

Pastoral love and ‘elegiac’ love, from Greece to Rome¹

MARCO FANTUZZI (FLORENCE-MACERATA)

ABSTRACT: Latin elegiac poets often set their dreams of peaceful fulfilment of the passion of love in the countryside. Propertius and Ovid (more than Tibullus) refer to a countryside that has specifically bucolic features. This paper analyses some Greek texts, mainly by the ‘minor bucolic’ poet Bion of Smyrna, that may have given rise to the ideal of bucolic (happy) love.

In poem 2.34 Propertius gives a lesson in poetics to a friend of his, a man of letters known under the pseudonym Lynceus. The latter had attempted, first of all, to betray him with Cynthia (the first thirty lines are dedicated to this subject); but this had happened because he had been under the influence of wine, and therefore he could perhaps be forgiven. However, if Lynceus has this overriding interest in amorous adventures, he is ill-advised to dedicate his efforts to philosophy and epic (or tragedy), and so on: he should, instead, turn his attention to light poetry of a learned kind, like that of Callimachus and Philetas, as this is more attractive to girls. This is what Propertius does, and he reigns sovereign among women at feasts. Proud of this self-appraisal, Propertius compares his own poetic career with that of Virgil, and dedicates a brief but (at least apparently) highly appreciative comment to the *Aeneid* (*nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade*, 66). Immediately afterwards, he starts to speak with particular sympathy about the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*, especially the former (67-74):

tu canis umbrosi subter pineta Galaesi
Thyrsin et attritis Daphnin harundinibus,
utque decem possint corrumpere mala puellas,
missus et impressis haedus ab uberibus.
felix, qui vilis pomis mercaris amores!
huic, licet ingratae, Tityrus ipse canat.
felix intactum Corydon qui temptat Alexin,
agricolae domini carpere delicias!

Propertius’ reappraisal of the *Eclogues* is highly personalised, and freely introduces adaptations. The undoubtedly arbitrary decision to connect Virgil’s *Eclogues* with the banks of the Galaesus, a river near Tarentum, which (though it was mentioned at *Georgics* 4.126) never appeared in the *Eclogues*, is not the only example. Even more revealing, in my opinion, is the relatively arbitrary adaptation whereby the gift of ten apples or a baby lamb as sufficient to conquer the *puellae* derives from the association of various models, not all of which are Virgilian. On the one hand, there is the union of Theocritus *Idyll* 3.10, where the

¹ This paper was first presented at the colloquium ‘Greek and Latin Pastoral’, organised by the School of Classics at the University of Leeds, 25 January 2002. A fuller, annotated version is to be published in Italian in the proceedings of the conference ‘L’officina ellenistica: poesia dotta e popolare in Grecia e a Roma’, held at Trento, 4-6 April 2002. I would to thank the editors of *LICS* and an anonymous referee for their valuable suggestions.

gift of the ten apples was offered to the lady Amaryllis as a prelude to the herdsman's long, fruitless serenade in front of her door, with Virgil's *Eclogue* 3.70f., where Menalcas mentions the gift of ten apples for his extremely obliging *puer* (cf. 66 *mihi sese offert ultro*). On the other, there is Virgil's *Eclogue* 1.30-35, where Tityrus says that he has found his freedom,

postquam nos Amaryllis habet, Galatea reliquit.
Namque, fatebor enim, dum me Galatea tenebat,
nec spes libertatis erat, nec cura peculi:
quamvis multa meis exiret victima saeptis,
pinguis et ingratae premeretur caseus urbi,
non umquam gravis aere domum mihi dextra redibat.

Thus Propertius' *puella* is happy to accept his gift of apples, unlike Amaryllis in Theocritus. In *Idyll* 3 this gift is only one of many clumsy gestures on the part of the herdsman, who, like the Cyclops in *Idyll* 11, sees everything from the narrow point of view of his pastoral world, and is destined to failure in his courting of Amaryllis. By contrast, the gift of ten apples in *Eclogue* 3 gratifies a *puer* who appears to satisfy the love of Menalcas, and the Amaryllis of *Eclogue* 1 personifies the refusal of venality and a gratifying acceptance of Tityrus' love. Even if she did not subsequently satisfy him (*licet ingratae*, Propertius adds jokingly), at least she would not ruin him economically, as Galatea had risked ruining Tityrus in *Eclogue* 1. Both because she is ready to surrender, and because she is, at any rate, not ruinously expensive for her lovers, the *puella* 'constructed' by Propertius' revisitation of the *Eclogues* possesses the characteristics of the ideal lover of an elegiac poet. Unlike the inflexible Amaryllis of Theocritus' primordial creation, she is more than willing to open her door to her lover in exchange for ten apples ... If it is true, as commentators unanimously suggest, and as I too believe, that the idea of the 'ten-apple woman' was bound to evoke the Amaryllis of Theocritus' *Idyll* 3, then it is very likely that Propertius would have wished to underline this difference deliberately, so as to emphasise the progress made by Virgil (or at least by *his* Virgil) in constructing the ideal of a pacific pastoral love, compared with the grotesque parody of situations typical of a *paraklausithyron* found in *Idyll* 3.

But Propertius' idealising reinterpretation of Virgil's *Eclogues* can be seen even more clearly in his presentation of the characters of *Eclogue* 2. Corydon is said to be *felix*, because *temptat carpere*, 'he tries to pick' the *intactus* Alexis, 'the delight of his rural master' (73f.). Thus Corydon's *felicitas* does not consist in the reciprocation of his love (although Propertius' *temptat* involves some ambiguity about Corydon's success, by contrast with the acknowledged failure of Virgil's Corydon), but in the fact that he has as the object of his desire a youth who is *intactus*. In erotic contexts *intactus* is practically a *terminus technicus* meaning 'virgin', but Alexis, who had been presented more directly by Virgil as *formosus*, is most certainly not 'virgin', seeing that Virgil said (2.2), and Propertius repeated, that he was the 'delight' of his master. *Deliciae* is another technical term of erotic language, quite often used to indicate an *eromenos*, and for this reason it tends to belie the technical-erotic value of *intactus*. Thus the reader is invited to pay particular attention to this adjective, and is led to interpret it in the

metaphorical/cultural sense of 'uncontaminated', and to find a justification for this in the specification *agricola*, which Propertius uses to describe the *dominus* whose status Virgil had left indeterminate. In conclusion, Corydon is happy, not because his love is (or is certainly going to be) requited, as might be expected in erotic poetry, but simply because he is courting an Alexis who is uncontaminated, seeing that, as the boy-friend of an *agricola*, he lives his life out in the fields.

It is common opinion that Propertius is carrying out a sort of eroticisation of the *Eclogues*, aiming to reduce to the minimum the distance between his own poetry and that of Virgil. I am inclined to think that this is not an isolated and factious interpretation of bucolic poetry (Virgil and Theocritus) on the part of Propertius, designed to eliminate the clear difference between erotic poetry and bucolic poetry, or to criticise bucolic poetry in the name of an elegiac ideology. In this passage of Propertius and in other ones which we will consider later, but also in Tibullus, in the Gallus of Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, and in at least the fifth of Ovid's *Epistulae heroidum*, there is a sort of intergeneric synthesis which indicates the pastoral setting of love as an ideally positive, even if consciously utopian, setting of eros. In this way a kind of erotic-pastoral poetry is created which provides an alternative to the erotic-elegiac poetry of the urban setting. I would like to show that behind the erotic-pastoral poetry of these Latin authors of the first century BC there was a precise trend of Greek bucolic poetry, which has largely been lost for us, but which may still be traced, at least partially—a trend of erotic poetry with a strong bucolic colouring, which departed from the presentation of love as a disease traditional in tragedy and epigram, and anticipated aspects of a vision of eros which were, to some extent, elegiac *ante litteram*.

The bucolic poetry of Theocritus had presented the bucolic environment and eros as terms of a regularly contrastive and exclusive opposition. Even if love is one of the themes that Theocritus' herdsmen speak about most frequently, the opposition between unhappy, suffering love (and love poetry) on the one hand, and bucolic life (and poetry) on the other could already be seen in various poems by Theocritus. The *ekphrasis* of the cup in *Idyll* 1 (32-8, 45-54) had created a contrast between the woman's agitated relationships with her two lovers and the peacefulness of the picture of country life. In *Idyll* 7.122-7 the invitation expressed by Simichidas to Aratus to abandon his desperate passion is immediately followed by Simichidas' long, sweet description of the *locus amoenus*, with the implicit effect of contrasting the song of unhappy love and bucolic serenity and connecting the latter with the renunciation of love. Lastly, the love-song of Bucaeus in *Idyll* 10 (24-37), which is presented with characteristics that are no less clumsy than (if not actually a parody of) that of *Idyll* 3, is contrasted with Milon's song at work (42-58); then at the end of the latter song, the meaning of the opposition eros/country life is made explicit in a final statement which opposes the latter to the former and possesses all the emphasis of a programmatic sentence of Theocritus, even if it is expressed through the opinion of a character—whether this is Milon, in a warning to Bucaeus, or Bucaeus himself, who performs a sort of self-criticism (56-8):

ταῦτα χρὴ μοχθεῦντας ἐν ἀλίῳ ἄνδρας ἀεΐδειν,
τὸν δὲ τεόν, Βουκαΐε, πρέπει λιμηρὸν ἔρωτα
μυθίσδεν τᾷ ματρὶ κατ' εὐνὰν ὀρθρευοῖσα.

Later, this same contrast is presented even more explicitly in various epigrams based on the opposition between 'pastoral' and 'erotic', which consider the feeling of love to be in contrast with the rough, elementary world of the shepherds and their animals (as Theocritus often does, too), or proclaim (as Theocritus had never done) the separation between pastoral life and love. I am thinking in particular of the epigrams of Meleager, which apparently develop the old topos of poetry as a medicine for love (most recently developed by Theocritus, *Idyll* 11, and by Callimachus, *AP* 12.150.1-4 = *HE* 1047ff.), but which introduce an innovation by specifically presenting bucolic poetry in the role of a temporary respite or escape from the vicissitudes of love. See, above all, *AP* 7.196 (= *HE* 4066ff.):

Ἀχίεις τέττιξ, δροσεραῖς σταγόνεσσι μεθυσθεὶς
ἀγρονόμαν μέλπεις μοῦσαν ἐρημολάλων·
ἄκρα δ' ἐφεζόμενος πετάλοις πριονώδεσι κώλοις
αἰθίοπι κλάζεις χρωτὶ μέλισμα λύρας.
ἀλλὰ, φίλος, φθέγγου τι νέον δενδρώδεσι Νύμφαις
παίγνιον, ἀντφδὸν Πανὶ κρέκων κέλαδον,
ὄφρα φυγὼν τὸν Ἔρωτα μεσημβρινὸν ὕπνον ἀγρεύσω
ἐνθάδ' ὑπὸ σκιερῇ κεκλιμένος πλατάνῳ.

This may be linked to its twin epigram, *AP* 7.195 (= *HE* 4058ff.)

Ἀκρίς, ἐμὼν ἀπάτημα πόθων, παραμύθιον ὕπνου,
ἀκρίς, ὀρουραΐη Μοῦσα λιγυπτέρυγε,
αὐτοφυὲς μίμημα λύρας, κρέκε μοί τι ποθεινὸν
ἐγκρούουσα φίλοις ποσσὶ λάλους πτέρυγας,
ὥς με πόνων ῥύσαιο παναγρύπνοιο μερίμνης,
ἀκρί, μιτωσαμένη φθόγγον ἔρωτοπλάνον.

We are left in little doubt of the fact that bucolic life is presented here as a specific antidote to the negativity of the experience of love. This is shown by the opposition between the music of the 'song' of the cicada or the cricket (ἀγρονόμαν ... μοῦσαν ἐρημολάλων, a clear metaphor for pastoral poetry) on the one hand, and, on the other, the love that is enabled by that music to 'flee' (φυγὼν τὸν Ἔρωτα) or to 'be led astray' (ἐρωτοπλάνον). It is shown, too, by the opposition between the rest that this same music offers to the 'fugitive' from Love—a rest to be 'captured' even at midday—and the sorrowing vigils (παναγρύπνοιο μερίμνης) which another inveterate topos, particularly dear to Meleager, attributes to those who are in the grip of love.

The same contrastive distinction between the bucolic setting and erotic poetry can be found in Bion (fr. 10 Reed = Gow), but with an almost opposite option in favour of the latter:

Ἄ μεγάλα μοι Κύπρις ἔθ' ὕπνώοντι παρέστα
νηπίαχον τὸν Ἔρωτα καλῶς ἐκ χειρὸς ἄγοισα
ἐς χθόνα νευστάζοντα, τόσον δέ μοι ἔφρασε μῦθον·
ἴμέλπειν μοι, φίλε βοῦτα, λαβὼν τὸν Ἔρωτα δίδασκε'.
ὥς λέγε· χᾶ μὲν ἀπῆλθεν, ἐγὼ δ' ὅσα βουκολίασδον,
νήπιος ὥς ἐθέλοντα μαθεῖν, τὸν Ἔρωτα δίδασκον,

ὥς εἶπεν πλαγίαυλον ὁ Πάν, ὥς αὐλὸν Ἀθάνα,
ὥς χέλυν Ἑρμάων, κίθαριν ὥς ἄδῃς Ἀπόλλων.
ταῦτά νιν ἐξεδίδασκον· ὃ δ' οὐκ ἐμπάζετο μύθων,
ἀλλὰ μοι αὐτὸς ἄειδεν ἐρωτύλα, καὶ με δίδασκε
θνατῶν ἀθανάτων τε πόθως καὶ ματέρος ἔργα.
κῆγῶν ἐκλαθόμαν μὲν ὅσων τὸν Ἔρωτα δίδασκον,
ὅσσα δ' Ἔρωσ με δίδαξεν ἐρωτύλα πάντα διδάχθην.

The protagonist forgets what he had tried to teach Eros, that is to say, the subjects that he had sung previously as a bucolic poet, and allows Eros to instruct him in ἐρωτύλα, 'short love poems'.

It is not possible to establish with certainty what love poetry Bion is speaking about: the bucolic-erotic kind with pastoral protagonists, as in his fragments 9 and 11 or the pseudo-Theocritean *Idyll* 20 or 27, or erotic-mythological poems with a very limited pastoral frame of the same kind as the *Epithalamium of Achilles and Deidamia* (= [Bion] 2). It is beyond doubt, however, that his protagonist focuses here on the opposition between the 'bucolic'-heurematistic poetry presented in 7f. (the kind adopted by Bion himself, e.g. in fragment 5, or in PVind.Rainer 29801) and poetry with an erotic-bucolic subject (the lover in the erotic fragment 9, at any rate, has a pastoral name). Furthermore, he adopts a specific term, ἐρωτύλον, for the 'short poem with erotic subject-matter', for which no specific definition is attested in previous poetry or literary reflections. And, finally, he sustains the overriding irresistibility of the latter with a firmness that finds few parallels in the Greek literary tradition—apart from *Anacreontics* 1, which analogously opens with the visit of Anacreon and Eros to the poet in a dream, and closes analogously with the declaration of faithfulness to love and to love poetry: καὶ δῆθεν ἄχρη καὶ νῦν ἔρωτος οὐ πέπαυμαι.

Indeed there must have been at least two traditions of love poetry with which Bion came into direct contact: epigrammatic poetry on the one hand, and on the other the poetry of the *Anacreontics*. These two traditions had given widely differing interpretations of the possibility of a peaceful relationship between the Muses and Eros. Bion appears to detach himself sharply from the first of these positions, and to be in fairly close agreement with the second. The tradition of the *Anacreontics* had perpetuated the figure of the poet-symposiast, who was constantly tipsy and constantly in love, in a perfect correspondence between poetry on the one hand and love and symposia on the other. By contrast, the erotic epigram of the third century had shared with many philosophers of the period an intellectualistic attitude of condemning the passion of love; and its authors, even while writing love poetry, considered and often declared love to be a sort of illness, an irrational fall. They paradoxically experience as a contradiction the fact that they are poet-intellectuals *but at the same time* in love, and love poets.²

There is no doubt that the bucolic Virgil attributed considerable importance as a model to the precedent of Meleager *AP* 7.196, in view of his two 'programmatic' imitations in the first and the second lines of *Eclogue* 1: *patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi* > ὑπὸ σκιερῇ κεκλιμένος πλατάνῳ and *silvestrem*

² I have dealt at length with this topic in Fantuzzi and Hunter 2002, 448-62; on the most telling fr. 9 of Bion, see *ibid.* 235f.

Musam meditaris > ἀγρονόμαν μέλπεις μοῦσαν. More generally, in the light of the tradition of contrastive comparison between bucolic poetry and love poetry represented by Bion (in favour of the latter) and Meleager (with his *temporary* preference for the former), I believe we can better understand why the Virgil of *Eclogue* 10 imagines that his friend, the elegiac poet Gallus, conceives of the possibility of pastoral life (and poetry) as the alternative (not an alternative, but *the* alternative) to the love he feels for Lycoris, and also to his previous mythological-erudite poetry and to elegiac poetry. Or rather, the poem creates an ideal, impossible synthesis between eros and pastoral setting: Gallus, the hero of the passion adopted as a choice of elegiac life, agrees, at least in Virgil's vision, to become a sort of Daphnis, the pastoral victim of love.

The contemplation of the ruins of his love, proclaimed by Apollo (22f.), leads Gallus to regret that he had not joined the shepherds in their world in the past, and had not found solace with the love of some Phyllis or Amyntas, who 'among the willows or under the vine' would undoubtedly have yielded themselves to him willingly (that is to say, without the dramas of refusals and the unfaithfulness of elegiac loves), or that he had not enjoyed the love of Lycoris amid those *loca amoena* (37-43):

certe sive mihi Phyllis sive esset Amyntas
seu quicumque furor (quid tum, si fuscus Amyntas?
et nigrae violae sunt et vaccinia nigra),
mecum inter salices lenta sub vite iaceret;
serta mihi Phyllis legeret, cantaret Amyntas.
hic gelidi fontes, hic mollia prata, Lycori,
hic nemus; hic ipso tecum consumerer aevo.

Then Gallus seems to understand that to find a remedy for the agitation of his passion it is not sufficient simply to change environment, and to leave the city of the elegy for the pastoral countryside. Thus he proposes to take the concrete decision to change his life and his poetry in future, or rather to re-elaborate, in symbiosis with the Muse of Theocritus, his previous poetry, which had been written under the guidance of the 'Chalcidian' Muse (51f.), and the very idea of love and love poetry, so that they may become a function of the bucolic environment (*tenerisque meos incidere amores arboribus—crescent illae, crescetis, amores*, ll. 53f.). But then the dream collapses: in the end Gallus is forced to recognise this, with an unconditional surrender ('Love triumphs over everything: we, too, must give way to Love') which has many analogies with the Propertian ideology of *servitium amoris*. This surrender is probably not to be interpreted as an admission of the inferiority of the idea of bucolic love proposed by Virgil to Gallus, but of the incapacity of the elegiac poet Gallus (who has his own different, pre-existing, prepotent ideology of love) to understand the rhetoric of erotic discourse pastorally re-interpreted and controlled. Virgil says something quite analogous also in *Eclogue* 2, where the rhetoric of Corydon's erotic discourse tries to transform the loved one into a function of the bucolic world, until he realises the impossibility of the task: that is to say, he realises the radical separation that exists between love and pastoral life, and the overriding superiority of the former.

There is a clear connection between *Eclogue* 10 and the fifth of Ovid's *Epistulae heroidum*. The intention of the Nymph Oenone is to contrast Paris' new love for the adulterous Helen, which is fraught with danger for the future (156), with the opposing possibility of a 'love without any risks' (*tutus amor*, 89) with her, a nymph who had only belonged to Paris, and would have liked to continue to belong to him—elegiacally—for ever (133 and 157f.). But unfortunately for her, Paris, a bit like Virgil's Gallus, remains insensitive to Oenone's appeal when she invites him to return to the erotic-pastoral synthesis of life, as if he, too, were an irreversible creation of elegiac poetry, who had passed through the pastoral experience without being significantly affected by it.

The possibility that erotic pathos may become controllable, without the sorrows caused by elegiac (or urban) love, when it is set within the coordinates of the pastoral world, is clearly formulated again several times, at least in Propertius.³ A rapid hint, based more on literary allusiveness than on autonomous images, can be found in Propertius 1.18. As he is afraid that his face is not sad enough or emaciated enough to show fully how much he suffers for love of Cynthia and his faithfulness to her, the poet does not limit himself to donning the clothes of a passionate lover of the tradition. Instead he practically invents, in the name of his love for Cynthia, a sort of pastoral prehistory, based first of all on the story of Gallus in the *Eclogue* 10 and ultimately on the Acontius of Callimachus (19-22):

vos eritis testes, si quos habet arbor amores
fagus et Arcadio pinus amica deo.
a quotiens teneras resonant mea verba sub umbras,
scribitur et vestris Cynthia corticibus!

In Propertius 2.30, the imitation of *Eclogue* 2, another of Virgil's most erotic bucolic poems, is the starting point for a true intersection between bucolic ideal and elegiac ideal. Propertius has just declared, in a highly Catullan manner, that he is not bothered in the slightest if his life-style is criticised by excessively austere elderly people, and that no-one can blame him if he 'is happy living with one woman' (23). His only desire is that Cynthia is ready to follow him away from the city, to live with him amid the wild nature of the mountains, because there it will be possible for them to hear the Muses sing love stories: with these Muses (who are not unacquainted with the sufferings of love: 34-6) Cynthia will be able to take part in the dance, together with the Muses and Bacchus, and Propertius himself will place the Bacchic crown of ivy on her brow. Let us consider in particular 25-9:

libeat tibi, Cynthia, mecum
rorida muscosis antra tenere iugis:
illic aspicias scopulis haerere Sorores

³ In the poetry of Tibullus, too, there are frequent dreams of golden ages or prospective utopias in a rural setting, which exalt the purity of life in the countryside. But in these primitivistic outbursts the sweetening of eros is only a relatively marginal component of the ideal of life of ἀντάρκεια, and the tradition of cynical primitivism and diatribe, or Virgil's *Georgics*, prove to have far more influence than the poetic models of Greek or Latin poetry with a bucolic setting.

et canere antiqui dulcia furta Iovis,
ut Semela est combustus, ut est deperditus Io ...

Lines 25f. are a clear allusion to *Eclogue* 2.28f.:

O tantum *libeat mecum tibi* sordida rura
atque humilis habitare casas ...

Similarly, the involvement of Cynthia and Propertius in the Bacchic dances of the Muses enacts the same atmosphere of rural/poetic *enthousiasmos* as can also be found in Virgil's *Eclogue* 2.31:

mecum una in silvis imitabere Pana canendo.

Basically, Propertius does not limit himself to situating amid the wild woods the mystical communion between himself, Cynthia, the Muses and Bacchus, which would best correspond, at the same time, to his desires of love for Cynthia and his ideals as an elegiac poet. That would be a banal setting, in line with the highly traditional setting of scenes of poetic initiation in wild, uninhabited places. He goes further than this and, through his allusion to Virgil, Propertius marks out his position within literary history, representing it as intimately linked to the bucolic environment. This ideal evasion into a fantastic world where eros is everything is thus achieved specifically in the countryside, and consciously assumes the modes and the forms of bucolic poetry.

Propertius 3.13 once again speaks about a utopia, but this time retrospectively, and therefore with the force of a fictitious, consolatory historicity. Propertius begins by deprecating the extravagance of matrons and the unfaithfulness of wives, and then he breaks off with a *makarismos* which introduces the golden age (25f.):

felix agrestum quondam pacata iuventus,
divitiae quorum messis et arbor erant!

There follows a long description (27-46) of this ancient period of spontaneity and simplicity, when the gifts that were exchanged consisted simply of fruit and flowers (which, as we have seen, Virgil had already presented as the typical gifts exchanged among shepherds), and women sold their kisses at the price of these simple gifts; no need was felt for luxuries, but lovers slept under a blanket made from the skin of an animal. At the end of this long description, to exemplify the simplicity of the religious feeling of these long-lost times, are the following lines (43-6):

et leporem, quicumque venis, venaberis, hospes,
et, si forte meo tramite quaeris, avem:
et me Pana tibi comitem de rupe vocato,
sive petes calamo praemia, sive cane.

These lines translate almost to the letter a famous epigram by Leonidas (*AP* 9.337 = *HE* 2143ff.)—the only such case in Propertius' poetry.⁴ With the appropriation

⁴ The well-known case of Propertius 1.1.1-4 ~ Meleager *AP* 12.101 = *HE* 4540ff. is much more an adaptation than a translation.

of these words, Propertius acknowledges his debt to the sensibility and the religious nature of the tradition of Greek bucolic poetry.

An analogous allusion referring to a precise model in Greek bucolic poetry, which has so far escaped the notice of scholars, should be considered at work in Propertius 2.19. This time, it specifically involves Bion. It is a daydream about the future, which might include a possible stay of Cynthia in the countryside, and the involvement of Propertius. For once the poet states that he is not afraid that Cynthia will be unfaithful when she is far away from him: the countryside, which is devoid of temptations, will be a guarantee of her purity, and Cynthia will be alone among the fields and the flocks (7f.), far away from the temptations of the city, and from the people she usually met when she went out to go to the temples (9f.). As for him, he will be ready to devote himself to the worship of Diana, leaving aside that of Venus (*iam me sacra Dianae suscipere et Veneris ponere vota iuvat*, 17f.), and to hunt, giving orders to the dogs himself (*audaces ipse monere canis*), but with all due caution (21-4):

non tamen ut vastos ausim temptare leones
aut celer agrestis comminus ire sues.
haec igitur mihi sit lepores audacia mollis
excipere et structo figere avem calamo.

In this passage, in my opinion, we can see a reflection of the tardy rebuke formulated by Aphrodite over the dead body of Adonis in the *Epitaph for Adonis*, a poem which describes the lament of Aphrodite for her beloved Adonis, who has just been killed by the wild boar: 'but why do you give orders to the dogs, O reckless one? why did you, who are handsome, desire so ardently to struggle against a wild beast?' (τί γάρ, τολμηρέ, κυνάγεις; καλὸς ἔὼν τί τοσοῦτον ἐμήναιο θηρὶ παλαίειν; 60f.). There is also an anticipation of the more circumstantially described warning which Ovid, probably also remembering Bion and undoubtedly adapting Propertius, places in the mouth of the goddess when (like Propertius) she subjects herself, at the height of her love for Adonis, to a sort of venatorial *servitium amoris* (*Met.* 10.533-52). She adopts Diana's costume (*genus veste ritu succincta Dianae*, 536) and starts giving orders to the dogs (*hortatur canes*, 537). But she only attacks animals that it is not dangerous to hunt (*tutae animalia praedae*, 537), such as hares (Propertius, too, speaks of *lepores*), and at all costs (539-46) she keeps away from strong wild boars, and from wolves, and bears (*a fortibus abstinet apris raptoresque lupos armatosque unguibus ursos vitat*); and she warns Adonis, too, to fear these beasts, telling him: 'be brave against fearful animals, but boldness against bold animals is not safe' (*in audaces non est audacia tuta. parce meo, iuvenis, temerarius* [cf. Bion's τολμηρέ] *esse periculo, neve feras, quibus arma dedit natura, lacesse* ...). As Ovid correctly 'interprets' in his imitation, Propertius in this way presented himself as a sort of prudent Adonis, who does not commit the sin of recklessness of which Bion's Aphrodite had accused her loved one.

Last, but not least, Propertius 2.13 provides further strong evidence that Propertius, at least, considered Bion one of his favourite authors. In this case, anyway, Bion's intertext has already been described in detail.⁵

It therefore appears to me highly attractive to consider the possibility that Propertius was induced to evoke Bion because he detected in the *Epitaph for Adonis*, as in other poems by Bion considered above, a precedent for some of the attitudes involved in his ideal as an eternal singer of love. But it is difficult to say to what extent Bion, and an insufficiently documented re-interpretation of love outside the epigram (with its consolidated traditions and its high level of topicity), really represented the archetypes of Latin elegiac poetry. In any event, as well as proposing genetic hypotheses, my discussion ought at least to have highlighted the fact that the bucolic environment quite often becomes, for Propertius and Ovid, the wishful setting of the 'road not taken' by elegiac love, namely the idealised happy prehistory or alternative to the urban environment where the unhappiness of elegiac poetry was enacted.

Bibliography

H. Bernsdorff, *Hirten in der nicht-bukolischen Dichtung des Hellenismus* (Stuttgart 2001)

E. Cecchini, 'Properzio 2, 34', *RFIC* 112 (1984) 154-66

G.B. Conte, *Virgilio: il genere e i suoi confini* (Milano 1984²)

G. D'Anna, 'Cornelio Gallo, Virgilio, Properzio', *Athenaeum* 69 (1981) 288-97

C. Fantazzi, 'Virgilian Pastoral and Roman Love Poetry', *AJP* 87 (1966) 171-91

M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, *Muse e modelli: la poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto* (Roma-Bari 2002)

E.J. Kenney, 'Virgil and the Elegiac Sensibility', *ICS* 8 (1983) 48-52

E.W. Leach, 'Nature and Art in Vergil's Second *Eclogue*', *AJP* 87 (1966) 427-45

S.H. Lindheim, 'Omnia vincit amor: Or, Why Oenone Should Have Known it Would Never Work Out (*Eclogue* 10 and *Heroides* 5)', *MD* 44 (2000) 83-101

T. Papanghelis, *Propertius: a Hellenistic Poet on Love and Death* (Cambridge 1987)

— 'Eros Pastoral and Profane: on Love in Virgil's *Eclogues*', in S. Morton Braund and R. Mayer (edd.), *Amor: Roma. Love and Latin Literature: Eleven Essays (and One Poem) by Former Research Students presented to E.J. Kenney* (Cambridge 1999) 44-59

C.G. Perkell, 'The "Dying Gallus" and the Design of *Eclogue* 10', *CP* 91 (1996) 128-39

J.D. Reed, *Bion of Smyrna. The Fragments and the Adonis* (Cambridge 1997)

⁵ Papanghelis 1987, 64-70; Fantuzzi, in Fantuzzi and Hunter 2002, 240-2.

MARCO FANTUZZI, PASTORAL LOVE AND 'ELEGIAC' LOVE, FROM GREECE TO ROME

D.O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry* (Cambridge 1975)

E.A. Schmidt, *Poetische Reflexion: Vergils Bukolik* (Munich 1972)

K.-H. Stanzel, *Liebende Hirten: Theokrits Bukolik und die alexandrinische Poesie* (Stuttgart 1955)