

VORWORT

Der vorliegende Band umfasst Beiträge zu dem gleichnamigen Symposium, das am 15. und 16. November 2018 an der Bergischen Universität Wuppertal stattgefunden hat.

Als „Erfinder“ der Bukolik ist Theokrit in der Literaturgeschichte berühmt und steht am Anfang einer langen Gattungstradition, die von seinen griechischen Nachfolgern über den zweiten „Erfinder“ Vergil bis in die Neuzeit und darüber hinaus reicht. Ein Geheimnis für den anhaltenden Erfolg besteht zum einen in der weitgehenden Zeitlosigkeit der im engeren Sinne bukolischen Stücke sowie auch in der zum Teil bewussten Uneindeutigkeit, welche zusammen Theokrits Gedichte für alle Arten von Interpretationen, Adaptionen und Imitationen offen machten. Wie Theokrit selbst in seinen Gedichten ganz unterschiedliche Gattungen und Traditionen verband und seinen Absichten anpasste, wurde auch er oft später benutzt und in neue Kontexte eingebunden, sei es als kleines Versatzstück oder als großflächige strukturelle Vorlage. Theokrit gehört deshalb – leider im Widerspruch zu seiner Wahrnehmung außerhalb der Philologie – im wahrsten Sinne zu den „Trends in Classics“, um den Titel einer bekannten Reihe zu zitieren. Man könnte hier etwa auf die Sammelbände „Brill’s Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral“ von Marco Fantuzzi und Theodore Papanghelis aus dem Jahr 2006, „Pastoral Palimpsests“ von Michael Paschalis aus dem Jahr 2007, „Bukoliasmos“ von Irene M. Weiss und Helmut Seng aus dem Jahr 2016 und schließlich „Présence de Théocrite“ von Christophe Cusset, Christine Kossaiï und Rémy Poignault aus dem Jahr 2017 hinweisen.

In all diesen Bänden ist der Aspekt der Rezeption und Intertextualität sehr wichtig. Und natürlich ist der einfachste Weg, intertextuelle Beziehungen zu erkennen, die Rezeption in den Sprachen zu studieren, in denen auch der Prätext geschrieben worden ist. Im Fall Theokrits ist dies natürlich das Griechische, doch wenn man die kulturelle Einheit der beiden Sprachsphären in der römischen Kaiserzeit betrachtet, ist dies ebenso Latein. Die Beiträge des vorliegenden Bandes beschränken sich daher auf die Theokritrezeption in zwei besonderen Perioden, in denen Griechisch und Latein als zentrale und beinahe gleichberechtigte Medien des intellektuellen Diskurses angesehen worden sind: die römische Kaiserzeit (nach Vergil) und die frühe Neuzeit. Es versteht sich von selbst, dass die Beiträge und dieser Band natürlich nicht erschöpfend sind. So hätte man etwa auch noch Theokrit in der spätgriechischen Epik, bei christlichen Dichtern wie Gregor von Nazianz oder griechische Übersetzungsversuche der vergilischen *Eklogen* in den Blick nehmen können. Dennoch werden ausgewählte wichtige Aspekte berührt.

Die Beiträge wurden zu drei thematischen Sektionen zusammengefasst. Die erste Sektion mit dem Titel „Ἄδῃ τι τὸ ψιθῦρισμα – Theokritspuren in nachvergi-

lischer Literatur der Kaiserzeit“ umfasst drei Beiträge von Anne-Elisabeth Beron, Valeria Pace und Hamidou Richer zu Theokriteischem bei Calpurnius Siculus, im Hirtenroman des Longos und bei anderen Prosaautoren der Kaiserzeit.

Die zweite Sektion „Ἀρχετέ βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ’ αἰοιδᾶς – Rezeption griechischer Bukolik im 16. Jahrhundert“ mit drei Beiträgen von John Van Sickle, Christian Orth und Thomas Gärtner nimmt besonders die Rezeption Theokrits und der anderen griechischen Bukoliker in der Literatur des Reformationszeitalters in den Blick. Konkret geht es um Texte von Eobanus Hessus, Henri Estienne, Joachim Camerarius und Lorenz Rhodoman.

Die Beiträge von Stefan Weise und William Barton schließlich bilden die dritte Sektion „Λήγετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι, ἴτε λήγετ’ αἰοιδᾶς – Griechische Bukolik aus dem 17. und 18. Jahrhundert“. In ihnen wird der Theokritrezeption in griechischen Gedichten von Johann Gottfried Herrichen und Adam Franz Kollár nachgegangen. Beschlossen wir der Band durch ein zusammenfassendes „Afterword“ Richard Hunters.

Die Beschränkung in den zwei letzten Sektionen vornehmlich auf den deutschen Sprachraum hat rein pragmatische Gründe und möge dazu einladen, Theokriteisches auch in den „neuklassischen“ Literaturen, das heißt der neualt griechischen und neulateinischen Literatur, der anderen europäischen und außereuropäischen Länder zu untersuchen, um so das angeschnittene Panorama zu vervollständigen. Auch die zeitliche Beschränkung bis in 18. Jahrhundert ist nicht final zu verstehen: Natürlich gibt es Theokritrezeption auch noch ab dem 19. Jahrhundert! Verwiesen sei hier nur auf Harry C. Schnurs Scherzartikel „Ein neuentdecktes Theokrit-Fragment“ (in: *Tournoy/Sacré, Pegasus devocatus*. Leuven 1992, 230).

Bei der Vorbereitung des Bandes haben uns viele unterstützt. Bedanken wollen wir uns vor allem für die Finanzierung beim Graduiertenkolleg 2196 „Dokument – Text – Edition“ und der Fakultät für Geistes- und Kulturwissenschaften der Bergischen Universität Wuppertal. Weiterhin bedanken wir uns herzlich bei Christoph Schubert für die Durchsicht und Aufnahme des Bandes in die Reihe „Palingenesia“ sowie beim Franz Steiner Verlag für die hervorragende Betreuung. Bei der Erstellung der Druckfassung haben uns Sofie Auer und Christopher Loga geholfen.

HINWEIS ZUR BENUTZUNG

Die Kürzel für die Zitation griechischer Autoren der Antike folgen „A Greek-English Lexicon“ von Liddell/Scott/Jones, diejenigen für die Zitation lateinischer Autoren dem *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*. In englischen Aufsätzen erfolgt die Zitation mit Punkt zwischen Buch, Kapitel, Abschnitt oder Vers (bspw. Theoc. 1.1), in deutschsprachigen mit Komma (bspw. Theoc. 1,1). Abkürzungen von altertumswissenschaftlichen Zeitschriften entsprechen denen der *Année philologique*.

ΑΔΥ ΤΙ ΤΟ ΨΙΘΥΡΙΣΜΑ

THEOKRITSPUREN IN NACHVERGILISCHER LITERATUR
DER KAISERZEIT

STANDING IN TITYRUS' SHADOW

Theocritus in the First and Fourth *Eclogue*
of Calpurnius Siculus

Anne-Elisabeth Beron (Wuppertal/Heidelberg)

Abstract: Whereas the Virgilian traits of the Neronian pastoral poet Calpurnius Siculus have already been examined in great detail, less attention has been given to the imitation of Theocritus, especially in the political *Eclogues* 1, 4 and 7. This paper seeks to display for *Eclogue* 1 and 4 Calpurnius' relationship to both Virgil and Theocritus in three passages (Calp. *ecl.* 1.4f.; 1.8–12; 4.58–65), two of them probably linked by the god Faunus: The Virgilian *Hyblaea avena* (Calp. *ecl.* 4.63) and its sweet tune (Calp. *ecl.* 4.61) will be explained by the Theocritean programmatic sweetness of Theoc. 1.1f.; furthermore, the Theocritean features of the Virgilian beech-tree (Calp. *ecl.* 1.11f.) will be uncovered, as it is adorned with a spring like the pine in Theoc. 1.2, while fulfilling with *implicare* a Theocritean action (Theoc. 1.52). Yet, it will be argued, that Calpurnius uses Theocritus primarily to demonstrate the latter's influence on Virgil and only secondary on himself.

I. THEOCRITUS IN CALPURNIAN SCHOLARSHIP

As the newest edition of the Neronian¹ pastoral poet Calpurnius Siculus states, scholars have outlined two possible scenarios for the poet's imitation of Theocritus:² Some find a myriad of common motifs and verbal citations – those attempts are marked as “exaggerated” by editor Vinchesi –,³ while others deny the use of the Theocritean oeuvre in Calpurnius altogether and select Virgil as the one and only model.⁴ Several papers dealing with the Theocritean model in the *merae bucolicae*, i.e. those of Calpurnius' *Eclogues* displaying a pastoral world with shep-

1 The *communis opinio* of the Neronian date for Calpurnius Siculus will not be challenged. For a thorough discussion, cf. Vinchesi 2014: 15–20 and Di Salvo 1990: 27–34 (with a focus on *Eclogue* 7). For a comprehensive bibliography on the Neronian date cf. Karakasis 2011: 36 n. 183 und 2016, 1f. n. 2.

2 Vinchesi 2014: 35. Cf. also Vinchesi 1996: 42.

3 Vinchesi 2014: 35 n. 99 cites especially Messina 1975: 33–62, who is criticized by Gagliardi 1975: 278 and 1984: 83 n. 1 as well. Not exactly exaggerated, but overly thorough is the list of bucolic generic markers starting with Theocritus given by Karakasis 2016: 7f.

4 Williams 1978: 151 n. 165; Gagliardi 1984: 13 n. 17, 37 n. 31 and 34; Halperin 1983: 3; Hubbard 1996: 72 n. 19; Hubbard 1998: 156 n. 28.

herds, their song-contests and their daily chores, confirm in general, that Calpurnius made use to whatever extent of the founder of the genre.⁵

If one is, however, looking for traces of Theocritus in the so-called political *Eclogues* of Calpurnius, namely poems 1, 4 and 7,⁶ there is no vast bibliography to start from.⁷ Moreover, a glimpse into the thorough *index auctorum, imitatorum, locorum similium* of Heinrich Schenkl's 1885 edition reveals the reason why: For *Eclogue* 1 and 7 Schenkl lists no parallels to Theocritus, for *Eclogue* 4 just one.⁸ That does, of course, not mean that there are virtually no Theocritean echoes in Calpurnius' political poems, although it seems that Theocritus is standing here definitely in Virgil's shadow, who can be found in Schenkl's index with so many parallels one is likely to give up counting.

Since Calpurnius is, however, very conscious of matters of literary succession and imitation, especially in the first and fourth *Eclogue*, one has to suspect him dealing there with the Theocritean model as well and not only in the *merae bucolicae*. This focus on a "generic consciousness"⁹ in the political, one might even say in comparison less pastoral *Eclogues* is linked to the recurrence of a character, namely the shepherd Corydon, behind whom the reader can recognize the author Calpurnius himself.¹⁰ Of course, a total equation between the historical Calpurnius – whoever he might be – and the literary character Corydon is not suggested here, although it is safe to assume a principal agreement in topics such as the praise for emperor Nero, the literary succession and the reflection about the work as a poet and the own poetics.¹¹ As Corydon is only developing from the everyday pastoral singer to an ambitious panegyric, yet bucolic poet with the high hopes of admittance to Nero's court in *Eclogue* 4, he gives the afore-mentioned topics a great deal of consideration in this poem. Therefore, *Eclogue* 4 seems a good starting point for the search for the Theocritean model beyond the *merae bucolicae*.

Naturally, previous scholarship has long uncovered the overt allusion to Theocritus in *Eclogue* 4.60–63, but never bothered with some details like the fact that

5 For the *merae bucolicae*, Theocritean motifs are highlighted e.g. in Paladini 1956: 529–531; Friedrich 1976: 171–174 (a useful overview, although not every passage cited might be a genuine intertext for Calpurnius); Leach 1975: 213; Di Salvo 1990b: 275f.; Vinchesi 1996: 42–45; Mayer 2006: 462; Becker 2012: 32–39. For Calpurnius' modelling on and developing of Theocritean motifs, especially in *Eclogues* 3 and 6, cf. e.g. Vinchesi 1991, Baraz 2015 and Karakasis 2016: 123–154, 223–250.

6 For the structure of the Calpurnian book of *Eclogues* cf. e.g. Korzeniewski 1972 and Friedrich 1976: 12–15.

7 In *Eclogues* 1, 4 and 7 Theocritean traces are uncovered by e.g. Paladini 1956: 530, Di Salvo 1990: 41 and Vinchesi 1996: 43f. and 2014: 36f. For *Eclogue* 1 cf. primarily Fritzsche 1903: 4–6 as well as Davis 1987: 39, 53 n. 38; for *Eclogue* 4 cf. Esposito 1996: 29.

8 Furthermore, even Friedrich 1976: 171–174 in his useful index of Theocritean parallels does not give examples for the political *Eclogues*.

9 This term is used by Karakasis 2016: 23 in regard of Calpurnius' and Virgil's imitation of the pastoral predecessor(s).

10 Cf. e.g. Friedrich 1976: 152f.; Langholf 1990: 356f.; Schröder 1994: 21–29. See chapter II.1.

11 Schröder 1991: 25.

Corydon evokes the Syracusan Theocritus through the city of Hybla. Furthermore, the occurrence of Faunus next to the originally Theocritean pipes never received any comment. Here, it is argued that the pastoral god might function as a link back to *Eclogue* 1, where Calpurnius offers his reader a more subtle allusion to the founder of the genre via a wood of pine-trees (Calp. *ecl.* 1.9f.), which he transplanted from the first *Idyll* right into his first *Eclogue*. Again, as scholarship has deciphered this botanical reference before, there is still space for some further remarks, that show how Calpurnius took great efforts to intertwine Theocritean and Virgilian pastoral poetry. Finally, an answer to the question will be attempted, why Theocritus serves as a less dominant role model than Virgil in the political *Eclogues*.

II. LITERARY SUCCESSION IN THE FOURTH *ECLOGUE*

II.1. Virgil

By the fourth *Eclogue*, the shepherd Corydon, the poet's alias, attempts his own song praising the Neronian golden age, after he has heard a prophecy of similar content by the god Faunus in *Eclogue* 1.¹² In regard of this new task, he is discussing with his patronus Meliboeus¹³ the conditions of a poet's life, the plans for his career and in the following passage especially the topic of literary succession, more precisely his role model (Calp. *ecl.* 4.58–65):

- C. [...]forsitan illos
*experiar calamos, here quos mihi doctus Iollas
 donavit dixitque: "truces haec fistula tauros
 conciliat nostroque sonat dulcissima Fauno.
 Tityrus hanc habuit, cecinit qui primus in istis
 montibus Hyblaea modulabile carmen avena."*
- M. *Magna petis, Corydon, si Tityrus esse laboras.
 ille fuit vates sacer [...]*

12 Calpurnius makes this influence very clear through verbal echoes, because Corydon's plan for his new song 4.5–8 (*carmina iam dudum, non quae nemorale resulent, / volvimus, o Meliboe; sed haec, quibus aurea possint / saecula cantari, quibus et deus ipse canatur, / qui populos urbesque regit pacemque togatam*) is obviously repeating a defining quality of Faunus' prophecy 1.29 (*nihil armentale resultat*) and a crucial piece of its content 1.46 (*dum populos deus ipse reget*). On that cf. Schröder 1991: 24, 75 (*ad* 4.5: *carmina iam dudum, non quae nemorale resulent*), Garthwaite/Martin 2009: 317 and Stöckinger 2017: 295.

13 As Corydon is the poet's mask, the *patronus* is clearly modelled on a historical person due to his precise literary achievements (4.53–57), his acquaintance with the emperor and his political influence (4.158f.) and due to his positive evaluation of Corydon's, i.e. Calpurnius' poetical skills (4.147–151) after a sceptical assessment in the beginning (4.64–69, 73–77). Surely, a contemporary reader was able to unmask Meliboeus, even if it is today not possible anymore (cf. Schubert 1998: 72 with n. 94; Calpurnius Piso or Seneca are not entirely satisfactory suggestions, cf. Schröder 1991: 30–32 pointing to Friedrich 1976: 242 n. 100). Contra Schröder 1994: 32–24 (following Leach 1973: 65; approval from Merfeld 1999: 84 n. 2), who argues for a fictional character.

C. I might make trial of those reeds which skilful Iollas presented to me yesterday with the words, "This pipe wins over savage bulls, and makes sweetest melody to our own Faunus. It once was owned by Tityrus, who among these hills of yours was the first to sing his tuneful lay on the Hyblaeon pipe."

M. You aim high, Corydon, if you strive to be Tityrus. He was a bard inspired...¹⁴

Corydon wants to use his brand-new pipes, yesterday's gift from a *doctus Iollas*,¹⁵ who also told him of the previous owner, a certain Tityrus. Tityrus was the first singer in this mountainous realm of shepherds (4.62f.: *cecinit qui primus in istis / montibus*) with his special pipes (4.59: *illos calamos* = 4.60: *haec fistula* = 4.63: *Hyblaea avena*)¹⁶, who – being a *vates sacer* (4.65) – cannot easily (4.64: *magna petis [...] laboras*) be reached by others. Later in the poem, Tityrus is said to have had a patronus, who introduced him to the emperor's court (4.160–162); furthermore, after having finished his pastoral poems, Tityrus apparently has written about *rura* and finally about *arma* (4.162f.). With this kind of information, Tityrus is easily identified as Virgil, who himself uses the character Tityrus as a *πρόσωπον* in his first and sixth *Eclogue*.¹⁷ In addition, Virgil gives in *Eclogue* 6

14 The Latin text is based on Vinchesi 2014, the translations are taken from Duff/Duff 1935. Other Latin authors are cited according to the editions indicated in the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*.

15 According to Friedrich 1976: 66f. and Schröder 1991: 119 (*ad* 4,59) Iollas is appearing here because in Virgil he has a superior position: in *Verg. ecl.* 2.57 he is the master of Alexis, whom Corydon is fancying; in *ecl.* 3.76, 79 he could be the master of the two shepherds as well (cf. Coleman 1977: 119 [*ad Verg. ecl.* 3.76]). Maybe, however, Calpurnius chose him since Corydon and Iollas are occurring together in Virgil's second *Eclogue*. It is impossible, though, to detect if Iollas is meant as a mask for a historical person (cf. Hubbard 1996: 81 and 1998: 169). Of course, there have been attempts of unmasking, e.g. Herrmann 1952: 38f. and Verdière 1954: 58. For criticism of an extensive unmasking-process cf. Schröder 1991: 24f.

16 Although the pipes are denoted as *calami*, *fistula* and *avena*, there is no hint that one should think of different instruments, which is clearly visible in the case of *haec fistula* (4.60) taking up *illos calamos* (4.58f.); the change of the pronoun of the third (*illos*) to the one of the first person (*haec*) might be explained in the following way: whereas Iollas was talking to Corydon yesterday, he was also presenting the clearly visible pipes (therefore *haec fistula*) – Corydon, however, is now referring to his future play on those pipes, which he has not yet unpacked as he is waiting for Meliboeus' approval (therefore *illos calamos*). All three pipe-words are applicable to the shepherd's flute known as panpipes (ThLL 2, s.v. *avena*, 1309, 39; ThLL 3, s.v. *calamus* II.A, 124, 26; ThLL 6,1, s.v. *fistula* II.D.2, 829, 79sq.). These nouns describe, however, different features of the same instrument: *calamus* and *avena* comprise an originally metonymical definition of what the instrument is made (*calamus* = reed, originally a Greek word; *avena* = oats, roughly another type of reed), while the plural *calami* underlines the connection of multiple reeds to achieve the form of panpipes (cf. Schröder 1991: 89 [*ad* 4,19: *calamos*]; contra Mahr 1963: 35f.).

17 Cf. Schröder 1991: 22, 121 (*ad* 4,62: *Tityrus hanc habuit*) with further bibliographical remarks. A separation is necessary between the poet Tityrus and a homonymous character occurring in Calp. *ecl.* 3.19, 74, 97, who is fulfilling only minor tasks. The same applies to Virgil, who features another Tityrus (*Verg. ecl.* 3.20, 96; 5.12; 8.55; 9.23f.): most of the ancient commentaries do not identify him with the poet. Therefore, even Virgil – followed by Calpurnius – did not use Tityrus always as the *πρόσωπον* for himself (cf. Schröder 1991: 121f.; cf. also Schmidt 1972: 122).

even a hint to merge Tityrus at least with the literary self.¹⁸ Therefore, if the shepherd Corydon wants to compete with the poet (*vates*¹⁹) Tityrus/Virgil, which is hard work according to his *patronus* (4.64), this is a clear hint that Corydon stands for Calpurnius' literary self.

In the end, Calpurnius easily lets the reader detect the literary succession of Virgil via the allegorization of Corydon and Tityrus. Furthermore, he exemplifies the Virgilian role model through verbal echoes from the *Eclogues*: e.g. *experiar calamos* (Calp. *ecl.* 4.59) tracing back to *carmina* [...] / *experiar* (Verg. *ecl.* 5.14f.), *in istis montibus* (Calp. *ecl.* 4.62f.) back to *montibus in nostris* (Verg. *ecl.* 5.8), *donavit dixitque* (Calp. *ecl.* 4.60) back to *dedit olim / et dixit* (Verg. *ecl.* 2.37f.).²⁰

Moreover, the poet even evaluates the Virgilian literary filiation and his own position in the genre: Since Corydon's pipes were given him only yesterday (4.59: *here*), we might deduce that Calpurnius is not an established poet, but a newcomer. His pipes belonged to Tityrus before, who was the first to play on them in Corydon's mountainous realm (4.62f.: *cecinit qui primus in istis / montibus*). Because Corydon is primarily a fictional character in a pastoral poem, his mountains could be interpreted as pastoral poetry,²¹ so Tityrus is portrayed as the first Latin pastoral poet. Thus, Corydon/Calpurnius as a new poet is proving himself in a genre with history, particularly as the pipes have played the famous second and fourth *Eclogues* of Virgil (Calp. *ecl.* 4.75f.: *si quando laudat Alexin*; Calp. *ecl.* 4.76f.: *canales / et preme, qui dignas cecinerunt consule silvas* – cf. Verg. *ecl.* 4.3: *si canimus silvas, silvae sint consule dignae*).

This observation is supported by a similar scene in *Eclogue* 1, where pipes are handed down from one shepherd to another as well:

18 Verg. *ecl.* 6.3f. (*cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem / vellit et admonuit: 'pastorem, Tityre, ...'*). Cf. Schmidt 1972: 122; Langholf 1990: 357 n. 21; Korenjak 2003: 68–70.

19 For *vates* cf. Dahlmann 1948, Newman 1967 und Pierre 2016: 267–279; for the separation from *poeta* cf. Jocelyn 1995; for *vates* in Virgil cf. M. Massenzio, EV 5 (1990), s.v. *vates*, 456–458.

20 These observations are made also by Schröder 1991: 119–125 (there is hardly more in Vinchesi 2014 *ad loc.*). Furthermore, even the fact that Corydon's pipes can calm bulls (4.60f.: *truces haec fistula tauros / conciliat*), might be due to Virgilian influence: in Virgil's seventh *Eclogue*, the cowherd Corydon (!) announces that Galatea is *thymo* [...] *dulcior Hyblae* (Verg. *ecl.* 7.37; cf. Calp. *ecl.* 4.63: *Hyblaea* [...] *avena*) and that she should come to him, *cum primum pasti repetent praesepia tauri* (Verg. *ecl.* 7.39; cf. Calp. *ecl.* 4.60f.). The repetition of *taurus* and the adjective to Hybla in Calpurnius is surely no coincidence. Yet, even only from the point of Calpurnius' book of *Eclogues* it makes sense, that Corydon's new pipes have influence on bulls, as Corydon is tending cows in the first *Eclogue* (1.4: *vaccae*), cf. Schröder 1994: 120 (*ad* 4.60f.).

21 Following Mahr 1963: 109f. and Schröder 1994: 123 (*ad* 4.62f.: *in istis / montibus iste* is used as a pronoun for the first person, not for the second as usual (cf. LHS 2, 184, b), so the connection to Corydon is maintained. Extremely fitting to the identification of *montes* with pastoral poetry would be the etymology of *Musa* derived from *mons*, as proposed by Wackernagel 1953: 1204–1207 (for an overview of modern etymologies cf. Camilloni 1998: 7f.). Ancient etymologists, however, did not refer to that (for their choices cf. ThLL 8, s.v. *musa*, 1691, 32–41 and Camilloni 1998: 5f.).

*nec tibi defuerit mea fistula, quam mihi nuper
matura docilis compegit arundine Ladon.*
(1.17f.)

My pipe, you will find, will not fail you – the pipe that Ladon’s skill fashioned for me lately out of a ripely seasoned reed.

Here, Corydon is announcing his newly obtained pipe (1.16: *nuper*), which Ladon²² made from already fully grown reed (1.17: *matura* [...] *arundine*). Again, the contrast between the established genre through the old pipe or matured material and the young newcomer-poet, who just got his hands on the instrument, is visible.²³ Furthermore, in the first and fourth *Eclogue* the intermediary Ladon or Iollas is displayed as *docilis* (1.17) or *doctus* (4.59), which surely is no coincidence and could allude to the Callimachean ideal of erudite poetry.²⁴

It is quite remarkable, in fact, that the newcomer Corydon/Calpurnius does not receive his new instrument, on which he can start a career in the pastoral poetry, straight from the predecessor Tityrus/Virgil, but only through an intermediary, may he be fictional or not.²⁵ Although in his poetry the debt to Virgil is obvious, Calpurnius might not have wanted to compare his alias directly and therefore in a

- 22 As in the case of Iollas (and Meliboeus), Ladon could be intended as a historical person, whom to unmask is not possible anymore. He can be read, however, as fictional only: This way, there is a strong connection to the tale of Syrinx in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, where the river Ladon conceals the nymph Syrinx in his reeds, so that her suitor Pan cannot reach her and has to make pipes out of the reeds to mend his broken heart. Like the river Ladon is secluding Syrinx in the reeds in the *Metamorphoses*, the peasant Ladon is building a syrinx out of reeds. Calpurnius enforces the link to Ovid especially through the verb *compingere*, as the noun *compago* is featured in the metamorphosis of Syrinx as well (Ov. *met.* 1.711: *atque ita disparibus calamis conpagine cerae*).
- 23 Cf. Wendel 1933: 36f.; Hubbard 1998: 156; Fucecchi 2009: 47; Karakasis 2016: 17. A reference to the established genre is, moreover, detectable in the date given in the first verses of *Eclogue* 1, which show the end of summer and the beginning of autumn, still with a scorching heat (Calp. *ecl.* 1.1–3): As the early autumn functions as a time of ripening, Calpurnius is able to collect the ripened literary fruits of his predecessors, while continuing the mature genre (cf. Karakasis 2016: 15f.). For a more negative interpretation of belatedness cf. Hubbard 1996: 71 and 1998: 154. That Calpurnius’ poetry is, however, something new in genre, is suggested by the tree-inscription with only recently incised and therefore fresh green letters (Calp. *ecl.* 1.22f.: *apicis ut virides etiam nunc littera rimas / servet et arenti nondum se laxet hiatus?*).
- 24 Karakasis 2016: 21.42.46.
- 25 Hubbard 1996: 81 and 1998: 169 connects the handing down of pipes in Calpurnius with a similar scene in Verg. *ecl.* 2.36–39, where Corydon, Virgil’s πρόσωπον (cf. Serv. *ecl.* 2.1), receives his pipes from the dying Damoetas, who announces Corydon as his successor. Since Damoetas is occurring in Theocritus’ sixth *Idyll*, Hubbard treats him as a literary πρόσωπον of the inventor of pastoral poetry and stresses that the pipes are handed down here directly without an intermediary, which means that Virgil saw his poetry closer to his predecessor than Calpurnius did. Note, furthermore, that Calpurnius uses Iollas again as an intermediary in his third *Eclogue*, where he is going to deliver Lycidas’ letter to his alienated girlfriend Phyllis (cf. Hubbard 1996: 81 n. 34 and 1998: 169 n. 43). In the end, the handing down of pipes occurs already in Theoc. 1.128f., namely from Daphnis to Pan.