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The thesis examines the modernist revival of a poetic revolution begun in Alexandria in third century B.C. by the Greek poet Callimachus and his circle, and revived in first century B.C. by the Roman poets Catullus, Ovid, Propertius, and Virgil. After examining Eliot's and Pound's knowledge of the Alexandrian poetic movement and the possible roads of influence, Chapter 1 focuses on the differences between Alexandrian and non-Alexandrian poetics in respect to their approach to allusion, obscurity, and genre. Chapter 2 concentrates on the question of genre: what is epic and what is its relationship to lyric? I examine Callimachus' *Hecale*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Pound's *Cantos* as attempts to create a new form of epic which fuses the large-scale epic form with the small-scale lyric style. This new Alexandrian epic arises from the Hesiodic, as opposed to Homeric, tradition of epic. Each of these three poets was concerned with finding a viable alternative to traditional Homeric unity; each arrived at the same solution in the creation of overall associative unity by linking disjunctive elements one to the other. The means of doing this I call the "associative technique."

The second half of the thesis examines the fusion of lyric with epic in the poetry books of Theocritus, Virgil, and Eliot. Chapter 3 begins by looking at the poetry book as genre: what is the difference between a poetry book and a poetry collection and what is the relation of the former to epic? While Theocritus' *Idylls*, Virgil's *Eclogues*, and Eliot's *Prufrock and Other Observations*, on the formal level, present themselves generically as collections of individual poems, on the stylistic level, they enact also the generic codes of greater epic. Each of these three poets uses the associative technique to instil unity in the poetry book as a whole. This chapter discusses the
relationship of the poetry book to the epic genre and the implications of that relationship for how these poetry books are to be read. Finally, Chapter 4 provides an in-depth exegesis of how the associative technique works to create epic unity in the *Idylls*, the *Eclogues* and *Prufrock and Other Observations*. 
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Introduction

When Callimachus (c.305-c.240 B.C.) left Cyrene to come to Alexandria, he entered a city which was born only 26 years before him. Created from the remains of a lonely outpost, what became the political centre of Egypt and the cultural hub of the Greek world had been mere villages and twelve rivers rushing down to the sea.¹ The most important of these little villages was Rhacotis, a guard post which the Pharaohs used to keep all foreign influence—both goods and peoples—out of Egypt. In 331 B.C., Alexander chose this site for his new city, presumably because of its easy sea access to Europe. Ptolemy Soter made it his home in 323 B.C. Villages were levelled, rivers filled in to form main streets and city squares, and exclusionary doors were flung open with a beckoning gesture. Foreigners, once so zealously kept back, now poured in from all over the Greek world.

When one considers that prior to 331 B.C. there was virtually nothing and no one on the site of Alexandria, it is remarkable that the city was fully functional very shortly after its foundation (Fraser 6). Where did all the people come from? Scholars continue to be baffled as to the source of the original population (Fraser 63). Greeks who immigrated to Alexandria lived in the city as foreign nationals (Xenoi), maintaining their Greek ethnic and civic links to their cities of origin. With perhaps the exception of Apollonius of Rhodes, all of the great names in scholarship, literature and science were from this group (Fraser 50). Still, they were greatly outnumbered by the non-Greek population.² The latter consisted of two groups: Egyptians, who had no recognised civic status, and Jews, who, protected by their own constitution, kept separate from both Egyptians and Greeks.

¹ For the foundation and history of Alexandria, see P.M. Fraser, Ptolemaic Alexandria, 3 vol., Oxford: Clarendon P. 1972: 1: 5ff.
² Neil Hopkinson estimates the Greek population at 100,000, the Egyptian at 7 million. A Hellenistic Anthology, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988: 3.
Ptolemy Soter found himself the ruler of a city with no roots, with no culture, in a city with no past. His response was to acquire one. His first step was to seek out the brightest intellectual lights in the entire Greek world and set them within the Museum he had created for them. The Museum (literally "shrine of the Muses") was established as a place where all of the Greek literature of the past could be compiled, studied, explained, and revivified in the verse of the poet-scholars who lived and worked there. The idea of a Museum was not new in itself. Many Greek cities had buildings called Museums which functioned as cult centres for the worship of the Muses (Fraser 305). What was new was Ptolemy's vision of the Museum as a place of scholarship. His concept was as new as his city: for the first time in history the creations of the past would be objects of study (Fraser 305). Ironically, then, this city with no past became the first to appropriate and objectify the past.

Ptolemy attracted intellectuals to Alexandria with the promise of patronage. Another attraction was the chance to live and work in close proximity with others of intellect and accomplishment in a place where everything was fresh and new and anything seemed possible. But perhaps the strongest attraction was the opportunity to read and ponder all the great works of the Greek world. The importance of this factor cannot be over-stated: because of the difficulties and expense involved in producing books, libraries (if they even existed in the modern sense of the word) were rare and their holdings meagre. In the fourth century, some tyrants had book collections and Aristotle had considerable holdings at the Lyceum, but there was nothing on the scale of the library at Alexandria (Fraser 324). The acquisition of books for the library was even more aggressive than the campaign to acquire intellectuals. Crown agents were regularly sent to Athens and Rhodes (the two main book markets) to purchase new holdings. Books not on the market for sale were gotten by other means, often
underhanded. For example, in the reign of Euergetes, an order was issued to search all ships unloading in Alexandria, confiscate any books, and copy them. The copies were then returned to the ships and the prized originals found a new home in the Alexandrian library (Fraser 325). It is said that Ptolemy went so far as to trick the Athenians out of their priceless original manuscripts by ostensibly borrowing their official copies of the works of the three great tragedians (leaving a large deposit as security). He had handsome copies made on the best papyri and returned the copies to Athens, forfeiting his deposit. The originals stayed in Alexandria.

The concept of the poet-scholar begins with Antimachus of Colophon (born c. 440 B.C.), the author of the Lyde, a long elegiac poem much admired by many Hellenistic writers (but not Callimachus)\(^3\) and the Thebaid, an epic poem which was still read and enjoyed 500 years after Antimachus' death.\(^4\) Antimachus produced an edition of Homer which scholars continued to use for centuries. He was the first poet whose scholarly interest in philology influenced his work: his verse abounds in rare Homeric "glosses" (words of doubtful meaning), archaisms and neologisms, and was famed for its obscurity.

The first major writer who was both poet and scholar was Philetas of Cos (born c. 320 B.C.), the precursor of the Alexandrian poetic movement. While there is no direct evidence that Philetas was ever in Alexandria, he was tutor to Ptolemy Soter's

\(^3\) Callimachus' disdain is apparent in fr. 398, which I translate: "The Lyde is a gross [pachus] and obscure poem." As I will discuss in Chapter 1. Callimachus prized poetry that was leptos (slender, elegant) and rejected the pachus (fat, gross). Unless otherwise stated, all references to Callimachus are to R. Pfeiffer's 2 vol. edition, Callimachus, Oxford: Clarendon, 1949, 1953; translations of the Hymns and Epigrams are from A.W. Mair's, Callimachus, Lycophron, Aratus, London and Cambridge: William Heinemann and Harvard UP, 1921, revised 1955; and translations of the Aetia, Ismē, Hecale, and uncertain fragments are from C.A. Trypanis, Callimachus. Fragments. London and Cambridge: William Heinemann and Harvard UP, 1958.

heir (the future Philadelphus) and thus likely followed Ptolemy to Alexandria at some point. Philetas' scholarship includes a standard reference book on rare words and dialect forms in Homer as well as interpretations of Homer. His pupil Zenodotus succeeded him as regal tutor and was appointed as the first Librarian of the newly established library in 284 B.C. While all sources agree that Zenodotus was the first Librarian and there is evidence that Apollonius of Rhodes and Eratosthenes followed him, it is not known in what order. There is no evidence (though much dispute remains) that Callimachus himself was ever Librarian, although he was certainly very active in the library.5

It is thought that the poets who were supported by Ptolemy in the Museum also worked in the library sorting, cataloguing, and editing the ever-increasing bulk of new acquisitions. The fruits of their labour were diverse and, particularly in the case of Callimachus, copious. Zenodotus was the first to take on the task of producing a critical edition of Homer and is considered responsible for the division into twenty-four books of the Iliad and the Odyssey (Hopkinson 9). He also wrote monographs on Homer and a glossography of epic and lyric poetic language.6 Apollonius of Rhodes performed textual work on Homer and wrote an attack on Zenodotus. He also worked on Hesiod's Works and Days and on the poems of Archilochus. Lycophron (the author of the extraordinarily obscure and pedantic hexameter poem Alexandra) was an expert on comedy, producing a treatise on the subject as well as the earliest attested compilation of anagrams (Bulloch 548). Callimachus' scholarship was prodigious, varied, and ambitious.7 His major work was the Pinakes ("Tables"), a highly influential work in one

5 The only ancient source that suggests Callimachus was a Librarian is the "Latin Tzetzes" which calls him "aulicus regius bibliothecarius" (Fraser 330).
7 Details of Callimachus' scholarly works are drawn from Fraser 452-456 and Bulloch 550.
hundred and twenty books. Its full title was *Tables of persons eminent in every branch of learning, together with a list of their writings*. As indicated by the title, the *Pinakes* was a universal biography and bibliography. Authors were arranged by subject (for example, there was a Table of Lyric Poets and a Table of Philosophers); each entry contained a brief biography, titles of works and/or opening lines, and the total number of lines in the work according to Callimachus' edition. Callimachus also compiled a smaller chronological list of all the dramatic poets and wrote the first known paradoxography, a prose work called *Collection of marvels in all the earth according to localities*, as well as lists of curiosities such as strange objects and historical and mythical events. The latter sparked many imitations and spurred the interest in strange and unexplained phenomena which was characteristic of the period. Other minor works of Callimachus include: *On the rivers of Europe, On changes of names in fish, On winds, On birds, On rivers in the inhabited world, List of rare words and constructions in Democritus*, and *Foundations of islands and cities and their changes of names*. Theocritus seems to be the exception to the rule of the poet-scholar at Alexandria: while he is a central figure in the Alexandrian poetic scene and was heavily influenced by the new poetry, there is no evidence or suggestion that he was involved in scholarship at the Museum.

While the lack of surviving literature from the fourth century obscures the evolution of poetics in the third, it is apparent that this century saw a revolutionary change in poetic practice which was to a great extent a reaction against the Homeric epic, or rather against a public who so loved the Homeric poems that they were unwilling to read anything else. Theocritus summed up the public's attitude in Idyll 16.20 where a prospective patron rejects the new poetry because as long as one has
access to Homer, "who would listen to another?" As a result of this attitude, over four hundred years after Homer, the public still demanded that poets produce poems in imitation of the Homeric epics, conforming strictly to the conventions of a long dead genre—the oral epic—and the style, vocabulary, and manner of its prime practitioner. The majority of poets in this period obliged. Those, like Callimachus, who did not were a very small minority and they were in a unique position: because of Ptolemy's patronage, they needed only to please the court—a particularly highly educated and erudite court at that—and were not dependent on a mass audience. Nor was there any such audience to be had. With the prevalence of reading and writing, the poet's role in society had changed dramatically. No longer was he, like Homer and Hesiod, the recorder of communal memory and the sole means of keeping alive a whole body of collectively held lore: in this immigrant society, there was no cohesive community and no common tradition or mythology. No longer was he, like Archilochus and Pindar, the lyric policeman publicly commenting on exceptional behaviour in the community and thus influencing its members to avoid bad behaviour by means of blame poetry and its consequent public shame and humiliation, or to strive for glory and be celebrated in praise poetry; there were no longer large festivals held where scorn or praise might be sung, and now there were laws in place to guide one's actions. No longer was the poet, like Aeschylus, Euripides, and Sophocles, a dramatist who could speak in one voice for the voice of thousands of profound religious feelings, for society was diverse and fragmented; its members had no religion in common. Even the Greeks in Alexandria were drawn from different parts of the world, each with their own tradition. Drama was unpopular; comedy was nonexistent, not only because it was politically inexpedient: comedy depends on public presentation to a large like-minded group.

---

with the same background, conditions which had been easily met in fifth century Athens but which existed no longer (Fraser 618-621). Alexandria lacked the homogeneous experience required to convey intelligent humour to a large audience. The city did have very low-level, low-brow comic performances called *phylakes* or “hilarotragedies,” what one might call burlesque tragedies. There were also mimes, as well as small, intellectually undemanding performances on heroic themes which may have taken the place of tragedy. There were public poetry readings, but these were likely small-scale. Poetry circulated primarily via the written word.

Though poets had been writing down their verses for many years, writing had been incidental and irrelevant to the audience who experienced the poem chiefly as performance (Bulloch 543). Only in the Hellenistic age does the textual dimension of poetry become essential as poetry becomes a private experience between an individual reader and text. Poetry was no longer written for performance; it was written to be read. The absence of public performances of poetry had an effect on its formal qualities, particularly that of metre. Because poets had few opportunities to hear lyric poetry, they were uncomfortable with its metrical complexities and as a result avoided lyric metres. For example, instead of lyrics Callimachus wrote epinician verse in elegiacs, and while Theocritus imitates sapphics and alcaic greater asclepiads, he simplifies the metre by dispensing with the stanzaic structure (Bing 23). If poets had difficulties writing lyric measures, then certainly their readers would be unable to sound out those metres from the written page without having had the benefit of hearing the tune. The fact that books were now the primary mode of communicating poetry had a profound impact on poetics in other ways as well. When poetry is experienced as performance, it must be capable of being comprehended at a single hearing. Consequently, it is often repetitive and may lack a certain subtlety of content and

---

expression. Heroes and their deeds are broadly brushed: they must be larger than life in order to be readily memorable. When poems are no longer heard, but read, they can be much more compact, more allusive and finely etched: a reader can study a poem and ponder it at length. The more dense the poem, the more rewarding it will prove, for it can be re-read and re-experienced indefinitely. Each subsequent reading may reveal new treasure to the reader. Since books are a purely visual medium, the visual aspect of a poem can now take centre stage. Hence, there is evidence in this period for pattern poems (poems written in the shape of the thing they describe) and acrostics containing the poet's name or a key word (Bing 15).

Literary allusion per se was not new. What was new was the degree of importance it acquired in the Hellenistic age. Bing explains that the Alexandrian poet, "pushed the technique further than ever before and assigned to it a position of unexampled preeminence" (73). Literary allusion became highly self conscious, acutely intertextual and even autotextual. The most minute details of characters, scenes, diction, style, and metre of antecedent texts (both ancient and contemporary) would be evoked. Such allusion is the product of the poet's intimate knowledge of and familiarity with literary tradition resulting from the poet's own repeated re-readings. Bing attributes the centrality of allusion in Alexandrian poetry, in part, to the poets' sense of rift:

Their was a passionate, relentless endeavour--an obsessive endeavour--to permeate their works with the literature of the past, to acquire and exhibit encyclopaedic grasp, as though to insist that they knew it after all, that despite historical-geographical impediments and isolation they were as familiar now with the cultural heritage as a
cultivated person might have been in the time when it was being produced—perhaps even more so! The allusiveness of these poets was, I submit, not merely fashionable erudition. Rather, it reflects the profound desire to compensate for a perceived epigonality and artistic disjunction. Social and geographical isolation in Alexandria could only have intensified this desire, for the burden of asserting one's cultural identity in such an old and alien civilization would have been especially onerous. In part, then, the avid, at times extravagant cultivation and preservation of the heritage is like that familiar to us from immigrant communities throughout the ages: a desire to be more Greek than the Greeks. Put somewhat differently, the underlying hope of these poet's allusiveness is meaningful continuity. (74-75)

The Alexandrians' sense of rupture from their literary past is evident in their keen concern with past poets, genres, and literary conventions. Theocritus wrote five epigrams posing as memorial inscriptions for ancient poets: Anacreon (17), Epicharmus (18), Hipponax (19), Archilochus (21), and Pisander (22). The poet Poseidippus urged his readers to weep for Archilochus, demanding tears for a poet dead three hundred years as if he had died just yesterday.10 Antipater of Sidon wrote five sepulchral poems for Anacreon alone (Bing 59). Callimachus impersonated Hipponax in the lambi, poems written in the dialect and metre of that great invective poet. The Alexandrians' sense of rupture was not to be healed by strict imitation of the old masters; but by appropriation, assimilation, and revivification in a form made new. It was an Alexandrian project to remake the old forms; thus Callimachus re-created the

Homeric hymn in his *Hymns*, Homer’s heroic epic in his *Hecale*, Hesiod’s didactic epic in the *Aetia*, Hipponax’s invective iambic poems in the *lambi*, Pindar’s epinician odes in his non-lyric epinicians. He also tried his hand at the genres of elegy, epigram, and, reportedly, drama.

The Alexandrian poetic movement enjoyed a resurgence in Rome in the first century B.C. which was perhaps inspired by Parthenius of Nicaea (another Greek immigrant—though not a voluntary one) not long after 73 B.C. Parthenius was a very learned man who became the mentor of Cinna, Gallus, and Virgil as well as possibly Catullus and Calvus (Clausen, “Callimachus” 188). Indeed, Cinna’s masterpiece, the *Zmyrna*, like Eliot’s *The Waste Land* was “so learned and obscure that it required an exegetical commentary” upon publication. The influence of Alexandrian poetics on Roman poetry was profound, so profound, in fact, that in trying to determine Alexandrian influence on later Western literature it is not necessary to prove whether or not a given author read Callimachus. As J.K. Newman explains, “If he read Ovid, he read Callimachus enough.” Still, as we shall see, Eliot and Pound (particularly Pound) had some awareness of the Alexandrian poetic movement and may have been directly influenced by its Greek practitioners, although to a far lesser extent than they were by its Roman proponents.

The modern revival of Alexandrian poetics was largely unconscious: Eliot and Pound never styled themselves Callimacheans, nor would they have viewed their aesthetics as particularly Alexandrian especially in view of the way the term “Alexandrian” was used and understood in the early twentieth century. It is only in the last thirty or forty years that the Alexandrianism of Virgil and Ovid has been generally

---

recognized; yet, as I will show, it is the particularly Alexandrian qualities of their poetry that Eliot and Pound admired and emulated. Like the Greeks--Callimachus, Theocritus, Aratus, and Apollonius in the third century B.C. and Parthenius in the first--Eliot and Pound were immigrants. Indeed, the modernist circle whom Lewis branded the "Men of 1914" were all exiles and immigrants of one sort or another: Pound and Eliot as Americans in London, Joyce as an Irishman in Paris and Trieste; even Lewis, though educated in England, was born off the coast of Canada where he was to return during World War II. All were exiles in temperament, with Lewis' sense of isolation and societal estrangement especially evident from his self-styled epithet "the Enemy." Like the Greeks of third-century Alexandria, the modernists lived at a time when literature had grown dull and stagnant and the public demanded ever more of the same. Looking at the literary milieu of the early twentieth century, C.K. Stead notes that, "The situation of poetry in 1909 or 1910 was stagnant to a degree difficult for any young poet today to imagine." Literature was still respected, but fuelled by narrow demands for poetry and novels of a very particular--and very second-rate--kind (Stead, New Poetic 48). Like the Alexandrians, Eliot and Pound were not just poets, but also scholars whose purpose (and great accomplishment) was to reinvent poetry and literary criticism for their time.

A great part of this dissertation focuses on very fine literary distinctions as it illustrates the uniquely Alexandrian qualities of the poetry of Eliot and Pound. In order to do this, one must be clear what exactly Alexandrian poetics are. A basic definition might describe the poetry as: highly allusive; obscure; erudite and scholarly (even

---

bookish); extremely self conscious and aware of its status as art; concerned with literary tradition almost to the point of obsession; fond of blurring linguistic, generic, spatial, and temporal boundaries; laboriously worked over and finely drawn on a small scale; more private than public; very musical; and keenly interested in mythology, psychology, and the pathology of eros. The fact that a particular poet meets one or two of the above criteria does not mean that he or she is an Alexandrian poet. If that were so then Milton and Browning would be Alexandrians by virtue of their allusiveness and obscurity, and Homer and Chaucer by virtue of their mingling of dialect forms and blurring of generic boundaries. Taken to its logical extreme, such a line of enquiry could only lead to the conclusion that all poets are Alexandrian and, clearly, this is not the case. Conversely, Callimachus and Pound at times use Homeric language and formulae, but they are not Homeric poets. No one reading Callimachus and Homer could mistake one for the other; no one would ascribe to both the same poetics.

Confusion may arise from a simple fact: all poets use literary devices such as allusion, obscurity ("making strange"), generic and linguistic play to some degree or another. They do so because they are all writing poetry and these devices are the properties of poetry. Homeric and Alexandrian poetry, Miltonic and modernist verse are subspecies of the main genus of poetry. Naturally, then, they hold in common those traits which belong to the larger genus. For example, allusion is a property of

---

17 The failure to recognize this distinction is the major flaw underlying Alan Cameron’s *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1995. Cameron, an eminent historian (and not a literary critic), questions the entire existence of an Alexandrian poetic programme (and the many years of scholarship devoted to it), arguing that every agreed-upon tenet of that programme either cannot be proven historically (and thus did not exist) or existed also in other non-Alexandrian poets. By dismantling the perimeters of the sub-category “Alexandrian” and denying its unique characteristics, Cameron’s polemic leaves the critic with no way to classify the poetry at all. Still, the absolute conviction that the poetics of Callimachus and Propertius differ radically from that of Homer remains—for that is a common sense judgment—but one no longer has any means to talk about it. Cameron’s extremely provocative work merits serious consideration; however, it is not the purpose of this dissertation to serve as a direct rebuttal to this very recent book. Suffice it to say that Cameron disagrees with almost every accepted tenet of Alexandrian poetics.
poetry and as such both Homer and Callimachus may (and do) use it; it is how often they use it and how they use it *most of the time* that helps us to determine to which subspecies they belong. The fundamental difficulty here can perhaps be best illustrated by an analogous problem: the difference between poetry and prose. Both poetry and prose are linguistic systems, thus both employ devices such as rhythm and metaphor which are the properties of language. Although the question of the difference between poetry and prose is highly contentious and to date it has been impossible to reach a scholarly consensus on a precise definition of either, with the exception of those borderline cases which partake of elements of both poetry and prose, no one would mistake one for the other. There will always be those middle cases over which people argue, but there is no disagreement as to the extremes. A prose piece can have many of the characteristics of poetry and yet not be poetry. Similarly, a poem may have many prose qualities, but still be instantly recognizable as poetry. So, too, with Alexandrian and non-Alexandrian poetry: there may be borderline cases and various shades of grey, but in this thesis, I will be dealing only with those poets at either extreme.

After examining Eliot's and Pound's knowledge of the Alexandrian poetic movement and the possible roads of influence, Chapter 1 focuses on definitions and illustrations. Alexandrianism is essentially reactionary in nature; therefore it is necessary to examine not only the new poetics but also the old poetics against which the new define themselves. Thus the thesis begins with an in-depth study of poetics: for example, what is the difference between Alexandrian and non-Alexandrian allusion, how is each used and how do they function within the text? What is the function of obscurity? In what fundamental ways does obscurity in Milton differ from that found in Pound? Who is the reader-addressee to whom these highly wrought,
erudite and allusive Alexandrian-style poems were written? Related to this issue is the role of extraneous material such as epigraphs and notes. How does this material affect a poem’s meaning and how does it function in the text? This will be explored in relation to The Waste Land.

Alexandrian poetry sets itself up against the epic tradition. To comprehend its aims, a thorough understanding of the Western epic tradition is critical. Thus the dissertation encompasses a wide range of epics, including those of Homer, Hesiod, Callimachus, Virgil, Ovid, Dante, Milton, Browning, and Pound. Chapter 2 concentrates on the question of genre: what is epic and what is its relationship to lyric? I examine Callimachus' Hecale, Ovid's Metamorphoses, and Pound's Cantos as attempts to create a new form of epic which fuses the large-scale epic form with the small-scale lyric style. This new Alexandrian epic arises from the Hesiodic, as opposed to Homeric, tradition of epic. One of the difficulties with the works in this tradition is their apparent disjointedness: how does one create the unity demanded of a major form like epic in a disjunctive and non-linear poem? Looking at Callimachus, Ovid, and Pound, we shall see that each of these poets was concerned with finding a viable alternative to traditional Homeric unity; each arrived at the same solution in the creation of overall associative unity by linking disjunctive elements one to the other. The means of doing this I call the "associative technique."

The associative technique is essentially metaphorical in nature and thus appropriate to the Alexandrians' (Greek, Roman, and modern English) brand of highly allusive poetry. It is a method of setting two things or more side by side in implicit comparison, of likening one thing to another. As I will illustrate, it is the foundation for Pound's ideogrammic method for poetry and for what Pound called "subject rhyme." The associations thus created slowly accrue over the course of a poem. The resultant
unity is not based on logic or built up in linear fashion; it is an aggregate perceived principally on an emotional level. Nevertheless, it is carefully and consciously created and this dissertation will examine precisely how it is achieved.

The second half of the thesis examines the fusion of lyric with epic in the poetry books of Theocritus, Virgil, and Eliot. Chapter 3 begins by looking at the poetry book as genre: what is the difference between a poetry book and a poetry collection and what is the relation of the former to epic? While Theocritus' Idyls, Virgil's Eclogues, and Eliot's Prufrock and Other Observations, on the formal level, present themselves generically as collections of individual poems, on the stylistic level, they enact also the generic codes of greater epic. Each of these three poets uses the associative technique to instil unity in the poetry book as a whole. This chapter discusses the relationship of the poetry book to the epic genre and the implications of that relationship for how these poetry books are to be read. Chapter 4 provides an in-depth exegesis of how the associative technique works to create epic unity in the Idylls, the Eclogues, and Prufrock and Other Observations.

One of the central issues in this dissertation is that of genre. I will not attempt simply to re-classify the pertinent works generically; rather my intent is to clarify misunderstandings and to illustrate and explore generic relationships which are all too frequently overlooked. By increasing our understanding of a text's generic implications, we also increase—and alter—our understanding of the text as a whole. It matters if we are to read the Eclogues, say, as a collection of poems or as an epic. The Alexandrian epic and the Alexandrian poetry book form answers to the question of how a poet in the "modern" world can write epic at a moment in history when the genre has grown stale. In each case, the answer is essentially the same, namely, to infiltrate one major genre with its generic antithesis; to temper epic with lyric, or lyric with epic.
Chapter 1

Alexandrian and Modernist Poetics

The Background: Eliot and Pound's Knowledge of Alexandrian Poetics

It has been stated with the conviction of a truism that T.S. Eliot is the modern incarnation of an Alexandrian poet.1 Likewise, Ezra Pound has been deemed equivalent to the Alexandrians whose audience demanded more and more imitative poetry written in a long-dead style.2 Yet what do such statements imply? What, specifically, did Eliot and Pound learn from the ancient poets whose work bears the mark of Alexandrian influence and how conscious were they of the debt they owed them?

As early as 1927, E.R. Curtius stated "Eliot is an Alexandrian in the strictest sense of the word--as such a poet can and must look today" (359). It is likely that Eliot was aware of Curtius' view and understood what the term "Alexandrian" meant: he was familiar with Curtius' work and the two men became acquainted after Eliot approached Curtius in 1922 to ask him to write for The Criterion.3 Curtius' summary of Alexandrian poetics within this essay is brief (359-360), but includes the salient points: the Alexandrian poet is marked by his or her extreme erudition, knowledge of different languages and literary traditions, and mastery of a wide range of poetic techniques.

---


3 Curtius was to contribute three articles (Essays on European Literature xvi).
Drawing upon a wide, often idiosyncratic, knowledge base, the poet incorporates into his or her own work allusions to, quotations from, and even citations of other texts. The resulting poetry possesses an unprecedented depth of intertextuality and a level of obscurity ranging from the arcane to the impenetrable. There is an emphasis on poetry as craft, as the product of painstaking labour as opposed to the effortless flow of a moment's inspiration. It is poetry that is clean and precise; that is keenly concerned with mythology and anthropology. By conflating myriad literatures, cultures, literary techniques and conventions, the poet creates an artful mosaic wherein, as Curtius states, "Ages and styles coalesce into magical substance" (359). It is art which is acutely conscious of its status as art; it is, as Curtius states, "the poetry of an expert, and only the expert will get the best out of it" (359).

One essential quality of Alexandrian poetry which Curtius does not discuss is that of music. The sound of poetry is important as ever, but poetry is now composed using methods analogous to the composition of music. Newman calls this the lyrical or musical analogy. As he explains it, in Alexandrian poetry, "The lyrical analogy, which means ultimately an analogy of music, would be paramount, and would make itself felt both in formal devices such as balance and verbal repetition, and in musicality of language and mood" (Class. Epic 20). The modern poets take this much further, using musical forms as an analogy for poetical ones. In effect, they compose words in a poem as if they were notes in a piece of music. For example, consider Pound's description of the structure of The Cantos as "Rather like, or unlike, subject and response and counter subject in fugue."4 Betty S. Flowers' description of the musical analogy as it pertains to poetic structure is particularly apt:5

What is "musical" about these structures is not their beauty of sound, but the use of syntax, rhythms and imagery to create a pattern of meaning which will have the power of music to express abstract emotion, while at the same time, carrying the weight of words with their inescapable references to the concretes. In modern poetry, as in Browning's poetry, this attempt to give words the power of music has resulted in an organisation of poetic forms based on association rather than on a narrative or logical progression.

Thus the musical analogy forms the genesis for what this dissertation terms the associative technique. By means of this technique, the Alexandrian poet constructs unity within a work composed of disparate parts, for example, Callimachus in the *Aetia*, Theocritus (as I will argue) in the *Idylls*, Ovid in the *Metamorphoses*, Pound in *The Cantos*, Eliot in *Prufrock and Other Observations*, and Joyce in *Ulysses*. While examination of the associative technique in Joyce's *Ulysses* is beyond the scope of this dissertation, its foundation in music is particularly apparent from Joyce's comments on that book to Harriet Weaver in which he equates writing a novel to musical composition: in place of chords or motifs, "A man might eat kidneys in one chapter, suffer from kidney disease in another, and one of his friends could be kicked in the kidney in another chapter."6 All three episodes, then, become associated with one another by the common thread "kidney" which runs through each of them. That association creates a perceived unity in the reader's mind, even if it is only on a subconscious level. It is not, strictly speaking, narrative unity, but an emotional unity such as occurs in musical compositions.

---

The musical analogy and the structure it provides is of central importance to much of Eliot's work, as suggested by his choice of titles, for example, *Four Quartets*, "Preludes," and "Five-Finger Exercises." Eliot's interest in the musical aspect of verse is apparent also in the variety of metrical forms and patterns which comprise his *vers libre*. In his article "Reflections on *Vers Libre*," Eliot claimed that *vers libre* can be defined in negative terms only, as an absence of pattern, of rhyme, of metre. While one might infer from this statement that Eliot's *vers libre* is inherently unmusical, one must approach such an inference with extreme caution: First, it is well known that Eliot's criticism is inconsistent and does not reflect his practice as a poet; second, as Pound writes in his essay "T.S. Eliot," Eliot contradicts the statement elsewhere when he writes "No vers is libre for the man who wants to make a good job." Refuting the comments Eliot makes in "Reflections on *Vers Libre*," Pound states, "In a recent article Mr. Eliot contended, or seemed to contend, that good *vers libre* was little more than a skilful evasion of the better known English metres. His article was defective in that he omitted all consideration of metres depending on quantity, alliteration, etc.; in fact, he wrote as if all metres were measured by accent" (421). As Pound suggests, the term *vers libre* is erroneous: music remains a central element in the poetry of this period, but it is a different kind of music (*LEofEP* 12-13). To Pound, *vers libre* represented the poet's instinctual return to quantitative verse: "I think the desire for *vers libre* is due to the sense of quantity reasserting itself after years of starvation." This return Pound sees not as an abandonment of verse form *per se*, but as necessary for the future of

---

8 Eliot himself was aware of (and indifferent to) his inconsistencies. As he wrote Sir Herbert Read in a letter of 1924, "I do not, for myself, bother about the apparent inconsistency--which has been made the most of--between my prose and my verse." Sir Herbert Read "T.S. Eliot: A Memoir" *T.S. Eliot: The Man and His Work*, Ed. Allen Tate. New York: Delacorte Press, 1966: 21.
poetry: "I think progress lies rather in an attempt to approximate classical quantitative metres (NOT to copy them) than in a carelessness regarding such things." Certainly, Eliot's vers libre was not careless, for although he dispenses with the traditional metrical forms based on regular accentual stress, he replaces those traditional forms with a more free-flowing form based on cadence and rhythmic patterns, repetition and irregular rhyme. The primary importance of poetic music is evident as well from the poet's mode of composition. In "The Music of Poetry" Eliot states, "I know that a poem, or a passage of a poem, may tend to realise itself first as a particular rhythm before it reaches expression in words, and that this rhythm may bring to birth the idea and the image." Likewise, Pound was known to emit a low tuneless hum as he composed and Yeats to begin with a "tune"--and not a word or theme or image--in his head. The music of poetry is not imposed as an afterthought, but is often the very impetus and guide of the poetic creation.

Those few scholars so far noted who view Eliot as an Alexandrian appear to present this as a laudable comparison, but until fairly recently, "Alexandrian" was used as a term of disapprobation. Curtius' positive stance on Alexandrian poetry was

10 For a study of Eliot's prosody, see Sister M. Martin Barry, An Analysis of the Prosodic Structure of Selected Poems of T.S. Eliot, rev. edn. Washington: The Catholic U of America P, 1969. Barry states that Eliot's consistent practice is to operate from a basic metrical norm but vary it to a greater or lesser extent: "Generally Eliot is well within the limits of traditional metrical prosody although, at times, as in 'Mr. Apollinax,' 'Little Gidding, III' and The Hollow Men, he departs from metre rather extensively in favor of simple direction of a general cadence combined with stress balance. Within the traditional form his changes in length of lines, his varying degree of departure from exact metre, his careful discrimination in the size of groups, and his attention to pause and to repetition of unit cadence patterns reveal the proficiency of an artist who is refashioning the materials given to him by craftsmen of the past to build for himself a structure of sound which is exactly suited to what he has to say" (118).


12 As Pound notes in a discussion of the importance of musical knowledge to the poet, "Mr Yeats probably would distinguish between a g and a b flat, but he is happy to think that he doesn't, and he would certainly be incapable of whistling a simple melody in tune. Nevertheless, before writing a lyric he is apt to 'get a chune' in his head." A footnote explains that "chune" is Yeats' Neo-Celtic for "tune." The ABC of Reading, New York: New Directions, 1960: 197.
unusual in 1927. A more typical view is pronounced by F.L. Lucas who, in a 1923 review of *The Waste Land* for *The New Statesman*, noted Eliot's Alexandrian propensities with considerable disgust. For the standard view of Alexandrianism in the period, Lucas is worth quoting at length:

Among the maggots that breed in the corruption of poetry one of the commonest is the bookworm. When Athens had decayed and Alexandria sprawled, the new giant-like city, across the Egyptian sands; when the Greek world was filling with libraries and emptying of poets, growing in erudition as its genius expired, then first appeared as pompous as Herod and as worm-eaten that *Professorenpoesie* which finds in literature the inspiration that life gives no more, which replaces depth by muddiness, beauty by echoes, passion by necrophilia. The fashionable verse of Alexandria grew out of the polite leisure of its librarians, its Homeric scholars, its literary critics. Indeed, the learned of that age had solved the economic problem of living by taking in each other's dirty washing, and the "Alexandra" of Lycophron, which its learned author made so obscure that other learned authors could make their fortunes by explaining what it meant, still survives for the curious as the first case of this disease and the first really bad poem in Greek. The malady reappears at Rome in the work of Catullus' friend Cinna (the same whom with a justice doubly poetic the crowd in "Julius Caesar" "tears for his bad verse") and in the gloomy pedantry that mars so much of Propertius; it has recurred at

---


intervals ever since. Disconnected and ill-knit, loaded with echo and allusion, fantastic and crude, obscure and obscurantist—such is the typical style of Alexandrianism.

In his comparison of Eliot to the Alexandrians, Lucas is almost apoplectic in his fury, as irate that *The Waste Land* has notes at all ("a poem that has to be explained in notes is not unlike a picture with 'This is a dog' inscribed beneath") as he is at the fact that the notes do not help him read the poem and are "muddled and incomplete" (199).

Although these two instances of scholarly recognition of Eliot's Alexandrianism are both very early, they occur after Eliot's poetics were formed. Did Eliot know about the Alexandrian poetic programme in his formative years as a poet? Would he have approved of its tenets? The latter would be more likely had he learned of Alexandrian poetics from someone who shared Curtius' (and not Lucas') view. Eliot's learning in the classics was impressive. He began Latin at age 12 and Greek at 13.\(^{15}\) By age 16, he had won the Latin prize at Smith Academy and gained entrance to Harvard with his grades in English, French, Latin, Greek, Algebra, and Plane Geometry, accomplishments detailed in a letter from his parents to Milton Academy.\(^{16}\) Eliot's own summary of his classical studies to that date states that he had covered: "Latin and Virgil's *Aeneid* Books 3-12, I read books I-II last year. Ovid 2,000 lines. Cicero, Milo Grammar. Composition based on Caesar. Greek--I read Xenophon's *Anabasis* books I-IV with *Hellenica* at sight last year. *Iliad* I-III, also books IV-VI, VII and XVIII at sight. *Odyssey* selections. Xenophon at sight. Prose composition" (8). Howarth notes that in college seven of Eliot's 18 undergraduate courses were in Classics: Greek literature in

---


first and second year, including Plato's Apology and Crito, Lysias, Xenophon's Memorabilia, Euripides' Medea and Iphigenia Among the Taurians, Aristophanes' Acharnians and Birds, Aeschylus' Prometheus Bound, Sophocles' Oedipus Tyrannus, books VI and VII of Thucydides, and selections of lyric, elegiac, and iambic verse (Howarth 66-69). In Latin, he studied Roman poetry and the Roman novel.17

It has been suggested that Eliot's theory of tradition was shaped by E.K. Rand, his instructor in Latin poetry (Howarth 69). Howarth notes that in 1942 Eliot presented his old teacher with a copy of What is a Classic? which he had inscribed “for Ken Rand with diffidence” and explains “I imagine that Eliot must have been prepared for his doctrine of tradition and the creative assimilation of the past by lectures in which Rand showed him how Virgil studied, assimilated, and transformed his poetic forerunners” (69-70). The assimilation and transformation of literary tradition is especially characteristic of Alexandrian poets. Rand's study of Virgil concentrates on this aspect as it details how Virgil appropriated and made new the works of his literary predecessors: Homer, Hesiod, Theocritus, and Apollonius of Rhodes.18 Rand is particularly impressed with Virgil's ability “to convert most heterogeneous, sometimes absurdly heterogeneous, substances into a harmonious unity” (vii). Elsewhere, Rand describes this process:

Let the whole poem breathe Homer by the most painstaking imitation—the imitation that challenges attention and that frustrates the critic who would condemn the thefts. There are no thefts; it is easier to steal the club of

17 Apart from Petronius and Apuleius, Howarth does not detail the Latin works or authors Eliot studied.
18 E.K. Rand, The Magical Art of Virgil, Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1931. While this study was published several years after Eliot's "Tradition and the Individual Talent" it is reasonable to suppose that the study reflects Rand's long, ongoing thought, the germ of which was likely present when he lectured to Eliot on Virgil. Eliot's inscription in What is a Classic?, a work largely concerned with Virgil, suggests that Eliot's ideas on Virgil were shaped by his old mentor. For "What is a Classic?" see OPP: 53-71.
Hercules than a verse of Homer's. Not petty larceny, but robbery in the
grand style--that is the programme. (385)

The analogy between poetic imitation and theft comes directly, Rand supposes, from
Virgil: "Virgil himself answered his detractors neatly with the remark that if they thought
he had stolen his best things from Homer, why did they not attempt the same theft
themselves? 'They will find it easier,' he declared, 'to steal his club from Hercules than
a verse from Homer'" (12).19 Or as Eliot puts it in "Philip Massinger" (perhaps having
stolen the analogy himself from Rand), "One of the surest tests [of a good poet] is the
way in which a poet borrows. Immature poets imitate; mature poets steal."20

Rand does link Virgil with Alexandrian poetics; specifically, he sees Catullus
and Calvus as early influences on Virgil who were themselves working within the
tradition of "their Greek masters of the Alexandrian age, who had practised mainly the
smaller literary varieties--mime, pastoral, elegy, and epigram" (34). As Rand points out,
Catullus' "craftsmanship is Alexandrian" (34). He sees Virgil as progressing from these
early influences as he moves "from Alexandrian to Augustan," a move which Rand
traces in Virgil's "ascent from Bucolics to Georgics to the Aeneid" (35). Unfortunately,
Rand nowhere within this study summarizes the tenets of Alexandrian poetics.

It is also possible that Eliot acquired some knowledge of the Alexandrian
poetics from his high school history text.21 In his brief discussion of Alexandrian
literature, Myers dismisses the period as one of "decline during which the productions

---

19 This is reported by Suetonius in the Vita Vergili ch. 46. See Suetonius, vol. 2. Trans. J.C. Rolfe.
20 The Sacred Wood (hereinafter referred to as SW), 7th edn., London: Methuen, 1950: 125
21 I believe this work to be Philip Van Ness Myers' popular High School Ancient History, Greece and
Rome, originally published in 1889 (Canadian Edition, Toronto: Copp, Clark, 1901). In the 1905 letter
noted above, the 16 year old Eliot's summary of his studies includes "History: Myers' History of Greece
and History of Rome" (LoFTSE 399).
of the preceding epochs were worked over and commented upon, or feebly imitated" (155). Myers does not mention Callimachus, Lycophron, or Apollonius; the only poet singled out is Theocritus whose *Idylls* win his praise (174). Curiously, Myers singles out for comment the same typically Alexandrian characteristic of the literature as did Rand in his lectures on Virgil, though he puts a negative slant on it; namely its incorporation of the literary tradition. In his summary of Alexandrian literature, Myers states that it "lacked freshness, spontaneity, originality. It was imitative, critical and learned. The writers of the period were grammarians, commentators, and translators--in a word, bookworms" (174). These are traits for which Eliot too was often condemned by critics. The difficulty that results from these traits in his work has made Eliot, as Hugh Kenner calls him, "for years the archetype of poetic impenetrability."23

Eliot, then, whether or not he would have known or used the term, likely had at least a rudimentary knowledge of Alexandrian poetics during his formative years. Even so, in his work, Eliot mentions Alexandria only once: it is one of the great cities mentioned in *The Waste Land*:

Falling towers
Jerusalem Athens Alexandria
Vienna London
Unreal

(373-376)

One cannot say for certain whether or not Eliot ever mentions Alexandria elsewhere in

---

22 Eliot appears to have read Theocritus in Greek in his youth. After he left America, he wrote to his mother requesting that she send certain of his books on to him in London. These included a Greek edition of "Theocritus, Bion and Maschus [sic]" (*LoFTSE* 399).

his prose work: to date, only the first volume of his letters has been published and this volume stops at 1922. In addition, the poet was a prolific writer of reviews and articles for a number of periodicals and these have yet to be collected and indexed.

Pound’s familiarity with Alexandrian poetry was, for a layperson in the early 1900’s, impressive. His knowledge of Catullus, Propertius, and Ovid is well known and this in itself would be more than sufficient to prove Alexandrian influence. As J.K. Newman states, it does not matter “Whether or not a given writer may or may not have read Callimachus….If he read Ovid, he read Callimachus enough” (Class. Epic x). Yet Pound did read the Greek Alexandrians, and in the original language. Pound’s interest in Theocritus is apparent from his two editions in the Pound archives at Brunnenburg: Theocriti, Idyllium [sic] (Venetiis, 1539) and Poetae Minores Graeci edited by T. Wood (London 1728).24 The former edition is unmarked, as one would expect, due to its value. The latter contains some markings on Idyll 10 and on Bion’s Lament for Adonis. More relevantly, there are four editions of Callimachus at Brunnenburg, two of them containing Pound’s annotations. The particular editions are: Callimaco: inni, translated by Dionigi Strocchi (Milan, 1805), which is an unmarked copy of the Hymns of Callimachus with a poetic translation in Italian; Callimaque, Hymnes, épigrammes, les origines, hecale, iambes, edited and translated into French by Emile Cahen (Paris, 1922) with light annotations; Callimachi (Orphica et Musaei) Hymni et Epigrammata (Germany, 1829) with copious marginalia in a neat hand (not Pound’s);25 and the Loeb edition Callimachus, Lycophron, Aratus with English translation by A.W. Mair (of Callimachus and Lycophron) and G.R. Mair (of Aratus) (London and Cambridge, 1921)

---

24 My thanks to Princess Mary de Rachewiltz for her generosity in allowing me access to her private collection at Brunnenburg.
25 This is confirmed by Princess de Rachewiltz. Although she cannot identify the hand, she suspects that Pound kept the edition out of admiration for the finely-drawn, minute handwriting in French and Greek which crams its slender margins.
which was checked out of the University of Pennsylvania Library on April 4, 1939. This last edition contains Callimachus' hymns, epigrams, and fragments of the Aetia, the Hecale, and the lambi. The poems of Callimachus are heavily annotated by Pound throughout, while the works of Aratus and Lycophron in this edition bear no markings. Pound, then, had read many of the programmatic passages in Callimachus, although, regrettably, there is no evidence that he had read the Prologue to the Aetia which forms Callimachus' most explicit statement of his poetic principles, and which was not included in any of Pound's editions. In his encounter with Callimachus, Pound was at a severe disadvantage: there were at the time no detailed commentaries on Callimachus and a poet as learned and subtle as Callimachus is virtually incomprehensible without one. That Pound struggled with Callimachus is evident from the fact that two of his editions, which contain many of the same poems, bear signs of use. This indicates that Pound read Callimachus not just once, but at least twice. One suspects that it was the Roman poets' esteem for the Alexandrian that sent Pound back again and again to Callimachus, but without the guidance of scholarship, Callimachus' genius remained largely locked away. Pound's marginal note on the Loeb edition is suggestive of his frustrated effort to understand the poet: "Callimachus must have been good if both Catullus and Propertius praise him. But the stuff is mainly dull. The best lost?"27

While Pound's readings suggest the possibility of direct Alexandrian influence, on the whole, his annotations do not indicate a grasp of the Greek Alexandrian poetic programme. This was to come from the Roman poets. Certainly, Pound was aware of

---

26 How Pound came into possession of this book is uncertain. While he visited America in April of 1939 in an attempt to promote his economic theories in Washington, D.C., according to Humphrey Carpenter, Pound did not leave Italy until April 13, 1939. See A Serious Character: The Life of Ezra Pound, Boston: Houghlin, 1988: 558.

27 This appears at the end of the introduction to the Lock of Berenice (Mair 225).
the possibility that the “Roman sophistication” he so admired in Catullus, Ovid, and Propertius likely originated in “the lost Alexandrines (Philetas, Callimachus).”\(^\text{28}\) Still, Pound’s unusual sensitivity to poetics and sympathy with Callimachus’ artistic sentiments is evident from his annotations on Epigram 28:\(^\text{29}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικὸν. οὐδὲ κελεύθω} \\
\text{χαίρω. τις πολλοὺς ὡδὲ καὶ ὡδὲ φέρει.} \\
\text{μισέω καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον. οὐδ’ ἀπὸ κρήνης} \\
\text{πίνω. σιχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια.} \\
\text{Λυσανίη. σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλὸς - ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν} \\
\text{τοῦτο σαφῶς. Ὡχώ φησί τις. ἄλλος ἔχει.}
\end{align*}
\]

I hate the cyclic poem, nor do I take pleasure in the road which carries many to and fro. I abhor, too, the roaming lover, and I drink not from every well; I loathe all common things. Lysanias, thou art, yea, fair, fair: but ere Echo has quite said the word, says someone: “He is another’s.”

The epigram asserts one of Callimachus’ central poetic tenets in its rejection of the traditional imitative post-Homeric epics known as “cyclic poems” (cyclic because they took their subject matter from the archaic epic cycle). The well-travelled road, the promiscuous beloved, and the public well act as metaphors for the tired, well-worn path of the epic written in strict imitation of Homer. The poem constitutes Callimachus’ *recusatio* of the Homeric project which is perhaps *kalos* “beautiful,” but is not the project Callimachus has chosen for himself. Callimachus rejects Homer as a model, not because he did not admire the poet, but because Homer had reached the peak of


\(^{29}\) This is epigram 30 in Mair’s edition.
perfection in the epic genre, and that peak could not be surpassed, or even equalled, by his successors. For hundreds of years, poets had been imitating the master and failing miserably in their attempt to “out-Homer” Homer. As Epigram 28 states, that particular poetic ground had been gone over far too many times. Callimachus dismisses popular demand for more of the same with the statement “I hate everything democratic,” a statement which is strongly bracketed by Pound in the Greek text. Pound has also marked Callimachus’ programmatic statement in the first three lines of the translation with a heavy vertical double line in the right-hand margin. His admiration of Callimachus’ subtle etymological word play is evident from further notations on the Greek text. Pound has circled the *chthairo* element of *echthairo* (“I hate,” 1), *chairo* (“I enjoy,” 2), the -*chaino* element in *sikchaino* (“I loathe,” 4) and *naichi* (“yes, indeed” 5). In the margin, Pound has written and under-scored twice “Excellent.” The word play here is particularly interesting because in each case it involves an antonym for the word echoed: the play on *echthairo*, “I hate,” and *chairo*, “I enjoy,” creates a false etymology of opposites and the negative sentiment *chaino*, “I hate,” is made positive by the near-perfect acrostic in the emphatic affirmation *naichi*, “yes, indeed.”

In considering whether Pound and Eliot would have consciously viewed themselves as Alexandrian poets, one must first determine what they would have understood by the critical term “Alexandrian.” Currently, there exists some ambiguity in the critical terminology, with “Alexandrian,” “Callimachean” and “Hellenistic” used often interchangeably. In this dissertation, “Alexandrian,” does not necessarily mean “from Alexandria;” more often, it means “of the Alexandrian style” and is used to describe poets and poetics (whether they be Greek, Roman or English).

---

30 Mair translates *demosia* “democratic” as “common,” perhaps in deference to modern feelings about democracy. Third-century Alexandria was no democracy and Callimachus was a court poet: such sentiments would not have rankled his audience.
“Callimachean” is used when the model for a poet or a particular piece of work is specifically Callimachus. While a Callimachean poet is necessarily also Alexandrian, an Alexandrian poet need not be Callimachean—he may take his model instead from Theocritus or Propertius, for example. “Hellenistic” is used to refer to the historical period of third-century B.C. Greece. R. Pfeiffer explains that, historically, much of the ambiguity in the terminology occurs because “Alexandrian” became a pejorative term after the publication of Winckelmann’s *History of Ancient Art* in 1764. As Pfeiffer observes, Winckelmann saw the Alexandrian age as the death of the Greek poetic genius and his view held sway for many years: “The impression Winckelmann made on the whole of Europe was prodigious; under his influence post-classical Greek production was regarded as imitative and decadent...the creed now accepted was this: the Greek genius degenerated and disintegrated in the Alexandrian period” (70).

Understanding of the poetry’s particular genius began with Wilamowitz in the late nineteenth century (Pfeiffer, *ibid.* 70-71). In the early twentieth century, “Hellenistic” might denote the poetics of Callimachus and his followers or merely things Greek, while “Alexandrian” might be used of a city and an era, but might also apply to denounce the poetry of imitation and decay—the type of poetry that Pound in particular so vigorously opposed. It was not a term that Pound would associate with the slender, erudite and witty “new” poetry of the Neoteric Catullus or Propertius or Ovid which he so admired, but one which he might apply to its opposite. This is suggested by his references to Alexandria in the early years. Consider his 1917 remarks to Margaret Anderson of *The Little Review*: “You advertise ‘new Hellenism.’

---

32 The term “Neoteric” comes from the Latin transliteration of the Greek *neoteroi*, “very new,” and was apparently coined by Cicero (along with *novi poetae*) to describe Catullus and his circle. See Kenneth Quinn, ed., *Catullus. The Poems*, London: MacMillan, 1973: xiii. All references to Catullus are to Quinn’s edition.
It’s all right if you mean humanism, Pico’s *De Dignitate*, the *Odyssey*, the Moscophoros. Not so good if you mean Alexandria and worse if you mean Munich-sham-Greek ‘Hellas’ with a good swabian brogue” (*LoFEP* 107). Pound’s equation of Alexandria with “Munich-sham-Greek” suggests that he associates Alexandria with falsity, lack of imagination, and downright imitation. This may be due in part to his denigration of the French movement led by Ronsard called the Pléiade who posited themselves as admirers of Callimachus. Ironically, the Pléiade’s admiration of Callimachus took the form of strict imitation, thus rendering them the modern equivalent to the Hellenistic cyclic poets whom Callimachus disdained. Pound criticizes the Pléiade for failing to move beyond their models and for “wastage and servile imitation” (*LoFEP* 214-215). The denigration of German Hellenism in particular may be attributable to Pound’s antagonism toward Romanticism. Nineteenth-century German scholars erroneously saw the Hellenistic period as an early precursor of Romanticism, a view confuted by new discoveries of Alexandrian verse which showed the spirit and literature of the age to be the antithesis of everything Romantic (Pfeiffer, “Future” 70). To Pound, “Alexandrian” might also evoke narrowness, as suggested by his 1920 comments to William Carlos Williams: “Not that I care a curse for ANY nation as such or that, so far as I know, I have ever suggested that I was trying to write U.S. poetry (any more than you are writing Alexandrine Greek bunk to conform to the ideas of that refined, charming and utterly narrow minded she-bard ‘H.D.’” (*LoFEP* 157). H.D. is perhaps the least Alexandrian of the modernists, and she is certainly far less so than Pound himself. From these comments, it appears that Pound had no knowledge of the critical term as it is now defined. While it is not known exactly when Pound first read Callimachus, it is evident that the pejorative connotations that “Alexandrian” held for him in the early years had evaporated by 1934. Recommending Greek poets for study
to Mary Barnard, he appears to put the poets of Alexandria on an equal footing with Aeschylus: "I personally think Homer the best Greek. But that don't mean you are warned off the grass re either Aeschylus or Alexandria" (LofEP 252). In 1953, his respect for Callimachus' craft is evident as he urges Barnard to translate the poet's *Hymn to Delos*: "It is now to be pointed out that there is no decent translation of Callimachus' 'Delos' or of the old bogie Bion 'Adonis' / both of which give something to get one's teeth into and a sustained body of verse, that needs an idiom AND a swing etc."33

While Pound would not have been familiar with the critical terminology of the Alexandrian poetic movement, he would have had a good grasp of its concepts to some extent from Callimachus' epigrams and *Hymn to Apollo*, but primarily through the Roman poets, who make strong statements of the Alexandrian poetic manifesto. In his own literary criticism, Pound uses two of the key terms of the Roman Alexandrian poetic movement. Finding fault with Andreas Divus' translation of Homer, Pound notes that Divus' Latin "is not the Latin of Catullus and Ovid:...it is *illepidus* [inelegant] to chuck Latin nominative parts about in such profusion" (LEofEP 264), and praises Divus for possessing the quality of *venustas* "charm" (ibid 265). Both *lepidus* and *venustas* have been read as rallying terms for the Alexandrian revival at Rome that began with Catullus and the Neoterics.34 Catullus begins the first poem of his collection with a dedication that highlights the work's allegiance to Alexandrian poetics: "Cui dono lepidum novum libellum," "To whom do I give this elegant, novel little book?" Here we have the important principles of novelty (*novum*), the small-scale

---

treatment (*libellum*), and the refined, witty, and elegant style signalled by *lepidum*, the Roman equivalent to Callimachus' *leptos*. The Alexandrian allegiance is even further strengthened by the bilingual pun *lepidum*/*leptos* (Wiseman 183). Further, Pound's Loeb edition of Callimachus describes some key elements of Callimachus' poetic programme and the new poetry, specifically the focus on precision and fine craftsmanship in relatively short poems versus the old, unwieldy epic written in imitation of Homer, and the consequent literary controversy which erupted into the "Battle of the Books." Mair describes the feud as essentially between Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes (3-6), a view which has been disproved in recent years.35 Although Callimachus was an outspoken and aggressive opponent of the "Big Book" there is absolutely no direct evidence that Apollonius was among his enemies. In fact, the earliest suggestion of a quarrel occurs in sixth century A.D., some 800 years after Callimachus (Newman, *Class. Epic* 73 n.1 for bibliography). Recent scholarship illustrates that Apollonius' *Argonautica* is a consummately Alexandrian poem written in accordance with Callimachean precepts (Newman *Class. Epic* 73-103). Still, Mair's summary of the nature of the controversy is apt and suggestive of the literary polemic of the early twentieth century:

In the view of Callimachus the day of the Homeric type of epic was past. That spacious type of poetry must now give place to a poetry more expressive of the genius of the age, the short and highly polished poem, in which the recondite learning of the time should find expression....To Callimachus it may well have seemed that the long epic, written in the traditional epic language with its set phrases and formulae, could hardly

be other than a weak and artificial echo of Homer: it could be no expression of the living culture of Alexandria: it could have no originality, nothing individual. (3-4)

The Greek Alexandrians' rejection of Homer as a model and their apparent condemnation of his bad influence on later poets is strikingly similar to the modernists' quarrel with Milton. Pound was a vociferous critic of Milton. Eliot shared Pound's opinion and composed two essays to explain the modernists' objection to Milton. Eliot observes Milton's deleterious effect on poetry: "To fall under the spell of Milton is to be condemned to imitate him" (149). Because of this, Eliot claimed that "Milton made a great epic impossible for succeeding generations" (150). It would be interesting to consider whether Milton and the more imitable (because flawed) Robert Browning were for the modernists (particularly Pound) as Homer and Hesiod were for the Greek Alexandrians. Browning, like Hesiod, could be surpassed, for while he pioneered the way to a new poetic, he had not found it. For Eliot, Browning's failure made him unsuitable as a model: "Browning was more of a hindrance than a help, for he had gone some way, but not far enough, in discovering a contemporary idiom." In contrast, Pound does not appear to have found Browning a hindrance; Pound simply followed the path Browning had begun to cut before him. When choosing a suitable model, imitability is not the sole criterion. The Alexandrians had other, positive reasons for selecting Hesiod. As K.J. McKay notes, Hesiod was to them, "a polymath with wide interests, a didactic poet who paid careful attention to sound, and, as the supposed author of the Catalogue of Women, a mythological mine, a model for narrative art, with

36 See, for example, Pound's comments in LEofEP, 217, 232, 237-238.
37 "Milton I" and "Milton II" are included in OPP 138-45 and 146-161, respectively.
even a curious reputation for love poetry." Likewise, Pound had positive reasons to choose to emulate Browning. The particular traits Pound admired in Browning are ones common to the Alexandrians, namely, his difficulty, complexity, extreme compression and condensation, his incorporation of "unpoetic" words and phrases which expanded the possibilities for poetic diction, his psychological insight, use of foreign languages, and his metrical innovations. One wonders if Pound's line "To break the pentameter, that was the first heave" is a reference to Browning's metrical innovations which paved the way for free verse: Browning typically uses enjambment to break the natural lilt of the line. As Bornstein observes, Browning "could break the pentameter nearly as well as Pound" (115).

What did Pound and Eliot say about their own poetic programme? One does not find a manifesto in verse such as one finds in Callimachus' Prologue to the Aetia, but Pound does spell out his "Credo" and basic principles for the poet early on in "A Retrospect" (LEofEP 9, 3-6). Pound was formulating his poetic principles as early as 1912 when he instructs the poet to follow these precepts:

1. Direct treatment of the "thing" whether subjective or objective
2. To use absolutely no word that does not contribute to the presentation.
3. As regarding rhythm: to compose in the sequence of the musical phrase, not in the sequence of a metronome. (LEofEP 3)

---

40 A study of Browning's place in the Alexandrian tradition will be an important contribution to scholarship, but it is, unfortunately, beyond the scope of this dissertation.
42 C 81/518. All references are to Ezra Pound, The Cantos (abbreviated herein as C), New York: New Directions, 1973.
Here, Pound singles out: 1. precision, for by treating the "thing" directly one necessarily prefers the particular over the general; 2. concision, which leads to extreme compression; and 3. the musical analogy discussed above, wherein verse is written not according to prosodic rules of form and metre but according to those of music. Further rules for poets focus on: extreme concision and verbal economy ("Use no superfluous word, no adjective which does not reveal something," "Use either no ornament or good ornament" 4, 5); precision (for example, he warns against mixing the abstract with the concrete); and the importance of sound and the musical analogy (discussed in a long section on rhythm and metre 5-7). The importance of the latter element to Pound is obvious and he stresses it to the aspiring poet: "Don't imagine that the art of poetry is any simpler than the art of music, or that you can please the expert before you have spent as least as much effort on the art of verse as the average piano teacher spends on the art of music" (LEofEP 5). Pound notes the importance of poetic influence by "as many great poets" as possible (5), an influence which necessarily leads to the poet's use and handling of the devices of allusion. The poet must either "acknowledge the debt outright" (direct quotation and citation) or try to conceal it (literary allusion).

Eliot, on the other hand, makes no such manifesto, not surprisingly in view of his ambivalence about literary creeds. As he says: "a creed is always in one sense smaller than the man, and in another sense larger; one's formulations never fully explain one, although it is necessary to formulate" (Read 21). Eliot's reluctance to make strong, definite statements of any kind earned him the monicker "Old Possum" from Pound, who edited out a great deal of the poet's hesitancy from the original
The manuscript of *The Waste Land*. The issue is further complicated by the fact that, as noted above, Eliot's critical comments cannot always be trusted to reflect accurately his poetic practice. While he does, in "Tradition and the Individual Talent," indicate that he *has* a programme, he keeps the details of it to himself--these must be inferred from his poetry.

Eliot addresses the issue of his poetics in *Four Quartets*, but solely in negative terms: not what he hopes his poetry will achieve and how, but the ways in which it has failed him. At a time later in life when he has virtually given up poetry for drama, Eliot can see only the impossibility of poetry, of language, to signify reality, to *do* anything:

...Words strain,
Crack and sometimes break, under the burden,
Under the tension, slip, slide, perish,
Decay with imprecision, will not stay in place.

("Burnt Norton" V.13-16)

Eliot rejects even the possibility of the precision mandated by Pound, though he does not reject the principle of precision itself. The fault, Eliot claims, lies not with the poet who strives for precision, but with his raw material--the language--which is simply not up to the task demanded of it:

---

43 The *Waste Land*: A Facsimile of the Original Drafts Including the Annotations of Ezra Pound. Ed. Valerie Eliot. San Diego, New York and London: Harcourt Brace. 1971. Pound was especially irritated by Eliot's use of qualifiers. For instance, he deletes "perhaps" at pp. 31, 33, and 45, writing in the margin of p. 31 "dam per'apsez." At page 47, Pound deletes the verbal qualifier "may" and writes "make up yr. mind you Tiresias if you know know damn well or else you dont [sic]."

44 Technically, Eliot continued to write verse (poetic drama), but he no longer wrote poetry. While poetic drama is a form of poetry, it differs from it significantly inasmuch as it is not entirely dependent on language to convey meaning. What the words fail to get across can be conveyed by the actors' performances, costumes, sets, music, etc. A well-staged poetic drama can do much more than words on a page.

That was a way of putting it--not very satisfactory:
A periphrastic study in a worn-out poetical fashion,
Leaving one still with the intolerable wrestle
With words and meanings. The poetry does not matter.

("East Coker" II.18-21)

The final half-line in the quote above is as close as one can get to a renunciation of poetry. The despairing lines in which Eliot sums up his relationship to his art are worth quoting at length:

So here I am, in the middle way, having had twenty years--
Twenty years largely wasted, the years of l'entre deux guerres--
Trying to learn to use words, and every attempt
Is a wholly new start, and a different kind of failure,
Because one has only learnt to get the better of words
For the thing one no longer has to say, or the way in which
One is no longer disposed to say it. And so each venture
Is a new beginning, a raid on the inarticulate
With shabby equipment always deteriorating
In the general mess of imprecision of feeling,
Undisciplined squads of emotion. And what there is to conquer
By strength and submission, has already been discovered
Once or twice, or several times, by men whom one cannot
hope
To emulate--but there is no competition--
There is only the fight to recover what has been lost
And found and lost again and again.

("East Coker" V.1-16)

Thus at the end of his poetic career, Eliot maintains the impossibility of articulation and the inevitability of the "emotional slither" which Pound bans from his poetics in "A Retrospect" (12). Eliot's despairing tone implies that this was his goal also--to achieve emotional precision and control in his poetry--as he laments his perceived failure and consequent lost years of striving in vain.

One suspects that Eliot saw his poetic programme as intimately linked with Virgil's, and that it was Virgil's Alexandrianism in particular that appealed to Eliot and influenced his work. When Eliot briefly refers to his own poetics in "Tradition and the Individual Talent," he singles out one quality he shares with Virgil, the particular quality which was so forcefully described by his esteemed teacher E.K. Rand, namely, the poet's need to assimilate the whole of literature and to incorporate his poetic ancestors within his own poetry. As noted, this quality is particularly Alexandrian. Eliot answers his detractors:

I am alive to a usual objection to what is clearly part of my programme for the métier of poetry. The objection is that the doctrine requires a ridiculous amount of erudition (pedantry)....What is to be insisted upon is that the poet must develop or procure the consciousness of the past and that he should continue to develop this consciousness throughout his
Tradition is central to the poet’s consciousness and this tradition “cannot be inherited, and if you want it, you must obtain it by great labour” (SW 48).

The Alexandrian qualities of Virgil are brought out most fully by W. Jackson Knight in *Roman Vergil*, a book which Eliot himself got accepted for publication by Faber between 1939 and 1940. While Eliot’s work on Knight’s behalf need not imply that he agreed with Knight’s treatment of Virgil, the fact of their subsequent friendship, Eliot’s own intense relationship with Virgil, and his explicit nod to Knight’s expertise on the subject in “Virgil and the Christian World” (OPP 122) suggest that this is so. While Rand had implicitly suggested that Virgil was an Alexandrian poet in his use of tradition, Knight is much more explicit on the subject. As he states: “Alexandrian poetry was the primary influence for Vergil” (86). He goes on to detail the specific areas of influence, noting in particular Virgil’s Alexandrian use of allusion, word play, learning, ambiguity, association, compression, and sound play (86). Knight goes so far as to equate this explicitly Alexandrian Virgil with the modernist poet T.S. Eliot:

Vergil was a bold and violent modernist. He coerced words and their meanings, and used unexpected licenses. This and his dependence on rhythm and sound for their own significance and almost for their own sakes must have made him seem as Hopkins and Eliot seem to us.

Above all his style has reality. He has something to say and he says it. Economy and compression remain his first characteristics, and they are

---

46 London: Faber, 1944.
Like Rand, Knight discusses how Virgil was criticized for his use of literary tradition in his poems and dismissed as a derivative poet—derivative and thus a plagiarist in essence as well as a bad poet (99). While Knight cites in Virgil’s defence T.S. Eliot’s critical work on the importance of tradition to literature (100), Eliot himself was often criticised for the very same thing: his use of literary allusion and quotation was seen by some as plagiarism and marked him, in their eyes, as a derivative poet, and one with a paucity of imagination and original talent.48

Alexandrian Allusion: What it is and How it Functions

The relationship between plagiarism and allusion is complex. As Todorov notes, classical literary history has often viewed askance the polyvalence of poetic language “when it invokes an interior discourse more or less explicitly,” with the exception of parody.49 Due to their high degree of reliance on allusion, the Greek, Roman and modern Alexandrians have been viewed as derivative at best and plagiarists at worst. Yet the difference between plagiarism and allusion is seen in the relationship between the old and the new text: a plagiarist merely substitutes someone else’s words for his or her own; an allusive poet uses someone else’s words to create

---

49 Tzvetan Todorov, Introduction to Poetics. Trans. Richard Howard. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P. 1981: 23. For an interesting discussion of plagiarism, see Thomas McFarland, “The Problem of Coleridge’s Plagiarisms,” Coleridge and the Pantheist Tradition. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1969: 1-52. While McFarland does not discuss the relationship between allusion and plagiarism, he makes the fascinating suggestion that Coleridge’s famous “borrowings” are not the result of plagiarism but of his mode of composition, which McFarland describes as “composition by mosaic organization rather than by painting on an empty canvas” (27). McFarland does not explore this possibility, but potentially there is a very interesting comparison to be made between the modernists’ mode of composition (the ideogrammic method) and Coleridge’s.
a metaphorical relationship between his or her words and theirs. There is an element of play in which the alluding text interacts with the text evoked to produce authorial comment on the new work, whether it be for the sake of irony, pathos, humour, etc. Thus when an author alludes to another text, three elements come into play: the new text, the old text, and the metaphorical relationship between them, a relationship that is greater than its constituent parts on their own.\(^{50}\) As Pasco explains, “we are encouraged to rise above the elements without negating them, to put them together, and to experience the resultant magic. And I suggest that it is this metaphorical relationship which is common to all allusive events that permits us to distinguish allusion from other devices” (14). Pasco’s explanation of the function of allusion is remarkably similar to Pound’s notion of the ideogrammic method of poetic composition: set two things side by side and one creates a third thing, the relationship between them. The difference is that in allusion the constituent parts are not images or concepts but texts. Pasco further differentiates parody from allusion, pointing out that in parody its two or more terms are different, “the one constantly holding the other up to ridicule and judgment, constantly saying ‘I am not that other absurd thing.’ Metaphoric integration is violently resisted” (15).

Eliot’s theory in “Tradition and the Individual Talent” is based on the premise that no text exists in isolation; it is always viewed in relation to its antecedents. The Russian Formalists also recognised this feature of the literary text. As Shklovski states, “The work of art is perceived in relation with other artistic works and by means of the association the reader makes with them....Not only parody and pastiche, but every work of art is created in parallel with and in opposition to some model.”\(^{51}\) All literature, then, is essentially intertextual to some degree or another. In an excellent discussion


\(^{51}\) As quoted by Todorov, *op. cit.* 23. Todorov gives no citation for the quote.
of intertextuality and Eliot's theory in "Tradition and the Individual Talent,"\textsuperscript{52} Thaïs E. Morgan describes Eliot's essay as an attempt to mediate between the two opposing theories of influence and inspiration (4-5). The model of influence valorizes the source text over its predecessors as being more pure; thus literary history must be viewed as essentially degenerative. Conversely, the model of inspiration maintains that "newer is better;" rejecting earlier models, it views literary history as progressive. Like the theory of influence, that of inspiration is based on a temporal model, but simply reverses the direction of flow. As Morgan explains (5), in "Tradition and the Individual Talent," Eliot locates the individuality of the poet in neither his innovativeness nor in his imitativeness, but in his ability to include all previous literature in his work so that past and present discourses co-exist....What emerges from Eliot's critique of the heuristic metaphors of influence and inspiration is the concept of literature as a system of co-equal, co-present texts. Although he certainly does not share the ideological premises of Roland Barthes or Julia Kristeva, Eliot's view of literary relationships as a network or structure rather than as an evolution or a family leads him to draw several conclusions found again in the theories of intertextuality proposed in S/Z (1970b) and Semanalyse (1969), respectively. Daringly, Eliot here reverses the directives of historicism and suggests the possibility that literature has no origins but only open sets of transformations within a closed system—a paradox that will occupy the semiotics of intertextuality.

If each text operates in an allusive relationship with all other texts and if most (if

\textsuperscript{52}"Is There an Intertext in This Text? Literary and Interdisciplinary Approaches to Intertextuality," \textit{American Journal of Semiotics} 3 (1985)1-40. For Morgan's explication of the theories of influence and inspiration summarized herein, see 2-3.
not all) poets consciously use allusion to enrich their work, what is it about the way the Alexandrian poets handle the device that distinguishes them from all other poets? The primary distinction is one of degree. While other poets use allusion, the Alexandrians rely on it to an unprecedented degree and push the device much further. Another distinction is the manner in which allusion functions within the text. Generally speaking (and there are always exceptions), non-Alexandrian allusion adds an additional layer of meaning or resonance to the literary text, but the work as a whole does not suffer if a given reader does not recognize the allusion (although his or her reading is certainly enriched if he or she does). With Alexandrian allusion, meaning is often dependent upon the metaphorical relationship created by the allusion: the allusion evokes a text (or texts) which creates a metaphorical field against which the poem is to be read. Miss the allusion, and you miss a great deal of the poem's meaning. One suspects that this is the reason for the relative unpopularity of the ancient Alexandrians. Particularly in the case of the Greeks, allusions are hopelessly lost to us because the texts evoked have not survived. If an allusion is lost it is not recognized, and if it is not recognized as an allusion, it does not function within the text. If its function is central to the text, then the text suffers proportionately. To appreciate the allusions in ancient texts which can be recognized as such and identified, one must frequently rely on dry scholarly notes. Chasing down allusions and working to reconstruct their relationship to the text has a rather different effect on the reader than that which occurs when the texts evoked are known and recognized at

---

53 For more on Alexandrian allusion, see Richard F. Thomas “Virgil’s Georgics and the Art of Reference” *HSCP* 90 (1986)171-198. Thomas has a full bibliography on Hellenistic allusion in his notes 1, 2, and 3. For bibliography on allusion in general, see Pasco, *op. cit.*

54 Non-Alexandrian poets such as Milton and Dryden do make occasional use of this type of allusion, but it is not their predominant mode.

55 As Pasco notes, an allusion does not need to be traced or even understood in order to function, although its function will be limited (18).
first or even subsequent readings.

To illustrate the centrality of allusion to meaning in Alexandrian poetry, consider Callimachus' *Aetia* fr. 177. The peasant Molorchus' battle with the pantry mice depends for its humour on recognition of its many allusions to the *Iliad*, in particular, to Achilles' outrages against the body of Hector. Callimachus evokes passages of the *Iliad* by using Homeric words which are, in the new, humble context, strikingly incongruous in their sublimity.\(^5^6\) For example, Molorchus' mice are described as a *kokumous* (a shrieking, a cause for wailing) to guests (14). This high-flown epic word recalls not only the underworld's river Cocytus (to which it is etymologically linked), but also the word used of the corpse of Hector as Achilles drags it around the walls of Troy: Hector's body is a *kokutos*, a cause of wailing, to his parents and to his wife (*Il.*, 22.409, 447).\(^5^7\) Thus the terrible confrontation between these two great heroes and its tragic outcome become part of the metaphorical landscape of Callimachus' poem.

The metaphorical field of Homer's battleground is further evoked at *Aetia* 177.29. When the mice gnaw at the old man's rags and wallet, they are called ravagers (*sintai*). *Sintai* is derived from the verb *sinomai* which means to plunder, spoil, or ravage. *Sinomai* is used frequently of wild beasts in the sense of to tear apart or devour; in a more general sense, it can mean to distress, harm or damage.\(^5^8\) In this particular context, *sintai* is hyperbolic: while the mice will no doubt damage Molorchus' clothes in their search for food, they will hardly rend them like a wild beast its prey. There is, however, a sense in which *sintai* functions as a dual sign inasmuch as it partakes of both meanings of its verbal root: to tear apart and to damage. The term *dual sign* is Riffaterre's; it is, as he explains:

---

\(^5^6\) All references to Homer's *Iliad* are to the 2 vol. edition of David B. Munro and Thomas W. Allen, Oxford: Clarendon P. 1920.

\(^5^7\) *Kokumous* and *kokutos* are both derived from the verb *kokuo*, to shriek or lament (*s.v. LSJ kokuo*).

\(^5^8\) *LSJ s.v. sinomai* I and II.
an equivocal word situated at the point where two sequences of semantic or formal associations intersect. Nodal point might be a better image, since the words link together chains of association drawn along parallel paths by the sentence. These parallels meet, in defiance of geometric law, only because the dual sign properly placed in one of the two sequences would have been just as much at home in the other. This potential appropriateness somewhere else, in another text, is a familiar concept at this point in our exploration of the semiotic grid; the difference here is that the other “text” is very close at hand, the sequence is mixed with the one in which the equivocal word rightly belongs. The potential appropriateness is its total or partial homophony with another word (or with itself, in case of a word endowed with very different meanings) that might be in the other sequence: to put it otherwise, the dual sign functions like a pun.59

While the mice will only damage Molorchus’ belongings, there is a sense in which the specific meaning of to ravage may also apply in this situation: mice, being animals, belong to the genus, at least, of beasts. Like beasts of a larger and predatory nature, the mice metaphorically “tear apart” Molorchus’ clothes. In Homer, sinomai is used of wild beasts when they attack their prey (see the scholia on Aetia 177.29 in Pfeiffer). In the iliad, the word occurs when murderous wolves fall upon lambs or kids (16.353); when a ravening lion attacks feeding jackals and steals their prey (11.481); and lastly when Achilles, like a ravening lion (leon sintes), rushes to attack the warrior Aeneas (20.165). By using sintai, the noun related to sinomai, of mice, Callimachus evokes the

comic equation mice = lions = Achilles.

This mock heroic depiction is further supported by the description of the mice drawing off oil from the lamp with their tails to lick: the word used for their tails is not the common one, *oura*, but *alkaia* (177.23), a word specifically used to denote the tail of the lion. As the scholiast on Apollonius notes, the tail (oura) of the lion is called the *alkaia* because of the etymological play with *alke* (strength): the lion's tail (*alkaia*) was viewed as a symbol of his might (*alke*) because he typically lashes it about before he attacks. The scholiast cites his proof for this from Homer; specifically, he refers to the simile noted above, the comparison of Achilles to a ravening lion that lashes its flanks with its tail (here *oura*) in an attempt to whip up its fury (*alkimon etor*, "brave heart") for the attack (*ll. 20.169-171*). By using *alkaia* of the mice's tails, Callimachus metaphorically casts the mice as lions; specifically, these *sintai* mice are like the *sintes* lion which steals the jackals' prey in *ll. 11*, and like the *sintes* lion to which Achilles is compared in *ll. 20*. The manner in which Callimachus evokes this allusion is typically Alexandrian: Callimachus uses the word *alkaia* of the mice's tails not to recall the precise word which Homer used for the lion's tail (for that was *oura*), but as a direct echo of the adjective *alkimon* in Homer and an indirect recollection of the usual application of the word *alkaia* to refer to the tail of a lion.

The word *sintai* in this passage also recalls *liiad* 24.45, where it appears to be used in the general sense of "injure" or "harm," as opposed to the specific sense of a predator spoiling prey. Here, Apollo pleads with the gods to find a solution to the problem of Achilles' mutilation of Hector's body, an act, he says, which destroys pity.

---

60 *LSJ* s.v. *alkaia*.
62 *Alkimon*, "brave, strong," is the adjectival form of the noun *alke* (*LSJ* s.v. *alkimos*).
and shame, shame which injures (sinetai) men and also profits them.63 One wonders if Callimachus' use of the word in both the general and specific sense is a veiled scholarly comment on Homer's practice.64 The Alexandrian poets, scholars as they were, typically engaged in "the textual criticism and lexical interpretation of 'classical' literature, again especially of Homer, whereby, for instance, a Homeric word of dubious meaning is placed in an explanatory context."65 Did Callimachus suspect Homer of including both the general and specific meaning in this particular passage? Perhaps Homer too is using sinomai as a dual sign: shame is literally harmful to men, and it also, metaphorically speaking, ravages or plunders them of their self-respect.

It is also possible that sintai in Callimachus is a double allusion: one to Homer's I. 24.45, discussed above, and another to the passage in Hesiod's Works and Days which, as noted, may be itself a reworking of I. 24.45. Interestingly, Hesiod's line, like Callimachus', couples the concept of plundering (sinetai) with that of shame:

αἰδώς. δ' οὖ άγαθή κεχρημένον άνδρα κομίζειν.
αἰδώς. ἦ τ' άνδρας μέγα σίνεται ἢδ' όνίνησιν.

(W.D. 317-318)66

Shame is not good at looking after the needy man; shame which ravages men greatly and which profits them. (My trans.)

---

63 While some scholars have deemed this line an interpolation due to its similarity to Hesiod Works and Days 317, C.W. Macleod makes a convincing argument against this position. He concludes that "it is not absurd to think that Hesiod was echoing his contemporary" and further "it is not necessary, and may well be wrong, to suppose that it is spurious." C.W. Macleod, ed., Homer: Iliad Book XXIV, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982: 92. For more on the relation between these two passages, see Macleod's bibliography on page 92.

64 Scholarly comments are typically embedded within Alexandrian poetry.


But this was the most shameless deed... that the thieves achieved within a short night

In Callimachus, *sintai* echoes Hesiod's *sinetai*; *kuntaton* ("most shameless") recalls Hesiod's *aidos* ("shame"), its antonym. The significance of the allusion to Hesiod, apart from the cleverness of alluding to two poetic masters at once, one of whom is using the other as a model, is not entirely clear: is Callimachus advancing his learned opinion on the scholarly condemnation of *Il. 24.45* as an interpolation in Homer from Hesiod *W.D. 318*? Perhaps Callimachus means to express his opinion that the line in question did appear in both Homer and Hesiod—that Hesiod modelled *W.D. 318* on *Il. 24.45*—by alluding to them both together in one line.

The sheer incongruity and bold-faced impudence of the implicit comparison evoked by Callimachus' allusion—the old peasant Molorchus as distressed by mice (mice described in terms of ravening lions!) as the immortal gods and Hector's loved ones were distressed by the mutilation of Hector's corpse—is what lends the piece its humour. If those allusions are not recognized and appreciated, the piece falls flat, for the surface details of the fragment are not particularly comic; indeed, they are rather banal. The comedy is in the intertextual play created by the allusions and not in the narrative *per se*.

Similarly, in the *Icos* fragment one does not catch the narrator's self-ironizing characterization of himself and his Icariian dinner companion unless one knows the
Homeric precedent. The relevant passage reads:

... ἄν δὲ γενέθλην

Ἅκιαος. ὃ ἡνήν εἶχον ἑγὼ κλισίην
οὐκ ἐπιτάξ. ἀλλ διόν Ὀμηρικός. οἴεν ὁμοῖον
ὡς θεός. οὐ ψευδῆς. ἐς τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει.

(Aetia 178.6-10)

He was an Icarian by birth, and I shared a couch with him—not by design, but the saying of Homer is not false that God ever brings like to like.

On its own, the saying of Homer "God ever brings like to like" is a rather meaningless platitude. It is the context in which Homer says it that is important; it is that context which must be compared to the context here in order to unearth the irony and humour in the Callimachus fragment. In Homer, this platitude is placed in the uncouth mouth of the goatherd Melanthios who greets the beggar-disguised Odysseus and the swineherd Eumaios with:

 νῦν μὲν δὴ μάλα πάγχυ κακὸς κακὸν ἡγηλάζει.
ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἄγει θεός ὡς τὸν ὁμοῖον

(Od. 17.217-218)

Here comes one villain leading another, as always God leads like to like.

Once again, an allusion brings to the text meaning which it would otherwise lack.

Allusion functions similarly in Eliot. To look at just one example, consider these lines from "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock:"
Though I have seen my head (grown slightly bald)
brought in upon a platter,
I am no prophet--and here's no great matter.

(82-84)

The obvious allusion is to Mark 6:22-25, the story of Herod's gift of the head of John the Baptist to the daughter of Herodias, an allusion which is evoked by the reference to a head on a platter. The mention of a prophet in addition to this reference clinches the identification of the allusion (although it is unnecessary for the identification). Thus, the timid, repressed "hero" of the poem recognizes his own cowardice, his own limitations, as he shies away from decisive action. With bitter irony, he protests that he is not such a one as the charismatic John the Baptist, a man brave and with the courage of conviction. Yet there is a further, more subtle resonance to the phrase "I am no prophet." As noted, the phrase is not needed to bring into play the allusion to John the Baptist since the reference to a head on a platter is sufficient for the purpose. While it does support this allusion, it also brings in an additional allusion of its own. Its placement at the beginning of the line as well as the syntax and word order of the phrase evoke Dante's Inferno II.32:67 as the hero Dante shies back from the daring journey which Virgil has proposed, he protests: Io non Enea, io non Paulo sono ("I am not Aeneas, am not Paul"). Thus, Prufrock's words and the allusion to Mark can be read through the veil of Dante. Self-aware and acutely self-conscious, Prufrock rejects any easy self-mythologizing: just as he knows full well he is no John the Baptist, so he is no Aeneas, no Paul--three men who ventured bravely great deeds in the name of

There is a further parallel drawn between Prufrock and the character of Dante who speaks these words in *Inferno*. Both protest their calling, both proclaim that they are not worthy. The difference is that Prufrock is right: where his protest is born of self-awareness, Dante's comes from a lack of it—he does not know, but will learn, that he is equal to the demands made upon his faith and courage. Unlike Prufrock, Dante possesses the faith of Aeneas, of Paul, of John the Baptist, and the courage it confers. This allusion to Dante adds a strong resonance to the characterization of Prufrock. Should the allusion pass unnoticed, the phrase "I am no prophet" is merely redundant, a decorative phrase which lacks poetic force. Eliot's allusion to a heroic Biblical figure contrasts with the essentially secular nature of his text and the anti-heroical character of Prufrock, thus investing his text with an irony and range of feeling it would not otherwise possess.

While this type of half-concealed or veiled allusion is essentially Alexandrian and is the primary mode of allusion for the Alexandrian poet, non-Alexandrian poets such as Milton may also avail themselves of this technique. For example, when Satan greets Beelzebub at *Paradise Lost* I.84-87:

---

68 In the case of Aeneas, it is Jove's command that he dedicate his life to the future Roman Empire that determines his actions.
69 John Heath-Stubbs points out another possible resonance in these lines, namely an allusion to Arthurian legend: "It is not impossible that he had read the Welsh *Peredur* (readily available in Lady Charlotte Guest's translation of the *Mabinogion* in Everyman's Library). This tale is a version of the Percival legend, in which the hero, like Prufrock, fails in his quest because he has failed to ask an important question. But in *Peredur*, for the Grail theme has been substituted a perhaps more primitive revenge motif. *Peredur*, like Percival, witnesses a mysterious procession in which both a bleeding spear and a blood-filled vessel are carried, but in the latter is a severed head—that, as he later finds out, is of a slain kinsman of his own. This revenge motif links *Peredur* with Prince Hamlet, to whom, of course, Prufrock also alludes." "Structure and Source in Eliot's Major Poetry," *Agenda* 23.1-2 (1985) 23-24.
If thou beest hee; But O how fall'n! how chang'd
From him, who in the happy Realms of Light
Cloth'd with transcendent brightness didst outshine
Myriads though bright...

Milton intends to call to mind the prophet Isaiah's "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning."71 Irony is created as Satan unconsciously mouths words which will later be applied to himself and his own downfall. There may be further irony in a second allusion to Aeneid II.275-6, where Aeneas addresses the ghost of Hector at the fall of Troy as the "lux Dardania" "quantum mutatus" (Bush 103), but whether such an allusion exists and how it might function are debatable. For instance, Martindale cautions that if this is indeed an allusion to the Aeneid, it may not serve to inject irony in Milton's portrayal of Satan:72

The allusion in Milton, if it is such, may be ironic, underlining the perverse heroism of Satan. Aeneas is a true leader who conceals his private emotions in the interest of his public duties; Satan by contrast speaks out of mere bravado, and his concealment serves his own evil desires, not the true interests of those he has misled. Alternatively, the allusion may be less focused, simply giving a Virgilian or epic colour. Anyway a proper understanding of Milton's lines in no way depends on a recognition of its probable Virgilian basis. The allusion rather supports that understanding, or adds an enhancing resonance.

Herein lies the essential difference between Eliot’s and Milton’s use of veiled allusion: Milton’s meaning usually does not suffer unduly if his allusion passes unnoticed—the allusion serves to enhance or underscore what is already present within the poem. Eliot’s meaning is dependent on understanding of each allusion—they add a note, a tone, a resonance which is not otherwise present. Generally, Milton’s allusions enhance what is there, Eliot’s add something which is not.

More usual in Milton is the open allusion which underscores an existing poetic resonance. For example, when God addresses Christ in heaven, he proclaims:

Then thou thy regal Sceptre shalt lay by,
For regal Sceptre then no more shall need,
God shall be all in all.

*(PL III.339-341)*

This is an allusion to I Corinthians XV.28 (identified by Hughes: 70):³⁷³

And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

In both allusion and poem, we find the same context: we have a Biblical allusion in a Biblical tale, both passages are about a time when the world shall be subdued, both are about Christ, both are about the ultimate rule of God. The allusion strengthens the force of the passage but adds nothing new to it. In this particular example, Christ is still

Christ, God still God—there is no metaphorical relationship operating between the source and target texts.

Similarly, Milton’s metaphors are often very explicit. While an Alexandrian poet would demand that the reader puzzle out the connection between tenor and vehicle, Milton makes the connection obvious:

...As when a prowling Wolf,
Whom hunger drives to seek new haunts for prey,
Watching where Shepherds pen thir Flocks at eve
In hurdl’d Cotes amid the field secure,
Leaps o’er the fence with ease into the Fold:
Or as a Thief bent to unhoard the cash
Of some rich Burgher, whose substantial doors,
Cross-barr’d and bolted fast, fear no assault,
In at the window climbs, or o’er the tiles:
So clomb this first grand Thief into God’s Fold:

(PL IV.183-192)

Another difference between Milton’s use of allusion and Eliot’s lies in the poets’ sources for allusion. The majority of Milton’s allusion are to classical mythology and the Bible—common knowledge for any schoolchild of the seventeenth century (Martindale 1). In contrast, Eliot’s allusions are to much less familiar (even downright unfamiliar) texts. To use The Waste Land as an example, one finds allusions to obscure and non-canonical texts such as Weston’s From Ritual to Romance and the

Upanishads; arcane knowledge such as Buddhism and the significance of Tarot cards; non-canonical authors such as Webster and Kyd; foreign authors such as Baudelaire and Hesse; contemporary culture such as burlesque and American popular music ("O O O O that Shakespeherian Rag" line 128); and to the poet's private experience, personal symbols such as the recurring lilacs of Jean Verdenal,75 interactions with friends, conversations held or overheard. Not even the most highly educated person of Eliot's day could possess all of this information. Indeed, the only person capable of identifying and appreciating all of Eliot's (or Pound's or Joyce's) allusions is Eliot, or Pound, or Joyce. On the other hand, Milton's poetry was readily accessible to an educated man in Milton's time. If Milton is considered difficult now (at least in terms of his content--the difficulties caused by Milton's style will be discussed below) perhaps it says more about us than about Milton.

Bush makes an important distinction between Milton's and Eliot's source material for allusions which he sees as a result of the decline of classical education and the metaphysical revival:

Scholasticism replaced the classics as the really respectable source of images and ideas for the older poets--with this very important difference, that whereas "the classics" generally meant classical literature and thought, scholasticism has hardly ever meant scholastic philosophy but only a dialectical texture and isolated scraps of curious learning.

(107-108)

75 Lilacs appear frequently in Eliot's corpus. This image was associated in Eliot's mind with his dear friend Jean Verdenal. A.D. Moody quotes from Eliot's "Commentary" in the Criterion of April 1934: "I am willing to admit that my own retrospect is touched by a sentimental sunset, the memory of a friend [Verdenal] coming across the Luxembourg Gardens in the late afternoon, waving a branch of lilac, a friend who was later (so far as I could find out) to be mixed with the mud of Gallipoli." Thomas Stearns Eliot, 2nd edn., Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994: 7. For more on Eliot's lilacs, see Roy Fuller, "L'Oncle Tom: Some Notes and Queries," Agenda 23.1-2 (1985) 41-52.
This phenomenon would seem to be less true of the Greek and Roman Alexandrians who, while they are notorious for alluding to highly obscure texts and rare mythical variants, draw largely upon canonical authors like Homer. While it is true that Milton called for “fit audience...though few” (PL VII.30-1) one must not take this literally and assume that the poet wrote for a tiny elite: Milton was always a popular poet (Bush 108-109; Martindale 1). In contrast, Eliot’s poetry has always been, as Curtius calls it, “the poetry of an expert” (359) and only an expert can fully understand it.

A further distinction between Alexandrian and non-Alexandrian allusion is that the former typically brings into the target text the context of the source text to which it alludes. As Martindale explains in respect to Virgil’s use of Homeric material:

...we can perceive behind Virgil’s words the continual ghostly presence of the plot of the Iliad and the Odyssey, and may be encouraged to reflect on both differences and similarities. Milton’s allusions sometimes work in this way, but it is doubtful whether this is so with the majority. Indeed there are occasions on which we need positively to repress any knowledge of the original context. (13-14)

Martindale cautions that one must consider each of the allusions in Paradise Lost as a separate case to determine whether or not the context of the source text is of any significance to the target text (14).

Further, as noted, Alexandrian-style poetry depends highly upon recognition and appreciation of its allusions to achieve its poetic effects; non-Alexandrian poetry is

---

76 That is, as far as we can tell from the literature extant. Allusions to texts which have not survived will likely pass the critic unnoticed.
enriched and enhanced by such recognition, but is not dependent upon it. Bush’s summary is apt:

Milton, like all great poets before him and most poets after him, put into his text everything necessary for the understanding of the whole and the parts. Mr. Eliot...achieved condensed brevity and continuously “poetic” vitality by cutting out all the expository and “prosaic” elements which the traditional epic needed....One may be greatly stirred by that poem [The Waste Land] without thinking that the poet’s method, the often arbitrary selection of more or less private symbols, linked by an almost invisible thread of emotional and literary association, is altogether superior to Milton’s use of the central, mainly familiar, and self-sufficient traditions of mankind. Although Milton is not only richly allusive but builds on such ideas as “right reason” which are no longer familiar, while Mr. Eliot belongs to our own world, it is the contemporary poet who requires footnotes and commentary. Milton’s incidental effects may be heightened by our recognition of sources, but they do not depend, as Mr. Eliot’s central effects do, upon such recognition. (110)

As Bush states, Milton includes in his poem all that is necessary for the reader to understand it; Eliot, in contrast, does not. This adds a further important distinction between Alexandrian and non-Alexandrian poetry: Alexandrian poetry is not self-sufficient--it sends the reader outside of the text to trace, locate, and learn specialized information, import it into the target text, and re-read and re-evaluate. The reader must labour to acquire understanding. On the other hand, it is up to the poet to ensure that
the acquisition of the knowledge needed to comprehend his or her poem is at least possible. As Pound responded to Edith Hamilton when she called him an aristocrat in his approach to his public and compared him to a great Confucian scholar who wrote such a learned letter that only one man in the whole of China could understand it, "It is democratic as long as it provides that any one may have the opportunity to learn to read that letter."77

Alexandrian allusion, then, functions as a highly economical form of poetic shorthand which is particularly well-suited to a condensed, elliptical style. As I.A. Richards has noted of Eliot, such allusion is, "a form of compression. The Waste Land is the equivalent in content to an epic. Without this device, twelve books would have been needed" (Grant 236). It is an attempt, as Grabes says, "to solve the perennial problem of ensuring that the particular and local bears universal significance without forfeiting concreteness."78 It is no longer the poet who provides meaning, but the reader who constructs it from the clues the poet leaves behind. The poet sketches out a map of significance which the reader is to use as a guide; the reader must make the effort and make the imaginative leap required to fill in the gaps. Difficulty arises if the reader refuses to take an active role or simply cannot jump far enough to bridge the gaps. Success depends on the reader's allusional competence.

Further difficulty arises when the poet has not given readers sufficient data to enable them to perform the hermeneutic leap. This occurs often in Pound.79 In one instance where we possess an early version of a canto, it is actually possible to trace

---

how Pound's compression of an allusion resulted in the near-loss of that allusion. The final version of Canto 3 begins:

I sat on the Dogana's steps
For the gondolas cost too much that year
And there were not "those girls," there was one face.

What no one appears to have noticed is that the Dogana, Venice's famous customs-house, has no steps. While Pound could have been taking poetic license with what is, after all, an insignificant detail, an examination of the Ur-Cantos published as Three Cantos in 1917 reveals that this is not a factual error but an elaborate allusion to Robert Browning. In Ur-Canto 1 (which was to become Canto 3) Pound addresses Browning and sets himself in Browning's poetic tradition:

Your "palace step"?
My stone seat was the Dogana's curb
And there were not "those girls," there was one flare, one face. (217)

The palace step in Venice on which the poet Browning (or his persona) in Book 3 of Sordello mused on his creation is compared to Pound's Venetian curb from which he ponders what is to be (he thinks) his Sordello. In the final version of the Cantos, the address to Browning has been greatly abbreviated and moved to Canto 2. In the final Canto 3, Browning's palace step and Pound's Dogana curb have been conflated into

---

80 The nearest steps belong to the church set back at a distance off to the left and behind the Dogana itself.
the phrase "Dogana's steps," a phrase which signals Pound's appropriation of the tradition of his model, Browning. The only marker that remains to signal the reader to the presence of an allusion is the factual error in the collocation "Dogana's steps." One must notice the "mistake" to notice the allusion. Even so, unless one has also read the Ur-Canto, which for most readers was rendered obsolete upon the publication in book form of its revision, one cannot identify the allusion’s referent (i.e., Browning’s palace step in *Sordello*). Consequently, the allusion simply does not function for most people.

To sum up, we might define allusion in Alexandrian poetry as different from allusion in non-Alexandrian poetry in these important respects:

1. Alexandrian poetry relies on the device of allusion to an unprecedented degree in respect to both number and importance.
2. Allusions are drawn from obscure or unfamiliar sources, rendering the poetry inaccessible even for very highly educated persons.
3. Allusions transport the context (in whole or in part) of the source text into the target text, even if it is only to divert from or subvert that context. Allusions rarely provide mere colour.
4. Allusions do not just heighten existing poetic effects, but add resonances to the poem which would otherwise be absent. Effects such as irony and comedy are often the product of the metaphorical relationship which is created between the source text and the target text.
5. Recognition of allusions is crucial for an understanding of the text.
6. Alexandrian allusion is often half-concealed or veiled.
Obscurity and Difficulty in Alexandrian Poetry

It is the subtlety of Eliot’s allusions, his idiosyncratic, obscure, and learned references along with his compressed, elliptical style which render his poems difficult and even impenetrable. Milton, too, is a poet noted for his obscurity, and justly so, but it is obscurity of a different kind. As noted, Milton’s allusions are largely to canonical texts such as the Bible, the Iliad, and the Aeneid, texts which for many years have formed the basis of Western education. As a poet, Milton shared with his society and his time a common mythology, a common pool of cultural knowledge from which metaphors and allusions might be drawn and read and recognised. In contrast, the modernists, like both the Greek and Roman Alexandrians, had no such common pool. They lived in a culture where societal breakdown had muddied the mythic waters; there was no common knowledge base in place. This situation was further exacerbated by the poets’ immigrant status. Because modern poets such as Eliot and Pound could not allude to the canonical Western literary tradition and be sure of being understood, they turned their backs on understanding: if a reader would not understand an allusion whether it was to Orpheus or to Jean Verdenal, what does it matter to which one he alludes? Hence, the allusions, at least of Pound and of Joyce, become more and more obscure, more and more personal, even as they grow more vital to the work’s meaning, as witness the move from Pound’s early work and Joyce’s Dubliners to the relative incomprehensibility of The Cantos and Finnegans.

---

83 A full discussion on the topic of obscurity—large and complex as it is—is beyond the scope of this thesis. For helpful bibliography, see The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics, eds. Alex Preminger and T.V.F. Brogan. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1993. The editors see obscurity in twentieth-century literature as particularly distinguished by “disjointed syntax, broken lines, rupture, and dissonance; deliberate stress on allusions, sometimes cryptic; exaggerated metaphors and unreal images; and a renunciation of the referential and communicative functions of language. Such obscurity of language distinguishes modern poetry from eighteenth- and nineteenth-century poetry, which seems relatively clear and transparent in comparison” (850-851).

84 There is another alternative, of course, and that is to eschew allusion altogether. Or, as one often sees with contemporary poets who allude to popular culture, one might restrict oneself to topical allusions.
Wake.

In general, Milton's obscurity is due not to any particular difficulty of allusion or to his content, but to his mode of expression: his word order, syntax, and vocabulary which are based often on the Latin—and not the English—language. For example, "For Man to tell how human life began / Is hard; for who himself beginning knew?" (*PL* 8.250-251). Because of the unnatural word order one cannot tell whether Milton means "It is hard for Man to tell how human life began" or "It is hard to tell how human life began for Man." Does the second line mean "who, beginning, knew himself," i.e., "who, as he came into being, knew/recognized what he was," or does it mean "who knew himself beginning," i.e., "who knew/realized that he was coming into being"?

Another of the many instances of such confusion is found at "Mee overtook his mother all dismay'd" (*PL* 2.792) where the syntax makes it unclear whether the phrase "all dismay'd" modifies "Mee" or "his mother." Does one understand Milton's meaning to be "His mother, who was all-dismayed, overtook me," or "His mother overtook me, all-dismayed as I was"?

Milton often uses words in their Latin sense and ignores contemporary denotations and connotations, thus creating further difficulty. For example, at "And Bush with frizzl'd hair implicit" (*PL* 7.323), the word "implicit" keeps its Latin meaning of "tangled" (Hughes 174). Gilbert Highet cites another example where the bridge from Earth to Hell which spans Chaos is said to be created "by wondrous Art / Pontifical" (10.312-313), noting that here "pontifical" is used solely in the Latin sense of pontifex "bridge-building."85 However, although its etymology is from *pons* (bridge) and *fex* (from *facio*, to make),86 pontifex has never actually meant bridge-making. In ancient

---

86 *OLD* s.v. *pontifex* I.
Rome, the word referred to "one of the college of priests having supreme control in matters of public religion" (Highet 159). This meaning is very similar to the English meaning of pontifex which refers to a pontiff, bishop, prelate, pope, or high priest.\textsuperscript{87} The word may also denote pomposity, dignity, authority, or dogmatism--traits associated with chief religious figures.\textsuperscript{88} It was not used before Milton in the sense of bridge-making, nor, it would appear, since, until Ruskin used it in 1887, presumably as an allusion to Milton.\textsuperscript{89} This sort of etymological word play is typical of poets of general and the Alexandrians in particular, yet, for the latter, its purpose differs from Milton’s. An Alexandrian poet would be inclined to use the etymological play as an additional effect—he or she would expand the word’s range of meaning by adding the etymological play “bridge-building” to pontifical’s usual connotations, perhaps using the word to denote wittily an elaborate bridge constructed under the sanction of an important religious figure or one on which the pope stands.\textsuperscript{90} Milton, however, eliminates \textit{all} of the word’s accepted meanings and uses it in the obscure etymological sense alone. As Highte explains, “to use a word \textit{only} in its Latin sense cuts out part of its meaning, and the most important part. The effect is not richness but obscurity” (160-161). Thus Milton both obscures and restricts the word’s meaning. Inasmuch as this is Milton’s general practice in \textit{Paradise Lost}, he narrows the poem’s meaning. In this respect, Milton differs radically from the Alexandrian poets who strive ever to widen and extend their poem’s field of reference. Highte explains Milton’s practice further:

\begin{quote}
In language Milton sometimes stepped over the narrow and almost
\end{quote}

\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{87} \textit{OED} s.v. pontifical A. I. 1, 2, and 3.
\item\textsuperscript{88} \textit{OED} s.v. pontifical I.4.
\item\textsuperscript{89} \textit{OED} s.v. pontifical III.6.
\item\textsuperscript{90} The Alexandrian desire to expand the range of possible meanings is evident in Eliot’s favorite response to critics and fans who asked what one of his poems or plays meant: “It means what you want it to mean.” See C.K. Stead, \textit{Pound, Yeats, Eliot and the Modernist Movement}, London: MacMillan, 1986: 354.
\end{enumerate}
imperceptible boundary which divides wealth from ostentation, eloquence from pedantry, art from technique... It is the mistake of the poet who is obscure, not because of the intensity of his thought and the variety of meanings he is evoking, but because he wishes to be dignified through obscurity. (161)

It was the manner of Milton's obscurity--and not obscurity per se--which alienated the modernists from him. As Pound complains in "Notes on Elizabethan Classicists," while Milton built up the sonority of the blank verse paragraph, "he did this at the cost of his idiom. He tried to turn English into Latin; to use an uninflected language as if it were an inflected one, neglecting the genius of English, distorting its fibrous manner, making schoolboy translations of Latin phrases: 'Him who disobeys me disobeys'" (LEofEP 237-238). As Pound makes clear, despite his dislike of both Milton's message and his authorial ethos, his rejection of Milton is based ultimately on a technical matter--Milton's lack of a natural idiom and his importation and imposition of Latin grammar and rhetoric onto a frame, the English language, which is foreign and inappropriate to it. It is this which Eliot, too, sees as responsible for the subsequent deterioration of the English language (SPofTSE 141). Eliot expands on Pound's criticism, noting that not only did Milton write English "like a dead language," using tortuous syntax, but that his complication of style is not aimed at precision (as Eliot maintains is the case with Henry James, also famous for his grammatical complexity) but is "dictated by a demand of verbal music, instead of by any demand of sense" (141). In Paradise Lost, Eliot argues, Milton exercises his auditory imagination at the expense of the visual and the tactile imagination, with the result that:
inner meaning is separated from the surface and tends to become something occult, or at least without effect upon the reader until fully understood. To extract everything possible from *Paradise Lost*, it would seem necessary to read it in two different ways, first solely for the sound, and second for the sense. (143)91

In Alexandrian poetry, obscurity is created not by unnatural word order or vocabulary, but by the supreme suppression of contextual and linguistic information. The work becomes dense and elliptical by virtue of stylistic compression and the resultant loss of logical connections. For example, in the Chinese Cantos, Pound assumes the reader's in-depth knowledge of Chinese history. He refers to historical figures, but he suppresses the information about them--their full names, their historical period, their stories--that is required to make sense of his poetic narrative. Consider the questions that arise (and are left unanswered) at C. 53/266, "Now Kieou's daughter / was baked in an ox and served." Who is Kieou and who is his (or her) daughter? When is "Now"? What are the circumstances leading up to, surrounding, and following this grotesque act of cookery? The reader can infer that the reference is to an act of cannibalism, since someone who is baked and served is presumably also eaten (or at least intended to be eaten). One might also surmise that this tale is deliberately associated with other similar stories of cannibalism in *The Cantos*, i.e., those connected with the house of Atreus, and the tales of Itys and Cabestan. Beyond

---

91 Notice once more the importance of music to Eliot. It is interesting that he reads first for sound, and then for sense. So, too, Pound recommends the budding poet "fill his mind with the finest cadences he can discover, preferably in a foreign language, so that the meaning of the words may be less likely to divert his attention from the movement" (*LEofEP* 5).
that, the poet is silent.\footnote{Carroll F. Terrell explains that Kieou is Chiu Hou, ca 1147 B.C., a noble of the emperor Chou Hsin: “His daughter disapproved of the evil emperor and his concubine, Ta Chi, so they had her killed, quartered, cooked, and served up to her father for supper. Repeat in history.” \textit{A Companion to the Cantos of Ezra Pound}, Berkeley: U of California P, 1980: vol. 1: 206.} Meaning must be studiously teased out; the reader is expected to labour at the poem as did the poet. In return, the poet must provide an aesthetic reward equal to the reader’s effort.

Eliot despaired of obscurity for the sake of effect alone. As he stated in a letter to Robert McAlmon regarding Thayer:

\begin{quote}
Why do our compatriots try so hard to be clever? Furthermore his language is so opaque through his cleverness, that it is unintelligible gibberish. Cummings has the same exasperating vice. But Joyce has form--immensely careful. And as for literary--one of the last things he sent me contains a marvellous parody of nearly every style in English prose from 1600 to the \textit{Daily Mail}. One needs a pretty considerable knowledge of English literature to understand it. No! You can’t generalize, in the end it is a question of whether a man has genius and can do what he sets out to do. Small formulas support small people. Aren’t the arty aesthetes you mention simply people without brains? (\textit{LoTSE} 450)
\end{quote}

There is something of an occult attitude exemplified here--poetry is for the initiate, the one who has achieved extreme erudition and laboured to master the code. The idea of the poem as an occult object is apparent also in Pound. As Pound wrote to Douglas McPherson in 1939, “The minute that you proclaim that the mysteries exist \textit{at all} you’ve got to recognize that 95\% of yr. contemporaries will not and can not understand \textit{one} word of what you are driving at. And you can \textit{not} explain. The SECRETUM stays shut
to the vulgo" (*LofEP* 328-329). The poem, a hermetically/hermeneutically sealed
object, gives clues to meaning via allusions and quotations (usually unattributed), like
so many hieroglyphs which the reader must decipher before it will reveal its secrets.
The poet constructs these clues, but omits information which would allow the reader to
-crack the code too quickly--a quest easily won is no quest at all--and to discourage the
unworthy.93 Consider Eliot's 1919 note to John Rodker: "It has just occurred to me that
the title ARA VUS PREC would do. For it is non-committal about the newness of the
contents, and unintelligible to most people" (*LofTSE* 338). In other words, Eliot chose
the title precisely *because* the masses would not understand it; he chose to be
unintelligible to certain people--and a very large number of them at that. Presumably,
he did not wish just anyone to be enticed into reading his work. The title, then,
deliberately excludes the masses; it says, in effect, this poem is not for you.94 The title
functions as a code which can be deciphered only by the chosen few who, inasmuch
as they have acquired the particular knowledge needed to understand it, have proven
that they meet the poet's standard of labour, erudition and aestheticism. Eliot's words
on Ben Jonson's verse might apply equally to his own: "not many people are capable
of discovering for themselves the beauty which is only found after labour."95 His tone
implies "thank goodness!" The pleasure afforded by the aesthetic experience is seen
as something which must be earned. It is a pleasure begrudged to the ignorant and
the indolent.

The dismissal of the untutored throng is typical of the modernists. Yet it is

---

93 The issue of obscurity is intimately linked to the question of audience--who are the poet's ideal readers
and what is demanded of them? While this thesis may suggest some answers to these questions, it can do
so only briefly.

94 Compare Eliot's later reversal: By the time he comes to write "Murder in the Cathedral," Eliot chooses a
title evocative of popular detective fiction. But then a play requires a large audience to see it and to pay for
its production costs.

evident as early as Yeats, whose passion to be a national poet—the voice of the Irish people—was in direct conflict with his elitism. As Yeats said, “One writes and works for one’s friends, and those who read, or at any rate those who listen [i.e. at the Abbey Theatre] are people about whom one cares nothing.”96 Pound put it more succinctly in a paragraph—highlighted by bold letters and extra-large type—in “After Election:” “Some time we will have to resign ourselves to the fact that art is what the artists make it, and that the spectator has damn well to take what he gets.”97 The veiled (and unveiled) contempt of Eliot, Yeats and Pound for their audience at large is transformed into pure invective by Pound in a short piece which appeared in *The Little Review* in 1918. It is entitled “The Audience:”

“The use of articulate speech by humans is inconsiderate,” said the pig.

“They should consider our capacity for comprehension. We can neither express ourselves in this fashion nor can we comprehend the utterance of these humans.” “O que le monde soit porcine [sic]!”98

Pound’s characterization of the unappreciative audience as pigs is reminiscent of Callimachus’ depiction of his literary foes as the Telchines (*Aetia* 1.1), a barbarous race who were reportedly the first metal workers as well as spiteful sorcerers.99 The difference is that where Pound attacks the masses, Callimachus here and elsewhere (e.g., *lambi* 13) singles out other poets or literary critics. One might presume that

99 The ancient grammarians traced the etymology of *Telchines* from thelgo, to charm, spell, cheat, or cozen (*LSJ s.v. telchis III*).
Callimachus, like Yeats, "cares nothing" about the general public who might chance to read (or hear) his poems. This would not be surprising, for as a court poet Callimachus did not depend upon them for his livelihood: he had only to please a liberal-minded patron.\textsuperscript{100} In contrast, modern writers depend on the sales of their books, if not for their livelihood, then to continue getting their work published.

Pound’s little parable implies that, faced with charges that he was unclear in his poetry, he perceived that the blame lay not with him, but with his readers--it was not that they \textit{could} not understand, but that they \textit{would} not. He refuted the critics of \textit{The Cantos} by stating, “There is \textit{no intentional} obscurity. There is condensation to maximum attainable. It is impossible to make the deep as quickly comprehensible as the shallow” (Carpenter 322-323). Likewise Browning, who was considered difficult throughout his career (as he is still today) and who might be seen as the precursor of modernism (Flowers \textit{passim}), was concerned about charges that he was obscure. Expressing sentiments similar to Pound’s, he wrote to Elizabeth Barrett: “I am almost inclined to say that clear expression should be his [the artist’s] only work and care....what ever \textit{can} be clearly spoken, ought to be: but “bricks and mortars” is very easily said and some of the thoughts in ‘Sordello’ not so readily” (Flowers 51).

Browning’s verse, like the modernists’, was highly elliptical and condensed, but it is not just density of structure and style which creates problems for readers’ comprehension (Flowers 31). Both Browning and the modernists were often criticized for using odd words and obscure facts (Flowers 31). Further, \textit{Sordello} is largely dependent on the highly complicated history of the Medieval Guelphs and Ghibellines, just as \textit{The Cantos} draw upon obscure Medieval Italian history and ancient Chinese

\textsuperscript{100} This is not to say that he could completely ignore his poetry’s potential reception, but that he only had to worry about how it would be received by a very small and erudite group headed by Ptolemy with whose tastes he was extremely familiar. The danger in having to please a less than liberal ruler is exemplified in Ovid’s fate.
history (to name just two examples). None of these histories are by any means common knowledge. Similarly, *The Waste Land* depends on the obscure symbolism of the holy grail (or at least, so its author claimed) and demands of its readers' familiarity with the Eastern literary tradition and the *Upanishads* as well as a smattering of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, German, French, and Italian. Unlike Eliot, when Browning was asked to provide notes to *Sordello* he refused, explaining that he was a poet--not a historian (Flowers 31). This raises an important question: given his apparent contempt for a mass audience, why did Eliot provide notes to *The Waste Land* at all and for whom are they intended?

**The Deferral of Meaning: The Function of Notes and Epigraphs**

The accepted explanation for the origin of the notes to *The Waste Land* is given by Eliot in “The Frontiers of Criticism” (*OPP* 109):

> I had at first intended only to put down all the references for my quotations with a view to spiking the guns of critics of my earlier poems who had accused me of plagiarism. Then, when it came to print the *The Waste Land* as a little book--for the poem on its first appearance in *The Dial* and in *The Criterion* had no notes whatever--it was discovered that the poem was inconveniently short, so I set to work to expand the notes, in order to provide a few more pages of printed matter, with the result that they became the remarkable exposition of bogus scholarship that is still on view to-day.

Eliot’s statement is somewhat duplicitous. While it is true that *The Waste Land* was first
published with no notes, he implies that they were never part of the poem proper. This is simply not true. The notes existed in private form prior to publication and were circulated by Eliot to his friends along with the manuscript of the poem. Similarly, Joyce circulated privately to his friends a chart of Ulysses’ symbolic correspondences to the Odyssey along with the unpublished manuscript (Litz 9). Both Eliot and Joyce recognized that an elaborate code was required for interpretation of their texts and they were willing to provide it to their hand-picked readers—friends, many of whom were fellow writers or literary critics—but not to the general public. While Eliot, unlike Joyce, did publish the notes to The Waste Land, he did so at his publisher’s prompting and later regretted it. Eliot felt that the notes had sparked the wrong kind of interest in his readers, who seemed to spend more time hunting out his sources than actually reading the poem (OPP 110). Presumably, Eliot did not perceive this to be a danger for his friends, who, given their literary sophistication and familiarity (and presumably sympathy) with Eliot’s poetic aims, might be supposed to be Eliot’s ideal readers. If anyone could fathom The Waste Land without the notes, it would be this group. On the other hand, no one needed interpretative notes more than the general public. Yet Eliot felt that the notes were necessary for the first group and begrudged them to the latter. Why might Eliot perceive interpretative notes to be harmful to the public at large and at the same time an aid to an erudite reader?

Looking at Eliot’s comments in his introduction to David Jones’ In Parenthesis, a book which includes several pages of interpretative notes, it is clear that Eliot worried that such notes would interfere with and even damage the reader’s reception of the literary work:

When *In Parenthesis* is widely enough known—as it will be in time—it will no doubt undergo the same sort of detective analysis and exegesis as the later work of James Joyce and the *Cantos* of Ezra Pound. It is true that *In Parenthesis* and David Jones’s later and equally remarkable work *The Anathemata*, are provided by the author with notes; but author’s notes (as is illustrated by *The Waste Land*) are no prophylactic against interpretation and dissection: they merely provide the serious researcher with more material to interpret and dissect.

This suggests that Eliot originally thought of and created his notes specifically as a “prophylactic” against interpretation and dissection; but why are these figured as a disease which must be shunned? Why are interpretation and dissection not encouraged, even aided? Eliot’s final paragraph in the above introduction is illuminating:

> Those who read *In Parenthesis* for the first time need to know nothing more than this and what the author tells us in his own Preface, except that *In Parenthesis* and *The Anathemata* have been greatly admired by a number of writers whose opinions usually command attention. The commentaries, as I have said, will follow in time. Good commentaries can be very helpful: but to study even the best commentary on a work of literary art is likely to be a waste of time unless we have first read and been excited by the text commented upon even without understanding it. For the thrill of excitement from our first reading of a work of creative
literature which we do not understand is itself the beginning of understanding and if *In Parenthesis* does not excite us before we have understood it, no commentary will reveal to us its secret. And the second step is to get used to the book, to live with it and make it familiar to us. Understanding begins in the sensibility: we must have the experience before we attempt to explore the sources of the work itself.\(^{103}\)

Just as one ought first to read for sound, and then for sense (66 n.91 above), so one ought to allow images and symbols to play upon the imagination before seeking out their meaning. The effects of poetry, then, ought to be fully felt before they become subject to analysis. Premature analysis is perceived to interfere with the emotional experience and the play of the poem on the reader's sensibility. But even though Eliot regrets publishing the notes to *The Waste Land*, there is no suggestion that he also regretted circulating the notes privately to his friends.

The fact that Eliot circulated such interpretative paraphernalia to a few select readers suggests that he was not concerned about their possible misuse from that quarter, that he trusted the *literati* to read first for effect and later for sense, at which time the notes might aid them. One observes that the notes are provided at the end of the poem as opposed to, say, in footnotes.\(^{104}\) Nothing within the text of Eliot's poem--no endnote number or asterisk--signifies the presence of an accompanying note. Thus the layout of the poem encourages the reader to read straight through--poem and then notes--and discourages flipping back and forth between the poem and the notes. It is

---

\(^{103}\) Compare Basil Bunting's comment on Eliot: "*The Waste Land* should be read without the notes. It needs no explaining that is not contained in its own lines. Every reference is a red-herring to drag the reader away to hunt the 'meaning' of the poem anywhere but in the poem itself. And as for the poet's intention, intention and achievement are two things." "Mr. T.S. Eliot," *Agenda* 23.1-2 (1985) 187.

\(^{104}\) For example, Alexander Pope used footnotes in his *The Dunciad Variorum* 1729; reprinted Leeds, England: Scolar P. 1966.
possible that after the publication of *The Waste Land* Eliot discovered that the very existence of the notes actually encouraged readers to read the poem backwards—consulting the notes first and then looking to the verse—thus privileging the notes over the poem. The literary elite, on the other hand, presumably could be trusted to use them according to Eliot’s wishes.

As Litz points out, the notes to *The Waste Land* and Joyce’s schema for *Ulysses* were the “top secret information needed for any successful revolution; they flaunt the fact that modern literature must be nurtured by a coterie of those who know” (9). That literature is to be left to the elite to write and shape and foster, and the role of readers is to purchase what the elite pass down to them is evident from the remarks of both Pound (“art is what the artists make it and...the spectator has damn well to take what he gets,” 69 above) and Eliot. Recall that Eliot considered that the readers of David Jones needed no additional information to appreciate Jones’ work “except that *In Parenthesis* and *The Anathemata* have been greatly admired by a number of writers whose opinions usually command attention.” Eliot does not say why these writers have admired Jones—only that they have done so. Nor does he identify these writers; rather he seems to expect the reader to accept his judgment as to their importance. Readers, then, are to trust the artists to know what is best for them; they are not to ask and not to know on what such judgment is based, nor to judge for themselves the work’s importance. Presumably, such an act of judgment is beyond their capabilities.

If the public at large is held in such contempt, for whom did Eliot write? Like Yeats, like Pound, for a very few. As Pound put it in a letter to an aspiring poet, urging him to find a group of other like-minded poets, “When you get five men who trust each other you are a long way to a start. If your stuff won’t hold the interest of the other four or of someone in the four, it may not be ready to print” *(LoFEP 221)*. Note also Pound’s
sentiment in “Causa,” one of the *Lustra* poems:

I join these words for four people,
Some others may overhear them,
O world, I am sorry for you,
You do not know these four people.105

Literature is seen as the province of artists and their coteries; any others who might read the work—i.e., the public at large—are outsiders permitted to eavesdrop as long as they behave themselves and refrain from interfering; they are, as Yeats said, “people about whom one cares nothing.”

The notes to *The Waste Land* have been called a hoax and a gimmick (Litz 9), a parody of scholarship (Eliot, *OPP* 110), “muddled” and “incomplete” (Grant 199). While the notes do name many authors from whom Eliot borrowed, and so perhaps serve as his desired safeguard against cries of plagiarism, they are woefully inadequate for the general reader’s purpose. For example, they include quotations in their original French, Italian, Latin, Greek, and German which are not translated. Eliot’s failure to provide translations suggests that he imagined a readership fluent in those languages. Interestingly, the four Sanskrit words (*WL* 401, 433) which are so important to the poem’s meaning are translated, indicating that Eliot conceded Sanskrit beyond his readers’ capabilities. The quotation from St. Augustine’s *Confessions* is given in English (n. to line 307, p. 84), but this is likely because Eliot read the text in English and quotes from the translation which he had at hand. Even when Eliot cites authors and provides quotations from them, he often omits the actual reference. For example, his note on line 60 states: “Cf. Baudelaire: ‘Fourmillante cité, cité pleine de rêves, /

le spectre en plein jour raccroche le passant.” Thus, even while the notes ostensibly send the reader to another text for interpretative aid, they make it extremely difficult to do so inasmuch as the notes do not provide the information required to locate the quotation. Consequently, the reader has no context for the specific lines. It is as if Eliot believed the quotation were sufficient to explain the borrowing or allusion and that knowledge of the original context in which they appear—the particular poem or chapter—is irrelevant. In the example cited above, not only are the line numbers of Baudelaire’s poem omitted, but so is the title of the poem. Similarly, note 218 quotes a long passage from Ovid which begins in the middle of the line and omits the subject and main verb; this note refers to neither the work (the Metamorphoses) nor the book or the line numbers of the quote. Note 366-376 refers to Hesse’s Blick ins Chaos, but gives no page number. In such cases, even a reader who could read and knew well Baudelaire, Ovid, and Hesse in their original tongues would have to labour to set the quote in context, perhaps scouring page upon page to locate a quote or resorting to a concordance to track it down.

Further, the notes are often frivolous and tongue in cheek. For example, note 221 can only be a joke: Eliot states “This may not appear as exact as Sappho’s lines, but I had in mind the ‘longshore’ or ‘dory’ fisherman, who returns at nightfall.” First, Eliot does not cite an actual poem of Sappho—one would need to be familiar with her entire corpus (small as it is) to recognize to what poem Eliot alludes. Further, Eliot’s note in which he compares his lines with Sappho’s implies that Sappho’s poem has something to do with fishermen, although hers are not of the “longshore” or “dory” variety. Anyone checking the Sappho corpus for relevant mention of sailors or fishermen in an attempt to track down this poem would do so in vain, for the allusion is to Sappho’s fragment 104(a) and her topic is goats. Once one has identified the
relevant Sappho fragment, Eliot's debt becomes obvious:

At the violet hour, the evening hour that strives
Homeward, and brings the sailor home from sea,
The typist home at teatime.

(220-222)

*Sappho Fragment 104 (a)*

Hesperus, Evening Star
You fetch what the Dawn-star scattered.
You fetch the lamb, fetch the kid,
Fetch the toddler back to its mama.\(^\text{106}\)

One cannot trace the original poem to which Eliot refers unless one already knows it. The note assists the knowledgeable reader only to *recognize* the allusion to a text with which he or she is already very familiar; it does not provide new knowledge to the neophyte. Eliot's comment, then, is rendered with a nod and a wink intended for the initiate who can appreciate his wit and how cleverly he excludes the masses even as he pretends to include them. Similarly, by providing quotations in their original languages and with no references, Eliot presumes that his reader is fluent in French, Italian, German, Latin, and Greek and *knows* these works already. Being on intimate terms with Baudelaire, with Ovid, with Hesse, this reader can set the lines in context without any aid from Eliot. Thus, Eliot presupposes an extremely erudite reader, one conversant with modern European as well as classical literature; a description which

---

would perhaps fit those friends to whom he originally circulated the notes.

Eliot called the notes to *The Waste Land* “bogus” and indeed they often read like a hoax or parody of scholarship. On the surface, to the untutored reader seeking illumination, Eliot appears as a helpful and earnest guide, but his erudite readers can catch the poet’s muffled laughter as he deliberately misleads the unwary and invites the more astute to share in the joke. For example, identification of the allusion to the thunder in part V of the poem (“What the Thunder Said”) is crucial to an understanding of the poem as a whole. Eliot identifies the reference as the central “fable of the meaning of the Thunder” in the *Upanishads*, giving the citation to the Sanskrit text and then “helpfully” referring the Sanskrit-less reader to a translation—in German! If one does not know either Sanskrit or German, the relevance of this important allusion will be lost, unless one displays the initiative to track down and read an English translation. Further, even as Eliot seems to reveal, he conceals, for there is a second, at least equally important, allusion operative here, namely to Revelation 10.2-4:

> He [the angel of God] had a little scroll open in his hand. And he set his right foot on the sea, and his left foot on the land, and called out with a loud voice, like a lion roaring; when he called out, the seven thunders sounded. And when the seven thunders had sounded, I was about to write, but I heard a voice from heaven saying “Seal up what the seven thunders have said, and do not write it down.”

Thus, the title of part V of *The Waste Land*—What the Thunder Said—suggests that not only has the poet, unlike John, the author of Revelation, disobeyed God’s command

---

and written down His words, he has also unsealed God's utterance for the world to read.

Once one has Revelation in mind, other strong correlations between the two texts become apparent: both Revelation and "What the Thunder Said" are placed at the end of their books, both purport to offer the mystic secret of the book as a whole, both offer a vision of apocalypse and of forgiveness, and both allude to the sins of cities. Concerning the last point, it is interesting that Eliot mentions five fallen (or falling) cities ("Falling towers/Jerusalem Athens Alexandria/Vienna London"). This, too, may be a direct allusion to Revelation which also marks five cities for destruction.108 Further, Eliot's reference to "seals broken by the lean solicitor" (408) may allude to the scroll in Revelation which contains God's plan for mankind and is sealed with seven seals:

And I saw in the right hand of him who was seated on the throne a scroll written within and on the back, sealed with seven seals; and I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, "Who is worthy to open the scroll and break its seals?" And no one in heaven or on earth or under the earth was able to open the scroll or to look into it, and I wept much that no one was found worthy to open the scroll or to look into it. Then one of the elders said to me, "Weep not; lo, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David [Christ] has conquered, so that he can open the scroll and its seven seals." (Rev 5:1-5)

In Revelation, the seal is broken not by some paltry solicitor, but by Christ the Lamb

108 Ephesus (Rev 2:1-7), Pergamum (Rev 2:12-17), Thyatira (Rev 2:18-29), Sardis (Rev 3:1-6), and Laodicea (Rev 3:14-22). In the seven letters to the churches, Smyrna (Rev. 2:8-11) and Philadelphia (Rev. 3:7-13) are commended for their good works and faithfulness.
and as he breaks that first momentous seal, one of the four fantastical living creatures cries out "as a voice of thunder" (Rev 6:1), a voice that anticipates the thunder of God in Rev 10:2. Eliot’s bathetic parallel between Revelation’s Christ unsealing the will of God and a lean solicitor in an empty room breaking the seals of legal documents ("wills"?) adds real irony and pathos to The Waste Land—to this we have descended and from what height fallen.

It is also possible that the dryness, the aridity, and consequent longing for water which begins “What the Thunder Said” was inspired by Revelation. Eliot writes:

Here is no water but only rock
Rock and no water and the sandy road
The road winding above among the mountains
Which are mountains of rock without water
If there were water we should stop and drink
Amongst the rock one cannot stop or think
Sweat is dry and feet are in the sand
If there were only water amongst the rock
Dead mountain of carious teeth that cannot spit
Here one can neither stand nor lie not sit
There is not even silence in the mountains
But dry sterile thunder without rain
There is not even solitude in the mountains
But red sullen faces sneer and snarl
From doors of mudcracked houses
If there were water
And no rock
If there were rock
And also water
And water
A spring
A pool among the rock
If there were the sound of water only
Not the cicada
And dry grass singing
But sound of water over a rock
Where the hermit-thrush sings in the pine trees
Drip drop drip drop drop drop drop
But there is no water

(331-358)

In Revelation, John writes of the faithful who will serve Christ in heaven:

They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; the sun shall not strike them, nor my scorching heat. For the Lamb in the midst of the throne will be their shepherd, and he will guide them to springs of living water; and God will wipe away every tear from their eyes. (Rev 7:16-17)

While this connection may seem tenuous, its validity is further suggested by the next passage, which alludes to Christ:
Who is the third who walks always beside you?
When I count, there are only you and I together
But when I look ahead up the white road
There is always another one walking beside you
Gliding wrapt in a brown mantle, hooded
I do not know whether a man or a woman
--But who is that on the other side of you?

(359-365)

In the notes, Eliot cleverly uses a playful red herring to dodge identification of the allusion:

The following lines were stimulated by the account of one of the Antarctic expeditions (I forget which, but I think one of Shackleton’s): it was related that the party of explorers, at the extremity of their strength, had the constant delusion that there was one more member than could actually be counted. (85)

The relevant allusion is actually to Luke who, in his account of the resurrection of Christ, describes how two of the apostles were walking to a village. As they were conversing, a third—the resurrected Christ himself—joined them on the road but was not recognized by them (Luke 24.13-16). In fact, Shackleton’s reference to an additional party, the fourth figure who joins them—not a third, as in Eliot—may be itself an allusion to the story told by Luke. Clues that the pertinent allusion in Eliot is to Luke are given in the poem: two are accompanied by an unknown third along a “white road” suggestive of dazzling desert vistas; the mysterious figure’s hooded brown mantle
suggests the plain brown draped robes in which Biblical figures are traditionally depicted. Amusingly enough, the white road could also signify a snowy Arctic trail and the hooded brown mantle a down parka. One suspects that, as with the Sappho reference discussed above, Eliot made the suggestion with tongue firmly in cheek.

The effect of such red herrings is twofold: one, to conceal the real allusion from the unknowing, unquestioning reader who simply takes Eliot at his word and ceases to hunt for sources; and, two, to amuse, challenge, and possibly even aid the literary initiate. Like one who cracks an elaborate puzzle, the successful reader enjoys a sense of complicity with the author and is rewarded by admission into a very exclusive, very private club whose doors only wit can open.

Similarly, Eliot's epigraphs defer meaning by sending the reader beyond the limits of the text at hand. The mere fact of an epigraph's existence need not defer meaning unduly: if a reader immediately recognizes the epigraph, identifies its source, mentally transports its context into the target text, and discerns the metaphorical relationship between epigraph and text, the construction of meaning may be swift; however, Eliot deliberately complicates each step of this operation and so delays comprehension. Specifically, epigraphs are given in foreign languages which slow down the reading process (or bring it to a full stop) to a greater or lesser degree depending upon the reader's degree of fluency in that language. Further, prior to 1935, Eliot does not fully identify the sources of his epigraphs: at times, he provides the title of the source text, at times, the author, but never both at once, and never does he quote the actual chapter and verse. It is not until one comes to "Burnt Norton,"
by which time Eliot’s poetics have changed dramatically,¹⁰⁹ that the poet
provides a full citation for his epigraphs—in this case, author, title of work, editor,
fragment number, line number, and page number—but even then, he does not
translate the Greek. Eliot does not facilitate the reading process, but deliberately
complicates it and slows it down, emphasizing the “otherness” of the epigraphs
by leaving them unidentified and undigested.¹¹⁰ For example, epigraphs are set
in smaller type, usually rendered in italics and indented on both sides; they
punctuate the white space between title and poem. Eliot’s epigraphs form the
final hesitation before entering the strange world of the poem itself, the last
barrier in the liminal space between the rational, logical consciousness and the
emotive, poetic subconscious of the reader.

Extraneous material such as notes and epigraphs set the literary object
inside a framework against which the work must be read. They serve as what
Hebel calls allusion markers which “direct the reader to certain points of

See Worthington’s n. 22 for bibliography. For details on the poetics of the later Eliot and the possible
reasons for the change, see Stead’s chapter 7: “Eliot and the Revolutionary Right” 194-235 (Pound,
Yeats, Eliot and the Modernist Movement).
¹¹⁰ As F.T. Flahiff, University of Toronto, has pointed out to me, an interesting (and, again, late) exception
is “Journey of the Magi” where what ought to be the epigraph—the close paraphrase of a sermon by
Lancelot Andrewes—is incorporated into the body of the poem (lines 1-5) and set off only by quotation
marks: Andrewes’ A Sermon Preached before the King’s Majesty, at Whitehall, on Wednesday, the
Twenty-fifth of December, A.D. MDCXXII. Being Christmas-Day is given in Anthony Hands, Sources for
had of it at this time of the year, just the worst time of the year to take a journey, and specially a long
journey in. The ways deep, the weather sharp, the days short, the sun farthest off, in solsticio brumali. ‘the
very dead of winter.’” Eliot switches from third to first person and edits this down to the essentials:

“A cold coming we had of it,
Just the worst time of the year
For a journey, and such a long journey;
The ways deep and the weather sharp,
The very dead of winter.”
reference outside the text under examination." Theoretically, such intertextual traces serve as guides to the reader, nudging them toward the "correct" interpretation (Morgan 24). As Riffaterre maintains, "every literary text contains certain subliminal components that guide the reader towards a single stable interpretation of that text." Thus, the intertext "offers a frame of thought or a signifying system that tells readers how or where to look for a solution or from what angle the text can be seen as decipherable. This frame, or system, or angle of vision, I call the hermeneutic model" (Riffaterre, "Hermeneutic" 7). Epigraphs and explanatory notes, then, refer the reader to other texts that will reveal the significance of the poem which they enclose. The relationship that is created by comparison of the work at hand and that other text increases the level of meaning within the new text as the older text sets a context for the new and directs our understanding of it. This newly created relationship between two texts may even, as the directional flow of meaning slips backwards, broaden the range of meaning of the older text as the new text revises our understanding of the old.

The force of the intertextual frame is aptly illustrated by Jeanine Parisier Plottel in her discussion of Borges' "Pierre Ménard, Author of Don Quixote."

Ménard, an imaginary French symbolist writer, a shade younger than Pierre Louÿs and Paul Valéry, with whom he has much in common, sets

---

114 This is essentially Eliot's theory in "Tradition and the Individual Talent."
himself the task of writing a Quixote verbally identical with Cervantes's text. Although his Quixote coincides word for word and line for line with the work of his seventeenth-century predecessor, its meaning is much more allusive, infinitely richer, subtler, and more complex. The two books are completely the same and yet completely different. The prose of Cervantes is simple, straightforward, seventeenth-century prose; that of Ménard, a symbolist playing with a baroque instrument, is circumlocuted, precious, and pedantic. The first Quixote is a popular masterpiece; the second, an invisible metaphysical demonstration. Cervantes's Quixote is an "imperfect" book: Pierre Ménard's text is the “perfect” scripture, the exact palimpsest, the ultimate transcription. The paradox can be resolved by noting that although the author's intentions are present in the structures of a text, they do not coincide with the reader's appraisals and responses. Interpretation is shaped by a complex of relations between the text, the reader, reading, writing, printing, publishing, and history: the history that is inscribed in the language of the text and in the history that is carried by the reader's reading. Such a history has been given a name: intertextuality.

Thus two texts which are absolutely identical have totally different meanings because one of them is writ within the frame of the other. The historical reality of the author and his time alter the meaning of his production: what is plain talk to Cervantes is baroque rhetoric in the hands of Ménard. Further, a layer of irony and humour not present in Cervantes is realized in Ménard's text because of his use of the Cervantes frame and this is central to Ménard's meaning. Unfortunately this layer is only realized if the
reader *knows* about the frame. To fully appreciate what Borges' Ménard is doing, the reader must know that the author is intentionally using Cervantes as a frame; otherwise, his or her reaction would be outrage at the perceived act of plagiarism. They simply would not get the joke. Further, the reader must know of and perhaps have read the real *Don Quixote*. The main difficulty in relying on this sort of allusion to realize meaning is that, ultimately, the writer leaves the task of fixing meaning in the hands of the reader, a reader who may well be an allusional incompetent (Hebel 8).

In the above discussion of "What the Thunder Said," we have seen how there may be two (possibly even more) correct interpretations of a single allusion. Perhaps Riffaterre's statement that there is only one correct interpretation of any text should be qualified. Or, perhaps one might propose that two or more interpretations in concert comprise one central core of meaning (the one correct interpretation) just as in the Chinese ideogram for the East one can discern the separate signs for man and tree and sun.116 The three signs taken together form a new sign, which Pound explains as "sun tangled in the tree's branches, as at sunrise, meaning now the East" (*ABC* 21). The one correct interpretation, then, is achieved by understanding the significance of the separate ideograms or signs both alone and in concert. For a full understanding of "What the Thunder Said" a reader needs to understand its relationship to the *Upanishads* as well as its relationship to Revelation. In addition, readers need to understand the relationship between the *Upanishads* and Revelation, and, finally, the relationship of *The Waste Land* to the newly-paired entity which we might call *Upanishads*/Revelation.

Foreign Languages as a Literary Device

Foreign languages are another device contributing to the difficulty of Eliot's and

---

Pound's poetry. As noted, Eliot uses several foreign languages in *The Waste Land*, languages which he could not reasonably have expected his audience to know. I have suggested that what is at issue here is, in part, Eliot's sense of audience, that his ideal reader would possess the education and literary sophistication to read the French, German, Italian, Latin, and Greek and to recognize his allusions. Still, one must be wary of making the assumption that writers write in order to communicate. It is possible that Eliot's and Pound's motivation, like that of many artists, is not to communicate to the public, but to express themselves in the only form which seems true to them, a form which happens to communicate effectively to very few people. If foreign languages do not communicate *information* to the majority of readers, what exactly do they convey and how do they function within the text?

Both Eliot and Pound pepper their works with a wide range of foreign words and quotations. While one might wish to compare Callimachus' startling use of language (his work displays linguistic influence from the entire Greek world and includes non-Greek words of Eastern origin) there is an important distinction to be made: Callimachus' Doric, Aeolic, Ionic, and Attic are Greek dialects which do not differ substantially from one another and which a reader of literature in Callimachus' day could be safely presumed to recognize. Many Greek Alexandrians would also be familiar with the few non-Greek words in Callimachus. Although the Greeks in Alexandria did not speak Egyptian, a large part of the population did and the Greeks would likely have some familiarity at least with the native tongue. The variety of linguistic forms in Callimachus does communicate information, but if all Callimachus wanted to do was to convey information, again, why use a different dialect at all? In the case of Theocritus' studied Doric, it is felt that the dialect adds to the rusticity of his

117 The usual answer to this is to fit the metre. While this may be true in some cases, in many instances it does not apply as a switch in dialect need not effect a change in vowel quantity.
pastoral Idylls, particularly for his sophisticated Alexandrian audience, yet even so it is a strictly literary form of Doric which does not represent the actual speech of the poet's native Syracuse (Gow 1:1xxiiff). While in antiquity certain dialects were associated with particular poetic genres, poets freely mixed different dialect forms as early as Homer.

While it is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain the effect of mixed dialects on an ancient audience, it is possible to discover how dialects and foreign languages function in Pound and Eliot. Consider Canto 79/485: “ah certainly dew lak dawgs / ah goin’ tuh to wash you.” Here the dialect suggests the speaker’s nationality (American), his region of birth (the South) and perhaps even race (African-American). The dialect is a shortcut to characterization and, insofar as it replicates actual speech patterns, contributes to the poem’s realism. As Pound notes of Joyce’s practice in *Ulysses*, the use of a variety of dialects allows an author “to present his matter, his tones of mind, very rapidly” (*LEofEP* 404). In this particular case, it adds a bathetic note also which undercuts the heroic nature of the fictionalized (and the real) Ezra Pound’s spiritual struggle in the cage at Pisa.

Eliot’s and Pound’s use of foreign languages as a device is more complex than the use of dialects in Callimachus and Theocritus. For those readers who do not understand the languages (and few readers will understand all of them), the lines of the poem which appear in foreign tongues no longer communicate textual meaning on the lexical level. I would suggest that they do communicate on another level. Whether or not the reader comprehends their lexical meaning, on a subconscious level, foreign languages can create the illusion of universality. As shall be discussed in Chapter 2, they may also be used to extend, to open up the temporality as well as the geography within the poem. For example, by incorporating within the *Cantos* Latin, Medieval Italian, and Modern Italian, Pound displays (and assimilates into his poem) the

118 In contrast, Theocritus’ highly stylized Doric is completely unrealistic.
evolution of the Italian tongue over some two thousand years along with the culture
and literary tradition which those languages evolved to express. In Pound, this
evolution is no longer linear. By juxtaposing Latin and Italian, Pound collapses
temporal borders: two thousand years of history and culture exist simultaneously. The
foreign words are not chosen strictly for their lexical meaning, but to insert this all-
encompassing sense of time and culture into the poem. For Pound, it is a way “to
efface the seams between languages in an effort to establish continuities between
texts and historical periods.”

Eliot inserts a witty clue to his agenda with respect to foreign languages at the
conclusion of The Waste Land:

Poi s'ascose nel foco che gli affina
Quando fiam uti chelidon - O swallow swallow
Le Prince d’Aquitaine à la tour abolie
These fragments I have shored against my ruins
Why then Ile fit you. Hieronymo’s mad againe.

Shantih shantih shantih

(WL 427-433)

The personal note at “These fragments I have shored against my ruins” signals a shift
from persona to poet which, as we shall see, is reinforced by the phrase “Why then Ile
fit you.” This quote from Thomas Kyd’s The Spanish Tragedy, subtitled Hieronymo is
Mad Againe, begins Hieronymo’s answer to the request that he write a play to

119 Michael Davidson, “From the Latin Speculum: The Modern Poet as Philologist.” Contemporary
entertain the court (Hands 116). The point of the allusion is apparent when Hieronymo's statement is put in context:

Balthazar. It pleas'd you

At the entertainment of the ambassador
To grace the king so much as with a show:
Now were your study so well furnished,
As for the passing of the first night's sport
To entertain my father with the like,
Or any such-like pleasing motion,
Assure yourself it would content them well.

Hieronymo: Is this all?

Balthazar. Ay, this is all.

Hieronymo. Why then I'll fit you; say no more.

When I was young, I gave my mind
And plied myself to fruitless poetry;
Which though it profit the professor naught,
Yet it is pleasing to the world. 120

The comments of Hieronymo anticipate Eliot's own remarks in "Four Quartets" on the fruitlessness of poetry (discussed above, 37-38). Thus Eliot's allusion at the close of his poem forms a self-conscious and ironic comment by the poet on his art. There is even more intertextual play going on than appears on the surface. As Hands points out, when Hieronymo later describes the play he has written, we learn that he has

written it in five languages (Latin, Greek, Italian, French, and English) just as Eliot writes the closing lines of *The Waste Land* in five languages (115-116). Hieronymo explains his reasoning thus:

Each one of us must act his part
In unknown languages,
That it may breed the more variety.
As you, my lord, in Latin, I in Greek,
You in Italian, and for because I know
That Bel-imperia hath practised the French,
In courtly French shall all her phrases be.
Bel-imperia. You mean to try my cunning, then, Hieronymo.
Balthazar. But this will be a mere confusion,
And hardly shall we all be understood.
Hieronymo. It must be so, for the conclusion
Shall prove the invention all was good;
And I myself in an oration,
And with strange and wondrous show besides,
That I will have there behind a curtain,
Assure yourself shall make the matter known.
And all shall be concluded in one scene,
For there's no pleasure ta'en in tediousness.
(IV.i.166-183)

Eliot's allusion is a nod from the poet to his readers as to the difficulty and confusion
that he has caused them which assures them that it was all to good purpose, that all will be well. There is in this assurance an understated gallows humour rather typical of Eliot, for Hieronymo's erudite play was the instrument of his revenge: his son's murderers were killed during the course of it. There is an additional interesting resonance imported from The Spanish Tragedy in Eliot's poem. Hieronymo's underlying motive for writing in five different languages is to echo Babel. After giving his assurance that the foreign languages will not mar the play, he says in soliloquy:

Now shall I see the fall of Babylon,
Wrought by the heavens in this confusion.

(IV.i:188-190)

The destruction of the tower of Babylon and the babble of Babel are echoed in Eliot's closing reference to the falling bridge and to ruins, ruins which recall the falling towers of the world's great cities (WL 373-375). The fall of Babel is further echoed in Eliot's employment of five languages and in his allusion to Hieronymo's use of them.

When a poet uses a range of foreign languages in a poem, it is a sign of the appropriation of all tongues, of all vehicles of possible meaning. The poet makes a claim for universal relevance. How does he achieve this? Principally--though not exclusively--by sound. To hear the Cantos read aloud is to hear the voice of all time and all cultures: from Confucius to Aeschylus, from Cavalcanti to Jefferson. Similarly, Callimachus' appropriation of Hipponax's dialect and style in the lambi can be seen as an appropriation of Hipponax himself and, by extension, Hipponax's tradition. That the sound of the languages is central to the intended effect is apparent from the frequency with which both Eliot and Pound transliterate foreign words. For example, Eliot does
not use Sanskrit characters when he quotes from the *Upanishads*—he wants the reader to sound out the words which close *The Waste Land*, "Datta. Dayadhvam. Damyata/ Shantih shantih shantih." Likewise, Pound transliterates the Chinese ideograms in the Cantos (e.g., 53/263). Neither poet consistently transliterates Greek characters which perhaps suggests that they believed that a reasonably well-educated reader could sound out, if not read, Greek characters. It is apparent that both poets were aware that not even a highly erudite reader was likely to know Sanskrit and Chinese as these are the only foreign languages within their work which they also consistently translate.\(^{121}\)

The look of the foreign language on the page is also important: both Eliot and Pound highlight the linguistic otherness by their choice of typeface. Eliot generally puts foreign words in italics to differentiate them from the rest of his poem. Pound at times uses italics to de-familiarize and at times omits the italics to make the foreign appear familiar. While Pound transliterates the Chinese, he privileges the ideogram by setting the transliteration next to or below the ideogram itself and by surrounding it with a generous amount of white space (e.g., C. 89/595). Poetry, in general, strives to make the familiar unfamiliar, to make us see anew. Charles Tomlinson comments on this aspect in respect to the climax of *The Waste Land* with its five different languages in their differing metrical forms:\(^{122}\)

> Read aloud like this, without warning the famous climax recalls, perhaps, our forgotten first reading, as the mind re-adjusts itself to take in and differentiate all that sheer noise, and attempts to reconstitute noise as

---

\(^{121}\) For example, see notes 401 and 433 to *The Waste Land* and Pound’s "Explication" of the ideograms in C. 77/476.

meaning. In the reconstituting, we help to complete a metamorphosis. Literary art was always like this—to some degree; so that what we are reading now reshapes what we have read up to this point. But Eliot foreshortens the process, speeds it up, involves you in the crisis of it, and the languages are a part of that.

Intertextual Allusion: Poets at Play

A further mode of allusion, perhaps the most difficult to detect and interpret, is allusion to the poetry of a contemporary, what one might call intertextual play among friends. This type of allusion is rarely integral to the poem’s meaning and often functions as a private joke which is extended to the diligent and erudite reader. There are two essential distinctions to be made within this category:

1. Large scale reworking of a section or the whole of a contemporary’s poem. The alluding poet uses the source text as an intertextual frame in order to implicitly comment upon and critique his or her contemporary’s practice. It is often an act of literary one-upmanship, an attempt to show a fellow poet “how it’s done.” This type of contemporary allusion differs from that of the fictional Pierre Ménard’s use of the Quixote as intertextual frame inasmuch as the poem does not depend on recognition of the interplay for its success. There is no metaphorical field created between the two texts, but what one might call a critical field. Such a field resonates for the poets and for their critics and, later, for scholars, but it is rarely significant for the public’s enjoyment and appreciation of the poem. Indeed, it is questionable whether the public at large could recognize such an allusion. At the time the intertextual allusion is actually made to a contemporaneous text, the text alluded to will not have been in the public domain long enough to have made a significant impact on the culture. If two
poems by two different poets are released at roughly the same time, what are the chances that the public will have read both of them? While we, more than a generation later, view Eliot and Pound in isolation as the two greats of the modernist movement, they were not seen thus when they were actually publishing. At that time, they were merely two poets among the hundreds publishing in the literary journals. There was no reason for most people to know both their works well enough to recognize when one is alluding to the other.

There are many examples of this type of allusion among Callimachus and his circle, for example, Theocritus' reworking of the Hylas episode in Apollonius' Argonautica. As Gow has noted, Theocritus' 13th Idyll is "plainly meant to criticize and improve" Apollonius' handling of the material (382).123 A modern instance is Pound's playful reworking of Yeats' famous "Lake Isle of Innisfree" in his own "The Lake Isle:"124

The Lake Isle of Innisfree

I will arise and go now, and go to Innisfree,
And a small cabin build there, of clay and wattles made:
Nine bean-rows will I have there, a hive for the honey-bee,
And live alone in the bee-loud glade.

And I shall have some peace there, for peace comes dropping slow,

123 For in-depth discussion of the correspondences between the two passages see Gow 231-245. Because of the difficulty of dating the two poems, opinions have differed as to which poet influenced the other.
124 Pound and Yeats met in 1909 and a close relationship developed between the two poets. Despite Pound's disdain for what he viewed as the overly Romantic and poetic language exemplified in the verse of Yeats' "Celtic twilight," he considered Yeats the greatest living poet. For full discussion and comparison of Yeats' and Pound's poetics see Stead, Yeats, Pound and Eliot, 9-33.
Dropping from the veils of the morning to where the cricket sings;
There midnight's all a glimmer, and noon a purple glow,
And evening full of the linnet's wings.

I will arise and go now, for always night and day
I hear lake water lapping with low sounds by the shore;
While I stand on the roadway, or on the pavements grey,
I hear it in the deep heart's core.125

*The Lake Isle*

O God, O Venus, O Mercury, patron of thieves,
Give me in due time, I beseech you, a little tobacco-shop,
With the little bright boxes
    piled up neatly upon the shelves
And the loose fragrant cavendish
    and the shag,
And the bright Virginia
    loose under the bright glass cases,
And a pair of scales not too greasy,
And the whores dropping in for a word or two in passing,
For a flip word, and to tidy their hair a bit.

O God, O Venus, O Mercury, patron of thieves,
Lend me a little tobacco-shop,
    or install me in any profession
Save this damn'd profession of writing,
    where one needs one's brains all the time.126

First, the formal similarities: the poems are roughly the same length; they both have three stanzas; in each, the beginning of the final stanza repeats the beginning of the first ("I will arise and go now, and go to Innisfree," "I will arise and go now, for always night and day;" "O God, O Venus, O Mercury, patron of thieves," "O God, O Venus, O Mercury, patron of thieves"); both poets use anaphora in the second stanza; and both poets begin four lines with the word "and." Next, there is the similarity in the titles, with Pound's title being an abbreviation of Yeats'. A further indication that Pound's title intends to recall Yeats' poem is the fact that Pound's title is otherwise unconnected to the poem it introduces: there is nothing in his poem about a lake or an island and no imagery to evoke them. In fact, the urban subject matter of Pound's poem is the antithesis of the rural setting conjured up by the title. Since the title does not describe the poem's subject, one is alerted to view it as a possible marker of allusion; one is nudged to look elsewhere--outside of the poem--for the title's referent.

While at first glance the two poems appear to deal with opposing themes--Yeats' pastoral theme versus Pound's urban reality--one must recall the genesis of Yeats' poem. As Yeats has explained:

I had still the ambition, formed in Sligo in my teens, of living in imitation of Thoreau on Innisfree, a little island in Lough Gill, and when walking

through Fleet Street very homesick I heard a little tinkle of water and saw a fountain in a shop-window which balanced a little ball upon its jet, and began to remember lake water. From the sudden remembrance came my poem Innisfree....

In Yeats' poem, then, we have the vision inspired by a city shop (a tobacconist's?); in Pound, we have the shop itself as the vision. In both instances, the poet stands outside a city shop-window looking in. Yeats sees a dream; Pound, the thing itself. Consider how the hazy, subjective romanticism of Yeats' poem is transformed into gritty, objective realism in Pound's: Yeats' tidy rows of beans become rows of tobacco boxes "piled up neatly" on the shelves; the longed-for "small cabin" becomes a "little tobacco shop," a transformation signalled by Pound's echo of Yeats' diminutive; the soft-focus beauty of nature in Yeats' second stanza becomes the grubbiness of dirty scales, which are presumably greasy, since we are told that they are "not too greasy;" the hive that houses honey in Yeats is now a glass case that houses tobacco; in Yeats, peace "comes dropping slow," in Pound, it is whores who are dropping, "dropping in for a word or two in passing;" instead of crickets' song, we have the chatter of whores (or in English slang, "birds"); and Yeats' glittering midnight metamorphoses into the glimmer of Pound's shop-window reflecting the whores' rumpled hair. In each instance, there is a move from nature to culture, from the natural to the artificial, the romantic to the realistic, from the heart to the head. In the final line, Pound makes this split between heart and head explicit, for where Yeats wrote "I hear it in the deep heart's core," Pound writes "where one needs one's brains all the time." Yeats' escapism and

128 This preference of the artificial over the natural is not at all antithetical to Yeats, particularly the later Yeats. One sees a similar move in Yeats' own work, for example in the post-Pound "Sailing to Byzantium."
yearning for a utopian pastoral ideal is mocked as empty-headed by Pound’s final line which implies the poet would be better off practising his craft than chasing Thoreauvian rainbows. Pound seems to assert that poetry is the result of craft and intelligence as opposed to sudden wild inspiration. One is tempted to read into this young poet’s re-working of his elder’s poem an opposing poetics: Yeats’ Romantic/Symbolist heritage versus Pound’s Imagist (and ultimately modernist) agenda.

One of the dangers with this mode of intertextual allusion is that the critic coming at the poems from a distance can easily lose historical perspective. One may erroneously assume that poets who knew each other and wrote at the same time are alluding to one another when a close look at the dates of the poems in question would reveal the apparent intertextuality to be mere coincidence (albeit, at times, strong coincidence). For example, one might suspect an intertextual relationship between Eliot’s “Portrait of a Lady” and Pound’s “Portrait D’Une Femme,” for they have the same title—Eliot’s in English, Pound’s in French—and they deal with the same topic, namely a cultivated, older woman, a patroness of sorts, in the grip of ennui who draws talented young men to her side; however, Pound’s “Portrait D’Une Femme” was published in *Ripostes* in London in 1912, two years before Pound had ever heard of Eliot and apparently before Eliot, still in America, had heard of Pound.129 The similarities between the two poems are very striking, indeed, but these similarities are likely due to the influence of Henry James on both, as well as plain coincidence.

2. Small scale private allusion. This type of allusion is often irretrievable by anyone not intimate with the poet’s circle. Recognition is usually restricted to the particular poet alluded to and perhaps to the coterie. It is often a private exchange

---

129 “Portrait of a Lady” was among the poems which Eliot had sent to Pound originally in 1914. While Eliot was somewhat familiar with Pound’s work before their 1914 meeting, he had read only *Personae* and *Exultations* (Carpenter 259).
performed in public, like the system of gestures devised by husband and wife to signal when it is time to leave a party or between a parent and child to indicate when the latter's behaviour has slipped out of line. Among poets, it may be used to make a critical comment on a particular word or phrase (or even a trick of metre) used by a fellow poet. Many such allusions escape notice completely. In some cases, it may be impossible to discover whether these are conscious allusions or coincidental echoes. For example, consider Pound's comment on the aristocratic Yeats' food preferences:

who would not eat ham for dinner  
because peasants eat ham for dinner  
despite the excellent quality  
and the pleasure of having it hot.  

(C. 83/534)

This passage echoes the words of Eliot's blue-collar (and so peasant?) woman in *The Waste Land*:

Well, that Sunday Albert was home, they had a hot gammon,  
And they asked me in to dinner, to get the beauty of it hot.  

(WL 166-167)

Did Pound echo the syntax of Eliot's Cockney ("the pleasure of having it hot," "the beauty of it hot") to reinforce Yeats' rejection of what he saw as peasant-food? Or were

---

130 For example, Chapter 2 discusses Callimachus' play on Theocritus' use of *helichryos* (128-130) and Pound's play on Joyce's use of the word ingle (161-162).
Pound and Eliot both imitating a common colloquial phrase?

It is easier to determine the relevance of some of Pound's other small scale intertextual allusions to Eliot. For example, at the beginning of Canto 74, Pound echoes and revises the memorable lines of Eliot's *The Hollow Men*:

\[
This \text{ is the way the world ends} \\
This \text{ is the way the world ends} \\
This \text{ is the way the world ends} \\
Not \text{ with a bang but a whimper}
\]

\( (HM \ 95-98) \)

yet say this to the Possum: a bang, not a whimper,
with a bang not with a whimper.

\( (C. \ 74/425) \)

At the time Pound's Pisan Cantos were published in 1948, Eliot was a very famous poet and his 1925 *The Hollow Men* well-known. Thus, readers of literary sophistication would catch Pound's echo of Eliot and the point of his revision. While readers may not have known that Possum was Pound's nickname for his friend, they could infer this from the juxtaposition of the nickname and the re-worked line from Eliot's *Hollow Men*.\(^{131}\)

Similarly, Pound twice echoes Eliot's "These fragments I have shored against my ruins" (WL 430). The first echo of this line in Pound is found at C. 8/28 "These fragments you have shelved (shored)." Here, it appears that the allusion is not

intended to draw in the context of *The Waste Land* itself, but the circumstances surrounding Pound's editing of it. Some months before the composition of Canto 8, Eliot had sent Pound the manuscripts of scraps and fragments he had accumulated which Pound would help to shape into *The Waste Land* (Terrell 1: 36-37). Pound's own "fragments" are the evolving Cantos. Presumably, these fragments (of Pound's and Eliot's) are "shelved" in the literal sense, i.e., left on the writers' shelves, but also, in the case of Eliot, put aside while the poet decided what—if anything—to do with them. Pound alludes to this line once more in Canto 110/781: "From time's wreckage shored, / these fragments shored against ruin." This allusion highlights an ambiguity in Eliot's text: while Pound's fragments shore off ruin (singular), presumably the ruin or destruction of the poet's memory after his death, Eliot's are shored against the ruins (plural), i.e., the remains of the soon to be fallen London bridge (*WL* 426) and the fallen towers of destroyed cities (*WL* 373-375). Eliot's sentiment is explicitly a public one—the wish to uphold the culture as symbolized by its architecture—while Pound's is private—the longing to preserve the poet's memory; however, implicitly, Eliot's line suggests the latter meaning, too, by his use of the personal pronoun: they are "*my* ruins" not "the ruins" (emphasis mine). Thus, Eliot's line does double duty. Behind the phrase "my ruins," the eye discerns "my ruin." That Eliot had in mind the *topos* of the poet's immortality as a subtext becomes clearer upon an examination of the first draft of *The Waste Land*, where "these fragments" were not "shored" but "spelt." The verb "spelt" emphasizes the linguistic aspect. The meaning of the original line might be construed, "these fragments which I have spelt, thus written, to ward off my ruin and/or the ruin of the culture at large." It is this subtext which Pound has picked up on in his allusions to the phrase in the Cantos. This is further supported by the final echo of the line at C. 116/781: "his fragments sunk (20 years)." As Terrell explains, this is an
allusion to Dr. Joseph, a research fellow of Harvard's Yenching Institute who spent twenty years working with the Na-Khi (2: 716-717). In 1943, Dr. Joseph tried to ship back to America seven hundred manuscripts, the product of his twenty-years' work. The ship carrying them was torpedoed by a Japanese submarine and sunk to the bottom of the sea. Pound’s point is that unlike Dr. Joseph's life's work, his and Eliot's will survive—the fragments which evolved into *The Waste Land* and *The Cantos* will ensure their poets' immortality.

The effect of these two allusions to Eliot in Pound is to reinforce the elegiac note. They contribute to the *pathos* and sense of loss which permeates *The Cantos*. By making such an intimate gesture to a friend in public, by inviting the public into this private conversation, Pound extends that intimacy to his and to Eliot's faithful readers who will be able to recognize the gesture. With respect to the allusion to Eliot at Canto 74, even if one does not recognize the exact source of the allusion and is unsure of what it is meant to signify, Pound’s intimate tone, the affectionate nickname, and the second person address to his friend signal to readers that this is a private exchange which they are invited to overhear and participate in.

**Summary**

Veiled allusions, obscure sources, uncited quotations, foreign languages, and intertextual play among contemporary poets render Alexandrian poetry difficult. They prevent the swift and simple construction of meaning in favour of a slow, aggregative accumulation of meaning, the painstaking assembly of a complex edifice of significance. The gradual accumulation of meaning, the delayed and laboriously-achieved effect may well have a greater emotional impact on the reader. As Pound
declares in C. 87/572, echoing Binyon's advice to Yeats: "Slowness is beauty."132 This mode of realizing meaning may also increase the poem's memorability. Just as the act of reading words aloud as one traces their shape with pen and paper improves the student's ability to learn and retain a new language, the active intellectual engagement over time which is demanded by Alexandrian poetry serves virtually to imprint it in the reader's cells of mind and heart. If, that is, the reader is both willing to go along with the poet and is up to the journey. As Derek Walcott has said, "Great poetry sticks."133

What makes a poet Alexandrian is not any one trait in isolation, such as allusiveness, erudition, or obscurity, but the collocation of all or most of the characteristics which make up the Alexandrian poetic programme. Perhaps, too, one might add the attitude of the revolutionary: the Alexandrian poet battles tradition and forms his or her poetic precepts in reaction against it. He or she is a self conscious artist eternally in search of innovation, to "make it new." Such a poet will often define his or her poetics in negative terms: not as lofty as Homer, nor as "fat" as Antimachus; not as martial as Ennius, nor as windy as Milton. Such poetry, even when it is more than two thousand years old, remains "new poetry."

---

133 In a 1993 seminar at the University of Toronto, Walcott asked that each week the students memorize a poem and then recite it as a group in class. While at first many students were daunted by what seemed an impossible task, Walcott insisted that the simple act of repeated recitation of a great work would imprint the words in memory. He was right.
Chapter 2
The Cantos of Ezra Pound and The Alexandrian Epic Tradition

The Generic Question

Scholars continue to dispute Pound's assertion that the Cantos are an epic poem because they differ markedly from the traditional, Homeric epic. Yet Pound consistently called the poem an epic in later years. Early on, Pound vacillated between calling the Cantos a "long poem" and an "epic," indicating an initial reluctance to embrace the generic term "epic" unambiguously. Ronald Bush attributes this reluctance to the fact that the symbolists had labelled the epic genre as outdated and old-fashioned and Pound did not want to associate himself with what was then considered passé (Genesis 74). It may be also that Pound did not originally conceive the poem as epic; however, it is apparent that his conception of the poem's genre changed as it developed. This is not surprising given its long course of composition, from the 1917 publication of "Three Cantos" to "Drafts and Fragments" in 1966, almost fifty years later. The matter is complicated by the plural form of the title Cantos which militates against epic unity and suggests that the poem should be viewed instead as a series of poems. But Cantos is the title of the work by chance, not choice: according to the Publisher's Note in the frontispiece of the poem, Pound had planned to give the poem a title when it was finished. The Cantos was merely a name for the work in progress.1 In Pound scholarship, the problematic nature of the plural title Cantos is evident from the practice of maintaining the plural in discourse about the poem; thus, one writes "the Cantos are" and not "the Cantos is." On the other hand, classical scholars regularly use the singular to refer to long poems which bear a plural title, for

1 Similarly, had Joyce died before completing Finnegans Wake that work would be known to us as Work in Progress, the title which Joyce used for the early published excerpts. Indeed, Joyce invariably used this title to refer to the work during its sixteen years of composition. As Hans Walter Gabler notes, Joyce withheld the final title Finnegans Wake, "until the moment of integral publication in 1939." "Joyce's Text in Progress," The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce. Ed. Derek Attridge. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990: 233.
example, the *Aetia*, "Causes" is; and the *Metamorphoses*, "Transformations" is. Although herein I follow the established practice in the respective disciplines, this is not to be construed as tacit agreement with the popular view that the *Cantos* lack epic unity.

Much scholarship on the *Cantos* has focused on exposing as spurious Pound’s view of the poem as an epic. But rather than “prove” that the poet was wrong about the work that consumed his life, that *il miglior fabbro* did not know his craft, perhaps one should question instead the underlying premise that there exists only one kind of epic and it is written on the Homeric model. If the poet insists his poem is an epic yet it does not fit our preconception of epic, perhaps we should take him at his word and question, instead, the preconception. Since it is plain that Pound was not emulating traditional epic, we might consider what he was doing: What epic model (if any) is followed? How does he alter or subvert generic conventions, and to what purpose? What is the poet’s vision of epic and how does he bring that vision into being? This chapter will examine these issues and propose another, non-Homeric, epic model for the *Cantos* in an attempt to reconcile the rift between Pound’s vision and the critical opinion of the genre of the *Cantos*.

Before one can answer the question is the *Cantos* an epic, one must first ask, what is epic? In search of an answer to this question, most scholars in the Western tradition confidently hold up the oldest epic extant, the *Iliad*, as the definitive epic poem against which all later long poems—even the *Odyssey*—are measured and found wanting to some degree or another. But the *Iliad* is merely the earliest surviving manifestation of an ever-evolving genre.² If the earliest epic poem extant were Hesiod’s *Works and Days* or Callimachus’ *Hecale* or even Virgil’s *Aeneid* what would be our conception of the epic genre? Poets continually play with literary tradition, 

² It is commonly accepted that the *Odyssey* was composed after the *Iliad*. For dating of the poems and discussion of the relationship between them see Denys L. Page, *The Homeric Odyssey*. Oxford: Clarendon P. 1955: 149-152.
freely breaking the "rules" set forth by their predecessors as they subvert poetic conventions and expand the possibilities of form and genre. L. E. Rossi sounds a cautionary note on the importance of genre rules to poets when he points out that in the Archaic period, genre rules were unwritten, but respected; in the Classical period, they were both written and respected; and in the Hellenistic period, they were "rigidly formulated but disregarded." In fact, Rossi speculates that classification of the genres was made in the Hellenistic period specifically for the purpose of violating the rules. There are generic differences even between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The structure of the *Iliad* is much more unified, with the action restricted to the battlefield and city of Troy and taking place over a matter of weeks. Its tone is tragic and so deemed serious. In contrast, the structure of the *Odyssey* is loose and episodic; while the story takes place over a few days, the events narrated in that period are strewn throughout the Hellenic world and over a space of ten years. Its tone is comic and thus it is viewed as less serious, less weighty than the *Iliad*. While the *Iliad* has an affinity with tragedy, the *Odyssey* was "thought to have a special kinship with comedy" (Newman, *Class. Epic* 15). The valuation of the tragic over the comic as being more serious and thus more important and of a higher quality--more "epic"--appears to originate with Longinus. As J.K. Newman notes, Longinus found the *Odyssey* inferior to the *Iliad*, "because it is a comedy of character" (*Class. Epic* 69). This devaluing of the comic does not occur in Aristotle whose vision of the epic encompassed both the comic and tragic modes (Newman, *Class. Epic* 69).

Post-Homeric epic is often viewed as impure, tainted by genre-mixing and

---

3 As quoted by G. Zanker, *Realism* 133.
4 Dante, too, saw two separate but equal possibilities for epic: the tragic and the comic. Thus, while Dante has Virgil describe the *Aeneid* as a tragedy (*Inf.* 20.113), he refers to his own poem as a comedy (*Inf.* 16.128, 21.2). Gilbert Highet observes that in his letter to Can Grande della Scala, Dante says that "comedy is a kind of poetic narrative which begins harshly and ends happily, and which is written in humble unpretentious language. He [Dante] explains this further by distinguishing comedy from tragedy--which begins quietly and ends in horror, and is written in a lofty style. Apparently this is a garbled reminiscence of Aristotle's definitions of the two main types of drama" (70-71).
divergence from the Homeric model in respect to such elements as structure, subject matter, characterization, style, and narration. Many poems thought to be epic by their authors and their public--indeed, many poems which are currently established in the Western epic canon--have been cast out of the epic genre at various times. Based solely on scholarship, one might reasonably conclude that the Iliad is the only epic ever written. For example, "epic" status has been denied to Apollonius of Rhodes' Argonautica, a poem which is generally considered to be our best example of Hellenistic epic. M. Marjorie Crump claims the poem is "little more than a collection of epyllia," an assessment which appears to be based on her opinion that the Argonautica is not a very good epic: "The failure of the Argonautica as a grand epic lies essentially in the weakness of its construction. Apollonius never mastered the technique of epic" (243). This is a confusion of quality with kind. Crump gave the same verdict (for different reasons) to Ovid's Metamorphoses, a poem of 15 books and approximately 12,000 lines, whose scope includes all of creation and all of history: "They might have been published as a collection of unconnected epyllia, without any loss of interest. In fact it is not at all unreasonable to suppose that Ovid wrote many of them as separate epyllia and later devised the connecting system" (203-204). Nor is the epic status of Dante's Divine Comedy uncontested: Renaissance critics were fond of claiming it was not an epic (Newman, Class. Epic 253), and a recent scholar, in her proposal of a new genre called the "fictional encyclopaedia" would include the Comedy here because, "in the sense that it includes topical issues, it is more encyclopaedic than epic." Using Clark's criterion, presumably we must also exclude Virgil's Aeneid from the epic canon. The genre of Milton's Paradise Lost is also moot, as evidenced by Merritt Y. Hughes' introduction to the poem which begins with a

5 The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid, Oxford: Blackwell, 1931: 247.
section on genre entitled “Epic or Drama?” (PL xv).

Curiously, while the epic poems of Hesiod are roughly contemporaneous with the Homeric poems (from which they differ significantly) modern critics do not take them as a primary generic model for the epic. Consequently, poems modelled after the Hesiodic epics, such as Aratus' Phaenomena and Virgil's Georgics, are generally excluded from the epic category and classed instead as didactic. Similarly, the Aetia and the Metamorphoses have been classed as aetiological poems. But, as Zanker points out, the Greeks and Romans had no separate category for didactic epic; thus Hesiod, Homer, and Aratus belong to the same category (Realism 153, n.60). As we shall see, the ancients' main criterion for the classification of genre was metre: a poem written in epic metre (dactylic hexameter) was classed as epic regardless of its subject matter. Arguably, "didactic," "aetiological," and "fictional encyclopaedia" are not genres at all, but modes. An epic may be also didactic, just as an elegy may be also an epithalamium. "Aetiological" or "epithalamium" or "fictional encyclopaedia" are secondary definitions attached to the primary generic classification such as epic, lyric, or elegy. They are not primary genres in and of themselves.

Using the Iliad, or even the Odyssey, as our sole epic model is problematical for other reasons. First, while many of the poems noted above are rejected as epics due to their blending of generic features, even the Iliad is guilty of this: it shares its main characters, subject matter, and tone with tragedy. It is likely because of this that Aristotle felt the need to differentiate sharply between the genres of epic and tragedy.

The two basic differences? The length of the poem and the metre it is written in.10

---

8 While the Aetia is not, strictly speaking, an epic but a long elegiac poem with a very close relationship to epic, it is the model for Ovid's epic Metamorphoses. See, for example, T. M. Klein, "The Role of Callimachus in the Development of the Counter Genre" Latomus 33.2 (1974) 227. For an in-depth study of the two poems, see K. Sara Myers, Ovid's Causes; Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1994.
Second, the Homeric epics are bound to differ strikingly from all later epic inasmuch as they are the product of an oral tradition and were composed orally for performance. Post-Homeric epic arose from the written word and its mode of composition had a profound effect on its poetics (Bing 10-48).

If we reject the Iliad as the sole epic model and instead view "epic" as ever-evolving, there are many epic models from which to choose. In the archaic period, epic is split into two primary forms: the Homeric (which, in turn, is divided into tragic and comic) and the Hesiodic. These two traditions were perceived as distinct and even antithetical, as indicated by the long standing tradition of a contest between Homer and Hesiod, a tradition which goes back at least as far as sixth century B.C. Hesiod set a precedent for the short epic and due to this as well as other stylistic concerns the Alexandrians associated him with the principle of leptotes "fineness." Hesiod was thus the antithesis of Homer who was associated with megethos "grandeur" (Halperin 246). It is from the Hesiodic leptos epic that the Alexandrian epic is born; and Alexandrian epic, primarily through its Latin practitioners, had a profound influence on later Western epic. This is the epic form against which we can measure the Cantos.

Expanding on Alexandrian techniques learned from Browning, Dante, Catullus, Ovid, Propertius, Theocritus, and Callimachus, and learning from their innovations in poetic form and genre, Pound breathed new life into the epic genre through his creation of a modern Alexandrian epic. His impulse to "Make it New" finds its artistic equivalent in Callimachus who also strove to make a place for himself in the tradition.

---

14 See Newman Class. Epic for full discussion of Alexandrian influence in major figures in Western literature such as Dante and Chaucer.
and at the same time to revolutionize that tradition: to "make it new" and in so doing to make it his own.

Callimachus and the New Epic: The Alexandrian Revolution

Callimachus' vision of the new epic is exemplified in the Hecale and, to a lesser extent, in the Aetia. The scholiast to Callimachus Hymn II.106 says "In these verses he attacks those who ridiculed him for not being capable of writing a long poem; for this reason, he was compelled to write the Hecale" (Trypanis 179). Whether or not the story is true, the Hecale can be viewed as Callimachus' poetic manifesto of what the "modern" epic poem can and should be. Elsewhere, Callimachus has given indications of what poetry in general should not be. For example, in Epigram 28 (discussed in Chapter 1, 28-29) Callimachus claims loathing of the cyclic poems which slavishly imitated Homeric practice; in the Hymn to Apollo he censures the poet who sings things as great as the sea; in the Aetia Prologue (lines 1-6) he dismisses his critics' complaints that he did not write a continuous poem of thousands of verses about kings or heroes, i.e., a traditional epic poem, but that instead like a child (a tiny person) he unrolls a tiny tale. Further, while Homer's poem is spoken, Callimachus' is distinctly written: the verb helisso, "to roll," refers to the action involved in reading from a roll of papyrus. Callimachus sets himself in contrast to the larger-than-life figure of Homer, a bard of mythic stature who sang a song of like proportions. As he admonishes the Telchines (Aetia fr. 1.17-18): judge poetry by its art, not by its length.

Callimachus reserves his praise for poetry that is small scale, highly wrought and innovative. As he maintains, mega biblion, mega kakon, "a big book is a big bore"

---

15 All references to the Hecale are to the edition and commentary of A.S. Hollis, Oxford: Clarendon P, 1990. Unless otherwise indicated, citations are to Pfeiffer's numbering of the fragments.
But what exactly is it that Callimachus rejects when he condemns the “big book”? It cannot be epic *per se* or he would not have turned his hand to that genre. And while Callimachus’s *Hecale* and Apollonius of Rhodes’ *Argonautica* are much shorter than the Homeric epics they are yet not small poems. Arguably, *mega* does not refer to length, but to style: it is possible that in Callimachus’ eyes, a book could be *mega* “big” or “great” without being long, just as it might be *leptos* “slender” without being short. For Aristotle, who was a champion of Homeric epic, the quality of *megethos* which characterizes epic seems to refer sometimes to physical length, sometimes to grandeur of content. Elsewhere in Callimachus *mega* refers to poetic aesthetics: in the *Aetia* Prologue 11-12 Callimachus rejects the *megale gune*, “Large Woman,” apparently a reference to Antimachus’ long poem the *Lyde*, in favour of another (unknown) poem written in the *leptos* style. Callimachus may have equated *mega* with bombast. Similarly, it has been demonstrated that *pachus* “fat,” another polemic term antithetical to *leptos* for the Alexandrians, may signal not bulk, but style; specifically, the stylistic element of verbosity and excessive ornamentation, or of harsh, discordant sound (Krevans, “Fighting” *passim*). In his rejection of the *pachus* “fat” style, Callimachus anticipates Pound who urged the poet to “de-suetize” his work. What is of primary importance to Callimachus is the level of craft, not length. Epic was perfectly legitimate—if it was written according to the new standards of technique. Alexandrian epic is much shorter than Homeric epic (though consistent with the length of Hesiod’s epic poems) because it is so dense and artfully wrought. As Newman observes, “there is simply not time to compose at length. But that does not preclude the possibility that

---

16 There is some ambiguity about the line (Pfeiffer *ad loc.*) and we have very little context for it. Athenaeus attributes it to Callimachus “the Grammarian.” One wonders if Callimachus was complaining about the *mega* book because, as a poet, he disapproved of its style, or because, as a grammarian and scholar, its length made it a nuisance for him to edit, or possibly both.

17 T.M. Klein “Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, and the Concept of the Big Book” *Eranos* 73 (1975) 22.

18 See Lucas’ commentary on ch. 4 49a 19.

19 On the problems with this fragmented section of the Prologue, see Pfeiffer *ad loc.* For a recent discussion, see Nita Krevans, “Fighting Against Antimachus: The *Lyde* and the *Aetia.*” *Callimachus.* Eds. M.A. Harder, R.F. Regtuit, G.C. Wakker. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1993: 149-160.
one day a super-human genius might emerge who was capable of reconciling length in the accepted sense and art."20 Such a genius was Ezra Pound.

Like Callimachus, Pound was drawn to the combination of the small-scale technique and large-scale form. He particularly admired Dante's lyricization of the epic genre in the Divine Comedy and wrestled with its significance for genre:

The Divina Commedia must not be considered as an epic; to compare it with epic poems is usually unprofitable. It is in a sense lyric, the tremendous lyric of the subjective Dante; but the soundest classification of the poem is Dante's own as "a comedy which differs from tragedy in its content"... The Commedia is, in fact, a great mystery play, or better a cycle of mystery plays.21

This was written at a time when Pound's own ideas of epic were in flux, but note that he does not say that the Divine Comedy is not an epic, but only that it must not be considered as an epic, or against epic norms with which it does not comply inasmuch as its lyric style is antithetical to the epic genre. As the years passed, Pound openly affirmed that the Divine Comedy is an epic poem in the tradition of Homer and Virgil (Bush, Genesis 75). Pound's interest in transferring lyric techniques (specifically, imagist techniques) to the long form and thus creating a modern lyric-style epic is apparent in 1914 when he writes "I am often asked whether there can be a long imagiste or vorticist poem" and again in 1915 when he wonders "Could one do a long Imagiste poem, or even a long poem in vers libre?" (Bush, Genesis 23). While his own aesthetic judgment prized Imagism's finely drawn precision and maximum compression--the modernist incarnation of Alexandrian leptotes--such small-scale

verse was not given serious critical attention and was often dismissed as "petty poetry" (Bush, *Genesis* 22). In the eyes of the literary community, one was not a major poet until one had mastered major form, and major form still meant epic. Pondering the opposition between the small-scale, or lyric, style and large form, Pound came to the same decision as had Callimachus centuries earlier; the *Cantos* were born of his desire to write a long poem on imagist principles (Bush, *Genesis* 48). As the work progressed, Pound's goal became more daring: to write the great modern epic, the "tale of the tribe," using the small-scale poetic principles of personal lyric. Thus, as the length and scope of the poem expanded, its over-riding poetics contracted as Pound's style became more and more condensed and elliptical. As Bush notes, Pound's main poetic principle was "never use a word to make the poem easier to read; add words only to particularize sense" (*Genesis* 210). The result is a level of obscurity which has compromised the poem's success. The comparatively short epics of the Alexandrians are perhaps more successful, but their brevity relative to the Homeric epics has been problematic for other reasons.

Later critics attempting to come to terms with the new short epics classified them as epyllia. Thus, as noted above, the *Argonautica* and the *Metamorphoses* have been viewed as collections of epyllia loosely strung together, a view which, incidentally, could also apply to James Joyce's modern epic, the novel *Ulysses*. But while modern critics might class these poems as epyllia, their authors believed that they were writing in the epic genre, a belief often (but not always) signified by their use of the dactylic hexameter. In their own eyes, these poets were not creating a new genre--the epyllion--but making bold modifications to an old one--the epic.

While for modern critics the term "epyllion" is convenient for distinguishing between the old Homeric epic and the new Alexandrian epic, for the ancients the term is inaccurate and even irrelevant. First, the word did not exist in antiquity as a designation of a literary type. In antiquity, the word *epyllion* is used by Aristophanes to
denote a "scrap of poetry" and by Clement of Alexandria and Ausonius to mean a short poem of any type.\textsuperscript{22} While Athenaeus calls the pseudo-Homeric \emph{Epicichlides} an \textit{epyllion},\textsuperscript{23} there is no evidence that he is using it as a generic term (Gutzwiller, \textit{Studies} 3). Diminutives usually denote size, but they may also express emotional colouring: \textit{epyllion} may be used dismissively "that wretched little poem," or fondly. One suspects both here since Athenaeus claims the poem was a song for children. Athenaeus characterises the \emph{Epicichlides} as a "little" epic which is thus appropriate for children who are, after all, "little" people. At any rate, \textit{epyllion} is never used to mean "little epic" in the generic sense before c.1890-1900 when it first enters the critical vocabulary.\textsuperscript{24} Second, it is not possible to ascribe common literary characteristics to the poems classed as epyllia. Allen summarizes the situation:

It is folly to talk of authors writing in a definite literary form before it is known that there was such a form and that they believed themselves to be writing in that form. The truth of the matter is that these poems do possess some qualities in common, but that they also possess these same qualities in common with other poems and other distinctive types of literature, so that it is not right to classify them as an individual and well-defined genre. (4)

These poems might be regarded instead as examples of the Alexandrian love for mixing poetical genres which are heavily influenced by the Hesiodic, as opposed to the Homeric, epic tradition (Allen 1).\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{25} For generic blending as particularly characteristic of Alexandrian poetry see L.E. Rossi, "I generi letterari e le loro scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche," \textit{BICS} 18 (1971) 69-94.
That the ancient authors of what we now call epyllia believed that they were writing epic is apparent from an examination of ancient literary theory. Gutzwiller explains that epyllia belong to the category of *epos*: epic, or poems written in hexameters (*Studies* 3). In Quintilian (10.1.55) metre is the main criterion for determining poetic genre, thus Quintilian classifies all of Theocritus' poems—both pastoral and those classed by modern critics as epyllia—as epic.26 So, too, Longinus compares Homer favourably to both Theocritus and Apollonius of Rhodes, using the word *Bucolica* of the former's work not as a generic term, but as a title equivalent to the *Argonautica*.27 Classification according to metre is found from the fifth century B.C. onwards. In Callimachus's time, then, poems written in dactylic hexameters belonged to the same poetic genre as Homeric epic. Thus, Theocritus' *Idylls*, Callimachus's *Hecale*, Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics* would be classed as epic. There is another ancient theory of generic classification that does not use metre as the defining characteristic. This is Plato's theory that poetry can be divided into three types: narrative, where the poet speaks in his own right (*diegesis*); dramatic, where the poet speaks as the characters (*mimesis*); and a mixture of the narrative and dramatic types, the *genos mikton*, or "mixed type."28 Plato classifies the Homeric epics as the mixed type. Likewise, Theocritus and Callimachus combine narrative and dramatic elements in their mythological poems (Gutzwiller, *Studies* 4). Using this criterion, the mythological narratives of Theocritus and Callimachus, which combine narrative and dramatic elements, belong to the *genos mikton*, or mixed type, in the same category as the Homeric epic. As Gutzwiller concludes, the result is the same "whether we use the

---

Platonic system of classification or the division by metre: to the ancient mind
Hellenistic epyllion and Homeric epic are identical" (Studies 4).

It was the application of Callimachean poetics to traditional large-scale epic that
transformed the epic genre, in particular, the application of the leptos style, the fine,
elegant, and highly wrought style, hitherto reserved for small-scale verse, to traditional
large-scale epic. This new style, seen as inappropriate for the venerated old epic,
appears to be what outraged Callimachus' critics who have been satirized as the
Telchines in the Aetia prologue. In the so-called Battle of the Books, the complaint
against Callimachus appears to be directed not so much against his choice of style--
the leptos style was considered fine for short epigrams and lyric verses--but against
what was viewed as a breach of decorum and generic contamination. One simply did
not use the ischnos "plain" style in its antithetical form, the epic genre.29 It was this
application of small-scale techniques to the large poem in an attempt to revolutionize
epic that conservatives found objectionable and outrageous (Newman, "Callimachus"
345). This mingling of the slender style and the large form resulted in what is now
considered a separate genre: the epyllion. So what then is the epyllion? Gutzwiller
concludes that it is "epic which is not epic, epic which is at odds with epic, epic which
is in contrast with grand epic and old epic values" (Studies 5). It is epic made new.

It has been demonstrated that whether or not Callimachus knew the text of the
Poetics as we have it, he was familiar with Aristotle's' thought on literary criticism
which is expressed in the Poetics.30 Callimachus appears to have been a strong
opponent of Aristotle in respect to epic. In the Poetics, Aristotle describes epic as well
as tragedy: its proper form, plot, subject matter, and subjects. Epic must be in dactylic

29 Demetrius characterizes the plain style as precise, vivid, clear, and simple and holds it in stark contrast
to the elevated style which is proper to the epic genre. Demetrius on Style, Ed. and Trans. W. Rhys
30 G. Zanker "Callimachus' Hecale: A New Kind of Epic Hero?" Antichthon 11 (1977) 68. See also K.O.
hexameters, the metre deemed slowest moving and weightiest and thus best able to accommodate foreign words and metaphors (59b1.35). Aristotle maintains that this metre is so particularly well-suited to the genre that no one has ever composed a long poem in any metre other than the hexameter. Epic must not be didactic. Thus writers such as Empedocles who convey scientific or medical information in verse are deemed unworthy of the appellation “poet” and dismissed as “science writers” (47b.19). Under these guidelines alone, Aristotle would not have put Homer and Aratus in the same class, although the Phaenomena is a lengthy and artful poem in epic metre written in the Hesiodic tradition (particularly that of the Works and Days). While Aristotle draws his guidelines for the epic genre from the Homeric epic tradition, the Hesiodic one is just as old and just as venerable, if less to Aristotle’s taste.

Where Callimachus appears to have taken most exception to Aristotle is in respect to his ruling on the appropriate subjects for epic and those regarding the strict separation of genres. Aristotle named three types of people as possible subjects of representation (48a.1-9): those who are better than us (spoudaioi); those who are like us; and those who are worse than us (phauloi). The spoudaioi are the proper subjects for epic and tragedy, while the phauloi are fit only for comedy (48a.16-17). The two distinctions seem to refer solely to social status and not to moral goodness. Aristotle’s objection to phauloi as epic and tragic subjects can be explained also by his concept of decorum (Zanker, Realism 142). Style, metre, and subject must be suited to one another. Thus the magniloquent epic and tragic metres are considered inappropriate for treatment of low subjects and especially incongruous issuing from the mouths of phauloi. Imagine, then, the bold effect of Theocritus’ vulgar shepherds and Callimachus’ “poor but honest” Hecale speaking in hexameter verse! And what does

31 "Didactic" in the sense of teaching a skill (e.g., farming) or providing technical or scientific instruction (e.g., astronomy). Homeric epic was didactic inasmuch as it was used as a tool to teach correct moral and civic behaviour; but it teaches by example; its lessons must be inferred. In contrast, Hesiod explicitly lays out farming procedures step by step and Aratus describes the constellations in precise detail to allow the student easy recognition.
one make of Hecale herself, a *phaulos*, as epic hero? As Zanker notes, in his choice of epic hero, Callimachus has “broken the doctrine of the separation of genres on the basis of subject-matter which is a crucial tenet of Aristotle’s *Poetics*” ("Callimachus" 72).

What Giuseppe Giangrande calls the “literary canon of reversal” is essential to an understanding of Hellenistic poetry in general and the *Hecale* in particular.\(^{32}\) Reversal may be lexical or thematic. For example, “Apollonius says *huper nepheon* [“over the clouds”] in pointed reversal of the Homeric formula *hupai (hupo) nepheon* [“under the clouds”]. Meleager uses *hiketes* [“suppliant”] in the sense opposite of the usual one” (Giangrande, “Hellenistic” 47). Reversal abounds in the *Hecale*: lexical, thematic, and even generic. One might argue that Callimachus reverses the entire Aristotelian hierarchy of genres which ranked epic and tragedy at the top and comedy at the bottom. By making his *phaulos*-subject the hero, by dwelling on low and comic plot elements, and by using comic language in an epic poem, Callimachus implies that, in the hierarchy of genres, comedy is on an equal footing with epic or tragedy.\(^{33}\)

The Alexandrian predilection for depicting heroic figures in unheroic, everyday settings has been noted by many scholars.\(^{34}\) This, of course, is one element of reversal. In the *Hecale* not only is the great hero Theseus put in an ordinary, unheroic setting, he is not even treated as the central figure of the poem. Instead, he acts as a foil to the figure of Hecale. The epic hero is usually young, male, urbane, and *spoudaios*? Callimachus’s hero will be old, female, rustic, and *phaulos*. The *Hecale* represents the first time in extant Greek literature that a *phaulos* is elevated to a main role in an epic poem. As Zanker explains, “we can see Callimachus in search of a new kind of epic hero to replace what he would have called the ‘played out’ hero of

\(^{32}\) "Hellenistic Poetry and Homer" *AC* 39 (1970) 47.

\(^{33}\) Callimachus constantly uses the language of comedy in the *Hecale* and in one instance, even a word from a satyr play (*pithi*). See Hollis 145 on Fr. 233.

\(^{34}\) e.g. Trypanis 177 and Zanker *Callimachus*, 71.
traditional epic" ("Callimachus" 77). One might add that Hecale appears to be our first example of a woman as epic hero.

The reversal of heroic convention is signalled in the very first line of the poem:

'Aktaií tis ēnaien 'Erechtheos ēn pote ēounw

(fr. 230)

Once on a hill of Erechtheus there lived an Attic woman

(My trans.)

Unlike the Homeric epics, the *Hecale* does not begin with a proem of any sort. The very first word—the word which sets the crucial overall theme of the poem—is a feminine adjective, signalling that the central theme of the poem is "woman," and a specifically Attic woman. This perhaps sets her in contrast to Theseus, the great Attic hero. It is likely that Callimachus' readers, having heard that the poem deals with the myth of Theseus, would expect the poem to open with the masculine adjective *Aktaïos*. One imagines that the feminine *Aktaie* would send a shock of delight (or consternation) through the reader. Further, by beginning with "woman" Callimachus also sets the stage for the many parallels which he will draw to the *Odyssey*, which begins with *andra* "man."35 In this opening line, the female subject of the poem is identified with her district. That she differs from the conventional epic hero who is a *spoudaios* of noble family is suggested by the unusual inattention to the hero's ancestry: she is herself unnamed and given no patronymic. Callimachus accents his particularly Alexandrian twist to the genre in the very first word of the poem, *Aktaie*, which is in form a neologism (something new) and in substance an archaism (something old). The adjective *Aktaios* -e appears to be Callimachus's invention

---

based on the ancient name for Athens: *Akte* (Hollis 137). Thus, the word *Aktaie* is a learned allusion which is itself a combination of both new and old. It serves as a paradigm for Callimachus's project in the *Hecale*: to take archaic epic and make it new.

The stunning departure from epic tradition in the first line of the *Hecale* is evident by comparing it to the first lines of traditional epic poems. If we consider that the poet lays out the central elements in his poem in the first line or two, then compare the opening of the *Iliad*:

Μῆνιν ἄειδε, Θεά. Πηλησίαδεω Ἀχιλῆος
Sing, Goddess, the rage of Achilles, the son of Peleus. (My trans.)

The poem begins with rage (*menin*), the rage of Achilles which is the motive force behind the narrative; then the injunction to sing; an address to the Muse; the hero's patronymic and finally his proper name. In contrast, the *Odyssey* begins with an unnamed man (*andra*); then the poet's injunction and address to the Muse to tell him the tale so he may sing it; it ends with a description of the man as a much beset but highly resourceful wanderer, the two qualities on which the narrative will focus:

ἄνδρα μοι ἐννεπε. Μοῦσα. πολύτροπον. ὦς μάλα πολλά
πλάγχθη...
Tell me, Muse, of the man of many ways, who wandered greatly...(My trans.)

The opening lines reflect the central plot of the poem: the story of a cunning man whose survival depends on his anonymity, and who thus is often disguised--sometimes even as a *phaulos* (i.e., on his return to Ithaka)--and of his many wanderings. The god-fearing Hesiod, not surprisingly, begins both the *Works and
Days and the *Theogony* with the Muses (Pierian and Heliconian, respectively) and an injunction to sing.36 The *Shield of Heracles* does appear to set a precedent for the opening of the *Hecale*:

\[ \text{"H oîn prōlipoûsa kai patrī̂da gaìan} \]

Or like she who left her home and paternal land (My trans.)

However, it is not certain that Hesiod is the author of the *Shield of Heracles*, that this was the beginning of the poem, or that the poem was even written in the Archaic period (Paley 107). Indeed, it has been argued that at least part of the poem may have been composed by an Alexandrian poet (Paley 107-108). Thus, it cannot be ascertained whether Callimachus modelled the opening of the *Hecale* on the opening of the *Shield of Heracles*, or whether another Alexandrian author wrote the *Shield of Heracles* and modelled its first line on the beginning of Callimachus' *Hecale*. The matter is further complicated by the fact that the first fifty-six lines of the *Shield of Heracles* appear to be taken from Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* (Paley 111, n. 1); however, the first line of the *Shield of Heracles* was not the first line of the *Catalogue of Women*; for that poem begins with a traditional invocation of the Muses:37

\[ \text{Νῦν δὲ γυναικῶν φύλον ἀείσατε, ἥδυεπειαί} \]

Μούσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Δίως αἰγιόχοιο

(fr. 1 in West, P.Oxy. 2345 ed. Lobel)

Now sing the race of women, sweet-sounding Olympian Muses,

---


daughters of Zeus who bears the aegis. (My trans.)

While the opening line of the *Hecale* is not specifically modelled on the first line of the *Catalogue of Women*, the *Catalogue of Women* does form an important precedent for the *Hecale* in many other ways, not least of which is that it appears to be the first epic poem which focuses on women.38

The Hellenistic epic writer’s basic problem in revivifying the epic genre is how to deal with the Homeric tradition (Newman, *Class. Epic* 349). Of the two extreme possibilities, studious imitation such as is practised by the cyclic poets is disdained by Callimachus, while complete avoidance of Homeric models is impossible. Callimachus’ solution to this problem is somewhere in the middle: he provides linguistic hints to the educated reader which immediately trigger their memory of a particular scene in Homer. Once the Homeric scene is evoked, Callimachus deliberately plays against reader expectation by subtly altering the scene. This technique of evoking a model only to alter it is known as *oppositio in imitando* and this, along with implied grammatical interpretation of the original model, are the two major characteristics of Alexandrian allusion to Homer.39 Alexandrian poetry gets much of its power from its ironic undercutting of the heroic tradition. This is achieved by reversal, by juxtaposition of the common and mundane with the lofty and heroic, by painting comic banality upon the canvas of epic grandeur, and by setting archaic words and neologisms side by side in such a way as to undermine the heroic value system (Gutzwiller, *Studies* 8-9).

The central episode in the *Hecale*, the visit of Theseus to Hecale’s poor hut, appears to be modelled on Eumaeus’ entertainment of Odysseus in *Odyssey* 14. There are many pointed reversals from the Homeric model. While both Eumaeus and

---

38 An important study would examine the relationship between the *Hecale* and the *Catalogue of Women* in-depth. Unfortunately, such a study is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Hecale are old *phauloi* of noble birth, one is male and a slave, the other is female and apparently a free woman. The former's guest is an old man in the guise of a beggar who has just come home, returning from his years of heroic questing, the latter's guest is a young man who has just left home, setting out on his first heroic quest. By recalling Eumaeus and Odysseus, Callimachus implies that Theseus will be as successful with the bull as Odysseus was to be with the suitors. Ostensibly, Callimachus has modelled the scene on Eumaeus' entertainment of Odysseus, but his hero Theseus, a youth on the brink of manhood, is more suggestive of Telemachus, who also visited Eumaeus' hut. Using the allusive technique of *oppositio in imitando*, the poet conflates two scenes and two mythic figures: Theseus visiting Hecale's hut recalls simultaneously Telemachus visiting Eumaeus' hut and Odysseus visiting Eumaeus' hut. This type of allusion is further developed and perfected by Virgil in the *Aeneid*, so that, for example, both Aeneas and Turnus are figures for Achilles. An example of this form of conflated allusion in modern literature is found in Joyce's *Ulysses* when, near the end of the book, the characters of Bloom and Stephen Dedalus are fused as "Stoom" and "Blephen."40 Another example in *Ulysses* is Joyce's depiction of Molly Bloom as both the dangerous temptress Calypso from whom Bloom-Ulysses must escape to begin his journey home, and the prudent wife Penelope to whom he must return at journey's end.

One of Callimachus's particularly comic variations on a Homeric model occurs in the episode of the talking birds (fr. 260). The crow foretells the fate of the raven for carrying bad news to Apollo in an imitation of Achilles' famous words referring to his time of death (Gutzwiller, *Studies* 60):

> ἔσσεται ἢ ἡώς ἢ δείλη ἢ μέσον ἡμαρ
> (Il. 21.111)

---

and there shall be a dawn or an afternoon or a noontime (My trans.)

(Achilles of his imminent death on the battlefield)

δεῖειος ἀλλ' ἡ νῦς ἡ ἐνδιος ἡ ἐσετ' ἡώς

(Hec. fr. 260.55)

but it shall be evening or night or noon or dawn (My trans.)

(the crow of the raven's imminent discolouration at Apollo's hands)

The comic effect is created by the incongruousness of the low context into which this weighty pronouncement has been transferred. Much of the comedy depends on this reversal from a tragic to a comic context, but note, too, the elements of reversal in the two speakers. The words originally spoken by a young, male, and human hero of his own death are placed in the mouth (or rather beak) of an old, female animal of another bird's fate. Generically the topos of talking animals is more appropriate to the folk tale and fable than to epic; however, such scenes do occur occasionally. One of them is particularly relevant here: at Il. 19.404, Achilles' horse addresses him and, like the crow, utters fateful prophecy, in this case of Achilles' own death. The episode of the prophetic crow, then, evokes two Homeric scenes, both prophecies of Achilles' death: one in Iliad 21 where Achilles foresees his own death, the other in Iliad 19 where his horse speaks to Achilles and predicts his death. Callimachus alludes to both episodes simultaneously by giving Achilles' own words to an oracular beast to speak. Since here we are not talking about a great epic hero and tragic consequence, but about a bird who is merely discoloured, the overall effect is comic, ironic, and amusing.

In his depiction of the crow, Callimachus also indulges in self-referential parody. The crow can be seen as a parodic parallel to Hecale herself. Like Hecale, the crow narrates her unhappy history, explaining how she fell from grace with Athena, a fall

which is perhaps the comic equivalent of the fall of Hecale from prosperity to poverty which Hecale narrates to Theseus. The crow, then, experiences what one might call an ornithological *peripeteia*. Like Hecale, the crow is old: she describes herself as a *greun koronen* "old crow" (fr. 260.50). *Graus* "old woman" is an odd word to use of an animal and it is never used by Callimachus elsewhere except of old people or of gods (the same is true of the masculine equivalent *geron*). The anthropomorphization of the bird is complete when she swears by her own "wrinkled skin" (*riknon suphan*, fr. 260.51-52). Wrinkling is a sign of aging in humans, not birds. This clever parody of Hecale in the crow is so well done that some scholars have assumed that Hecale herself—and not the crow—is the speaker of these lines.\(^{42}\)

In his parody of his own main character within the poem, Callimachus displays an acutely self-conscious method of intertextual allusion which is typically Alexandrian. As we have seen, using the technique of *oppositio in imitando*, Callimachus alludes to his literary predecessors as well as to his own text. He also uses the same techniques to allude playfully (and perhaps critically?) to the verse of his contemporaries. Consider fr. 274:

\[\text{\textbf{The Metrical Footnote:}}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ἀρμοὶ που κάκεῖνω ἐπέτρεξε λεπτὸς ίουλος} \\
\text{ἄνθει ἐλιχρύσω ἐναλίκιος}
\end{align*}\]

\[\text{a delicate down, was just spreading on his cheeks, too,}\]

\[\text{like the blossom of the helichryso. (My trans.)}\]

Callimachus' use of the word *leptos* to describe the down on a man's cheek signals us to look for some hint of poetic programme in the passage. The word *helichryso*, the yellow flower which buds on the grapevine, leads one to the description of the carved wooden drinking cup in Theocritus Idyll 1.29-30:

---

\(^{42}\) The error is aggravated further by an ambiguous statement in the Suda. See Hollis *ad loc.* for discussion.
Along the lips above, trails ivy
ivy dotted with helichrysum... (My trans.)

Here, we see that at line 30 the word *helichrysum* is in the same case and metrical position as it appears in Callimachus. In fact, the first four feet are metrically identical right down to Callimachus's imitation of the bucolic diaeresis which is common in Theocritus, less usual in Callimachus. The word *helichrysum* occurs once more in Theocritus in Idyll 2.78:

More golden than helichrysum were their beards (My trans.)

This time, the word is in a different case and metrical position and there are no verbal echoes of the line in the fragment of Callimachus. There is, however, a significant contextual echo: Theocritus' Simaitha is explaining how she fell in love with Delphis at the first sight of him walking with his friend. She describes the boys' downy cheeks as more golden than *helichrysum*. Similarly, in fr. 274, Callimachus' Hecale is thought to be telling Theseus how she first saw (and loved?) her dear husband, the man from Aphidna (Hollis 184). Callimachus, then, in one brief line appears to alludes to two poems of Theocritus.43 He seems to model his line grammatically and metrically on Idyll 1.30, an allusion which creates a playful red herring. At the same time, he models his word usage and context on Theocritus Idyll 2 in a much more pointed allusion. It is

---

43 This raises the question of the dating of the *Hecale* in relation to the *Idylls*, a question too complex to be dealt with herein. From the textual evidence discussed, particularly Callimachus' imitation of the bucolic diaeresis, it appears that the *Hecale* may have been written after the *Idylls*.
the riddling combination of the double allusion that creates delight and real poetic force. It has the feel of an in-joke between the two poets, now unrecoverable, but perhaps one concerning poetics, as suggested by Callimachus' use of the programmatic leptos.

In the *Hecale*, Callimachus worked with what had gone before him in the tradition. For the poets who were to come after him, Callimachus also expanded the possibilities of the epic genre by his startling use of language. Linguistic influence from the entire Greek world is apparent in the *Hecale*: from Thessaly, Thrace, Sicily, Crete, and Cyprus. The poem even incorporates non-Greek words, some of Eastern origin. Callimachus' poetic language is cross-generic: he freely uses comic and tragic diction throughout the *Hecale* (Newman, *Class Epic* 349); even the language of the satyr play (n. 33 above). The poem is filled with rare and archaic words and *hapax legomena*, although to what extent is hard to determine: most of the extant fragments of the *Hecale* survived precisely because they were noted by scholiasts, grammarians, and lexicographers. In many cases, it is because those words were rare or *hapax* that they were cited at all. The subject matter within the *Hecale* is also new. Callimachus includes many details that have no counterpart in Homeric epic (Gutzwiller, *Studies* 55). For example, in fr. 295 we are told that someone had to carry out the garbage and the dung—a detail that is especially low and non-epic (and indeed, suggestive of the scatological nature of Greek comedy). So, too, in fr. 236.3, Callimachus does not discuss the beauty of the sandals hidden beneath the rock, but expresses the hope that they will not rot from the inevitable mould. Such details heighten the realism of the poem, but they also, by the extreme shift in diction and tone which they effect, ironically undercut and serve as counterpoint to the heroic material in the poem. Flouting Aristotle's doctrine that science has no place in poetry, Callimachus includes scientific details himself and alludes to other poets who focus on scientific material. For example, he uses a rare meteorological term in his depiction of the coming storm
In his effort to revive the epic genre, to "make it new," Callimachus worked with motifs, language, and formulas which were already present in the genre. His techniques of reversal, juxtaposition, genre-mixing, intricate and clever allusion, and *variatio* create an entirely new spin on the old "played out" epic genre. His intertextual allusion to himself and to his contemporaries creates yet another layer of playful complexity. But he also added something new to the epic mix. By incorporating the language of comedy and tragedy and foreign words into epic, by including as his topics the comic, the banal, the scientific, and aetiological, Callimachus, like Pound, expanded the possibilities of epic and what it might encompass for later poets. The result was epic made new--so new that in the eyes of modern critics, it required a new name: the epyllion.

If the *Hecale* has been misclassified as an epyllion, the epic quality of the *Aetia* has been often overlooked, even though at four books and approximately 7,000 lines it is seven times longer than the *Hecale* and 1,000 lines longer than the *Argonautica*, whose four book structure it resembles. The difficulty is that while the *Hecale* and the *Argonautica* are written in dactylic hexameters, the conventional epic metre, the *Aetia* is in elegiacs, the metre usually reserved for short personal poetry. Based on the generic criterion of the time--that metre determines genre--the *Aetia* is not an epic. Still, it has a close relationship to traditional epic. Just as the *Hecale* is Callimachus' recreation of Homer's heroic epic on Alexandrian poetic principles, the *Aetia* represents his attempt to revivify Hesiod's didactic epic in elegiac form. As shown, with the *Hecale* Callimachus made radical modifications to the epic genre, particularly with respect to its characters, subject matter, tone, and decorum. His experiment with the *Aetia* is in some ways even more daring in its innovative use of structural devices such as narrative framing and ring composition, and the associative technique as a means of creating epic unity in a lengthy, discontinuous narrative poem. In this, the *Aetia*
forms an important model for the evolving Alexandrian epic. Its influence is seen in Virgil (particularly in the *Georgics*) and Ovid and, through the Roman poets, in Dante and Pound.44

The generic relationship of the *Aetia* to epic is powerful enough for it to serve as a model for later epics, but does this make the *Aetia* itself an epic? Zanker sees the poem as a further example of Callimachus' break with Aristotelian doctrine: Aristotle claimed no one could write a long poem in anything other than dactylic hexameters; Callimachus wrote one in elegiacs (*Realism* 155). Although the *Aetia* is epic in scope and length and is strongly engaged with Callimachus' vision of the new epic, I would hesitate to place it in the epic genre because of its metre. Zanker and Gutzwiller might disagree: Zanker states that in this period narrative elegiacs and poems in dactylic hexameters were both classed as epic, citing Schmidt as evidence (*Realism* 155); and Gutzwiller argues for the possibility of classification not by metre, but by manner of exposition, i.e., Plato's *diegesis*, *mimesis*, and *genos mikton* (*Studies* 4). The evidence on which Zanker's hypothesis is based is somewhat dubious: Schmidt's argument depends, in part, on Theocritus Idyll 8, a bucolic poem in dactylic hexameters with an inset written in elegiacs.45 Schmidt observes that while the ancient commentators note the change in metre in Idyll 8, they do not comment on it, inferring from this that the occurrence of elegiacs in a hexameter poem is not alarming (38).46 Schmidt infers further that, since Theocritus felt free to use elegiacs in a bucolic poem and since bucolic poems belong in the epic genre, the category of epic can include poems written in elegiacs. This is syllogistic reasoning at best. Genre is determined by a work's overall form, not by inset passages within it. It is possible for one literary work to be embedded in another. For example, a Renaissance tragedy may include a sonnet

---

44 See Newman, *Class. Epic* for Alexandrianism in Virgil, 104-187 and in Dante, 244ff.
46 Gow finds the use of elegiacs in Idyll 8 unique but no more startling than Theocritus' use of stichomythia in the epic narrative of Idyll 22.55 (171).
or a ballad, but it is not therefore a poem or a song; a comedy may include a full masque, without becoming itself a masque.\textsuperscript{47} Cross generic insets may affect genre in their creation of generic tension or conflict, but they need not actually effect a generic transformation on the work as a whole (Fowler 180). Gutzwiller's argument for Plato's non-metrical classifications is credible, but it seems unlikely. Callimachus was probably familiar with Plato's conception of the \textit{genos mikton} which would place Homeric epic and elegiac narrative in the same generic category, but there is reason to suspect he would give little credence to it. In his own classification of literary works, Callimachus did not use Plato's method, but classified works principally (though not consistently) by metre.\textsuperscript{48} Of course, this does not mean that Callimachus would not have felt free to use Plato's theory in his own poetry if it happened to suit his purpose; however, it is reported that Callimachus was contemptuous of Plato's judgment in literary criticism, and this would seem to reduce the likelihood that Callimachus would have emulated Plato in literary matters (Pfeiffer, \textit{History} 94, 136). The view that narrative elegy and epic hexameter verse both belong to the epic genre may arise further from confusion over the ancient distinction between declamatory and melic verse, the latter sung with musical accompaniment. Recited poetry in elegiacs and iambics was regarded under the blanket of \textit{epe} along with the hexameter epics and hymns (Pfeiffer, \textit{History} 182). The plural \textit{epe} can denote epic poetry, poetry in general (even lyric poetry), or merely the lines spoken (as opposed to sung) in the drama.\textsuperscript{49} Elegiac and iambic verse are \textit{epe} in the second sense, not in the first.

Strictly speaking, then, the \textit{Aetia} is not an epic; even so, it is heavily engaged in a dialogue with the epic genre both explicitly in its programmatic passages (for example, fr. 1 "Against the Telchines") and implicitly through generic modulation.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{47} For discussion of generic crossing in inset passages see Fowler 179-181.
\textsuperscript{49} LSJ s.v. \textit{epos IV.a, b, and c}.
\textsuperscript{50} For the principle see Fowler 191ff.
terms of genre, the *Aetia* is best viewed as an elegy with epic modulation. In this sense, it is something of a generic hybrid. There is a powerful generic tension in the poem between elegy and epic which was felt also by the ancients. That the *Aetia*'s elegiac metre was seen as inconsistent with and inappropriate to its length and subject matter is suggested by Ovid's *Fasti*, a poem closely modelled on the *Aetia*. Incomplete, the *Fasti* was planned as 12 books of approximately 10,000 lines—in other words, roughly the same length and structure as Virgil's *Aeneid*—written in elegiacs.

Like the *Aetia*, the *Fasti* deals with the origin of religious rites and customs. In explicating the Roman calendar, Ovid presents us with Rome in little: its history, legends and myths (Frazer 1: vii). Ovid first brings the generic conflict to the fore in book 2 when an epic trope is followed by the poet's self-admonishment for so heavily burdening his elegiac metre:

Nunc mihi mille sonos, quoque est memoratus Achilles
vellem, Maeonide, pectus inesse tuum
dum canimus sacras alterno pectine Nonas:
maximus hic fastis accumulator honos.
deficit ingenium, maioraque viribus urgent:
haec mihi praecipuo est ore canenda dies.
quid volui demens elegis imponere tantum
ponderis? heroi res erat ista pedis.

*(Fasti* 2.119-126)

Would that I had a thousand tongues and that heart of yours,

Maeonides, which recalled Achilles, while I sing in distiches the sacred

---


52 Homer, called "Maeonides" here perhaps because he was from Lydia (Maeonia is an ancient name for Lydia) or because his father's name was Maeon (Frazer 2: 308).
Nones: this is the greatest honour heaped upon the calendar. Poetic genius fails, the burden is beyond my strength: this day above all others is to be sung by me. Lunatic, what were you thinking by laying such a weight on your elegies? The matter was one for heroic feet.

The issue of generic identity remains central in this highly self-conscious work. In the Aetia, the incredible range of modes and sub-genres in the poem effect further generic contamination. For example, fr. 1, Against the Telchines, is invective and so suggestive of the lyric tradition of Archilochus; fragments 7-21 tell the traditional heroic tale of the Argonauts in untraditional fashion; book 2 is concerned with the origins of cities and thus is suggestive of the sub-genre of the ktisis or founding poem; fr. 64 is an epigram inasmuch as it depicts words written on a tomb which the deceased “speaks” to passers-by. The love story of Acontius and Cydippe (fr. 67-75) is in the tradition of erotic lyric poetry. We have the proverbs of fragments 64.1 and 75.9; the parodic astronomical Lock of Berenice (fr. 110) which, but for its comic effects, resembles Aratus’ Phaenomena; the extended mock epic battle between Molorchus and the mice in the action of the mouse trap (fr. 177): an epinician ode in Ionian dialect with Pindaric echoes, not in the traditional choral lyrics but in elegiacs; and finally an epilogue to balance the opening prologue. While the Cantos have been praised (and criticized) for incorporating diverse material such as prose, epistles, and sheet music, as well as myriad modes and sub-genres, and thus expanding the possibilities for poetic language, Callimachus set the important precedent for generic crossing in the Alexandrian epic, a precedent outdone by Ovid in the Metamorphoses.

Where, then, among such diversity, does one find unity? In structure, in subject, in repetition. Diverse elements are linked thematically by association. All of the tales told in the poem are aetia and even those which are superficially unrelated have at least this in common. The prologue itself is an aetion, for in narrating Apollo's injunction to the poet, Callimachus provides the cause of the entire poem, in other words, he gives an aetion for the Aetia. The ring-composed frame structure of the poem further reinforces unity. Just as the opening fragments invoke Apollo, the Muses, Hesiod, and the Graces and explain the impetus for the poem that follows, so too the fragmentary epilogue invokes the Muses, the Graces, Queen Berenice, Hesiod, and Zeus, and closes with an aetion of sorts for the poem to follow, namely, Callimachus' next project, which is thought to be the lambda. The Muses begin the poem and continue to dominate it as Callimachus connects Aetia books 1 and 2 with the device of the poet's ongoing conversation with the Muses. So, Queen Berenice begins and ends the second half of the poem, with the Victoria Berenices at the start of Aetia 3 and the Coma Berenices at the close of Aetia 4. Parsons sees the second, simpler frame of the second half, which appears to have been written at a much later date, as unconnected to the first (49), but I would suggest that there is a connection: Callimachus is deliberately supplanting the Muses with Berenice, with whose divine apotheosis he ends the poem. This is consistent with his practice elsewhere. Callimachus indulged in just this sort of elaborate and subtle flattery of the queen in Epigram 51 (52 in Trypanis):

Τέσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες, ποτὶ γὰρ μία ταῖς τρισὶ τήνας
ἀρτι ποτεπλάθη κητί μῦροις νοτεὶ.
εὐαίων ἐν πᾶσιν ἀρίζηλος Βερενίκα.

δς ἀτερ οὐδ σύται ταὶ Χάριτες Χάριτες.
Four are the Graces; for besides those three another has been fashioned
lately and is yet wet with perfume. Happy Berenice and resplendent
among all—without whom even the Graces themselves are not Graces.

Structurally, Callimachus frames Berenice with the threefold repetition of the divine
Graces. Thus, structure mimics sense: Berenice is said to be among the Graces and so
she is set among them; the poet claims that there are now four Graces and there are
four namings of women in the four lines of the poem (Charites 1, Berenice 3, and
Charites Charites 4). In the Aetia, Callimachus takes the compliment that much further
by relegating a lesser role to the Muses, a greater to his queen. There is an additional
inner element to the ring composition of the poem’s outer frame. The Aetia opens with
the programmatic battle between the poet and the Telchines, those spiteful sorcerers
who were the first workers in metal and who murmur threateningly against
Callimachus’ tender verse; it closes with a mock epic encounter between the product
of the Chalybes, who are the inventors of ironworks and thus parallel to the Telchines,
and the tender lock of Berenice as scissors meet hair. As the lock exclaims: “Oh that
the whole race of the Chalybes would perish, who first brought it to light, an evil plant
rising from the earth, and who first taught (men) [men like the Telchines] the work of the
hammer!” (fr. 110.48-50).

Unity is further created by repetition of characters and motifs. As noted, the
Muses are a constant presence in the first half of the poem, but while the Muses cease
to be examined by the poet-interlocutor with the end of Book 2, Callimachus does not
abandon the question and answer format. In Book 3, the poet and Muses are replaced
by Molorchus and Heracles who engage in similar dialogue (fr. 57). Further, in fr. 114
someone, presumably the poet, questions the statue of Apollo at Delos which--
surprisingly!—gives a full account of itself and its accoutrements. In fr. 178, the poet
questions an Icarian man whom he meets at a banquet. Apollo is a central figure throughout the poem and is an instigator of many of the aetia. As noted, he is the cause of the poem itself, but he is also the cause of the Argonauts establishing an altar of Apollo the Embarker (fr. 18) and the cause of the plague in fragment 26 (Trypanis 24-27, ad loc.). Many of the aetia center on the journey of the Argo and on Heracles and here, too, there is a link: Heracles was one of the original Argonauts until he got lost searching his beloved Hylas and the Argonauts were forced to sail without him. While Heracles’ association with the Argo is not mentioned, his acquisition of Hylas is narrated in fragment 24.

Blurring chronological boundaries, Callimachus narrates the incident of Heracles taking Hylas hostage from his father, King Thiodamas, after he tells of the return journey of the Argo, a journey which took place long after the Argo’s crew was separated from Heracles and Hylas. If one were to follow the sequence of events, one would start with the acquisition of Hylas by Heracles, move to their joining the Argonauts, the subsequent rape of Hylas by the nymphs and Heracles’ search for him, on to the tale of Jason and the golden fleece, and finally, the return of the Argonauts. Callimachus appears deliberately to collapse temporal borders and to call this to the reader’s attention by juxtaposing non-sequential events, although one must exercise caution here, due to the fragmentary nature of the text and the uncertain ordering of fragments. Even though Callimachus does not narrate the popular tale of the rape of Hylas nor point out directly the link between Hylas, Heracles and the Argo, the fact is that such a link exists and Callimachus’ readers would be well aware of it. Thus there is an indirect association between those tales which focus on the return of the Argonauts and those which focus on Heracles. It is from such associations that unity springs from the work as a whole. There are also associative links between the different tales told about Heracles. In fragment 24, Heracles approaches King Thiodamas who is plowing a field and begs for food for himself and his young son
Hyllus. In fragment 22, Heracles approaches the Lindian peasant who is plowing a field, and begs for food (Trypanis, 20-21 ad loc.). Callimachus appears to be creating a deliberate association between these two stories for while it is natural enough for the Lindian peasant to be out plowing the field, the poet adds the incongruous detail of a king engaged in the same activity. Thus, we are invited to view the peasant and king as parallel figures. In both cases, Heracles is refused food; in both, he uses force to take one of the oxen from the yoke, then kills it and eats it. This theme is further repeated with engaging variatio in the story of Molorchus (fr. 55), another poor peasant whom a hungry Heracles encounters and begs assistance of, but who, fortunately for him, appears to have been too poor to own oxen (Trypanis, 42-43 ad loc.). At any rate, Molorchus responds with ready hospitality and is perhaps rewarded (with a meal of oxen?) after Heracles returns triumphant from his encounter with the Nemean lion and offers sacrifice to Zeus. Statues are another recurring theme in the poem and in two fragments, the statue motif and the Heracles theme are conflated. Fragments 100 and 101 deal with statues of Hera and in case readers forget that “Heracles” means “glory of Hera” the poet subtly reminds them when he depicts the statue of Hera sporting the spoils of her enemy Heracles, who is her husband’s bastard son (Trypanis, 76-77 ad loc.).

In the Aetia, Callimachus uses the associative technique to create unity. By repeating themes with variation and creating verbal echoes in very different contexts, the poet expands his referents’ field of meaning and urges us to see similarities where, superficially, they may not exist. In this discontinuous, even disjunctive, narrative diverse episodes are linked by one major over-riding theme: aetia, “causes.” Further links are then drawn by common sub-themes and motifs, for example, Apollo’s oracle, Heracles’ requests for hospitality, queen Berenice, and the Argonauts. Small-scale linguistic echoes further solidify association, although to what extent this occurs in the Aetia and the Hecale is impossible to determine due to the highly fragmentary nature
of the text. Out of these links arises complex unity; out of this unity, epic is born.

The Associative Technique in the Cantos and the Metamorphoses

While the associative technique for creating epic unity may begin with Callimachus, it was Ovid, and later Pound, who brought the technique to its full development. One aspect of the associative technique found in both Pound's Cantos and in Ovid's Metamorphoses is what Pound called the subject rhyme. In a letter to his father outlining the main scheme of the Cantos, Pound explained: "Various things keep cropping up in the poem. The original world of gods; the Trojan War, Helen on the Wall of Troy....Elvira on wall or Toro (subject-rhyme with Helen on Wall)" (LofEP 210). Kay Davis explains Pound's term, "if two words rhyme because they sound the same, two ideas or images will rhyme because their meaning is the same" (31). Davis notes that Hugh Kenner considers subject rhyme to be the central unifying device in the Cantos (31). As Kenner observes, "Pound's heuristic device is always the subject rhyme. To elucidate the Italian New Birth of circa 1500, he compares it with the America of circa 1770. Specifically, Jefferson and his successors building a nation are rhymed with Malatesta building the Tempio." Subject rhyme is also prominent in Ovid. For example, the bovine metamorphosed Io of Met. 1, lover of adulterous Jove, who supplicates her captor, Juno's Argus, "rhymes" with the Callisto of Met. 2, lover of adulterous Jove, supplicating Juno before being metamorphosed into a bear. But how does the poet signal the reader to look for subject rhyme? Using the associative technique, both Pound and Ovid repeat over and over again key themes, words, and phrases in different contexts to alert the reader to search for similarities.

Pound's chief means of achieving subject rhyme is the ideogrammic method. To illustrate the method of composition of Chinese ideograms, Pound describes the

---

58 For the ideogrammic method, see Pound's edition of Ernest Fenollosa's The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry, San Francisco: City Lights, 1936.
ideogram for the colour red (ABC 22), which is created by putting together the pictures of:

ROSE       CHERRY
IRON RUST  FLAMINGO

Each element of the ideogram remains distinct, but the juxtaposition of the four elements creates a new element: the relationship, or association, among them. Thus, the reader must determine what it is that a rose, a cherry, rust, and a flamingo have in common. Pound transferred this method to the realm of literature, though not without some difficulties. As Michael Bernstein observes, the problem with using ideogrammic composition in poetry is that, "sometimes the text gives us too little indication that 'red' is the intended signified or it tells us this means 'red' without adequately substantiating its own interpretation of the given particulars."59 For an example of the ideogrammic method in Pound's poetry, consider the opening of the Pisan Cantos:

The enormous tragedy of the dream in the peasant's bent shoulders
Manes! Manes was tanned and stuffed,
Thus Ben and la Clara a Milano
by the heels at Milano
That maggots shd/ eat the dead bullock
DIGONOS, Διγόνος, but the twice-crucified
where in history will you find it?
yet say this to the Possum: a bang, not a whimper,
with a bang not a whimper

74/425

A.D. Moody sees “tragedy” in line 1 as an allusion to the Greek *tragoedia* “goat-song” or as he puts it “the song of the (scape)goat.” The word has further allusive value inasmuch as it refers to the prize for the winning tragedy—a goat to be dedicated to Dionysus, one of the central divine figures in the Cantos. Line 2, like line 5, begins with a word repeated twice: “Manes! Manes” but this is not merely the repetition of a name. The first reference is probably to the Latin *manes, -ium*, the spirits of the dead or a shade of a particular person. It also recalls the poetic manifesto of Propertius, the Roman Callimachus, in the programmatic opening poem of his third book of poetry, which begins by evoking the shade of Callimachus: “Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae.” Thus, behind Pound’s invocation of the shade of Manes one can hear a faint call to the shade of Callimachus. While this may seem too subtle to function as an allusion, it could hardly be unintentional: Pound himself translated Propertius 3.1 as the opening to his *Homage to Sextus Propertius*. Thus, the word “Manes” resonates with both poetic programme and literary tradition: the Greek tradition of the Alexandrian master, Callimachus, which Propertius had invoked; the Roman revival of Alexandrian poetic principles in which Propertius is a key figure; Pound’s homage to the Callimachean Propertius; as well as an invocation of his own early, pre-Cantos poetic self. The significance of the reference is somewhat unclear. One might expect an implicit declaration of poetic principles, but the allusion does not appear to function programmatically. Rather, in the context, it evokes disappointment and nostalgia—for the lost dead, for the lost traditions, for lost youth. The second reference to Manes is clearly to the Gnostic Manes who was pronounced a heretic and traitor to his own

---

60 “Pound’s Allen Upward” *Paideuma* 4 (Spring 1975) 68.
61 Margaret Dickie notes the double reference in *On the Modernist Long Poem*, Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1986: 135. Dickie points out that *manes* may also be a form of the Latin verb to remain.
brethren and sentenced to be flayed alive.\textsuperscript{64} The Gnostics were related to the
Manicheans and the Albigensians who were, in turn, associated with the troubadour
love cult. Rossetti saw the Manicheans and Albigensians as heirs of the Eleusinian
Mysteries.\textsuperscript{65} Pound has him "tanned and stuffed" like the ritual bull in Athenian rites.
Frazer explains that at the close of threshing, a bull representing the god Dionysus
was slaughtered in a rite called \textit{bouphonia} "bull-slaughter."\textsuperscript{66} The bull was skinned
and stuffed with straw and yoked to a plough in a symbolic resurrection of the corn
spirit. The resurrection of Dionysus may also have been enacted by the setting up of a
stuffed bull.

Line 3 recalls the slaughter of Mussolini, or as Pound called him "Bull"
(Carpenter 492), thus creating an association between Mussolini and Dionysus and
the sacrificial victim whose death brings new life. In this regard, Mussolini is also put
forward as a Christ-figure--only he is \textit{twice}-crucified.\textsuperscript{67} Like Christ, like Manes,
Mussolini was betrayed by a man pretending to be a supporter.\textsuperscript{68} Mussolini's role as
sacrificial bull is clarified further in the next line which alludes to the ancient rite of
\textit{bugonia} "bull-generation" or "generation from a bull." This rite is described in Virgil's
4th Georgic, lines 281-314 and 538-559.\textsuperscript{69} In the poem, the bee-keeper Aristaeus has
lost his entire stock of bees owing to divine wrath, for he had inadvertently caused the
death of Eurydice. The old man of the sea, Proteus, teaches him how to regenerate his

\textsuperscript{64} For Manes, see C.W. King, \textit{The Gnostics and Their Remains}, Minneapolis: Wizard's, 1973 (first
published 1864 and revised 1887) 47.
\textsuperscript{66} Sir James George Frazer, \textit{The Golden Bough}, London: MacMillan, 1987 (first published 1922) 466-
468.
\textsuperscript{67} Mussolini was shot to death and then later his corpse was publicly hung in a mock execution; hence, a
double-death.
\textsuperscript{68} After the partisans captured Mussolini and his mistress, they might have been safe but for the rage of a
small Communist caucus within the partisan movement. An assassin, Walter Audasio, was sent to their
discovered hiding place. He burst into the couple's bedroom shouting "Hurry, I have come to rescue you."
Mussolini and Claretta Petacci (Pound's "la Clara") left with him and Audasio shot and killed them. David
\textsuperscript{69} All references to the \textit{Georgics} are to Virgil, \textit{The Eclogues and Georgics}. Ed. R.D. Williams. New York:
St. Martin's, 1979.
bees: he must take a bullock to a confined space and beat it to death until the flesh is pounded to pulp, then spread the corpse with thyme and cassia and abandon it there. From the bullock’s flesh, first crawling things (suggestive of Pound’s “maggots”), then winged bees will be born.70 While Pound did not like Virgil and might be expected to pass over his agricultural verse, it is very likely that he knew this particular verse since the exposition of bugonia frames one of the most famous episodes in the Georgics: the story of Orpheus’ grief at the death of Eurydice and his descent into hell to rescue her. It ends with his death, torn apart alive at the hands of Bacchants, worshippers of Dionysus. Thus, the allusive resonances of the 4th Georgic reinforce Pound’s motif of the katabasis (descent into hell), of ritual sparagmos ( rending of live victims), of the Mystery god who dies and is reborn, and of regeneration through the death of a bull.

In line 5, Digonos, the epithet of Dionysus, who in the myth is twice-born (once of Semele and once of Zeus), is fittingly repeated twice. Pound indulges in etymological wordplay in the repetition of digonos: the word is actually derived from dio-gonos, “God-born,” but Pound’s twofold repetition suggests a second etymology, one from dis-gonos, “twice-born.” In these opening lines, a relationship is suggested between Manes, Mussolini, Orpheus, Christ and, implicitly, Odysseus, another important figure in the Cantos. As we have seen, twofold repetition works throughout the passage in the doubling of “Manes! Manes” and Dionysus’ epithet “DIGONOS, digonos” as well as the reference to Mussolini as “twice-crucified.” Odysseus’ presence is implicit here by association, for after his descent into hell in Odyssey 12.22, Odysseus gained as a new epithet the striking hapax legomenon disthanes “twice dead.”

The allusion to T.S. Eliot in the last line of the quote above is especially interesting. The specific referent for the allusion is found in the closing lines of The

Hollow Men:

This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
This is the way the world ends
Not with a bang but a whimper.

However, note the opening lines of *The Hollow Men*, which are particularly appropriate to the image-complex of the stuffed bull:

We are the hollow men
We are the stuffed men
Leaning together
Headpiece filled with straw.

Pound's line resonates further with Eliot's allusion in these opening lines to Brutus' words in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*; Pound's allusion to Eliot and to Eliot's allusion to Shakespeare adds a suggestion of the sickening decay of the sacrificial bullock and of the people's love affair with Mussolini:71

When love begins to sicken and decay,
It useth an enforced ceremony.
There are no tricks in plain and simple faith:
But hollow men, like horses hot at hand
Make gallant show and promise of their mettle;
But when they should endure the bloody spur,

71 I am indebted to F.T. Flahiff, University of Toronto, for this observation.
They fall their crests, and, like deceitful jades,
Sink in the trial.

(IV.2.20-26)\(^72\)

Thus, the Pisan Cantos begin with a poetic ideogram comprised of the rites and gods of ancient Greece; Mediaeval European religion and the troubadour love cult; an evocation of the Alexandrian tradition via Callimachus and Propertius; the early Modern poetic movement of Pound and Eliot's London years; ancient Rome filtered through Shakespeare's Renaissance; Modern Italy; the betrayal of Christ, of Manes, of Julius Caesar, and Benito Mussolini. With a bang, indeed.

Ovid, like Pound, contrasts similar motifs to achieve overall associative unity, but on the small-scale linguistic level, his method differs. Rather than use direct juxtaposition, Ovid repeats scene-types, reiterating key words and phrases to recall earlier scenes and earlier contexts. Three common story elements reinforced by verbal repetition in the Metamorphoses are the paelex "consort," the index "informer," and the consequent act of supplication bracchia tendens "stretching forth (his/her) arms."\(^73\) The word paelex appears seventeen times throughout the poem, and is used of Io, Callisto, Europa, Leucothoe, Semele, Ino, Philomela, Aegina, Procris, Deianira, and Myrrha.\(^74\) A paelex is "A mistress installed as a rival or in addition to a wife," and may refer specifically to Juno's rivals.\(^75\) Still, while many of the women named above are rivals

\(^72\) William Shakespeare, Complete Works, New York: Collier, 1925.


\(^75\) OLD, s.v. paelex, a and b.
to Juno, they are not all: Leucothoe is the rival of the nymph Clytie for Apollo’s affections, and Clytie is no wife (4.235, 277); Ino is not a paelex at all, but is assumed so by her friends who observe Juno’s punishment of Ino for guarding the son of Semele (4.547); Philomela herself laments the fact that Tereus has made her the rival of her own sister (6.537, 606); Procris mistakenly believes the wind “Aura” to be her husband Cephalus’ mistress (7.831); Deianira, another mortal wife, learns of Hercules’ paelex (9.144, 151); and Myrrha longing for her father’s love exclaims to herself “tune eris et matris paelex et adultera patris?” (10.347). Ovid appears to use paelex principally to mean an erotic rival and not simply a mistress. In the eight other occurrences of the word paelex, the rival is indeed Juno’s and as W.S. Anderson has noted, “Juno’s hatred of the human girls who have stolen Jupiter’s affections--though never of their own volition--again and again motivates episodes in early portions of the book.”76 By using paelex exclusively to denote rivals of Juno in the early books, and then expanding its definition to non-wives and mortal women in the later books, Ovid sets up an implicit comparison between those women and Juno; the verbal repetition in a somewhat different context invites us to see those figures as similar in some way to Juno.77 Thus, while Juno’s rage motivates the early tales, the rage that spurs the later ones is also seen as Juno-like. Juno, then, both explicitly and then implicitly, is perceived as a driving force throughout the entire poem.

If the paelex is the cause of the motive force--rage--behind metamorphosis, then the index is what spurs it, and the act of supplication with arms held out (brachia tendens) the attempt to subdue it. The betrayal motif is seen in Ovid’s use of the nouns index, indicium, and the verb indico -are. Index has two basic meanings: a sign or token; or a traitor, informer, or tale-bearer. It appears six times in the Metamorphoses,

---

77 Paelex denotes a rival of Juno at 1.623, 726; 2.469, 508, 530; 3.258; 4.422, 547; 7.524. It is used to refer to rivals of other women at 4.235, 277; 6.537, 606; 7.831; 9.144, 151; 10.347 (Concordance to Ovid).
four times in the same case and sedes. On four occasions it clearly refers to one who betrays a secret: the bird who tattles on Coronis (2.546), the old man who betrays Hermes' cattle-theft (2.706), the gossip who tells Procris of her husband's supposed lover (7.824), and Palamedes who exposed Odysseus' feigned madness (13.34). On the two occasions when it means token or sign, there are clearly elements of betrayal: Byblis recognises the index of her forbidden love for her brother, which confessed will lead to disaster (9.535), and Philomela weaves within the tapestry the facti indice, the wrong done her, and in so doing informs Procne (6.574). Both Byblis and Philomela effectively inform on themselves. Indicium also has two meanings: it is either disclosure of information or, in its special sense, disclosure of something intended to be secret. The word occurs thirteen times in the poem, ten times in the later special sense. The verbal form indico, -are occurs six times, only once in the sense of "to betray" (4.237). In total, then, a word which may denote betrayal of some kind occurs twenty-five times throughout the poem, at least once in every book with the exception of books 3, 8, and 13. The third repeated story element is the act of supplication which inevitably fails, as the person about to be metamorphosed stretches forth his or her arms, bracchia tendens. This gesture occurs twenty-three times in the Metamorphoses, six times with the variant manus tendens and once tendens palmas. It is not used exclusively in tales of erotic betrayal, but occurs in different contexts.

If one examines the three story elements of the paelex, index, and bracchia

---

78 It occurs in the nominative case at the end of the line in 2.546, 706; 7.824, and 9.535. In the oblique cases, it occurs at 6.574 and 13.34.

79 Specifically, indic0 -are is found at 4.237,688; 10.406; 11.405; 15.596, 668; indicium at 1.650; 4.190, 257; 5.542, 551; 6.578; 7.555, 833; 9.586; 10.417; 11.188; 14.27; 15.503 (Concordance to Ovid). For index, see note 20 above.

80 For bracchia tendens, see 1.635-6; 2.477, 580; 3.723; 4.517, 581; 5.176, 215, 419; 6.358-9; 7.188, 345; 8.432; 9.210, 293; 11.262. For manus tendens, see 4.238, 382; 6.639; 11.39, 397, 686-7. Palmas tendens appears at 8.849 (Concordance to Ovid).
tendens over the course of the poem one finds that with the exception of book 12, one, two, or all three elements occur at least once in every single book of the *Metamorphoses*, and sometimes several times. The association of the three elements is strengthened even further when two or even all three occur in the same story, for example, in the tales of Io, Callisto, Clytie, Ino, Philomela, Cephalus and Procris, and Deianira and Hercules. This suggests a strong association between stories that are superficially quite dissimilar.

One of the other common story types in the *Metamorphoses* which utilizes the element of supplication is that of a man dismembered by women, often relations, whose state of consciousness, whether they are maddened, enraged, deluded, or divinely inspired, does not allow them to perceive their act rationally. Pentheus, being torn apart by his Maenadic mother and aunts, supplicates them not with arms, but with bloodied stumps for *non habet infelix quae matri brachia tendat* (3.723). Likewise, Itys about to be killed, dismembered, and stewed by his mother and his aunt pleads for his life *tendentemque manus* (6.639). Medea, attempting to persuade Pelias' daughters to dismember and boil their father to "rejuvenate" him, whirls about as she casts her spell and begs heaven for the spurious youth serum *brachia tendens* (7.188), just as Pelias will soon beg his daughters not to slaughter him *brachia tendens* (7.345). Finally, when Orpheus is about to be torn apart by Maenads, he implores them for mercy *tendentemque manus* (11.39). While these four stories are similar in nature, Ovid varies the particulars and develops them by creating associative links, reversals, and ring-composition. For example, elements common to Pentheus and Itys are the murder and dismemberment of a male child (though Pentheus is a youth and Itys a

---

81 What is different about Book 12? While it is concerned with the Trojan War, the erotic motif of the *paelex* is a natural one owing to the role of Helen (*a paelex if there ever was one!* in the war. Similarly, scenes of supplication would be natural ones to find in the context, but none occur, not even in Ovid's description of the sacrifice of Iphigenia and the deaths of many in battles. Perhaps because such scenes of supplication are a frequent *topos* in Homer Ovid deliberately avoided them in his handling of Homeric material.

82 See Appendix A for a detailed analysis.
toddler) by his mother and aunt(s). There is a reversal in the Pelias story: where Itys and Pentheus are sons killed by mothers, Pelias is a father killed by daughters. Like Itys (but unlike Pentheus), Pelias, once dismembered, is cooked in a cauldron. Verbal echoes reinforce the narrative link. The dismembered Itys boils within brazen cauldrons, *pars inde cavis exultat aenis* (6.645). Falsely foreshadowing the fate of Pelias, Medea immerses the slaughtered lamb in a brazen cauldron, *mergit in aeno cavo* (7.317). Finally, having duped the daughters of Pelias, Medea immerses their father’s mangled body in the water which boils in a cauldron, *mersit in undis* (7.349). While the first and the third reference share no verbal echoes with each other, they are linked by their mutual association with the second reference which echoes them both simultaneously: the first by the echo of *cavis ...aenis in aeno cavo*, the third by the echo of *mergit in mersit*. Likewise, the four similar stories do not echo each other consecutively. For example, the tale of Orpheus does not refer back to the tale of Pelias or of Itys, but loops back to the first story in ring-composition. Like Pentheus, Orpheus is attacked and torn apart in ritual *sparagmos* associated with the god Dionysus, but unlike Pentheus, he does not know his female attackers. In this respect, Orpheus differs from all the others: he is not killed by his relatives. Even so, like Pentheus, Orpheus is torn apart by Bacchae. Through careful selection of detail, Ovid links these tales with one another as well as with many other tales throughout the poem. On the surface, Callisto and Orpheus, for example, have little in common, but the repeated gesture, the verbal reminiscence, creates an association between them: as Orpheus holds out his arms in supplication to raging women we see the face of Callisto imploring the enraged Juno for mercy and recall the good it did her.

In the *Cantos*, as in the *Metamorphoses*, motifs recur again and again. In the world of the *Cantos*, there is always a great man, whether he be Confucius or Malatesta, Jefferson or Mussolini; there is always a *nostos* (the homecoming of the traveller), a *katabasis*, intercourse with the divine, rebirth, and spiritual renewal. These
elements occur neither chronologically nor sequentially, but simultaneously. This is apparent from Pound’s double point indexing in his scheme for the Cantos:

1. Rather like, or unlike subject and response and counter subject in fugue.
   A A Live man goes down into world of Dead.
   C B The “repeat in history”
   B C The “magic moment” or moment of metamorphosis, bust thru from quotidian into “divine or permanent world.”
   Gods, etc.

   (LofEP 284-285)

There is in the Cantos a defiance of linear movement and chronological order. The “magic moment” is ever-present; history is not a progression but an unending circle which turns in upon itself; time is a vortex through which all history flows, to be comprehended in one grasp. This conflation of history, the collapsing of Newtonian time, is evident in Ovid as well. As Frederick Ahl notes, the Metamorphoses “is about a process, not a state.”83 One might say the same of the Cantos.

Despite the superficial temporal frame in the Metamorphoses’ movement from the origins of creation to Ovid’s own time, as Joseph B. Solodow observes, within the poem itself chronology is continually shattered, dulling the reader’s sense of temporal movement:

From beginning to end all the stories are told as if they were taking place in contemporary Rome. Thus an assembly of the gods closely resembles a meeting of the Roman Senate, Pentheus speaks of siege-engines, characters know the triumph and the census, Diana and her maids might

---

easily pass for a Roman matron, and a pet deer is even found wearing the *bulla*, the locket symbolizing free birth. Since everything is portrayed as happening "now," there is no feeling of temporal progression as the poem unrolls.\(^8^4\)

Scholars often privilege the *Metamorphoses*’ superficial chronological movement over the atemporality within the poem as a means of reconciling the generic problem. The assumption is that if the *Metamorphoses* is indeed an epic, then it must exhibit epic unity such as is found in a chronological, linear narrative. Hence, Brooks Otis focuses on the outer organizational frame and concludes the poem is an epic,\(^8^5\) while Crump views the inner chaos and classifies the poem as a series of loosely linked epyllia (203). Some critics view the poem’s unprecedented mixing of generic features and throw up their hands in despair claiming that it defies any generic classification. For example, J.B. Hainsworth claims the *Metamorphoses* is not an epic—or anything else—but *sui generis*.\(^8^6\) Some recent scholars conclude the poem is epic, but of the distinctly Alexandrian sort.\(^8^7\)

Quite apart from the unprecedented number and mix of genres in the *Metamorphoses* (Homeric and Alexandrian epic, tragedy, oratory, hymn, love elegy, epistle, pastoral, epigram, history, and philosophy), the matter is complicated by Ovid’s own ambiguous statement of his poetic intentions.\(^8^8\) At 1.3-4, the poet enjoins the gods to inspire his undertaking and "from the very origin of the world to my time,

---


draw down perpetual song:"

...primaque ab origine mundi
ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen

This would seem to imply an embrace of traditional epic principles and a rejection of the Callimachean programme, for Callimachus explicitly rejected the *hen aeisma dienekes* "one continuous song" at *Aetia* fr. 1.3. However, the verb Ovid employs, *deducite*, is a powerful marker of poetic preference for the decidedly Callimachean. For the Roman poets, the verb *deducere* with a noun like *carmen* as its object is highly programmatic; it denotes the particular kind of verse, the *Mousan...leptaleen* ("slender Muse") which Apollo urged Callimachus to write in *Aetia* fr. 1.23-24. Virgil’s translation of Apollo’s injunction to the Alexandrian appears in *Eclogue* 6:89

...pastorem, Tityre, pinguis
pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen

(6.4-5)

...“A shepherd, Tityrus,
Should feed his flock fat, but recite a thin-spun song.”

As Hinds explains the problem, "if the gods do what Ovid asks them to do here, *viz.* *deducite*...*carmen*, then what will be the literal result of their action but, precisely, a *deductum carmen*? In the very act of repudiating Callimachean principles, Ovid seems to let them in again by the back door" (19). The generic paradox between the Homeric *perpetuum carmen* and the Callimachean *deductum carmen* is played out throughout

the *Metamorphoses*. The poem's metre, length, and scope are clearly in line with traditional epic, but its style, subject matter, and narrative technique are pure Callimachean and thus anti-Homeric. In this sense, the *Metamorphoses* is a true inheritor of the *Hecale* and the *Aetia*.

A similar situation occurs in respect to the genre of the *Cantos*. Recalling Crump's dismissal of the *Metamorphoses* as a string of loosely linked epyllia, Leon Surrette maintains that "Pound's epic is more a collection of poetry than a single coherent poem."90 Reminiscent of Hainsworth's assessment of the *Metamorphoses*, Margaret Dickie denies the *Cantos* membership in any genre at all by classing it, along with Eliot's *Waste Land*, as a "Modernist long poem." Dickie's new classification is not a genre, but an "aspiration to form" (my italics), and hence, a denial of actual form (148). Hilary Clark invents a new genre to account for the *Cantos* which she calls the "fictional encyclopaedia." Max Nänny places the poem in the ancient genre of Menippean satire, a genre which we know little about (particularly in its Greek manifestation) and with which Pound appears to be unfamiliar.91 As with the *Metamorphoses*, the search for structural unity in the *Cantos* is ongoing. For example, Daniel Pearlman argues that unless the *Cantos* exhibit "an overall design in which the parts are significantly related to the whole" the poem does not possess major form and so cannot qualify as "epic."92 He finds a three part Dantesque structure in the poem which corresponds to an Inferno, a Purgatorio, and a Paradiso, with Time as the major unifying theme. While studies such as Pearlman's are an important contribution to the scholarship, the problem needs to be restated. What one should ask is not does the poem possess major form and thus qualify as epic, but is major form--in Pearlman's

---

91 "Ezra Pound and the Menippean Tradition" Paideuma 11 (1982) 395-405. The traits in the *Cantos* which Nänny sees as characteristic of Menippean satire are also characteristic of the Alexandrian epic. Some overlap of poetic principles between the two genres would not be surprising since both are the product of third-century Alexandria.
sense—a necessary component of an epic?

From the beginning of time, poets have subverted generic expectations and literary conventions. They are constantly expanding the possibilities of their craft, renovating traditional expectations. The artist’s job has ever been to “Make it New.” The experimentation of the true artist is inevitably in conflict with the critic’s drive to identify, to standardize, to classify, and make familiar: to “Make it Old.” As Frederick Ahl points out:

Often, instead of trying to understand the artist’s method of questioning and his perspectives, we reject them when they disagree with our own.... Our artistic and religious ideals are generally monist. We seek out and praise unity, the one that underlies the “apparent” many. The plural, latent, paradoxical, or contradictory we often regard as either primitive or degenerate, archaic or post classical. Art or poetry that cannot be explained as the expression of some straightforward and sincere “message” is, in the opinion of many critics, “flawed” or lacking in “structure.” At the root of apparent complexity, simplicity must lurk. (271)

Thus, as we have seen, although Pound considered his Cantos to be an epic poem, critics continue to dispute this. Instead of denying Pound’s and Ovid’s subversive disorder and pluralizing tendencies, instead of insisting on a unified reality, perhaps as Ahl suggests while “searching for order beneath apparent chaos, we should also look for chaos beneath apparent order” (274). In approaching the text, one must abandon Newtonian concepts where time is absolute and experiment with/experience “the idea of plural and contradictory realities” (Ahl 274).

While the Newtonian conception of time held sway from the seventeenth century to the beginning of the twentieth, there was no single theory of time in
antiquity; consequently, "Greek and Roman poets do not always share our concern for describing sequences in time" (Ahl 275). In fact, ancient notions of time bear a close resemblance to modern physics. Gary Zukav explains the difference between Newtonian time and Einstein's theory "in terms that should give any classicist [and, I would add, any Poundian] a feeling of déjà vu" (Ahl 275):

The Newtonian view of space and time is a *dynamic* picture. Events develop with the passage of time. Time is one-dimensional and *moves* (forward). The past, present, and future happen in that order. The special theory of relativity, however, says that it is preferable, and more useful, to think in terms of a *static*, non-moving picture of space and time. This is the space-time continuum. In this static picture, the space-time continuum, events do not develop, they just are. If we could view our reality in a four-dimensional way, we would see that everything that now seems to unfold before us with the passing of time, already exists *in toto*, painted, as it were, on the fabric of space-time. We would see all, the past, the present, and the future with one glance.\(^93\)

Poets, along with Einstein, have always wanted to view what are commonly perceived as successive events as co-existing (Ahl 76). The confusion this causes in the minds of critics leads them to suppose that the poet does not know the correct sequence of events, that he or she has made a mistake. In Ahl's example (280-281), when Virgil (*Georgic* 1.490), Statius (*Silvae* 2.7.65-66), Lucan (*Pharsalia* 1.694 and 7.872), and Ovid (*Met.* 15.823-824) ignore the fact that the battles of Pharsalia and Philippi occurred miles and years apart under (mostly) different leadership, scholars still treat it as a historical error. As Ahl explains, "to suggest that a poet might be deliberately

scrambling geographical space and sequential, historical time when he ‘knows better’ is, in the eyes of some, to suggest that he is ‘perverse’” (281). Rather, it is typical of Alexandrian and Latin epic to present historically distant events as if they occurred simultaneously (Ahl 281). Using Virgil’s Aeneid as his example, Ahl notes that Aeneas flees from Troy to Italy via Carthage, a city Virgil calls ancient (1.12-13) even though it was not founded until centuries after the fall of Troy (281). As for the Greeks, “sequential time is the obsession of tragedy, not epic” (Ahl 283).94

Ahl’s thoughtful remarks on the conception of time among the ancient poets could be transferred to the 1914 Vorticist movement (or, at least, Pound’s view of it) with little or no adaptation.95 Among many of the Modernists, in particular, Pound, Joyce, Proust, and Stein, the implications of Einstein’s special theory evoked an intense interest in Time-philosophy.96 Wyndham Lewis, the founder of Vorticism, scorned the obsession with temporal fluidity among his contemporaries and launched an attack in Time and Western Man, which begins:

This essay is a comprehensive study of the “time”-notions which have now, in one form or another, gained an undisputed ascendancy in the intellectual world....[It shows] how the “timelessness” of einsteinian physics, the time-obsessed flux of Bergson, merge in each other; and how they have conspired to produce upon the innocent plane of popularization, a sort of mystical time-cult.97

That Pound was an adherent of this “mystical time-cult” is apparent from his definition of the vortex printed in the first issue of Blast, which anticipates Zukav’s explanation of

---

94 For full bibliography on this aspect, see Ahl 283 n.22.
the space-time continuum quoted above:

All experience rushes into this vortex. All the energized past, all the past that is living and worthy to live. ALL MOMENTUM which is the past bearing upon us, RACE, RACE-MEMORY, instinct charging the PLACID, NON-ENERGIZED FUTURE. The DESIGN of the future in the grip of the human vortex. All the past that is vital, all the past that is capable of living into the future, is pregnant in the vortex, NOW.98

Pound’s sense of time as simultaneous precedes Vorticism. His remarks on Imagism which appeared in Poetry in 1913 recall his later conception of the vortex:

An “Image” is that which presents an intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time....It is the presentation of such a “complex” instantaneously which gives that sense of freedom from time limits and space limits; that sense of sudden growth, which we experience in the presence of the greatest works of art. (LEofEP 4)

As Harmon observes, the “unreality of historical time...preoccupied him for decades” (3). Even as early as 1910, Pound claimed that “All ages are contemporaneous” (SR 8), refusing “to accept time as a circumstance that can limit the continuity of culture” (Harmon 4). This sense of temporal simultaneity is found also in Dante, another model for Pound, who peoples his Divine Comedy with mythical, biblical, fictional, historical, and contemporary figures without privileging one over the other. For example, in the famous line Io non Enea, io non Paulo sono (Inf. II.32) the mythical/fictional Aeneas,

the biblical Paul and the historical Dante are placed on a parallel plain. To some extent, one can see the blending of time even in Browning. As Pound said of *Sordello* in his address to Robert Browning in the Ur Cantos:

And half your dates are out, you mix your eras;
For that great font Sordello sat beside -
'Tis an immortal passage, but the font? -
Is some two centuries outside the picture.
Does it matter?
Not in the least.

(Baechler et al. 2:216)

Pound’s use of foreign languages is similar to his use of time. He dispenses with linguistic barriers to indicate the continuity, the universality of the human experience. As discussed in Chapter 1, the Greek Alexandrians typically use a collage of dialects and languages, varying levels of diction, prose words, idioms and proverbs, archaisms and neologisms, literary language, and rare words to evoke all the Hellenic world with its myriad tongues and all its social strata. So, too, the *Cantos* shift freely from English to Greek, to Latin, French, Spanish, German, Chinese, and even Egyptian hieroglyphics, drawing from all manner of literature and language, from the formal diction of the presidential office to the slang of the prisoners in the DTC at Pisa. Functionally, the foreign languages in the *Cantos* do not contribute to sense and are usually translated into English elsewhere in the poem. Rather, they contribute to the poem’s texture. This is apparent from Pound’s letter to Hubert Creekmore of 1939:

I believe that when finished, all foreign words in the *Cantos*, Gk., etc., will be underlinings, not necessary to the sense, in one way. I mean a
complete sense will exist without them; it will be there in the American
text, but the Greek, ideograms, etc., will indicate a duration from whence
or since when. If you can find any briefer means of getting this repeat or
resonance, tell papa, and I will try to employ it.

(LotEP 322)

The collapse of temporal, spatial, geographic, and cultural borders in the Cantos
renders the poem a vortex through which all times, all cultures, all tongues flow.

Similarly, Pound collapses the barrier between literary traditions by
appropriating all traditions to himself. This is a typically Alexandrian gambit with an
important precedent at the beginning of the Aetia. There, Callimachus sets out his
project in relation to Greek tradition and present practice. The prologue lays out
Callimachus’ poetic manifesto which arose from the divine injunction of Apollo, the
god of poetry himself, and then relates his divine inspiration by the Muses, who are the
handmaids of poetry and, by implication, of Apollo as well. In fr. 2, Callimachus dreams
of the poet Hesiod’s inspiration by the Muses, the story with which Hesiod opened his
great poem the Theogony. Thus Callimachus begins his work by evoking in
descending order all relevant divinities, as well as Hesiod, the mortal font of his own
tradition. In fr. 3, Callimachus begins his first explicit action with the birth of the Graces,
minor goddesses, but good friends for a poet to have. Their introduction after the
mortal Hesiod may suggest that their role in the poet’s inspiration is less significant
than Hesiod’s role: Hesiod provides the original model, the Graces the final polish.

Pound begins the Cantos with the connective “And” which implies that the poem
is part of a continuum, of an ongoing conversation with prior tradition, the specifically
epic tradition which permeates Canto 1 on every level. Canto 1 is a modern translation
of a mediaeval translation of the archaic poet Homer; thus it incorporates the traditions
of Homer and archaic Greek epic, of medieval Europe and the tradition of Latin
translation of the classics, and of contemporary Europe in Pound's own time and the modern tradition of translation. Further, Pound evokes the Anglo-Saxon epic by using elements of Old English poetry in his verse, for example, alliteration and assonance, and compound words, as well as more explicit recollections such as his use of the Old English word "dreony" for "bloody" (Terrell 1:2). Renaissance drama is evoked by allusions to Shakespeare's Hamlet. At line 54, the ghost of Elpenor cries out to Odysseus the words of the ghost of King Hamlet to his son: "remember me." Tiresias' words at line 62, "leave me my bloody bever," also recalls Hamlet's father who is seen to walk with his "beaver" up (1.ii.229). In Pound, "bever" is used to denote a drink, as if it were an abbreviation for the modern "beverage." "Bever" is, in fact, an archaic word, now obsolete, which was adopted from Old French and means beverage.100 Just as Callimachus coined the neologic archaism Aktaie discussed above (122-123), Pound here creates what appears to be a neologism, "bever" as an abbreviation for "beverage," when it is in fact a revival of the archaic "bever" meaning "beverage." Like Callimachus' Aktaie, Pound's bever is a neologism in form and an archaisim in substance—something old made new.

The archaic feel of Canto 1 is further enhanced by the old-fashioned sounding neologisms "pitkin" and "ingle." Pound's use of "ingle" for "house" may contain an element of playful scholarly comment. "Ingle" appears to be short for "inglenook," Lowland Scots for "chimney corner" derived from the Scots Gaelic "Aingeal" for "fire" (Terrell 1:2). This is the language of Gavin Douglas' translation of the Aeneid which Pound admired greatly (Terrell 1:2); thus another element of the epic tradition is drawn into the poem. In Douglas, "ingle" alone always means "fire" (Terrell 1:2). Pound uses Douglas' word, but alters its meaning—"house" not "fire"—just as Callimachus appropriates the language of his epic predecessor, Homer, but attaches

100 OED s.v. bever 1; s.v. beverage 3.6.
a different connotation to Homer's words. For example, in fr. 67.3 of the Aetia, Callimachus describes Acontius as being not polukrotos "clever" which is a subtle scholarly comment reflecting his opinion on the heated scholarly controversy on whether line 1 of the Odyssey should introduce the hero Odysseus as polukrotos "clever" or polutropos "of many ways/resources."\textsuperscript{101} Pound's use of ingle may also be an example of playful intertextuality with a contemporary's text similar to the play between Callimachus and Theocritus on helichrysos discussed above. During the composition of "Three Cantos," Pound had been receiving chapters of Ulysses and was strongly influenced by the work (Bush, Genesis 193). Joyce uses "ingle" and the alternative "ingleside" twice each in Ulysses. In three instances, the word clearly means "fire" or "fireside;" however, in chapter 14, it means "house," which would seem to be the first time this meaning is attested for "ingle."\textsuperscript{102} Pound's use of ingle may be significant in relation to Ulysses for another reason: Joyce uses the word in those chapters which surround the Circe episode of chapter 15 (chapters 14, 16, and 17); Pound adopts Joyce's new meaning for the archaic word ("house") and uses it of Circe's home.

Just as Callimachus cites the authority for the tale of Acontius and Cydippe within his text in a learned Alexandrian footnote, "And this love of yours we heard from old Xenomedes" (Aetia 75.54ff), so Pound cites his authority at C. 1/5: "Lie quiet Divus. I mean that is Andreas Divus. In officina Wecheli, 1538 out of Homer." The display of learning and the perceived need to cite an authority, to affirm that one speaks within a long tradition, is typically Alexandrian. This may be attributed to a sense of cultural cleavage and the compensating desire to permeate one's work with the literature of the past, to display encyclopaedic grasp of a tradition of which one is no longer a part. Quotations from other authors and citations of authority lend the

weight of tradition to one's words. So Pound brings to bear virtually all of the Western epic tradition at the beginning of his own epic project. The original Canto 1 of “Three Cantos” was perhaps even more explicitly authoritarian in its evocation of the master and Alexandrian-style recusatio. Just as Callimachus evokes Hesiod, his poetic master, in Aetia fr. 2, so Pound appealed to Robert Browning and his Sordello. At first glance it appears that Pound rejects Browning for the same reason that the Alexandrians rejected Homer, because he is seen to be inimitable: “Hang it all there can be but the one Sordello!” Yet this misconception is clarified by the final version of this Canto (now Canto 2), which begins:

Hang it all, Robert Browning
There can be but the one “Sordello.”
But Sordello, and my Sordello?

Pound’s reference to “my Sordello” admits the possibility of producing another—presumably better—Sordello and thus “out-Browning” Browning. Pound, then, takes on Browning, his master poet, just as the Greek Alexandrians took on Hesiod. Pound also confronts Homer head on by alluding to Homer’s Odyssey in the very first word of the Cantos: note the bilingual pun on “And” and andra, “man,” the first word of the Odyssey.103

Canto 1 is a nekuiia, a discourse with the dead; the dead of all times and of all traditions. Canto 1 begins the Cantos in medias res, quite literally in the middle. It begins in the middle of a story being told, as suggested by the first word “And” and the final uncompleted clause “So that;,” it begins with an event from the epic tradition of Homer and Virgil which occurs at the mid-point of the epic hero’s quest and is told in the middle of their poems. In the Odyssey, the nekuiia occurs in Book 11, or roughly in

---

the middle of the twenty-four book poem. In the *Aeneid*, Virgil nods to Homer's practice by setting Aeneas' descent to the underworld in Book 6, the middle of his twelve book epic poem. By beginning the *Cantos* with an epic event that traditionally occurs in the middle of the epic narrative, Pound also evokes Dante's *Divine Comedy*, for it was Dante who set the precedent for placing the descent to the underworld at the beginning of an epic poem. Dante's literary self consciousness about his divergence from his Virgilian model is evident from the opening line of the *Inferno*: *Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita*, "In the middle of the path of our life." With *nel mezzo*, "in the middle," Dante acknowledges that such scenes traditionally belong *nel mezzo*—in the middle of the poem, not at its beginning. Pound, by beginning Canto 1 (and thus the whole of the *Cantos*) mid-sentence, also begins his account, quite literally, *nel mezzo*. Thus, in a subtle, playful allusion Pound acknowledges his debt to Dante. Pound's awareness of Dante at this point is further evident when his Odysseus begins his tale at roughly the same point as Dante's Ulysses does in *Inf.* 23.90ff., that is, after he has left Circe and is heading home. The *nekuia* of Canto 1 sets the *Cantos* in the middle of a long and venerable literary tradition. In his discourse with the dead, Pound awakens the voice of Homer through Divus, of Virgil through Douglas and Dante, of the Old English bard, of Shakespeare, and, in the Ur Canto 1, of Browning. By ending Canto 1 with the clause "So that:" Pound implies that all the rest of the Cantos are the result of this discourse, of the awakening of all traditions, and bear the authority of all time.
Chapter 3

The Alexandrian Poetry Book:

A Case for the *Idylls*, the *Eclogues*, and *Prufrock and Other Observations*

The Poetry Book as Genre

It was noted in Chapter 2 that the main criterion for establishing genre in antiquity was metre. Poems written in dactylic hexameter belong to the generic category of *epos*, or epic; thus Theocritus' *Idylls* and Virgil's *Eclogues* and *Georgics* were classed as epics alongside Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica* and the works of Homer. Longinus even sets the *Bucolica* (the ancient title for Theocritus' *Idylls*) parallel to the *Argonautica*, comparing those two works with Homer's epics as if the *Bucolica* were a narrative epic like the *Argonautica* and the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and not the collection of separate poems it is often supposed to be.\(^1\) To the ancient critics, Theocritus and Virgil were writers of epic.\(^2\) Chapters 3 and 4 will consider the implications of the ancient generic classification of the *Idylls* and the *Eclogues* for our reading of those texts. Are these works to be read as epics or merely fortuitous collections of verse? Is *Bucolica* a descriptive term for each of the poems which together comprise the collection or is it a title for the book as a whole? Should one speak of *poem 5* or *book 5* of the *Bucolica*? What, specifically, is the relation of these poetry books to the epic genre? Finally, I will consider how these issues surrounding the Alexandrian poetry book affect our reading of T.S. Eliot's first volume *Prufrock and Other Observations*.

---

\(^1\) Dionysius Longinus, *Libellus de sublimitate*, 33.4: ἐπείτοιε γὰς ἀπτωτος ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐν τοῖς Ἀργοναύταις ποιητής, κἂν τοῖς βουκολικοῖς πλὴν ὀλίγων τῶν ἕξωθεν ὁ Θεόκριτος ἐπιτυχέστατος, ὁδὲ ὁ Ομηρος ἀν μᾶλλον ἢ Ἀπολλώνιος ἐθέλοις γενέσθαι: “Consider, too: Apollonius is a poet without fault in the *Argonautica*, and in the *Bucolica*, apart from a few externals, Theocritus is highly successful. But would you rather be Homer or Apollonius?” (My trans.).

Chapter 2 explored how Pound codified *The Cantos* as epic, unifying this apparently disjunctive and fragmented text by means of the associative technique. These final chapters will examine three books which seem to present themselves generically as collections of separate and individual poems but which have been encoded to bear a strong relation to the epic genre, and which also use the associative technique to create epic unity throughout their books. As discussed in Chapter 2, while the formal generic codes of Pound's *Cantos*, Callimachus' *Hecale*, and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* declare these works to be single epics, on the stylistic level, each enforces a lyric generic code. They are epics with lyric modulation. This generic fusing is largely responsible for the lack of consensus as to the genre of these works: those scholars who heed the poems' formal codes (e.g., length, metre, subject matter) declare them epic; those who focus on stylistics (e.g., fragmentation, allusion, obscurity) find them, if not strictly lyric, then a sort of long anti-epic or even a string of separate poems masquerading as a single epic poem. 4 Conversely, the books of Theocritus, Virgil, and Eliot present themselves on the formal generic level as a series of separate poems, but on the stylistic level they enact also the generic codes of greater epic. While to the ancients, the *Idylls* and the *Eclogues* are epic, a modern critic might class them, along with *Prufrock*, as lyrics with epic modulation.

Both the Alexandrian epic and the Alexandrian poetry book use the finer elements of style to build associative unity, a unity which transforms apparent fragments into a cohesive unit; both depend upon a close relationship to the epic genre. Both forms are answers to the question of how a poet in the "modern" world (whether it be third or first century B.C. or the early twentieth A.D.) can write epic at a moment in history when the epic genre has degenerated into something trite and stale.

4 Witness the judgment of Surrette on *The Cantos* ("more a collection of poetry than a single coherent poem") and of Crump on the *Metamorphoses* ("a collection of unconnected epyllia"), as noted in Chapter 2, pages 153 and 110, respectively.
The author of Alexandrian epic sees the solution as the lyricization of epic, the compression of epic toward lyric; the author of the Alexandrian poetry book finds a solution in the reverse: the epicisization of lyric, the expansion of lyric toward epic. In both cases the problem—and the solution—is essentially the same: namely, to infiltrate one major genre with its generic antithesis; to temper epic with lyric, lyric with epic.

A poetry collection differs from a poetry book inasmuch as it is primarily a group of individual poems brought together for the purpose of creating a saleable item. Unless they are extremely long, one cannot usually sell poems singly or even by the dozen—poems are sold by the book. If an author writes short poems, a number of them must be compiled to fill the minimum number of pages required to make a book. While the poems within a collection may be linked thematically, they are designed to stand alone, unlike those in a poetry book which function also as the units of a consciously designed, and even intricate, whole. The similarity of themes that one may find within a collection is often more fortuitous than planned. It may arise naturally from the simple fact that the poems were all written by one person over a relatively brief space of time and thus reflect the concerns of the author at that time.

5 It is perhaps not coincidental that the division of ancient epics into books (the equivalent of chapters in the modern novel) was an Alexandrian innovation. As Nita Krevans notes, the generic play typical of the Hellenistic period even spilled over into their classification of archaic material with the result that "long epic was subdivided into books while tiny epigram was being compiled into books." The Poet As Editor: Callimachus, Virgil, Horace, Propertius and the Development of the Poetic Book. 1984 PhD Dissertation, Princeton University. Printed by University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, Michigan 1991: 4.

6 One recalls T.S. Eliot's claim that he wrote the notes to The Waste Land at his publisher's request because the poem itself was several pages short of book length (discussed in Chapter 1, 71). Similarly, Pound pressed Eliot for additional poems for the American edition of Prufrock to fill out the slim volume, but John Quinn, his American contact, and the publishers were too enthusiastic to wait for Eliot to produce them. See Donald Gallup, T.S. Eliot and Ezra Pound: Collaborators in Letters. New Haven: Wenning/Stonehill, 1970: 8.

7 It must be acknowledged that some authors' thematic concerns and subject matter remain the same throughout their careers. H.D., for example, with the notable exception of Trilogy, focused on retelling the myths (often the same myths) of ancient Greece. So, too, Whitman's themes and subjects remained consistent. Reading H.D.'s or Whitman's entire corpus from start to finish, one may feel that one is reading the same five poems over and over again. This is not to denigrate the greatness of those poets, but to point out a certain fixity and perhaps lack of development in this area of their work.
collection are not, however, seen by the author as part of a cohesive whole, nor are they encoded to be read as part of a larger design. One may be able to discern a form of unity within a poetry collection, but it is principally a psychological rather than a formal unity.

In contrast, poems in a poetry book can be read both singly and as units within a complex whole. Poems may be carefully arranged on principles of *variatio* and contrast, with the inspired juxtaposition of one poem against another creating an additional layer of meaning. Krevans provides a useful definition:

> The poetic book is a consciously designed collection of individual lyric poems, each of which can also stand alone. The literary interest of this form lies in the tension it creates between the individual poems and the book as a whole. On a formal level, the book serves to break down the boundaries between the single poems, while the boundaries in turn undermine the unity of the collection. The meaning of each poem in isolation also conflicts with the meaning it takes on in the context of the other poems around it. Finally, on the level of genre, the most interesting problem emerges: how can a poet write a poetic book which demonstrates its unity—and thus its importance in the usual generic hierarchy, which values the longer work more than the shorter—while at the same time it presupposes a different creative origin for each poem? (1)

While I concur with Krevans' definition in general, there are a few points with which I disagree. First, Krevans' term "poetic book" to describe the genre is essentially
inaccurate: a book can be poetic without being poetry, as evidenced by the common critical term “poetic prose” to designate a work which is, on the formal level, prose but which contains, on the stylistic level, elements of poetry. The term “poetry book” is more precise inasmuch as it designates a book which takes the form of poetry. Second, the poetry book need not be composed of lyric poems, as witness Virgil’s Eclogues (composed of poems in epic metre) one of our best examples of the genre. Further, Krevans’ suggestion that a literary work cannot possess unity if its parts do not arise from a common creative origin is based on a faulty premise, namely that unity is organic by nature. If one uses instead a mechanistic model for unity—a model which has enjoyed an equally long tradition and which is the model preferred by Alexandrian-style poets—Krevans’ concern is no longer a problem. Finally, Krevans’ point that a poetry book is consciously designed as a book is questionable. It is debatable as to how conscious anything is that arises during the artistic process. For example, many novelists do not know how a book in progress will end, yet once it is complete, one finds that very end had been foreshadowed from the beginning. So, too, poets often do not plan beforehand the major themes and symbols which will govern a poem, but may only discover them later on when they read over what they have written. The presence of a particular dominant theme may be a surprise even to its author. As Eliot himself explains:

It is necessary certainly, in a poem of any length, to have a plan, to lay a course. But the final work will be another work than that which the author set out to write; and will, as I have already suggested, be something of a surprise to the author himself. For the idea behind a poem will always be less than the meaning of the poem: the meaning depends upon the
musical structure as well as upon the intellectual structure. In a poem, one does not altogether know what it is that one has to say, until one has said it; for what one intends to say is altered in the course of making poetry of it.8

The point is that even if writers do not intend to insert into their text elements such as foreshadowing, themes, and symbols, they insert them anyway. Regardless of the author’s intentions, that information is present within the literary text and available to the reader for interpretation.

For many writers, the process of creation is a strange and nebulous thing. It occurs during an extremely heightened state of imagination in which one draws from the depths of one’s subconscious, during a time when both reason and the cold logic of the internal censor have been put aside, at least for the moment. This is true even of such an intellectual poet as Eliot who liked to play down (publicly at least) the role of inspiration in his work, probably to further distance himself from the Romantics.9

Consider Eliot’s comments on writer’s block to Sydney Schiff in 1922:

But a moment comes when the thing comes out almost automatically; I think that it is partly the anxiety and desire to express it exactly that form the obstacle; then a moment of self-forgetfulness arrives and releases the inspiration. I imagine that all writers who have arrived at a degree of consciousness in their mental activity suffer in this way. (*LoFTSE 561*)

It is clear here that Eliot saw consciousness as a barrier to the creative process.

---

8 *Scylla and Charybdis,* *Agenda* 23: 1 and 2 (1985) 9.
Where reason and logic, where consciousness, come into play is in the process of re-reading, editing, and revising. For example, while Virgil is thought to have planned in advance the complex patterning in the Eclogues and is even suspected of writing particular poems to fill out the pattern, Eliot appears not to have so planned Prufrock and yet, as we shall see, the volume is carefully unified by means of verbal echoes, self quotation, and repetition of lines, of themes, of symbols, and images. Eliot may not have planned these unifying elements in advance, he may not even have been aware of them as he was writing them, but he certainly would notice them when he was revising the work and putting the book together. Common sense tells us that he would have deleted them if they had not served his ultimate purpose.

Whether or not it was ever initially Eliot's intention to write Prufrock as a poetry book, in the end, it would have been apparent to him that he had written one. His tacit approval of the work's genre is evident from his willingness to let that genre stand. Indeed, Eliot's longer poems typically grew out of smaller, separate ones. His usual mode of composition was to work in fragments--fragments initially seen as individual poetic entities--and then to synthesize the parts into a unified whole. Unity was consciously created after the fact and was not born with the poetic inspiration. Eliot explains the process to an interviewer:

one or two early drafts of "Ash Wednesday" appeared in Commerce and elsewhere. Then gradually I came to see it as a sequence. That's one way in which my mind does seem to have worked throughout the years poetically--doing things separately and then seeing the possibility of fusing them together, altering them, and making a kind of whole of

Using conscious design as a criterion for genre is problematic because it focuses on the author's intention. Nevertheless, Krevans feels the need to employ this criterion in order to differentiate between a poetry book designed by the author and one created by a second party, such as an editor or anthologist like Meleager, who in his *Garland* displays great attention to the overall pattern and effect of the book.\(^{12}\) It is for this reason that Krevans also excludes from consideration Theocritus' *Idylls*: conscious design on Theocritus' part cannot be proven for there is no external evidence that Theocritus himself ever collected the poems. Still, there is an important difference between a poetry book compiled by an editor and one written and arranged by its author that Krevans fails to consider: while a poetry book arranged by a skilful editor may appear, on the surface, to be as unified, intricate, and artful as one by the author of the poems, and while an editor can create interesting levels of irony or comedy, for example, by means of clever juxtaposition of poems, the effects of this patterning will be completely superficial. Any additional layers of meaning thus created will skim the surface only. In contrast, in a poetry book where the poems are conceived and written by one author as parts of a single whole, one finds that unity, interrelationship, and intertextuality permeate the work on every level. It is for this reason that external evidence of an author's intention is not essential for determining whether or not a particular work falls within the genre of the poetry book. Conversely, an author may intend and plan to write a poetry book and ultimately fail to produce

---


\(^{12}\) The earliest known large anthology, the *Garland's* arrangement of poems by theme, not author, was highly influential; it was, Krevans explains, "constructed as an artistic unit—not as a reference collection; the poems are not organized for the convenience of a user who wishes to locate a particular poem, but are employed in sequences whose thematic links are offset by variatio in the authors" (303).
one. In this case, knowledge of the author's unrealized intentions would be useful to the critic who might then consider the reasons for the failure, but it would not change the actual genre of the work. What is essential to uphold the generic claim is the internal evidence (or lack thereof) of the text.13

The dangers of the intentional fallacy are well known: even if one is able to ascertain an author's intention, what an author intended a text to be and what that text actually is are often totally different things. But as my argument thus far has suggested, there is another kind of intentionality at issue and it is here that we might find a solution: what is important is not the intention of the author, but the intention of the text. The two are very different things. As Conte explains:14 "Searching for the text's intentionality—which is not a naive recourse to the author's intentions—will mean searching for the semantic energy which invests, motivates, and shapes the reader-addressee originally programmed by the form of the text." Every text is directed to an ideal reader, not to a reader-interpreter, as hermeneutics often has it, but to a reader-addressee, a "prefiguration of the reader" to which "all future, virtual readers must adapt themselves" (Conte xx). Specifically:

The author conceives the form of the reader as a communicative function, foreseeing it and articulating his discourse so as to entwine the reader's reactions with the literary act. In short, the text's form and intentionality determine the reader's form. This is a model of directed reception, for this kind of reader's form is defined precisely by a structure of constraints:

13 This seems an obvious point, but it is often overlooked, even in Krevans' brilliant study. To use an analogous situation, a literary critic can discern the value system of morals and ethics that governs a novel and thus is able to determine whether the fictional characters are heroes or villains from clues within the text; one does not need confirmation from the author to prove it.

strategies, conventions, codifications, expressive norms, selections of contents, all organized within a competence. This competence is the force that makes sure that a text's score is correctly performed. (Conte xx)

To take Conte's analogy further, a text is like a musical score, the author, its composer, and the reader, a musician. A poetry book, then, is like a symphony score which the reader is asked to play. How well readers play it will depend on the quality of their instrument, and their talent and dedication (the competence of the reader) as well as on how well and clearly the score is written (the competence of the author).

Conte points out that if “a text’s intention is considered as an active tension between virtuality and its actualization, the literary genre can be well defined as the sign of this intention” (36). What then is the status of the poetry book in terms of genre? Fowler, in his influential *Kinds of Literature*, views both the poetry collection and the poetry book as distinct genres. The collection is purely formal; it is a “constructional type” of genre (Fowler 56). Expanding upon this idea, Fowler explains that: “We tend to take for granted the idea of a collection of poems of various subjects and in different forms without reflecting that such collections constitute a specific genre. It seems almost as if the genre were too dominant, too non pareil, to have a name” (135). The genre of the poetry book is distinct from the genre of the poetry collection. It is made so distinct by what Fowler calls aggregation (171-172); aggregation is the fundamental principle underlying the associative technique.15 Fowler explains that in the poetry book, aggregation is the governing principle whereby:

---

15 Aggregation is seen by C.K. Stead as a central stylistic mode of Pound and of Eliot, particularly in *The Cantos* and *The Waste Land*. As Stead explains: “Modernism works not on narrative, or logical, or discursive progression, but by means of an aggregation of fragments arranged as within a mosaic or a field of force. It thus makes possible once again the long poem, while still repudiating those non-poetic linkages which led Poe to say that a long poem was a contradiction in terms.” (*Pound, Yeats, Eliot* 357).
several complete short works are grouped in an ordered collection—as the songs in a song cycle or the ballads in a ballad opera. The composite work may be united by framing and linking passages, sometimes of a very substantial character (for example, *Canterbury Tales*). Such an aggregate is generically distinct both from its component parts and from unordered collections. Thus, Boccaccio’s *Decameron* represents a different genre from that of the tales it orders. (171-172)

As discussed in the Introduction, the move from a primarily oral culture ("song culture") to a written one ("book culture") and the subsequent rise of the book which occurred in the third century B.C. led to a certain "bookishness" and to a self-conscious awareness of literature as text (as opposed to performance). This cultural shift had a tremendous impact on poetics. Along with the ascendency of the written word was born a new sensitivity to the tangible elements of the literary work, a sensitivity that sparked the innovator’s interest in manipulating the text as physical object. Consequently, it is in this period that pattern poems flourish, that acrostics are often embedded in verse, that the Homeric epics are subdivided into books or chapters, and that the poetry book develops as a genre.  

The first surviving poetry book is Callimachus’ elegiac *Aetia*, a work made up of four major sections, at least some of which seem to have been published separately.

---

16 See, for example, Bing and also Richard L. Hunter *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996: 3.
17 Books began to be circulated in the fifth century B.C., but nothing is known about the principles of arrangement within them. See Matthew S. Santirocco, "Horace’s *Odes* and the Ancient Poetry Book." *Arethusa* 13.1 (1980) 45. The scholarly consensus is that the sophisticated patterning one finds in the developed genre of the poetry book is the product of third-century B.C. Alexandria. See also Krevans’ Diss., Chapter 2 “The Rise of the Book.”
as well as in book form (Krevans 155). Like the new Alexandrian epic, the Alexandrian poetry book may have had its origin in Hesiod: the best structural parallel to Callimachus' Aetia is found in Hesiod's Ehoiai or Catalogue of Women (Krevans 170). Krevans argues convincingly that the rigid construction of Hesiod's series of genealogical legends (the stories of heroines are linked by the repeated phrase ehoie, "or like the woman who") may have led to the Alexandrian poetry book with its series of loosely connected tales: "However crude and artificial this phrase may be as a unifying device for a series of stories, the Alexandrians immediately saw the potential of the Ehoiai as a model for their derivative of catalogue poetry, the poetic book" (170-171). Krevans notes that the key word which opens four of the aetia--kos, "and as"--may be a deliberate echo of Hesiod's archaic phrase. The matter is complicated by the fact that the first lines of most of the aetia within the poem are missing so it is impossible to ascertain if the word kos appeared at the beginning of the other tales too (Krevans 171); the idea is certainly provocative. It may well be that Hesiod's repeated use of ehoie was the original inspiration for the associative technique: the repetition of a word or phrase as a formal unifying element.

While poetry books and collections of various sorts continued to be written after Callimachus and were not necessarily connected with Alexandrian poetics (Krevans 301ff), there was a renewed interest in the genre in the Roman period along with the rebirth of Alexandrianism. Our first example of the Alexandrian poetry book in Rome is the libellus of the neoteric poet Catullus. Although it is known that Catullus published a

\[\text{[18 As Krevans explains, the Aetia is "designed to be read as a whole and any rearrangement would destroy an important feature of the book" (166). For discussion of the publishing history of the Aetia and bibliography, see P.J. Parsons, "Callimachus: Victoria Berenices," ZPE 25 (1975) 1-50. Other poetry books in this period are Callimachus' lambi and Theocritus' idylls. For an analysis of the structure of the lambi, see Dee L. Clayman, Callimachus' lambi, Leiden: Brill, 1980.}\]
collection of his poetry, it is not known which of his surviving poems it included. The collection as we have it is comprised of 113 poems which are divided into three groups: the polymetrics (1-60), the long poems (61-68), and the elegiac fragments (69-116) (Quinn xx-xxii). As Quinn suggests (xxi), the best candidate for Catullus' original poetry book is the polymetrics (1-60) for they show signs of intelligent and artistic arrangement and possess a certain narrative unity—what Brooks Otis refers to as a "dramatic continuum." Otis explains that it has not often been realised that Catullus' *libellus*

and in particular his Lesbia poems constitute a kind of narrative—a narrative of emotional experience and dramatically contrasted feelings. The facts that the individual poems are lyric or elegiac in form, are not explicitly connected, and above all are autobiographical or confessional rather than normally "objective" narrative do not in themselves change the character of Catullus's achievement. (102)

Further, there is in Catullus' epigrams a temporal continuity which is reinforced by cross references between poems (Otis 102 n. 1). Any objection to the polymetrics as poetry book based on the fact that the poems vary in metre, are not arranged chronologically, and alternate in subject matter (i.e. the Lesbia poems are not together, nor laid out in a linear narrative) can be easily dismissed since the governing principle in Alexandrian poetry and poetry books is what the Greeks called *poikilia* and the

---

19 See Quinn, *Catullus* xvii as well as Krevans 309ff for more recent discussion and bibliography. Clausen sees Catullus' *libellus* as more of a poetry collection than a poetry book, although he acknowledges that the "artfulness of his arrangement, especially of poems 1-11, might seem to imply a precedent" for Virgil's poetry book (xx). Clausen does concede that it is "possible that Catullus composed a few poems with an eye to the shape of his book" (xxi n. 29).

Romans variatio; we might call this principle variety or diversity.21 As Dawson explains:

adjacent poems must differ one from the other in metre, form, or content, or even length; this common phenomenon needs no illustration. Yet no author would be satisfied by a kaleidoscopic hodgepodge of unrelated compositions; along with the diversity there must be some cohesive or unifying element and various means of achieving coherence were devised. A familiar example of this diversified coherence is offered by the second and third poems of Catullus' liber: both deal with Lesbia's pet bird; in the one the bird hops around, happily chirping, a source of joy to its mistress and the poet, but in the other the bird is dead, already on its way to inevitable Hades, bringing grief to Lesbia and Catullus. (141)

The central model for this principle of variatio in the Roman poetry book appears to be Callimachus' lambi, with its highly intricate structure and arrangement (Dawson 142ff).

While many elements of the genre are found in Catullus' possible libellus (the polymetrics), the poetry book does not reach its full potential until the publication of Virgil's Eclogues. Whether, as has often been suggested (e.g. Clausen, "Theocritus and Virgil" 313), Virgil wrote a book of ten poems in imitation of Theocritus, or whether Virgil arrived at this number on his own, Virgil set the trend in Rome for poetry books, especially books of ten. Within the next fifteen years, every major poet published at least one poetry book: Horace the Satires, Epodes, Odes, and Epistles; Propertius the Monobiblos and Propertius 3; Tibullus his first book of elegies; and Ovid the Amores

It is not known, though it is widely believed, that Theocritus himself published a poetry book. The bulk of scholarship does not dispute that there is a deliberately constructed unity within the poems, but only in which particular poems that unity exists. Scholars have gone to great lengths to determine which poems might have comprised the original collection and what structural pattern might have ordered the book.

External evidence suggests that whatever Theocritus' poetry book was, it was not the collection which survives today. For example, the sequence of the *Idylls* is unstable: it differs in each of the three manuscript families, although Idyll 1 is always first in the collection and the so-called "bucolic" poems, including the spurious Idylls 8 and 9, are usually grouped at the beginning of the various collections. Further, whatever Theocritus might have called his book, it was certainly not the *Idylls*: this title has been customary only since Roman times and is confined to the scholia of Theocritus. The word *Idylls* comes from the Greek *eidullion*, the diminutive form of *eidos*, a "sort, type, style," or as Rosenmeyer translates it "specimen" or "species" (8). "Specimen" or the plural "species" are partitive nouns which require a genitive for completion; presumably, the Idylls are "specimens" of poetry (Gow lxxi). But while a collection of

---


23 As Gutzwiller states, "The idea of an authorially sanctioned collection has become so accepted that elaborate schemes based on the numbers of lines in each poem have been devised in order to determine the original arrangement." *Theocritus’ Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*. Madison: U of Wisconsin, 1991: 8.

24 Gutzwiller summarizes the situation (*Theocritus*8). On whether or not there was a Theocritean poetry book, see Hunter 28.

25 There has been extensive debate over the meaning of the literary term "bucolic" and to which poems the term applies (Halperin 6-7 et passim).

26 For a summary of the manuscript tradition see Gow xxx-lix.

27 It is, in fact, quite late: As late as first century A.D. Pliny the younger could use the Latin transliteration *idyllia* to refer to his collection of short poems—poems in various metres and with no bucolic implications. *Idyllia* was also used thus as late as the fourth century A.D. by Ausonius (Gow lxxi).
poems might be designated by the plurals *eide* or *eidullia* (the diminutive form of *eidos*), as Gow points out, “a single poem cannot have been called an *eidos* or *eidullion* except as a component or an excerpt from such a collection” (lxxi). Therefore, the term *eidullion*, or idyll, could have been used only after the poems were collected, and thus not by Theocritus himself (if we believe—and there is no compelling reason not to—the received opinion that Theocritus did not compile the collection as we have it).

It is not known who collected and arranged the current collection. Nor is it known for certain if Theocritus published a poetry book, and, if he did, what its limits were and what he called it. So much we can conclude from the external evidence. The internal evidence, on the other hand, strongly suggests that Theocritus did conceive and write some of the Idyls as a poetry book, for there is in many of the poems a carefully constructed unity. While this thesis cannot attempt to set the borders for that original collection—as noted, the issue has been extensively argued and must remain inconclusive—it will analyze the means by which Theocritus created an artistic unity within the world of the Idyls. In other words, it shall work from the inside-out: if the manner in which Theocritus wrote the Idyls suggests (as it does to many scholars) that at least some of the poems are meant to be read together, we shall try to ascertain what, specifically, Theocritus did to create that impression; we shall examine the effect—artistic unity—and how that effect is created as opposed to the result of the effect—belief that particular poems comprised the collection. My analysis may be suggestive, but only incidentally, as to what poems might have formed Theocritus’ poetry book. In so doing, it may well uphold other scholarly conjectures for the possible book, but will likely draw in also some additional poems. One must be wary also that there is a large grey area: in many cases it is uncertain if echoes between poems are deliberate
attempts to evoke unity or merely the result of one particular author's preferred vocabulary. While this will be kept always in mind, it is inevitable that where I draw the lines of that grey area will differ from where others might set the boundaries. Thus the section on Theocritus shall function principally as a point of departure, as the Alexandrian locus and inspiration for the unifying techniques used within the poetry book which come to full fruition in Virgil and later authors.

Most scholarship begins with examining Theocritus' poetry book from the outside-in: it proceeds from the conviction that certain poems belong together, and then looks for a key to the commonalities between them. For example, Lawall argues that the key to Theocritus' poetry book is that all the poems included in it were written on the island of Cos. Thus Lawall is forced to omit from consideration poems which give no indication of Coan ancestry even though they are strongly (even obviously) linked to the so-called Coan poems. For example, Idylls 3, 6, 11, and 13 echo one another in many ways (Gow 208), but while Lawall includes Idyll 6 in Theocritus' book, he excludes both 11 and 13 because he cannot connect them to Cos. Similarly, Segal, rejecting Lawall's Coan hypothesis, maintains that the key to the poetry book is that all the poems included are bucolics. The problem--and it is a major one--is that we do not know what the ancients meant by the term "bucolic." Segal creates a definition and then claims that only Idylls 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 11 are "genuine bucolics" inasmuch as they fit the definition he has created in order to classify them. Consequently, in order to support his thesis, Segal must ignore or discount the many ties of unity between, for

28 Gilbert Lawall, Theocritus' Coan Pastorals, Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967. Lawall's proposed poetry book is Idylls 1 through 7. Often the connections he draws to the island of Cos are tenuous at best. For objections to Lawall's theory, see Giuseppe Giangrande's review in JHS 88 (1968) 170-173.
example, Idyls 1 and 2. Ultimately, both Lawall’s and Segal’s criteria are too simple and restrictive. As a result, Lawall often stretches a point too far to make a Coan connection and rejects poems only because he cannot prove such a connection exists, and Segal unduly narrows the meaning of “bucolic” in order to restrict the poetry book to the more obviously pastoral poems (i.e., those dealing with herdsmen in rural settings). Any theory which attempts to define the limits of Theocritus’ original poetry book must take into account the potent intertextuality between many of the Idyls: if Idyls 3, 6, 11, and 13 are not meant to be read as a quadruple play of sorts, if Idyls 1 and 2 are not a diptych, then why are there so many powerful echoes between them—echoes which often have a profound effect on meaning?

Whatever the ancients’ definition of “bucolic” was, there are hints that it had little in common with the modern one. For example, as Halperin points out (122), “the two poems [sung by the two herdsmen in Idyl 7] which Theocritus specifically labelled ‘bucolics’ are ones no modern critic would regard as exemplary bucolics;” the first song is an erotic propemtikon (a farewell song for a travelling beloved) and the second an urban paraklausithuron (a poem addressed to the beloved’s door by the locked-out lover). Moreover, the poems modern critics class as bucolics “are not distinguished from the rest of Theocritus’ work by unique features of style.” The difficulty is that modern critics want to equate “bucolic” with “pastoral,” an equation which did not exist in antiquity, for the concept of “pastoral” is very late and arises from Virgil, not

Lawall presents a convincing argument that Idyls 1 and 2 form a diptych. Halperin concurs (127), but other scholars, operating under the mistaken belief that only obviously pastoral poems can be related to one another reject this hypothesis because of the urban setting of Idyll 2 (e.g., Gutzwiller 102). Even so, Halperin argues that Idyll 2 is consistent with Theocritus’ conception of bucolic and thus belongs among the bucolic poems. For in-depth discussion of the definition of bucolic and the differences between bucolic and pastoral, see Halperin 1-74 and Rosenmeyer 35ff.

As Halperin notes, the “many continuities within the Theocritean corpus spanning the pastoral and non-pastoral Idylls represents only one of the current interpretative problems which any new and rigorous historical definition of bucolic poetry must attempt to solve” (136).

Theocritus (Halperin 124ff). As a result, even though Idylls 11 and 13 are clearly companion pieces and even though Idyll 13 is included among Theocritus' bucolic poems by the scholiast in Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica* 1.1236, modern critics exclude Idyll 13 from the bucolic corpus on the grounds that it is not pastoral (Halperin 126).

The very existence of Virgil's poetry book, the *Eclogues*, points to a Theocritean one as precedent and model. With the rare and important exception of Latin love elegy, the Romans were not innovators with respect to genre. They generally built closely upon their Greek models. Consistent with his practice elsewhere, Virgil closely modelled the *Eclogues* on the *Idylls* in terms of subject, style, and genre. It is for this reason that scholars suppose that Virgil wrote ten eclogues in imitation of Theocritus, specifically, that the edition of Theocritus which Virgil used as a model consisted of ten Idylls. Clausen explains: "Ten poems 'of Theocritus' varying in quality and casually arranged--Virgil could hardly have attached much importance initially to the number ten; presumably it became important to him as he began to think of arranging his imitations of Theocritus in a book" (*Eclogues* xx). Rudd, on the other hand, argues that Virgil wrote ten eclogues because Theocritus wrote ten "pastoral" poems (Idylls 1 through 11, omitting 2) (120). The difficulty here, again, is that the argument rests on one's definition of pastoral. Interestingly, Servius notes that while Theocritus wrote ten pastoral poems (he does not identify the particular poems), only seven of Virgil's ten eclogues are true pastorals (*merae rusticae*). The three Eclogues usually omitted from the pastoral canon are numbers 4, 6, and 10 (Jenkyns 28). Even so, scholars do not attempt to omit these eclogues from the poetry book, for

---

33 The *Georgics*, inspired by Hesiod's *Works and Days*, are modelled on Callimachus' *Aetia* and Aratus' *Phaenomena*. The *Aeneid* relies on Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* for its subject matter and on Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes for its style.

they cannot: the manuscript tradition leaves no doubt of their inclusion in Virgil's book. It has been proposed that the mix of pastoral and non-pastoral within the *Eclogues* is due to Virgil's attempt to extend the genre by incorporating non-pastoral elements within it (Rudd 120). But if we can accept that Virgil's poetry book contained both pastoral and non-pastoral poems, why do critics like Segal and Lawall maintain that Theocritus' poetry book could not have? I suspect that the precedent for Virgil's mix of pastoral and non-pastoral (or, to use the terminology I prefer, bucolic and non-bucolic) in the *Eclogues* existed already in Theocritus' poetry book, for generic contamination is characteristic of Alexandrian poetry and there is a contemporary precedent in Callimachus' *lambi* for major contrast and generic blending within a poetry book.

It is supposed that Virgil based the arrangement of his poems in the *Eclogues* on the arrangement of Theocritus' *Idylls*.\(^{35}\) It has been argued that Virgil used Artemidorus' edition of Theocritus which included Idylls 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, but this position is untenable, for if Virgil used this particular edition as a model, why did he, in Eclogue 8, imitate Idyll 2 which is not included in Artemidorus' edition? Similarly, there are passages in the *Eclogues* modelled on Idylls 18 and 24, also absent from Artemidorus' edition (Halperin 135-136). Indeed, Virgil alludes to almost all of the *Idylls* within the *Eclogues*. Either Virgil did not use Artemidorus' edition at all or he supplemented it with a second edition which included other Idylls. Did Virgil, then, have access to two different Theocritean poetry books or did he use another edition entirely? Further, why did Virgil include in the *Eclogues* an imitation of Idyll 8,

---

35 As Hunter notes, "the obviously artful arrangement of Virgil's *Eclogues* is particularly suggestive, given the primary position of Theocritus as a model for those poems" (29).
which is obviously spurious? Whatever edition of the *Idylls* Virgil used, if the book's overall arrangement operated on the same principles of juxtaposition and contrast that governs each of the individual poems, then Virgil may well have used Theocritus' practice as the basis for his own complex arrangement of the poems within the *Eclogues*.

Regardless of whether it was Theocritus or an editor who arranged the extant collection called the *Idylls*, the poems within it are artfully arranged and achieve a certain piquancy and irony through often jarring juxtapositions (Hutchinson 146). As noted, this characteristically Alexandrian principle of juxtaposition, which Pound called the ideogrammic method (see Chapter 2), functions also within the individual poems. Abrupt switches in the level of diction from the high Homeric to the low comedic are common, even characteristic of Theocritus' style. As Fabiano explains:

What seems chiefly to characterize Theocritus' poetic language is the instability of the system at every level, from the least phonetic unity, which always enjoys a considerable autonomy inside the changeable convention of the dialect, to the structure of the *Idylls* as complex syntheses of different literary genres. In Theocritus' poetry it is usual to

---

36 While Clausen presumes that Virgil did not know that *Idyll* 8 was not written by Theocritus, I find the suggestion incredible: its style is so different from and inferior to Theocritus' in the attested poems that only the most insensitive reader—and certainly not a poet with Virgil's extraordinarily subtle grasp of poetics—could mistake it for his. I suspect that Virgil knew the poem was not by Theocritus, but ultimately did not care as it furnished him with the material and inspiration for yet another brilliant eclogue (number 7). Curiously, in Eclogue 7 Virgil imitates both *Idylls* 1 and 2, which perhaps suggests that he saw a relationship between the two poems. Virgil's practice may lend further support to Lawall's hypothesis that *Idylls* 1 and 2 form a diptych.


meet with extravagant elements which apparently derive from other fields and clash with the fundamental character of the poem where they appear (e.g. epicisms in the Urban Mimes and in the Bucolic Idylls, colloquialisms and local-Doricisms in the Epyllia): the impact of these elements on the others is so typical of Theocritus' poetry that it is to be envisaged as one of the features which most distinguishes his style.

While I would take issue with Fabiano's use of terms like bucolic and epyllia, he is right in essentials: in Theocritus, contrast and juxtaposition are evident on every level, from the linguistic, to the structural, to the broader generic. Looking, for a moment, only on the verbal level, Fabiano concludes: "Theocritus' language, no matter what the dialect, is almost always made dynamic in a series of oppositions between Homerisms and rough Doric forms, high artificiality and colloquialisms, realism in some details and refusal of a consistent realistic poetics, personal tone and literary stimuli" (533). Gutzwiller uses the term symmetrization to explain how the structure in both Theocritean and Virgilian pastoral functions: 39 "Symmetry of the parts induces the reader to seek the poem's meaning by weighing one section against another and thus produces a poem's internal analogical character" (Theocritus 102). The underlying structure in the poetry books of Theocritus and Vergil, then, is symmetrical, which Gutzwiller sees as based on the "thrust and response of an amobean contest" (Theocritus 101). Thus form mimics and reinforces content. 40

---
39 Gutzwiller uses the term pastoral to refer to the poems about herdsmen.
Unlike Theocritus' *Idyls*, the manuscript tradition for Virgil's *Eclogues* is secure. There can be little doubt that Virgil wrote, compiled, arranged, and published the poetry book as we have it (Rudd 119-120). Curiously, though, just as Theocritus' book was almost certainly not called the *Idyls*, so Virgil's book was not entitled the *Eclogues*. There is unambiguous evidence that Virgil's title for the book was *Bucolica*. As Clausen summarizes the evidence (xx, n. 23), the capital manuscripts are headed: "P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica Explicit" (G); "P. Vergili Maronis Bucolicon Liber Explicit" (M); "Bucolicon" (P); and "Vergili Maronis Bucolica Explic. Feliciter" (R). Further, Clausen notes that ancient critics referred to the books as *Bucolica*: Servius in the *Prooem* states "Bucolica, ut ferunt, dicta sunt" and Quintilian, too, refers to the book as *Bucolica* (xx n. 23). There is a further reason to support *Bucolica* as Virgil's original title: *Bucolica* is the Latin transliteration of the Greek *Boukolika* the title by which Theocritus' poetry book was known in antiquity. One might view the Latin appropriation of the Greek title as emblematic of Virgil's poetic agenda throughout the *Eclogues*, specifically, the appropriation and Latinization of the Greek genre of bucolic poetry.

There is intriguing internal evidence which lends further support to the argument for *Bucolica* as Virgil's title for the work. In a provocative article on the programmatic aspects of Eclogue 1 and their relevance to the poetry book, James R.G. Wright argues that in the injunction of the god to Tityrus at Eclogue 1.45, "pascite ut ante boves, pueri; summittite tauros," "Graze cattle as before, my children, and yoke

41 Quintilian 8.6.46, referring to Eclogue 9.7-10.
42 In addition to Longinus 33.4, there are many references to the work by this title. The *Suda* is particularly unambiguous: ἔγραψε τὰ καλούμενα βουκολικά ἐπὶ Δωρίδι διαλέκτῳ. "He [Theocritus] wrote the poems called *Bucolica* in Doric dialect" (cited by Gow xiv). It seems that Theocritus coined the word *boukolikos* which Halperin defines as "of or pertaining to a cowherd or cowherds" (79 ). The word was later used only of poetry (Halperin 75). Theocritus appears also to have invented the verbal form *boukoliasthai* used in *Idyls* 5 and 7, a word which "suggests by morphological analogy with other verbs of speaking the utterance characteristic of cowherds" (Halperin 79 n. 12, following Dover 4v).
bulls," *boves* is used metaphorically of the poems within the volume.\textsuperscript{43} Tityrus here represents Virgil, and the unnamed god stands in for Augustus (who was then still Octavian). Thus the line may be interpreted as the veiled command of the poet’s patron to Virgil to foster, to tend, his poems. Tityrus has often been seen as a figure for the poet in the *Eclogues*, particularly in Eclogue 1 (Wright 112ff); however, as Wright explains, rejecting naive allegorical interpretations, this does not mean that there is a one-to-one correspondence throughout the book between Virgil and Tityrus.\textsuperscript{44} It is more accurate to say that sometimes Virgil takes on the persona of Tityrus, sometimes that of Menalcas, and sometimes neither. Thus, Servius (on Eclogue 1.1) writes "et hoc loco Tityri sub persona Vergilium debemus accipere; non tamen ubique, sed tamen ubi exigit ratio" ("in this place, we should assume Virgil under the character of Tityrus--not everywhere, however; but everywhere reason compels [us to do so]").\textsuperscript{45}

As a result of his trip to Rome, Tityrus has won the leisure to lie under the spreading beech, to compose and play his songs--to be a poet. And yet the god he holds responsible had said nothing to him about poetry. What does the god’s command to herd his cattle have to do with Tityrus’ current occupation of singing songs?\textsuperscript{46} Wright explains that in light of the ancient literary convention of “describing the author as doing that about which he writes," in the context of the *Eclogues*, “looking after cows is the same thing as being a pastoral poet” (150 n. 42 for bibliography). This is especially apparent at Eclogue 3.85 with its close echo of 1.45, an echo that creates


\textsuperscript{44} It is a mistake to expect consistent characterization anywhere in the *Eclogues*. As shall be shown, characters continually shift and change even when they bear the same name. For example, there are several characters named Daphnis in the book, but they are not always the same Daphnis.

\textsuperscript{45} Cited by Wright 112, but with my translation.

\textsuperscript{46} It is true that Tityrus is also a herdsman, but he relates the story of his trip to Rome to explain to Menalcas specifically why, in these troubled times, he can lay about and sing his songs, not to explain why he still has cattle to herd.
an associative link between them:

“pascite ut ante boves, pueri; summittite tauros”

(1.45)

“Graze cattle as before, my children, and yoke bulls.”

Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam:

Pierides, vitulam lectori pascite vestro.

(3.84-85)

Pollio loves our Muse, bucolic though she be.

Fatten a heifer for your reader, Pierians.

In both passages, there is repetition of the imperative verb pascite “graze” and in both its subject is bovine, boves “cattle” and vitula “heifer.” The metaphorical meaning of vitula in the passage above is plain, for what might the Muses prepare for a reader but a poem?

Cattle resonate of poetic programme elsewhere in the Eclogues, as for example, in the highly programmatic Eclogue 6, where Silenus’ song has been read as a catalogue of the appropriate types of poetry for a good Alexandrian poet to write.47 In the song of Silenus one finds an odd abundance of cattle:48 the affairs of the house of Minos with Pasiphae and her love for the white bull; the daughters of Proetus who, maddened by Hera, erroneously believed they had been changed into cows; and the allusion to Calvus’ Io (the story of a woman who was turned into a cow, this time to evade Hera) at Eclogue 6.47 (Clausen 195). In addition, this preponderance of cattle

47 See Clausen Virgil, 176ff.
48 I am indebted to Alison M. Keith, University of Toronto, for this observation.
has generic implications: although Eclogue 6 is usually omitted from the pastoral
canon because of its mythological subject matter, the presence of cattle makes this
poem particularly bou-colic—if we recall the etymology of the term from bous “ox” or
“cow.” There are further indications that Virgil saw Eclogue 6 as bucolic: even though
Eclogue 6, like Eclogues 4 and 10, does depart somewhat from what the reader might
expect of bucolic poetry, it is at the beginning of these three poems that Virgil
especially advertises “his pastoral credentials by allusion to Sicily, homeland of the
first pastoral poet, Theocritus” (Jenkyns 34).

Related to these parallels between cattle and bucolic poetry in Eclogues 1 and
6 is Virgil’s imitation of Callimachus’ famous prologue to the Aetia (1.23-25) at
Eclogue 6.4-5. Another god, this time Apollo, the god of poetry (and one recalls that
Augustus claimed Apollo as his patron god),49 enjoins Tityrus, “pastorem, Tityre,
pinguis / pascere oportet ovis, deducere carmen” (“It behoves a shepherd, Tityrus, to
feed his sheep fat, but to sing a slender song”). Here, Virgil recalls Callimachus’
opposition of two poetic styles: the pachus, or fat, style which the Alexandrians
abhorred, and the approved leptos, or slender, style. The first poem of Virgil’s poetry
book, like the introduction to Callimachus’ Aetia, is intensely—though subtly—
concerned with poetics: the fat sheep are metaphors for the fat style of poetry, and
grazing is compared to the act of poetic composition.50 The equation of herds with
poems is made explicit in the anonymous epigram which opened Artemidorus’

50 An early parallel for Eliot’s digestive analogy for the writer’s craft? The digestive process is a frequent
metaphor in Eliot for poetic composition. For example, note Eliot’s comment on the assimilation of literary
tradition in “Euripides and Professor Murray:” “But H.D. and other poets of the ‘Poets’ Translation Series’
have so far done no more than pick up some of the romantic crumbs of Greek literature; none of them has
yet shown himself competent to attack the Agamemnon. If we are to digest the heavy food of historical
and scientific knowledge that we have eaten we must be prepared for much greater exertions. We need a
digestion which can assimilate both Homer and Flaubert” (my italics) (SW77).
collection of bucolic poetry:\footnote{51}{Epigram 26 in Gow's Theocritus.}

Boukoliakai Moisai sporades poká. tên d' ama pássai
ěnti miàs mnádras, ěnti miàs ágélas.

The Bucolic Muses were once scattered, but are now united in one fold,
in one flock.

In this epigram, the poems collected by Artemidorus undergo two metaphorical
transformations, first, into Muses (specifically cow-herding ones) who are the
inspiration of the poems, and, second, into cattle (representing the subject matter of
the poems) which are now at last gathered into one "herd." The herd here acts as a
metaphor for Artemidorus' anthology.

While the equation of cows and poems may seem odd, there is a Hellenistic
precedent for the taking of beasts--in this case, birds--as metaphorical representatives
of the poet's poems. Significantly, it is in Callimachus, epigram 2:

Eiπé τις Ἡράκλειτε. τεὸν μόρον. ές δέ με δάκρυ
omaly. έμνήσθην δ' ουσίας ἁμώτεροι
ηλιον έν λέσχη κατεδύσαμεν. ἀλλὰ οὔ μέν που.
έειν Ἡλικαρνησσείι. τετράπαλαι σποδιή.
aï δε τεαί ζωοσιν ἁθόνοις, ἣσιν ο πάντων
ἀρπακτής Ἡλικης οὐκ ἐπὶ χειρὰ βαλεὶ.

Someone recalled to me Heracleitus, thy death and brought me to tears,
and I remembered how often we two in talking put the sun to rest. Thou,
methinks, Halicarnassian friend, art ashes long and long ago; but thy
nightingales live still, whereon Hades, snatcher of all things, shall not lay his hand.

In this epigram, the word nightingales refers metaphorically to Heracleitus' poems. As the Greek Lexicon notes, the word nightingale, *aedon*, is related to the verb to sing (*aeido*). The word later came to be used of a poet's songs. The citation given by *LSJ* for this is Callimachus epigram 2, above. More pertinently, Callimachus in his Hymn to Artemis (170-182) figures his poetic powers as *boes* in what appears to be another *recusatio* of the Homeric project. As Bing explains, Callimachus' wish that his oxen not work another man's fields is a metaphor: Callimachus "does not want his poetic powers (*Boes*) to work someone else's territory" (3).

While there is no difficulty in ascertaining the contents and arrangement of T.S. Eliot's first published volume, *Prufrock*, there is some difficulty in determining whether it belongs to the genre of poetry book or poetry collection. The book has been received, it appears, without question as a poetry collection, but, as I shall argue, it properly belongs to the genre of the poetry book. The first problem in viewing it in this light centers around the issue of intentionality. There is no external evidence that Eliot ever intended or even considered the volume as a poetry book; however, as I have argued above, in determining genre, the intentionality of the text must take precedence over the intentionality of the author (though it need not negate it). While a statement from Eliot would certainly strengthen the case for genre, it is not essential and given the force of the internal evidence, it is unnecessary.

---

52 *LSJ* s.v. *aedon* 1. songstress, i.e., the nightingale.
53 The first example cited by *LSJ* of the collocation of nightingales and poets is found in Hesiod's *Works and Days* 203. This is interesting and suggestive given Hesiod's importance as a model for the Alexandrian poets.
The second problem is Ezra Pound’s role in the book. If Pound—not Eliot—actually choose and arranged the poems for the volume, one would be faced with the same difficulty as with other collections put together by editors, that any unity or meaningful juxtapositions are formal only. Although some scholarship has implied that this is the case, examination of the issue tells us otherwise. We first learn of Pound’s part in *Prufrock* from Hugh Kenner who states, “It was Pound who took pains, Eliot recalled forty years later, over the arrangement of *Prufrock and Other Observations*.” Kenner’s statement suggests that Pound was the one who put together the book, but it is by no means unambiguous. Kenner does not provide an actual quote and he omits the context for Eliot’s remark: was Eliot being his usual modest and self-deprecating self in respect to his poetic career? Was he playing “Possum?” When Kenner says that Pound “took pains” over the arrangement of the poems, does this mean that Pound did it himself or only that he stressed its importance to Eliot, perhaps goading him into paying more attention to this aspect than Eliot might have otherwise? Apart from the remark to Kenner, Eliot kept silent about the matter. If Pound did play the central part in *Prufrock*’s structure, Eliot’s silence is strange given his eagerness to publicly acknowledge his debt to Pound elsewhere, particularly in connection with the formation of *The Waste Land*.

The one direct statement I have been able to locate regarding Pound’s role in the selection and arrangement of poems in *Prufrock* is from Pound and it suggests that his role was advisory only. Pound writes to Harriet Monroe on April 21, 1916: “Eliot has

---

55 *The Pound Era*, 355 n. 38. Eliot made the remark to Kenner in a private conversation. Kenner does not actually quote the remark or give any context for it; he only provides his interpretation of the gist of it.  
56 Similarly, consider the scholarly misconceptions which would ensue if Donald Hall had not set some of Pound’s comments on the *Cantos* firmly in context. As Hall makes clear, Pound’s opinion that the *Cantos* were a failure was born of severe depression. “Fragments of Ezra Pound,” *Their Ancient Glittering Eyes. Remembering Poets and More Poets*, New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1992. See, for example, page 249.  
57 Eliot frequently referred to it in print and in interviews. Stead reproduces six such testimonials (*Pound, Yeats, Eliot* 84-85).
been worried with schools, etc. (i.e. teaching, not schools of verse or porpoises). He is to come in next week to plan a book, and I will then send you a group of his things.” In his discussion of this passage, Donald Gallup speculates that Eliot, his nerves overtaxed by his current troubles, sought Pound’s help to weed out any poems that were not quite good enough for inclusion in the book (7-8). Unfortunately, it is not known which of the fifteen unpublished poems written in the early period Eliot may have originally considered for the volume, though it is quite likely that some were considered and omitted on Pound’s advice (Gallup 7-8). Still, it must be stressed that whatever influence Pound had over Eliot in literary matters, it was no more than Eliot himself allowed. The final word was always Eliot’s.

Despite Eliot’s willingness to credit Pound and Pound’s undeniably major role in shaping The Waste Land, Pound’s suggestions did not always prevail. For example, it is apparent from Pound’s letter to Harriet Monroe of January 31, 1915 that Pound disliked the Hamlet section of “The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock” and tried to persuade Eliot to delete it. As Pound writes: “I dislike the paragraph about Hamlet, but it is an early and cherished bit and T.E. won’t give it up, and as it is the only portion of the poem that most readers will like at first reading, I don’t see that it will do much harm” (LofTSE 50). Even a cursory comparison of the first and final versions of The Waste Land indicates that Eliot frequently exercised veto power over Pound’s suggestions. For example, on what would become the first page of the poem, Pound had marked the following for change or deletion: the adjective “forgetful” in the line “Earth in forgetful snow, feeding;” the phrase “there you feel free” at “In the mountains, there you feel free;” the phrase “I could not / Speak” at “Your arms full, and your hair wet, I could not / Speak, and my eyes failed...;” and the line “(Those are pearls that were his eyes. Look!).” Not one of these was changed in the final version. Still, Eliot...
was open to suggestions and made the most of Pound’s, and anyone else’s, ideas when they suited him. For example, when Harriet Monroe published “Conversation Galante,” “La Figlia Che Piange,” “Mr. Apollinax,” and “Morning at the Window” under the title Observations, Eliot wrote back to her on seeing the proofs, “The title you have given will do excellently” (Letters 153). Eliot, in fact, liked Monroe’s title so well that he adopted it, with variations, for his first poetry book: Prufrock and Other Observations.

It is important to note that in his letter to Monroe, Pound says Eliot is coming in to “plan a book;” he does not say “I am going to plan his book for him” or even “we are going to plan a book together.” Pound’s statement suggests that Eliot arranged the book himself, but came to him for advice. This would be quite natural in any case: poets typically “try things out” on one another. It is even more understandable that Eliot, new to London and about to publish his first book, would consult an old hand like Pound who was by then a real fixture on the literary scene and who had published ten books and had another four books coming out in that year alone. Pound knew all the important personages and all the ins and outs of publishing; he knew the literary market, the literary scene, and was himself a first-rate poet. Who better for Eliot to consult about his first published book?

Whether or not Eliot was directly influenced by the ancient poetry books is unknown, but it is certainly possible. Eliot possessed Theocritus’ Idylls in Greek and Propertius in Latin (LoftSE 398-399); in his third year at Harvard, he took two Latin

---

58 Poetry 8.6 (September 1916) 292-295.
59 A Lume Spento, 1908; A Quinzaine for this Yule, 1908; Personae, 1909; Exultations, 1909; The Spirit of Romance, 1910; Provenca, 1910; Canzoni, 1911; Ripostes, 1912; Sonnets and Ballate of Guido Cavalcanti, 1912; Cathay, 1915; Gaudier-Brzeska: A Memoir, 1916; Lustra, 1916; Certain Noble Plays of Japan, 1916; and ‘Noh’ or Accomplishment, 1916.
courses: one on the Roman novel and the other E.K. Rand’s Roman poetry course
which included Horace (and so perhaps the book of *Odes*) and likely also Catullus (Howarth 66). While it is highly improbable that a general course on Latin poetry would exclude Catullus and an introduction to the neoterics, it is not, of course, impossible: in a 1918 letter to his mother, Eliot writes “I have also read this week most of Catullus” (*LofTSE* 235). Unfortunately, there is no way to determine whether Eliot’s remark referred to a first reading or a re-reading of Catullus.

Eliot was likely familiar with Virgil’s *Eclogues* early on, given his love for the poet, a love born of his reading of the entire *Aeneid* in Latin at a very tender age. His knowledge of Virgil’s major work is apparent from the appendix to his mother’s 1905 letter to Milton Academy in which Eliot writes that he has read: “Latin: Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Books 3-12. I read Books 1-11 last year” (*LofTSE* 8). This statement directly contradicts Ziolkowski’s contention that Eliot had never read past book six of the *Aeneid*.61 Ziolkowski also maintains that Eliot did not know the *Eclogues*, for Eliot “displays no familiarity with the *Eclogues* either in his essays or in his poetry” (120). This, too, is easily disproved by Eliot’s own words. In “Virgil and the Christian World” (*OPP* 121), Eliot speaks of the fourth Eclogue and while he quotes the opening lines in English, the translation is from the Loeb bilingual edition, an edition which includes the entire *Eclogues* book. Eliot, then, owned the *Eclogues* in Latin and English, whether he read it in either or both languages. Again, there is no telling exactly when he might have read the *Eclogues*—the essay referred to was written in 1951—but given his early and fond exposure to Virgil, it seems quite likely that he read the *Eclogues*, at least in an English translation, in his youth.

Ziolkowski errs by presuming that familiarity leads to allusion, thus he

---

erroneously concludes that Eliot never read the Eclogues or most of the Aeneid because Eliot does not allude to them. This is a risky assumption, but Ziolkowski is not alone in making it. Stormon also attempts to determine the extent of Virgil's influence on Eliot by the extent of Eliot's allusions to Virgil. Like Ziolkowski, Stormon concludes that Eliot read little Virgil because he rarely alludes to him; consequently, Stormon rejects the possibility of evaluating Virgil's influence on Eliot's poetics even though he acknowledges that Eliot's poetics are astonishingly similar to Virgil's:

It is true that one is tempted to go further, and to see significance in the marked similarities of technique—in the use of language with penumbral meaning, in the constant refringering or repetition in new contexts of earlier lines, in the deliberate evocation of past poets—but in matters like these it is really impossible to tell how far Eliot has learnt from Virgil and how far the aesthetic experience of the two poets runs parallel. (10)

Stormon's objection might be reasonable, if overly cautious, were it not for the fact that Eliot had been immersed in Virgil's Latin and received the full impact of Virgil's poetic programme in his formative years, that he had read the poet's major work before his seventeenth birthday and obviously felt a keen affinity with him. What better breeding ground for poetic influence? One notes, too, that the particular elements of affinity that Stormon finds between the two poets are elements characteristic of the Alexandrian poetic programme, namely, poetic ambiguity, repetition, and the ironic recasting of phrases (the associative technique), and the appropriation of literary tradition.

In contrast to Stormon's reticence, W.F. Jackson Knight, one of Eliot's acquaintances, had no compunction at all about identifying Eliot's poetry as

"technically very Vergilian...even going farther than Vergil in a whimsical acceptance of sound for what looks like its own sake, with rhymes, final and internal, and massed assonances" (300). Conversely, as noted above (Chapter 1, 40), Knight freely likens Virgil to the modernist poets. Likewise, Halperin sees a parallel between the poetics of Eliot and another Alexandrian--Theocritus--specifically, in regard to the frequent juxtaposition of different linguistic registers. Looking at the comic effect Theocritus achieves by drawing epic parallels in incongruous situations, Halperin explains:

the function of this juxtaposition--which is not essentially different from Eliot's "brings the sailor home from sea, the typist home at teatime"--except perhaps for its greater impertinence--is to demonstrate the inappropriateness of traditional language to the task of conveying homely reality in verse. (222)

Ancient Relations: The Poetry Book and the Epic Genre

At the very beginning of their projects, both Theocritus and Virgil made a conscious decision to compose a poetry book to the beat of epic. The choice of dactylic hexameter for the genre was not a given: Callimachus wrote one poetry book in iambics (the *lambi*) and another in elegiacs (the *Aetia*), Propertius wrote the *Monobiblos* in elegiacs as did Ovid the *Amores*. As discussed in Chapter 2, in antiquity, metre determined genre and dactylic hexameter meant epic. By choosing epic metre for a work that is patently different from traditional epic, Theocritus and Virgil advertise a relationship between their works and the epic genre. The metre is a signal to the reader to look beyond apparent differences, to read the work against the

---

63 As Halperin points out, "Thematic considerations were subordinate to metrical ones in classification of genres until second century A.D." (15).
backdrop of traditional epic. On the surface, the poetry book and the epic could not be more dissimilar, and in many ways they are formally antithetical: the poetry book is composed of a series of relatively short poems, while the epic's most distinctive formal characteristic is its (usually great) length. Further, the poetry book deals with a variety of characters, tales, places, and times; it lacks the central overriding narrative which is characteristic of epic. The poetry book is domestic, private; it draws its subject matter from everyday life (even if it is, at times, the everyday life of exceptional beings such as heroes, nympha and deities). In contrast, the epic is communal and public; it tells of actions consequential for society at large, of wars won and kings installed. The Alexandrian poetry book, like the Alexandrian epic, is essentially oppositional in nature, presenting itself as an alternative to traditional epic. This is apparent in the prologue to the Aetia, but especially in Roman poetry books, which typically include an imitation of this famous recusatio of the epic project. And yet the poetry book shares some literary conventions with epic, such as the invocation to the Muse, divine epiphanies, and the artful presence of the poet, which, as Krevans explains, "signal that the poetic book is to be regarded in some way as equivalent to an epic. In fact, the poetic book is better than an epic, as Callimachus is at pains to point out....the most noticeable feature of these opening poems [of poetry books] is their intense preoccupation with genre" (11).

It is apparent from the evidence that to Theocritus and his contemporaries, and

---

64 For discussion of the literary implications of the Aetia Prologue see Dee Lesser Clayman, "The Origin of Greek Literary Criticism and the Aetia Prologue," Wiener Studien 90 (1977) 27-34.
65 For example, Eclogue 6.1-6. For discussion of the Callimachean recusatio in Roman poetry books see Krevans 432. The recusatio is a staple of Alexandrian poetry which is also common in modernist poetry. For example, as early as 1920 an anonymous reviewer writing on the "new poets" (shades of neoterici!) states, "Often they seem in their poetry to be telling us merely how they refuse to write poems and not how they wish to write them." He cites Eliot as an extreme example of this, for his "cleverness, which is also extreme, expresses itself almost entirely in rejections; his verse is full of derisive reminiscences of poets who have wearied him." See T.S. Eliot: The Critical Heritage, Ed. Michael Grant, vol. 1, London: Routledge, 1982: 106.
to the ancient Romans, Theocritus' poems in dactylic hexameter belonged to the genre of epic. So, too, to his contemporaries, Virgil's Eclogues were epic poems, if a distinctive kind of epic. It is important for the modern critic to keep in mind that bucolic and pastoral were not genres in antiquity. The bucolic poetry of Theocritus and his followers, Halperin advises:

does not possess an autonomous identity or definition. It is part of the genre of epos and is able to distinguish itself only in the context of the epic tradition as a whole through a delicate interplay of similarities and differences. It owes its genesis to a reaction against preexisting literary formulas, and its own identity is accordingly shaped and determined by the characteristics of the traditional epos in response to which it arose. The bucolic epos is therefore defined by opposition. (249)

The term bucolic, as it is used by Theocritus in his poetry and later by the Romans, is descriptive rather than generic. Thus Quintilian (Institutio Oratoria 10.1.55) and Longinus (De Sublimitate 33.4-5) see bucolic as a subspecies of epic. The descriptive nature of the term bucolic is further evident in Horace's Satires (written before the publication of the Georgics and the Aeneid) when he classifies Virgil's Eclogues as a kind of epic:

...forte epos acer

---

66 As Halperin notes, "The criteria which contemporary critics use today to identify works of pastoral literature in all times and places were simply not perceived in antiquity as constituting a basis for literary groupings" (15). For discussion of bucolic and pastoral and how they evolved, see Halperin, passim.
ut nemo Varius ducit, molle atque facetum
Vergilio adnuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae,
hoc erat experto frustra Varrone Atacino
atque quibusdam aliis melius quod
scribere possem inventori minor...

(Satire 1.10.43-48)

Varius brave as no one else commands the strong epic; to Virgil the
Camenae who delight in the country have granted the delicate yet witty
epic; this epic [i.e., the Satires, written in dactylic hexameter] tried in vain
by Varro of Atax and some others, was what I could write best, though
less than its founder...68

Horace describes Virgil’s form of epic as molle and facetum. Molle was a
programmatic word for the Romans which was associated with Alexandrian poetics in
the rejection of grand epic subject matter--harsh wars--for the soft, the gentle, the
amatory. For example, in his recusatio of the epic project, Propertius, the self-styled
Roman Callimachus, writes:

Quaeritis, unde mihi totiens scribentur amores,
unde meus veniat mollis in ora liber.

(2.1.1-2)

Or, as Pound translated this passage in his Homage to Sextus Propertius V.2:

Yet you ask on what account I write so many love-lyrics

---

68 The translation is from John Van Sickle, “Epic and Bucolic” QUCC 19 (1975) 51 and n. 28.
And whence this soft book comes into my mouth

The word *facetum* stands out also. It means “displaying cleverness of judgment, clever, adept” and is used of writers and their works; it also may mean “gently humourous, whimsical.” Quintilian was particularly struck by Horace’s application of this adjective to Virgil’s *epos* and explains that, here, the term does not mean “humourous” but rather denotes a style that is graceful, polished and elegant: “Decoris hanc magis et excultae cuiusdam elegantiae appellationem puto.” *Facetum*, then, may convey elements of poetic programme. Further, since its connotations are very similar to those of *tenuis*, it, too, may serve as a translation for Callimachus’ *leptos*. *Facetum*, with its connotations of wit and whimsy, is suggestive also of one of Catullus’ terms for the Alexandrian style in its neoteric incarnation: *venustas*, “charm, attractiveness (of style, presentation, etc.).”

Horace certainly was familiar with the works of the neoteries and with Callimachean poetic principles, whether or not he would have agreed with or followed them. In his use of the programmatic words *molle* and *facetum*, Horace may be indicating that he saw Virgil’s *Bucolics* as a distinctly Alexandrian-style *epos*. So Van Sickle, taking Horace’s contrast of the *acer* or “harsh” *epos* of Varius with the *molle* “soft” and *facetum* “witty” one of Virgil, concludes that Horace “perceives the *Bucolics* as a form of *epos*, Hesiodic rather than Homeric, following the Alexandrian dualism.”

---

69 OLD s.v. *facetum* 1 and 2.  
70 *Institutio Oratoria* 6.3.19-20.  
71 OLD s.v. *venustas* 3.  
72 P. Michael Brown believes that Horace “would not have sympathised with the Alexandrian attitude of ‘Art for art’s sake’ and their denial of any moral purpose to literature” but suspects that Horace “cannot have objected to the personal, subjective aspect of their poetry, still less, given the Callimachean ideal implied at 4.11, to their concern for formal perfection” (185). For more on Horace and Alexandrian poetics see J.K. Newman, *Augustus and the New Poetry* 270-365.  
In his analysis of this passage in the *Satires* 1.10, Van Sickle explains that there existed within the tradition of *epos* a three part hierarchy of poetics--pascua, rura, duces--which roughly (and perhaps only incidentally) corresponds to Virgil's three works: the *Bucolics*, the *Georgics*, and the *Aeneid* (*Design* 102). While we are used to equating Virgil's three works to three separate genres--pastoral, didactic, and epic--each mode belonged, in fact, to the epic genre. The difference lay in its place on the epic hierarchy, with pascua (pastoral or bucolic epic) at the bottom and duces (heroic epic) at the top (Van Sickle, *Design* 102). While Virgil may have made a conscious decision to work in each of the three modes, working his way up the hierarchy over the course of his career, Van Sickle notes that he

would hardly have thought of the bucolic, georgic, and heroic as distinct genres since all were written in the dactylic hexameter and were classed as a single genre by the criterion of metrical form: a criterion implicit in the practice of a poet like Theocritus and articulated already by Alexandrian critics, whose approach still appears in Quintilian.... If Quintilian provides evidence of the metrical criterion for genre in Alexandrian criticism and its persistence well beyond Virgil's time, Horace shows its presence in Rome in Virgil's own circle, indeed applied to Virgil's work. (*Design* 112-113)

To Virgil, to Theocritus, to their ancient readers and critics, bucolic poetry was a mode of epic, thus the *Bucolics* and the *Idylls* were books of epic poetry. But is a book of epic poems itself an epic? As we have seen, a poetry book, unlike a poetry collection, must be viewed as a unified whole and not merely as a series of separate, though
perhaps related, poems. If the parts that comprise the whole are epic, is the whole epic also? Does each separate poem which comprises the poetry book function as a sort of mini-chapter? The form of the poetry book does encourage the first-time reader to read the book sequentially as one reads an epic or a novel (the epic's modern equivalent). If instead the reader browses at random, as one does in a poetry collection, the poetic effects carefully created by means of aggregation, arrangement, and juxtaposition are lost. Indeed, to get the full impact of these effects and extract the book’s meaning one must read in sequence and then re-read (and often more than once).

The evidence presented thus far suggests that we are to view the poetry book as a sort of epic or a novel. The evidence is further underscored by Longinus' use of *Bucolica* ("cow-herding," sc. poems) as a title equivalent to Apollonius of Rhodes’ *Argonautica* (sc. poem, “of the Argonauts”) and the *Iliad* (sc. poem, “of Ilium”) and the *Odyssey* (sc. poem, “of Odysseus”), for as noted, *Bucolica* could not have been used as a generic description. The ancient critics Longinus and Horace took for granted that Theocritus' *Bucolica* and Virgil's *Bucolics* were of the same genus as traditional epic and could be profitably compared to them, without any explanation or justification. And yet this concept, that Theocritus' *Bucolica* and Virgil’s *Bucolics* on the one hand and Homer’s *Iliad* on the other are somehow the same is a radical one for many later critics, often too radical to accept. One wonders if this discomfort on the part of critics led to the change of titles from *Bucolica* to *Idylls* and from *Bucolics* to *Eclogues*. The original titles describe the poetry books’ primary (or most distinctive) subject matter. In doing so, they function in the same manner as the titles of traditional epics: they tell what the pieces of the book have in common and so serve to unify the book. The titles--the *Idylls* and the *Eclogues*--which were to supersede them, on the other hand, emphasize the separate elements, the fragments, and so serve to shatter unity. In
effect, the new titles advertise the poetry books as poetry collections, for *Idylls* means "Selections" or "Specimens" and *Eclogues* is a Latin equivalent for it meaning "Selections" or "Pieces." One suspects that the new title *Eclogues* or "Selections" was created by critics on analogy with *Idylls* or "Selections," a title which was also created by critics. Ironically, the critics may have unwittingly mimicked Virgil's own strategy, for it appears that Virgil created the title for his poetry book, *Bucolics*, on analogy with Theocritus' title *Bucolica*. Thus it is likely that both the original title and the later one for Virgil's poetry book were created on analogy with the titles given Theocritus' book. There is however an important distinction: in both cases, the poets chose a title which emphasizes the unity—the epic quality—of the poetry book, while critics have changed the title to privilege the status of the individual poems over the whole and thus to reject implicitly the epic affiliation signalled by the original title. Where the original titles promote the poetry books as a variation of traditional epic, the new titles remove the generic signal and promote the books as poetry collections instead.

While metre and title signal the poetry book's strong generic tie with traditional epic, both Theocritus and Virgil make programmatic statements which more specifically affiliate their books with Callimachean poetics and thus, by implication, with an anti-epic (specifically, an anti-Homeric-epic) stance. I have discussed *leptos* or *leptotes* as the central concept of Callimachus' poetic manifesto. It is the principle of *leptotes*, the fineness, clarity, precision, and subtlety of the exacting poetic craftsman,

---

74 Guy Lee suggests that the term *eclogae* may have arisen from the "grammarians' habit of referring to *Piece* 1, *Piece* 2, etc., the meaning of the Greek word *eklōge* being 'extract, piece'" (14 n. 4).
75 As discussed, we do not actually know what title Theocritus gave the work, although the evidence presents a good case for *Bucolica*. At any rate, the work was known as *Bucolica* in Virgil's time and it is reasonable to suppose Virgil thought this was what Theocritus called it.
76 In the case of Virgil, some critics have attempted to reconcile the issue by inventing a false etymology for the word *ecloga* which affiliates it more closely with *bucolic* (cow-herding): *Aig-loga* or "goat-talk" (Guy Lee 14 n. 4).
that followers typically invoke to declare their allegiance to Callimachus. *Leptotes* as a literary concept appears to have originated with Philetas, the precursor of the Alexandrian poetic movement: it was most likely Philetas’ intellectual subtlety and stylistic “slenderness” that gave rise to the legend that he was himself, like his poetry, so slender (*leptomatos*) that he had to wear lead weights in his boots to prevent being blown away in a strong wind.77 The word *leptos* is used by Alexandrian poets to indicate their poetic affiliation, most cleverly by Aratus in the *Phaenomena*:78

\[
\text{λεπτή μὲν καθαρή τε περὶ τρίτων ἡμαρ ἑοῦσα}
\]

\[
\text{εὐδιὸς κ’ εἰη. λεπτὴ δὲ καὶ εὖ μάλ’ ἑρευθῆς}
\]

\[
\text{πνευματὴ. παχίων δὲ καὶ ἀμβλείγοι κεραίαις}
\]

\[
\text{τέτρατον ἐκ τριτάτοιο φῶς ἀμενηνόν ἔχουσα}
\]

\[
\text{ἡ νότω ἀμβλυνταὶ ἢ ὑπατος ἐγγὺς ἐόντος.}
\]

*(Phaenomena 783-787)*

If she [the moon] is slender and clear about the third day, she heralds calm: if slender and very ruddy, wind; but if thick and with blunted horns she show but a feeble light on the third and fourth night, her beams are blunted by the South wind or imminent rain.

*Lepte* appears in the nominative case at the beginning of sentences at lines 783 and 784; it also occurs as an acrostic in that case down the left-hand margin, with the initial lambda of *lepte* at line 783 forming the first letter of *lepte* both vertically and

77 The word *leptos* and its derivatives may denote a fine, thin body or a fine, subtle wit. The latter connotation appears as early as Euripides. For discussion, see Alan Cameron, “How Thin was Philetas?” *CQ* 41:2 (1991) 534-538.

horizontally. The poetic implications of leptos here are further underscored by the contrast Aratus draws between leptos and pachus at lines 783-785, recalling Callimachus' key critical terms for good and bad poetics in the Aetia Prologue: the slender (leptos) and the fat (pachus). Kathare (pure) at 783 also resonates of poetic programme. Apollo twice gives direct instructions to the poet in Callimachus, in the Aetia Prologue, and also in the Hymn to Apollo. There, Apollo urges the poet to reject the wide (mega) waters of the Assyrian river with all its filth for the pure (kathare) and undefiled fountain (Hymn 2.111). This has been viewed as a metaphorical rejection of grand epic for the Callimachean fine-drawn style, a rejection of the mega style for the pure (kathare), refined (leptos) style. The poetic connotations of the pure fountain are clear to the Roman Callimacheans who took this as a symbol for the Alexandrian style. For example, Propertius' poetic manifesto in Book 3.1 begins:

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae,

in vestrum, quae so, me sinite ire nemus.
primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos
Itala per Graios orgia ferre choros.

(3.1.1-4)

Shade of Callimachus and rites of Coan Philitas, suffer me, I pray, to come into your grove. I am the first to enter priest from an unsullied spring bringing Italy's mystic emblems in dances of Greece.

79 For an excellent discussion of this and other acrostics, see William Levitan "Plexed Artistry: Aratean Acrostics," Glyph 5 (1979) 55-68.
Poetics are also symbolized as water in Propertius 3.3.5 where Apollo prevents the poet from drinking of the potent epic spring and at 3.3.51ff where the Muse Calliope effectively "baptizes" Propertius as an Alexandrian poet by brushing his lips with waters Philitas once drank (Conte 110).

The practice of affiliating one's work with the Callimachean poetic programme begins in the third century B.C. with Callimachus' inner circle.\textsuperscript{81} While Aratus' \textit{Phaenomena} depends on Hesiod (particularly on the \textit{Works and Days}) for its vocabulary and manner, it is a decidedly Hellenistic effort, displaying its allegiance to the Callimachean style. For example, in Aratus' play with genre, one can view the \textit{Phaenomena} as a typical Hellenistic experiment; as Hopkinson puts it, "an attempt to revive and update Hesiodic verse."\textsuperscript{82} The \textit{Phaenomena} shares in the Alexandrian poetic project of taking on literary tradition and making it new. Aratus' reputation as a distinctly Alexandrian poet--a \textit{leptos} poet--is evident further from the title given his collection of poems: \textit{Ta Kata Lepton}, roughly, "Things Written in the \textit{Leptos} Manner," a title which inspired the one given to the miscellaneous collection of poems attributed to Virgil, the \textit{Catalepton}.\textsuperscript{83} Further, Aratus was praised by Callimachus for his mastery of the \textit{leptos} style--specifically, his \textit{leptai rheseis}, or "slender verses"--in the \textit{Phaenomena}. As Callimachus writes in epigram 29 (Pf. 27):

\begin{quote}
'\νοιὸδου τὸ τ᾽ ἄεισμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος, οὐ τὸν ἀοίδῳν

ἐφασαν. ἀλλ οἶκνε φή τὸ μελιχρότατον

τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο. χαῖρετε λεπταί
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{81} It is not known if Callimachus was the first of his contemporaries to call for a \textit{leptos} poetics, but it seems reasonable to suppose so given that he is the only one of them to issue an explicit poetic manifesto (\textit{Aetia} Prologue and \textit{Hymn to Apollo}). Certainly, the Romans took him to be the father of the Alexandrian poetic movement.


Hesiod's is the theme and Hesiod's the manner. I misdoubt that not to the utter end but only the most honeysweet of his verses has the poet of Soli copied. Hail subtle discourses, the earnest vigil of Aratus.

It should come as no surprise that Theocritus, like his contemporaries Aratus and Callimachus, frequently invokes the principle of leptotes in the Idyls. The word occurs nine times and in nine different poems in its verbal and adjectival forms. Just as bucolic poetry is figured as cows, just as poetry in the "thin" leptos style is figured as the product of a skinny poet, so in Theocritus' Idyls the abstract poetic concept of leptos is rendered in physical terms. For example, the Cyclops Polyphemus, as he tries to woo his beloved by singing his love (in a poor attempt at Alexandrian poetry) represents himself as growing thinner (leptunonta 11.69) every day like a master of leptos verse (specifically, like Philetas in the legend). Much of the humour in Idyll 11 arises from the ineptitude of the Cyclops' song, unwitting on Polyphemus' part, but deliberate on Theocritus'. The object of the parody is not Alexandrian poetics, but bad (monstrous?) poets. Note also how Theocritus employs a rare fifth foot spondee to emphasize the word leptunonta, a word which is also remarkable because it takes the intransitive form (elsewhere in Greek literature it is found only in transitive form): "though she sees me growing thinner day by day" (11.69).

---

84 Leptotes is the noun relating to the adjective leptos.
86 Naive critics, noting the metrical roughness and overall clumsiness of Idyll 11 have assumed these were the product of Theocritus' own (relative) incompetence and so have judged Idyll 11 to be an early poem, its "mistakes" bred of the poet's inexperience. To the contrary, these infelicities are a deliberate attempt to characterize the grotesque Cyclops as a typically self-deluded poetaeter. A good indication of this is that these infelicities do not occur throughout the poem, but are carefully restricted to the song of Polyphemus (Gow 209).
Similarly, in Idyll 14.3, Aeschines, another sufferer from unrequited love, is described as *leptos*. Ironically, he is compared to a Pythagorean (14.5), one of those philosophers notorious for their pallor (from studying indoors all day), who went about barefoot and dishevelled as a gesture of their contempt for worldly goods and concerns. As we learn at 14.8, Aeschines is not a follower of Pythagoras, but of Cynisca, whose name might be translated as "little Cynic." Thus Aeschines pursues philosophy of a different sort: not Pythagoreanism but Cynicism in the guise of a girl, a move which perhaps inspired Propertius 2.4, "ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit," or as Pound translates "My genius is no more than a girl" ("Homage to Sextus Propertius" V.2).

There is yet another instance—an especially comic one—in the *Idylls* of a pining "lover" who grows *leptos* with longing for the absent beloved. In Idyll 4, Corydon explains to Battus that the herd is downhearted because they miss their master. Here, Theocritus uses *potheunti* ("longing," 4.12), a word that signifies erotic longing in particular. Further, like any respectable lover, the herd refuses to eat (4.14); indeed, one of the calves is described as wasted to skin and bones, prompting Battus to ask if she lives on dew like the cicada (4.16). The thin song of the cicada was especially admired by the Alexandrians and was held up as an appropriate response to the booming thunder of epic. As Callimachus states in the *Aetia* Prologue: "Let others bray just like the long-eared brute, but let me be the dainty, the winged one. Oh, yes indeed! that I may sing living on dew-drops, free sustenance from the divine air" (fr. 1.31-34). So Theocritus, recalling this passage in Callimachus, figures the slender, love-sick calf as an appropriate subject for an Alexandrian poet: in contrast to the martial blares of traditional epic, she is as thin and tuneful as the Alexandrian verse which depicts her.

---

87 The name also means "little bitch." It is the diminutive form of *Kunna*, *dog* or *bitch,* which was a common name for prostitutes. Theocritus likely chose the name with a view also to her profession—for at 14.21 it is apparent that she is a *hetaira* (Gow 249).
That this reference is intended to evoke Theocritus' poetic programme is further supported by the description of the bull—who also pines for the master—as leptos at 4.20.

Elsewhere in the Idylls, leptos is associated with lovers, thus recalling the Alexandrians' preference for love over war, the domestic over the public sphere, as subjects for poetry. For example, it is used of the wreath which the goatherd wears for his darling Amaryllis when, scorned again, he threatens to tear it into little pieces (lepta, 3.21); of the tapestries at the Adonia which depict the doomed lovers Adonis and Aphrodite (15.79); and of the coy glance which a soon-to-be-beloved boy tosses at his lover (30.7). Poetic connotations are evident at 16.97 where the leptos webs which the spider weaves upon the armour suits in peacetime may be seen as a symbol for the victory of peace over war, or private life over public, and of the leptos erotic poet over the poet of grand martial epic. Weaving, in antiquity, is a frequent metaphor for the poet's craft as well as a symbol for the domestic sphere, associated as it is with the home and with the lives and work of women.88 Finally, at 25.155, when Herakles and Phyleus make their way to town, they do so via a narrow path (lepen...tribon) which recalls the unworn path (keleuthous atriptous), narrow though it be (steinoteren), to which Apollo directs his protégé Callimachus in the Aetia Prologue (27-28).89

Taking his cue from Aratus and Theocritus, Virgil uses tenuis, the Latin translation of leptos, to signal his poetic allegiance to Callimachus in the Eclogues.90

---

88 For discussion of weaving as a metaphor for poetic composition in Eclogue 10 and Idyll 1, see Alpers, "Theocritean Bucolics and Virgilian Pastoral," Arethusa 23.1 (Spring 1990) 22-23.

89 There is one additional occurrence of leptos in the Idylls at 5.95 which may function as a subtle signal of poetic alliance, but appears to function primarily as a false etymology: the holm oak's acorns (lepurion) are said to have a thin (leptos) rind.

The word occurs twice in the book and in the two most important sections of any book (programmatically speaking)—at its very beginning and at its centre. The Eclogue book begins with Tityrus, a figure for the poet Virgil, playing his bucolic song on a slender oat:

\[\text{Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi} \]
\[\text{silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena} \]
\[\text{(1.1-2)} \]
\[\text{Tityrus, lying back beneath wide beechen cover,} \]
\[\text{You meditate the woodland Muse on slender oat} \]

In his analysis, Tracy suggests that the passage alludes, by *tenuis*, not only to Callimachus’ concept of the *leptos* style in poetry, but also in the hyperbaton *silvestrem...Musam* directly to Callimachus’ *Mousan...leptaleen* (slender Muse, *Aetia* fr. 1.24).\(^{92}\) Further, Virgil invokes the founder of the Alexandrian poetic movement via Catullus, who represents the movement’s first Latin incarnation. Tracy explains that the interlocking word order of 1.2—two adjectives followed by the two nouns which govern them—is just as programmatic as Virgil’s use of *tenuis*, for in Catullus 64 (a long mythic narrative in dactylic hexameter), Catullus “gave currency to this word order by using it on the average once in every seven verses and made it a hallmark of the Callimachean style in Latin poetry.”\(^{93}\) This double invocation of Callimachus, first directly and then through his Latin successor, in the same line at the beginning of the

---

\(^{91}\) While the song, strictly speaking, is not identified as “bucolic,” but “woodland,” *sîva* in the *Eclogues* is particularly associated by Virgil with bucolic poetry (Clausen xxvi).


\(^{93}\) Tracy 54, see n. 7 for bibliography. Tracy sees Virgil’s use of *otium* (1.6) and *ludere* (1.10) as additional allusions to Catullus (poem 50) which constitute Virgil’s poetic nod to a fellow neoteric.
book marks the *Eclogues* as distinctly Callimachean.

The full implication of Eclogue 1.2 for Virgil's poetics is brought home in Eclogue 6, the centrepiece of the book and a poem intimately concerned with poetics. At the beginning of this central poem, Virgil echoes Eclogue 1:

silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena

(1.2)

You meditate the woodland Muse on slender oat

agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam

(6.8)

[now I] Will meditate the rustic Muse on slender reed

As at Eclogue 6.8, Virgil employs Catullan word order--two adjectives followed by their nouns, this time in chiastic order--but reinforces the neoteric order by setting it within a golden line,\(^9^4\) another structural device highly favoured by Callimachus' Roman followers and one considered especially characteristic of Gallus.\(^9^5\) Further, Virgil's marked allusion to the *Aetia* fr. 21-24 is immediately followed by yet another allusion to

---

94 In a golden line, the verb stands in the middle of the line framed by its nouns and adjectives. Adjectives are separated by the verb from the nouns they modify.

95 An important figure in the *Eclogues*, Gallus was a contemporary of Virgil. He is a poet who is often viewed as the "missing link" between Catullus and Propertius in the development of Latin elegy. Unfortunately, Gallus' influence cannot be measured: he fell into disfavour with Augustus who ordered his suicide and the official obliteration of his memory (*damnatio memoriae*), hence his works were destroyed and all mention of him was banned. Until 1978, we had exactly one line of Gallus, a golden line: "uno tellures dividit amne duas." The find at Qasr Ibrim increased the extant corpus of Gallus by ten lines. For discussion of Gallus and his importance, see D.O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1975. For the text of Gallus with detailed commentary, see R.D. Anderson, P.J. Parsons, and R.G.M. Nisbet, "Elegiacs by Gallus from Qasr Ibrim" *GRS* 69 (1979) 125-155.
Callimachus, to fr. 612:96

καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρώτιστον ἐμοὶς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα
goύνασιν. Ἀπόλλων εἶπεν ὃ μοι Λύκιος.
....... ὁιδέ, τὸ μὲν θύος ὅτι πάχιστον
θρέψαι. τὴν Μοῦσαν δ ὡγαθε λεπταλέην.

(Aetia 1.21-24)

For, when I first placed a tablet on my knees, Lycian Apollo said to me:
“.... poet, feed the victim to be as fat as possible but, my friend, keep the
Muse slender.”

ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἄείδω

(fr. 612)

I sing nothing that is not attested

cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthius aurem
vellit et admonuit: “pastorem, Tityre, pinguis,
pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen.”
nunc ego (namque super tibi erunt qui dicere laudes,
Vare, tuas cupiant et tristia condere bella)
agrestem tenui meditabor harundine Musam:
non iniussa cano....

(6.3-8)

When I was singing kings and battles, Cynthius pulled

96 Callimachus fr. 612 has been viewed as a statement of poetic authority garnered through the poet's
mastery of the tradition and the origin of the topos of the Alexandrian footnote. As Trypanis notes, the
fragment is "One more proof of the 'erudite' nature of Callimachean poetry" (271).
My ear in admonition: “A shepherd, Tityrus,
Should feed his flock fat, but recite a thin-spun song.”
I now (for you'll have many eager to recite
Your praises, Varus, and compose unhappy wars)
Will mediate the rustic Muse on slender reed.
I sing to order...

These allusions to Callimachus in Eclogue 6 imply, as Clausen states, that Virgil’s
bucolic poetry “though ostensibly Theocritean, is essentially Callimachean” (175).

In conclusion, Theocritus’ and Virgil’s creation of a close relationship between
the poetry book and the epic genre is set in decidedly Callimachean terms as
indicated by the evocation of Callimachean poetic principles like *leptotes* and
Callimachus’ poetic manifesto in the *Aetia* Prologue. Like the *Hecale*, like the
*Metamorphoses*, the *Idylls* and the *Eclogues* fuse epic and lyric to make something
utterly new: a counter-genre, epic in form, but anti-epic in its implications.
Chapter 4

Unity Within the Poetry Book

The Traditions of Epic Unity

As discussed in Chapter 2, there are two traditions of epic: the Homeric, and the Hesiodic which evolves over time into the Alexandrian epic. Both forms of epic possess epic unity ("epic" inasmuch as it occurs in an epic), but the type of unity in each form differs substantially. The unity typical of the traditional Homeric style of epic is organic, by which I mean it occurs naturally as a primary consequence of the systemic connection of the parts within the whole. Organic unity arises naturally from the author's focus on a single action: description of the action itself, of the people involved in it, and of the consequences that arise from it.1 As Aristotle describes it, this central action has a beginning, a middle and an end, all of which are, ideally, capable of comprehension in a single view, with all the parts in proper proportion to the whole (Poetics 50b.22-39, 51a.1-15). Unity is the natural consequence of the fact that everything within the poem has a single origin and a single object, for example, in the Odyssey, Odysseus' homecoming; in the Divine Comedy, the salvation of Dante's soul; in Paradise Lost, the fall of man.

While the Poetics have often been viewed as the origin for the conception of the three unities of action, time, and space, in fact only the idea of unity of action can be ascribed to Aristotle.2 Even so, the unities of time and space are implicit in Aristotle's view: the concept of beginning-middle-end implies temporal progression and a

---

1 I use the term "single action" in Aristotle's sense to refer to the central plot. "Single action" does not mean that only one thing happens. See Aristotle, Poetics 51a.16-37.
predominantly linear approach to it. Further, unity of space is implicit in Aristotle's conception of proportionate length—that the whole must be comprehensible at a glance—which is elucidated by a spatial metaphor: the text is compared to a living creature, which, if excessively large "cannot all be perceived at once and so its unity and wholeness are lost" (Poetics 51a.50).

The form of unity characteristic of the Alexandrian epic and the Alexandrian poetry book (which, as we have seen in Chapter 3, is a form of epic) is essentially mechanistic: it is not innate; it does not arise naturally within the poem. Rather, it is the result of the poet's attempt to create associative links between things that are not linked by nature, that are perhaps even inherently dissimilar. Despite the Alexandrians' defiance of organic unity and linear movement, chaos does not reign: order is imposed by the careful comparisons implicit in the associative technique that says always, this is somehow like that; this must be measured, modified, or defined by that. The text constantly directs the reader to find the unity deep below disjunctive surfaces. Mechanistic unity, in place of the unities of action, time, and space, substitutes a powerful linguistic, thematic, and musical unity which is effected through repetition of words, thematic elements (Pound's subject-rhyme), or the musical phrase.

In organic unity, there is a natural or inherent connection between the several parts of the whole. In mechanistic unity, there is an unnatural (even perverse) connection between all the parts of the whole which is deliberately crafted by the author. The effect remains the same: regardless of how the connections are made—organically or mechanistically—they are still there within the text, and if we agree that it is the connections between all the parts of the whole that result in unity, and not how

---

3 As Else notes, the Renaissance concept of "unity of time" is based on a misunderstanding of Poetics 49b.12 (89). Aristotle did not suggest that the events depicted in a tragedy should occur in the course of one day, but that the play itself should last no more than one day. The reference in Aristotle is to the length of the performance. Gerald F. Else, trans., Aristotle. Poetics, Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1970. Unless otherwise stated, translations quoted are from Else.
those connections are forged, then it is clear that the Alexandrian epic, and, as I shall illustrate, the Alexandrian poetry book, do possess a form of unity as valid and compelling as that found in traditional epic poems. An analysis that concludes that Alexandrian epics are not unified merely because they do not possess unity in the Homeric sense must be invalid, just as it is wrong to conclude that an Alexandrian epic is not a "real" epic simply because it does not conform to the Homeric standard: it does not, and that is the point. It offers an alternative to that standard, one substantially different, yet somehow of the same kind.

In the Alexandrian poetry book, the subversion of traditional unity is especially marked: there is no single action, no beginning, middle and end; the integrity of time and place, and even character--like the integrity of genre and level of diction--is constantly violated. Ironically, the various inconsistencies may result in a very real, overall consistency, and this consistency helps to effect unity: if everything, at every single level of the work, is constantly called into question, then all the elements of the whole are united in their fundamental instability. So, too, Fabiano, refuting Rosenmeyer's contention that the most distinctive aspect of the bucolic genre in Theocritus is the absence of unity, notes: "I am inclined to think that variation of the level of style, which appears not only in the pastoral but in almost every idyll, is one of the main agents of poetic unification" (536).

Each of the three poets under examination deliberately subverts traditional epic unity to some degree, Virgil most markedly and Eliot least so. This is probably because Eliot, unlike Theocritus and Virgil, was not consciously working in opposition to the epic tradition; indeed, he had no reason to see Prufrock as belonging to that tradition at all: he was not writing in a metre reserved for the epic genre nor was genre necessarily determined by metre at that time in history. This does not alter the fact that
Eliot did create epic unity throughout the book, employing the same associative technique as Theocritus and Virgil to do so. Eliot’s project differed from theirs: his was not to revitalize the epic genre by creating a new form of epic—the poetry book—but to revitalize the genre of the poetry collection by adding to it epic unity, using techniques learned from Virgil (and which Virgil had learned from Theocritus). Because of this, Eliot was not concerned with subverting the readers’ expectations of epic and attacking the tired conventions of that genre. Instead, he was improving upon another old genre, the poetry collection. Either way, the result is the same: a poetry book imbued with shades of epic and possessing mechanistic unity; a poetry book with a strong relationship to epic.

T.S. Eliot is notorious for ignoring temporal and spatial unities. As Foster notes, he treats “time and distance contemptuously, as if they were random accidents.” Foster uses a fine example of this, citing the first 30 lines of “Fire Sermon” and identifying its concentrated allusions to Spenser’s “Prothalamion,” Psalm 137, Marvell’s “To His Coy Mistress,” Ezekiel’s “dry bones,” the Fisher King, The Tempest, Day’s “Parliament of Bees,” a ballad from Australia, Sweeney, a foot-washing ritual, and Verlaine’s “Parsifal” (87). As Foster explains, all of these historical elements “are brought into such proximity that the time-lapse between them often gives the illusion of being zero” (88). In Prufrock, most of the twelve poems in the book appear to be set in a big city, perhaps—if it is always the same city (and this is not clear)—an American one, as suggested by the first line in “Mr. Apollinax” (“When Mr. Apollinax visited the United States”). Boston is named once (“The ‘Boston Evening Transcript’”) and the rural hills of New England in “Cousin Nancy,” but most of the poems could just as well be set in New York City or London. The many topical references (e.g., to style of dress

---

and social conventions) set *Prufrock* firmly in Eliot's own time, the early twentieth century. Wherever it is, it is a modern and mannered city. The majority of poems take place in the evening or the afternoon, but there is no sense of temporal progression in the book.\(^5\) We do not move from morning to night, or dusk to dawn, but switch back and forth at apparent random. Nor is there any seasonal progression: "Prufrock" takes place in October (21), "Portrait" moves from December (1), to April (52) and then October (84), and "Preludes" is in winter (1). Other than the consistent narrative voice of the poet (itself an important unifying device), characters do not recur from poem to poem. Character types, however, do: for example, the timid, sexually repressed man tormented by desires he cannot express, and the aggressive, sexually expressive (or potentially so) woman, superficial and destructive, yet strangely indifferent in her cruelty. Nor does Eliot paint a single action, but rather a constant inaction. There is no character development, no narrative progression in the book. Indeed, there is no overriding narrative to be constructed at all. Instead, there is a development of themes and images.

There are indications that Theocritus, like Virgil and Eliot after him, consciously played with the unities of time, space, action, and character, but the matter is complicated by the instability of the manuscript tradition: one cannot judge narrative progression and character development without knowing how the author ordered the poems. Looking at the poems individually, the evidence indicates that Theocritus deliberately subverted the notion of linear time and the unity of what one might call "modes of being." For example, real people, fictional characters, legendary figures, mythical figures, and gods belong to different modes of being. Both mythical figures

and gods belong to a time long past; legendary figures are likely from a time somewhat less remote than the mythical; fictional characters, like real people, may be past, present, or future; however, fictional characters set in an ideal setting are likely to function as representatives of the long lost Golden Age and thus belong to past time. In a work where the unities of time and mode of being are closely observed, one would find the characters drawn from the same time and kind: for example, mythical figures would consort with their like in a mythical landscape; fictional characters would interact with their like in a fictional world. If the demands of the narrative require characters from different realms to merge, for example, when gods and humans meet in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, it is presented as remarkable—such meetings are the exception that prove the rule. One does not expect to find characters belonging to the present day in casual interaction with those of the past, or real people to intrude on fictional and/or mythical characters. Yet this is what one finds in Theocritus as fictional characters in an ideal (and thus past) setting mouth the names of real contemporary poets (7.40, 98); and as fictional country folk sport with nymphs (7.154) and keep company with local legends like Daphnis (7.73). Logically, what could the fictional Lycidas and Simichidas know of real men like Philetas and Aratus?6

Similarly, in Eclogue 6 Virgil depicts the legendary Silenus singing of divine and mythical figures such as Prometheus and Pasiphae, and among them, he sets Gallus, his friend and fellow poet.7 Thus, we are presented with a real, contemporary Roman poet in a fictional landscape.8 In this eclogue, and in the *Eclogues* in general,

---

6 Much scholarship has been devoted to discovering the real people hiding behind the fictional personae of *Idyll* 7. One of the best and more interesting is Nita Krevans, "Geography and the Literary Tradition in Theocritus 7," *TAPA* 113 (1983) 201-220. For *Idyll* 7 in general, see S.A. Hatzikosta, *A Stylistic Commentary on Theocritus' Idyls VII*, Classical and Byzantine Monographs 9 (Amsterdam, 1982).

7 Sileni are similar to satyrs. They are unknown to Theocritus’ poetry (Clausen 175, n. 5 and 6 for bibliography).

8 Gallus also plays a part in Eclogue 10, where his status as a contemporary Roman is especially highlighted.
there is an astonishing collision of worlds—mythical, legendary, fictional, and real (both historical and contemporary). Let us consider the relevant passage in Eclogue 6 in some detail:

tum canit, errantem Permessi ad flumina Gallum
Aonias in montis ut duxerat una sororum,
utque viro Phoebi chorus adsurrexerit omnis;
ut Linus haec illi divino carmine pastor
floribus atque apio crinis ornatus amaro
dixerit: "hos tibi dant calamos (en accipe) Musae,
Ascreao quos ante seni, quibus ille solebat
cantando rigidas deducere montibus ornos.
his tibi Grynei nemoris dicatur origo,
ne quis sit lucus quo se plus iactet Apollo."

(64-73)

Then [Silenus] sings of Gallus wandering by Permessus’ stream,
How one of the Sisters led him to Aonia’s mountains,
And how all Phoebus’ choir stood up to greet a man;
How Linus there, the shepherd of inspired song,
His locks adorned with flowers and bitter celery,
Told him: “The Muses give you this reed pipe (there, take it)
Which once they gave the old Ascrean,9 whose melody
Could draw the stubborn rowans down the mountainside.
Tell you with this the origin of Grynia’s grove,
Lest any sacred wood be more Apollo’s pride.”

9 The “old Ascrean” is Hesiod.
Gallus is initiated as a poet by the divine Muses and the legendary singer Linus who gives him the pipe of the historical poet Hesiod. Thus Virgil presents an example of poetic excellence in each of four realms: the divine (and thus also mythical), the legendary, the historical, and the contemporary. Further, Virgil calls attention to the oddity of a real living man keeping such company at line 66 where Gallus’ mortal status is stressed (*viro*), and then highlighted by the juxtaposition of the name of a god, *viro Phoebi* (Clausen 202).

Sileni are legendary figures which properly belong in the past. Yet Gallus is known to the Silenus as a figure of song, thus the time period in which the Silenus episode occurs must be the present in which Gallus lives. On the other hand, if one supposes that Gallus has himself become the stuff of legend by the time Silenus sings him, then perhaps the episode is set in a far off future, long after Gallus’ death (for few become legends in their own time). By fusing past and present (or future and present), Virgil implicitly asks the reader to imagine that these strange creatures—sileni and nymphs like Aegle—are not the fancies of a bygone day but actually frolic in the woods round Rome in Virgil’s own time, or will in a distant future. Virgil deliberately blurs the boundaries of the fictional and the actual by actualizing the fictional (setting the Silenus in the real world and in contemporary times) and by fictionalizing the actual (making Gallus the subject of a legendary song in a fictional work). While there are traces of this sort of conflation of worlds and times in Theocritus (e.g., Idyll 7), there is nothing approaching the complexity and sophistication found in Virgil. As Mack notes, “nobody, prior to Virgil, seriously shows men of the present in close contact, and on an equal footing, with divine beings.”

Further, Virgil’s “preoccupation with historical and fictional time is new in literature, his treatment of it is equally novel and striking. He

---

sustains no single temporal viewpoint in his works; he blends and shuffles times into elusive and changing patterns” (Mack 4). Sometimes time is linear, sometimes “almost circular” like a wheel in which “past and present merge and blur” (Mack 4).

Scholars have attempted to plot linear narrative and character development throughout the *Eclogues*. The intellectual contortions required to accomplish this lead to rather dubious results. For example, in order to prove her thesis that there is linear character development in the *Eclogues*, Hahn re-orders the poems according to the order in which they were supposedly written.11 Discarding Virgil's careful arrangement of the poems, Hahn decides that the “proper” order of the poems is Eclogue 2, 3, 7, 8, 5, 9, 6, 1, 4, and 10. She then traces linear development in this new chronology, a chronology which is essentially the product of her own invention. This is akin to re-ordering the chapters of a novel so as to prove one's hypothesis that a character or plot develops in a particular way because the order the author chose does not allow for it.12 Even if it were possible to determine when each eclogue was written, it simply would not matter: it is irrelevant what order the poems were written in, what matters is the order Virgil published them in, for it is this which tells us how he expected them to be read. If there ever was any linear progression in the poems, Virgil was careful to remove it from the finished book.

One of the reasons scholars are tempted to construct such fallacious arguments for narrative progression and character development is that Virgil uses many of the same character names in different poems. The fact that there is a Daphnis in six different eclogues (2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9) and an Amaryllis in five (1, 2, 3, 8, and 9) invites

---

11 E. Adelaide Hahn, “The Characters of the *Eclogues*,” *TAPA* 75 (1944) 196-241. The date of composition for the various eclogues is itself highly speculative.

12 So, too, John Van Sickle (“Reading” 594 n. 51) criticizes Eleanor Winsor Leach in her *Vergil's Eclogues. Landscapes of Experience*, Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1974, because she “treats the eclogues out of Virgil’s order, regrouping them by theme and presentational mode.”
the expectation that each Daphnis, each Amaryllis, is the same one, and that it might be possible to follow their fates chronologically throughout the book. One is inevitably disappointed; characters with the same names are simply not consistent; indeed, they are deliberately inconsistent.\textsuperscript{13} As Jenkyns explains:

The \textit{Eclogues} shun consistency, evading our attempts to pin them down. The Tityrus of Eclogue 1 is not the Tityrus of Eclogue 6...and neither is the same as the Tityrus mentioned in Eclogue 8; the Corydon of Eclogue 2 is not the Corydon of Eclogue 7; the Daphnis of 7 seems to be a different sort of figure from the divinized Daphnis of 5. (38)

Snell, in a landmark article,\textsuperscript{14} notes the inconsistency of the Daphnis figure, “he is the mythical shepherd in 2.26, a common herdsman in 7.1 and 9.46. In Eclogue 5 he is both” (i.e., both the herdsman friend of Mopsus and Menalcas and the divinized mythic figure of whom they sing). Thus, Virgil blends the bucolic and the mythical Daphnises. In Theocritus also, characters sharing the same name recur from poem to poem, but they are not the same character each time. As Segal explains, the earthy Comatas of Idyll 5 is not the divine one of 7 and likewise “the unmythic, though amiable, Daphnis of 6 contrasts with the mysteriously suffering Daphnis of 1. Similarly the Tityrus of 3, who herds another’s goats to permit him to sing, contrasts with the Tityrus of 7, who will himself sing wide-reaching and evocative songs” (49). Still, Theocritus’ same-name characters are not so sharply differentiated as Virgil’s: the mortal Comatas and his

\textsuperscript{13}See for example, Otis, Virgil 134, and Rudd 122. Contra, see T.E.S. Flintoff, “Characterization in Virgil’s \textit{Eclogues}” \textit{PVS} 15 (1975-6) 16-26. Flintoff actually compares the characters in the \textit{Eclogues} to the characters in a single play like Shakespeare’s \textit{Hamlet}. For further discussion and bibliography on the issue, see Van Sickle, \textit{Design} 81-84 and Van Sickle “Reading” 589ff.

divine incarnation are both talented singers, and Daphnis is always a singing neatherd, although he is mythic and heterosexual in Idyll 1 and mortal and homosexual in 6.15

This raises the question—if each Daphnis is not the same Daphnis then why do they all have the same name? Van Sickle has hit upon part of the answer: the names do not represent actual characters, but themes, themes which develop throughout the book (Design 83). This development is not chronological. To use a simple example, consider Virgil’s Amaryllis theme: there are five characters called Amaryllis in the book (in Eclogues 1, 2, 3, 8, and 9). Each is a desirable, passionate young woman; however, in Eclogue 1, she is the tender-hearted beloved of Tityrus (1.5, 30), who pines for him during his absence in Rome (1.36-39); in Eclogue 2, she is the ex-beloved of Corydon, discarded for a boy due to her sullen temper (2.14-15, 52); in Eclogue 3, she is the beloved of Damoetas, whose anger he fears (3.81); in Eclogue 8, she is a servant who assists a lover of Daphnis cast a love-spell (8.77), performing the supernumerary role which Thestylis plays in Theocritus’ Idyll 2; and, finally, in Eclogue 9, she is the girlfriend of Menalcas and also the beloved of everyone; as Lycidas calls her, “nostras delicias Amaryllida” (9.22). Lycidas’ description of her as “our darling Amaryllis” serves as an appropriately ironic summation of Amaryllis’ role in the Eclogues since she (or a version of her) has been seen as the girlfriend of so many of the men—simultaneously it seems—in the world of the Eclogues.16 We see various

15 It is unfortunate that we do not know Theocritus’ ordering of the poems, for there is an interesting disruption of narrative chronology within the order of the book as it now stands—Daphnis dies in Idyll 1, is alive in 6, and dead again in 7. Virgil’s imitation of this narrative sequence in the Eclogues (Daphnis dies in the middle of the book and is later “resurrected”) suggests that perhaps Theocritus’ poems were ordered thus in Virgil’s edition.

16 Clausen sees nostras as opposed to te, i.e. Lycidas uses the royal “we” to imply in his words to Menalcas that Amaryllis belongs to him, not Menalcas (274). Along with R.D. Williams (127 n. 22), I follow the critical line that begins with Servius, who interprets from the line that Amaryllis is “communem amicam.” As Williams puts it, she is “Amaryllis whom we all love.”
aspects of development in the Amaryllis theme: the beloved girl as a sensitive romantic, as a chiding harridan, as a treasured (if touchy) darling, as a one-dimensional servant (though still associated with love affairs—it is a love spell she helps to cast), and as the amiable girlfriend of the entire countryside. This development is not chronological, nor is there any linear narrative which might be constructed to explain logically the different stages of character development. In the course of the book, Amaryllis does not move from immaturity to maturity, from servitude to freedom; she does not learn from experience. One cannot construct from the book a feasible series of tales to explain her changing faces.

Problems ensue when critics try to read these character-themes as biographical people with sequential narrative and character development. M. Owen Lee’s analysis of the Daphnis character in the Eclogues illustrates the difficulties inherent in this approach. There is an (I think) insurmountable obstacle to tracing progressive character development and linear narrative in Daphnis in the Eclogues: the character is dead in Eclogue 5 and alive again in 7. Lee’s questionable, if imaginative, way around this problem is to view Daphnis’ reappearance after his death and apotheosis in Eclogue 5 as a divine epiphany. Despite the lack of evidence, Lee considers this “the most logical solution to the problem of Daphnis dying in Eclogue 5 and reappearing in Eclogue 7, and is the necessary consequence of insisting that the eclogues be read sequentially with the characters preserving one identity from poem to poem” (40). But why must one insist on such a reading, particularly when it is clear that the author chose to dismember any such narrative and dramatic unity in the book? What if the poems are to be read sequentially, but continuity of narrative and character are not to be sought?

Just as Virgil compromises the integrity of time and various modes of being by

---

fusing the Greek and Roman, the mythical, the legendary, the fictional and real (both historical and contemporary), just as he violates the integrity of his characters by using the same name for different figures, so too he creates a fictional landscape that is a virtual collage, a landscape that exists nowhere in nature. Even when Virgil sets a poem in his own native Mantua, he moves it to the seashore, resulting in an apparent geographical blunder that embarrassed some of Virgil’s ancient readers (Clausen xxx, n. 74). And yet the poet could hardly be so obtuse as to forget the location of his own home town. This “error” is deliberate—not a mistake. Likewise, Clausen notes that in the first eclogue “reference to the land-confiscations places the scene in the Po valley near Mantua,” but in this, again, Virgil’s native landscape...“Hyblaean bees feed on the willow hedgerow; moon-clover flowers there, where it never grew, for the goats to crop; and in the evening shadows fall from mountains required by the cadence of the poem” (xxx). As Clausen notes elsewhere, Hyblaean bees and moon-clover (*cytisum* 1.78) were native to Sicily near Syracuse. They are features of Theocritus’ home, not Virgil’s. So, too, Virgil’s tamarisks (*myricae* 4.2, 6.10, 8.54, 10.13) are borrowed from Theocritus, for as Clausen points out, “Tamarisks grow by the seashore and in other arid and barren places; quite possibly as a young poet from the Po valley, V. had never seen one” (130). Virgil presents us with a literary landscape that is partly Italian, partly Greek, and wholly imaginary.

Like an epic poet or a modern novelist, the author of a poetry book creates a discrete fictional world, a world which need not be at all realistic, but which must conform consistently to its own internal rules. Umberto Eco explains this idea in his postscript to *The Name of The Rose*:18

---

princesses are restored to life by a kiss, but that world, purely possible and unrealistic, must exist according to structures defined at the outset (we have to know whether it is a world where a princess can be restored to life only by the kiss of a prince, or also by that of a witch, and whether the princess' kiss transforms only frogs into princes or also, for example, armadillos. (513-514)

In the fictional world which Virgil creates in the Eclogues, the landscape is unrealistic because it is composed of elements which do not exist together in nature--some taken from Mantua, some from Syracuse, others Arcadia; however, it is consistent inasmuch as it is composed thus throughout the book. So, too, the mingling of modes of being (mythical and real), and of times (historical and present) is unrealistic, yet it is faithful to Virgil's conception of a fictional world where such elements routinely blend. The fact that different characters bear the same name from poem to poem is not true to life--after all, how many Tityruses (Tityri?) can there be in a rural landscape?--but it is consistent. Virgil does not ask us to believe that there are six different men who happen to be called Tityrus existing at once in the world of the Eclogues--the shepherds feel no need to differentiate between the various Tityruses, as, say, Tityrus the son of Damon, or the Tityrus from Syracuse. Rather, Virgil proposes a world in which there is always a Tityrus, though never exactly the same one. In other words, the consistency lies not in the character Tityrus, but in the name Tityrus. Furthermore, this phenomenon occurs consistently with all of the repeated characters in the Eclogues, and there are several: excluding divine, mythical, and real figures, whose characters might be expected to remain fairly fixed, nineteen characters appear in
more than one poem. There are thirteen fictional characters who appear in only one poem. All but one of these minor characters are very minor indeed. Four of these characters who appear in only one poem play small parts: Palaemon judges a singing match in Eclogue 3; Chromis and Mnasyllos tie up Silenus in Eclogue 6; and Nysa is the subject of Damon’s song in Eclogue 8. The nine remaining characters are mentioned only in passing as part of the pastoral background: Maevius (3.90) and Alcon (5.11) as singers; Stimichon as a praiser of song (5.55); Thestylis (2.43), Neaera (3.3), and Alcippe (7.14) as generic girlfriends; and Bavius (3.90) and Antigenes (5.89) as their male counterparts.

There is only one eclogue in the entire book which does not possess a single repeated character of the strictly fictional variety (Eclogue 4); however, it does contain seven repeated figures from the other categories (deities, and legendary and real singers). In contrast, Eclogue 5 possesses thirteen repeated fictional characters. Factoring in repeated characters from all categories, Eclogue 3 tops even that with twenty repeated characters (twelve fictional, six divine, one legendary figure, and one real person). All told, there is not one poem in the Eclogues which does not contain many repeated characters, and even the poem with the fewest has six (Eclogue 1).

Repeated character names convey a powerful sense of continuity and unity: in Virgil’s

---

19 This category shall be referred to as fictional. While mythical and legendary figures are also fictional in one sense, I use the term herein to designate those characters which Virgil himself created to people his fictional world. They are Aegon (Eclogues 3 and 5), Alexis (Eclogues 2, 5, and 7), Alphesiboeus (Eclogues 5 and 8), Amaryllis (Eclogues 1, 2, 3, 8, and 9), Cadorus (Eclogues 5 and 7), Corydon (Eclogues 2, 5, and 7), Damoetas (Eclogues 2, 3, and 5), Damon (Eclogues 3 and 8), Daphnis (Eclogues 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 9), Ioilas (Eclogues 2 and 3), Lycidas (Eclogues 7 and 9), Meliboeus (Eclogues 1, 3, 5, and 7), Menalcas (Eclogues 2, 3, 5, 9, and 10), Moeris (Eclogues 8 and 9), Mopsus (Eclogues 5 and 8), Phyllis (Eclogues 3, 5, 7, and 10), and Thyrsus (Eclogues 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9). For a full breakdown and analysis of repeated characters in the Eclogues see Appendix B.

20 They are: Alcippe (Eclogue 7), Alcon (Eclogue 5), Antigenes (Eclogue 5), Bavius (Eclogue 3), Chromis (Eclogue 6), Maevius (Eclogue 3), Mnasyllos (Eclogue 6), Neaera (Eclogue 3), Nysa (Eclogue 8), Palaemon (Eclogue 3), Stimichon (Eclogue 5), Thestylis (Eclogue 2), and Thyrsus (Eclogue 7).

21 The exception is Thyrsis, one of the singers depicted in Eclogue 7.
fictional world, there is always a shepherd named Tityrus, always a singer named Daphnis, always a beloved Phyllis or Amaryllis (and with their sing-song rhyme, their names—like the role they play—are almost interchangeable). It is a world in which it is ever now and always, where the fictional and the real coexist; an eternal Neverneverland where the borders between times and places and modes of being collapse, and all possibilities exist in concert. The fictional world of the Eclogues is consistent in itself and inasmuch as it is so, it is unified.

Unity also lies in the consistent authorial voice, in the single poetic consciousness that creates and informs the poetry book. There is in these works a strong emotional unity. This is not to say that emotional unity is a property restricted to Alexandrian poetry—it is not. Indeed, it may be found in many different types of poetry including the Homeric and the Miltonic. Emotional unity has been viewed as the mark of all major poets:

A characteristic of great poets, strongly exemplified by Virgil, is the continuity of their mental process. This characteristic is equally clear in Shakespeare, who in the early play Richard II forecasts with astonishing

---

22 Dante's fictional world is composed along the lines of Virgil's in many ways. For example, among the lustful in the second circle of Hell the historical Semiramis of Assyria and Cleopatra of Egypt mingle with the fictional Dido of Carthage, the mythical Helen of Sparta, the legendary Tristan of medieval French romance, and Dante's real Italian contemporaries, Paolo Malatesta and Francesca da Rimini (Inferno V.58-67). Dante learned much more from Virgil than lo bello stile (Inferno 1.87). The affinity in poetics between Dante and Virgil is largely a shared Alexandrian sensibility; as E.R. Curtius points out, the two poets have similar "artistic aims: the achievement of beauty and sublimity by means of the selection and arrangement of words. In this larger sense, Virgil, supported by the example of the Alexandrian poets, created the model for all of Western artistic poetry." "Virgil in European Literature," in Modern Critical Views. Virgil, ed. Harold Bloom, New York: Chelsea, 1986: 78. An important study will examine the influence of Alexandrian poetics on The Divine Comedy.

23 To cite just a few possible examples, disunity would likely result if Tityrus were clearly the same character in all but one of his many appearances, or if the landscape were purely real and Italian in nine poems and mythical and mixed in another, or if Virgil kept strictly to past time and then introduced one or two contemporary elements. These divergences would then be the exception and not the rule; they might be jarringly inconsistent within the context of the fictional world of the Eclogues.
precision the course which his work would take during the many remaining years of his life. (Knight, *Roman Vergil* 88)

One wonders if Knight got this idea from Eliot or if it was one they found they shared, for Eliot maintained that:

The whole of Shakespeare's work is one poem; and it is the poetry of it in this sense, not the poetry of isolated lines and passages or the poetry of the single figures which he created, that matters most. A man might, hypothetically, compose any number of fine passages or even of whole poems which would each give satisfaction, and yet not be a great poet, unless we felt them to be united by one significant, consistent, and developing personality.24

For Eliot, then, a strongly unified corpus makes a poet great. What makes the work unified is not adherence to the three unities of action, time and space, but the poet's force of personality,25 a force which, in the case of Shakespeare, transcends even the boundaries between separate, seemingly unrelated plays. Unity, to Eliot, is the product of the poet's, presumably unified, sensibility: “It has been said that Shakespeare lacks unity; it might, I think, be said equally that it is Shakespeare chiefly that is the unity, that unifies so far as they could be unified at all the tendencies of a time that certainly lacked unity” (*Elizabethan Essays* 53). Eliot elucidates further:

---


25 This is perhaps a strange view for a poet who advocates an impersonal theory of poetry (discussed in “Tradition and the Individual Talent,” *SW* 37-44).
The standard set by Shakespeare is that of a continuous development from first to last, a development in which the choice both of theme and of dramatic and verse technique in each play seems to be determined increasingly by Shakespeare's state of feeling, by the particular stage of his emotional maturity at the time. What is "the whole man" is not simply his greatest or maturest achievement, but the whole pattern formed by the sequence of plays; so that we may say confidently that the full meaning of any one of his plays is not in itself alone, but in that play in the order in which it was written, in its relation to all of Shakespeare's other plays, earlier and later: we must know all of Shakespeare's work in order to know any of it. No other dramatist of the time approaches anywhere near to this perfection of pattern, of pattern superficial and profound; but the measure in which dramatists and poets approximate to this unity in a lifetime's work, is one of the measures of major poetry and drama.

(Elizabethan Essays 135-136)²⁶

It is perhaps not surprising, then, that the only form of organic unity to be found in Eliot's work is emotional unity. As C.K. Stead notes, no matter how the sections in

²⁶ William Wordsworth in his Preface to The Excursion also sees the entire poetic corpus of a great author (specifically, his own) as a unified whole, a whole which he compares to a gothic cathedral, with "his minor Pieces, which have been long before the Public, when they shall be properly arranged [by the author, i.e. himself], will be found by the attentive Reader to have such connection with the main Work as may give them claim to be likened to the little cells, oratories, and sepulchral recesses, ordinarily included in those edifices." "Preface to the Edition of 1814" The Prelude VII: 712-713. Ed. Ernest de Selincourt. 2nd edn. Revised by Helen Darbishire. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Interestingly enough, given that Wordsworth's poetics are in many ways antithetical to modernist poetics, one critic notes that the order of The Prelude is governed by the principle of juxtaposition; further, that the poem does not possess "the linear quality of simple narrative verse and this is because it proceeds through its verse-paragraphs in quantum-jumps of poetic energy, rather than straightforwardly through the lines." Ted Holt and John Gilroy, "Preface" to A Commentary on Wordsworth's Prelude Books I-V, London: Routledge, 1983: x.
"Prufrock" are arranged, the poem retains a certain unity “for its coherence depends on consistency of feeling, not on a fixed sequence of idea or event.”27 Similarly, *The Waste Land* is “composed of a series of projections of states of feeling, having no fixed centre but their common origin in the depths of one man’s mind” (Stead *New Poetic*, 151). The form of corporeal unity which Eliot himself praised in Shakespeare has been observed in his own work. In a 1937 review of Eliot’s *Collected Poems 1909-35*, R.P. Blackmuir writes:

> It is astonishing, generally, how much the poems here collected tell about each other in the way of prediction and illumination, of obsession and insight, of the strength of form and the agony of formulation, of poverty, of means and of the riches secured and even predetermined by those means. The unity of the work taken together as a form of response is indefeasible, and creates, among the fragments of the separate poems, a kind of inevitable involvement which is a virtual unity of substance.28

But emotional unity, important though it is, is not enough on its own to create a strong sense of unity—an epic unity—within an individual work. To achieve this, the author must employ also a major structural form of unity such as the two we have discussed (traditional/Homeric/organic or untraditional/Alexandrian/mechanistic). The remainder of this chapter illustrates how, precisely, Theocritus, Virgil and Eliot have built Alexandrian-style epic unity within their respective poetry books by means of the associative technique.

---

28 *The Critical Heritage* 367. One wonders if Blackmuir’s view changed with the publication of *Four Quartets*, a poem which marked a turning point in Eliot’s poetic aesthetic.
Associative Unity in Theocritus' *Idylls*

Analysis of associative unity in Theocritus' poetry book must be prefaced with the usual cautionary note: without knowing the exact contents of Theocritus' poetry book, it is difficult to know whether repetitions are due to the poet's attempt to link poems associatively or if they are due to the accident of a single poet's favoured vocabulary. For this reason, my examination will be limited to the more obvious instances of repetition. I exclude from consideration the poems believed to be spurious: *Idylls* 8, 9, 12, 19, 20, 21, 23, and 27, as well as the doubtful 25. Of the remaining twenty-two *Idylls*, seven are very closely associated with one another by means of repetition of words, themes, and characters. These are *Idylls* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. This group happens to correspond exactly with Lawall's proposed poetry book; with the exception of *Idyll* 2, it also corresponds to the standard bucolic grouping. While many scholars have attempted to exclude *Idyll* 2 from the so-called bucolic corpus due to its urban subject matter (as noted in Chapter 3), there is good evidence for its inclusion: *Idyll* 2 has a close relationship with *Idyll* 1, and further there are numerous echoes of *Idyll* 2 in every other poem within this particular group. I do not believe that this is a coincidence. In addition to this group of seven *Idylls*, there are two more poems which possess many close associations with each other and with the other poems in the group: *Idylls* 11 and 13.29 While this is not the place to advance a detailed argument (and at any rate such arguments can be only speculative at present), it is my view that this tightly knit group of nine poems is a good candidate for Theocritus' poetry book: not only do they form a cohesive, strongly intertextual group,

---

29 Other groupings can be discerned among the remaining poems in the *Idylls*, but they have little connection with any of the other poems: for example, *Idylls* 14, 15, 16, and 17 form a group in praise of a patron; and *Idylls* 28, 29, and 30 form a group in the Lesbian dialect and in the Lesbian poetic tradition of Sappho and Alcaeus.
unified by repetition, echo and self reference, but these poems also total 945 lines, which is just about the size to fit on the average papyrus (usually estimated at 1,000 lines). This group of poems--Idylls 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, and 13--is certainly the right length for a poetry book.

Continuity arises from Theocritus' limited cast of characters. Pan and Aphrodite are frequent presences, as one might expect in a book with a mostly rural setting which focuses on tales of love. Adonis is named in two Idylls (1.109; 3.47); as is Amaryllis (3.1; 6, 22; 4.36, 38); Tityrus (3.2; 7.72); Corydon (4.1; 5.6); Comatas (5.4, 9, 19, 70, 79, 138, 150; 7.83); Galatea (6.6; 11.8, 13, 19, 63, 76); Clearista (2.74; 5.90); and Theocritus' real friends Aratus (6.2; 7.102, 122) and Nicias (11.2; 13.2).30 Polyphemus is referred to in three Idylls (6.6; 7.72; 11.8, 80); and Daphnis in four (1.19, 66, 77, 82, 97, 100, 103, 113, 116, 120, 121, 135, 140; 5.20, 81; 6.1, 5, 42, 44; 7.73). While Daphnis does not appear in Idyll 2, his name is echoed there in the name of Delphis which recalls it. The names Daphnis and Delphis are associated in many ways. Apart from the close verbal similarity, both names evoke properties of the god Apollo and are thus metonymic of the god himself: *daphnis* means "bay leaf" and the bay is a noted property of Apollo; Delphis, an extremely uncommon name (Dover 96), suggests both *delphinus*, "dolphin," and Delphi, and Apollo is the dolphin god, who dwells in Delphi. There are further suggestions that Theocritus was drawing an association between the two names: in her spell to attract Delphis, Simaitha burns bay (*daphne* 2.33), a substance not associated with such spells elsewhere (Gow 36). Indeed, the reference here to *daphne* is pointed--it is the only item singled out from the charm's ingredients at 2.1. The bay is made symbolical of Delphis: Simaitha burns *daphne* in order to inflame Delphis with love for her in an act of sympathetic magic. Delphis is further associated with *daphne* by virtue of juxtaposition at 2.23: *Delphidi*

30 Nicias appears also in Idyl 28.6.
daphnan. Finally, one might almost read Simaitha’s anxious *pai moitai daphnai*
“where are my bay leaves?” (2.1) as “where is my Delphis?” for that is the real concern of the poem. Daphnis, then, is actually present in four poems and symbolically at hand in another.

Certainly, Virgil recognized this association of Delphis and Daphnis: in his Eighth Eclogue, which is modelled on Idyll 2, Virgil changes the name of the witch’s beloved from Delphis to Daphnis. Further, Virgil places additional emphasis on the role of bay in the love spell and on its association with Daphnis:

\[
\text{sparge molam et fragilis incende bitumine lauros:}
\]
\[
\text{Daphnis me malus urit, ego hanc in Daphnide laurum.}
\]

(8.82-83)

Sprinkle the meal and burn the brittle bay with pitch:

False Daphnis burns me. I burn Daphnis in this bay.

For the learned reader, Virgil’s juxtaposition of Daphnis and bay—*Daphnide laurum*—is a telling allusion to the Greek etymology *Daphnis/daphne*, and to Theocritus Idyll 2.23, *Delphidi daphnan*.31 Virgil picks up the associative thread Daphnis/Delphis in Theocritus, strengthens it, and builds upon it.

Whether he is mythical or mortal in any particular appearance, homo- or heterosexual, alive or dead, Daphnis plays a central part of the fictional landscape of the *Idylls*. Not only is he a fictional character in the book, but he is also *fictionalized* by the other characters within it. The narrative of Daphnis (and it is one particular narrative, though it is told with variations) which the characters tell forms one of the

myths on which this world is based. We first hear of Daphnis in Idyll 1 where Thyrsis is enjoined to sing the woes of Daphnis:

άλλα τύ γάρ δή. Θύρσι. τά Δάφνιδος ἀλγε' ἀείδες

(1.19)

But thou, Thyrsis, art wont to sing the woes of Daphnis

At 5.20, we discover that this--"the woes of Daphnis"--is a proverbial phrase within the fictional world of the *Idylls*; as Lacon cries out:

αἱ τοι πιστεύσαιμι. τά Δάφνιδος ἀλγε' ἀροίμαν

The troubles ["woes"] of Daphnis fall on me if I believe you

At 7.72, the goatherd Lycidas sings and dreams how Tityrus might sing to him one day of Daphnis just as we have seen Thyrsis sing to another, unnamed, goatherd. The tale Lycidas imagines hearing is the same one Thyrsis told in Idyll 1, namely, the woes of Daphnis, except that now we learn some new details: the name of Daphnis' beloved (Xenea, 7.73), of the nearby mountains (Haemus, Athos, Rhodope, Caucasus 7.76-77), and the river (Himera 7.75). While the substance of the tale is the same as the one narrated in Idyll 1, the setting differs: it has been moved from Syracuse to Himera (Gow 2). If Daphnis were a contemporary of these shepherds or of the generation before them, the details of his story would be too well-known to withstand such alteration. Thus, we can presume that by the time the shepherds sing him in Idylls 1 and 7, Daphnis has been long dead--long enough to move into the realm of myth, for like a myth his tale has variants, and is appropriated by different geographical regions.
This sort of self-reference by the poet, of self-mythologizing almost, can be found also in Virgil’s *Eclogues* where the opening lines of Eclogues 2 and 3 are quoted as songs, not the songs of the poet Virgil, but the songs of his fictional character Menalcas:

Formosum pastor Corydon ardebat Alexin

(2.1)

For beautiful Alexis, the master’s favourite,
Shepherd Corydon burned...

Dic mihi, Damoeta, cuium pecoris? an Meliboei?

(3.1)

Tell me, Damoetas—whose flock? Meliboeus his?

haec nos “formosum Corydon ardebat Alexin,”
haec eadem docuit “cuium pecus? an Meliboei?”

(5.85-86)

This [pipe] taught us “Corydon burned for beautiful Alexis;”
This also taught us “whose flock? Meliboeus his?”

At this point, Eclogue 5 becomes a meta-narrative that frames Eclogues 2 and 3, poems which, until that moment, appeared to be direct narratives. The mythologizing element is also interesting: note that the lines from Eclogues 2 and 3 have not just been quoted, but *mis*-quoted. Menalcas sang “Formosum pastor Corydon” not “Formosum Corydon,” “cuium pecoris?” not “cuium pecus?” It is as if Virgil is aiming for
the inaccuracy of myth, of recollection.

Eliot employs self-quotation similarly in *Prufrock*. J. Alfred Prufrock alludes to Orsino’s comment in *Twelfth Night*:

> I know the voices dying with a dying fall  
> Beneath the music from a farther room.

(“Prufrock” 52-53)

If music be the food of love, play on,  
Give me excess of it, that, surfeiting,  
The appetite may sicken, and so die.  
That strain again, it had a dying fall:

( *Twelfth Night* I.i.1-4)³²

In “Portrait,” the phrase “dying fall” is repeated, and this time it appears in quotation marks, but is it a quotation from *Twelfth Night* or from “Prufrock”? (Remember, in “Prufrock” the phrase “dying fall” is not presented to the reader as a quotation, but it is in “Portrait.” In “Prufrock” it functions as an allusion, not as a quotation.): “This music is successful with a ‘dying fall’” ("Portrait" 122). The phrase “dying fall” has become part of the common allusive background from which the inhabitants within Eliot’s world may draw. This phrase and the allusive baggage it brings—Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*, the character and situation of Orsino—are primary in the imagination of the narrators of both “Prufrock” and “Portrait,” narrators who are of a similar type, but who are essentially different people.

It is as if each of these three poets, in his creation of a fictional world, has also

created a literary tradition for that world, in the case of Theocritus and Virgil, one of his
own devising. The effect is meta-fictional: for a moment the characters within the poetry
book step outside of its pages and join us, the reader, in the act of reading the very
book which depicts them. This sort of self-reference has a second effect, an important
one in each of these poets’ aesthetic agendas: brevity and maximum emotional impact
with a minimum of exposition. Just as they allude to other texts in a form of poetic
shorthand, so they allude to their own texts when the desired emotional resonances
do not exist outside it. As Newman explains, writing of Virgil’s many references to the
Georgics in his Aeneid:

The poet is only able to abbreviate later because he has expanded
earlier. His attitude to his poetry shows us a deeper sense of the word
brevitas. It is not a mechanical snipping. It depends on remembered
tradition to convey its dense meaning, even when the poet has had to
create that tradition himself. (Class. Epic 135)

While repetition of lines and phrases in the Idyls may be construed as an
attempt to mimic Homer’s formulaic language (and play with the Homeric tradition is
important in Theocritus), there is much more than that at issue: examination of the
contexts of repetition reveals that they function primarily as unifying elements and not
as mere echoes of Homeric usage.33 While it is impractical, in the context of this thesis,
to examine every repetition in the Idyls, it will be worthwhile to look at one Idyll in
detail and then to consider some of the major thematic and verbal repetitions in the
corpus. I have chosen Idyll 1 because it appears to be representative of the poems
which follow and forms a particularly good introduction to the book. Most repetitions in

33 For discussion of Homerisms and their function in the idyls, see Fabiano 532-536.
the *Idylls* are of words or brief phrases, but there are two complete lines (both in Idyll 1) which are repeated exactly in other poems. Both appear in Idylls 1 and 5. The first is:

\[ \text{\textit{\(\omega \zeta \tau \varsigma \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \tau \varepsilon \varsigma \tau \tau \tau \varphi \varepsilon \omega \nu \lambda \kappa \varphi \nu \varsigma \alpha \iota \tau \varepsilon \) \text{(1.13 and 5.101)}} \]

where is this sloping knoll and the tamarisks

In Idyll 1, the line occurs when Thyrsis invites the unnamed goatherd to come sit by him and pipe as he (Thyrsis) tends his goats for him. The goatherd refuses to pipe lest he wake and anger sleeping Pan, but agrees to sit and listen if Thyrsis will sing. Later, he awards Thyrsis a prize for his efforts. In many ways, this exchange in Idyll 1 follows the conventions of the singing contest: two shepherds meet, a song is proposed, prizes are staked, an impartial judge is chosen, the two compete, and the prize is awarded. In this case, the participants are so amiable that neither wishes to compete with the other. Thyrsis invites the goatherd to play for his (presumably silent) pleasure, and the goatherd asks Thyrsis to sing for him. Nor is a judge required: all Thyrsis needs to do to take away the prize is to sing as he is wont to do (1.59-60). In contrast, Idyll 5 presents a conventional singing match. Also in contrast to Idyll 1, here, the two participants are actively hostile to one another as they alternate verses with insults.

In the oral tradition, repeated lines most often occur in stock situations: a particular line or block of lines may be repeated whenever a character dons armour or performs a sacrifice, for example. Such repetitions are a necessary component of oral composition (Lord *passim*). If Theocritus were using these repetitions primarily to recreate traditional formulaic language, one would expect the line at 5.101 to recur in the same place in the narrative as it occurs in 1.13, i.e., at the beginning of the poem.
and as part of the invitation to the rival singer. It does not. Instead, the repeated line is an aside which occurs near the end of the poem and midway through the actual contest; further, Comatas directs it not to his fellow competitor, but to his goats. The exact repetition of the line leads the reader to expect formulaic usage; having raised that expectation, Theocritus then subverts it.

The second repeated line in Idyll 1 forms another associative bridge between poems 1 and 5:

...τηνεὶ δρύες ὢδε κύπειρος.
αἰ δὲ καλὸν βομβεῖντι ποτὶ σμάνειςι μέλισσαι.

(1.106-107 and 5.45-46)

...There are oaks and galingale, and sweetly hum the bees about the hives.

In both Idylls 1 and 5, the line follows an exchange of hostilities: in Idyll 1, the dying Daphnis casts up her romantic follies to a gloating Aphrodite and wishes her gone; in Idyll 5, it forms part of the preliminaries to the singing contest as Comatas invites Lacon to come and join him where he stands. Daphnis uses the line to dismiss Aphrodite, Comatas to entice Lacon. There is a further contrast in tone between the sad, mythic narrative of the death of Daphnis in Idyll 1 and the comic vulgarity of 5, where the repetition occurs immediately after an obscene exchange:

ΚΟ. ἀνίκ’ ἐπύγιζόν τυ. τύ δ ἄλγεες. αἰ δὲ χίμαιραι
αἴδε κατεβληκώντο. καὶ ὁ τράγος αὐτὰς ἐτρύπη.
ΛΑ. μὴ βάθιον τήνω πυγίσματος. ὑβὲ. τασείς.
ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἔρρει. ὥδε ἔρπε. καὶ ὑστατα βουκολιαξῆ.
ΚΟ. οὐχ ἔρρει τηνεὶ. τουτεὶ δρύες. ὥδε κύπειρος.
You grieved when I buggered you. She-goats bleat too when the he-goat penetrates them.

May you be buried no deeper than that buggerization, you humpback! Why don't you come over here--right here!--you'll sing your last bucolic song.

I won't go there. Here are oaks and galingale, and sweetly hum the bees about the hives. (My trans.)

Note the provocative repetition of algees at 5.41 which further links Idylls 1 and 5 as it draws an implicit (and comic) association between the proverbial woes (algea) of Daphnis (his painful death from love) and the woe of Lacon when sodomized by Comatas. Moreover, both the woes of Daphnis and of Lacon are erotic, one caused by unrequited love for a woman and the other by the (unwanted) requital of another man's desire.

The association of Idyll 1 with singing contests in general also links it with Idyll 6. In contrast to the hostile competition in Idyll 5, Idyll 6 features two contented male lovers in a match that needs no judge at all. In contrast to the end of Idyll 5 where Comatas gloats at having defeated Lacon, Daphnis and Damoetas end their match with a tender kiss and a free exchange of gifts; neither triumphs over the other (6.46). Similarly, in Idyll 7 an exchange of song is agreed to and performed and a present given, although the gift here is a token of friendship (xeineion 7.128), as opposed to a prize awarded to the better singer (7.128-130). Thus the theme of the singing

For discussion and bibliography, see Hatzikosta.
competition (whether it is a serious competition or not) links Idylls 1, 5, 6, and 7.

Like the tale of Daphnis, the tragic story of Aphrodite and Adonis forms part of the mythological backdrop to which the inhabitants of Theocritus' fictional world may allude. Theocritus uses verbal repetition to allude to this myth in three poems, thus linking Idylls 1, 3 and 5:

\[
\text{\(\omega ραίος \chi \omega δωνις,\) επεί καί \(μήλα\) νομε\(ύ\)ει}
\]
\[
\text{καί πτ\(ώκας\) βάλλει καί \(θηρία\) πάντα διώκει.}
\]
\[
(1.109-110)
\]

Adonis too is in his bloom; he herds his sheep, kills hares and hunts all manner of beasts.

\[
\text{τάν δέ καλ\(ά\)ν \(Κυθέρειαν\) \(έν \(\omega\)ρει \(μήλα\) νομε\(ύ\)ων}
\]
\[
\text{ο\(ύ\)χ \(ούτως\) \(\'\Omega\)δωνις \(έπι\) πλέον \(άγαγε\) \(λύ\(σ\)ας.}
\]
\[
(3.46-47)
\]

And did not Adonis, as he fed his sheep upon the hills drive the fair Cytherea to such frenzy...

In the first case (1.109), Daphnis reminds Aphrodite of her love affair with Adonis. In the second (3.46-7), a coarse goatherd draws an unlikely comparison between himself and Adonis in an attempt to convince Amaryllis that a herdsman can make a worthy lover—after all, wasn't Adonis a herdsman like him? In the third instance, Theocritus alludes back to 1.110:

\[
\text{δ\(ν\) τ\\' παι\(δ\)ί δι\(δ\)ωμι \(τ\)ά \(θηρία\) πά\(ν\)τα \(δι\(ώ\)κε\(ι\)ν}
\]
Here, Lacon speaks of a dog he has given to his boyfriend, describing the boy in the same terms in which Adonis was described earlier. At 3.46-7 and 5.107, Theocritus uses the verbal allusion to Idyll 1 to draw into these poems the context of Adonis and Aphrodite. An abrupt shift of diction and a bathetic effect is achieved as we move from the mythical and sublime tone of Idyll 1 to the vulgar, coarse one of Idyll 3, and finally descend to the obscene and comic tone of Idyll 5--how can one compare a goatherd and a plain shepherd’s boyfriend to Adonis? And, in the latter case, if Lacon’s boy love is a figure for Adonis, then with whom in the equation does Lacon himself compare--Aphrodite?

There is an additional connection between Idylls 1 and 5. Note the verbal repetition at the end of the following lines:

(5.53)

I shall set up a great bowl of white milk

At 1.58, the goatherd tells Thrysis the price he paid for the handsome cup which he offers as an enticement to Thrysis to sing. At 5.53, Lacon tries (and fails) to entice
Comatas to come over to his side and start the singing match. In the latter case, the specific enticement given is not offered to Comatas, Lacon's competitor, but to the nymphs in the hope that they might favor Lacon in the match. In both cases, the phrase is used as a preliminary to song.

We have seen that verbal repetitions may occur in contexts that are similar in a general way, but are very different in their particulars. Another example is in the associative link drawn between Idylls 1 and 7:

\[ \delta \eta \theta \alpha \ \kappa \lambda \omega \theta \delta \iota \omega \eta \nu \tau e s \ \varepsilon \tau \omega \sigma i a \ \mu o x \theta i \zeta \zeta \omicron \nu t i. \]

(1.38)

while they, long hollow-eyed from love, labour to no purpose

\[ \acute{a} \nu t \iota \alpha \ \kappa \kappa \kappa \xi \zeta \omicron \nu t e s \ \varepsilon \tau \omega \sigma i a \ \mu o x \theta i \zeta \zeta \omicron \nu t i. \]

(7.48)

crowing against one another, they labour to no purpose

(My trans.)

Both verses are of competitions fought in vain, but while the first describes the efforts of two men who vie for the love of an indifferent woman, the second is about poetics: it describes the cocks of the Muse (poets) who crow against (vie with) the bard of Chios (Homer). There is an additional connotation of both with singing contests: the men vie for the woman's hand in alternating speech (amoibadis 1.34, from which we derive the literary term amoebean song) and the poet-roosters contend in song for Homer's place.

Unrequited love is another frequent theme in the Idylls. Sub-themes related to
this include love as madness (3.40, 47; 4.11; 5.16; 14.9), and women (particularly old women) and witchcraft: for example, Simaiath of Idyll 2 and the hag who taught her (2.91); the old crone who taught Polyphemus to spit thrice to avert the evil eye (6.40); the crone who does this herself in Idyll 7 (124); the female seer whom the goatherd consults for advice (3.31); the old woman's grave which seems to impart magical properties to the squills which grow upon it (5.121); and the old woman who is said (ironically) to pronounce oracles (15.61).

Another frequent sub-theme is that of apples as love-gifts. Apples are a common love token in antiquity and are particularly associated with marriage (as opposed to flirtation). Thus a gift of apples symbolizes serious romantic intentions. This is the implication of Delphis, trying to convince Simaiath of his (false) sincerity, claiming that, had she not called him first, he would have come to her house bearing apples in his bosom (2.118-122, 127-128). The plan that Delphis professed in Idyll 2 is actually carried out by the goatherd (who, unlike Delphis, is sincere) in Idyll 3: we see him descend upon his beloved Amaryllis' home with a gift of apples (3.10). Similarly, Hippomenes symbolically woos Atalanta with apples at Idyll 3.41 as he tosses them in her path during the foot race which will make her his bride should he win it.

In addition to its link with the other poems which invoke the theme of the apple as love-gift, Idyll 3 is also linked to other poems by the theme of love-madness, particularly as it is expressed in Idyll 2:

\begin{verbatim}
ίππομανές φυτόν ἔστι παρ Ἀρκάσι. τῷ δ ἐπὶ πᾶσαι
καὶ πῶλοι μαίνονται ἀν' ἰεα καὶ θοαὶ ἵπποι.
ὡς καὶ Δέλφιν ἰδεοίμι. καὶ ἐς τόδε δώμα περάσαι
\end{verbatim}

Coltsfoot [hippomanes] is an Arcadian weed, and for it all the foals, all the swift mares run mad upon the hills. So may I see Delphis, and so like one maddened may he come to this house from the bright wrestling-school.

Note the elaborate etymological gloss for the herb hippomanes—*hippo* + *manes*, “horse-mad”—for which horses (*poloi*, a synonym for *hippo*) run mad (*mainontai*). The intricate wordplay sets this passage firmly in the reader’s mind; it will be recalled in Idyll 3 when the name Hippomenes arises in a similar context: just as horses are said run mad after hippomanes in Idyll 2, so Atalanta will run after Hippomenes in Idyll 3. Like the horses, Atalanta is symbolically maddened with desire for what she chases. In her case, it is not Hippomenes she desires but the golden apples in his possession. Still, the effect of Hippomenes upon Atalanta is, indirectly, the same as the effect of hippomanes on horses.

Littlewood notes that, as early as Stesichorus, apples were traditionally thrown at the bridegroom in the wedding procession (155). The phrase to throw apples at someone could also serve as a euphemism for making love (Foster 46). Hence when Clearista pelts the goatherd with apples as she whistles to him (5.88-89), she is indicating strong erotic interest. Thus Idyll 5 is connected with Idylls 1, 2, and 3 by the theme of the apple as love-token. In addition, Comatas’ mention of Clearista links Idyll 5 to Idyll 2 where another (urban) Clearista is mentioned as a friend of Simaitha (2.74). The description of Clearista throwing apples at a goatherd is also a powerful link to Idyll 6 where another girl throws apples. Note the contextual and verbal repetition:
with apples too Clearista pelts the goatherd as he passes with his flock, and sweetly she whistles to him.

Galatea pelts thy flock with apples, Polyphemus, and calls thee cursed in love and goatherd.

In both verses, the verb is in the same position and form. Both lines 5.88 and 6.6 end with an article and a woman’s name in the nominative case. The object of the verb *ballei* (to throw) is in the same position in both passages (*aipolon*, “goatherd,” 5.88 and *poimnion* “flock,” 6.6). Although “goatherd” is not the object of *ballei* at 6.7, as it is at 5.88, notice how Theocritus reminds us of its earlier usage by repeating it again in the same number and case and in the same metrical position: at both 5.88 and 6.7, *aipolon*, “goatherd,” forms the fourth dactylic foot of the line, preceding a fifth foot dactyl and a sixth foot spondee. Moreover, while Clearista pelts apples at a goatherd, Galatea pelts them at a shepherd who *behaves* like a goatherd. Notice, too, the additional link which this phrase—“she calls thee cursed in love and a goatherd”—draws with Idyll 1:

---

36 Goatherds were proverbially backward with women. It was even rumoured that they were prone to bestiality with their charges (Gow 20).
... ἀ δύσερώς τις ἁγαν καὶ ἀμήχανος ἔσσι.

βούτας μὲν ἐλέγευ. νῦν δ' αἰτόλω ἄνδρι ἑοίκας.

(1.85-86)

Ah, truly, cursed in love and helpless art thou. Neatherd wast thou called, but now thou art like the goatherd.

We have seen in Idyll 3 how awkwardly a goatherd woos his love, how cursed he is in love. In Idyll 6, Galatea calls Polyphemus a goatherd in love, and in Idyll 11, as he pines for Galatea, Polyphemus will indeed take on the same role that the goatherd played in Idyll 3. In fact, Idyll 3 has many links with Idyll 11: both feature an ugly shepherd who tries to soothe the pain of unrequited love by performing a rural paraklausithuron before his beloved’s “door,” the goatherd before the opening to Amaryllis’ cave, and Polyphemus at the edge of the sea, the entrance to the water-nymph Galatea’s watery home (11.13-14).

There are two more links in this elaborate chain of association. The reference to Polyphemus is picked up at Idyll 7.152, where Polyphemus is mentioned again, but now he is doing the pelting—not hurling apples at a beloved, but mountains at ships, specifically Odysseus’ ship:

τὸν κρατερὸν Πολύφαμον. δς ὠρεςι νᾶας ἐβάλλε

(7.152)

even the mighty Polyphemus, who pelted ships with mountains...

Note the intricacy of the verbal repetition, which does not directly echo 5.88 or 6.6 (above), but 6.21, which is itself connected with both 5.88 and 6.6. At 6.21,
Polyphemus comments on Galatea's actions:

εἶδον. ναὶ τὸν Πάνα. τὸ ποίμνιον ἀνίκ' ἔβαλλε

By Pan, I saw her when she was pelting the flock

Both 6.21 and 7.152 use the same verb (eballe) in the same form and in the same position within the line.

The final link in this chain pulls in Idyll 11, this time, picking up on the mythical meeting of Polyphemus and Odysseus. Once more, the subject is the love affair of Polyphemus and Galatea, but with a neat reversal: now he woos her and she ignores him:

αι δὲ τοι αὐτὸς ἐγὼν δοκέω λασιώτερος ἡμεν.
ἐντὶ δρυὸς ξύλα μοι καὶ ὑπὸ σποδῶ ἀκάματον πῦρ.
καἱόμενος δ ὑπὸ τεῖς καὶ τὰν ψυχὰν ἀνεχοίμαν
καὶ τὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμόν...

(11.50-53)

But if it is I myself that seem too shaggy to thee, oak-logs I have, and fire undying beneath the ash, and thou mayest burn my soul, and my one eye too...

There is considerable dramatic irony here—Polyphemus’ eye will quite literally be burnt out by Odysseus, and with a log pulled out from under ash. Theocritus emphasizes this by means of a verbal echo of the pertinent scene in Homer’s Odyssey; there Odysseus pulls an olive-log from under ash (hupo spodou, Od. ix.375;
hupo spodo. Idyll 11.51). The dramatic irony is further reinforced by Polyphemus’ words at 11.60-62 as he bemoans the fact that he loves a water nymph yet cannot join her in her natural habitat; still, he has hope:

νῦν μὰν. ὦ κόριον. νῦν αὐτίκα νεῖν γε μαθεῦμαι.
αἱ κά τις σὺν ναὶ πλέων ξένος ὡδ ἀφίκηται.
ὦς εἰδὼ τί ποχ’ ἀδῦ κατοιεῖν τὸν βυθὸν ὑμῖν

(11.60-62)

Now, maiden, even now, will I learn at least to swim, if some stranger sail hither in his ship, that I may know what pleasure it is to you to dwell in the depths.

When that stranger (Odysseus) finally does come, the last thing he is going to do is teach the Cyclops to swim!

As we have seen by following only one element of a complex chain of association, Theocritus has carefully built association upon association, interweaving various themes and echoes, resulting in a linkage between Idylls 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 11. Idyll 13 is also linked to this chain by allusion to the Polyphemus theme and by its formal similarity to some of other poems. Idyll 13 is an epistolary poem like Idylls 6 and 11, the two Polyphemus poems. Like Idyll 6, Idyll 13 is addressed to Nicias. While Idyll 13 does not explicitly deal with the character Polyphemus, the Polyphemus theme is evoked by two complex and subtle allusions and by similarities in themes. Consider the repetition and structural similarities of a verse in each of the three poems:

πολλάκις. ὦ Πολύφομε. τὰ μὴ καλὰ καλὰ πέφανται

37 Noted and discussed by Dover 177.
Very often, Polyphemus, to love what is not fair appeared to be fair

(6.19)

δηλον ὅτι ἐν ταῖς γῆς κῆρυγμα τις φαίνομαι ἦμεν

(11.79)

It's clear that on land I, too, am somebody

(13.3)

nor does what is fair appear to be fair to us at first

Each of these passages has to do with unrequited love, each is an attempt to comfort a sufferer. Note the striking repetition twice within the line of kala kala in Idylls 6 and 13, with the unusual change in vowel quantity of the first alpha in kala at 6.19. This alone serves as a link between Idylls 6 and 13. In addition, each of these passages uses the verb phainomai, "to appear," or (in the grammatical context of 11.79) "to be." Idylls 11 and 13 are linked by the repetition of phainomai-etai emen, and its appearance in the same sedes. The same verb appears in Idyll 6 in another form, but with the same meaning as in Idyll 13 (as noted, the meaning differs in Idyll 11). All of these elements of verbal and metrical repetition combined serve to associate these three poems with one another.

In addition, Idylls 6, 11, and 13 are associated by the Polyphemus theme, for
Theocritus carefully associates Herakles with Polyphemus: both are big, hairy, and gluttonous; both lament a love that cannot be requited because the beloved is consigned to the water (Galatea lives in the sea, Hylas is imprisoned in a spring). Water nymphs figure in all three poems: Galatea in 6 and 11, and the nymphs of the spring who capture Hylas in 13. There is a further connection made between Herakles and Polyphemus, or, at least, with the name Polyphemus. The story told in Idyll 13 of the rape of Hylas is the same one which Apollonius of Rhodes narrates in the *Argonautica* (1.1187-1357). In Apollonius, the man who hears the cry of Hylas, runs to help him, and then reports the abduction to Herakles is named Polyphemus. While this character is clearly not the Cyclops of Idylls 6 and 11, and the association of Apollonius’ Polyphemus and the Herakles of Idyll 13 may seem unlikely, Theocritus has ensured that his reader will make this connection by playfully modelling a simile for Herakles’ panicked behaviour as he runs to Hylas’ aid on a simile Apollonius used for Polyphemus’ frenzied behaviour in the same situation. It is a particularly bizarre (and thus memorable) simile, given its context:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{βὴ δὲ μεταίξας Πηγέων σχεδόν. ἧτο τις θήρ} \\
\text{ἀγριος. ὃς ρά τε γήρυς ἀπόπροθεν ἱκετο μῆλων.} \\
\text{λιμῷ δ᾽ αἰθόμενος μετανίσσεται. οὐδ᾽ ἐπέκυρος} \\
\text{ποίμνησιν. πρὸ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἐνὶ σταθμοῖσι νομῆς} \\
\text{ἔλοιαν...}^{39}
\end{align*}\]

(1.1243-1247)

---

38 There is much interplay between the two texts. I am assuming, with Gow and Dover, that Theocritus is improving upon Apollonius’ text; however, the dates of both poems are uncertain. See Dover 179ff and Gow 231ff for full discussion and bibliography.
And he [the hero Polyphemus] rushed after the cry, near Pegae, like some beast of the wild wood whom the bleating of sheep has reached from afar, and burning with hunger he follows, but does not fall in with the flocks.40

\[\text{\begin{verse}
\text{ως οπότ’ ήμενειος ἀπόπροβη λίς ἔσακούσας}
\text{νεβροῦ φθεγχαμένας τις ἐν οὐρεσιν ώμοφάγος λίς}
\text{ἐξ εὐνάς ἔσπεροσεν ἐτοιμοτάται ἐπὶ δαίτα.}
\end{verse}}\]

(13.61-63)

The ravening lion hears a fawn cry upon the mountains and hastens to his lair in search of the ready prey. [So in the untrodden thorn-brake Heracles in his longing for the lad went raging...]

In both instances, the details of the simile are strikingly incongruous: a man rushing in panic to the aid of the helpless Hylas is compared to a beast of prey frenzied with bloodlust for a helpless victim. As Dover notes: “Both similes are curious since Polyphemus and Herakles alike are anxious to save Hylas, not to destroy him” (180).

Other associative elements in the Idylls are evoked on the small-scale verbal level. One of the major ones is the repetition of simos “snub-nosed” as a separate word or as the phoneme sim-. For example, In Idyll 2, the rejected lover Simaitha sings to the moon of her lost beloved just as the rejected lover of Idyll 3—the snub-nosed goatherd (simos 3.10)—sings to his beloved. There are other similarities between these two characters: both Simaitha and the goatherd consult a female seer for advice (2.91; 3.31), both perform magic rituals (Simaitha’s spell, the goatherd’s attempt at

divination with the flower of love-in-absence at 3.28-30). Both Simaitha and the
goatherd initially believed their love was returned; both were told by a third impartial
party—a woman in each case—that they were wrong. As noted, the goatherd performs
a rural komos with apples and song before the door of his beloved just as Delphis
implied he had planned to do for Simaitha. Just as Simaitha burns from love (2.131-
134), just as she burns Delphis over a fire in effigy in the hope of inflaming him (2.26-
28), so the goatherd complains that love burns him over slow fires (3.17). There is
perhaps a further connection, which comes with a tidy gender reversal: while the Moon
figures in Simaitha’s song, Endymion, the Moon’s beloved, is named in the goatherd’s
(3.50).

The name Simaitha is suggestive of goats (Dover 95) and so, by implication,
goatherds. Compare also the names Simichidas (Idyll 7) and Simos (Idyll 14.53). As
Dover explains (95) “Simaitha” is derived from simos “snub-nosed” plus -aitha, a
component in names of goats, particularly of goats in Theocritus, e.g., Kissaitha
(1.151) and Kumaitha (4.46). Similarly, note the name for the lamb in Idyll 5: Kinaitha
(5.102). The association of Simaitha with goats and lambs imports bucolic implications
into Idyll 2, despite its urban setting. Just as Virgil infiltrates his non-bucolic Idyll 6 with
the presence of cattle and so bucolicizes it (keeping in mind the etymology of bucolic
from bous “cow”), so in Idyll 2, goats and goatherds are constantly brought to the
reader’s mind by association. In the rural landscape where many of the Idylls are set,

---

41 Simaitha hears from the mother of two of her girlfriends 2.145-146; the goatherd from the diviner
Agroeo 3.31.
42 The komos is a phenomenon of urban courting. A lover would visit his beloved’s home late at night
(often on his way home from a drunken symposium) bearing gifts and singing in the hopes of being
admitted. If she refused him, he would lie before her door all night making a nuisance of himself until she
relented. As Cairns notes, Theocritus liked to amuse his sophisticated Alexandrian audience by
transferring such urban practices to a rural setting. Francis Cairns, Generic Composition in Greek and
Roman Poetry, Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1972: 144-145. For more on the convention, see Frank O.
even the bees are snub-nosed (*simai melissai* 7.80). While *simai* "snub-nosed" seems a strange adjective to attach to bees, Theocritus may be hinting at an etymological connection with *simblos*, "beehive," a word which occurs in Idyll 19.2. By repeating the *sim-* element of *simos*, Theocritus connects particular characters with one another and with elements of the bucolic landscape--goats and bees--and thus "bucolicizes" the landscape in the non-rural poems, namely the urban Idylls 2 and 14 and the agricultural Idyll 7.

Another way in which Theocritus creates associations is to repeat the same adjective in similar contexts. For example, *charieis*, "desirable, charming," is used fourteen times in the *Idylls*, nine times of a particular beloved. Specifically, it is used to describe the beloved of Bias (3.45), Amaryllis (3.6; 4.38), Bambocca (10.26, 28), Galatea (11.30), Hylas (13.7), Kunisca (14.8), and Helen (18.38). It is also used of a desirable youth in general (Philinus, a rival athlete in 2.115) and once of a tapestry which depicts a lover and her beloved, Aphrodite and Adonis (15.79). Beloveds, then, are typically described as *charieis* in the *Idylls*, although in Greek, *kalos* "beautiful" would seem a more natural--or at least less remarkable--choice for such frequent usage. One wonders if Theocritus selected *charieis* specifically because of its poetic implications. As Dawson points out, the noun *charites* ("graces" or "the Graces") is used by Theocritus "to denote the shorter poetry of which he and Callimachus approved" (*The lambi* of *Callimachus* 145). Moreover, the only time Theocritus uses the adjective *charieis* to denote an object--the tapestry of 15.79--he couples it with *lepta*, another word with powerful programmatic resonances, as discussed above.

**Associative Unity in Virgil's *Eclogues***

Virgil, like Theocritus, employs the associative technique to unify his poetry
book, repeating key words and phrases in different poems in a variety of contexts. We have seen how intricate and contrived the device is in the *Eclogues* in respect to the repeated names of characters, names which function as key words to form the single most powerful means of unification in the book. While Virgil might have learned the associative technique elsewhere (from Callimachus, for example), he openly displays his debt to Theocritus by imitating one of Theocritus' own associative threads, specifically, the verbal repetition of *charieis*, "lovely, charming." As discussed above, Theocritus repeatedly uses this adjective to describe the various beloveds in the *Idylls*. Virgil translates *charieis* into the Latin *formosus*, "beautiful, handsome, shapely," and uses it in the same manner as Theocritus did in the *Idylls*, repeating it sixteen times in the *Eclogues*. That this repeated and frequent usage is not due to the limitations of vocabulary or an especial fondness, but is instead deliberate, and even pointed, is clear, for the word is extremely rare in Virgil outside of the *Eclogues*. As Clausen explains, Virgil's:

predilection for this adjective in the *E.* is remarkable...and equally remarkable is his avoidance of it thereafter: once in the *G.*...never in the *A.* This distribution is not, however, typical of *V.*'s practice (Axelson 60-1); of the forty adjectives in -osus used by *V.*, only three are peculiar to the *E.* (all in *E.* 7, 29 *saetosus*, 30 *ramosus*, 45 *muscosus*) while no fewer than seventeen are peculiar to the *A.* (37)

The connection between *formosus* and beloveds is made especially plain by its frequent application to one particular beloved: Corydon's Alexis. This scornful boy is referred to as *formosus* five times in the *Eclogues* and always in connection with his
rejected lover Corydon (2.1, 17, 45; 5.86; 7.55). There are, in addition, five other instances of a beloved being described as *formosus*: Amaryllis is so called by Tityrus (1.5); Menalca by Phyllis (3.79); Galatea by Corydon (7.38); and Lycidas by Thyrsis (7.67). The word is used also of desirable divinities: Venus (7.62); Apollo (4.57);43 Adonis, the beloved of Venus (10.18); and of Daphnis as well as his flock (5.44).

The remaining two occurrences of *formosus* are less erotically charged, but still contain erotic connotations. The word *formosus* is used to describe the staff which Mopsus gives to Menalca for his victory in their singing match (5.90), an object that has a connection with a beloved: Mopsus, attempting to enhance the value of the prize, claims that his boyfriend Antigenes had often begged to have it:

> At tu sume pedum, quod, me cum saepe rogaret,
> non tulit Antigenes (et erat tum dignus amari),
> formosum paribus nodis atque aere, Menalca.

(5.88-90)

You take the crook, then, which Antigenes failed to get

For all his asking (lovable as he then was),

A handsome thing, with matching knobs and brass, Menalca.

By now, the reader has encountered the adjective *formosus* four times to describe another homosexual boyfriend (Alexis). Indeed, it is used of Alexis only two lines before Mopsus’ speech (5.86), and so the connection between boy beloveds and *formosus* is fresh in the reader’s mind. This association leads one to expect the passage above to read Antigenes...*formosus* instead of *pedum*...*formosum*. The effect

---

43 While "the beauty of Apollo is traditional," only here is he *formosus* in Virgil; at *Aeneid* 3.119 he is "pulcher Apollo" (Clausen 143).
of formosus here is that of a transferred epithet.

Another frequently recurring word which serves to unify the Eclogues is silva ("woods"); it occurs in eight of the ten poems. As Clausen explains:

The woods are a constant presence in Virgil's landscape and intimately related to pastoral life, especially to pastoral song. Tityrus' song teaches the woods to resound Amaryllis' name (1.5); Corydon sings to the woods and hills of his hopeless passion for Alexis (2.5); the woods are in leaf as Damoetas and Menalcas begin their singing match (3.57); looking for a place in which to sing, Menalcas and Mopsus consider a shady grove of hazels and elms but choose instead a cave overgrown with wild vine (5.1-7); the distraught lover, in Damon's song, bids a last farewell to the woods; and, above all, the woods hear and answer, completely answer, man's song, "non canimus surdis, respondent omnia silvae" (10.8). (xxvi)

The prominence of the woods in bucolic song is Virgil's innovation: woods are scarce in Theocritus' landscape (Clausen xxvi). Why, then, are they associated with poetry here? I suspect that Virgil is playing upon the Greek hule, which means "woods" but also "poetic material."44 The woods are necessarily an important part of the landscape in the Eclogues for they are the material out of which bucolic poetry is made. Interestingly, there is also an etymological connection between the Greek word hule and the name Hylas (Hulas). As noted Theocritus uses the adjective charéis to describe Hylas. Given the poetic implications of charéis for Theocritus (discussed above), one wonders if this usage of the adjective is programmatic: Hylas is a beautiful beloved (charientos Hula 13.7), but he is also a charming subject for a poem--as one

44 LSJ S.V. hule III.3
might put it, charieissa hule.45

Similarly, other elements of the fictional landscape are frequently repeated in the Eclogues. For example, umbra, “shade,” occurs seventeen times and in seven of the ten poems; lauri, “laurels,” with its connections to the legendary bucolic singer Daphnis and Apollo the god of poetry, occurs seven times and in five poems; myricae, “tamarisks,” again, with an association with pastoral poetry, occurs four times and in four poems; and nemus, “grove,” which is also strongly associated with poetics, occurs eight times and in four poems.46

Often particular lines or phrases are picked up throughout the book and transformed. The beech tree, fagus, is particularly important in the Eclogues. Scholars have noted that fagus is comparatively rare in Latin poetry (O’Hara 243), and yet it appears six times in the Eclogues. In Virgil, it represents a playful instance of what O’Hara calls “translation with paranomasia” or “translation by homonym:” “in the Eclogues, fagus, which in Latin should mean ‘beech,’ is used to correspond to the Greek phagos, ‘oak,’ as though fagus and phagos were related etymologically” (63). Fagus seems to refer to Theocritus’ shady oak, skieren d’ hupo phagon at 12.8, with its respite from the midday sun. Virgil draws a complex series of verbal echoes, beginning at Eclogue 1:

Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi

(1.1)

Tityrus, lying back beneath wide beechen cover

45 Whether or not this is the correct etymology is irrelevant. The Alexandrians loved etymological wordplay and were not concerned with the veracity of the linguistic connections they made.

46 As noted earlier, the poetic implications of nemus are clear from the invocation of Propertius 3.1: “Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra Philitae / in vestrum, queso, me sine te nemus.”
Immo haec in viridi nuper quae cortice fagi
carmina descripsi...

(5.13-14)

No, I'll try out the song I wrote down recently
On green beechen bark...

Note that while quae cortice fagi (5.13) echoes sub tegmine fagi (1.1), and both are associated with song, the context is rather different. Tityrus will lie under the beech and sing; Mopsus will sing what he has written on the bark of a beech. Yet the connection is there in the verbal echo and Virgil insists upon it: the preceding line in Eclogue 5 refers to Tityrus and how he will watch the flocks as Mopsus and Menalcas sing (5.12). Thus the link is made: Tityrus plus song plus fagi in Eclogue 5 recalls Tityrus plus song plus fagi in Eclogue 1.

Next we have a reference to fagi which is not a direct verbal reminiscence of 1.1, but a contextual one:

tantum inter densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos
adsidue veniebat...

(2.3-4)

Only, he [Corydon] used to walk each day among the dense Shady-topped beeches...

Again, a shepherd sings under beech trees, but while Tityrus lolls contented, Corydon paces in frustration. Eclogue 9 provides a direct verbal echo to this passage at Eclogue 2.3-4:
usque ad aquam et veteres, iam fracta cacumina, fagos

(9.9)
Right to the water and the old beeches’ broken crowns.

Here, too, there is a connection with song: the line designates the property Menalcas’ songs were intended to save for its owners during the land confiscations. The context in Eclogue 9 is directly opposed to that in Eclogue 1. Tityrus’ property was saved (by his verses?) and so he can laze under the beeches; Moeris’ was lost and Menalcas’ petition (unlike Tityrus’) a failure. The beeches of Eclogue 9 are broken and old (veteres) like the expelled farmers at 9.4, “veteres...coli.” Compare the state of the trees in Eclogue 9 with that in Eclogue 2.3 where, despite Corydon’s shattered heart, the tops of the trees are not broken, but full of pleasant shade. There is a fourth direct echo of fagi, this time, picking up on 9.9:

Aut hic ad veteres fagos cum Daphnidis arcum
fregisti et calamos...

(3.12-13)
Or here by the old beeches, when you broke Daphnis’ bow and his reeds...

(My trans.)
The position of fagos within the line differs from 9.9, but the adjective veteres is repeated from that verse--once more, they are old beeches--and veteres appears in the same metrical position as at 9.9: in both 9.9 and 3.12, veteres straddles a second foot dactyl and a third foot spondee. Again, there is an association with song: it is by the beeches that Menalca and Damoetas sing their match, by those beeches where
once the legendary singer Daphnis defeated Menalcas and Menalcas broke his prize for spite. Indeed, there is also an echo of Eclogue 9's \textit{fracta}, “broken,” in \textit{fregisti}, “you broke,” (the verbal form) at 3.13.

Like Theocritus, Virgil begins with a phrase and echoes different elements of it (verbal, metrical, contextual) in subsequent lines. Echoes may go back to the original phrase or to later variations of it. Thus while 3.12 and 5.13 appear to be connected only coincidentally in that they both employ the word \textit{fagi}, they are indeed very closely associated by means of their secondary echoes: 5.13 is like 1.1 which is like 2.3 which is like 9.9 which is like 3.12. In this manner, an associative net of major and subsidiary threads spans the whole of the \textit{Eclogue} book: from Eclogue 1, 2, 3, and 5, to 9.

There is a powerful link between the old beech trees of 3.12 and 9.9 and the old expelled farmers of 9.4, for the latter are set in deliberate, ironic contrast to the young farmers who maintain their lands in Eclogue 1. Consider the official orders issued to both:

\begin{quote}
“pascite ut ante boves, pueri; summittite tauros.”
\end{quote}

(1.45)

\begin{quote}
“Graze cattle as before, my children, and yoke bulls.”
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
diceret: “haec mea sunt; veteres migrate coloni.”
\end{quote}

(9.4)

And say: “This property is mine; old tenants out!”

Both passages quote the speech of a third party; each speech has an imperative verb and a plural subject in the vocative case. Note also the pointed contrast between
pueri, "children, boys," and veteres coloni, "old tenants," as well as the difference in tone. The particularly harsh and unfeeling tone of 9.4 stands in sharp contrast to the mild beneficence of 1.45. This passage is echoed further at 3.85:

Pierides, vitulam lectori pascite vestro.
Fatten a heifer for your reader, Pierians.

As in 1.45, we find the plural imperative pascite coupled with a plural vocative subject and a bovine object. As in Eclogue 1, in Eclogue 3, the phrase functions as a metaphor for poetic production (discussed above): the boves Tityrus will tend are the songs he composes under the spreading beeches; the vitula the Muses tend for a reader is a poem for his or her consumption. In addition to the repetition of the grammatical structure of Eclogues 1 and 3, Eclogue 9 shares with those poems a concern with poetry. Unlike Eclogue 1, in Eclogue 9, the efficacy of poetry is denied: it has failed to save Moeris’ property (9.11-13), and Moeris ultimately refuses to sing (9.66-67). A particularly poignant effect is achieved at 9.50 by the echo of the imperatives and vocatives of 1.45 and 9.4:

insere, Daphni, piros: carpent tua poma nepotes.

(9.50)

Graft pear-trees, Daphnis. Grandchildren will pick your fruit.

Here, Lycidas reminds Moeris of a song that Moeris once sang and of his own injunction to Daphnis in that song. Considerable dramatic irony is achieved, an irony to which Lycidas is oblivious, but of which Moeris is keenly aware: Moeris has learned
that there is no point in tending pear trees: now that his land has been confiscated, his
descendants will never know the fruits (metaphorical and literal) of his labours.

There is a further connection between Eclogues 9 and 5, with a nice inversion:
just as Moeris begs Lycidas to stop trying to persuade him to sing, so Menalcas urges
Mopsus to stop talking so that the two of them can sing:

Desine plura puer, et quod nunc instat agamus

(9.66)
No more of that, lad, and let's do what's urgent now;

sed tu desine plura, puer: successimus antro.

(5.19)
But no more talk, lad: we have come into the cave.

Boys and old men are contrasted once more in echoing phrases in Eclogues 1
and 5. In Eclogue 1, Menalcas twice addresses Tityrus as Fortunate senex (“Lucky old
man,” 1.46, 51). In Eclogue 5, Menalcas addresses Mopsus, another singer, as
fortune puer (“lucky boy,” 5.49). The repetition of the vocative address fortunate by a
Menalcas in each case serves to link the two poems.

Eclogue 2 is also linked to Eclogue 1 not by an echo of the vocative address,
but by an echo of a rather unusual turn of phrase which occurs in close proximity to it
in Eclogue 1:

fortune senex, hic inter flumina nota
et fontis sacros frigus captabis opacum
Lucky old man, among familiar rivers here
And sacred spring, you'll angle for the cooling shade;

nunc etiam pecudes umbras et frigora captant

Now, even the cattle cast about for cool and shade.

Capio, "to seize, lay hold of," is an odd verb to use in the context, and Virgil avoids it elsewhere in the Eclogues. The unusual usage makes the two verses stand out and allows the reader to draw an associative link. Virgil's deliberate attempt to link these two passages is apparent: the two are so similar that, as Clausen notes, 1.52 "reads like a refinement of 2.8" (51).

Another repeated theme with a verbal echo is the comparison of dark and fair complexions:

...nonne Menalcan,
quamvis ille niger, quamvis tu candidus esses?
o formose puer, nimium ne crede colori:
alba ligustra cadunt, vaccinia nigra leguntur.

...Better endure Menalcas,
However black he were and you however blond?
O lovely boy, don't trust complexion overmuch:
White privet flowers fall, black bilberries are picked.
Corydon, spurned by Alexis, warns the boy not to be too arrogant about the beauty of his blondness: such beauty is lost with age; and even when fair beauty is young and fresh, dark comeliness may be chosen over it. This prophecy is fulfilled in Eclogue 10 when the lover defensively responds to imagined slurs about a desired boy:

...(quid tum, si fuscus Amyntas? 
et nigrae violae sunt, et vaccinia nigra)
(10.38-39)
...(what if Amyntas is dark-skinned?
Dark too are violets, and bilberries are dark.)

Eclogues 2 and 4 are connected by a syntactical and verbal echo: Corydon compares his looks favorably to those of Daphnis, the shepherd of legend and lover of Pan (Clausen 73):

...non ego Daphnin
iudice te metuam, si numquam fallet imago.
(2.26-27)
...With you [Alexis] as judge
I'd not be scared of Daphnis, if mirrors tell the truth.

From the beauty contest of Eclogue 2 we move to the singing match of Eclogue 4: compare the words of the singer of the 4th Eclogue, with the emphatic double repetition of the ablative phrase with variation:
Pan etiam, Arcadia mecum si iudice certet,
Pan etiam, Arcadia dicat se iudice victum

(4.58-59)
If Pan too challenged me, with Arcady as judge,
Pan too, with Arcady as judge, would own defeat.

Finally, the phrase is picked up--and again varied--at Eclogue 5. Again it refers to a singing competition:

iudicio nostro tantum tibi cedit Amyntas

(5.18)
So does Amyntas in our judgment yield to you.

Curiously, Amyntas is the dark youth whose beauty was defended in Eclogue 10 (an echo of the beauty contest in Eclogue 2?). It seems that not only are dark boys less lovely than fair, they are also inferior singers.

There is another verbal thread begun in Eclogue 2 and picked up at Eclogue 4 in the repetition of the name Pan. The twofold repetition of “Pan” in the passage at 4.58-59 (quoted above) is an echo of the threefold anaphora of the name in Eclogue 2:

mecum una in silvis imitabere Pana canendo
(Pan primum calamos cera coniungere pluris
instituit, Pan curat ovis oviumque magistros),

dec te paeniteat calamo truisse labellum:
Piping beside me in the woods you'll mimic Pan
(Pan pioneered the fixing fast of several reeds
With bees-wax; sheep are in Pan's care, head-shepherds too);
You'd not be sorry when the reed calloused your lip:

Further, the repetition of this device—anaphora of a character's name—links Eclogues 2 and 10 with Eclogues 1 and 9 where the repeated name is not Pan's, but Tityrus:‘

Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena;
nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arva.
nos patriam fugimus; tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra

(1.1-4)
Tityrus, lying back beneath wide beechen cover,
You meditate the woodland Muse on slender oat;
We leave the boundaries and sweet ploughlands of home.
We flee our homeland; you, Tityrus, cool in shade

“Tityre, dum redeo (brevis est via), pasce capellas,
et potum pastas age, Tityre, et inter agendum

(9.22-23)
“Tityrus, till I come (the way's short) feed the goats,
And drive them fed to water, Tityrus, and take care
This passage in Eclogue 2 (noted above) reverberates in Eclogue 10 in a line which occurs just prior to Pan's appearance:

nec te paeniteat pecoris, divine poeta
(10.17)
Nor be you shamed, inspired poet, by the flock;

Both verses are in the context of song: the amateur singer Alexis is told not to be ashamed to imitate Pan by piping on the reed; the master singer Gallus is urged to feel no shame before the flock as he dies of an unworthy love.

The death of Gallus in Eclogue 10 is modelled on the death of Daphnis in Theocritus’ Idyll 1. One of the links between Gallus and the Daphnis of the Eclogues is this motif of the lover dying for a beloved who is unworthy of him. Compare Daphnis' words in Eclogue 8 with the description of Gallus in Eclogue 10:

coniugis indigno, Nysae deceptus amore
dum queror et divos, quamquam nil testibus illis
profeci, extrema moriens tamen adloquor hora
(8.18-20)
Deceived by sweetheart Nysa's undeserving love
While I lament, and though their witness helped me none,
Yet call upon the gods in this my dying hour.

Quae nemora aut qui vos saltus habuere, puellae
Naides, indigno cum Gallus amore peribat?
What woodlands or what rides detained you, Naiad maids,
When Gallus pined away of an unworthy love?

In the description of Daphnis as *deceptus amore* at 8.20 there is a further echo of Eclogue 6.10, where a potential reader of the poet Varus is said to be *captus amore*. Etymologically, *deceptus* and *captus* are derived from the same root: *deceptus* comes from *de + capio*, and *captus* comes from *capio*. Repetition of the phrase links Eclogues 6 and 8. Eclogue 10 is drawn into this association also for Gallus is a notable illustration of a man *captus*—or even *deceptus*—*amore*, even though he is not so called. Eclogue 10 is more explicitly linked to Eclogue 6 in its reference to a potential reader:

```
(6.9-11)
non iniussa cano. si quis tamen haec quoque, si quis
captus amore legit, te nostrae, Vare, myricae,
te nemus omne canet;...
```

(10.9-10)
I sing to order. Yet if any read this too,
If any love-beguiled, Varus, our tamarisks
Will sing of you, each grove of you...

```
pauca meo Gallo, sed quae legat ipsa Lycoris,
carmina sunt dicenda; neget quis carmina Gallo?
```

(10.2-3)
For Gallus mine (but may Lycóris read it too)
A brief song must be told; who'd deny Gallus song?

non canimus surdis: respondent omnia silvae

(10.8)

Not to the deaf we sing; the forests answer all.

Where the groves, the tamarisks will sing of Varus, the woods will answer all Gallus' song (10.8). Both passages concern an actual contemporary poet and his songs of love; in both, the very landscape lends its echoing voice.

There is a further link between Eclogues 6 and 10: Silenus, who is a Pan-like figure, appears like Pan in Eclogue 10: both present themselves to view (videnti, vidimus) with their face reddened (sanguineis) by blood-red berries (Clausen 301):

Aegle Naiadum pulcherrima, iamque videnti
sanguineis frontem moris et tempora pingit.

(6.21-22)

Aeglē of Naiads loveliest, and now he's looking,
With blood-red mulberries paints his temples and brow.

Pan deus Arcadiae venit, quem vidimus ipsi,
sanguineis ebuli bacis minioque rubentem.

(10.26-27)

Pan came, Arcadia's god, whom we ourselves have seen
Ruddled with elderberry blood and cinnabar.
The context and mood of Eclogue 6 differs dramatically from those in Eclogue 10: in Eclogue 6, two boys and a nymph play a light-hearted prank, in Eclogue 10, Pan attends while Daphnis lies dying and chides him for his excessive grief. Even so, there is a contextual similarity between the two poems, for both are connected with Gallus: the ruddy faced Silenus sings of Gallus, and Pan speaks to him.

Pan’s question to the dying Gallus is an echo of Corydon’s rhetorical question to himself in the same context (Clausen 84). Thus Virgil links the rejected lovers Corydon, Daphnis, and Gallus:

me tamen urit amor: quis enim modus adsit amori?

(2.68)
But I burn in love’s fire: can one set bounds to love?

“ecquis erit modus? inquit. “Amor non talia curat

(10.28)
“When will it end?” he said “Love cares not for such things

Virgil adds irony into this equation by bringing into it Pasiphae by association. Spurned by her beloved bull, Pasiphae is presented as a rejected lover like Corydon, Daphnis, and Gallus. Virgil addresses Pasiphae in the same words with which Corydon berates himself for love’s madness:

a Corydon, Corydon, quae te dementia cepit!

(2.69)
Ah, Corydon, Corydon, what madness mastered you!
a, virgo infelix, quae te dementia cepit!

(6.47)

Unlucky maiden, ah, what madness mastered you!

This is an especially memorable link for the lines here are remarkable in many ways. First, 2.69 is a direct translation of Theocritus Idyll 11.72 (Clausen 84). The Cyclops Polyphemus, rejected by his beloved Galatea, addresses himself as follows:

ὦ Κύκλως Κύκλως. πά τὰς φρένας ἐκπεπότασαι:

(11.72)

O Cyclops, Cyclops, whither have thy wits wandered?

Virgil substitutes the neoteric a for the vocative O in Theocritus but duplicates the music of Polyphemus' plaint.47 Where Eclogue 2.69 is based on Theocritus Idyll 11.72, its imitation at Eclogue 6.47 has a completely different origin. The first half of the line at Eclogue 6.47 is a reworking of a line from Calvus' lost I0, “a, virgo infelix, herbis pasceris amaris,” “Ah, unlucky maid, you will graze on bitter grasses” (noted by Clausen, 195). The line at Eclogue 6.47 is further remarkable for Virgil's astonishing address to Pasiphae, a married women (perhaps even a mother by then) as virgo (“maid, virgin”). As Patricia Watson notes,48 in contrast to puella, virgo "is always applied to girls of a specific status (that is girls who are unmarried and not meretrices)...the word virgo generally refers to a young unmarried woman of

47 The exclamation a occurs 9 times in the Eclogues, twice in the Georgics and not at all in the Aeneid (Clausen 305). For this exclamation as typical of Latin elegy, see, for example, Allan Kershaw, "Emendation and Usage: Two Readings of Propertius," CP 75 (1980) 71-72.

respectable morals. In most cases, she is also sexually inexperienced.” At the time that Pasiphae fell in love with the bull, she was the wife of Minos and thus a matrona; she was not famed for respectability, but notorious for her wrongful lust. In no sense of the word was Pasiphae a virgo. Even so, Virgil's sympathy for Pasiphae is apparent in his reluctance to assign blame to her: not only is she virgo, she is also infelix, “unhappy, unlucky.” The word infelix implies that she is not herself responsible for the act she commits; it is something that happens to her, not something she does. Pasiphae is not portrayed as an evil woman, but as a woman subjected to an evil (or unfortunate) fate. Virgil’s address to Pasiphae as virgo infelix conveys a view of her as essentially innocent—in intent, if not in fact—of the obscenity she is driven by the gods to commit.

Virgil may not fault Pasiphae for her crime, but he does find fault with the crime itself. This is suggested by another verse which associates the rejected lover Corydon with Pasiphae. Both Corydon and Pasiphae are described as seeking a male beloved—in both cases, a beloved who flees them—by retracing his footprints:

at mecum raucis, tua dum vestigia lustro,
sole sub ardenti resonant arbusta cicadis.

(2.12-13)

But l, while vineyards ring with the cicadas’ scream,
Retrace your steps, alone beneath the burning sun.

si qua forte ferant oculis sese obvia nostris
errabunda bovis vestigia...

(6.57-58)

somewhere, perhaps, the wandering hoof-prints of a bull
Will find their way to our eyes;

The word which Virgil uses for the beloved’s footprints (vestigia) is used elsewhere in the *Eclogues* only of crime, specifically, of the evils which the birth of the child in Eclogue 4 will put to rest:

\[
\text{te duce, si qua manent sceleris vestigia nostrri} \\
\text{(4.13)} \\
\text{With you to guide, if traces of our sin remain} \\
\text{pauca tamen suberunt priscae vestigia fraudis} \\
\text{(4.31)} \\
\text{Traces, though few, will linger yet of the old deceit.}
\]

Thus despite Virgil’s overt sympathy with the plight of Corydon and Pasiphae, covertly he seems to condemn the nature of their desires, Corydon’s homosexuality and Pasiphae’s adultery and bestiality. Corydon and Pasiphae are linked as spurned lovers, as trackers of a loved one’s footprints, and, finally, in the perversity of their desires.  

As noted, the exemplary singers Daphnis and Gallus are often linked in the *Eclogues*. In addition to the many verbal associations which I have discussed, they are

---

49 The fact that homosexual affairs occur in the *Eclogues* need not indicate an attitude of approval or even tolerance for the phenomenon in real life for such affairs are a frequent literary trope. While this *topos* is one the Romans inherited from the Greeks, Roman attitudes toward homosexuality were very different from Greek ones. For a summary of the topic and bibliography, see Louis Crompton, “Roman Literature,” *The Gay and Lesbian Literary Heritage: A Reader’s Guide to the Writers and Their Works From Antiquity to the Present*. Ed. Claude J. Summers. New York: Henry Holt, 1995: 594-600. If Virgil were a homosexual or even just sympathetic to that orientation, it is unlikely that he would portray it in too positive a light given the political climate in which he lived.
linked structurally and thematically. For example, the death of Daphnis from love is narrated in Eclogue 5 which stands at the very centre of the poetry book; the death of Gallus from the same cause is depicted in Eclogue 10, at the very end of the book. Further, the death of Gallus in Eclogue 10 is modelled on the death of Daphnis in Theocritus’s first Idyll, just as the death of Daphnis in Eclogue 5 is inspired by that same poem. Virgil’s narration of Gallus’ demise is presented as the poet’s final task within the eclogue book:

Extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborem
pauca meo Gallo, sed quare legat ipsa Lycoris

(10.1-2)

Permit me, Arethusa. this last desperate task
For Gallus mine (but may Lycoris read it too)

The link with Virgil’s Daphnis is explicit; compare the introduction to the tale of the death of Daphnis in Eclogue 5:

Exstinctum Nymphae crudeli funere Daphnin
flebant...

(5.20-21)

The Nymphs for Daphnis, cut off by a cruel death,
Shed tears...

The first word in each line echoes the other (Extremum/Exstinctum). Further, this verbal adjective is juxtaposed with a reference to nymphs in both passages: to Arethusa in
Eclogue 10 and to the generic *Nymphae* in Eclogue 5.

As noted, Corydon is linked with Daphnis and Gallus elsewhere. Corydon is drawn into this particular strain of association at 7.21, as he, too, asks the nymphs (this time Libethrian ones) to grant him a song:

*Nymphae noster amor Libethrides, aut mihi carmen,
quale meo Codro, concedite proxima Phoebi
versibus ille facit aut, si non possumus omnes,
hic arguta sacra pendebit fistula pinu.*

(7.21-24)

Nymphs, our belov'd, Libethrians, either grant me song
Such as you grant my Codrus (he is second best
At verse to Phoebus), or, if we can't all succeed
Here on the sacred pine shall hang a tuneful pipe.

The singer Corydon asks aid from the Libethrian Nymphs to sing a song such as they grant *meo Codro*, "to my Codrus." Similarly, the poet of Eclogue 10 begs the nymph Arethusa's aid so he might sing *meo Gallo*, "for my Gallus" (10.2). Note the repetition of the imperative verb, *concede* at 7.22 and *concede* at 10.1, as well as the masculine dative singular name plus first person pronoun, *meo Codro* at 7.22 and *meo Gallo* at 10.2.

Like Daphnis at Eclogue 5.45, Gallus is a "divine poeta" (10.17). So, too, the legendary singer Linus (6.67) and Alcimedon, the artisan of the beechwood cup (3.37), are *divinus*, divine artists. Meliboeus, whom Daphnis asks to join him and listen to the match of Thyrsis and Corydon in Eclogue 7 is also linked to Gallus, and thus to
Daphnis (who is, of course, present in this poem). Meliboeus accedes to Daphnis’ request in an echo of words of Gallus:

\[ \text{quid facerem? neque ego Alcippen nec Phyllida habebam} \]
\[ (7.14) \]

So what was I to do? I had no Phyllis, no Alcippē...

Compare the words of Gallus as he imagines what joy his life would have been were he born Arcadian:

\[ \text{certe sive mihi Phyllis sive esset Amyntas} \]
\[ (10.37) \]

For surely, were I mad on Phyllis or Amyntas

In both Eclogue 7.14 and Eclogue 10.37, the ideal world is a place where there is always a Phyllis, an Amaryllis, an Amyntas, to tend one’s flock, to love and to delight with song.

In many ways, the landscape is itself a character in the *Eclogues*. As noted, the woods, the groves, like Daphnis, sing of human loves. The pathetic fallacy is a frequently repeated *topos* and perhaps this is not surprising given the importance of song and singers in the book: archetypal poets such as Orpheus and Linus were typically in tune with nature. Like Orpheus, “Silenus charms the world of nature with his song” (Clausen 187 on 6.27-28). Like Orpheus, like Virgil’s Silenus, Damon and Alphesiboeus make the lynxes lie down with the cows with their song (8.1-2). A related
device, also frequently employed, is the *adunata* (literally "impossibilities") where the processes of nature are reversed in response to human fortunes. For example, Nysa's rejection of Daphnis for Mopsus is seen as so perverse, so against the laws of nature that Nature herself will be forced to alter in response to it: "Soon mares will mate with gryphons, and the time will come / When timid hinds go down to drinking-pools with hounds" (8.26-28).

We have seen that in Virgil's fictional world, the landscape itself is a singer, an instrument which conveys human song in the voice of its woods, its grove. There is an interesting thread of associations woven into one of these personifications of nature; in this case, the landscape sends music to the very stars. This motif begins with Menalcas' promise to sing of Daphnis:

> ...Daphninque tuum tollemus ad astra;
> Daphnin ad astra feremus: amavit nos quoque Daphnis.
> (5.51-52)
> ...and praise your Daphnis to the stars--
> Yes, to the stars raise Daphnis, for Daphnis loved us too

The motif of Daphnis raised to the stars by song becomes a pathetic fallacy a few lines down when, at Daphnis' apotheosis the very landscape sings his praises:

> ipsi laetitia voces ad sidera lactant
> intonsi montes; ipsae iam carmina rupes,
> ipsa, sonant arbustra: "deus, deus ille, Menalca!"
> (5.62-64)
For gladness even the unshorn mountains fling their voices
Toward the stars; now even the orchards, even the rocks
Echo the song: "A god, a god is he, Menalcas!"

The emphatic threefold repetition within ten lines (Daphnin...tollemus ad astra,
Daphnin ad astra feremus, and ad sidera iactant) wherein the phrase is varied each
time sets this motif firmly in the reader's mind. It is recalled in the next poem as Silenus
sings and the valleys relay his song to the heavens:

ille canit, pulsae referunt ad sidera valles;
      (6.84)
He sings (the smitten valleys tell it to the stars)

Finally, Menalcas' song addresses Virgil's friend, the contemporary poet Varus, and
promises that his name will ascend to heaven, as Daphnis' did in Eclogue 5:

"Vare, tuum nomen, superet modo Mantua nobis,
Mantua vae miserae nimium vicina Cremonae,
cantantes sublime ferent ad sidera cycni."
      (9.27-29)
"Varus, your name, if only Mantua be spared
(Ah Mantua, too near, alas, to poor Cremona!)
Shall be uplifted to the stars by singing swans."

Thus the repetition of the pathetic fallacy with its strong verbal echoes initially
associates the three singers Daphnis, Silenus, and Menalcas with one another. Varus is drawn into the equation by means of his association with Daphnis: Daphnis ascends to the stars as does the name of Varus, and Menalcas is a witness to the ascension of both. This association of Daphnis, Silenus, Menalcas, and Varus sets these four poets on a par with one another. Inasmuch as it does so, it constitutes an enormous compliment to Varus, whose talents are equated with those of Daphnis himself.

There is, in the sympathy between man and nature, and in nature's easy responsiveness to man, a suggestion of Hesiod's Golden Age. This suggestion is reinforced in the repeated mention of beasts with udders not just flowing, but overflowing with milk. Virgil first posits this condition as a sign of the return of the Golden Age in Eclogue 4. At the birth of the promised child, Virgil predicts:

\[
\text{ipsae lacte domum referent distenta capellae} \\
\text{uberam...} \\
(4.21-22) \\
\text{She-goats unshepherded will bring home udders plumped} \\
\text{With milk...}
\]

When this "sign" occurs elsewhere in the \textit{Eclogues} there is no other suggestion of a Golden Age. One wonders if we are still to construe it thus: is Virgil's landscape in general a place the Golden Age has never fully left? For example, in Eclogue 7, as the singers Corydon and Thyrsis prepare to compete, they join their flocks:

\[
\text{Thyris ovis, Corydon distentas lacte capellae} \\
(7.3)
\]
Corydon she-goats milk-distended, Thyrsis ewes

In Eclogue 9, this is a condition wished for and so, one infers, not actual. Here it is fitting that vestiges of the Golden Age retreat, for song has failed its singers; Moeris has been exiled from the landscape:

Sic tua Cyrneas fugiant examina taxis,
sic cytiso pastae distendant ubera vaccae,
incipe, si quid habes...

(9.30-32)
As you would wish your swarms to shun Cyrnéan yews,
And clover-feed to swell the udders of your cows,
Begin, if you have anything....

In Virgil, the suggestion of a Golden Age is not unmixed; harsh reality frequently intrudes. Night falls, it grows cold, and the flocks go home. It is a landscape in which one's place is insecure: like Menalcas, like Moeris, one can be exiled from it. Even the reader, in a light-hearted twist, is ultimately expelled from the pastoral landscape.

Virgil ends the Eclogues with a command to the goats, but it goes for us too:

ite domum saturae, venit Hesperus, ite capellae.50

(10.77)
Go, little she-goats, Hesper comes, go home replete.

Like the goats, we have been "fed" quite enough by our metaphorical shepherd (and

50 This phrase is itself echoed at 1.74 and 7.44.
as we know, in this world, all shepherds are poets). As Virgil explains to the Muse when he ends his song, he has sung quite enough:

Haec sat erit, divae, vestrum cecinisse poetam

(10.70)

These verses, goddesses, will have been enough for your poet to have sung.

(My trans.)

Note the etymological connection between the adjective *satur*, “sated, having eaten enough,” and the adverbial *sat*, “enough.” The Muses, like the goats and like us, have been given enough to sate them; it is time to go.

**Associative Unity in T.S. Eliot’s *Prufrock and Other Observations***

While in Theocritus and Virgil the associative technique is effected primarily (but not only) on the verbal level, in Eliot one finds more a repetition of images than words, although there is at times a subtle verbal echoing. Many of the central images of *Prufrock* are introduced in “Prufrock,” a poem which in many ways functions as an overture for the entire book.

Like Virgil, Eliot creates a powerful fictional world; also like Virgil, Eliot uses the device of personification: the landscape itself becomes a central character in the book. It is a landscape full of murky alleys and gutter-streets, of smoke, and fog and sawdust soaked with beer. At the same time, it is a place of refined interiors, of conversations restrained, and the polite drawing room. There is a major opposition drawn between these exterior and interior spaces which are signified primarily by the street and the
The street figures in seven of the twelve poems in the book. Eliot personifies the street in “Prufrock” and in “Preludes” while it is merely evoked in “Portrait,” “Rhapsody,” “Morning,” “Boston,” and “Aunt Helen.” In “Prufrock” the street is a sinister presence that mutters (“The muttering retreats” 5), that stalks, that possesses a certain low cunning; they are “Streets that follow like a tedious argument / Of insidious intent” 8-9). In “Preludes” the street is less malevolent, but is given an active intelligence: “You had such a vision of the street / As the street hardly understands” (33-34). In both poems, the street has the property of understanding. Even in the poems which do not personify it, the street is always dark and vaguely disquieting; it is never presented in sunlight (Gruszewska-Wojtas 71).

In contrast to the street, the drawing room possesses beauty and art, but its beauty is shallow and its art sham (Gruszewska-Wojtas 75). One finds little warmth or comfort within it. The drawing room appears in four poems and is perhaps implicit in another two. In “Prufrock,” the polite society of the drawing room is evoked in the refrain “In the room the women come and go / talking of Michelangelo.” Interestingly, in the next poem, “Portrait,” there appears to be some narrative progression: from listening to a man’s report of a conversation overheard, we move to eaves-dropping ourselves, this time on a man like Prufrock and a lady like the ones Prufrock had eaves-dropped on. Further, we seem to have entered the drawing room we overlooked before. Like the women in “Prufrock,” the woman in “Portrait” speaks of European art, not of Michelangelo, but of Chopin. Her banal remarks recall the imagined banality of the women’s conversation in “Prufrock” (while their words are not

---

51 Ludmila Gruszewska-Wojtas, “The Street’ and ‘The Drawing-Room:’ The Poetic Universe of T.S. Eliot’s Prufrock and Other Observations,” Essays in Poetics: The Journal of the British Neo Formalist School 14.2 (1989) 65-82. Gruszewska-Wojtas explores the contrasts and similarities between these two realms. Though valuable, her analysis is at times forced: for example, one of the similarities she finds between the street and the drawing room is that they are both enclosed spaces: the drawing room is bounded by walls and the street is bound by the sky (69). The idea of a street as an enclosed space seems to me incredible, for there is surely no boundary bigger or more open than the sky.
reported directly, an impression of banality is conveyed by the flatness of the Prufrock's observation and the childish rhyme in which it is couched). The scene also appears to be a drawing room in "Preludes" for it is a place where men smoke pipes and read the evening paper (43-44). Similarly, "Morning" and "Boston" seem to be set in the drawing room; it is even possible that the eponymous evening newspaper of "Boston" is the same one read in "Preludes" (44). While in "Morning" the speaker peers out a window, in "Rhapsody" the narrator describes people peering in: "I have seen eyes in the street / Trying to peer through lighted shutters" (41-42). The shutters of "Rhapsody" enclose a particularly female world: "female smells in shuttered rooms" (66). This line is recalled in "Aunt Helen" when we learn the dead woman's "shutters were drawn" (6). "Aunt Helen's" shuttered rooms may be imagined to enclose "female smells" as well, smells associated with the woman's death. It is possible that "Cousin Nancy" ends in a drawing room, and this seems also a likely location for "Mr. Apollinax." In "Hysteria," the scene is not a drawing room, but the outdoor patio of a restaurant. Even so, this couple seated at a dining table being addressed by a solicitous servant recalls and serves as pointed contrast to the disrespectful servants behaving badly at the dining table in "Aunt Helen."

One of the first major themes we encounter is that of fog, and the related element of smoke. In "Prufrock," the fog is an active presence, not just personified, but truly animated as its behaviour mimics a household cat who wants to come inside:

52 The waiter's repeated comment "if the lady and the gentleman wish to take their tea in the garden" may imply that they are not in the garden at that moment, for such statements are usually polite ways of directing someone where one wants them. For example, one does not say "if you would like to sit in the dining room" to someone who is already sitting there, but to someone whom you want to go there. In this case, we can infer that the couple is already in the garden for they sit at a "rusty green iron table." Wrought iron tables are generally used outdoors, green ones are particularly common in gardens, and this one is rusted, thus one can infer that it has been exposed to the elements. The waiter's repeated comment and his hurry to dress the naked table is due to his anxiety—he was not prepared to serve outdoors and does not want them there.
The yellow fog that rubs its back upon the window-panes,
The yellow smoke that rubs its muzzle on the window-panes,
Licked its tongue into the corners of the evening,
Lingered upon the pools that stand in drains,
Let fall upon its back the soot that falls from chimneys,
Slipped by the terrace, made a sudden leap,
And seeing that it was a soft October night,
Curled once about the house, and fell asleep.

(15-22)

In the last two lines quoted above, the fog curls around the exterior of the house, then settles down, just as a cat inside will circle and curl about its chosen resting place before settling down to sleep. This image is recalled in Eliot's description of smoke (an element similar to fog) in the same feline terms. The smoke slides along the street while the fog slips (and note the verbal echo of "slip" and "slide"); both rub their backs on the city's window-panes:

For the yellow smoke that slides along the street
Rubbing its back upon the window-panes

(24-25)

The evening, too, behaves in catlike fashion. In the following metaphor, it sleeps stretched out, it is smoothed by a woman's long fingers like the back of a cat under a languorous stroke:
And the afternoon, the evening, sleeps so peacefully!
Smoothed by long fingers,
Asleep...tired...or it malingers,
Stretched on the floor, here beside you and me.

(75-78)

In “Preludes” the image of the fog curling about the house is further echoed. The subject now is not the fog, but the equally nebulous “fancies:"

I am moved by fancies that are curled
Around these images, and cling:

(48-49)

Finally, there is an interesting echo and reversal of the image in “Rhapsody” where a real cat is described in terms which recall the cat-like fog and smoke of “Prufrock.” This time, instead of depicting the fog as a cat, Eliot renders a cat like the fog:

“Remark the cat which flattens itself in the gutter,
Slips out its tongue
And devours a morsel of rancid butter.”

(35-37)

The action of the cat flattening itself in the gutter recalls the way the fog in “Prufrock” stayed about the pools in the street’s drains (its gutters). Further, as the cat “slips” out its tongue, one recalls how the cat-like fog “slipped” by the terrace (20) and how
smoke "slid" along the street (25). In "Morning," the fog is an agent of imagery:

The brown waves of fog toss up to me
Twisted faces from the bottom of the street

(5-6)\(^{53}\)

Fog is mentioned also in the first line of "Portrait" where it is coupled with a reference to smoke: “Among the smoke and fog of a December afternoon.”

The theme of smoke runs throughout the book, beginning with "Prufrock" where the days are compared to spent cigarettes: “To spit out all the butt-ends of my days and ways” (60). This particular image is brought up again at "Preludes" with its reference to "The burnt-out ends of smoky days" (4). In "Prufrock" Eliot introduces into the scene men smoking pipes at windows:

Shall I say, I have gone at dusk through narrow streets
And watched the smoke that rises from the pipes
Of lonely men in shirt-sleeves, leaning out of windows?

(70-72)

We seem to encounter these very same men (or at least an identical scene) again in "Preludes," this time as they prepare their pipes to smoke. As in "Prufrock," the narrator walks the streets and observes men at windows with their "...short, square fingers stuffing pipes, / And evening newspapers..." (43-44). As noted, the reference to newspapers further associates these men with the male narrator who brings home a copy of the Boston Evening Transcript in "Boston." Additional references to cigarette

\(^{53}\) Incidentally, this image is quite similar to the one Pound used in "In a Station of the Metro."
smoke in *Prufrock* include the double reference to a "tobacco trance" in "Portrait" (36, 113), the smell of "cigarettes in corridors" in "Rhapsody" (67), and in "Cousin Nancy," the information that "Miss Nancy Ellicott smoked" (7).

The hazy air of fog and smoke that wafts through *Prufrock* is often illuminated by the soft glow of lamp or candle. The image of the light throwing patterns on a (presumably) pale background is evoked in several poems, perhaps most subtly at "Prufrock" where the arms that normally appear "white and bare" are discovered in the lamplight to be "downed with light brown hair" (63-64). In this case, the reader imagines the darker tracing of the hair on the pale skin and the patterns that it draws. This image is picked up again at line 109, "But as if a magic lantern threw the nerves in patterns on a screen." Here, it is followed by another reference to a woman's arms as she settles a pillow and throws off a shawl (112). The image is developed further at "Preludes:"

You lay upon your back, and waited;
You dozed, and watched the night revealing
The thousand sordid images
Of which your soul was constituted;
They flickered against the ceiling.

(25-29)

The allusion may be to Plato's *Republic* (book 7.514-515) and the famous simile of the cave:

I want you to go on to picture the enlightenment or ignorance of our human
condition somewhat as follows. Imagine an underground chamber like a cave, with a long entrance open to the daylight and as wide as the cave. In this chamber are men who have been prisoners there since they were children, their legs and necks being so fastened that they can only look straight ahead of them and cannot turn their heads. Some way off, behind and higher up, a fire is burning, and between the fire and the prisoners and above them runs a road, in front of which a curtain-wall has been built, like the screen at puppet shows between the operators and their audience, above which they show their puppets....Imagine further that there are men carrying all sorts of gear along behind the curtain-wall, projecting above it and including figures of men and animals made of wood and stone and all sorts of other materials, and that some of these men, as you would expect, are talking and some not....do you think our prisoners could see anything of themselves or their fellows except the shadows thrown by the fire on the wall of the cave opposite them?54

The image in Plato illustrates the limited nature of mankind and its fundamental self-deception. Considering the sense of despair, futility, and self-delusion in Eliot, this is a particularly apt allusion. There is perhaps a further, slight echo of the image at “Portrait.” The narrator describes the scene in which the lady sits:

And four wax candles in the darkened room,
Four rings of light upon the ceiling overhead
An atmosphere of Juliet's tomb

(4-6)

By this allusion to the tragic fate of Romeo and Juliet, Eliot creates a mood of delusion, disappointment, and longing for the unattainable. The mood is very similar to the one evoked by the earlier allusion to Plato's cave; one can infer an additional association between the two allusions from the similarity of locations: the tomb-like cave of Plato and the cave-like tomb of Juliet, both illuminated by the light of a flame, both with their flickering images.

The introduction of candles here in "Portrait" begins another image-stream, that of artificial lighting. Later in the poem, the narrator speaks of his self-possession which "gutters; we are really in the dark" (101). The metaphorical use of "dark" and its coupling with the verb "gutter" suggests the image of a candle: candles gutter and leave one in the real (as opposed to metaphorical) dark. While the implicit vehicle of the metaphor is a candle, the word "gutter" also evokes the street and its gutters along which slides the cat-like fog ("Prufrock") and against which the fog-like cat flattens itself ("Rhapsody").

The lamplight that pervades "Prufrock" is present also in "Preludes" with "the lighting of the lamps" (13). In "Rhapsody," the street-lamp provides a sort of background music and is personified as the narrator's guide to the street scene:

Every street-lamp that I pass
Beats like a fatalistic drum

The street-lamp sputtered,
The street-lamp muttered,
The street-lamp said, "Regard that woman

The street-lamp said,

"Remark the cat which flattens itself in the gutter

..............................................

"The lamp sputtered,

The lamp muttered in the dark.

The lamp hummed:

"Regard the moon.

..............................................

"The lamp said,

"Four o'clock,

Here is the number on the door.

(8-9, 15-17, 34-35, 47-50, 69-71)

The personification of the street-lamp as a guide is recalled in “Conversation” where the moon is portrayed metaphorically as a street-lamp which leads one’s way: “an old battered lantern hung aloft / To light poor travellers to their distress” (4-5).

Because of the repetition from poem to poem of various aspects of the landscape--the haze of fog and tobacco smoke, candles, the street’s lamps and gutters--Eliot conveys the impression that all the poems are set in essentially the same place, whether outside on the street or inside in the drawing room. At times, we see the same scene from a slightly different perspective or at a different time. For example, the men smoking pipes at windows in “Prufrock” and filling their pipes in “Preludes;” the man listening to a women’s drawing room conversation, as an eavesdropper in “Prufrock,” and as a participant in “Portrait.” Another example is found in “Prufrock” and in “Preludes” in the repeated image of the restaurant bar with its sawdust-strewn floor.
The association of a restaurant floor with sawdust is first made in “Prufrock:"

Of restless nights in one-night cheap hotels
And sawdust restaurants with oyster shells:
Streets that follow like a tedious argument
(6-8)

In “Preludes,” the restaurant is not mentioned, but evoked through the deliberate recollection of the association established in “Prufrock:"

The morning comes to consciousness
Of faint stale smells of beer
From the sawdust trampled street.
(14-16)

The sawdust on the street smells of beer, so one infers that it came from the floor of a restaurant or bar, a floor on which beer was spilled. The sawdust was then tracked onto the street in front of it. Thus, the lines recall the “sawdust restaurant” of “Prufrock.” Eliot links these two poems and creates the impression that the restaurant of “Preludes” may even be the same one as in “Prufrock.” Further, by the time the reader gets from “Prufrock” to “Preludes,” there has been some unseen narrative progression in the book: we have moved from the late night walk past the sawdust restaurant of “Prufrock” to arrive at the morning after, when in “Preludes” we find the street littered with the beer-soaked sawdust tracks of the restaurant’s exiting customers.

Another natural element frequently evoked in Prufrock is the sea. This sea-
theme appears first in “Prufrock” with its sea, seaweed, mermaids, and talk of drowning:

I should have been a pair of ragged claws
Scuttling across the floors of silent seas.

I shall wear white flannel trousers, and walk upon the beach.
I have heard the mermaids singing, each to each.

I have seen them riding seaward on the waves
Combing the white hair of the waves blown back
When the wind blows the water white and black.

We have lingered in the chambers of the sea
By sea-girls wreathed with seaweed red and brown
Till human voices wake us, and we drown

(73-74, 127-128, 130-135)

In “Morning,” the fog is metaphorically described in terms of the sea: “The brown waves of fog toss off to me / Twisted faces from the bottom of the street” (5-6).

In addition to the mermaids of “Prufrock,” Proteus, the old man of the sea, is evoked in “Mr. Apollinax:”

His laughter was submarine and profound
Like the old man of the sea’s
Hidden under coral islands
Where worried bodies of drowned men drift down in the green silence,
Dropping from fingers of surf.

(8-12)

Like "Prufrock's" seagirls "wreathed with seaweed" (134), Mr. Apollinax appears with seaweed in his hair (15). Further, there is a mention of drowned men in both poems. Drowning in "Prufrock" is associated with mermaids while in "Mr. Apollinax" the bodies of drowned men ride the waves like "Prufrock's" mermaids as they ride out to sea (cf. "Mr. Apollinax" 9-12 with "Prufrock" 130-131, quoted above).

Moving from the exterior to the interior spaces of Prufrock's fictional world, one of the echoing motifs one encounters is the taking of a toast and tea, as well as the occasional coffee. This banal activity acquires an ironic importance in "Prufrock" where the "overwhelming" (though unspecified) question might be settled "Before the taking of a toast and tea" (34)—or even afterward; as Prufrock asks:

Should I, after tea and cake and ices
Have the strength to force the moment to its crisis?
........................................................................
And would it have been worth it, after all,
After the cups, the marmalade, the tea
Among the porcelain...
........................................................................
After the novels, after the teacups....

(79-80, 89-91, 105)
Juxtaposition of the everyday tea ritual with the elemental question of human existence (whatever that may be) creates a stirring bathetic effect: Eliot's fictional world is both decadent and indifferent; it is a world in which the crucial issues are considered of no more importance than an afternoon tea. Prufrock's despair over his wasted life, his lost opportunities, is also figured by this banal metaphor: "I have measured out my life in coffee spoons" (51).

Prufrock's repression, his retreat behind the genteel mask of an English-style tea, is evident also in "Portrait." There, a Prufrock-like hero hides his discomfort, repressing his real thoughts and feelings:

I smile, of course,
And go on drinking tea
(50-51)

When the lady of "Portrait" speaks, she depicts herself sitting in this same place "serving tea to friends" (68, 108). The implication is that there will be similar moments of future discomfort for this and her other young male visitors. Finally, completing this hot drink motif there is a reference to "early coffee-stands" in "Preludes" (18). The rattling of breakfast plates in "Morning" (1) suggests the morning tea that usually accompanies the meal. In addition, both "Mr. Apollinax" and "Hysteria" are set at teatime ("His laughter tinkled among the teacups," "I remember a slice of lemon and a bitten macaroon," "Mr. Apollinax" 2, 22; "If the lady and the gentleman wish to take their tea in the garden, if the lady and the gentleman wish to take their tea in the garden" "Hysteria").
When he is not imbibing, the narrator of Prufrock may be found navigating stairways:

And indeed there will be time
To wonder, “Do I dare?” and, “Do I dare?”
Time to turn back and descend the stair

(“Prufrock” 37-39)

Except for a slight sensation of being ill at ease
I mount the stairs and turn the handle of the door
And feel as if I had mounted on my hands and knees.

(“Portrait” 85-87)

The little lamp spreads a ring on the stair.
Mount.

(“Rhapsody” 74-75)

I mount the steps and ring the bell, turning
Wearily,…

(“Boston” 6-7)

In each case, the ascent or descent has negative associations: a failure of nerve in “Prufrock,” anxiety in “Portrait,” fear and resignation in “Rhapsody,” and tired

---

55 The imperative “Mount” implies hesitation on the part of the one addressed—he has to be urged to climb the stairs. What awaits him at the top is a death-like life which he calls “The last twist of the knife”; hence I infer that his reluctance was due to fear. Resignation is apparent from the fact that he obeys the command regardless.
resignation in “Boston.” From the narrator’s defeated descent, from his fearful or futile ascent in these poems, we move finally to the open air of defiance in “La Figlia” with its powerful opening injunction: “Stand on the highest pavement of the stair.”

In a book so concerned with time wasted and time running out, it is not surprising that time and timepieces are mentioned so frequently. This theme is most prominent in “Prufrock” with its repeated phrase “There will be time” and its many variations (23, 26, 31, 32, 37, 39, 47); its sentiment is belied by its anxious repetition. A concern about time is revealed also in “Portrait” where we stop to “Correct our watches by the public clocks” (39). In “Preludes,” time is insistent and instigative as it resumes the “masquerades” of our lives (19-20). The intrusiveness of time in Prufrock is conveyed in “Preludes” and in “Rhapsody” by the repetition of temporal markers which recall the intense repetition of the varied phrase “there will be time” in “Prufrock:” in “Preludes” lines refer to “Six o’clock” (3) and “At four and five and six o’clock” (42); in “Rhapsody,” there are references to “Twelve o’clock” (1), “Half-past one” (13), “Half-past two” (33), “Half-past three” (46), and “Four o’clock” (70). Just as these temporal markers keep time ticking in the reader’s ears throughout the course of the book, so in “Aunt Helen,” time marches on relentlessly in spite of Helen’s death: “The Dresden clock continued ticking on the mantelpiece” (10). Finally, the passage of time is evoked in “La Figlia:

She turned away, but with the autumn weather
Compelled my imagination many days
Many days and many hours

(17-19)
The theme of the essential, the overwhelming question is prominent in the book, if infrequent. It occurs most memorably in “Prufrock,” where the journey through the streets may lead (if one is not careful) to an “overwhelming question” (10), and where, in a world of time, hands will “...lift and drop a question on your plate” (30). While the word question is only mentioned twice in “Prufrock,” its importance as a concept is conveyed by the series of unanswered and unanswerable questions which Prufrock addresses to himself, such as “Do I dare / Disturb the universe?” (45-46) and “So how should I presume?” (54). This theme is picked up again in “Portrait,” first in the “bloom” of music which is “rubbed and questioned in the concert room” (12-13) and then in a more explicit evocation of “Prufrock’s” unanswerable questions. Here, the lady’s question is banal and insignificant:

And so you are going abroad; and when do you return?
But that’s a useless question.
(88-89)

Prufrock’s questions are useless, too, either because he can not answer them or because he can do nothing to affect the situation the answers might reveal. The lady’s question in “Portrait” is useless for the same reasons: the young man does not know when he will return and even if he did know, one senses along with her that she could do nothing to affect the date of his return. The juxtaposition of these superficially similar (though fundamentally different) situations lends a certain irony to both: the crucial question of “Prufrock” acquires some of the insignificance of the one in “Portrait” and the useless question in “Portrait” gains some of the importance of the one in “Prufrock.” Thus, a bathetic effect is achieved by the pointed juxtaposition of the
important and the banal; what is important becomes trivialized and what is trivial becomes more grave. The echo lends to the lines in both poems a depth of emotional complexity that might not otherwise be present.

A similar effect is achieved in "Prufrock" itself where Eliot's narrator juxtaposes questions of fundamental importance such as "Do I dare / Disturb the universe?" (45-46) with trivial ones like "Do I dare to eat a peach?" (126). Because of the direct verbal echo of the former question in the latter, one assumes that the former one is an example of the speaker's illusions about his own importance: a man who obsesses about such trivialities would seem incapable of an act which could affect the universe. Conversely, the latter question "Do I dare to eat a peach?" acquires significance as we assume it too has some universal implication to the speaker. The echo of "Do I dare to disturb the universe?" convinces the reader that the peach is somehow symbolic of an unspecified act of universal importance to the speaker.

Set against the backdrop of the street and drawing room, of fog, of lamp, and candlelight, in Prufrock there is a constant undulation of feminine arms and hands. Their repeated gestures frequently involve flowers. Arms and the gestures they perform are particularly important in "Prufrock:" there are hands "That lift and drop a question on your platen" (30); "Arms that lie along a table, or wrap about a shawl" (67); "long fingers" which smooth the night beside them (76); hands that settle a pillow for a head (98, 111); and hands that throw off a shawl (111). The importance of this image is particularly plain at lines 62-69:

And I have known the arms already, known them all--
Arms that are braceletled, and white and bare
(But in the lamplight, downed with light brown hair!)
Is it perfume from a dress
That makes me so digress?
Arms that lie along a table, or wrap about a shawl.
And how should I presume?
And how should I begin?

The arms here are feminine and provocative. They arouse in the viewer passion and a
desire for action. The gesture of arms, the toss of the shawl in wrapping, or the toss in
unwrapping, inflames Prufrock's desire though he cannot act upon it.

Where the female gestures in "Prufrock" are languorous and seductive, in other
poems such gestures become anxious. For example, as the lady in "Portrait" speaks to
the poem's narrator, she worries stalks of lilacs in her hands like rosary beads:

Now that lilacs are in bloom
She has a bowl of lilacs in her room
And twists one in her fingers as she talks.
"Ah, my friend, you do not know, you do not know
What life is, you who hold it in your hands";
(Slowly twisting the lilac stalks)
(41-46)

Similarly, in "Rhapsody," the moon is personified as a woman past her prime, vain and
lonely, one very like the woman of "Portrait." As Eliot depicts this female moon:

Her hand twists a paper rose,
That smells of dust and eau de Cologne

(57-58)

In “La Figlia” we find also the emotionally charged female gesture coupled with flower imagery:

Clasp your flowers to you with a pained surprise—
Fling them to the ground and turn
With a fugitive resentment in your eyes;

(4-6)

So, too, the reference in “La Figlia” to “Her hair over her arms and her arms full of flowers” (20) conflates two image streams which flow throughout the book: the image of flowers within arms or hands and the image of the arms in “Prufrock” which, viewed under lamplight, are found to be “downed with light brown hair” (64). The association of “La Figlia” and “Prufrock” by means of female arms suggests that the hair over the arms of the girl in “La Figlia” is like the woman’s in “Prufrock;” namely, that it does not flow from her head and over her arms (the otherwise logical assumption) but that Eliot refers to the downy hair that grows on her arms which is revealed in the brilliant sunlight just as the other woman’s was in lamplight.

The last evocation of the image of the flower moving in a nervous hand is in “Rhapsody.” This time, the gesture is made by a man:

Midnight shakes the memory
As a madman shakes a dead geranium
There are other flowers in *Pruftrock*, for example, the hyacinths of "Portrait" of which the scent is an impetus to memory:

> With the smell of hyacinths across the garden
> Recalling things that other people have desired

(81-82)

In addition, flowers are present in the garden settings of "Hysteria" and "La Figlia."

Apart from the repeated images discussed thus far, Eliot also associates one poem with another by means of grammatical and verbal echoes. He writes in the first person and frequently uses the second person singular address to speak directly to the reader. For example, "Pruftrock" begins with a direct invitation "Let us go then, you and I" (1). There is a similar invitation to go out and walk in "Portrait," one which directly echoes the opening of "Pruftrock:" "Let us take the air" (36, 113). So, too, the narrator of "Preludes" includes the reader in the picture he paints: "The grimy scraps / Of withered leaves about your feet" (6-7). The effect of this is to implicate the reader in the fictional world; to make him or her complicit with it. The reader experiences an intimacy with the author and shares in his anxiety as Eliot guides him or her through this decadent, spoiled world. The second person singular address is repeated frequently as well in "Rhapsody," but here it is the narrator who is addressed and the street itself and its representatives which act as his guide, much as Pruftrock acted as ours in the opening poem.

Direct verbal echoes appear from poem to poem. For example, in "Pruftrock" the
main character fears that were he to find the courage to express himself honestly he would be misunderstood or would subject himself to humiliation. This sense of the futility of communication is echoed in “Mr. Apollinax,” where it is signalled by a direct verbal echo of “Prufrock:”

If one, settling a pillow by her head,
Should say: “That is not what I meant at all.
That is not it, at all.”

Would it have been worthwhile
If one, settling a pillow or throwing off a shawl,
And turning toward the window, should say:
“That is not it at all,
That is not what I meant at all.”

(“Prufrock” 98-100, 110-114)

As his dry and passionate talk devoured the afternoon.
“He is a charming man” -- “But after all what did he mean?”

(“Mr. Apollinax” 17-18)

“Prufrock” and “Rhapsody” are linked further by a complex image which centers around the idea of the eye as a pin:

The eyes that fix you in a formulated phrase,
And when I am formulated, sprawling on a pin,
When I am pinned and wriggling on the wall
Then how should I begin

("Prufrock" 56-59)

Which opens on her like a grin.
You see the border of her dress
Is torn and stained with sand,
And you see the corner of her eye
Twists like a crooked pin

("Rhapsody" 18-22)

In "Prufrock," the female gaze is like a pin that fixes the male subject, that pins him down, both literally and figuratively. In "Rhapsody," the female eye that looks upon him resembles a pin. While this connection between the two passages may seem a little tenuous, Eliot makes it plain that the image in "Rhapsody" is intended to recall the one in "Prufrock;" note how he employs a similar end rhyme in both poems: "pin" and "begin" in "Prufrock," and "pin" and "grin" in "Rhapsody."

Another echoing theme is that of the "eternal Footman;" it appears first in "Prufrock:"

I have seen the moment of my greatness flicker,
And I have seen the eternal Footman hold my coat, and snicker

(85-86)

This phrase, "eternal Footman," is later split and carried through two additional poems:
“Aunt Helen” picks up the element “footman,” and “Conversation” picks up the element “eternal.” In “Aunt Helen” the footman, like the one in “Prufrock,” is contemptuous of his supposed social superiors:

And the footman sat upon the dining-table
Holding the second housemaid on his knees--
Who had always been so careful while her mistress lived.

(11-13)

In both poems, a footman expresses irreverence and contempt: the snicker in “Prufrock” at one who, by virtue of his social position (if nothing else), should command his respect; the love-play with the maid in his dead employer’s house, someone who should command the respect of mourning, and presumably with the corpse upstairs. This irreverent and contemptuous attitude is found also in “Conversation.” The element of “footman” has disappeared from the phrase, but “eternal” repeats as a woman who greets a man’s remarks with the derision and contempt of the footmen in “Prufrock” and “Aunt Helen” is styled an “eternal humorist:”

“You, madam, are the eternal humorist,
The eternal enemy of the absolute,
Giving our vagrant moods the slightest twist!
With your air indifferent and imperious
At a stroke our mad poetics to confute--”

(14-18)
The striking image of the crab that crawls on the water’s floor which occurs first in “Prufrock” is picked up and developed further in “Rhapsody.” Compare the two passages:

I should have been a pair of ragged claws
Scuttling across the floors of silent seas
(“Prufrock” 73-74)

And a crab one afternoon in a pool,
An old crab with barnacles on its back,
Gripped the end of a stick which I held him.
(“Rhapsody” 43-45)

Other minor images which are echoed throughout the book include the opening one in “Prufrock:”

When the evening is spread out against the sky
Like a patient etherised upon a table
(2-3)

This is picked up in “Preludes,” where we find the image of a man’s soul stretched out across the sky recalling the night spread out like a patient awaiting surgery in “Prufrock:”

His soul stretched tight across the skies
That fade behind a city block

(39-40)

Mention of a parrot in "Portrait" in the strange injunction, "Cry like a parrot, chatter like an ape" (112), is picked up again in "Aunt Helen." In "Aunt Helen," the parrot is dead: "But shortly afterwards the parrot died too" (9).

A strictly verbal echo creates yet another link between "Prufrock" and "Rhapsody:"

And time yet for a hundred indecisions,
And for a hundred visions and revisions

"Prufrock" 32-33, 47-48

Compare the echo of the syntax and the rhyme of this phrase in "Rhapsody: "Its divisions and precision" (7).

An interesting narrative progression is created in an echo between "Hysteria" and "La Figlia." In "Hysteria," the watcher is drawn into the mouth of the laughing woman and "lost finally in the dark caverns of her throat, bruised by the ripple of unseen muscles." Metaphorically, the narrator enters her body and is bruised in the process. Conversely, in "La Figlia," the narrator imagines the male subject leaving her like a soul exiting a body:
So he would have left

As the soul leaves the body torn and bruised

(10-11)

Repetition of the word "bruised" in this similar context (someone enters a human body, something leaves it) suggest that in "La Figlia" the phrase "torn and bruised" modifies the noun "soul" instead of "body:" just as the male narrator is bruised by the journey into the female body, so the soul is "torn and bruised" as it exits the body. In both poems, there is a collocation of a timid male and an overwhelming female, and the painful envelopment of one body within another. In "Hysteria," the image of devouring (consumption/consummation) is further reinforced by etymological word-play.

Although "Hysteria" is not printed in verse-lines, line endings are very deliberately placed. For example, note how the word "accidental" is set at the end of a line, broken and hyphenated so that the verbal element "dental" begins the next line. Eliot marks this break as significant. First of all, this is not the correct place to hyphenate the word: it should be "accid-ental" not "acci-dental." Second, the placement of "dental" follows a mention of teeth and is followed by the word "drill:"

As she laughed I was aware of becoming involved in her laughter and being part of it, until her teeth were only acci-
dental stars with a talent for squad-drill.... (my italics)

The juxtaposition of "teeth," "dental," and "drill" suggests the image of a patient in a dental chair, which recalls also the image of the etherized patient of "Prufrock" and the related image of the soul spread out in "Rhapsody" (discussed above). This evocation
of a dental examination brings to mind the painful wipe-open position of the mouth required, as well as the terror involved in such visits. Here, the terror is not felt by the waiting patient, but by the watcher of the stretched-wide mouth. The object of the male narrator’s terror is not the literal female mouth, but the metaphorical one: specifically, the vagina dentata. This is evident from the poem’s title, “Hysteria,” for the word hysteria is etymologically derived from the Greek word for “womb,” hysteros.

The musical metaphor is another common unifying element throughout the book. For example, the line “Inside my brain a dull tom-tom begins / Absurdly hammering a prelude of its own” in “Portrait” (32-33) is picked up by the title of the next poem in the book, “Preludes.” The “dull tom-tom” of “Portrait” continues to beat in “Preludes” in the sound of the showers that “...beat / On broken blinds and chimney pots” (9-10) and in the tramp of “insistent feet” (41). We hear this sound again in “Rhapsody” where “Every street-lamp that I pass / Beats like a fatalistic drum” (8-9), and, finally, in “Mr. Apollinax:” “I heard the beat of centaur’s hoofs over the hard turf” (16). The musical metaphor is most utilized in “Preludes.” Although “Prufrock” provides an excellent overture to the book because it introduces the major repeated notes of sound and imagery, in some ways “Preludes” would seem a more obvious choice for the first poem in the book; a prelude is, after all, a short piece of music which acts as an introduction to a longer work. The plural title of the poem indicates more than one prelude, and indeed, in its last three stanzas “Preludes” evokes three other poems in the collection:

I am moved by fancies that are curled
Around these images, and clinging:
The notion of some infinitely gentle
Infinitely suffering thing.

Wipe your hand across your mouth, and laugh;
The worlds revolve like ancient women
Gathering fuel in vacant lots.

(48-54)

The cat-like fancies of lines 48-49 that curl and cling recall the fog and smoke of
"Prufrock." The gentle, suffering creature of lines 50-51 evokes the young girl of "La
Figlia." Finally, line 52 suggests the laughing woman in "Hysteria."

In addition to these major associative links, throughout the Prufrock book, Eliot
uses many similar-sounding words to reinforce the reader's sense of overall unity.
Consider the repeated phonemes and rhymes of words like: muttering ("Prufrock" 5),
muttered ("Rhapsody" 15), and sputtered ("Rhapsody" 14); shutters ("Preludes" 31,
"Rhapsody" 41, "Aunt Helen" 6), shuttered ("Rhapsody" 66), gutters ("Portrait" 101,
"Preludes" 32), gutter ("Rhapsody" 35), butter ("Rhapsody" 37), and scuttling
("Prufrock" 74); platter ("Prufrock" 83), matter ("Prufrock" 84), chatter ("Portrait" 112),
patterns ("Prufrock" 109), and rattling ("Morning" 1); and finally, flicker "Prufrock" 85),
flickered ("Preludes" 29), and snicker ("Prufrock" 86).

Summary

As we have seen, Theocritus' Idylls, Virgil's Eclogues, and Eliot's Prufrock are
poetry books with a cohesive fictional world which are unified by a tightly knit web of
associations. These associations are effected by means of the associative technique
and its devices of juxtaposition, repetition, and echo. The powerful overall sense of unity in each poetry book renders the genre a compelling alternative to traditional epic. As discussed, these books do have a strong relationship to epic, but are they themselves epics? Ought we to speak of the idylls and the Eclogues in the singular instead of the customary plural, i.e., "the idylls is" not "the idylls are"? For the modern critic, to simply re-classify these works as epics like the Iliad and the Odyssey is to miss the point: the idylls and the Eclogues are deliberately as unlike the Homeric epics as they are like them. Ultimately, despite the ancient classification, the idylls and the Eclogues, like Prufrock, are not epics in the modern sense of the word. Rather, each book advertizes itself as having a relationship to epic and urges the reader to read it against the epic genre. The Alexandrian poetry book, like the Alexandrian epic, is a form of epic that is as far away from pure epic as it can get and still remain in the genre. It is both epic and anti-epic. Straddling the boundary between epic and lyric, both the Alexandrian poetry book and the Alexandrian epic are unique generic hybrids that may be viewed more profitably not as genres, but as counter-genres (to use Klein's term).

One of the main objectives of this thesis has been to expand the all-too-narrow modern definition and conception of the epic genre and to illustrate how, as the definition of epic has become more and more narrow, many texts (ancient and modern) have been wrongly ousted from the epic genre and misclassified. Consequently, an extremely important layer of literary meaning has been lost due to the failure to recognize the generic interplay of these works with traditional epic. As Northrup Frye so aptly notes, "The purpose of criticism by genres is not so much to classify as to clarify...traditions and affinities, thereby bringing out a large number of literary relationships that would not be noticed as long as there were no context
established for them."\textsuperscript{56}  

## APPENDIX A

Repeated Story Elements in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book #</th>
<th>The Rival</th>
<th>The Informer</th>
<th>The Act of Supplication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Repeated Characters in the Eclogues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fictional Characters</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th># Times Named</th>
<th># Poems Appears in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aegon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphesiboeus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaryllis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyntas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codrus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corydon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damoetas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daphnis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iollas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycidas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meliboeus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menalcaes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moeris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mopsus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyllis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tityrus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divine Characters</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th># Times Named</th>
<th># Poems Appears in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amor</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muse(s)*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Legendary Characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th># Times Named</th>
<th># Poems Appears in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galatea</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nymph(s)**</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orpheus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Real Characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th># Times Named</th>
<th># Poems Appears in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gallus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollio</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Repeated Characters in Each Eclogue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Character</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Poets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 6 10 20 7 16 8 16 11 11 10

**Number of Times That a Name is Repeated in the Eclogue Book:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Character</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortals</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deities</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legends</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Poets</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 263

*Calliope (1), Camenae (1), Muses (9), Pierian (5), Sicelides (1)*

**Dryad (1), Hamadryad (1), Libethrian (1), Naiad (3), Nymphae (10)*
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