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My study investigates the connections between the poems that are attributed to Vergil but were most likely not written by him. I systematically traverse these poems, beginning with the writings ascribed to Vergil in the biography of Donatus (i.e. the Culex, the Ciris, the Lydia, the Dirae, the Catalepton poems, and the Priapeia poems); followed by those added in the biography of Servius (i.e. the Aetna, and the Copa); and finally the remaining works transmitted in the biographical tradition and also those remaining in the so-called “Appendix Vergiliana” (i.e. the “Ballista” epigram, Vergil’s epitaph, the pre-proem to the Aeneid, Elegiae in Maecenatem, and the “Helen Episode” from the Aeneid). These poems were probably written by different authors, in different time periods, and across different genres. They nevertheless display a concatenation of similar topoi. Most previous scholarship in this area has focused on issues of authorship, and when scholars have addressed the purely poetic aspects of these works, they have done so by focusing on individual poems. By looking at these poems as a group, we are able to look for and find similarities between them. My dissertation argues that these pieces of pseudepigrapha draw upon and react to the authentic works of Vergil in very
similar ways. More specifically, that the authors of these poems engage directly with the Vergilian biography, Vergil’s authentic poems, and Vergil’s literary predecessors, amongst other topics, to create an almost unitary reception of the author and his works. In addition, each poem references the Eclogues, the Georgics, and the Aeneid, usually obliquely and in close succession. We can infer from these references, along with mentions in both biographies, that there was some question of the authenticity of Vergil’s works. Moreover, I argue, we can discover a purpose for the writing of pseudepigrapha: recognition of Vergil’s authentic canon. My study also has broad significance for the reception of Vergil’s authentic works. Scholars on Vergil and, more specifically, on the reception of his works and their afterlife can now begin to view these poems as mirrors into what ancients believed were the most important elements of Vergil’s biography and works.
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Introduction

“Picasso had a saying: ‘good artists copy; great artists steal.’” (Steve Jobs)

Scholarly Framework and Approach

When listing the works of Vergil, one would surely name the Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid. However, those are not the only works transmitted to us from antiquity under the name of Vergil. In fact, there are more than twenty additional works, mostly poems but one prose text, which are said to have been written by Vergil, but are considered inauthentic by scholarly consensus today. These compositions are found apart from the authentic works in the manuscript tradition: some are transmitted in biographies, some only mentioned in other ancient texts, while others are preserved among scholastic rewritings. The authorship of these poems may never be securely established; the time period during which they were

---

1 Steve Jobs often quoted this line when confronted with accusations of and lawsuits concerning the theft of ideas in the creation of Macintosh computers. This quotation is also applicable to the discussion of ancient pseudepigrapha in this dissertation. When good artists simply “copy” another’s work, it is usually apparent because of a lack of creativity. This derivative work may be aesthetically pleasing but it is unoriginal and uninspired—any value is derived from the original version. But when great artists “steal,” they do so through interpretation and reuse of previous material in their own new work. While traces and influences of the originals will remain, great artists will create an innovative and inspired work. There are many forms of pseudepigrapha, some more successful than others in their purposeful reuse of previous material. In some instances, we as readers find the pseudopigraphic works to be mere copies of a previous work; but in others, we find them to be masterful “thefts” of original material, reinterpreted in a new way.

I also find this quotation interesting because, even though Jobs repeatedly attributed it to Picasso, no one seems to be able to find the original attestation. This fact adds an additional layer of meaning: as with some pseudepigraphic texts, one author may not have intentionally written in the guise of another, but instead a work was misattributed to that other author later on. While Jobs meditates on the nature of the reuse of ideas and material, he is making a mistake common to the field of pseudepigraphic studies as well. This quotation has taken on various forms throughout the years but it seems that the original sentiment comes from T.S. Eliot who said “immature poets imitate; mature poets steal.”
written may never be identified; the motivations behind them may never be known. The one thing that ties these works together is their attribution to the great poet Vergil.

The scholarship on these poems and on literary fakes, or pseudepigrapha, in general has followed two paths: discussions of authorship and examinations of individual texts. First, much of previous scholarship began with a question of the authenticity of the texts. The most basic methods to determine authorship and/or time period are through the examination of language, style, and meter, a so-called aesthetic approach. However, authors may experiment from one work to another and therefore many elements may not be consistent through a whole oeuvre. Moreover, the aesthetic approach tends to be flawed because analysis of style may be highly subjective and therefore an inaccurate indicator of authenticity. Scholars have attempted to use external evidence as well, including the manuscript tradition, scribal notes, additions, omissions, and ordering to support a particular theory of authorship. Other external evidence that can be used to determine authorship includes mentions of the poems in other ancient works (and any attributions therein). Furthermore, scholars examine literary fakes for references to other works, especially those later than the purported author, and even historical events.

---

2 I will more fully define the term “pseudepigrapha” in Chapter One.
3 For example, see Fairclough (1922) and Shipley (1926), who use the same evidence about Vergilian vocabulary but come to opposite conclusions.
4 For example, see Hunter (2002) who notes that Theocritus differs in his style from work to work, thereby making it difficult to identify a piece of pseudepigrapha.
5 For example, see Duckworth (1966).
6 Two different scholars can read the same evidence in two different ways, as noted above.
7 For example, see Ritchie (1964) and Hunter (2002).
8 For example, see Richmond (1981).
in order to date them comparatively. These techniques have also produced mixed (and subjective) results. Often, ideas of authorship are tied heavily to the aesthetic judgment of a work: a “good” poem will be deemed authentic, undermining efforts to determine legitimate authorship. Hunter blames this fact on the anxiety of classicists towards anonymous works since they never went through the typical channels of organization and compartmentalization.

More recent work on the field of pseudepigraphy, however, has begun to move away from attempts to discern the author and/or date of a given work. I begin my study from Knox, who in his article concerning the pseudepigraphic works of Ovid, states that no malice should be seen in such works of forgery, or pseudepigraphic literature, but instead “imitation [should be seen] as the means of working towards interpretation” of authentic works in order “to flesh out and make sense of the narratives of classical literature.” Therefore, I intend to move away from any discussion concerning the authenticity of what are now considered Vergilian pseudepigrapha. Today, the consensus among scholars is that the additional poems attributed to Vergil in antiquity were not written by him, but were instead penned by unknown (and perhaps unknowable) author(s). Additionally, I suggest a shift in focus to the poems themselves, following a model more commonly

---

9 For example, see Clift (1944).
10 Hunter (2002) 91. See Hunter (2002) for a well-argued overview of the state of the field and some cautions against these types of aesthetic judgments.
11 For example, while Kayachev (2016) in his monograph on the Ciris focuses mostly on the aesthetics of the work, he does still make the argument that Cornelius Gallus was its author.
13 The change in scholarship occurred around the 1960s and 1970s. However, there are some scholars like Richmond (1981), unquestioned by Horsfall (1995), who continue to argue that certain poems (e.g. Culex, various Catalepton like 2, 5 and 8) are potentially authentic works.
used in scholarship on Vergilian centos, specifically the work of McGill.\textsuperscript{14} With centos, which reuse authentic lines of Vergil to create new compositions, one never need question whether they are authentic works of Vergil. Although the words were originally his, centos are clearly not \textit{Vergil's} but are instead \textit{Vergilian}. It is here, then, I begin my study of these works, treating them as pieces of anonymous Vergilian reception. When Knox uses the word “interpretation” to describe the activities of writers of pseudepigrapha, I do believe that he is referencing a “reception” of the source material. Literary reception is itself an interpretation and subsequent appropriation or reuse of a previous work. Our approaches, then, are similar if not the same, since we both examine how ancient readers may have read a text, understood an author and his biography, and finally recast that familiarity in a new work. This new work would then serve as a means of expression for such knowledge.

Second, pseudepigrapha in general, especially Vergilian pseudepigrapha, are usually treated separately from one another by scholars, despite being grouped in primary sources. The names of most of these Vergilian works are found listed in the two most famous biographies of Vergil, those of Donatus and Servius, which both date to the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE.\textsuperscript{15} While these biographies make almost no mention of the authenticity of the works, they are nevertheless important to this study. It is here that we find these works first grouped as part of a collection, however loosely. The

\textsuperscript{14} See McGill (2005) for discussion of Vergilian centos.

\textsuperscript{15} Donatus names the \textit{Culex, Ciris, Dirae/Lydia, Catalepton, Priapeia} and possibly the \textit{Aetna}, while Servius adds the \textit{Copa} to the list, as well as the \textit{Aetna} securely. I must note that the versions the biographers had, if they had the texts at all, may not be the versions we have today. Beyond the epitaph in the \textit{Culex}, we have no quotations from the works themselves. I posit that the versions we have today may have been later forgeries in order to fill in the holes left by only the titles in the biographical tradition. Oudin (1729) has proposed this situation for the \textit{Culex}. 
fact that these lists are virtually identical led Teuffel to argue for a collection entitled “Virgilii iuvenalis ludi libellus.” In both biographies, what are now considered Pseudo-Vergilian works are set off from the descriptions of the authentic works—a fact that I believe is significant for their unified consideration. The 9th century Murbach catalogue contains a collection of poems, expanded from what is in the biographical tradition. J.C. Scaliger later termed this grouping the Appendix Vergiliana, a fact that further suggests we should view these poems in combination with one another. While neither Donatus nor Servius nor the catalogue explicitly states that the poems formed a formal collection, their textual juxtaposition is nevertheless important. It is from here that I begin my argument for reading these works together.

Despite the concatenation of the poems in these lists, as previously mentioned, scholars have tended to analyze them in isolation, rarely drawing connections between more than two poems. Holzberg’s most recent collection of essays on the Appendix Vergiliana claims to discuss a theme that would unify the Pseudo-Vergilian poems while simultaneously dividing the discussion of individual poems into discrete chapters. Peirano attempted a more holistic reading of

16 Teuffel (1873) 440. This is the title given to it by Teuffel himself and is not ancient. While I believe this scholar goes too far in arguing that there was a book in circulation before Suetonius’ time (the supposed writer of Donatus’ biography; see Chapter Two for discussion), I think the notion of some sort of collection should stand. Vollmer (1908) also makes a case for the existence of a book due to the fact that these poems were frequently transmitted together, although provides no dating.

17 To lists in the biographies of Vergil, the Moretum, Elegiae in Maecenatem, and the De Viro Bono, the Est et Non, and the De Rosis Nascentibus are added.

18 I must admit that perhaps one reason for this is the fact that the Vergilian pseudopigrapha do not mention each other directly in any significant way.

19 Holzberg’s edited volume, Die Appendix Vergiliana. Pseudopigraphen im literarischen Kontext, contains nine essays by scholars, one on each of the poems of the Appendix. There is only a short introduction to the essays, providing background to this work and the Appendix in general. There is a brief mention of the idea that the collection was created as a literary game for elites, but this idea is
pseudepigrapha in her recent book.\textsuperscript{20} There, she proposes to analyze not simply the Pseudo-Vergilian poems but all pseudepigraphic poems in general in order to distinguish the literary fake as its own genre. While it may be challenging to connect all pseudepigrapha, I do believe there is merit to her approach of unification when dealing with the literary fakes surrounding one author.

I also admit there are a couple reservations concerning the holistic approach to analyzing the Vergilian pseudepigraphic poems. First, despite the fact that both Donatus and Servius list almost identical titles for these works, there is no known mention of these poems existing as an ancient collection in circulation. These lists may just be inventories of works attributed to Vergil with no implication of shared origin or authorship. The fact that these biographical inventories are almost exactly the same, however, is significant and should not be easily dismissed. Both Donatus and Servius mention other poems of Vergil either in quotation or by name in other sections of their biographies. But both biographers purposefully chose to list these titles together suggesting a link between them. Furthermore, the idea of a collection, however loosely joined, is supported later by the Murbach Catalogue/Appendix Vergiliana, which contains almost the exact same works. Therefore, I believe that the lack of attestation of an ancient collection should not bar us from reading the works together.

\textsuperscript{20} In her book The Rhetoric of the Fake, Peirano (2012:10) argues that literary fakes were “creative supplements,” created to fill in gaps left by authentic works and authors. In addition, she argues that such works stemmed from the rhetorical tradition in which authors attempted to recreate the past.
Second, there are no mentions of the authors or times at which these Vergilian pseudepigrapha were produced. While scholars have attempted to date the works comparatively, they have not reached a consensus, and there is no way to know for sure whether the poems’ authors knew of each other and the various other works of Vergilian pseudepigrapha. It would be helpful for this study to know if they were writing in response to one another – a fact that would provide a more secure and firm picture concerning the important elements we are to glean from the poems. Due to the vast number of links between the works, we can safely say that certain elements of Vergil’s biographies and works must have been held in common consciousness, even if their authors were writing in isolation from one another. Furthermore, at the very least, we can say that many of the authors of works catalogued in the biographies were writing between the first and fourth centuries CE.21 Although still a significant amount of time, it is possible that some authors may have known at least the works of the other authors, if not the authors themselves.

Furthermore, the choice to discuss only the lists of additional poems, now considered pseudepigrapha, in the biographies of Donatus and Servius was not an arbitrary one. Servius’ is not the last biography of Vergil that we have from antiquity, nor is it the last to mention other works of Vergil. However, none of the later biographies from antiquity mention Vergilian works that were not already mentioned by Servius and Donatus. There are four other biographies extant from the 4th through 6th centuries CE. The Vita Focae, dating from the late 4th or early 5th century, not long after Servius’ biography, provides the epitaph of the gnat from the

---

21 There are some scholars who date individual works earlier than this time period. For example, Kayachev (2016) dates the composition of the Ciris to the 1st century BCE.
end of *Culex*, which is found in the biographies of Donatus and Servius, as well. However, the title of the work, *Culex*, is not found, nor are any of the other works attributed to Vergil besides the authentic three. The *Vita Philargyrii* I, dating from the second half of the 5th century, returns to the list of works provided by Donatus.\(^\text{22}\)

The *Vita Philargyrii* II from the same time, however, mentions only the authentic three works. The last of the biographies, the *Vita Probi* from the 5th or 6th centuries also provides no account of Vergil’s literary output beyond the authentic texts.\(^\text{23}\)

These six are the only biographies transmitted from antiquity. It must be noted that other Vergilian biographies may have existed but have unfortunately not survived. From this meager sample, a summary can be drawn about the inclusion of what will be considered Vergilian pseudepigrapha: Donatus catalogues four poems and two poetic collections; Servius adds two further poems that increase this list of works to its greatest number. After that, biographies either parrot the list provided by Donatus or mention only the canonical three works (the *Eclogues*, *Georgics* and *Aeneid*). It seems from the evidence at hand that the desire to attach additional works to the oeuvre of Vergil dies out by the end of the fifth century. Therefore, it should be clear why I have limited the main discussion of Vergilian pseudepigraphic poems to those found in the biographies of Donatus and Servius.

I intend, then, to examine all the Pseudo-Vergilian poems from antiquity simultaneously and comprehensively as pieces of Vergilian reception. In doing so, I hope to create a catalogue of common Vergilian-derived *topoi* from which the authors drew while composing these pseudepigraphic Vergilian poems. This

---

\(^\text{22}\) *I.e.* the *Catalepton*, *Priapeia*, *Epigrammata*, *Dirae*, *Ciris* and *Culex*.

\(^\text{23}\) See Appendix A for quotations from these later biographies.
approach will perhaps allow us to see why these poems were linked in the biography of Donatus, and subsequently that of Servius, whether or not they circulated together in antiquity as proposed by previous scholars. I believe it will be useful to identify connections between the poems in order to gain an understanding of what elements of the Vergilian tradition (both from Vergil's biographies and authentic works) were most important or interesting to ancient readers and writers.

Chapter Summaries

I consider it important to my study to discuss the cultural literary context in which these poems were created. For this reason, the first chapter is devoted to a survey of two key literary terms and how they created a potential breeding ground for the creation of Pseudo-Vergilian works. I begin with a discussion of imitatio, the imitation or reuse of previous works in a new composition, an idea that forms the foundation of Roman literature. Authors often drew upon earlier writings in their new works, yet still create something original. While there was no legal concept of plagiarism in antiquity, there was a moral precept against the outright theft of another's works. I then transition into a discussion of the term pseudepigrapha, providing both ancient and modern definitions. I suggest that this term should be broadly construed, in order to cover a wide range of texts. Due to the unknowability of a given pseudepigraphic work's author, time period, and motivation, it is hard to identify precisely whether, for example, a work was written to “pass” as that of another writer, perhaps for financial gain, or was mistakenly attributed in the
manuscript tradition. Finally, I discuss a potential origin for many pseudepigraphic texts, most especially the Vergilian ones: the Roman educational system. Vergil’s poems became instant classics and foundational material for schools. It was in these schools that boys would have first been introduced to Vergil’s texts and would have produced rewritings of them, as evidenced by the various school exercises, *progymnasmata*.

Chapter Two commences the discussion of the poems found in the biographical tradition of Vergil. I begin with the issues surrounding the biography attributed to Donatus, a work that may in fact have its origins with the biographies of Suetonius. The question of authorship here is important for the dating of the poems listed within: if the biography were completely Suetonius’, it was composed in the late first/early second century CE; if Donatus’, the fourth. Before treating the poems themselves, I discuss some of the problems with the list provided.

I then begin an exploration of the poems from an objective, *i.e.* not aesthetic, point of view, examining their metrical and lexical similarities, as well as the similarities with the authentic works of Vergil. I transition into the creation of a catalogue of common *topoi* for these works. All the poems make reference to the biography of Vergil in very similar ways, painting a certain picture of the author. When the poems fail to address parts of Vergil’s biography, their topics seem to fill “holes” in his *vita* in places that ancient readers may have thought lacking. The poems also declare themselves works of a young “Vergil” through their lexical choices, a fact that supports their placement in the biographical tradition. I then discuss the ways in which the poems reference the authentic works of Vergil. In
doing so, I introduce what I think is the most important link between the poems: references to the three authentic works of Vergil, often in their canonical order. Finally, I end with comparisons between these poems and the *progymnasmata*, arguing that these poems are more complex than one simple educational exercise, and instead combine multiple exercises in one composition.

Larger connections between these poems are examined in Chapters Three and Four, beginning with a discussion of literary ludism. I start with a definition of this term as well as ancient examples of its use. A complementary *topos*, parody, is also defined here. I show how the poems declare their connection to ludism through their authors’ lexical choices. I then discuss various examples of playfulness and parody in the poems. I end with an investigation into two potential acrostics—a common feature of ludic poetry—both of which were utilized as important connectors to the authentic works of Vergil.

Another of the key links between the poems is a shared debt to Hellenistic and Neoteric poetry. Again, I begin at the most basic linguistic level with the use of important terminology. Then, I investigate how the anonymous authors of these poems make direct reference to central figures from both Hellenistic and Neoteric traditions, notably Catullus, Callimachus, and Theocritus. I also discuss the forms and features typical of these literary movements found in the poems, for example the epyllion and the *recusatio*. Their heavy use as found in the Vergilian works is logical, I argue, since they were *en vogue* at the end of the Republic when Vergil would have been writing his juvenilia. Finally, at the end of this chapter, I provide a case study on ancient reception of Vergil. I use the *Culex* to illustrate how ancient
readers may have read and then reused authentic material in Pseudo-Vergilian works.

Chapter Five begins similarly to Chapter Two, with a discussion of a biography of Vergil, in this case Servius’. His biography adds two poems, the *Copa* and *Aetna*, securely, to the list of youthful works of Vergil provided by Donatus. I use the framework and connections discussed in Chapters Two through Four to investigate how (or if) these poems fit in with those previously discussed. I move from metrical and lexical links, through references to Vergil’s biography and authentic works, to educational exercises, and finally on to ludic and Hellenistic connections. At the close of this analysis, I conclude that these poems do not fit together as well as the ones discussed in previous chapters.

The six individual poems and two collections listed in the biographies of Donatus and Servius are not the only additional works attributed to Vergil in antiquity. In Chapter Six, I introduce nineteen poems and one prose letter into the discussion. I provide brief analyses of many of these works, as well as reasons for omitting them from a more in-depth investigation. I explore five poems for their connections to the previously described framework. While four fit well, one does not, perhaps because it is a different type of pseudepigraphic work. With the establishment of connections between all of the poems attributed to Vergil, including connections between these poems and his biography and authentic works, we will hopefully better understand their significance in establishing the oeuvre of Vergil.
Summaries of Works

Since most of the Pseudo-Vergilian poems are unfamiliar to readers, I include below brief summaries of the works listed in the biographies of Donatus and Servius. I have chosen to list them alphabetically for easy reference and so as not to prioritize any work over another.

*Aetna*: The eponymous mountain in Sicily is the subject of this didactic poem. This poem claims that it is the first work to investigate the scientific, *i.e.* non-mythological, explanation for volcanic activity and eruptions, even though it begins with mythological reasons. Deep hidden channels run from the mountains into the earth, containing winds and fire, both of which in turn can either cause earthquakes or eruptions from underground. The author transitions to a discussion of the causes of winds, both within the earth and outside of it. Then the author proposes reasons for the fire that fuels the volcano, primarily through visual inspection. Finally, we hear of the eruption proper and the destruction it brings. The poem ends with a description of the man-made wonders of the earth, as a contrast to the natural one previously described.

*Catalepton*: This is a collection of 15 or 16 poems in various meters and on various topics. Themes include love, both hetero- and homosexual; rhetoric; philosophy;

---

24 *Catalepton* 16 is bracketed in the *OCT* edition of the *Appendix Vergiliana*. This poem is found in the margin of Manuscript Z and seems to have been a humanist tribute to another writer, not Vergil. Therefore, there are 15 *Catalepton* poems attributed to “Vergil,” but 16 in the total collection.
celebration of, encomium for, or warning to an addressee; parody and attacks; concerns about poetry; and finally an epilogue concerning Vergil’s works.

_Ciris:_ After an invocation to the poet’s patron, Messalla, we meet the subject of our tale: Scylla -- not the sea monster who eats men as in Homer’s _Odyssey_, but instead the girl who will be turned into a bird. Scylla fell in love with Minos after being struck by Cupid’s arrow. Minos told Scylla that she would win his love in return if she were to cut off a purple lock of hair from her father’s head, a lock that ensured the safety of the city. After doing so, she is quickly tied to a boat and swept across the sea, abandoned and betrayed by her lover. She cries out about her terrible situation, and Amphitrite takes pity on her, turning her into a bird, the ciris. At the end of the poem, Jupiter turns faithful Nisus into a sea eagle to chase constantly after his now avian daughter.

_Copa:_ Addressed to an unnamed traveler, this poem celebrates a roadside tavern and the people and elements therein. It begins with a description of the eponymous barmaid, before transitioning to a description of the allures of the tavern, including various fruits. The last section of the poem mentions activities within the tavern, like the kissing of girls, before ending with a command to live because life is short.

_Culex:_ In this poem, a shepherd, while tending his flocks at mid-day, comes upon a grove and decides that it is a good place to take a nap. While asleep, a snake approaches him and is ready to bite, until a gnat rouses the shepherd. When the
pastor awakens, he kills the snake and, inadvertently, the gnat. That night, the ghost of the gnat visits the shepherd in his sleep and, while lamenting his fate, gives a description in the form of a *katabasis* into the underworld and those who live there with him now. The poem ends with the shepherd erecting a temple for the gnat and inscribing an epitaph upon it.

*Dirae*: This work takes the form of a curse poem (or a series of curses) from a farmer to a former soldier, Lycurgus, who has presumably taken the farmer’s lands from him. The farmer laments how the lands, once pristine and fruitful, will devolve into a muddy, burnt parcel. He wishes for destruction to be brought on his former lands at the hands of the gods and nature in order to punish their new owner. However, he ends by noting how he will always love these lands.

*Lydia*: This poem begins with an address to the fields in which the speaker’s potential beloved, Lydia, plays. The speaker laments how the fields, instead of himself, will be able to experience the wonder that is Lydia. He continues describing the wretched state he finds himself in, since his lover is no longer with him. The speaker invokes mythological comparisons similar to those found in elegy, before ending with a wish that he had been born at a different time.  

*Priapeia*: There are four such poems among the Vergilian pseudepigrapha. In the first three, the god, Priapus, is the speaker. The first is a mock-inscription for a

---

25 This poem is connected to the *Dirae* in the manuscript tradition to form one poem. See Chapter Two for a discussion of the split by recent scholars and for bibliography.
statue of the god. The second and third are addresses to passers-by in which Priapus outlines how he protects the farm. The fourth, sometimes called the “Quid hoc novi est?” as per its first line, features an address to Priapus, and to the speaker’s phallus, after a failed sexual encounter with a young boy.
Chapter 1: Roman Literary Culture

Before discussing what the Pseudo-Vergilian poems in antiquity have in common, it is first necessary to discuss the circumstances surrounding literature in Rome during the early Principate. In doing so, we will see the opportunities for and circumstances under which pseudepigraphic texts, like those attached to Vergil, were written. I begin with ancient ideas on authorship. Imitation of previous texts was the norm in the production of new texts, a fact that led to the idea of works being open for reuse. The methods for publication and dissemination allowed for the (mis)appropriation of texts and their topoi as well. These facts, I argue, enabled reuse of previous works in more sinister ways, that is the passing off of one’s own texts as someone else’s. Finally I turn to a place of incubation for later pseudepigraphic works: the educational system. The exercises that school children engaged in, in which they recycled and built upon the ideas of previous authors, may have spurred on the creation of the more complex literary pursuits of pseudepigrapha.

Ancient Ideas on Authorship

As the Iliad and Odyssey were handed down through antiquity under the name of Homer, a biography was created for him: he was supposedly a blind bard from Chios. But nowhere in the text does this “Homer” name himself or provide

---

26 Fantham (1996) has a monograph of the same title in which she traces the history of literature from the times of Cicero until that of Apuleius.
these biographical anecdotes—no “onymity,” or the statement of a named author, exits. Instead, it was those bards who came after called “Homeridai” who gave Homer a name and life. Homer, then, became a created, fictitious author. By attributing these epics to an author, later bards were able to give authority to “Homer’s” texts, as well as themselves. The poet of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo buys into this idea of Homer, claiming that he himself is a “a blind man, and he lives in rocky Chios” (τυφλὸς ἀνήρ, οἶκεῖ δὲ Χῖῳ ἐνι παιπαλοέσσῃ). By using the biography, although not the name of Homer, this author is able to gain the cultural authority that is reserved for Homer himself.

In the seventh century, Hesiod begins the tradition of expressing one’s name in the text: when the Muses appear to a named Hesiod in the Theogony, we see the beginning of the transition from textual anonymity to acknowledged authorship. By the time of Theognis, an elegiac poet in the sixth century BCE, authorial self-reference in a text has become more complex. Modern editions of his poem end with a five line “sphragis,” or seal. In it, he states who he is, where he is from, and that
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27 See Peirano (2013) for further discussion of this term.
28 See recently Nagy (1999, passim) and West (2009) for further discussion of the persona and creation of Homer.
30 Peirano (2013: 268) points out the use of a name can be a positive and negative – it can create authority but also be disruptive to it because it is anachronistic.
31 Hes. Theog. 22-4. Interestingly, Lamberton (1988) has noted that the proems to the works of Hesiod, which include his name, are sometimes left out in antiquity because they were deemed spurious. Lamberton argues that removing the name of Hesiod allows the texts to be anonymous and therefore more connected to Homer and his authority (47).
32 Theognis (IEG 19-23). See Woodbury (1952), Ford (1985) and Edmunds (1997) for further discussion of the importance of this sphragis. Woodbury firmly states that, “the seal attests ownership” (1952: 24/31). See Kranz (1961) for a comprehensive study of this technique. A related technique was a “colophon,” which found its origin in cuneiform texts of the Near East. A colophon would include certain key information, like the title, how it was copied, the name of the scribe, etc., in order to show that the text was authentic. While this technique is also used in biblical texts, there is no mention of it being used in classical texts or early manuscripts.
the previous lines are in fact his. The use of this seal is supposed to stop any future theft of the work or lines, according to Theognis. The use of onymity by authors like Hesiod and Theognis allows such authors to gain “cultural capital” through their acknowledgement of authorship and to validate their texts as well.\textsuperscript{33}

As time continues, the use of the sphragis becomes more important for book production, as this technique is used by authors as a safe way to signal authorship.\textsuperscript{34} For example, Vergil ends his \textit{Georgics} with a sphragis, in which the poet both names himself and then quotes the first two lines of the \textit{Eclogues}.\textsuperscript{35} The use of these indicators is supposed to signify to the reader that both the \textit{Georgics} and the \textit{Eclogues} were indeed authentic works of Vergil. This marker was thought by the ancients to convey the authority of the author and thus the confidence of authenticity. However, the use of a sphragis came to be more symbolic to the reader rather than practical over time.\textsuperscript{36}

It is not hard to see the problems surrounding the usefulness of sphragides. These seals were transmitted either as part of the work themselves or as a separate entity. While the earliest ones would be used to begin or end a poem or a collection of poems, by the Hellenistic and Roman times, they were found exclusively at the end. Sphragides, especially those that were not fully integrated into a work, could

\textsuperscript{33} Peirano (2013) 263.
\textsuperscript{34} I will discuss Roman literary production later in this section. The use of a sphragis is practiced throughout various time periods, genres and locations. Other examples include Hesiod in the \textit{Theogony} (vv. 22-25) where he names himself and meets the Muses; Timotheus in his \textit{Persians} (vv. 215-248) where he mentions his 11 string lyre and how his poetry is a response to conservatism in Sparta at the time; Pindar in \textit{Olympian} 1 (vv. 115-117) where he expresses his occupation as the best of epinician poets; and Horace in \textit{Odes} 3.30 where he notes his place of birth as well as a hope for eternal glory through his poems. Other ways to signal authorship included marginal notes, titles, and hand tags. However, none of these were fool proof (Peirano (2013) 272).
\textsuperscript{35} Verg. \textit{Georg}. 4.559-566. Donatus (\textit{VSD} 48) claims that this sphragis marks the work as solidly authentic.
\textsuperscript{36} Peirano (2013) 281.
easily be faked without any other form of outside authority to vouch for authenticity. As Seo points out, Martial's use of a sphragis demonstrates the efficacy of such a technique, one that requires the knowledge and complicity of the audience to make it truly effective against forgers—that is the audience must already believe there is some authenticity to the text.37

For authors like Theognis, texts were immaterial and therefore writers used the seal as the physical material through which they could authenticate the text. But it was up to the audience of Theognis’ poem to provide for the poem’s future in a cultural setting, a fact that makes a spraghis so very important for early authors. By the time of Martial, however, texts were seen as physical, material objects, ones that had been commoditized. In epigram 1.53, Martial upends the traditional application of the sphragis, using it to authentic a forgery. For this poet, it is no longer the aural audience who must transmit a claim to authenticity but the retail audience who must discern which is a real work of Martial and which is the fake.38

It seems, then, that the importance behind the use of sphragides changed over time, alongside the ideas of literary circulation. While at first used as literal seal in order to authenticate one’s works, a sphragis comes to be seen as a typical motif, one that can be exploited for other purposes. In the example above, Martial uses it as a way to indicate not that a work is authentic but inauthentic. While the hope is that the author of the text himself used the seal as an almost signature to the work, that is not necessarily the case. Or, as the example below will show, it can be faked to

---

38 See Seo (2009: 584-591) for further discussion.
bring more authenticity to a text, authenticity that ancients perhaps thought was missing.

Peirano rightly points out that even within the oeuvre of Vergil, we can see the problems inherent in sphragides, namely that they can be faked in order to authenticate a work.\(^{39}\) Donatus claims that the *Aeneid* once started differently, as the beginning was changed by Vergil’s editors, Varius and Tucca. The following four lines were added to the traditional beginning of the poem to create the marker:

\[
\text{ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus auena} \\
\text{carmina et egressus siluis uicina coegi,} \\
\text{ut quamuis auido parerent arua colono,} \\
\text{gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Martis} \\
\text{arma uirumque cano.}\(^{40}\)
\]

I am he who once having composed poems with a slender pastoral pipe 
And having come from the wilderness forced the neighboring fields 
To obey their farmer however ardent, 
The work was pleasing to farmers, and now the bristling 
Arms of Mars and a man I sing.

The so-called pre-proem to the *Aeneid* was written to be a sphragis connecting what will come in the *Aeneid* to the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* through quotations of the latter two works. In the opinion of Donatus, these quotations gave needed authority to the *Aeneid* and confirmed the authorship of Vergil. However, it has long been acknowledged that these lines were not written by Vergil himself, and therefore cannot provide the type of authority which Donatus claims.\(^{41}\)

\(^{39}\) Peirano (2013) 273-274. In addition, the epitaph at the end of the *Culex* may perhaps be a sphragis for Vergilian authorship, even though the poem is clearly not an authentic work of that poet. See Chapters 2 and 3 for further discussion.

\(^{40}\) VSD 42.

\(^{41}\) See Austin (1968) and Kayachev (2011) for further discussion of this passage. I will discuss these lines more fully in Chapter 6.
Ancient authors were aware that techniques were needed in order to give authority and authenticity to the texts so that they were able to acquire their rightful fame, legacy and perhaps even further patronage through their poems. However such authenticity was not always feasible. Quintilian, in a discussion concerning techniques of legal speeches, pauses to reflect on the state of his own works:

\[ \textit{Cuius actionem et quidem solam in hoc tempus emiseram, quod ipsum me fecisse duc\textit{tum iuvenali cupiditate gloriae fateor. Nam ceterae, quae sub nomine meo feruntur, negligentia excipientium in quaestum notariorum corruptae minimum partem mei habent}. }^{42} \]

Indeed I had published that case alone up to this time, which I admit I myself did, led by a youthful desire for glory. For others, which are brought forth under my name, have the least part of me, having been corrupted by the negligence of short-hand writers taking it down for profit.

Quintilian notes that there are problems with the authenticity of texts and that there are those who would put forth a work for their own financial gain. He also acknowledges his own motivation behind publication: not money, but glory. For him, it is the fame and legacy of an authentic text that is most important.

As should be clear from the example above, formal dissemination of texts further complicated matters for authors.\(^{43}\) Prior to the invention of the printing press, publication carried with it different ideas than its modern day connotation.\(^{44}\) Without any legal restrictions against borrowings, authors lost all rights when they first sent the work out into the world at large. While there were moral restrictions in

\(^{42}\) Quint. \textit{Inst.} 7.2.24.

\(^{43}\) By formal, I mean in bookshops or libraries, as opposed to more informal dissemination through circles of friends and patronage. See below for further discussion of these techniques.

\(^{44}\) Even though the term “publication” is anachronistic in discussing elements of this period, as that term refers to the era of formal printing, it is the term most scholars still use while discussing the dissemination of texts in antiquity.
place, those could be easily overlooked. Once publication happened, an author would suffer “alienation from his personal ownership and control.”

Publishing, or the intentional presentation of one’s work to others, would begin with providing copies of one’s work to a small group of friends. This would allow for the author to gather comments and make corrections before the text was disseminated more widely and became fixed. The work would continue to be passed around through concentric circles associated with the patronage system, which would help to foster and protect an author’s work. This system allowed for a free flow of ideas between author and audience in a sympathetic environment. Here, an author was able to test out material to discern how it resonated with readers. Pieces could be changed and honed without harsh criticism before given to the general public. Eventually, though, the work would pass to a wider distribution. At this point, without any safeguards, authors essentially resigned the rights to their own works, which would now be out in the world forever. Works could be copied as people demanded, either from private collections, libraries or booksellers, again through the system of patronage and friendship. Non-current texts would circulate in the same way, through borrowing from friends and copying. A reader under this system would never be able to fully know if the work he was reading was in the

---

45 Farrell (2009) 174. Farrell continues by arguing that the materiality of books is a double-edged sword: it provides the best chance for the book to live on but also the best chance for it to be mistreated (179). Horace also laments this fact in the *Ars Poetica* (386-390).

form in which the author intended it to be read, or even if its purported authorship was genuine.47

There is also a debate over how these texts were first introduced into the world. Starr has argued that most of the reading done in ancient Rome was done out loud, and perhaps for entertainment at dinner parties, or for practical reasons at the very least. Scrolls were large and unwieldy and therefore it was easier to listen to texts.48 Parker also acknowledges that there were instances where public performances of readings occurred. But he concludes that authors intended their texts to be read from books.49

Through the end of the Republic and into the early Principate, we find instances of authors giving public readings of their works. For example, Donatus, a biographer of Vergil, notes that Vergil read Books Two, Four, and Six of the Aeneid to Augustus and Octavia once they had been completed.50 The reading aloud of a work by its author may have been another authentication tool at the time. Perhaps it was through public readings that authors were able to almost “sign” their text. If an author read his work aloud, it was a tacit acknowledgement to those listening that the text was authentic. By controlling the inception point, authors were able to demarcate what was legitimately theirs. In this scenario, the listeners would serve as witnesses. Having heard the work directly from the author, these people would

47 Some authors tried to use this fact to their advantage. Cicero, in a letter to Atticus, writes that a speech of his was leaked unfinished so he claimed that it was a forgery (Cic. Att. 3.12.2). Quintilian, though, laments the fact that this happens, often for financial reasons (Inst. 7.2.24). See Starr (1987: 218-219) for further discussion.
49 Parker (2009) 187-188.
50 VSD 32.
know whether a later written text was the true version. While this system would not be foolproof, it was perhaps one small way in which to mark one’s work as one’s own. Although, I must end with a caveat: as seen in the example from Quintilian above, a public recitation might also open the door for unauthorized copies to be circulated for financial gain.

Although public readings may have occurred, from the early Principate, the two most common distribution points were libraries and bookshops.\textsuperscript{51} By the time of the late Republic, private, usually specialized, libraries were \textit{en vogue}, a fact that would allow for copying by friends. The first public library, planned by Julius Caesar and realized after his death by Asinius Pollio in 40-30 BCE, was centrally located adjacent to the forum. Augustus added libraries of his own on the Palatine and Campus Martius. These libraries, based on the Library at Alexandria, contained both Latin and Greek works, new and old, the latter acquired through copying.\textsuperscript{52} Even though we have few mentions of libraries outside of Rome, we know that they existed in cities like Pompeii.\textsuperscript{53}

The rise of public libraries necessitated the need for the acquisition of works, driven by the demands of greater readership. It is a fair assumption that it would have been easy to obtain authentic copies of recently produced texts. However, it may have been more difficult for those texts produced centuries before in both Rome and, especially, in Greece. The question must be asked: if so much time had passed since composition, how were those in charge of obtaining such texts able to

\textsuperscript{51} However, that is not to say that private book trade died out.

\textsuperscript{52} Those works that are preserved in libraries are, logically, those authors that have the most fame and interest (Fedeli (1989) 360).

\textsuperscript{53} Casson (2001) 73-110.
know for sure if the texts were authentic or not? As I will discuss below, this was a problem even for the Library of Alexandria, where we find attempts to decipher what is real and what is fake. It should come as no surprise then that the rise in production of literary fakes seems to coincide with the increase in libraries in Rome.

Most bookshops were centrally located right off the forum, allowing for easy access for those interested. While this location allowed for a greater dispersion of an author’s works, the selling of books was only profitable for the booksellers, as authors received little to no money for their works. Also, this type of production led to imprecise editions of texts due to the demand for production of more copies. This fact leads Horace to compare the practices of booksellers to prostitution. The booksellers would usually have one exemplar copy of a work and would either employ slaves or allow a buyer’s slave to make a copy of it upon request.

It is easy to see how interpolations could creep into texts, and, with no real guarantees of authorship, how pseudepigrapha, or literary fakes, could also arise. Libraries and booksellers would have an exemplar copy from which all subsequent copies were created. If an author were to provide this exemplar copy to the bookseller himself, a “safeguard” against errors was perhaps offered. However, the accuracy of a work depended on the quality of both the bookseller as well as the copyists. The inaccuracy in the book trade was well-known; while errors in copying and interpolations are far different things, the reputation of the book trade leaves
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54 The paragraph that follows discusses what is known about the new book trade. Starr (1990) argues that, although we have no evidence for it, a used-book trade probably did exist, perhaps for educational texts.

55 Hor. Epist. 1.20. While never using the word prostitute to describe his book, Horace nevertheless refers to a potential reader as a lover, to the signs of age with overuse, and to its fate while standing on street corners recounting its tales later on. See Oliensis (1995) and White (2009) for further discussion.
open this possibility. Although the economics of the book trade are vague at best, if an author received any money from publishing, it was from the sale of an exemplar copy to a bookseller.\textsuperscript{56} It was the booksellers who had the greater financial motivation; if one were able to claim to possess a rare youthful work of Vergil, one would then be able to sell copies of it for a good amount.

Additionally, there is little to stop a person from including in their private library a youthful work of Vergil written neither by a youth nor by Vergil, but perhaps instead by the library's owner, although not necessarily. This forger could then pass the work through circles of friends or booksellers until it is widely accepted as Vergil's. It is this motivation that may have driven the creation of "youthful" works of Vergil.\textsuperscript{57}

Ancient methods of publication leave open the possibility for literary imposture, as do ancient attitudes towards the reuse of previously written material. The foundation of the Roman literary tradition is the idea of \textit{imitatio}, the imitation of or modeling on the works of authors who had come before.\textsuperscript{58} Latin literature began with the translation of Greek plays and Homer's \textit{Odyssey} into Latin by Livius Andronicus. Subsequent authors, like Gnaeus Naevius and Ennius, would continue

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{56} The only other financial incentive may have been as part of the patronage system. If an author could acquire a wealthy patron, then the former could have relied on the latter for any financial needs.
\textsuperscript{58} A related idea is \textit{aemulatio} or the competition with or the attempt to surpass the original. See Kelly (1999: 50) for more discussion. Russell (1979: 10) says that \textit{imitatio} and \textit{aemulatio} should not be seen as negative versus positive, but instead how deep of connection there is between the two works and how well an author can make another work his own.
\end{footnotesize}
this tradition of translation.\textsuperscript{59} Literary works were “open” to revision and reuse due to *imitatio*.\textsuperscript{60} It was a “tradition in which [all Latin authors were] bred.”\textsuperscript{61} Martindale, in fact, argues that the meaning of a work only begins with its reception and that imitations allow us to view how people use the original text.\textsuperscript{62} Indeed, the notion of authorship -- of a writer having produced a work that is said to be his and only his-- is possibly relatively new, seeing its inception in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century among the Romantic poets.\textsuperscript{63}

In antiquity, by contrast, all authors used previous works as inspiration or perhaps went even further by borrowing words and phrases as well. But plagiarism and imitation are not and should not be considered the same thing, as I will detail below. While all authors imitate, only certain ones plagiarize. Those that accomplish the latter seek validation for works and originality that is not rightfully theirs. As McGill notes plagiarism is the act of “earn[ing] recognition for doing things they did not actually do,” whether it is intentional or not. Accusers point out this type of borrowing not only to laud the original writers but also to cast themselves in a

---

\textsuperscript{59} See Conte (1994) and Goldberg (2005) for general information. See Beare (1968) for the Greek influence on the Roman stage and Skutsch (1984) on Ennius'.

\textsuperscript{60} The ancient idea of *imitatio* is closely tied to our ideas of allusion and intertextuality. An “allusion” is a purposeful reference to another work of literature, whether pointed (Thomas (1986) 173-174) or covert (Hinds (1998) 19). Authors use allusions to direct the reader to examine references to other works. Hinds differentiates the related concept of “intertextuality” from allusion by making these former references more reader-centered, because the intention of the author can never be known. For Hinds, “meaning is always constructed at the point of reception.” A *topos*, or commonplace, denotes a reference between different texts but one that is encouraged by a collective tradition, similar to “stock material.” This kind of reuse does not necessarily have any intentionality behind it. See Hinds (1998) for a complete discussion of all these terms and examples of each. Also, see Conte (1986a: 29), who adds that a text cannot exist or be understood outside a complex web of allusions. Farrell (1997: 228) adds to the discussion that references made clear to the reader are only enhanced by those that require more investigation.

\textsuperscript{61} Russell (1979) 1. Indeed, a work only becomes significant when it can be reused and re-appropriated by later authors.

\textsuperscript{62} Martindale (1993) 3.

\textsuperscript{63} Logie (2003) 353.
better light for not participating in this behavior. Apologists, however, see borrowing as having value. Ancients recognized the distinction between these two types of reuse, viewing plagiarism as illegitimate and “a product of misreading.” While there may be no legal precepts against plagiarism, it is clear from the opinions of ancients that it was culturally looked down upon.\textsuperscript{64}

Macrobius hits on this exact point, describing this “sharing” culture when discussing the charge of literary theft against Vergil. He states that all authors imitate previous works, a fact that we should praise since those previous works will now be preserved: “it is conceded that this society and community of things must be engaged with by all poets and writers” (\textit{haec societas et rerum communio poetis scriptoribusque omnibus inter se exercenda concessa est}).\textsuperscript{65} However, while imitatio is allowable, it needs adaptation and modification in order to be an acceptable practice. Horace urges just that in his \textit{Ars Poetica}:

\begin{center}
\textit{Publica materies priuati iuris erit, si}
\textit{non circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem,}
\textit{nec uerbo uerbum curabis reddere fidus}
\textit{interpres nec desilies imitator in artum,}
\textit{unde pedem proferre pudor uetet aut operis lex.}\textsuperscript{66}
\end{center}

A public topic will be of a private right, if You do not linger on the low and common ring, You will neither care to render word for word as a faithful translator Nor will you jump as an imitator into the art, Whence shame or the rule of the work may forbid you to proceed.

\textsuperscript{64} McGill (2012) 221-222.
\textsuperscript{65} Macrobr. \textit{Sat.} 6.1.5. See Kaster (2011: xliii-xlvi) and McGill (2012: 179-182, 197-199) for further discussion.
\textsuperscript{66} Hor. \textit{Ars P.} 131-135. See lines 268-269 as well, where Horace urges writers to use Greek models. See Russell (1979: 1) and Fantham (1978: 103-104) for further discussion.
One should not mindlessly follow the paths of others, but should instead escape from what has come before entirely so that one's work is not considered theft.\textsuperscript{67} Ancient authors agree, then, that imitation is necessary, but in addition, an author, according to Behme, must "say something new and better about something significant [\textit{i.e.} a previous work]."\textsuperscript{68} As Kelly points out, there must be some sort of "metamorphosis" of the source material by the imitator in order to create artistry in the new work and there must be more than just a "change in context."\textsuperscript{69}

\textit{Imitatio} has its challenges. How much modification is enough? How did the ancients separate \textit{imitatio} from simple copying of another's work? Plagiarism or "the culpable reuse of earlier texts, customarily described in terms of stealing, in which a person wins false credit by presenting another's work as his own" is a modern term.\textsuperscript{70} While the ancients did acknowledge the idea of what we will come to call plagiarism, there are no clear examples from ancient times, even though there are many charges.\textsuperscript{71} Some ancient critics will cry plagiarism, when it is simple imitation, because of the uncertainty of an author's intentions. Charges are often put forth to deride other authors due to an animus on the part of the critic towards the writer. For example, McGill points out a charge of plagiarism advanced by a

\textsuperscript{67} Horace is not the only writer to touch upon this idea. Also see Quint. \textit{Inst.} 10.2.1 and 1.3.1, who lobbies for the importance of imitation. After criticizing the practice of imitation (Quint. \textit{Inst.} 10.2.4-9), that most will not be as good as those who came before, he states that newer authors must imitate. Sen. \textit{Ep.} 79.6 also encourages this practice, but only \textit{if} a topic has not yet been covered too much. Isocrates, likewise, elaborates on this idea, \textit{for example} in \textit{Panegyricus} 7-10. (See Behme (2004) for more examples from Isocrates.)

\textsuperscript{68} Behme (2004) 201. McGill (2012: 20) also discusses this idea.

\textsuperscript{69} Kelly (1999) 74. See Kelley for a more complete discussion of the potential steps, which need to be taken by an imitator to ensure a "metamorphosis" (55-75).

\textsuperscript{70} McGill (2012) 3. McGill goes on to differentiate between the ideas of forgery, or the production of a work using someone else's name as one's own, plagiarism, or the production of a work as if one's one but using parts of another's, and piracy, or the production of a work without an author's permission.

\textsuperscript{71} McGill (2012) 4. See Cic. \textit{Brut.} 76 and Sen. \textit{Suas.} 3.7 for examples of charges against Ennius and Brutus respectively. See Russell (1979) for further discussion.
grammarian, Lenaeus, a former slave to Pompey the Great, against the works of Sallust and the author himself. Lenaeus assails Sallust with apppellations such as “scoundrel” and “monster” due to the latter’s attack on Pompey the Great. Lenaeus ends with an attack on the author’s writing, in particular charges of plagiarism (præterea priscorum Catonis[que] verborum ineruditissimum furem). While Sallust’s imitatio of Cato is well known, Lenaeus transforms the debt into a charge of plagiarism (furem), due to his personal feelings towards the author.72

Even Vergil was not immune from such charges. Donatus discusses the obrectatores (“detractors”) of Vergil who created catalogues of his borrowing as a type of plagiarism-hunting. The biographer notes various incidents, including Q. Octavius Avitus’ eight volume work entitled Ὅμοιοτέλευτων (“Resemblances”), in which all the verses Vergil took and their provenances were catalogued.73 It seemed a common occurrence at the time to discuss the theft or plagiarism by Vergil. But it seems equally as common to defend Vergil, as Asconius Pedo and Macrobius did, the former’s work mentioned by Donatus. McGill describes these attacks and defenses as “a struggle over [Vergil’s] cultural authority and canonical value.”74 For those perpetrating the charges, Vergil’s prominent place in Latin literature is questioned. For those defending, there was the belief that a great author would never plagiarize.75

72 DGR 15.2. McGill (2015) 33-34. McGill continues in Chapter Two with a discussion of what seemingly constitutes plagiarism to the ancients through an examination of the prefaces of authors like Vitruvius in his De Architectura. There, Vitruvius attacks those who plagiarize/steal (furantes) another’s work and claim that they are the authors (DA 7 praef. 2).
73 VSD 44-46.
75 See McGill (2012: 178-209) for a discussion of the attacks on Vergil and his defense by Macrobius (Sat. 6.2). Cameron (2004: 85), as McGill notes, goes even farther and calls the mentions of Vergil’s
As discussed above, the line between imitation and plagiarism seemed to be a subjective one in antiquity even for an author like Vergil. The logical conclusion to this statement is that if even Vergil could be charged, then any author could be charged with such thefts of words. Furthermore, it suggests that any work could be susceptible to theft as well. There seemed to be no idea of an untouchable text, i.e. one that could not be plagiarized. Even the works of Vergil would have been seen as fair game for reuse, both in terms of imitation and plagiarism, perhaps in order to canonize him even more.\textsuperscript{76} No author was immune both from imitating and being imitated.

The idea of plagiarism in antiquity is so unclear that often the ancients themselves inconsistently use the terms surrounding it. For example, some ancient critics use the “language of theft” when they really mean a too strict adherence to a predecessor.\textsuperscript{77} Authors do, however, distinguish between the correct form of reuse with the verb \textit{sumere}, meaning “to imitate legitimately,” versus \textit{surripere}, meaning “to steal.” The implication of the latter term is deception to gain credit for someone else’s work.\textsuperscript{78}

The idea of literary theft is more clearly defined by the Greeks who usually used the word κλοπή (“theft”) for such a practice.\textsuperscript{79} It is unclear how this idea was

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{76} McGill (2012: 220) continues that the fact that there were many more instances of theft from Vergil than by Vergil shows how great he and his poetry was.
\textsuperscript{78} McGill (2012) 2-3. See Cicero’s \textit{Brutus} (75-76) for use of these words.
\textsuperscript{79} \textit{LSJ} s.v. κλοπή. For example, Porphyry provides a fictional symposium in which guests scrutinized the works of authors looking for κλοπαί (\textit{Pr. Ev.} 464a-468b). See Stemplinger (1912), McGill (2012: 6-8), and Grafton (2014) for further discussion.
transferred to Rome but it probably occurred in the third or second centuries BCE with increased contact between the two peoples.\textsuperscript{80} The most common term for literary theft in Latin literature is \textit{furtum}, or simply “theft.”\textsuperscript{81} The Romans, as will be made clear below, adapted words already in existence in order to discuss these new ideas of literary theft.\textsuperscript{82}

It is Martial in the late 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE who provides us with the term we use today. Martial writes in 1.52:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Commendo tibi, Quintiane, nostros — nostros dicere si tamen libellos possum, quos recitat tuus poeta —:
\textit{si de seruitio graui queruntur, adsertor venias satisque praestes, et, cum se dominum vocabit ille, dicas esse meos manuque missos.}
\textit{Hoc si terque quaterque clamitaris, inpones \textit{plagiario} pudorem.}}\textsuperscript{83}
\end{quote}

I entrust to you, Quintianus, my —
If I am able to call them my little books nevertheless,
Which your poet recites:
If they complain about harsh servitude,
You should come forward as their protector and vouch for them sufficiently,
And, when he calls himself their master,
You will say that they are mine and were sent from my hand.
If you shout this three or four times,
You will impose shame on the kidnapper.

Here, Martial adapts the term \textit{plagiarius}, a term that is usually used for a kidnapper or for someone who illegally or improperly enslaves another, for someone who

\begin{flushright}
\\textsuperscript{80} McGill (2012) 6-7. Terence (ca. 160 BCE) mentions in his prefaces such accusations were a common facet of old comedy.
\textsuperscript{81} Other terms that are used include \textit{alieni usurpatio} (a term for theft of property) and \textit{pro suo} (“as one’s own”). \textit{Transferre} (“to translate”) may also be used in certain contexts.
\textsuperscript{83} Emphasis my own.
\end{flushright}
“kidnaps” another’s literary production, taking credit for work that is not one’s own.\textsuperscript{84} It is here that Martial “legalistically asserts proprietary rights over his poems.”\textsuperscript{85} As I discussed earlier in this section, it is during the time of Martial when texts become commodities and therefore gain a sense of physicality in the form of purchasable books. Since books are now physical items, they can then be stolen.

Pliny also uses related imagery in his exhortation to a friend to make haste to publish or recite his work because some verses have already gotten away. Here Pliny states: “Unless you recall them into your body of work, just as runaway slaves, at some point they will find someone whose they may be called” \textit{(hos nisi retrahis in corpus, quandoque ut errores aliquem cuius dicantur inventent)}.\textsuperscript{86} The slave stands in for fame that has potentially slipped away, another great concern for poets.

As should be clear from the discussion of terms above, the words used to describe literary theft often have their foundation in the legal arena.\textsuperscript{87} However plagiarism was not considered a legal offense in antiquity. There was no idea of copyright law, and the lack of intellectual property restrictions allowed for authors to engage in heavy \textit{imitatio}, which bordered, or even crossed, the line into our notions of plagiarism in the literary sphere, without fear of legal repercussions.\textsuperscript{88}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{84} Seo (2009) 567. In fact, as Seo points out, the \textit{OCD} cites this as the only place \textit{plagiarus} is used for literary theft. Martial, in his cycle of poems on literary theft, distinguished between plagiarism, where a poet takes credit for another’s work (1.29, 1.38, 1.52, 1.63, 1.72, 2.20, 10.102, 11.94, 12.63), a forgery, where another author would use Martial’s name for his own work (1.53, 1.66, 10.100), and defamation, where one would attribute offensive poems to Martial (7.12, 10.3). See Seo (2009) for further discussion. The \textit{Lex Fabia} (90 CE) defines \textit{plagium} as the “stealing or claiming a slave belonging to someone else” (Seo, 572). See Robinson (1995: 33-35) for further discussion.

\textsuperscript{85} Seo (2009) 569.


\textsuperscript{87} Seo (2009: 573) even mentions that Martial 1.52 is heavily imbued with legalistic language.

\textsuperscript{88} McGill (2012) 10. Seo (2009: 573) says that it is anachronistic to talk about a lack of intellectual property laws because our societies and ideas of ownership are so different. However, McGill (2012: 11) notes that even today plagiarism is more of a moral rather than an economic transgression even
\end{footnotesize}
Nevertheless, the right one has to one’s own work should be respected by later authors. As McGill notes, “conventional and moral” reasons against such borrowings do exist. Later writers such as Symmachus in his *Epistle* 1.31 began to assert their claims to authorship, even if solely symbolic, while acknowledging the conventional means of dissemination.

Ancient authors recognized the conventions and constraints of their literary world and attempted to create safeguards against theft. The use of one’s name, at minimum, marked a work as belonging to a certain author. The use of the sphragis that began with Theognis and continued through Roman poets, like Vergil and Martial, marks further attempts to lay claim to one’s literary work, even if it was ultimately only symbolic. When more public means of dissemination through libraries and booksellers came about, there was greater potential for authors to lose control over their works. Errors and interpolations through copying could occur. Moreover, with increased exposure came more chances for *imitatio*—a double-edged sword. While increasing the fame of the author, publicity can also lead to unacknowledged theft. Thus, *imitatio*, a concept embedded in Roman literary culture and one that could allow for creative and meaningful engagement with the literary tradition, also allowed for later authors to reuse material, sometimes wholesale, from an original. Although charges akin to plagiarism could be leveled, though there are laws governing this type of theft. Therefore, McGill argues, the idea of plagiarism can pre-date the invention of the printing press because in both societies this type of theft is morally wrong.

90 See McGill (2009) for further discussion of this letter and its implications for the ideas of authorship.
there was a fine line between theft and imitation. I believe it is in these circumstances that we can begin to understand the context for the emergence of the literary phenomenon that we term “pseudepigrapha.”

**Defining “Pseudepigrapha”**

In this section, I will begin with a summary of the various terms and concepts found in modern scholarship, before proposing a return to the ancient sense of the term pseudepigrapha. Pseudepigrapha can be defined as “texts that are suspected, and in many cases proven, not to be the work of the author to whom they are ascribed.” 91 In other words, these are works whose authenticity, as it pertains to authorship, is in doubt. The term is derived from the Greek adjective ψευδής meaning “false, untrue.” 92

The term is first used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his essay on the works of the attic orator Deinarchus, *De Dinarcho*. Here, Dionysius mentions, amongst other spurious works termed ψευδεπίγραφοι, private speeches attributed to the orator, who would have been an adolescent at the time of composition (Δείναρχος δ᾽ οὔπω δέκατον ἐτὸς τηνικαῦτα εἶχε / “but Deinarchus was only 10 years old at that time”). There is no mention of the author of the pseudepigraphic works trying to pass them off as authentic, *i.e.* the speeches were not written as an imposture of the

---

91 A related field is *Echtheitskritik*, or authenticity criticism, the determination of authentic authorship of a given work. This field of study, and the problems of subjectivity inherent in it, has recently been discussed by Peirano (2012b). Peirano (2012a) 1. See Clift (1945: 1), and Rix (2003) for other variations on this definition.

92 *LSJ* s.v. ψευδής (1). Peirano (2012a) 42.
orator. However, this term and its definition are commonly expanded to include works that do attempt to deceive the reader intentionally as to authorship. As I will discuss later in the chapter, modern scholars have attempted to distinguish between works that are pseudepigraphic (i.e. works that were transmitted under another person’s name purposefully) and works that were accidentally misattributed. However, in the first use of the term, intentionally is not explicitly implied.

Even in ancient times, the term pseudepigrapha could refer both to plagiarism and forgery, as well as other types of misattributed works. An early explanatory example can serve as evidence of the complexity of such a term. As McGill points out, Donatus, when discussing the tragedy *Thyestes*, states that Varius claimed it was his even though he himself knew that it was Vergil’s. Donatus conflates the ideas of plagiarism and literary forgery under the term pseudepigrapha when he says:

*Quamvis igitur multa ψευδεπίγραφα, id est falsa inscriptione sub alieno nomine sint prolata, ut Thyestes tragoedia huius poetae, quam Varius suo nomine edidit, et alia huiusmodi, tamen Bucolica liquido Vergilii esse minime dubitandum est.*

Therefore although there are many pieces of pseudepigrapha, that is those advanced with a false inscription under another’s name, as with the tragedy *Thyestes* of this poet, which Varius disseminated under his own name, and others of this type, nevertheless it must not be doubted that the *Elegories* are clearly Vergil’s.

---

94 Clift (1945: 144 ff.) explains that Books Three and Four of the Tibullan corpus, featuring poems under the names Lygdamus and Sulpicia, amongst others, are often referred to as pseudepigraphic. Following the standard definition, these poems do not fit because the attribution of these works to Tibullus seems to be an accident of transmission, rather than a willful publication under the name of Tibullus, which would be considered pseudepigrapha. However, perhaps a change in terminology or an expansion of this field is necessary to include such works. See Keith (2006-2007) for a discussion of the *Echtheitskritik* of these poems. Holzberg (1998-1999: 6) argues that all these poems may have been written by one author in the persona of a young Tibullus.
96 VSD 48.
Plagiarism occurs when an author claims another’s work as his own. Forgery occurs when an author attributes his own work to another. Instead, Donatus conflates the two and defines pseudepigrapha “as texts presented under the name of somebody other than the real author,” either when a plagiarist claims a work as his own or a forger presents the work as a different author’s.\(^{97}\) However, it is clear that the motivations behind both of these literary pursuits are very different and therefore should not be conflated. Even in antiquity, the definition of pseudepigrapha was open.

However, it is problematic to conflate the terms pseudepigrapha and forgery. It is crucial to note that pseudepigrapha are not necessarily forgeries, although they can be considered such. Instead, they are better connected with imposture, or pretending to be the work of another. The term forgery implies profit and intentional deception, almost of the criminal sort. Imposture, however, may suggest the innocent use of a pseudonym.\(^{98}\)

Modern scholars use many words to further describe the works termed “pseudepigraphic.” The terms fake and forgery are used interchangeably to mean that a work is spurious or counterfeit.\(^{99}\) In other words, a literary work was written in the style or guise of a certain author and circulated under his name, but was not

---


\(^{99}\) OED s.v. fake. In other situations, for instance in the world of art, these terms can also refer to reproductions of a given work not by the hand of the purported artist often for monetary gain. For literary works, copies are a necessity of production and therefore they do not take on this further definition. See Dutton (1983) and Jones et al. (1990) for discussions of forgery in the art world.
written by him. These terms tend to imply a purposeful re-appropriation of material. Often a financial motive can be ascribed to it, but not necessarily. Perhaps to this category we can ascribe the “Helen Episode,” an addition to Book Two of the Aeneid. A work that is termed “inauthentic” likewise is one that was not written by the stated author, but instead by someone else. This term is less malicious than fake or forgery since it takes into account a potential misidentification of an author. Perhaps the three poems found in the Appendix Vergiliana may serve as examples: the De Viro Bono, the Est et Non, and the De Rosis Nascentibus were handed down under the name of Vergil, but are now firmly attributed to Ausonius. Lastly, scholars often refer to pseudepigraphic works as “anonymous works,” with no judgment attached towards the work. For example, the Anonymous Seguerianus wrote a work in the 3rd century CE referencing the work of the rhetorician Alexander. As discussed in the introduction, scholarship on this field has moved from a focus on authenticity to a focus on analyzing the works themselves. Most of these works can never be attached securely to the name of an author and are therefore referred to as anonymous works.

Today, on the other hand, scholars have tried to recognize a distinction between works that have been misattributed and works that are under the umbrella

---

100 See Chapter 6 for discussion and bibliography on this poem.
101 See Green (1991: 436-438, 669) for further discussion of these poems.
102 Similarly, scholars may refer to the authors of pseudepigraphic texts as having taken a pseudonym. Here, the pseudonym is actually the name of another author, as opposed to a fictitious name.
103 OCD s.v. Anonymous Seguerianus. Although this is an example of a purely anonymous text, the fact that we do not know the actual authors of most pseudepigraphic texts, in a sense, makes them all anonymous.
Yet the general term of “pseudepigraphic” is still often given to all such works. Guzman, for instance, sees no fewer than five ways to characterize such works, with pseudepigrapha being just one of them. While Guzman presents multiple options, none seems to be satisfactory in its ability to define this genre. As Metzger first pointed out in his work on canonical pseudepigrapha, there are many reasons why such works usually termed pseudepigrapha were written or accepted and there might not be one answer for them all. I agree with Metzger’s observation and believe that it is also fitting for classical pseudepigrapha. The problems with defining this type of work lie mainly in our inability to decipher the immediate context under which the poems were written. It is safe to assume that the contexts for production for all such poems were not the same. Since we will probably never know the exact context for these poems, I believe that we should avoid attempting to classify them too strictly. In doing so, we as modern readers accidently imply certain connotations, e.g. untoward motives with the word forgery, that may have never been intended by the ancient author.

See Metzger (1972: 4), and Peirano (2012a: 42) for discussion of the distinction. Guzman (2011: 26–29) recognizes five different labels: forgery, plagiarism, imposture, products of a “forger of fiction” or pseudepigraphon. Forgery involves deliberate deception in which the author sees some benefit. Plagiarism is a modern term with negative connotations, defined as the “misappropriation of a work (or part of a work) of an author.” A “forger of fiction” is an author who boasts of his deception but has no intention of cheating. In my opinion, this category seems specious and takes into account elements of forgery and imposture. In ancient times, the phenomenon could still be seen, as discussed later in this chapter, though under different terms. Imposture has no intended deception even though the works are not authentic, with various motivations behind it including prestige, schools, and veneration for great writers. Last, pseudepigraphon for Guzman is the false attribution of an author to anonymous texts, which are similar to others by that author. While Guzman sees these as distinct categories, there is in fact a large degree of overlap between the terms. Also, without knowing the reasons or methods behind a given work, there is no way to assign it to a category without doubt.

The term “canonical pseudepigrapha” can be used for literary forgeries relating to the Bible and other theological works. Metzger (1972: 19) first pointed out the problematic nature of this term. However, that does not mean that we as scholars should not attempt to decipher certain motivations and aims behind these works, simply that the immediate context for production may never been know.
It is unclear whether the works that moderns call pseudepigrapha were meant to be circulated widely, or were only intended for a small circle of friends. Furthermore, it is unclear whether they were intended to be circulated under the name of a given author, or if they were mistakenly attributed to him on stylistic or thematic bases. Perhaps these works were never intended to be viewed as authentic. In addition, it is unknown whether there was a financial motivation behind their production. For modern scholars like Guzman, there is an anxiety to categorize and define pseudepigraphic works in order to fully understand the work. But without any indication of means of production, I would like to point out that it is hard to know how to do so -- and perhaps it is unnecessary. While we as modern scholars can acknowledge the many different reasons for such production, as I mentioned above, it may not be necessary or indeed appropriate to define and then shoehorn a work into a specific category.

The production of inauthentic works began as early as the 6th or 5th centuries BCE, both orally and in written form. They can be found in all genres and subsequent time periods as well.\textsuperscript{108} For instance, the *Athenaion Politeia*, while widely ascribed to Aristotle and dated to the 4th century BCE, may not actually have

\textsuperscript{108} Two articles by Gudeman (1894a & 1894b) give the most complete discussion concerning which Greek and Roman works respectively should be considered pseudepigrapha. Clift (1945) discusses Roman pseudepigrapha from Plautus through the Augustan age, in a more in depth way, discussing even the smallest of examples. Unfortunately, she ends with that time period. Speyer (1971) provides a comprehensive study of the background of Classical and Ecclesiastical pseudepigrapha but does not provide a detailed analysis of all the texts. While modern scholars continue to discuss pseudepigraphic works, they do so individually or centered around one author. Peirano (2012a) attempts to unite all pseudepigraphic works, mentioning a handful of works to support her central thesis. A more complete identification of Greek pseudepigrapha and later Latin ones would be a benefit to the field.
been written by the philosopher.\textsuperscript{109} The political letters written to Caesar and an attack against Cicero both of which have come down to us under the name of Sallust are now known to have been written after the death of that author in the first century CE.\textsuperscript{110} Works can be fairly short, like the epigrams attributed to Seneca,\textsuperscript{111} or longer, like the mock-epic, the \textit{Batrachomyomachia} ascribed to Homer.\textsuperscript{112} What they all have in common is their connection to a better-known author. As discussed previously in this chapter, the identification of an author’s work helps to create a sense of authority, even if it is symbolic. Turning to Vergilian pseudepigrapha, these works could be large scale, such as the Pseudo-Vergilian poems the \textit{Ciris} or \textit{Culex}, or smaller ones such as in the “Helen Episode” of the \textit{Aeneid},\textsuperscript{113} or even as small as half lines\textsuperscript{114} added in order to finish the \textit{Aeneid} by Vergil’s friends, Varius and Tucca.\textsuperscript{115}

The heyday of such literary activity was in the Hellenistic period and in the late Republic/early Principate, when the rise of libraries saw the drive to collect as much literature as possible. When it was not possible to find authentic material, or when there was a want for more material from an author, pseudepigraphic works could be produced in order to fill in the holes in the literary tradition.\textsuperscript{116} In view of the wide range of works which the term pseudepigraphic covers, it is easy to see why this term is so expansive.

\textsuperscript{109} See Rhodes (1981: 51-63) and Chambers (1993) for discussions of the authenticity of this text.
\textsuperscript{110} See Syme (1964: 313-349) for more discussion on Sallustian pseudepigrapha.
\textsuperscript{111} See Breitenbach (2009) for further discussion.
\textsuperscript{112} See Sens (2006) for further discussion.
\textsuperscript{113} \textit{Verg. Aen.} 2.559-623. See Horsfall (2006) for a recent discussion. I will discuss this passage further in Chapter 6.
\textsuperscript{114} See Horsfall (2006: 2) for more discussion.
\textsuperscript{115} \textit{VSD} 37. See Sparrow (1931) for a list of all half lines in the \textit{Aeneid}. For a more recent discussion, see O’Hara (2010).
Ancient scholars were concerned with such motives for production and sought to determine which works were authentic and which were not. For example, Callimachus’ prose work, the *Pinakes*, includes a section that divides the works in the Library of Alexandria into those that were “legitimate” (γνήσιοι) and those that were “bastards” (νόθοι).117 Callimachus bases his decisions on the biography, both traditional and real, of the author and/or stylistic matters.118 In the fragments we have, Callimachus never discusses the intentions of or circumstances around such works, but rather focuses on determining authenticity.119

As mentioned previously, most scholars describe the motivation behind such production as financial. Booksellers could have charged a high price for a work, claiming it was a rare book of an author, even though it was a fake.120 The private, not-for-profit book trade, in addition to the growth of public libraries, opened up the possibilities for dissemination of works without a monetary exchange.121 Although some pseudepigrapha were surely written to make money off the name of a Vergil or a Cicero, it must be acknowledged that some of these works passed through

---

118 Blum (1991) 233. See Blum (1991) for further discussion on the *Pinakes*.
119 On the Roman side, Varro is credited with determining which works of Plautus were authentic in his work *De Comoediis Plautinis*. Varro determines that 21 of the 130 plays circulating under the name of the playwright were authentic. Varro based his evidence on the universal agreement concerning authenticity of critics who came before him and the presence of production notices. It is those 21 which have survived to us from antiquity. See Nadjo (2002) about the ways in which Varro’s criticism of authenticity differed from what came before him.
120 Zetzel (1973) 240. Zetzel adds that the pressing need for schoolbooks in Rome led students to buy forgeries instead of the authentic works (243). Syme (1972: 13), Metzger (1972: 5), Rix (2003), and Guzman (2011: 26) also mention financial gain as a reason for writing pseudepigraphic works. Peirano (2012a), though, only names as potential reasons: misattribution, gain or loss of reputation for an author, or the conferral of more authority to a text. Although financial gain may be in the background for these reasons, Peirano does not name it explicitly as a potential impetus. There was no concept of royalties in the ancient world, but the seller/author of the rare work could also make money from the one-time sale of it to a bookseller.
121 However, as Zetzel points out, libraries could also pay for such works to be brought into their collections (1973: 243).
libraries and private hands as well. As I discussed previously in this chapter and will explore further in Chapter Three, these works may also have been written for private purposes, in order to display one’s erudition or even as a literary game of sorts with a group of like-minded friends (for instance in the case of the Ciris and the Culex). The fact that some literary fakes were produced before the growth of the book trade does suggest that the motivation must be viewed as more complex than simply financial.\footnote{122}

Irrespective of the motive for such production, the ease with which many of these works passed unidentified throughout antiquity is striking: for instance, the Culex is ascribed to Vergil by no fewer than five ancient writers, including his earliest biographers, even though its structure clearly mimics the authentic works of Vergil in their canonical order.\footnote{123} As this example shows, the acceptance of works as authentic, even those clearly fake, is widespread. Perhaps part of the reason is a desire for more writing of an authentic author that drove the ancients to accept such works.\footnote{124}

\footnote{122} For example, the plays of Plautus, which Varro famously investigates as to their authenticity, were arguably written before the advent of the book trade for profit, even though performance of such plays could have been lucrative. In addition, we cannot say for certain how these works were disseminated. Were they purely in written form or were they delivered orally as well? While many pseudepigraphic works in general were composed in the 2nd century CE, oral performances of works were not completely passé, even though they were held less frequently than in previous centuries.\footnote{123} Martial (14.185.1-2) equates Vergil’s Culex and Homer’s Batrachomyomachia, which the poet mentioned in epigram 183. In both epigrams, Martial begins by mentioning the pseudepigraphic, mock-epics attributed to the poets, but moves to mentions of the authentic epics of both authors in the second lines. Statius (Silv. 1 Praef) states that even serious authors can produce lighter works. Statius continues (Silv. 2.7.73-74) that it was prophesied that Lucan would write a major work before Vergil wrote his Culex. Suetonius (Vita Luc. 5-7) ascribes to Lucan a statement that his earlier works did not reach the level of Vergil’s Culex. See Most (1987) for the argument concerning the structure of the Culex. See St. Louis (2006: 2), and Peirano (2012a: 36) for further discussion of these ancient citations. All citations are quoted in full in Appendix A.\footnote{124} While not all literary fakes “pass,” so to speak, nevertheless, some do. Surely, it cannot have been the pure ignorance on the part of all readers that allowed such a thing to happen.
Galen was so concerned with the authenticity of his own literary production that he wrote a whole treatise on this topic. *De libris propriis* provides a list of all Galen's works still in existence at his time, presumably as a bulwark against forgeries. Interestingly, Galen makes some commentary on the publication of his works, noting those that had been retrieved and corrected, authentic works that were unintentionally circulated, as well as lost works that had been retrieved from friends.\textsuperscript{125} In an anecdote therein, Galen was in the Sandaliarion, a district in Rome, which housed most of the booksellers. There, he overhears an argument about the authenticity of a book. The buyer assumed it was written by Galen, whose name was on it. A passerby, however, upon hearing only a few lines dismissed it easily as inauthentic.\textsuperscript{126}

One point of the story (for us) is that it was possible to distinguish authentic and inauthentic works, if one so wished or was able to because of one's education, in Galen's opinion. This anecdote is also important as it transmits to us the first hand opinion of an author whose work was forged. For Galen, the authenticity of his work and the recognition therein was important for his reputation as a scholar. His motives behind publication were not primarily financial but instead laudatory. Works attributed to Galen that were not his, or even ones that were circulated unintentionally, would have the potential to diminish his standing and the standing of his works. Without control over what was disseminated, there was no guarantee

\textsuperscript{125} In this middle category, Mattern (2013: 144) notes the work, *On Venesection against Erasistratus*, which circulated due to a betrayal by an old friend. This betrayal caused Galen much grief as the worked was disseminated unknown to him and unedited.

\textsuperscript{126} Gal. *Libr. Propr.* XIX.8-48k. See Zadorojnyi (2013: 392) and Mattern (2103: 263-264) for further discussion and bibliography.
that the medical observations contained within a given work were correct. Incorrect knowledge would then have harmed his brand. It also allows us to ask why someone would circulate a work under the name of Galen. Perhaps it is due to a betrayal by a friend as mentioned above. A more common reason may be in order to gain recognition. While the name of the author would not be attached to said praise, the successful passing off of a forgery under the name of someone like Galen would still have garnered personal pride and success. Among the many reasons for acceptance of inauthentic works, most scholars emphasize that certain authentic works were held in such high esteem that from the time of their dissemination, they were ripe for reuse and reinterpretation, either maliciously or reverently, i.e. with intent or without intent to deceive the reader, as the example from Galen shows us.\footnote{As should be clear from the discussion above, defining or even characterizing works of literature commonly known as pseudepigrapha is fraught with difficulty. Without secure knowledge of the motivations behind composition and acceptance of these works of unknown authorship (and therefore provenance), it is hard to classify an individual example, let alone the entire genre. Even the ancients were confused as to how the term should be correctly applied. While it is convenient to group all such works under the one heading of pseudepigrapha, these works are far more nuanced than that a monolithic term can accommodate. However, without a secure understanding of their motivations, it is difficult to assign them any clear label.}

As should be clear from the discussion above, defining or even characterizing works of literature commonly known as pseudepigrapha is fraught with difficulty. Without secure knowledge of the motivations behind composition and acceptance of these works of unknown authorship (and therefore provenance), it is hard to classify an individual example, let alone the entire genre.\footnote{For further discussion of such motivations see Syme (1972), Metzger (1972), Rix (2003), Knox (2009).}

Even the ancients were confused as to how the term should be correctly applied. While it is convenient to group all such works under the one heading of pseudepigrapha, these works are far more nuanced than that a monolithic term can accommodate. However, without a secure understanding of their motivations, it is difficult to assign them any clear label. However, without a

\footnote{While we may not know a motivation for sure, I will provide some suggestions for Vergilian pseudepigrapha and pseudepigraphic works in general throughout the rest of this chapter and dissertation.}
superior one to supplant it, it will continue to be used often with a lack of classification. Vergilian pseudepigrapha themselves defy simply categorization. Some works, like the *Culex*, seem to be Vergilian impersonations, in which the anonymous author wrote in the guise of a (youthful) Vergil. Some works, like the *Ciris*, seem to be receptions, using the exact same topics and even words of Vergil in a new text. Other works, like the *Elegiae in Maecenatem*, may be misattributed to Vergil due to their topic. Without knowledge of the background to these works, we are not able to classify them more securely than as pieces of pseudepigrapha.

The acknowledgement of a more expansive definition, as I suggest, would allow for a wider range of circumstances for composition. If pseudepigrapha come to encompass plagiarism and forgery, not as separate categories alongside it, this term would allow for such ambiguity in the causation of works. In this way, pseudepigrapha would be allowed to cover works that were both unintentionally and intentionally ascribed to well-known authors. Although some already use the term in such a way, acknowledging a range in meaning, and not just a narrow definition, would allow for a greater understanding of the works that it is said to define.

**Education in Antiquity**

Though the immediate motivation lying behind individual pseudepigraphic works cannot be known for sure, there is nevertheless one likely source of
inspiration: the educational system. It is here that young boys were first exposed to
the authentic works of authors that they might imitate both at school and later in
life.

Children began in the formal Roman educational system at the age of seven,
progressing through three levels. Quintilian points out learning should be
cumulative. He says:

Quare et pueri statim, ut praecepi, quam plurima ediscant, et, quaecunque aetas
operam iuvandae studio memoriae dabit, devoret initio taedium illud et scripta et
lecta saepius revolendi et quasi eundem cibum remandendi. Quod ipsum hoc fieri
potest levius, si pausa primum et quae odium non adferunt coeperimus ediscere, tum
cotidie addicere singulos versus, quorum accessio labori sensum incrementi non
adferat, in summam ad infinitum usque perveniat... 130

Therefore also boys immediately, as I previously instructed, should learn as many
things as possible, and, whatsoever age will pay attention to the pursuit of helping
one’s memory, at the outset should devour that tedium of re-reading both what
was written and read rather often and as if re-chewing the same food. This itself is
able to become easier, if we begin to learn a few things first which might not bring
hatred, then every day add single lines, the increase of which should not bring a
sense of growth to the labor, but which eventually leads to a limitless amount...

As a child reads an author over and over through many levels of education and in
many different ways and for various purposes, it is easy to see how he would be able
to internalize the works of an author. 131

School started at age seven in primary school (ludus litterarius). Here, a
student would begin one’s education with reading out loud and memorizing two-
line gnomic phrases, in prose or poetry. 132 In addition students would copy out lines

129 As opposed to the informal education before the age of seven, which could take place in the home.
130 Quint. Inst. 11.2.41. See Small (1997: 117-122) for more discussion.
131 Kaster (1988: 45) mentions that Vergil was present in all levels and places of such education.
132 It is in this educational context that a work such as the Distichs of Cato might have been produced
(Marrou (1956) 270).
of such verses, progressing from letters, to syllables, to words. So here, students could first be exposed to Vergil, even without knowing anything about his techniques, and begin their memorization.

Education continued through grammar school (*ludus grammaticus*) from approximately age 11 or 12. At this stage, in the words of Morgan, students began to develop their own “sense of understanding and control over” what they were reading. Words were not mere words, but were identified through context and the artistry behind them. Students would begin to learn the important features of works, such as events, principles, and characters, and would then begin to use these elements in their own writing. The prescribed works for reading in grammar school were usually poetry, more often than not with an emphasis on the *Aeneid*.

At age 15 or 16 until age 20 or so, boys would then enter rhetorical school (*ludus rhetoricus*), with the focus moving to prose works. Rhetorical school was intended to train those going into legal or political positions, in which case the focus on prose and the writing of *suasoriae* and *controversiae* was fitting. However, that does not necessarily mean that poetry was completely abandoned, even if it was often pushed to times of leisure. While most of the evidence from student texts suggests that the writing done at this level was in prose, exercises written in verse

---

133 Bonner (1977) 175, 180.
136 Quintilian (*Inst.* 1.4.2) states that students were supposed to learn how to speak correctly and interpret poets. Although students were not supposed to read prose at this stage, it was still possible. See Marrou (1965: 275) for further discussion. Bonner (1977) 213. Before the *Aeneid* was published, the focus was on Ennius’ *Annales*.
137 Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.5.15-16) and Pliny (*Ep.* 7.9.9-10) both attest to the continued reading of poetry. Cribiore (2001: 227) points out that Libanius (*Ep.* 1066, 990) does attest to some work with poetry at this stage.
are attested in Egypt, a fact that has led McGill to suggest that this practice may have also been present in Roman schools. Wilkins claims that Quintilian advises that poetry be left behind in favor of prose because he was an orator himself and therefore naturally draws the attention to that side. It seems plausible, then, that poetry was not altogether discarded at this point in a student’s education. Exercises that were learned and employed for the production of prose works could easily have been adapted to use with poetic works and in verse. These are the skills that can show up later in the production of pseudepigrapha.

Of course, for the most part, this type of schooling was enjoyed by the elite young males in Roman society. Anyone not of that social class or gender was unlikely to receive a similar education or to read as widely – if at all. While there is some evidence that elite young girls and less wealthy males might have had the opportunity to attend the lowest level of school for four to five years, both groups often left education before much or any training in the elite writers like Vergil occurred. This fact does not mean that those who were not wealthy males were not exposed to Vergil in other ways however. Vergil’s influence was pervasive even in the common culture of Roman society, as will be discussed below.

---

138 McGill (2005) 158, following Wilkins (1905). Cribiore (2001: 230) also states that verse writing was “more popular than is usually admitted” following Strabo (1.2.8) and Plato (Prt. 339a), both of whom suggest that poetic writing was useful and important in education.

139 But even Cicero had translated Aratus’ Phaenomena into Latin verse as a youth! And of course wrote poetry on his own political exploits (Quint. Inst. 10.5.16).


141 Cribiore (2001) 187. For information on vocational training, see Westermann (1914). For the education of slaves and freedmen see Booth (1979) and for their literacy, see Harris (1989: 255-259).
The most important tool of education in Rome was the practice of *imitatio* or the imitation and reuse of the authors who were a part of the educational system, like Vergil, starting in the 1st century BCE.\textsuperscript{142} Quintilian observes: “for it cannot be doubted, that a large part of the art is composed of imitation” (*neque enim dubitari potest, quin artis pars magna contineatur imitatione*).\textsuperscript{143} The point of *imitatio* was to “warm up the muscles” by using the texts of other authors until a student was ready to create original compositions of greater difficulty.\textsuperscript{144} Students would begin with works in prose or poetry (depending on the level) and then usually turn them into original prose compositions, though poetic ones were also possible. The importance of *imitatio* in education means that students could not help but be influenced by the words of canonical texts that persisted as rich fields to plough again and again.\textsuperscript{145} One consequence of such a pursuit is that the line between an original work and one inspired by it can become blurred.

*Imitatio* encouraged original composition; it also trained the memory. Memory is of the utmost importance when it comes to education according to Plutarch: “It is most important of all to train and exercise the memory of children; for this is a treasury of learning, as it were…” (*Πάντων δὲ μάλιστα τὴν μνήμην τῶν παιδῶν ἀσκεῖν καὶ συνεβίζειν, αὕτη γὰρ ὤσπερ τῆς παιδείας ἐστὶ ταμιεῖν…*).\textsuperscript{146} Students in primary school started by reading out loud and memorizing smaller, two-line statements, but as they progressed in school, memorization became more

\textsuperscript{142} McGill (2012) 19.
\textsuperscript{143} Quint. *Inst.* 10.2.1. Quintilian does caution against too much imitation and adds that we should also be original in how we use prior authors. See Morgan (1998: 251ff.) for more discussion.
\textsuperscript{144} Cribiore (2001) 222-223.
\textsuperscript{145} See McGill (2005: xvii) for further discussion.
\textsuperscript{146} [Plut.] *Lib.Educ.* 9e (Mor. 9e). See Small (1997: 74) for further discussion.
extensive. When students in grammar and rhetorical schools read longer passages out loud, they enhanced their memory by exercising two senses, visual and aural, at once.\textsuperscript{147} Theories about the role of memorization changed over time. Towards the end of the Republic, memorization for memorization’s sake was \textit{de rigueur}.\textsuperscript{148} Yet, by the time of Quintilian as discussed above – and therefore once Vergil was being read -- it became important to join memorization with assimilation, in order for students to understand more of the thinking and meaning behind the memorized words.\textsuperscript{149} When students go on to write their own works, they will not produce straight imitations, but carefully nuanced emulations of the texts they had read previously.\textsuperscript{150} It is in these activities that we can see the origins of or inspiration for pseudepigraphic works, in which previous works and topics were given new life and meaning.\textsuperscript{151} \emph{Progymnasmata}, or school exercises, come in various forms, but usually involve the reuse or repurposing of previous works.\textsuperscript{152} They can take the form of \textit{suasoriae}, or advice given to a fictional character or in the persona of a fictional character.\textsuperscript{153} They can be \textit{encomia} (praise works),\textsuperscript{154} speeches for a literary or

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{147} Small (1997) 74.
\textsuperscript{148} Cic. \textit{De or.} 1.157. See Fantham (1978: 110) and Roberts (1985: 8-14).
\textsuperscript{149} Quint. \textit{Inst.} 10.1.19 compares reading and re-reading to the mastication process. We must not swallow whole what we first bite off, but chew and chew until it can be processed through our system more easily. So we should do with reading and memory. See Fantham (1978: 110) for further discussion.
\textsuperscript{150} Sen. \textit{Ep.} 84 gives the analogy of a bee, which goes back and forth, picking up pieces from different flowers, with which to build the honeycomb. Macrobius (\textit{Sat. Preface} 5-6) similarly discusses the imitation of bees and further notes that even if we can see the sources, something new is still produced. See Fantham (1978: 110), Finkelpearl (2001: 83-84), and Sandnes (2011: 39-41) for further discussion.
\textsuperscript{151} Thomas (2001: 79) calls this type of activity “collaborative intertextuality.”
\textsuperscript{152} See Peirano (2012a: 18-19), McGill (2005: xvi-xix), and Bonner (1977: 253-273) for further discussion of these activities.
\textsuperscript{153} Serv. \textit{Ad Aen.} 10.532 gives an example of how this was done with the \textit{Aeneid}.
\end{footnotesize}
mythological character, variously termed ethopoeiae, prosopopoeiae, or sermocinationes. Other forms include: controversiae (fictional legal cases), ekphrases (descriptions), chreiae (anecdotes), synkrises (comparisons), gnomai (maxims), topoi (commonplaces), anaplerosi (filling gaps), and themata (situations from passages). We also have evidence of summaries of original works, in both prose and poetry; whether written by students or by teachers for use with students, these summaries were another form of recasting.

Vergil’s impact on Roman culture was felt immediately, and nowhere more than in the education system, as one of its most important authors. Quintus Caecilius Epirota, a freedman and instructor of grammar, introduced Vergil’s Eclogues and Georgics into schools in 26 BCE, and the Aeneid, published in 19 BCE, entered the curriculum soon after. School children’s use of Vergil was extensive: “reciting,
memorizing and interpreting” in addition to rewriting. Evidence from graffiti, which we assume were scholastic exercises by young boys, further supports this overwhelming influence. In Pompeii, 69 Vergilian quotations are mostly limited to the first words of Books One and Two of the Aeneid, 16 and 14 graffiti, respectively, either in full or abbreviation. At times, the quotation of the incipit is adapted, or even parodied to fit its surrounding environment, as evidenced by CIL 4.9131 (fullones ululamque cano, non arma virumque). This graffiti was found outside the house of a fuller, whose profession had strong ties with the images of owls. The writer of this line seems to be parodying the original, showing support to the fuller, instead of the great hero Aeneas.

Quintilian, in his work the Institutio Oratoria, describes the early education and development of a future orator, and establishes Homer and Vergil as the foundation of such a system. He says early on in his work that

Ideoque optime insitutum est, ut ab Homero atque Vergilio lectio inciperet, quanquam ad intelligendas eorum virtutes firmiore iudicio opus est; sed huic rei superest tempus, neque enim semel legentur.

Therefore it is best established that reading begin from Homer and Vergil, although there is need for a more established judgment to understand their virtues; but there is enough time for this matter, for they will not be read only once.

---

162 McGill (2003) 86. This sentiment is also echoed by Horsfall (1995: 298).
163 Horsfall (1995) 298. See recently Milnor (2014: 233-272) concerning the connection between graffiti and education in Pompeii. She concludes that the quotation of Vergilian lines is less about specific taste and more about a desire to commoditize it as a useful tool. See Appendix 5.1 in Milnor’s book for each graffiti, size, location and other notes (where applicable). Most Vergilian references are to the Aeneid, however there are a few to the Eclogues and Georgics as well.
164 Quint. Inst. 1.8.5. Quint. Inst. 10.1.85-6 provides another of example of the importance of starting an education with Vergil, who is almost as good as Homer. In this rendering, Vergil has taken the place of honor as Homer did in the Greek educational system. For evidence of this see Ziolkowski and Putnam (2008: 46).
Quintilian is not the only author to write of Vergil's central place in the educational system.\textsuperscript{165} Notices of his importance appear from the Classical to the Christian era, from lighter works such as Juvenal’s \textit{Satires} to more serious works such as Servius’ \textit{De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus}. Even Augustine, having been educated in the classical system, recalls his composition of a speech for Dido in the style of Vergil for a scholastic competition. By the 4\textsuperscript{th} century CE, Vergil had joined Terence, Cicero, and Sallust as part of the \textit{quadriga} of authors at the heart of the Roman curriculum.\textsuperscript{166}

Yet Vergil’s impact progressed far beyond just the educational system and, at a certain point, became the “\textit{lingua franca} in Roman society.”\textsuperscript{167} In fact, in one graffito, the first line of the \textit{Aeneid} is preceded by the words “\textit{carmina communemne}” (or a “popular song”).\textsuperscript{168} The archaeological record demonstrates that people, educated or not, would have had an opportunity to come into contact with Vergil and his works. As noted above, there are 69 pieces of graffiti from Pompeii that use Vergil’s texts, mostly the \textit{Aeneid}, as well as various inscriptions.\textsuperscript{169} While most of these graffiti do not show a deep engagement with the texts of Vergil, Milnor argues that a

\textsuperscript{165} For further examples of how and why one would use the works of Vergil see Starr (1991) and Starr (2007). Evidence for Vergil’s importance in education includes: Seneca the Elder (\textit{Suas}. 4.4-5); Tacitus (\textit{Dial.} 12); Suetonius (\textit{Gram.} 16); Juvenal (\textit{Sat.} 7.226-7); Capitolinus (on education of Emperor Clodius Albinus); Augustine (\textit{De civ. D.} 1.13, \textit{Con.} 1.27); Macrobius (\textit{Sat.} 1.24.5-6); Priscian’s \textit{Enarratio} (\textit{Aen}. 1). See Distler (1966: 148-151) for further discussion.

\textsuperscript{166} Kenney (1982) 7. The 4\textsuperscript{th} century grammarian Arusianus Messius gave the term \textit{quadriga} to the authors of the education system (GLK vii 449-515). See also Marrou (1956: 277-278), and Bonner (1997: 213).

\textsuperscript{167} McGill (2005) xxii.

\textsuperscript{168} \textit{CIL} 4.2361. Milnor (2014) 240. Milnor notes that the grammar here is hard to construe. We must rely on nineteenth century excavators, since the original plaster has disappeared. However, she remains confident in the implications of “common” and “song” as referring to the first words of Vergil’s text because of the many other graffiti quotations.

\textsuperscript{169} Horsfall (1995) 252-253. Again, see Milnor (2014: 263-272) for a complete list of graffiti quotations and their locations and dimensions.
number do show a background in education accompanied by a deeper engagement
with the text.  

In addition, the impact of Vergil is blatantly clear in visual arts: various wall
paintings, mosaics, sarcophagi, spoons, coins and gems also reference, sometimes
unquestionably, the works of Vergil.  

Even the illiterate of Rome could have heard
readings of his poems, as Augustine tells of nocturnal recitations.  
The presence of
frequent quotations of Vergil by members of the non-elite class in Petronius’
Satyricon is further possible evidence that it was not only the upper class who used
Vergil as their common currency, but instead all strata of society.  

Vergil’s texts
frequently inspired others to quote and produce similar works for the enjoyment of
all.

The use of Vergil’s authentic words, themes, and productions in student
exercises is well attested in the transmission tradition: multiple papyri or
manuscripts have been found with paraphrases of Vergil in verse, usually
hexameters, or passages of Vergil written over and over.  

Although it is unclear
whether these were written by students or by teachers for an instructional purpose,
they still offer insights into the ways in which Vergil was (re)used within the
educational system.

170 Milnor (2014) 252-262.
171 For further discussion of such remnants, see Comparetti (1997: 26-27), Horsfall (1995: 253-254),
and Ziolkowski and Putnam (2008: 44).
(2009).
174 Papiri Grecie e Latin i 2.142; AL 1 SB; AL 672a R; AL 717R; AL 720aR; AL 653 R; AL 591-602; AL 634
R (all from late antiquity); P.Tebt.2686 – G.4.1-2; P.Hawara 24 – A.2.601 and 4.174 (See Most (2010)
965 for discussion of the latter set).
By the time young men reached the end of their education, certain works would have been burned into their memory, as the 5th century Christian author Orosius says about the *Aeneid*. Works that they were exposed to as youths, along with an understanding and appreciation of Vergilian narrative, techniques, and skills, followed them into adulthood. They were inescapable even by the most ardent of detractors, as evidenced by Christian authors. As Syme notes, “When models of classic excellence were imitated by teachers and by their pupils, emulation might lead to impersonation.” These types of impersonation, though, can lead to problems later on. As Fraenkel notes in his work on Horace, “the harmless rhetorical exercise, executed with sufficient verve and stylistic credibility will naturally, by the Renaissance, be accepted as authentic.” Although it might be difficult to believe that works written by school age boys were those that were accepted as authentic in Fraenkel’s words, it is not unreasonable to think that they were inspired by the techniques from school but written later in life.

The “openness of Virgilian poetry,” that is the use of *imitatio* towards the works of Vergil, in the words of McGill, allowed for various modes of reinterpretation and reuse in adulthood when former students would create more sophisticated pieces of literature that employed exercises and words used

---

175 Oros. *Adv Pag.* 1.18.1. Orosius is not the only Christian author to discuss his education with Vergil and the continued use of Vergil in the educational system. Paulinus of Nola, while railing against the use of pagan authors, still quotes or alludes to the works of Vergil. Walsh (1975/6: 9) says that Paulinus is not alone but a “victim of traditional Roman education,” in that he was never able to forget his Vergil as much as he tried. Concerning Augustine, Lim (2004: 113) states that “the cultural authority of Vergil and the classroom practice of the grammarians furnished Augustine with a familiar and expedient frame of reference,” which he would continue to use.

176 Syme (1972) 16.

177 Fraenkel (1957) 21ff. To continue this line of thinking, it is interesting to note that Sanford (1924: 200) also states that later handbooks contain both authentic and non-authentic (*i.e.* those that will later be classified as the *Appendix Vergiliana*) works of Vergil.
throughout the educational system.\textsuperscript{178} Pieces commonly referred to as pseudepigrapha could be inspired by such youthful activities, showing an active engagement with texts or, at the very least, traces left in memory, ones that seemed inescapable.\textsuperscript{179}

The best examples of student exercises that reuse the authentic works of Vergil come from the \textit{Codex Salmisianus}, a collection created around 534 CE, preserved in a manuscript dating from the 7\textsuperscript{th}-9\textsuperscript{th} centuries CE. Here we find three poems in the \textit{Locus Vergilianus} that resemble exercises using the works of Vergil that one would find in the educational system.\textsuperscript{180} Although they seem to be more sophisticated than the works of school-age children and indeed have been attributed to adults, nevertheless it is clear that they were influenced by scholastic activities.\textsuperscript{181} Commenting on the poems in this collection, McGill notes that, “The texts are not scholastic exercises, but examples of scholastic poetry, or texts deriving from the schools rather than arising in them.”\textsuperscript{182} And their significance for us is that, as McGill points out, “ties to the scholastic world, whether in the capacity simply of former students or of instructors as well, best explain why the authors of the Virgilian texts recast the \textit{Aeneid} as they do.”\textsuperscript{183}

\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{178} McGill (2005) xxiv.
\textsuperscript{179} Not all works might be inspired by vestiges in one’s memory, however. Some works show direct, verbatim quotations of an authentic text, which perhaps suggest literal engagement with the text. But for inspiration, for example, in the \textit{Culex} and its parade of heroes in the underworld, these vestiges would suffice.
\textsuperscript{180} The \textit{Locus Vergilianus} contains three poems inspired by sections of the \textit{Aeneid}. One poem was written by the late 5\textsuperscript{th} or early 6\textsuperscript{th} century writer Coronatus entitled \textit{Vivo Equidem Vitamque Extrema per Omnia Duco}. The other two are anonymous poems (or \textit{Themata Vergiliana}), entitled \textit{Turne: in Te Suprema Salus} and \textit{Nec Tibi, Diva Parens} (McGill (2003) 85).
\textsuperscript{181} See McGill (2003) for a further discussion of these poems.
\textsuperscript{182} McGill (2003) 91.
\textsuperscript{183} McGill (2003) 93.
Included in the *Codex Salmasianus* are seven distichs, which are transmitted under the name of Vergil (*AL 250-257 / AL 256R-263R*). They have been recorded as follows:

*Nocte pluit tota, redeunt at mane serena.*

*Commune imperium cum love, Caesar, agis.* (*AL 250 / AL 256R*)

It rains the whole night, but good weather returns in the morning.

You, Caesar, hold a power shared with Jupiter.

*Hos ego versiculos feci. Tulit alter honorem.*

*Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes.* (*AL 251 / AL 257R*)

I composed these little verses. But another took the credit.

As you, bees, do not make honey for yourselves.

*Pars tibi, Nise, datur Bacchi, pars deinde negatur:*

*Esse potes liber, non potes esse pater.* (*AL 252 / AL 258R*)

Part of Bacchus is given to you, Nisus, part is denied:

You are able to be Liberated, you are not able to be paternal.

*Arretine calix, mensis decor anter paternis,*

*Ante manus medici quam bene sanus eras!* (*AL 253 / AL 259R*)

O Aretian cup, a decoration before for paternal tables,

How very healthy you were before the hands of a doctor!

*Humor alit segetem; segeti contrarius humor.*

*Quod iuvat, hoc dulce est; quod cogitur, altera mors est.* (*AL 254 / AL 260R*)

Water nourished the crop; to the crop dangerous is water.

That which helps is also pleasant; that which is forced is a second death.

*Monte sub hoc lapidum premitur Ballista sepultus:*

*Nocte die tutum carpe viator iter.* (*AL 255 / AL 261R = VSD 17*)

Under this mountain of rocks, the buried Ballista is concealed:

By day, by night, traveler, have a safe trip.

---

184 Technically, there are eight distichs, however one (*AL 255 / AL 261R*) is transmitted independently in the biographical tradition. Therefore, I will refer to them as seven, since this is their first appearance. Three other poems quoted in the *Anthologia Latina* are attributed to Vergil: *AL 674aR, 675R, 813R*. These come from various manuscripts and various centuries. All three poems attempt to connect themselves with the biography and/or oeuvre of Vergil. The first two listed concern themselves with the poetry of Vergil. In *AL 674aR*, we find "Vergil" in competition with Homer. The speaker, in the persona of Vergil, is victorious as the best epicist (at least in his own estimation). This poem is clearly a reflection of the tradition of equating the two classical epic poets, one that is also exhibited in the educational system. The third of these poems is addressed to an unspecified Caesar, although likely Augustus. This poem, similar to *AL 250 / AL 256R*, equates the ruler on land, Caesar, to the ruler in the sky, Jupiter, in order to glorify the former and enhance the connection between the poet and (future) emperor. Unfortunately, we do not know how these poems became connected with the name of Vergil or the rest of his works, authentic or not.
It is interesting that, in this codex that features many re-writings of the authentic works of Vergil, from the novice school activities to the sophisticated centos, we also find works purported to have been written by Vergil. These works are both short and easily understood, with almost all verbs in the present tense, a fact that gives the impression that the poems themselves were also the result of school exercises. As with other pieces, schoolboys could have been tasked with composing in the voice of Vergil following typical progymnasmata. For example, AL 256 appears to be a maxim about the nature of humans and their interactions with gods. But somehow the compiler of this codex attributed them to Vergil himself rather than a school child.

As discussed above, authors often used a sphragis to give authenticity to their work. AL 251/AL 257R seems to take the form of such a tool. The distich suggests that there is an issue with the authorship of an unspecified text. The author indicates that a work that is his was claimed by another as the other’s own. In the elegiac line, the author suggests that he is resigned to the fact that this occurs fairly often, comparing the situation to bees making honey. While this distich takes the

\[Si quotiens peccant homines, sua fulmina mittat\]
\[lupiter, ex quo tempore inermis erit. (AL 256 / AL 262R)\]

If as often as humans err, Jupiter would send his Lightening bolts, he will be disarmed in a short time.

\[Dum dubitat natura, marem faceretne puellam,\]
\[Natus es, o pulcher, paene puella, puer. (AL 257 / AL 263R)\]

While nature hesitates, if it should make a boy a girl, You were born, oh beautiful boy, almost a girl.

\[\text{185 Although short and fairly simple, the poems are not without any poetic artistry. For example, the hexameter line of AL 254 / AL 260R is almost chiastic, beginning and ending with the word “humor,” and seeing the word “seges” in two different cases in the middle.}\]
form of an authentication tool, it only seems to do so after the fact. The theft already occurred and there is nothing to be done, though the author still attempts. Therefore, it is not being used as most sphragides are, that is as a means to confirm the authorship of a given text, but here, instead, these lines seem to be written as a cautionary tale concerning the practice of *imitatio*, one that was discussed above. Works are not made for the enjoyment of the one who creates them, but instead for others. Because of that fact, however, one’s own work can be claimed by someone else. This relatively simple distich reflects the literary culture at the time in a refined way: acknowledging a system in which all writers take part, and the consequences of such, all in just two lines. So while these distichs may seem relatively simple on the surface, their meanings may convey something much deeper.

Although the poems are rather short, nevertheless they also display a level of playfulness in their word choice.\textsuperscript{186} For example, there seems to be a play on the nature of Nisus in *AL 252*/*AL 258R*. In the hexameter line, Nisus in part is equated with Bacchus, followed in the pentameter line with the adjective “liber.” “Liber” is also the name of a god, one frequently assimilated with Bacchus, both as Roman equivalents of the Greek god Dionysus. Therefore, in the first half of each line, Nisus is equated partly with a god of wine, one that is perhaps free from many responsibilities. *AL 253*/*AL 259R* may also display a play on word meanings. In the pentameter line, the cup is described as *sanus*, a word that is usually used to describe the health of a person, not an inanimate object as here. The cup was sound,

\textsuperscript{186} I will talk about the “Ballista” epigram and its ludic qualities in Chapter 6.
but once in the hands of a doctor, a person who usually improves the health of a patient, the implication is the cup is no longer safe. Perhaps, it is due to the hands (manus) of this doctor: ones that should be steady and helpful are here possibly clumsy. One last interpretation may be that the doctor used the cup to administer a drug, but that drug did more harm than good to the patient.\textsuperscript{187}

However, these compositions attributed to Vergil are met with mixed results, as some seem more Vergilian than others. For example, \textit{AL} 254 begins with the nature of agriculture, which could be a seed for the \textit{Georgics} to come, even using a word from the first line of that didactic work. \textit{AL} 250 celebrates an unspecified Caesar, most likely Augustus if Vergil is meant to be the author, a fact that would connect the two figures further and earlier in their lives. Continuing this trend, \textit{AL} 253’s first word, \textit{Arretine}, might be a reference to Maecenas, Vergil’s great patron, who was said to be from that region. \textit{AL} 251 on poetry and plagiarism seems especially fitting for a piece of pseudepigrapha. However, there are others that feel, on the surface, un-Vergilian or that feature fewer connections to Vergil. For example, \textit{AL} 252 and 257 both deal with reproduction. In the latter, the sex of a child can be confused due to hesitation on the part of nature.

More than half of these distichs foreshadow Vergil’s future life and works in small ways. There are brief hints of his biographical tradition and some of his authentic works. However, these references were crafted in a more simplistic way.

\textsuperscript{187} Books 23-32 of Pliny’s \textit{Natural History} deal with medicine; Book 29 (1-8) begins with a discussion of the origins of doctors. Pliny expresses a negative (and perhaps exaggerated) opinion of the profession (sections 7-8 especially). Some of the interpretations of this distich support Pliny’s thoughts concerning doctors. See Nutton (2013) on the history and practices of ancient medicine, in particular Chapter 11 on Roman views of Greek medicine.
than we will see with other pseudepigrapha. I think that the inclusion of the Ballista epigram (AL 255/AL 261R) is key to their interpretation. This epigram can also be found in the biographical tradition where it is named as the very first of Vergil’s works. The placement of that poem in the middle of this set further supports the view that these were meant to be seen as the earliest works of Vergil, ones in which Vergil experimented with different topics, some of which would be continued and expanded upon later in life. The longer, more sophisticated pseudepigrapha mentioned within the biographical tradition will flesh out the biography and authentic works and their influences further and in a more complex way. But it is here, in this codex, surrounded by other re-inventions of Vergil, that we see imaginations of what, perhaps, a school age Vergil would have written.

Even though the provenance, authorship, impetus, even date of the works contained in the Codex Salmasianus are unknown, the conclusion can still be drawn that the poems found their start in the Roman educational system. I would like to apply this idea to the other pseudepigraphic works of Vergil, and consider whether they, too, might have had their beginnings in that system. In order to produce works of such sophistication, the authors would need an intimate connection to and

---

188 Again, see Chapter 6 for further discussion of this poem.
189 McGill (2005: xx) makes a similar argument for Vergilian centos and suggests that while they were not composed in schools, it is clear that their beginnings were there. People educated in the ways discussed above would have had the experience with the oeuvre of Vergil to write centos later in life, using the exact phrases/lines of Vergil reordered. McGill sees centos or “secondary authorship, as an extension of the principle that they had encountered in the ‘curriculum’” (xxi). Since centos are another form of Vergilian reception, it is easy to see how this notion can be transferred to pseudepigraphic works, as well.
knowledge of Vergil. While Vergil may have been the common cultural currency, the close engagement between Vergilian pseudepigrapha and the authentic texts of Vergil resulted in greater refinement than one could gain simply through wall paintings and a few famous quotations. Such refinement was the product of a rarified sort of introduction to the work, one that only the educational system could provide. The reading, memorization, rewriting and expansion of the authentic works of Vergil are evident in the *progymnasmata*; the textual transmission as well shows what can be produced post-education in the evolution of such activities; and the Vergilian pseudepigrapha are the culmination. The educational system, with its constant use of Vergil, was inescapable later in life, even to the extent of writing works as if one were Vergil himself.

Although I have been focusing on and will continue to focus on the pseudepigraphic texts of Vergil, the educational system also inspired work in imitation of other authors read in schools. Indeed, school texts were the basis for more significant forms or numbers of pseudepigrapha than works not read in schools. Besides Vergil, Cicero and Sallust, both part of the *quadriga* of education, have pseudepigrapha attached to them including the *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* and

---

190 Even though scholars have been arguing for centuries about how they do not measure up to the Vergilian originals (see discussion in introduction), there is no doubt that there is still an artistry and skill to them.

191 As Ziolkowski and Putnam (2008: 43) state, the widespread knowledge of Vergil was “due less to reverence than to the effectiveness of the Roman system of education, which so quickly made the verses of Virgil like a song one cannot get out of one’s head.”

192 Peirano (2012a: 245) states that fakes tend to cluster around genres whose origins you can find in education, such as encomium and lament. While it is interesting that there are a number of these types of pseudepigrapha, it does not account for all such works unless one acknowledges the importance of *imitatio* in *progymnasmata*. 
letters to Caesar, as well as the attack on Cicero, respectively.\footnote{Before Vergil, Ennius held the place of prominence for epic in the Roman educational system. Yet because his works are so fragmentary and not enough is extant, it hard to know if any of what has been passed down to us is pseudepigraphic. Homer, the foundation for the Greek education system, also had a large number of pseudepigraphic texts attached to his corpus, so it is not a stretch to think Ennius did as well. I am indebted to Jay Fisher for this point (per litteras).} Ovid, who also becomes important to education, inspired numerous pieces of pseudepigrapha-- in fact even more than Vergil himself (including the \textit{Halieutica} and \textit{Nux}).\footnote{See Knox (2009) for a discussion of Ovidian pseudepigrapha.}

There seems to be only one significant exception to the claim that the educational system inspired pseudepigrapha: Terence. His inclusion in the educational curriculum first needs some exploration. Terence was a school author because, in order to make the Roman curriculum mirror the Greek, a substitute for Menander was needed. Though comedy was usually denigrated for its morals, Terence was seen to be the best of the comic writers due to his purity of style and skill in characterization.\footnote{This is the characterization of Terence's works according to Cicero, Caesar, Varro (fr. 99) (Bonner (1977) 216), and Augustan critics in general (Suet. \textit{Vita Terent.}).} Additionally, his works were able to provide real-life examples as opposed to mythological ones found in works of other poets. However, scholars continue to view the inclusion of Terence as an unexpected choice.\footnote{Marrou (1965: 278) notes that the inclusion of Terence in this system is odd because in Terence's own time he was no higher than "6th class," even if his status began to be rehabilitated during the Empire.}

I argue that there are a few possible reasons for the lack of Terentian pseudepigrapha. First, a simple lack of interest: other authors in the education system may have provided more inspiring examples to imitate. Second, the length of his works: most pseudepigraphic works are short, simply because it is easier to pretend to be another author in a shorter piece than in a longer one.\footnote{The \textit{Rhetorica Ad Herrenium} is a notable example of a lengthy pseudepigraphic work. See Winkel (1979) and Perez Castro (1999) for a basic discussion of authorship and date.} In a longer
work, more flaws and indications of non-authentic authorship can shine through.

Third, transmission: Terentian pseudepigrapha may have been written and circulated, but they were exposed as fakes along the way and discarded from his oeuvre.

Setting Terence to one side, there is a strong connection between the stature of the authentic author in the educational system and the number of pseudepigrapha that are passed down as authentic. Although there is no way to identify the authors and determine the dates of most pseudepigrapha, their origins in the educational system should be acknowledged. Activities such as an *ethopoëia* or a *synkrasis* can easily be seen as inspiration for works like the *Ciris* or *Culex*. Even if a pseudepigraphic work does not take its origin directly from one of the scholastic exercises, the employment of Vergilian words, phrases, themes, and point of views still owes a debt to the educational system. It is here that young boys would first learn the words of Vergil before moving on to interpretation, and eventually impersonation. While texts that “passed” as authentic works of authors like Vergil were most likely written by skilled adults, the foundation for their composition came in boyhood.

**Conclusion—Connections to Vergil**

The Roman literary system was rife with problems when it came to protecting authors and their works and it encouraged or at the very least allowed authors such as Vergil to be mined for further productions like pseudepigrapha. The
only protection the authentic, original poems had, the sphragis, could be corrupted and was not always used by authors. Publication practices easily allowed for works to be put out under the name of Vergil after his death, even though they were not written by him. Pseudo-Vergilian poems do in fact show that themes and expressions from authentic Vergilian works were often imitated and, at times, simply copied.

Would ancient readers have cared that some poems disseminated under the name of Vergil were not actually written by him? Martial 1.29 implies that there had to be public awareness (fama refert / “rumor has it”) or acceptance of a work in order for it to “pass.”¹⁹⁸ This suggests, in my opinion, that the audience plays a large part in the system of literary fakes. It is not simply enough to attribute a work to a poet like Vergil, but the public at large has to accept that Vergil was indeed the author. There is very little evidence for the recognition by readers either way, but considering how easy it was for such works to be accepted, perhaps the public at large really did not care whether the works were authentic.¹⁹⁹ The lack of concern may be due to the fame of an author with Vergil’s stature, fame that would drive such an interest in and desire for new works that the public at large were willing to overlook any questions of authenticity.

The legendary story of Vergil on his deathbed tells us that he ordered works not published in his lifetime to be burned, but that they were nevertheless saved by his friends and future editors.²⁰⁰ If Vergil wanted his unpublished works burned,

---

¹⁹⁸ See Anderson (2006: 119-120) for further discussion.
¹⁹⁹ Zetzel (1973) 243.
²⁰⁰ VSD 39.
then clearly he meant more than the *Aeneid*-- or so the ancients must have thought. This detail about his death gave possible inspiration for literary fakes in Vergil’s name. As Horsfall has pointed out: “As a poet, Virgil begins late: that is a boon to biographers and fakers.”

Vergil, the master poet, was then looked upon as the most desirable author to forge: “There was never enough Virgil to satisfy the enthusiasm and curiosity of his ancient readers,” says Horsfall.

Whether the Vergilian pseudepigrapha were written for profit, private pleasure, or any other myriad reasons given by modern scholars, will never be known. Nor can we know when, by whom, or where they were written. Yet we can discern some suggestion of evidence for their creation in the literary and educational culture of that time, and that context permits us to compare them with one another in content, conventions, and their use of Vergil.

\[201\text{Horsfall (1995) 10. Clift (1945: 123-128) previously brought up similar points concerning Vergil and his works and the holes that were there to be filled. She says that because of the “deferred publication” of the works later termed pseudepigrapha, however, they were not included in the usual grouping of Vergil’s poems – perhaps as evidenced by their placement in the biographies of Vergil – and therefore questions were raised concerning them. Yet, clearly, the questions were not sufficiently serious to remove them from consideration as Vergil’s at least by the 4th century, when the first extant biographies of the poet were written.}\]

\[202\text{Horsfall (2006) 1. This fact is supported by Holzberg (2004a: 7) who also references Vergil as a celebrity whose shoes later imitators wished to fill.}\]
Chapter 2: The Pseudo-Vergilian poems in Donatus’ *Vita Vergiliana*

Although the *Culex* and the *Catalepton* individually were attributed to Vergil in first century CE, the first place where we see Vergilian pseudopigrapha referenced together as a group is in the biographies of Vergil handed down from antiquity.\(^{203}\) Suetonius wrote the first known biography of Vergil, one that was contained in his work *De viris illustribus*. Unfortunately this life, written in the second century CE only a century after Vergil’s death, has been lost to us. However most, or all, of his biography has survived in a large quotation via another biographer. In this chapter, I will discuss the pseudopigraphic poems listed by the inheritor of Suetonius’ biography, namely Donatus. With this biography, we have a *terminus ante quem* for the production of such works. The biography also contains the first grouping of the poems together, a fact that forms the basis for this study. Here, I will discuss the connections that are of most importance to this collection: biographical, metrical, linguistic, intertextual, and scholastic. In doing so, I hope to glean the characteristics of both Vergil and his authentic works most important to the ancients.

---

\(^{203}\) The *Culex* is mentioned by Martial (14.185.1-2 and 8.56.19-20), Statius (*Sil. 1. Praef.* and *Sil. 2.7.73-74*) and Suetonius (*Vita Luc. 1*) as Vergil’s. *Catalepton 2* is mentioned by Quintillian (*Inst. 8.3.27-28*) and Ausonius (*Technop. 15.5*) as Vergil’s. See Appendix A for texts and translations. These poems may have been known before, but it is in the biographies that they were first grouped together, namely in the biography written by Donatus (Terenzio (1989) 261). See Zogg (2016) for discussion of these ancient citations, the correlations between them, and how they relate to Vergil’s authentic oeuvre.
Donatus’ Biography

The biography written by Donatus concerning the life of Vergil is commonly referred to as the *Vita Suetonii vulga Donatiana (VSD).*\(^{204}\) Aelius Donatus was a teacher in the schools of grammar in Rome around the middle of the fourth century CE. Amongst his other writings, including a commentary on Terence, he wrote a commentary on Vergil’s works sometime before 363 CE, which has mostly been lost.\(^{205}\) We are indebted to Jerome, his most famous student, for inserting the *VSD* in his own works.\(^{206}\)

As should be evident from the full title of this biography, Donatus owes a large debt to Suetonius’ biography of Vergil. While there is no scholarly unanimity on the extent of that debt, the general consensus is that a significant portion of the biography that we attribute to Donatus was actually written by Suetonius.\(^{207}\) It is clear that Donatus at the very least revised Suetonius’ biography and put it at the beginning of his own commentary on Vergil’s works. But scholars debate how much of the biography is Suetonius’, how much Donatus’, and how to go about distinguishing the sections from one another.\(^{208}\) Naumann has taken the hard position that the whole work is Suetonius’, with Paratore taking the opposite position.\(^{209}\) Most other scholars fall into the middle.\(^{210}\) Only sections 37-38 have

---

\(^{204}\) From here on out, I will refer to this biography as the *VSD*, as is the common convention.


\(^{206}\) Brugnoli and Stok (1997) vii.

\(^{207}\) Hardie (1966) xi. Brugnoli and Stok (1997: xi) write that Donatus says he “plucked, tore, culled” (*decerpsit*) his work from Suetonius.

\(^{208}\) Stok (2014) 751-752. Most scholars acknowledge this fact, then claim that the majority is in fact Suetonius’ but continue to attribute authorship to Donatus.

been attributed to Donatus unanimously -- even by Naumann-- as these sections concerning the will of Vergil contain a poem by an author known to have lived after the time of Suetonius.\(^{211}\)

The sections originally written by Suetonius have been identified in a number of ways. First, the structure of the biography follows the typical structure of a Suetonian biography.\(^{212}\) Second, the biography seems to mention only sources that pre-date Suetonius. Sources may include, for example, the correspondence between Vergil and Augustus, Asconius Pedianus’ *Liber contra Vergilii obtrectatores*, a biography of Vergil by Varius Rufus, perhaps an editor of the *Aeneid*, and Vergil’s will in the imperial archives.\(^{213}\) Horsfall argues that Donatus could not have had better sources than Suetonius and biographical techniques would not have changed between the times of the two biographers, so Donatus would have simply used Suetonius’ work.\(^{214}\) Third, according to Naumann, only 3.3% of the vocabulary used is non-Suetonian, perhaps only allowing for the two added sections, 37 and 38.\(^{215}\)

Finally, in his prefatory letter to Lucius Munatius, Donatus states that he will follow the biographies of Vergil that came before him, *i.e.* that of Suetonius, since his

\(^{210}\) For example Lyne (1971: 234) writes that, while the biography attributed to Donatus is close to that of Suetonius, there is no consensus about how much material is from the Suetonian original, and how much was a Donatian addition.

\(^{211}\) Naumann (1981) 185. Horsfall (2000) 3. Section 38 quotes a poem of Sulpicius of Carthage about the almost burning of the *Aeneid* after the death of Vergil. This poet lived in the second century CE, after Suetonius had died, and so could not have been quoted by that biographer.

\(^{212}\) Stok (2014) 751-752. However, I believe this to be a weak reason for attributing the work to Suetonius. The structure could be the same because of Suetonius’ heavy influence on the genre, and not necessarily because he wrote the work.

\(^{213}\) Stok (2014) 751-752. Also see Stok (2010) for a further discussion of the sources for this biography. He concludes here that all the sources (except for 37-38, as previously mentioned) date to Suetonius’ time (335).

\(^{214}\) Horsfall (2000) 3.

is the only previous one that dealt systematically with Vergil’s life.216 Further,
Donatus states that he plans “to preserve the words also” (etiam verba servare) and
continues “even when mixed with our sense” (admixto etiam sensu nostro).217 Both
phrases provide us with a picture of Donatus’ intentions: to follow the previous
texts word for word with allowances only for small changes.218 Yet he never says in
this letter that he has taken the biography of Suetonius almost wholesale as he
admitted in his life of Terence.219 Nevertheless, Naumann argues that if Donatus did
it once, then clearly he did it again.220 However, this is a hard argument to support
since it does not allow for any change in biographical technique on the part of
Donatus. It supposes that Donatus repeated his actions in a second biography, a fact
that is unsubstantiated. At most, using Donatus’ own words, we can say that the
biographies are mostly the same, but Donatus made some changes.

On the other hand, Lyne notes that just because Donatus may follow closely
upon his predecessor, it does not mean that Donatus could not have added to that
work.221 In fact, Geer has found as many as 14 sections in Donatus that might not be
attributable to Suetonius due to their use of non-Suetonian wording and
vocabulary.222

The authorship of sections 17 and 18, which list what we now consider the
pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil, is of special interest to us. On the one hand,
Terenzio argues that these sections must be Suetonian. Taking up the line of

---

216 Horsfall (2000) 3 n. 24. Donatus makes this claim at the end of his life of Terence.
217 VVA 15-16.
219 At the end of his Vita Terentii, Donatus adds: haec Suetonius Tranquillus (8).
221 Lyne (1971) 234.
222 See Geer (1926) for a full discussion of these passages.
reasoning that the whole work is mostly Suetonian, he argues that these two sections cannot have been added because there is a progression from what precedes the first section to what follows the final section, as is made clear by the adverbs denoting the order of the texts. Terenzio continues that Suetonius must have had access to these poems, perhaps from the heirs of Vergil, and does not question their authenticity, even though Terenzio does not attribute them securely to Vergil.

However, a number of scholars have called into question the authorship of these sections. Geer includes both sections 17 and 18 in his list of questionable Suetonian passages, writing that they contain words and wording unusual for Suetonius that should lead us to attribute them to Donatus instead. Lyne agrees that these sections are most likely non-Suetonian, as it is “highly improbable” that Suetonius would have included more than one or two of the cited poems—the Culex and perhaps one or two of the Catalepton poems. Because the other poems in these sections have not been cited in pre-Donatian works, Lyne believes that these two sections were written by Donatus, not Suetonius. In addition, Lyne argues that since there are no biographical snippets from these poems used in the bulk of the VSD, Suetonius either did not know of these poems or did not use them. Typically, Suetonius does not simply list works, as found in these sections, without further discussion of them. Therefore, concludes Lyne, Suetonius probably either did not

---

223 Terenzio (1989) 253-254. He does not, though, acknowledge that if these sections were interpolated, Donatus could have also changed or added the adverbs to make the sections flow as Terenzio has noted.
225 Geer (1926) 110-111.
226 See Appendix A for citations.
know of these works or did not consider them to be Vergil’s—Donatus, then, was
the first to do so.²²⁷

In a 1971 article, Lyne continues to expand upon the theory that these
sections were written by Donatus and what that could mean for the poems
themselves. Lyne supposes that Donatus did not actually know the texts of the
poems, just their titles: the biographer cites no allusions to them in his commentary
on authentic Vergilian works, except to the Culex, a fact that Lyne acknowledges
complicates matters. Lyne continues that, due to the fact that they are simply listed
without any further description, any information provided by Donatus about these
poems is second-hand and that he never actually had access to these works.

There must have been a time during which the titles of these works were
known but the texts had been lost. Prior to this time, the texts were known
individually, but were only occasionally mentioned. Perhaps around the 4th century
CE, the lost poems were re-discovered in a group, and were collectively mentioned
in numerous biographies.²²⁸ However, whether these newly-discovered works were
the same as the texts that were circulated before is a matter of debate.²²⁹ These
facts, then, lead us back to the proposal that Donatus was the first biographer to list
these works of Vergil as a sort of “collection,” despite not having access to the texts
themselves.

In conclusion, it is hard to disagree with the majority of scholars who state
that the vita attributed to Donatus is substantially that of Suetonius. However, the

²²⁷ Lyne (1971) 237-238.
²²⁸ Lyne (1978a) 53. For further discussion of the various lives of Vergil, see Stok (2014).
²²⁹ Lyne (1978a) 50-53.
life as a whole is not as important to this study as the sections that mention the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil, namely 17 and 18. The arguments put forth by Geer and Lyne discussed above concerning vocabulary, phrasing, and methodology are convincing. I agree with Lyne that Donatus’ use of a list format to introduce these poems suggests his unfamiliarity with them. The quotation of the gnat’s epitaph from the *Culex* in *VSD* 18, a fact that shows some familiarity with the text, may be the only exception to the statement above. However we do have evidence of its independent circulation even before Suetonius, unlike the other poems mentioned.\textsuperscript{230} This fact suggests that this poem enjoyed a reputation or an awareness that the other poems listed did not. If Suetonius had the best sources -- or at the very least better than Donatus—his omission of the poems from his biography suggests that they were not readily available (if available at all), or he did not think they were actually Vergil’s.\textsuperscript{231} In short, I believe sections 17 and 18 are sections added by Donatus to Suetonius’ original biography. Furthermore, the fact that Donatus only provides the names of such works suggests an unfamiliarity with their content.

We are left with the question about the importance of this debate: how would the authorship of Donatus’ biography, or pieces thereof, affect our understanding of the list of poems attributed to Vergil in his youth? Simply, it would shape our knowledge of the authenticity of these poems.\textsuperscript{232} Suetonius was the

\textsuperscript{230} See Appendix A for citations.
\textsuperscript{231} The latter seems more likely. If Suetonius had known of other authentic Vergilian poems, he surely would have mentioned them.
\textsuperscript{232} Although authenticity is not the primary concern of the study, it is still interesting to note its implications here.
closest biographer to Vergil’s time, living approximately 100 years after his death, and presumably had access to reliable sources. Access to such sources should then confer greater authority and authenticity on his biography. In addition, if it were somehow possible to solve the question of authorship of the Pseudo-Vergilian poems, whether written by Vergil or not, it would allow us to pinpoint the time period in which they were written and circulated. From there, we could extrapolate the prevailing opinions concerning Vergil and his works during that period by looking at the connections to the poet’s authentic works.

In this case, it seems that the poems as a collection, at least, date to the later author, Donatus. However, that is not to say that the individual poems may not date to a time between Suetonius and Donatus. Besides a few mentions of the *Culex* in the Flavian Age, there are no mentions of the works in other sources that would allow us to date them. The fact that Donatus simply lists the works without any quotations or summaries again suggests an unfamiliarity with the texts and an earlier dating. Also, Donatus, almost without question, accepts these works as Vergil’s – again a fact that may point to an earlier dating. If the poems had only just appeared within Donatus’ lifetime, it follows that he may have been more suspicious of their supposed authorship. On the other hand, dating to the fourth century CE would have allowed more time for the development of so many works and also for enthusiasm for Vergil to gain momentum again. The educational system’s debt to Vergil ensured his continued preservation through the ages, when interest in other writers

---

233 Terenzio (1989: 256) agrees with this statement.
234 As Rees (2004: 6) notes, “... The fourth century did not see a revival in interest in Vergil so much as a new energy and variety in the way Vergil was read, understood and inscribed.”
waned. However, it was at this point in time, when earlier Latin writers as a whole were being read more, that Vergil was being re-used in new and innovative ways. It comes as no surprise then that as-yet unseen “authentic” works of Vergil begin to creep out into private and then public consciousness. We can safely say that the codified list provided by Donatus dates to the fourth century CE.235

**Donatus’ List of Poems**

Turning from the question of authorship of the *VSD*, I will now elaborate on the list Donatus provides for the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil.236 The biographer writes about the early output of Vergil:

\[
\text{deinde Catalepton et Priapea et Epigrammata et Diras, item Cirim et Culicem, cum esset annorum XXVI. cuius materia talis est: pastor fatigatus aestu, cum sub arbore condormisset et serpens ad eum proreperet e palude, culex prouoluit atque inter duo tempora aculeum fixit pastori. at ille continuo culicem contriuit et serpentem interemtit ac sepulcrum culici statuit et distichon fecit:}
\]

\[
\text{parue culex, pecudum custos, tibi tale merenti}
\]

\[
\text{funeris officium uita pro munere reddit.}
\]

\[
\text{scripsit etiam, de qua ambitgitur, Aetnam.} \]

Then he wrote the *Catalepton* and *Priapeia* and *Epigrams* and *Dirae*, and then the *Ciris* and *Culex*, when he was 26 years old. The subject of the *Culex* is such: a shepherd tired by the heat, when he had fallen asleep under a tree and a snake crept upon him from a

---

235 Or, perhaps, these works were not newly composed but had been previously attributed to other authors. In this scenario, the works may have been read previously but had been attributed to other authors and then forgotten about until they were rediscovered and assigned Vergilian authorship. Unfortunately, however, this is simply a theory since we have no evidence for it.

236 There are two poems quoted by Donatus as Vergil’s, which fall outside this list – the *Ballista* (*VSD* 17) about his schoolmaster and his epitaph (*VSD* 36). Because they are not included in the complete juvenilia list, I will discuss both in Chapter 6. From here on out, for ease I will refer to the author of the *VSD* as Donatus, as is the common convention.

237 *VSD* 17-19. Lyne (1971) rightly notes that we must assume this is the list and order that Donatus put into the biography and not one added by later transcribers. The fact that an almost similar list is contained in the biography written by Servius allows us to be fairly sure this is the intended list.
marsh, a gnat flew forth and put a sting between the temples of the shepherd. And he immediately squashed the gnat and killed the serpent and also erected a tomb for the gnat and wrote the distich:

O little gnat, the shepherd of sheep, gave the rite of burial
To you so worthy for the gift of your life.
He also wrote the Aetna, about which there is a dispute.

A few points concerning this list of poems must be addressed before moving on to their analysis. First, Donatus acknowledges that even at the time of his writing there were questions about the authenticity of the Aetna. For that reason, I will not be discussing this didactic poem with the rest listed above. The poem is mentioned by Servius without any ambiguity in his biography of Vergil. Therefore, I will discuss this poem in Chapter Five.

Second, what Donatus refers to as the Dirae is most likely a reference to both the Dirae and Lydia poems. Their text was not divided into two until the end of the 18th century. Up until then, manuscripts presented only one poem, with the 80-line Lydia considered part of the Dirae. Most, but not all, modern scholars agree that the text titled the Dirae in the manuscripts is actually two separate poems.238 One notable dissension comes from Duckworth, who has argued on metrical grounds that they are actually one poem.239 For the purpose of this study, I will assume that what Donatus calls the Dirae contains both of these poems.240

Finally, there has been some confusion about how to interpret the “Catalepton et Priapea et Epigrammata” portion of the list. Today, scholars agree

---

238 See Breed (2012: 4 n.6) for a discussion and relevant bibliography of where the question stands. Rupprecht (2007: 21-23) provides a summary of the reason for this division.
239 Duckworth (1969) 85-86.
240 For ease, however, I will refer to them separately as the Dirae and Lydia. I am persuaded that they are two separate poems due to the sudden shift in tone and content after line 80, without any transition or connection.
that the problem is clarified by the following punctuation: “Catalepton (et Priapea et Epigrammata).” We are to take the Catalepton, then, as a general title for a collection of Priapeia poems and epigrams.\(^{241}\) In modern editions, the epigrams are called the Catalepton, while the Priapeia poems stand separate from them\(^{242}\).

The VSD is important to our current study of the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil because it is here for the first time that they are referenced together in list form. Perhaps I may suggest that they are a corpus, considering virtually the same list in found in Servius’ biography, to be discussed later\(^ {243}\). This is not to imply that there was a published collection circulating that contained all these poems. Instead, it is with Donatus that we first see an acknowledgement that these poems could (or should) be read together. The rest of this chapter will deal with how these 23 poems—Dirae, Lydia, Culex, Ciris, 15 epigrams of the Catalepton, and 4 Priapeia—fit together and share common themes.

**Meter**

One fruitful way to discuss the poems attributed to Vergil in the biography written by Donatus is to examine their form, namely their meter. As discussed in the introduction, works of pseudepigrapha have generally been prone to subjective valuations, which, in turn, have led to proposals about authenticity. I view meter and the statistical calculations that follow as more objective assessments of the poems.

---

\(^{241}\) Holzberg (2004a) 29.

\(^{242}\) I will follow modern convention for nomenclature here as well.

In measuring the total number of patterns that appear in each line, we can then compare what is found in the pseudepigrapha to that found in the authentic lines of Vergil. From an investigation of metrical patterns, their similarities and differences, we can find an objective way to discuss the poems without our own personal evaluations invading.

The longer poems (Dirae/Lydia, Culex, and Ciris) all share the same meter, while the shorter poems show a greater metrical variety. Let us begin with the longer poems. At the most basic level of analysis, they follow the dactylic hexameter metrical pattern, a fact that should not come as a surprise. All three of Vergil’s authentic works are in dactylic hexameter, so it follows that imitations of them would be written in the same meter. Moreover, these three pseudepigraphic works touch upon similar themes as the authentic ones: the Dirae/Lydia are bucolic poems that concern land confiscations, like the Eclogues; the Culex and Ciris are similar to the Aeneid, in their use of epic and mythological topoi. Therefore, it is clear that the choice of dactylic hexameter for these poems was meant not just to imitate the form of Vergil’s authentic works but also to invoke their context as well.

The poems included in the Catalepton and Priapeia collections, however, do not use dactylic hexameter at all. Instead, they display a greater variety of meters, five in all: elegiac,244 coliambic,245 pure iambic,246 iambic epodic247 and priapean.248 While it is logical that most of the longer poems are in dactylic hexameter, it also

---

244 Cat. 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15; Priapeia 1.
245 Cat. 2, 5.
246 Cat. 6, 10, 12; Priapeia 2, 4.
247 Cat. 13.
248 Priapeia 3.
makes sense that the shorter ones are not. These poems are meant possibly to represent the youthful work of Vergil. As such, we are meant to view this metrical variety as the result of a young “Vergil” experimenting with different meters.\textsuperscript{249} They evoke an image of a Vergil who has not fully developed his craft and therefore tries out various meters. It is later when he matures that he settles on dactylic hexameter as his meter of choice. The topics of these poems also explain the choice of non-hexameter meters: while the themes of the longer pseudepigraphic poems are more analogous to those of the authentic poems, the sets of shorter poems are not. In fact, these poems are usually considered the more personal of the literary impersonations. In them, we hear from “Vergil” in his own voice, and learn about, for example, his schooling and friends. It is entirely appropriate that these poems on more biographical themes utilize a greater variety of meters, as dactylic hexameter is reserved for those poems on loftier themes. Instead, we find the greater metrical variety in the more personal poems.\textsuperscript{250}

The four dactylic hexameter pseudepigraphic poems share some commonalities that draw them together as a corpus. Duckworth, in his work on all Latin hexameter poems, points out that these poems show similarities in the first four feet of their eight most frequent patterns. The \textit{Culex} contains 16 spondees and 16 dactyls, while the \textit{Ciris} and \textit{Dirae (Lydia)} have 18 spondees and 14 dactyls.\textsuperscript{251} Significantly, their metrical patterns are similar to each other especially in comparison with another potential pseudepigraphic poem referenced by Donatus:

\textsuperscript{249} I agree with Peirano (2012a: 74-116) in her assessment of these works. 
\textsuperscript{250} Perhaps this fact allows us to further compare these poems with those of Catullus, who discusses personal topics, such as his love affair with Lesbia, in his polymetric poems.
\textsuperscript{251} Duckworth (1969) 81.
the *Aetna*. This poem has 21 spondees and 11 dactyls. Donatus, in his biographical work, claimed that the authenticity of the *Aetna* is debated, and this fact seems borne out by an analysis of its meter. Donatus does not mention why its authenticity is debated, but it is interesting that he (or Suetonius before him) saw something in this poem that makes it different from the other hexameter poems; perhaps it was its meter. While the other dactylic hexameter poems mentioned as Vergil’s by Donatus have a very similar ratio of dactyls and spondees, the *Aetna* does not.

The similar metrical frequencies of the *Culex, Ciris, and Dirae/Lydia* do not suggest that these poems form some sort of collection or book. However, it does suggest some sort of link or acknowledgement between them. Further supporting this connection, I suggest, is a similar use of patterns of spondees and dactyls. The most frequent patterns within these poems are almost the same across the group with some variation in order. The patterns DSSS, DDSS DSDS, SDSS, and DDDS all appear in greatest numbers. Some of these patterns also appear in the most frequent numbers in the authentic poems of Vergil, but again not in the same order of frequency. There is also far more variety in the patterns in the hexameter pseudepigraphic poems than in the authentic ones of Vergil.

---

252 For the sake of comparison, the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* have equal numbers with 20 spondees and 12 dactyls showing their metrical consistency. But these patterns can vary greatly. For example, in Ovid’s authentic works we see a frequency of 12 spondees and 20 dactyls. (Duckworth uses this point to prove that Ovid could not have been the author of the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil as argued by Radford (1920, 1930-31).)

253 VSD 19.

254 Or, alternatively, perhaps this was a common sentiment at the time. Donatus (or Suetonius) does not mention his source for this information or if it was just a personal feeling. The passive voice of the verb *ambiguitur* leaves it open for interpretation (VSD 19).

255 Duckworth (1969) Table 1. I have scanned and recalculated the metrical figures for these poems. In most cases, I agree with Duckworth and note where we diverge.
One pattern that appears frequently both in the authentic and pseudepigraphic works of Vergil is DSSS. This pattern is more frequent in Vergil than in any of the other Latin poets, so it follows that it would also be common in poems that attempt to mimic Vergil’s. In fact, this pattern is the first, second and (tied for) second most frequent patterns in the Ciris, Culex and Dirae/Lydia, respectively. While the frequency of this pattern in the pseudepigraphic poems is not as high as in any of Vergil’s authentic works or subsections therein, the percentages in these poems do hover around the average of 14.39 percent that we find in the authentic works of Vergil. It is significant then, I argue, while there may be more variety in the patterns used in these poems, the pattern for which Vergil is most known appears as frequently as it does in the authentic works of Vergil.

---

256 Duckworth (1966) 67. It is also quite frequent in the works of Horace.
257 These numbers are mostly supported by Duckworth (1969: Table 1). The only place of divergence between our figures is that Duckworth places the frequency of DSSS in third place for the Dirae. Line 41 of this poem has been questioned and is changed or removed in certain texts. I have included it in my totals and because it is a DSSS line it causes a tie for second with DSDS in the two poems as a whole. Without it, both Duckworth and myself would put the DSSS pattern in third place.
To conclude, there is some overlap in metrical patterns and usages in the *Culex, Ciris,* and *Dirae/Lydia.* I would like to suggest that there was some interaction or correspondence between the authors of these three poems. But because the frequencies are not exactly the same it is hard to conclude that they were written by the same person.\(^{259}\) Instead, perhaps these poems were the individual output of members of a literary group. Such a group in which participants composed poems in the guise of Vergil would be the perfect breeding ground to give rise to works that have a similar, but not identical, use of patterns and meter. This collective would have tried to imitate the master’s style and would have allowed for some collaboration between writers. However, it is hard to know for sure without certain dates of composition for these works. Without any need for a literary collective, we could say that the poems were composed separately and that each author was individually attempting to mimic the authentic works of Vergil metrically. Each would do so with varying degrees of success, thereby accounting for the slight differences in meter.

\(^{259}\) While we would expect some variety in usage in one author, the difference between the *Culex* and *Ciris* does seem significant.
One interesting fact is borne out when further analyzing the meter of the Culex. As Glenn Most has argued, this poem can be broken down into sections referencing the three authentic works of Vergil in their canonical order. When we look at the three sections individually, not only do the topics and themes change from one to another in order to reflect their connections to the authentic works, but, as I will argue below, the meter also changes. In each section of the poem, the patterns more closely match the authentic works that they are referencing than the poem as whole.

Overall, the Culex is the most similar metrically to the Eclogues as Duckworth has argued. The “Eclogue” section of the pseudepigraphic poem is most similar to that work as well. Here we find the top five patterns of the authentic poem but in a different order: DSSD is in position 4-5 for the Eclogues and tied for 1 for the Culex; DDSS in first and tied for first; DSDS in third and tied for third; and DSSS in second and tied for third, respectively. The fact that this section of the Culex is almost identical to the overall metrical schema should not come as a surprise. It is in the other two sections of the Culex that we see a correlation between its pattern usage and that of authentic works, as well as a divergence from the patterns of this poem as a whole.

---

260 See Most (1987) for analysis. This theory will be discussed further later in this chapter in the section on connections to the authentic works of Vergil. Section one consists of lines 42-97, two of 98-201, and three of 202-414.

261 Duckworth (1966) 90. Duckworth then uses this fact to argue that the Culex is an authentic work of Vergil, having been written not long before the Eclogues.

262 Only one pattern is added to the top five most common patterns overall, SDDS, which stands in eighth place for the Eclogues.
In the “Georgics” section of the *Culex*, we see more of a metrical variety than we do in the *Georgics*. Here we see the first and third through fifth most common patterns of the authentic *Georgics*: *DSSS* in first position for the *Georgics* and second for the *Culex*; *DDSS* in third and first; *SDSS* in fourth and tied for fifth; and *DSSD* in fifth and third, respectively.\(^{263}\)

Similarly, in the *Aeneid* section, we see a correlation between the authentic and inauthentic works. The first through fourth and sixth most common patterns of the former appear in the latter. As I mentioned previously, certain patterns increase in frequency from the overall averages for the poem in these individual sections. For example, in the “Georgics” section, there is a greater frequency of the *SDSS* pattern, which is the fourth most common pattern in the Vergilian original. In the “Aeneid”

\(^{263}\) *SSSS* is in fourth position for the *Culex* and in seventh for the *Georgics*. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DDSS</th>
<th>DSSS</th>
<th>DSDS</th>
<th>DSSD</th>
<th>DSDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Eclogues</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Culex</em> (lines 42-97)</td>
<td>T-1</td>
<td>T-3</td>
<td>T-3</td>
<td>T-1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DSSS</th>
<th>DSDS</th>
<th>DDSS</th>
<th>SDSS</th>
<th>DSSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Georgics</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Culex</em> (lines 98-201)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>T-5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
section, we see an increase in the SDSS pattern which is the fourth most prevalent pattern in the authentic poem of that name and the DDDS pattern which is the sixth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DSSS</th>
<th>DDSS</th>
<th>DSDS</th>
<th>SDSS</th>
<th>DDDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeneid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culex (lines 202-414)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>T-5</td>
<td>T-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, I argue that not only do the themes of these sections map onto the authentic works of Vergil, but so does the meter. While the patterns are not found in the exact same order of frequency, the most frequent patterns in the authentic works are found in each of the corresponding sections of the Culex. It appears that care was paid not only to imitate the meter of Vergil but the metrical differences between each of his authentic poems. The fact that the most frequent patterns differ between sections and relate to the variations in Vergil’s works makes it clear that this was not mere happenstance but a clever and delicate method to imitate the master poet.

Lexical Similarities

As has been mentioned previously, in the VSD, we find the Pseudo-Vergilian poems collected together as Vergilian juvenilia. The few mentions of these poems that appeared previously in Latin literature refer only to individual poems. It may be helpful, then, to continue to look for the interconnectedness of these poems within
the structure of the poems themselves. Information about relationships and authenticity can be gleaned from how the questionably attested poems compare to each other and authentic ones in terms of meter and, as explored below, lexical choice. Are there similarities at the most basic level of composition?

Unfortunately, in regards to the latter, the answer is no. Following on previous scholarship from the early 20th century, my renewed investigation has shown that there are no significant lexical parallels between the pseudopigraphic and the authentic poems of Vergil. Similar vocabulary is used in all the texts in question, but the words are not often used with the same frequency. On the rare occasion that the frequencies are similar, I suspect it is a mere accident and not a purposeful reuse of Vergilian vocabulary. In addition, there is little overlap among the inauthentic poems themselves. Again, any correspondence most likely was by accident and not significant enough to say that there is purposeful correlation between the works.

Word choice can still be significant in the comparison of Vergilian works when it is used to calculate lexical density. This term refers to the complexity of a given work, and is calculated by dividing the total number of words by the number of unique words. The higher the quotient, the less complex and therefore more readable the work is. Works that are longer naturally have a higher density because common words (et, sed, iam, cum, etc.) must be repeated more often.

---

264 See Fairclough (1922) and Radford (1931) for examples of this discussion. While I support their lexical conclusions, I do not agree with Radford in his supposition that the lexical patterns are so similar to Ovid that this author must have written them.
The chart below lists the lexical densities of the authentic works of Vergil and those pseudepigraphic ones found in the VSD. All except the Priapeia poems have a higher density than the Eclogues, and the Dirae, Lydia, and Catalepton are not far below that of the Georgics. The four pseudepigraphic poem sets just mentioned however are significantly shorter than either the Eclogues or Georgics and therefore their lower lexical densities may not be significant. The Priapeia in particular have eleven and a half times fewer words than the Eclogues; its brevity, along with its unique sexual vocabulary, may account for its density being the lowest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Lexical Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeneid</td>
<td>63,719</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgics</td>
<td>14,183</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclogues</td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciris</td>
<td>3,472</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culex</td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalepton</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirae</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priapae</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The better comparisons may come when we look at the densities of the longer works mentioned in the VSD, the Culex and Ciris. Both these poems have a significantly higher lexical density than the authentic works of Vergil, suggesting that they are less complex and more readable than the authentic ones. It should be noted that they have significantly lower lexical densities than the Aeneid; however, this is due to the fact that the epic poem is far longer than either of these two works and therefore naturally has more repeated words.

265 The similar lexical densities of the Dirae and Lydia suggest that perhaps they should be read as one poem or as having been written by one poet.
A better way to compare these two Pseudo-Vergilian epyllia may be vis-à-vis other Latin works of approximately the same length. As should be clear from the chart below, the densities for the *Culex* and *Ciris* are far higher than any other work of similar length, except for Catullus 64, Grattius’ *Cynegetica*, Ovid’s *Remedium Amoris* and the Pseudo-Ovidian *Consolatio ad Liviam*. At the highest, we find densities of these poems in the low twos, while these literary impersonations are far higher—almost double in certain circumstances. It is clear, then, that these works do not show the lexical sophistication and refinement that is found in the poems of better-known Latin authors.

I think the readability of these poems as evidenced by their lexical densities is important to their understanding. On the one hand, the high frequencies of words in poems like the *Culex* and *Ciris* might be intentional. As mentioned previously and as will be discussed below, these poems are set up in the biography of Vergil as Vergilian juvenilia – a fact confirmed in the poems themselves. They are not intended to be read as the literary output of an adult Vergil but that of a youthful and not fully developed one. Therefore the poems may not be intended to be as complex and difficult to read as his authentic works, but instead present a youthful purported place in the author’s development.

---

266 Besides Catullus 64, I avoided analyzing poems that are part of longer collections. (For example, I did not use a book of the *Georgics* because they are meant to be read all together.) We do not know how the works of Catullus circulated, if the poems we have were meant to be read as a complete collection, or certain poems circulated individually. Also, this is the only other extant stand-alone Latin epyllion.

267 Perhaps the high individual lexical density for this poem suggests that it should be read as part of the Catullan corpus and not separate from it. Grattius’ work is highly fragmentary and we may only have part of it. The fact that the *Consolatio* is also high suggests that its authorship is correctly questionable. The *Remedium* is higher than any other text, which might be intentional. Ovid may have constructed the poem to be especially readable since it is a didactic poem offering advice about love.

268 See below for further discussion.
Another suggestion about the poems’ easy readability might come from their connections to the educational system. As will be discussed later in the chapter, many of these poems may show the vestiges of the works done by students in school. While the compositions produced as youths would have been even less complex than we find here, perhaps these poems are more sophisticated examples of the *imitatio*-based exercises begun while their authors were youths. Or perhaps the production is on the other side of the educational system; schoolmasters, who were so well versed in the texts to be studied and the techniques of *imitatio*, themselves composed the works either as examples for students or simply for fun as part of a ludic game.\(^{269}\) If this were the case, again, it is easy to see how readability would be high.

Perhaps another reason for the divergence in lexical density is due to the difference in genre. The works that are closest to epic, the *Ciris* and *Culex*, are more readable, *i.e.* understandable to a general audience, than those that are epigrams, the *Catalepton* and *Priapeia* collections. While epic is situated at the top of the hierarchy of ancient genres, it is nevertheless the basis for the education system and must be easily understood by those of all ages. It may have a loftier tone and structure but it is also generally more readable than epigram, which is placed at the bottom of the same hierarchy. The sheer length of an epic allows for more repetition of words and phrases and therefore a higher density as evidenced by the *Aeneid* quoted above. The *Dirae* and *Lydia*, while written in dactylic hexameter, are not epic but bucolic poetry. The lexical density in the middle of the two ends of the spectrum quoted

\(^{269}\) I will fully discuss the connection between these poems and ludism in Chapter Three.
above is reflective of the generic placement of this type of poetry. The frequencies of word choice in the poems are elevated from their authentic counterparts, yet still display the generic hierarchy frequency present in ancient literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catullus</td>
<td>Poem 64</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid</td>
<td>Ibis</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovid</td>
<td>Remedium Amoris</td>
<td>5,106</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ovid]</td>
<td>Consolatio ad Liviam</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Ars Poetica</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horace</td>
<td>Epodes</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudentius</td>
<td>Psychomachia</td>
<td>5,667</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statius</td>
<td>Achilleis</td>
<td>7,598</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ausonius</td>
<td>Mosella</td>
<td>3,264</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>De Bello Gildonico</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>De Bello Gothico</td>
<td>4,033</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>De Raptu Proserpinae</td>
<td>4,269</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>In Eutropium</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>Panegyricus De Quarto</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>Panegyricus De Sexto</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>Consulatu Honorii Augusti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>Consulatu Honorii Augusti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persius</td>
<td>Satires</td>
<td>5,769</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemesianus</td>
<td>Eclogues</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grattius</td>
<td>Cynegetica</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned previously, in the objective criteria of vocabulary analysis, the pseudepigraphic poems attributed to Vergil in the VSD do not show significant similarities to one another. It is reasonable to conclude that these poems were not written by Vergil himself and, though they were meant to imitate Vergil’s writings, did not mimic his word choice.²⁷⁰ As this chapter unfolds, further discussion will be

²⁷⁰ It seems incongruent that the two objective analyses end so differently: there is unity in metrical but not in lexical choices. Perhaps this fact suggests that it is easier to imitate meter than vocabulary. Perhaps it suggests that these poems, as reception of authentic works, focused on themes or
made about what does in fact make these works Vergilian (as opposed to Vergil’s).
Even though the similarity in meter will be significant and is the underpinning to all the poems, it is perhaps the least important to their interconnectedness. The casual reader of these works would not have noticed the metrical ties to authentic Vergilian works beyond the use of dactylic hexameter. It is the surface features, like themes and motifs and even quotation of authentic Vergilian works that emerge as the most important ties.

**Portrait of an Artist**

As discussed in the introduction, there is little controversy now in the claim that none of these poems were actually written by Vergil. However, that does not preclude the fact that we as readers read them as Vergilian, due to the many thematic and biographical associations with Vergil, associations that will be discussed below. The fact that they are included in the biographies written about Vergil is evidence that they were thought of as Vergil’s, at least in the 4th century CE, but presumably earlier as well. One of the most simplistic ways to view these poems is through that lens. Many, although not all, of these poems seem to answer the question: “What would Vergil say about [a certain topic], had he written about it?”

For example, “what would Vergil have written about the land confiscations he faced, if he had been able to write about them from a more personal

---

271 In this point, I agree with Peirano (2012a: 10). See Oosterhuis (2007) for discussion of this phenomenon in the *Catalepton* poems.
perspective?” For that, we can look to the Dirae. This curse poem is directed to those who have taken the land, wishing for it to be no longer prosperous and bountiful as it was while the speaker possessed it, thereby cursing it. Vergil had addressed the topic of land confiscations in the Eclogues 1 and 9, but perhaps we are to read the Dirae as expressing the full force of his anger in his own voice. There is no dialogue between its interlocutors but simply is the supposed voice of Vergil.

*Catalepton* 14 accomplishes a similar purpose. We have no completely personal writings from Vergil—for example, no authentic letters that could reveal to us his writing process or thoughts about his poems. Here in *Catalepton* 14, we

---

272 Similar sentiments, *i.e.* anxieties concerning the writing of the Aeneid, are expressed in a prose letter from Vergil to Augustus, which was recorded by Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.24.11). Here, we find a debate about the importance of Vergil and whether he is a poet just for school-aged boys or he is an author whose works can provide applications to a variety of pursuits. In Vergil’s “own” words he says:

‘Ego vero frequentes a te litteras accipio;’ et infra: ‘de Aenea quidem meu, si meherecule iam dignum auribus haberem tuis, libenter mitterem, sed tanta inchoate rest est ut paene vitio mentis tantum opus ingressus mihi videar, cum praesertim, ut scis, alia quoque studia ad id opus multoque potiora impetiar.’

‘Truly I am getting frequent letters from you;’ and further: ‘Indeed about my Aeneas, if by chance I already had something worthy of your hearing, I would have gladly sent it, but the matter upon which I have started is so great that, to me, I seem to have started on such a great task nearly with a fault of my mind, since, as you know, I devote my time to many other, and much more important, pursuits as well in this work.’

It is clear from this letter, as well as from *Catalepton* 14, that Vergil worked so painstakingly on his epic, because not only did he focus on poetry but also on many other topics to be included in the Aeneid as well, topics such as rhetoric, according to Symmachus in this debate. This letter, then, connects Vergil not only to his authentic works but also to Augustus. In fact, *VSD* 31 mentions an epistolary correspondence between the two men, in which Augustus asks for sections of the Aeneid to be sent to him. The sentiments conveyed by “Vergil” in this letter and the aforementioned *Catalepton* poem, expressing worry about his great undertaking, also support his characterization as modest in the biographical tradition (*VSD* 11). “Vergil” worries that his work will not live up to the expectations of the emperor. As with other Vergilian pseudepigrapha, this piece fits nicely into the biographical tradition of the poet. A reader of the *VSD* might wonder about the return correspondence from writer to patron concerning the status of the Aeneid. This letter, then, fills in that gap in the tradition. However, beyond that, it does not display the other common *topoi* found in these pieces, most especially the connections to all three authentic works of Vergil— in fact, it is solely concerned just with the last of these works, the Aeneid. Nor is this work poetic in nature. This letter is
find Vergil in the midst of writing the *Aeneid*, his great masterpiece. He sends up a prayer to Venus and Amor separately for the completion of the work.\footnote{\textit{Cat.} 14.3-4.} We learn that he wants Aeneas to be borne “in a worthy poem” (*digno...carme*), either continuing to show his anxiety or hiding behind false modesty and thereby showing some hubris.\footnote{\textit{Cat.} 14.11.} The poem ends with a mention of Caesar who is said to be counting on the work—clearly a reference to Augustus.\footnote{\footnote{Both gods are the perfect choices for such a prayer since they are the mother and half-brother of Aeneas, the protagonist of the epic.} \footnote{While almost every piece of Vergilian pseudepigrapha is set up as juvenilia, this poem clearly is not. Richmond (1975), for example, has found symmetry in this collection of supposedly youthful poems, but finds this one problematic because of its content. Just because there are correspondences between the poems does not mean that they were all written at the same time by the same author or should be seen as authorially organized (\textit{cf.} the Catullan corpus). \textit{Catalepton} 14 may have been a later addition to this set of poems in order to fill in that biographical detail concerning the production of the *Aeneid*. Oosterhuis (2007) acknowledges that these poems can be contradictory.} Through this poem, we learn about the pressure that Vergil was facing while writing this epic and its potential for success.\footnote{\footnote{We learn that the wants Aeneas to be borne “in a worthy poem” (*digno...carme*), either continuing to show this anxiety or hiding behind false modesty and thereby showing some hubris.} 

Alternatively, I argue, these poems may have been created to fill in potential holes in the biographical tradition of Vergil. For example, there is no mention in the only piece of prose attributed to Vergil, authentic or not. This fact, then, might fill in another biographic hole: what would Vergil have written about in a prose, rather than poetic, work? 

Ziolkowski and Putnam (2008: 4) include this letter under the heading “Virgil on Virgil,” noting that it was written circa 25 BCE. While the sentiments espoused in the letter would date it during the composition of the epic and therefore around that date, this definitive dating seems suspect. There is no mention by either these scholars or Macrobius about the authenticity of the letter. Macrobius seemingly accepts the letter as authentically Vergil’s, using it as evidence for the complexity of Vergil’s work. White (1993) also seems to accept this letter as a genuine response to Augustus’ request for some portion of the *Aeneid* to be sent to him, as quoted in *VSD* 31 (112-118; 302 n.11). Powell (2011: 216-217) likewise accepts the letter as authentic in his analysis of the biographical mentions of Vergil. While most scholars still accept this letter as one written by Vergil to Augustus, Deufert (2013) has recently argued that this piece should be categorized as a pseudo-epistolary work. He continues that it is a work of *prosopopoeia*, a rhetorical exercise, inspired by the passage of the *VSD* mentioned above. (It is here again that the letter fits nicely with other Vergilian pseudepigrapha since it also seemingly stems from the Roman educational system.) As Burnyeat and Frede (2015: 7) note in their work on “Plato’s” Seventh Letter, most letters from antiquity are spurious unless they are official documents. It should be assumed that this letter is also spurious. 

For a general survey of ancient letters and the definition thereof, see recently Morello and Morrison (2007), Gibson and Morello (2007) and Gibson (2012).
extant sources of Vergil having a military career. However, *Catalepton* 13 discusses the military career of the speaker, which is problematic if we are to assume he is actually Vergil, since Vergil himself seemingly did not have a military career.\(^{277}\) But perhaps this poem was created as an addition to the biographical tradition of Vergil, one that would fill in and enhance Vergil’s life. One potential reason to add this poem to Vergil’s oeuvre, I suggest, could be to enhance his reputation, showing that not only did he write to support Rome but he also fought for his homeland. Similarly, it could have been written to make Vergil seem more well-rounded or to balance out other items in his biography.\(^{278}\) Perhaps most importantly, it may serve to give Vergil a certain cachet – that of a soldier – to imbue him with the authority to write the *Aeneid*. Although an author does not need to have experienced something to write about it, in this case it is helpful to give Vergil a background for the writing of his great martial poem.

While some of these pseudepigraphic works apparently provide insights into the life and works of Vergil, others are simply reflections of the biographical tradition transmitted by authors like Donatus. When one reads all these poems together, a clear picture of Vergil is produced—a man who is respectable, of humble origins, but well-educated, with a large circle of friends and even male lovers. These are the elements of the biographical tradition that the author (or authors) of these

\(^{277}\) There is no mention in any biographies or other works of Vergil having a military career so it is probably safe to say that he did not. See Lind (1935) for discussion of dating and authenticity.

\(^{278}\) For instance, it could be a way to make Vergil seem more masculine to counteract potential effeminacy associated with his love of men (*VSD* 9).
poems continues to return to once and again. While other elements of his persona are mentioned, these listed above are the most heavily emphasized.279

The biographical tradition describes Vergil as _tam probum_ or "so good/honest," a characterization that is borne out throughout these poems.280 In _Catalepton_ 5, the addressee, presumably Vergil, on the eve of his education in philosophy, is told to revisit his old training _prudenter_ or "prudently."281 The adverb here seems to be suggesting a path that Vergil will follow in his life and that will be described in his biographical tradition. It is a presupposing of a characteristic for which Vergil is sufficiently known and with which Donatus describes him.

However, even more than this use of an adverb, Vergil shows how reputable he is through his reaction to a certain situation. In both _Catalepton_ 6 and 12, we see similar stories in which a man either violates or does not respect a woman and the disdain shown by the author, "Vergil."282 In the first of these poems, the offending

---

279 For instance, there is only one mention of Vergil's detractors (Cul. 5 and VSD 43). This type of biographical detail seems primed for a poem with "Vergil's" response. But there is only one brief note. Perhaps if Vergil were to fight back against those who attack him, however nobly, it would take away from the reverence in which Vergil is held. One potential reason is the framing of these poems as juvenilia. However, as seen with _Catalepton_ 14, not all were written as if by a young Vergil so this cannot be the only reason. More likely it was excluded because it did not fit the image of Vergil that was being created.

280 VSD 11.

281 Cat. 5.14.

282 Perhaps these epigrams should be considered scoptic. Lucilius, in the first poems of this genre, attacks recognizable, satiric types rather than individuals, concluding his epigram with a strong point. Seventeen of Martial's epigrams can be considered scoptic. (See Burnikel (1980) for further discussion.) Maybe we should read these two epigrams as a part of this sub-genre. Both _Catalepton_ 6 and 12 feature the figures of Noctunius and Atilius, a father and son-in-law, both possibly caricatures of men drunk at a wedding. The wedding chant that ends _Catalepton_ 12 can be taken humorously or as parody – a solemn statement closing a poem about a man marrying a woman and a wine jug. Often, the name of the protagonist has humorous meaning for the action related in the poem. "Noctunius" means "little owl" (OLD s.v. noctuinus). According to Hersch (2010: 175 n. 174), one reason for the use of torches at wedding was to ward off owls that are considered bad omens. It follows then that the marriage described in _Catalepton_ 12 was poorly consecrated with the bride marrying the personification of a bad omen. See Chapter 3 for further discussion of this poem as parody.
man, Noctinus, is called "an addled head" (*putidum caput*) because "such a girl was assaulted" (*puella talis ... pressa*) by him and his father in law. Noctinus is again called a *putidum caput* in *Catalepton* 12. Here his actions are less offensive – becoming so drunk at his wedding that he marries not only his wife, but also her sister and a jug of wine. The wedding chant at the end of the poem, *Thalassio, Thalassio, Thalassio* seems to be in jest more than in celebration of a holy rite. "Vergil" passes judgment on Noctinus through his use of pejorative epithet and tone throughout the poem. It seems, then, that Vergil was on his path to probity from an early age as exhibited in these three poems.

The particular picture of Vergil is continued in light of his association with certain geographical areas. Among the many mentions of locations important to the poet, Rome is never included. Since these poems were supposed to be written by a Vergil in his youth before he ever made it to Rome, it seems reasonable that this city never appears: Vergil had not yet frequented that city. Most of the locations mentioned are in Northern Italy, the area in which Vergil grew up. Mantua and Cremona are both mentioned twice in the pseudepigraphic poems. Vergil is from Mantua originally and spent his early life in Cremona. Brixia is also mentioned

---

283 *Cat.* 6.2.
284 *Cat.* 6.3-4.
285 The father-in-law, who is not named, is said to have nothing blessedly (*beate*) for himself, or the son in law as well (*Cat.* 6.1).
286 *Cat.* 12.1.
287 *Cat.* 12.9. See most recently Hersch (2010: 148-150) for more about this wedding chant.
288 However, there are poems written at a more mature age, for instance *Catalepton* 14, while also writing the *Aeneid*.
289 There is one mention of Sorrento near Naples whence Vergil is called to write the *Aeneid* (*Cat.* 14.12), but this poem was clearly not meant to be read as juvenilia. Naples is where Vergil was educated before he came to Rome where he was writing his great epic.
290 Mantua: *Cat.* 8.6 and *Cat.* 10.4. Cremona: *Cat.* 8.6 and *Cat.* 10.12.
once, and though it is not mentioned explicitly in the biographical tradition, its location in Northern Italy continues to fit with the geographical trend.

The emphasis placed on his origins in Northern Italy is important to Vergil’s characterization: he is not from an urban and therefore urbane background but instead a more provincial one. The first line of the VSD further supports this characterization: Vergil comes “from modest parents” (parentibus modicis).

_Catalepton_ 8 also invokes this sort of imagery. In talking about Siro’s farm, “Vergil” reminisces about his own upbringing in this poem. He addresses this farm as “poor little farm” (pauper agelle), wishing that it might treat Siro as “Vergil’s” treated him. This _villula_ clearly holds a warm place in “Vergil’s” heart, even though it could not have been grand—the adjective and two diminutives support this conclusion. As portrayed in these poems, not to mention the VSD, Vergil is not of the upper class, having grown up outside of Rome in the North of Italy and outside of the negative influences that Rome brings with it.

Even though Vergil might be from a modest background, if we are to believe his biography, that fact does not mean he was uneducated. Indeed, multiple facets of his education come through in the pseudepigraphic poems. Much of the focus in these poems is on his teacher Siro and his connections to Epicureanism. Vergil’s ties to Siro are mentioned in _Catalepton_ 5 and 8. In the fifth _Catalepton_, “Vergil” bids

---

292 VSD 1.
293 _Cat._ 8.1.
294 _Cat._ 8.1.
295 This is further supported by the biographical tradition in which Vergil is called “Parthenias” (“Maidenly”) (VSD 11). Whether this all is true of Vergil can be debated, but it is interesting to note that this is the image of Vergil transmitted to us through various sources. This title might also have connections with Naples where Vergil continued his education.
296 Vergil’s connection to Siro is not mentioned in the biographies written by Donatus or Servius but shows up in that by Phocas (87). See Chambert (2004) for further discussion of this connection.
farewell to his previous instructors as he makes his way to Siro’s school in Rome. In the eighth *Catalepton*, as discussed above, “Vergil” mentions Siro’s farm, while remembering his own. The beginning of the *Ciris* likewise mentions this philosophy, Epicureanism. Here the speaker is tossed through the “The Attic garden” (*Cecropius ... hortulus*)—a reference to where Epicurus used to teach.\textsuperscript{297} Also, it has been suggested that Scylla is a philosophical allegory of lust and its associated dangers.\textsuperscript{298}

However, a more intriguing allusion to Vergil’s education, I suggest, might come from his connection to his teacher Parthenius. It is only in Macrobius, not the biographical tradition, that we find mention of Parthenius as the teacher of Vergil in Greek.\textsuperscript{299} Even though it is only this one mention, the *Ciris* seems to be centered on this relationship—as if this were a poem that Vergil would have written during his studies under Parthenius. Parthenius is best known for his extant work the *Erotica Pathemata*, a summary of mythological stories with the theme of tragic love.\textsuperscript{300} It was written in prose with the expectation that each story would be expanded into poems. Although Parthenius did not include the story of Scylla and her lover, Minos, the theme of the story means it would not be out of place in a work about the downside of love.\textsuperscript{301} (In this poem, Scylla betrays her father and fatherland as a promise to her lover, who promptly leaves her a victim of her tragic love.) Perhaps,

\textsuperscript{297} Cir. 3.
\textsuperscript{298} Cir. 69. See Lyne (1978a: 131) for further discussion on these lines.
\textsuperscript{299} Marob. Sat. 5.17.18. See Dyer (1996) for further discussion of this topic.
\textsuperscript{300} Parthenius addressed the *Erotica Pathemata* to Cornelius Gallus. While I try to avoid discussions of authorship of Vergilian pseudepigrapha, it is interesting to note that Gallus has been suggested as the author of the *Ciris* (see Skutsch (1901:136-139) for first mention of this fact, which has been picked up more recently by Kayachev (2016a: 210) who deems it “worthy of consideration.”). The connections to Parthenius in this poem then would help to strengthen this connection. However, I do still find its purpose as a piece of Vergilian reception more intriguing.
\textsuperscript{301} Or, should I say, as far as we know it was not included. We have to assume that the manuscript tradition has transmitted all the stories that Parthenius included.
then, the *Ciris* was written in response to Parthenius’ work, filling in the gap of what Vergil could (or would) have produced under the guidance of his teacher. Lyne dates the *Ciris* to the 2nd century CE at a time when, coincidentally, there was a resurgence of interest in the works of Parthenius. Following this line of thinking, a young “Vergil” would have written the *Ciris*, a tale of tragic love, under influence from his teacher. Parthenius’ magisterial precept at the beginning of his work would have guided “Vergil” in his composition.

I continue that there is an additional interesting facet to this story, which involves another work of Parthenius: his *Metamorphoses*. A fragment from the scholium on Dionysius Periegetes recounts that this work of Parthenius contained the story of Scylla, the same version contained in the *Ciris*. Lightfoot argues that this work was probably a poetic work, and not prose, or even poeticizing prose, as with the *Erotica Pathemata*. However, due to its fragmentary nature, it is unclear how it was organized or how continuous it was. According to Skutsch, this work was influential on an authentic work of Vergil, namely the sixth *Eclogue*, most probably, and its list of metamorphic themes—a list that happens to mention the alternate story of Scylla as a monster. It is therefore likely that this work of Parthenius had influence on not only authentic works of Vergil but his pseudepigraphic ones as well. In fact, Lyne has argued that there probably existed an influential poetic version of the Scylla tale by the Augustan Age, which Lightfoot suggests might have

---

303 Lightfoot fr. 24= SH 637; 20M. Peirano (2012a: 173) mentions this fragment briefly, but goes no further in her analysis of it or why it might be important to Vergil’s biography.
304 Skutsch (1901) 42. Skutsch bases his argument on the fact that Gallus’ own works usually treated topics such as this. While I may not fully support the reason behind such an assessment of Vergil’s *Eclogue*, I do nevertheless agree that the *Erotica Pathemata* must have had an influence on Vergil since Parthenius was his teacher and a great teacher of Hellenistic poetic aesthetics.
been Parthenius’ version.\textsuperscript{305} Lightfoot has proposed that when the author of the \textit{Ciris} uses the verb \textit{trahere} in line 390 to describe how Scylla is dragged through the sea after she has cut the lock of hair, it is a reference to Parthenius’ use of \textit{σύρεσθαι}.\textsuperscript{306} His use was novel because it was employed as an etymological reason behind the name of the Saronic Gulf through which Scylla was pulled. Clearly then, the \textit{Ciris} was influenced by Parthenius’ writings. But we must also acknowledge an additional mode of influence—the idea that the author of the poem was taking on the persona of Vergil as if writing under Parthenius’ guidance.

Perhaps due to his personality and the advantages granted to him through his education, Vergil became part of a larger group of friends (or acquaintances), especially in respect to his literary pursuits as was common at the time.\textsuperscript{307} In the biographical tradition, we see Vergil frequently associated with his patron, Maecenas, his editors and the executors of his will, Varius and Tucca, and even Augustus, to whom Vergil read his works.\textsuperscript{308} All these figures show up in some form or another in the pseudepigraphic poems found in Donatus’ biography.

It is interesting that these individuals appear regularly considering that they are not present in much of the authentic Vergilian material, due at least partly to the genres in which he wrote.\textsuperscript{309} However, I suggest, the pseudepigrapha do seem the next most logical place for them. If we think of the poems as often filling in holes in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{305} Lyne (1978a) 14. Lightfoot (1999) 166.
\item \textsuperscript{306} Parthenius fr. 24. See Lightfoot (1999: 164-167) for commentary. We find the same verb used in Prop. 3.19.26 and Ov. \textit{Met.} 8.142, evidence for the influence of this verb in this scene.
\item \textsuperscript{307} It is hard to know from the ancient \textit{testimonia} the nature of these friendships or how close these figures actually were. Nevertheless, they are connected.
\item \textsuperscript{308} \textit{VSD} 27.
\item \textsuperscript{309} White (1993) 254. When making mention of the evidence for Vergil’s literary connections, White notes that Vergil makes very little mention himself of such connections and therefore the evidence we have is much less than most other poets White discusses.
\end{itemize}
the tradition, then they were written in order to make mention of Vergil’s friends and connections, ones that Vergil himself does not. Also, perhaps, they are meant to reflect growth on the part of the poet. When he was “young,” he would have written more personal poems in his juvenilia, writing about what he knew. As he grew up and further refined and developed his craft, he would have moved farther away from such topics and forgone such references. So it was the purpose of the writers of Vergil’s inauthentic poems to reflect that transition.

It is in the very first of the *Catalepton*, arguably the most biographical of all the pseudepigraphic poems, that Tucca, a close friend of Vergil and the executor of his will, is addressed in the first line.⁴¹⁰ Here, we have a poem between two friends discussing a woman who rarely leaves her husband’s house. The friend is allowed to see “Vergil’s” love, while the poet is not. The speaker, presumably Vergil, laments the fact that he cannot see her and by the end asks for advice from his friend. Varius is introduced to the reader in *Catalepton 7*, where again “Vergil” is lamenting over a lover, in this case a young boy, a slave of Varius.³¹¹ Here, it seems that “Vergil” is allowed contact but nevertheless is in a painful situation. I argue that it is in the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil concerning love, one of the most personal of emotions, that we see Vergil turn to his friends.³¹² The pseudepigraphic poems make mention of those friends with whom he is frequently associated in the biographical tradition. Varius and Tucca were even made inheritors of Vergil’s will,

---

³¹⁰ *Cat*. 1.1. See *VSD 37* for mention.
³¹¹ *Cat*. 7.1. See *VSD 37* for mention.
³¹² That, at least, is the impression from the biographical tradition.
a fact that attests to their closeness. The purpose of such mentions seems to be to ground the poems with an air of authenticity. Whether Vergil discussed his romantic problems with these two men is less important than the fact that these discussions are believable. We, the readers, are able to picture this scenario, and therefore it allows us to believe more easily that they were in fact written by Vergil.

Vergil’s best-known associations in antiquity show up in the pseudepigraphic poems we are discussing, with the notable exception of his patron Maecenas. In the poems listed in the VSD, there are no explicit mentions or allusions to this figure. The only possible association with him comes through the Priapeia poems in general. We have two notices from antiquity, beyond those in Vergil’s biographies, one from Pliny the Younger and one from Diomedes, a grammarian, that make the claim that Vergil wrote Priapeia poems. It is no wonder, then, that the earliest manuscripts we have of these works, the so-called Corpus Priapeorum, dating from the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, ascribed the poems to Vergil. Furthermore, the first printed editions of Vergil’s works in Rome in 1496 included all eighty of these poems. This fact caused many scholars to look for or create a connection between the poems and Vergil’s patron. Scioppius in 1606 claimed that these poems were just collected by Vergil, and not actually by him; they

---

313 VSD 37.
314 VSD 30.
315 There is a pseudepigraphic poem, the Elegiae in Maecenentem, which is devoted to Maecenas upon his death, which will be discussed in Chapter 6. Perhaps one of the reasons for its production was as a reaction to the dearth of mentions of Vergil’s patron. 316 Plin. Ep. 5.3.2-6. Diom. AGL 3 (Keil 1.512.27).
317 In the earliest manuscript, however, Vergil’s name was erased and replaced with an attribution to various authors (diversorum auctorum). Parker (1988) 32. There are only four Priapeia poems which are now associated with Vergil. We have no way of knowing how many of the eighty poems Donatus meant when he included them in the list of youthful works of the poet.
were in fact written on the walls of the well-known shrine of Priapus, located on the grounds of Maecenas’ garden.\(^{318}\)

Milnor has recently pointed out in her monograph on graffiti in Pompeii evidence of a similar type in that city. In the vineyard in the Caupona of Euxinus, we would have seen now lost poetic graffiti quoting Propertius and Ovid. Most interestingly, also lost were paintings of Priapus and Bacchus with whom the poems were associated. It is therefore in Pompeii that we have a precedent for the combination of an idyllic space and poetic production. While here, Milnor argues, there was a conscious creation, putting the poems with the images, nevertheless there are further examples in Pompeii where such a combination was more organic.\(^{319}\) It is not a stretch, then, to suppose that graffiti might have been present in the garden of Maecenas—an idyllic location with an image of Priapus.\(^{320}\) I suggest visitors to the shrine, having been inspired there, could have added their thoughts in poetic form, and these would have been collected and attributed to Vergil at a later date.

But at the very least, the shrine to the phallic god is attested even if the poems written in it are a conjecture. Nevertheless, there seems to be a connection made, however specious, between the garden’s shrine and the Priorapeia poems attributed to Vergil, through their common link of Maecenas. Perhaps this link, no matter how weak, is the reason the poems were attributed to Vergil in the

\(^{318}\) Parker (1988) 32-33. Other scholars including Baptius Pius and Gyraldus a half century earlier and Baehrens (1879) also suggested that these poems had to do with Maecenas and his group of poets.

\(^{319}\) Milnor (2014) 87-97.

\(^{320}\) Hor. Sat. 1.8. It is unknown whether the statue described by Horace was actually real. See Dufallo (2013: 74-107) for more discussion of this poem and garden.
manuscripts and why Donatus included them in the list of Vergilian juvenilia. It is in these works that we find a connection between the two figures, however tenuous, in further support of their well-known association.

Interestingly, the relative absence of Maecenas in the pseudepigraphic works of Vergil is contrasted with the presence of another important patron of the time, Messalla Corvinus. He is the addressee of the *Ciris* and *Catalepton* 9, in both of which his great deeds are celebrated. The chronology between the composition and the deeds do not match up, but Lyne and Richmond in separate articles both argue that the celebration is for ancestral acts of the family and those presumed for the future, not for the addressee in particular.\(^{321}\) The commemoration of this Messalla would not seem out of place, at least at first glance, among the real and attributed works of Tibullus or Ovid, poets regularly associated with this patron. In fact, Book 3 of the *Corpus Tibullianum* does contain such a commemorative work, the anonymous *Panegyricus Messallae*.\(^{322}\)

On the surface, there seems to be no strong link between Vergil and Messalla.\(^{323}\) However, upon second glance, the connection created between these two figures in the pseudepigraphic poems is not as strange as it seems. White has argued that the common perception that the circles of poets were fixed and mutually exclusive is wrong. These literary groups were more fluid and there was

---


\(^{322}\) There has been much debate on the nature of this book, whether it is Tibulluan pseudepigrapha or written by another member of Messalla’s circle. See Holzberg (1998-9) for a complete discussion of the history of this issue as well as Peirano (2012a: 117-172). It is interesting that Messalla is so interconnected with two collections of presumed Roman pseudepigrapha from antiquity. Unfortunately, it is unknowable whether the authors of the poems in both ever interacted.

\(^{323}\) See Peirano (2012a: 120-132) Peirano focuses her study on the gap it would fill in the history of literary patronage, while I focus on the connections between Messalla and Vergil.
more interaction between them than is usually portrayed.\textsuperscript{324} When we look to the ancient testimonia, we are able to see a connection between Vergil and the other great patron of the time: for example, White points to Servius Auctus’ note on \textit{Aen.} 8.310 in which he mentions a dialogue between Maecenas, Messalla, Horace and Vergil.\textsuperscript{325} I propose that perhaps these two pseudepigraphic poems reflect the fluidity of the literary culture of the time, portraying a mixing of literary circles, one that brought Vergil and Messalla closer together. The interaction might have been well known at the time but unfortunately has mostly been lost to us. Even without the mentions of Maecenas, these poems still reflect Vergil’s standing in the literary community and his connections to well-known people.

As I have been arguing, the addresses to important figures in these poems create ties to the life of Vergil. One other such figure is Octavius/Augustus, the (future) emperor. Much has been written about the address of the \textit{Culex} and \textit{Catalepton} 11 to a figure named “Octavius.” Some scholars have argued that this figure is not the future emperor but an Octavius Musa, perhaps a historian friend of Vergil and other poets of the time.\textsuperscript{326} Scholars use the fact that \textit{Catalepton} 4 is addressed to a certain “Musa” as evidence for this previous identification.\textsuperscript{327} I must acknowledge that these three could be the same person. But what if the addresses to Octavius are in fact to the future emperor, not a contemporary writer?

\textsuperscript{324} White (1993) 37.
\textsuperscript{325} White (1993) 37 n.3.
\textsuperscript{326} See Peirano (2012a: 89-90) for further discussion.
\textsuperscript{327} \textit{Cat.} 4.6. Most people identify the “Musa” as a person and not a Muse of mythology. However, the more simple identification could also fit the poem. This “Musa” has been dear to the speaker and is skilled in the arts of writing.
If these poems are pseudepigraphic and therefore were not actually written by Vergil but are instead in his voice, I suggest there would be no chronological problem. It would not matter that the poet and future emperor would not meet until a time later than that purported for the compositions. The poet, then, writing in the persona of Vergil, might have imagined a meeting or relationship between the two figures before it is attested in the biographical tradition—again a sort of “what if” situation. As is the case with the inclusion of Varius and Tucca, the presence of Octavius would serve to give the poems, but also Vergil himself, more authority. That the future emperor, nephew of the most powerful man in Rome at the time, would associate himself with this young writer would convey a higher standing.

The characterization of this Octavius in the Culex points towards the idea of the figure being more than just a mere friend of Vergil. Octavius here is addressed as “of so much merit” (meritis tantis), “venerable” (venerande), and a “holy boy” (sancte puer) in consecutive lines. All of these descriptive terms suggest a more elevated personage than Octavius Musa. While it must be conceded that these terms do not fit a young Octavius, they do seem to presuppose the man and figure that he will become. The speaker continues in the following lines that he will sing for Octavius and not Jupiter or the god’s deeds. With the list of impressive deeds of the god, there is an implicit comparison with Octavius, that his will be bigger and better than

---

328 Cul. 24-26.
329 We must remember that these poems were not actually written at the time they purport to be but much later. The author knew what and who Octavius would become because it was written after the fact. The katabasis section of the Culex also presupposes the katabasis of Aeneas in the Aeneid as I will argue below.
330 Cul. 27-38.
those of even Jupiter himself. This Octavius cannot be Octavius Musa but someone far more important—the future Augustus.

The other mention of Octavius in *Catalepton* 11 complicates the situation between he and Vergil. In this poem, a parody of an epitaph, Octavius is mourned as if dead in the opening lines, having drunk too much. He is revealed as still living in the second couplet, answering the first that it is his fate to be that drunk. There are descriptive terms of esteem here as in the *Culex*, but it must be admitted that there is also a lack of reverence in this poem. Yet perhaps that is by design. If we are to assume that both Vergil and Octavius are young at the writing of this poem, as evidenced by the name used, then this tone could serve a purpose. I propose that perhaps this poem sets up a more intimate relationship between the two than is otherwise known. It is one of youthful indiscretion, but also closeness—one that is not evident from the biographical tradition. Again, it can serve a dual purpose. It can elevate a young Vergil, showing his worldly connections at an earlier moment in his life than previously supposed. But it also establishes the personal relationship between emperor and author, placing it at a younger age when such behavior was more appropriate before they both became venerable men.

A close connection between Vergil and the future Augustus is also implied in *Catalepton* 3. The poem is written about an unnamed figure who once rose to the

---

331 The lack of reverence in this poem and the mention of “writings” in lines 5-6 do seem to point towards this poem as concerning Musa and not the future emperor. However, the writing and reference to history could be referring to Octavius’ future autobiography and such writings. For more about this work see Smith and Powell (2009) most recently.

332 Cf. Callimachus 61 ΠΕ. = *A.P.* 7.725. In Vergil’s *Eclogue* 6, we find Silenus passed out as well because he is so drunk.
pinnacle of military success only to fall victim to fortune. There is no stated addressee for the poem, but I would like to suggest that it is in fact for Octavius/Augustus. VSD 7 mentions that all these pseudepigraphic poems were written by Vergil at age 26. Vergil was that age in 44 BCE or so, coincidentally the same year Julius Caesar was killed and Octavius moved to center stage in Roman politics. While the advice in this poem involved a man heavily involved in the East, which is not a characteristic of Julius Caesar’s time in power, the overall message is universal: “fortune can easily change, so beware!” Again we must remember that this was not written by Vergil in 44 BCE, but as if it were. This poem, as with the two discussed previously, creates a connection between poet and emperor earlier and more intimately than imagined or known. As someone slightly older who has lived through the recent political upheavals in Rome, “Vergil” is trying to protect or counsel the young man on the verge of power. The goal of all three of these poems with their explicit or veiled mentions of Octavius enhances the standing of Vergil vis-à-vis his relationship with the future emperor.

The final group of people connected to young Vergil are his lovers. The biographical tradition mentions Vergil’s connection with only one woman—a Plotia Hieria, who vehemently denied any relationship; instead, Vergil loved younger boys. The same predilection can be found in the pseudepigraphic works attributed to Vergil. First in Catalepton 1, like in the biographical tradition, we find

---

333 This poem and its unnamed figure will be discussed later in this chapter.
334 Scholars have debated whether this is the right age or a change in the manuscript. I will assume that the age given is correct.
335 It is more closely related to a Pompey or a Marc Antony.
336 VSD 9, 11.
“Vergil” attached to a female lover.\textsuperscript{337} Here, the woman is not available, but is kept away by her husband. Just as in the biographical tradition there is a tease of a heterosexual relationship, but it is again unfulfilled. The poem does not tell us whether “Vergil” would have followed through if the woman had been available. Nevertheless, the heterosexual relationship is not satisfied. On the one hand, as I have mentioned, this fact might be a reflection of the biographical tradition. On the other hand it might also be an attempt to add to it. Vergil as a youth may have indeed been in love with women before turning to men, but we have no evidence of this. \textit{Catalepton} 1 then stands to fill in that hole in the life of Vergil. Two further \textit{Catalepton} poems express Vergil’s homosexual love. The \textit{VSD} tells us that he had two male lovers, one of whom he supposedly mentions in the \textit{Eclogues}. Following the biographical tradition, these two \textit{Catalepton} poems would stand out as “evidence” of Vergil’s love for these men, something that Vergil did not or could not write about in his authentic poetry.\textsuperscript{338} Essentially, these poems, both in elegiac meter, turn Vergil into a love poet expressing his love for men. In \textit{Catalepton} 4, “Vergil” divulges that he does not think anyone can be “more dear to me” (\textit{carior mihi}) than his addressed love, Musa—a frequent \textit{topos} for lover/beloved in elegiac verse.\textsuperscript{339} After praise of Musa’s writings, “Vergil” confirms that their love is unrequited, and that he wants to figure out how his love can be returned to him.\textsuperscript{340} In \textit{Catalepton} 7, the love expressed by “Vergil” is even stronger—in this case it is

\textsuperscript{337} Servius, likewise, connects Vergil with a female lover, most probably the wife of Varius, Vergil’s friend. I will discuss Vergil’s connections with women and specifically the mention by that biographer in Chapter 5. See McGill (2013) for further discussion of this passage.

\textsuperscript{338} \textit{VSD} 9.

\textsuperscript{339} \textit{Cat.} 4.3.

\textsuperscript{340} \textit{Cat.} 4.12.
killing him.\textsuperscript{341} While it has been argued that “Pothos” is philosophical love, not actual love, when read with \textit{Catalepton} 4 along with the biographical tradition, we should take the poem at face value, \textit{i.e.} an expression of love for a young boy of Varius.\textsuperscript{342} These three \textit{Catalepton} poems, then, I suggest, seem to have been written in order to advance the story of Vergil’s love life beyond the scant details contained in the authentic works of the poet. Writers like Catullus and Propertius discuss their loves openly whether real or fictional, but Vergil does not. Instead, we have the poems of the \textit{Catalepton} collection to fill in those gaps.

It should be clear that the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil have an agenda when it comes to their supposed author. They were written in order to fill out the biographical tradition of the poet. Vergil’s best traits are enhanced: his humility and probity. He is the provincial who looks down on the lewd acts of others; he is well educated, both in philosophy with Siro and Greek literature with Parthenius; he has a large group of friends and is well known in literary circles. However, he is not immune to the travails of love, having experienced it with both sexes. While it might go too far to say the pseudepigraphic poems were written with the biographical tradition in mind—either mimicking or expanding upon it—I have argued that it is clear that the presentation of the poet is consistent in both.

\textsuperscript{341} \textit{Cat.} 7.2.
\textsuperscript{342} Hardie (1982: 50) argues for philosophical love. However, I agree with Carlson and Schmidt (1971: 253) that this should be taken as a young boy.
Interplay with the Authentic Vergilian Works

The placement of these writings in the biographical tradition makes it clear that they are intended to be considered as pre-dating the Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid: Donatus’ list of what we now know as pseudepigraphic poems is placed before the authentic one. The biographer lists the works of Vergil in their chronological order, with this set written at age 26. But the pseudepigraphic poems themselves also make it clear how they are supposed to be read, i.e. as juvenilia. For example, the proem to the Culex notes (implicitly) how the works that are being produced now are light but will be heavier “later” (posterius). The Ciris and Catalepton 5 both use forms of the word iuvenis -- iuvenum and iuventutis, respectively -- in order to denote the age at which these pieces were written. Catalepton 15 is even more explicit in the description of what these poems are. Even though this poem is assumed to be a later editorial addition to the Catalepton collection, as such, its thoughts might be even more intriguing. It calls the Catalepton poems “rudiments of the poet” (elementa poetae); and while most likely an epilogue to these 14 or so poems, this statement can be seen as elucidatory for all of the poems being discussed here. The biographical tradition, along with mentions of the author’s youth in these poems, only further supports the idea that these poems were meant as Vergilian juvenilia.

343 VSD 17.
344 Cul. 8. The lightness is implied by the term ludus and its derivatives. See Chapter 3 for more discussion.
345 Cir. 36 and Cat. 5.5. The Ciris also contains the term ”primum nascimur” again implying that this work was made as a youth (42).
346 Cat. 15.4.
Much has been written previously about how and where authentic Vergil appears in these pseudopigraphic works. At times the references might be subtle or even obscure, but at other times they are quite open and blatant. For example, the *Ciris* contains at least 15 direct quotations of or allusions to the authentic poems of Vergil and indeed the borrowing is so extensive that it has led Peirano to compare the *Ciris* to a cento. Let us stay with the *Ciris* for examples of both explicit and implicit borrowings from Vergil. Lines 405-6 are the same as *Eclogue* 8, lines 19-20—explicit borrowing. Both texts read:

\[
\text{dum queror, et diuos, quamquam nil testibus illis}
\]
\[
\text{profeci, extrema moriens tamen adloquor hora.}
\]

While I weep, and, although I have accomplished nothing for them as witnesses, I, dying, nevertheless call upon the gods in final hour.

The borrowing gains additional resonance from text: in the lines in the original poem, we find Damon spurned by his love, Nysa, who has decided to marry someone else while similarly in the *Ciris*, Scylla has been spurned by Minos after he breaks his promise of love in return for her cutting her father’s lock. Contextual echoes are not always present when lines are reused wholesale or alluded to, but when present, they lend an added layer of intertextuality. Moreover, their presence indicates that the reuse of authentic lines of Vergil was not just mere copying. Instead, one can read more closely to recognize that it is a comparable situation.

---

347 See Gorman (1995) on her attempts with the *Ciris* and Kennedy (1982) on the *Culex* for example.
348 Peirano (2009). While it is a little too much to say that the *Ciris* is a cento since the borrowings are not ubiquitous, it is interesting to view this poem in such a light. Perhaps this is a stepping-stone towards centos of Vergil, which will come into vogue in the fourth century CE. See McGill (2005) for a discussion of Vergilian centos.
349 We do not know if it is because he is marrying someone else like in *Eclogue* 8, or just because he used the young princess. Nevertheless, the circumstances are still similar.
The purpose of the borrowings and contextual echoes suggests the placement of the pseudepigraphic poems in the larger oeuvre of Vergil. They are meant to be read as his early works, and we the readers are meant to see the quotations in the pseudepigraphic poems as the originals and not the borrowings, with Vergil drawing on early writings, such as the *Ciris*, when writing the *Eclogues*, not the other way around. It was here in the early works that “Vergil” experimented, only to refine his craft in his later adult works. In reality, perhaps, the relationship is reversed and is in fact artificial.

The borrowed lines from Vergil's authentic poems have been identified and analyzed throughout the ages. While this is an important first step in analyzing these works, *i.e.* to find the exact points of comparison, it is also important to view the pseudepigraphic poems macroscopically as a whole. Instead of taking the traditional approach of treating the poems individually as I mentioned in the introduction, I turn to some new points of investigation to understand further the implications of such compositions. I focus not on when and where the borrowing happened, but instead how the authors set out to “pre-figure” the authentic writings in these pseudepigraphic works, a more complex action in order to see what later readers/writers found important in the authentic works and what they emphasized.

---

350 The 1997 edition of Salvatore (et. al.) of these poems is the best example with its attempt to identify every Vergilian connection. However, most of these connections do not hold up under strict scrutiny. For example, *Ciris* 4 (*florentis viridi sophiae complectitur umbra*) seems to recall *Aeneid* 1.694 (*floribus et dulci adspirans complectitur umbra*). However it might be too much to say that it also recalls *Eclogues* 9.19-20 (*quis caneret nymphas; quis humum florentibus herbis / spargert, aut viridi fontes induceret umbra?).
in the supposed earlier, pseudepigraphic works, from which Vergil was supposed to have drawn.\textsuperscript{351}

Frequently, a pseudepigraphic text will reference all three authentic works of Vergil, often in their canonical order as well. In doing so, as I will argue through various parts of my dissertation, the texts display an anxiety on the part of the ancients concerning the authentic works of Vergil. Donatus notes that there was some editing done to the texts of Vergil, for example the removal of what were supposedly once the original first lines of the \textit{Aeneid}. Donatus writes:

\textit{Nisus grammaticus audisse se a senioribus aiebat, Varium duorum librorum ordinem commutasse, et qui nunc secundus sit in tertium locum transtulisse, etiam pr\'emi libri correxisse principium, his uersibus demptis….}\textsuperscript{352}

The grammarian, Nisus, used to say that he had heard from older people, that Varius had changed the order of two books, and had moved into the third position that what is now in the second, also he had corrected the beginning of the first book, with the following verses removed….

Concern for the status of the text is found not only in the biography of Donatus but also in that of Servius. There, the latter states that not only were the first lines of the \textit{Aeneid} removed but the so-called “Helen Episode” in Book 2 was as well.\textsuperscript{353} Unlike Donatus, Servius is firm in his assertions, not couching them as rumors.

The anxieties expressed by the biographers seem to center around the \textit{Aeneid}, and understandably so. It was this work that Vergil left unfinished upon his death, and so questions arose concerning what he would have added, removed,

\textsuperscript{351} Peirano (2009) has made this argument about the \textit{Ciris} so I will avoid talking about that poem here, even though it is a key example of this phenomenon.
\textsuperscript{352} \textit{VSD} 42.
\textsuperscript{353} I will discuss these two passages in Chapter 6.
or changed had he not died before its completion. This fact left the text open to potential emendations, as evidenced by Augustus’ declaration not to finish any half lines. Also, the fact that Vergil’s works became instant classics also surely led to anxiety over the text. As discussed in Chapter One, the basis of the educational system was *imitatio* and reuse of texts. Four generations after the death of Vergil, perhaps the two biographers were reflecting on that fact. On top of that, we have the state of ancient publication, in which errors and changes can be made through copying.

However, as Donatus and Servius suggest, the editors believed that changes needed to be made. Unfortunately, neither express reasons why such removals occurred: was it because these passages were not actually Vergil’s? Or was it simply because Vergil did not have the time to remove them himself? Since these removals are mentioned in both biographies, I do think that we should place value on their assessments. The opinions of Servius are especially important, as he is direct in his discussion of such removals and because of his status as commentator on the authentic works of Vergil. I believe that, while there are many connections between these works of reception, it is their focus on the recognition of the authentic works of Vergil often in their canonical order, which seems to be most important. Perhaps, then, these constant references are a reflection of the anxiety concerning the status of his text in the ancient biographies.

The references to all three authentic works of Vergil are not only found in Vergilian pseudepigrapha, but are in fact also found in the works of authors contemporary with Vergil. In *Amores* 1.15.25, towards the end of his list of
influential authors, Ovid invokes Vergil without mentioning his name or the title of any of his works, instead writing: “Tityrus and fruits and Aenean arms will be read” (Tityrus et fruges Aeneiaque arma legentur). These references to the works of Vergil also appear in Propertius (2.34.59-82). There, the allusions to the Aeneid, Eclogues, and Georgics, in that order, are not stated as concisely as in Ovid, but more subtly through verbal reminiscences. Cairns also suggests Tibullus 2.5 as containing this type of reference but correctly notes that there is continued debate whether Tibullus had heard or read portions of the Aeneid before he composed this elegy.

While most commentators, such as McKeown, view the reference to Vergil’s authentic works in the Amores as evidence of that author’s great fame, Cairns suggests that there is more to it than that. Cairns views Ovid’s allusive mentions to the three works of Vergil as a method “to answer wittily a question of ongoing interest in his time, namely ‘What do Virgil’s diverse works have in common – besides, of course, all being written in hexameters?’” Cairns tantalizingly notes: “the ‘unity’ question appears to be echoed in the Virgilian biographical tradition, but nothing can be made of this since the information does not derive from Suetonius.” He goes no further in recognizing the same patterns in what the biographers refer to as juvenilia or that their authors may have a different motivation there.

---

354 I should note that there is some debate over the reading of the third word in the line referencing the Georgics, whether it is fruges, as found in Kenney’s OCT text (1994) and supported by Cairns (1998), or segestes, as suggested by McKeown (1987) in his commentary. While segestes is enticing since it would standardize the references to the works of Vergil, I agree that the reading is more likely fruges as evidenced by the majority of the manuscripts.

355 Cairns (1998) 103. Because this reference is so uncertain, I will avoid discussing it here.


357 Cairns (1998) 103 n.12.
It is interesting that in these early examples the authentic works of Vergil are mentioned solely in elegy. D’Anna had previously noted that when these poets mention the hexameter works, they render them “deformata” (re-appropriated or deconstructed, from context, not necessarily the cognate of deformed) into elegy in each case.\footnote{D’Anna (1989) 55.} D’Anna continues discussing how Propertius (re)uses the authentic works of Vergil, noting that his works and those of the elegiac love poets are antithetical to one another. For Vergil, love and passion will never win out, but instead ataraxia will triumph. Propertius, however, uses Vergil’s words and images of nature as balm for victorious love.\footnote{D’Anna (1989) 56.} He ends his “Vergilian” section saying: “Nevertheless these (poems) will not come unwelcome to any reader / whether he will be inexperienced or experienced with love” (non tamen haec ulli venient ingrata legenti, / sive in amore rudis sive peritus erit).\footnote{Prop. 2.34.81-82.} Ovid, likewise, gives Vergil and his texts a place of prominence in his literary pantheon, mentioning him and his works allusively. In fact, the second line of the couplet (Roma triumphati dum caput orbis erit) may recall an authentic line of the Aeneid, again recasting epic in elegy.\footnote{Ov. Am. 1.15.26. cf. Verg. Aen. 6.851 (tu regere imperio populous, Romane, memento).} Both elegists, therefore, are referencing and recasting the works of Vergil in a “courteous ‘literary polemic.’”\footnote{Cairns (1998) 103 n.10.} But also references in the works of these contemporary authors seem to show that the themes and topics found in the authentic works of Vergil are adaptable and can be found, albeit in different contexts and for different purposes, in the works of elegiac authors.
As I will show throughout this dissertation, Vergilian pseudepigrapha consistently refer to the three authentic works of Vergil, often in quick succession and in their canonical order. Not every work will do so in the exact same way but the purpose is the same: to recognize the authentic Vergilian canon. These earlier mentions of the authentic works of Vergil, then, do not seem to be of the same type as found in the Vergilian pseudepigrapha. There was no need for writers contemporary with Vergil to recognize his canon. Instead, they seem to be interested in investigating how the works form a completed oeuvre. Ovid, Propertius (and possibly Tibullus) attempt to unite all the works through an underlying principle, reacting to Vergil’s writing in (almost) real time. While both types of references are allusive and ludic in nature and their techniques are quite similar, the difference in time periods is significant, I believe. What we find in the pseudepigraphic texts is more akin to unifying and recognizing the corpus in the most basic of ways. However, the earlier authors attempt to adapt the works and themes of Vergil to elegiac and amatory contexts in order to display the universality of Vergil’s texts. These authors unify the corpus in a more advanced way, perhaps because there was no need at that time to recognize a corpus that was still being or had just been written.

Let us begin with the references to the three authentic works of Vergil in *Catalepton* 15. This poem has widely been considered a sort of sphragis to the whole collection, clearly a poem not written in the guise of a youthful Vergil.\(^{363}\) Even though this may be the case, I believe that we are still intended to view it, in part, as

a piece of Vergilian pseudepigrapha, akin to Vergil’s own funerary epitaph. In both poems, the writer is portrayed not in the persona of a youthful Vergil, but instead as an older Vergil, perhaps looking over his entire corpus of works and unifying them. In fact, *Catalepton* 14, immediately preceding, also discusses a point in time later in Vergil’s life while writing the *Aeneid*. So while *Catalepton* 15 declares the poems before to be the youthful works of Vergil, that fact is not strictly born out. *Catalepton* 15 does stand apart from the rest of Vergilian pseudepigrapha as well. If the author is supposed to be Vergil, then he is talking about himself in the third person, which should not be completely dismissed. Continuing, perhaps “Vergil” at the end of his career came back to his earliest works to add a coda to them. Having written his three best-known works, we are to envision him marking this edition with a sphragis to unite his oeuvre, including the *Catalepton*, in one complete corpus. While most Vergilian pseudepigrapha was written in the guise of a youthful Vergil, we do have evidence of pieces written in the guise of the adult poet as well.

It is, however, undeniable that the third person styling is troubling for this interpretation. In the other examples of a guise of an adult Vergil, the poems are written in the first person. Perhaps we are to see this poem as simply laudatory, detailing the achievements of Vergil from his youth in writing the *Catalepton* through to the *Aeneid*. Even if the poet here is not writing in the persona of Vergil at any time in his life, I think his words still have significance in

---

364 I will discuss this poem further in Chapter 6.
365 Hesiod does refer to himself in the third person at the beginning of the *Theogony* in a section considered a sphragis (vv. 22-25) so it is not out of the question for an author to do so.
reflecting the concerns of the rest of Vergilian pseudepigrapha regarding the canonicity of Vergil’s works.

The author of this poem here acknowledges the predecessors upon which Vergil has built his own poetry:

\[
\textit{Vate Syracosio qui dulcior, Hesiodoque maior, Homereo non minor ore fuit, illius haec quoque sunt divini elementa poetae, et rudis in uario carmine Calliope.}
\]

O poet, who was sweeter than Theocritus, and greater than Hesiod, And no less than Homer in speech, These were also the elements of that divine poet, And his unpolished Muse in a various meters.

In referencing Vergil’s influences, the author is also referencing the authentic works of Vergil in their canonical order: Theocritus invokes the \textit{Eclogues}, Hesiod the \textit{Georgics}, and Homer the \textit{Aeneid}.\textsuperscript{366} Oosterhuis, in his dissertation on the \textit{Catalepton} poems, discusses this poem at length. He argues that “such an arrangement reflects the canonicity not only of Virgil’s individual works, but of their progression as well.”\textsuperscript{367} He leaves behind the importance of the former and focuses on that of the latter. However, I believe, that when all Vergilian pseudepigrapha are read together, the canonicity of Vergil’s works becomes the most important. It is the inauthentic which make the authentic authentic.

While the focus on the three authentic works of Vergil is the most important aspect of these pseudepigrapha, there are other interesting connections to the authentic works as well. For example, let us return to \textit{Catalepton 3}. Scholarship on

\textsuperscript{366} The invocation of the works of Vergil with one word is quite common in the pseudepigrapha. It is presumed that the works themselves are so well known that further description is not needed.  
\textsuperscript{367} Oosterhuis (2007) 30.
this poem has tended to focus on discovering (in vain) the identity of the addressee, whether the poem alludes to a single person and whether that person is real.\footnote{See Gillespie (1939/40) and Winstrand (1967) for two discussions of this sort.} One suggestion for the identity of the figure is Pompey the Great.\footnote{Gillespie (1939) 106-107. See Westendorp Boerma (1949) for further discussion of candidates.} Vergil grew up in the heyday of Pompey's power and conquest so it would make sense for this figure to be the example the poet chose as a “youth” to describe. In addition, \textit{Catalepton} 6 even obliquely references this general when quoting a line of Catullus, a line that refers to Pompey and Julius Caesar.\footnote{Cat. 6.6 and \textit{Cat.} 29.24.} The identification may be correct and would connect \textit{Catalepton} 3 and 6, poems themselves wrought with intratextual connections. In Book Two of the \textit{Aeneid}, Vergil describes the fall of Troy and the death of its king, Priam. Bowie has noted that in describing the death of Priam, Vergil is also referencing the death of Pompey.\footnote{\textit{Verg. Aen.} 506ff. Bowie (1990) 473. Bowie is not the first to notice this, as he himself acknowledges. It seems to have been common knowledge in antiquity as Servius says the same thing in his commentary on line 557ff.} I would like to add that verbal allusions exist, too, between the figure of the eastern leader in \textit{Catalepton} 3 and Vergil's Priam/Pompey. For example, there is a reference in \textit{Catalepton} 3.4 to the figure conquering the “kings of Asia” \textit{(reges Asiae)}, with the implication that he is now the supreme commander in that area, while in the \textit{Aeneid}, Vergil refers to Priam as the “king of Asia” \textit{(regnatorem Asiae)}, here having already finished the conquering.\footnote{\textit{Cat.} 3.4. \textit{Verg. Aen.} 2.557.} In both of these poems the figure of Pompey implicitly is referenced as having taken command over the whole region of Asia. Both figures are cut down, with the figure in the \textit{Catalepton} suffering the same fate as Priam. Fate is emphasized in both of the
accounts with the use of *numen* in the *Catalepton* and *sorte* in the *Aeneid*.373 If the identification is correct and the allusions real, then “Pompey” may be strong and commanding of a great swath of territory, but he is powerless against fate.

If we are to read *Catalepton 3* as anticipating the *Aeneid*, then we can see the supposed beginning of Vergil’s treatment of Pompey. Although named in neither the pseudepigraphic or genuine passages, in the *Catalepton* his identification is a little clearer. Here we read of “Pompey’s” accomplishments and also his downfall, perhaps as a warning for the reader or implied addressee.374 In the *Aeneid*, Vergil develops the characterization with more sympathy, depth, and emotion, figuring him as a Priam to emphasize his fall.

The *Culex* is perhaps the best and most extensive example of this phenomenon of pseudepigraphic prefiguring and the focus on recognizing the authentic works of Vergil. Glenn Most has argued that this poem highlights the three authentic works of Vergil in their canonical order.375 Most begins his analysis in approximately line 50 with the *Eclogues*, passing through the *Georgics* and ending with the *Aeneid* in line 384. Most does not deal at length with lines 1-49 and 384-end, but I suggest that they too are significant. Expanding on Most’s argument, I argue that the *Culex* can be viewed as prefiguring Vergil’s whole career and output and not just his best-known or even authentic works.

---

373 *Cat. 3.9* and *Verg. Aen. 2.555.*
374 Above, I suggested that the unnamed addressee may be Octavius, a fact that is made stronger if the anti-exemplum is indeed Pompey.
375 See Most (1987) for a detailed description of how the pieces of the poems fit together.
The beginning of the poem is addressed to a friend, Octavius. "Vergil" reminds him of their time together: we “played” (lusimus), he tells him.376 The game stemming from the verb ludere suggests a youthful poetic activity between the two boys, ones who have little experience in the composition of works. Also, the contrast between a work that is levior now as opposed to a graviore one that will come later—the lighter type of poetry versus the heavy—adds to this idea.377 These are clearly young men who have just started on the path of writing and have more to learn before they can write a magnum opus, like the Aeneid. But every poet must start somewhere.378 This proem, then, is more than just a proem to the Culex, I argue, but a proem to the career of Vergil. In the opening line of Tristia 4.10, Ovid describes his youthful poetic endeavors and dubs himself “a playful writer of tender loves” (tenerorum lusor amorum).379 The line from Ovid suggests, then, that writers had referred to their first attempts in poetry with a derivative of the verb ludere. In fact, I believe, the comparison between the declarations can go one step further: both poets demarcate what their future works will be, for Ovid, love poetry, and for

---

376 The idea of ludism will be discussed fully in Chapter Three. For now, I assume a few key elements of the idea.
377 Cul. 7-8.
378 The use of a gnat as the protagonist further suggests that this is a youthful output. The Testamentum Porcelli, a parody from the 4th century CE that finds a pig writing a will following correct Roman legal procedure, may provide a useful comparison. See Champlin (1987) for bibliography and interpretation of the text. The Testamentum, which also features an animal as protagonist, may have had some connection to the educational system as well, either due to its popularity with school-aged boys or because it was written by an instructor (175, 183). As I will argue below, the same may be said of the Culex. The Pseudo-Homeric Batrachomyomachia might also prove an interesting point of comparison. Bertolin-Cebrian (2008: 1-4) argues that this work is an example of a "beast-narrative," which allows for the introduction of epic to young children, or perhaps is an example of a youthful endeavor. While this analysis is quite enticing, however, I must note one major flaw: there is no direct evidence for this type of work in antiquity. Bertolin-Cebrian’s argument rests on indirect evidence and this scholar declares this work to be the sole example. See Sens (2006) for analysis of this work as parody.
379 Ov. Tr. 4.10.1.
“Vergil” something serious, like epic. Whether one believes that the pseudepigrapha surrounding the master poet are authentic or not, one should acknowledge that the *Eclogues* were most likely not Vergil’s first poetic output. There must have been some work, even if solely school exercises, that came first. The proem here apparently provides confirmation: Vergil, in his youth, wrote poetry, even if it was not as serious or heavy or refined as his later works.

Following the proem, the *Culex* turns to authentic poems of Vergil as told through the lens of a gnat’s journey to and meeting with a shepherd, followed by the gnat’s eventual death. After the shepherd visits the gnat in the underworld, we learn that because the gnat had saved his life he built a tomb for the insect and upon it, placed a commemorative inscription. The gnat’s journey mirrors Vergil’s journey as a poet: both man and gnat are given an epitaph to celebrate their lives and memorialize their deeds. The epitaph for the deceased gnat reads:

\[ \text{parue culex, pecudum custos, tibi tale merenti funeris officium uitae pro munere reddit.} \]

O little gnat, the keeper of the herd gives back to you, Worthy of so much, the service of a funeral for the gift of life.

Donatus records the epitaph Vergil (supposedly) wrote for himself:

\[ \text{Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere, tenet nunc Parthenope. cecini pascua rura duces.} \]

Mantua bore me, Calabria snatched me, now Naples Holds me. I sang of pastures, the countryside and leaders.

---

380 While it is unknown if the epitaph of Vergil is authentic, the implication in this progression is that it is. Or at the very least, it is assumed that Vergil would have written one even if what we have is not the exact one he wrote. See Chapter 6 for more discussion of this poem.

381 *VSD* 18.

382 *VSD* 36.
Donatus records the epitaph from the *Culex* too after enumerating the early works of Vergil and introduces both epitaphs with the phrase “he created the distich” (*distichon fecit*). In addition he describes both figures as buried in a *tumulus*.

While these are common expressions, their employment, I propose, somewhat equates the afterlife of the gnat, in some sense, with that of Vergil.

If we were to read these epitaphs together with an epigram of Martial, perhaps further significance can be gleaned. In epigram 3.93, Martial describes a certain Vetusillia, a woman who is so old, yet is still thinking about marriage. While describing her appearance, both directly and through metaphor, Martial says: “and the gnat of Atria sings more sweetly” (*et Atrianus dulcius culex cantet*), a clear attack on her vocal skills. The adjective *Atrianus* links the gnat here to the Northern Italian town of Atria, not far from Mantua, Vergil’s place of birth. The gnat also sings (*cantet*) as Vergil did in his funerary epigram (*cecini*). Although both mentions do not use the exact same verb, the former is a derivative of the later -- we have here a mention of a gnat, which does emit a buzzing sound, not normally compared to singing. Finally, this mention of a singing gnat comes in the hexameter line of the elegiac verse, which may be a nod to both the meter of the *Culex*, as well as the authentic works of Vergil. I propose, then, that perhaps it is through this poem of Martial that the two epitaphs found in the biography of Vergil gain a closer connection. Martial, in fact, is the only poet explicitly to mention the *Culex* as Vergil’s

---

383 VSD 18, 36. The subjects however are different. The shepherd wrote the epitaph for the gnat, Vergil for himself. But the shepherd did not really write the epitaph even though he was given credit for it – Vergil (as we are to assume) wrote it and therefore wrote both.

384 Mart. 3.93.9.

385 Both verbs also have the added connotation of singing poetry.
in his poems, and does so twice, or perhaps thrice if this poems serves as a further allusion.\textsuperscript{386} Martial’s mention of a Northern Italian gnat, which sings may be a direct reference to Vergil, who sings, along with his gnat.\textsuperscript{387}

I suggest that the \textit{Culex} does not simply prefigure the authentic works of Vergil; instead, it pre-figures the entire poetic output of its purported author. The poem begins with the early poetic games played between two young boys, progresses through the authentic writings of Vergil in order of publication—\textit{Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid}—until finally it comes to the last piece of poetry we will read of Vergil’s, his epitaph.\textsuperscript{388} The intention of the poem was apparently to showcase Vergil at an early age looking forward through the rest of his life. We are to see him imbued with much forethought and determination as a young man writing his \textit{Culex}, and planning his entire poetic output early on -- not a very good cover for a pseudepigraphic poet.\textsuperscript{389} In doing so, the author the \textit{Culex} recognizes the complete ouevre of Vergil, expanding upon what is seen in works like \textit{Catalepton} 15. In this poem, the authentic works of Vergil are invoked through the life and death of a gnat. They are integrated in a story and not referenced with single words but

\textsuperscript{386} See Appendix A for quotations. The word \textit{culex} also appears in Martial 11.18.13. There, Martial describes the tiny farm Lupus has given him and how the plot of land is not even big enough to satisfy a gnat. I do not think that this poem has any poetic connotations beyond a general reference to the countryside that may invoke the \textit{Eclogues} or \textit{Georgics}.
\textsuperscript{387} Interestingly, Vetustilla is described as having ... \textit{araneorum cassibus pares mammas} (3.93.5). The diminutive of the words for spider, \textit{araneolus}, appears in the proem to the \textit{Culex} (\textit{Cul}. 2). Because of the difference in context, I’m not sure that this is as strong a reference to the poem of the gnat, but when combined with the use of the word \textit{culex} perhaps we are to see a subtle allusion.
\textsuperscript{388} Interestingly, the epitaph of Vergil sets out to accomplish the same task of the \textit{Culex}. They both touch upon the authentic works of Vergil in their canonical order, but not explicitly. Both instead use metaphors or allusions to get their references across. See Chapter 6 for further discussion.
\textsuperscript{389} Of course, the poetic plan provides the most compelling argument against the authenticity of this poem, notwithstanding its pedigree in ancient testimonia as discussed earlier in this chapter. Vergil could not possibly have planned his output in such a precise way. However, the notion of a plan gives Vergil an almost a mystical aspect: that even before he had ever written anything of worth he had the ability to do so.
instead through detailed images and references. But nevertheless the preoccupation and focus hold: the recognition of the authentic works of Vergil in their canonical order.

Not only does the *Culex* as a whole pre-figure the oeuvre of Vergil, but its individual components also pre-figure certain poems of Vergil as well. For example the last section of the poem, with its Parade of Heroes, is clearly an homage to Book Six of the *Aeneid*. However, in its attempt to honor the better-known work, it also omits key components, such as Augustus and his family, perhaps in order to hide the fact that it was written after the *Aeneid*. The true author seems to have referenced the epic but either simplified or avoided too much detail.

We can see an example of simplification of the content of the *Aeneid* in the *Culex* by analyzing the topography of the underworld in each poem. For example, the *Aeneid* passage begins with a description of the entrance to the underworld and the types of people that Aeneas sees first, such as the infants who have not lived long and cannot pass the threshold into the underworld. The author of the *Culex*, though, avoids those preliminary details and instead has his protagonist pass over the waves of the river Styx—the first place of comparison between the two works—and to Hades proper. In both poems, the protagonists quickly come face to face with people vital to the mise-en-scène—such as Charon, who ferries the dead

---

390 *Cul.* 202-384.
391 Not all Vergilian pseudepigrapha, however, attempt to hide such potential anachronisms.
392 See Barrett (1970) for a further discussion of the topography of the underworld in the *Culex*.
across the river Styx into the underworld, and Cerberus, the three-headed dog who is the guards it.\textsuperscript{395}

Both protagonists then move to the part of the underworld that contains those being punished—although Vergil has Aeneas make some detours on the way.\textsuperscript{396} The most significant difference between the two areas for the punished is found in their names. In Vergil, this area is called “Tartarean Phlegethon” (\textit{Tartareus Phlegethon}) and is characterized by huge gates, flames and cliffs:

\begin{center}
\textit{Respicit Aeneas subito, et sub rupe sinistra}
\textit{moenia lata videt, triplici circumdata muro,}
\textit{quae rapidus flammis ambit torrentibus amnis,}
\textit{Tartareus Phlegethon, torquetae sonantia saxa.}
\textit{Porta adversa ingræ, solidoque adamante columnae,}
\textit{vis ut nulla virum, non ipsi exscindere bello}
\textit{caelicolae valeant....}\textsuperscript{397}
\end{center}

Suddenly Aeneas looks back, and under a cliff on the left
See wide walls, girded by the triple wall,
Which the swift river circles with burning flames,
Tartarean Phlegethon, and turns along the resounding rocks.
A huge gate is in front, and columns of solid adamant,
Such that no force of man, nor the heaven dwellers themselves may be able to uproot it in war.

In the \textit{Culex}, this area is called the "Cimmerian Grove" (\textit{cimmerii luci}), perhaps just in reference to the area around Lake Avernus, the entrance to the underworld. The gnat describes his movement through the area:

\begin{center}
\textit{... Feror avia carpens,}
\textit{avia Cimmerios inter distantia lucos,}
\textit{quem circa tristes densentur in omnia poenae.}\textsuperscript{398}
\end{center}

I am born taking up pathless way,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{395} Verg. \textit{Aen.} 6.299, 326, 417. \textit{Cul.} 216, 220. The mention of Cerberus is slightly delayed in the \textit{Aeneid.}
\textsuperscript{396} Vergil passes through the areas, which contain infants, suicides, those in mourning (“The Mourning Fields”), and those good in war.
\textsuperscript{397} Verg. \textit{Aen.} 6.548-554.
\textsuperscript{398} \textit{Cul.} 231-234.
\end{flushright}
Pathless ways distant among the Cimmerian groves,
About me sad penalties are pressed together for all things.

The description of the grove as “Cimmerian” is significant when we consider the
{	extit{Culex}} as an imitation of the {	extit{Aeneid}}. The gnat wanders the underworld without a
guide, unlike Aeneas who has the help of the Cumaean Sibyl. The Roman scholar
Varro tells us that one of the ten canonical Sibyls is the Cimmerian Sibyl.\textsuperscript{399} Perhaps,
then, the reference to the “Cimmerian Groves” is meant to invoke in the minds of
readers the guide of Aeneas during his travels in the underworld. However, I
propose, the Cimmerian Sibyl might be alluded to as well because she, not the
Cumaean version, is found more often in the pre-Vergilian tradition.\textsuperscript{400} Again, with
the author’s subtle change in prophetess, he is setting up his poem as the
predecessor to Vergil’s.

Continuing through the journey of the hero and the gnat, we reach female
characters in each with strong literary connections to one another. In the {	extit{Aeneid}},
she is Dido, and in the {	extit{Culex}}, she is Medea. In addition, these two women are
explicitly described in these narratives in terms relating to marriage. Dido was
involved in a pseudo-marriage with Aeneas, who then leaves her behind in order to
continue his journey to found Rome. In the underworld, she walks away from him
and returns to her previous husband who had died. The narrator describes the
scene thus:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Inter quas Phoenissa recens a volnere Dido}
\textit{errabat silva in magna;}
\textit{...}
\textit{atque inimica refugit}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{399} This fact is quoted in Lactantius’ {	extit{Divine Institutions}} (I.6).
\textsuperscript{400} Horsfall (2014) 81.
in nemus umbriferum, coniunx ubi pristinus illi respondet curis aequatque Sychaeus amorem.\footnote{Verg. Aen. 6.450-451; 472-474.}

Among whom Phoenician Dido with her wound still fresh
Was wandering in the great forest;
...
... and his enemy fled back
into the shade-bearing grove, where her first husband,
Sychaeus, responds to her care and equals her love.

In the Culex passage, Medea is also described with the vocabulary of marriage. The gnat describes her in the following way:

\begin{quote}
sicut Hymen praefata dedit conubia mortis
\end{quote}

\footnote{Cul. 247-250.}

\begin{quote}
 atque alias alio densas super agmine turmas,
impietate fera vaecordem Colchida matrem, anxia sollicitis meditantem volnera natis.
\end{quote}

\footnote{In some editions, for example Salvatore's, there is no lacuna before the explicit mention of Medea and the references to marriage are unequivocally joined to Medea.}

Thus, with the wedding announced, she gave a marriage of death

\begin{quote}
 And the other dense crowds above the other line,
The Colchian mother, frenzied with wild impiety,
Thinking up troublesome wounds for her worried children.
\end{quote}

She is called Cholcida matrem, a term probably meant to invoke her relationship with Jason and their suspect marriage. We remember that Jason disavows their marriage upon arrival in Corinth to marry a local princess, and Medea, to punish Jason, kills their children. The invocation is emphasized, if we read the line preceding the lacuna as referring to Medea, a line that mentions marriage twice.\footnote{In some editions, for example Salvatore's, there is no lacuna before the explicit mention of Medea and the references to marriage are unequivocally joined to Medea.}

In addition to the textual similarities, most scholars agree that the character of Dido in the Aeneid is based at least in part on the Medea of Apollonius of Rhodes'
*Argonautica*. If the *Aeneid* is indeed imitating the *Culex*, as we are led to believe, then, I argue, Vergil’s sources for Dido should be both the *Argonautica* and the *Culex*. And indeed we find the same character type, a marriage-themed female, in the *Aeneid* but in a figure that fits into the rest of the narrative, since Dido was an active participant in the journey of Aeneas before her suicide.

Directly after Medea’s appearance, we turn to the story of the Trojan War, but more specifically the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. In both the *Aeneid* and the *Culex*, we hear of Odysseus, and in both poems, Odysseus is never explicitly named but is known by a patronymic. In the *Aeneid*, he is “the son of Aeolus” (*Aeolides*). Aeolus was grandfather of Odysseus, through his son Sisyphus, an alternative father of the hero. But in the *Culex*, he is said to have a *Laertia vultus* or simply of “the face of the son of Laertes,” his father according to the *Odyssey*. The *Culex* rewrites the naming of Odysseus in the *Aeneid* in order to show that the supposedly “youthful” writer of the *Culex* follows the more ordinary and simple tradition, I offer. But having “matured” and learned more about the tradition of Odysseus, the “adult” Vergil uses the lesser known, but more learned, patronymic.

After weaving our way through the story of the great Greek heroes of the Trojan War in the *Culex*, we might expect to hear the story of the great Trojan hero, the one who would go on to found the Roman race. But instead, we are given a

---

404 For a discussion, see Chapter 7 in Hunter (2005).
405 However, because the mention of Medea is restricted to just a few lines, further comparisons between the characterizations of these two women are not possible. Most recently, Nelis (2001) has shown that the *Argonautica* is a critical model for the *Aeneid*, with the former acting as a lens through which Vergil adapts the epics of Homer.
406 *Cul.* 295-357.
408 *Cul.* 327.
narrative of Roman history, devoid of details. There is no mention of Aeneas, either in the preceding war saga or at the start of the Roman section. Scholars have noted a preponderance of Greek figures at the expense of Roman figures but have been unable to explain it satisfactorily.\textsuperscript{409} But if we agree to read the \textit{Culex} as a piece of pseudepigraphic Vergilian juvenilia that prefigures the \textit{Aeneid}, a clear explanation can be deduced. I suggest that the gaps created by the lack of Roman figures allow the author to achieve his goal as set forth in the opening lines of the poem: the holes will be filled by the adult writer. The author, in fact, is playing a game of pre-figurement that the reader has to piece together.

The \textit{Culex} includes only scant detail in its prefiguring of \textit{Aeneid} 6. The reader expects to find a “Parade of Heroes” à la the \textit{Aeneid}. It is well known that the work directly preceding the \textit{Aeneid} was the \textit{Georgics}. The author of the \textit{Culex} sets the stage for the \textit{Aeneid} section, the \textit{katabasis} of the gnat, by referencing the very last story in Book Four of the \textit{Georgics}: that of Orpheus and Eurydice.\textsuperscript{410} The gnat describes Eurydice as follows:

\begin{quote}
Quid, misera Eurydice, tanto maerore recesti
poenaque respectus et nunc manet Orpheos in te?\textsuperscript{411}
\end{quote}

Why, poor Eurydice, have you withdrawn in such sadness
And why even now does the penalty for the backward look of Orpheus remain in you?

\textsuperscript{409} For example, Most (1987: 207) remarks that there are so many Greek figures because this section is based more on Greek epic than even the \textit{Aeneid}. Unfortunately, Most does not go into any further detail to explain the significance of such a comparison. In addition, Fraenkel (1952) argues that this poem is based on a lost Greek epyllion.

\textsuperscript{410} Cul. 268-295; Verg. \textit{Georg.} 4.453-527. The story in the \textit{Culex} relates how Orpheus won the pardon of the gods with his song, in order to go to the underworld to regain Eurydice. However, Orpheus lost her again through a mistake on his part: turning around to look for her while leaving the underworld.

\textsuperscript{411} Cul. 268-269.
The description closes with Orpheus turning around on his way out of the underworld and again losing Eurydice—a twist possibly created by Vergil. The author of the *Culex* then describes the rest of the tale as found in the *Georgics*, and although there are no direct quotations from the *Georgics*, as Salvatore notes, there are many verbal echoes between these two sections.

The *Culex*’s narrator now begins a new story: the Trojan War and its aftermath. He starts with Aeacus, the grandfather of Achilles. The next twenty lines describe the Trojan War, the narrative following Homer’s *Iliad*. The subsequent thirty lines then go on to describe Odysseus’ journey and struggles to return home, a narrative similar to that told in Homer’s *Odyssey*. The gnat then switches quickly from the Greek to the Roman section without much notice: the sole transitional phrase is “here others reside” (*hic alii resident*), before he begins to enumerate the Roman figures. However, his list of famous Romans is by no means long or exhaustive, lasting only 14 lines. Names are given, such as the families of the Fabii and Decii, without any talk of their deeds. Some are described more fully, for instance Curius, but usually in a line or less. Clearly the great heroes of Rome and mentions of their deeds are lacking. There is no reference to Aeneas, his journey, or

---

413 For example, Salvatore identifies *Cul.* 280-281 (*iamque imam viridi radicem moverat alte quercus huma*) and *Georg.* 4.510 (*mulcentem tigres et agentem carmine quercus*) as echoes since it is Orpheus’ voice which moves the oaks. Additional echoes include: *Cul.* 287-288 (*Eurydicenque... reddere*) and *Georg.* 4.486 (*redditaque Eurydice...*); *Cul.* 289 (*Illa quidem...*) and *Georg.* 4.506 (*Illa quidem...*); *Cul.* 293 (*rupisti...*) and *Georg.* 4.492 (*rupita...*); finally, *Cul.* 294-295 (*...amantem...ignoscenda...scirent si...nossent...meminisse...*) and *Georg.* 4.488-489 (*...amantem...ignoscenda...scirent si ignoscere...*). Some of these echoes seem faint at best.
414 *Cul.* 296-326.
415 *Cul.* 327-357.
416 *Cul.* 358.
417 *Cul.* 361. The Decii are the only figures in the list of Roman figures to overlap (*Aen.* 6.824).
418 *Cul.* 367.
any of the early inhabitants of Rome here either. Instead, the narrative skips from the end of Odysseus’ journey to Republican Rome. The question then arises: what would fill the gap between those sections and also complete the narrative of the end of Republican Rome? The *Aeneid*. The “older” Vergil will be able to fill out in that work what the “younger” Vergil left out of the *Culex*.

I suggest that the pseudepigraphic poem is carefully crafted in order to avoid overlap between itself and the authentic works of Vergil. The *Culex* is supposed to be a poem written by a youthful and inexperienced or unknowledgeable “Vergil,” who in his mature years, crafts a more complex and complete narrative. Therefore the second half of this section of the *Culex* presupposes what is “to come” from Vergil: his great Augustan epic. There, he will discuss the journey of Aeneas, the Alban Kings, the Roman Kings, the great heroes of the Republic, and finally the transformation of the Republic into the Augustan Principate and those figures involved in it. But in the epic of his “youth,” none of these exists. The young “Vergil” has not even begun to think of the epic that will become his masterpiece. All of these figures will come later in the expansion of the *Culex* that is the *Aeneid*.

---

419 It would seem to have been a natural place to mention Aeneas, if the author were to mention him in this poem, above in the section that describes the troubles that the warriors encounter on their way from Troy. Although all those mentioned are Greeks, nevertheless his story fits the theme of those lines. In my opinion, the reader is supposed to notice that there is a glaring omission and recognize what it is: the *Aeneid*. The structure of this poem illuminates the inauthenticity of its authorship, and the pattern here supports it further.

420 *Cf. Ov. Met.* 13.623- end, which employs a similar technique in avoiding the previous tradition.

421 Another reason why the author might avoid the figures that Vergil includes in the *Aeneid* is ego and self-awareness. While the *Culex* is artful, it is not as well written as the *Aeneid*. By not including the same figures, there can be no direct comparison and the faults of the fake “Vergil” would not be as readily apparent.
The pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil have at times been dismissed as lacking in complexity and style when compared with the authentic writings of Vergil. Yet, upon closer inspection, we find artistry in the imitation. In the reuse of both lines and indeed whole works, the interplay between the authentic and inauthentic poems of Vergil is complex. The inauthentic works aim to pre-figure, as well as recognize, the authentic ones, to act almost as a rough draft or sketch of what Vergil will write later. If we read these poems with the authentic ones in mind, the pseudepigrapha become an even richer tapestry, reflective of the tradition of Vergil’s works.

**Connections to Education**

As I discussed in Chapter One, the writing of pseudepigrapha is founded at least in part in the educational tradition. We can see the concepts behind *progymnasmata* re-utilized in literary fakes. Even though, in many cases, their forms have been elevated beyond simple school exercises, educational foundations are still evident. These works show a sophistication beyond what a student could presumably produce, but that does not exclude the possibility that school exercises could have served as an inspiration to adult authors.

Almost every poem mentioned by Donatus as written by Vergil in his youth can be analyzed for its connections to the educational tradition. However, for the sake of space, I will only touch upon a few of the poems. To begin with, let us return to the *Culex*. As previously mentioned, Most has argued that this work reflects the
three authentic poems of Vergil in their canonical order. A common school exercise was to summarize works, including those of Vergil, in either prose or poetry. I suggest that the *Culex* could have begun as such an exercise and, while the exercises must have produced simple summaries, these still could have been the bases for the more elaborate pieces found in each section of the *Culex*. The poem’s author could have taken what he practiced as a child and developed it to craft a more complete and complex narrative, tied together by the protagonist of an insect. Youthful exercises, then, could serve as a starting point for the creation of the story surrounding the gnat and shepherd.

Of the school exercises that may have informed or inspired pseudepigraphic poems not all involved reworking the poems of Vergil. If we are meant to consider the author of the literary fakes to be a youthful Vergil, perhaps even still at school, then it would make sense for those poems to draw on the authors who pre-date Vergil. For example, the *Catalepton* draws heavily on the writings of Catullus, one of the most influential poets of the generation before Vergil. In *Catalepton* 10, we find a retelling of Catullus 4, his poem about a famous ship that is better and faster than all other ships. In *Catalepton* 10, instead of a ship we encounter a new protagonist: a muleteer. Using many of the same words and phrases as the original piece by Catullus, “Vergil” explains that a certain Sabinus is the fastest of the muleteers. As the poem continues, we hear about Sabinus’ origins and finally about his current situation, as we do similarly with the Catullan boat. I propose that

---

422 See Chapter 1 for more discussion and bibliography.
423 See Chapters 3 and 4 for further discussion of the use of Catullan poems in these pseudepigraphic poems.
424 See Chapter 4 for further discussion.
we might imagine that *Catalepton* 10 was written first as a bland summary of the poem of Catullus, but embellishments were added in later life. It makes sense that Catullus would have been the primary model for this poem, since that poet would have been a key figure in the literary world while Vergil was young. Alternatively it could have been created to stand as a *synkrisis* (comparison), another type of school exercise. The goal here might have been to compare the high literary original about the boat to the lower work of a school child about a muleteer, something a child might have more knowledge of or contact with.\(^{425}\) Or perhaps it was simply started as a *thema* (a situation from a passage), retelling the same story in a different way.\(^{426}\)

Yet, *Catalepton* 10 does diverge in places from its Catullan original. The Adriatic, Cyclades, Rhodes--all Greek geographical locations--and other places mentioned in Catullus 4 are nowhere to be found in the parodic version.\(^{427}\) Instead, we see the muleteer racing towards Mantua, Vergil’s hometown, or Brixia, another town in Northern Italy.\(^{428}\) In *Catalepton* 10, Amastris is exchanged for Cremona,

---

\(^{425}\) The switch in protagonist from boat to muleteer in *Catalepton* 10, and the poem’s relationship to animals, may have been influenced by the use of animals as actors in fables. Kurke (2011: 3-4) has noted that fables in their “style, content, and tone” are automatically of lower register than works such as epic and higher types of prose works – fables and their authors are equated with the popular and therefore low. While the pseudepigraphic works lack the moral overtones of fables (43), their context does seem similar: they are not meant to be high, epic literature, as their use of talking animals demonstrates. (See Chapters 3 and 4 for more information on how the poems in the VSD acknowledge this fact.) Moreover, fable also has an educational connection: “fable” is described by Aelius Theon while discussing the educational *progymnastica* (43). Aelius Theon is not alone in his inclusion of fable among school exercises, as this type appears in the works of Aphthonius and Nicolaus as well. All three define this activity as “a fictitious story picturing a truth” (*λόγος* *ψευδής εἰκόνιζων ἡθείαν*) (43 n. 130). While we do not find a moral behind *Catalepton* 10, nevertheless the use of animals might hearken back to the educational production of fables.

\(^{426}\) See Chapter 1 for further bibliography.

\(^{427}\) Cat. 4.6-8.

\(^{428}\) Cat. 10.4-5. See VSD 2 for mention of Mantua. See section above for more discussion of the significance of these places.
where Vergil spent his early years. The change of places from one poem to another should not be seen as mere accident. Instead, I suggest that we should view it as a means of further connecting the poems with Vergil, as these are places that would have had well-known connections to its purported author. If we are to see the author of this poem as a youthful Vergil, as with many of the Vergilian pseudepigrapha especially the *Catalepton*, then the homage to Catullus is fitting, as he, along with other Neoteric poets in general, would have been one of the most important influences on a young boy growing up at the end of the Republic. It follows, then, that a school exercise may have involved rewriting an important piece, say by Catullus, with a change in focus. A boat is exchanged for a muleteer, and the Greek locations for Northern Italian. In this scenario, a young boy would have written about what was most familiar to him, in this case “Vergil,” and hence we find the change in the later pseudepigraphic version to the places of his youth.

A final example is found in *Catalepton* 9, a praise poem in honor of Messalla. While this poem is evidence of a more sophisticated engagement with the literary tradition, an engagement that I will discuss further in Chapter Four, it is also an example of an elaboration of a school exercise, the *encomium*. As I discussed earlier in this chapter, Vergil had some sort of connection to Messalla, even if the latter is not the patron usually associated with Vergil. In this poem, we see a focus on the poetic works of Messalla, which is fitting considering the praise is found in a work of poetry and its apparent author will become one of the best-known Latin poets. The writing of encomia is quite common in pseudepigraphic writings, a fact

---

430 Again, see Chapter 1 for bibliography and further discussion.
that further supports the idea that the foundation of these works can be found in the educational system.\textsuperscript{431} Again, even though this poem demonstrates a sophistication beyond what we would expect from a school-aged child, it is not impossible that the impetus for such a work began in an educational setting.

Through these three examples, it should be clear that a wide range of educational exercises (\textit{progymnasmata}) may have been the foundation for the pseudepigraphic works named in the \textit{VSD}. One should note that it is not only with Vergilian pseudepigrapha that connections to the educational exercises are present. For example, it has been argued that the \textit{Epistula Sapphus}, found in the \textit{Heroides} collection, was not in fact written by Ovid.\textsuperscript{432} In this letter, Sappho, the 7\textsuperscript{th} century BCE lyric poet, writes to her lover, Phaon, after he left her. I propose that this letter takes the form a \textit{prosopopoeia} (a inventive speech for a character). The series of poems between spurned mythological women and their former lovers in fact all take on this form in some way. However, I think the addition of a poem by Sappho is interesting. She was considered not only one of the best poets but also one of the most evocative love poets from antiquity. It makes sense, then, that a school exercise would be one that requires students to create a letter from her perspective when her love was not reciprocated, picking up on a legendary item in her biography. Thus, a schoolboy may have been charged with writing such a speech in the form of

\textsuperscript{431} There is actually another encomium for Messalla, the \textit{Panegyricus Messallae}, found in the \textit{Corpus Tibullianum}, a fact that is interesting and perhaps increases the evidence for the prominence of this figure in the literary world. See Schoonhoven (1983) for a comparison of these two poems. See Holzberg (1998/9) for a general discussion of the pseudepigraphic poems at the end of the Tibullan corpus.

\textsuperscript{432} See Knox (2009: 211-212) for discussion and bibliography.
a letter in the style of Ovid (or even the persona of Ovid), and that work later became attached to the authentic works of the poet.

Like with Ovid, we may even be able to add a work of Pseudo-Seneca into this category as well. There are around seventy epigrams that have been handed down to us under the name of the great writer, poems that are now generally considered spurious.\textsuperscript{433} Within this collection, we can glean various connections to the educational exercises as well. For examples, epigrams 28-34 discuss the military successes of Claudius in Britain. The author, writing in the persona of Seneca in exile, praises the deeds of the emperor. Here, then, we find evidence of \textit{encomia}, one of the most common \textit{progymnasmata} found in pseudepigraphic works. As above, perhaps the work began as an exercise of a schoolboy, instructed to write an encomiastic poem in the style of Seneca.\textsuperscript{434} There is an apparent connection between pseudepigrapha in general and the educational re-workings of authentic texts. While there is not always a correspondence, it does happen more often than not, especially in the Vergilian sort. \textit{Imitatio} is not only the basis of the Roman literary system but the educational system as well, a fact that may lead to the production of certain pseudepigraphic works.

Additionally, there is not always a simple one-to-one correspondence of one scholastic activity and a resulting pseudepigraphic work, although \textit{Catalepton} 9 can

\begin{footnotes}
\item[433] See Holzberg (2004b) for a most recent and thorough discussion of these poems and Breitenbach (2009) for text and commentary. Both scholars believe these poems should be read as carefully organized \textit{liber}, and so I will refer to them as a collection.
\item[434] As Holzberg (2004b: 426) notes, these poems all connect with the authentic works of Seneca, using his stylistic choices in order to convince the reader that they were written by Seneca. The problem, however, is that the author uses the style and thoughts of an older Seneca in poems supposedly written by a younger Seneca, as if these elements would not have changed over time. I think this statement can apply not only to Pseudo-Senecan works but all pseudepigraphic works as well.
\end{footnotes}
be seen as an example of such a correspondence. We may find a mix of scholastic exercises leading to one poem, as in *Catalepton* 10. Yet the fact remains that the nature of *progymnasmata* emphasizes the frequency in ancient literature of the re-appropriation of earlier material. As discussed in Chapter One, the fluidity of literature in antiquity allowed for common reuse of material, not only in schools but also in later pseudepigraphic works.

**Conclusion**

We began this chapter with a general introduction to the early works of Vergil as found in the biography written by Suetonius and added to by Donatus. While we cannot be sure how much Donatus contributed to the biography, he is nevertheless our earliest source for, at the very least, the names of the “youthful” poems of Vergil. I began with discussion of metrical and lexical similarities, or the lack thereof between these poems and the authentic works of Vergil. Meter did display correspondences between not only the pseudepigrapha but also the authentic works. In fact, the repurposing of meter showed nuance in a work like the *Culex*. On the other hand, lexical similarities are lacking both between pseudepigrapha themselves and with the authentic works. Moreover, the lexical densities of these works are far higher than that of the authentic works of Vergil suggesting that these works were less complex.

I then moved onto thematic *topoi*, which tie the pseudepigrapha together – those that can be seen as Vergilian reception. The young Vergil of the
pseudepigrapha is provincial, humble and upright. Anticipating their portrayal as juvenilia in the later biographical tradition, the authors present their poems as the youthful works of Vergil. They go further as well by writing their poems to prefigure the authentic writings of the master poet. In a sophisticated literary game, the authors lead their readers to take the poems as early works from which the older Vergil drew inspiration-- not the other way around. Additionally, their reuse of Vergil's authentic works, often in their canonical order, recognizes Vergil's authentic oeuvre. It is not advantageous to read these poetic works singly as scholars usually have. If read altogether, as if a proper corpus, we are able to glean more about their supposed author and his works. The structure and content of these poems are possibly evidence of their origins in the educational tradition. They draw on scholastic exercises for their bases, forms and conceits and Vergil’s authentic works for their inspiration. The pseudepigraphic poems use, create, and further the tradition of Vergil and his works in antiquity.
Chapter 3: Ludism in the Pseudo-Vergilian Poems in the VSD

As seen in Chapter 2, the poems attributed to Vergil in Donatus’ *Vita Suetonii vulga Donatiana* (*VSD*) can be tied together in many ways. I have argued that the poems in this biography should be united as a collection through their meter, connections to the real Vergil, both his biography and authentic works, and the educational tradition. While all of those links are significant and important to this study, there are two even greater connections: literary ludism and Hellenistic poetry. In this chapter, I will begin with the discussion of the ludic qualities of these poems.435

Defining Ludism

In Latin, *ludus* can be translated simply as a play or a game, either public or private in nature.436 While the noun and its accompanying derivatives can refer to an actual physical activity participated in by one or more contestants, in classical literature the word quite often was extended to include activity in the written realm as well.437 In fact, the verb *ludere* has many definitions beyond the physical action

435 I will discuss the connections to Hellenistic poetry in Chapter 4.
436 *OLD s.v.* ludus (1).
437 Examples of its use will be discussed shortly. There is one more meaning of the word *ludus* that deserves a brief mention – that of “gladiatorial school.” The training facility would have housed a large number of both trainees and active gladiators, referred to collectively as a *familia*. In the Late Republic, Capua held claim on the best of schools. However, after the construction of the Colosseum, it was necessary to have an elite training facility close to the amphitheater. The *Ludus Magus*, begun by Domitian and completed by Hadrian, was built next to the amphitheater in Rome, and the two were connected by an underground passageway. This *Ludus* was of course the largest in the Empire but followed a common building plan – a central exercise area with living quarters around it. Additionally here, the exercise area was surrounded by circular seats, for spectators to come and watch. The gladiators-in-training were educated usually by current or former successful gladiators. Their instruction was high quality and grueling, creating a great discipline in the students (Dunkle...
associated with the word “game.” Further definitions of this verb include “to play with short poems,” “to jest,” “to enjoy the delights of love,” and “to train.”

The word takes on further meaning when viewed as an extension of physical play. We can define the more literary use of ludus (the meaning of our term “ludism”) as a poetic game in which people, often youths, during their free time (otium), produce light and/or witty works in a variety of meters. As should be clear from the variety of definitions sourced from dictionaries and scholars, levity is of the utmost importance. The work that is produced in such an environment should be taken lightly and should serve as a contrast to work that is considered more serious or elevated.

The notion of contrast is important to ludism. Poems that declare themselves to be ludic, or lend themselves to such an appellation, are intended to be distinguished from other works. If one were to write poems as part of ludism, the product would be shorter poems with a less serious tone and subject matter, as opposed to longer and more serious works, like epic. However, as I will discuss below, we are not given strict criteria as to what exactly constitutes a ludic poem and are instead forced to follow generalities provided by ancient writers.

---

(2008) 35-58). See also Ville (1981) and Futrell (2006: 138-143) for further discussion of the ludi and training. It is interesting to note that, while on the surface ludic poems may seem less than serious, they are often well-crafted, artistic productions which were laborious, as evidenced by Hor. Ep. 2.2 (see below for further discussion). In this aspect, then, a gladiatorial ludus and a poetic ludus may have some common ground.

438 OLD s.v. ludere. These definitions are also discussed by Wagenvoort (1956: 37-8).

439 This definition is my own composite based on Wagenvoort (1956: 30-34). Kayachev (2013) has recently argued that poets often play into what a poetic career is supposed to look like as laid out by Philodemus, beginning with a lusus and moving to a studium, specifically philosophy. Even in the pseudepigraphic tradition, this progression is borne out.

The best-known example of the poetic play of ludism comes from Catullus 50. In the beginning of this poem, Catullus and Licinius Calvus were engaged in play:

Hesterno, Licini, die otiosi  
Multum lusimus in meis tabellis,  
Ut convenerat esse delicatos.  

Yesterday, Licinius, in leisure  
We played much on my tablet,  
As we had agreed to be wanton.

As Scott has pointed out, Catullus’ word choice in the second line is significant. The poet chose not to use the verbs *canere* or *exprimere* for his activity, as these verbs usually denote written activity that can be considered high literature. Instead, Catullus and his friend, by contrast, are practicing a lighter sort of creative enterprise, supported by the simple grammatical structure in the beginning of the poem.

The partnership in the type of poetic activity displayed here is also noteworthy and appears in many mentions of ludic activity. Burgess suggests that the action behind this verb implies a “reciprocal” game in which verses are

---

441 Catullus 50 is often linked to the poem that follows, Catullus 51, through the shared theme of *otium*. The latter poem is an adaptation (or possibly translation) of Sappho, fr. 31. The activity displayed by Catullus in Poem 51 is quite reminiscent of the activity of Hellenistic poets to whom the Roman poet is heavy in debt. (See Finamore (1984) for further discussion concerning the links between these two poems.) The pair of poems, then, serves almost as a direct predecessor for the Vergilian pseudepigrapha. Both Catullus and the anonymous authors rely heavily on the ideas of ludism as well as Hellenistic poetic aesthetics in their compositions, often at the same time. (I will discuss the connections between Vergilian pseudepigrapha and Hellenistic poetry in Chapter 4.)

442 Cat. 50.1-3.

443 Scott (1969) 170-171. Thomson (2003: 325 n. 2) adds that we are to take the verb here to mean the friends “wrote (trivial or amatory) verses.”
exchanged.\textsuperscript{444} This reciprocity may not be readily apparent in this poem but the fact that Catullus himself acknowledges there are two participants in the writing on his tablets implies that there is more there than meets the eye. We are therefore supposed to read this action as a back and forth response game, collusion if you will, between the two young authors instead of each writing poems without relation to one another, collaboration, if those works were serious.

Let us continue with Catullus 50 for a moment to pick up on a further description of ludic composition. The speaker says that he and his friend accomplished their composition game at leisure (\textit{otiosi}).\textsuperscript{445} Here it is implied that Catullus and Calvus were not participating in the writing process for any important or serious reason but instead were doing it for fun, in a time when they were not concerned with the public affairs of the day. This depiction is further supported by Pliny, who uses the word in a similar way, in his letter to Fuscus:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Fas est et carmine remitti, non dico continuo et longo (id enim perfici nisi in otio}\textsuperscript{446} non potest) sed hoc arguto et brevi, quod apte quantas libet occupationes curasque distinguat. \textit{Lusus vocantur; sed hi lusus non minorem interdum gloriari quam seria consecuntur; atque adeo (cur enim te ad versus non versibus adhorer?)}\textsuperscript{447}
\end{quote}

It is good to be relaxed by a poem, I do not mean by a continuous and long one (for that is not able to be accomplished except in free time) but by this witty and brief one, which fittingly separated however many occupations and cares it pleases. They are called a

\textsuperscript{444} Burgess (1987) 576-577. This scholar also notes that there is a Greek equivalent to this type of relationship, which Atheneus calls a "\textit{skolion}\" (578).

\textsuperscript{445} Cat. 50.1.

\textsuperscript{446} The fact that Pliny here uses a form of the adjective used by Catullus seems problematic because they are used to mean different things. For Pliny it seems that long poems are to be written in free time while it is the short type for Catullus. I think however what Pliny means here is that long poems were to be written by those perpetually \textit{in otio}, \textit{i.e.} those who never have to engage in public work or \textit{negotium}, while Fuscus is simply in a \textit{secessus}. The fact that Pliny finds writing \textit{lusus} relaxing implies that they as well have to be written in some type of leisure time. See Gibson and Morello (2012: 193) for further discussion of this difference.

\textsuperscript{447} Plin. \textit{Ep}. 7.9.9-10. For further discussion of this letter, see Sherwin-White (1966: 412-413) and Gibson and Morello (2012: 81-82). Sherwin-White (1966: 413) also notes that Pliny uses this term more broadly and loosely than some of his contemporaries who use it to simply refer to epigrams.
lusus;⁴⁴⁸ but these games gain no lesser glory than serious works; and indeed (for why should I exhort you to verses not with verses?)

For Pliny, then, the poems that are considered a lusus, namely those that are shorter in form, are still worthwhile in that they bring relaxation to the writer in addition to glory. As will be apparent from the example below found in Eclogue 6, it is something that even a Muse, usually invoked at the beginning of serious works of literature, can be called upon to participate in.

To return to one last point that Pliny makes, these poems all show one very important characteristic: wittiness. It is for this very reason perhaps that participation in a ludic activity can actually be a worthwhile endeavor for a poet. However, not all writers agree that a lusus is valuable, even if it is clever, as we will see in our final ancient example. Unlike the previous authors who seem to relish or support a ludus, Horace, declaring his intention to retire from public life, mentions how he wishes to escape from that sort of lifestyle because he thinks himself too old to participate in such activities.⁴⁴⁹ He announces that he has decided to turn from such endeavors not because a lusus is necessarily trivial but instead because it is quite strenuous for a good poet: “he will give the appearance of playing and will be tortured” (ludentis speciem dabit et torquebitur).⁴⁵⁰ Reckford therefore extrapolates

---

⁴⁴⁸ I retain the Latin here in my translation for brevity. Sherwin-White (1967: 132) suggests using the word “triflings” for the translation. While I like that translation as it implies brevity and wit, it also implies a work of little importance. As the next example from Horace will show, a ludus must not necessarily be an inferior work of poetry.


⁴⁵⁰ Hor. Ep. 2.2.124. There is some controversy over the dating of this poem and whether or not it comes before or after Book Four of the Odes, which themselves are quite ludic. Harrison (2008) dates this Epistle to later in Horace's career, after the last book of the Odes. However, there is a possibility that we should not take Horace at face value when he says that he is nearing the end of his career but instead assume that it is a persona he is adopting.
from Horace’s use of the idea of ludism that “poetry may be a game, but not in the way its detractors suppose. Although it arises from a play-instinct, it requires intense discipline, effort, and concentration.”451

The noun ludus can mean “play” but it can also mean “training.”452 It is the latter definition that Horace attempts to convey when he discusses poetic ludism. While other authors describe these types of works as less serious, we are not meant to infer that they are inferior to other poems in terms of artistic merit. (As Pliny states, these works are meant to be short but also witty and can still produce glory.) In fact, if we follow Horace’s line of thinking, these poems can take just as much effort and intellect to create as their heavier counterparts.453

While the rest of this chapter will discuss the use of the term ludus and its application in the Pseudo-Vergilian texts, Vergil himself uses and further delineates this term for us in his authentic works. In Eclogue 1, we find two shepherds, Meliboeus and Tityrus, in conversation with one another. Tityrus, in his first reply to his comrade, says:

Ille meas errare boves, ut cernis, et ipsum
Ludere, quae vellem, calamo permisit agresti.454

That one permitted my cows to wander, as you see,
And I myself to play on my shepherd’s pipe, whatever I wish.

452 OLD s.v. ludus (6).
453 However, because these types of poems are meant to be shorter, there is the implication that it may take less time to write them, but that is not necessarily true. Catullus notes that Cinna’s Zmyrna took nine years to complete (Cat. 95).
454 Verg. Ecl. 1.9-10. We find a similar mention at Geor. 4.565, which is a reference back to these lines of the Eclogues, completing the cycle of poems. It is interesting that Vergil only uses this word in (or in reference to) his earliest work, the Eclogues. As I mentioned above, one of the possible connotations of this word is “youthful” poetic exercise. Then, it seems Vergil restricts his usage of ludus to the authentic work, written at his youngest age, in order to keep with the word’s meaning.
Here, just as in the previous example, the speaker uses the verb in the context of a poetic composition, now with music. While Catullus’ speaker used tablets, Tityrus is using his musical instrument as a means of production. Again, we find the use of the verb *ludere* in reference to the action of two figures in an implied reciprocal poetic relationship with one another—a relationship that is not serious but is instead playful.\(^{455}\) Both are presumed to be *in *otio*, in the fields lying under a canopy tree.

Vergil uses a form of the verb *ludere* later in the *Eclogues* again. Through this use we are able to add further nuances to the definition. *Eclogue* 6, another programmatic poem in the collection in addition to *Eclogue* 1, begins with the Muse and her taking part in such a playful writing game:

\begin{quote}
*Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu,*
*Nostra nec erubuit silvas habitare Thalia.*\(^{456}\)
\end{quote}

First our Muse Thalia deigned herself to play in a Syracusan meter, Nor blushed to inhabit the woods.

It is no surprise that there is an invocation to a Muse in the middle poem of this poetic collection. However, what is surprising are her actions. The main verb *dignata est* here implies that the complementary infinitive to follow is not worthy of the Muse—in this case, the verb *ludere*. It seems then, with use of the main verb in these lines, the action implied by the infinitive *ludere*, is lower than what a Muse is wont to produce, *i.e.* serious or epic poetry. This implication fits with the uses of the verb previously discussed. The ludic action is meant to be fulfilled in a leisurely manner as opposed to in a more heavy or severe approach taken for other types of

---

\(^{455}\) Coleman (1977) 75 n.10.

works. However, though it is stated that the Muse lowers herself by doing so, she participates nonetheless. Although a work might be a product of ludism, it does not mean that the poem is without merit. And perhaps that point adds to the definition of ludic poetry. While the reputation is one of being less serious that other genres, for instance epic, the Muse’s participation in this poem hints at the fact that these authors viewed ludic poetry as more important and even better than that defined by the more serious genre. 457

While the term *ludus* may refer to poems that are shorter in length and lighter in tone, the ancients did not mean that these poems were created without skill. In fact, the type of reciprocal play that is often implied when they are mentioned should be viewed in a more serious way. The composition of such works is not mere silliness but instead displays an intellectual sort of play, one that should garner no less fame, as Pliny wrote. As the examples above show, especially Catullus 50, ludic poems are not necessarily written with an eye to publication, even if circulation does also occur. Instead, they tend to be more of the moment, works written in leisure, removed from public life and the public in general.

As discussed in the introduction to this dissertation, the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil were often dismissed by scholars after a discussion of their authenticity: they were seen as “playful,” *i.e.* ludic, and therefore less serious and skillfully written. However, by assessing them more deeply, I hope to show that

---

457 This realignment of ludic poetry with more serious poetry certainly begins with Catullus and the other Neoterics. It is through them that Hellenistic poetry is filtered into Latin and for a Roman audience. And it is during this time period that Vergil is being educated and coming of age. It is no wonder, then, that these poets were of such an influence on Vergilian pseudepigrapha. Further discussion of their importance and their terminology, beyond *ludus*, will be discussed in the next chapter.
there is more to their playfulness—a complexity that could cause the author torture.
Ludism seems to span various different contexts as well: individual amusement, competition, and friendly interaction. Since each piece of Vergilian pseudepigrapha is different in its topics and techniques, not every piece will reflect the same context. Some, like the Culex seems to have been written as a friendly interaction with Octavius; while the Lydia seems to be about individual amusement, as the author discusses his love; further the Ciris may be more competitive with its invocation of Messalla and their once ludic activities.

Ancient parody

Ludic poems clearly deviate from accepted standards of what is “serious” poetry, and, to go one step further, are often parodic in nature. The definition of parody has changed throughout the millennia so it is important to define it as it was in antiquity. Because no ancient definition has been transmitted to us, Householder first attempted to derive a definition of ancient parody from Aristotle’s Poetics, with some additions from a later commentator, Athenaeus of Naucratis. Aristotle first uses this term in connection with a work of Hegemon, a writer of Old Comedy:

οἶνον Ὅμηρος μὲν βελτίους, Κλεοφῶν δὲ ὁμοίους, Ἦγημων δὲ ὁ Θάσιος <ὁ> τὰς παρῳδίας τοῖς πρωτοῖς καὶ Νικοχάρης ὁ τὴν Δειλίάδα χείρους…

458 See Rose (1993) for a discussion of how the term parody has changed from antiquity through modernity.
459 Arist. Poet. 2.1448a.12-13. For Athenaeus’ addition, see 697f-699c. See Householder (1944) for a good linguistic discussion of this word and its origins. On the Roman side, see Quintilian’s Institutio Oratia 6.3.96-7 and 9.2.35.
For example, Homer (portrays) people better, but Cleophon (portrays) people the same, while Hegemon of Thasos, the first having written parodies, and Nicochares, writer of the Deiliad, (portray) people worse....

From these sources, this scholar infers that parody is “a narrative poem of moderate length, in epic meter, using epic vocabulary, and treating a light, satirical or mock-heroic subject.” This narrow definition only allows for one extant text to be defined as parody: Pseudo-Homer’s Batrachomyomachia. Lelievre widens the definition stating that parody is “singing after the style of an original but with a difference.” Rose attempts to complete the definition of ancient parody begun by these previous two scholars, believing that both lack an emphasis on the imitation present in parody. She states that parody does not have to be limited to an imitation of form with a change in subject matter as it is used now, but both can be utilized. In addition, she argues that parody can still be successful whether or not the reader has knowledge of the original text. In a successful parody, the target text becomes part of the new work so that the reader can understand the parody even if one is not familiar with the original. For example, Aristophanes’ comedies are Athenocentric, parodying figures known to that society. In a later staging, the audience may not be familiar with Cleisthenes’ reputation in Athens but should be able to gather that he is a notorious effeminate homosexual and therefore understand a joke from
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460 Householder (1944) 3. As Householder points out, Athenaeus mentions quotes other writers of parody as well, for example Aristoxenus (xiv. 638b), Polemo (xv. 698b), Alexander the Aetolian (xv. 699c), Xenophanes of Colophon (ii. 54e), and Timon the siliographer via Diogenes Laertius (ix. 111). See Sens (2006) and Bertolin Cebrian (2008) for further discussion of this topic. It can be argued that the Culex fulfills many of these points as well. See Ross Jr (1975) and Marinčič (2011) for further discussion of the Culex as parody.
461 Lelievre (1954) 72. This scholar adds to the list of primary sources of his definition: Hermogenes (περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος 34) and Quintilian (Inst. 6.3.97, 9.2.3).
scenes calling up those attributes in the *Thesmophoriazusae* when this man comes as a messenger to the women’s caucus to tell them of Euripides’ infiltration. He begins by stating how he loves women to the point that he is changing his appearance to seem like one. Rose suggests that the attributes of this figure were easily identifiable and the audience could understand the parody without knowing all the historical background of the figure.\footnote{\textsuperscript{464} A}Rose then continues with a discussion of the tone of parody. While modern parody, in her opinion, has a negative connotation (one of ridiculousness), the ancient approach is more neutral.\footnote{\textsuperscript{465} A} It comes to refer to other humorous adaptations outside of epic, at least by the time of Aristophanes, if not before. Parody, then, is “comical,” both because of its associations with comedy but also because it causes laughter generally.\footnote{\textsuperscript{466} A} In combining the ideas of imitation and comedy, Rose argues that what is comic usually stems from the reuse of previous works in the new, causing the expectations from the original to be juxtaposed with how it is re-appropriated.\footnote{\textsuperscript{467} A}

Rose combines these different facets to devise one definition for ancient parody. She states:

‘Parodia’ could imitate both the form and subject-matter of the heroic epics, and create humor by then rewriting the plot or characters so that there were some comic contrast with the more ‘serious’ epic form of the work, and/or create comedy by mixing references to the more serious aspects and characters of the epic with comically lowly and inappropriate figures from the everyday or animal world.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{464} Aristoph. *Thesm.* 574-581.}\footnote{\textsuperscript{465} Rose (1993) 9. She argues that that connotation derives from a misuse of the adjective “*ridiculus*” by J.C. Scaliger in the 16th century.}\footnote{\textsuperscript{466} That is not to say that parody necessarily causes laugh-out-loud laughter, but is of a lighter tone that is generally humorous.}\footnote{\textsuperscript{467} Rose (1993) 18-20, 29-32.}
In short, she says that it is “the comic re-functioning of preformed linguistic or artistic material.”

Even though we may not have a definition of parody from antiquity, nevertheless, through the many references to and uses of this term, it is clear that ancients understood its meaning and connotations. Therefore, I do not believe that it is overly problematic to rely on a modern reconstruction of the term.

Often times, the most basic way to identify parody is through a change in genre, for instance from a “higher” one, like epic, to a “lower” one, such as elegy or satire. For example, from extant quotations and ancient notices, it seems that Lucilius, in Book 1 of his *Satires*, parodied the councils of the gods, in particular that found in Book 1 of Ennius’ *Annales*. There, the rewriting of the epic is in a different and lower genre of satire. While details are sketchy, the charge at hand is the decadence of a certain Lupus. Various comic turns of phrase are used, including a play on the name of the defendant: Lupus means wolf but can also mean bass, a feral type of fish, a witty and comic play on his name. While in the Ennian original, Romulus, the defendant, rises to heaven to dine with the gods, here, Lupus is drowned in fish sauce. In this sense, then, much of Vergilian pseudepigrapha follow the examples of authors like Lucilius. Higher genres, most especially epic, are reworked into works like mock-epics (*Culex*) and epigrams (*Catalepton*).

---

468 Rose (1993) 15, 52.
469 There may have been a standard definition of this term in antiquity that has not been preserved for us. Even though a definition can be reconstructed, it is hard to say if modern scholars overlooked any of the nuances of this term.
470 See Connors (2005) for further discussion of this scene.
Most authors of ancient parody do in fact focus on one text or author upon which the re-functioning is based. This is different from parody in the Vergilian pseudepigrapha. Often, parody in the latter context will be found directed towards a target, sometimes Vergil. When not, the parody is still often mixed with Vergilian elements. However, there are instances from Roman literature in which multiple texts and authors can be parodied simultaneously. Petronius’ *Satyricon* is one such example, displaying a parody of many different types of literature, like epic and the Greek novel simultaneously.\(^{471}\) In that respect, we can view works like *Catalepton* 10, which takes Catullus 4 as its most apparent target but also adds elements from biography of Vergil as well, as a parody that mixes elements from different sources.

Works that derive from the tenets of ludism often display characteristics similar to parody. However, that is not to say, that ludic works must also be parodic, and vice versa. Ludic works may not be humorous just because they are a game – for instance, acrostics are certainly ludic, but not humorous. Additionally, parodies may simply be humorous without being short, or witty, as ludic works usually are. But nevertheless, there are areas in which ludism and parody overlap in their methods and/or intensions, for example in the mixing of different genres and the switching high topics for low, both of which can lead to a comic result for the reader.

\(^{471}\) Slater (1990) 18.
**Terminology**

One way in which an author can convey the fact that he is working within the boundaries of ludism is through his lexical choices. There are specific terms that, when employed, will instantly signal to the reader that he is to expect a certain type of work. With ludism, one will find a form of the verb (*ludere*) or noun (*ludus* or *lusus*). These terms are ever-present in the pseudepigraphic works of Vergil named in the *VSD* to such an extent that even the ancients noticed a specific playful tone within them.

Pliny the Younger, in Epistle 5.3 written to Titius Aristo, mentions Vergil in connection with ludism. Pliny here acknowledges that not all of Vergil’s works bear a serious tone (*severos parum*), and that Vergil in fact participates quite often in works with a playful nature (*rideo iocor ludo*). Pliny continues enumerating all of the famous figures who have done similarly, including orators such as Cicero and Messalla, politicians such as Brutus and Sulla, historians such as Nepos and Varro, and again, even Vergil himself. Radford, when discussing the *Priapeia* poems attributed to Vergil, argued that Pliny must be referring to this small group of poems as they follow the qualities found in ludic poetry. Finding it shortsighted to say that it is only *this* collection that is ludic in nature, I would like to expand upon Radford’s assessment. As will be clear from the discussion below, we should consider all the pseudepigraphic poems found in the *VSD* to be ludic. There is no

---

474 Radford (1921) 173-174.
reason to think that Pliny was narrowly defining Vergil’s literary output with his
comment, but rather we should take it more generally.\textsuperscript{475} I should also note that this
mention is important because it suggests that Pliny perhaps knew of Vergilian
works outside the canonical three. Unfortunately for us, he does not name any so we
cannot be sure if he was familiar with the works mentioned by the ancient
biographers.

Most of the pseudepigraphic poems attributed to Vergil in the \textit{VSD} make
obvious their connection to ludism through the use of the terms noted above. Yet,
not every poet of these works does so in a uniform way. Some poems are written in
a persona of a youthful Vergil; while others are stylized as small poems, or works in
minor genres written in leisure; while still others involve wordplay. Ludic works
often overlap in their categorization as well. The term ludism, then, is a widely
encompassing one, defining many different types of works sometimes in multiple
ways.\textsuperscript{476} While all works may not be defined as ludic in the exact same way, they
should nevertheless be defined as such.

The protagonist in the \textit{Dirae} exemplifies ludism when discussing how he
sings of the woods in his playful song (\textit{lusibus et multum nostris cantata libellis}).\textsuperscript{477}
In the \textit{Lydia}, the use of the verb \textit{ludere} at first glance seems to refer less to poetic
activity than to actual playing in the fields. The author writes:

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{475} Unfortunately, Pliny does not make specific reference to any work of Vergil, nor the work of any
other of the figures listed, as he is making a general statement about ludic activity. There is no way to
know if Pliny was referring to any of the texts except those that are firmly attributed to Vergil, or
other works that existed at the time. Nevertheless, it is evident that there were works of Vergil that
should be considered ludic. Scholars, for example Fraenkel (1952) with the \textit{Culex}, have ascribed
ludism to other juvenilia of Vergil.

\textsuperscript{476} McGill (2005) 5. See McGill (2010: 5-10) for a discussion of the various elements of ludism in
Vergilian centos.

\textsuperscript{477} \textit{Dir}. 26.
Invideo vobis, agrī formosaque prata,
Hoc formosa magis, mea quod formosa puella
***
et vobis tacite nostrum suspirat amorem;
vos nunc illa videt, vobis mea Lydia ludit,
vos nunc alloquītur, vos nunc arridet ocellis,
et mea submissa meditatur carmina voce,
cantat et interea, mihi quae cantabant in aurem.478

I envy you, O fields and beautiful meadows,
More beautiful than this, which my beautiful girl
***
and she sighs silently for our love for you;
now that one sees you, my Lydia plays for you,
now she addresses you, now she smiles at you with her eyes,
and she hums my songs with a lowered voice.
And meanwhile she sings (those) which used to sing in my ear.

However, right after the use of this verb, we find the girl humming the singer's songs.479 I propose that the combination of fields, singing compositions, and the verb ludere is significant. The name “Lydia” can stand in for both his beloved and the poem about his beloved – a fact that lends a metapoetic level to the use of the verb ludere.480 Here, the use of the term seems to suggest a leisurely poetic activity.

In the Culex, we find the most blatant declarations of ludism. The opening lines declare:

$Lusimus, Octavi, gravili modulante Thalia$
$Atque ut araneoli tenuem formavimus orsum;
$Lusimus: haec propter culcis sint carmina docta,$
$Omnis et historiae per ludum consonet ordo$
$Notitiaque ducum voces, licet invidus adsit.$
$Quisquis erit culpae iocos musamque paratus,$
$Pondere vel culcis leviore famaque feretur.$
$Posterius graviore sono tibi musa loquetur$
$Nostra, dabunt cum securos mihi tempora fructus,$

478 Lyd. 1-7.
479 Lyd. 6.
480 Lyd. 4.
We played, Octavius, while the slender muse plays,
And like little spiders we created a fine undertaking;
We played: For the sake of these things, let this song for a gnat be learned.
And let the whole plot of the story through the game
and the voices of heroes agree with its reputation, although a critic may be present.
Whoever will be prepared to blame the jokes and the muse.
He will be called lighter than the weight or the fame of the gnat.
After our muse will speak to you with a heavier sound
When times will give sure fruits,
So that, for you, the songs are polished worthy of your taste.

Within the first three lines, we find the verbal form twice and the noun form once. In fact, the first word of this composition is *lusimus*, clearly acknowledging that this work will be a playful one. This, however, is seemingly not enough, as the author continues to note the work’s status, once with the participial form (*ludente*) and once with the infinitive (*ludere*).\(^{482}\) We as readers are not to expect a work about gods and battles, the author proclaims, but should instead imagine something lighter. It is later in life when the author will produce a heavier work.\(^{483}\) Here, the use of ludism is through the persona of a youthful Vergil – an author just beginning his great, future poetic career. Later, when he is an adult, he will produce longer and more serious works of literature.

The author of the *Ciris* dedicates his poem to Messalla, promising to deliver him a great gift in song, a song worthy of his deeds. In this invocation, the author writes:

... *(quamvis interdum ludere nobis)*

---

\(^{481}\) *Cul*. 1-10.  
\(^{482}\) *Cul*. 1, 3-4, 19, 36.  
\(^{483}\) *Cul*. 8.
et gracilem molli liceat pede claudere versum)…

... (although once it may be permitted for us to play and to close a slender verse with a soft foot)....

The writer acknowledges that he himself once played with Messalla, an activity that has seemingly influenced the current writing he has undertaken. Even though the Ciris purports to be something greater, the author conceded that he and the subject of the praise have been known to participate in ludic activities. The line continues to describe this type of playful work, as if the verb were not enough. We hear that they wrote a slender verse in an elegant meter. While the two adjectives are not necessarily part of the vocabulary of ludism, they are heavily employed in either Hellenistic poetry with their Greek equivalents or in their reception in Latin literature among the Neoteric poets. While the Ciris does not claim to be derived from ludic activities, the reader learns that both the author and addressee are capable of participating in such. The Ciris does not, then, display its ludic tendencies in the same way as the Culex does. It is less overtly playful in nature, leaning more towards the serious. But nevertheless it is a stylized as a small – yet highly refined piece – one that was produced potentially in leisure.

It is in the two poetic collections mentioned in the VSD, namely the Catalepton and Priapeia, that we find poems most exemplifying ludism, even though neither contains this term. Yet the Catalepton declares its entry into this world with
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484 Cir. 19-20.
485 Cir. 19-20.
486 Cir. 20.
487 See Lyne (1978b) and Johnson (2007) for further discussion of these poets and terminology. I will discuss the influence of Hellenistic poetry on these works in Chapter 4. Catullus 1 supplies us with examples of such vocabulary: his work is lepidum (1) but also expolitum (2), and while he writes nugas (4), his friend Cornelius believes that it is still aliquid (4).
its very title. There is no mistaking its debt to Callimachus’ Aetia prologue, which declares that works should be κατὰ λεπτὸν.\footnote{Call. Aet. fr. 1.11.} We are not to expect anything “heavy” in this collection but rather slender, small, ludic works in a minor genre, following Callimachus’ poetic assertion.\footnote{Perhaps it is also indebted to Aratus’ lost epigrammatic work of the same name.}

The four Priapeia overtly connected to Vergil in the manuscript tradition do not contain any terms of this sort either, despite the fact that their tone and content both reflect the precepts of ludism.\footnote{See Chapter 2 (section: “Portrait of an Artist”) for a discussion of the manuscript tradition of these poems.} The first three poems feature the god Priapus as speaker. But, it is not actually the divine god that is personified but instead, a wooden (ligneus) statue of the god.\footnote{Priapeia 1.3.} In each poem, he reminds us of his physical nature and his lowly status thereby (arte fabricata rustica) and how he is at the will of humans around him (quare hinc, o pueri, malas / abstine rapinas).\footnote{Priapeia 2.1. Priapeia 3.18-19.} Priapus, by nature, is not a serious god but the fact that Priapus the wooden statue is the speaker here further enhances the ludic qualities of the poems. While statues of gods may be majestic, Priapus’ is not, a fact that creates another ludic contrast. It is hard to take the statue and his warnings seriously because of the manner in which he is described as noted above. The fourth poem does stand in contrast to the first three. The god is no longer the speaker but the addressee. The ludic qualities of this poem are found in the much more overt nature of the poem with its lascivious lines (at, o sceleste penis... nec tibi tener puer / patebit ullus, in tremente ... toro).\footnote{Priapeia 4.19-22.} Ludism
is not always displayed in the same way in these four poems, as with the rest of
Vergilian pseudopigrapha, but nevertheless it is still a key component.

However, these are only four of the poems found in the complete *Priapeia*
corpus.⁴⁹⁴ Within the complete one, one can find many acknowledgements of the
poems' participation in ludism through the use of the verb or noun form. For
example, the prefatory epistle to the *Priapeia* collection states in the middle of the
first line that this collection will be ludic:

```
Carminis incompti *lusus* lecture procaces,
conveniens Latio pone supercilium.
non soror hoc habitat Phoebi, non Vesta sacello,
 nec quae de patrio vertice nata dea est,
   sed ruber hortorum custos, membrosior aequo,
   qui tectum nullis vestibus inguen habet.
   aut igitur tunicam parti praetende tegendae,
   aut quibus hanc oculis aspicis, ista lege.⁴⁹⁵
```

Oh you, about to read the frivolous games of an unpolished song,
Put down your brow fitting for Latium.
The sister of Phoebus does not live in this shrine, nor Vesta,
Nor the goddess who was born from her father's head,
But the red guardian of the gardens, larger membered than usual,
Who has his groin covered with no garments.
Either, therefore, spread the tunic over the part which must be covered,
Or with which eyes you see this, read these.

**Additionaly, Priapeia** 1 begins with the participle *ludens*.⁴⁹⁶ The author of this poem
states that he is writing poems for the god, under the cover of ludism. This poem
proceeds thus:

```
*Ludens* haec ego teste te, Priape,
horto carmina digna, non libello,
scrispi non nimium laboriose.
```

⁴⁹⁴ In fact, there is no way to know how many of these poems Donatus refers to when he says Vergil wrote *Priapeia* poems, as there are no quotations. Perhaps there were more (or even different) poems of this sort that circulated under Vergil's name in antiquity.
⁴⁹⁵ *Priapeia* Pr.
⁴⁹⁶ *Priapeia* 1.1.
nec Musas tamen, ut solent poetae,
ad non virgineum locum vocavi.
nam sensus mihi corque defuisse
castas, Pierium chorum, sorores
auso ducere mentulam ad Priapi.
ergo quicquid id est, quod otiosus
templi parietibus tui notavi,
in partem accipias bonam, rogamus.497

I, playfully writing these songs, with you as witness, Priapus,
(songs) worthy of a garden, not a little book,
I wrote no less laboriously.
Nor did I not call the Muses, as poets are accustomed,
To the non-virginal sport.
For my senses and heart would have not failed
To lead the chaste sisters, chorus of Pierides,
To the penis of Priapus with daring.
Therefore whatever it is, which in leisure
I noted on the walls of your temple,
We ask that you accept it in good part.

As in the case of the Culex, the fact that the programmatic first poem begins in such a
way is a signal to the reader that he is not meant to think that what follows is
supposed to be serious, but in fact light. It seems sensible then to ascribe this
context for writing to all poems that can be called priapic, including those attributed
to Vergil.

The pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil named in the VSD clearly indicate that
they are part of a tradition of literary play – often from the very first word, or at
least the opening lines. Through their use of the forms of ludere, they acknowledge
their debt to and participation in ludic literature, in various different ways. Again,
these poems all adhere to ludism, even if in various ways. We, as readers, therefore
are alerted to watch for further elements of this genre.

497 Priapeia 1.
“Playfulness”

As mentioned above, the declaration of ludism informs the reader to look for a certain amount of levity in the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil found in the VSD. Now, I will turn formally to those ideas inherent in ludism: how the ideas of ludism are also reused, beyond simple use of ludic terminology. A central tenet of ludic poems is the reversal of high and low topics, themes, vocabulary, protagonists, and settings -- a reversal that appears often in the pseudepigraphic works of Vergil. Because of this, I suggest, the tone of these poems is often changed for parodic effect.

For example, it is rare in ludic poetry to find addresses to Muses, and patrons are not necessary. Instead, we find addresses to inanimate objects. The Lydia, while seemingly about the love of the speaker, is instead addressed to the fields (agri) in which his beloved is wont to play. The author personifies these places, claiming that he envies them because of what they are able to share with his love. Catalepton 8 is also addressed to an object, in this case a little villa (villula). Again, the author personifies this house, imploring it to be good to its new owner, after the death of Siro. A similar address is found in Martial. In poem 7.17, the poet addresses a library in the countryside, asking it to take care of his works:

\[Ruris\ bibliotheca\ delicati,\]
\[uicinam\ uidet\ unde\ lector\ urbem,\]
\[inter\ carmina\ sanctiora\ si\ quis\]
\[lasciuæ\ fuerit\ locus\ Thaliae,\]
\[hos\ nido\ licet\ inseras\ uel\ imo,\]
\[septem\ quos\ tibi\ misimus\ libellos\]

\[\]
Martial characterizes his work not as long and serious but instead short and playful.

He makes it clear that his poems, including this one, are ludic but should still be stored even if on the bottom self of the bookshelf by the again personified library.  

Priapic poems and the sexual themes contained therein seem like a natural fit for ludic literature. Inherent in these poems is a juxtaposition between the nature of the god, Priapus, and the more demure society in Rome in which the priapic works would have been read. As Uden has argued, Priapus has a “hyper-sexuality” ...
“which, in its single-minded and over-exaggerated emphasis on penetration and submission, seemed farcically boorish and unsophisticated.”

It is in this contrast that we can find a switch in tone from what is found in Vergil’s authentic works to
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500 Martial often addresses inanimate objects both elements from nature (e.g. 10.7 to a river), or items of clothing (7.2 to a breastplate). Catullus addresses poem 36 to the cacata charta of Volusius (1), clearly not considering his works high literature. Perhaps we can include the “Coma Berenices” of Callimachus (Aet. fr.110) and Catullus (66). In this poem, the lock of hair is not directly addressed but it is the protagonist and speaker of this playful poem, although with more serious politics as a backdrop.

that in the *Priapeia*. The former set deal with more serious topics, such as farming and war, but it is in the juvenilia in general, but the *Priapeia* poems in particular, that a different tone of literature can be explored.\footnote{502} While sexuality is almost entirely repressed in the authentic works, it is explored from all angles in the *Priapeia* poems, even if this might offend certain sensibilities.\footnote{503} The *Priapeia* especially display this type of openness and vulgarity, which is not found in the hexameter pseudepigraphic poems like the *Culex* or *Ciris*. While these two epyllia are ludic in nature, they are not overtly sexual. The theme of love is not found in the former at all, and is of a chaste nature in the latter.

The tone of many of these poems shows a sense of playfulness, or even parody. As previously mentioned, both *Catalepton* 10 and 11 are parodies of previous works, namely Catullus 4 and an epigram of Callimachus, respectively. The *Culex* should also be considered parodic, adhering closely to the ancient definition of parody derived from ancient sources, although perhaps not a strict parody of one particular work.\footnote{504} The poem itself declares that we are not supposed to consider it high literature with both its first word (*lusimus*) and also through its acknowledgement in its *recusatio* that we will not read about the exploits of gods and myth.\footnote{505} The *Culex*’s form begins the parodic change: we are dealing not with a large-scale epic but instead with a small one, an epyllion. Our protagonist is not a

\footnotes

\footnote{502} However, the *Eclogues* at times do veer towards the ludic, even if there are more serious poems, like *Eclogue* 4. The fact that the *Eclogues* were the first authentic work written by Vergil perhaps explains that tendency and also their connection to some pseudepigrapha, for example the *Dirae* and *Lydia*.

\footnote{503} Sex does appear at times in the authentic works of Vergil, for example *Georg.* 3.209-283, in which Vergil discusses the necessity of keeping male and female bulls apart due to their sexual (almost human like) attraction.

\footnote{504} See Ross (1975) and Marinić (2011) for further discussion.

\footnote{505} *Cul.* 7-10; 24-41. This point will be further discussed later in this chapter.
hero like Aeneas but is instead a little gnat. Even though the work is set up as such, nevertheless the gnat is treated as if he were actually a hero: he saves the lowly shepherd from death, sacrificing his own life in the process. An epic tone is used here for a non-epic subject. Early in the work we find an invocation of the gods, Apollo, the Muses and Pales, to watch over the work—Apollo is called “the originator and author of our song” (nostri princeps et carminis auctor). Epics, for example Vergil’s Aeneid, often invoke either Apollo or a Muse as inspiration for their work. The description of the snake is over-exaggerated, attempting to make this snake the most frightening monster a great hero has ever faced. Each body part is described in menacing detail from its threatening tongue (vibranti...lingua) to its fiery eye with a piercing gaze (aspectuque...flammarum lumina torvo). The gnat still receives rewards after death, obtaining a burial, gravestone and epitaph in honor of his sacrifice (vitae pro munere) from the shepherd, something usually reserved for a great epic hero.

I would like to argue that Catalepton 12 is a parody as well, although not necessarily of a specific author or work, but of a genre, namely epithalamia. As Hersch has argued, “it seems that for an epithalamium to be effective, it must extol the elements of a wedding that would be desired by, or at least known to the

---

506 I generally agree with Ross (1975: 245) who argues that the Culex is a parody of a style, that is epic, rather than a parody of a specific poet, work, or line. I do think that the poem’s association with Vergil aims the parody towards him, however. While the author of this poem does utilize the conventions of epic in general, I think there is always a focus on Vergil, more than any other poet.

507 Cul. 11-23.

508 Verg. Aen. 1.8.

509 Cul. 163-182.

510 Cul. 385-414.

511 However, Catullus 61 and 62 must have been the most well-known examples from that time period. As with many other Vergilian pseudepigraphic poems, Catullus is a key model, a fact that is fitting considering the age at which “Vergil” would have written the piece.
average Roman audience.”

But in this poem, the elements of the wedding and its participants that are extolled do not seem to be positive ones. For example, epithalamia usually contain praise for either the bride and/or the groom. Here, the identity of the bride is denied to the reader until the second to last line when her true identity is revealed: “she” is a wine jug. Instead, we hear much more about the groom: he is described as *superbus* twice, as well as *putidum caput*, neither being positive attributes. Images of the natural world are often present, with the wedding pair compared to various elements. Here, it is in the groom’s name, Noctuinus, that we find his implicit natural comparison: a little owl. Omens, especially of the avian sort, are important to wedding ceremonies. However, as evidenced by the wedding of Tereus and Procne, the appearance of an owl in the wedding chamber foreboded the downfall of their marriage. The advantages of marriage are often praised, with men being urged to give up other lovers in order to have a successful marriage with his soon-to-be wife. Instead, we find no such recommendation here but exactly the opposite: Noctuinus’ love for his wine jug is not denigrated and denounced, but celebrated, as if he were marrying a woman.

There are some traditional elements of epithalamia however, elements that serve to enhance the vividness of the parodic wedding. There is an invocation of a marriage god, Thalassius, in the last line in the form of a traditional marriage

---

513 See Wheeler (1933) for a discussion of the most common elements to be found in epithalamia. He notes that not all elements are found in every epithalamium, as here not every element is accounted for. For example, the time of year at which this wedding takes place is omitted.
514 Cat. 12.1.4.
517 Cat. 12.7-9.
chant. The call of *adeste* towards the end of the poem seems to signal wedding guests to gather around for the viewing of the marriage procession, alluded to at the end of the line. While there is no explicit reference to rejoicing through song and dance, we do learn that a crowd has gathered.

There is one final element often found in epithalamia that is missing here, but I believe it to be intentional in order to further bring out the humor in this wedding chant. Lacking is hope for future children. The children will never and can never be forthcoming since the marriage is not between a man and woman, but a man and object. There can be no dream of offspring. Of course the author could not add that traditional facet into the text or the sly wit of the poem would be compromised, and the poem would become too outrageous or ludicrous. This epithalamium reproduces the atmosphere for a traditional wedding but its elements undermine the setting created. Instead, we find a parody of the wedding, concluding with a marriage, which can in no way be considered successful.

The literary fakes attributed to Vergil in the *VSD* are not of the type of high literature that the authentic works exemplify. Serious topics like the displacement of people caused by land confiscation are often eschewed for more farcical and parodic topics. The addressees have been changed to anthropomorphized objects. The celebrations are for gnats, sacrificing their lives, instead of the great heroes of the epic cycle. The spirit in which these pseudepigraphic poems were written stands in contrast to that of the authentic works. It is during his youth that “Vergil” would have been able to explore a lighter side of poetry.

---

518 *Cat.* 12.9.
519 *Cat.* 12.7.
However, I would be mistaken in characterizing ludism found in these poems only in such a simplistic way. Authors may declare their adherence to this type of poetry through their forms and lexical choices, but they also display complex interactions and re-workings of authentic Vergilian texts. For example, in Chapter 2, I discussed the so-called parade of heroes found at the end of the Culex. While Odysseus’ *katabasis* into the underworld in Book 11 of the *Odyssey* may also be an influence, the passage’s intended target is Aeneas’ journey in Book 6 of the *Aeneid*. As I discussed there, the trip of the gnat prefigures that of Aeneas, intentionally omitting or stepping around or simplifying who and what would come “later” in the *Aeneid*. This section of the Culex displays a carefully constructed, sophisticated (and ludic, in an erudite way) interplay with the authentic work. It is also made more overtly ludic with the choice of protagonist as a gnat.

Learned ludism is also at play in the *Ciris*. There, authentic lines of Vergil are recast in the most simplistic way as straight quotations. We as readers are perhaps meant to find the “real” Vergil among the inauthentic. But the subtle correcting of the Vergil’s authentic work, vis-à-vis the story of Scylla, also invokes an erudite game. Vergil is never named, and cannot be named, as a predecessor who conveyed the wrong version of the myth of Scylla, but nevertheless the quotation of the authentic lines directly before this rebuke is meant as an indicator for readers. Therefore, ludism not only displays different aspects of its connotations in various works, it also displays various levels of levity as well.
Acrostics

There is an additional way in which these pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil have displayed their playfulness: acrostics. This technique does not necessarily demonstrate the switch in tone from serious to light, or parody that the other poetic passages discussed above display. Instead, the search for an acrostic is a play-on-words, in which certain letters from different lines of a work form a different word or sentiment. This type of playfulness focuses more on the reader than the text, as seen with the examples above. They mark the texts as ludic but do so in an elusive way. Finding one can add to the content and meaning of a text for the reader, but it takes skill to identify one. So acrostics should be seen as a highly erudite mental game.\(^{520}\) I argue that there are two acrostics in the poems named in the VSD.\(^{521}\)

\(^{520}\) This type of play also has Hellenistic predecessors. Wordplay is of course play, one that “toys with the boundaries of language,” notes Katz, and one that sees acrostics as the most straightforward example, even if at times difficult (2013: 3-4). See Katz (2013) for a brief history and bibliography on this topic and Luz (2010: 1-78). See O’Hara (2001) for further discussion on Hellenistic influence on Vergilian wordplay.

\(^{521}\) There may be a third acrostic or word play of that sort (i.e. an acronym) but it is hard to say for certain. The epitaph for the gnat at the end of the Culex may contain that third example (lines 413-414). The shepherd has given a burial to the gnat “for the gift of life” (Vitae Pro Munere). The ultimate sacrifice of the gnat, as emblazoned on his literary tomb, begins with the letters V, P, and M. These are also the initials of Vergil’s full name, Publius Vergilius Maro. Because the letters are not in the same order in both instances, it is hard to say this is an acrostic. A play on the first letter, or letters, of Vergil’s name appears quite often in his authentic works, most famously the MA-VE-PU to begin every other line at Georg. 1.429-433. As the example from the Georgics shows, his initials need not be in the correct order to be seen as a play on his name. Additionally, the idea of burial and being hidden away may be an indication that there is wordplay in this line (similar to what is found in Aen. 12.578-8). Furthermore, it would act as a seal for the end of the poem, similar to the spherigis at the end of the Georgics. While thematically there does not seem to be a strong connection to any of Vergil’s predecessors, perhaps the link is to Vergil’s authentic works. The seal here then acts as a payment of debt, returned not to the gnat, but instead to Vergil and his body of work. See Katz (2016) for a review of scholarship and identifications, as well as a new proposal for acrostics in authentic Vergilian works. He does mention that the use of the first letter of Vergil’s name does occur without significance at times (79). However, taking into account the other evidence, this play-on-words might be important.
The first potential acrostic can be found at the end of the Eclogues section of the Culex. Here the good life of the shepherd is celebrated. In the first line of this section the rhetorical question is posed: Who is more blessed that the shepherd (Quis magis [...] queat esse beatior [...]?)\(^{522}\) The answer of course is no one, as the shepherd is the most blessed, we learn, because he never faces greed or war, amongst other things. Instead, he lives a simple life in the fields with his flocks. The end of the section reads:

\[
\text{Frigidus}^{523} \text{ Hamadryadum, quorum non divite cultu} \\
\text{Aemulus Ascreao pastor sibi quisque poetae} \\
\text{Securam placido traducit pectore vitam.}^{524}
\]

The cool house of the Hamadryads, in whose non-costly worship
The shepherd each for himself rival of the Ascrean poet
leads a secure life with a calm heart.

The first letter of these three lines spells out the Latin word fas vertically. The second definition in the Oxford Latin Dictionary for this word is “ordained by divine will.”\(^{525}\) As mentioned, this section has described the life of the shepherd as similar to one lived in the golden age, an age in which there are no labors, hardships or wars, and an age smiled upon, and perhaps dictated, by the gods. The acrostic here then should be read as the closing device for this section, a way to finalize it in one word and to imbue it with the feeling that the life of a shepherd is the ideal one.

\(^{522}\) Cul. 79.
\(^{523}\) There is textual uncertainty with this reading. The OCT (1966) prints the first words as fontis surrounded by dangers based on Ω, the consensus of six manuscripts. Fairclough and Goold (2000) print frigidus following an emendation by Housman (1902: 340). Other lesser suggestions include fons as a vocative with an implied et by Sudhaus (1913: 457), which might pick up on the acrostic in Ecl. 1.5-8 (FONS) as a closure to this section, or fama in the same way by Schmidt (1955: 317), etymologically related to fas. Bailey (1995: 136) notes that none of these have won wide support. I believe that using the nominative form of frigidus makes the most sense thematically and linguistically of all the options presented to us. Whatever the reading is meant to be, fas the first letter of the line stands unquestioned.
\(^{524}\) Cul. 95-7. Emphasis my own.
\(^{525}\) OLD s.v. fas (2).
Perhaps this acrostic serves an additional purpose, to mark the transition to the *Georgics* section of the *Culex*. At the end of Book 1 of that authentic work, we have a section describing the state of Rome at the time following the death of Julius Caesar, before the city is saved by Octavian/Augustus. The situation is dire: there is war and crime; there is no law; the fields have been neglected out of necessity. In fact, Vergil writes that “as you see where right and wrong are inverted” (*quippe ubi fas versum atque nefas*). By invoking this passage of the *Georgics* through the acrostic, the author of the *Culex* makes the life of the shepherd even more exceptional. There really is no one more blessed, especially when one considers the alternative introduced in the *Georgics*. The acrostic draws a stark contrast to the described state of contemporary Rome. The reader then transitions into the *Georgics* section of the *Culex*, having already had an introduction to that work through the acrostic.

The second acrostic is found towards the end of the *Ciris*, while Scylla is lamenting her actions and their consequences. She states that it was love that did her in:

\[
\text{NON metus impendens potuit retinere deorum:} \\
\text{Omnia uicit amor: quid enim non uinceret ille?} \\
\text{NON mihi iam pingui sudabunt tempora myrrha,}^{528}
\]

A threatening fear of the gods was not able to restrain me; Love conquered all; for what would that one not conquer? My temples will no longer sweat with rich myrrh...

---

527 There also are references to the praise of the farmer at *Georg*. 2.458-540, as well as to Hesiod (*Ascreao...poeta*). See Bailey (1995: 126-127) for further discussion and identification of such allusions. It would make sense for references to the *Georgics* to seep into the transition from one authentic work to the next in order to help demarcate that change.
The acrostic reads “not” (non) vertically and frames an almost exact rendering of the authentic Vergilian phrase of Eclogue 10.69: *omnia vincit amor.* Only the tense differs between the two versions. I argue that the acrostic in these three lines is not a mere accident of writing, but again must instead be viewed as a conscious construction by the anonymous author for two reasons. First, the fact that this acrostic frames an authentic phrase of Vergil makes it significant. Second, this acrostic is further marked by the double use of the word “non” to begin lines 436 and 438, these lines framing the famous line of Vergil. That the same words are used three times, and in such significant ways at the beginning of lines and as an acrostic, suggest this passage is critical. As Feeney and Nelis have pointed out in their article on the “MARS” acrostic in *Aeneid* 7, the repetition of the acrostic word in the same set of lines should draw the reader’s attention to the fact that this technique is being used here.

The placement of the NON acrostic reveals a ludic activity in the form of a puzzle. Furthermore, the fact that it is a palindrome, albeit short, adds to the wordplay. It is up to the skilled reader to hunt down the elements that resemble authentic Vergilian poetry and their implications. While the *Ciris* may have circulated under the name of Vergil, it is at this point in the poem, only 100 lines

---

529 The choice of segment quoted from Vergil at line 437 in the *Ciris* is significant, and it is a line that was probably widely known in antiquity, even by the uneducated. The line *omnia vincit amor* from *Eclogue* 10 is itself an allusion to a line of Gallus and was alluded to on multiple occasions by authors such as Tibullus, Sulpicia, Ovid, Propertius, and Vergil in the *Aeneid*, as pointed out by Cairns (2006: 107). The line, then, can be seen as a well-known trope in the genre of elegy, and although the *Ciris* is written in dactylic hexameter its content is nevertheless reminiscent of that genre. It is easy to see that a line such as this could have been learned and memorized in school and been in the minds of those writing in imitation of Vergil.

530 Feeney and Nelis (2005) 644.
from the end, that the author perhaps tacitly acknowledges that he is not in fact Vergil. If the reader has entered into this game fully understanding its rules, he would have been on the lookout for a device such as this acrostic, which lets the reader in on a little secret: “Although I may be able to imitate and even use the words of Vergil, I am not (non) Vergil himself.” The fact that non perfectly surrounds one of the most famous phrases of the master poet makes abundantly clear that the author of the Ciris should not be confused with Vergil.\textsuperscript{531}

Second, I propose, this acrostic can be seen as an example of references to the authentic Vergilian compositions, as there are allusions to all three works in this three-line section. The Ciris begins with a message to the audience that this is not the traditional story of Scylla metamorphosing into a monster; rather, in this divergent version, she will become a bird. Gorman rightly points out that the conflation of these two transformation myths can be found in Eclogue 6.74-77. But the author of the Ciris, without explicitly mentioning Vergil or any of his authentic works, makes sure to correct this mistaken merging. Gorman makes the observation that the anonymous author of this poem takes Vergil to task for conflating the two stories and therefore sets out to correct such an oversight.\textsuperscript{532} Here the author writes:

\begin{verbatim}
Sed neque Maeoniae patiuntur credere chartae
Nec malus istorum dubiis erroribus auctor.
Namque alias alii vulgo finxere puellas,
Quae Colophoniaco Scyllae dicantur Homero.\textsuperscript{533}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{531} This acrostic is not mentioned in either of the ancient biographies, a fact that lends credence to the idea that the biographers only knew the titles of the Vergilian juvenilia and not the substance of the works.
\textsuperscript{532} Gorman (1995) 37.
\textsuperscript{533} Cir. 62-65.
But neither do Homer’s pages allow us to believe in dubious errors nor a bad author. For also various writers have made up various girls, Who would be called “Scyllas” by Colophonian Homer.

While Homer is named, Vergil is implied in the group of unnamed other writers. In fact, the anonymous author of the Ciris almost quotes those lines of Eclogue 6 right before this chastisement. Vergil wrote in this poem about Scylla:

Quid loquar aut Scyllam Nisi, quam fama secuta est
Candida succinctam latrantibus inguina monstris
Dulichias vexasse rates, et gurgite in alto,
A, timidos nautas canibus lacerasse marinis...?  

What should I say either about Scylla, daughter of Nisus, whom Rumor said that she, surrounded around her white loins by barking monsters, Vexed the Dulichian ships, and in the deep whirlpool, Alas, tore apart the fearful sailors with her marine dogs...?

The author of the Ciris writes, almost quoting the authentic lines of Vergil:

illam esse, aerumnis quam saepe legamus Ulixi,
Candida succinctam latrantibus inguina monstris
Dulichias vexasse rates, et gurgite in alto,
Deprensos nautas canibus lacerasse marinis,  

(They say) that she is, about whom we may read in the labors of Ulysses, girt around her white loins by barking monsters, Vexed the Dulichian ships, and in the deep whirlpool, tore apart the caught sailors with her marine dogs.

Only line 58 of the Ciris is significantly different from the same passage in Eclogue 6, however in both we get an introduction to a report about Scylla. If a reader were not reading these lines with care and with Vergil in the back of his mind, he could have

---

534 Of course, Vergil could not have been named, if the author is intentionally imitating and impersonating Vergil.
535 Verg. Ecl. 6.74-77.
536 Cir. 58-61.
easily passed over the references. But in a complex literary game, one must always be mindful of the authentic works of Vergil. The reuse of a quotation of Vergil is a clue to the meaning of the acrostic and, once it is found, then the message must be deciphered.

The connection between the acrostic and authentic Vergil goes further than a mere quotation. The placement of the authentic line of Vergil in the middle of the acrostic (line 437) is not mere happenstance because the context it uses is strikingly similar to that of the original line in Eclogue 10. In both works, the line is spoken by a lover who has been wronged by a beloved. In Eclogue 10.69, it is presumed that Gallus’ lover Lycoris has been unfaithful, and that is why Gallus wanders in the groves of Arcadia. In the Ciris, Scylla has been similarly betrayed by the unfaithful Minos, who broke his oaths to her. In fact, about 10 lines earlier (line 427), Scylla again calls to mind Eclogue 10.69 when at that point she says “now already an evil deed conquered all” (*iam iam scelus omnia vicit*). With similar contexts for both quotations, it should be clear that the inclusion of the Vergilian *omnia vi(n)cit amor* is intentional as is the embracing acrostic that signals its importance.

Let us turn back to Eclogue 6, where, as I previously described, in lines 74-77, Scylla is mentioned in her alternate mythological form as a terrifying monster. Note that both Eclogue 6 and Eclogue 10, the source for the quote of Vergil used in the NON acrostic, feature the figure of Gallus, who was highly influential on Vergil’s poetry and the possible source for line 69 of Eclogue 10.\(^{537}\)

The fact that both of these Eclogues and the Ciris either directly or indirectly mention Gallus draws all

\(^{537}\) See Conte (1986a: 14 n. 27) for citation and relevant bibliography.
three poems together and suggests to the reader that they should be read as a collection. In light of this fact, then, the mention of Scylla in *Eclogue 6* and again in the *Ciris* should draw the reader’s attention to a potential symmetry in their stories at exactly these lines.

Directly following the mention of Scylla in monster form in line 75 of *Eclogue 6*, we hear of the story of Philomela. There are many parallels between the stories: like Scylla, Philomela was turned into a bird after a disastrous interaction with her brother-in-law, who, like Scylla’s Minos, broke implicit promises to his wife and society through his actions towards Philomela. In the *Ciris*, the author picks up on these parallels and further develops the connections between the two females Vergil had included in *Eclogue 6*. At the beginning of her speech in the *Ciris*, Scylla addresses the still human Procne, Philomela’s sister. The parallel between the figures of Scylla and Procne is stronger than that between Scylla and Philomela because the former duo are both women betrayed by their male lovers. While Philomela was wronged by her brother-in-law Tereus, it was Procne—sister of Philomela and wife of Tereus—who was ultimately betrayed by him, just as Scylla was by Minos. This connection may be more important than the shared fate of metamorphosis into a bird. The wrong committed towards each female figure is central to both stories and it is those female figures that should be contrasted. I suggest the change of sister from Philomela to Procne becomes a second “correction,” one that pairs the two women who have suffered similar

---

538 *Cir. 4* 10.
circumstances and fates. The acrostic about twenty lines later in her speech further draws attention to the Vergilian original.

While this section of the *Ciris* and the acrostic in particular draw heavily on the *Eclogues* for inspiration, the other two authentic works of Vergil also appear. Lyne has argued in his commentary on the text that the change in tense of *vincere* from present in the *Eclogues* to perfect in the *Ciris* is solely to fit the story.\textsuperscript{539} While this change may be purely practical, I believe the change in tense might also be a reflection of the second authentic work of Vergil. The idea of an abstract noun (like *amor*) "conquering all" appears in Book 1 of the *Georgics*, where it is said that "labor conquered all" (*labor omnia vicit*).\textsuperscript{540} Perhaps the line in the *Ciris*, then, is an attempt to combine the two statements of abstract nouns "conquering all" from the authentic works—the first noun *amor* changes to match the *Eclogues* (and the context of the story) and the verb tense changes to match that in the *Georgics*. So possibly the change in tense is more significant than once thought.

In addition, I suggest this acrostic refers to the last of Vergil's authentic works, the *Aeneid*. The same acrostic appears in Book 12 of the great Roman epic. There, Juturna is addressing the Rutulians, attempting to prepare them for battle:

```
"NON pudet, o Rutuli, pro cunctis talibus unam
Obiectare animam? Numerone an viribus aequi
NON sumus? En, omnes et Troes et Arcades hi sunt, ...
"
```

"Is it not shameful, o Rutulians, to expose one soul for all such men? Are we not equal in number or force? Lo! All these men are both Trojans and Arcadians...."

\textsuperscript{539} Lyne (1978a) 280.
\textsuperscript{540} Verg. *Georg.* 1.145.
\textsuperscript{541} Verg. *Aen.* 12.229-231.
Directly preceding this speech, there is an acknowledgement that Turnus knows and understands his fate not to survive, and, in some sense, has been betrayed as well. Scylla's speech containing the NON acrostic in the Ciris also involves fate. Scylla has become resigned to the consequences of her actions and, like Turnus, knows that there is nothing that she can do. Again, the contexts in the authentic and inauthentic works of Vergil are similar and therefore mark them as significant. It should be clear, then, that the NON acrostic in the Ciris brings together all three authentic works of Vergil in a complex play, one that must be deciphered by readers.

Literary wordplay, such as acrostics, creates a game for the educated reader. The authors of these texts embedded at least two attempts at wordplay into the pseudepigraphic texts in furtherance of ludism. Again, these passages are ludic in nature, but as game-pieces. Play in literature does not mean that the high must be abandoned for the low; it can appear in more erudite and hidden ways as seen here. The examples from the Culex and Ciris show that the authors not only embedded acrostics for their reader to find, but also engaged with authentic Vergilian texts in a complex and enriching way.

**Conclusion**

As should be clear from the discussion above, the pseudepigrapha attributed to Vergil by Donatus are connected through their use of ludism. This type of literary play is announced by all of these works, either implicitly or, more often, explicitly. Forms of *ludere*, and its noun form *ludus*, appear in most of these works. It is more
than just the lexical choices of the author(s); their tone equally shows their allegiance to ludism. The mixing of high and low for parodic ends -- for example when a gnat becomes an epic hero -- adds to the ludic tone. Moreover, the presence of acrostics and the game to find their connections to the authentic works of Vergil introduces a further element of play. The use of ludism, though, in these poems is not shown in identical ways. Some poems, like *Catalepton 8*, simply channel the spirit of a youthful Vergil. Some, like the *Culex*, mix various elements: a youthful Vergil, wordplay, and a light, non-serious poem. But all display at least one portion of the definition of ludism.\(^{542}\) This idea of playfulness is not only ludic, however. As I will discuss in the next chapter, these poems also owe a great debt to the Hellenistic tradition. It is there that we will see further evidence of the levity of these works.

\(^{542}\) As noted above, the term ludism has many different facets to it, often displayed in various arrangements within the same poem. Simply because these works do not always display the same ludic elements does not suggest that they are not a collection of some sort. Instead, I believe, this fact give further support to the idea that these poems were written by different authors and at different time periods.
Chapter 4: The Use of Hellenistic Models in the Pseudo-Vergilian Poems in the VSD

As previously discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, there are many ways in which the poems attributed to Vergil in Donatus’ *Vita Suetonii vulga Donatiana* (*VSD*) can be tied together. One of the strongest connections between these works is their overall ludic, or playful, quality. Building upon the discussion of that characteristic, in this chapter I will discuss another way in which these poems are interconnected: their interaction with works composed during the Hellenistic Age, as well as those by Neoteric poets who imported their Greek predecessors’ works to Rome.

**Background**

Authors during the Hellenistic Age, at the Library at Alexandria during the Ptolemaic period, were able to read and gain knowledge of their predecessors in the literary community; with this knowledge they were able to create a large output of new works which would influence not only the Greek world of that time but also Roman writers to come.\(^{543}\) It is, of course, inaccurate to say that all writers of the Hellenistic era wrote with exactly the same approach, in the same genres, meters, lexical choices, etc., as if they all consciously decided to follow similar innovative aesthetic choices in the composition of their works. However, a frequently adopted ethos does seem to emerge at this time, even if not all authors always follow every

---

\(^{543}\) See Hutchinson (1990) and Strootman (2010) for discussion of the Library at Alexandria.
Callimachus is identified as the originator or perhaps disseminator of such ideas, at least for the Romans. “Callimachean aesthetics,” then, can be defined as short poetry, but one that is precise, original and nevertheless light. Other important elements include a recusatio (a poetic refusal to write poetry), a mix in tone, renewed interest in previous forms, innovation in techniques, erudition, and allusion. Again, while not all works display every characteristic of this poetic ethos, authors of the time tend to engage with this new aesthetic of short but learned, sophisticated and innovative works.

“Callimachean” poetic aesthetics were transferred from 4th century BCE (and onwards) Egypt to 1st century BCE Rome. As the story goes, Hellenistic (or more
precisely Callimachean) poetry first made its way to Rome at the end of the Republic in the hands of Parthenius of Nicaea.\textsuperscript{552} While Roman poets may have heard of or read Callimachus prior to 73 BCE, it is at this point that Callimachus begins to inspire a new generation of poets, directly because of Parthenius. Parthenius in particular teaches and befriends the group of poets referred to as the “Neoterics” or “new poets,” a group that includes figures like Catullus and Cinna, as well as a later group that would have included Vergil and his contemporaries.\textsuperscript{553}

Because of this sudden impetus towards the Callimachean aesthetics, Clausen suggests that Parthenius’ arrival in Rome acts as the key turning point in Roman poetic discourse, in fact arguing that Latin poetry would not have been the same without exposure to Callimachus’ works.\textsuperscript{554} Around this time, Vergil was born and educated, perhaps even taught by Parthenius himself.\textsuperscript{555} It is no wonder then that we see a well-acknowledged debt to Greek Hellenistic and Roman Neoteric poetry in Vergil’s authentic works and by extension his inauthentic works as well.\textsuperscript{556} Vergil came of age during the time of this poetic movement and was thereby heavily influenced.\textsuperscript{557} The writers of the later, pseudepigraphic works employ the aesthetic elements of these traditions as well, as will be discussed below.

Roman authors like Vergil engaged with the Hellenistic tradition through the lens of the Neoteric poets, writing in the last years of the Republican era. A young

\textsuperscript{552} See Lightfoot (1999: 50-96) for further discussion of Parthenius’ influence in Rome.
\textsuperscript{553} Clausen (1964) 187-188.
\textsuperscript{554} Clausen (1964) 181. Clausen (1964: 191) also adds the likelihood of an influence from the poetry of Euphorion. Unfortunately, we have very little of his poetry extant for comparison.
\textsuperscript{555} Marob. Sat. 5.17.18.
\textsuperscript{556} See Hutchinson (1990) for discussion of Hellenistic poetry and Roman poetry in general. See Clausen (1987) for Hellenistic poetry and Vergil in particular.
Vergil grew up while Catullus and the other Neoteric poets were active, and, in adulthood, engaged with the Callimachean tradition, as well as the Roman Neoteric, directly in his authentic poetry. For example, *Eclogue* 6 opens the latter half of this work with a second programmatic start. Here the poet writes:

> Prima Syracosio dignata est *ludere* versu,  
> nostra nec erubuit silvas habitare Thalia.  
> Cum canerem *reges et proelia*, Cynthius aurem  
> vellit, et admonuit: "Pastorem, *Tityre*, *pinguis*  
> pascere oportet ovis, *deductum dicere* carmen."\(^{558}\)

First our Muse Thalia deigned herself to play in a Syracusan meter,  
Nor blushed to inhabit the woods.  
When I was singing of kings and battles, the Cynthian  
Pulled my ear, and admonished: It is proper for a shepherd, Tityrus,  
To pasture fat sheep, but to speak a refined song.

Even though he invokes Theocritus in the first line, Vergil calls upon Callimachus and his aesthetic program at the end of this passage, as well as throughout the rest of his work. Just as Callimachus, or more precisely Lycian Apollo, states in the prologue to the *Aetia* a sacrificial animal should be fat, but a work of poetry should be slender and refined. Vergil declares his aesthetic choices in passages like the one above, swearing allegiance to elements of Hellenistic poetry. The authors of pseudepigrapha do similarly in responding to what was made manifest by Vergil in his own authentic works.

As will be evidenced by the discussion to follow, Vergilian pseudepigrapha are heavily indebted to their Greek Hellenistic and Roman Neoteric predecessors.

\(^{558}\) Verg. *Ecl.* 6.1-5. See Chapter 3 for discussion of this passage in regards to the verb *ludere*. This passage also serves as a Callimachean *receusatio*, another element found often in Vergilian pseudepigrapha, a fact that I will discuss further below. See Clauss (2004) for further discussion of the connections between these two authors.
Scholars have long acknowledged the connections between the authentic works of Vergil and his forerunners in both of these traditions.\textsuperscript{559} Logically, one reason for the references found in the Pseudo-Vergilian works is purely imposture. In wanting to imitate the authentic works of Vergil, the authors of the inauthentic works must also find themselves under a Hellenistic influence. For example, both authentic and inauthentic use the same methods and topoi, like a recusatio, while invoking the same Muse and the same aesthetic ideals.\textsuperscript{560}

However, Vergilian pseudepigrapha may independently engage with the Hellenistic tradition as well. The inauthentic works relate to the works of their Hellenistic predecessors in ways that are not seen in the Vergilian originals. For example, the pseudepigraphic poems use a greater variety of structures and meters than what is found in their authentic counterparts: the inauthentic Catalepton are a collection of epigrams, perhaps even authorially ordered, as will be discussed below; the Ciris and Culex are stand-alone epyllia. Neither of these forms, so present in the Hellenistic tradition, are found amongst the authentic Vergilian texts.

I believe that Vergilian pseudepigrapha engage with the Hellenistic and Neoteric traditions in two related ways. One, they do so through their interaction with the Vergilian originals which themselves openly referenced the Hellenistic tradition. Two, they do so independently of their Vergilian predecessors. These two levels of engagement are not mutually exclusive but in fact quite complimentary. The anonymous authors of the pseudepigraphic texts are able to explore the aesthetics and forms prevalent in the Hellenistic tradition with both Vergil as a

\textsuperscript{559} See, for example, Clausen (1987) for evidence of such debt.
\textsuperscript{560} See Verg. Ecl. 6 and Cul. 1-10 for examples.
guide and in their own ways as well. Therefore, we as readers are able to glean a complex engagement with the Hellenistic literary tradition, as well as a lens through which to view it.

**Terminology**

One way in which an author can convey the fact that he is working within the boundaries of Hellenistic poetry is through his lexical choices. The pseudepigraphic writers employ specific terms that instantly signal to the reader that he should expect a certain type of work. Since we are dealing with Latin poetry, it is perhaps more precise to say Neoteric terminology, as this is the filter through which the Greek predecessors are transferred into Latin. For example, in first two lines of the *Culex*, between the two declarations of play, the author states:

*Lusimus, Octavi, gracili modulante Thalia
Atque ut araneoli tenuem formavimus orsum...*

We played, Octavius, while the slender muse plays,
And like little spiders we created a thin undertaking....

The adjectives *gracili* and *tenuem* hark back to the aesthetic goals of λεπτός in the works of Callimachus, who believes in well-written, concise works. Both words

---

561 See Crowther (1970) and Lyne (1978b) for a basic discussion of the Neoteric poets. Again, see Lightfoot (1999: 50-76) for Parthenius as the driving force behind the movement.

562 *Cul.* 1-2.

563 Both terms are also found in the works of Propertius. In poem 3.1, the poet states that his works had been filed down by a *tenui pumice* (3.1.8). As Keith (2008: 78) states, Propertius is here equating his style with that of Callimachus. For Propertius’ debt to Callimachus, see Keith (2008: 45-85). Because the date of the *Culex* is unknown, it is hard to say whether Propertius’ use had an impact on the Pseudo-Vergilian text, or not. Perhaps it is safer to say that both poets are working under the influence of Hellenistic poetry.
are found in the middle of the line and scan in the same way: the first two syllables are short at the end of a dactyl and the last is long to start a spondee, between caesurae. These two words, I believe, are framed and placed significantly in order to draw our attention to the type of work we are entering upon. In fact, the proem, still utilizing such terms, characterizes the poem to follow as “a learned song” (carmina docta), one that is “lighter” (levior) but “is polished” (poliantur).564

Likewise, the author of the Ciris employs the same terms found in the Culex. As discussed in Chapter 3, the writer acknowledges how he and the subject have played and that this current work is in a “slender” meter:

...(quamvis interdum ludere nobis
et gracilem molli liceat pede claudere versum)....

...(although once it may be permitted for us to play and to close a slender verse with a soft foot)....

The mention of previous ludic activity, I believe, hints that the author is capable of such production again, perhaps even here in the Ciris. The use of another typical term of Neoteric poetry supports this supposition; later in this work, the author again calls on the Muses to give himself rewards for his “learned songs” (cantus

---

564 Bailey (1995: 104) notes on this line that the use of the plural is poetic. It introduces doctrina in the next line, and is a cliché of Late Republican and Augustan poetry. Cul. 3, 7, 10. Cf. Catullus 1. There we find similar concerns about writing. Catullus’ libellum (1), not a full-length liber, has just now been expolitum (2), probably both literally and figuratively. Again his works are called nugas (4), a word that implies something lighter without actually using the adjective levis. Finally, Catullus praises the work of his addressee, Cornelius, calling them doctis (7). It seems clear, then, that the ethos present in the opening poem of Catullus’ work is also present in Catalepton 9.

565 Cir. 20.
doctos).\footnote{\textit{Cir.} 92. The reading of \textit{doctos} is debated. Manuscript \textit{H} (15\textsuperscript{th} c.) prints \textit{cocos} which does not make sense in the line. Lyne (1978a: 57) calls it a crux because few, if any, emendations are appealing. (He critiques this manuscript in his introduction for being conservative and containing “trivial errors”). It seems right then to question the reading on that basis, as well as contextually. Lyne chooses the reading of \textit{caecos} for this word as the best reading of what is available but then has to force an interpretation on the text (141-142). Ellis (1887: 2), however, argues for \textit{certos} because the author will leave behind the other erroneous tales about Scylla and tell the certain one. (See both previous scholars for additional suggested emendations as well. However, both lack a discussion concerning why other attempts at emending the text are incorrect.) Ellis’ reading does make some sense since this line comes directly after the discussion of previous Scylla tales. However, I side with the recent suggestion of Fairclough \& Goold (2000) of \textit{doctos}, following Bergk (1850). Bergk, however, fails to provide any evidence to support his reading (160). The author of this poem established its nature earlier, stating in lines 42-47 that this work has emerged from youth and early schooling now to become something more sophisticated. The lines in between, then, discuss the various Scyllas, only to have this idea of a more adult work picked up again in the first line of the next sentence. Therefore, I believe that \textit{doctos} is the best reading here.} Clearly, then, the spirit of Callimachus has not left our author, who continues to view his new works in the same way he did the old.

The pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil named in the \textit{VSD} clearly indicate that they are part of a tradition beyond just that of Vergil. Through their use of typical Neoteric terminology, they acknowledge that they owe a debt to and participate in the aesthetics of Hellenistic and Neoteric poetry. While the works may be lighter, it is not implied that they were hastily written. In fact, they eschew that description, instead referencing Callimachean poetics to emphasize that just because works are short and not serious, does not mean that they cannot also be learned and well-written.

Form

In the proem to his \textit{Aetia}, Callimachus states that authors should keep the muse “slender” (\textit{λεπταλέην}).\footnote{Callim. \textit{Aet.} fr. 1.24.} The authors of the pseudepigraphic poems ascribed
to Vergil seem to have taken that idea seriously, as none of the poems are particularly long. The shortest, *Catalepton* 7 and 15, are only 4 lines; the longest, the *Ciris*, is 541. As I discussed in Chapter 1, it is easier to produce a short impersonation than a long one. However, the connection between these poems and Hellenistic poetry suggests, I propose, that their length is purposeful.

In fact, we find many of the most common and innovative forms of Hellenistic poetry reflected in these works. For example, among these few poems, we find two examples of stand alone epyllia: the *Culex* and *Ciris*. Both are written in dactylic hexameter and fall within the usual range of lines. The *Ciris* treats a well-established story from mythology, that of Scylla, Minos and Nisus. The *Culex*, upon first glance, does not seem to adhere fully to the typical subject matter, as it does not transmit a mythological story. However, the last section, in which the gnat proceeds on a *katabasis*, all the while imbued with speech, recalls journeys typical in epic, most specifically, in this case, the *Aeneid*. Therefore, I believe, both these works should be considered epyllia.568

The epigram, another important genre from the Hellenistic period, is well represented. Within the group of poems from the *VSD*, we have two smaller collections containing epigrams. The first of these collections, the *Catalepton*, in fact draws its name directly from a phrase found in the *Aetia* prologue: κατὰ λεπτόν.569 Richmond has successfully argued that this collection is highly organized, suggesting that the collocation of six pairs of poems cannot be a coincidence.570 The purposeful

---

568 See above for relevant bibliography and definition of an epyllion.
569 Callim. *Aet*. fr. 1.11.
570 See Richmond (1984) for further discussion.
arrangement of poems in a collection begins in the Hellenistic period, where we find
the first organized group of poems by Posidippus about stones.\textsuperscript{571} Arrangement of
works continues to be influential through Hellenistic poetry’s move to Rome, where
we later find authorially organized collections like Vergil’s \textit{Eclogues}.\textsuperscript{572} Poems can
be arranged in many different ways, such as metrically, stylistically, thematically, in
mathematical patterns, or by length. As has been noted previously, Catullus’ poems
seem to have had a large impact on Vergilian pseudepigrapha. Scholars have
debated over the arrangement of the Catullan corpus and whether it is possible to
see an authorial hand in it. There is some consensus now that the opening poems (at
least 1-14) of the polymetric section are well-structured metrically and thematically,
facts that suggest these poems were arranged by Catullus himself.\textsuperscript{573} It is no
surprise, then, that the author of the \textit{Catalepton} would artfully arrange his poems
following in the footsteps of Catullus and Vergil.

The \textit{Priapeia} collection, on the other hand, is not organized in any
discernable way, but nevertheless displays an engagement with Hellenistic poetry.
Because these poems are derived from various sources, and because questions exist
over how many were considered Vergil’s in antiquity, as detailed in Chapter 2, we
cannot know if there were more Vergilian \textit{Priapeia} poems and if they were once
organized by their writer or writers. Also, it would be difficult for an author to
display any meaningful arrangement between only four poems. However, the lack of
organization does not preclude a connection to Hellenistic poetry; in fact their form,

\textsuperscript{571} See Gutzwiller (2005) for further discussion.
\textsuperscript{572} See Van Sickle (2004) for further discussion.
\textsuperscript{573} Skinner (2011) 48. See Skinner’s article (2011) for an unbiased overview of the issue and
previous scholarship.
and vulgarity in general, are well represented, quite often in the poetry of Callimachus and Catullus.\textsuperscript{574} In addition, these Vergilian \textit{Priapeia} display elements typically found in epigrams at this time, another important form as discussed above. For example, \textit{Priapeia} 2 addresses a “passerby” (\textit{viator}) and also ends with a striking close, a witty threat from the farmer.\textsuperscript{575}

Two other forms revived during the Hellenistic period are briefly used in the pseudepigraphic works as well – panegyric and iambic poetry. For example, \textit{Catalepton} 2, written in choliambic meter, is an attack against a certain rhetorician who wrote in the style of Thucydides. In addition, we find an encomium in the form of \textit{Catalepton} 9, a praise poem in honor of Messalla Corvinus.\textsuperscript{576} Perhaps we are prompted to think of Theocritus’ \textit{Idyll} 17 in honor of Ptolemy II, as indicated by the reference to the “Sicilian” as an invocation of Theocritus. The author writes:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Dulcia iactantes alternō carmina versu}
\textit{Qualia Trinacriæ doctus amat iuvenis}.\textsuperscript{577}
\end{quote}

Throwing off in a different meter sweet songs
The sort which the learned youth of Sicily loves.

While the form is undeniably evocative, the covert reference to Theocritus further supports the connection between the Hellenistic and pseudepigraphic authors.

The Pseudo-Vergilian poems found in the \textit{VSD} are connected to the compositions from the Hellenistic age in many ways. But, at the most basic level, the same forms are employed in both sets of works. Poems are short as well as

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{574} Uden (2007) 2. Uden argues that Priapus is invoked in Catullus 16, 47, and 56. \textit{Cf.} Callim. \textit{Iamb. 9 (inter alia)}, which involves a statue of Hermes that takes on characteristics of one of Priapus.
\textsuperscript{575} \textit{Priapeia} 2.2. \textit{Priapeia} 2.19-21.
\textsuperscript{576} See Kayachev (2016) for further discussion of the Hellenistic predecessors for this poem.
\textsuperscript{577} \textit{Cat. 9}.19-20. The use of \textit{doctus} here even further strengthens the connection between this poem and Hellenistic poetry.
\end{footnotesize}
generically and formally similar. In addition, the organization of verse and use of meter in these pseudepigrapha serve to connect them strongly with the Hellenistic tradition.

**References to Important Figures**

The authors of the Pseudo-Vergilian works catalogued in the *VSD* make clear that they are working within the tradition of Greek Hellenistic (and Roman Neoteric) poetry through the use of key terms discussed previously. Additionally, as though that were not enough, the poems also reference the key figures associated with these movements, those who themselves used the same terminology in their works. Most of these passages reference the Hellenistic poets, with myriad mentions of Callimachus, as well as a few of Parthenius, and Theocritus. Of the Neoterics, the pseudepigraphic poems allude to the works of Catullus, especially in the *Catalepton* collection.

As previously mentioned, the figure that appears most often in these poems is Callimachus.\footnote{As noted by Fairclough in the Loeb edition of the poems, the first four verses of *Catalepton* 11 recall Callimachus 6.1 Pf = A.P. 7.725 as well.} Let us first look at the *Dirae*. Scholars have attempted to identify the *Battare* to whom the poem is addressed in the first line:\footnote{*Dir*. 1. Battarus does not appear in the epigraphic record, but Battara appears once (CIL 6.9714; Rome).} a river in Corsica (Scaliger), a personification of Echo (Canal), a slave who accompanies the poet with a pipe (Näke) or a bleating pet goat (Ellis).\footnote{Ellis (1899) 139-141.} Perhaps it is simply the name of the man who is friendly with the protagonist. Wernsdorf believed it to be a fictitious
name that points to some other poet, perhaps Callimachus.\footnote{Wernsdorf, Poet. Lat. Min iii. p. xlviii. \&c (reference from Smith s.v. Battarus). Fraenkel (1966:153-154) proposes a few other options.} I agree with this supposition and want to take it a step further: I believe that the Battarus is a fictional figure who most certainly is named so as to invoke Callimachus. If we were to take one syllable out from the name, we would be left with Battus, a frequent figure in Callimachus’ poetry and perhaps his ancestor. The invocation of Battus would then set the tone for the whole poem. In fact, the genre itself, that of a curse poem, instantly brings to mind Callimachus and his own curse poem, the \textit{Ibis}.\footnote{See Nisetich (2001: xix-xxi) for further discussion. Unfortunately, nothing survives of the poem.} Battarus, then, may be a pseudonym used for the author’s friend and guide, invoking Callimachus. Perhaps we are to read the battle over the land, then, as really one over Callimachean aesthetics.\footnote{Heslin (2011: 53-55) argues similarly concerning the use of a pseudonym in Propertius. In elegies 1.7 and 1.9, an unknown Ponticus (or “the sea”) is discussed as a writer of an epic work on the sons of Oedipus, a Thebaid. Heslin compares this author with Antimachus, an author who was assumed to have written anti-Callimachean poetry. Propertius outlines the type of poetry he will be writing (\textit{i.e.} love) and that he wishes to achieve fame from it and even surpass that of epic poets (1.7.21: \textit{tum me non humilem mirabere saepe poetam}). He warns Ponticus in 1.7 that love will eventually impact everyone including him. In 1.9, this statement has come to fruition: Ponticus is in love and his epic does not help. Propertius, the \textit{Callimachus Romanus} (4.1.64), set up a dichotomy between himself and Pontius, and elegy and epic. Therefore, we have precedent for the use of pseudonyms in Latin poetry with Callimachean elements.}

However, not only does the \textit{Dirae} include a name possibly meant to reference Callimachus, it also contains many more veiled allusions to this poet. In the middle of the poem (lines 48-53), Callimachus is invoked again. Here, the protagonist calls upon the gods to help bring destruction to his previously owned lands: “Let Neptune with his waves move into the fields and coat the lands with thick sand” ([...] \textit{migret Neptunus in arva / fluctibus et spissa campos perfundat harena}).\footnote{\textit{Dir.} 50-51.} The author implies that the lands were once pristine when held by the speaker of the poem,
while in the future, they will be muddy. But, I would like to suggest, the speaker is not actually talking about land but instead about poetry. A similar metaphor appears at the end of Callimachus’ “Hymn to Apollo,” where we find the speaker espousing the wonders of the clear stream as contrasted to the muddy rivers of the Euphrates. There, Callimachus writes:

> ὁ Φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ’ οὐσια λάθριος εἶπεν
> 'οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὡς οὐδ’ ὅσα πάντος ἀείδει.
> τὸν Φθόνον ὡπόλλων ποδὶ τ’ ἠλασεν ὅδε τ’ ἔειπεν:
> Ἄσσωριον ποταμοίο μέγας ρόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ
> λάσματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἕβρ’ ὕδατι συρφετόν ἐλκεί.
> Δηοὶ δ’ οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὑδῷρ φορέουσι Μέλισσαι,
> 'ἀλ’ ἔτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἄχραντος ἀνέρπει
> πίδακος ἣς ἐξ ἀείρης ὀλίγη λιβάς ἁκρον ἀντον.’
> χαίρε ἄνας: ὃ δὲ Μῶμος, ἵν’ ὃ Φθόνος, ἔνθα νέοιτο.\(^{585}\)

Envy secretly spoke into Apollo’s ears:
'I do not admire a poet who does sing such great things of the sea.'
Apollo kicked Envy with his foot and spoke thus:
'Great is the stream of the Assyrian river, but much filth of earth and much refuse it carries on its water.
And the bees bring water to Deo not from everywhere, But that little trickling stream bubbles up
From a holy spring, both pure and undefiled, the very finest.'
Hail, o Lord: but Blame, let him go where Envy has.

The author of the Dirae makes a similar contrast, although not as explicitly.

The references to Callimachus continue a couple of lines later when the protagonist declares this muddy new land to be called an "altera Syrtis."\(^{586}\) The Syrtis is a body of water located on the northern coast of Africa, near Cyrene, the homeland of Callimachus. The placement of this mention must not be taken as

---

\(^{585}\) Callim. *Hymn* 2. 105-113. See Williams (1978) for further discussion. We see the same comparison between muddy rivers and negative views of poetry in other Latin writers as well, for example Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.36-37 (*turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque / diffingit Rheni luteum caput, haec ego ludo... / "While bloated Alpinus slaughters Memnon and while transforms the muddy head of the Rhein, I write these light poems...").

\(^{586}\) Dir. 53.
accidental, but, I suggest, should be viewed as a continuation of the invocation of the Hellenistic poet. Callimachus himself made an allusion to this gulf in fr. 602 where he references the maidens, the Nasamones, who live near there.\textsuperscript{587} Because of the state of the fragment, we do not know the context of the mention or if there was more written about the area.

One last parallel appears twenty lines later in the \textit{Dirae}, ending the mentions of Callimachus. Again, the speaker lays curses upon the ill-gotten lands that now seem to belong to his enemy, Lycurgus, reminiscing about how wonderful the lands once were to him. He curses the land saying "let the croaking frog inhabit the caves of the melodious cricket" \textit{(incolat arguti grylli cava garrula rana)}.\textsuperscript{588} The contrast between the loud noise of the frog and the sweet sounds of the cricket immediately recalls that found in the \textit{Aetia} prologue, where Callimachus also juxtaposes the noises of the ass and cicadas: "For we sing among those who love the shrill voice of the cicada/ not the noise of asses" \textit{(τεττίγων ἐν τοῖς γάρ ἀείδομεν οἰ λιγύν ἣχον / .... θῷρθ' οὐκ ἐφίλησαν ὥνων)}.\textsuperscript{589} In both, we find the songs of the small insect to be much preferred over that of the larger animal.

The addressee of the \textit{Dirae}, an unknown "Battarus," seems to refer to the Callimachean "Battus" when read with the additional allusions to the poetry of Callimachus.\textsuperscript{590} The \textit{Dirae}, with its continued refrain, seems to be a work about poetry, with metapoetic references similar to those we find in Callimachus. One

\textsuperscript{587} Apollonius of Rhodes also mentions it in Book 4 of the \textit{Argonautica} (4.1676).

\textsuperscript{588} Dir. 74.

\textsuperscript{589} Callim. \textit{Aet. fr.1.30}.

\textsuperscript{590} I do not mean to suggest that Battarus must be identified as Callimachus himself; I believe that we are to read this poem with Callimachean aesthetic principles in mind as invoked by the name and other references.
should exalt the pure, sweet song represented by the lands once owned by the speaker rather than what the lands will become under the new owner. The references to the biography of Callimachus suggest that the Dirae should be read as a lament for lost lands, and perhaps a lament about poetry as well.

I suggest that the anonymous author perhaps is also expressing a worry quite common amongst autobiographical works: legacy. While he may be discussing the different aesthetics of poetry in the metaphor of the river and lands, he may be lamenting what will come of his work in the future as well. The mention of muddying the once pristine lands might then be a metaphor for the state of one's works in the future. As time passes, there is no guarantee that one's works will be read and celebrated, or even be found in the same physical condition they once were due to copying errors. Once works are made public, authors lose all control over them, allowing for their reuse and perhaps even “plagiarism.” The pristine river, then, represents the original status of the work; the muddy, an imitation of the original. The metaphor of the taken lands then could stand for the anxiety of the poet over the status of his poems in the future.

I believe the Ciris may also contain a reference to the works of Callimachus. Fr. 110 of the Aetia contains the story of the “Coma Berenices,” preserved for us by Catullus 66. The subjects of both these works are quite similar: the cutting of a lock of hair. In the Ciris, Scylla wavers about whether she should shear her father's

---

591 Cf. Ov. Tr. 4.10.
592 See Putnam (1960) and Hollis (1992). We do not know how faithful to the original Catullus is, however. Fr. 113 of Callimachus' Aetia may have contained the story of Scylla and her transformation into the ciris, as told in the Pseudo-Vergilian Ciris. However, Harder (2012: 870) notes that “the evidence is not strong enough to be entirely certain.” See Harder (2012: 870-873) for commentary on this fragment.
head. The preservation of the lock is directly connected to the preservation of the city, as evidenced by the narrator’s interjection: “such trust in taking precaution is in the small lock” (tanta est in parvo fiducia crine cavendi).\textsuperscript{593} Perhaps this is a reference to Callimachus’ tale of Berenice’s lock, though in reverse.\textsuperscript{594} For the queen, the lock must stay safe on her head as protection until her husband returns home. Once he does, the female figure in that tale cuts her hair. It is then stolen away from the temple at night and the court astronomer explains that it was raised up to the heavens as a constellation in a mock-catasterism. In both stories, much trust is placed in the lock, for protection of the city and for one’s husband on campaign, an extension of a safeguard for the city. A female actor cuts both locks, but in the Ciris the shearing causes pain, while in the “Coma Berenices,” it is a source of joy.

While most of the poetic references in these works are to Callimachus, there are two notable references to other Hellenistic poets. The first of these references was mentioned in Chapter 2, when I explored the parallels between the Ciris and Parthenius while discussing the poem’s connection to the biographical tradition of Vergil. It should be clear that, while there is no direct extant Parthenian precedent, the Erotica Pathemata may have been an inspiration for the Ciris. In the latter, the youthful student, “Vergil,” was carrying out the directive of his former teacher Parthenius.

The second notable poem to reference Hellenistic poets, in this case, Theocritus as well as Callimachus, is much more explicit. In Catalepton 9, while

\textsuperscript{593} Cir. 380.
\textsuperscript{594} Unfortunately, this line does not appear in any form in Catullus 66. The Callimachean original is very fragmentary and is heavily reconstructed through its Latin translation. Perhaps, then, it is safer to say that there is a mythical parallel between the two passages rather than a direct allusion.
praising the literary works of the addressee, Messalla, the author states that his idyllic poetry was like that favored by Theocritus, the Sicilian writer of the Hellenistic Period (*qualia Trinacriae doctus amat iuvenis* [...]).

I would like to add that the inclusion of Theocritus in this particular poem is even more striking due to its content. *Catalepton* 9 is an encomium of a man who was not only a poet but also a statesman. About halfway through the poem, at line 39, there is a switch from praise of Messalla's writing to an argument that his public deeds should be lauded as well. This blending of the poetic and the political calls to mind Theocritus' *Idyll* 17 in honor of Ptolemy II, Philadelphus. The laudatory nature of that poem, along with the explicit reference in *Catalepton* 9 to Theocritus and his more bucolic poetry, reinforces the importance of the poem's Hellenistic predecessor.

Towards the end of this *Catalepton*, the author invokes the other Hellenistic author discussed above. The speaker wishes for his poetry to be worthy of the deeds it glorifies, but acknowledges that it would be hard to approach Cyrene, *i.e.* Callimachus. The author recounts that

\[
\begin{align*}
  Si laudi aspirare humili, si adire Cyrenas, \\
  Si patrio Graios carmine adire sales \\
  Possumus.....
\end{align*}
\]

If we can aspire to humble praise, if we can approach Cyrene, If we can approach the Greek wit in a Roman song,.....

The speaker has previously praised the poetry of Messalla and continues to do so here, invoking Apollo, the Muses, and other gods for aid in the lines directly before those quoted above. No actual motion is implied by the verb (*adire*) here, instead

---

595 *Cat.* 9.20.
596 See Hunter (2003) for further discussion of this poem.
597 *Cat.* 9.61-63.
the motion is more metaphorical. Supported by the noun carmine in the following line, we know that the noun Cyrene does not signify the actual location but instead stands in for one of its most famous inhabitants, Callimachus. It is through this additional reference, I would like to add, that this poem must be read with the Hellenistic tradition in mind. It is not only Theocritus who held sway over its composition but also Callimachus, even if the writer believes his own work will never reach those heights.

In addition to referencing Hellenistic poets, the pseudepigraphic works of Vergil also refer to the Neoteric poets. Catullus, one of the most important figures in the Romanization of early Hellenistic poetry, appears often in Vergilian pseudepigrapha, but especially in the Catalepton poems, as has been acknowledged.\textsuperscript{598} References can be found in direct quotation, for example Catalepton 6 exactly quotes Catullus 29.24 concerning Julius Caesar and Pompey as a comparison for a son and father-in-law who violated a young girl. Or, references can be mere allusions, as the wedding chant of Thalassio at the end of Catalepton 12 may point the reader to Catullus’ wedding poems, 61 and 62, the most famous Latin epithalamia in existence during Vergil’s youth. Catalepton 10 is a parody of Catullus 4, with added Vergilian touches, as discussed in Chapter 2. Here, not only does the author engage with his predecessors but also with the devices that they employ, including switching the tone of the piece from high to low. The stately boat has been swapped for the lowly muleteer with comic implications.

\textsuperscript{598} See Holzberg (2004a) and Oosterhuis (2007) for a general discussion and Kronenberg (2014-15) for Catalepton 10 in particular. Catullus is also the only Neoteric poet whose work has survived in a large quantity, so in that way, he is the most important.
The authors of the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil strengthen their works’ connections to Hellenistic poetry and their Neoteric predecessors through direct allusions to the poets of both movements. At times, they explicitly reference the previous works through direct quotation. At others, they are oblique, relying on similarities of topic or material. In both cases, the reuse of and references to Callimachus, Parthenius, Theocritus, and Catullus are important in connecting these works with their Vergilian predecessors.599

Other Hellenistic Elements

Above, I have discussed the key elements drawn from Hellenistic poetry that are most prevalent in the pseudepigraphic works of Vergil. However, other elements can also be found as well. First, Hellenistic poetry is highly self-conscious of its position in the canon of Greek literature and therefore emphasizes the discussion of poetic composition. For example, while the Dirae is superficially a poem of curses by a farmer directed towards the man who has taken his land, it focuses more on the figurative (poetry and singing) rather than on the literal (attacks on property), as I have proposed. Themes of poetry and singing are scattered throughout, even outnumbering mentions of the curse. A refrain emphasizing the speaker’s song is repeated twelve times throughout the poem, for an average of one refrain every eight lines. While the refrain changes almost every time, one example runs “thus I

599 There seem to be no direct mentions of another leading literary figure of the Hellenistic Age, Apollonius of Rhodes, considering the importance of the Argonautica to the Aeneid. (See Nelis (2001) for discussion.) Perhaps it is due to the large scale and epic nature of the Argonautica that these smaller and lighter works do not directly mention it.
pray, and in my prayers let these songs prevail" *(sic precor, et nostris superent haec carmina votis).* The *Lydia* continues to emphasize song, although not as consistently as its counterpart. The proem to this piece mentions poetry and singing three times in the first fifteen lines. The poem begins:

Invideo vobis, agri formosaque prata,  
Hoc formosa magis, mea quod formosa puella  
***  
et vobis tacite nostrum suspirat amorem;  
vos nunc illa videt, vobis mea Lydia ludit,  
vos nunc alloquitur, vos nunc arridet ocellis,  
et mea submissa meditatur *carmina* voce,  
cantat et interea, mihi quae *cantabant* in aurem.  
Invideo vobis, agri: discetis amare.  
O fortunati nimium multumque beati,  
In quibus illa pedis nivei vestigia ponet  
Aut roseis viridem digitis decerpserit uvam  
*(dulci namque tumet nondum vitecula Baccho)*  
aut inter varios, Veneris stipendia, *flores*  
membra reclinarit teneramque illiserit herbam  
et secreta meos furtim *narrabit* amores. *601*

I envy you, 0 fields and beautiful meadows,  
More beautiful than this, which my beautiful girl  
***  
and for you she sighs silently for our love;  
now that one sees you, my Lydia plays for you,  
now she addresses you, now she smiles at you with her eyes,  
and she hums my songs with a lowered voice.  
And meanwhile she sings (those) which used to sing in my ear.  
I envy you, fields, you will learn to love.  
0 too fortunate and very happy (fields),  
In which that one will place the steps of her snowy foot  
Or will pluck a ripe grape with her rosy fingers,  
*(for the little vine does not yet swell with sweet juice)*  
or among colored flowers, 0 tribute of Venus,  
she will have reclined her limbs and will have crushed the tender grass,  
and she will in private secretly tell of my loves.

Additionally, as mentioned above, the narrator of the *Culex* refers to the poem as "learned songs" *(carmina docta).* *602* Finally, although a celebration of all the deeds of

---

*600* Dir. 25.  
a certain Messalla, Catalepton 9 focuses mostly on the poetry of this figure and ends with a wish that the author's own poetry could be considered as good as Callimachus’ (... si adire Cyrenas,... Possumus / “if I am able to approach Callimachus”).

Poetic recusatio, or a refusal to write large-scale epic poetry, also often appears in the pseudepigraphic poems. It is characteristic of Callimachean aesthetics for an author to compose a smaller work about non-epic themes, while apologizing for not writing a grander, epic work. For example, the author of the Culex acknowledges that his current work is one that is “lighter” (levior) but that “later” (posterius) he will write “with a heavier sound” (graviore sono). Towards the end of the proem, the author returns to this subject by declaring what will not appear in his works, including the Gigantomachy and the Persian Wars, topics better suited to epic. He wishes the best for his addressee, Octavius, but will return to singing about his own theme – the life of the gnat.

In the other epyllion of this collection, the Ciris, we again find an apology for not writing larger epic. The author mentions his age and place in his literary career so that we readers—and specifically the addressee, Messalla—do not hope for much from this work: “at this very moment for the first time we are firming our youthful sinews with strength” (nunc primum teneros firmamus robore nervos). We can expect more from the author later in his career, but this (the Ciris) is the best he can

---

602 Cul. 3.
603 Cat. 9.61-63.
605 Cul. 7.10.
606 Cul. 24-41.
607 Cir. 43. Lines 41-53 encapsulate the recusatio fully.
produce at this point. We find the last recusatio in Catalepton 9, a poem that is also addressed to Messalla. The author seems to hesitate before undertaking the encomium for this figure, humbly admitting that the former does not know what to say about the latter. Of course, this uncertainty does not stop the author from writing copiously about him for the next fifty lines. But a refusal, which was later completed, is the point of writing a recusatio.

As evidenced by Callimachus’ Aetia (and the many other works on academic matters, like the Phaenomena written by Aratus and the Lesbou Ktisis perhaps written by Apollonius of Rhodes), literature as an intellectual pursuit is also important to Hellenistic poetry. Authors were able to learn about and reference lesser-known stories, especially aetia, thanks in part to the resources and intellectual climate of Alexandria. Despite not writing during the Hellenistic age, the author of the Ciris displays an interest in such knowledge. Towards the end of this work, we learn why the ciris is so-named: its derivation from the verb κείρειν, meaning “to cut.” This verb is appropriate both vis à vis Scylla’s actions and also as an appropriate basis for the aetion of the bird’s name.

Earlier in the same work, the author offers a correction to an existing story, another typically Hellenistic and learned practice. Referencing Homer directly, he corrects the Odyssey, in which Scylla was turned into a monster. However, because the author is assuming the persona of a young Vergil, one who has not yet written the Eclogues, he can only obliquely reference that work in which Vergil described

---

608 Cat. 9.9-10.
609 Cir. 488-489.
610 Cf. Callimachus’ “Hymn to Zeus” in which the author corrects the story about Zeus’ birth (4-9).
the metamorphosis of Scylla into a monster. Still, through this reference he is able to offer a correction of his future self, again changing the metamorphosed form of Scylla from monster to bird. In a complex game, the poet creates a work, the Ciris, that is meant to anticipate the authentic works of Vergil since it was supposedly written by a youthful Vergil. However, in this instance, the real author reveals himself, correcting the passage of the Eclogues. If the author were a youthful Vergil, no correction would be necessary because the Eclogues had not been written yet. The author of the Ciris, as young “Vergil,” is taking to task the older version of himself in this passage, correcting it.

One additional element that appears repeatedly throughout these poems, and specifically in almost every single poem or set of poems, is a mythological catalogue. Lists of this sort are not alien to the authentic works of Vergil. I suggest that the pseudoepeigraphic poems connect themselves with the authentic works through the use of this device, even if it is not a frequent trait of Vergil’s writing, and, in doing so, also connect themselves to Hellenistic poetry. In referring to this topos in Eclogue 6, Coleman comments that “[here the speaker’s song] is very

---

611 Cir. 54-91. Homer (Ody. 12.54 ff and 12.210 ff) is explicitly named (65) but Vergil (Ecl. 6.74 ff) is not. In fact the Eclogues are quoted word for word in this section (Cir. 59-61 = Ecl. 6.75-77). See Gorman (1995) for further discussion.

612 There may be some connections between this device and the educational tradition as well. Throughout the scholastic works of Seneca the Elder, lists of figures appear in nine different practice speeches. However, only one of them is mythological in nature (Suas. 4.2), while the remaining eight are historical (Contr. 1.5.3; Contr. 1.6.4; Contr. 2.1.7-8; Contr. 5.1; Contr. 7.2.6-7; Contr. 8.4; Contr. 10.1.8-9; Suas. 6.1-2). While there is scant evidence for lists of mythological figures, the overall number of lists in general could suggest a debt.

613 Ecl. 6.31-81 (The mythological catalogue is contained within the song of Silenus, sung after being caught by two young men. He begins with the origins of the universe and continues with many stories of transformation usually involving maidens, like Scylla.). Ecl. 8.17-63 (Here we find the song of Damon in a musical contest with Alphesiboeus. He sings of the god of love and the problems people have had because of him.). We may also include the “parade of heroes” in Book 6 of the Aeneid.
much that of neoteric narrative. In each case the story is treated very allusively on
the assumption that it is already well known."\(^{614}\) This technique also owes a debt to
its predecessors in Hellenistic poetry in which poets would display their knowledge
in a transitory way.

There are eight mythological catalogues contained within the
pseudepigraphic works of the VSD. Each one is fully integrated into the narrative
around it, expounding on what comes both before and after it in the given poem. In
addition, the catalogues feature not only names but also short snippets about each
of the figures. For example, in the early lines of the Culex, we find one of the five
examples from this poem alone.\(^{615}\) Specifically here, the author in a recusatio
addresses the fact that he is unable to discuss lofty mythological tales—while
naming those of Jupiter in brief—but will instead sing the deeds of Octavius. The
author writes:

\[
et tu, cui meritis oritur fiducia chartis,
Octaui venerande, meis adlabere coepit,
sancte puer, tibi namque canit non pagina bellum
triste luis pontique acies quibus horruit olim\(^{616}\)
Phlegra, Giganteo sparsa est quae sanguine tellus,
 nec Centaureos Lapithas compellit in enses;
 urit Ericthonias Oriens non ignibus arces,
 non perfossus Athos nec magno uincola ponto
 iacta meo quaerent iam sera volumnin famam,
 non Hellespontus pedibus pulsatus equorum,
 Graecia cum timuit uenientis undique Persas;
mollia sed tenui decurrens carmina uersu
\]

\(^{614}\) Coleman (1977) 204. Coleman names Parthenius’ Erotica Pathemata as an example of this
technique, although the stories there are rather obscure.

\(^{615}\) The other ones occur at line 109-145 (figures of nature), 241-258 (pathetic figures in the
underworld), 260-295 (a throng of women in the underworld), and 295-357 (heroes of the Trojan
war in the underworld).

\(^{616}\) I follow Fairclough & Goold’s (2000) reading here, who follow Bücheler’s (1890) based on similar
readings in Lucretius and Valerius Flaccus. The OCT (1966) prints canit non pagina olim, the second
half of the preceding line, in brackets. It seems clear that this is a scribal error, which does not allow
for understanding of the line.
viribus apta suis Phoebu ducere ludere gaudent.
hoc tibi, sancte puer; ....617

And you, revered Octavius, for whom trust rises because
Of your worthy records, fall towards my beginnings,
Holy boy, for my page sings for you not the sad war
Of Jupiter and places the battle lines in which Phlegra
Once bristled, the land which was sprinkled with the blood of Giants,
Nor drives the Lapiths onto the swords of Centaurs;
The East does not burn the Erichthonian citadels with fires,
Neither Mount Athos, dug through, nor the chains thrown on the great sea
Seek fame, already late, in my volume,
Nor the Hellespont struck with the feet of horses;
When Greece feared the Persians coming from all sides;
But it pleases her that the gentle songs, running with a slender verse,
Fitting to her strengths, play while Apollo is leader.
This is for you, holy boy; ....

A wide variety of stories are mentioned, from Jupiter's defeat of the Giants, to the
non-mythological, but perhaps legendary, defeat of the Persians by the Greeks,
Athens in particular. But no details are given about any of the eight or nine stories
introduced in the cursory fashion. It is assumed that we, as intelligent readers,
already know the rest of the story and therefore do not need more than a brief
mention to understand the implications. The placement of these great deeds in the
recusatio addressed to Octavius stands to enhance his glory more, even though he is
just a young boy at this point. One mythological list also appears in each of the Lydia,
Ciris, and Catalepton 9 as well.618 I propose that the prevalence of this mechanism
should not be overlooked in further illustrating the debt of these poems to the
Hellenistic tradition, where games of this sort were prevalent.

Lastly, elements of innovation—changing old forms of poems and poetry into
something new—are shown here as they were in Hellenistic poetry. For example,

617 Cul. 26-37.
618 Lyd. 22-75 (discussion of unhappy love between mortals and immortals); Cir. 54-91 (retellings of
the previous stories surrounding Scylla); Cat. 9.23-38 (young female mythological characters who
are similar to Messalla's puella).
the *Lydia* is addressed to a novel subject; as previously mentioned, the protagonist does not address his love poem to his beloved but instead to the field in which she frolics. I believe this address to an object is similar to a paraclausithyron, or address to a doorpost, common in elegiac poetry.\(^{619}\) Canter states that "the door is usually obdurate and unyielding, is now apostrophized, now flattered, now treated with violence."\(^{620}\) Here, in a dactylic hexameter work, we have a meadow standing between a lover and his beloved instead of a door, but the sentiment is similar. In addition, the field and its trappings are given agency: they hold the girl, rejoice, and pause, implying action. It is also the object of the actions of the girl, in which she plays, to which she directs her address. While the field is not fully anthropomorphized, the field does “act” in certain ways throughout the poem.

Canter continues that the lover may write his beloved a poem or sing her a serenade often lamenting how the door stands in the way.\(^{621}\) Here, we again see the same implications. The protagonist of this poem sings to the field that again hinders his love. But the song is then eternally immortalized through the poem, the *Lydia*. Usually this type of poem would have been written on the doorpost, an action that is impossible, however, in this situation. Furthermore, the singer invokes various mythological parallels of women wronged by their lovers, for example Ariadne by

\(^{619}\) We have many parallels of this form in Hellenistic poetry (*e.g.* Theocritus’ *Idyll* 3), a fact that lends further support to my supposition. See Cantor (1920: 359-361) for discussion of this form in Hellenistic poetry. Catullus 67 also features this form in an address to a door concerning the actions of a female inhabitant.

\(^{620}\) Canter (1920) 355.

\(^{621}\) Canter (1920) 356-357.
an unnamed Theseus.\textsuperscript{622} The lamenter equates himself with the female figure in each of these stories in order to heighten the tragedy of his situation.

I believe, then, that the \textit{Lydia} follows many of the elements typical of Latin love elegy as outlined above. The lover’s profound feelings both of desire and loss drive this poem without a resolution.\textsuperscript{623} While the poem may be elegiac in topic, the meter is hexameter. I suggest that the poet of the \textit{Lydia} innovates yet again, mixing the elements of one genre with the meter of another. Perhaps the author desired to mimic the authentic works of Vergil in meter, while nevertheless reflecting different themes. However, ideas of love are not foreign to the authentic works of Vergil. In fact, Propertius addresses this fact writing about Vergil’s works, but especially the \textit{Eclogues}: “But these poems will come welcome to any reader / whether he will be inexperienced in love, or skilled” \textit{(non tamen haec ulli venient ingrata legenti / sive in amore rudis, sive peritus erit)}.\textsuperscript{624} In the lines preceding these, Propertius recasts all three authentic works of Vergil in elegiac meter. The author of the \textit{Lydia} seems to accomplish the reverse: writing a love elegy in a Vergilian \textit{(i.e.} hexameter) meter.

In addition, authors of other pseudepigraphic poems innovate in the amalgamation of different genres in the same work as their Hellenistic counterparts once did. As has been discussed often, the \textit{Culex}, in imitating the authentic works of Vergil, reflects their genres as well. This poem displays elements of bucolic, didactic, and (mock) epic poetry in its various sections.\textsuperscript{625} I suggest that we should add two

\textsuperscript{622} \textit{Lyd}. 49-52.
\textsuperscript{623} Cf. Propertius 1.3 in which the poet is distressed because of his separation form Cynthia and uses mythological parallels to prove his point.
\textsuperscript{624} Prop. 2.34:81-82. See Heyworth (2007: 261-280) for commentary and bibliography on these lines.
\textsuperscript{625} See Barrett (1976) for further discussion. As has been well established, the \textit{Culex} is very much a mock-epic, akin to the \textit{Batrachomyomachia}. The humor in both, then, derives from the disparity
further elements. First, on his deathbed, the gnat states: “while your life is dearer to me than life itself” (*tua dum mihi carior / ipsa vita fuit vita*). The *topos* of a beloved’s life being more important than one’s own is a typical element of elegiac poetry. In such poems, the speaker, so in love, is willing to make the ultimate sacrifice of his life in order for his beloved to continue on. Here, we find the same situation, except not overtly amorous. The gnat was willing to die in order to save the shepherd from death by snake. Second, the epitaph of the gnat is representative of the genre of epigram. The *Culex* should be seen as a mix of at least five different genres comprising the poem as a whole.

From the emphasis on poetry, to the displays of intellect including mythological catalogues, finally, to innovation, these poems named in the *VSD* have connections with many kinds with Hellenistic poetry. While these *topoi* do not appear in every pseudepigraphic poem, these works as a whole strongly represent the many elements common in Hellenistic poetry.

**Conclusion**

The most significant themes that connect together the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil named in the *VSD* are borrowed from Hellenistic poetry (and its
successor Roman Neoteric poetry) and its counterpart, ludism, as discussed in the previous chapter. Hellenistic poetry, the larger of the two categories, almost fully encapsulates the ideas of ludism. The poems in the VSD draw on key terms and motifs in Hellenistic poetry and ludism, and also all explicitly or implicitly reference figures important in both the Hellenistic/Neoteric and ludic traditions. The poems display the most important elements of both movements: levity, play, innovation, acrostics, and parody. They appropriate more serious elements as well, including discussions of the importance of poetry and their own place within the hierarchy of that art form.

It is no wonder that the pseudepigraphic poems in the VSD draw so heavily on traditional themes and forms. These poems declare themselves to be the youthful works of Vergil, a conceit bolstered by the biographical tradition: Vergil was educated at a time when (Hellenistic and) Neoteric literature was at a high point. The pseudepigraphic poems reference poets like Catullus and Parthenius, who were adapting Hellenistic techniques into a Roman context during Vergil's youth. Further, as youthful works, the poems were meant to stand as a contrast to the later works of Vergil: their authors declare their work puerile and promise that something heavier or more serious will come later; nevertheless, they themselves are still carefully crafted pieces of poetry, i.e. serious in poetic terms. Although we as readers are led to believe these works are juvenile, their artistry and skill are not work of a mere youth. Perhaps the anonymous authors of these works may want to show that Vergil wrote impressive, but ludic, works in his youth, even if they were not yet epic.
Case Study on Ancient Reception

At this point, I would like to return to a quotation from Knox, mentioned in the introduction to this dissertation. In his article on Ovidian pseudepigrapha, but pertinent to all investigations of pseudepigraphic works, he states that “imitation [should be seen] as the means of working towards interpretation” of authentic works in order to “to flesh out and make sense of the narratives of classical literature.” I stated that I planned on following a similar, if not the same, approach as Knox, treating Vergilian pseudepigrapha as pieces of Vergilian reception, placing aside any attempts to determine authenticity. I believe that by examining these works as pieces of reception, modern readers are able to gain a better understanding as to how ancient readers may have understood the works and biography of a given author. It is fitting to end this chapter with a case study of the reception of Vergil and his works in the Culex, since the Hellenistic authors were masters of the reception and recasting of earlier works.

As previously mentioned, Most has successfully argued that the body of the Culex reflects the three authentic works of Vergil in their canonical order. The anonymous author of this work recasts both the topics and the genres of the authentic works in the one cohesive narrative of an interaction between a gnat and shepherd. For example, as Most points out, it is not enough for the gnat to undertake a heroic katabasis in the third section of this poem; the author must also mention almost every Greek hero of importance, as if to underscore the fact that we are in

the epic genre.\textsuperscript{629} While the writer of the \textit{Culex} overemphasizes the epic generic elements in the poem, at the same time he carefully avoids topics found in the \textit{Aeneid}. As discussed in Chapter Two, the \textit{katabasis} scene, for the most part, does not overlap at all with Aeneas' \textit{katabasis} in Vergil's authentic epic.\textsuperscript{630} The only overlap is seen briefly in the parade of Roman figures at the very end.\textsuperscript{631} Here, the author demonstrates a close reading of the \textit{Aeneid}, as I have argued, in avoiding and pre-figuring the authentic work, which was in fact an inspiration. Although in this example, the author does not necessarily reuse authentic material, the reception of Vergil's epic can be seen in the topographical simplification, glaring holes, and missing figures throughout the underworld. It is the carefully executed lack of connections between the two works that attest to the reception.

While Most is correct in his assessment of the \textit{Culex}, I must note that its author does not simply reference each authentic work in isolation, but blends together Vergil's authentic poems as well. For example, in the \textit{katabasis} section we find an extended description of Orpheus and Eurydice, figures found at the end of the \textit{Georgics}.\textsuperscript{632} The two figures naturally fit in this scene even though the didactic authentic work of Vergil is not heavily referenced in these lines otherwise. It seems, then, that the author does not strictly refashion authentic material in a one-to-one correspondence, but also adapts it where suitable.

The \textit{Culex} can also be described as a parody in the way it reuses authentic Vergilian material. As Bailey has pointed out, the target of this parody must certainly

\textsuperscript{629} Most (1987) 207.
\textsuperscript{630} Cul. 202-384.
\textsuperscript{631} Cul. 358-371.
be the *Aeneid* and Vergil’s authentic works in general, but may also have some
secondary targets, such as the clichéd writings of contemporary authors.\(^{633}\) I agree
with Bailey that the primary focus of the *Culex* must be on Vergil due to the poem’s
strong connections to him and to his authentic works. In Chapter Three, I discussed
the meaning of parody, both ancient and modern, according to Rose.\(^{634}\) I will follow
her definition of the term to discuss how the *Culex* acts as a piece of parodic
reception of the *Aeneid*.

First, parody should imitate the form of the target work. The *Culex* is written
in dactylic hexameter, the meter of epics. Also, it takes the form of an epyllion, a
relatively short narrative work akin to epic. Second, there must be humor. Here, the
comic reworking can be seen most simply through the choice of subject. While the
work begins with the idyllic situation of a shepherd, we are quickly introduced to
the co-protagonist of the story: a gnat. Parody also tends to use low figures, both
human and animal, to highlight the contrast between the target work and the new
one. While a gnat is not an animal, I suggest that as an insect it is close to the animal
family. Its small stature further highlights the contrast – instead of a larger-than-life
mythological hero, our story revolves around a talking gnat.

Finally, parody should imitate the subject-mater of the epic. As previously
mentioned, the third section of the *Culex* is most similar to the *Aeneid* and it is there
that we find the gnat’s trip to the underworld.\(^{635}\) Instead of a great hero with the
Sibyl, we find an insect leading the way through his new home. But elements of epic

\(^{634}\) See Rose (1993: 15) for her definition.
\(^{635}\) *Cul.* 202-284.
can be found throughout the whole work. For example, the poem begins with an invocation of a Muse, as an epic would. Here, however, the Muse partakes in jokes and levity, instead of serious topics, which the speaker states will come later.\textsuperscript{636} A hallmark of ancient epics is a \textit{monomachia}, or one-on-one combat. So at the end of the \textit{Aeneid}, we find Aeneas and Turnus facing off against one another, until the former is victorious, killing the latter. In the \textit{Culex}, we have a tiny gnat set up against a larger, terrifying snake.\textsuperscript{637} The contrast is comic: it is not a battle of equals but instead two completely disproportionate figures. There is a clear winner in the battle found in Book Twelve of the \textit{Aeneid}. In the \textit{Culex}, there does not seem to be one. The shepherd is able to defeat the snake, but only because the gnat has sacrificed his own life to do so. Both combatants lose in the end.\textsuperscript{638} Nevertheless, our hero must be celebrated. While Aeneas does not reap any stated rewards at the end of the \textit{Aeneid}, we as readers know he will continue on to found Lavinium and be an ancestor to the Romans. The gnat receives something more tangible: a great mausoleum and an honorific inscription.\textsuperscript{639} It should be clear that the gnat is stylized as if a great mythological hero throughout the work, in contrast to Aeneas. However, because it is an insect, the narrative is rather comic.

In conclusion, while one may argue that the \textit{Culex} is a parody of epic in general, we must view the parodic elements discussed above through the lens of authentic Vergilian material. The themes, topics and word choice found here guide

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{636} \textit{Cul.} 6-10.
\item \textsuperscript{637} \textit{Cul.} 157-201. There may be as many as three \textit{monomachias} in this section: one between the gnat and snake, one between the snake and the shepherd, and one between the shepherd and the gnat.
\item \textsuperscript{638} However, one could argue that both Aeneas and Turnus lose at the end of the \textit{Aeneid}: Turnus dies and Aeneas loses his compassion.
\item \textsuperscript{639} \textit{Cul.} 385-414.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the reader towards the authentic works of Vergil. The comic aspects of the tale of our hero gnat are enhanced when it is compared to the hero of Vergil’s epic, Aeneas. The careful side-stepping of the Aeneid in the underworld scene highlights the contrast between these two works. The author of the Culex writes a piece of Vergilian reception, taking in the most important topics and themes from the authentic works and recasting them as a complete narrative and a comic re-functioning, *i.e.* parody.
Chapter 5: The Pseudo-Vergilian Poems in Servius’ *Vita Vergiliana*

Donatus’ biography of Vergil provides us with the first compilation of ancient Vergilian pseudepigrapha, consisting of four individual poems along with two collections of multiple poems each. These works are linked in the many ways discussed in Chapters Two, Three and Four. Not long after Donatus wrote his biography and enumerated the aforementioned works, another grammarian, Servius, wrote a biography that added two more poems to the list attributed to Vergil. In this chapter, I will evaluate these two poems, attempting to discern their connections to the previously named works and perhaps the reasons for their inclusion in this biography, but not the previous one.

The Biography of Servius

Marius/Maurus Servius Honoratus flourished a few decades after Donatus, roughly 360 to 430 CE, and was a student of the aforementioned biographer.\(^{640}\) He worked as a grammarian in Rome, but is better known for his commentary on all three of Vergil’s authentic works. In fact, his is the only commentary to be handed down from antiquity intact.\(^{641}\) The introduction to this commentary contains a biography of Vergil.

Servius’ extant biography is probably only an abridged version of a longer one, with additional biographical elements scattered throughout his commentary.

\(^{640}\) Servius’ full name appears in manuscripts only from the 9th century on (Fowler (1997) 73). See Kaster (2014: 1152) for dating.

\(^{641}\) Kaster (2014) 1152-1153. See Kaster (1988: 169-197) for more on Servius’ role as commentator.
This biography generally follows that of Donatus but is “only partly dependent on it.”\textsuperscript{642} Important to our discussion of the pseudepigrapha of Vergil is the addition of two poems to the list, the \textit{Copa} and \textit{Aetna}. Servius writes of Vergil:

\textit{Scripsit etiam sepetm sive octo libros hos: Cirin, Aetnam, Culicem, Priapeia, Catalepton, Epigrammata, Copam, Diras.}\textsuperscript{643}

He also wrote these seven or eight books: the \textit{Ciris, Aetna, Culex, Priapeia, Catalepton, Epigrammata, Copa}, (and) \textit{Dirae}.

A couple aspects of this list deserve discussion here.\textsuperscript{644} First, the inclusion of the \textit{Aetna} (this time without question) and the \textit{Copa} sets Servius’ list of what are now considered pseudepigrapha apart from that found in Donatus’ biography.\textsuperscript{645} The titles of these works are fully integrated into the list, not simply added at the end, suggesting that they were not merely a later addition by a different hand.

Second, similarly to the VSD, Servius mentions the Ballista as “the first” (\textit{primum}) of Vergil’s literary output. Its placement outside of this list suggests that it should be read apart from it.\textsuperscript{646} Again, both biographers separate this list of works from what we now consider the authentic works, however no mention is made that they are not authentic. Nevertheless, as Vergilian juvenilia they occupy a different space than the authentic works.

\textsuperscript{642} Stok (2014) 753. There are other differences between the two biographies as well, for example the addition of the name of Vergil’s mother. However, these elements are not germane to the discussion here.

\textsuperscript{643} Unfortunately, there are no section numbers for Servius’ biography.

\textsuperscript{644} See Chapter 2 for discussion of difficulties with the \textit{Catalepton, Epigrammata} and \textit{Dirae}.

\textsuperscript{645} Donatus doubted the inclusion of the \textit{Aetna} in his list of Vergilian juvenilia.

\textsuperscript{646} For more on this poem, see Chapter 6.
Finally, Servius discusses the editing process that surrounded the authentic texts of Vergil, demonstrating an interest in the removal of unnecessary material, a discussion not significantly present in the biography of Donatus. The inclusion of such information perhaps lends to Servius a greater authority to determine what was actually Vergil's and what was not. Servius attributes to Varius and Tucca the removal of the pre-proem to the *Aeneid* and the “Helen episode” of the same work, along with various other deletions. He makes it clear that there were problems identified with material in some copies of Vergil and actions were taken to restore those works to their apparently pristine condition. Perhaps the implication of such editorial activity was a drive towards authenticity, towards including only material that was truly Vergil’s, though this fact is not explicitly stated. This attention to editing further enhances the significance of the inclusion of the *Copa* and, especially, the *Aetna*, which was doubted by Donatus. If the authorship of these texts, or indeed any of the others included in this list, were ambiguous, perhaps Servius would have mentioned it, as he had done in other cases.

**The Copa**

First, I will discuss the *Copa* in the context of the *topoi* discussed in Chapters Two through Four, *topoi* that connect the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil. In doing so, I hope to show how the *Copa* fits (or does not fit) into the mold of the previous set of poems provided by Donatus’ VSD. To begin, I discuss the internal

---

647 The former two will be discussed in Chapter 6 since, again, they are not included in this central list.
characteristics of this poem, both metrical and lexical. I then turn to the poem’s biographical elements, Vergilian connections and educational conventions, before discussing its links to Hellenistic poetry and ludism.

As with the previously discussed poems found in the VSD, it will be interesting to look at the lexical density of the Copa as an objective method of comparison. At a rate of 1.368, the density of this poem falls well below that of any other poem written by or attributed to Vergil. However, at thirty-eight lines, it is also far shorter than any of those poems as well.648 While the brevity of the work might help explain its low density and therefore complexity, genre may have an influence as well. As will be discussed below, it is unclear into which genre this poem falls. However, its elegiac meter is evidence that this poem could be classified as an epigram, albeit a lengthy one. If we do label the poem as such, then the complexity of its language is not surprising as epigrams are often more linguistically complex than didactic and epic works. Perhaps, then, this fact is suggestive of an overall or guiding genre of the poem.

The word copa, meaning barmaid, is uncommon in Latin literature. The only other use appears in a passage from Suetonius’ Life of Nero in which Roman barmaids are compared negatively with matrons.649 Terms for other women of ill repute, such as dancing (saltatrices) and instrument-playing girls (cymbalistriæ), appear more frequently. For example, Propertius 4.8 finds the poet-narrator

---

648 In this respect, I suggest we take the Catalepton and Priapeia poems as collections rather than individual poems.
649 Suet. Nero. 27.3. See Bradley (1978: 158) for commentary on this section. There might be a third use of this word found in Pliny’s Natural History (34.90). However, the use of this word is a conjecture according to the OLD as it does not fit the text around it (s.v. copa).
separated from his lover, Cynthia, and so he takes up with other women who are drunken and low. He describes the scene of their ménage-a-trois, which includes music by a “castanet-player” (crotalistria) named Phyllis. Cynthia comes upon him during this rendezvous and promptly flies into a rage because of his illicit behavior. The invocation of Phyllis in the Copa invokes the setting and atmosphere from Propertius’ original.

The Copa displays an experimental use of vocabulary, especially in its mix of Latin words with those borrowed from most notably Greek. For example, in the first two lines of the poem, there are three words with foreign origins: mitella, crispum, and crotalus. J.N. Adams, in his work Bilingualism and the Latin Language, has recently discussed the impetus for and implications of the mixing of Latin with other languages, not only Greek but others from the Italian peninsula (for example, Etruscan), from further afield in Europe (Celtic), and even beyond (Hebrew).

According to Adams, the linguistic mix of the Copa characterizes it as among “texts implicitly reflecting a bilingual situation [...]” written in one language but showing

---

650 Prop. 4.8.39. Heyworth (2007: 479) in his commentary notes the connection between these two poems, in particular the fact that Copa 29 quotes line 37 of this poem. He further suggests that a Syrian origin for this Phyllis is “attractive” because of these connections. Petron. Satyr. 55.6 also uses this word for the noise created by the beak of the stork. However, Petronius’ use of the word seems to be the outlier. Courtney (1991: 22) says we are to picture the dancing girls, and Smith (1975: 149) goes further by saying that this image is invoked as a contrast to the pietas that the poem cited purportedly discusses. In 22.6, during the scene at the home of Quartilla, a cymbalistria (“a female cymbal-player”) enters to provide entertainment for the dining guests. Again, this is not a setting in which a respectable person would find himself, with its extravagance, people of low repute, and sexual activity. One theory concerning the Copa, long since discarded, is that it was composed by Propertius or a female follower. See Dana & Dana (1909) for discussion of the evidence.

651 In Satire 11, Juvenal also discusses a convivial setting in his attack on extravagance and the importance of moderation. Lines 162-164 mention the dancing girls as entertainment, along with music, in an extravagant dinner party. Again, sex and illicit behavior are en vogue in a situation like this. See Courtney (2013: 450) for commentary on this line.

652 See McCracken (1932/3), Wilkinson (1965) and Tarrant (1992) for discussions about this mixing. Tarrant further adds that this sort of language is typical of the 1st century CE (346).
signs of interference or influence from another language.” Adams describes Latin as a “supraregional” language, meaning that its use was not confined to a small area, but was used throughout a large geographical space and therefore came into contact with various regional languages and dialects. It is in the assorted regions that variations in language can appear. Adams continues that loan words entering into the Latin language thus give it a “regional flavor.” These additions can then potentially help identify where the work was composed or where the author was from, as long as this “flavor” has not spread too far.

There are two main reasons for these borrowings from Greek in this work: for the most part, the author chose to use a Greek word instead of available Latin equivalents because of a regional Greek influence as well as perhaps a literary one; at other times, the author clearly borrowed technical terms that were Greek.

The question remains why the author of the *Copa* would use so many words of Greek and foreign origin. For example, as mentioned above, in the first two lines there are three non-Latin words, *mitella*, *crispum* and *crotalo*, alone. However, this should not come as a surprise to the reader: directly in the middle

---

653 The emphasis here is Adams’. Adams (2003) 30. The other categories described by Adams are bilingual, transliterated, or mixed-language texts.
657 Adams (2003) 443. The third reason for use is that the author had a lack of fluency in Latin. While the author will forever be unknown, he does show mastery of the Latin language, a fact that makes it hard to believe he was not fluent in it.
658 Approximately 5% of the words in the poem are of Greek, foreign or low origin. It is much higher, 15%, in the first 10 lines.
659 *Copa* 1-2.
metrically of the first line is the word *Graeca*. Goodyear notes that there is controversy over this word because it does not make sense with *mitella*, as the origin of this article of clothing is not Greek.\(^{660}\) Perhaps, I propose, the adjective is used as a declaration by the author that this work will rely heavily on the Grecisms and other loan words commonly found in poetry created in Vergil’s youth, namely those of the Neoteric poets. Criticism by Horace, a contemporary of Vergil, of this very mixing of foreign, especially Greek, words into Latin poetry by the previous generation alerts us to its popularity. Reading the *Copa* in light of Horace’s views on poetry is perhaps helpful in understanding the context of the poem.\(^{661}\)

In *Satires* 1.4 and 1.10 Horace constructs his poetic program while at the same time attacking his forerunner in satire, Lucilius.\(^{662}\) For example, in 1.4, Horace first praises the wit of Lucilius but then promptly describes his faults:

> *Cum fluere lutulentus, erat quod tollere velles;*  
> *Garrulus atque piger scribendi ferre laborem,*...\(^{663}\)

When he flowed muddily on, there was plenty you’d want to remove;  
He was wordy and lazy to bear the labor of writing,...

Horace sets out his desire for pure poetry, one that is not too heavy or mixed.  
Neoteric poets seemingly claim the same aesthetic choices and adherence to the

---

\(^{660}\) Goodyear (1977) 121.  
\(^{661}\) Westendorp Boerma (1958: 332) states that “the atmosphere reminds the reader of Horace” but goes no further with this line of discussion. Gruenewald (1975) notes some of the allusions to Horatian poetry but does not note any significance to these mentions.  
\(^{662}\) See Gowers (2012) for her insightful commentary on Horace’s first book of *Satires*. Her commentary supplants previous editions, most recently such as that by Brown (1993), which Gowers notes does not reflect the complexity of this book of Satires (1).  
\(^{663}\) Hor. *Sat*. 1.4.11-12.
Hellenistic poets. Yet Horace finds fault with them, in particular Calvus and Catullus. Uneducated people might claim that:

‘At magnum fecit, quod verbis graeca latinis miscuit.’ …
… ‘at sermo lingua concinnus utraque suavior, ut Chio nota si conmixta Falerni est.’

‘But it was a great achievement, because [Lucilius] mixed Greek with Latin words.’
… ‘But a style blended from both tongues is sweeter, as if a brand of Falernian wine was mixed with Chian.’

But Horace calls such people “late-learners” (seri studiorum) in the midst of their praise-statements. The work of authors like Lucilius “alters the muddy head of the Rhine” (diffingit Rheni luteum caput), while Horace states about himself that “I am writing these poetic trifles” (haec ego ludo). He goes on to describe the earlier works of late-Republican poets with various verbs (including garrire) and adjectives (such as lutulentum), all with negative connotations. Horace does offer some praise to his contemporaries: he applauds the Eclogues of Vergil towards the middle of Satire 1.10 (Vergilio adnuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae). He continues such praise at the end of the poem when enumerating the current crop of readers, and perhaps even poets, who will laud and support a new type of poetry written by Horace, one that is clear and pure, unmixed, and fully Latin.

---

665 Hor. Sat. 1.10.20-21; 23-24.
666 Hor. Sat. 1.10.21.
667 Hor. Sat. 1.10.37. The association of “mud” with negative literary connotations refers back to Callimachus’ Hymn to Apollo 105-113. Cf. Chapter 4 for further discussion of this idea.
668 Hor. Sat. 1.10.41; 50.
669 Hor. Sat. 1.10.45. Vergil had written only his Eclogues by the time Horace was composing his Satires. Hor. Sat. 1.10.81.
Horace praises Vergil’s adult and authentic works, but, if we are to take him at his word, it may be unlikely he would have praised the *Copa*. In fact, I would suggest that the *Copa* reads as possibly a response to Horace’s aesthetic program. As I already mentioned, the *Copa* declares its use of loan words, especially Greek, in the first lines of the poem, a trend that continues throughout. This mixing is picked up later through a metaphor involving wine, an image that Horace also uses. The tavern is described as serving a type of wine directly from its jars called *vappa*, one that has “gone flat as a result of secondary fermentation.” Although not mixed, the wine is nevertheless of inferior quality due to this double processing. Similarly in *Satire* 1.10.23-24, Horace attacks the mixed wine (another product of double processing) as impure and therefore also not of high-quality.

The rest of the tavern is denigrated as well through the use of Horatian allusions. For example, in the *Copa* pastoral piping “prattles” (garrit): Horace had denigrated Lucilius using the adjective *garrulus*, as well as the verb *garrire*, as noted above. The sounds in the tavern are attacked further as the narrator relates how the fountain is “crackling with a noisy sound” (*crepitans raudo murmore*). Towards the end of the poem, again it seems that Horace’s aesthetic ideas are invoked, only to be discarded. For example, we hear that outside the tavern “now the cicadas with their frequent song break through the thickets” (*nunc cantu crebro rumpunt arbusta cicadae*). The image of cicadas and pleasant song is commonly

---

671 *Copa* 9.
672 *Copa* 12. While there is no direct reference here, Horace does attack loud and unnecessary talking in *Sat*. 4.73-78.
673 *Copa* 27.
found in poets of the Hellenistic age, poets to whom at times Horace pays heed. But here again it seems that the song has been weakened by its accompanying noun and adjective: it is not pleasant but rather repeated and it breaks through, rather than plays or sings. The setting in the Copa does not use Horace’s vocabulary directly, but uses images that are similar in order to create a contrast.

A final reference to Horace appears in the section describing the tavern and its environs. The narrator tells the reader:

\[
\textit{Sunt etiam croceo violae de flore corollae}
\]
\[
\textit{Sertaque purpurea lutea mixta rosa...}\]

There are also violet garlands from the yellow flower
And saffron wreaths mixed with a purple rose...

The adjective \textit{lutea} could refer back to Satires 1.4.11, in which Lucilius’ poetry is described using the same root word, \textit{lutulentus}. The conventions that are held to represent pure poetry are not found in the tavern and by extension the poem, in a situation where content influences form.

At the end of the poem, the author announces that he does not care what his potential detractors—presumably including the “future” Horace—have to say about his poem. When talking about the tavern, and by extension his work, the author of the Copa declares: “But let him perish he who has severe eyebrows!” (\textit{a pereat cui sunt prisca supercilia!). The author makes no excuses for the status of the tavern or indeed of his poem. Neither conforms to someone else’s aesthetic or moral ideas:

\[\textsuperscript{674}\textsuperscript{675}\textsuperscript{676}\textsuperscript{677}\]

674 See below for discussion of citations of cicadas in Greek and Latin literature.
676 The adjective \textit{luteus, -a, -um}, while meaning saffron, stems from the noun \textit{lutum}, meaning mud.
677 Copa 34.
the tavern is of ill-repute and the poem follows ideas expressed in poetry from the
Late Republic.

The poem ends with a pronouncement: “death, pulling on our ear, says ‘Live,
for I am coming” (mors aurem vellens ‘vivite’ ait, ‘venio’).

The poet is perhaps again attacking his imagined detractors, who disagree with the way of life in the tavern. He exhorts his reader to live life to the furthest extent, drink wine and play dice, and do so as quickly as possible because death is around the corner. The reminder to enjoy life in the face of death of course invokes Horace’s carpe diem of Odes 1.11, although here life and pleasures are slightly rushed and found in a more erotic context. Beyond the line’s link to Horatian poetry, this invocation of Epicurean philosophy likewise joins it to Vergil and his biography. As previously discussed in Chapter 2, Vergil’s connections to this philosophical school, while not mentioned directly in the two main biographies of the poet, are nevertheless acknowledged.

The ending of the Copa seems then to fill in that hole, just as the mentions of Siro in Catalepton 5.9 and 8.1 do. While in those two poems, a youthful "Vergil" more explicitly participated in that philosophy, here it is a simple invocation of a philosophical element that ties the supposed youthful author to Epicureanism.

The Copa is a poem about more than just a tavern. It may also be a poem about poetry, a common subject among Hellenistic poets, as I have discussed in previous chapters. While the style of the Copa and its tavern setting might not meet all of Horace’s, or other readers’, expectations of high literature and culture,

---

678 Copa 38.
679 Vergil’s connection to Siro is not mentioned in the biographies written by Donatus or Servius but shows up in that by Phocas (87). See Chambert (2004) for further discussion of this connection.
nevertheless they draw on these expectations in setting up the idyllic beauty of the tavern, while simultaneously subverting them with various images and vocabulary discussed above. In doing so, the Copa then can be seen as a parody of this type of environment. The author here imitates the aristocratic world in creating both the fictional tavern and the poem, which describes it. But in doing so, he also rewrites their elements so that the result is a comic contrast between high and low. Any beauty in the tavern that the poet describes is undercut by loud noise and substandard wine, just as the beauty of the poem is undercut by the use of Grecisms and terms of low register that are not found in high literature. Yet one can find pleasure in both.

As I have suggested above, I believe the Copa was written as a response to the poetic aesthetics constructed by Horace in his Satires. Horace claims that the current crop of poets will follow his program, with the implication that his program is opposed to that of the poets from the generation before. Perhaps then this is the starting point to understand the implications of this Copa. If, as I claim below, we are meant to assume that “Vergil” wrote this poem in his youth—as its tone and the biographical tradition suggest—then he would have written it under the influence of the poets of the Late Republic. “Vergil” would have read writers of the previous generations, like Lucilius, Calvus and Catullus (the latter two being Neoteric poets). He would have used their common tropes, as outlined by Horace, in order to

---

680 See Chapter 3 for further discussion, definition and bibliography for the idea of parody.
681 Cf. for example, Martial 10.68, in which that poet also employs grecisms in a lower type of poem. Lucci (2015) argues that Martial is purposefully ambivalent towards the implements of the Greek language and culture in his poems with the result that Greece plays a liminal role in his poems. I think that a similar liminality can be found in the Copa as well.
reinforce the youthful age at which he was supposedly writing. I think, then, the author of the *Copa* wrote the poem so that it would be viewed in a negative light by those sympathizing with Horace’s position. Yet, the work displays greater artistry than someone like Horace may give it credit for. The careful reading and response to Horace’s *Satires* suggests a level of skill and competence on the part of the writer. While Horace will praise the works of the adult Vergil, the youthful “Vergil” in the *Copa* would apparently adeptly use techniques of which “future” Horace is critical.

Like many of the shorter pieces of Vergilian pseudepigrapha, for example individual *Catalepton* and *Priapeia* poems, the *Copa* is written not in dactylic hexameters but instead in elegiac meter. As I proposed before, the anonymous author might use this meter, never found in authentic works, as an indication of youthful first attempts on the part of “Vergil.” Experimentation in meter seems to be connected to experimentation with subject matter: the low elements of the tavern contrast with the lofty themes of Vergil’s authentic poems, just as the elegiac meter of the *Copa* contrasts with Vergil’s later hexameter. Low themes are found also in the poems of the *Priapeia* and *Catalepton*, and it is therefore logical that these poems and the *Copa* all use the same, non-Vergilian meter.

The *Copa* shares more than low themes and meter with the other pseudepigraphic poems. I suggest that the poem may have been intended to be read as a piece of Vergilian juvenilia, when read in response to Horace’s *Satires*. There are

---

682 Ovid uses the elegiac meter as a way to indicate his rejection of epic. While I think it is too much to say the author here is rejecting epic in the same way as Ovid, I do think that he is putting that genre to the side momentarily, as a sort of *recusatio*. In doing so, the author again signals the age at which “Vergil” supposedly wrote the *Copa*. When he matures and enters adulthood, then Vergil can embrace that genre and the meter that accompanies it, *i.e.* epic and dactylic hexameter.
no internal indicators that the poem was composed by an adolescent (as is the case with other pseudepigraphic poems), but the biographical connections to Vergil that are created through the Horatian references, as well as its placement in Servius’ biography, suggest that the author took on the persona of a youthful Vergil.683

As discussed in Chapter Two, in the VSD, Vergil is called probus.684 Yet the pseudepigraphic poems, specifically Catalepton 1 and the Priapeia poems, show that there was another side to the poet as well. Perhaps the Copa should join that group: it too helps to provide Vergil with a fuller character, more than just being “upright” or uptight. Perhaps readers, then, desired more information concerning Vergil’s youth. As we have seen with Catalepton 13 and its exploration of a military career, the Copa may have been written to fill a hole in Vergil’s biography, one in which “Vergil” acted as a typical Roman youth and visited places of ill-repute.685

The Copa also fills another gap in the biography of Vergil: heterosexual love. The only mention in the biographical tradition of Vergil’s experience with women is a rumor of an affair with a prostitute, who denies that anything happened between the two.686 Instead, Vergil is often connected to young men.687 The lascivious barmaid and her invitations of sex would allow the reader to imagine a potential liaison between the two, just as the tantalizing rumor reported in the biographical tradition does. In fact, further similarities exist between these two women: both the

683 Grant (2001: 125) argues that this poem was written by a youth. His reasons include an abundance of emotion that he finds youthful and the idea that it was common for young aristocratic boys to visit taverns of this sort. See Suet. Nero 27.3 for the contrast between matronae and copae. 684 VSD 11.
685 Copa 37 reads: “let him perish, he who cares about the things of tomorrow” (pereat qui crastina curat). This is the sentiment of one who is willing to experience life freely, no matter what that entails and will not be a prude about it.
686 VSD 10.
687 VSD 9.
prostitute in the biography and the barmaid in the *Copa* hold positions representative of low-class hedonism. While the barmaid is not explicitly named as a prostitute, both are clearly of the lower class and are connected to sex.  

Additionally, both women have foreign connections. The prostitute in the *VSD* is named Plotia Hieria. Her *praenomen* is a vulgar form of the upper class Plautus, while her *cognomen* suggests a connection to the city of Hieria in Asia Minor near Byzantium. Similarly, the barmaid in the *Copa* is called *Syrisca*. This cognomen is either her personal name or a name that records her ethnicity or, as I think Goodyear rightly argues, a combination of both. The foreign (and eastern) background of the barmaid again suggests a comparison to the prostitute of Vergil’s past. While the two women are not meant to be the same person, there may be a conscious relating of the two in order to connect the *Copa* to the biography of Vergil.

---

688 The barmaid is described as *lasciva* or promiscuous (3). See McGinn (1998: 53-58) for a discussion of Ulp. (*6 ad edictum*) D. 3.2.4.1. There, the jurist discusses the penalties imposed on pimps, even if the prostitution of women occurred indirectly. One example given is when the staff at a tavern or inn prostituted themselves in addition to their other work, either on their own accord or because of a command of the management. It does not imply that all tavern-workers were prostitutes but it does suggest that some were.

689 Another suggestion for her name is provided by Horsfall (1995: 7). There, he notes that Plotius Tucca, Vergil’s friend. That she was then married to Varius could be implied by the *VSD*, notes Horsfall. Hieria is Greek for “priestess.” I think that both interpretations could be right because, as Horsfall states, “names are favourite toys of the biographer-romancer” (7).

690 Kajanto (1982) 242. He provides evidence that “Plotus” and “Plautus” are equated with one another. Either can also be used as a *praenomen*. The addition of the “-ius” suffix to the name is the fourth most popular for free people during the empire (103). He also discusses the use of geographic terms as a *nomen* (43-53). He argues that *nomina* of this sort are mostly ethnic and reflect the names of peoples and tribes more so than towns for those originally from outside of Italy (43, 45). Unfortunately, he only mentions names derived from the East in passing and so provides no discussion of this name in particular. Hieria occurs eight times in the epigraphic record (*CIL* 6.8734, Rome; *CIL* 6.19833, Rome; *CIL* 6.19870, Rome; *CIL* 6.20515, Rome; *CIL* 9.4803, Vescovio; *CIL* 10.2868, Puteoli; *CIL* 12.3794, Nemausus; *HEp*-1.104, Merida). Plotia is very common appearing almost 300 times epigraphically.

691 *Copa* 1. For the low reputation of Syrians, see Cic. *De Or*. 2.265, for example. Syrisca is found twice in the epigraphic record (*BCAR*-1923-115, Rome; *CIL* 6.12262, Rome).

692 Goodyear (1977) 121.
The Copa also displays connections to the educational *progymnasmata*. For example, perhaps the description of the interior of the tavern and/or potential experiences within can be linked to the exercise of an *ekphrasis* (“description”), and the passage can be read as a subversion of the *locus amoenus* description. As John Henderson has shown, the poet drew especially on *Eclogues* 1, 2, and 7 for images of the rustic life full of lakes, fruits and music, which have then been subverted and transferred to the context of this lowly, roadside tavern. Perhaps, this strong connection to the *Eclogues* explains its association with Vergil. As evocative a setting as it may be, I believe the grammatical structures used to describe it are lacking in artistry. In essence, the interior of the tavern is presented as a reverse *locus amoenus* in a list of elements joined simply by the present tense of the verb *esse*, rendering it a basic catalogue of *topoi*. This section, I propose, also exemplifies another educational exercise, the *synkrisis* (“comparison”), in which a poet shifts tone within his work to invite contrast between two unlike items. In the *Copa*, the poet sets the scene in the tavern with a dancing girl, drunk and sexy. She is described in the following passage:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\textit{crispum sub crotalo docta movere latus,} \\
&\textit{ebria fumosa saltat lasciva taberna} \\
&\textit{ad cubitum raucos excutiens calamos.}\end{align*}\]

Knowledgeable in moving her trembling body to the castanet,
Drunkenly, wantonly, she dances in the smoky tavern
Shaking to and fro the noisy castanets in time with (the rhythmic motions of) her elbows.

---

693 *Copa 5*-23.
694 See Henderson (2002) most recently for a full discussion of connections between the *Copa* and the authentic works of Vergil, along with connections to poets such as Propertius and Ovid.
695 *Copa 2*-4.
However, we quickly see a contrast a few lines later, changing our expectations to a
typical bucolic scene. The tavern is advertised to the weary traveler who needs a
rest. He should be drawn in by the following elements:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sunt topia et calybae, cyathi, rosa, tibia, chordae,} \\
\text{et triclia umbrosis frigida harundinibus;} \\
\text{en et Maenalio quae garrat dulce sub antro} \\
rustica pastoris fistula more sonat. \\
est et uappa cabo nuper defusa picato, \\
est crepitans rauco murmure riuus aquae. \\
sunt etiam croceo uiolae de flore corollae \\
serataque purpurea lutea mixta rosa \\
et quae uirgineo libata Achelois ab amne \\
lilia uinameis attulit in calathis.696
\end{align*}
\]

There are paintings and cabins, goblets, roses, flutes, harps,
And a pavilion cooled by the shady reeds;
Ah, and the rustic pipe in the custom of the shepherd sounds
(the pipe) which chatters sweetly in the Arcadian grotto.
And there is wine just recently brought out of its pitch-jar,
There is a stream of water crackling with a noisy sound.
There are also violet garlands from the yellow flower
And saffron wreaths mixed with a purple rose
And lilies which a nymph took from a virgin stream
And brought in baskets made of osier.

The description continues with the food and drink available and likewise
demonstrates the same juxtaposition of low and high aspects in the tavern.

There are elements of the Hellenistic and ludic traditions in the *Copa* as well.

For example, the poet uses *docta* in the second line to describe the barmaid: she is
learned, knowing how to dance to the rhythm of the music.697 In the context of
Hellenistic poetry and its inclination towards layers of meanings, I suggest that
perhaps we are to read the barmaid’s knowledge in the art of dance and music not
only literally but also metaphorically for the author’s knowledge in the art of

696 *Copa* 7-16.
697 *Crispum sub crotalo docta movere latus* (2).
It is possible that readers are meant to think of the barmaid as an artist and to consider the art of her dance produced against the backdrop of the tavern as standing for poetic production. She is no mere simple dancer, but rather one who is adept in the creation of art, in a similar fashion to the poet’s composition of the verses to come.

The introductory lines of the Copa establish the poem as one that has a connection to the production of art, as displayed by the knowledgeable dancing barmaid. In the final third of the poem, I argue the theme of artistic and poetic composition is picked up again. As discussed previously concerning the poem’s connections to Horace, the environment of the tavern is described with the line: “now the cicadas with their frequent song break through the thickets” (nunc cantu crebro rumpunt arbusta cicadae). The invocation of the sound of the cicadas is usually meant to invoke a type of highly refined poetry and the pleasant environment of Bucolic poetry. The cicadas’ song also appears in the authentic works of Vergil to connote a pleasant environment with polished songs. However, here, we find a contrast between the expectation of cicadas’ song and the reality of the lowly tavern. This motif, along with the presence of the docta barmaid and the

698 Movere, the object of the adjective docta, can mean “to move the limbs (esp. in dancing)” (OLD s.v. movere (2)). There are no attestations of the verb with strictly poetic connotations but it can mean “to move forward in discussion” (OLD s.v. movere (18)). It is due to this more “verbal” meaning that the knowledge displayed in the Copa may be able to be extended to poetry as well. Cf. the docta puella of the late Republican authors, like Catullus, and elegiac authors, like Propertius.

699 Copa 27.

700 See Chapter 4 for discussion of this idea.

701 Verg. Georg. 3.327 (see Henderson 2002) and Verg. Ecl. 2. 13. The mention of cicadas here falls in the dactylic line of the elegiac meter, an occurrence that might be purposeful since the other two works are written in dactylic hexameter.
contrast between the potential pastoral setting of the tavern with its actual features further enhance the poem’s connections to Hellenistic poetry and its elements.

References in the Copa to the poetry of Theocritus have been well established. Drew, for example, has argued that the poem draws heavily on Theocritus Idylls 7 and 11. I would like to add to the discussion some additional Theocritean poems that may have been influential. The chirping of the cicadas surrounds the tavern, as we have already seen. These insects also appear in Idylls 5 (twice), 9 and 16, and in each case their invocation implies a pleasant song. In Idyll 16, the speaker is a poet who is also a traveler, another connection to the Copa, which also features a traveler, here as the addressee.

I argue that the first Idyll of Theocritus might be the most influential on the Copa. The prize for the winner of the bucolic singing contest recounted in Idyll 1 is a cup engraved with the female figure. In this ekphrastic passage, the reader is introduced to a woman, dressed up with head band, laughing, dancing and engaging in bawdy talk; the barmaid in the Copa is described similarly in the opening lines. Moreover, the singing contest in Idyll 1 occurs under a statue of Priapus, a piece of art that is also present in the Copa. References to Hellenistic poetry here are almost exclusively to Theocritus’ work. First, the setting of the tavern is described in bucolic terms, the genre with which Theocritus is most associated. Second, the location of the tavern is Southern Italy, where Theocritus himself was born.

702 Drew (1925) 38-39.
703 Theoc. Id. 5.29; Theoc. Id. 5.110; Theoc. Id. 9.31; Theoc. Id. 6.94. cf. Copa 27.
704 Theoc. Id. 1.32-38. Cf. Copa 1.4.
706 See Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004: 133-190) for further discussion of Theocritus and his importance to the genre.
The authentic works of Vergil were of course influenced by Theocritus, most notably in the *Eclogues*. It is important to recognize Theocritus here as the most likely source of inspiration for the *Copa*—an inspiration that would continue into the next work of the actual Vergil as well.\(^{707}\) Perhaps, then, we should see the connections between the *Copa* and the poetry of Theocritus through the lens of the authentic bucolic poems of Vergil. *Eclogue* 2 may be the most important of the pastoral poems for a reading of the *Copa*. The setting of the authentic work of Vergil is also in Southern Italy, more precisely Sicily. The mention of the noise of cicadas and the garlands of flowers in the *Copa* certainly hearken back to this poem as well.\(^{708}\) Both poems are also about love, a male Alexis, in the *Eclogues*, and the female barmaid, in the *Copa*. I suggest, then, perhaps these two poems are meant to be set pieces for one another, reflective of Vergil’s bisexuality as expressed in the *VSD*.\(^{709}\)

While there are no direct verbal quotations, there are a number of reminiscences that tie the two poems together.

The poet of the *Copa* continues to display his debt to Hellenistic poetry and its *topoi* by innovating with genre. Many scholars have attempted to identify the genre or genres to which the poem belongs, but in many respects it defies traditional classification. Genres suggested have been elegy, bucolic, epigram, priapic,\(^{710}\) philosophy,\(^{711}\) and graffiti.\(^{712}\) I argue that the poem does not fall into a

---

\(^{707}\) That is if we believe that the *Copa* was written as a piece of Vergilian juvenilia, one supposedly written directly before the authentic works.

\(^{708}\) See *Copa* 27 vs. *Ecl.* 2.13, and *Copa* 13-19 vs. *Ecl.* 2.45-53, respectively. See Drew (1925) for a further discussion of linguistic interplay between the two poems, as well as the *Idylls* of Theocritus.

\(^{709}\) *VSD* 9-10.

\(^{710}\) Cutolo (1990).

\(^{711}\) McCracken (1932/3: 127) mentions the ending is Epicurean. See also Gruenewald (1975) for discussion of the Epicurean elements of the poem.
single category, but rather eludes categorization intentionally and is influenced by all the following genres: graffiti-based, epigram, elegy, bucolic, priapic, philosophy and ekphrasis. The complex interplay of genres is an indication of Hellenistic learning: Hellenistic authors would try to combine a wide variety of genres in order to show off their erudition in writing and knowledge of poetry.\textsuperscript{713} It is exactly this tradition on which the poet here draws.\textsuperscript{714}

Just as there is a mix of genres, there is also a mix of tone throughout the \textit{Copa}. It is here that a certain playfulness is cultivated through a switch in the reader’s beliefs about taverns, from their expected baseness and depravity (and that of their barmaids also) to a pleasant, almost idyllic, scene.\textsuperscript{715} Individuals or establishments considered socially low were frequently featured as the main protagonists or settings in Hellenistic poetry. For example in Callimachus’ \textit{Hecale}, the main character is a poor, elderly woman and yet the poem is written in dactylic hexameter, a meter usually reserved for epic poetry about heroes.\textsuperscript{716}

I suggest the Greek novel provides an interesting point of comparison with the \textit{Copa} as well. Arising from the late Hellenistic period, this genre may have flourished at or directly before the time the pseudepigraphic poems of Vergil were composed. Women in Greek novels are found not in their conventional, suppressed roles but instead enjoy more agency than was afforded in actual society. For

\textsuperscript{712} Grant (2001).
\textsuperscript{713} For example, Apollonius of Rhodes structured his epic around many etiological set pieces, mixing the tale of heroes with didactic digressions.
\textsuperscript{714} Perhaps the mix of genres in this poem also owes a debt to the genre of Roman satire, which was originally a mix of forms. This fact is further supported by its heavy reliance on Horace’s \textit{Satires} as detailed above. See Freudenberg (2005) for an overview of the origins of this genre.
\textsuperscript{715} It is well known that barmaids and taverns had bad reputations. See Suetonius’ \textit{Life of Nero} (27.3) for evidence of the former and Kleberg (1957: 89ff.) for evidence of the latter.
\textsuperscript{716} See Hollis (2009) for discussion of this poem.
example, they are allowed to engage in sexual activities with humor instead of moral indignation. Following upon that example, the *copia* in this poem is not denigrated for her position in society: though she is not celebrated, she is also not described in a negative light, and thus seems to occupy a liminal space. The tavern is also reminiscent of the *triclinium* in the “Cena Trimalchionis,” from Petronius’ *Satyricon*, another work likely influenced by the Greek novel, or a parody of it. In the “Cena,” Trimalchio, a (formerly) low status individual, indulges extravagantly in the basest pleasures of life, all the while quoting authentic lines of Vergil. The environment of the *Copa* displays a similar contrast. While its denizens may be of lower socio-economic status, nevertheless, there are elements of a superior life infused through their existence, for example the beautiful, pastoral environment and the abundance of food.

The mixed tone is displayed not only through the whole of the *Copa* but also appears in successive lines. Towards the end of the middle third of the poem, we are told about the *custos* of the tavern, who holds a sickle. In the next line, this bodyguard is described more fully: he is equipped “with a large phallus” (*vasto [...]*

---

717 Haynes (2003) 114. Xenophon’s *Ephesian Tale* (2nd c. CE) provides an example of the actions of women outside of commonly held expectations. In this novel, Kyno murders her husband so that she can marry a new husband, even though she is later judged for it (3.12). Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* (late 2nd c. CE) 9.5-7 provides another example in a Roman novel. Here, a wife is almost caught with her lover by her returning husband. Her quick and clever thinking allows for her adultery to escape unnoticed, even when right under her husband’s nose. The Greek novel in general often portrays women in this light. However, as Haynes also cautions, there is no one general formula that covers all Greek novels. Each one is slightly different and there are so few that it is hard to come to a consensus concerning all.

718 Perhaps Catullus’ Lesbia and the *docta puella* of Latin elegy – comparisons previously noted—could be seen similarly. These women are also often removed from their repressed societal roles and given a prominent place and role in poetry.

719 E.g. Pet. *Sat.* 36.2. See Courtney (2001) for discussion of various reuses of authentic Vergilian lines. There are no direct quotations of the authentic works of Vergil in the *Copa*. There are many reminiscences of his poetry, however, as pointed out by Goodyear (1977). For example, he sees *Copa* 12 as inspired by *Georg.* 1.109-110 and confirms a reading in the text (*rauco*).
It is clear that this guard is none other than the god Priapus. Just two lines later, in the description of a weary traveler and his donkey, we are told that “the donkey is the pet of Vesta” (*Vestae delicium est asinus*). It is interesting that these gods, the former more sexual and the latter more matronly, are both linked to the tavern in quick succession. Yet, this contrast fits with the *topos* of extreme opposites displayed throughout this poem. The concept of opposing high and low elements is not unique to this poem either, as it appears throughout Vergilian pseudepigrapha.

From the discussion above, it should be clear why the *Copa* appears among the Vergilian juvenilia in Servius’ biography. Not written in dactylic hexameter, as the authentic poems are, it is instead in elegiacs, like other pseudepigraphic works. Its author’s lexical choices may be suggestive of a youthful period in Vergil’s life, as may the poem’s biographical connections. In addition, the *Copa* has connections to the educational exercises of the time period. Finally, with its frequent mixing of high and low social concepts, playful tone, and connections to Theocritus, the *Copa* displays elements of Hellenistic and ludic poetry.

---

721 *Copa* 26. Beard (1980) has shown that the Vestal Virgins, and by association Vesta herself, have many different and often opposing aspects of their priestesshood. The Vestals are neither virginal nor matronal, but both. Beard continues by pointing out another layer to them: their masculinity. Beard sees their status as “interstitial,” combining all three aspects at once, a fact that is key to their position and sacredness. One aspect, which must stand, however, is their virginhood (16). In her discussion of these varied aspects of the Vestals’ identity, she praises one aspect of Brelich’s study of these priestesses in which he notes how elements of the cult itself are often oppositional to one other, including “the associations of Vesta with aggressively male phallic deities,” in Beard’s words (19). So again, through the mention of these two gods, we can see the dual nature of this tavern, present through the invocation of the goddess Vesta and the implications of (at the very least) her chastity and of Priapus and the implications of his sexual promiscuity.
722 Both are also involved in the same mythological story in which a donkey warns Vesta of the advances of Priapus (see Ovid’s *Fasti* 6.311ff. for the complete story).
There is one way, however, in which the Copa does not fully fit in with other pieces of Vergilian pseudepigrapha, that is connections to the authentic works of Vergil. As mentioned above, there are some vague reminiscences but no direct quotations or firm allusions. The authentic works of Vergil and this poem have similar influences, like Theocritus and the poetry of the late Republic. But the Copa is lacking the references to the three authentic works of Vergil, references that almost every other piece of pseudepigrapha has—or even multiple, significant references to all three authentic works. In fact, the only significant references are to the Eclogues. So while this poem connects to the rest of the Pseudo-Vergilian poems discussed previously in many ways, it does not engage with the authentic Vergilian tradition in the same manner. Perhaps, then, this is a reason why the poem was included by one biographer, Servius, and not the other, Donatus.

The Aetna

The other poem mentioned by Servius as Vergil’s is the Aetna, a didactic poem about volcanoes, specifically the eponymous one found in Sicily. Unlike the Copa, which is included only by this biographer, the Aetna is mentioned in both ancient biographies. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Donatus clearly questions the

---

723 In his commentary on the poem, Goodyear (1977) points out some correspondences between the Copa and all three works of Vergil, however the majority come from the Eclogues. As mentioned above, Henderson (2002) does find some reminiscences to the authentic works of Vergil. However, it is hard to say that they were direct and purposeful allusions, beyond those to Eclogue 2.

724 Of course, I must also admit, perhaps the Copa did not exist when Donatus was writing.

725 Servius also mentions it in a note on Aeneid 3.571. Goodyear (1977) notes that the summary provided there is nothing like what we have here. He argues it is more likely that Servius did not read or remember this Aetna than that he read a different version (56 n.2). Goodyear goes no further, however, to describe what Servius would have read or from where this summary originated.
authenticity of this poem, stating that its authorship is ambiguous. I will discuss the internal elements of this poem, then the connections to Vergil and education, and finally to the tenets of Hellenistic and ludic poetry in an attempt to understand why Donatus questioned it and why Servius included it.

To begin, let us look at the internal elements of the *Aetna* to determine how they compare to the poems found in the *VSD*. Unlike the *Copa*, this poem is written in dactylic hexameter, reflecting the meter of all three authentic Vergilian poems and most of the pseudepigraphic poems as well. However, as discussed in Chapter 2, Duckworth has shown that the other pseudepigraphic hexameter poems show a similarity in the first four feet of their eight most frequent patterns, containing a balance in spondees and dactyls. The *Aetna* is the outlier: instead, it shows a greater spondaic tendency with 21 spondees and 11 dactyls. Therefore, this work does not seem to fit with the more uniform use of meter in the other pseudepigraphic works.

It is also interesting to analyze the most frequent patterns in the *Aetna* to see if they reflect the authentic and pseudepigraphic works of Vergil. The patterns found in the greatest numbers here are in fact similar to those found in the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, but not in the *Eclogues*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DSSS</th>
<th>SDSS</th>
<th>DSDS</th>
<th>DDSS</th>
<th>SSDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Aetna</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eclogues</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(not in top 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Georgics</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aeneid</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

726 Duckworth (1969) 81.
When we compare the *Aetna* to the other pseudepigraphic poems written in dactylic hexameter, no two of these poems share the same order of frequency patterns, although it is the closest to the *Ciris*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DSSS</th>
<th>SDSS</th>
<th>DDSS</th>
<th>DSDS</th>
<th>SSDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Aetna</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Culex</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ciris</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dirae/Lydia</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet, I must note that there is one similarity in meter between the *Aetna* and all of the authentic or inauthentic poems: one of the most prevalent patterns for all of these poems is DSSS. As noted in Chapter 2, the heavy use of this pattern is a trademark of authentic Vergilian poetry. Appearing in 13.6% of lines in the *Aetna*, the percentage of use for this pattern is almost as frequent here as in the authentic works of Vergil, differing by less than one percentage point.\(^{727}\) If there were one method a writer would employ in order to imitate Vergil, it might be the use of this pattern. The fact that DSSS emerges as one of the most frequent patterns should not be surprising, but the similarity to the authentic works does not prove shared authorship. Despite the frequent use of this pattern, the *Aetna* also does not

\(^{727}\) However, I must note that the poem is fairly short, a fact that might hinder any significant conclusion.
necessarily coalesce with the collection of pseudepigraphic works, as it shares few other metrical features with those poems.

The lexical density of the *Aetna* provides another way in which to compare it objectively to the other poems in the *VSD* and the authentic works of Vergil. Interestingly, here again, as with meter, we find a major discrepancy between this poem and the other pseudepigraphic works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
<th>Lexical Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Aetna</em></td>
<td>4,195</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aeneid</em></td>
<td>63,719</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Georgics</em></td>
<td>14,183</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Eclogues</em></td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ciris</em></td>
<td>3,472</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Culex</em></td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Catalepton</em></td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dirae</em></td>
<td>648</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lydia</em></td>
<td>531</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Priapaea</em></td>
<td>506</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The density of this poem is 5.63, making it higher than any of the other pseudepigraphic Vergilian poems, even though the *Culex* and *Ciris* are of similar lengths. It is also higher than that of the *Eclogues* and of the *Georgics*, though the latter is significantly longer. The high lexical density of the *Aetna* can be explained in a few different ways. A positive explanation could be that there is a limited vocabulary for describing a volcano and volcanic activity. Also, the *Aetna* is a didactic work and as such may have been intentionally reader friendly in order to fulfill its purpose. A negative explanation, on the other hand, could be that the vocabulary is quite repetitive due to authorship by an unskilled writer. Whatever
the reason, the *Aetna* is not as varied as the other authentic and pseudepigraphic works in terms of lexical choice.

In this objective measurement of the *Aetna*, we again see that it is most similar to the *Ciris*. Out of any of the other pseudepigraphic poems, then, these two poems are the closest both metrically and lexically. Additionally, the tone of these two poems is similar: both are more serious than their counterparts. While the *Ciris* is a somewhat ludic epyllion, it is a much more erudite one than the openly playful *Culex*. While the *Ciris* is not didactic like the *Aetna*, it does have an element of that genre as it provides an *aetion* for the ciris bird. Perhaps, then, the formal links of the poem are further enhanced by the tone as well.

At this point, let us return to the lists of pseudepigrapha provided by Donatus and Servius. While most of the poems listed are the same, they are not in the exact same order: Donatus lists the *Ciris* and *Culex* at the end, followed by a mention of the *Aetna* two sections later. Servius, meanwhile, mentions the *Ciris* first, followed by the *Aetna* and then the *Culex*. Listing these three poems together is logical: they are all written in dactylic hexameter.\(^{728}\) However, what is curious is the fact that the *Culex* and *Ciris*, two works that share not only the same meter but also the same form, that of an epyllion, are separated by this didactic work. On the one hand, perhaps there was no motivation behind this structuring of the list.\(^{729}\) On the other hand, perhaps in light of the metrical, lexical and tonal similarities between the *Aetna* and the *Ciris*, the list is more carefully constructed than once thought. I

\(^{728}\) Although I should note that the fourth dactylic hexameter poem, the *Dirae*, is mentioned last in Servius’ list.

\(^{729}\) The pseudepigrapha are not listed in alphabetical order so that can be discounted as a reason.
suggest that the internal elements of these poems connect them to one another more than to the other pieces of pseudepigrapha and perhaps Servius noticed that when revising the biography of Donatus. Additionally, both of these poems share a similar connection to the works of Vergil. As will be discussed in more depth below, both engage with separate authentic works in order to “correct” them. The authors of these poems declare that what has come before, i.e. the stories in Vergil’s authentic works, are false and they will tell the true stories. While they may be set up as Vergilian juvenilia and therefore composed before the authentic works, nevertheless they will emend them. This type of correction, coupled with the internal, structural similarities in the poems, I propose, lend credence to the idea that Servius’ list of pseudepigrapha may have had a carefully considered structure.

In searching the Aetna for connections to Vergil—both to his biography and to his authentic works—we find very few of those present in the other pseudepigraphic poems. While many of the other works clearly fill gaps in the biography of Vergil, it is hard to see what gap the Aetna fills. From the placement of the Aetna before the other authentic works in Servius’ biography, it is assumed that it is a youthful composition. However, unlike many of the other pseudepigraphic poems, there is no internal indication that it is meant to be read as such. In the other poems, we have references to the age of the author, explicitly or implicitly through mentions of what will come later, or connections to Vergil’s youthful exploits. The Aetna mentions neither the author’s age nor events from

---

730 Perhaps the Aetna could be seen as reflecting a young “Vergil’s” interest in both Epicureanism and didactic poetry, both in reaction to Lucretius’ De Rerum Natura. These interests, whose beginnings are found here, would be fully realized in the more mature Georgics.
Vergil’s youth. I think we could still read this poem as a youthful work, following the implications contained in the biographical tradition, but the support for this interpretation is not as strong as in the other poems.

Perhaps instead, we are to view the composition of a poem on this topic as almost a “rite of passage” for authors. Seneca the Younger, in his 79th letter to Lucilius, discusses writing about Mount Etna in poetry, stating:

*Quid tibi do ne Aetnam describas in tuo carmine, ne hunc sollemnem omnibus poetis locum adtingas? Quem quominus Ovidius tractaret, nihil obstitit quod iam Vergilius impleverat; ne Severum quidem Cornelium uterque deterruit. Omnibus praeterea feliciter hic locus se dedit, et qui praecesserant non praeripuisse mihi videntur quae dici poterant, sed aperuisse.*

What am I to give to you, so that you do not merely describe Aetna in your poem, so that you do not mention briefly this topic customary for all poets? A topic that Ovid dealt with no less, it hindered him in no way that Vergil already had fully covered it; both not even deterred Cornelius Severus. Besides this topic gave itself happily to all, and those who have gone before seems to me not to have forestalled the things which were able to be said, but have opened (the topic) up.

Seneca clearly notes that Vergil had touched upon the topic, as many other poets of the time had done. Seneca very well may be referencing the mention of the mountain in the *Aeneid* to be discussed below. However, Seneca does not name the work in which Vergil discusses the mountain, just as he does not name the work of Ovid. Perhaps the *Aetna* accidently became ascribed to Vergil by later copyists seeking to fill this hole in the biography of Vergil. But again, while Seneca most probably was referencing the passage in the *Aeneid*, the reference may have been misinterpreted by later scribes who connected this work to Vergil. This poem, then,

---

733 I hesitate to say that this is why Donatus and Servius add the poem, even if tentatively, to Vergil’s oeuvre, as it seems they would have most likely understood it to be a reference to the passage in the *Aeneid*. However, that is not to say later readers of the epistle would not have made a connection between it and the *Aetna*.
may fall into the category of misattribution, rather than an intentional impersonation of Vergil. Nevertheless, it is clear that the topic of Mount Etna was a common one for many poets of the early Principate.

If we do pay heed to the biographical mention found in Servius, however, perhaps ancient readers would see the *Aetna* as a youthful first attempt at a didactic work preceding the more mature *Georgics*.\(^{734}\) The *Aetna* also contains the descriptions of rural scenery that may provide a preview of those seen later in the *Eclogues*.\(^{735}\) Instead of choosing to write about a location with obvious ties to Vergil’s youth, like Mt. Vesuvius in Southern Italy, the author chose to write about the more pastoral Sicily, the location of Mt. Etna. The choice may also be a nod to Theocritus. In addition, a young Vergil would have been writing before the major eruption of Vesuvius in 79 CE. Prior to that, the last recorded eruption was in 217 BCE, meaning that “Vergil” would have had no frame of reference for volcanic activity in mainland Italy, whereas Etna is almost constantly active.\(^{736}\) Thus, it makes sense that even though Vergil might have studied under the specter of Vesuvius, it is the more active Etna that “he” could have experienced and therefore described.

Last, the choice of the volcano in Sicily may be a nod to the third authentic work of Vergil, the *Aeneid*.\(^{737}\) Aeneas, while describing his journey from Troy to

\(^{734}\) I will discuss the didactic elements of the *Aetna* in more detail later in this section.

\(^{735}\) *E.g.* *Aetna* 264-270.


\(^{737}\) Mount Etna is also briefly mentioned in the *Georgics*, but without much comment. In the last lines of Book One, we hear about the aftermath of the death of Caesar and how Etna continued to erupt (*Georg.* 1.472-3). This line of the *Georgics* is recalled in the section of the *Aeneid* discussed below. Later in the *Georgics*, Etna is mentioned again when the work of bees is contrasted with that of the
Central Italy, mentions the turnaround in Sicily and the view of Mount Etna. A few lines later, we get a description of the mountain in full. The hero continues with the mythological tale of the giant Enceladus, who was imprisoned under the mountain, and whose movements cause the mountain's frequent eruptions. It is this mythological tale that the author of the Aetna wishes to correct in his poem, in which Enceladus and his actions are discussed again. The author states that he will only describe scientific reasons for the activity of the volcano but then proceeds to tell the mythological tale of Enceladus. I argue that this section of the Aetna is meant to correct, and perhaps even chastise, the tale of the volcano in the Aeneid. The author of the Ciris likewise corrects a story written by the authentic Vergil, as we have seen. There, the anonymous author sets out his topic: the avian, not monstrous, metamorphosis of the maiden Scylla. In both poems, their respective authors make only oblique references to Vergil, as they are supposed to be one and the same. The author of the Aetna corrects the tale to the more scientific explanation of the volcanic activity that is continued throughout the remainder of the poem.

The Aetna, then, brings together all three authentic works of Vergil as discussed above: the (Sicilian) pastoral Eclogues, the didactic Georgics, and the etiological Aeneid. We see this same phenomenon in other pseudepigrapha like the Culex, as one of the key motivations behind the compositions of such works: to

---

Cyclopes under the mountain (Georg. 4.173). Again, this sort of mythological etiology is something the author of the Aetna cautions against.

Verg. Aen. 3.554.

Verg. Aen. 3.570-587.

Aetna 71-73; Aetna 74. Neither Ellis nor Goodyear mentions this connection in their respective commentaries. There do not seem to be any verbal reminiscences except for the verb expirare (Aetna 73; Aen. 3.580) with a word for fire nearby (Aetna: ignem; Aeneid: flammam). Even though there may not be any direct lexical similarities, the mention of the same figure is nevertheless noteworthy.
recognize the authentic works of Vergil. However, here, the references to the authentic works are more haphazard than those found in the story of the gnat. Or, I must admit, perhaps the references seem haphazard because they were unintentional, unlike in the *Culex*. Following this line of reasoning, the anonymous author here composed the *Aetna* not necessarily to pass as Vergil’s, as with other pseudepigraphic works, but instead readers believed that this poem was a work of a youthful Vergil and therefore mistakenly attributed it to him. Seneca’s letter mentioned above could serve as support for accidental attribution. If writing on Mount Etna was a common activity amongst poets, then perhaps this version was written not in the guise of Vergil but simply by an unknown author. As my discussion of this poem continues below, the lack of Vergilian connections will become more apparent. However, I believe those references above to be intentional and their vagueness to be important, as I will discuss later. While the writer of the *Aetna* may not be as talented in blending together authentic Vergilian mentions, as we see with the writer of the *Culex*, their purpose is still similar.

Scholars have discussed the philosophical background of the *Aetna* extensively and most have described the poem as broadly reflective of Epicurean philosophy.\(^\text{741}\) That influence may supply a connection to Vergil’s early education: as mentioned in Chapter 2, Vergil continued his schooling in Naples under Siro, where he was trained in Epicureanism. Some scholars, however, have noted that this poem is more reflective of Stoic philosophy. Although not mentioned in the biographical

\(^{741}\) de Lacy (1943) 177. de Lacy discusses the opposing arguments of Sudhaus (1898) and Rostagni (1933), who think the poem is reflective of Stoic and Epicurean philosophy, respectively. de Lacy comes down on the side of Epicureanism, but only hesitatingly, still contending that it is broadly a mixture—a position with which I agree.
tradition, Vergil’s debt to Stoicism, especially in the *Aeneid*, has been well noted.\(^{742}\)

Therefore, it is not odd to see the positions of various philosophical schools presented in the *Aetna*. In fact, this mix, de Lacy notes, is reflective of the late Republican/early Imperial period, when it was very much *de riguer* to compose works that reflected the positions of a combination of disparate philosophical schools.\(^{743}\)

I would like to posit another connection between the *Aetna* and the authentic didactic poem of Vergil, the *Georgics*. The introductions to both works are structured similarly: first the topic of each poem is introduced in brief before there is a quick shift to an invocation of inspirational gods.\(^{744}\) This structure is not uncommon for didactic works, though not all works in the genre are introduced the same way.\(^{745}\) Perhaps the topic-inspiration pattern was chosen by the author of the *Aetna* in order to recall generally the introduction of the *Georgics*.

One significant difference between the *Aetna* and *Georgics* is a dedicatee, or lack thereof. Vergil dedicates the *Georgics* to Maecenas in the poem’s opening lines. Even the *Ciris* and the *Culex* are dedicated to important figures in Vergil’s life, Messalla and Octavius, respectively. As seen in other pseudepigrapha, forgers attempting to pass their works off as Vergil’s often attempt to connect their works with key figures in his life, even if Vergil had not yet met that person, as is the case

\(^{742}\) Most recently, see Stevens (2007).

\(^{743}\) de Lacy (1943) 177. Even if the *Aetna* were not written during that time, it should be viewed as such because it purports to be a youthful work of Vergil according to the biographical tradition of Servius.

\(^{744}\) The Muses are different for each of the works and there is an interesting change that will be discussed later in this chapter.

\(^{745}\) Lucretius in his *De Rerum Natura* starts with an invocation of the gods, Venus and Mars. Manilius in his *Astronomica* however starts with a discussion of topic before turning to his guiding god, Mercury.
with the *Culex*. It is the lack of details such as this that make it easy to see why Donatus doubted its attribution to Vergil.

As discussed in Chapters 2 through 4, the pseudepigraphic works of Vergil make frequent reference to the authentic works of the author – the sort of references that are lacking between the *Aetna* and those works. Faint echoes of Vergil have been found throughout the *Aetna*, although it is unclear what is definitively borrowed from Vergil and what is common to poetic vocabulary.\(^746\)

While works like the *Ciris* draw lines unquestionably from the authentic works, the same cannot be said about the *Aetna*, as with the *Copa*.\(^747\) Its lack of biographical allusions to the life of Vergil further complicates the connections between this work and its purported author.

Even though the *Aetna* draws little from the biography and authentic works of Vergil, it does reflect elements of the educational system that was in place during Vergil’s life. Perhaps the work as a whole was meant to be an example of how to write a didactic poem, as written by a schoolteacher. Volk, in her introduction to Ellis’ commentary, notes that the poem follows the tenets of didactic poetry so well that “one has the impression that the author self-consciously set out to compose a work according to all the rules of the genre.”\(^748\) If this poem were a production of the

---

\(^{746}\) Ellis (1901) xxxii. For example, one Vergilian echo is the *manifesta fides* in line 177, which seems to be taken from the *Aeneid* 2.309 and 3.375 (xxxii). See Goodyear’s commentary (1977) for various other examples throughout.

\(^{747}\) There are a few Vergilian echoes within the *Aetna*. For example, *fervet opus* (169) is found in *Georg.* 4.169 and *Aen.* 1.436. However, in both authentic examples, the actor in the sentence is a swarm of bees, not the mounting pressure under a volcano. Therefore, while there are some reminiscences, there is nothing unquestionably and significantly drawn from the authentic works of Vergil. Moreover, when allusions to the authentic works exist, there is no correspondence in context as we have seen in other pseudepigraphic poems.

\(^{748}\) Volk (2008) XXI. See Volk (2005) for further discussion of these conventional didactic features.
education system, perhaps its lack of a dedicatee is more easily explained, as one would not have been necessary.

The *Aetna* contains examples of several types of educational *progymnasmata*.\(^{749}\) As a didactic work, the purported purpose of the *Aetna* is to teach the reader about volcanoes, particularly Mount Etna, and to describe the nature of the mountain and its volcanic activity.\(^ {750}\) The resulting physical description of the mountain and its eruption has a technical purpose and is an example of *ekphrasis*. The explanation of the threatening mountain is then grounded by an actual experience when confronting it. The ending includes an anecdote, or *chreia*, about a previous eruption of the volcano when two brothers valiantly saved their parents from certain death.\(^ {751}\) The anecdote hews closely to educational exercises and even ends in a maxim, or *gnome*, that reminds the reader of the rewards one can reap for heroic deeds.\(^ {752}\) The use of several different types of *progymnasmata* further supports Volk’s claim that the *Aetna* reads like an example to others of how to write in the didactic genre.

While the *Aetna* shares some structural traits with the authentic and other pseudepigraphic works of Vergil as described above, it does not share the stylistic traits of ludic poetry. The tone of the *Aetna* is purposefully serious, as it is a didactic work about a volcano that has caused major destruction. The author is attempting to

\(^{749}\) It must be noted that there seems to be no large scale *progymnasmata* that takes a philosophical bent such as is found in the *Aetna*. However, there are examples of exercises that do deal with philosophical schools. See Bonner (1977: 250-276) for evidence.

\(^{750}\) *Aetna* 175-189; *Aetna* 449-568.

\(^{751}\) *Aetna* 625-646.

\(^{752}\) *Aetna* 643-646. See Morgan (2013) for further discussion of and bibliography for the study of *gnomai* in antiquity.
convey important scientific information and inform his audience of the signs and signals of volcanoes. Therefore, there is no room for playfulness and levity.

Though the Aetna was not written in a ludic style, its author did draw on some elements of the related tradition of Hellenistic poetry, including the studied learning that was fostered in the vibrant intellectual Library and Mouseion at Alexandria. I suggest the didactic nature of the Aetna reflects the erudition of works from that time period, in that it contains an intensely in-depth discussion of volcanoes, their causes (with various explanations) and effects.\textsuperscript{753} The poet explicitly states that he is writing from the stance of an expert, instructing his readers “from the beginning let the fictions of the poets not capture anyone” \textit{(principio ne quem capiat fallacia vatum)}.\textsuperscript{754} The author goes on to elucidate those fictions and to correct those that have come before him, calling them “erroneous” \textit{(mendosae)}.\textsuperscript{755} The poet emphasizes that he is breaking from the mythological explanations of Etna’s activity employed by past poets, noting that he will undertake “unknown […] tasks” \textit{(ignotas […] curas)}.\textsuperscript{756} He sets out to correct previous tales, stating that he will discuss the volcano “in truth” \textit{(in vero)}.\textsuperscript{757} Armed with more scientific knowledge, this work will tell the accurate account of Etna and will be the

\textsuperscript{753} For example, Aratus’ \textit{Phaenomena} has a tremendous impact on Roman didactic works, like Lucretius’ \textit{De Rerum Natura} and Vergil’s \textit{Georgics}. See Gale (2000) for further discussion. Aetna 110ff. This display of erudition, however, does not stop with volcanoes. The poet provides other \textit{aetia}, for example on earthquakes (158ff).

\textsuperscript{754} Aetna 29. \textit{cf}. the author of the \textit{Ciris} who similarly sets out to correct the Scylla stories that came before – including that of Vergil.

\textsuperscript{755} Aetna 74.

\textsuperscript{756} Aetna 24. There are no trigger words in this poem to indicate that it is Hellenistic, but the idea of trying out a course that no one has before is a common theme. Perhaps this statement also has links to the Pre-Socratic philosophers, most especially Empedocles, in their search for rationalizing the world. The author of the \textit{Aetna} may be attempting to invoke both traditions: the Hellenistic tradition of innovation in inquiry and the Pre-Socratic interest in natural philosophy.

\textsuperscript{757} Aetna 92.
first to do so. But, as Taub has argued, the poet, while dismissing previous authors, acknowledges the importance and tradition of a poetic medium for the conveyance of ideas about science and the natural world.

Even though most of the poem focuses on teaching its readers about the natural, scientific world, there is still concern about poetry. As is typical in didactic, the poem opens with an invocation to the gods, namely Apollo and the Muses. As previously mentioned, this opening is similar to that of the Georgics, in which we find an invocation to Ceres and Liber, the goddess of the grain and the god of wine and viticulture, respectively. The choice of these two gods at the beginning of the Georgics is appropriate, since the poem will focus on farming. But the selection of gods in the Aetna’s invocation is not as logical. Previous scholars noted simply that Apollo is the god of poetry and the work to follow is poetic; but he is not the god of volcanoes or even a god of the natural world. I argue that Apollo is invoked because he is also the god of harmony and order.

The subject matter, volcanoes and eruptions, is naturally chaotic. So perhaps Apollo is invoked here for poetic inspiration, but also to render a disorderly topic orderly for the audience. Goodyear notes that the invocation is “Alexandrian in tone” without commenting on Apollo. The contrast between subject matter, disruptive volcanoes, and divine source of

---

758 The idea of distinguishing one’s own truthful work from one’s predecessors is a common *topos* in didactic works as well.
759 Taub (2008) 46. She continues that the anonymous author here, like Lucretius before him, sees mythology and gods as useful in his work but only to a certain extent. He may invoke a god for assistance but that same god has no causative role in the universe (55).
760 Aetna 4-8.
761 Hard (2004) 142. These qualities seem to stem from his oracular connections. Additionally, Apollo might be an appropriate god for a scientific work because, as a god of rationality, he may be able to help the poet find order in the chaos of volcanic eruptions.
762 Goodyear (1965) 99.
inspiration, harmony-bearing Apollo, is quite evident. However, if we read the invocation as part of a Hellenistic tradition in which unlike elements are mixed to form something innovative, perhaps we can gain a better understanding for why Apollo is called upon.

Finally, like most of the previously discussed pseudepigraphic poems, the *Aetna* contains lists of mythological figures. After invoking Apollo and the Muses, but before beginning the introduction to the volcano, the poet includes a mythological list that seems out of place.\(^{763}\) Despite concluding with a statement that all of what has preceded has been told in poetry before, his list includes figures that have nothing to do with the topics to come. The list begins with a mention of the Golden Age and then transitions to other mythological figures of various periods, like Bacchus and Minos. The transition into and out of the list seems awkward, progressing from the proem, to the mythological list, to the topic of the poem, without any connection to what comes before or after. There is another problematic list towards the end of the work. The list occurs as a travel guide to sites in Greece, describing the connections of different locations to various mythological figures.\(^{764}\) Again, the list does not fit into the surrounding context: the poet shifts from a description of the Etna in Southern Italy, to the Greek travel guide, and back again to the description of the volcano. Perhaps this geographical juxtaposition is intended to indicate to the reader the enormity and superiority of this mountain to all other sites. However, without a firm conclusion to the comparison, the reader is left

\(^{763}\) *Aetna* 9-23. One reason for the mention of the Golden Age might be the similar mention early in the *Georgics* (1.125-129). However, that section makes more sense in its context.

\(^{764}\) *Aetna* 568-599.
wondering why he took this journey through the Mediterranean. As I have shown in previous iterations of mythological lists in poems like the *Culex*, connections to the surrounding texts are much stronger. But in the *Aetna*, again, the devices common to other pseudepigrapha are not found, or are not used in the same ways.

As should be evident from the discussion above, Donatus had valid reasons for questioning the authenticity of the *Aetna*. While the poem has some connections to both the authentic and pseudepigraphic works of Vergil, these links do not seem to be as fully integrated with the poems as with other pseudepigrapha. Although the poem displays connections to all three authentic works, these references are not as significant as those found in the other pseudepigrapha, for example *Catalepton* 15. It is still important, however, that references to all three authentic works are present, in terms of setting, genre, and a mythological story, in order to further recognize the oeuvre of Vergil. However, these references as mentioned above are quite slight and therefore do not necessarily accomplish the task as well as previous iterations of the same *topos*.

Throughout my discussion, I have noted that there are some similarities in the use of metrical patterns and a few shared elements of Hellenistic poetry. Overall, however, the *Aetna* seems to be missing the hallmarks of Vergilian poetry, both authentic and not. There is a lack of interplay with the figure of Vergil, his biography and works. The *Aetna* lacks the lightness in tone of many of the other pseudepigraphic poems, and its lexical choices do not mark it as Hellenistic.

I must note, however, that the text of the *Aetna* is quite corrupt and perhaps the transitions were smoother in the original version. While he does not make note of the awkward transitions, Goodyear (1965) does add four cruxes, reorders lines, and notes a potential missing line in this section.
Perhaps, then, we should consider this poem a misattributed text, instead of one intentionally written in the guise of Vergil. Unfortunately, we cannot know why Servius unquestionably included this poem in his list of Vergilian works, but we can see why Donatus doubted its authorship.

**Conclusion**

Servius’ biography of Vergil owes a considerable debt to that written by Donatus. Yet he adds two poems to the list of Vergilian juvenilia posited by his predecessor. The *Copa* and *Aetna* each have different connections to the poems of the *VSD*. The *Aetna* does not fit as well into the paradigm of connections investigated in Chapters 2 through 4, a fact that encourages us to take Donatus’ doubt about this work seriously. Donatus seems to question the attestation of it to Vergil but perhaps that is because it does not resemble the other juvenilia amongst which it is found. While the *Copa* is never mentioned by Donatus, it is clearer why it is included in Servius’ list: unlike the *Aetna*, it has stronger connections to the other pseudepigraphic works. However, as noted above, it is missing the strength of references to all the authentic Vergilian works, references that are present in most other pseudepigrapha.

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, perhaps there is a reason why these two poems are added together by Servius to the list of pseudepigrapha. On the surface, the two poems appear dissimilar: they do not share the same meter, topic, or genre. Both poems, however, are set in Southern Italy. The *Copa* features an
atmosphere that scholars have linked to that around Naples; the *Aetna* features the
eponymous volcano in Sicily. The other pseudepigraphic poems found in the *VSD*
mostly reference the northern part of the Italian peninsula, the location of Vergil’s
childhood. The shift in these poems may reflect the geographic shift of Vergil’s
adolescence to the lower part of Italy. Both poems can also be considered Epicurean,
although not exclusively. The adherence to this philosophical school is logical
considering the poems’ setting in Southern Italy, a location strongly connected with
Epicureanism. Yet these are not the sole pseudepigraphic poems that reflect that
school of philosophy.

But beyond these tenuous facts, these two poems do not seem to have much
in common. The topics of these poems could reflect the supposed author’s first
forays into new topic, if we are to take their placement in the biographies as
significant: in the *Copa*, we are introduced to the world of lasciviousness, and, in the
*Aetna*, the more refined didactic tradition. On the other hand, their respective tones
and connections to the other Vergilian works, authentic or not, are disparate.
Perhaps we should view both of these poems as misattributed, due to their lack of
strong Vergilian connections. It is unfortunate that Servius records for us no further
reason for his inclusion of these poems in his list of Vergil’s poetic corpus, when he
is so careful to note the removal of other inauthentic Vergilian material.
Chapter 6: Vergilian Test Cases

In the previous four chapters, I have discussed the pseudepigraphic poems enumerated within the ancient biographies of Donatus and Servius. I have attempted to set up a guide for the commonalities that can been found among the pseudepigraphic works, as well as perhaps the ways in which these poems were meant to be understood. These six individual poems (Ciris, Culex, Lydia, Dirae, Copa, and Aetna), along with the two sets of poems (the Catalepton and Priapeia), all share unique links: metrical, biographical, allusive, educational, ludic, and those to Hellenistic poetry. While these poems may not have been written by the same person, or even at the same time, they all display similar characteristics that allow us perhaps to see how and why they were grouped together within the biographies. However, the works that I have considered so far are not the only pieces of Vergilian pseudepigrapha in existence from antiquity. In this chapter, I will analyze additional works attributed to Vergil and demonstrate how these poems do or do not display the same characteristics found in the other Vergilian pseudepigrapha. My discussion in previous chapters will add to the conversations about these extra poems’ connections to Vergil. I will focus, more importantly, on poetic concerns of these poems and how their poetic elements help us to read the pseudepigrapha together.

More Pseudepigrapha

Vergil was one of the most widely read authors in antiquity, and as such, his poems were key texts in the ancient Roman educational system. His poetry was
pervasive, with references to it permeating all subsequent Latin works in antiquity from high poetry to graffiti.\textsuperscript{766} While Vergil wrote only three works, the ancients craved more. As Horsfall has stated, “There was never enough genuine Virgil to satisfy the enthusiasm and curiosity of his ancient readers,” a fact that therefore engendered “attempts to supply the need for more.”\textsuperscript{767} To satisfy this desire, a number of ancient writers began composing works in the style and tradition of Vergil, some of which were attributed to the author himself and named in the aforementioned ancient biographies. Even though it seems that we have a large number of pseudepigrapha attributed to Vergil, the amount is actually “modest” compared to other authors like Ovid.\textsuperscript{768}

I have prioritized the pseudepigraphic works contained in the biographies of Vergil -- six individual poems (\textit{Ciris}, \textit{Culex}, \textit{Lydia}, \textit{Dirae}, \textit{Copa}, and \textit{Aetna}) and two poetic collections (\textit{Priapeia} and \textit{Catalepton}) -- due to their ancient pedigree. All of these poems were mentioned by the two ancient biographers as Vergil’s within a few centuries of his death, bestowing upon them greater importance. Besides these, there are nineteen additional individual poems and one prose letter, works that at some point were linked with Vergil’s name in the tradition. Most of these other twenty works are not mentioned for some time after the death of Vergil and/or have

\textsuperscript{766} See Ziolkowski and Putnam (2008: 5-13) for evidence of the contemporary response to Vergil’s writings, pp. 14-178 for later influence and importance of the same.
\textsuperscript{767} Horsfall (2006/7) 1.
\textsuperscript{768} Ziolkowski and Putnam (2008) 26. It must be noted, however, that just because what we have is “modest” does not mean that what once existed was modest. There must have been more pseudepigrapha in existence in antiquity that never made it into the ancient biographies or manuscript tradition. Perhaps there were some considered not good enough for copying. Unlike with the pseudepigrapha of Vergil, much of Ovidian pseudepigrapha are transmitted with his authentic works, a fact that makes identification of the inauthentic ones more difficult. See Knox (2009) for discussion of spurious works and bibliography on the subject.
questionable connections to him. In this chapter, I will discuss in depth five of these works: four of which fit into the guidelines I have previously established and one that lies outside of them, perhaps because it is a different type of pseudepigraphic work, *i.e.* one that is not a complete poem on its own but instead was discreetly included in an authentic work, the *Aeneid*. I have chosen these five due to the strength of their attestations and connections to Vergil. As for the remaining works, I briefly discuss here their links to Vergil, his authentic works, and his pseudepigrapha:

-- In note 272 of Chapter 2, I mentioned the one existing prose pseudepigraphic work attributed to Vergil by Macrobius. In this letter to Augustus, “Vergil” expresses concern about the composition of the *Aeneid*, a sentiment similar to that conveyed in *Catalepton* 14. The letter’s brevity and non-poetic composition do not allow for much interpretation beyond what has previously been discussed in this dissertation.

-- In the education section (pages 59 through 64) of Chapter 1, I discussed the seven distichs attributed to Vergil contained within the *Codex Salmasianus*. These inauthentic pieces are interesting in what they tell us about the educational system but, again, due to their brevity, do not relate much about their connections to the other pseudepigraphic works. The codex in which they are found is known for containing rewritings of Vergil in various forms from centos to those clearly marked as educational exercises. These distichs perhaps show the first attempts of schoolboys at writing as if they were Vergil, not merely summarizing his works.
-- In note 184 of Chapter 1, appended to the discussion above, I mentioned three other compositions that are attributed to Vergil in the *Anthologia Latina*. While these poems do contain some passing references to Vergil’s place in the literary canon and his biography, their lack of a secure manuscript tradition makes it difficult to analyze them alongside the other pseudepigrapha.

-- Three poems, the *De Viro Bono*, the *Est et Non*, and the *De Rosis Nascentibus* are first mentioned as Vergil’s in the 9th century Murbach Catalogue and are part of the later-named *Appendix Vergiliana*. Even though these three poems are mentioned in this collection alongside other Vergilian pseudepigrapha, they have not been considered Vergil’s for centuries. Instead, they are considered authentic works of Ausonius. While they are listed in the *OCT* text of the Vergilian *Appendix*, they are referred to as *Ausaniana* in the introduction.

Green details the manuscript tradition of these poems in reference to Ausonius. The *De Viro Bono* and *Est et Non* are contained in the collection of Ausonius’ *Eclogues*, numbers 20 and 21 respectively. Both of these poems, along with the other Ausonian *Eclogues*, are found in Manuscript V, which is the manuscript containing the greatest number of works of Ausonius (63%) and dates

---

769 Very little bibliography exists on these poems. Scholars on the *Appendix Vergiliana* focus on the poems more securely connected to Vergil and therefore ignore these Ausonian poems in their scholarship. The little scholarship on them is found in Ausonian works. Cupaiulo (1984) provides a text and commentary for the *De Rosis Nascentibus*. Polara (1981) discusses the Ausonian poems and how they set out to mock and joke with the image of Vergil.

770 Clausen, et al. (1966) vi. Interestingly, these are the only Pseudo-Vergilian poems securely attributed to another author, and a well-known one at that.

771 I follow Green’s numbering here.
from the 9th century at the earliest. The De Rosis Nascentibus is considered a stand-alone poem, as it is not a part of any collection of Ausonian works. This composition was first attributed to Ausonius by Jerome Alexander in the 15th century. However, it might have been connected to Ausonius earlier in the 12th century by Accursius, a Roman jurist who had access to a now lost manuscript testimony. Green also notes that various lexical choices and descriptive elements point to Ausonian authorship here.

Due to the long-acknowledged Ausonian authorship of these poems, I will not be including them for discussion. Based on available evidence, these poems have been included in Ausonius’ oeuvre for as long as they have been connected to the Appendix Vergiliana and Vergil. It makes sense that these poems, although written by Ausonius, could have been mistaken as Vergil’s, since the former’s debt to the latter has been long acknowledged. Additionally, Ausonius is well-known for establishing a new form of writing to pay tribute to Vergil: the cento. Perhaps, then, Ausonius not only reused Vergil’s own words to create a new work but had his own original works mistaken for Vergil’s.

-- The last pseudepigraphic text to be discussed in this section is the Moretum. As with the Ausonian poems, this work was attributed to Vergil through

---

772 Green (1991) 435-439. These poems are also found in G and W, two other important manuscripts for the text of Ausonius. See Green (1991: xli-xlix) for discussion of the manuscript tradition of Ausonius.


774 See O’Daly (2004) and Gruber (2008) most recently for a discussion of Ausonius’ debt to Vergil.


776 See Perutelli (1983), Kenney (1984), and Laudani (2004) for textual editions and commentary on this poem. Some work has been done on connections between this poem and other works of ancient literature. For example, Steele (1930) does put forth an interesting comparison between this poem and the works of Columella, even though he focuses mostly on the poem’s authenticity. Höschele
a mention in the Murbach Catalogue of the 9th century. However, unlike the previous set of poems, this work does not also appear in the manuscripts of another poet, thus making attribution of authorship more difficult. The fact that the Moretum has long been attached to Vergil does not mean, though, that the poem is Vergilian, comparable to the other Vergilian pseudepigrapha, or even written intentionally in the guise of Vergil.777

While the Moretum contains some general references to the authentic works of Vergil, for example the meal in Eclogue 2, the feel of the poem is almost completely Hellenistic, far more so than we see with other Vergilian pseudepigrapha.778 Following Hellenistic tradition, it takes the form of an epyllion, starting in medias res. The protagonist is a rustic farmer but is nevertheless called a hero, invoking the topos of mixing high and low.779 It is also an aetion, instructing the reader in how to make the meal. There are clear parodic elements as well, perhaps due to a complex metapoetic play.780 If we view it as a ludus, the flowers and vegetables found in the garden would then represent the various contributions to the poem.781 The pieces of pseudepigrapha previously discussed contain elements

---

777 The Moretum is best known for providing a motto for the United States. In line 102, the farmer is mixing the elements of his meal and color est e pluribus unus. With only a slight modification, this line became e pluribus unum. It is interesting that the one dollar bill contains quotations of this line of the Pseudo-Vergilian Moretum as well as lines from the authentic Vergilian Eclogues and Georgics.
778 E.g. Mor. 85-116 and Verg. Ecl. 2.11.
779 Mor. 59.
780 See Ross Jr. (1975) and Egea Carrasco (2010) for further discussion of parody in this poem and, in the latter article, its connections to other parodic pieces. In addition, Douglas (1929) has shown connections between this work and mime and farce. Fitzgerald (1996) also picks up on the parody of epic in his article concerning the uniqueness in Roman literature of a poor laborer.
781 Horsfall (2001) 314. Horsfall puts forth the comparison to garlands in Hellenistic anthologies in which each contributor is marked by a different flower. Unfortunately, Horsfall does not give further examples of which vegetables might correspond to which poetic elements.
reflective of Hellenistic poets as seen through the lens of Neoteric poets. However, in this poem there seems to be no critical reflection on the tenets of Hellenistic poetry. This piece feels more Callimachean, as opposed to Vergilian, as if it were written as a work of pseudepigrapha for the former rather than the latter. Perhaps, because of the poem’s connections to the Eclogues, the work was simply misattributed to Vergil, as opposed to its author intentionally writing in the guise of Vergil. Due to the absence of Vergilian aesthetics (for example the emphasis on the authentic three works or elements of Vergil’s biography and educational influence) in this work as well as its late attribution, I therefore exclude it from consideration as a piece of Vergilian reception and pseudepigrapha.

It should be clear, then, why these sixteen works do not warrant further discussion for this study. Although each poem, or group thereof, is interesting for various reasons, they do not fit well with the discussion at hand.\textsuperscript{782} The evidence provided by these works might be unreliable due to their lack of Vergilian pedigree and should therefore be excluded from further analysis here. However, the five poems for which this study may provide significant evidence are discussed below.

\textsuperscript{782} Additionally, I believe that the lack of early references to these poems in the tradition surrounding the works of Vergil is also a reason for disqualification. If these poems had appeared earlier as “Vergil’s,” it would have been interesting to analyze why they did not fit in with the other pseudepigraphic poems. However, if they had been attested earlier and perhaps composed earlier, then they may have contained different elements.
**Vergil’s “First” and “Last” Poems**

As noted in previous chapters, Donatus and Servius provide readers with a list of Vergilian juvenilia, now mostly identified as pseudepigraphic. However, there are two other poems contained in their entirety in both biographies—works that are purported to be Vergil’s first and last works. While neither is found in the lists of other Vergilian compositions, both are important to understanding the oeuvre of Vergil as a whole. Mentioned immediately prior to the list of juvenilia, the “Ballista” epigram, we are told, was written by Vergil for a deceased teacher while the author was still in school:

\[
\text{Monte sub hoc lapidum tegitur Ballista sepultus.} \\
\text{nocte die tutum carpe, viator, iter.}^{783}
\]

Under this mountain of rocks, the buried Ballista is concealed: 
By day and night, traveler, have a safe trip.

Vergil’s activity and age are introduced to the reader in the biography of Donatus thus: “while still a boy, he began a poem auspiciously for Ballista, his school teacher” (poetricam puer adhuc auspicatus in Ballistam ludi magistrum). As the participle auspicatus suggests, “Vergil” began his career under the best of circumstances, foreshadowing what will come next with his career and writings. Presumably, Vergil’s last piece of writing was for his own epitaph, mentioned after discussion of the *Aeneid*, the third of Vergil’s authentic works. This distich provides evidence for the fulfillment of his auspicious beginning. He wrote of himself:

---

783 VSD 17. Text from Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae (ed. Hardie 1966). Rincon Gonzalez (1994) discusses the variant distichs contained in the biography of Phocas (ll. 74-83). She attributes them to imitation and rewriting in the Roman educational system (853). Lacki (2014) mentions this figure but all details are gleaned from this poem and the VSD. Hermann (1964) connects this distich to the fables of Phaedrus and places it in the context of other pieces of Latin literature.
The two epigrams display many similarities. To begin, both are directly introduced in the biographical tradition with the same words “he composed this distich” (*distichon fecit*). While there are admittedly few ways to introduce such a composition, the identical wording should not be dismissed. Both poems are in elegiac meter as well per the genre of the poems. While Vergil himself never used this meter in his authentic works, it does appear in the pseudepigraphic texts quite frequently. Moreover, the use of elegiac meter in the Vergilian juvenilia suggests that this was an experimental meter of Vergil’s youth, before he progressed to the meter of his adulthood, dactylic hexameter. Although the funerary epigram would have presumably been written before Vergil’s death, the choice of meter was appropriate for the dark subject matter and inscription.

I argue that genre is the most important link between the two distichs: both are sepulchral epigrams. This form of course connects the poems to their Hellenistic predecessors, as the Greek poets of that time period often wrote funerary epigrams. But both distichs are connected to Hellenistic poetry in other ways as well. For

784 *VSD* 36. Text from *Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae* (ed. Hardie 1966). Ziolkowski (2014: 1343) notes that the “antiquity of the distich is supported by the appearance of its first three words … in the second-century graffito found on the wall of a classroom … in Rome.” (This scholar does not suggest that it is indeed authentic but simply dates from an early age, a fact that imbues it with more cultural authority. He suggests that it was written by a contemporary of Vergil.) Its location in a classroom is quite interesting as it lends further support to the literary evidence of Vergil’s works as school texts and to the idea that many of the pseudepigraphic texts attributed to Vergil had connections to the educational tradition. For more about the afterlife of this epitaph, see Pease (1940) and Frings (1998).
example, the “Ballista,” despite being a funerary inscription, is nevertheless also witty. The word *ballista* means “a military engine [...] for discharging stones and other missiles.”\(^{785}\) It is funny that this man, Ballista, is then covered forever under rocks, which were presumably thrown on top of him.\(^{786}\) Peirano takes the idea of play one step further, noting that this youth is “indirectly participating in the punishment” through the composition of this distich intended for the deceased’s tomb.\(^{787}\) Likewise, Vergil’s own funerary epigram shows Hellenistic tendencies in its mention of the poet’s authentic works. All three authentic productions of this author are mentioned in the second line, each invoked with a single word: *pascua* for the *Eclogues*, *rura* for the *Georgics*, and *duces* for the *Aenid*. The implication is that these works were so well known and so closely associated with Vergil that further description was rendered unnecessary. The audience of this epigram should be knowledgeable enough to decipher the implications behind these allusive references.

The fact that both poems take the form of a sepulchral epigram helps to link these two short works together and create a circular construction for Vergil’s writings. Just as the last lines of the *Georgics* circle back to the first lines of the *Eclogues*, these lines help fill out the biography of Vergil, linking the beginning to the end, and therefore demarcating the works between them as Vergilian. With such curiosity directed towards Vergil by the populace of the time, it is easy to see why

\(^{785}\) *OLD* s.v. *ballista*. Ballista as a name is attested five times as a name in the epigraphic record (CIL 5.3357, Verona; CIL 6.10053, Rome; CIL 9.376, Canusium; IMS 6.213, Pcinja; Stobi 133, Stobi).
\(^{786}\) See Kajanto (1982: 341) for further attestations of this name.
\(^{787}\) Peirano (2012a) 98. Rincon Gonzalez (1994: 853) mentions the humor in this as well.
they would want to have and to read the very first and very last writings of the author as a lens into his life at its earliest and latest stages.

As I have previous argued, almost all of the pseudepigraphic pieces discussed in previous chapters mention the three authentic works of Vergil and do so in order to recognize them as the authentic works of Vergil. Vergil's epitaph is no exception, invoking the three works in their canonical order with one word each. Although the Ballista epigram does not produce the same effect, this fact is not surprising since it is a work composed in honor of his schoolteacher. However, if we were to read these two epigrams together, I suggest that perhaps we can see an attempt at the creation of Vergil's oeuvre. These two elegiac poems have such strong connections that they can function as bookends to all the works of Vergil—the “Ballista” as the beginning and the funerary epigram as the conclusion. In their symmetry, they emphasize their own status as questionably attributed, as well as the status of the authentic works as genuine, narrowing Vergil’s oeuvre to just three works. In case the reader were to misunderstand the purpose of these epigrams in establishing Vergil’s canon, the funerary distich ends with an invocation of the three authentic works of the poet.

I propose that the composition of these two epigrams then can be seen as simultaneously creating, reinforcing, and finally closing the oeuvre of Vergil. While there are other connections to the previously discussed pseudepigraphic works of

---

788 In doing so, I believe these two epigrams almost dismiss the rest of the poems mentioned in the biographical tradition as inauthentic—or at least they are an acknowledgement that not all readers believed these other works to be authentic. It seems, then, that as early as the second century CE, the canonical works of Vergil were limited to just three. Or perhaps there was a preoccupation in limiting them to just three, as a response to the Flavian Age references (see Appendix A) to these works as Vergil’s.
that poet, the biographical structure that they provide is their biggest contribution to Vergilian poetry as a whole. The importance of this pair of poems is supported by the fact that they were contained in both ancient biographies of the poet. These distichs form a gateway or frame through which we can view the authentic works of Vergil.

**Pre-Proem to the *Aeneid***

In the biographies of Vergil, both Donatus and Servius mention that the *Aeneid* had undergone editing. Donatus relates that the grammarian Nisus used to speak of a rumor that Varius had switched the order of books and removed original lines. Servius adds further embellishment to the story, stating that the editing was done by both Varius and Tucca. Under orders of the emperor Augustus, they were to add nothing and to remove only what they deemed unneeded; one such removal involved the beginning of the work. The *Aeneid* once began thus, as recorded by both biographers:

*Ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus avena  
Carmen et egressus silvis vicina coegi,  
Ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono,  
Gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrendia Martis,  
Arma virumque cano...*

---

789 The only other quotation of pseudepigrapha is also a funerary epitaph – that of the gnat from the *Culex* (*VSD* 18). See Chapter 2 for discussion of the connections between these epitaphs.

790 *VSD* 42. The distancing of the biographer from this story suggests that Donatus himself did not believe it.

791 As mentioned in Chapter 5, there is no established numbering for the sections of Servius’ biography. This mention comes towards the end of his biography.

792 *VSD* 42. Text from *Vitae Vergilianae Antiquae* (ed. Hardie 1966).
I am that one who once sang my song on a slender reed
And having left the woods, compelled the neighboring fields,
So that they might obey the farmer, however eager,
A work pleasing to farmers, but now the bristling deeds of Mars,  
Of arms and a man I sing...

Although arma virumque cano is the well-known *incipit* to the great Roman epic, we
are led to believe that was not always the case. It is only due to Vergil’s editors
that we begin with “arms and a man,” as opposed to an invocation of the author’s
previous works.

Like other Vergilian pseudepigrapha, the pre-proem to the *Aeneid* could have
been written as a biographical correction or as an educational exercise. As Austin
notes, this piece may have been written as a response to those who questioned why
Vergil began the *Aeneid* as he did. The pre-proem, then, can be understood as a
way to re-start the *Aeneid* in a way that was more pleasing or fulfilling to readers,

---

793 Austin (1968: 113) notes that some have taken *horrentia* with *arma* in the following line in order
to make this passage even more inseparable from the *Aeneid*.

794 Austin (1968) 108.

795 Fontaine (2004) has recently suggested that perhaps the pre-proem lines were alluded to in
*Propertius* 1.1, noting how the authentic *incipit* of the *Aeneid* is similarly alluded to in *Propertius* 3.4.
(See Cairns (2003) for the latter argument.) While I cannot agree with Fontaine’s overall suggestion
that this allusion provides some degree of authenticity to the pre-proem, I do think it can serve
another purpose. Hansen (1972) and Gamberale (1991) have also suggested that the lines are
authentic. Hansen himself acknowledges that this is his “personal belief” and that his evidence is
“circumstantial” (148). While he does put forth some important arguments, for example that the
quality of these lines is subjective and therefore cannot be used for an argument concerning
authenticity, he lacks support for others, for example the idea that Vergil did not have to follow his
epic predecessors, but then of course does so with the authentic *incipit*. If the allusion is valid, then in
order for *Propertius* to have referred to it, we need to date the pre-proem to a time before the death
of Vergil. Additionally, while there is no way to know whether it had been written by Vergil, it does
show us that it was known in certain literary circles. I think that it would be a stronger argument if
we say the pre-proem to the *Aeneid* alludes to *Propertius* 1.1. We cannot date the lines for certain,
but it is more than likely that they were written after both Vergil and *Propertius*. With the
relationship reversed, the allusions can stand but the questions of authenticity are removed.

796 Austin (1968) 115. Austin is following a note of Servius on *Aen*. 1.1 where he states: *multi varie
disserunt cur ab armis Vergilius coeperit.* He continues: *omnes tamen inania sentire manifestum est,*
cum eum constet aliunde sumpsisse principium, sicut in praemissa eius vita monstratum est. Even
though the established opening seems fitting following Homeric tradition, questions remained
through the 19th century.
one that introduces the topic more fully and connects the epic to the previously written works of Vergil. A second suggestion for its purpose sees the idea of rewriting not in response to detractors, but instead as a proghymnasmata from the educational tradition. Writing summaries of works, in both prose and poetry, was common in schools. Following upon that idea, perhaps these lines were then meant as an introduction composed for a summary of the Aeneid or of all Vergil’s works. Another suggestion is that it was an anaplerosis (“filling gap”), as some thought the introduction, as it stood, was lacking.797

Although only four short lines, the pre-proem to the Aeneid displays strong Hellenistic tendencies similar to those in other Vergilian pseudepigrapha. The first line sees the author declaring that he has sung “with a slender reed” (gracili avena). Gracili is an adjective important to Hellenistic and Neoteric predecessors;798 I believe this word is marked as significant by its placement in the middle of the line metrically, set between two caesurae. Additionally, there has been some discussion about the genre of this pre-proem, a confusion that, again, might have been caused by its debt to Hellenistic poetry. Kayachev has recently argued for this piece to be viewed as a prefatory epigram on the model of Theocritus, creating another connection to the Hellenistic tradition.799 It is interesting, then, that a piece that is

797 See Peirano (2012: 19) for further discussion of this term and examples from Homer and Ovid.
798 See Chapter 4 for further discussion of this term.
799 Kayachev (2011) is building on Conte’s (1986: 84-87) arguments concerning the introductory epistle to Ovid’s second edition of the Amores. This scholar defines the prefatory epigram as one that “was normally distanced from the work it presented not only in terms of genre, but location as well” (77). Farrell (2004) concurs that there is a connection between the two prefatory epigrams but it is the anonymous writer of the pre-proem that imitates Ovid, not the other way around, as suggested by Conte. Kayachev notes that it is unusual for such an epigram to be so connected with the work that follows, i.e. that it cannot be understood without the lines that follow. He quickly dismisses this fact, however, noting that this epigram must have been inside the codex so that they were read together. I
written in dactylic hexameter and is intertwined with the epic to come, can also be seen as an epigram. One suggestion proposed is that this epigram was separate from the work, and was meant to act as a front plate placed under a picture of Vergil in a codex.\textsuperscript{800} However, I think it is more interesting to posit that this was intentionally written as an epigram connected to the work that follows. In that vein, it is a piece that uses a meter more often associated with the epic to come, a mixing of genres consistent with its Hellenistic tendencies. Following upon this line of reasoning, I believe we can see even further mixing through references to all three authentic works of Vergil, each of which belongs to a different genre. The opening line of the pre-proem declares that we are to read at the very least the Eclogues to which the adjective directly pertains, if not the whole pre-proem, as I suggest, in the Hellenistic tradition, which is further supported by the mixing of genres.\textsuperscript{801}

In the biographical tradition, we are told that these were once the first lines of the Aeneid, intertwined with the authentic first lines of the epic. The author implies that the pre-proem and the first line of the epic are unintelligible without one another. But the pre-proem connects to more than just the Aeneid. The opening lines invoke another authentic work of Vergil's: the Eclogues. In the pre-proem, the

---

\textsuperscript{800} Brandt (1928) 334. Unfortunately, Brandt does not suggest when this addition would have been made, only drawing parallels from Martial, Propertius and various inscriptions. Austin (1968: 114) doubts this conjecture since the piece would end mid-thought, and Hansen (1972: 247) concurs.

\textsuperscript{801} And perhaps we are to read the whole epic to come as Hellenistic as well, as Nelis (2001) has most recently argued.
author notes that at some point (*quondam*) he sang on a reed (*avena*), invoking *Eclogues* 1.2, where the shepherd Meliboeus did the same. The author then mentions his “work pleasing to farmers” (*gratum opus agricolis*), clearly an invocation of the second of Vergil’s works, the *Georgics*. As scholars have often suggested, these lines are meant as a link to the second of Vergil’s authentic works, thereby uniting our pre-proem to it as well as to his third work. It has been suggested that, by invoking the final lines of the *Georgics* and perhaps even picking up where that sphragis left off, “Vergil” is attempting to create a *sphragis* here in order to name himself as author and thereby authenticate his epic work. While Austin dismisses this fact due to generic concerns, I agree with Peirano, who views these lines as an authentication tool in order to establish Vergilian authorship of the *Aeneid*. Perhaps, as she suggests, there was a concern in antiquity that Vergil marked his first two works as his own, but the third was lacking such a seal, the presence of which is a characteristically Hellenistic trait.

I suggest that not only is this pre-proem meant to be a *sphragis* to authenticate the *Aeneid* as Vergil’s, it is also an authentication tool for all of Vergil’s poems. As we have seen with works like the *Culex* and Vergil’s own funerary epigram, there is a preoccupation in the pseudepigraphic works with acknowledging Vergil’s oeuvre. Here, though, unlike with the *Culex*, a poem that

---

803 Austin (1968) 109. The concern over genre is unwarranted as authors commonly mixed different genres within the same work, especially in the pseudepigraphic texts of Vergil. In fact, the point of this *sphragis* is to mix genres in order to invoke authenticity. Furthermore, the *sphragis* at the end of the *Georgics* also mixes genres in authenticating that work (didactic) and the *Eclogues* (bucolic).
804 Peirano (2013) 274.
805 Kayachev (2011: 82) in passing mentions that this passage “establishes the Virgilian corpus,” but does not see how it fits into the rest of the Vergilian pseudepigrapha as a whole.
acknowledges the corpus in a ludic way, the recognition is straightforward and blunt. Again, we as readers are confronted with mention of Vergil’s authentic works in their canonical order and, once again, they are not mentioned by name. The *Eclogues* are invoked with the word *avena*,\(^{806}\) the *Georgics* with *agricolis*, and the *Aeneid* with *arma virumque cano*, words by which each work would have commonly been understood. While there is some allusiveness with these references, it would be hard not to understand the titles behind them -- it is almost polemical in its delineating of the authentic works of Vergil. What is ironic, however, is that this poem is clearly marking the authentic works of Vergil, all the while the poem itself is inauthentic.

These pseudepigraphic lines display many of the same characteristics as other inauthentic Vergilian works such as connections to the biographical tradition, to the educational tradition, and to Hellenistic poetry. But it is this summoning of the authentic works themselves that most solidly cements the pre-proem as a tool to seal the Vergilian oeuvre.

---

\(^{806}\) I think a case may be made that the author of the pre-proem to the *Aeneid* is also invoking the *Culex* here. The adjective *gracilis* and a participle of the verb *modulari* appear in the opening lines of both. Fraenkel (1952: 8) notes this fact but says we cannot know which poem came first and goes no further with this idea. Perhaps the verbal reminiscence here can provide valuable information about the status of this poem in antiquity. Save one *Catalepton* poem, the *Culex* is the only piece of Vergilian pseudepigrapha mentioned in extant works before the biography of Donatus. (See Appendix A for citations.) It is also the only pseudepigraphic work that is quoted in the biographies of both Donatus and Servius, again providing it with an elevated status. While there is no way to know for sure, perhaps all these pieces of evidence suggest that the *Culex*, above all others, was considered Vergilian in antiquity. (However, that does not mean that the version we have today is the same as the one in existence then.)
Elegiae in Maecenatem

The Elegiae in Maecenatem, poems written in memory of Vergil’s patron Maecenas, present an interesting and different case from the works discussed above.\footnote{Schoonhoven (1980) is still the most cited text and commentary by scholars on these poems. Much of the discussion of them has centered on their cohesiveness. Scaliger in the 16th century decided to break the work that was once whole into two different poems after line 144, because of the abrupt transition that follows. Bickel (1950) and, most recently, Marincic (2005) have argued for unity between the two halves of the poem. A third solution for this problem is that the transition at this line feels disjointed because there is a lacuna between the two parts, as suggested by Ellis (1907). I, however, agree with Schoonhoven (1980), amongst others, who thinks that they are two individual poems, due to the structural unity in each section. I will refer to these works in the plural throughout this section in order to reflect this fact.} To begin, these poems are mentioned neither in the ancient biographies of Vergil, nor in any other ancient source. Like the Moretum and the three Ausonian poems, they are first marked as Vergil’s in the Murbach catalogue in the 9th century. Second, because of their topic, these compositions, while referred to as Vergil’s, could never pass as authentic works. These poems were written as a celebration and defense of the life of Maecenas after his death in 8 BCE.\footnote{See LeDoze (2012) for further discussion of this defense. See Nicastri (1980) for an analysis of three passages and what they can tell us about the cultural history of the time period.} By that time, Vergil had been dead for eleven years and therefore could not have written the poems. While the authenticity of other poems can be debated, these elegies defy any debate. Their attribution as Vergil’s, though they are clearly not his, makes these poems an interesting test case for the interconnectedness of the inauthentic Vergilian poems.\footnote{I must note as well that the Elegiae’s attribution to Vergil may have been accidental. Perhaps these poems were not intentionally written to be read as Vergil’s, but instead were ascribed to him accidentally due to the subject matter. Unfortunately, there is no way for us to know for certain.}
The *Elegiae* share many characteristics with the other works misattributed to Vergil.\footnote{810}{See Bellandi (1995) for discussion of Maecenas’ patronage and these poems. However, I must note that while most of the pseudepigrapha claim that they were written in Vergil’s youth or make connections to biographical elements of Vergil’s youth, these poems do neither. The fact that Vergil in no way could have written such works is problematic for their inclusion with the other literary impersonations. Perhaps this is one reason why they were not included in the earlier biographical tradition. While it is at least somewhat believable that the other poems may have been written by Vergil, it is not possible with these.} For example, they connect with his biography and fill a gaping hole in the tradition. We are told that Maecenas was Vergil’s patron, giving him money for a house, saving him from attack at the hands of a veteran over a land boundary, and fostering his writing of poetry.\footnote{811}{See VSD 13, 20, 27, 37, 44, 63 for references to Maecenas throughout Vergil’s biography.} Even though there was a close association between the two men, Maecenas is never mentioned by name in any other pseudepigraphic work attributed to Vergil. Instead, we find myriad references to Messalla Corvinus and his family. Perhaps the absence of Vergil’s patron in his earlier attested inauthentic works was the impetus for the creation of the *Elegiae*, however anachronistic. Even though Vergil had died before Maecenase, we are led to imagine that he would have written on his patron’s passing if still alive. Additionally, Caesar-- certainly here Augustus—is mentioned numerous times throughout the *Elegiae* to add to the chronological placement and realism of the works. While other inauthentic works reference the biography of Vergil, these poems not only reference his life but also fill in a missing piece of key information, namely the connection to his well known patron, Maecenas.

The context of the *Elegiae* makes sense when we view the poems in light of the educational practices of the time, the same practices that may have inspired many of the other pseudepigrapha discussed earlier in this dissertation. It has
previously been acknowledged that the *Elegiae*, or at least sections of them, read as
if they were created from *progymnasmata*. In fact, they clearly form an *encomium*
(“praise work”), a common school exercise. So here, we find one written in verse
under the guise of Vergil to his patron, Maecenas. Interest in the relationship
between these two figures would have been high from the 30s BCE onward and
therefore this subject matter forms a natural prompt for these works. While it is
reductive to discuss the artistry in the *Elegiae*, since aesthetic judgments are so
closely tied to ideas of authorship, I must note that scholars like Ellis have
highlighted their relative simplicity. Perhaps, then, these poems are closer to the
educational tradition, having been penned by a school-aged writer, than other
pseudepigrapha that exhibit more complexity.

The *Elegiae in Maecenatem* additionally display many elements of Hellenistic
poetry. For example, we find an emphasis on metapoetic play in this work, poems
that themselves celebrate Maecenas’ own writing in the field. Although the *Elegiae*
do not resemble an epic in form or meter, they invoke Muses in the first line, asking
them to watch over the composition, a motif that is commonly seen in epic poetry.
The author acknowledges the importance of Apollo and Minerva to the deceased’s
poetic craft. In fact, the goddess is referred to as “learned” (*docta*), an important

812 Holland (1926) 234ff.
813 Ellis (1907) 7. Ellis notes the poems’ “humbleness” (7) and “non-descript style” (16).
Unfortunately, he goes no further in his aesthetic assessment of the poems but one can assume he is
referring generally to the elements of the poems, including vocabulary, structure and motifs, among
others.
814 Schoonhoven (1980: 101-102) has suggested that Apollo and Minerva are working here in their
dual roles as guiders in the art of poetry and also war, reflecting the dual natures of Maecenas’ own
pursuits.
word for the Hellenistic and Neoteric poets.\textsuperscript{815} Not long after the author refers to Maecenas’ removal from public life, he goes on to describe how the patron valued poetry and writing over triumphs. Again, the Muses and Apollo are invoked for their guidance while our subject writes in his gardens.\textsuperscript{816}

Additionally, while \textit{docta} Minerva may have inspired Maecenas’ own works, the \textit{Elegiae} also display their own author’s learning. As in the other inauthentic Vergilian works, lists of mythological stories are present. The author of the \textit{Elegiae} includes a catalog of the deeds of Hercules and another of various mythological youths, both serving to celebrate Maecenas’ life through metaphor.\textsuperscript{817} Equating in these lists Maecenas and his deeds with those figures and their deeds allows the author to enhance the subject of this \textit{encomium}. He may not have defeated the Hydra like Hercules or stolen the Golden Fleece like Jason but Maecenas’ actions, for example at the Battle of Actium, are augmented through comparison. As a result, the author is able to combat the negative characteristics, such as effeminacy, usually associated with the great patron.\textsuperscript{818} Again, these lists are cursory and without much description, and thus rely on the learned readers to fill in the details. Through the use of mythological references and invocations as described above, these poems engage with the Hellenistic tradition in ways similar to the other Vergilian literary pseudepigrapha.

\textsuperscript{815} \textit{Maec.} 1.17. Minerva is also referred to as \textit{docta} in Cic. \textit{Arat.} 302 (\textit{doctissima Pallas}) and Ov. \textit{Fast.} 6.656 (\textit{doctae...deae}). In both of these passages, Minerva’s skill in the art of poetry is emphasized as it is here. Cicero’s use, in fact, is derived from Aratus’ \textit{Phaenomena} (529) and clearly reflects the Hellenistic origins of and influences on his version of the cosmic poem.

\textsuperscript{816} \textit{Maec.} 1.31-39.

\textsuperscript{817} \textit{Maec.} 1.81-92. \textit{Maec.} 1.107-140.

\textsuperscript{818} See Schoonhoven (1980: 39-56) for discussion of the ancient testimonia surrounding criticisms of Maecenas and the poet’s defense of him.
Of course, there are a few ways in which the *Elegiae in Maecenatem* do not completely fit into the paradigm that I have established with the other inauthentic Vergilian works. For example, the meter is not consistent with the other works; the elegiac meter seems to be used here because it was the meter of lament. In the Vergilian pseudepigrapha, elegiac meter seems to be reserved for youthful and more playful works, in the vein of the *Catalepton* or *Priapeia*. But we as readers would find it difficult to view these poems as Vergilian juvenilia because Maecenas would have still been alive if Vergil were a youth, and this somber work cannot be classified as ludic. Finally, while these poems are important for establishing or reinforcing the biography of Vergil, they do not serve the same function for his oeuvre as the works that are listed in the biographies of both Donatus and Servius. While there are some allusions to his authentic works within the *Elegiae*, there are not blatant references to all three works, as found in pieces like the *Ciris.*

In summary, while these elegies have many of the elements important to Vergilian pseudepigrapha, a key element, *i.e.* the recognition of the authentic Vergilian canon, is missing. Perhaps this omission caused Donatus and Servius to exclude them from their lists, if indeed the poems had been written before the 4th century CE. Or, perhaps, they were written well after the first wave of Vergilian pseudepigrapha, too late to have been included by the ancient biographers. In that

---

819 See Marincic (2005) for discussion of allusions to the *Aeneid*. Scholars usually focus on connections to the *Consolatio ad Liviam* and Seneca, not Vergil, when discussing this poem. (See Schoonhoven’s (1980) introduction for a detailed discussion.)

820 I must note as well that perhaps the two biographers did not include these poems due to their anachronisms. Or perhaps, these poems falls under the heading of “accidental transmission,” that due to their connection with Vergil’s patron, it was added to his oeuvre. If this were the case, then the *Elegiae* would be similar to the distichs found in the *Codex Salmasianus* that were later attributed to Vergil.
case, we might be able to view the *Elegiae* as written in response to the pieces mentioned in the biographies, works which pay homage to Vergil yet were not meant to be attributed to the now-famous poet. Following this line of reasoning, perhaps by the time these poems were written, it was no longer so important to write in the voice of Vergil and pretend to be him, but rather to write in response to Vergilian pseudepigrapha—those that had been mentioned in the biographies. Vergil’s authentic oeuvre was securely established at that point and therefore there was not as great a need, or opportunity, for poets of the time to compose supposedly Vergilian works to flesh out his catalog and biography.\(^\text{821}\)

**The “Helen Episode”**

As previously discussed, there is some concern in the ancient biographies over the post-mortem editing of the texts of Vergil, especially the *Aeneid*. According to Donatus, the epic was left unfinished and destined to be burned before it was saved.\(^\text{822}\) While both Donatus and Servius are careful to note that nothing was added by Varius and Tucca, leaving half-lines unfinished, his editors nevertheless did remove some text. For example, as discussed above, Donatus notes the report that Varius had removed the original opening to the *Aeneid*.\(^\text{823}\) Donatus mentions only the status of the pre-proem, whereas Servius mentions an additional passage, the

\(^{821}\) This idea could also be the reason why the *Moretum* is so lacking in the other elements displayed by Vergilian pseudepigrapha, especially the emphasis on the three authentic works. While, again, we can never know when that work was composed, it was not mentioned with regards to Vergil until a later date as well, perhaps suggesting a similar situation as with the *Elegiae*.

\(^{822}\) *VSD* 39.

\(^{823}\) *VSD* 42.
so-called “Helen Episode.” In this passage from Book Two of the *Aeneid*, Aeneas, standing in the midst of Troy as it burns, encounters Helen:

[And now I was the only one left, when I see the daughter of Tyndareus watching over the temple of Vesta and silently hiding in the secret seat; The fires give a clear light to me wandering and casting my eyes here and there over everything. She, fearing the hateful Trojans on account of overthrown Troy And the penalty of the Greeks and the anger of her deserted husband, A Fury common to Troy and her fatherland, She had hidden herself away and was sitting hated on the altars. Fires blazed in my heart; anger enters to avenge my falling homeland and to exact wicked penalties. “Is it certain that this one unharmed will look upon Sparta and native Mycenae, will go as a queen in the gained triumph? Will she see both her husband and home, parents and children

---

824 Verg. *Aen.* 2.566-588. Text is quoted from the *OCT* (Mynors (ed.) 1969). The *OCT* notes that these lines (re)entered the Vergilian text with the 1473 edition. Horsfall (2008: 568-586) also provides text, translation and commentary on this passage in Appendix 1 of his commentary on Book 2 of the *Aeneid*.

825 *i.e.* Helen.
Accompanied by a band of Ilions and Phrygian attendants?  
Priam will have perished by the sword for this? Troy burned by flame?  
The Dardan shore soaked totally by blood?  
Not so. For although there is no memorable name  
In punishing a woman, and victory does not hold the honor;  
Nevertheless I will be praised for extinguishing an evil woman and  
Exacting worthy penalties, it will be pleasing to have filled my soul  
With the fame of vengeance and to have satisfied the ashes of my people.”  
Such things I threw out and was carried on with a frenzied mind,]

This passage presents a case that bears both similarities to and differences from that of the pre-proem of the Aeneid. Both of these pieces are preserved for us in Servius’ biography of Vergil, but not in the manuscript tradition of the poet.\textsuperscript{826}

Thus, the implication is that both were removed from the text by the editors but must have still been known by readers of the time. However, unlike the pre-proem, these twenty-three lines were removed from within the text itself. It is not hard to see how extra lines or passages could be added to the start or end of a text, but for lines inserted within the body, the author would then have to ensure that their style and story are consistent with the surrounding text. That is the case we are presented with here.

There has been much debate over the authenticity of the “Helen Episode.” Servius notes in his commentary on Aeneid 2.592 the reasons for his rejection of this passage: moral turpitude, inconsistency with Helen’s appearance in Book Six, and

\textsuperscript{826} I think the fact that it is neither recorded nor even mentioned by Donatus is also significant. Perhaps it did not exist in the text of Vergil when Donatus was composing his biography and only appeared by the time of Servius. Or, perhaps, Donatus dismissed it out of hand and did not think that it was worthy of recording or even mentioning because it was so obviously not Vergil’s. As discussed in Chapter 5 concerning the Aetna, Donatus might be more discerning in his inclusion of what he thinks was written by Vergil.
Vergil’s own words at 2.601.\textsuperscript{827} Yet even with these stated reasons, scholars have continued to debate the authenticity of the passage, finding that, although it may not be fully consistent with the rest of the narrative, it does feel Vergilian.\textsuperscript{828} The text of the \textit{Aeneid} was unfinished, and perhaps this was a section Vergil would have edited had he not died. However, I agree with Horsfall, who argues that while the passage does fit in with the rest of the \textit{Aeneid} both stylistically and lexically, it is perhaps \textit{too} consistent. As Horsfall notes: “Repeatedly, the writing is excessively Virgilian, the work of one who spares no effort to prove that the author is Virgil.”\textsuperscript{829} Perhaps the author, in an effort to pass off these lines as authentically Vergil’s, went too far.

While authors of other pseudepigraphic compositions attempt to channel Vergil and his works, they produce poetry that is more nuanced than what is presented in the “Helen Episode.”

The motivation behind the “Helen Episode” is therefore different, I suggest. It is not attempting to channel Vergil as a youth prior to his fame as with other pieces of pseudepigrapha. It seems the impetus of the pieces mentioned in the biographies often is to fill a hole in the life of Vergil: What did he write in his youth? What was

\textsuperscript{827} See Horsfall (2006/7: 11-12) for further discussion of Servius’ reasons for removal. Horsfall, in his commentary on \textit{Aeneid} Book 2 (2008), provides an updated version of this article with different emphasis but the same conclusion.

\textsuperscript{828} Murgia (2003: 405), concerning this debate, states: “In general, textual critics, on grounds of the suspect quality of the tradition and of the language and style of the passage, deny authenticity, while literary critics maintain it.” Both Murgia (2003) and Horsfall (2006/7; 2008) agree that it is not authentic, along with Goold (1968). Murgia notes that Austin (1964, 1966) in his commentary on the second book of the \textit{Aeneid} and Conte (1978) both defend this passage. Defenders, Murgia continues, usually fall back on the argument that a piece written this well surely had to have been written by Vergil himself (406). Horsfall (2006/7: 24) notes that it is the particular use of meter, vocabulary and phrasing that seems Vergilian. For example, in both the “Helen Episode” and authentic Vergilian poetry, there is tendency towards synaloepha at the caesura. However, in the former, there is an overabundance of this phenomenon.

\textsuperscript{829} Horsfall (2006/7) 24. Horsfall, in his argument, builds upon and praises the work of Goold (1968) and Murgia (1971) for his identification of Vergilian echoes in this work.
his last work? What would he have written upon the death of his patron? But this passage does not fill a biographical hole.\textsuperscript{830} The reader might be tempted to wonder what the purpose is for this passage, except an attempt to pass off successfully a piece of writing as authentically Vergil's when it is, to any observant reader, clearly not written by Vergil. Vergil has Deiphobus in the underworld mention Helen.\textsuperscript{831} She also is mentioned directly after this scene by Venus in her speech to her son.\textsuperscript{832} It seems, perhaps, unnecessary, then, for her to appear earlier in Book Two as well, in such close succession. While other pieces of pseudepigrapha attempt to mirror the stylistic and lexical choices of the authentic works of Vergil, none does so in the excessive way seen in this passage, nor does any other piece insert itself into the body of an authentic work.

The motives behind the creation of the "Helen Episode" must be addressed. One possible solution is an error in copying. Perhaps this passage began as a notation or as a musing on Helen and Aeneas' opinions towards her. In this scenario, the owner of the copy of the \textit{Aeneid}, or at least Book Two, would have written these lines on the side of the work in his private library. Then, when a friend or acquaintance wanted to copy the work for his own collection, the copyist accidentally added this passage into the text without knowing that it was not actually part of it. I should note one problem with this suggestion: the length of the

\textsuperscript{830} Perhaps, one could argue that the passage is similar enough and fits the narrative sufficiently well that, if Vergil had lived, he would have written a passage similar. In other words, it is not too far of a stretch to see why some scholars still support the authenticity of this passage.

\textsuperscript{831} Verg. \textit{Aen.} 6.509-534.

\textsuperscript{832} Verg. \textit{Aen.} 2.601. Here, Venus exculpates Helen, instead blaming the gods, for the cause of the Trojan War – whereas Aeneas continues to blame Helen in the previous passage. If the passage is authentic, then the speech of Venus might serve as a correction to her son's opinion. If the passage is inauthentic, then the two opinions are incongruous.
passage. While an accident in copying is plausible, errors usually occur on a smaller scale, either with words or with single lines. It might be too bold to suggest that this passage is completely due to scribal error.

However, a more plausible explanation for the production of the “Helen Episode” is the educational system. The bulk of the passage features a speech from Aeneas about Helen, the woman who is blamed for the Trojan War. Upon seeing her as his city falls, Aeneas expresses his anger towards her, that she might see her family in the future while his is ruined. A common *progymnasmata* is a *prosopopoeia*, a speech for a mythological or literary figure on a certain topic. As mentioned above, scholars have noted that Helen’s appearance at this point in the text is unnecessary since she shows up later in the work. But, the fall of Troy may have stood as the setting for such a scholastic exercise. The activity may have involved writing a passage in the voice of Aeneas, expressing his sentiments in this dire situation. Furthermore, the guidelines may have included an emphasis on Vergilian style, meter, and vocabulary, a fact that would account for the overly Vergilian feel of the passage. We have, in fact, evidence of just this sort of rewriting in the *Codex Salmesianus* in the so-called *Locus Vergilianus*, and the “Helen Episode” could be a variation on that practice.\(^{933}\)

The quality of this passage does present a problem however. Perhaps, then, the “Helen Episode” was not created by schoolboys but instead for them as an example of the scholastic activity upon which they were to embark. In that way, the high level of skill displayed in the piece can be attributed to the schoolmaster who

---

\(^{933}\) See McGill (2003) for further discussion of this codex and the Vergilian writings therein.
composed it, one who had studied and then taught the works of Vergil. At some point, the passage, through either errors in attribution or errors in copying (or perhaps both), then became circulated as part of the authentic text of the *Aeneid*. This imposture perhaps was created as part of the education system in order to be excessively Vergilian on purpose. In this scenario, this passage should not be seen as attempting to “pass” as Vergil’s own, as many pieces of pseudepigrapha do, but instead as attempting to use his exact same techniques but in an extremely exaggerated form for the purpose of education.

This passage presents us with a different type of pseudepigrapha, which, for the most part, does not fit in with the other works previously discussed—it is the exception that proves the rule. There is no connection to the biographical tradition, no relationship with Hellenistic poetry, nor ludism. The only commonality present is a connection to the authentic works of Vergil. However, unlike other pseudepigraphic poems, this passage is tied to just one authentic work of Vergil, the *Aeneid*, and inextricably so. There are no subtle allusions or references to this or the other authentic works. There is no attempt to establish the authenticity of the *Eclogues, Georgics* and *Aeneid*. The author does not even seem to endeavor to recognize the *Aeneid* as authentically Vergil’s, as these lines comprise such a minor part of the overall work. Here, we have a passage that is attempting to be actual, authentic Vergil, a passage that, in doing so, sets itself apart from the other previously discussed pseudepigrapha.

The “Helen Episode,” in being different, helps to points out the commonalities and therefore interconnectedness between the pseudepigrapha enumerated in the
biographies. It is not mere happenstance that those pseudepigraphic poems are united by Donatus and reinforced by Servius. There are many commonalities between the pseudepigrapha listed and quoted by the biographers in their *vitae*, the most important of which seems to be an effort to authenticate the canonical works of Vergil. However, these lines stand apart as unlike the other poems. No other inauthentic works, passages or lines have been found within the authentic works of Vergil as of yet. Simply through its transmission, the “Helen Episode” is unique. But it also lacks the other key elements of what makes Vergilian pseudepigrapha a whole. Instead, it attempts to “pass” itself off as authentically Vergil, more so than any other piece of pseudepigrapha, most simply by its position in the *Aeneid*.

This passage in Book Two of the *Aeneid* helps to recognize a Vergilian oeuvre, but in this case an oeuvre of pseudepigraphic Vergilian works, rather than the authentic works. The passage shows us that there were other types of inauthentic Vergilian works in existence from antiquity, a detail that renders the group of poems recorded in the biographies more significant. The passage also reinforces their grouping and the fact that they should be read together. The “Helen Episode” does not fill in the holes in Vergil’s biography, nor does it tap into Hellenistic or ludic tendencies. Instead, these lines in Book Two of the *Aeneid* alert us to the connections between other pseudepigrapha—ones that are lacking here.

---

834 This is unlike Ovidian pseudepigrapha which find many inauthentic passages and poems inserted into his authentic corpus. Again, see Knox (2009) for discussion.
Conclusion

I began this chapter with an observation from Horsfall, who notes that there was always a demand for more works of Vergil. Although there were only three authentic works, their afterlife spawned many more works that are Vergilian in tone, structure, and subject matter; some, admittedly, are more questionable in their attachment to Vergil than others. For example, there are three poems that were connected to the so-called Appendix Vergiliana, but have now been attributed to Ausonius for as long as they have been attached to Vergil – and the Ausonian attribution seems more secure.

As seen through the discussion of the funerary epigrams recorded in Vergil's biographies, the pre-proem to the Aeneid, and even the Elegiae in Maecenatem, there are certain concepts and topoi that the authors of these works continue to employ. The shared subjects suggest that these works should be read together and in response to one another. The main focus of these works continues to be an emphasis on recognizing the authentic works of Vergil as his canon. The Elegiae perhaps mark a moment where the canon of Vergil has been appropriately established and the pseudo-Vergilian works no longer need to be so singly focused on the author's authentic works.

The exception to the unity presented by Vergilian pseudepigrapha is the “Helen Episode.” Even though the reasons for the removal of this passage provided by Servius in his commentary to the Aeneid can be explained away, scholars have continued to question its authenticity largely because the passage seems too Vergilian in nature, as well as because of its omission in the best manuscripts. I
would like to add that this passage is also at odds with the inauthentic texts of Vergil because its purpose and techniques are antithetical to what is seen in the other pseudepigrapha. It shows us that the additional works attributed to Vergil can have different forms and impetuses, and thus this passage may be the exception that proves the rule, *i.e.* that the other works are similar in a way that is more meaningful than merely being by dint of their classification as Vergilian pseudepigrapha. If so, then the “Helen Episode” might do for Vergilian pseudepigrapha what Vergilian pseudepigrapha do for the authentic Vergilian works: recognize the canon.
Conclusion

Sed hoc ipsum crimen sic defendere assuetum ait: ‘cur non illi quoque eadem “furta” temptarent? uerum intellecturos facilius esse Herculī clauam quam Homero uersum surripere.’

But [Asconius Pedianus] said that [Vergil] defended himself thus against this customary accusation: “why don’t those people also attempt the same “thefts”? Truly they will understand that it is easier to steal the club of Hercules than it is to steal a verse from Homer.”

I. Premise of Dissertation/Dissertation Question

This study began as an inquiry into the connections between the works attributed to Vergil in antiquity, now referred to as pseudepigrapha, those beyond the canonical three (Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid). It was important to begin with a discussion of the literary environment under which production of these works took place in order to contextualize them. The concept of imitatio, in which authors purposefully reused various topoi from works of previous authors, and ancient notions (or lack thereof) of plagiarism were investigated. The fact that previous compositions were so open to rewriting aided in the production of pseudepigraphic works. I then discussed how the term pseudepigrapha was defined or used in ancient literature, as well as in the works of modern scholars, in order to explore how the texts thus termed are delineated. Finally, I progressed onto Vergil’s place in the literary canon, focusing on the role of his works in education. I suggested that this was a starting place for the production of what would come to be seen as literary fakes.

835 VSD 46.

836 See McGill (2012) for further discussion of the ideas of plagiarism in antiquity.
I focused my study on the works enumerated in the biographical tradition, since Donatus and Servius’ biographies of Vergil contain the majority of ancient citations. For the most part, the VSD contains the first extant references to what are now considered pseudepigrapha (the Culex, the Ciris, the Dirae and Lydia, the Catalepton, and the Priapeia poems), as well as probably the first catalogue of them. In viewing the poems cohesively, as opposed to individually, as most scholars continue to do, I suggested reconsidering not only their importance as pieces of literature but also their importance as pieces of Vergilian reception. While the list of works in Servius’ biography is primarily the same, I considered the addition of two works, the Copa and the Aetna, and their interconnections as well.

Additionally, there are works from antiquity handed down to us under the name of Vergil that are found in other sources. Some compositions are mentioned as part of the Murbach Catalogue, later termed the Appendix Vergiliana (the Moretum, the Elegiae in Maecenatem, the De Viro Bono, the Est et Non, and the De Rosis Nascentibus); some are distichs transmitted in the Codex Salmasianus; some are to be found in the biographies themselves (the “Ballista” epigram, Vergil’s funerary epigram, the pre-proem to the Aeneid, and the “Helen Episode”); and there is one prose letter in Macrobius’ Saturnalia. After setting up a structure of common topoi between those poems found in the biographies, I scrutinized these additional works in order to see whether they displayed the same commonalities as the aforementioned ones.
II. General Conclusions

As I hope to have shown in the preceding chapters, there seem to be many ways in which the Vergilian pseudepigrapha are interconnected, even though they do not directly reference each other in any significant way.\textsuperscript{837} I began with an objective study of the metrical and lexical similarities (or lack thereof) between all Vergilian works. Among the hexameter works found in the \textit{VSD}, save the \textit{Aetna}, there is some overlap between the most frequent patterns among both the inauthentic, as well as the authentic works of Vergil. Poems written in non-hexameter meters often show similar characteristics: experimentation with youthful topics and levity. But there is no lexical correspondence between these poems or with the authentic ones. However, I did explore how their higher individual lexical densities can be significant for easy readability and, perhaps, for the purpose or genre of the work. The fact that the pseudepigraphic poems are in different genres and have different topics makes lexical similarity unlikely, and while there are instances of wholesale lifting of phrases, these are few and far between.\textsuperscript{838} As I have shown throughout this dissertation, these poems should be seen as “Vergilian” because of their references to the authentic Vergilian material (topics, themes, influences) and biography. The eschewing of lexical similarity

\textsuperscript{837} For the most part, these pseudepigraphic poems do not allude to one another. As mentioned in Chapter 6, the pre-proem to the \textit{Aeneid} may refer to the opening lines of the \textit{Culex} (or vice versa), providing the only significant example within the pseudepigraphic corpus.

\textsuperscript{838} The notable exception is the \textit{Ciris} in which phrases are quite often lifted wholesale from the authentic Vergilian texts.
confirms that these works were not written as simple imitations. Instead, we should see them as having a more complex relationship with the authentic works of Vergil.

I then moved to a discussion of thematic elements that tie the Vergilian pseudepigrapha together. I began with their links to the biographies of Vergil and to the images they paint of the poet. It is interesting that the same themes are emphasized regularly in the biographies and pseudepigrapha: chastity, humility, provincialism, education, and friendship and friends. Further, not only do the biographers make clear that we are to read the poems as the youthful works of Vergil, but numerous internal verbal indicators in the poems also suggest we are to read them as such. Yet, not all works attempt to mirror the biographical tradition. Topics and themes in certain poems build upon the biographies of Vergil in order to fill in holes that readers may find lacking in Vergil’s vita, for example *Catalepton 6* and (Vergil’s lack of) lasciviousness. Additionally, the structure and content of these poems display myriad connections to the *progymnasmata* of the educational tradition. While the level of complexity in the poems presumably surpasses what a school-aged boy could write, I nevertheless suggest that we can see the foundation for the pseudepigraphic poems here in the scholastic tradition. Almost every work displays at least one type of *progymnasmata*, if not a mixture of multiple exercises.

Two larger themes that connect these literary imitations of Vergil are poetic ludism and the common aesthetics of Hellenistic poetry. First, the poems announce their ludic qualities overtly through the use of specific terminology. But not only do they declare their allegiance to ludism explicitly through the use of key words, but

---

839 The *Copa* also displays this type of lasciviousness.
also implicitly through various elements, for example tone, parody of better-known texts, and acrostics. Not all poems, however, are ludic in the same way: some are less serious, for instance the *Culex*, whose protagonist is a gnat in the guise of a mythological hero; while some are more competitive, for instance the *Ciris*, whose author and addressee once partook in ludic activities. Although the ways may be varied, all the poems display at least one facet of ludism.

Second, building from the ludic tendencies of these poems, I argued that the Vergilian pseudepigrapha also owe a large debt to Greek Hellenistic and Roman Neoteric poetry and draw on important terminology and motifs from these aesthetic movements. Often, Hellenistic and Neoteric authors and texts are mentioned, usually indirectly through, for example, parody, in order to advertise the connection. They appropriate from Hellenistic poetry both light elements, for example levity and innovation, and more serious ones, such as ruminations on poetry. It is easy to see why such links are made: if we are to read these works as Vergilian juvenilia as is suggested, it is under the influence of Hellenistic and Neoteric poetry that Vergil would have learned and written in his youth.

The most significant way in which all the Vergilian pseudepigrapha are connected is through their references to the authentic texts of Vergil. Their anonymous authors, writing in the guise of Vergil, allude to the authentic works in various ways, for example directly through quotation or, more subtly, through themes and motifs. In so doing, they at times attempt to create the impression that these poems were the first poetic endeavors of Vergil and that his later writings would have drawn on them, not the other way around. In fact, as I argued
throughout the preceding chapters, it is through the references to all three authentic works of Vergil in quick succession and often, although not always, in their canonical order, that the pseudepigraphic works show their importance. As a result, the inauthentic works have an almost canonizing effect on the authentic ones. As I discussed in Chapter 2, Donatus and Servius both mention in their biographies of the poet that concern was expressed in antiquity about the authenticity and integrity of the texts and their afterlife. Both refer to the editing of authentic material, in particular the *Aeneid*, which Vergil had left unfinished. Also, the concept of *imitatio* combined with the problems surrounding ancient publication practices may have further exacerbated these fears over the status of the text. Therefore, I believe that one purpose of the Vergilian pseudepigrapha may have been to combat the anxieties expressed by the ancient biographers.

References to the three authentic works of Vergil are found in the following poems: the *Ciris*, the *Culex*, the *Catalepton*, the pre-proem to the *Aeneid*, and the Ballista/Epitaph epigrams. Interestingly, the poems listed above almost exactly correspond to the additional Vergilian works, now considered pseudepigrapha, found in the biography of Donatus. The *Aetna* may also be considered in the same category, although its allusions to the authentic works are not as overt as those found in the other poems. I believe the *Aetna* should be considered as adjacent to Donatus' list: although it is questioned by Donatus, it too refers to all three authentic works of Vergil, though less securely than the other poems in the list. This latter fact may explain why Donatus would question the inclusion of the *Aetna*. 
There are two exceptions to the argument that the poems included in Donatus’ biography of additional Vergilian works all display these references to Vergil’s three authentic poems. First, the *Priapeia* poems do not seem allude to them. This fact can easily be explained, however: as noted previously, we do not know, nor do we have any way of knowing, which *Priapeia* poems, from the large number of poems of that genre, were considered Vergil’s in antiquity. The four that are now regarded as Vergilian may not be the ones that were intended to be attributed to him. Or, perhaps, there may have been more poems of this genre once considered his that were not transmitted under his name in the manuscript tradition. Therefore, canonizing references may be missing from these poems because what we now consider the Vergilian *Priapeia* poems are not those once associated with Vergil. The second exception cannot be as easily explained: the *Dirae/Lydia*. As discussed previously, these poems allude more strongly to the *Eclogues*, less often to the *Georgics*, and not at all to the *Aeneid*.\(^{840}\)\(^{841}\) Scholars have discussed potential problems with the extant manuscripts, *e.g.* the division of the poem and added lines.\(^{841}\) Perhaps the texts we have now are not in the same state as those considered Vergil’s by Donatus and Servius. Additionally, perhaps these poems were not intentionally written in the guise of Vergil in order to “pass” as his own work. Instead, perhaps these works were misattributed, written by an

---

\(^{840}\) The *Copa* as well displays more references to the first two works of Vergil than to his epic.

\(^{841}\) See Fraenkel (1966: 152-3) for discussion of the potential for additional lines. Goodyear (1977) disagrees with Fraenkel’s theory concerning problems with the manuscript. I must note that if Fraenkel is correct and there are interpolations, this fact could lead to further questions with the manuscript and explain the lack of Vergilian references.
unknown author and attached to Vergil’s oeuvre because of their close relationship to the *Eclogues*.

I would like to suggest, then, that it is the additional poems, *i.e.* those beyond the *Eclogues, Georgics* and *Aeneid*, found in the biography of Donatus that should be read together as the “authentic” inauthentic Vergilian works. These poems are not only the oldest attested, individually or otherwise, they also repeatedly recognize the three authentic works of Vergil. While other works attributed to Vergil show similar *topoi*, for example connections to the biography of Vergil or the Hellenistic tradition, these poems stand out for their constant repetition and recognition of the authentic works of the master poet. And while the other works may have simply been mistakenly attributed to Vergil, perhaps these poems are meant to be considered the “authentic” Vergilian pseudepigrapha whose purpose was to authenticate the works of Vergil.

While I argue that we should read the poems as pieces of anonymous Vergilian reception, I would be remiss if I did not address the question of authorship more fully. In essence, what would change if we were able to identify the authors behind these works? If the author of one of these poems were to be identified as a heretofore-unknown author or an author without attributed works, we would be able to learn more about the history and trajectory of Latin literature. This knowledge may also allow us to date securely the poems and, again, provide us with more information about literary time periods and literary movements.

However, knowing the authorship of these poems may also have a negative effect on how we read them. As evidenced by the Pseudo-Vergilian poems
commonly attributed toAusonius, we may read and study the poems less, if they were not attached to the name of Vergil. While the three Ausonian poems are read as part of his corpus, they receive far less attention than the anonymous pseudepigrapha. Furthermore, authorship does influence the reading of poems, for better or worse. If we were to discover that the *Lydia* was written by Propertius, for example, rather than Vergil, we might diminish the importance of any Vergilian references for the Propertian ones. While we might discover new and further Propertian references in that situation, we may also be too influenced in our hunt. It is hard to dismiss our preconceived notions about the author and his voice when reading a work, a fact that might manipulate our reading. In learning the authorship of the text, our understanding of it might be weakened or at least changed.

Therefore, I firmly believe that we should read these pieces as anonymous works rather than assigning them to an author. As mentioned previously, scholars have valued (or devalued) these works depending on if they proved (in their opinion) the works to be authentically Vergil’s. By reading them as Vergilian, we allow ourselves to focus on references to Vergil and his works but do not limit ourselves to just Vergil. We are able to explore references to the works of other poets as well, contemporaries and predecessors, almost equally. In this way, we are able to understand and learn more about the poems, time period, and reception of known authors’ works.

This study has significance beyond the connections between works attributed to Vergil. For scholars on this author and, more specifically, on the
reception of his works and their afterlife, we can view these poems as mirrors into what ancients believed were the most important thematic elements of Vergil’s biography and works. The concatenation of connections is significant in understanding how Vergil was seen and reread over time; for example, the pseudepigraphic poems explore the notion found in the biographical tradition that Vergil was chaste. However, at times, we can see themes that might have been thought lacking in his works or life, for example *Catalepton* 13 and the mention of a military career. Ancients were able to explore and fill in these holes through pseudepigrapha.

References to Vergil’s authentic works, style, and fame are found in a variety of ancient works over time, from Propertius, Vergil’s contemporary, to Pompeian graffiti, through to the Christian Augustine. Some authors (known and otherwise) will even quote or allude to the authentic works of Vergil.842 Some later authors, such as Aulus Gellius, analyze Vergil’s word choice and style.843 However, outside of the biographical tradition, Vergil’s life and times are rarely mentioned. On five occasions, Vergil’s male lover in the *Eclogues*, Alexis, is mentioned.844 Most frequently, Vergil is referred to by his demonym, Mantuan.845 Interestingly, other than those scant few references to Vergil’s *vita*, the only other biographical information comes to us from his contemporary, Horace, who provides a more well-rounded portrait of Vergil. In *Satire* 1.3, Horace relates to us that Vergil has a temper.

844 Mart. 5.16.11-12, 6.68.5-6, 7.29.7-8, 8.73.10. Apul. *Apol.* 10. See *VSD* 9 for further information.
845 E.g. Sil. *Pun.* 8.591-594. Once, Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 3.7.8) refers to Vergil’s tomb at Naples. This is the only mention outside of his birthplace.
and is not urbane, in a negative way. He ends his description, however, positively, telling his readers that Vergil is friendly.\footnote{Hor. Sat. 1.3.29-34. Horace also describes Vergil positively as honest and the best in later Satires (Sat. 1.5.39-49 and Sat. 1.6.52-55, respectively). Horace, in Satire 1.5, encounters friends, including Vergil, and they all spend time together in leisure.} The first two details provided by Horace do not make their way into either the biographical tradition of Vergil, nor the pseudepigrapha.

Overall, however, the Vergilian pseudepigrapha diverge from our other ancient authorities when it comes to the biography of Vergil. I propose it is significant that biographical testimonia of Vergil in the pseudepigraphic works are so many and so varied. While writers of the post-Augustan age seem to reference the poet in an almost standardized way, most often mentioning his writings, sometimes his birthplace, and rarely his male lover, it is left almost exclusively to his biographies and pseudepigrapha to fill in additional details of his works and elements of his \textit{vita}. Therefore, it is through the Vergilian pseudepigrapha that modern readers are able to gain a greater appreciation of how the ancients viewed Vergil, both his life and his poetic output.

Additionally, the fact that the pseudepigrapha repeatedly recognize the authentic texts of Vergil seems to support the notion, apparent in both Donatus and Servius, that there were problems with those texts. Both authors, writing a few centuries after the death of Vergil, address some controversy with the state of those texts, in particular concerning the removal of disputed portions.

My analysis of Vergilian pseudepigrapha collectively, rather than individually, has other wide-ranging applications. I have shown that reading
pseudepigraphic texts together may help to bring out potentially new nuances in the reception of a given author, here Vergil. A change in approach to one that is more holistic may be fruitful for other authors as well. Piecemeal treatment of the poetic forgeries attributed to authors such as Homer and Ovid may benefit from such a shift and shed light on new issues of importance. I hope that this study has shown that there is a need to reread works that were once dismissed as literary fakes, and therefore considered “less than” authentic works. In doing so, the inauthentic works may provide new insight into the authentic works of well-established ancient authors.
Appendix A
Ancient Testimonia of Vergilian Pseudepigrapha

A. Biographies

1. VSD 17-19 (4th c. CE)

deinde Catalepton et Priapea et Epigrammata et Diras, item Cirim et Culicem, cum esset annorum XXVI. cuius materia talis est: pastor fatigatus aëstu, cum sub arbore condormisset et serpens ad eum proreperet e palude, culex prouoluit atque inter duo tempora aculeum fixit pastor. at ille continuo culicem contriuit et serpentem interemit ac sepulcrum culici statuit et distichon fecit:
   parue culex, pecudum custos, tibi tale merenti
   funeris officium uitae pro munere reddit.

Then he wrote the Catalepton and Priapea and Epigrams and Dirae, and then the Ciris and Culex, when he was 26 years old. The subject of the Culex is such: a shepherd tired by the heat, when he had fallen asleep under a tree and a snake crept upon him from a marsh, a gnat flew forth and put a sting between the temples of the shepherd. And he immediately squashed the gnat and killed the serpent and also erected a tomb for the gnat and wrote the distich:

O little gnat, the shepherd of sheep, gave the rite of burial
To you so worthy for the gift of your life.

He also wrote the Aetna, about which there is a dispute.

2. Servius’ Biography of Vergil847 (late 4th- early 5th c. CE)

Scritpsit etiam septem sive octo libros hos: Cirin, Aetnam, Culicem, Priapeia, Catalepton, Epigrammata, Copam, Diras.

He also wrote these seven or eight books: the Ciris, Aetna, Culex, Priapeia, Catalepton, Epigrammata, Copa, (and) Dirae.

---

847 Unfortunately, there are no section numbers for Servius’ biography.
3. *Vita Focae* 84-86 (late 4th- early 5th c. CE)

_Hinc culicis tenui praelusit funera versu:_

"Parve culex, pecudum custos tibi tale merenti
funeris officium vitae pro munere reddit."

Thence he premised the death of a gnat in a refined verse:
O little gnat, the keeper of the herd gives back to you,
Worthy of so much, the service of a funeral for the gift of life.

4. *Vita Philargyrri I* (late 5th c. CE)848

_Deinde Catalepton et Priapeia et Epigrammata et Diras, item Cirim, Culicem, cum esset annorum XVI, cuivis materia talis est: pastor fatigatus aestu cum sub arbore pro calore dormisset et serpens ad eum proreperet a palude, culex provolavit atque inter duo tempora aculeum fixit pastoris; et ille continuo culicem contrivit et serpentem interemit ac sepulcrum culicis statuit et distichon fecit:"

"Parve culex, pecudum custos tibi tale merenti
funeris officium vitae pro munere reddit."

Then (he wrote) the _Catalepton_ and _Priapeia_ and _Epigrams_ and _Dirae_, likewise the _Ciris, Culex_, when he was 16 years old, whose subject is thus: When shepherd, tired out by the heat, slept under a tree because of the heat, and a snake crawled forth towards him from the marsh, a gnat flew forth and fixed a sting between the two temples of the shepherd; and that man immediately crushed the gnat and killed the snake and built a tomb for the gnat and wrote the distich:

"O little gnat, the keeper of the herd gives back to you,
Worthy of so much, the service of a funeral for the gift of life.”

### B. Other Ancient Writers

1. Quintilian *Inst.* 8.3.27-28849 (1st c. CE)

[27] Quaedam tamen adhuc vetera vetustate ipsa gratius nitent, quaedam et necessario interim sumuntur, ut nuncupare et fari; multa alia etiam audentius inseri possunt, sed ita demum si non appareat adfectatio, in quam mirifice Vergilius:

[28] "Corinthiorum amator iste verborum,
Thucydidis Britannus, Atticae febris,
tau Gallicum, al, min, et sil ut male elisit:
ita omnia ista verba miscuit fratri."

---

848 Unfortunately, there are no section numbers for this biography.
849 Quintilian does not name this poem as _Catalepton_ 2, simply that it is Vergil’s.
[27] Nevertheless, certain old words themselves are thriving for us by their antiquity, and certain ones are taken up periodically out of necessity, like *nuncupare* and *fari*; many others also are able to be inserted rather daringly, but just so, if an affectation should not appear, about which Vergil marvelously [said]:

[28] “That lover of Corinthian words,
Britain’s Thucydides, of an Attic fever,
As he poorly uttered the Gallic *tau, al, min*, and *sil*:
Then he mixed all those words for his brother.”

2. Statius *Sil. 1. Praef*. (1st c. CE)

> Quid enim [opus eo tempore hos] quoque auctoritate editionis onerari, quo adhuc pro *Thebaide mea*, quamvis me reliquerit, timeo? sed et *Culicem legimus et Batrachomachiam etiam agnoscimus*...

For why [should they at that time] also be burdened with the authority of publication, when I still fear for my *Thebaid*, although it has left me? But we both read the *Culex* and also recognized the *Batrachomachia*...

3. Statius *Sil. 2.7.73-80* (1st c. CE)

> *Haec primo iuvenis canes sub aevo,*  
  *ante annos Culicis Maroniani.*  
  *cedet Musa rudis ferocis Enni*  
  *et docti furor arduus Lucreti,*  
  *et qui per freta duxit Argonautas,*  
  *et qui corpora prima transfigurat.*  
> *Quin maius loquir: ipsa te Latinis Aeneis venerabitur canentem.*

You will sing these things as a youth in early life,  
Before the age of Maro’s Gnat.  
The wild Muse of ferocious Ennius will yielde  
And the heightened frenzy of learned Ennius,  
And he who led the Argonautes through the seas,  
And he who transforms the first bodies.  
No, a greater thing I will say: *Aeneis* herself  
Will venerate you, singing to the Latins.
4. Suetonius *Vita Luc.* 1 (late 1st – early 2nd c. CE)

*M. Annaeus Lucanus Cordubensis prima ingenii experimenta in "Neronis laudibus" dedit quinquennali certamine, dein "Civile Bellum," quod a Pompeio et Caesare gestum est, recitavit, ut praefatione quodam aetatem et initia sua cum Vergilio comparans ausus sit dicere:

"et quantum mihi restat
Ad Culicem?"

Marcus Annaeus Lucanus of Cordoba gave his first attempts of talent in the “Eulogy of Nero” at the quinquennial contest, then recited the “Civil War,” which was wages by Pompey and Caesar, so that in a sort of introduction he dared to speak, comparing his age and his first attempts with Vergil:

“ And how much remains for me until the Culex?”

5. Martial 8.56 (late 1st – early 2nd c. CE)

Temporibus nostris aetas cum cedat auorum
creuerit et maior cum duce Roma suo,
ingenium sacri miraris desse Maronis
nec quemquam tanta bella sonare tuba.
Sint Maecenates, non derunt, Flacce, Marones
Vergiliumque tibi uel tua rura dabunt.
iugera perdiderat miserae uicina Cremonae
flebat et abductas Tityrus aeger oues:
risit Tuscus eques paupertatemque malignam
reppulit et celeri iussit abire fuga.
"Accipe diuitias et uatum maximus esto;
tu licet et nostrum" dixit "Alexin ames."
Adstabat domini mensis pulcherrimus ille
marmorea fundens nigra Falerna manu,
et libata dabat roseis carchesia labris
quae poterant ipsum sollicitare Iouem.
Excidit attonito pinguis Galatea poetae
Thestylis et rubras messibus usta genas:
protinus Italiam concepit et "Arma uirumque,"
qui modo uix Culicem fleuerat ore rudi.
Quid Varios Marsosque loquar ditataque uatum
nomina, magnus erit quos numerare labor?
Ergo ero Vergilius, si munera Maecenatis
des mihi? Vergilius non ero, Marsus ero.
Since the age of our grandsons yields to our times
   And Rome has grown greater with its leader,
You wonder that the talent of sacred Maro is lacking
   And that not anyone sounds war with so great a trumpet.
Let there be Maecenases, Let Maros not be lacking, Flaccus,
   And you countrysides will give you a Verguk,
Grievous Tityrus had lost his acres neighboring miserable Cremona
   And was crying over his sheep having been carried off:
The Tuscan eques smiled and drove back malignant
   Poverty and ordered it to leave with a swift flight.
“Accept riches and be the greatest poet;”
   He said, “You are allowed to love my Alexis.”
That most beautiful boy was standing at his master’s tables
   Pouring dark Falernian wine with a marble-white hand,
And was giving cups tasted with rosey lips,
   Which were able to solicit Jupiter himself.
Plump Galatea and Thestylis with red cheeks burnt by the harvests
   Vanished from the inspired poet:
Immediately he conceived “Italy” and “Arms and the Man,”
   He who just now cried over the Gnat with a rough mouth.
Why should I speak of Variuses and Marsuses and the enriched
   Names of poets, whom it will be a great undertaking to name?
Therefore will I be Vergil if you give the gifts of Maecenas
   To me? I will not be Vergil, I will be a Marsus.


Accipe facundi Culicem, studiose, Maronis,
   Ne nucibus positis “Arma virumque” legas.

Accept, studious one, the Culex of eloquent Maro,
   So that you may not read the Aeneid when the nuts have been put away.
7. Ausonius *Technop.* 15.5

En logodaedalias; ride modo, qui nimium
frivola condemnans: nequam quoque cum pretio est
Ennius ut memorat, repleat te laetificum
livida mens hominum concretum felle coquat
dic quid significat Catalepta Maronis. in his
Celtarum posuit, sequitur non lucidius
et quod germano mixtum male letiferum
imperium, liorem, venerem cur una notat
estne peregrini vox nominis an Latii
lintribus in geminis constratus ponto sit an
Bucolico saepes dixit Maro, cur Cicero
an, Libyae ferale malum, sit Romula vox
vox solita et cunctis notissima, si memores,
cur condemnatur, ratio magis ut faciat
si bonus est insons, contrarius et reus, est
dives opum cur nomen habet love de stygio
unde Rudinus ait ‘divum domus altisonum
et cuius de more, quod astruit, ‘endo suam
aut, de fronde loquens, cur dicit ‘populea

And preciosity; laugh just now, you who too savage
Condemn frivolous things; even useless goods have their value.
As Ennius says, may joy-bringing please fill you up.
May the envious mind of men cook the hard pus with bile.
Tell, what does the *Catalepta* of Maron mean? In these
He put the Celtic *al*, the *tau*, not more clear, follows.
And that so deadly when mixed with its cousin – *min*.
Why does *res* mean power, litigation, love alone?
Is this the sound of a foreign word or a Latin – *sil*?
That laid on boats side by side, is it a pontoon or a bridge?
In the *Bucolics* Maro said hedge, why Cicero hedg’?
Or, is *seps* a Latin name, that deadly evil of Libya?
A usual word and most known to all, if you should remember, is *lac* (milk),
Why is it condemned, so that rather analogy uses *lact*?
If a good man is sinless and on the other hand guilty, is he of sin?
Why does a man rich in resources have the name of Stygian Jove, *dis* (wealthy)?
When the Rudinian says, “the deep echoing home of the gods, heav’?
And from whose custom, which he added, “into his own hou’?
Or, speaking about a leaf, why does he say “a poplar le’f”?\(^{851}\)

\(^{850}\) As Quintilian above, Ausonius does not name the work here, simply quoting a line of *Catalepton* 2 as Vergil’s.
Bibliography


--- Translation adapted from Evelyn White (1919).


---. *Aetna*. Oxford: Claredon, 1901.


Hansen, P.A. ‘Ille ego qui quondam ... once again.’ *CQ* 22 (1972): 139-149.


Pease, A.S. “*Mantua me genuit.*” *CPh* 35 (1940): 180-182.


---. "Ciris v. 48." RhM 68 (1913): 455-449.


Wilkins, Augustus. Roman Education. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1905.
Winkel, Laurens. “Some Remarks on the Date of the Rhetorica ad Herrenium.”