonstrated such non-aggression through the image of herding the same bullock (*iuvencum*) with the butt of a spear, Ascanius' vow to sacrifice the animal if Remulus' death is achieved is a blatant affront to local tradition: with Ascanius' words, the death of Remulus becomes closely intertwined with the death of the votive bullock, the two forming a symbolic doublet whose destruction marks out Ascanius' willingness to both ignore and destroy local tradition in achieving victory. The effect is heightened when one considers the intratextual resonances of line 629: *iam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat harenam*. The verse is repeated from Vergil's third eclogue (3.87), where the two singers Damoetas and Menalcas both use the image of putting a cow to graze as a metaphor for nurturing new poetic endeavours;[100] the original line describes the bull, already on its way to (poetic maturity), which Menalcas asks the Muses to nourish (*pascite taurum*). The repetition of the line in *Aeneid* 8 reinforces what, from an Italian perspetive, registers as cruelty: not only is his promised sacrifice yet another Trojan destruction of a blameless feature of a thriving Italian landscape,[101] the bull's associations with local Italian identity in its original context seems to speak indirectly, through its sacrifice and destruction, to the loss of culture and cultural identity that accompany the Trojans' aggression.

Veluti cum prima in proelia taurus : Oxen similes in the *Aeneid*

In addition to these roles in plot and characterization in the second half of the poem, cows and bulls cleave close to the expression and understanding of Italian identity in those most quinessentially epic features of the poem: the similes. Consider, for example, the simile comparing the Etruscan Arruns to a wolf just after striking down the warrior Camilla (*Aen.* 11.809-814):

> ac velut ille, prius quam tela inimica sequantur,
> continuo in montis sese avius abdidit altos
> occiso pastore lupus magnove iuvenco,
> conscius audacis facti, caudamque remulcens
> subiecit pavitantem utero silvasque petivit;
> haud secus ex oculis se turbidus abstulit Arruns.
>
> And just as a wolf, before hostile weapons can pursue him,
> immediately betakes himself to high mountains, hiding in remote places,
> after he has killed a shepherd or a great bullock, and –

[100] *Ecl* 3.84-87: **D.** *Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam; Pierides, vitulam lectori pascite vestro*; **M.** *Pollio et ipse facit nova carmina; pascite taurum, iam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat harenam*. See Chapter 2, herein.

[101] This kind of destruction of products of the local Italian landscape is a recurring theme of the second half of the *Aeneid*: consider Aeneas' sacrifice of the white sow on the future site of Alba Longa (8.81-85), as well as the bulls and pigs sacrificed to Death during the lull in the battle in *Aen.* 11 (11.197-199), animals which are specifically said to come from all of the surrounding areas (*raptasque ex omnibus agris*). Cf. the Clitumnan bull marked for triumphal sacrifice in *G.* 2, and the felled *oleaster*, once sacred to Faunus, at the close of *Aen.* 12.

feeling guilt for such audacity—letting droop his trembling tail
to hide between his legs, he seeks out wild forests;
no differently did Arruns anxiously remove himself from sight. 814

While Arruns is compared to a wolf, Camilla, the Amazonian warrior-queen of the Volscians, is implicitly aligned with the murdered shepherd or great, slaughtered bullock. Volscian Camilla had earlier provided the finale to the catalogue of Italian troops in *Aeneid* 7, and, at her reintroduction into the poem in *Aeneid* 11, Turnus addresses her as *decus Italiae virgo*—"maiden glory of Italy" (11.508). If this were not enough to demonstrate Camilla's hyper-emphasized status as a quintessentially Italian warrior, it is further confirmed by her position as leader (again *decus*, 11.657) of the *Italides*—the "daughters of Italy"—her personally selected coterie of Italian *bellatrices* whose duty was to act as worthy ministers of peace and war (*pacisque bonas bellique ministras*, 11.658).[102] It is not then insignificant that the slain Camilla becomes in simile a slaughtered bullock, symbol of both a unified Italy and, at times, its resistance against Rome. Here the wolf, corresponding to Etruscan Arruns fighting on the side of the proto-Roman Trojans, slaughters the bullock, symbol of Italy, stand-in for Camilla, glory and daughter of Italy, reversing the imagery of the Italian bull goring the Roman wolf found on Social War coins (Fig. 1 & 2). That Arruns is figured as a wolf is both unsurprising and puzzling. On the one hand, the man's dedication to the side of the war that pre-figures, and within the poem's mythology will eventually become Vergil's contemporary Rome makes association understandable, and in this sense Arruns stands for Roman encroachment more generally. On the other hand, Arruns is Etruscan—not Roman, of course, but not Trojan or Arcadian either—making the confrontation between him and Camilla a clash between two natives of the Italian peninsula rather than between foreign Trojan and native Italian. Arruns' acting the wolf manifests his loyalty to history's victor, Rome, while also demonstrating the local disruption that the events of that history will cause.

There are three additional similes involving bovids—all bulls—in the last half of the *Aeneid*: one with Pallas as bull in *Aeneid* 10, and two with Turnus compared to a bull in *Aeneid* 12. Let us start with the similes involving Turnus. Near the beginning of book 12, Turnus arms himself in preparation for meeting Aeneas in battle, working himself into a fury (12.101-106):

his agitur furiis, totoque ardentis ab ore 101
scintillae absistunt, oculis micat acribus ignis,
mugitus veluti cum prima in proelia taurus
terrificos ciet aut irasci in cornua temptat
arboris obnixus trunco, ventosque lacessit 105
ictibus aut sparsa ad pugnam proludit harena.

Turnus is driven by this madness, and burning sparks shoot out 101
from his entire visage, and fire flashes from his violent eyes,
just as when a bull, preparing for the start of battle, bellows out

[102] All with names smacking of Italian resistance to Rome: Larina, whose name recalls the *municipium* of Samnian Larinum, in the territory of the Frentani, the Samnites being some of Rome's fiercest Italian adversaries; Tarpeia, whose namesake, the daughter of a Roman general, would be responsible for the Sabine infiltration of the Capitol under Titus Tatius; and Tulla, reminiscent either of early king Tullus Hostilius, famous for martial campaigns against Veii, Fidenae, the Sabines, and Alba Longa, or of Tullia, daughter of Servius Tullius, who legend told had murdered her father to ensure Etruscan Tarquinius Superbus' accession.

dreadful roars, or works to channel his anger into his horns,
charging against a tree trunk, and he challenges the wind
with his blows, or anticipates the battle by pawing at the sand.

The bull preparing himself for a coming battle has a backstory in Vergil. The language and imagery of the simile are modeled on an earlier passage from Vergil's third georgic, the famous scene from the discussion of the dangers of *amor* in which two bulls vie for the attention of a single heifer (3.219-36):

pascitur in magna Sila formosa iuvenca:
illi alternantes multi vi proelia miscent
vulneribus crebris; lavit ater corpora sanguis,
versaque in obnixos urgentur cornua vasto
cum gemitu; reboant silvaeque et longus Olympus.
nec mos bellantis una stabulare, sed alter
victus abit longeque ignotis exsulat oris,
multa gemens ignominiam plagasque superbi
victoris, tum quos amisit inultus amores,
et stabula aspectans regnis excessit avitis.
ergo omni cura viris exercet et inter
dura iacet pernox instrato saxa cubili
frondibus hirsutis et carice pastus acuta,
et temptat sese atque irasci in cornua discit
arboris obnixus trunco, ventosque lacessit
ictibus, et sparsa ad pugnam proludit harena.
post, ubi collectum robur viresque refectae,
signa movet praecepsque oblitum fertur in hostem,
fluctus uti medio coepit cum albescere ponto ...

There grazes upon great Sila a beautiful heifer:
with great strength [the bulls] enter into battle in turns,
often landing a blow; black blood washes their bodies,
and horns turned against the butting enemy are borne down
with a huge groan; the woods and length of the sky reecho the sound.
Nor is it customary for the fighters to share a dwelling, but the other –
the loser—he goes away to live in unknown lands as an exile, far-off,
with many a sigh at his shame, at the blows of the haughty
victor, at the affection he has lost—unavenged –
and, looking upon his halls, he goes out from his ancestral kingdom.
Consequently, with every attention he builds up his strength, and amongst
hard rocks he lies all the night long on an uncovered bed,
feeding on bristly leaves and sharp-edged rush,
and he tests his strength and learns to channel his anger into his horns,
charging against a tree trunk, and he challenges the wind
with his blows, or anticipates the battle by pawing at the sand.
Afterwards, when vigor has been collected and strength replenished,

> he moves standards and rushes headlong against the enemy who has forgotten him,
> just as when the crest of a wave begins to grow white in the middle of the sea ...

The reference to *Georgics* 3 in Turnus' simile in *Aeneid* 12 does far more than deepening the understanding of Turnus' anger by drawing a parallel with unbridled rage from the natural world. As Turnus' main antagonist prepares himself for his final battle, the poet points the reader to an earlier passage which already stands out for its severe personification,[103] a reimagining of events in the natural world through the lens of human passion and concerns. The image assigned to Turnus in *Aeneid* 12 is that of the defeated bull, banished from the herd, training and regaining his strength in isolation, soon to return and make his attack upon the rival who has forgotten him. Yet the characterization of the bulls in *Georgics* 3 is already hyper-loaded with signification relevant to our discussions of Vergil's dialectics of acculturation. For one, the vignette of the bulls' battle is explicitly set in an Italian locale, the mountainous plateau of La Sila in Bruttium in southernmost Italy. The Italianate setting is reinforced by the use of language reminiscent of the *Eclogues*, beginning with *formosa* at line 219, here in its only occurrence in Vergil's corpus outside of the *Eclogues*. The bulls' contest is also strangely reminiscent of the poetic competitions we have seen in Vergil's bucolic poems: the bulls attack in turn (*alternantes*, 220; cf. *Ecl.* 3.59: *alternis dicetis: amant alterna Camenae*; *Ecl.* 7.18-19: *alternis igitur contendere versibus ambo coepere; alternos Musae meminisse volebant*); they vie over a prize—here, the heifer (*iuvenca*, 219; *femina*, 216)—and there will be a winner (*victoris*, 227) and a loser (*victus*, 225); and the whole landscape echoes with the sound (*reboant silvaeque et longus Olympus*, 223; cf. *Ecl* 1.5: *formonsam resonare doces Amaryllida silvas*; and *Ecl.* 6.84: *pulsae referunt ad sidera valles*).[104]

The most chilling reminiscences of the *Eclogues* in the vignette, however, are two lines that hearken back to the plight of Meliboeus in the first eclogue. Upon losing the contest for the heifer and the herd, the defeated bull "goes away to live far-off in unknown lands as an exile" (*victus abit longeque ignotis exsulat oris*, 225), bemoaning much (*multa gemens*, 226) over his shame, his rival, and his losses (226-27);[105] "looking upon his halls, he goes out from his ancestral kingdom" (*stabula aspectans regnis excessit avitis*, 238). The focus on the bull's exile in far-off, unknown lands connects the passage to similar discussions of exile in *Eclogue* 1, both Tityrus' incredibly insensitive "*adynaton*" employed in expressing the longevity of his gratitude to Rome's *iuvenis* (*ante pererratis ... finibus exsul ... ante nostro illius labatur pectore vultus*, 60-62), as well as Meliboeus' subsequent lament for his own imminent exile: *at nos hinc alii sitientis ibimus Afros ... et penitos toto divissos orbe Britannos* (1.64-66). Vergil takes special care to vary his mode of expression here: the *Eclogues' finibus* becomes *oris* in the *Georgics*.[106] *Ignotis* in the latter poem, while not appearing itself in the *Eclogues*, forms a

[103] The heavy personification is noted by both Thomas and Mynors. Thomas: "V. here intensifies his use of language suggesting a human context—the connection is made explicit in the next passage [i.e. *G.* 3.242-83]—but completely avoids the grotesquerie which such a suggestion could have produced" (79 ad 3.209-241); "femina: emphatic, and only here in the *Georgics*, never the in *Eclogues* ... The effect of the word in the present line is unmistakable: if only momentarily, the boundary between man and animal is once again broken" (81 ad 3.215-16). Mynors: "In any case, to treat the bulls as human beings required no great imaginative power, and a few words like *illecebris* and *amantis* will make the point, with metaphors from political life like 212 *relegant*, 225 *exsulat*, 228 *regnis*" (216 ad 3.215-41). The humanizing language draws frequently from the elegiac, as Thomas notes (80 ad 3.212-13); this is little of a surprise given the wider passage's discussion of the powers of *amor*.

[104] Cf. also: *nec nemorum patitur meminisse nec herbae* (216) and *immemor herbarum quos est mirata iuvenca* (*Ecl.* 8.2); *carice* (231) and *carectum* (*Ecl.* 3.20).

[105] Cf. the dulcet complaints of the turtle doves (*nec gemere aeria cessabit turtur ab ulmo*, *Ecl.* 1.58), which immediately precedes Tityrus' *adynata* and Meliboeus' own complaints about his coming exile.

[106] The only use of *ora* in the *Eclogues* occurs at *Ecl.* 8.7, in the poet's address to his patron and dedicatee Pollio,

contrast with Meliboeus' idealized description of Tityrus' meager estate, in particular the *non insueta pabula* upon which his flocks will graze (*Ecl.* 1.49) and the *flumina nota* among which Tityrus will take his rest (1.51). Furthermore, the ideas of separation expressed by *hinc ... ibimus* (64) and *penitus toto divisos orbe* (66) in *Eclogue* 1 become more simplified in the *Georgic* 3's *abit longeque ... exsulat* (64) and *excessit* (66). The variation in word choice nevertheless betrays an close affinity of theme, one clarified by each passage's explicitness about the centrality of exile (*exsul*, *Ecl.* 1.61; *exsulat*, *G.* 3.225).[107]

Yet the echoes do not end here. The restatement of the bull's exodus from Sila at *Georgics* 3.238—*stabula aspectans regnis excessit avitis*—unequivocally recalls Meliboeus' impassioned emotional climax in the first eclogue (*Ecl.* 1.67-72), wherein he wonders aloud whether he will ever again see his home and ancestral fields: *en umquam patrios longo post tempore* finis *pauperis et tuguri congestum caespite culmen, post aliquot, mea regna, videns mirabor aristas? Aspectans* in the later passage restates the *Eclogues*' *videns*, whereas *stabula* "dwelling" corresponds to the description of Meliboeus' *pauper tugurium* at *Ecl.* 1.68, also an object of the verb of seeing; the later work still captures the wrenching *pathos* of the original.[108] The *regnis ... avitis* from which the bull is departing, meanwhile, is a masterful conflation and restatement of two memorable moments of Vergil's climax: the *patrios fines* Meliboeus laments leaving at *Ecl.* 1.67 (itself recalling the *patriae fines ... linquimus* at *Ecl.* 1.3), as well as Meliboeus' emotional appositive at *Ecl.* 1.69, *aliquot, mea regna, ... aristas*. *Avitis*, "ancestral," from *avus*, "grandfather," cleverly gives the same meaning as *patrios* (from *pater*) by simply taking the reference back another generation.[109] *Regna* in both passages, meanwhile, is an extreme hyperbole—neither actually being a king—brought on by the heavy emotional connection the banished feels to the land he is leaving.

Earlier in this study, it was noted that the position of Meliboeus in *Eclogue* 1 is essentially that of a loser in a poetic contest, his land and flocks the stake he has lost, and the *barbarus miles* who comes from outside the local landscape the victorious rival. Through the references to *Eclogue* 1, the battle of the bulls in *Georgics* 3—itself an actual contest—becomes infused with the struggle over local land so integrated into the first eclogue: the losing bull, who becomes an exile (*exsulat*) and leaves his ancestral lands (*avitis*) upon Sila's plateau, suffers the same plight as Meliboeus. His rival is able to remain with the herd upon Sila, assimilated to the *barbarus miles* who appropriates Meliboeus' land—and, indeed, while Sila is "ancestral" to the exiled bull, Vergil does not share whether the victorious bull was native or foreign to the landscape. All that is sure is that the bull's victorious rival is an "enemy" (*hostem*), and that the future conflict is inevitable as the defeated animal strikes back in retribution: *praecepsque oblitum fertur in hostem* (3.236). This inescapable retaliation is a narrative direction left unpursued in Meliboeus' narrative, but it is one that follows naturally from the struggle over the possession and enjoyment of local Italian land: the defeated bull's headlong charge upon his enemy is essentially the start of either a civil or social war, either between "fellow-citizens" (*civis*, Ecl. 1.71) of Sila or against a foreign usurper (*miles ... barbarus*, *Ecl.* 1.70-71). The third georgic's defeated bull—itself the symbol of Italian resistance during the Social War—has lurking

who is "either passing by the rocks of great Timavus, or skirting the shore of the Illyrian Sea" (*Ecl.* 8.6-7): *seu magni superas iam saxa Timavi*, *sive oram Illyrici legis aequoris*. These lines draw the reader outside of the immediate pastoral landscape, in fact recalling an entirely different poetic genre, that of epic. There seem, then, to be generic considerations playing a part in the different in vocabulary between the two passages.

107 Mynors 1990 notes the connection: "Here too the noble language fits a human exile, and recalls *E.* 1.67-72" (217 ad 3.228).

108 Thomas 1988: 83 ad 3.228: "a vivid and pathetic picture"; Mynors 1990: 217 ad 3.228: "a shameless appeal to the reader's sympathy."

109 Cf. the poet's description of Mantua at *Aen.* 10.201 as *dives avis*, and the discussion in the first chapter.

behind it the spectre of Meliboeus, whose loss of land in *Eclogue* 1 was already reminiscent of the struggle between Romans and Italians over land and hegemony that characterized the Social War. In this context, the strange name of Vergil's *goatherd* (*capellas*, 1.12; *capellae*, 1.74, 77) perhaps begins to make sense: Meliboeus—he who "has concern" (μέλει) for the oxen (βόες)—is instead he who has concern for Italy and its lands,[110] who feels the pain and loss of local Italian land, as the bull certainly does here.

Returning to *Aeneid* 12, the poet's repetition of two and half lines from the vignette of the bulls in the third *Georgic* creates an incredibly complex characterization of Turnus at this moment. Turnus does not just have the ferocity of just any bull preparing to attack. Vergil's intratextual layering casts Turnus as a once-bested rival, obsessing over his victorious rival and the love and land he runs the risk of losing forever;[111] he gathers all his remaining strength for one final attack upon the one who threatens to take possession of his land and country. Yet the reminiscences of *Eclogue* 1 in the passage from *Georgics* 3 introduce another level to Turnus' representation, one that calls into question the characterization the epic has given to the Rutulian hero: if that passage links the defeated bull to the exiled Meliboeus, then a Turnus who recalls that defeated bull in his striving after revenge also becomes an instantiation of the "defeated" Meliboeus, whose sentimental complaints over loss of native land represent one of the emotional acmes of Vergil's earliest collection. And if Turnus becomes the wronged native Meliboeus—"he who has concern for Italy"—then his soon-to-be-victorious rival Aeneas becomes none other than the *barbarus miles* of Vergil's first eclogue, the markedly *im*pious (*impius*, *Ecl.* 1.70) outsider (*barbarus*; cf. *advena*, *Ecl.* 9.2) who has come to claim lands and resources to which he has questionable rights, at least to the minds of those native to the region. That is to say, Turnus becomes for a moment, through the simile of the bull and its intratextual references, the protagonist of the epic's story—the defender of Italy, likened in simile to the symbol of her unity, reminiscent of the sympathetic "He-who-cares-for-the-oxen" of *Eclogue* 1—while Aeneas himself takes for a moment on the role of antagonist, questionably working to occupy another's native land, at the beginning of a book which will end with his equally (morally) questionable slaughter of this erstwhile symbol of Italian resistance against the Trojans. Turnus' death parallels to an extent the death of Camilla: both are compared to oxen in simile while fighting for a unified Italy to which they believe the outsider Trojans have no right, and both are slaughtered in the course of the story that leads to Trojan hegemony. Like the snow-white Clitumnan bull only to be struck down on Roman altars, Turnus and Camilla are sacrifices made for the greater Trojan/Roman good, and they represent, too, one foregone possible future, that of a unified but *non-Roman* Italy, an idea silently present in the *laudes Italiae* as well.

The transformation of *pius Aeneas* into the *impius/barbarus miles* of the first eclogue reveals, moreover, the remarkable diversity of perspective which the *Aeneid* allows. This fact is made clear when the scene of the rival bulls is referenced again in simile near the end of Book 12, this time with not only Turnus explicitly identified as one of the bulls, but Aeneas as well (*Aen.* 12.715-724):

> ac velut ingenti Sila summove Taburno 715
> cum duo conversis inimica in proelia tauri
> frontibus incurrunt, pavidi cessere magistri,

[110] Cf. *G.* 3.157: *cura in vitulos*; see below.

[111] Love = *G.* 3.227 *quos amisit inultus amores*; cf. Turnus' pangs of love upon Lavinia's blush at *Aen.* 12.70, just 30 lines before Turnus' bull simile: *illum turbat amor figitque in virgine vultus*. Land = *G.* 3.238 *regnis ... avitis*; cf. Iuturna's pained exhortation to the Rutulians, Latins, and Laurentines to defend their land at *Aen.* 12.236-37: *nos patria amissa dominis parere superbis cogemur, qui nunc lenti consedimus arvis*; cf. too *Ecl.* 1.72: *his nos consevimus agros.*

stat pecus omne metu mutum, mussantque iuvencae
quis nemori imperitet, quem tota armenta sequantur;
illi inter sese multa vi vulnera miscent
cornuaque obnixi infigunt et sanguine largo
colla armosque lavant, gemitu nemus omne remugit:
non aliter Tros Aeneas et Daunius heros
concurrunt clipeis, ingens fragor aethera complet.

And just as upon huge Sila, or the peak of Taburnus,
when two bulls charge one another, each to attack his enemy,
horns directed at one another, the masters stand back, terrified;
the entire herd stands silent with fear, and the heifers silently wonder
which one will command the grove, which one all the herds will follow;
with great strength they inflict wounds upon each other, and
they butt and stab with their horns, and they wash their necks and shoulders
with gallons of blood, and the entire grove bellows back with their groans:
no differently did Trojan Aeneas and the heroic son of Daunus
rush together with their shields, and a huge crash filled the heavens with sound.

Another exercise in Vergilian *variatio*, the simile contains a number of echoes of the scene from the third georgic. The simile opens itself ecphrastically upon the plateau of La Sila (*ingenti Sila*), as did the central episode from the *Georgics* (*pascitur in magna Sila*, 3.219); Vergil adds another possible location here, Mt. Taburnus in modern-day Campania between Capua and Benevento, in Roman times in the territory of the Caudine Samnites, reinforcing the idea of the setting as a specific local site in Italy.[112] There are a number of close verbal parallels: *inimica in proelia* (716) recalls the *proelia* at *G.* 3.220; *illi inter sese multa vi vulnera miscent* (720) is a slight variation on *G.* 3.220, *illi alternantes multa vi proelia miscent*, replacing *alternantes* with *inter se* (cf. *G.* 3.218) and *proelia*, already used above, with *vulnera* (cf. *G.* 3.221, *vulneribus crebris*). Lines 721-22 and the last half of 724 condense and rephrase *G.* 3.221-23: *cornuaque obnixi infigunt* (721) ~ *versaque in obnixos urgentur cornua* (*G.* 3.222); *sanguine largo colla armosque lavant* ~ *lavit ater corpora sanguis* (*G.* 3.221); *gemitu nemus omne remugit* (722) and *ingens fragor aethera complet* (724)~ *vasto cum gemitu; reboant silvaeque et longus Olympus* (*G.* 3.222-23).[113] There is also a new element: the silent flock which stands around the two bulls, consisting mostly of heifers who wonder which of the two will win the right to lead the flock. This addition to the simile's scene of conflict, responding outside of the simile to the just-mentioned crowd of Trojans, Rutulians, and all the other Italians who turn their eyes upon the pair,[114] underscores the fact that this battle will determine the fate of the peninsula. The outcome of this face-off will decide who should rule (*quis ... imperitet*), whom all the others should follow (*quem ... sequantur*).

[112] Note that Mt. Taburnus was the site of the "Battle of the Caudine Forks" that ended the Second Samnite War; the poet chooses a location connected in cultural memory to the struggle between Romans and Italians.
[113] Another element that point to the original passage from the *Georgics* is the mention of the "masters" (*magistri*), the farmers or shepherds who should have control over the herd; cf. *G.* 2.529, 3.118, 3.185, 3.445. Here the herdsmen have run away from the battle in fear: *pavidi cessere magistri* (12.717); cf. *G.* 3.549-50: *cessere magistri Phillyrides Chiron Amythaoniusque Melampus*—the "masters" of healing fail in the plague's wake.
[114] *Aen.* 12.704-707: *iam vero et Rutuli certatim et Troes et omnes convertere oculos Italia, quique alta tenebant moenia quique imos pulsabant ariete muros, armaque deposuere umeris*.

Yet—as the simile at 12.101ff. has proleptically shown—Turnus has no chance. The poem's earlier casting of Turnus as the defeated bull in that simile communicates to the reader that, whatever equivalence seems to exist between the two contenders in the narrative present, this confrontation will end in Turnus' removal from his "ancestral kingdom" (*regnis ... avitis*, *G.* 3.228)—specifically through his death at Aeneas' hands. Moreover, through the simile's repetition of the geographically situated setting of Mt. Sila from the third georgic's bull vignette, as well as the appending of the additional Italian locale of Taburnus, the passage imports the themes of nativity-of-place and exile present in the passage from the *Georgics*, as well as those already in that passage's own partial model, *Eclogue* 1: the *nemus* over which the bulls contend (12.719, 722) is not simply a geographical location, but the *germana patria* of Cicero's *De Legibus* or *Eclogue* 1's Meliboeus, the significance of which lies in the deep geographical, familial, and experiential connections developed over successive generations (*avitis*), an affective identification based precisely in nativity. And indeed, here again the poet employs that subtle signal that a passage is to read with a heightened attention towards local subjectivity: the keyword *ingens*—"huge", to be sure, but surfacially presenting itself as "within-the-*gens*", as "in-born"—appears in the first and last line of the passage, encircling the passage in ring composition with the concerns of nativity: "upon huge Sila" (*ingenti Sila*) shades in meaning toward "on their native Sila", while the "huge crash" of *ingens fragor* wavers and shifts to become "the crash of local violence"—"the breaking clash of civil conflict."

What is likewise remarkable about the passage in this context is something not made as explicit in the previous simile in *Aeneid* 12—namely, Aeneas' characterization as the other bull, also potential symbol of Italy, also potentially fighting for land to which he claims a native's right.[115] Yet the poem removes this possibility almost as soon as it has presented it—for the passage brings to a close its thematic ring focused around place and identity not just with the repeated *ingens*, but also with a renaming of the duel's combatants by their ethnic signifiers: *Tros Aeneas et Daunius heros* (723)—"Trojan Aeneas and the hero from Ardea".[116] The simile suggests at its start (but neglects to subsequently confirm) that each warrior fights as a native of the Italian landscape for land to which he feels a deep, rooted connection, only to reveal at its end that only Turnus, the warrior from Latin Ardea, can claim such a relationship to Italy: Aeneas is Trojan in the end, an *advena* or a *barbarus* who has entered Italy with the intention of asserting authority over the landscape and its current inhabitants. The battle is more of a Social War than a civil war: Turnus and the Italians fight for the right to their local autonomy against those striving for hegemony, who threaten it from the outside, rather than against a foe nurtured in their own homeland.[117]

There is one last simile involving a bull in the poem, occurring in the middle of *Aeneid* 10, which, in traditional Vergilian fashion, adds nuance to the bull's connection to the idea of local Italian identity. Turnus appears here again, but this time not as the bull: he is instead compared to a lion, as he stalks through the battle searching for Pallas ('*solus ego in Pallanta feror, soli mihi Pallas debetur*', 10.442-443), who runs onto the field as the Arcadians watch anxiously (10.451-52). Turnus spots him (10.453-456):

115 This is essentially the claim made by Aeneas and the Trojans in their belief in their "return" to Italy as the native home of their ultimate Trojan/Italian progenitor Dardanus—e.g. *Aen.* 7.195-211.

116 *Daunius* was in reality often an ethnic marker for Apulia in Latin, since Daunus had, in the dominant tradition, settled in that area of Italy; cf. Horace *Od.* 1.22.13-14 (*militaris Daunias*); *Od.* 4.14.26 (*Dauni Apuli*). But Vergil has moved Daunus from Apulia to Ardea to be king among the Rutuli. Noonan 1993 believes that Vergil does so "to locate Daunus in proximity to Latinus and Faunus" (114 n. 6), to play, as Noonan sees it, on shared imagery between the two gods' cults and their associations. The movement of Daunus from Apulia to Ardea seems to be Vergil's own innovation; see Holland 1935: 207.

117 Cf. Toll 1991 & Toll 1997, and the discussion of Toll's work in the opening chapter.

desiluit Turnus biiugis, pedes apparat ire
comminus; utque leo, specula cum vidit ab alta
stare procul campis meditantem in proelia taurum,
advolat, haud alia est Turni venientis imago.

Turnus leapt down from the chariot, and readies his feet to
close in; and just like a lion, when from a high perch he has seen
a bull standing far off upon the plains preparing to charge and attack,
flies forth—no different is the sight of Turnus as he draws near.

The comparison to a lion emphasizes Turnus' blood-thirst at this moment, while foreshadowing the lack of humanity the hero will show in his brutal slaughter of Pallas. Considering the strong connections formed between bulls and warriors on the Latin side of the war—Turnus, Camilla, Numanus Remulus—it may come as a surprise to see Pallas, an Arcadian fighting on the side of Aeneas and the Trojans, taking on the role of bull in the present simile. This perplexity disappears when one remembers Pallas' own genealogy, shared by Evander as he explains to Aeneas why he did not believe his own son was able to be the *externus dux* predicted by a soothsayer to be necessary to overcome Mezentius' Etruscan forces (8.510-511):

natum exhortarer, ni mixtus matre Sabella
hinc partem patriae traheret.

I would be encouraging my own son, if he were not of mixed origin
with a Sabellian mother, claiming part of his *patria* from her.

Pallas himself, through his central Italian mother, is likewise able to claim native Italian status; he too, just as much as Camilla or Turnus, fights on behalf of a land in which he was born and to which he has familial connection. This fact is emphasized by the description of the bull in simile in *Aeneid* 10—*stare procul campis meditantem in proelia taurum* (10.455). The description of the bull, with its intentions set on attack, recalls again the bull from *Georgics* 3, recouping his strength as he prepares to attack the rival who has driven him from his native Sila. Pallas, too, is a native of Italy, despite his Arcadian father, and Vergil's representation of him as such seems to speak optimistically of the possibility of the Trojan-Italian melding decreed by Jupiter in *Aeneid* 12: like the *Romana propago* that Juno will entreat Jupiter for at the end of *Aeneid* 12, Pallas represents an ideal example of bicultural identity integration, with both the heritage and received culture given equal weight in considerations of identity. Pallas thus stands as an example of the successful integration of foreign and native culture, though one who also perishes at the hands of Turnus.[118]

Itali and *Vituli*

Most of the instances of oxen or oxen imagery which we have covered so far have been forms of the other words for bull discussed at the start of the previous section: *taurus*, *bos*, and *iuvencus/iuvenca*, each

[118] See Quint 2018: 177-179, and especially 178: "But this structure also suggests that the death of Pallas ... substitutes for the death of Aeneas' own son: Iulus."

set of which has over 30 individual attestations in Vergil's corpus.[119] Yet one word for *bovids* deserves special attention—*vitulus*—with its hypothesized status as the etymological origin of the name for Italy, as described in the sources examined above, and referenced at so many points in Vergil's corpus. In this final section, I wish to explore a final set of passages within Vergil's poems that are connected to this image of the Italian bull, all united by the use of the specific term *vitulus/vitula*, and particularly when used in a seemingly incorrect way that belies further poetic motivations in the passage.

Forms of *vitulus* are used more sparingly by the poet than other terms for bovids. The word is used only 13 times in the poet's entire corpus, including five times in the *Eclogues* (but all in the single poem, *Eclogue* 3), one time in the *Aeneid* (a single occurrence in *Aeneid* 5), and seven times in the *Georgics* (in every book except the first).[120] This seems calculated on Vergil's part. We have seen that the oxen imagery used elsewhere in the poems can often be seen quite clearly to be used to signal an episode meant to be interpreted evaluatively with respect to the substance of local Italin identity. This continues to be true with *vitulus*—and, indeed, it is my contention in this section that Vergil's use of the word *vitulus*, because of the etymological connection already commented upon by Vergil's contemporaries Varro and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, which Vergil was undoubtedly aware of, stands as a signal to read a passage quasi-allegorically in terms of the historical struggle between local Italians and Rome. That is to say, Vergil's *vituli* are more than the calves they denotationally represent, coming to stand as a connotational symbol of local Italian *gentes* themselves via the already-existing etymological and visual-symbolic connections between the *vitulus*/ἰταλός and the idea of Italy. This practice is taken to its most extreme—and significant—point in those passages where Vergil uses the term *vitulus/-a* while marking this word-choice as denotationally incorrect: namely, the stake of the *vitula* in *Eclogue* 3, and the sacrifice of the *vitulus* during the *bugonia*-episode of *Georgics* 4. As we shall see, these passages mark the culmination of the Vergilian tendency towards exploring both the tensions that arise between local Italian and Roman state identity that we have seen so far in the poem, and the loss of local identity Vergil sees connected to the creation of an idea of a unified Italy that is understood to be, on some new level, an extension of the city of Rome and its empire.

Vitulus is used only once in the *Aeneid*, in the sacrifice of three *vituli* ordered by Aeneas and his men before they set sail from Sicily, leaving Acestes and the group of Trojan women (*Aen.* 5.772-73):

> tris Eryci vitulos et Tempestatibus agnam 772
> caedere deinde iubet solvique ex ordine funem.
>
> He orders them to sacrifice three calves to Eryx, and a lamb 772
> to the Storm-gods, and for the mooring line to be let loose in turn.

Though it may not seen so at first, Vergil's choice of the sacrifice of the *vituli* at this point in his epic is extremely significant. The calves are sacrificed to Eryx, who, far from just being a local mountain or deity,

[119] The official count for each is as follows: 38 occurrences of forms of *taurus* (42 including forms of *taurinus* at *G.* 4.171, *G.* 4.371, and *Aen.* 1.368, and *taureus* at *Aen.* 9.706); 31 occurences of *bos* (34 including forms of *bucula* at *Ecl.* 8.86, *G.* 1.375, and 4.11); and 41 occurrences of *iuvencus/iuvenca*.

[120] *Vitulus/-a* at 13 occurrences shows up with comparable frequency to *agnus/agna* (13 occurrences) and *haedus/-a* (12 occurrences) in Vergil's corpus. However, considering that words for cattle show up 130 times in Vergil, as compared to 40 instances of sheep and 38 instances of goats, one might expect the attestations of *vitulus/-a* to be up to three times as many; there seems to be some selectivity in Vergil's usage.

is the mythical half-brother of Aeneas, son of Venus and Butes, either a native king of Sicily[121] or an Argonaut who, abandoning the Argo to swim to the Sirens' island, captivated by their music, was saved by Aphrodite who transferred him to Sicilian Lilybaeum and took him as a lover.[122] More significantly, Eryx was said to have been killed by Hercules in a boxing match as the hero was returning from Spain with the cattle of Geryon, the Sicilian king either having reappropriated Hercules' lost ἰταλός to breed into his own herds,[123] or challenging the Greek to a boxing match in order to take possession of the cattle;[124] here, then, we have the - ἰταλός-thief Eryx juxtaposed with *vitulos*, the Latin/Italic word assumed by the ancients to be cognate with Greek ἰταλός. Thus, a key character from the story of Italy's naming is juxtaposed with one of its proposed *etyma*. This is even more significant considering that this is the last sacrifice which Aeneas and the Trojans will make before landing in Italy at the beginning of Book 6: the *vituli* are sacrificed to guarantee Aeneas and the Trojans' safe passage to Italy—the *vituli*'s namesake—by the authority of Aeneas' half-brother Eryx, who almost himself took possession of those stolen *vituli*, but did not. The Trojans will not touch shore again until landing in Cumae, the only intervening episode the death of Palinurus as scape-goat for all the Trojans: *unum pro multis dabitur caput* (5.815).

The first occurrence of *vitulus* in the *Georgics* is in the discussion of the nature of different soils and their suitedness for different agricultural activities, immediately following the *laudes Italiae* (2.195-199):

> sin armenta magis studium vitulosque tueri
> aut ovium fetum aut urentis culta capellas,
> saltus et saturi petito longinqua Tarenti,
> et qualem infelix amixit Mantua campum
> pascentem niveos herboso flumine cycnos
>
> But if you are eager instead to keep watch over flocks and calves (*vitulos*)
> or over the young of sheep or she-goats which graze pastures to exhaustion,
> seek out the groves of far-off plains of rich Tarentum,
> and a stretch of country of the sort that unlucky Mantua lost,
> nurturing snow-white swans with its reed-fringed river.

As we have discussed above, the discussion of soil types at *Georgics* 2.177-225 is a sort of negative doublet of the *laudes Italiae* immediately preceding it: whereas the *laudes* go out of their way to present *Italia* as a sort of geographical and cultural unity that is united by its products—grains, wine, olives, flocks, fruits, minerals, and men—the passage on soil-types, through its enumeration of specifically Italian examples, demonstrates the overwhelming diversity and variety of different Italian locales, a message that works against the universalizing tendency of the *laudes*-passages: thus clayey and rocky soils are good for the olive and *oleaster* (2.179-183), whereas rich, silty soil is best for sustaining the vine (2.184-194). These differ from the grassy, fountain-dotted landscapes which are best for grazing flocks of all sorts, fields of the sort that Vergil identifies with far-southern Tarentum and his native Mantua in the passage that supplies the above excerpt (2.195-202), both places that held a place of special significant for the poet.[125] Following these

121 Diod. Sic. 4.83.1.
122 Apollonius *Arg.* 4.912-919.
123 Apollodorus *Lib.* 2.5.10.
124 Diod. Sic. 4.23.2-3.
125 Considering, for example, the mentions of Mantua and the Mincius in *Ecl.* 7 and 9 and *Aen.* 10 and the

come land with black, friable soil that is fertile for crops (2.203-211); loose gravelly soils, as well as tufas and chalky soils, which are mostly good-for-nothing, beset by snake-holes, though perhaps a good place for a beehive (2.212-216); and wet, ultra-rich soils which are good for all types of production: vines, olives, grains, and flocks (2.217-225). This last type of soil is again given geographical specificity within the peninsula, as Vergil defines the type with a list of four Campanian places names: "just such soil rich Capua ploughs, and the regions that neighbor Vesuvius' peak, and the river Clanius, unfavorable to empty Acerrae".[126] The six subsequent vignettes of distinct soils and their accompanying landscapes are an extraordinary testament to geographical variety; "[i]t would be hard to find such a set of word-pictures of landscape in poetry anywhere else".[127] Yet it is a variety that is defined in specifically Italian terms: Tarentum, Mantua; Capua, Vesuvius, Clanius, Acerrae. Considering this passage's lively differentiation of the Italian landscape through soil type and appearance, the employment of the etymologically loaded (and poetically unnecessary)[128] term *vitulos* is surely intended here as a kind of meta-linguistic marker meant to cue to the reader another significant attempt to define the supposed unity or non-unity of the peninsula. Just as the poet's actual use of the toponym *Italia* (*laudibus Italiae*, 2.138)—the only use of the word, it should be remembered, in the entirety of the *Eclogues* or the *Georgics*—served as an early signal to the reader that that passage was engaged with one particular notion of "Italy", the use of *vitulos* in the immediately subsequent passages can be seen to be doing much the same, marking out an Italy defined by local character more than generalization.

The weight attached to this metalinguistic marker increases in the following book, that concerned itself with the flocks to which the *vituli* belong. Two of the three instances of *vitulus* appropriately occur in the passage on the care of young oxen (3.157-178), a passage which we have already seen is full of not only personification, but the language of subjugation and domestication. Before we look at the passage itself, it should be noted that the so-called metalinguistic quality of *vitulus* in this passage is signaled by the poet himself in two distinct ways in the immediately preceding section. This is the famous excursus on the gadfly, its different name for the Greeks and Romans, and its creation by Juno as a nuisance to oxen specifically (3.146-48, 152-53):

> est lucos Silari circa ilicibusque virentem
> plurimus Alburnum volitans, cui nomen asilo
> Romanum est, oestrum Grai vertere vocantes,
> . . .
> hoc quondam monstro horribilis exercuit iras
> Inachiae Iuno pestem meditata iuvencae.
>
> There exists around the groves of Silarus and Mt. Alburnus which grows
> green with holm-oaks, a swarming fly, for which the Roman name is
> *asilus*, but the Greeks have changed its name, calling it *oestrus*,
> . . .
> With this monster once Juno took out her terrible anger,
> meditating ruin upon that descendant of Inachus, a heifer.

excursus on the Old Man of Tarentum at *G.* 4.116-148.

[126] 2.224-225: *talem dives arat Capua et vicina Vesaevo ora iugo et vacuis Clanius non aequus Acerris*.

[127] Mynors 1990: 125.

[128] That is, because it simply amplifies the already-stated object of the verb *tueri*: *armenta*.

As Thomas has noted, Virgil is "much concerned with variant names for the gadly" in this passage,[129] a concern which leads the poet to engage in a fair amount of folk etymological play. Namely, Thomas notes that the setting of the scene at the river Silarus—the modern Sele near Paestum which formed the boundary between Campania and Lucania in antiquity—is "an anticipatory gloss on the name of gadfly"—*asilus*—"as if it came from the name of the Lucanian river: *a-Sil(ar)o*".[130] Vergil will make a similar etymological gloss during an ecphrastic *aition* in *Georgics* 4, during his treatment of the medicinal plant *amellus* (4.271-280), which shepherds are said to pick "around the stream of the river Mella" (*prope flumina Mellae*) in Cisalpine Gaul near Brixia. Thomas notes that this etymological play may extend to the episode of the battle of the bulls on Mt. Sila less than a hundred lines later in this same book (3.219: *in magna Sila* ~ *a-Sila*) as well as the mention of Taburnus at *Aen.* 12.715-717, itself probably a play on another Latin word for gadfly, *tabanus*.[131] The etymological playfulness in the *asilus* passage begins as early as 3.144, two lines before the ecphrastic opening *est*, where the hyper-pastora setting is said to include moss—*flumina, muscus ubi et viridissima gramine ripa*—*muscus* reminiscent of the similar-sounding *musca*, "fly," another gloss on the gad-fly to come, and the word avoided with the use of the participal *volitans* at 3.147.[132] Vergil displays his well-established[133] interest in etymological word-play in both the *asilus* and *amellus* passages, connecting each to specific north and south Italian geographical locales, respectively, in these passages.

Such an extended etymological, ecphrastic excursus seems particularly well-placed before the immediately following passage on the care of the *vituli*, a word which again urges on its reader to read its passage meta-linguistically, *cura in vitulos* gradually becoming blurred with *domitura (v)Italorum* (3.157-169):

post partum cura in vitulos traducitur omnis;
continuoque notas et nomina gentis inurunt,
et quos aut pecori malint summittere habendo
aut aris servare sacros aut scindere terram
et campum horrentem fractis invertere glaebis.
cetera pascuntur viridis armenta per herbas:
tu quos ad studium atque usum formabis agrestem
iam vitulos hortare viamque insiste domandi,
dum faciles animi iuvenum, dum mobilis aetas.
ac primum laxos tenui de vimine circlos
cervici subnecte; dehinc, ubi libera colla
servitio adsuerint, ipsis e torquibus aptos
iunge pares, et coge gradum conferre iuvencos;

After birth every care is transferred over onto the *vituli*;
from the outset they burn on branding-marks and the names of sires,
and [mark off] those they prefer to rear to stud for the maintenance of the herd,
or to keep pure for the altars, or to plough the earth and

[129] Thomas 1988: 66 ad 3.144.
[130] Thomas 1988: 67 ad 3.146-7.
[131] Thomas 1988 ibid.
[132] Thomas 1988: 66 ad 3.146-7.
[133] O'Hara 1996.

turn up the field, marked with ridges, with the clods all broken down.
Some of the herd are pastured over green, grassy meadows;
but those you will mold for agricultural pursuits and labor,
while they are still *vituli*, encourage them and set upon the path of domestication,
while the spirits of the young animals are docile, while their age is yielding. 165
As soon as you can, fasten loose halters made of light willow rope
around their necks; from there, when their necks, previously free,
have become accustomed to servitude, fastened together by the same collars
join them in pairs, and compel the bullocks to keep pace with one another. 169

While this section on the care of calves might be taken as a "didactic interlude"[134] that is merely a return to the stated didactic purpose of the poem, it is also a passage in which the language of violence and subjugation is particularly strong (*inurunt*; *summittere*; *aris servare sacros*; *formabis*; *domandi*; *subnecte*; *servitio*; *coge*; etc.); combined with a spike in the personifying language so frequent in this poem (*gentis*; *hortare*; *iuvenum*; *libera colla*; etc.), it is difficult not to read this passage as a sort of how-to guide for Roman subjugation of the Italian peninsula. The *notas et nomina gentis*—that is, the brands indicating the animal's owner (*nota*) and marks indicating the parentage, i.e., mother and sire of the calves—could be read in another context as "the names of a people and their distinctive signifiers";[135] the exhortation to "brand on" these names and signifiers might be taken both as a reminder that the regional diverisity of Italy requires the Roman *domitor* to heed regional specificities as he negotiates the terms of the incorporation of individual Italian *gentes* into the Roman state: *quare agite o proprios generatim discite cultus* (*G.* 2.35). The actions referenced in the next few lines also contain colonialist overtones reminiscent of the struggle between Romans and locals prominent elsewhere in Vergil's corpus. In *quos ... malint summittere* (161), the non-agricultural meaning of *summittere*—i.e. "submit, subjugate"—looms large, while the word itself recalls the *iuvenis*' directive to Tityrus and others in *Eclogue* 1 to *pascite ut ante boves, pueri: summittite tauros* (1.45), itself another moment of Roman adjudication over the fate and use of the Italian landscape. The setting aside some of the *vituli* for sacrifice (160) points both toward the more sacrificial function that oxen will play in Vergil's final poem, as well as toward Aeneas' sacrifice of eight Italians during the funeral rites for Pallas and other fallen Trojans in *Aeneid* 11.

The passage's subsequent exhortation to the early breaking of the oxen for the yoke (*domandi*, 164), meanwhile, like the other passages on training and domestication in the poem, can be read to describe an incredibly specific acculturation strategy, that of local Italian *assimilation* into the Roman civic and cultural sphere. Vergil's specification of "those you will mold for agricultural pursuits and labor" (*quos ad studium atque usum formabis agrestem*, 163) and the suggestion to do so "while the spirits of the young are docile" (*dum faciles animi iuvenum*, 165) paint the *agricola* as a sort of all-powerful determiner of the character of those he oversees, able to completely control the outcome of those they raise if enough dedication is given at an early enough time. The passage itself is reminiscent of that in *Georgics* 2 on the cultivation of the vine, where through grafting and transplantation the farmer is able to cause trees and vines "to shed their rustic spirit, and, through repeated cultivation, they will follow without delay into whichever arts you call them" (*exuerint silvestrem animum, cultuque frequenti in quascumque voces artis haud tarda sequentur*, 2.51-52). There, too, the poet imagines the farmer's *labor* resulting in the subject's complete assimilation to his will, the spirit (*animum*) prone to molding. Such an impression is encouraged by the personifying vocabular: *hortari* (164)

134 Thomas 1988: 70 ad 3.157-79.
135 Note Mynors 1990 207 ad 3.158 on *ge*

is often used of the raising or education of children,[136] a connotation which the poet does not discourage from being read by his describing the animals in the next line not as *iuvenci*, "bullocks", but *iuvenes*, "adolescents," blurring the line between animal and human in the swap of the two (etymologically related) terms.[137] A similar but more haunting effect is created in the subsequent lines, when the young oxen's growing accustomed to being led around by ropes made of withies is described by the poet as the moment "when their free necks have become accustomed to servitude" (*ubi libera colla servitio adsuerint*, 167-168). The poet's description of the domestication of plough-oxen essentially renames the molding (*formabis*) and domestication (*domandi*) involved in breaking oxen as an equivalent to servitude. Read with the surrounding personifications and the metalinguistic directive (through the double citation of *vitulos* at lines 157 and 164) to re-contextualize the didacticism within the frame of Roman cultural subjugation of Italians, the passage draws up a parallelism between cultural assimilation and servitude: that is, the imposition of an outside culture to which a subject was not previously inured is here represented by the violence of domestication and the forming to agricultural purpose—including literally marking the animals with fire through branding. Such a perspective—veiled but not hidden—presents a much different view on acculturation than the more optimistic picture of integration provided by Jupiter's vision of Italy and Troy incorporated in the last book of the *Aeneid*. Vergil's views on acculturation remain various and multifaceted.

Considering these usages of forms of the word *vitulus*,[138] the most striking instances are those in which the word *vitulus*—strictly "calf"—is itself not actually the most appropriate word for the context. This was true to an extent for the second occurrence of the word *vitulos* in the previous passage, where Vergil instructs his reader to begin the process of breaking animals for the yoke "while still calves": *iam vitulos* (3.164). Columella's own advice on this matter was that "one should not break bullocks (*iuvencos*) before three years of age nor after four years"—*nec ante tertium neque post quartum annum iuvencos domari placet*.[139] Columella's choice of vocabulary to describe the animals to be broken as *iuvenci*, "bullocks," is itself a signal that *vitulos* is not strictly correct for describing oxen of ploughing age; we can confirm that this is the case from other agricultural writings and from the etymologists. Varro begins his section on oxen by giving four different terms for oxen of different ages (*DRR* 2.5.6): "First of all, among oxen four levels of age are distinguished: first, calves (*vituli*), second yearlings (*iuvenci*), third young cows (*boves novelli*), fourth old cows (*vetuli*)" (*primum in bubulo genere aetatis gradus dicuntur quattuor, prima vitulorum, secunda iuvencorum, tertia bovum novellorum, quarta vetulorum*). In his own passage on the breaking of young oxen, Varro describes the animals involved in the training described above as *novelli iuvenci*, "new steers," somewhere between the second and third age-tiers;[140] this choice of terminology makes sense, since Varro, like

136 Mynors 1990: 209 ad 3.164.

137 This effect is heightened here considering that *vitulos* is not strictly correct in the present context; see below. Since Vergil goes out of the way to use *vituli* here, it is possible the poet had meta-literary concern doing so.

138 There are two additional instances of *vitulus* in the *Georgics* which I will not take the time to discuss, but which remain suggestive. The first is at *G* 3.494, where during the plague of Noricum, calves perish in drove among otherwise green pastures: *hinc laetis vituli volgo moriuntur in herbis*; for the Noric plague's (and the *bugonia*'s) relationship to individuality and collectivity, see Gardner 2014. The other instance occurs in simile at *G.* 4.434 during the Aristaeus epyllion, where Proteus overseeing his seals on the shore is compared to a cowherd watching *vituli* return home from pasture while *lupi* howl in the distance; small as it is, the further collocation of oxen and wolves here (as at *Aen.* 11.811, for example) is striking, to say the least.

139 Col. 6.2; see Mynors 1990: 209 ad 3.164.

140 *DRR* 1.20.2: *novellos cum quis emerit iuvencos, si eorum colla in furcas destitutas incluserit ac dederit cibum, diebus paucis erunt mansueti et ad domandum proni.*

Columella, advises the farmer, when selecting animals to train for the plough, to "procure animals that are unbroken (*rudes*), no less than three years old and no more than four years old".[141] That animals which were able to pull the plough fell into the second age classification, that of *iuvenci*, is confirmed by Isidore of Seville's explanation of the etymology of *iuvencus*, stating that the animal is so called "on account of its beginning to aid (*iuvare incipiat*) men's activities in working the earth".[142] This same age-range is also often quoted as being that appropriate for heifers to begin bearing young, thus identifying the bearing of calves as a feature of *iuvencae* that marks their passage from being *vitulae*.[143] Thus Varro says that "cows should not be covered before they are two years old (*bimae*), in order that they be three years of age when giving birth; and all the better if they are at least four years old when they first give birth",[144] and Isidore of Seville specifically identifies birth as a distinguishing line between *vitula* and *iuvenca*: "a *vitula* is still young and has not yet given birth: for once it has given birth the animal is a *iuvenca* or a *vacca*".[145] Elsewhere in literature, *vituli* is used for animals still accompanied by their mother;[146] another oft-mentioned feature of the *vitulus* is its not yet having grown horns.[147] *Iuvenci*, in contrast, are those animals that have grown horns, been weaned from their mothers, have reached the age of sexual maturity, and are able to be broken and pull the plough—i.e. the so-called *vitulos* at 3.164 above.

Another occasion in Vergil's corpus where *vitulus/-a* is employed against standard usage is in *Eclogue* 3, where the *vitula* is the stake which the herdsmen Damoetas proposes for his song contest with Menalcas; neither competitor ends up winning, since the judge Palaemon is unable to decide between the two, declaring that "both you and this other one are worthy of the *vitula*" (*et vitula tu dignus et hic*, 3.109). Yet Damoetas' first mention of the *vitula* makes clear that the stake cannot be a *calf* (*Ecl.* 3.29-31):

ego hanc vitulam (ne forte recuses,	29
bis venit ad mulctram, binos alit ubere fetus)	30
depono.	

For my part, this *vitula* (lest you should happen to refuse,	29
she comes to the milk-pail twice-a-day and nourishes two offspring)	30

141 *DRR* 1.20.1: *Quos rudis neque minoris trimos neque maioris quadrimos parandum*.

142 *Orig.* 12.1.28: *iuvencus dictus, quod iuvare incipiat hominum usus in colenda terra.* Cf. Varro *DLL* 5.96: *iuvencus, iuvare qui iam ad agrum colendum posset*.

143 Considering such, Lalage's classification as a *iuvenca* in *Odes* 2.5, who is "not yet strong enough to bear the yoke ... nor able to stand the weight of a bull rushing toward Venus," (*nondum ... ferre iugum valet ... nec tauri ruentis in Venerem tolerare pondus*, 2.5.1-4), who instead spends her time wandering the fields and "now greatly desiring to play with the calves in the damp willow-grove" (*nunc in udo ludere cum vitulis salicto praegestientis*, 7-9)—that is, as a heifer who still wishes to play among the calves—suggests perhaps less a Lalage that is too *physically* immature to reciprocate Horace's affection than a Lalage who is of sexual maturity, but "not acting her age", so to speak, and so still concerned with the play of youth (*cum vitulis*) than with pursuing a relationship, a future also imagined within the metaphorical realm of the *iuvenca*: *iam proterva fronte petit Lalage maritum* (15-16).

144 *DRR* 2.5.13: *non minores oportet inire bimas, ut trimae pariant, eo melius, si quadrimae*.

145 *Orig.* 12.1.32: *vitulam ergo parvam esse et nondum enixam: nam enixa iuvenca est aut vacca*.

146 Varro *DRR* 2.5.6: *cum creverunt vituli, levandae matres pabulo viridi obiciendo in praesaepiis ... siquae amisit vitulum, ei supponere oportet eos, quibus non satis prabent matres*; Ovid *Rem. Am.* 184: *et queritur vitulum mater abesse suum*; *Fasti* 4.459: *ut vitulo mugit sua mater ab ubere rapto*;

147 Lucretius *DRN* 5.1034-35: *cornua nata prius vitulo quam frontibus extent, illis iratus petit atque infestus inurget*; Ovid *Am.* 3.13.15: *et vituli nondum metuenda fronte minaces*; Ps.-Ovid *Halieutica* 2-3: *vitulus sic namque minatur, qui nondum gerit in tenera iam cornua fronte*; Martial 3.58.11: *vitulusque inermi fronte prurit in pugnam*.

I lay down as a pledge.

That Vergil's *vitula* here gives milk and has two young calves of her own goes explicitly against Isidore's definition of the *vitula* as "still young and not yet having given birth".[148] That some ancient readers objected to Vergil's word choice here is shown by Servius' commentary at *Ecl.* 3.30: "For certain ones unnecessarily bring up the question, saying that a *vitula* is young and does not match well with the fact that we say that the animal has already given birth, saying instead that we ought to understand *iuvenca*".[149] Servius himself claims this is unproblematic, though his justification forces him to play fast and loose with Varro's definitions: "*Vitula*, 'calf,' is so named from its 'greener' age (*viridiore aetate*), as is the word *virgo*, 'maiden,' as well ... for *vitula* is the name of an age-range (*nomen aetatis*), not a thing which heifers (*iuvencae*) can only possess before giving birth".[150] Considering that we have just seen that pregnancy and birth *do* delineate the line between *vitula* and *iuvenca* for Varro, Columella, Isidore, and others, Servius seems to be re-classifying the semantic sphere *ad absurdum* in his suggested definition of *vitula* here as "a young cow that's either a calf (*vitula*) or a heifer (*iuvenca*)," his point can be appreciated: Vergil is employing language loosely here in order to draw upon the connotative possibilities of language. For Servius, Vergil wants to emphasize the youth of the animal through the verbal similarity between *vitula* and *viridis/virgo*; I would suggest that Vergil's word choice here is meant to draw the reader back into the dialectics of Italian acculturation into Roman culture, through an intended association between *vitula, Italia*, and the image of the bull or calf that stood as a symbol thereof. That is to say: Damoetas' and Menalcas' contest here is not merely over a calf, but over possession of *(V)Italia* itself.

As we say in the discussion of the *Eclogues*, *Eclogue* 3 is in many ways attempts to create difference between its two competitors, Menalcas and Damoetas, despite their comparability and belonging to the same landscape: this attempt to differentiate was apparent most of all in the judge Palaemon's inability to choose a winner between the two (*non nostrum inter vos tantas componere lites*, 3.108), both of the competitors being worthy of the stake: *et vitula tu dignus et hic* (3.109). The recognition of a potential meta-linguistic marker in the staking of the *vitula* in *Eclogue* 3 opens up another level of interpretation for the poem. If the *vitula* is understood as a sort of symbolic replacement for the physical landscape of *Italia* itself[151]—or, within the poem, the local landscape that both Menalcas and Damoetas occupy—the poem itself reveals new ways how struggles over land, worthiness, and identity are brought into a local physical landscape by the kind of scarcity brought on by Roman encroachment. Specifically, the struggle to win the *vitula*, played out between two characters whom, we have seen, the poem itself does its best to confound and assimilate

148 *Orig.* 12.1.32: *vitulam ergo parvam esse et nondum enixam.* The stake of the *vitulus* is also in part motivated by the stake of the μόσχος, "calf," at Theocritus *Id.* 8.14

149 Servius ad *Ecl.* 3.30: *male enim quidam quaestionem movent, dicentes, vitulam parvam esse nec congruere ut eam iam enixam esse dicamus, sed debere nos iuvencam subaudire*.

150 Ibid.: *vitula a viridiore aetate dicta est sicut virgo ... vitula enim est nomen aetatis, non quod tantum ante partum iuvencae possideant.* Servius' other point is that Vergil must mean *vitula*, if only because he goes on to repeat the word two more times: *et paulo post ipse dicturus est "si ad vitulam spectas, nihil est quod pocula laudes", item "et itula tu dignus et hic": unde iuvencam subaudire non possumus, sed secundum superiorem sensum intellegamus*. In his commentary, Coleman 1977 suggests that "*vitulam* 'female yearling' instead of *iuvencam* may also be colloquial" (ad loc.), another instance of the nonstandard language seen in *quoium* at the poem's beginning and throughout the collection.

151 Notice the similarity in description between the hyper-productive *vitula* here—*bis venit ad mulctram, binos alit ubere fetus* (3.30)—and *Italia* as almost impossibly fertile in the *laudes Italiae* at *Georgics* 2.150: *bis gravidae pecudes, bis pomis utilis arbos*. Both lines narrative two different sorts of (almost unbelievable) "double" productivity, each formed of two half lines beginning with forms of *bis/bini*, each with a strong caesura in the third foot.

to one another through multiple processes of "doubling," stands in for the larger anxiety that has permeated the Italian landscape that surrounds Menalcas and Damoetas: the contest between them, the stake for which is the markedly non-calf-life *vitula*, represents the individual struggle to hang onto personal and local affiliations—and property—in an environment that is continually suffering change brought on by encroachment and cultural erasure and change. Menalcas' and Damoetas' contest is only over a *vitula*, but, considering that this hypercompetitiveness between neighbors has been brought on by the precariousness of land, property, and status in the wider landscape following the rise of Roman hegemony, the struggle over the *vitula* and *Italia* are really one and the same: the struggle over this single small possession, the *vitula*, stands in microcosm for the struggle over Italian land and identity that the herdsman fear may come to them too, as it has come to others in the *Eclogues*. Thus the constant anxiety of possession in the poem, from the very beginning of the poem: *Dic mihi, Damoetas, quoium pecus*?

Considering this increase in competitive anxiety in *Eclogue* 3 associated with Rome's import of a previously unknown spirit of competition into the environment, it is interesting to consider the judge Palaemon's fittingness as a judge of this dispute. Palaemon was the name assumed in divinity by the mortal Melicertes, son of Ino; Ino, pursued by her husband Athamas, king of Boeotia, who had been driven mad after he and his wife had helped to raise the infant Dionysus against the will of Hera, jumped into the sea with their son Melicertes to escape, Athamas having already killed their son Learchus in his madness.[152] Carried to shore by a dolphin, Melicertes was transformed into the sea deity Palaemon, and the Isthmian Games were instituted in his honor.[153] The appeal to a sea-god as the arbiter of a contest over territorial identity—one wonders if Vergil means the cross-linguistic pun inherent in Palaemon's former name, Melicertes, Μελι-*cert-es*, "he who cares for contests" (à la Meliboeus)—seems apposite: the sea was, in Roman law, considered *res communis*, a thing not able to be an object of property, and thus *res nullius*, not able to be assigned to any one individual.[154] The pelagic Palaemon has no stake in land or property rights; his final judgment that both are worthy of the *vitula* is unbiased, needing no qualification.

We have already seen in the *Eclogues* chapter how Pollio, Bavius, and Mevius appear in the poem as stand-ins for Rome's authority in this poem, subtly bringing in the anxiety of competition and threat of encroachment we see more clearly in other *Eclogues*. There is another figure in *Eclogue* 3 whose presence points to Rome's encroaching effects upon the Italian landscape: the *noverca*, "step-mother," whom Menalcas cites as a reason for not being able to supply his own *vitula* as stake (3.32-34):

> De grege non ausim quicquam deponere tecum. 32
> est mihi namque domi pater, est iniusta noverca,
> bisque die numerant ambo pecus, alter et haedos. 34
>
> I wouldn't dare to stake anything from our flock along with you. 32
> For I have my father at home, and also a harsh step-mother,
> and they both count our flocks twice a day, and she does the same for the goats. 34

These lines are inspired by, but slightly adapted from, a passage of Theocritus' eighth *Idyll* (8.15-17):

[152] *OCD*, s.v. Athamas.
[153] *OCD*, s.v. Melicertes.
[154] Smith 1875, s.v. *dominium*.

ΔΑ. μόσχον ἐγὼ θησῶ, τὺ δὲ θὲς ἰσομάτορα ἀμνόν. 15
MEN. οὐ θησῶ ποκα ἀμνόν, ἐπεὶ χαλεπὸς ὁ πατήρ μευ
χὰ μάτηρ, τὰ δὲ μῆλα ποθέσπερα πάντ᾽ ἀριθμεῦντι. 17

Daphnis: I'll wager a calf; you stake a lamb as big as its mother.
Menalcas: I'll never wager a lamb, since my father is hard on me,
and also my mother; they count all the flocks every evening.

Vergil eliminates any mention of ps.-Theocritus' lamb, instead doubling the stake of *Id.* 8's μόσχος, which has become Vergil's *vitula*. This is not the only doubling from the earlier passage: the nightly counting of the flocks in the *Idylls* happens twice a day (*bisque die*) in the *Eclogues*, with emphasis placed on the fact that *both* parents (*ambo*) do this work. Perhaps the biggest change is Vergil's seemingly unmotivated shuffling of Menalcas' family dynamic, from a mother and father in the *Idylls* (ὁ πατήρ μευ χὰ μάτηρ) to a father and a step-mother in Vergil (*pater et ... noverca*); moreover, the strictness which seems to decribe both parents in the *Idylls* (χαλεπὸς) is applied in this eclogue to only the step-mother—*iniusta noverca*—though both, of course, count the herds. This substitution begins to make sense when one considers the associations of birth and descent which are connected by Cicero in the *De Legibus* and by Vergil in the *Georgics* with the idea of the *germana patria*. The *noverca*, a flagitious character elsewhere in Vergil[155] and in Latin literature more generally,[156] stands antithetically against the ideas of blood-relation and descent that give meaning to place and property in the Ciceronian formulation: her relation to her step-children was precisely an artificial and constructed one, a kind of "graft" onto existing familial relationships. Indeed, it is the same discourse of genealogical illegitimacy seen in the passages on grafting in the third chapter that underlies a famous comment by Scipio Aemilianus after the assassination of Tiberius Gracchus.[157] Questioned by the tribune Carbo as to his opinion on the death of Tiberius, Scipio, fresh from his defeat of Celtiberian Numantia in 133 BC, responds that the man had been rightly killed if he had harbored ill will toward the Republic;[158] at this, the crowd cries out in affront, provoking the following reproach from Scipio: "How am I, who remained unafraid so often when confronted by the roar of armed enemies, able to be moved by your shouts, you to whom Italy is only a step-mother (*noverca*)?"[159] Scipio presumably implies that a large portion of his audience are non-natives of Italy and Rome, likely freedman from lands recently brought under Roman rule (as Scipio's addition of "*quos ego sub corona vendidi"* in the version of the story in *De Viris Illustribus* implies). Whoever the words were directed toward, the rhetorical use of *noverca* in this context is quite clear: those crying out in protest at the fate of Gracchus (and his policies on the distribution of Italian land) are implied to have no claim to such indignation, since they bear no genetic or hereditary relationship

155 *G.* 2.128: *pocula siquando saevae infecere novercae*; *G.* 3.282-83: *hippomanes, quod saepe malae legere novercae miscueruntque herbas et non innoxia verba*; *Aen.* 7.765-66, of Phaedra: *Hippolytum, postquam arte novercae occiderit*; *Aen.* 8.288-89, of Hera/Juno: *ut* [*Hercules*] *prima novercae monstra manu geminosque premens eliserit angues*; also *Aen.* 10.389.
156 M. J. G. Gray-Fow 1988; Noy 1991; Watson 1995.
157 131 BC or theneabouts. For discussion, including of date and context, see A. E. Astin 1960.
158 Vell. 2.4.4: *hic, eum interrogante tribuno Carbone quid de Ti. Gracchi caede sentiret, respondit, si is occupandae rei publicae animum habuisset, iure caesum*; cf. Val Max. 6.2.3, *de viris illustribus* 58.
159 Vell. 2.4.4: *et cum omnis contio acclamasset, 'hostium' inquit 'armatorum totiens clamore non territus, qui possum vestro moveri, quorum noverca est Italia?* Cf. Val. Max. 6.2.3: *cui dicto cum contio tribunicio furore instincta violenter succlamasset, 'taceant' inquit 'quibus Italia noverca est*; and *de viris illustribus* 58: *obstrepente populo, 'taceant' inquit 'quibus Italia noverca, non mater est'; et addidit: 'quos ego sub corona vendidi.*'

to Italy, but only an artificial one: Italy is only their adopted home, not their original one. The same conceit is called upon by Petronius in his *Satyricon*, during the imitation of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* (119-124). In section 122, the poetic narrator rails against men discouraging war, calling them "base hirelings bought at a price, to whom my native Rome is a step-mother".[160] Clearly motivated by the words attributed to Scipio, the identification of Rome as *noverca* (rather than *mater*) to those complaining reveals their lack of any legitimate claim to pass judgment on the issues at hand; it also makes explicit the antipathy of Rome towards those presumed outsiders, a hostility which is only implied in the former example through the inextricability of the idea of wickedness in the Roman conception of the *noverca*.[161]

The *noverca* holds similar suggestion in Vergil's third eclogue, though with a shift in perspective: whereas Scipio and Petronius' poetic narrator use the idea of the *noverca* to delegitimize attempts by non-genetic Romans to weigh in on political matters, Menalcas's *iniusta noverca* is figured as an outsider, to the family and the narrative setting simultaneously, who nevertheless claims the authority to take control of the flocks and of Menalcas' ability to use his patrimony as he will.[162] The *noverca*, who neither appears in the landscape of the poem as we see it, and who was also an "external" figure associated with unjustified concern for property and affairs not her own, stands somewhat in parallel with Pollio, Bavius, and Mevius as a figure who, despite a non-presence in the landscape, exerts an influence that results in the herdsmen's anxiety. Moreover, while, Damoetas has control of one *vitula* that he wagers in this contest, there is another *vitula* that Menalcas' *noverca* maintains control of, keeping it at home (3.33) and obsessively taking inventory (3.34). The "possession" of *vitulae*, then, is split between those in the local landscape—Damoetas, here—as well as those outside of it—the *noverca*; moreover, the parallel between the *noverca* and Rome found in their externality, as well as the historical linkage of Rome to the *noverca* metaphor, leaves it again apparent that the local conflict between Damoetas and Menalcas is brought on by an outside competitive force.

The most significant use of *vitulus/-a* in the *Georgics* occurs in the prescription of the sacrifice of a bull to restore a hive that has been completely wiped out, usually referred to by the originally incorrect term *bugonia*.[163] The rite is first described about halfway through *Georgics* 4 (4.281-314):

> sed si quem proles subito defecerit omnis 281
> nec genus unde novae stirpis revocetur habebit,
> tempus et Arcadii memoranda inventa magistri

[160] Petr. *Sat.* 122.165-166: *mercedibus emptae ac viles operae, quorum est mea Roma noverca*. I borrow the translation of Heseltine & Rouse 1913.

[161] Noy 1991: 358, n.9: "Rome or Italy may be called the step-mother of people who are not natives, to emphasise that their interests are opposite (Petronius, 122.165-166; Velleius, 2.4.4)."

[162] Noy 1991 identifies two problematic aspects of the stepmother: the "sexual" and the "patrimonial": "The "sexual" aspect is represented by Phaedra, the stepmother who falls in love with her stepson Hippolytus, is rejected by him, and avenges herself by causing a fatal breach between him and Theseus, his father and her husband.... When Pompey married Cornelia, people complained that she was of an age more suitable to marry one of his sons.... This is an area which has not been fully studied, but it seems less central to the particularly Roman interpretation than the "patrimonial" difficulties in which the stepmother was involved" (347).

[163] The application of the term *bugonia/bougonia* comes from a mis-reading of the sequence of thought in the second book of Varro's *DRR*, where the proximity of the mention of "ox-born bees" with the title of an ancient treatise called *Bougonia* has created an association between the two. By the usual rules governing the creation of compounds in Greek, of course, a term such as *bougonia*/βουγονία, implies an object-compound signifying "the birth/creation of oxen", and *not* "birth/creation *from* oxen," an idea communicated in Greek with *e*-grade form of the verbal root, as in the related adjective βουγενής, "ox-born".

pandere, quoque modo caesis iam saepe iuvencis
insincerus apes tulerit cruor. . . .
. . .
exiguus primum atque ipsos contractus in usus
eligitur locus; hunc angustique imbrice tecti
parietibusque premunt artis, et quattuor addunt
quattuor a ventis obliqua luce fenestras.
tum vitulus bima curvans iam cornua fronte
quaeritur; huic geminae nares et spiritus oris
multa reluctanti obstruitur, plagisque perempto
tunsa per integram solvuntur viscera pellem.
sic positum in clauso linquunt et ramea costis
subiciunt fragmenta, thymum casiasque recentis.
. . .
interea teneris tepefactus in ossibus umor
aestuat, et visenda modis animalia miris,
trunca pedum primo, mox et stridentia pennis,
miscentur, tenuemque magis magis aëra carpunt,
donec ut aestivis effusus nubibus imber
erupere, aut ut nervo pulsante sagittae.

But if the entire race will have suddenly failed someone
and he will have stock of new lineage from which to recall it,
it will be time to reveal the unforgettable discoveries of the
Arcadian expert, and how often already through the slaughter
of bullocks (*iuvencis*) corrupt gore has brought forth bees . . .
. . .
First, a narrow place is chosen, one measured off for the
rites themselves; this area they close off with a narrow, tiled roof
and close-set walls, and they add four windows
in the direction of the four winds, admitting light at an angle.
Then a *vitulus* already curving its two-year horns upon its head
is sought; the two nostrils and the breath of the mouth are
obstructed, the animals struggling greatly; and the innards of the
dead animal are liquefied by beating it through its unbroken skin.
In this state, they leave the animal in the closed space, propping up
its ribs with fragments of branches, thyme and fresh wild cinnamon.
. . .
Meanwhile, the fluid that has grown warn in the tender bones
begins to boil, and marvelous animals, miraculously, begin to
take shape, at first the trunks of their feet, and soon winged,
buzzing, and more and more they take to the light air,
until they burst out, just as the rain poured out of summer
clouds, or like arrows released from a twanging string.

The *bugonia* and its ensuing aetiology is central also for an understanding of the representations of local

and communal identity in the poem. This is especially the case considering the bee society's status as correlative of the Roman *patria communis*: the bees are called *Quirites*, a word for Romans in specifically their political role as members of the state (*G.* 4.201); they keep their children and the buildings of their cities in common, *communis*, pointing to the shared ideals of the *patria communis* (*solae communis natos, consortia tecta urbis habent*, 4.153); and "they alone have an established *patria* and *penates*" (*patriam solae et certos novere penates*).[164] The references to *Quirities*, *patria*, and *communitas* in the context of the wholly collective society of the bees, who are rarely individually characterized, can be read as a description of an ideal *patria communis*, with no idea of separate origins, only the *patria* that is connected to one's participation in the state. With the *bugonia*, the animal that we have established as the de facto symbol of the convoluted state of Italian identity—itself defined by the struggle to accentuate local particularities and diversity while simultaneously contemplating and questioning the value of building community through the cultivation of shared, pan-Italian identity—is brutally and violently sacrificed in order to restore another race of creatures, one the poem itself has elected as representative of the kind of communal identity achieved in the creation of a Roman identity. The symbolic function of the animal here is made the more explicit both by its being identified as a *vitulus*, an identification which allows this animal to stand in, in some sense, as the ultimate *etymon/aetion* for Italy itself. The poet himself foregrounds the etymological and meta-linguistic play with the same trick of topographical etymologizing he had employed in *Georgics* 3 with his excursus on the gad-fly immediatey before the passage on the care of calves (*vitulos*), here through his discussion of the curative herb *amellus* which precedes the start of the *bugonia* passage (4.271-280):

est etiam flos in pratis cui nomen amello
fecere agricolae, facilis quaerentibus herba.
...
asper in ore sapor; tonsis in vallibus illum
pastores et curva legunt prope flumina Mellae.
huius odorato radices incoque Baccho
pabulaque in foribus plenis appone canistris.

There is also [for sick bees] a flower in the meadows to which
farmers gave the name *amellus*, an herb that is easy to find.
...
It leaves a bitter taste in the mouth; shepherds pick it amidst
grazed-down valleys and along the curved streams of Mella.
Cook the roots of this plant in scented wine and
place full baskets of it in their dwellings as sustenance.

Here again, as Thomas has pointed out, Vergil suggests a double etymology of *amellus*, as coming either from *a-mel(l)-us*, "without honey," since the sick bees who require it will fail to produce honey,[165] or from *a-Mell(a)-us*, "from Mella," since the poet suggests the herb is found in abundance along the small Transpadane river north of Brescia, only about 50 kilometers north-west of Vergil's native Mantua.[166] This

[164] For the idea of Vergil's bees as Romans, see: Griffin 1979; Johnson 1982; Morley 2007; Gardner 2014.
[165] Vergil might also suggest *a-mel(l)-us* as "not sweet," i.e. "bitter", through *asper in ore sapor* at line 277.
[166] Mynors 1990: 293 notes that Nicander's *Theriaca*, in a similar "plant-portrait" on the herb all-heal, notes that the plant is picked on the banks of the river *Melas* (*Ther.* 686), suggesting that Vergil might have the Melas river

etymological speculation not only signals to the reader to be on the look-out for similar place-focused linguistic play in the section immediately following, it also introduces into the passage a gentle stroke of local specificity and affection by recalling the Cisalpine river Mella, which Vergil may have known, just as the mention of Mt. Sila had done in the earlier passage on the name of the gadfly.

This meta-linguistic signaling is bolstered by the fact that in the *bugonia* passage, too, *vitulus* does not seem to be the most appropriate terminology for the occasion. The poet instructs the reader to select "a *vitulus* already curving its two-year horns upon its head" (*vitulus bima curvans iam cornua fronte*, 4.299). At *De Re Rustica* 2.5.13, Varro had suggested that two-year old heifers—*bimae*—were of an appropriate age to be covered by bulls,[167] and thus should be classified as *iuvencae* or *boves* rather than *vitulae*; one would assume, then, that *bimi* would likewise be classified as at least *iuvenci*, not *vituli*. Further, we have seen that *vituli* are often characterized as innocuous specifically by virtue of their lacking horns;[168] having horns, then, would also suggest that the animal here should properly be classified at one of the higher *gradus aetatis*. Indeed, elsewhere in Varro's treatment on the care of oxen, he specifically calls sexually mature one- and two-year old oxen *tauri*, "bulls," when advising on the number of bulls to keep in a herd of cows: "Regarding bulls (*tauris*) and cows, the numbers should be kept such that for every sixty cows there be one yearling bull (*anniculus*) and one two-year old bull (*bimus*)".[169] A two-year-old animal with horns ought not to be classified as a *vitulus*, but as a *iuvencus* or a *taurus*, just as the milk-bearing mother with twin progeny in *Eclogue* 3 should have properly been a *iuvenca* or *bos* instead of *vitula*.[170] Vergil's awareness of his own linguistic impropriety here is gestured to at the beginning of the passage (4.284), where the animals killed to restore the hive are not *vituli,* but the *caesi iuvenci* with their grim overtones.[171]

The ethnographic significance of the *bugonia* passage is built up also through its use of vocabulary appropriate for ethnography, as well as generally reminiscent of the issues discussed above. The concern that motivates the discussion of the *bugonia* in the first place is that of the failure of the race—of the complete obliteration of a shared ethnic, social, or cultural identity. The *bugonia* rites should be sought out if all offspring (*proles*) should fail, if there is no race or stock of a new lineage (*genus novae stirpis*) to maintain the (re-)production of identity: *proles* points to the successive, consanguineous relationship produced by genetic progenitors, whereas *nova stirps* suggests the possibility of an artificial relationship like that achieved through grafting, a new trunk or bole to support the growth which has failed.[172] There is also a small focus on the selection of *place* (*eligitur locus*, 296). The description of the *bugonia* also emphasizes wholeness and

also in mind as *etymon* for the curative *amellus*, though ultimately deciding that these questions of poetic intent are "difficult to formulate, and impossible to answer".

167 *DRR* 2.5.13: *non minores oportet inire bimas, ut trimae pariant, eo melius, si quadrimae*.

168 Lucr. *DRN* 5.1034-35; Ovid *Am.* 3.13.15; Ps.-Ovid *Halieutica* 2-3; Martial 3.58.11; see note 394 above.

169 *DRR* 2.5.18: *numerus de tauris et vaccis sic habendus, ut in sexaginta unus sit anniculus, alter bimus*. Similarly, at *DRR* 2.5.12, a two-year-old animal is classified as a *taurus*: *habeo tauros totidem, quot Atticus, ad matrices LXX duo, unum anniculum, alterum bimum*. Cf. Columella's discussion of castration at 6.26-27 where he seems to suggest the two-year-old animal being castrated is a *iuvencus*: *melius bimus quam anniculus castratur … nam hoc modo nec eruptione sanguinis periclitatur iuvencus*.

170 There is always a possibility that part of Vergil's motivation is metrical, but the attention that has been paid in other passages involving *vituli*, as well as his awareness of the word *vitulus*' identity as an *etymon* for Italy, makes it extremely unlikely, in this author's mind, that Vergil uses the word *metri gratia* without any thoughts for other connotative and symbolic considerations.

171 Dyson 1996; see note 314, above.

172 In discussing the *bugonia*'s geographic origin, in a passage not quoted above, Vergil also mentioned the *Pellaei gens Canopi*, the "race of Alexandrian Canopus" (287), in the midst of a general Egyptian ethnography.

completeness in the instruction to not break or pierce the animal's hide during the liquification of the organs through beating: *tunsa per integram solvuntur viscera pellem* (302); at the same time it is specifically *mixing* which will finally result in the creation of the *genus novae stirpis*, the new stock of bees for the hive: *visenda modis animalia miris ... miscentur* (310-312). Couched between the mini-ethnographies of the Egyptians (287-294) and the Parthians (313-314), the poet's use of vocabulary suggest that the failure of progeny requires the seeking of a new stock, one that remains pure (*integram*) until, through mixture or intermingling (*miscentur*), new kinds of creatures (*visenda animalia*) are produced.

Yet, the instructions for the *bugonia* do not end with this passage. One of the most intriguing problems of the *Georgics* is the fact that the procedure given by the poet at 4.281-314 does not match the instructions of Cyrene nor the actions of Aristaeus in the poem's finale, at 4.538-558:

'quattuor eximios praestanti corpore tauros,
qui tibi nunc viridis depascunt summa Lycaei,
delige, et intacta totidem cervice iuvencas.
quattuor his aras alta ad delubra dearum
constitue, et sacrum iugulis demitte cruorem,
corporaque ipsa boum frondoso desere luco.
post, ubi nona suos Aurora ostenderit ortus,
inferias Orphei Lethaea papavera mittes
et nigram mactabis ovem, lucumque revises;
placatam Eurydicem vitula venerabere caesa.'
haud mora, continuo matris praecepta facessit:
ad delubra venit, monstratas excitat aras,
quattuor eximios praestanti corpore tauros
ducit et intacta totidem cervice iuvencas.
post, ubi nona suos Aurora induxerat ortus,
inferias Orphei mittit, lucumque revisit.
hic vero subitum ac dictu mirabile monstrum
aspiciunt, liquefacta boum per viscera toto
stridere apes utero et ruptis effervere costis,
immensasque trahi nubes, iamque arbore summa
confluere et lentis uvam demittere ramis.

"Pick out four choice bulls, of surpassing form,
that now graze among your herds on the heights of
green Lycaeus, and as many heifers of unyoked neck.
For these set up four altars by the stately shrines of the
goddesses, and drain the sacrificial blood from their throats,
but leave the bodies of the steers within the leafy grove.
Later, when the ninth Dawn displays her rising beams,
you must offer to Orpheus funeral dues of Lethe's poppies,
slay a black ewe, and revisit the grove. Then with Eurydice
appeased you should honour her with the slaying of a calf."
Tarrying not, he straightway does his mother's bidding.
He comes to the shrine, raises the altars appointed, and

leads there four choice bulls, of surpassing form,
and as many heifers of unyoked neck.
Later, when the ninth Dawn had ushered in her rising beams,
he offers to Orpheus the funeral dues, and revisits the grove.
But here they espy a portent, sudden and wondrous to tell—
throughout the paunch, amid the molten flesh of the oxen,
bees buzzing and swarming forth from the ruptured sides,
then trailing in vast clouds, till at last on a treetop they stream
together, and hang in clusters from the bending boughs.[173]

In Cyrene's restatement of the *bugonia* ritual—or, rather, her original instructions to Aristaeus concerning it—much of the more graphic and violent imagery has disappeared, tranforming the rite into something seemingly closer to a standard ancient sacrifice.[174] The exact specifications have also changed: whereas the mid-book description calls only for the rather gruesome slaughter of one *vitulus* left to decompose in a custom-built structure, Cyrene's instructions at the book's end involve the sacrifice of four bulls and four heifers abandoned in a grove, as well as the additional sacrifice of a black sheep and a *vitula* on the ninth day. Here the animals whose decomposing carcasses will produce the new swarm are specifically *tauri* and *iuvencae*, not a *vitulus* as in the previous passage; yet even this enumeration of the victims holds intra-Vergilian references of its own that connects this version of the sacrifice also to the idea of local Italian identity. First of all, as we have seen, the phrase *praestanti corpore* used to describe the bulls marked for sacrifice (538; 550) was also used to describe Turnus during the catalogue of Italian troops at 7.783ff., where he was seen carrying a shield featuring the transformed Io as its *argumentum ingens*. The same phrase was also seen in the following book of the *Aeneid* to describe the eight head of Geryon's cattle stolen by Cacus from Hercules, a passage which has further verbal reminiscences with the current passage (*Aen.* 8.207-208):

quattuor a stabulis praestanti corpore tauros,
avertit, totidem forma superante iuvencas.

The similarity of vocabulary and structure in these two passages, between the eight oxen to be sacrificed by Aristaeus and the eight of Geryon's oxen—for whom, recall, *Italia* would be named—transforms the animals in Cyrene's sacrifice into the originary "Italian" cattle, sacrificed here to restore the race of productive but undifferentiated bees of Aristaeus' hive. The strong link between sacrifice and the loss of local Italian identity and resources is underscored by a third passage also following the same *quattuor* ... *totidem* ... pattern, one undoubtedly holds resonance for these two sets of lines: the eight young sons of Sulmo and Ufens reserved for human sacrifice by Aeneas on the tomb of Pallas (10.517-20):

Sulmone creatos
quattuor hic iuvenes, totidem quos educat Ufens,
vivientis rapit, inferias quos immolet umbris
captivoque rogi perfundat sanguine flammas.

[173] I borrow the translation of Fairclough 1916 with slight modifications.
[174] On the questions of whether we should understand either case of *bugonia* to be a "formal" or "successful" sacrifice, see Thomas 1991, contra Habinek 1990.

The sons of Sulmo, 517
four young men, and—the same number—those raised by Ufens,
Aeneas seizes them alive, to sacrifice them to the infernal shades,
in order to drench the flames of the pyre with captive blood. 520

This is the most paradigmatic and explicit sacrifice of local inhabitants of the peninsula by Aeneas and the Trojans: separate into two groups of four, the first set born to Aequian Ufens (*Aen.* 7.744ff.) and the second to Paelignian Sulmo,[175] the young men (*iuvenes*) are captured explicitly in order that they might be sacrificed to Pallas' shades. The verbal parallelism between this passage and that from *Georgics* 4 goes beyond simply *quattuor ... totidem ...*: *inferias* appears in both passages (*G.* 4.545, 553; *Aen.* 10.519), and the *iuvenes* here recall the *iuvencae* sacrificed in the earlier poem, the verbal similarity reflecting the real etymological connection between the words. Thus the sons of local Italian leaders Sulmo and Ufens, sacrificed on the altar of a foreign invader in vengeance for losses sustained as those leaders protected their local autonomy, are drawn as a parallel to the bulls and heifers which Aristaeus must sacrifice to restore his hive. Aristaeus, of course, is also an invader who incurred loss as a result of seeking to possess what was not his, in lands that was not his own: his pursuit of Eurydice in Orpheus' native Thrace (*Ciconum*, 4.520; *Oeagrius Hebrus*, 4.524) finds him far from his flocks in Arcadia (*Arcadii magristri*, 4.283; *qui tibi nunc viridis depascunt summa Lycaei*, 4.539), and Eurydice had already been married to Orpheus (*pro coniuge*, 4.456). Aristaeus plays the role of an Aeneas: understanding himself as entitled to even that outside his native land, he undergoes a sacrifice to regain and avenge the loss he has incurred; in the *Georgics*, however, it is the symbol of local Italian identity which is sacrificed, the *taurus*/ἰταλός first identified as a *vitulus*, rather than sons of the Italian soil themselves. Aristaeus' gruesome slaughter of the *vitulus*/*tauri* stands as a figure for the loss of the substance and particularity of local Italian identity, sacrificed in order to resurrect a race marked not by local individuation but sweeping homogenization, that of the hive of bees committed not to any particular place, but to their shared *patria communis*.

The *bugonia*, then, resolves the tensions in the *Georgics* between the concerns of the *germana patria*—those of local differentiation and specification—and the *patria communis*—seen as unifying and homogenizing social and cultural forces—by sacrificing the concerns of the local at the altar of the shared. In this sense, the two ritually distinct forms of the *bugonia* work together to explore what is lost in the acquisition of Roman citizenship and identity. The initial sacrifice of the *vitulus* focuses on this loss at an individual level, on the individual *oppida* and *municipia* which have been and will be irrevocably changed by their interactions with Rome: indeed, the strange structure built to house the murdered bull, with its roof (*tecti*, 4.296), walls (*parietibus*, 4.297), and windows (*fenestras*, 4.298) is essentially a house—a *domus*:[176] this small plot of land (*exiguus ... locus*, 4.4.295-296) and its building stands as a symbolic "home" in which the idea of an identity focused on localized differetiation and connection to place itself have gone to die. The *vitulus* is the individual that must be lost at the expense of the group—or, better, at the expense of a formation of a group identity: *unum pro multis dabitur caput*, as Jupiter remarks about Palinurus' death,

175 Sulmo was a *municipium* of the Paelignians in the modern province of Abruzzo, most famous today as the birthplace of Ovid.

176 Indeed, the vocabulary here is reminiscent of Cato's description of the building of the *villa* in *De Agri Cultura* 14.1-2: *Villam aedificandam si locabis nouam ab solo, faber haec faciat oportet: parietes omnes, uti iussitur, calce et caementis, ... ianuam maximam et alteram quam uolet dominus, fenestras, clatros in fenestras ... .*

scapegoat for the Trojan cause (*Aen.* 5.815). Cyrene's description, meanwhile, emphasizes the gravity and extent of this loss: four bulls and four heifers slaughtered and left in a grove—no eating of the meat, no sacrifice proper—the seeming futility of the rites reflected in the human sacrifice of eight Italians in the *Aeneid* which it foreshadows. Together, the two descriptions succeed in emphasizing that the loss of local identity that is felt by the Roman unification of Italy is felt deeply at both an individual level and on a large-scale. At the same time, the sacrifice of *vitulus* and the *tauri* can be read metapoetically as Vergil's shift away from a local Italian perspective in the *Georgics*, towards one grounded in the point-of-view of shared identity, specifically that of the Roman citizen. Marvelous things are possible with this sacrifice: at the narrative level, Aristaeus' bees are reborn; at the symbolic level, a new *communis patria* is created; and, for the poet, the temporary sacrifice of the local focus of the *Georgics* has resulted in the elevated Aristaeus epyllion. Yet it is a sacrifice that invariably involves a loss—of the *vitulus*, of the local and the poetry inspired by it alone.

The sacrifice of the *vitulus*, then, is the final relinquishing of the local point-of-view—Italy will return in the *Aeneid*, but almost entirely from the perspective of its (pre-Roman) Trojan invaders. The Aristaeus epyllion is to the *Georgics* what *Eclogue* 4 had been to the *Eclogues*: it is what agricultural didactic becomes when one abandons the local perspective—a perspective by now associated with the bucolic, with the *humilis* genres, with Italy—and let the urban perspective take over—one that is directed toward the city, toward epic, toward Rome; the Aristaeus epyllion is the transformation of agricultural didactic into *georgica urbana*, bringing forth the 'cultivation' associated with Rome and the higher genres it is ushering into Vergil's poetry. The change in the ceremony of the *bugonia* between the middle and the end of *Georgics* 4, then, can be seen as a result of this 'smoothing over', this subduing or "Rome-estication" of the local, Italian perspective; the process of aligning the story of history with the unitary and unifying voice of the *patria communis* erases the more gruesome details of the sacrifice. The bloody reality of the *bugonia* must be removed if the story of Aristaeus, of Aeneas is to be told: the horrifying details of local loss may have a place in a poem which aims to clarify the distinctions between places, but they have no place in a story whose focus is not the pain of loss, but the greatness of the achievement to be won through that sacrifice. Yet whatever one's perspective on the integration of the local into the unified Italian or Roman perspective, it becomes undeniable that there is great loss involved. This is the loss of Meliboeus and Menalcas as they lose possession of their land; this is the loss of *patria* resulting from civil war and conflict with Rome; this is the loss of distinction between Marsi and Sabelli as *Italia* is understood as one indifferentiable whole rather than a series of distinct and culturally distinct peoples; most of all, it is the loss of Italian life in the *Aeneid* which will ultimately lead to the founding of the city. *Tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem.*

Epilogue

Dilapsus Cito In Unum Confluit

But here we are on the island; surely nothing could be more lovely. It cuts the Fibrenus like the beak of a ship, and the stream, divided into two equal parts, bathes these banks, flows swiftly past, and then comes quickly together again, leaving only enough space for a wrestling ground of moderate size. Then after accomplishing this, as if its only duty and function were to provide us with a seat for our discussion, it immediately plunges into the Liris, and, as if it had entered a patrician family, loses its less famous name, and makes the water of the Liris much colder. For, though I have visited many, I have never come upon a river which was colder han this one; so that I could hardly bear to try its temperature with my foot, as Socrates did in Plato's Phaedrus.

— Cicero, *De Legibus* 2.6-7[1]

After hearing Cicero's formulation of the *duae patriae* of Roman municipal citizens in the *De Legibus*, before the interlocutor return to their discussion of the law, Atticus rounds out their preliminary discussion by acknowledging that Arpinum is indeed Cicero's *patria* (*videar adduci hanc quoque, quae te procreari esse patriam tuam*) and that the republic should indeed be thankful to the munipality for having brought him up (*rem publicam nostram iustissimas huic municipio gratias agere posse*).[2] At this point, the interlocutors reach the island in the Fibrenus toward which they had been walking, and Atticus comments upon the landscape, ostensibly as a transition away from the topic—but the description itself is strangely apposite of the previous topic:

> Sed ventum in insulam est; hac vero nihil est amoenius. etenim hoc quasi rostro finditur Fibrenus et divisus aequaliter in duas partes latera haec adluit rapideque dilapsus cito in unum confluit et tantum conplectitur quod satis sit modicae palaestrae loci. quo effecto, tamquam id habuerit operis ac muneris, ut hanc nobis efficeret sedem ad disputandum, statim praecipitat in Lirem et, quasi in familiam patriciam venerit, amittit nomen obscurius Liremque multo gelidiorem facit; nec enim ullum hoc frigidius flumen attigi, cum ad multa accesserim, ut vix pede temptare id possim, quod in Phaedro Platonis facit Socrates.
>
> But here we are on the island; surely nothing could be more lovely. It cuts the Fibrenus like the beak of a ship, and the stream, divided into two equal parts, bathes these banks, flows swiftly past, and then comes quickly together again, leaving only enough space for a wrestling ground of moderate size. Then after accomplishing this, as if its only duty and function were to provide us

1 Translation that of Keyes 1928.

2 *De Leg.* 2.6: Recte igitur Magnus ille noster me audiente posuit in iudicio, cum pro Ampio tecum simul diceret, rem publicam nostram iustissimas huic municipio gratias agere posse, quod ex eo duo sui conservatores extitissent; uti iam videar adduci hanc quoque, quae te procrearit, esse patriam tuam.

> with a seat for our discussion, it immediately plunges into the Liris, and, as if it had entered a patrician family, loses its less famous name, and makes the water of the Liris much colder. For, though I have visited many, I have never come upon a river which was colder han this one; so that I could hardly bear to try its temperature with my foot, as Socrates did in Plato's Phaedrus.[3]

Though this is merely a description of a surrounding landscape, Atticus' description of the Fibrenus and its island is presented in terms that strongly recall the themes of Cicero's account of the incorporation of different identities. Atticus takes special care to narate how the Fibrenus is divided into two equal parts by the island (*finditur Fibrenus et divisus aequaliter in duas partes*)—two streams running parallel in the same direction, part of the same river, but, for whatever brief space and time, running past their own banks, separated into unique and distinguishable parts. But when it has gone around the river, the two parts fall in quickly again upon one another, "and flow quickly together into one" (*rapideque dilapsus cito in unum confluit*); the space of the island pulls apart for whatever brief time these two streams, before again becoming the unity—the river Fibrenus—that Atticus and his conversation partners understand it to be. Even this newfound unity only last for a short space and time, however: soon after flowing together again, the Fibrenus, a tributary of the Liris, flows into the Liris, and "as if it has entered a patrician family, and loses its less famous name" (*statim praecipitat in Lirem et, quasi in familiam patriciam venerit, amittit nomen obscurius*). But the Liris is difference for its mixing with the Fibrenus: even though its name is lost, it makes the water of the Liris noticeably colder, leaving a lasting effect on the qualities and identity of the river into which it has been absorbed. The river's flow is an apt analogue of a municipal citizen's dual identities and the obligations it entails: the equal splitting of the Fibrenus around its island is, in a sense, a visual demonstration of the parallel cultural streams corresponding to one's Italian *origo* and one's identity as a Roman citizen. The flowing of the Fibrenus into the Liris, meanwhile, illustrates a separate aspect of Cicero's formulation: the greater duty that one owes toward the *patria communis*, and the way in wich, in the assimilative strategy Cicero proposes as best for municipals, local identity flows into the legal or state identity associated with one's citizenship, perhaps having a small affect—the perceptible shift in the temperature of the Liris after its confluence with the Fibrenus—but ultimately one that is not named, not completely recogized, but sufficiently disguised in its incorporation into the larger cultural stream.

The metaphor of the Fibrenus' flow into the Liris is just as apposite for understanding Vergil's work. From the very beginning of the *Eclogues*, to Juno's request for and Jupiter's prediction of the incorporation of the Trojans and the Latins, it is clear that the capturing the dialogue of different cultural streams and strands of identity is one of the thematic focuses of Vergil's work, and the dialectics of Vergil's various representations of Italian-Roman acculturation in his poems can also be understood through Cicero's fluvial metaphor. The *Eclogues*, in the clear distance they draw between the ideas of Italian locality and regionalism, on the one hand, and the urban politics and law of Rome, on the other, is paralleled in the acknowledgement that the Fibrenus and the Liris are separate rivers with separate characters, and in their awareness that something, if only a name, will be lost in their confluence. The individual *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* as a whole, meanwhile, exhibit a noticeable commitment to exploring the many different and differently formulated strategies of acculturation—different manifestations of the strategies of separation, marginalization, assimilation, and integration—a function that corresponds in a sense to the perspective and perspective that the island in the Fibrenus provides as a *sedem ad disputandum*: Vergil's poems place his readers on such an island, slipped between two ever-flowing cultural streams, in the hopes that such a

[3] Text and translation from Keyes 1928.

viewpoint—being able to assess each individually and on their own terms, while also looking forward and back to the ways they flow back together into one, how they do or do not successfully become a unified incorporation of their two separate parts—will provide if but a little additional understanding of the processes involved in navigating multiple cultural streams as an Italian-Roman bicultural individual. At the same time, the flow of Fibrenus down into the Liris serves as an apt metaphor as well for the flow of Vergil's work from a perspective rooted mostly in local Italian considerations in the *Eclogues*, down through the assessment of different cultural streams in the *Georgics*, before the local is subsumed into the greater *patria communis* that is Rome, just as the Fibrenus incorporates its own streams into the Liris. The beauty of this metaphor, of course—as any metaphor—is not that it provides a more certain or syncretized understanding of a thing, but that it opens up an even greater number of perspetives from which a problem or formulation may be approaches and engaged with, leading from there to even deeper understanding.

In her revolutionary study of Romanness, Italianness, and the *Aeneid*, Kate Toll observes how "the poem inaugurates the process by which an indefinite series of *externi* can go on becoming Roman";[4] the long historical arc that the poem provides, she argues, that determines the focal length of the *Aeneid*, and that accounts for Vergil's de-emphasizing the civil wars and Augustus' achievement in their immediate aftermath in favor of the long view of Roman-ness from whose perspective all *externi* are potential partners, and all war is civil war".[5] This is an important point, and it accounts for much in Vergil's *Aeneid*, not least of all the poem's constant focus on nativeness and externality, and its tendency to represent the war in Itay as a kind of Civil or Social War. Such an interpretation, to use Cicero's metaphor of the Arpinate rivers, takes the wide view of the river's confluence, looking ahead to see that the Fibrenus eventually becomes the Liris to see that, in that sense, the concerns of the Liris are the concerns of the Fibrenus, and vice versa. But, as I hope to have shown in this dissertation, Vergil is just as aware of the these long historical processes—the eventual incorporation of Italians and other *externi* into Rome—as he is of the smaller minute processes. In terms of Cicero's rivers, Vergil is just as concerned with the eventual flow of the Fibrenus into the Liris as he is with the tip of the Fibrenus' island, where, "like the beak of a ship" (*quasi rostro*), the two streams of an apparently united Fibrenus' are pulled apart into their constituent parts, different streams and identities to be assessed and considered on their own terms; or, with the tip of the island, where quickly these two equal halfs flow together into one, integrating themselves back again into a single individual formed nevertheless of many streams; and equally too with the moment of confluence itself, where the Fibrenus loses its name but makes its former presence known by some small change to the Liris' constitution writ wide. That is to say, Vergil as a poet is just as concerned to make his reader aware of this wider arc of history as he is to reveal the individual moments of pain, loss, and confusion, as well as a joy and delight, that happen along the way. It is, of course, true that when one considers the broad time-frame of Vergil's corpus, all the enemies of Rome become Roman—all a single *patria*—but in the synchronic moment, to the individual Vergilian character, this cannot be known: all that is known and felt is the pain of present loss, regardless of the longer course of history. It is an awareness of this loss that is inseparable from Vergil's poetry: it is present in his picture of Meliboeus, exiled from his land by newly arrived Roman soldier, as well as in Turnus and Camilla, both of whom represent the potential flourishing of Italian

[4] Toll 1997: 45.

[5] Toll 1997: 50. Cf. Pogorzelski 2009, whose conclusions about the "reassurance of fratricide" in the *Aeneid*'s depiction of the Trojan-Italian War as a kind of civil war are very similar: "Fratricidal war in the *Aeneid* is reassuring for Romans because it naturalizes Italian unity, because it obscures the conquest of Italy, and because the deaths of heroes on both sides of the war become keystones for Roman collective identification" (263).

virtue apart from Troy and Rome. Standing on the island in the Fibrenus that Vergil has constructed for us, we cannot ultimately know exactly how the poet approached his own process of acculturation into a new Roman and Italian identity; we can, however, deepen our understanding of the possibilities, dipping our hands into one or the other of the Fibrenus' chilly streams before they flow back into one.

Bibliography

Adams, J. N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.

Adkins, L., & R. A. Adkins. 1996. *Dictionary of Roman Religion*. New York.

Alföldi, M. R., E. Formigli, & J. Fried. 2011. *Die römische Wölfin: ein antikes Monument stürzt von seinem Sockel*. Stuttgart.

Alpers, P. 1979. *The Singer of the Eclogues*. Berkeley.

-----. 1990. "Chapter One: Theocritean Bucolic and Vergilian Pastoral." *Arethusa* 23.1: 19-47.

-----. 1996. *What is Pastoral?*. Chicago.

Altheim, F. 1938. *A History of Roman Religion*. Trans. H. Mattingly. London.

Ando, C. 2002. "Vergil's Italy: Ethnography and Politics in First-Century Rome." In *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, edd. D. S. Levene & D. P. Nelis: 123-142. Leiden.

-----. 2016. "The Changing Face of Cisalpine Identity." In *A Companion to Roman Italy*, ed. A. Cooley: 271-287. West Sussex.

Appel, G. 1909. *De Romanorum precationibus*. Giessen.

Astin, A. E. 1960. "*Dicta Scipionis* of 131 B.C." *Classical Quarterly* 10.1: 135-9.

Badian, E. 1958. *Foreign Clientelae*. Oxford.

Banti, L. 1973. *The Etruscan Cities and their Culture*. London.

Barchiesi, A. 2008. "*Bellum Italicum*: L'unificazione dell'Italia nell'*Eneide*." In *Patria Diversis Gentibus Una? Unità, politica e identità etniche nell'Italia antica*, ed. G. Urso (Convegni della Fondazione Niccolò Canussio 7): 243-60. Pisa.

-----. 2011. "The War for *Italia*: Conflict and Collective Memory in Vergil's *Aeneid*. Sather Classical Lectures, University of California, Berkeley. Spring 2011.

<http://www.classics.berkeley.edu/people/sather/alessandro-barchiesi>.

Barolini, T. 1984. *Dante's Poets: Textuality and Truth in the Comedy*. Princeton.

-----. 2018. "Inferno 20: Astrology and Determinism, Deflected." *Commento Baroliniano*, Digital Dante. Columbia University Libraries. Accessed 25 February 2019.

<https://digitaldante.columbia.edu/dante/divine-comedy/inferno/inferno-20/>.

Basore, J. W., trans. 1928. *Seneca. Moral Essays, Volume I: De Providentia. De Constantia. De Ira. De Clementia*. Loeb Classical Library 214. Cambridge, MA.

Basso, K. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache.* Albuquerque, NM.

Batstone, W. W. 1988. "On the Surface of the *Georgics*." *Arethusa* 21.2: 227-45.

-----. 1990. "Introduction: On How Virgil's Pastoral Makes a Difference." *Arethusa* 23: 5-17.

Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. 2006. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Berlin.

Benario, H. W. 1983. "Vergil and the River Tiber." *Vergilius* 29: 4-14.

Benet-Martínez, V., J. Leu, F. Lee, & M. W. Morris. 2002. "Negotiating Biculturalism: Cultural Frame Switching in Biculturals with Oppositional Versus Compatible Cultural Identities." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 33.5: 492-516.

Bengston, H. 1982. *Grundriss der römischen Geschichte*. 3rd edition. Munich.

Berman, J. 1990. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Lincoln, NE.

Berry, J. W. 1990. "Psychology of acculturation." In *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1989: Cross-cultural perspectives*, ed. J. Berman: 201-234. Lincoln, NE.

-----. 2017. "Theories and Models of Acculturation." In *The Oxford Handbook of Acculturation and Health*, edd. S. J. Schwartz & J. Unger: 15-29. Oxford.

Bettini, M. 2001. *Contro le radici: Tradizione, identità, memoria*. Bologna.

-----. 2006. "Forging Identities: Trojans and Latins, Romans and Julians in the *Aeneid*." In *Herrschaft ohne Integration? Rom und Italien in republikanischer Zeit*, edd. M. Jehne & R. Pfeilschifter: 269-291. Frankfurt am Main: Studien zur alten Geschichte 4.

-----. 2011. *The Ears of Hermes: Communication, Images, and Identity in the Classical World*. Trans. W. M. Short. Columbus, OH.

Bispham, E. 2007. *From Asculum to Actium: The Municipalization of Italy from the Social War to Augustus*. Oxford.

-----. 2016a. "The Social War." In *A Companion to Roman Italy*, ed. A. Cooley: 76-89. West Sussex.

-----. 2016b. "The Civil Wars and the Triumvirate." In *A Companion to Roman Italy*, ed. A. Cooley: 90-102. West Sussex.

Bömer, F., ed. 1986. *Metamorphosen, Buch XIV—XI, Kommentar*. Heidelberg.

Bonjour, M. 1975. *Terre natale: Études sur une componsante affective du patriotisme romain*. Paris.

Booth, J., & R. Maltby. 2006. *What's in a Name? The Significance of Proper Names in Classical Latin Literature*. Swansea.

Bradley, G. 1997. "Iguvines, Umbrians and Romans: Ethnic Identity in Central Italy." In *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*, edd. T. Cornell & K. Lomas: 53-67. London.

Breed, B. W. 2000. "Imitation of Originality: Theocritus and Lucretius at the start of the *Eclogues*." *Vergilius* 46: 3-20.

-----. 2006a. "Time and Textuality in the Book of the *Eclogues*." In *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*, ed. M. Fantuzzi & T. D. Papanghelis: 333-367. Cambridge.

-----. 2006b. *Pastoral Inscriptions: Reading and Writing in Vergil's* Eclogues. London.

-----. 2009. "Perugia and the Plots of the *Monobiblos*." *Cambridge Classical Journal* 55: 24-48.

Brennan, T. C. 2000. *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*. Oxford.

Broadhead, W. 2008. "Migration and hegemony: fixity and mobility across the 2nd century." In *People, Land, and Politics: Demographic developments and the transformation of Roman Italy, 300 BC—AD 14*, edd. L. De Ligt & S. Northwood: 451-70. Leiden.

Broughton, T. R. S. 1951-1960. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. 2 volumes. New York.

Brugnoli, G. & F. Stok. 1997. *Vitae vergilianae antiquae: scriptores graeci et latini*. Rome.

Brummer, J., ed. 1912. *Vitae Vergilianae*. Leipzig.

Brunt, P. A. 1965. "Italian Aims at the Time of the Social War." *Journal of Roman Studies* 55: 90-109.

-----. 1971. *Italian Manpower 225 B.C.-A.D. 14*. Oxford.

-----. 1982. "Nobilitas and novitas." *Journal of Roman Studies* 72: 1-17.

-----. 1988. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays.* Oxford.

Cairns, F. 2006. "The Nomenclature of the Tiber in Virgil's *Aeneid*." In *What's in a Name? The Significance of Proper Names in Classical Latin Literature*, edd. J. Booth & R. Maltby: 65-82. Swansea.

Campana, A. 1987. *La monetazione deglia insorti italici durante la guerra sociale.* Soliera.

Campbell, B. 2012. *Rivers and the Power of Ancient Rome*. Chapel Hill.

Carandini, A. & R. Cappelli. 2000. *Roma: Romolo, Remo e la fondazione della città.* Milan.

Carlà-Uhink, F. 2017. "*Alteram loci patriam, alteram iuris*: 'Double Fatherlands' and the Role of Italy in Cicero's Political Discourse." In *Citizens in the Graeco-Roman World: Aspects of Citizenship from the Archaic Period to AD 212*, edd. L. Cecchet & A. Busetto: 259-282. Leiden.

Carruba, A. M. & L. De Masi. 2006. *La Lupa capitolina: un bronzo medievale*. Rome.

Cary, E., trans. 1937. *Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Roman Questions, Volume I: Books 1-2*. Loeb Classical Library 319. Cambridge, MA.

Cecchet, L. & A. Busetto, edd. 2017. *Citizens in the Graeco-Roman World: Aspects of Citizenship from the Archaic Period to AD 212*. Leiden.

Chase, D. C. 1897. "The Origin of Roman Praenomina." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 8: 103-184.

Chassignet, M. 1986. *Les Origines (Fragments)*. Paris.

Chilver, G. E. F. 1941. *Cisalpine Gaul: Social and Economic History from 49 B.C. to the Death of Trajan.* Oxford.

Clausen, W., ed. 1994. *Eclogues*. Oxford.

Clement, P. A. & H. B. Hoffleit. 1969. *Plutarch. Moralia, Volume VIII: Table-Talk, Books 1—6*. Loeb Classical Library 424. Cambridge, MA.

Coarelli, F. & H. Patterson, edd. 2008. *Mercator placidissimus : the Tiber Valley in antiquity : new research in the upper and middle river valley : Rome, 27-28 February 2004*. Rome.

Coleman, R., ed. 1977. *Eclogues*. Cambridge.

Connolly, J. 2001. "Picture Arcadia: The Politics of Representation in Vergil's *Eclogues*." *Vergilius* 47: 89-116.

Connors, C. 1992. "Seeing Cypresses in Virgil." *Classical Journal* 88: 1-17.

Conte, G. B. 1992. "Proems in the Middle." *Yale Classical Studies* 29: 147-159.

Cooley, A., ed. 2016a. *A Companion to Roman Italy*. West Sussex.

-----. 2016b. "Coming to Terms with Dynastic Power, 30 BC—AD 69." In *A Companion to Roman Italy*, ed. A. Cooley: 103-120. West Sussex.

Corbett, G. 2015. "Pagan Dawn of a Christian Vision." In *Vertical Readings in Dante's Comedy: Volume 1*, edd. Corbett & Webb: 13-24. Open Book Publishers.

Corbett, G. & H. Webb. 2015-17. *Vertical Readings in Dante's Comedy*, 3 vols. Open Book Publishers.

Cornell, T. & E. Bispham, edd. 2013. *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*. Oxford.

Cornell, T. & K. Lomas., edd. 1997. *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*. London.

Coşkun, A. 2005. "Inklusion und Exklusion von Fremden in den Gerichtsreden Ciceros: zugleich ein Einblick in die Arbeit des Projekts "Roms auswärtige Freunde." In *Corona Coronaria: Festschrift für Hans-Otto Kröner zum 75. Geburtstag*, edd. S. Harwardt & J. Schwind: 77-98. Hildesheim.

Crawford, M. H. 1974. *Roman Republican Coinage*. 2 vol. Cambridge.

-----, ed. 1996. *Roman Statutes*. 2 vols. London.

Crook, J. A., A. Lintott, & E. Rawson, edd. 1994. *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 9, *The Last Age of the Roman Republic, 146-43 B.C.* (2nd ed.). Cambridge.

Dart, C. J. 2009. "The 'Italian Constitution' in the Social War: A Reassessment." *Historia* 58: 215-224.

-----. 2010. "Deceit and the Struggle for Roman Franchise in Italy." In *Public and Private Lies: The Discourses of Despotism and Deceit in the Graeco-Roman World*, edd. A. J. Turner, J. H. Kim On Chongh-Gossard, & F. Vervaet: 91-105. Leiden.

-----. 2014. *The Social War, 91 to 88 BCE: A history of the Italian insurgency against the Roman Republic*. Farnham.

David, E. J. R., ed. 2014. *Internalized Oppression: The Psychology of Marginalized Groups*. New York.

David, E. J. R. & A. O. Derthick. 2014. "What is Internalized Oppression, and So What?" In *Internalized Oppression: The Psychology of Marginalized Groups*, ed. E. J. R. David: 1-30. New York.

Davidson, J. & A. Pomeroy, edd. 2003. *Theatres of Action: Papers for Chris Dearden*. Auckland.

Davis, G. 2012. *Parthenope: The Interplay of Ideas in Vergilian Bucolic*. Leiden.

de Grummond, N. 1990. "Pax Augusta and the Horae on the Ara Pacis Augustae." *American Journal of Archaeology* 94: 663-77.

De Ligt, L. & S. Northwood. 2008. *People, Land, and Politics: Demographic Developments and the Transformation of Roman Italy, 300 BC—AD 14*. Leiden.

Dench, E. 1995. *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples of the Central Apennines*. Oxford.

-----. 1997. "Sacred Spring to the Social War: Myths of Origin and Questions of Identity in the Central Apennines." In *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*, edd. T. J. Cornell & K. Lomas: 43-51. London.

-----. 2005. *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford.

-----. 2013. "Cicero and Roman Identity." In *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, ed. C. Steel: 122-138. Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge.

DeRose Evans, J. 1996. "Bulls on Republican and Early Imperial Coins." *Numismatica e Antichità Classiche: Quaderni Ticinesi* 25: 197-213.

De Sanctis, G. 1976. *La Guerra Sociale: Opera Inedita*, ed. L. Polverini. Florence.

De Vito, A. J. 1951. "Dante's Attitude toward the Italian Cities in *The Divine Comedy*." *Studies in Philology* 48.1: 1-14.

Dick, B. F. 1968. "Ancient Pastoral and the Pathetic Fallacy." *Comparative Literature* 20: 27-44.

Dominik, W. J. 2009. "Vergil's Geopolitics." In *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*, edd. W. J. Dominik, J. Garthwaite, & P. A. Roche: 111-132. Leiden.

Dolvanov, A. 2008. "Constructing Author and Authority: Generic Discourse in Cicero's *De Legibus*." *G&R* Ser. 2, 55: 1: 23-38.

Dominik, W. J., J. Garthwaite & P. A. Roche. 2009. *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*. Leiden.

Dugan, J. 2005. *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*. Oxford.

Dulière, C. 1979. *Lupa romana: Recherches d'Iconographie et Essai d'Interprétation*. Rome.

Dumézil, G. 1996. *Archaic Roman Religion: with an appendix on the religion of the Etruscans*. Trans. P. Krapp. Baltimore, MD.

Dury-Moyaers, G. 1981. *Énée et Lavinium: A propos de découvertes archéologiques récentes*. Brussels.

Dyck, A. R., ed. 2004. *A Commentary on Cicero,* De legibus. Ann Arbor.

Dyson, J. T. 1996. "*Caesi Iuvenci* and *pietas impia* in Virgil." *CJ* 91.3: 277-86.

Earl, D. C. 1961. *The Political Thought of Sallust*. Amsterdam.

Eden, P. T. 1975. *A Commentary on Virgil, Aeneid VIII*. Leiden.

Edmonson, J. & A. Keith. 2008. *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*. Toronto.

Ernout, A. & A. Meillet. 2001. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine : Histoire des mots*. 4th edition. Paris.

Erren, M. 2003. *P. Vergilius Maro*, *Georgica*. 2 vols. Heidelberg.

Esposito, R. 2010. *Communitas. The Origin and Destiny of Community*. Trans. T. Campbell. Originally published in Italian in 1998. Stanford.

Fairclough, H. R., trans. 1916. *Virgil. Eclogue. Georgics. Aeneid 1-6*. Revised by G. P. Goold. Loeb Classical Library 63. Cambridge, MA.

-----, trans. 1918. *Virgil. Aeneid: Books 7-12. Appendix Vergiliana*. Revised by G. P. Goold. Loeb Classical Library 64. Cambridge, MA.

Fantuzzi, M., & T. D. Papanghelis. 2006. *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*. Leiden.

Farney, G. 2007. *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*. Cambridge.

Farney, G. & G. Bradley, edd. 2018. *The Peoples of Ancient Italy*. Berlin.

Farrell, J. 2001. *Latin Language and Latin Culture: From Ancient to Modern Times*. Cambridge.

Farrell, J., & M. C. J. Putnam. 2010. *A Companion to Vergil's* Aeneid *and its Tradition*. West Sussex.

Feeney, D. 1986. 'History and Revelation in Vergil's Underworld.' *PCPhS* 32: 1-24.

Feldherr, A. 1998. *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History.* Berkeley.
< http://ark.cdlib.org/ark:/13030/ft1g500491/ >.

Fletcher, K. F. B. 2014. *Finding Italy: Travel, Colonization, and Nation in Vergil's* Aeneid. Ann Arbor.

Flintoff, E. 1974. "The Setting of Virgil's *Eclogues*." *Latomus* 33: 814-46.

Flower, H. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roma Culture*. Oxford.

Forcey, C., J. Hawthorne, & R. Witcher, edd. *TRAC 1997: Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference, Nottingham 1997*. Oxford.

Forni, P. M. 2009. "Dante between Antiquity and Modernity." *Dante Studies* 127: 55-58.

Fowler, W. W. 1916. "Virgil's Idea of the Tiber." *The Classical Review* 30.8: 219-222.

Fraenkel, E. 1957. *Horace*. Oxford.

Fratantuono, L. M., & R. A. Smith. 2018. *Virgil, Aeneid 8: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Leiden.

Gabba, E. 1976. *Republican Rome, the Army and the Allies*. Trans. P. J. Cuff. Oxford.

-----. 1994. "Rome and Italy: The Social War." In *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 9, *The Last Age of the Roman Republic, 146-43 B.C.* (2nd ed.), edd. J. A. Crook, A. Lintott, & E. Rawson: 104-28. Cambridge.

Galsterer, H. 1976. *Herrschaft und Verwaltung im republikanischen Italien*. Munich.

Gardner, H. H. 2014. "Bees, Ants, and the Body Politic: Vergil's Noric Plague and Ovid's Origin of the Myrmidons." *Vergilius* 60: 3-31.

Gardner, R. 1958. *Cicero. Pro Sestio. In Vatinium*. Loeb Classical Library 309. Cambridge, MA.

Gazzoni, A. 2019, ed. "Mapping Dante: A Study of Places in the *Commedia*." Accessed 25 February 2019. <https://www.mappingdante.com>.

Ghiselli, G. 2005. "Alcuni stili dell'apparire di donne e di uomini nella letteratura antica: *cultus*, *rusticitas*, e *sui neglegentia*." In *Properzio nel genere elegiaco: modelli, motivi, riflessi storici: atti del convegno internazionale: Assisi*, 27-29 *maggio* 2004, edd. C. Santini & F. Santucci (Centro Studi Poesia Latina in Distici Elegiaci, 9): 395-436. Assisi.

Giardina, A. 1997. *L'Italia romana: storie di un'identità incompiuta*. Rome.

Ginsberg, E. K. 1996. *Passing and the Fictions of Identity*. Durham, NC.

Goodenough, W. 1970. *Description and Comparison in Cultural Anthropology*. Cambridge.

Gowers, E. 2000. "Vegetable Love: Virgil, Columella, and Garden Poetry. *Ramus* 29.2: 127-148.

-----. 2011. "Trees and Family Trees in the *Aeneid*." *Classical Antiquity* 30.1: 87-118.

Gray-Fow, M. J. G. 1988. "The Wicked Stepmother In Roman Literature and History: An Evaluation." *Latomus* 47: 741-57.

Greco, M. 2006. *Cultus e Gioco dell'Amore in Ovidio*. Galatina.

Greenough, J. B. 1900. *Vergil. Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics of Vergil*. Boston.

Griffin, J. 1979. "The Fourth Georgic, Virgil, and Rome." *Greece & Rome* 26: 61-80.

Griffith, M., & D. Mastronarde, edd. 1990. *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer*. Atlanta, GA.

Habinek, T. 1990. "Sacrifice, Society, and Vergil's Ox-born Bees." In *Cabinet of the Muses: Essays on Classical and Comparative Literature in Honor of Thomas G. Rosenmeyer*, edd. M. Griffith & D. Mastronarde: 209-23. Atlanta, GA.

-----. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.

Haeussler, R. 2013. *Becoming Roman? Diverging Identities and Experiences in Ancient Northwest Italy*. Walnut Creek, CA.

-----. 2018. "The Galli." In *The Peoples of Ancient Italy*, edd. G. Farney & G. Bradley: 719-754. Berlin.

Hälikkä, R. 2001. "*Sparsis comis, solutis capillis*: Loose Hair in Ovid's Elegiac Poetry." *Arctos* 35: 23-34.

Hall, J. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge.

Halperin, D. M. 1983. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven.

Hardie, P. 2008. "Cosmology and National Epic in the *Georgics* (*Georgics* 2.458-3.48)." In *Vergil's Georgics*, ed. K. Volk: 161-81. Oxford.

Harris, M. 1976. "History and Significance of the Emic/Etic Distinction." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 5: 329-350.

-----. 1979. *Cultural Materialism: The Struggle for a Science of Culture*. New York.

Harris, W. V. 1971. *Rome in Etruria and Umbria.* Oxford.

-----. 2007. "Quando e come l'Italia divenne per la prima volta Italia? Un saggio sulla politica dell'identità." *StudStor* 48: 301-322.

Harrison, S., ed. 1991. *Vergil,* Aeneid *10*. Oxford.

Harvey, Jr., P. B. & C. E. Schultz, edd. 2006. *Religion in Republican Italy*. Cambridge.

Harwardt, S. & J. Schwind, edd. 2005. *Corona Coronaria: Festschrift für Hans-Otto Kröner zum 75. Geburtstag*. Hildesheim.

Henderson, J., ed. 1997 (revised). *Suetonius. Lives of the Caesars, Volume II: Claudius. Nero. Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. Vespasian. Titus, Domitian. Lives of Illustrious Men: Grammarians and Rhetoricians. Poets (Terence. Virgil. Horace. Tibullus. Persius. Lucan). Lives of Pliny the Elder and Passienus Crispus*. Original edition and translation by J. C. Rolfe (1914). Loeb Classical Library 38. Cambridge, MA.

Herring, E. & K. Lomas, edd. 2000. *The Emergence of State Identities in Italy in the First Millennium BC*. Accordia specialist studies on Italy 8. London.

Heseltine, M. & W. H. D. Rouse, trans.. 1913. *Petronius, Seneca. Satyricon. Apocolocyntosis*. Loeb Classical Library 15. Cambridge, MA.

Heslin, P. 2010. "Virgil's 'Georgics' and the Dating of Propertius' First Book." *JRS* 100: 54-68.

Holland, L. A. 1935. "Place Names and Heroes in the *Aeneid*." *AJPh* 56: 202-15.

Hooper, W. D. & H. B. Ash, trans. 1934. *Varro. On Agriculture*. Loeb Classical Library 283. Cambridge, MA.

Hornblower, S., A. Spawforth, & E. Eidinow, edd. 2012. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 4th edition. Oxford.

Horsfall, N. 1971. "Numanus Remulus: Ethnography and Propaganda in *Aen.,* ix, 598f." *Latomus* 30: 1108-16.

-----. 1997. "The Unity of Roman Italy: Some Anomalies." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 16: 71-76.

-----. 2001. "The Unity of Roman Italy: Anomalies in Context" *Scripta Classica Israelica* 20: 39-50.

-----. 2013. *Virgil, Aeneid 6: A Commentary*. Berlin.

Hubbard, T. K. 1998. *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*. Ann Arbor.

Humbert, M. 1978. Municipium et civitas sine suffragio: *L'organisation de la conquête jusqu'à la guerre sociale*. Rome.

Hunter, R. 2006. *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*. Cambridge.

Isaac, B. H. 2004. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. Princeton.

Jansen, L., H. Luijten, and N. Bakker. 2009. *Vincent van Gogh—The Letters: The complete illustrated and annotated edition.* Amsterdam (van Gogh Museum). Accessed online via vangoghletters.org.

Jehne, M, & R. Pfeilschifer, edd. 2006. *Herrschaft ohne Integration? Rom und Italien in republikanischer Zeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Studien zur alten Geschichte 4.

Jenkyns, R. 1989. "Virgil and Arcadia." *Journal of Roman Studies* 79: 26-39.

-----. 1998. *Virgil's Experience: Nature and History, Times, Names, and Places*. Oxford.

Johnson, W. R. 1976. *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's* Aeneid. Chicago.

-----. 1982. "Vergil's Bees: The Ancient Romans' view of Rome." In *Roman Images*, ed. A. M Patterson: 1-22. Baltimore.

-----. 2001. "Imaginary Romans: Vergil and the Illusion of National Identity." In *Poets and Critics Read Vergil*, ed. S. Spence: 3-16. New Haven.

Jones, P. 2009. *Reading Rivers in Roman Literature and Culture*. Oxford.

Kania, R. 2016. *Virgil's Eclogues and the Art of Fiction: A Study of the Poetic Imagination*. Cambridge.

Karakasis, E. 2011. *Song Exchange in Roman Pastoral*. Berlin.

Katz, J. T. 2008. "Vergil Translates Aratus: *Phaenomena* 1-2 and *Georgics* 1.1-2." *MD* 60: 105-123.

Keay, S. and N. Terrenato, edd., 2001. *Italy and the West: Comparative issues in Romanization*. Oxford.

Keith, A. M. 1991. "Etymological Play on *Ingens* in Ovid, Vergil, and Octavia." *AJP* 112: 73-6.

Kendall, S. 2012. "Appian, Allied Ambassadors, and the Rejection of 91: Why the Romans Chose to Fight the *Bellum Sociale*." In *Processes of Integration and Identity Formation in the Roman Republic*, ed. S. T. Roselaar: 105-121. Leiden.

Kennedy, R. F., R. C. Sydnor, & M. L. Goldman. 2013. *Race and Ethnicity in the Classical World: An Anthology of Primary Sources in Translation*. Indianapolis, IN.

Kent, P. A. 2018. "The Italians in Roman Armies." In *The Peoples of Ancient Italy*, edd. G. Farney & G. Bradley: 255-268. Berlin.

Kent, R. G., trans. 1938. *Varro. On the Latin Language. Volume I: Books 5-7*. Loeb Classical Library 333. Cambridge, MA.

Keyes, C. W., trans. 1928. *Cicero. On the Republic. On the Laws.* Loeb Classical Library 213. Cambridge, MA.

Koch, C. 1933. *Gestirnverehrung im alten Italien: Sol Indiges und der Kreis der di Indigetes.* Frankfurt am Main.

Korenjak, M. 2003. "'Tityri sub persona. Der antike Biographismus und die bukolische Tradition.' *Antike und Abendland* 49: 58-79.

Kosso, C., & A. Scott, edd. 2009. *The Nature and Function of Water, Baths, Bathing and Hygiene from Antiquity through the Renaissance*. Leiden.

Kottak, C. P. 2017. *Mirror for Humanity: A Concise Introduction to Cultural Anthropology*. 11th ed. New York.

Kraus, C. S., J. Marincola, & C. B. R. Pelling, edd. 2010. *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in honour of A. J. Woodman*. Oxford.

Krebs, C. B. 2009. "A Seemingly Artless Conversation: Cicero's *De legibus* (1.1-5)." *CP* 104.1: 90-106.

LaFramboise, T., H. L. K. Coleman, & J. Gerton. 1993. "Psychological Impact of Biculturalism: Evidence and Theory." *Psychological Bulletin* 114.3: 395-412.

La Regina, A. 2006. "Roma, l'inganno della Lupa è 'nata' Medioevo." *La Repubblica*: 17. November 2006.

Latte, K. 1960. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. München.

Levene, D. S. & D. P. Nelis, edd. 2002. *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*. Leiden.

Lewis, C. T., & C. Short, edd. 1989. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford.

Lindsay, W. M. 1913. *Sexti Pompei Festi De Verborum Significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*. Leipzig.

Lipka, M. 2001. *Language in Vergil's Eclogues*. Berlin.

Lomas, K. 1997. "Introduction." In *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*, edd. T. Cornell & K. Lomas: 1-8. London.

-----. 2004. "A Volscian Mafia? Cicero and His Italian Clients in the Forensic Speeches." In *Cicero the Advocate*, edd. J. Powell & J. Paterson: 97-116. Oxford.

-----. 2016. "Language and Literacy in Roman Italy." In *A Companion to Roman Italy*, ed. A. Cooley: 217-234. West Sussex.

Lowe, D. 2010. "The Symbolic Value of Grafting in Ancient Rome." *TAPA* 140.2: 461-488.

Luraghi, N. 2002. "Antioco di Siracusa." In *Storici Greci d'Occidente*, ed. R. Vattuone: 55-89: Bologna.

MacKail, J. W. 1912. "Virgil's Use of the Word *Ingens*." *The Classical Review* 26.8: 251-254.

-----, trans. 1934. *Virgil's Works: The Aeneid, Eclogues, Georgics*. New York.

Maltby, R. 1991. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds.

Marchesi, S. 2016. "Dante's Fatherlands." In *Vertical Readings in Dante's Comedy: Volume 2*, edd. G. Corbett & H. Webb: 77-100. Open Book Publishers.

Marincola, J. 2010. "Eros and Empire: Vergdil and the Historians on Civil War." In *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in honour of A. J. Woodman*, edd. C. S. Kraus, J. Marincola, and C. B. R. Pelling: 183-204. Oxford.

McCoskey, D. E. 2012. *Race: Antiquity and its Legacy*. London.

McGushin, P., trans. 1992. *Sallust: The Histories*. Oxford.

Meyers, G. E. 2009. "The Divine River: Ancient Roman Identity and the Image of Tiberinus." In *The Nature and Function of Water, Baths, Bathing and Hygiene from Antiquity through the Renaissance*, edd. C. Kosso & A. Scott: 233-248. Leiden.

Miles, G. B. 1980. *Virgil's Georgics: A New Interpretation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Millar, F. 1995. "The Last Century of the Republic: Whose History?" *JRS* 85: 236-243.

Moch. K. E. 2017. "*Certamen Magnum:* Competition and Song Exchange in Vergil's *Eclogues*." *Vergilius* 63: 63-92.

Momigliano, A. 1966. "Thybris Pater." In *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Storia e letteratura raccolta di studi e testi 109: 609-614.

Morley, N. 2007. "Civil War and Succession Crisis in Roman Beekeeping." *Historia* 56.4: 462-470.

Morstein-Marx, R. 2001. "The Myth of Numidian Origins in Sallust' African Excursus (*Jugurtha* 17.7-18.12)." *AJP* 122.2: 179-200.

Mouritsen, H. 1998. *Italian Unification: A Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. BICS Suppl. 70. London.

Mozley, J. H., trans. 1929. *Ovid. Art of Love. Cosmetics. Remedies for Love. Ibis. Walnut-tree. Sea Fishing. Consolation*. Loeb Classical Library 232. Cambridge, MA.

Muecke, F. 1975. "Virgil and the Genre of Pastoral." *AUMLA: Journal of the Australasian Universities Language & Literature Association* 44: 169-80.

Myers, K. S. 2009. *Ovid. Metamorphoses. Book 14*. Cambridge.

Mynors, R. A. B., ed., 1990. Georgics. Oxford.

Nagle, D. B. 1973. "An Allied View of the Social War." *AJA* 77: 367-378.

Nappa, C. 2005. *Reading after Actium: Vergil's Georgics, Octavian, and Rome*. Ann Arbor.

Nauta, R. R. 2006. "Panegyric in Virgil's *Bucolics*." In In *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*, ed. M. Fantuzzi & T. D. Papanghelis: 301-332. Cambridge.

Nelsestuen, G. A. 2016. "Numanus Remulus, Ascanius, and Cato's *Origines*: The Rhetoric of Ethnicity in *Aeneid* 9." *Vergilius* 62: 79-97.

Nicolet, C. 1980. *The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome*. Trans. P. S. Falla. Berkeley.

Nisbet, R. G. M. 1991. "The Style of Vergil's *Eclogues*." *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 20: 1-14.

Noonan, J. D. 1993. "Daunus/Faunus in *Aeneid* 12." *Classical Antiquity* 12: 111-25.

Noy, D. 1991. "Wicked Stepmothers in Roman Society and Imagination." *Journal of Family History* 16.4: 345-61.

Oakley, S. P. 1997. *A Commentary on Livy: Books VI—X*. Oxford.

Oldfather, C. H., trans. 1939. *Diodorus Siculus. Library of History. Volume III: Books 4.59—8*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA.

Ogilvie, R. M., ed. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy, Books* 1-5. Oxford.

O'Hara, J. J. 1996. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor.

Orlin, L, ed. 1975. *Janus: Essays in Ancient and Modern Studies*. Ann Arbor, MI.

Pallottino, M. 2014. *A History of Earliest Italy*. Routledge Revivals Series. New York & London.

Palmer, R. E. A. 1970. *The Archaic Community of the Romans*. Cambridge.

Paratore, E. 1947. *Le Georgiche*. Verona.

Parry, A. 1963. "The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*." *Arion* 2.4: 66-80.

Patterson, A. M. 1982. *Roman Images*. Baltimore.

-----. 1987. *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valéry*. Berkeley.

Patterson, J. R. 1987. "Crisis, what Crisis? Rural Change and Urban Development in Imperial Apennine Italy." *PBSR* 55: 115-146.

-----. 1988. *Samnites, Ligurians and Romans*. Circello.

-----. 2016. "Local Elites." In *A Companion to Roman Italy*, ed. A. Cooley: 483-497. West Sussex.

Pease, A. S. 1933. "Notes on Ancient Grafting." *TAPA* 64: 66-76.

Peraki-Kyriakidou, H. 2006. "Antonomasia and Metonymy in the Proem to Virgil's *Georgics*." In *What's in a Name? The Significance of Proper Names in Classical Latin Literature*, edd. J. Booth & R. Maltby: 83-99. Swansea.

Perkell, C. G. 1989. *The Poet's Truth: A Study of the Poet in Virgil's Georgics*. Berkeley.

-----. 1990. "On *Eclogue* 1.79-83." *TAPhA* 120: 171-181.

-----. 1996. "The 'Dying Gallus' and the Design of the *Eclogue* 10." *CP* 91 (2): 128-40.

-----. 2001. "Pastoral Value in Vergil: Some instances." In *Poets and Critics Read Vergil*, ed. S. Spence: 26-43. New Haven.

Petrocchi, G., ed. 1967. *La Commedia secondo l'antica vulgata*. Milan.

Philip, C. 2007. *Asian American Identities: Racial and Ethnic Identity Issues in the Twenty-First Century*. Amherst, NY.

Phinney, J. S. 2003. "Ethnic Identity and Acculturation." In *Acculturation: Advances in theory, measurement, and applied research*, edd. K. M. Chun, P. Balls Organista, & G. Marín: 63-81. Washington, D.C.

Pico, T. 2017. *Nature Poem*. Tin House Books: Portland, OR.

Pike, K. 1967. *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*. 2nd ed. The Hague.

Pobjoy, M. 2000. "The First Italia." In *The Emergence of State Identities in Italy in the First Millennium BC*, edd. E. Herring & K. Lomas: 187-211. Accordia specialist studies on Italy 8. London.

Pogorzelski, R. 2009. "The 'Reassurance of Fratricide' in the *Aeneid*." *AJPh* 130.2: 261-289.

Powell, J. & J. Paterson, edd. 2004. *Cicero the Advocate*. Oxford.

Prontera, F. 1992. "Antioco di Siracusa e la preistoria dell'idea etnico-geografica di Italia." *Geographia Antiqua* 1: 109-35.

Prosdocimi, A. L. 1989. 'Le lingue dominanti e i linguaggi locali.' In *Lo spazio litterario di Roma antica. II. La circulazione del testo*: 11-91. Rome.

Purcell, N. 2013. "Rivers and the Geography of Power." *Pallas* 90: 373-387.

Putnam, M. C. J. 1970. *Virgil's Pastoral Art: Studies in the* Eclogues. Princeton.

-----. 1975a. "Italian Virgil and the Idea of Rome." In *Janus: Essays in ancient and modern studies*, ed. L. Orlin: 163-86. Ann Arbor, MI.

-----. 1975b. "Vergil's First *Eclogue*: Poetics of Enclosure." *Ramus* 4: 163-86.

-----. 1979. *Virgil's Poem of the Earth: Studies in the Georgics*. Princeton.

Quint, D. 2018. *Virgil's Double Cross: Design and Meaning in the Aeneid*. Princeton.

Rackham, H., trans. 1914. *Cicero. On Ends*. Loeb Classical Library 40. Cambridge, MA.

-----, trans. 1942. *Cicero. On the Orator: Book 3. On Fate. Stoic Paradoxes. Divisions of Oratory*. Loeb Classical Library 349. Cambridge, MA.

Ramsey, J. T. 2015. *Sallust. Fragments of the Histories. Letters to Caesar*. Loeb Classical Library 522. Cambridge, MA.

Redfield, R., R. Linton, & M. J. Herskovits. 1936. "Memorandum for the Study of Acculturation." *American Anthroplogist* 38.1: 149-152.

Reed, J. D. 2008. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the* Aeneid. Princeton.

-----. 2010. "Vergil's Roman." In *A Companion to Vergil's* Aeneid *and its Tradition*, edd. J. Farrell & M. C. J. Putnam: 66-79. West Sussex.

Ridley, R. T. 2003. "The Contradictory Revolution: The Italian War (91-89 BC)." In *Ancient History: Resources for Teachers* 33: 31-57.

Rolfe, J. C., trans. 1927. *Gellius. Attic Nights, Volume II: Books 6—13*. Loeb Classical Library 200. Cambridge, MA.

Roselaar, S. T., ed. 2012. *Processes of Integration and Identity Formation in the Roman Republic*. Leiden.

Ross, D. O. 1980. "*Non Sua Poma*: Varro, Virgil, and Grafting." *Illinois Classical Studies* 5:63-71.

-----. 1987. *Virgil's Elements: Physics and Poetry in the Georgics*. Princeton.

Rudd, N. 1976. *Lines of Enquiry: Studies in Latin Poetry*. Cambridge.

Rumpf, L. 1999. "Bukolische Nomina bei Vergil und Theokrit: Zur poetischen Technik des Eklogenbuchs." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 142: 157-75.

Russell, D. A., trans. 2002. *Quintilian. The Orator's Education, Volume I: Books 1-2*. Loeb Classical Library 124. Cambridge, MA.

Rutter, N. K., ed. 2001. *Historia Numorum. Italy*. London.

Sabbatucci, D. 1988. *La religione di Roma antica: Dal calendario festivo all'ordine cosmico*. Milan.

Salat, P. 1983. "Un mître-mot chez Virgile, l'adjectif ingens." *Annales Latini Montium Arvernorum* 10: 71-84.

Salmon, E. T. 1962. "The Cause of the Social War." *Phoenix* 16: 107-119.

-----. 1967. *Samnium and the Samnites*. Cambridge.

-----. 1982. *The Making of Roman Italy*. London.

Santangelo, F. 2018. 'The Social War.' In *The Peoples of Ancient Italy*, ed. G. Farney and G. Bradley: 231-253. Berlin.

Saunders, T. 2008. *Bucolic Ecology: Virgil's* Eclogues *and the Environmental Literary Tradition*. London.

Scheid, J. 2007. "Sacrifices for Gods and Ancestors." In *A Companion to Roman Religion*, ed. J. Rupke: 263-73. Malden, MA.

Schmidt, E. A. 1972. *Poetische Reflexion: Vergils Bukolik*. Münich.

-----. 1975. "Arkadien: Abendland und Antike." *Abendland und Antike* 21: 36-57.

-----. 2008. "Arcadia: Modern Occident and Classical Antiquity." Translation of Schmidt 1975, trans. B. Schmidt. In *Vergil's Eclogues*, ed. K. Volk: 16-47.

Schoder, R. 1949. "Vergil in the Divine Comedy." *CJ* 44.7: 413-422.

Schultz, C. E. 2006. "Juno Sospita and Roman Insecurity in the Social War." In *Religion in Republican Italy*, edd. P. B. Harvey, Jr. & C. E. Schultz: 207-227. Cambridge.

Schwartz, S. J., D. Birman, V. Benet-Martínez, & J. B. Unger. 2017. "Biculturalism: Negotiating Multiple Cultural Streams." In *The Oxford Handbook of Acculturation and Health*, edd. S. J. Schwartz & J. Unger: 30-40. Oxford.

Schwartz, S. J. & J. Unger, edd. 2017a. *The Oxford Handbook of Acculturation and Health*. Oxford.

Schwartz, S. J. & J. B. Unger. 2017b. "Acculturation and Health: State of the Field and Recommended Directions." In *The Oxford Handbook of Acculturation and Health*, edd. S. J. Schwartz & J. Unger: 1-14. Oxford.

Schwartz, S. J. & B. L. Zamboanga. 2008. "Testing Berry's Model of Acculturation: A confirmatory latent class approach." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 14.4: 275-285.

Scopacasa, R. 2016. "Rome's Encroachment on Italy." In *A Companion to Roman Italy*, ed. A. Cooley: 35-56. West Sussex.

Segal, C. 1965. "*Tamen Cantabitis Arcades*—Exile and Arcadia in *Eclogues* 1 and 9." *Arion* 4.2: 237-266.

Seng, H. 1999. *Vergils Eklogenbuch: Aufbau, Chronologie, und Zahlenverhältnisse*. Hildesheim.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R., ed., trans. 2002. *Cicero. Letters to Quintus and Brutus. Letter Fragments. Letter to Octavian. Invectives. Handbook of Electioneering*. Loeb Classical Library 462. Cambridge, MA.

Sherwin-White, A. N. 1973. *The Roman Citizenship*. Oxford.

Smith, A. 1986. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford.

Smith, W. 1895. *Dictioary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*. London.

Snell, B. 1945. "Arkadien: Die Entdeckung einer geistigen Landschaft." *Antike und Abendland* 1: 26-31.

-----. 1953. "Arcadia: The Discovery of a Spiritual Landscape." In *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought*, trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer. Cambridge, MA.

Social Science Research Council. 1954. "Acculturation: An Exploratory Formulation." *American Anthropologist* 56.6: 973-1000.

Solodow, J. B. 1986. "*Ravcae, tva cvra, palvmbes*: Study of a Poetic Word Order." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90: 129-153.

Sonnenschein, E. A. 1897. '*Sabellus*: Sabine or Samnite?' *The Classical Review* 11.7: 339-440.

Spence, S., ed. 2001. *Poets and Critics Read Vergil*. New Haven.

Spofford, E. W. 1981. *The Social Poetry of the Georgics*. New York.

Steel, C., ed. 2013. *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*. Cambridge Companion to Literature. Cambridge.

Stok, F. 2013. "*Triunviri agris dividendis*: una leggenda virgiliana." *Argos* 36.1: 9-27.

Sydenham, E. A. 1952. *The Coinage of the Roman Republic*. London.

Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. 1939.

Tarrant, R., ed. 2012. *Virgil. Aeneid. Book XII*. Cambridge.

Tataranni, F. 2005. "Il toro, la lupa e il guerriero: l'immagine marziale dei Sanniti nella monetazione degli insorti italici durante la guerra sociale (90-88 a.C.)" *Athenaeum* 93.1: 291-304.

Terrenato, N. 1998. "The Romanization of Italy: Global acculturation or cultural bricolage?" in C. Forcey, J. Hawthorne & R. Witcher, edd., *TRAC* 97: 20-7. Oxford.

Thibodeau, P. 2011. *Playing the Farmer: Representations of Rural Life in Vergil's Georgics*. Berkeley.

Thomas, R. 1983. "Callimachus, the Victoria Berenices, and Roman Poetry." *CQ* 33: 92-113.

-----, ed. 1988a. *Georgics* (2 vol.). Cambridge.

-----. 1988b. "Tree Violation and Ambivalence in Virgil." *TAPA* 118: 261-73.

-----. 1991. "The 'sacrifice' at the end of the *Georgics*, Aristaeus, and Virgilian Closure." *Classical Philology* 86: 211-18.

Thomas, Y. 1996. Origine *et* Commune Patrie*: Étude de droit public romain (89 av. J.-C.-212 ap. J.-C.).* Collection de L'École Française de Rome 221. Rome.

Toll, K. 1991. "The *Aeneid* as an Epic of National Identity: *Italian laeto socii clamore salutant*." *Helios* 18: 3-14.

-----. 1997. "Making Roman-ness and the *Aeneid*." *ClAnt* 16.1: 34-56.

Toner, J. 2015. "Barbers, Barbershops, and Searching for Roman Popular Culture." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 83: 91-109.

Torelli, M. 1999. *Tota Italia*: *Essays in the cultural formation of Roman Italy*. Oxford.

Torino, G. C., D. P. Rivera, C. M. Capodilupo, K. L. Nadal, & D. W. Sue, edd. 2019. *Microaggression Theory: Influence and Implications*. Hoboken, NJ.

-----. 2019. "Everything You Wanted to Known About Microaggressions but Didn't Get a Chance to Ask." In *Microaggression Theory: Influence and Implications*: 3-15. Hoboken, NJ.

Trundle, M. F. 2003. "Camilla and the Volscians: Historical Images in *Aeneid* 11." In *Theatres of Action: Papers for Chris Dearden*, edd. J. Davidson & A. Pomeroy: 165-186. Auckland.

Turner, A. J., . H. Kim On Chongh-Gossard, & F. Vervaet., edd. 2010. *Public and Private Lies: The Discourses of Despotism and Deceit in the Graeco-Roman World*. Leiden.

Tweedie, F. C. 2012. "The *Lex Licinia Mucia* and the *Bellum Italicum*." In *Processes of Integration and Identity Formation in the Roman Republic*, ed. S. T. Roselaar: 123-39. Leiden.

Uden, J. 2011. "Codeswitches in Caesar and Catullus." *Antichthon: Journal of the Australasian Society for Classical Studies* 45: 113-130.

Untermann, J. 2000. *Wörterbuch des Oskish-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg.

Urso, G. 2008. *Patria Diversis Gentibus Una? Unità, politica e identità etniche nell'Italia antica*. Convegni della Fondazione Niccolò Canussio 7. Pisa.

Van Sickle, John. 1978. *The Design of Virgil's Bucolics*. Rome.

Vattuone, R., ed. 2002. *Storici Greci d'Occidente*. Bologna.

Verkuyten, M. J. A. M. 2005. "Ethnic Group Identification and Group Evaluation Among Minority and Majority Groups: Testing the Multiculturalism Hypothesis." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88.1: 121.

Vetter, E. 1945. "Di Novensiles Di Indigetes." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 62: 1-32.

Volk, K., ed. 2008. *Vergil's Eclogues*. Oxford Readings in Classical Studies. Oxford.

-----. 2008b. *Vergil's* Georgics. Oxford.

von Albrecht, M. 2010. "Presenza dell'Italia nelle opere di Virgilio." *Aevum Antiquum* 10: 3-11.

Vonnegut, K. 1973. *Breakfast of Champions*. New York.

Wagenvoort, H. 1947. *Roman Dynamism: Studies in Ancient Roman Thought, Language, and Custom*. Oxford.

Wallace, R. 2004. 'Sabellian Languages.' In *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*, ed. R. D. Woodard: 812-839. Cambridge.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.

Watson, P. A. *Ancient Stepmothers: Myth, Misogyny, and Reality*. Leiden.

-----. 2001. "Parody and Subversion in Ovid's *Medicamina faciei femineae*." *Mnemosyne* 54.4: 457-71.

Weeda, L. 2015. *Vergil's Political Commentary in the Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid*. Berlin.

Weinstock, S. M. 1971. *Divus Iulius*. Oxford.

White, H., trans. 1913. *Appian. Roman History, Volume III & IV: The Civil Wars*. Loeb Classical Library 5. Cambridge, MA.

Wilkinson, L. P. 1966. "Virgil and the Evictions." *Hermes* 94: 320-324.

-----. 2008. "Pindar and the Proem to the Third *Georgic*." In *Vergil's Georgics*, ed. K. Volk: 182-88. Oxford.

Wilson-Okamura, D. S., trans. 1996. *Aelius Donatus: Life of Vergil*. Revised 2005, 2008, 2014. Accessed 27 February 2019. <www.virgil.org/vitae/a-donatus.htm>.

Winterbottom, M. 1976. "Virgil and the Confiscations." *Greece and Rome* 23: 55-59.

Wiseman, T. P. 1969. "The Census in the First Century BC." *JRS* 59: 59-75.

-----. 1971. *New Men in the Roman Senate, 139 B.C.—A.D. 14*. Oxford.

Wissowa, G. 1904. *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur römischen Religions- und Stadtgeschichte: Ergänzungsband zu des Verfassers 'Religion und Kultus der Römer'*. München.

-----. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. München.

Woolf, G. 1998. *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge.

Wright, J. R. G. 1983. "Virgil's Pastoral Programme: Theocritus, Callimachus, and *Eclogue* 1." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 29: 107-160.

Zavaroni, A. 2006. "Osservazioni su lares e di Indigetes." *Grazer Beiträge* 25: 181-99.