Jacopo Sannazaro's *Piscatory Eclogues* and the Question of Genre[i]

© Erik Fredericksen

INTRODUCTION

In 1526, Jacopo Sannazaro (1458-1530), the Italian humanist and poet from Naples, published a collection of five Neo-Latin eclogues entitled *Eclogae Piscatoriae*. He had already authored a hugely influential text in the history of the Western pastoral tradition (the vernacular *Arcadia*) but, while the *Piscatory Eclogues* had their admirers and imitators, these poems provoked a debate for many later readers over their authenticity as pastoral poems, due to one essential innovation: Sannazaro exchanged the bucolic countryside and shepherds of classical pastoral for the seashore and its fishermen.[ii] Through this simple substitution, Sannazaro's poems question the boundaries of the pastoral genre and—considered along with their critical reception—offer a valuable case study in how a work attains (or does not attain) generic status. In what follows, I argue, against recent criticism, that Sannazaro's *Piscatory Eclogues* should be regarded as a pastoral work and suggest that this leads to a better understanding both of the poems themselves and of the dynamics of generic tradition. After examining various features of Sannazaro's poems, I turn to his models for literature of the sea, both within and outside of pastoral poetry. This is more than a debate over how to label or categorize Sannazaro's poems; rather, I am arguing that these poems are best understood in relation to the classical tradition of pastoral poetry.[iii] Thus, after arguing for the collection's identity as pastoral poems, I will examine the structural relationship of Sannazaro's eclogue collection to earlier eclogue books (especially Vergil's), emphasizing how recognition of the poems' genre helps us appreciate Sannazaro's sophisticated intertextuality with Vergil and other pastoral predecessors.

Before examining Sannazaro's poems, it is worth summarizing some of the features of pastoral poetry. The genre is particularly difficult to define, and the question of what, exactly, pastoral is has spawned quite a bibliography,[iv] but the main features of classical pastoral may given as follows: pastoral poems occur in collections of short hexameter poems, some with one speaker and some with multiple speakers. The genre is centered around shepherds (often to some degree figures for poets) who sing during their leisure time (occasionally in competition with each other) and are often afflicted with the passions of *eros*. The content of the shepherds' songs varies but generally involves tensions between work and leisure, the country and the city, humans and nature, realism and an idealized landscape, and politics and a (notionally) apolitical bucolic world.

But of all these features, the shepherd is generally seen as the most central. Thus, Leo Marx summarizes much early modern pastoral criticism with the dictum, "no shepherd, no pastoral." (Marx 1986: 45) And in his recent examination of pastoral as a genre and a mode, Paul Alpers defines it as essentially about not nature or the countryside, but "herdsmen and their lives." (Alpers 1996: 22) Sannazaro's alteration of classical pastoral thus seriously calls into question the boundaries of the genre, by writing eclogues without shepherds. Indeed, Thomas Hubbard has recently argued that the poems are not pastoral, but a transitional work between Sannazaro's pastoral *Arcadia* and epic *De Partu Virginis*, transcending the pastoral genre. However, Sannazaro's innovations can just as easily be seen not as transcending the bounds of pastoral, but as extending them, expanding the terrain of the genre both literally and figuratively.

Hubbard sees the *Piscatory Eclogues* as "a transitional work...that self-consciously leaves pastoral behind in favor of epic topoi," (Hubbard 2007: 60) thus fitting Sannazaro's literary career into the familiar *rota Vergilii*. But must we force the Vergilian progression of genres upon Sannazaro? As Michael Putnam notes, "perhaps it is best...not to speak of an evolution in Sannazaro's career based on the Vergilian model but of an interpenetration of Vergil's masterpieces with Sannazaro's poetry as a whole." (Putnam 2009: xii) Hubbard's argument for treating the *Piscatory Eclogues* as, like Vergil's *Georgics*, a movement away from pastoral and toward epic essentially rests on three lines of reasoning: he believes the topic of fishing is associated with extreme toil antithetical to pastoral; he finds numerous epic intertexts that bring

the poems out of the pastoral world; and he reads several scenes in the poems as reflecting upon their own transcendence of the pastoral genre.

WORK AND LEISURE IN PASTORAL

In identifying fishing with a kind of anti-pastoral labor, Hubbard cites the two major precedents of fishing in pastoral: Theocritus' *Idyll* 21 and the ecphrasis of the ivy-cup in *Idyll* 1. For Hubbard, *Idyll* 21 depicts the "never-ending toil of the two old, broken-down fishermen." (Hubbard 2007: 62) But toil is not "never-ending" in this poem. As one of the fishermen remarks,

> And besides, there's time for rest. For what is there for one to do when lying awake
> among the leaves by the sea?

> ἄλλως καὶ σχολά ἐντι. τί γὰρ ποιεῖν ἂν ἔχοι τις
> κείμενος ἐν φύλλοις ποτὶ κύματι μηδὲ καθεύδων; (Theocritus, *Idylls* 21.34-35)

The labor of fishing is balanced by substantial leisure-time, not unlike that which a shepherd might fill with song.[v] In *Idyll* 1, the ecphrastic description of an old fisherman is certainly concerned with his strenuous labor (Theocritus, *Idylls* 1.39-44). Hubbard claims that this toil of Theocritus' fishermen "would have struck Sannazaro as georgic rather than pastoral," (Hubbard 2007: 64) but—while this is possible—how can one be so certain? Given that these georgic depictions occur in pastoral texts (*Idyll* 21 is arguably distinct from Theocritus' more bucolic poems, but *Idyll* 1 is at the core of Theocritean pastoral), could they not have struck Sannazaro as instances of pastoral's close connection to georgic? After all, work is not necessarily antithetical to pastoral. In Theocritus, Vergil, and Calpurnius Siculus work is always present, if peripheral, in the pastoral world. Theocritus' *Idyll* 10, for example, presents two reapers in a poem whose Hesiodic emphasis on work "thematises an opposition between two views of the countryside: a place of romantic fantasizing...and a place of back-breaking labour." (Hunter 1999: 200) A similar tension exists in Vergil's *Eclogues*, where "there are references to ploughing and sowing (2.66, 5.36) and pruning (9.61), swineherding (10.19), marketing (1.34-35) and even the technicalities of animal husbandry (1.45)." (Coleman 1977: 23) And Calpurnius Siculus certainly has no qualms about introducing labor into pastoral. In his fourth eclogue, Meliboeus recalls how Corydon used to tell his younger brother to abandon singing in favor of work (Calpurnius Siculus, *Eclogues* 4.23-27), while his fifth eclogue is essentially a didactic poem, in which the aged Micon instructs Canthus in the practicalities of rural life.

Work is thus present in classical pastoral, though often just off-stage, so to speak, the absent but implied complement to *otium*. Sannazaro treats the topic of labor in exactly this manner in the *Piscatory Eclogues*. In the first eclogue, Mycon encourages Lycidas to sing while another fisherman works, in language reminiscent of the beginning of Nemesianus' *Eclogues*, where Tityrus is encouraged to sing while working (Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 1.42-43 and Nemesianus, *Eclogues* 1.1-4; see Mustard 1916: 80). Lycon's singing in the second eclogue occurs under similar conditions (Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 2.4-7) and in the third eclogue Mopsus recalls the singing that occurred only because he and others were prevented from sailing due to wind (Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 3.1-7). Thus in Sannazaro, as in earlier pastoral, the concepts of work and leisure are not so much opposed as complementary, defined by each other's absence.

If Sannazaro effaces the tension between leisure and work in his *Arcadia*, in the *Piscatory Eclogues* he reinstates it. By doing so with fishermen, Sannazaro was able to defamiliarize his readers from this peculiarly pastoral tension. One of the most common charges leveled against Sannazaro by 17th and 18th century critics was that the profession of fishing was too toilsome for pastoral eclogues (Smith 2002: 433-436). Bernard le Bouvier de Fontenelle, for example, wrote in 1688, "I always perceive, when I read those Piscatory Poems, that the idea which I have of the Fishermen's hard and toilsome way of living, shocks me." (Fontenelle *apud* Smith 2002: 433) What Fontenelle found shocking—and what Hubbard finds georgic—is actually the fiction upon which pastoral is founded: that rustic, working people are somehow also leisurely, sophisticated poets and singers. After hundreds of years of literary tradition, this had merely come to be accepted; only through the figure of the fisherman could Sannazaro make the

strangeness of this crucial fiction felt anew. The toilsome characteristics of the fisherman's life thus do not move Sannazaro away from pastoral, but closer to its roots.

NON-PASTORAL INTERTEXTS IN THE PISCATORY ECLOGUES

In linking the *Piscatory Eclogues* with the higher genre of epic, Hubbard traces numerous intertexts from epic works (Homer, Ovid, Statius, and especially Vergil's *Aeneid*) in the poems, reading this as indicative of their breaking out of the pastoral tradition (Hubbard 2007:66-74). However, in doing so he risks neglecting a primary characteristic of the pastoral genre: its flexibility.[vi] One may also read such intertextuality simply as an expansion of pastoral, an absorption of extra-pastoral texts. It is telling that Hubbard focuses almost exclusively on didactic and epic intertexts in Sannazaro, attempting to link his eclogues to those higher genres of the Vergilian career. But there are a wide variety of intertexts in the poems—for example, a Catullan reference in Sannazaro's first eclogue, as Lycidas describes speaking to the deceased Phyllis' "unresponsive tomb, *ingrato...sepulcro*" (Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 1.56),[vii] which recalls Catullus 96.1 ("If anything is pleasing or acceptable to silent tombs, *Si quicquam mutis gratum acceptumve sepulcris*") and the "mute ash, *mutam...cinerem*" of Catullus 101.4 (Putnam 2009 notes the former). But this does not make Sannazaro's eclogue lyric, or hint that the poem is breaking out of the pastoral genre. Rather, Sannazaro uses whatever poetic material is useful, regardless of its original genre.

Moreover, Sannazaro's use of non-pastoral texts in his eclogues reveals affinities between pastoral and other genres. In his second eclogue, for example, Lycon's lament over his unrequited love draws on Vergil's Dido.[viii] For Hubbard, this lends Lycon "an aura of epic grandeur." (Hubbard 2007: 69) But for Sannazaro, Dido might simply be the troubled lover *par excellence*, an appropriate model for such a character regardless of genre. Furthermore, in making the allusion, Sannazaro implies a link between Vergil's depiction of love in the *Eclogues* and of Dido in the *Aeneid*. His use of this epic intertext implicitly claims that Vergil's ability to write the character of Dido derived from his earlier depiction of erotic suffering in the *Eclogues*, that Dido is an epic character with pastoral roots. It is in this manner that allusions to non-pastoral texts in the *Piscatory Eclogues* do not necessarily imply dissatisfaction with their own genre, but rather a confidence to absorb such intertexts into pastoral.

SANNAZARO'S ACHIEVEMENT

Finally, Hubbard adduces several metapoetic moments in the *Piscatory Eclogues*. In the second eclogue, Lycon boasts that he has wool given to him by the shepherd Melisaeus, imitating a similar claim in Vergil's second eclogue (*Eclogues* 2.36-38). Hubbard writes:

> In Vergil, the gift is a syrinx, and as I argued in my book, is an explicit metaphor for succession and continuity among pastoral poets... Meliseus says to the younger Lycon, *nostra cecinisti primus in acta* ["you were the first to sing on our shore"] (*Pisc.* 2.45)...and by declaring that the fisher-poet Lycon is *primus*, Meliseus implies that his poetry is something distinctive and new in genre, not merely another stage in the centuries-long succession of the pastoral syrinx.
> (Hubbard 2007: 69-70)

But why should *primus (*"first") signify "something distinctive and new in genre," rather than a new variation on an existing genre? Vergil uses the same word at the beginning of his sixth eclogue (*Eclogues* 6.1) to assert primacy in adapting an existing body of poetry, while Horace uses the related word *princeps* ("first, foremost") at *Odes* 3.30.13 for a similar claim. Moreover, "*nostra cecinisti primus in acta*" is an assertion with a pastoral heritage, recalling Calpurnius Siculus: "[he] who was the first to sing among those mountains, *cecinit qui primus in istis / montibus*." (Calpurnius Siculus, *Eclogues* 4.62-63; see Mustard 1916: 77) And Melisaeus here refers to the seashore as *nostra* ("ours"), implying that it is not outside his realm as a shepherd. Finally, it is difficult to see how a gift of wool can signify departure from the world of shepherds,[ix] especially as the pastoral pipes absent here appear elsewhere in Sannazaro's

poem. Lycon mentions his *avena* ("reed-pipe"; Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 2.28) and his singing is described with the verb *meditari* ("consider, practice"; Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 2.7): together, these two instances recall the second line of Vergil's *Eclogues*: "you practice the muse of the forest on a slender reed, *silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena*." (*Eclogues* 1.2) Sannazaro has evidently taken the pastoral pipes from Vergil, even if he does not depict the scene of their transmission.

In his fourth eclogue (*Pisc.* 4.19-20), Sannazaro again reflects upon his own literary achievement, referring to himself with both *primus* ("first") and *ausus* ("daring, having dared"). As above, *primus* signifies primacy not in creating something other than pastoral, but in adapting pastoral to a new setting. As for *ausus*, Hubbard reads it as referring to "the dangers in Sannazaro's bold new generic experiment," (Hubbard 2007: 74) but this boldness specifically recalls the *sphragis* that concludes Vergil's *Georgics*, where the related word *audax* refers to Vergil's writing the *Eclogues*:

> ...I who played at the songs of shepherds and, bold in my youth,
> sang of you, Tityrus, beneath the spreading shade of a beech tree.
>
> *...carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuventa,*
> *Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.* (Vergil, *Georgics* 4.565-566)

Thus, Sannazaro may be seen as daring precisely for writing pastoral, not departing from it.

Hubbard's tendency to read metapoetically, generally appropriate for the self-conscious tradition of pastoral, can also lead him to over-determined readings. In Sannazaro's second eclogue, Melisaeus hears Lycon singing from a cliff, which

> recalls the pastoral *frondator* [pruner] who *alta sub rupe canet* [sings beneath a lofty cliff]
> in *Ecl.* 1.56... However, whereas Vergil's hedge-trimmer sings *beneath* the cliff, the
> fisher-poet Lycon sings *from* the cliff, occupying a higher generic
> position. (Hubbard 2007: 70)

But Lycon is still in the same pastoral landscape as Vergil's *frondator*. Even if one accepts the reading of relative cliff-position as allegory for generic station, Lycon has not departed from the genre. He simply occupies a different part of it.

Sannazaro's self-conscious, metapoetic moments in the *Piscatory Eclogues*, then, do not present the poems as a new generic invention. And the poems' numerous allusions to non-pastoral texts do not signify a departure from pastoral, nor is the life of a fisherman necessarily antithetical to pastoral leisure. The only truly non-pastoral feature of Sannazaro's poems appears to be their setting. But Sannazaro's use of a personal, local landscape (the surrounding bay of Naples) can itself be seen as a pastoral trope, following Vergil's translation of Theocritus' Sicilian muses to northern Italy and the banks of the Mincius. Moreover, the sea is not entirely foreign to classical pastoral. In fact, Sannazaro's innovation draws upon a substantial body of maritime descriptions in Theocritus and Vergil, beyond the fishermen of *Idylls* 1 and 21.

THE SEA IN CLASSICAL PASTORAL

To begin, both Theocritus and Vergil have characters threaten suicide by leaping into the ocean, in imitation of the lover's leap from the Leukadian rock, of Sapphic fame (Theocritus, *Idylls* 3.25; Vergil, *Eclogues* 8.59). And in Theocritus, the threat expands into a description of the seashore, where a fisherman named Olpis looks out for tunny-fish, θύννως (*Idylls* 3.26). In the first two lines of Sannazaro's first eclogue, Lycidas describes exactly this activity, waiting for the same species of fish, *thynnos* (*Pisc.* 1.1-2). Thus, in the opening lines of his eclogue collection, a generically programmatic moment (Harrison 2007: 30-31), Sannazaro uses the tunny-fish to assert Theocritean precedent for pastoral's place among fishermen. In Theocritus' ninth *Idyll* (even if not genuinely Theocritean, it was transmitted as such and is

still a bucolic poem), a seashell is given as a prize in a singing contest (*Idylls* 9.25), just as a conch is awarded after the contest of Sannazaro's third eclogue (*Pisc.* 3.97 ff.). In Vergil's seventh eclogue, Thyrsus calls Corydon "more vile than cast-up seaweed, *proiecta vilior alga*" (*Eclogues* 7.42), a phrase Sannazaro clearly imitates in his first eclogue with **"**cast up among the vile seaweed, *vili proiectus in alga*." (Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 1.54; see Putnam 2009 ad loc.) In Vergil's eighth eclogue, Damon mentions the mythical Arion as a maritime equivalent of the pastoral hero Orpheus (*Eclogues* 8.56), while in *Eclogue* 9 Lycidas describes the silence of the sea (*Eclogues* 9.57). Beyond these brief mentions, Sannazaro also appeals to several characters associated with the sea. The sea nymph Doris, for example, is named in Vergil's tenth eclogue, while Theocritus' eighth *Idyll* describes Proteus, who pastures seals (*Idylls* 8.52), using the verb νεμεῖν ("pasture, graze," normally used of herdsmen) to create just the sort of analogy that Sannazaro would later exploit. And there is Galatea, Polyphemus' beloved sea-nymph from Theocritus and Vergil. With Galatea, pastoral prior to Sannazaro already contained an erotic relationship between land-dweller and sea-dweller. In his second eclogue, Sannazaro simply reverses the land-dweller's desire: rather than wanting his beloved to come to shore, Lycon goes to sea to seek her.[x]

These instances of the sea in Theocritean and Vergilian pastoral are surely nothing like the entirely piscatory setting of Sannazaro's eclogues, but they do provide classical precedent for Sannazaro's innovation. For further literary treatment of the sea, Sannazaro had to venture outside of pastoral. But, although there existed a tradition of texts framing seafaring and pastoral life as drastically opposed,[xi] Pliny's *Natural History*, Oppian's *Halieutica*, and the *Halieutica* ascribed to Ovid all would have provided Sannazaro with a tradition of comparing the inhabitants of the ocean to those of the land.[xii] Sannazaro's innovation in the *Piscatory Eclogues* may be regarded as the ability to bring out this latent analogical structure, to see the opposition between land and sea as analogy. Moreover, the very positing of such a parallel is a pastoral maneuver. Kathryn Gutzwiller has shown how multi-layered analogies form the distinctive inner structure of the pastoral genre beginning with Theocritus (Gutzwiller 1991, esp. 13-19 and 83-90). Sannazaro's creation of a new system of analogies (whereby fishermen are to fish as shepherds to sheep) is thus an appropriately pastoral method of innovation.

<div align="center">SANNAZARO'S PISCATORY MODELS</div>

It was Sannazaro himself who preserved the pseudo-Ovidian *Halieutica* (Smith 2002: 422 n. 27 and Rinaldi 2006: 197), a discovery that seems to have stirred interest in the subject, as a manuscript of Pliny's *Natural History* owned by Giovanni Pontano attests. The manuscript is replete with Pontano's notes on the names of fishes in book nine (Rinaldi 2006). Michele Rinaldi traces this interest to Sannazaro's discovery of the pseudo-Ovidian *Halieutica*, about which the two corresponded (Rinaldi 2006: 197-202). These two texts—and potentially Oppian's *Halieutica*[xiii]—doubtlessly influenced Sannazaro's conception of how to treat the marine world in his own poetry. Pliny begins the ninth book of the *Natural History* by asserting that the sea contains versions of animals and objects from the land:

> One may understand that there are likenesses in [the sea] not only of animals, but of things, as well, if one looks at the grape-fish, the sword-fish, the saw-fish, and the cucumber-fish, which is similar actually in smell and color.
>
> *rerum quidem, non solum animalium, simulacra inesse licet intellegere intuentibus uvam, gladium, serras, cucumin vero et colore et odore similem*."
> (*Naturalis Historia* 9.2-3)

This relationship is borne out on a linguistic level, as the fish Pliny lists take their names from what, on land, they resemble: a grape, a sword, a saw, and a cucumber. The very language available to describe the inhabitants of the sea is inherently analogical, relating them to creatures of the land. Pliny is filled with such names: he describes sea-calves, sea-pigs, sea-swallows, sea-dogs, sea-rams, sea-foxes, sea-hares, sea-wolves, sea-mice, and fish named after oxen, eagles, and frogs.[xiv] Similarly, within the surviving 134 lines of the pseudo-Ovidian *Halieutica*, Sannazaro would have found again fish named after cows, wolves, pigs, and hares, as well as the goat-fish and donkey-fish.[xv] Oppian's *Halieutica* offers more

New Voices in Classical Reception Studies   www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/newvoices
Issue 9 (2014)

23

such names, including the sea-sheep "πρόβατον" (*Halieutica* 1.146), and also uses ἀγέλη (herd) to refer to groups of fish (*Halieutica* 1.76, 1.673, 2.533, 2.561).

But the analogy between land- and sea-creatures goes further. Both the *Odyssey* and Vergil's *Georgics* compare Proteus to a shepherd, a comparison exploited by Sannazaro,[xvi] while Pliny compares sea-creatures and seals to cattle and crabs to rams (*Naturalis Historia* 9.7, 9.41, 9.99). Oppian employs land-sea similes throughout his work,[xvii] comparing fish to sheep, goats, pigs, and oxen, (*Halieutica* 1.137, 1.441, 2.506-532, 3.236-238, 3.439-442, 4.393-401) and dolphins to both shepherds and sheep (*Halieutica* 1.679, 1.720). And in the beginning of book five, he explicitly compares various land creatures with their oceanic counterparts (*Halieutica* 5.25-45).

Moreover, Oppian relates two accounts in which the boundary between land and sea is transgressed. In book five, Oppian mentions the legend of a dolphin so enamored of a singing shepherd-boy that it wished to leave the sea and join the boy's sheep (*Halieutica* 5.453-457). In book four, Oppian describes the peculiar behavior of the *sargus*, a fish that attempts to mate with goats (*Halieutica* 4.308 ff.). In both instances, sea-creatures desire not simply to be on the land, but to join a flock of pastoral animals. As Oppian elaborates on the attempt of the *sargi* to mate with goats bathing in the ocean, he provides even more precedent for a mixing of the piscatory and pastoral worlds. According to Oppian, fishermen take advantage of the fish's strange desire, dressing in goat-skins and wading into the water in order to lure the fish. Thus, the fisherman puts on a pastoral guise, combining the realms of *pastor* and *piscator* into one figure. Oppian labels the fishermen's deceptive strategy as a "shepherdly trick, νόμιον δόλον" (*Halieutica* 4.356) strengthening the parallel between fisherman and herdsman by ascribing to the former the clever trickery traditionally associated with the latter.[xviii] In these stories, individuals attempt to realize the latent analogy between land and sea by becoming inhabitants of both at once: the dolphin wishes to be both dolphin and sheep; the *sargus* wishes to be both fish and goat; and the fisherman learns to be both fisherman and herdsman.

Prior, non-pastoral texts thus provided Sannazaro with both a tradition of analogizing the realms of sea and land and, in Oppian, examples of a potential fusion of the two based upon their latent similarity. This body of marine poetry allowed Sannazaro to expand upon the marginal presence of the sea in earlier pastoral, making that realm the core of his eclogues while remaining true to the spirit of pastoral.

<div align="center">SANNAZARO'S ECLOGUE BOOK</div>

In establishing the genre of the *Piscatory Eclogues*, more is at stake than mere categorization. Recognition of the poems as pastoral allows one to appreciate Sannazaro's sophisticated use of earlier pastoral models, especially Vergil. The structure of Sannazaro's collection of eclogues is based upon Vergil's *Eclogues*: Sannazaro reduces Vergil's ten pastoral poems to five, and in doing so condenses two different Vergilian eclogues into each one of his.[xix] Sannazaro's first eclogue is most clearly modeled on Vergil's fifth (Putnam 2009: 432), mourning Phyllis instead of Vergil's Daphnis. But the poem opens with an allusion to Vergil's first eclogue (Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 1.1-7; Vergil, *Eclogues* 1.36) and Lycidas' recounting a spectacle to Mycon (lines 18 ff.) recalls Tityrus' telling Meliboeus about seeing Rome. Sannazaro's first eclogue condenses two different Vergilian eclogues of loss (of land, of Daphnis) into one coherent poem. Sannazaro's second eclogue, unmistakably modeled on Vergil's second, also incorporates Vergil's tenth. As the desperate Lycon contemplates traveling to faraway lands before realizing that his pain will follow him (lines 63 ff.), Sannazaro recalls Gallus' attempted flight to wilderness before submitting to love. Lycon's realization, "Winds can be avoided, rains and the heat can be avoided—not love, *Vitantur venti, pluviae vitantur et aestus, / non vitatur amor*," (Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 2.71-72) even provides a reworking of Gallus' famous "Love conquers all, *omnia vincit Amor.*" (Vergil, *Eclogues* 10.69; see Kennedy 1983: 165-166 and Salemme 2007: 36 for the parallel) Sannazaro thus skillfully combines Vergil's two best-known suffering lovers in the *Eclogues*, Corydon and Gallus, into one character, as he condenses their two poems into one.

New Voices in Classical Reception Studies   www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/newvoices
Issue 9 (2014)

24

In his third eclogue, Sannazaro assimilates Vergil's two contest eclogues (3 and 7). The poem begins with the first two words of Vergil's third eclogue ("tell me, *dic mihi*") and takes the name Aegon from its second line. At the end of the poem, neither Chromis nor Iolas wins the contest, in imitation of the tie at the close of *Eclogue* 3, but the poem only ends because Mopsus, who is recounting the contest, can remember no more of it. Mopsus' summarizing "this much I remember, *hactenus...memini*"(Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 3.94-95) is a version of Meliboeus' "I remember these things, *haec memini*" (Vergil, *Eclogues* 7.69) from Vergil's seventh eclogue, wherein Meliboeus also recounts the singing contest. For the fourth of Sannazaro's eclogues, he combines Vergil's fourth and six, the two Vergilian eclogues that most stretch the bounds of the pastoral genre. Vergil's song of Silenus becomes the song of Proteus, while the poem begins with a modification of Vergil's invocation at the start of his fourth eclogue.[xx] Finally, Sannazaro's last eclogue combines Vergil's eighth and ninth. Sannazaro follows Vergil's eighth eclogue in introducing the songs of two characters—one a version of Theocritus' *Pharmakeutria*. The second song of Sannazaro's eclogue, though, takes Vergil's ninth eclogue, specifically the singing of Moeris, as a model. In it, Thelgon sings of his love for Galatea, the subject of one of Moeris' fragments of song (Vergil, *Eclogues* 9.39-43). Thelgon also sings of exile, a reference to Sannazaro's own exile, just as Moeris' loss of land has often been read in relation to Vergil's troubles with land-confiscations. Michael Putnam notes that in Sannazaro's fifth eclogue, "two forms of exile merge...the Petrarchan separation from the beloved and the poet's factual absence from Naples in 1501-5." (Putnam 2009 on *Pisc.* 5.118) The foundation of this merging is in the fusion of Vergil's eighth and ninth eclogues.

The entire structure, then, of Sannazaro's *Piscatory Eclogues* is owed to Vergil's *Eclogues*, though in no simplistic manner. Sannazaro models each of his eclogues on a different pair of Vergil's, in ways that suggest sophisticated readings of Vergil—seeing a link between physical exile and separation from the beloved, for example.[xxi] Additionally, Sannazaro's first four eclogues are each partly modeled on Vergil's first four—in order—so as to suggest the progression of Vergil's eclogue book. And in his first eclogue, Sannazaro incorporates allusions not only to Vergil's first eclogue, but also to the first poems of Theocritus and Nemesianus,[xxii] linking it to the programmatic openings of three of his pastoral predecessors.

Sannazaro's use of Vergil operates on a close, line-by-line basis as well, but beyond simplistic allusion. Two instances may serve as examples. In Sannazaro's first eclogue, Lycidas imagines a reader of his poetry saying, "Lycidas, Lycidas made these songs, *Lycidas, Lycidas haec carmina fecit*." (Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 1.125) The repeated name in a proclamation of poetic accomplishment recalls Vergil's seventh eclogue, where Meliboeus declares, "since then, Corydon is Corydon [a lark[xxiii]] for us, *ex illo Corydon Corydon est tempore nobis*." (*Eclogues* 7.70) Lycidas, modeled on the Corydon of Vergil's second eclogue, thus makes reference to the Corydon of Vergil's seventh eclogue, blending the two appearances of the character (as hapless lover and as victorious singer) into one.

The beginning of Sannazaro's third eclogue offers another sophisticated engagement with a Vergilian source, as Celadon asks Mopsus, "What did you play at, when you were unoccupied in the empty caves?, *Ecquid desertis vacui lusistis in antris*?" (*Pisc.* 3.5) This question recalls the Vergilian line, "Be here, Galatea; for what pleasure is there among the waves?, *Huc ades, o Galatea; quis est nam ludus in undis?*" (*Eclogues* 9.39) The two hexameters both end with a form of *ludus* or *ludere*, followed by *in* and its object. Moreover, the line directly preceding in Sannazaro (*Pisc.* 3.4) ends with the word *unda* ("wave")*,* strengthening this association. In Sannazaro, the verb *lusistis* has poetic implications,[xxiv] as Mopsus' reply is to recount a singing competition. Reading this back onto Sannazaro's source, one finds an intriguing reading of the Vergilian line: there, Moeris asks Galatea what pleasure there is in the waves, but—given that he is attempting to woo Galatea with song—he may also be asking what poetry or song there is in the sea that could rival that which he offers. Along this interpretation, "*quis nam est ludus in undis?*" ("what poetry is there among the waves?") becomes the question to which Sannazaro's *Piscatory Eclogues* is the clever reply.

CONCLUSION

As I have shown, the *Piscatory Eclogues* engage deeply with Sannazaro's pastoral predecessors, most especially Vergil—from quoting and imitating individual lines, to intelligently reworking and interpreting source texts, to establishing multiple levels of correspondence between the structure of the eclogue book and other eclogue collections. Understanding Sannazaro's eclogues as pastoral poems brings to light such sophisticated intertextuality and thus deepens one's understanding and appreciation of the poems themselves as a complex, valuable literary achievement—not merely a rung on the ladder to epic. The laborious lives of fishermen do not bring these poems out of the pastoral genre, but rather replicate the essential tension between work and leisure inherent in classical pastoral. The substitution of fishermen for herdsmen may even be seen as a pastoral operation, applying the genre's analogical structure to a tradition of analogizing sea and land. Moreover, the fact that Sannazaro's eclogues also resonate with the echoes of epic and didactic texts does not compromise their generic identity, but merely reaffirms it through pastoral's ability to subsume other genres. And finally, Sannazaro's celebration of his own poetic achievement recognizes his innovation not in creating an entirely new genre, but in transforming an existing one. Rather than slavishly imitating the exact content of Vergil's *Eclogues*, Sannazaro imitated Vergil's poetic method of working inventively with source texts. By bringing pastoral from the countryside to the seashore, Sannazaro was able to reinvigorate the tired tropes of the genre, rendering newly strange its fiction of toiling rural laborers as erudite poets, its tension between realism and poetic artifice. In other words, in order to bring pastoral closer to its ancient tradition, Sannazaro had to move it farther away.

And yet, Sannazaro's achievement relies upon the willingness of his readership—from the shocked Bernard le Bouvier de Fontenelle to classicists and readers today—to accept Sannazaro's innovative work as still belonging to the pastoral genre. In this, Sannazaro's *Piscatory Eclogues* may hold a valuable lesson for the dynamics of generic tradition and classical reception more generally. In order to keep a tradition alive, an author must depart from its conventions. However, such innovation then relies upon a readership willing to accommodate new features into a generic framework. On a broader level, this collaboration between authors and communities of readers structures the reception of classical antiquity, as well. The classical tradition survives by being appropriated, changed, and remade—but only if we readers allow it to be.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alpers, Paul. 1996. *What Is Pastoral?* London: University of Chicago Press.

Bartley, Adam Nicholas. 2003. *Stories from the Mountains, Stories from the Sea: the Digressions and Similes of Oppian's Halieutica and the Cynegetica.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Clausen, Wendell. 1994. *A Commentary on Virgil: Eclogues.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coleman, Robert, ed. 1977. *Vergil: Eclogues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conte, Gian Biagio. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Poets*. Trans. Charles Segal. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Czapla, Beate. 2006. "Sannazaros zweite Ekloge *Galatea* als Neufassung eines *non ignobile Carmen* (Vergil *Ecl.* 9, 37-43)." In *Sannazaro und die Augusteische Dichtung*. Ed. Eckart Schäfer. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag. 69-86.

Gutzwiller, Kathryn J. 1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hall, Henry Marion. 1912. *Idylls of Fishermen: A History of the Literary Species*. New York:

Columbia University Press.

Halperin, David M. 1983. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Harrison, S.J. 1998. "The Lark Ascending: Corydon, Corydon (Vergil, Ecl. 7.70)." *Classical Quarterly* 48: 310-311.

Harrison, S.J. 2007. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hubbard, Thomas. 2007. "Exile from Arcadia: Jacopo Sannazaro's Piscatory Eclogues." In *Pastoral Palimpsests: Essays in the Reception of Theocritus and Vergil*. Ed. Michael Paschalis. Heraklion: Crete University Press. 59-77.

Hunter, Richard, ed. 1999. *Theocritus: A Selection*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kennedy, William J. 1983. *Jacopo Sannazaro and the Uses of Pastoral*. London: University Press of New England.

Marx, Leo. 1986. "Pastoralism in America." In *Ideology and Classic American Literature*. Ed. Sacvan Bercovitch and Myra Jehlen. Cambridge University Press. 36-69.

Mustard, Wilfred P, ed. 1914. *The Piscatory Eclogues of Jacopo Sannazaro*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Mustard, Wilfred P. 1916. "Later Echoes of Calpurnius and Nemesianus." *The American Journal of Philology* 37: 73-83.

Nash, Ralph. 1965. "Oppian and Sannazaro." *Classical Philology* 60: 116-118.

Nash, Ralph, trans. 1966. *Jacopo Sannazaro: Arcadia & Piscatorial Eclogues*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Putnam, Michael C.J., ed. and trans. 2009. *Jacopo Sannazaro: Latin Poetry.* The I Tatti Renaissance Library. London: Harvard University Press.

Rinaldi, Michele. 2006. "Un codice della *Naturalis Historia* annotato da Giovanni Pontano." *Studi Medievali e Umanistici* 4: 161-202.

Salemme, Carmelo. 2007. *Il Canto del Golfo: Le* Eclogae Piscatoriae *di Iacopo Sannazaro.* Naples: Loffredo.

Smith, Nicholas D. 2002. "Jacopo Sannazaro's 'Eclogae Pisacatoriae (1526)' and the 'Pastoral Debate' in Eighteenth-Century England." *Studies in Philology* 99: 432-450.

Stewart, Zeph. 1959. "The Song of Silenus." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 64: 179-205.

---

[i] I would like to thank the anonymous referee, as well as Stephen Harrison, for their helpful thoughts and comments.

[ii] For the popularity of Sannazaro's *Piscatory Eclogues*, see Hall (1912) and Mustard (1914: 16-53). For controversy over the poems' pastoral authenticity, see Smith (2002).

[iii] On the importance of genre for interpretation, despite 20th century critique of the concept, see Harrison (2007: 11-12).

[iv] Alpers (1997: 10-11 and 11 n. 4) offers a useful, succinct summary of some major modern attempts at defining pastoral. See also Halperin (1983).

[v] In Sannazaro, the habit of Mediterranean fishermen to fish at night and rest during the day provides an equivalent (though reversed) structure to that of the day-laboring shepherd. See Putnam (2009) on *Pisc.* 2.7.

[vi] Vergil's fourth, sixth, and tenth eclogues, for example, stretch the bounds of pastoral. See Stewart (1959), Conte (1986: 100-129) and Harrison (2007: 34-74).

[vii] For the *Piscatory Eclogues*, I use the text in Putnam (2009).

[viii] For the intertextual link between Dido and Sannazaro's Lycon, see Hubbard (2007: 69) and Putnam (2009: 440).

[ix] Both Czapla (2006: 70, 77) and Salemme (2007: 33-34) see the gift of wool as a symbol of poetic investiture and continuation of pastoral, noting that the gift has Theocritean precedent (Theocritus, *Idylls* 5.50, 5.98).

[x] At one point, Theocritus' Polyphemus even wishes he were a sea-creature so that he could go to Galatea (Theocritus, *Idylls* 11.54 ff.).

[xi] See Hubbard (2007: 64) and Hall (1912: 1-44).

[xii] Additionally, the latter two works, as didactic texts without a pastoral counterpart, may have struck Sannazaro as calling out for a pastoral correlate, in the way that Vergil's *Georgics* and *Eclogues* complement each other.

[xiii] While it is not certain that Sannazaro knew Oppian (*editio princeps* 1517) as he was writing the *Piscatory Eclogues*, Hubbard (2007: 64) notes that a fifteenth-century manuscript did circulate in Naples. Nash (1965) provides correspondences between Oppian and Sannazaro that suggest familiarity.

[xiv] Respectively: *vitulus* (Pliny, *Historia Naturalis* 9.13), *porculus marinus* (9.45), *hirundo* (9.82), *marinus canis* and *canicula* (9.110, 151-152), *aries* (9.145), *vulpis marina* (9.145), *lepus* (9.155), *lupus* (9.162, 185), *musculus* (9.186), and the fish named *bos*, *aquila*, and *rana* (9.78).

[xv] Respectively: *bos* (Ovid, *Halieutica* 94), *lupus* (23, 39, 112), *sus* (132), *lepus* (126), *tragus* (112), and *asellus* (133).

[xvi] See Homer, *Odyssey* 4.413 and Vergil, *Georgics* 4.433-436. Sannazaro uses the comparison at *Pisc.* 3.62, 3.65, and 4.22.

[xvii] Bartley (2003: 207, 208-209) notes the prevalence of similes—especially those comparing fish with land animals—in Oppian's *Halieutica*.

[xviii] See Gutzwiller (1991: 35-44) for the traditional associations of shepherds with trickery.

[xix] There survives an additional fragment of an eclogue by Sannazaro, but it is transmitted separately from his five *Piscatory Eclogues*, which he published together as a collection. Even if Sannazaro intended to write ten eclogues in imitation of Vergil, as some have suggested, these five eclogues have structural integrity as a distinct collection. See Putnam (2009: 458), Mustard (1914: 91), and Nash (1966: 11, 190 n. 8).

[xx] See Putnam (2009) on *Pisc.* 4.1 and Hubbard (2007: 72) for the parallel.

[xxi] This is not to suggest that each of Sannazaro's eclogues alludes only to two of Vergil's, but rather that each one takes two of Vergil's eclogues as its primary models.

[xxii] Sannazaro, *Pisc.* 1.106 recalls Theocritus, *Idylls* 1.1-3. *Pisc.* 1.42-43 recalls Nemesianus, *Eclogues* 1.1-4, on which see Mustard (1916: 80).

[xxiii] See Harrison (1998) for the meaning of Corydon as lark.

[xxiv] Play is a common metaphor for the writing of poetry, but Sannazaro would have also seen it at Vergil, *Eclogues* 6.1.