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This thesis is about the representation of herdsmen in bucolic poetry, mainly in Theocritus, with particular reference to the ways in which their roles in the poems and their different characteristics are affected by the ‘pastoral hierarchy’, that is the ranking or ordering of some types of herdsmen above others, placing cowherds on the top, shepherds in the middle and goatherds at the bottom.

The hierarchy is certainly present in the characterisation of the herdsmen in Theocritus. It is normally goatherds who exhibit most explicitly the typical motifs of the new genre of bucolic poetry: the behaviour of lower-class people and their rusticity. They serve primarily for urban readers’ derisive laughter. On the other hand, cowherds tend to function as retaining more traditional values in literature, to be depicted as more heroic or noble. The shepherds’ character is set in some ways in the mid-point between those of the cowherds and goatherds: they can be elevated and associated with the nobility of the cowherds, or dragged down to a lowly characterisation similar to that of the goatherds.

However, Theocritus occasionally changes the way the rule of the hierarchy is applied to his characters, so that his characters, especially the goatherds, have fascinatingly diverse features, such as Lycidas in *Idyll 7*, who holds a dual character, as a down-to-earth goatherd as well as the symbol of bucolic poetry itself.

The different characteristics of herdsmen convey different aspects of the *Idyls*, such as the different levels of seriousness or playfulness in the different poems. Furthermore the goatherds’ rusticity works to present pastoral as a radically new genre, clarifying its difference from traditional epic, whereas the cowherds’ nobility functions to place the pastoral in the wider current of epic. Theocritean pastoral poetics are systematically made of these two sides, *aepolic* and *bucolic*.

After Theocritus, the distinction between the herdsmen-characters (cowherd, shepherd or goatherd) is often blurred and the hierarchy-based characterisation sometimes becomes less important. The post-Theocritean writers’ various uses of the hierarchy and its occasional absence tell us of the development of the pastoral genre into diversity. Also, we find strong Theocritean influence in some significant descriptions of the goatherds as bucolic icons and rustics to be sympathised with.
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Introduction: Herdsmen in the Theocritean corpus

This thesis is about the representation of herdsmen in bucolic poetry, with particular reference to the ways in which their roles in the poems and their different characteristics are affected by the ‘pastoral hierarchy’, that is the ranking or ordering of some types of herdsmen above others.¹ My focus is principally on those bucolic poems normally now regarded as genuinely Theocritean, that are composed by the historical Theocritus of Syracuse in the third century BC (i.e. Idylls 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 11),² but I also examine those bucolic poems in the Theocritean corpus which are probably not by Theocritus (i.e. Idylls 8, 9, 20 and 27), and later bucolic works in both Greek (Moschus, Bion and Longus) and Latin (Vergil and Calpurnius Siculus) to determine the developments and changes in the use and presence of the pastoral hierarchy in post-Theocritean bucolic.

I begin with a brief survey of the herdsmen in the genuine Theocritean Idylls. In Idyll 1, there appear two herdsmen, Thyrsis the shepherd and an unnamed goatherd. Thyrsis, after being asked to do so by the goatherd, sings of the suffering and death of Daphnis the legendary cowherd. Idyll 3 is a first-person narrative, where an unnamed goatherd serenades a girl, Amaryllis. The goatherd talks to a person called Tityrus, presumably a fellow goatherd. Idyll 4 presents a dialogue between two herdsmen: Battus the goatherd and Corydon the cowherd. They talk about another cowherd, Aegon, who is now absent, and about a man, ὁ γέρων, who is probably Aegon’s father.³ Idyll 5 narrates the argument and singing-match between two herdsmen, Comatas the goatherd and Lacon the shepherd. In their dialogue, there also appear several other names of herdsmen or of those who may

¹ See below for a fuller definition of the hierarchy.
² The Theocritean corpus also contains a number of non-bucolic poems which do not feature herdsmen as central characters (e.g. Idylls 2 and 15). I omit those poems from this thesis.
³ See Gow 1952: 77.
be herdsman, such as Corydon (v. 6). At the end, Comatas talks about a Homeric goatherd, Melanthius of the *Odyssey* (v. 150). Daphnis the legendary cowherd is also referred to in line 20 by Lacon and in line 90 by Comatas. In *Idyll* 6, the poet addresses his friend, Aratus, and tells a story of two cowherds, Daphnis and Damaetas. There the two cowherds sing about Polyphemus the Cyclops and shepherd, whom Daphnis teases and talks to, and in whose guise Damaetas responds to Daphnis. *Idyll* 7 has a first-person narrator called Simichidas and describes his journey to a harvest-festival on the island of Cos and his encounter with a mysterious goatherd called Lycidas on the way. Lycidas in his song describes two unnamed shepherds or herdsmen (v. 71) and another named Tityrus, who may be a goatherd. Lycidas also sings about the two legendary herdsmen, Daphnis the cowherd and Comatas the goatherd. In addition, Simichidas later tells us that he himself was once a cowherd (v. 91-2). *Idyll* 11 is a story of Polyphemus, where the narrator (Theocritus himself) tells to his friend Nicias how the Cyclops loved Galatea and his song saved him from his unrequited love. Polyphemus, as a herdsman, is again a shepherd.

As we have seen above, Theocritus specifies each of his herdsmen clearly as cowherd (βουκόλος or βούτας), shepherd (ποιμήν) or goatherd (αἰπόλος), while the swineherd (συβώτης), such as Eumaeus in the *Odyssey*, does not appear. Each type of herdsman seems to present some distinctive characteristics. For example, cowherds are described as noble, or at least nobler than other types of herdsmen who accompany them (e.g. tragic and heroic Daphnis in *Idyll* 1 and calm and logical Corydon in *Idyll* 4). This seems true of their behaviour and speech, as well as their social status in their community. On the other hand, the goatherds tend to be pictured as more rustic and unsophisticated. They often serve as a target of readers’ laughter (e.g. the dramatic and emotional goatherds in *Idylls* 3 and 4). The shepherds can be either a serious character partly like a cowherd (Thyrsis in *Idyll* 1), or a simple and uncultured one (e.g. Polyphemus in *Idyll* 11).

The relationships between the herdsmen are also very interesting to note. They vary from a harmonious and affectionate one between cowherds as in *Idyll* 6 to a bitter, competitive and adversarial one between a goatherd and a shepherd in *Idyll* 5. Those relationships, as well as their behaviour and speech, seem to reflect the herdsmen’s different status and nature: for a given goatherd, the fact that he is a goatherd is one of the best reasons for the way in which he acts, and for his relationship to others around him.
The different characters of particular types of herdsmen, and the ways in which they interact, points us towards the concept of the so-called ‘pastoral hierarchy’, in which there are differences in social status between types of herdsmen according to which animal they herd. This hierarchy brings social context to Theocritus’ *locus amoenus*.\(^4\) We find that the pastoral world is not entirely free from a social order or class distinctions. The herdsmen are not all of precisely the same lowly status, but have higher and lower categories among themselves. Interestingly, Theocritus does not always straightforwardly link a herdsman’s character and ability with his status in the ranking. We will examine how Theocritus uses the concept of the hierarchy, discuss both typical and exceptional features of each kind of herdsmen and therefore demonstrate the complexity of Theocritus’ characterisation of his herdsmen.

I shall now explain the ancient concept of the pastoral hierarchy by looking at some examples of it in literary texts, as a precursor to investigating its presence in Theocritean and post-Theocritean bucolic, and its forerunners in earlier Greek literature.

Aelius Donatus in the fourth century AD describes the pastoral hierarchy as follows in *Vita Vergiliana*:\(^5\)

\[
\text{tria genera pastorum sunt, qui dignitatem in bucolicis habent, quorum minimi sunt qui αἰπόλοι dicuntur a Graecis, a nobis caprarii; paulo honoratiores qui μηλονόμοι ποιμένες id est opiliones dicuntur; honoratissimi et maximi qui βουκόλοι, quos bubulcos dicimus.}
\]

Here, the social ranking places cowherds on the top, shepherds in the middle and goatherds at the bottom. Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*, although it is later in date than Theocritus’ *Idyls*, affords us some more ideas about the hierarchy.\(^6\) It seems safe to admit that the concept of the hierarchy exists for certain in Longus from the following points.\(^7\) In lines 1.16.1.1-4, Dorcon the cowherd teases Daphnis the goatherd that Dorcon is higher in his status than Daphnis and that the gap

\(^6\) I return to Longus at the end of chapter 3 in a section devoted to the pastoral hierarchy in *Daphnis and Chloe*. See pages 105-110.
\(^7\) See also Van Groningen 1958.
between them is as large as the gap between the value of a cow and of a goat.\(^8\)

Ἐγώ, παρθένε, μείζων εἰμὶ Δάφνιδος, καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν βουκόλος, ὁ δ’ αἰπόλος τοσοῦτον ἐγὼ κρείττων ὀσον αἰγών βόες καὶ λευκός εἰμι ὡς γάλα, καὶ πυρρὸς ὡς θέρος μέλλον ἀμάσθαι, καὶ ἐθρεψε μήτηρ, οὐθηρίον. (2.) Ὄσως δὲ ἐστὶ μικρὸς καὶ ἀγένειος ὡς γυνή, καὶ μέλας ὡς λύκος νέμει δὲ τράγους, ὅδωρ ὃς ἀπ’ αὐτῶν δεινόν, καὶ ἐστι πένης ὡς μηδέ κόνα τρέφειν. Εἰ δὲ, ὡς λέγουσι, καὶ αἷς αὐτῷ γάλα δέδωκεν, οὐδὲν ἐρίφων διαφέρει.» (3.) Ταῦτα καὶ τουταύτα ὁ Δόρκων καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ Δάφνις Ἐμὲ αἷς ἀνέθρεψεν ὡσπερ τὸν Δία νέμω δὲ τράγους τῶν τοῦτον βοῶν μείζονας ὃς δὲ οὐδέν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, ὅτι μηδὲ ὁ Πάν, καὶ τοιοὶ γε ἄν τῷ πλέον τράγος. (4.) Ἀρκεῖ δὲ μοι ὁ τυρός καὶ ἄρτος ὃς ἀθλοῦμαι καὶ ὁ ὑάκινθος, ὅσα ἀγροῖκων πλουσίων κτήματα. Ἀγένειός εἰμι, καὶ γὰρ ὁ Διόνυσος μέλας, καὶ γὰρ ὁ ὑάκινθος ἀλλὰ κρείττων καὶ ὁ Διόνυσος Σατύρων καὶ ὁ ὑάκινθος κρίνων.

(\textit{Longus} 1.16.1-4)

These lines tell us the reasons for the herdsmen’s ranking. Initially, as Dorcon implies, the herdsmen’s status in the hierarchy is probably indexed to the value of the animal he herds. Not contradictory is the fact that Daphnis’ foster-parents, who are in charge of taking care of goats, are described as the poorest among the named characters throughout this text and they are the only characters who are clearly slaves who their master’s flock (3.31.3).\(^9\)

The other cause is the negative image and nature a goat has as an animal. In their fight, Dorcon points out Daphnis’ similarities to a goat to try to show how insignificant and lowly Daphnis is, compared to himself. It is interesting, however, that even Daphnis, being a goatherd, also assimilates Dorcon’s beard with that of a goat in insulting Dorcon. Furthermore, Daphnis likens himself to Dionysus and Dorcon to a satyr, giving credit to himself by comparing himself to the gods Zeus, Pan and Dionysus through this exchange. This may imply his higher birth, although Daphnis himself is not aware of it at this point.\(^10\)

Also, one interesting point about Dorcon’s speech is the different skin colours between

\(8\) According to Lonsdale 1979, cows could be especially a sign of wealth in the ancient Greece, as taking care of cows was costly compared to smaller animals like sheep and goats.

\(9\) Morgan 2004: 221.

\(10\) For the structure of the speech in \textit{Longus}, see Morgan 2004: 165.
himself and Daphnis. He mentions himself as λευκός ὡς γάλα and Daphnis as μέλας ὡς λύκος.\footnote{We note two descriptions of dark complexion in Theocritean pastoral, in minor female characters, presumably with negative sense, indicating them as low class (Id. 3.33-5 and 10.24-28). However, the description in Idyll 10 is slightly complex. Bucaeus loves Bombuca, a woman who works for Polybotus. Then Milon makes fun of Bucaeus, probably because Bucaeus’ lover is skinny and dark. Bucaeus sings to defend her, as follows, in the similar way Daphnis defends himself. Perhaps Longus had these lines in mind for his lines 1.16.4:}

White complexions may be attributed to cowherds, as we can see in an epigram of Theocritus:

\begin{verbatim}
Δάφνις ὁ λευκόχρως, ὁ καλ∆Ἔἱẖ家都知道 μελίσδων
 βουκολικοὺς ὤμνους, ἄνθετο Πανί τάξε,
\end{verbatim}

(Theocr.Epigr.2.1-2)

Although it is odd to find cowherds described as white, because they should be still exposed to the sun, this may be to enhance the noble image of cowherds, compared with other types of herdsmen. At any rate it gives a further indication of the type of subtle differentiation between the status and character of different herdsmen we can find in Greek bucolic literature.

Before bucolic poetry developed as a particular genre, a herdsman in earlier Greek literature was always someone on the periphery of the storyline, rather than being its main focus, regardless of whether they were a cowherd or a shepherd.\footnote{See Gutzwiller 1991: 23 and 2006: 1-2 in Fantuzzi-Papanghelis (ed.) 2006.} But, nonetheless, goats and goatherds may have had a sense of being particularly alien. The reason that goatherds are at the bottom of the pastoral hierarchy we should probably consider as related to the goat’s low value compared to other animals and also the negative and wild image and nature a goat has, such as a strong smell, violent aggressiveness and goatish sexuality (which are partly taken into the images of Pan and satyrs in Greek culture). In addition, a scholiast tells that there was a notion in ancient Greece that a...
herdsman’s disposition is affected by the kind of animal he herds. In this way, goatherds were expected to behave, to some extent, in a ‘goatish’ manner in their literary representations.

When we have established how and where the hierarchy operates in Theocritus (chapter 2) we will examine its presence in bucolic ‘after Theocritus’ (chapter 3). We will examine later bucolic poetry in Greek and Latin to clarify what is similar to Theocritus’ picture and what has changed. But we will begin not by looking to the reception of Theocritean bucolic but at its roots, by examining the traces of the pastoral hierarchy in earlier Greek literature. The different characteristics associated with oxherds, goatherds and shepherds in Theocritus points to the existence of the hierarchy there, but to what extent can we trace this idea in earlier Greek literature? This is the focus of chapter 1.

---

13 Wendel: 1920: 60-61. For details, see page 32-3 for the discussion on Id. 1.87.
Chapter 1

The Pastoral Hierarchy before Theocritus

1.1 Herdsmen in Archaic and Classical Literature

In this section, we explore the various descriptions of herdsmen before Theocritus in Archaic and Classical Greek poetry. Here I gather some examples of herdsmen-images which seem to have influenced Theocritus in developing the character of his herdsmen.

Gutzwiller suggests that the herdsman before Theocritus was often a figure of ‘analogy’ and one of the most important aspects of herdsman/herd-ing world in literature is its association with peace and order.\(^{14}\) The Iliad contains many herdsmen. Some Trojan noblemen appear as herding in peacetime, although they are not always herdsmen in a strict sense. They include Aeneas, herding cattle (Il. 20.188), and some minor characters such as Priam’s sons, Isus and Antiphus who are described as having driven sheep (Il. 11.101-6). Gutzwiller also notes that the herding characters often symbolise the Trojans’ defending status as warriors, since they are associated with the defensive nature of the herding practice, protecting the herds.\(^{15}\) Also, the use of herdsmen’s images in epithets shows that herdsmen stand for ‘a leader’ and the social order.\(^{16}\) The word ‘shepherd’ frequently appears in certain characters’ epithets: ποιμὴν λἀων, ‘the shepherd of people’ is used often to describe Agamemnon (e.g. Il. 2.254) and some other characters in a leading position of the society (e.g. Il. 1.263). Thus, we see that, although the existence of herdsmen or their way of life is not the main theme of this epic, herding bears significant metaphorical meanings.

Besides those characters, we find a good number of herdsmen’s images in similes:\(^{17}\)

\[\text{Toûς δ’ ὦς τ’ αἰπόλια πλατε’ αἰγῶν αἰπόλοι άνδρες}\
\[\text{ρεία διακρίνωσιν ἐπεί κε νομῷ μιγέωσιν,}\
\[\text{ὡς τοûς ἡγεμόνες διεκόσμησεν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα}\
\[\text{ὑσμίνην δ’ ἱέναι, μετὰ δὲ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων}\

\(^{14}\) Gutzwiller 2006: 2-10.\(^{15}\) Gutzwiller 1991: 27.\(^{16}\) Gutzwiller 1991: 27-28.\(^{17}\) Other examples include Il. 3.10-14 and 4.275-78.
In similes such as this, one image is very neatly applied to the situation being described. Here an image of goats and goatherds is used, probably because goats can be more independent and widely scattered around (αἰπόλια πλατέ’ αἰγ’, v. 474) than, for instance, clustering sheep, so that the simile best describes the high ability as leaders of the Achaean commanders.18

What is most prominent in herdsman-images in the Iliad is their anti-heroic nature. There is a tendency for Homer to describe in similes herdsmen in a situation where they are either inefficient in protecting their herds or in danger of losing their life themselves. They are vulnerable, ordinary, unarmed humans, who occasionally become victims of wild beasts, or even other humans (e.g. Il. 16.352-5, 18.161-62).

Outside the similes, there is a notable vulnerable herdsmen’s image on the shield of Achilles.19 It appears as a typical scene in the field and tells us not only how herding culture was familiar to the ancient Greeks, but also that people had already shaped some ideas about the ‘peaceful countryside’ to be placed in contraposition to discord or the harsh reality of war:

(II.525-9)

In this pleasant portrait of two herdsmen, although disturbed seriously afterwards by being involved in battle, we already find the close connection of music to herdsmen, long before Theocritus. Here we see not only their practice of music, but also their naivety and devotion to music (so that they do

not notice the ambush). The stunning contrast is between the herdsman’s innocent working-day moment, their subsequent fate and the calamity brought by the armed forces that turn the herding place into a bloody battlefield. This relief on the shield and the herding Trojans tell us that the Iliadic shining, war-like world has the innocent, down-to-earth ancient life of ordinary herdsman behind it, and its destruction as its price.

Another point which presents herdsman as anti-heroic is their eroticism. It is seen in some Trojan characters, since some of them got their sons by goddess/nymphs and the birth of the children is introduced clearly as the result of their fathers’ herding (e.g. In Anchises’ case, ἡ μὴν ὑπ’ Ἀγχίσῃ τέκε βουκόλεοντι 5.313. For Bucolion, son of Laomedon, ποιμαίνων δ’ ἐπ’ ἐσσεί μίγη φιλότητι καὶ εὐνή, 6.25). This erotic dimension to herdsman leads to the characterisation of Paris, for example, who was once herding, as particularly anti-heroic, although Homer does not tell in detail the herding life of the prince (ὦ νείκεσσε θεᾶς ὅτε οἱ μέσσαυλον ἵκοντο, / τὴν δ’ ἣνη’ ἢ οἱ πόρε μαχλοσύνην ἀλεγεινήν. 24.29-30).

In the Odyssey, although a herding life is not yet a central theme of epic, some slave herdsman appear as well-developed characters: Eumaeus the swineherd, Philocteus the cowherd and Melanthius the goatherd, with several anonymous younger herdsman under their direction (e.g. Od.17.214). These herdsman are, however, not closely associated with music or pastoral ease, but are given more practical roles. In the ancient world, livestock made up a highly important part of people’s assets and therefore, these herdsman are supposed to work as good trustees. They also, of course, take on important roles in Odysseus’ conflict with the Suitors:

“ὦ φίλοι, ἢδη μὲν κεν ἐγὼν εἶποιμι καὶ ἀμμὶ μνηστήρων ἐς ὅμιλον ἀκοντίσαι, οἱ μεμάασιν ἠμέας ἐξεναρίξαι ἐπὶ προτέροισι κακοῖς.

ὥς ἐφαθ’, οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες ἀκόντισαν ὀξέα δοῦρα ἄντα τιτυσκόμενοι Δημοπτόλεμον μὲν Ὀδυσσείς,

Εὐρυάδην δ’ ἄρα Τηλέμαχος, Ἕλατον δὲ συβώτης,

20 cf. Od.14.100-8. Eumaeus mentions the number of livestock Odysseus holds to speak for how wealthy his master is.
Πείσανδρον δ’ ἄρ’ ἔπεφνε βοῶν ἐπιβουκόλος ἀνήρ.

(Od. 22.262-268)

They function mainly in the context of their relationship with their master and are judged in the poem from the point of their being dutiful or not: the unfaithful one takes the side of the Suitors, helps them consume the master’s flock (Od. 22.178-199) and as a result, is killed in agony (Od. 22.474-477). Gutzwiller rightly suggests that the herdsman here is associated with peace and order and the swineherd Eumaeus’ role as the last remaining wall against the Suitors is related to the defensive nature of herding practice.21 The faithful herdsmen wait for the master’s return and help him to execute the Suitors, and as a result, join the happy ending (Od. 21.203-230). The swineherd and the cowherd serve to hold the order of Odysseus’ realm from collapsing during his absence (e.g. 17. 374-391, 589-597, 20.210-225), whereas the goatherd reveals the mean side of slaves’ nature, disloyalty.

The Cyclops, Polyphemus, can be counted as another important herdsman. Odysseus and his comrades enter Polyphemus’ cave when the dweller is away herding and consequently lose some of their men to this gobbling single-eyed monster. Although he does not obey Zeus’ rule of ξενία,22 and is marked as a savage, brutal character who maltreats his human guests, as a herdsman, on the contrary, he is efficient and takes good care of his sheep and goats (Od. 9.216-230). This contrasting treatment to human and animal implies his affinity for the animal, rather than for human. He is not close to humanity, but belongs to the wild, uncivilised world.23 This is partly related to a metaphorical meaning of lowly herdsmen: although herding is a purely human activity, the closeness of herdsman to animal places him somehow between civilised, human life and that of the animal, and the Cyclops is a monstrous version of the herdsman.

However, apart from these characters, another rather different kind of herdsman-image we find in the Odyssey is Athena disguised as a shepherd. When Odysseus landed finally on his home Ithaca, the goddess approaches him in the shape of a noble-looking, elegant young shepherd (Od. 13.221-4). We wonder where this noble shepherd’s image comes from. As is seen in the

23 However, his affection to his ram may be understood as ‘human warmth’. See Gutzwiller 1991: 113.
Trojans of the *Iliad*, there might be a real practice at that time, in which owners of large flock or noblemen let their own children tend their flock, instead of hired men or slaves. But there exists no relevant supporting historical evidence.\(^{24}\) We would rather understand this as a poetic creation, yet Athena’s intention by being dressed regally is not quite clear. It might be to imply that the shepherd is not in actual fact a shepherd.

The *Works and Days* provides us some practical information about herding animals. For example, lines 405-6 reflect the fact that in many regions, oxen were mainly used for ploughing and kept in small number in each household, except by a few breeders in some places with good pasture, which may indicate that cowherds could be fewer in number than the other types of herdsman:\(^{25}\)

\[
\text{Οἶκον μὲν πρώτιστα γυναικὰ τε βοῦν τ’ ἁρτῆρα,}
\text{κτητήν, ώ γαμετήν, ἥτις καὶ βουσὶν ἐποιτο,

\text{ }(Op.405-6)
\]

The more remarkable thing in Hesiod is, however, the beginning of the herdsman-poet tradition, which is passed on to poets including Theocritus, Vergil and to much later generations.\(^{26}\) According to the *Theogony*, Hesiod describes himself as a shepherd, when he encountered the Muses and received initiation to poetry.

As we have seen in the *Iliad*, music was already associated with a herding life. In the *Theogony*, when a herdsman meets the divine, a poet is born in the countryside. In the most famous passage, the Muses appear and address Hesiod with mockery:

\(^{24}\) See Hoekstra in Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989: 178.
\(^{25}\) Burford 1993: 149. For discussion on the authenticity of line 406, see West 1978: 260.
\(^{26}\) e.g. Edmund Spenser’s *Faerie Queen* 1590:
Lo I the man, whose Muse whilome did maske,
As time her taught, in lowly Shepheads weeds,
Am now enforst a far vnfitter taske,
For trumpets sterne to chaunge mine Oaten reeds,
And sing of Knights and Ladies gentle deeds;

\text{(Book 1, Canto 1, 1-5)}
The goddesses stress the lowliness of the shepherds or herdsmen in general.\(^{27}\) And, very interestingly, on this coarse shepherd, whom they describe as γαστέρες οὖν, ‘mere bellies’, they bestow poetic ability and encourage him to sing about the gods and grand themes of the earliest days of the world. γαστέρες οὖν implies the herdsmen’s lowly nature of easily yielding to pleasure.\(^{28}\) This striking combination of lowliness and high art of poetry creates the tradition of herdsmen-poets in literature.

A lowly shepherd may represent all humankind, the intermediate of gods and beasts, but yet so remote from the divinity in the eyes of the supernal goddesses.\(^{29}\) Still, the ancient Greeks visualised several occasions where herdsmen in particular and the immortals met in fields and on mountains. It is perhaps no wonder that ancient herdsmen could feel close to the gods, when they were remote from the rest of the human society and surrounded by nature. Buxton discusses Greek mountain (ορος) as ‘a place for reversals’, where unusual encounters occur.\(^{30}\) For Hesiod, the consequence was his poetic ability and inspiration.

For other herdsmen who met divinity in the mountains, there was the possibility of an erotic encounter. As we have seen, the Iliad tells some short stories of minor characters whose fathers were herdsmen and mothers were nymphs or gods.\(^{31}\) The most famous story of this kind is Anchises’, which is precisely told in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite. Anchises is a beautiful cowherd with divine blood, playing the κιθάρα at his encounter with the dreadful goddess:

---

\(^{27}\) Stoddard 2004: 74 suggests ἀγραυλός is almost always used for cattle, not for human, in the Iliad. κάκ’ ἐλέγχεα may be summing up the words of ἀγραυλός and γαστήρ.

\(^{28}\) Gutzwiller 2006: 12.

\(^{29}\) Stoddard 2004: 77.


\(^{31}\) e.g. Il.6.21-8 and 14.442-5. Anchises is also clearly shown as having driven oxen when he met Aphrodite: Il.5.313, ἢ μιν ὑπ’ Ἀγχίση τέκε βουκολέοντι.
In the *Homeric Hymns*, there is another unique herdsman-figure, Hermes, the patron of herdsmen. Soon after his birth, Hermes invents lyre, and sets off to steal Apollo’s cattle. Tricks and lies have become his attributes:

\[\text{ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ μεγάλοιο ∆ιὸς νόος ἐξετελεῖτο,}
\[\text{τῇ δ’ ἢδη δέκατος μεῖς οὐρανὸς ἐστήκτο,}
\[\text{εἰς τὲ φόως ἄγαγεν, ἀρίσημα τε ἔργα τέτυκτο·}
\[\text{καὶ τότ’ ἐγείνατο πολύτροπον, αἱμυλομήτην,}
\[\text{λῃστὴρ’, ἐλατῆρα βοῶν, ἡγήτορ’ ὀνείρων,}
\[\text{νυκτὸς ὀπωπητήρα, πυληδόκον, ὃς τάχ’ ἔμελλεν}
\[\text{ἀμφανέειν κλυτὰ ἔργα μετ’ ἀθανάτοις θεοῖσιν.}

\[(h.Merc.10-16)\]

Cattle-raiding reveals a down-to-earth side of herdsmen. Gutzwiller has examined some cattle-raiding characters in Greek myth and early literature, and also pointed out, particularly with regard to Hermes, that his animal theft is an intellectual activity, whose purpose is not only gaining the flock itself, but also, or rather, showing his cleverness to the others.\(^{32}\)

In fifth-century tragedy, herdsmen often appear as heralds or messengers. One of the most notable is the shepherd in Sophocles’ *Oedipus Tyrannus*, who plays a crucial role in baby Oedipus’ survival and later the doomed king’s discovery of his crimes. Other examples are *Iphigenia in Tauris* and *Bacchae*. Gutzwiller has analysed these two plays and argues that ‘both present classic

\(^{32}\) Gutzwiller 1991: 41-42.
characterizations of herdsmen as fearful, quarrelsome, susceptible to superstition, and easily persuaded.\textsuperscript{33} The general view towards herdsmen-characters at that time seems to associate the herdsmen with the lack of sophistication or intelligence.

In one class of stories, in which some noble children are abandoned and discovered later, herdsmen often function as the low-class or slave first-finder/foster-parents of the children, for example, in \textit{Antiope}, a lost play by Euripides. Antiope gave birth to two sons, Amphion and Zethus and left them to be raised by a herdsman. Later, the two sons gain recognition by the mother and they rescue her. The same type of plot is found among (partly) extant plays in \textit{Epitrepontes} by Menander. These herdsmen in the dramas are more or less minor characters and shown as ‘others’. In these foundling stories, we often see their contemporary concerns about the main character’s (abandoned child’s) ‘being a citizen or not’. Herdsmen are placed on ‘the other side’ from which the children of higher birth should be discovered and restored back to ‘our (audience’s) side’\textsuperscript{34}.

Euripides’ \textit{Cyclops}, the only completely extant satyr-play, reflects largely the monster’s picture in the \textit{Odyssey}.\textsuperscript{35} The romance between Polyphemus and Galatea, which became very popular in the Hellenistic and Roman periods (cf. Theocritus’ \textit{Idylls} 6 and 11), is not described here. However, the pastoral picture presented with satyrs as herdsmen seems, to our eyes, to be reflected in some comical pastoral pieces featuring goatherds by Theocritus.

So far we have examined several literary works to see what the herdsmen means or what kind of notion he is associated with: peace and vulnerable human in the \textit{Iliad}, peace, order and justice in the \textit{Odyssey}, intermediary between beasts and gods as well as between human and nature, rusticity and poetic inspiration in the \textit{Theogony}, eroticism (anti-heroism) and cunningness in the \textit{Homeric Hymns} and wildness and existence as ‘others’ in some tragedies. Now we shall examine in the next section if we can see the hierarchy between those herdsmen, concerning in particular those notions we have observed they are associated with, in some works especially where more than one herdsmen-character appears.

\textsuperscript{33} Gutzwiller 1991: 48.
\textsuperscript{34} For an interesting analysis of Amphion as a herdsman and natural philosopher in \textit{Antiope}, see Gutzwiller 1991: 56-9.
\textsuperscript{35} Gutzwiller suggests Euripides developed Polyphemus’ story of the \textit{Odyssey} to reflect the contemporary debate of nature and culture. See Gutzwiller 1991:61.
1.2 The Pastoral Hierarchy before Theocritus

It is highly probable that the concept of the pastoral hierarchy can be traced back to early Greek epic, although Homer does not describe it as Longus does. Nevertheless, in Homer the hierarchy is almost certainly at the back of the characterisation of the major herdsmen. As we look into their social status, the poet seems to form the characters of each herdsman, reflecting his own idea of the pastoral hierarchy. Melanthius is particularly important to examine, as Theocritus’ goatherd mentions his name at the end of *Idyll 5*.

As we have discussed earlier, the descriptions of herdsmen in the *Odyssey* are associated with the idea of ‘peace and order’, and we shall now examine how each of the different kinds of herdsmen is related to it. Melanthius is a slave goatherd and his role in the *Odyssey* is totally opposite to that of Eumaeus. Eumaeus expects his master to return and longs for the day he will meet Odysseus, whereas Melanthius and his sister, Melantho, betray Odysseus by taking the side of the Suitors. Moreover, this goatherd is not productive in his herding, as he helps the Suitors consume Odysseus’ flock, in other words, his lord’s fortune, and Eumaeus criticises Melanthius’ apathetic attitude towards his task, pointing out that he is always in town (*Od.17.245-6*). The lines below present a prayer by Eumaeus to the gods when he faced Melanthius:

```
“Νύμφαι κρηναίαι, κυραι Διός, εἰ ποτ’ Ὀδυσσεύς
ῡμι’ ἐπὶ μηρ’ ἐκη, καλύψας πῖνι δημῷ,
ἀρνὼν ἢδ’ ἐρίφων, τόδε μοι κρηήνατ’ ἐκλήσωρ,
ὡς ἔλθοι μὲν κεῖνος ἀνὴρ, ἀγάγοι δέ ἐ δαίμων.
τὸ κέ τοι ἀγαπάς γε διασκεδάσειεν ἁπάςας,
τὰς νῦν ὑφρίζων χορέεις, ἀλαλήμενος αἰεὶ
ἄστυ κάτ’ αὐτάρ μῆλα κακοὶ φθείρουσι νομῆς.”
```

(*Od.17.240-6*)

The poorly maintained cattle shows metaphorically Odysseus’ household in danger and an obvious

---

36 For Melanthius and the possibility of creation of this character by later poet(s), see Fernandez-Galiano 1992: 166, in Russo, Fernandez-Galiano and Heubeck 1992.
difference between Melanthius and Eumaeus, the latter of whom shows a deep devotion to taking care of his master’s swine even during the night (Od.14.523-33). Thus, from the viewpoint of ‘peace and order’, Melanthius is worthless and even a harmful herdsman.

Melanthius is a slave by birth, as his father, Dorius, serves Laertes. It is interesting that Melanthius and Melantho, the two main disloyal slaves, are described as having been born into slavery. Their father Dorius himself is devoted to his master and he also has several other children who serve Laertes with loyalty. But the other children remain anonymous (Od.24.228).

In this early epic, the affinities in the characteristics between a herdsman and a type of the animal he herds are not given prominence as much as in Theocritus. For example, Theocritean goatherds are usually associated with passionate love, whereas Melanthius’ sexuality is not emphasised very much. Still, when we think about his sister’s sexual misbehaviour with the Suitors and that the severe and insulting punishment on him by Odysseus was castration (Od.22.474-7), depriving him of his sex, we find that Melanthius’ sexuality is marked as rather negative. Homer may have been already aware of the strong connection between goatherds and coarseness in sexuality and expressed it as one aspect of the disloyalty of Melanthius. The other aspect of Melanthius, his aggressive attitude, may have to be understood as consistent with his being a goatherd, as long as there was already the ancient notion that a herdsman’s nature would follow that of the animal he herds.

Eumaeus the swineherd and Philoetius the cowherd are the main male faithful slaves. These two ideal herdsmen, especially Eumaeus, function as true-hearted slaves, protectors of livestock as their masters’ property and also as strong defence against the Suitors. Therefore, they are positive herdmen in terms of ‘peace and order’ and Homer describes them as noble people in their minds. Eumaeus can be interpreted not only as a slave but also as a major character representing Zeus’ Justice in this epic:

δμώες δ’, ευ’ ἄν μηκέτ’ ἐπικρατέωσιν ἄνακτες,
οὐκέτ’ ἐπεὶ’ ἐθέλουσιν ἐναίσιμα ἐργάζεσθαι

37 See Thalman 1998: 67-70. Dorius, whose name seems to be derived from δοῦλος is depicted as, and could represent, a ‘slave’ itself, who can potentially be good or bad.
38 See pages 32-3 for the discussion on Id.1.87.
Here, Eumaeus talks about slaves and ἀρετή, suggesting that those who have fallen into slavery are likely to perform less virtuously, since their servile status would harm those people’s excellence.

Nevertheless, despite his servile status without his master’s presence, Eumaeus’ allegiance is consistent throughout. However, this does not necessarily mean the poet intentionally depicts ‘slaves’ themselves as virtuous. First, we have to consider the fact that Eumaeus is not a slave by birth, but a ‘blue-blooded slave’, who was born as a king’s child but kidnapped by pirates and sold as a slave when he was a child (Od.15.389-484). Now it is worth considering where in the hierarchy a swineherd fits and whether a swineherd or a goatherd is higher in the herdsman’s ranking. We can assume swineherds are not considered very high, because, in the Odyssey, at the first encounter of Eumaeus and Odysseus in disguise with Melanthius, Melanthius insults Eumaeus by calling him a pig, perhaps bearing in mind Eumaeus’ low status among herdsmen (Od.17.204-32). He associates Eumaeus with his mean animal, the pig. This may have the same kind of meaning as Daphnis and Dorcon’s comparisons of each other to a goat or to something goatish in their fight in order to insult each other in Longus. Then, the setting of Eumaeus as a swineherd is to bring the dramatic contrast between his noble birth and his present status. This gains the same effect as intended by Longus when Daphnis is raised by a slave goatherd, not a cowherd or shepherd.

Now we turn to Philoetius’ case. As nothing is told clearly about Philoetius’ background, the only thing we know about him is that he became Odysseus’ cowherd in his childhood (Od.20.197-25) and that Philoetius’ epithet is ὄρχαμος ἀνδρόν, a leader of the people (e.g.20.185), which is rather high-sounding for a herdsman. This is also applied to Eumaeus (e.g.17.184), and

---

40 In Theaetetus, three types of herdsmen are named as swineherd, shepherd and cowherd (179D), instead of Theocritus’ version of the three, ‘cowherds, shepherds and goatherds’ (Id.1.80). We are not sure if Plato intended to introduce these herdsmen in the hierarchical order in these lines. See also Kossaifi 1997: 234. Herodotus tells of swineherds as a disdained type of herdsmen in Egypt and the Egyptian social order with cowherds more highly regarded than swineherds. (Hdt.2.47.4, 2.164.) On the other hand, in some places in Egypt, the worship of goats as sacred resulted in the high status of goatherds (Hdt.2.46)
this epithet may only refer to their good personalities and loyalty, or also to their social status or birth. Philoetius might be a slave by birth. The point is, however, that Melanthius is clearly defined as a slave by birth, whereas Philoetius is not. It seems that Melanthius’ negative personality is connected to his being a goatherd as well as being a slave by birth.

We also note that this cowherd serves just as a subordinate helpmate to noble Eumaeus, simply because on their own Odysseus and Eumaeus are not sufficient in number to wreak full vengeance on the multitude of the Suitors. Strict limitations are put on his character, as Homer does not spare many lines to describe him, but still efficiently provides this cowherd with minimum features as a good servant with his unchanging loyalty to his master and as a productive slave herdsman who increases the number of the master’s cows (Od.20.198-25). However, this very brief description of the cowherd may tell that Homer did not need to devote as much attention to him, because as a cowherd he is already associated with nobility and higher status, which might allow readers to easily assume that he will be good and loyal.

Additionally, it is significant that the two faithful herdsmen are not closely linked with poverty, owing to their favourable relationship with Odysseus. Eumaeus does not suffer from poverty because he is taken good care of by his master (Od.15.488-91) and Philoetius is put in charge of cows, which could represent his master’s wealth. Later, these loyal slaves are liberated and given houses and wives (Od.21.203-220), so that they would gain a social status suitable for their deeds. In Odysseus’ struggle to live a life, Homer expresses that there is some value even in the life of the lowest class such as θής when Achilles talks to Odysseus in Hades and expresses his longing for life: better to live as θής than be great but dead (Od.11.488-491). However, the way the poet portrays his named characters seems to reflect his strong concern for the social hierarchy. In most cases, a character’s noble status in society corresponds with his noble personality and that of a poor status, with his poor personality. Even though there are some characters like the Suitors, who are aristocrats in the society and poor in their deeds, or someone like the Phoenician slave from a rich family who carried off little Eumaeus to be sold as a slave (Od.15.415-29), it is difficult to find any named slave with a well-developed character, who is low-ranked in the hierarchy but shows excellence in his personality. It seems that the good slaves are either noble by birth, blurred as

---

42 Philoetius by name is defined as an aid towards the favourable ending. See the note above.
anonymous or characterized with limitations.\textsuperscript{43} Being a slave goatherd does not give a person any excellence here. As far as the herdsmen are concerned, in the \textit{Odyssey}, we find the characterisation of them corresponding to the order in the hierarchy and especially the lowliness of the goatherd, both in his social status and personality.

The ranking in the hierarchy matches well with some other Archaic depictions of herdsmen. It can explain that the divine herdsmen, Hermes and Apollo are thought to have been cow herding (e.g. in the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Hermes}). It also gives good reasons for the noble picture of god-like beautiful cowherd Anchises in the \textit{Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite} (e.g. line 45) and his son Aeneas, who is a cowherd and an excellent warrior, as is Priam’s nephew, god-like Melanippus (\textit{Il.15.547-59}). On the other hand, some of the Trojan minor characters, like Laomedon’s illegitimate son Bucolion (\textit{Il.6.21-6})\textsuperscript{44} and Priam’s two sons described together as killed by Agamemnon at the same time, Isus and Antiphus, the former of whom is illegitimate (\textit{Il.11.101-6}), were shepherds. Their being shepherds, not cowherds, might imply either their status as bastards (except Antiphus), simply their minor roles in the story or their youth and immaturity, compared to their fellow cowherd heroes.

Especially in Isus and Antiphus’ case, their immaturity is implied also in a typical course of life and death for some young Trojans: captured by Achilles on Mt. Ida, released for ransom, but in the end, killed by Achilles or other great Greek warriors.\textsuperscript{45} As we have seen earlier, Iliadic herdsmen often stands for peace and anti-heroism. If the difference in the herding animals is related to the Trojan’s nature in terms of maturity, the lowlier herdsmen could mark a less heroic being.

When we turn to the Attic tragedies, we find some more compatible examples. Usually, the herdsmann-messenger characters are either cowherds or shepherds (e.g. \textit{Oedipus Tyrannus}, \textit{Bacchae}). It is because of their credibility: being higher ranked herdsmen seems to give them their roles of fairly trustworthy messengers.\textsuperscript{46} As we find in the examples in the \textit{Theogony} and some

\textsuperscript{43} For Eurycleia, her patronymic and kinship to Odysseus’ family similar to Eumaeus’, see Thalman 1998: 74-6.
\textsuperscript{44} Kirk 1990: 158.
\textsuperscript{45} See also Lycaon’s case in \textit{Il.11.35-155}.
\textsuperscript{46} Berman 2005: 236.
tragedies, the Greek herdsman tends to be portrayed as less intelligent and the lowlier herdsman could especially be so.

To sum up, we see those herdsman’s different aspects/images (which are more or less related to the central theme of the story) are featured in each literary text, and when there is more than one herdsman in one story, we can see how differently each of the different kinds of herdsman is depicted, concerning the image he is associated with, or more simply how positively or negatively they appear. For example, in the *Odyssey*, the herdsman is supposed to work for the peace and order of Odysseus’ household and the swineherd and the cowherd are effective in this regard, whereas the goatherd is not.

On the whole, it seems cowherds are depicted as relatively positive, whereas we do not find positively marked goathers. Shepherds are more complicated, being almost neutral, as Berman suggests, and they can be described both as positive and negative.\(^\text{47}\) They can be described as being as good as cowherds. But at the same time, they can represent uncivilised villains such as Polyphemus the Cyclops, who keeps sheep and goats in the *Odyssey*.

Chapter 2

The Pastoral Hierarchy and Theocritean Herdsmen

2.1 The Pastoral Hierarchy in Theocritus

Now we would like to consider if there is this concept of hierarchy in Theocritus visible in his own poetry, although it is already easy to assume that he has inherited the idea of the hierarchy from his literary predecessors. When we turn back to the Theocritean text, *Idyll* 1 line 80, where three types of herdsmen appear at Daphnis’ death, we find the same order from cowherd to goatherd, if that is the poet’s intention (ἜἵเธξώὡζϊlὈνθον τοὶ βοῦται, τοὶ ποιμένες, ὕπόλοι ἔἵθθον). It has been debated whether this concept of the hierarchy actually exists in Theocritean poetry. Schmidt denied it and his idea has been supported by some readers. However, Van Groningen, and more recently, Berman have raised enough evidence for this concept in Theocritus, such as the different levels of speech between cowherds and goatherds: cowherds speak in a more sophisticated manner and goatherds in a more rustic one.

More apparent evidence is that in some ‘realistic’, or non-idealised descriptions of goatherds in *Idylls* 4 and 7, they seem to be less wealthy than the accompanying cowherds, especially in their clothing. In *Idyll* 4.56-7, the goatherd Battus is barefoot (νήλιπος), whereas his cowherd friend, Corydon, seems to wear sandals or shoes. The cowherd insults, or gives advice to the barefoot goatherd, who has stepped on a thorn in the mountain. Also, the other cowherd, Aegon, who appears in their conversation, seems even better off. In *Idyll* 7.10-20, there is a famous precise depiction of the humble guise of Lycidas the goatherd, where even his smell is described. Rustic smell is perhaps an attribute of goatherds, as a mention of the smell of a goatherd and his goatskin is also found in *Idyll* 5 (50-2). The goatskin itself may be a clear sign of a goatherd’s humble

---

48 Halperin suggests the possibility that the orderly use of words, *bucolic* (τὰς βουκολικὰς 20), *poemenic* (ὁ ποιμενικὸς 23) and *aepolic* (αἰπολικὸν 56) in the goatherd’s speech in *Idyll* 1 also implies the hierarchy. See Halperin 1983: 182.
50 Van Groningen 1959: 314, Berman 2005: 230-231. However, what is suggested there briefly is an overall impression of different levels of speech by herdsmen.
51 Kossatifi 1997: 234-239.
Also, we assume some connection between barefoot Battus and Lycidas, the latter of whom seems also to be barefoot, when he makes fun of the sound caused by the shoes of Simichidas (7.26), a town poet as well as a former ‘cowherd’ according to his own words (7.92).

We can find further evidence in the herdsmen’s relationships to each other. When the goatherd and the shepherd start the singing match in *Idyll* 5, the shepherd first talks about calling Lycopus, the cowherd, to be their judge (62). This perhaps implies that the cowherd’s higher status would add to the credibility of his judgement.

Indeed, *Idyll* 5 is the very piece which invites us to consider closely the issue of the herdsmen’s status difference behind the pastoral scenes. Further support for the hierarchy there is that the two herdsmen in *Idyll* 5 are the only characters through the *Idylls* who are undeniably slaves (5.5-10), whereas, for example, Aegon the cowherd in *Idyll* 4 cannot be a slave, because he is an Olympian athlete (4.6) and also the old man, who seems to be Aegon’s father, is an owner of cows (4.1-4). Comatas of *Idyll* 5 calls Lacon δόλε Σιβύρτα (5.5), ‘Sybaritas’ slave’, and Lacon, in return, calls Comatas ωλεύθερε (5.8), ‘a freeman’, which is interpreted as ironic, based on Lacon’s knowledge of Comatas’ being a slave to Eumaras (5.10).53

In addition, we may try to ascertain that Theocritus was aware of the two aspects of the hierarchy we have seen in Longus: the difference in value of animals and as far as goatherds are concerned, the negative aspect of the animal and its herding. Firstly, in *Idyll* 5, Comatas and Lacon

---

52 In the earlier literature, a goatskin occasionally might have signified servile status of the wearers. e.g. *Od*.14.530 and especially *Eur.* Κτε.76-80:

ἐγὼ δ’ ὁ σὸς πρόπολος
Κύκλωπι θητεύω
τῶι μονοδέρκται δοῦλος ἀλαίνων
σὺν ταῖδε τράγου χλαίναι μελέαι
οὰς χωρίς φιλίας.

53 See Gow 1952: 97.
argue over the fair stakes of the singing match, revealing only a mature he-goat (rather than a kid) to be of the same value as a lamb:54

KO. ὅς ποι᾽ Ἀθαναίαν ἔριν ἡρίσεν. ἡνίδε κείται

ωρίφος ἀλλ’ ἤγε καὶ τῷ τιν’ εὐβοτον ἀμφότερον ἐρείδε.

ΛΑ. καὶ πῶς, ὦ κίναδος τῷ, τάδ’ ἐξετάστα τὲ ἱσώ ἀμμιν;

τῖς τρίχας ἀντʼ ἐρίων ἐποκίξατο; τὶς δὲ παρεύσας

αἶγος πρατοτόκοιο κακὰν κόνα δήλητ’ ἀμέλειτε;

ΚΟ. ὅστις νικασέει τὸν πλατίον ὡς τῷ πεποίθεις,

σφὰξ βομβέων τέττιγος τῷ, τὰδ’ ἔσσεται ἐξ ἴσω ἄμμιν;

ὁ τράγος οὐδ’ ἐρίστε.

(Id.5.23-30)

Secondly, the notoriously rank smell of goats and goatherds may well be one of the reasons for the disadvantage of goatherds, also here in Theocritus (5.52 and 7.16):55

αἰ κ’ ἔνθῃς, ὕπνω μαλακώτερα· ταὶ δὲ τραγεῖν

ταὶ παρὰ τίν’ ὄσδοντι κακώτερον ἢ τῷ περ ὄσδες.

(Id.5.51-2)

Furthermore, we may deduce a difference in social position between Lacon and Comatas, intended also from the following point. Lines 14-16, where Lacon the shepherd names himself by revealing his mother’s name, which is one of the pieces of evidence that Lacon is shown as a slave, make us suspect that this shepherd enjoys higher social status than the goatherd, as it has been pointed out that here Lacon may be described as an οἰκογενής, a home-born slave:56

ΛΑ. οὐ μαὐτὸν τὸν Πάνα τὸν ἄκτιν, οὐ τὲ γε Λάκων

54 In the *Idylls*, goats may not fully be a generic symbol of richness or good life on their own, as, for example, in a usage of plentiful cows and sheep in a peaceful and expansive society in *Id*. 16.90-97.
55 Although Lycidas’ smell is from rennet and may not be the same as Comatas’ smell, the motif of smell is used to enhance the character’s rustic image. See pages 26-7.
56 See Gow 1952: 97-8 and Zanker 1987. However, Crane 1981 is not convinced by this argument.
Although we do not have any further evidence to strengthen this possibility, if Lacon is an ὀικογενής and Comatas is not, it may well explain why Lacon dares to say his mother’s name in making an oath. As we can see in these herdsmen’s later encounter with Morson the woodcutter, Lacon is reluctant to show his servile status to a stranger (5.74-5). Even though the two herdsmen know that they are both slaves, Lacon would not speak of his mother’s name during their fight, unless it gives a sense of his own superiority to Comatas. The difference in their social positions seems to be meant and the lines 118-19 can be interpreted as a further support for this. Lacon mocks Comatas for his having been beaten by his master, which discloses to readers the harsh treatment Comatas received.

Beyond Idyll 5, goatherds’ being negative cultural models certainly exists elsewhere. Twice it is shown that being called a goatherd brings insults to the other types of herdsmen (Id. 1.87 and 6.7). Also in the ending of Idyll 4, where Battus and Corydon compare Aegon’s father’s goatishness with that of Pans and satyrs (4.62-3), 57 mythical goatish creatures, their intention is mockery of this middle-aged owner of cows.

Here we have seen the basic concept of the pastoral hierarchy and collected some examples of the sense of the hierarchy in Theocritus. Although there is the case of the anonymous goatherd in Idyll 1, whose identity is blurred, it is highly reasonable to think that Theocritus deliberately describes goatherds as particularly humble and intends to convey the sense of earthiness in them. The cowherds and the shepherds are, basically, portrayed as higher in status than the goatherds. Thus, we assume practically that Theocritus introduced the idea of the hierarchy as one of the rules governing his pastoral world.

57 Not only satyrs, but also Pan appears in plural. It seems to refer to Pan-like rustic divines or spirits. See Gow 1952: 91, Hunter 1991: 144.
2.2 Goatherds: Vulgarity and Rusticity

In the following sections of this chapter, we discuss some characteristics of each of the different kinds of herdsmen, starting with the goatherds. Although their low rank in the pastoral hierarchy (one of the ‘social rules’ of pastoral) seems to be expressed largely in the goatherds’ ‘lowly’ nature, we will also note that the poet changes the way the rule is applied to his characters, which results in the complex and rich characterisation of the goatherds. We start from how their low status is indicated and how their status is related to their behaviour and roles. Then we will discuss non-lowly aspects of some of the goatherds and the new literary meanings they came to acquire in the *Idylls*, compared with earlier Greek literary goatherds.

**Status as slaves and unkempt appearance**

As we discussed in the previous chapter, Comatas in *Idyll 5* is a slave and probably meant to appear as one of the lowliest in status throughout the pastoral *Idylls*. He and Lacon give each other that even their owners are not wealthy (5-10). In addition, Lacon goes further to tell us the harsh treatment Comatas received from his master in order to mock him (118-19). Comatas in *Idyll 7*, a goatherd of the same name, has a master as well and is tortured by him (78-82), although, to be exact, this Comatas might not be a slave. His story seems to be based on a folk tale about a herdsman serving a king.\(^{58}\) Likewise, we do not have clear evidence for the other goatherds in the *Idylls* being slaves. Still, their humble and rustic guise often indicates their relatively lower status. We find the most elaborate example in *Idyll 7*:

\[
\text{ἐσθλὸν σὺν Μοίσαισι Κυδωνικὸν εὕρομεν ἄνδρα,}
\text{oὔνομα μὲν Λυκίδαν, ἡς δ' αἰπόλος, οὐδὲ κέ τίς νιν}
\text{ἡγνοίησεν ἰδών, ἐπεὶ αἵπτόλω ἐξοχ' ἐώκει.}
\]

\(^{58}\) Gow 1952: 152. According to Lucus of Rhegium, a herdsman was giving sacrifices to the Muses from his master’s flock, was then punished by the master, but had his life saved by the Muses, being nurtured by honey for two months. See Wendel 1920: 99-100.
ἐκ μὲν γὰρ λασίοιο δασύτριχος εἶχε τράγοιον
κνακὸν δέρμ' ὤμοισι νέας ταμίσοιο ποτόσθον,
ἀμφὶ δὲ οἱ στήθεσσι γέρων ἐσφίγγετο πέπλος
κορύναν. καὶ μ᾽ ἀτρέμας ἐπε σεσαρώς
ὀμματὶ μειδιόωντι, γέλως δὲ οἱ εἶχετο χείλευς

(Id.7.12-20)

Simichidas depicts Lycidas carefully, from what he wears to what he smells of, and focuses on the rustic, humble, very goatherd-like appearance of Lycidas (οὐδὲ κέ τίς νιν / ἡγνοίησεν ιδών, ἐπεὶ αἰπόλῳ ἔξοχ’ ἐῴκει. 13-14). From his smell of ταμίσοιο, ‘rennet’ (16), he seems to engage in some of the typical work of a herdsman: Lycidas seems to have made cheese and wiped his hands with his goatskin.59 Lycidas’ status as a down-to-earth goatherd is clear from his appearance, even though his herd of goats does not appear.60

We have discussed in the earlier chapter the goatherds’ smell, bare feet and goatskin as the visible indicators of their lowly status. But beyond Idylls 4, 5 and 7, the goatherd-like rustic appearance is not only found in their clothes and bare feet. In Idyll 3, the unnamed protagonist is described as having just such a typical appearance of a goatherd, although what he wears is not stated. He starts to describe his own physical features, wondering if those are the reason why his beloved Amaryllis is indifferent to him now:

(Id.3.6-9)

60 Hunter 1999: 147.
Here we see some links between the goatherd and a half-goat and half-human creature, a satyr. First, he says that he has a flat nose (σιμός 8). This characteristic is what the ancient Greeks thought ugly and satyrs were often described as having this type of nose. As in the pseudo-Theocritean Idyll 8, σιμός is applied to kids (8.50), there might be a close association between a goatherd’s rustic feature and the nature of his animal. The second feature is προγένειος (9). Some interpret this word as ‘long-chinned’, while others as ‘with full beard’. We can, again, speculate about the goatherd-goat association, since we come to an ancient usage of προγένειος as ‘with full beard’ observed in Longus, when Daphnis calls Dorcon’s beard goat-like to insult this cowherd (προγένειος ώς τράγος 1.16.5).

We may interpret this very goatherd in Idyll 3, as well as Amaryllis and his friend Tityrus as a kind of mythical character: the two goatherds as satyrs and especially Amaryllis as a sea-nymph, who lives in a cave. Interestingly, however, the goatherd is not free from a sense of ‘social class’. Three other minor characters in the goatherd’s narrative lend ‘realism’ to the poem: Olpis the fisherman (26), Agroeo the augur (31-3) and a dark-complexioned hired girl of Mermon (ά Μέρμνωνος ἐριθακίς ἁ μελανόχρως 35). Another fisherman in the Idylls is in a goatherd’s description of his κισσύβιον (wooden drinking-cup) in Idyll 1.39-44: Theocritus uses the fisherman’s image as part of typical rustic scenery by the sea. The rare name of Agroeo, Ἀγροιώ, may be intended to show her as a typical ἀγροῖκος, as in the Idylls, characters’ names are often strongly related to what they really are (i.e. Tityrus, the Doric form of satyr, used as the name of a goatherd in Idyll 3 and perhaps also in Idyll 7). As far as the tanned girl is concerned, we understand tanned skin is a typical feature of labourers, which in this Idyll mark Mermon’s girl as lowly and less attractive to the goatherd.

Theocritus has put these ‘realistic’ characters in to associate the goatherd with a ‘realistic’ working class. ‘Realistic’ here does not necessarily mean this Idyll describes actual herdsmen at that time or based on some facts from the real world. Rather, it merely means ‘not idealised’, that is

---

63 Gutzwiller 1991: 118-120. For a debate whether Tityrus is a human figure or a goat, see Gow 1952: 65.
64 On the fictionality of the character-setting and ‘the copresence of theatrical performance and unromantic agricultural labor’ see Payne 2007: 63.
65 For the fisherman’s image in the Hellenistic trend of visual art, see Hunter 1999: 77.
66 Hunter 1999: 120-121.
what urban readers might expect to find in the rural people in countryside.

**Lowly characteristics, rustic lack of sophistication**

We have observed the goatherds’ low status and rustic guise. Now we wonder how their lowliness affects their inner character, if Theocritus links the character’s low social status and behaviour. Perhaps one of the most obvious examples is seen in Comatas in *Idyll* 5. One of the themes in the ‘realistic’ *Idyll*, the conflict between herdsmen, seems to come largely as a result of their being lowly in their status as slaves.\(^67\) The two herdsmen start off their exchange by accusing each other of theft:

\[
\text{ΚΟ. ἄλλες ἐμαί, τὴν ποιμένα, τὸν Συβαρίταν,} \\
\text{φεύγετε, τὸν Λάκωνα· τὸ μεμνακός ἐκλεψεν.} \\
\text{ΛΑ. οὐκ ἀπὸ τὰς κράνας· ἄμνιδες οὐκ ἐσορήσετε} \\
\text{τὸν μευ τὰν σύριγγα πρόαν κλέψαντα Κομάταν;}
\]

\(^5\text{I}d.5.1-4\)

Comatas claims that Lacon stole his goatskin, then Lacon retorts by asserting that Comatas carried off his syrinx. This argument ends without winner, so that they proceed to a singing match (διαείσομαι 22). Yet, they have another quarrel over the stakes (14-30), the place to sing at (30-61), the judge (62-66) and the way they introduce themselves to the judge (67-79), before they finally start to sing. The disagreements and inharmonious attitude continue through both dialogues and songs.

Other goatherds appear without harsh hostility. For example, Battus the goatherd and Corydon, who pastures cows, in *Idyll* 4 appear as friends, although there are some agonistic exchanges in their conversation (16-43),\(^68\) Battus has emulation towards the absent cowherd and


\(^68\) Hunter 1999: 129-130.
tries to make fun of him and is also contrasted with Corydon in his character and style of speech. In the opening of the \textit{Idyll}, Battus asks Corydon whose cattle he is pasturing and Corydon tells the name of the owner, Aegon, who is absent now. Then Battus asks if Corydon is going to milk the cows secretly and take the milk:

$\text{BA. Εἰπέ μοι, ὦ Κορύδων, τίνος αἱ βόες ἢ ὅτα Φιλώνδα;}$

$\text{ΚΟ. οὐκ, ἀλλ' Ἀγώνος βόσκειν δὲ μοι αὐτάς ἐξώκεν.}$

$\text{BA. ἤ πά ψε κρύβαν τὰ ποθέσπερα πάσας ἀμέλεις;}$

$\text{ΚΟ. ἀλλ' ὁ γέρων ύφίητι τὰ μοσχία κἡμὲ φυλάσσει.}$

(\textit{Id.}4.1-4)

In reply, Corydon declines, because Aegon’s father (ὁ γέρων) is watching over him. The motif of ‘theft’ emerges again here. As for \textit{Idyll} 5, the theft theme is to present both of those herdsmen as lowly and somehow mean figures, although we are not sure if the thefts have in fact taken place. In \textit{Idyll} 4, in turn, the goatherd’s base, cunning idea of stealing milk is shown, but not explicitly as Corydon the cowherd’s, as Corydon closes this topic by saying simply he is not able to conduct the theft.

In \textit{Idyll} 4, we read the further rusticity of goatherd contrasting with the cowherd’s more sophisticated manner. After the discussion of stealing milk, Battus and Corydon continue to talk about the absent cowherd and his poor cows left (δείλαιαί γ’ αὖται, 13). It is often suggested by readers that the speeches by the two herdsmen are contrasting in quality:

$\text{ΒΑ. δείλαιαί γ’ αὖται, τὸν βουκόλον ὡς κακὸν ἐἄται;}$

$\text{ΚΟ. ἀλλ' ἔναν δείλαιαί γε, καὶ οὐκέτι λύντι νέμεσθαι.}$

$\text{ΒΑ. τήνας μὲν δή τοι τὰς πόρτιος αὐτὰ λέλειπται}$

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{See page 57.}
\item In this mimetic \textit{Idyll}, the character setting is not well explained to readers. Interestingly, Battus has not caught up with latest local gossip. Perhaps he is back in this region after a while, see Gow 1952: 76. Some suggest he might not be as local as Corydon - cf. Hunter 1999:129.
\item Gutzwiller 1991: 137 suggests Lacon’s countercharge instead of a claim of his innocent does not necessarily show he is guilty.
\item Segal 1972 in Segal 1981: 89-90. ‘Battus is emotional, sentimental, inclined to exaggeration and despair. Corydon is more even-tempered, calmer, quietly efficient.’
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
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Here, they talk about the pitiful cows, dwindling, missing their master. Battus’ speech sounds more tragic and exaggerated, whereas Corydon’s is modest and fact-based. Battus says that the skinny cow must be living on dews like a cicada, ὤ τέττιξ,73 though Corydon replies, listing what he does to nurture the cattle. Battus is actually jesting with Corydon, but Corydon takes Battus’ comment literally and tries to give some correct information. Even after this, Battus’ speech brings a negative and despairing mood, whereas Corydon brings forward positive and promising comments based on the facts he assembles.74

We should note that the character of this goatherd itself is not tragic. Rather, he is a loud, comic and rustic figure. He has a dramatic tendency, not only in his speech but also in his behaviour. His speech inclines both to very positive remarks and negative ones from time to time. Once he tells audaciously he is better than Polydeuces, as his mother told him so (9). Later, the talk comes to be about a girl, called Amaryllis, who has passed away but was the beloved of Battus:

Battus wails over how ill-fated he is, having lost her (αἰαὶ τῷ σκληρῷ μᾶλα δαίμονος ὃς με λελόγχει.)

---

73 A cicada is referred here because of its lacking of physical strength. See Hunter 1999: 135.
74 Corydon is a ‘conversational literalist’, see Hunter 1999: 129.
λελόχει 40). Then, Corydon tries to hearten his friend (θαρσεῖν χρῆ, φίλε Βάττε 41). Again, Battus is emotional and pessimistic,\textsuperscript{75} in contrast to Corydon with his rather optimistic and undisturbed attitude. Additionally, after these lines, Battus gets a thorn in his bare foot and Corydon extracts it for his friend (50-51).\textsuperscript{76} The loud and emotional goatherd’s speech and acts followed up by the self-controlled and realistic cowherd’s one continues.

**Sexual Desire**

One of the conspicuous characteristics of the goatherds is their sexuality, the basic idea of which we find in *Idyll* 1:

\[βούτας μὲν ἐλέγευ, νόν δ’ αἵπολῳ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας.\]
\[φῷπολος, ὴκι ἔσορη τὰς μηκάδας οὐ βατεῦνται,\]
\[τάκεται ὀφθαλμῶς ὅτι οὐ τράγος αὐτὸς ἐγέντο.\]

(*Id.1.86-88*)

Here, Priapus faces dying Daphnis and mocks him for his struggle for love, his ‘being like a goatherd’ (νόν δ’ αἵπολῳ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικας, 86). Daphnis’ attitude is, according to Priapus, δύσερως and ἀμήχανος (85), δύσερως, ‘feeling love-sick’, or ‘cursed in love’ seems to refer to Daphnis’ complicated attitude towards love: he is in love but not yielding himself to an easy satisfaction. ἀμήχανος in the same line, ‘at a loss’, reveals therefore that there is no way out of it for Daphnis.\textsuperscript{77}  

The *Idylls* feature herdsman’s *eros* often largely because of their somehow intermediate position between human and animal, although of course, the herdsman are human. This erotic side of the herdsman is what we have observed also in the earlier literature occasionally. They possess animal-like natural passion and human-like emotional complexity. The goatherd is thought to be influenced by animal mating, to envy he-goats for their mounting of she-goats and fulfilling their

\textsuperscript{75} Hunter 1999: 138 suggests we may not take Battus’ comment as a serious sentiment.

\textsuperscript{76} The thorn in the foot is another popular Hellenistic motif in visual art, See Hunter 1999: 141-142.

\textsuperscript{77} For more detailed analysis of Daphnis’ love, see pages 52-3.
sexual desire and to pity himself with tears in his eyes for his own frustration. The scholia comment on line 86 as follows.\textsuperscript{78}

In the former one, the reader interprets that Daphnis seems to have lost self-control over his desire, which is normally a characteristic of a goatherd. The second comment implies that the goatherds’ disposition is wilder than that of cowherds, which is determined by goats’ wilder life than that of oxen. In the context of Daphnis’ love, this ancient reader seems to imply here that a goatherd’s passion is wilder than that of a cowherd. Indeed, the idea that connects goatherds and strong, uncontrollable love seems to exist throughout Theocritean pastoral. Besides, Gow suggests the reason why the goatherd is δόσερως is that goatherds are ‘proverbially embarrassed in their relations with women’, which leads them (and also shepherds) to other types of sexual indulgence.\textsuperscript{79} The goatherd’s desire appears repeatedly, though is seen in different ways in each of the \textit{Idyls}.

In Comatas’ case in \textit{Idyll 5}, his love is mainly manifested as his sexual vigour. He reveals that Lacon and he used to have a physical relationship some time in the past (41-2, 116-17), presumably with Lacon being young and Comatas taking the active role. This took place since Comatas was senior to Lacon and now Comatas talks about it to insult Lacon, for Lacon’s past status of being penetrated by the elder (ἀνίκ’ ἐπύγιζόν τυ, τῷ δ’ ἡλικίας 41). Lacon now has grown older and tries

\textsuperscript{78} Wendel 1920: 60-61.  
\textsuperscript{79} Gow 1952: 20.
to emulate Comatas as their relationship became bitter (35-38). In his song, Comatas tells about his present love, bringing the motif of heterosexual love, which makes a contrast to homosexual one by Lacon.\(^8\) Comatas’ coarse sexuality is vividly highlighted, particularly when he compares his own past sexual behaviour with that of his animal, the he-goat:

"ΚΟ. ἀνίκ’ ἐπύγιζόν το, τῷ δ’ ἄλγες αἰ δὲ χίμαιραι
αἴδε κατεβληχώντο, καὶ ὁ τράγος αὐτὰς ἐτρύπη."

(Id.5.41-2)

In the end, again, the victorious image of Comatas over the shepherd is partly represented in his own description of his sexually vigorous, uncastrated he-goat, which repeatedly mounts the she-goats (147-150).

Comatas also sings about unsuccessful experience of love for a girl (5.133-4). And outside \textit{Idyll} 5, this unsuccessful aspect of the goatherds’ love, or their frustration, is typical. In fact, love in the pastoral \textit{Idylls}, especially heterosexual love (including Comatas’ case in Id.5.132-133), is almost always a frustration. \textit{Eros} is shown as destroying ἀσυχία (Id.7.126), a desired state of mind without disturbance\(^8\) and often it is well expressed through the goatherds. In \textit{Idyll} 3, when the anonymous goatherd serenades Amaryllis, his love-interest does not reply to him. However, the whole tone of this \textit{Idyll} is comical, and as Hunter suggests, we may assume this frustrated goatherd as having an erect penis, in a satyric fashion.\(^8\) Another similarly frustrated goatherd is Battus in \textit{Idyll} 4, if the two goatherds are different characters. Here the girl is dead and the tone is less funny than in \textit{Idyll} 3, although still the \textit{Idyll} does not fall into his tragedy and keeps a fairly comical, peaceful mood.

Although we have not got decisive evidence to identify the anonymous goatherd in \textit{Idyll} 3 with Battus, or the Amaryllis there with that of \textit{Idyll} 4, let us take a close look at \textit{Idyll} 3 as an example of a goatherd’s unrequited love motif under a comical light. This \textit{Idyll} presents a unique κώμος, which often takes place at night, following a symposium or another similar occasion, but here is replaced by a pastoral setting under daylight.\(^8\) This is a dramatic poem: through his speech,

\(^8\) See page 40.
\(^8\) Hunter 1999: 190.
\(^8\) Hunter 1999: 114.
\(^8\) The word κώμος refers to various types of activities. Cf. Pind.\textit{Pyth.} 5 22. However, the type of
the goatherd sometimes talks to himself (or unconsciously to readers) and provides readers with some information about the stage-setting or each of his actions, without being asked to, which is similar to a common feature in comedies, where characters, consciously or unconsciously, talks to the audience (e.g. Menander’s *Dyscolus* 179-188, where Sostratus talks to himself).

In the opening, the innocent goatherd first addresses Tityrus, asking him to take care of his goats. The goatherd warns Tityrus against an uncastrated (ἐνόρχαν 4) Libyan he-goat, before he turns to talk about himself and his unrequited love:

Τίτυρ’, ἐμὶν τὸ καλὸν πεφιλημένε, βόσκε τὰς ἄγας,
καὶ ποτὶ τὰν κράναν ἄγε, Τίτυρε καὶ τὸν ἐνόρχαν,
tὸν Λιβυκὸν κνάκωνα, φυλάσσεο μή τυ κορύψῃ.

(*Id.*3.3-5)

As we have seen, in *Idyll* 5, a he-goat’s passion represents that of the goatherd (5.41-2). In *Idyll* 3, however, the opening brings the contrast, more than close similarity, between the sexually active he-goat and his herdsman, who is now unable to gratify his passion. The usage of contrasting situation of a he-goat and his herdsman is analogous to the one in *Idyll* 1.88. Those verses stress the goatherds’ cleaving to sexual pleasure and its unsuccessful result. Generally, we interpret *Idyll* 3 as a hilarious comedy. A rustic, flat-nosed, ugly ‘representative of goatherd’ (thus he does not bear a specific name) gives trials for love in vain and despairs. He is superstitious, seeking an augury (27-33, 37) and has sincere and simple attitude leading to turgid suffering, all which are designed for our laughter, rather than anxious compassion.

Interestingly, he takes the theme of his serenade from some traditional, high, mythical loves:

Ἰππομένης, ὅκα δὴ τὰν παρθένον ἤθελε γὰμαι,
μᾶλ’ ἐν χεροῖν ἐλὼν δρόμον ἀνουεν ἀ δ’ Αταλάντα
ὡς ἴδεν, ὡς ἐμάνη, ὡς ἐς βαθὸν ἄλατ’ ἔρωτα.

*urban κόμος parodied in* *Idyll* 3 may be similar to the one in *Idyll* 2.118-122, where Delphis says he would have come with friends to visit Simaetha for courtship. See also Hunter 1999: 107-110.

84 Hunter 1999: 112.
Here, Theocritus aims at an artificial combination of cultural objects: a rustic goatherd and mythical and heroic love themes, much as he does with the whole of the poem with a countryman and a κώμος. This works as amusing, especially because the goatherd is not quite capable of handling the high themes he brought into his serenade. He lists five men of the mythical past who received love from goddesses or their beloved women. Those examples are, however, as readers would know, without simple happy endings (e.g. Adonis loved by Aphrodite, 46-47). Moreover, the huge gaps and contrasts between the mythical characters and the rustic, deluded goatherd are implied occasionally: the magical apple which caught Atalanta’s heart (40-43) echoes the goatherd’s gift of ten apples and some more to come tomorrow (10-11), to no avail. Endymion sleeps inside the cave of the goddess (49), whereas the goatherd is to lie down outside his lover’s cave (52-54). Towards the ending, when he says he is going to be eaten by wolves, we do not take it as a serious scene of his death, but still imagine him lying on the ground desperately, exactly as he said he would. In this way, the dewy-eyed goatherd’s intense passion and the pain it brings, when unrequited, lend the Theocritean goatherd a comical tone.

---

85 Hunter 1999: 123.
How their lowliness works in the poems

Goatherds’ lowliness is certainly a vigorous driving force of the Theocritean pastoral world. It makes readers laugh, and characterises the pastoral as ‘realistic’ and ‘lowly’, a unique herdsman’s world.

Firstly, the goatherds’ erotic frustration presents them as non-heroic, mundane characters. This reflects a traditional view of herdsmen in general as romantic and sometimes even anti-heroic beings as we have seen in Paris in the Iliad. The further point is, however, the goatherds’ lowly manners and the sexual nature of their love is often stressed, so that even the pain of love is understood as comical (cf.3.10-14).

We would suggest that the goatish passion in particular is a chief Idyllic element and can be interpreted as Theocritus’ favourite motif to mark the opening or the ending of the Idylls. For example, Idyll 3 opens with the goatherd’s warning to his fellow goatherd against an aggressive uncastrated he-goat, implying the whole Idyll has the theme of the rusticity and passion. Also in Idyll 1, where an anonymous goatherd warns his she-goats not to jump up, (otherwise his he-goat would mount them), the goatish ending is a clear indicator of the rusticity:

\[\text{ὢδ' ἔθι, Κισσαίθα· τὸ δ' ἄμελγέ νιν. αἱ δὲ χίμαιραι,}
οὐ μὴ σκαρτασῆτε, μὴ δ' τράγος ὅμμιν ἀναστῇ.\]

(Id.1.151-152)

It functions primarily to represent the rustic setting: the pastoral version of ecphrasis by the goatherd\(^{87}\) and Thyrsis’ elaborate song of Daphnis somehow elevate the atmosphere to sophistication, but the goatish ending draws this down back to the ‘realistic’ setting in the countyside.\(^{88}\) The same sort of ending is set also in Idyll 5. Theocritus’ intention in those goatish endings and opening is to show the rustic passion to laugh at as something very coarse and to admire at the same time, for its simple, natural energy.

Other rustic features of the goatherds also play a considerable part of the Idylls. In Idyll 4, for

\(^{87}\) For the ecphrasis and the goatherd, see page 65.

\(^{88}\) See Gow 1952: 32.
instance, Battus’ loud character brings in rustic incidents from one after another to this εἰδύλλιον ‘small picture’ of the countryside: a cunning idea of the theft of trivial material (cow’s milk), his innocent, cheeky attitude when he says he would match the legendary boxer Polydeuces (9), an exaggerated description of the suffering of driver-less cows, his own suffering of love-loss, a fuss with a thorn in his bare foot and his constant showing of his interest in gossiping (including an erotic topic in 58-9). The rapid changes of topics may tell us of Battus’ attempts to hold the initiative in conversation against the cowherd. At the same time, it functions for fuller picture of ‘countryside’ in the dramatic frame of the poem. It is very important to note that the goatherds’ rusticity for readers’ amusement characterise some of the Idylls as ‘realistic’, which partly contributes to the ironical atmosphere of the Theocritean Idylls, in contrast, as Halperin suggests, to Vergil’s more sentimental world of the Eclogues, for example, Eclogue 1 with the poet’s deep sympathy with the goatherd Meliboeus.

The bucolic world is, in many cases, in its full meanings, or defined clearly, by oppositions with the pre-existing patterns and motifs in literature and the goatherds’ rusticity often serves to highlight this opposition. Primarily, Theocritean ‘countryside’ exists to present some contrasts with the ‘city’ and Theocritus occasionally shows the gap explicitly. As we discussed previously, Idyll 3 gives a rustic paraklausithyron, a parody of an urban practice. When the goatherd sings, we do not think that a real goatherd at that age would have done the same thing to court his woman: making use of the style of an urban form, Theocritus turns it into a comedy by adding a rustic setting. Readers enjoy the unusual combination of rusticity against urbanity, or rather, are amused by a rustic goatherd, who unconsciously and awkwardly is put into a role of an urban lover, sings a komos-like serenade without success and ends up in a comical misfortune. By doing so, the goatherd highlights his own rusticity and innocence, which readers expect to see in the countryside as typically ‘bucolic’.

By describing some goatherds, the bucolic realm presents a very different world, not only from the ‘city’, but also from ‘the heroic past’ in literature including the traditional hexameter epic.

89 For the term εἰδύλλιον, see Gutzwiller 1996:129-133.
91 Halperin 1983: 249.
92 Paraklausithyron: ‘lament at the door’ by a komast rejected by his lover. cf.Plut.Mor.753b.
When Battus the goatherd and Corydon chatter away about people around them, mainly about the absent cowherd and his highly-sexed father, we are amazed to realise how wide a range of themes hexameter poetry has come to cover. Theocritus brings some motifs which look on their surface traditionally heroic or tragic to these herdsman’s daily chatting. But, after all, those motifs highlight the non-heroic, non-tragic aspect of the *Idyll*. The same sort of gap between the rustic goatherd and the legendary past in his failed song is what we observed in *Idyll* 3.

**Relationship to the earlier goatherd**

Theocritus, in the creation of his own goatherds, makes a playful challenge to our view of an earlier literary goatherd. When we read *Idyll* 5, we ask ourselves why the goatherd wins over the shepherd in the singing match. This question, seeming simple on its surface, holds a clue to Theocritus’ intention in his making of the new goatherd, especially in the final lines of the *Idyll*, where Comatas declares his victory, which contains a significant Homeric allusion (5.150).

As I stated above, Comatas is very goatish and coarse, as stressed in his bad smell and his mentions of sexual desire and his display of aggressiveness. Many interpretations have been introduced so far, concerning how Comatas wins, or Lacon loses the match, with regard to the Theocritean rules of amoebaean singing-contests, singer’s skills and techniques. The contents of

---

93 From Comatas’ speech in the lines 76-7, some interpreters have suggested that ‘speaking truth’ is the unmentioned rule of this singing match and this is the point Lacon misses in his final lines 134-5, when he tells that he gave a syrinx to Eumedes, cf. Serrao 1975: 86.

There, some scholars suggested that in lines 134-5, in his last singing, Lacon dishonestly mentions the name of the second lover, or having given the syrinx which he says was stolen by Comatas in lines 3-4, actually to his own lover. Cf. Schmidt 1974, Walker 1980, Meiller 1986. Giangrande 1976 suggests the syrinx of lines 3-4 is different from the one in lines 134-5, but still Lacon tells a lie because a syrinx is too expensive for a slave to possess two of them, although Crane 1988 does not think this type of syrinx is expensive. However, some other interpreters do not support ‘truthfulness’ as a rule in the singing match, because Comatas also speaks implausibly of his having a bowl of ‘Praxiteles’ in line 105. From these lines, Gutzwiller 1991 does not believe this singing match contributes to the poetics of bucolic singing and suggests this is merely an agon of persuading and deceiving the others, which is derived from the herdsman’s tradition of cattle-theft.
each couplet are as follows. For example, in the first couplet, Comatas sings that he is loved by the Muses, followed by Lacon singing that he is loved by Apollo. The contents of each piece of song make a contrast, based on the same themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comatas</th>
<th>Lacon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-3(1)</td>
<td>• Comatas, beloved of the Muses&lt;br&gt;• animal offered (2 goat-kids)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-7(2)</td>
<td>• Self-praise of wealth (twin kids) &amp; of having being talked to by a girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-91(3)</td>
<td>• Self-praise of having received a sweet voice from a girl (Clearista)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-5(4)</td>
<td>• Rose more beautiful than anemone and dog-rose (allusion to heterosexual love?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96-9(5)</td>
<td>• A gift to a girl (A pigeon to Clearista?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-3(6)</td>
<td>• Addressed to goats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104-7(7)</td>
<td>• Self-praise for rich gifts to the girl (a bucket and a bowl by Praxiteles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-118(8)</td>
<td>• A brake to vermin (grasshoppers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112-5(9)</td>
<td>• Damage caused by vermin (foxes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116-9(10)</td>
<td>• Recalling their past sexual intercourse (mocking Lacon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-3(11)</td>
<td>• Address to Morson (mocking Lacon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124-7(12)</td>
<td>• Wishing the Golden Age to come (abundant milk, wine and nuts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128-31(13)</td>
<td>• Good pasture for goats&lt;br&gt;• Ideal herding place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132-5(14)</td>
<td>• A gift to another girl in the past (a pigeon to Alcippa)&lt;br&gt;• A kiss he failed to receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-7(15)</td>
<td>• Criticism of Lacon (the end of the match)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some readers focus on the crucial lines, where the singing match ends with Comatas’ lines, pointing out Lacon’s lower ability. Köhnken suggests that Lacon lost because he could not perform his next line after Comatas’ promptly.94 That is to say, Lacon could not prepare his lines, then stopped and lost. This idea concerns lines 20-23, where Lacon says he will sing until Comatas ‘gives up’ (διαείσομαι ἔστε κ’ ἀπείπῃς). So far, this idea to prove Lacon’s lesser ability in singing seems persuasive.

In this section we will pay attention to how well Lacon’s lines respond to Comatas’, in order to demonstrate Lacon’s fault in his too boastful attitude. Most of Comatas’ phrases are very closely

94 See Köhnken 1980. See also Gow 1952: 93 and Gutzwiller 1991: 139, Radt 1971 and Pagliaro 1974 find fault with Lacon’s last lines, where he repeats the same words from Comatas’ lines.
followed by Lacon’s in their contents, except the two below.

(a) Lines 108-111 (8th couplet)

KO. ἀκρίδες, αἱ τὸν φραγμὸν ὑπερπαδήτε τὸν ἀμόν,
       μὴ μεν λωβάσητε τὰς ἀμπέλος ἐντὸ γὰρ αὖαι.
ΛΑ. τοὶ τέττιγες, ὄρθε τὸν αἰπόλον ὡς ἐρεθίζω
       οὕτω κύμμες θην ἐρεθίζετε τῶς καλαμευτάς.

Here, both of them refer to insects’ influence on people. However, Lacon mentions the goatherd, trying to agitate Comatas and showing off his own anticipated victory.\footnote{According to Gutzwiller, Lacon is leading at this point, because Comatas’ ‘grasshopper’ couplet ‘seems to lack relevance to the context’. See Gutzwiller 1991: 140.} It is not clear in which sense Lacon thinks his late comments are provoking Comatas (τὸν αἰπόλον ὡς ἐρεθίζω 110). Probably, he is referring to his ability so far in catching up with Comatas’ rendering new topics, and Comatas may soon run out of meaningful couplets.

(b) Lines 132-5 (14th couplet)

KO. οὐκ ἔραμ’ Ἀλκίππας, ὅτι με πρὰν οὐκ ἐφίλησε
       τῶν ὑτων καθελοῦσ’, ὅκα οἱ τὰν φάσσαν ἔδωκα.
ΛΑ. ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ Εὐμήδευς ἔραμαι μέγα· καὶ γὰρ ὅκ’ αὐτῶ
       τὰν σύριγγ’ ὤρεξα, καλὸν τί με κάρτ’ ἐφίλησεν.

As far as this couplet Lacon’s rustic self-praise had followed those by Comatas. Here, however, Comatas speaks of his unrequited love, whereas Lacon still shows off his own success in his love-affair. Respecting this point, some scholars assume there must have been an unmentioned rule of the amoebaean singing match that the second singer should follow the first singer’s lines very closely, that is to say, in this couplet, Lacon also should have sung about unrequited gift to a lover.\footnote{Cf. Ott 1969: 33.}
In addition, we note the characteristics of Lacon seen in lines (a) 108-111 and (b) 132-5, which seem to be criticised in the following lines by Comatas.

ΚΟ. ὅστις νικασείν τὸν πλατίον ὡς τὸ πεποίθεις,
    σφάξ βομβέων τέττιγος ἑαυτόν. ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὔτι
    ὑφίστασθαι τοι, ἰδ’ ὁ τράγος οὗτος ἔρισθε.

(Id.5.28-30)

ΚΟ. οὐ θεμιτόν, Λάκων, ποτ’ ἀηδόνα κίσσας ἐρίσθειν,
    οὐδ’ ἔποπας κύκνοισι· τὸν δ’, ἔρισθε, ἐσσὶ φιλεχθής.

(Id.5.136-7)

Here, Comatas seems to be convinced of his own victory, taking Lacon to be a lesser singer than himself. Still, Lacon tried to show his higher capability in love-affairs and even singing, in vain. There, we might even suppose younger Lacon’s bravado is brought forth by his pride in his higher status than that of Comatas.

Now let us go on to a question from a slightly different point of view: why the winner is a goatherd, not a shepherd. We may suppose many justifications are combined. Lawall understands Comatas as one of Theocritus’ favourite figures, ‘the passionate desirous lover’, just like Simaetha in *Idyll* 2.97 This idea is simple, but well identifies the goatish passion as a highlighted Idyllic element. Kossaifi suggests that Comatas, being a goatherd, has a close relationship to Pan the pastoral god and this is the reason for his victory.98

It seems almost certain that Theocritus sees this goatish character in a positive light, especially for his goatishness. Besides, according to what we have concluded about the hierarchy, perhaps Theocritus was aiming at a playful inversion of the characters’ singing ability as against their status. When we reach the end of the poem, the Homeric allusion, we notice Theocritus’

---

97 Lawall 1967: 64-5
98 Kossaifi 2002 argues that Comatas is in favour of Pan, whereas Lacon is dear to Apollo, and as Pan is the central god in the bucolic world, Comatas is the supposed winner, even before the singing-match.
intention to show his goatherd as victorious, in clear contrast with the Homeric goatherd, which may show even Theocritus’ challenge to the characterisation based on the pastoral hierarchy:

Comatas promises Morson that he will send a share of the sheep meat to Morson. Then, he boasts of his own triumph over the shepherd (ἴδ’ ώς μέγα τούτο καχαξῶ καττῶ Λάκωνος τῷ ποιμένος). Comatas encourages his she-goats to leap, (φριμάσσεο) with joy. Also, he tells them to take courage (θαρσεῖτε). Beside the delighted goatherd and his goats, a lamb, the stake in the singing-match, is waiting to be sacrificed. As the goatherd won the match, the life of a he-goat is saved, as the stake proposed from Comatas was a he-goat (ἴδ’ ὁ τράγος οὗτος 30). Certainly, the goats and the goatherd are the protagonists and presented in a positive light.

Towards the end, Comatas addresses his he-goat. According to critics, the term φλάσσω, ‘break’ implies ‘castrate’ in this context. Comatas warns the he-goat not to mount on she-goats and cries out that if he does not castrate the he-goat which still keeps on mounting, he ‘would be Melanthius (Comatas himself would be castrated)’. Here Theocritus reminds his readers of the

99 Gow 1952: 117.
100 If we take Comatas’ threat literally, we need to think about why Comatas has to be castrated unless he castrates his goat. So far, one explanation is given to a question why the he-goat cannot mount a she-goat, from a religious perspective. Dover points out that, in ancient Greece, humans had to avoid sexual intercourse in sanctuaries or before religious acts like sacrifice, and here Comatas applies this rule even to his he-goat with humour. See Dover 1971: 140. From these lines,
end of Melanthius, who was castrated and put to death by Odysseus and his comrades. Why castration if the he-goat mounts? We read two points by the poet here: threatening castration as a joke which further highlights the goat’s passion, and Melanthius, whose image was evoked through the sexual joke, to be contrasted with the successful goatherd. We do not necessarily have to believe Comatas is indeed cruelly eager to castrate his he-goat, but rather he is humorously showing off the goatish passion. Comatas’ attitude towards he-goats is not hostile, as he and the he-goat are analogous in their sexuality, which we have seen in that he compares the image of his own past sexual intercourse with Lacon to that of a he-goat with a she-goat (Id.5.41-2). This, what we may call a goatish ending, is a celebration of the lowly sexuality and rustic liveliness embodied in Comatas and his goats: the coarse impression from Comatas’ speech about castration reveals that Comatas’ and goats’ coarse sexuality still has a dismissive meaning designed for readers’ laughter. At the same time, there is a sense of admiration of natural energy of sex and life, when Theocritus places Comatas and the he-goat among she-goats rejoicing with their master’s victory over the shepherd.

Theocritus let Comatas talk of Melanthius, an epic character. The unique combination of rustic goatherds and ‘high literature’ motifs are what we have observed also in Idyll 3. However, the main difference between Idylls 3 and 5 is that while the anonymous goatherd’s poor handling of the mythical themes in his song results chiefly in the increasing gap between the funny, naïve rustic and the mythical past, Comatas is in control of his own situation and eloquent enough to assert himself to be the protagonist of the new kind of hexameter poetry.

Zanker suggests that this confrontation of lowly Comatas (new epic) and Melanthius (old one) ‘merely serves to underline how far down we have come in the epic world’ and he finds this phenomenon can be interpreted within the Hellenistic cultural trends, in which, for instance, lowly figures were described in highly stylised marble sculptures, nevertheless retaining their associations of disadvantage in order to highlight the wealthy owner’s prominent social status. This

---

101 Zanker 2004: 132
seems true, when the ‘realistic’ Idyls are designed for urban readers’ laughter. However, at the same time, it also seems irrefutable that Theocritus let the lowly Comatas not only to avoid being Melanthius, but also to convey the radical poetic message of challenging the traditional value of favouring those who are in higher status. This makes us think that some post-Theocritean positive descriptions of rustic characters, which we will discuss later in chapter 3, (e.g. the rustic pride of the cowherd in Idyll 20, Longus’ tributes to Theocritean goatherds and Vergil’s sympathy towards Meliboeus, who had spent all his life in the countryside) may be rooted in Theocritus’ way of favouring the goatherds, the embodied rusticity.

**Non-lowly characteristics of goatherd**

Theocritean goatherds are fascinatingly multidimensional. Now we focus on non-lowly aspect of the goatherd, the mysterious Lycidas in Idyll 7. He has a very goatherd-like appearance as we have seen before, but without a herd of goats. The unmentioned goats imply either that Lycidas is alone, temporarily away from his duty to his goats, that Simichidas sees goats but intends to emphasise a picture of the goatherd’s humble appearance alone, or that Lycidas is not a simple goatherd. Here we do not find any address to goats by goatherds, which we find in some other Idylls emphasising the lowly, ‘realistic’ picture of goatherds (cf. Id.1.151-2, 5.1-2). Where has Lycidas come from? Simichidas plainly tells that they ‘met’ (εὕρομες 13) Lycidas on the way. Thus it is not clearly stated where Lycidas has come from, what he has been doing, when he meets Simichidas. He comes up suddenly and talks only to Simichidas. (19-21) Simichidas’ two friends, Eucritus and Amyntas, rejoin the storyline to Simichidas’ narrative only after Lycidas has left them (131).

It has been pointed out that, in the setting of this encounter scene, there is an allusion to the Odyssey 17.204-232, where Odysseus in disguise and Eumaeus meet Melanthius. The goatherd is on the way to town and casts insulting words on Odysseus and Eumaeus.\textsuperscript{102} Just before those lines, Homer describes a lovely fountain (κρήνην τυκτήν καλλίροον 205-206) with legendary origin, surrounded with poplars (αἰγείρων ὑδατοτρεφέων 208) at which they found the goatherd and

\textsuperscript{102} Hunter 1999: 146-148.
Theocritus traces over this to set a fountain (Βούριναν κράναν 6) with poplar trees (αἴγειροι 8) in the opening of the *Idyll* 7. The fountain is set here actually to introduce the noble family Simichidas is visiting at the time, as the ancestor of the family, Chalcon (6) is the mythical founder of the fountain. Concurrently, the fountain with a Homeric allusion supports the entry of a Theocritean goatherd. As well as in the ending of *Idyll* 5, here, the poet expects readers to compare Homeric goatherd with his own. After presenting Lycidas as a very goatherd-like figure, what we expect a goatherd to look like (13-14), Theocritus turns to hint at the nature of Lycidas. In contrast to Melanthius’ aggressive attitude and abusive words, Lycidas’ smile and pleasantry follow (καί μ’ ἀτρέμας ἐπι οὐφαρής ὤματι μειδιῶντι, γέλως δέ οἱ εἶχετο χείλευς 19-20). The cool ἀτρέμας smile tells Lycidas’ confidence in facing Simichidas. Theocritus seems to enjoy fashioning his own goatherd by reviewing the Archaic model carefully in *Idyll* 7 as well as in *Idyll* 5.

Besides, this encounter scene is designed to evoke Homeric encounters between humans and gods.¹⁰³ For example, in the *Odyssey* 13.217-235, Athena appears to aid Odysseus in disguise as a young shepherd. Odysseus meets her, failing to recognise her as the goddess and invents a false story of him to conceal his own identity. Then, the goddess smiles, reveals herself and tells Odysseus to stop the attempts to deceive each other. Although Athena sees everything from above and is never deceived, she also appreciates Odysseus’ bold attitude as a tactician. Her divine smile conveys her superiority over Odysseus and her acknowledgement of his cleverness at the same time. This Homeric meeting of the two tacticians, one divine and one human, is particularly important for our reading of the Lycidas-Simichidas encounter.

With hints of epic goatherd/divine encounters with humans, Lycidas is introduced, not as a simple countryman, but as someone greater than Simichidas in their field, bucolic singing. Lycidas somehow holds a dual identity: lowly goatherd and divine figure. So even his smell of rennet comes to convey his mysterious air: often epiphany is accompanied with a sweet aroma from the god (e.g. *h.Dem.* 275-280), but Lycidas carries quite a different kind of odour.¹⁰⁴

Lycidas is friendly, polite but sarcastic. There is always a sense of advantage in him. The following speech tells more about himself and Simichidas:

---

¹⁰³ See Puelma 1960 for discussion on *Idyll* 7 as Dichterweihe.
Lycidas asks about Simichidas’ journey, noting it is now mid-day, time for rest, just as the anonymous goatherd in *Idyll* 1 says the following:

*οὐ θέμις, ἄριστον οὐ θέμις ἄμμιν συρίσδεν. τὸν Πανὸν αἰεὶ δριμεῖα καὶ χολὰ ποτὶ ῥινὶ κάθεται.*

(Id. 1.15-18)

The anonymous goatherd respects Pan by not bothering this pastoral god at mid-day. It seems also in *Idyll* 7 that resting at mid-day is taken as a bucolic norm. At the same time, this may be another clue to Lycidas’ identity: Simichidas’ mid-day journey could have bothered a pastoral divinity. Lycidas, since the Greeks often told the stories of humans who encountered gods around noon, although, often for unfavourable results.

Lycidas, whether a god or just a goatherd, lives according to θέμις, nature’s law (1.15) in the bucolic world, having a rest at mid-day, whereas Simichidas does not and he seems as if he is urging on (ἔπείδη 24) or darting off (θρῴσκεις 25) to somewhere in a townsman’s manner. Then he continues to make fun of the sound caused by the boots of Simichidas (26). Simichidas with boots is not as rustic or does not fit as naturally into the bucolic countryside as Lycidas does. Lycidas humorously describes a pebble striking against Simichidas’ boots and singing.

---

105 For the similarity with Hermes’ address to Priam in *Il.* 24.362-363, see Hunter 1999: 158.
106 e.g. Teiresias in *Call. H.* 5, Erysichthon in *Call. H.* 6.
πταίοισα ποτ’ ἄρβυλιδεσσιν ἀείδει 26) and derives a bucolic joy of music from the environment. Thus Simichidas notices that he has stepped into the bucolic realm (of his own imagination). Here, it seems that Lycidas is more than a mere goatherd. Rather, we may understand Lycidas represents ‘the bucolic poetry’ in Theocritus.

Unlike Athena in the Odyssey Book 13, who is disguised as a shepherd, though still with noble atmosphere (οὔτε ἡ ἄνακτων παῖδες έξαι 13.223) and fine garments, Lycidas is a rustic himself, as a character. The simple goatskin bound to his body (λασίοιο δασύτριχος εἶχε τράγοιο κνακὸν 15-16) symbolises what he is. He is closer to nature, looks like a more ‘realistic’ down-to-earth herdsman than the legendary noble cowherd Daphnis. Lycidas stands for rusticity, ‘naturalness’ and ‘reality’ of the bucolic world in Simichidas’ imagination, although even ‘naturalness’ itself is a creation. Simichidas, an alter-ego of Theocritus, takes a trip to the Theocritean bucolic world,107 where Theocritus has set norms, such as the themis of mid-day rest, one’s attitude as a singer, and bucolic ‘rusticity’. Lycidas is designed to meet the norms and therefore appear as a ‘typical’, ‘natural’ goatherd.

Lycidas, although he is a rustic in one side, is not as lowly or as comical as the other goatherds. As far as Lycidas’ love is concerned, the goatish sexuality is quite absent. The unrequited love motif is seen in him as well as in the other goatherds, when he sings about Ageanax (7.52-62), although this does not quite exhibit Lycidas’ romantic attitude as lowly. Although he describes his own love as fierce (τὸν Λυκίδαν ὀπτεύμενον ἐξ Ἀφροδίτας 55, θερμὸς γὰρ ἔρως αὐτῷ ὑπὸ καταίθει. 56), in his song he is already in the ideal state of mind to accept the ending of his love and is released from the pain:

χα στιβάς ἐσσείται πεπυκασμένα ἔστ’ ἐπὶ πάχυν
κνύξα τ’ ἀσφόδελῳ τε πολυγνάμπτω τε σελίνῳ.
καὶ πίσμαι μαλακῶς μεμναμένος Ἀγεάνακτος
αὐτάς ἐν κυλίκεσσι καὶ ἐς τρύγα χείλος ἑρείδων.

(Id.7.67-70)

The main difference between Lycidas’ and the other goatherds’ love lies in the fact that Lycidas

handles well his own love as a theme in his song in which his stance regarding himself and his love is quite self-possessed, whereas the other goatherds’ love songs reveal mainly their obsession with the love. The subject of the song shifts later to the bucolic heroes whom Lycidas’ heart goes out to. These motifs, the acceptance of the love-loss and the adoration to the pastoral legends, make Lycidas’ verses rich in peaceful sentiments.

In Lycidas’ song, he dreams of himself drinking with his friends, while one of them, Tityrus, sings about Daphnis’ love and Comatas’ suffering and protection of Comatas by the Muses (72-89). Lycidas’ song ends with an address to Comatas (83-89) and, interestingly, the two goatherds have some similarities, or Lycidas duplicates himself with Comatas. According to Segal, the same words are used to describe both goatherds in many lines: ‘Both are associated with sweetness (20/21, 42; 82, 89); both “recline” (66 and 89); both have “toiled” (ἐξεπόνασα, 51; ἐξεπόνασας, 85).’ As a theme, having ‘toiled’ seems important. In his song, Lycidas imagines himself drinking peacefully, listening to the friend’s music after being released from his serious love-sickness (63-70) and then, dreams of Comatas, who once suffered from his master’s harsh treatment, now, if he still existed, sitting under a tree and singing while Lycidas tends Comatas’ goats. A motif of peaceful moments with songs for goatherds after their suffering is repeated here.

Although Lycidas’ status in the society is blurred (either he is a free man or slave), his existence as a goatherd is used to describe one distinctive type of bucolic singer. Comatas’ suffering caused from his low social status contrasts with and even highlights his poetic talent, a gift from the Muses

(οὖνεκά οἱ γλυκὸ Μοῖσα κατὰ στόματος χέε νέκταρ. 82), which saves him from death and later leads him to receive such an honour as to be sung by another herdsman. This combination of humbleness and poetic brilliance is precisely what Lycidas manifests in his outward appearance (13-14) and smile (19-20).

Lycidas does not represent a real goatherd in the field of this time in his attitude or poetic knowledge. Lycidas as a character is much idealised, being humble in appearance and status, but has a divine smile,\(^{109}\) by which he shows agreement and appreciation to Simichidas. His manner is sophisticated, mild and much less aggressive, compared, for instance, to the goatherd and shepherd in the *Idyll* 5. We do not necessarily have to assume Lycidas to be a particular god.\(^{110}\) Rather, Lycidas is still a goatherd, just as he looks, idealised to be a symbol of the bucolic poetry.

We may be able to see in Lycidas how the Theocritean meaning of ‘countryside’ fluctuates. As we have observed before, the goatherds often embody the rusticity of the pastoral world: the countryside as rural and unsophisticated. However, through Lycidas, ‘the country’ is also idealised as ‘inspiring the art of poetry’. Although the opposition of ‘country’ and ‘city’ is quite prominent in *Idyll* 7, the countryside and rusticity itself is much idealised here so that the character’s rustic manner is not facetious, but even culturally or spiritually high, implying it to be somehow close to divine: Lycidas’ dual existence as a rustic character and also as the embodiment of the bucolic poetry elevates the meaning of ‘rusticity’.

---


\(^{110}\) cf. William 1978 discusses Lycidas as Apollo. Some readers take Lycidas as actual poets. e.g. Bowie 1985 interprets Lycidas as Philetas.
2.3 Cowherds: Nobility and Tragedy

Noble characteristics of Cowherds

The cowherds in the *Idylls* are, in many cases, contradistinctive to the goatherds. A noble and heroic aspect is often stressed in them, which Daphnis represents well. Also, he exhibits tragic features, which makes him the archetypal bucolic legend. In *Idyll* 1, Thyrsis the shepherd sings for a goatherd a song about a legendary cowherd, Daphnis’ suffering and death. According to Diodorus Siculus 4.84, Daphnis was a Sicilian cowherd, born to Hermes and a nymph, nurtured by nymphs to be the inventor of the bucolic poem and song (ἐξευρεῖν τὸ βουκολικὸν ποίημα καὶ μέλος). Diodorus also tells of Daphnis’ connection to Artemis and a famous romance that a nymph loved Daphnis and he was blinded for having slept with another woman.\(^\text{111}\)

Thyrsis wonders where the Nymphs had gone to when Daphnis was dying and implies that they could have saved Daphnis’ life if they had been there beside him.

\(\text{"Αρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοίσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς. Θύρσις ὅδ' ὡξ Αἴτνας, καὶ Θύρσιδος ἁδέα φωνά. πᾷ ποκ' ἄρ' ἡσθ', δικα Δάφνις ἐτάκετο, πᾷ ποκα, Νύμφαι; (Id.1.64-6)\)

Indeed, Daphnis was close to the Nymphs and also to the Muses (τὸν Μοίσας φίλον ἄνδρα, τὸν οὐ Νύμφαισιν ἀπεχθ\(\text{141}\)). Thyrsis continues to tell who came to meet dying Daphnis: wild animals including lions (71-2), many oxen and cows (74-5), then Hermes (77),\(^\text{112}\) the three kinds of herdsmen in the pastoral hierarchical order (80) and Priapus, who teases Daphnis.

\(^{111}\) According to Gow, Diodorus’ version is based on Timaeus’ account. For a summary of different versions of Daphnis’ legends, see Gow 1952: 1-2. For Daphnis and a hypothesis of a Sicilian origin of bucolic poetry, see Rosenmeyer 1969: 32-33. The idea of Daphnis as a hero-founder of bucolic poetry seems to date back at least to Stesichorus: Fanuzzi-Hunter 2004: 138.

\(^{112}\) Hermes appears either because of his mythical parentage to Daphnis, or his being the pastoral god, the latter of which is implied in line 77, Hermes ‘from the mountain’ ἀπ’ ὄρεος. See Gow 1952: 19. Priapus may be a son of Hermes, which makes him Daphnis’ brother.
κῆρα 'Δάφνι τάλαν, τί τύ τάκεαι; ἀδε τυ κόρα
πάσας ἀνὰ κράνας, πάντ' ἀλσεα ποσσὶ φορεῖται—
ἀρχετε βουκολικάς, Μοίσα φιλα, ἀρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς—
ζάτεισ' ἄ δοσερώς τις ἠγαν καὶ ἀμήχανως ἐσσί. 
βούτας μὲν ἐλέγευ, νῦν δ' αἰπόλω ἀνδρὶ ἐοικας.

(Id.1.82-86)

We wonder where Daphnis’ suffering, τὰ ∆άφνιδος ἄλγε’ (19), comes from, when Priapus tells the girl (ἀ κόρα 82) is indeed in search of Daphnis. Daphnis' love sickness is not as straightforward as loving somebody and not being loved back, if we assume that the girl is the one he actually loves. For the reason of his untypical frustration, we may try to grasp the background story by turning to some folk tales related to him.\(^3\) However, none of those extant gives clear answer to why he does not want to gratify his passion for the girl. Rather, it seems a Hippolytus-like sense of chastity dominates Daphnis and the link to Hippolytus is even stressed when he stands in opposition to Aphrodite (100-103).\(^4\) He felt strong love for a girl, but does not allow himself to indulge in it, even when the pain of unfulfilled passion is driving him to death.

Priapus continues to give a metaphorical comparison of Daphnis with a goatherd. It is meant as mockery of Daphnis, in a way that Priapus assimilates Daphnis to the lowlier herdsman. This indicates Daphnis’ passion as very strong (even to the extent that it is similar to that of a goatherd). However, there still seem a difference between goatherd’s wish and Daphnis’.

\(^4\) Gow 1952: 2.
The goatherd cries (τάκεται ὀφθαλμῶς ὁ κόρης 88), envying he-goats for their sexual indulgence, and Daphnis cries because he is unable to join dancing maidens. If the point Priapus makes in the analogy is that neither of the goatherd or Daphnis can transform into he-goats or dancing maidens, both of whom are free from erotic frustration, the goatherd’s eros seems designed wilder and simpler: he wishes to fulfil his sexual passion simply as he-goats do. Daphnis, on the other hand, wishes rather to be literally free from the passion, or not even feel it.

Daphnis’ heroic aspect is reinforced when he faces Aphrodite. He does not give up his struggle against Eros:

τάν δ’ ἄρα χῶ Δάφνις ποταμεῖβετο· Ἐρωτὶς ἐσσεταί ἄλγος Ἐρωτὶς
Κύπρι νεμεσσατά, Κύπρι θνατοῖσιν ἀπεχθής,
Ηδὺ γὰρ φράσδῃ τάνθ’ ἐλιν ἄμμι δεδόκειν;
Δάφνις κὴν Ἀίδα κακὸν ἔσσεται ἄλγος Ὁ Ἐρωτὶς.

(Id.1.100-103)

The proverbial phrase about sun-setting (102) actually indicates his pertinacity. Then, τὰ Δάφνιδος ἄλγεα (19) by Eros finally leads to κακὸν ἄλγος Ὁ Ἐρωτὶς (103), as Daphnis remains as one human who didn’t yield to the powerful god and chose his own fate of death. Of course, Daphnis’ heroism or heroic death is certainly of different kind from those of the Iliadic heroes. He is a pastoral hero, not a war-hero. However, the struggle, the tragic choice of his fate and the dealing with divinities show Daphnis somehow fitted to some aspects of the traditional value of heroism in the epic. Though wasting away, he repeats his own name, knowing he will be remembered as the hero (103, 116, 120-121 and 135):

Δάφνις ἐγὼ ὅδε τὰς ὅπλας ὅπλας ὅπλας νομεύων,
Δάφνις ὁ τὸς ταύρως καὶ πόρτιας ταύρως πόρτιας πόρτιας πόρτιας ποτίδων.

(Id.1.120-121)

As far as his divine connection is concerned, we may wonder why the Nymphs were not there beside him to save him. There might be the reason as Daphnis had not requited one of them for her love to him.\textsuperscript{117} Or, perhaps, unintentionally, the Nymphs were somewhere else at that time.\textsuperscript{118} This question seems to be harder to answer, when we note the fact that immortals came and even wild animals mourned Daphnis, which indicates that Daphnis lived in accord with the nature and his death does not imply his lack of the ‘unity with nature’, a bucolic ideal quality. He ends his words with his farewell to Pan and the pastoral nature to descend to Hades (115-138).

Now we turn to non-tragic, noble cowherds. Another cowherd’s love we find is in \textit{Idyll} 6, where Daphnis and Damoetias sing together. Theocritus describes them in a harmonious affectionate relationship, which stands as the opposite of the lowly herdsmen’s discordant relationship pictured in \textit{Idyll} 5.

In \textit{Idyll} 5, the way the herdsmen, who met accidentally, sing in the match is highly aggressive, as the purpose is to out-sing each other by intense exchanges of short verses, just until one of them ‘gives up’ (δακτύλισμα ἔστε κ’ ἀπείπης 5.23). In \textit{Idyll} 6, on the other hand, the two cowherds tend their cattle in the same place and have a singing match as they take a rest. Although Daphnis ‘challenged first’ πρῶτος ἔρισθεν (5), the purpose of the singing seems to be also to compose one complete piece of song together. Daphnis sings first by inventing a theme of Polyphemus and demanding Damoetias a quality second half of the song. The match ends in a complete harmony, where the two cowherds acknowledge each other’s talent and show both of themselves unconquerable (ἀνήσαστοι 46).

\begin{quote}
Τόσσ’ εἰπὼν τὸν Δάφνιν ὁ Δαμοίτας ἐφίλησε·
χῦ μὲν τῷ σύριγγ’, ὃ δὲ τῷ καλὸν αὐλὸν ἔδωκεν.
αὐλεὶ Δαμοίτας, σύρισθε δὲ Δάφνις ὁ βούτας
 الوحصεντ’ ἐν μαλακᾷ ταί πόρτιες αὐτίκα ποία.
νίκη μὲν οὐδάλλος, ἀνήσαστοι δ’ ἐγένοντο.
\end{quote}

\textit{(Id.6.42-6)}

\textsuperscript{117} See Wendel 1920: 56-57. See also Gutzwiller 1991: 96.
\textsuperscript{118} See Hunter 1999: 87 for some possible reasons.
The kiss (ἐφίλησε 42) from Damoetas to Daphnis after singing makes us wonder if the relationship between the two is sexual or simply friendly. There is an age difference between them, but minor (3). Hunter suggests that kissing in Theocritus is usually erotic (including somehomosexual cases like Id.5.135) and according to the subject the cowherds have just sung together, the kiss afterwards may be interpreted more naturally as erotic.\textsuperscript{119} they sang about love with tactics by Galatea and Polyphemus, which, they confirm by kissing, is not needed in their own peaceful love. So, if the cowherds may exhibit homosexuality as much as the other types of herdsman, there still seems a point setting the cowherds apart: the pederastic element is expressed mildly, compared with what we find in the goatherd and the shepherd of Idyl 5 (e.g. sexual intercourse is clearly meant in between the goatherd and shepherd, and the shepherd and another boy in 5.41-2, 86-87, told by the herdsmen here largely to show off their social power).\textsuperscript{120}

Here we do not find any frustrated lover. They exchange gifts and their playful calves jump up to the cowherds’ piping to mark the joyful moment and consonance. Just as in the ending of Idyll 5 with goats jumping up, the scene is about celebration of natural energy. However, there is no goatish comical element, but a softer, elegant expression of pleasure by the noble cows and cowherds.

**How Nobility works in the poems**

We now proceed to discuss how these noble elements of the cowherds work in each of the *Idylls*. In the earlier literature, we have observed several contacts between herdsmen and divinities, normally in inhabited places, for either romantic consequences or for a poetic one in Hesiod’s case. In the *Idylls*, although herdsmen feel pastoral divinities close to their own lives (e.g. Id.1.3-4) and occasionally pray and give offerings to gods (e.g. Id.1.143-145), there is no explicit epic theophany in their herding life.\textsuperscript{121} Those days when humans interacted with deities are gone and Daphnis is

\textsuperscript{119} Hunter 1999: 260. See also Gutzwiller 1991: 125.

\textsuperscript{120} Van Groningen does not interpret the cowherds’ relationship as sexual. Van Groningen 1958: 314. ’le bouvier se distingue même en ce qu’il n’est jamais pédéraste, à l’encontre du berger et, surtout du chevrier.’ See also Halperin 1983: 183.

\textsuperscript{121} A possible exception is Simichidas’ claim that ‘the Nymphs also taught’ him (Id.7.92).
one of those who lived in the ideal mythical past. The noble elements often work as a link to the past, as this is partly observed even in Aegon, a somewhat comical cowherd in *Idyll 4*, whom we will discuss later.

The goatherds often showed us how new and non-heroic the world hexameter poetry came to cover in Theocritus. Still, the bucolic world needs its own heroes to place their poetic world in the wider current of epic tradition. Cowherds serve this purpose well. They are, of course, a different kind of hero from those in the traditional epic. Daphnis in Thyrsis’ song is the mythical founder of bucolic song and the tradition of these songs is supposed to have started as the herdsmen sang of Daphnis when he died and became their legend, which *Idyll 1* actually manifests.\(^{122}\) The myth of the creation of ‘bucolic poetry’ was perhaps noted earlier than in Theocritus.\(^{123}\) In *Idyll 1*, Daphnis’ status as a bucolic hero seems already to have been certified, and viewed by the herdsmen as the heroic past of their realm. Daphnis is in love, but with his determination and stubborn attitude, he never yields himself to the sweetness of love, or stands down from his struggle against love, which leads him to tragic death, to be a legend, sung by later herdsmen. In other words, the heroic Daphnis is remembered, but has departed from the present pastoral world of the *Idylls*.

**Non-noble Cowherd**

In the earlier section on the goatherds, we explored the contrasting qualities of Battus the goatherd and Corydon the cowherd in *Idyll 4*. However, it is interesting that Battus is, throughout the poem, in some ways critical of Aegon, another cowherd, and seems to foster rivalry towards him:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ΚΩ. φαντί νιν Ἡρακλῆ βίην καὶ κάρτος ἐρίσδειν.} \\
\text{ΒΑ. κῄμ' ἔφαθ' ἁ μάτηρ Πολυδεύκεος ἐξὼ Ὀι βίην καὶ κάρτος ἐρίσδειν.}
\end{align*}
\]

(*Id.4.8-9*)

\(^{122}\) Hunter 1999: 60.

\(^{123}\) See Theocritus’ contemporary, Callimacus’ *Epigr.* 22 Pf, where a deceased goatherd is commemorated after Daphnis.
These lines show that Corydon associates Aegon with Heracles. Battus tries to emulate and bring Polydeuces, another figure among the Argonauts, to compare himself with. This is an amusing line, a lowly goatherd associating himself with a divine boxer, for the purpose of emulating a wealthy cowherd, Aegon. Battus’ sense of rivalry towards Aegon perhaps comes from Aegon’s past approach to Amaryllis (35-37).124

Cowherds in Theocritus, as we have observed, are normally sketched as noble, sometimes as heroic, in the case of the legendary cowherd Daphnis. However, Aegon’s character is problematic. Being an Olympian athlete (6) is considered to be an older, traditionally heroic quality, as is seen in, for example, Pindar’s *Olympian Ode* 3, where Heracles is told to be the founder of the Olympic games on his ascent to Olympus (τοῖς γὰρ ἐπέτραπεν ὄλυμπον ἱὸν θαυτὸν ἀγῶνα νέμειν / ἀνδρῶν τ’ ἀρετὰς πέρι καὶ ῥιμφαρμάτου / διφρηλασίας. 36-8). Besides the heroic depiction of Aegon, he has a kind of comic aspect as well, prominently, when he is shown as a glutton, in lines 10 and 35 and also for his unusual physical strength (35-37). In addition to Corydon’s comment above, these comical features make us consider Aegon in some ways more analogous to Heracles, for example, Heracles in Euripides’ *Alcestis* (Heracles, not being informed of Alcestis’ death, gets drunk and starts to annoy Admetus’ servant with his optimistic view of mortal life in 773-802, he wrestles to rescue Alcestis from Θάνατος in 840-849).

Aegon is, from his name, problematic. It seems Theocritus took Aegon’s name from Croton’s heroic figure.125 At the same time, the word Aegon itself comes from αἴξ, a goat. His comic aspect which is unseemly for a cowherd, the goatherd’s sense of rivalry towards him and his name as ‘Mr. Goat’ makes the athlete Aegon an engaging figure. Interestingly, his father is more immediately linked to goatishness, which is indicated in the final lines of the *Idyll*, lines 58-63, where Battus asks Corydon about this Aegon’s father’s relationship with his lover:

ΒΑ. εἴπ’ ἄγε μ’, ὦ Κορύδων, τὸ γερόντιον ἦ β’ ἐτὶ μύλλει
τήναν τὰν κυάνοφρυν ἐρωτίδα τὰς ποκ’ ἐκνίσθη;
ΚΟ. ἀκμάν γ’, ἦ δείλαιε· πρόαν γε μὲν αὐτὸς ἐπενθώλον
καὶ ποτὶ τὰ μάνδρα κατελάμβανον ἅμοις ἐνήργει.

Corydon tells that he actually witnessed Aegon’s father having a sexual intercourse with his lover the other day. Then, Battus compares Aegon’s father with mythological goatish figures, Pans (Pan-like rustic divinities) and satyrs. The goatish sexuality motif in an ending appears again here. In *Idyll* 4, there’s no depiction of Battus’ flock of goats and the goatherd’s sexuality is not very stressed (except Battus’ lament about Amaryllis), either. Instead there appears Aegon’s father, a wealthy owner of cattle, not a cowherd himself in a strict sense, with a goatish attitude towards sex.

Perhaps we can interpret Aegon as having two sides: an exceptionally comical cowherd but still holding the link to the mythical past as the other noble cowherds. Here, Heracles is an important figure for the background, as the *Idyll* is set in Croton, southern Italy, and Hercules is thought to be the mythical founder of the city. Again, the rural scene in *Idyll* 4 featuring two countrymen rises in opposition to heroic grandeur or the mythical past. Aegon the athlete, who is assimilated to Heracles, acts as a small comical Heracles, whose existence retains a part of ‘the heroic past’ in literature. However, not only Heracles but even Aegon is ‘gone’ (αὐτὸς δ’ ἐς τίν’ ἀφαντὸς ὁ βουκόλος ᾤχετο χώραν; 5; κἀ’ χέρες έχων σκαπάναν τε καὶ εἰκάτι τοιοῦτος μῆλα, 10), and only the cowherd and the goatherd are left on stage in the pasture, leaving the place non-heroic.

2.4 Shepherds in Theocritean Bucolic

Theocritean shepherds are not numerous: there are two of probably Theocritus’ own creation, Thyrsis in *Idyll* 1 and Lacon in *Idyll* 5, and a more mythical one, Polyphemus, in *Idylls* 6 and 11. Lawall describes Lacon, for instance, as having ‘lambish playfulness’ for his witty verses, contrasting with Comatas’ ‘goatish belligerence’.\(^ {127}\) Indeed, literary shepherds may have common features stemming from their tending the same animal, sheep. However, when we turn to Thyrsis and Polyphemus, we find it almost impossible to identify any characteristics to tie up all the shepherds. Also, when it comes to herdsman’s relationships in each *Idyll*, simply enough, the two shepherd-goatherd combinations in *Idylls* 1 and 5 present quite different pictures of herdsman’s relationships: *Idyll* 1 features Thyrsis as a bucolic singer and the nameless goatherd takes a sort of supportive role in the harmonious *locus amoenus*. In *Idyll* 5, the goatherd and the shepherd are contending against each other, which makes a lowly, ‘realistic’ picture of countryside.

Thyrsis sings to accommodate a goatherd’s request in *Idyll* 1. When they praise each other and talk about the prize each other deserves, there is the sense of hierarchy behind the scene. Thyrsis is a great singer, second only to the Muses in singing and would deserve a lamb, while the goatherd is a great piper after Pan and would receive a kid. Theocritus seems to distinguish ‘piping’ and ‘singing’ separately and may place ‘piping’ as a more rustic, humbler activity.\(^ {128}\)

\[ \text{ΘΥ 'Αδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα καὶ ἀ πίτος, αἰπόλε, τήνα,} \]
\[ ά ποτι ταῖς παγαῖσι, μελίσδεται, ἀ δύ δὲ καὶ τό} \]
\[ συρίσδες μετά Πάνα τό δεύτερον άθλον ἀποισῃ,} \]
\[ α' κα τήνος ἐ λη κεραῶν τράγων, α'γα τό λαψψὶ} \]
\[ α' κα δ' α'γα λάβῃ τήνος γέρας, ἐς τὲ καταρρεῖ} \]
\[ ἀ χίμαρος χιμάρω δὲ καλόν κρέας, ἐς τε κ' ἀμέλξης.} \]

(*Id.1.1-6*)

---

\(^ {127}\) Lawall 1967: 60.

Still, there is a mutual respect between the two figures. The modest goatherd declines to play a pipe and pass on the spotlight to Thyrsis.\(^{129}\) This stands in contrast to Lacon, when he challenges Comatas in singing (5.20-23) and loses.

Thyrsis is a master bucolic singer (τὰς βουκολικὰς ἐπὶ τὸ πλέον ἕκει μοῖσας, 20). Unlike the exchanges of short impromptu verses in *Idyll* 5, Thyrsis’ song about Daphnis’ death is a complete song, which the goatherd has heard before (23-5), and has a high, tragic theme. The goatherd continuously praises Thyrsis, later saying that sweet foods are suited to the sweet-voiced singer. This praiseful association of a great singer with sweet foods appears also in the honey-nurtured Comatas in *Idyll* 7.84:

αἰ. πλήρες τοι τῷ καλὸν στόμα, Θύρσι, γένοιτο,
πλήρες δὲ σχαδόνων, καὶ ἀπ’ Ἀιγίλω ἰσχάδα τρώγοις
ἀδείαιν, τέττιγος ἐπεὶ τύγα φέρτερον ἤδεις,

(*Id.* 1.146-9)

The non-human shepherd Cyclops in Theocritus is, surprisingly, romantic and human. Polyphemus in the *Odyssey* keeps sheep and goats together (Od.9.219-220) and other Cyclopes also seem to tend sheep and goats, not oxen (Cf. *Od.*9.166-7). The Theocritean Polyphemus, however, seems to tend sheep only, as a goat is never mentioned as part of his flock, whereas sheep repeatedly appear in lines (cf. *Id.*6.6, 11.12). What amuses us the most in Theocritus’ characterisation of his Polyphemus is that both *Idylls* describe this Cyclops at his young age, before his days in the *Odyssey*, his encounter with Odysseus, and, although his fate of being blinded by Odysseus is alluded to (cf. 6.21-5, 11.50-3) and perhaps the huge number of sheep he keeps for milk and cheese (33) still reveals his horrendous appetite,\(^{130}\) there are some differences in character: the Theocritean Polyphemus is a young naïve lad, suffering from love, whereas Homer features the uncivilised, savage aspect of the monstrous Cyclops. Theocritus illustrates the love-sickness and recovery from it of Polyphemus, much in the way anybody can experience in our

\(^{129}\) Berman 2005: 231 suggests Thyrsis as ‘consistently employing a more civilised level of discourse than the goatherd.’

\(^{130}\) Gutzwiller 1991: 111.
life, the pain of love can drive us to think about one thing after another, until the sad feeling is digested and accepted to rest in our heart. The *Idyll* raises ‘song’ (ταὶ Πιερίδες) as the only ‘medicine’ (φάρμακον) to cure love (1-3) with the example of Polyphemus. His love was an outright madness (ὁρθαὶ μανίαις, 11) and Polyphemus found the medicine (16). However, the medicine does not eliminate love. Through the song, he learned to ‘tame the love’ (ἐποίμανεν τὸν ἔρωτα, 80) and live along with it.\[131\]

This unique picture of the epic monster makes us intrigued to know how Theocritus locates himself in the tradition of the Greek epic. We find Theocritus’ intention elaborated in *Idyll* 11.60-1, which is another allusion to Polyphemus’ future harm by Odysseus. There, Polyphemus, who wails over his inability to swim and go down to the bottom of the sea to see his beloved Galatea, reveals his wish to learn swimming, when a ξένος, ‘a stranger’, sails to his home. The Homeric Polyphemus, of course, is notorious for his violation of the social rules of ξενία. But Theocritus’ Cyclops would not seem to behave in the same manner to strangers as the Homeric one had done. Young Polyphemus later would grow up to the brutal Homeric character, but we are enticed to think the two Polyphemus’ characters somehow incompatible. Acknowledging occasionally in lines the future incident of Polyphemus and Odysseus as a strong literary fact, Theocritus still does not feel restricted to shaping his version of the mythical character according to the way his predecessor has done.

In *Idyll* 6, the gap between Homeric Polyphemus and Theocritean one seems to be even greater. He is becoming more like a herdsman of Theocritus’ own creation.\[132\] As far as the pastoral hierarchy is concerned, Polyphemus is a mythical creature who does not necessarily fit into the social hierarchy of the other human herdsmen, although we assume that his tending sheep and goats, not cows in the *Odyssey* helps to define him as lowlier than cowherds. Still, *Idyll* 6 gives a thought-evoking picture concerning the hierarchy: a song of Polyphemus, a one-eyed monster but otherwise quite similar to the other Idyllic humans, presumably defined as a shepherd by his

---

\[131\] There has been a long debate over how the φάρμακον works. See Hunter 1999: 20-21. Good song may help to destruct him from the pain, or from devastating force of love. Goldhill 1991: 254-261 suggested the dual side of φάρμακον: both a cure and hindrance to a complete cure. See also Faraone 2006, in Fantuzzi-Papanghelis 2006: 75-90.
occupation, narrated by two cowherds, and called in one of their songs a ‘goatherd’ (6.7). In Daphnis’ part of the song, there is a slightly mocking, teasing tone to the monstrous shepherd:

βάλλει τοι, Πολύφαμε, τὸ ποίμνιον ἁ Γαλάτεια
μάλοισιν, δυσέρωτα καὶ αἰπόλον ἄνδρα καλεῖσαι
καὶ τύ νιν οὐ ποθόρησθα, τάλαν τάλαν, ἀλλὰ κάθησαι
άδεα συρίσδων. πάλιν ἄδ', ἰδε, τὰν κύνα βάλλει,

(Id.6.6-9)

Firstly, Galatea in Daphnis’ song-part calls Polyphemus a ‘goatherd’, which we generally interpret as the same type of insult Priapus casts on Daphnis in *Idyll* 1.85. The word δύσερως, ‘laggard in love’, refers to his hesitant reaction, as Polyphemus is not responding to Galatea straightforwardly in a supposed lover’s manner. Next, Daphnis continues to tease the Cyclops and tells that Polyphemus’ eye fails to catch flirting Galatea (καὶ τύ νιν οὐ ποθόρησθα, τάλαν τάλαν), as if he is not seeing keenly, which is an allusion to his being blinded in the future.\(^{133}\)

In Damoetas’ response to Daphnis’ song, however, ‘Polyphemus’ tries to reverse the previous mocking tone. He now is one of the Idyllic herdsmen, having come out of mythical himself as ‘the other’, which he was indeed especially in the *Odyssey*, where he and humans did not enjoy mutual understanding. He says he does notice Galatea and it is his tactic to tease and draw Galatea nearer to him. It is difficult for us to deduce what would happen to their relationship after this, as we do not know if Galatea is really in love with Polyphemus or just playing with him. Still, Polyphemus here confidently shows himself holding the situation he is in now and even knowing Telemus’ prophecy that he would be blinded and denying its possibility. This may have a similar meaning as the allusion in *Idyll* 5.150, where Comatas asserts himself as a new type of literary goatherd. This amuses us and makes us wonder if Theocritus intended this to be another story of Polyphemus, independent from the Homeric one.\(^{134}\) If, on the contrary, this is the point that the audience, or Daphnis and Damoetas, know better than Polyphemus himself (that he will still inevitably be blinded), the tone of the whole *Idyll* becomes quite cynical, with the two

\(^{133}\) Hunter 1999: 245.

\(^{134}\) cf. Hunter 1999: 247. ‘… *Idyll* 6 reasserts the power of the present over the tradition.’
cowherds mocking the monstrous shepherd being trapped with his ignorance.

As seen above, the shepherds’ characters seem to vary with each example. As far as the hierarchy is concerned, as Berman suggests, it is highly possible that their character is set somehow in the mid-point between those of the cowherds and goatherds.\textsuperscript{135} It is basically neutral, which can be elevated and associated with the nobility of the cowherds, as in the case of Thyrsis, who sings on an elaborate heroic theme and is a bucolic singer as a ‘descendant’ of Daphnis,\textsuperscript{136} or can be dragged down to the lowly manner similar to that of the goatherd in \textit{Idyll 5}.

\textsuperscript{135} Berman 2005: 236-238.
\textsuperscript{136} Hunter 1999: 99-100.
2.5 Bucolic and Aepolic

In his discussion of Lycidas as a goatherd, Puelma suggests that a goatherd is the lowliest, therefore, very typical as a herdsman\(^{137}\) and can represent the herdsman in general. According to our study so far, a goatherd and a cowherd would have different roles and many of them are indispensable and irreplaceable with other types of herdsmen in each Idyll. Certainly, however, the lowlier goatherds seem to represent rustic ‘bucolicism’ more radically than others. Although we call all bucolic poetry featuring herdsmen ‘bucolic’, regardless of which type of herdsman it features, our study of the Idylls so far makes us wonder if there was any idea of aepolic, as an independent notion from ‘bucolic’. A scholiast writes as follows:\(^{138}\)

Here we should consider once again the roles of the goatherds in Theocritus in the matter of bucolic poetics, since Theocritean use of the hierarchy seem to influence not only the characters and the tones of the poems (serious or funny), but also the crucial, systematic way of Theocritus’ presentation of his own poetics, as we have seen partly in Comatas’ Homeric allusion. This time, we take an example from each of Idyll 1 and 7, concerning the bucolic ecphrasis and also several pairs of ‘one cowherd and one goatherd’ characters.

Although Thyrsis’ song of Daphnis the bucolic hero makes the predominant theme of Idyll 1, we consider the description of κισσύβιον (the ivy-cup) by the unnamed goatherd, as a sort of counter-attraction of this poem, which develops the dramatic aspect of the herdsmen’s conversation.\(^{139}\) Furthermore, if the poet intends to use the ecphrasis to convey the poetics and

\(^{137}\) Puelma 1960: 119.
\(^{138}\) Wendel 1920: 3-4.
\(^{139}\) Halperin 1983: 162. See vv.176-182 for the meanings of the ecphrasis in relation to the Archaic models.
subjects he would deal with in his whole pastoral works, we note it is remarkably achieved through a goatherd’s mouth:

τήνος ὁ ποιμενικός καὶ ταὶ δρύες, αἱ δὲ κ’ ἀείσης ώς ὁκα τὸν Λιβύαθε ποτὶ Χρόμιν ἵος ἔρισδων, αἰ γὰ τοι δωσῳ διδυματόκον ἐς τρὶς ἁμέλξαι, ἃ δυ’ ἔξχοις ἐρίφως ποταμέλλεται ἐς δύο πέλλας, καὶ βαθὺ κισσύβιον κεκλυσμένον ἀδεὶ κηρῷ, ἀμφωες, νεοτευχές, ἐτὶ γλυφάνοιο ποτόσδον.

(Id.1.23-28)

The wooden ivy-cup as a motif of *ecphrasis* is in the position of Achilles’ shield, a symbol of Achilles’ heroism in the *Iliad* (II.18.478-617). The cup is to be given together with goat’s milk to Thyrsis by the goatherd, for the shepherd’s singing. It is new and there carved are two male rivals arguing over a woman standing beside them (31-38), an old but physically strong fisherman casting a net (39-44), and a boy who is in duty of guarding a vineyard but absorbed in weaving (45-54), with two foxes escaping his notice to steal grapes and food. Each of the three scenes represents one of the three periods of human life: adulthood, old age and childhood. At the same time, it describes Theocritean bucolic world: *eros*, lowly people’s life and absorption in art (poetry).  

The cup is ‘a marvel at goatherd’s eyes’ ἀιπολικὸν θάημα (56). A scholiast writes that the goatherd here also means a shepherd or cowherd (διὰ τῶν αἰπόλων δηλοὶ καὶ τοὺς ποιμένας καὶ τοὺς βουκόλους), indicating the goatherd could represent the herdsman in general. There have been suggestions, however, that Theocritus’ choice of ‘goatherd’ here is meaningful: the goatherd is the lowliest of herdsmen, therefore he has keener eyes to every trivial pastoral pleasure. Then, it seems that even the fact that the goatherd is not given a name comes to be consequential: the goatherd, the lowliest of all in the pasture and who does not even bear a specific name to be called,
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140 Hunter 1999: 76-77.
141 Wendel 1920: 52
can stand as the symbol of the newly created bucolic world, in a clear contrast with the protagonist of the Homeric epic.

There seems something in the goatherds that makes them spokesmen of Theocritean poetics. We may raise their attitude towards arts as one of the reasons. Although Lycidas hardly holds similarities with the comical goatherds, apart from his rustic appearance, one affinity we can raise between Lycidas and the unnamed goatherd in Idyll 1 is their strong adoration for higher arts. The unnamed goatherd would give away perhaps the best of his possessions just to listen to Thyrsis sing of the legendary Daphnis, while Lycidas dreams of Daphnis and the goatherd-hero Comatas.

The fact that these two bucolic legends, Daphnis and Comatas, are one cowherd and one goatherd in Idyll 7 also seems suggestive. We shall now consider the meanings of the pair of ‘one cowherd and one goatherd’ characters. We notice that Theocritus often employs this pair to describe his pastoral world and poetics. In Idyll 1 they are Thyrsis and the goatherd. Thyrsis, a shepherd as he is, is a bucolic ἄοιδός, a successor of Daphnis, since he evokes the Muses repeatedly (e.g. 1.64), as he tells a story of the hero ‘dear to the Muses’ (1.141). In the Idylls, the Muses’ role is almost exclusively confined to the stories of the bucolic heroes in the mythical past and to the expression of bucolic poetics. The goatherd, being a piper, represents the more rustic side of the Idylls, so that Thyrsis and the goatherd co-exist in one place to present both of the noble and humble sides, the more traditionally epic as well as the newer, lowlier sides of the pastoral.

In Idyll 7, we find this pair of characters twice, in the legendary Daphnis and Comatas and also in Lycidas and Simichidas (narrator and the alter-ego of Theocritus). The legendary Daphnis and Comatas represent the bucolic ideal connection to both nature and art to be elevated singers. Thus, they have a lot in common, especially as far as the Muses’ favour to the singers is concerned (cf. 7.82). Here as well as in the Idyll 1, the presence of the Muses helps to place the bucolic as a new literary genre within the wider current of hexameter poetry, the whole of which the Muses are

143 In Idylls 3, 4, 5, 6 and 11, the Muses are almost absent from the herdsmen’s life. Even in the rare case of Idyll 5.80-81, where Comatas’ pompous boast as his first verse that he is favoured by the Muses even more than Daphnis is, followed by a similar boast by Lacon about Apollo, the Muses are recalled in relationship to Daphnis. Both of the gods mentioned here are patrons of music and appear as very high-sounding gods for the lowly herdsmen. Indeed, Comatas’ sacrifice of a lamb is in the end dedicated to the Nymphs instead of the Muses (138-140). In another case of Idyll 11, the Muses are mentioned to indicate Nicias’ poetic ability.
responsible for. The depiction of the heroes, especially Daphnis the cowherd, gives the pastoral a noble aspect as a genre of ‘high poetry’. For instance, when this legendary Daphnis’ name appears in Comatas’ boast about himself in Idyll 5, Comatas refers to Daphnis as τὸν ἀοιδόν Δάφνιν (80-81). Theocritus seems to engage consciously with the idea of Homer and the traditional epic genre when he uses the word ἀοιδός, which often refers to poets of heroic themes: normally, the herdsmen in the Idylls are not called ἀοιδός, except the legendary cowherd, the related bucolic singer (Thyrisis)144 and Simichidas, whose existence goes beyond the smaller, lowlier world of the bucolic world and helps to locate the bucolic poetry in the greater genre of epic.

The legendary Comatas may, to some extent, function in the same way since he also is closely associated with the Muses’ art. However, he is not specifically called an ἀοιδός. The two bucolic heroes seem to symbolise slightly different aspects of Theocritus’ poetics, just as their realistic counter-parts, Daphnis in Idyll 6 and Comatas in Idyll 5 are different.145 In the first place, we are intrigued to know how Daphnis in Idyll 6 and Comatas in Idyll 5 are related to those mythical counter-parts of the same names. The ‘realistic’ Daphnis and Comatas seem to act as life-sized versions of the mythical counter-parts. Daphnis retains a part of the predecessor’s pastoral ideal of harmony and singing talent. The legendary Comatas can be the later-day of the realistic Comatas, or at least close to the realistic counter-part in his singing ability. Although we do not necessarily take those of the same name as identical, we assume their names give these ‘realistic’ herdsmen a sort of excellence in singing at least, and this probably suggests, in reverse, slightly different roles for each of the legends, the noble and epic hero of divine origin Daphnis and the humbler and lowlier hero Comatas.

The similarities and differences between Daphnis and Comatas, the two beloved of the Muses, are perhaps similar to those we find between Simichidas and Lycidas, two other ‘dear to the Muses’. Again, Theocritus uses a pair of one cowherd and one goatherd to make the Idyll convey his poetics more fully. We shall examine closely how each of the cowherd and the goatherd’ entity

144 Thyrisis is not referred to specifically as ἀοιδός, but seems undeniably associated with this type of poet, as he repeats the bucolicised epic refrain calling the Muses (‘Ἀρχετέ βουκολικάς Μοίσας φίλας ἄρχετε ἀοιδάς’) and his song is called ἀοιδά. Throughout the Idylls only twice are the herdsmen’s songs called ἀοιδά, one of which is that of Thyris (1.62) and the other is in the Lycidas-Simichidas’ conversation (7.49).
reflects Theocritean poetics.

As we have discussed earlier in this chapter, Lycidas is a personification of ‘bucolic poetry’ in the large frame of *Idyll 7*. At the same time, he is, as a character in Simichidas’ journey-story, a rustic goatherd. In other words, he is a bucolic character (rustic goatherd), who embodies the intense ‘bucolicism’ in the *Idyll*, while Simichidas is a poet, but, as a bucolic character (former cowherd), someone yet to reach the bucolicism, the intensely rustic side of pastoral.

From the opening, besides Lycidas’ lowly appearance as a goatherd, Simichidas notes the link between Lycidas and the Muses constantly to show he is not simply a funny rustic of the kind we find in the other *Idylls*. Firstly, he calls Lycidas ἐσθλὸν Κυδωνικὸν ἄνδρα (11) and this encounter is ‘thanks to the Muses’ (σὺν Μοίσαισι 12). Later he calls Lycidas as ‘dear to the Muses’ (φίλος Μοίσαις 94), after listening to the goatherd’s song.

Although both of them are beloved of the Muses, we note that Lycidas and Simichidas clearly belong to different worlds. Simichidas says Lycidas is the best piper (συρικτὰν μέγ’ ὑπείροχον 28) among herdsmen and reapers, whereas he gives himself out as called the best singer (ἀοιδὸν ἄριστον 38). Piping and singing are closely related and may mean the same activity occasionally, because piping is often involved in singing to give a rhythm for songs. However, in *Idyll 1*, it seems that the shepherd and the goatherd are distinguished as a singer and a piper, with a sense of hierarchy: singing is a higher-level activity than piping. In *Idyll 7*, it is more difficult to distinguish, because Lycidas’ song and Simichidas’ do not seem too different in style or in means of presentation and both are sung through the two dear to the Muses. Some critics even suggest that Simichidas’ song is inferior to Lycidas’. Perhaps, here the difference between piping and singing exhibits where the two belong: Lycidas as a bucolic character lives in the fictional bucolic countryside and plays a pipe among other rustics. Simichidas is, on the other hand, a poet from town, who sees the bucolic world from outside and sings about it as a subject. This explains why Simichidas clearly states what he is by comparing himself with notable poets in reality, Sicelidas of Samos (indicating Asclepiades) and Philetas (40-41), speaking of himself not as good as them
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146 Hunter 1999: 160.
147 Van Groningen 1959: 36.
148 Gow 1952: 141.
and reveals his ambitious outlook that his reputation would reach to ‘Zeus’ throne’ (93), which we assume makes a link with the Ptolemaic court,\textsuperscript{149} whereas Lycidas’ social position in the real world is blurred.

Still, Lycidas’ one side as a rustic character here is intimately intertwined with another side as the personification of the bucolic poetry. In agreeing with Simichidas on poetics, he makes a comment of criticism to those contemporary poets who try to emulate the great poet with long poems, as follows:

\begin{quote}
πᾶν ἐπ’ ἀλαθείᾳ πεπλασμένον ἐκ Διὸς ἔρνος.
ὡς μοι καὶ τέκτων μέγ’ ἀπέχθεται ὅστις ἔρευνή
ίσσον όρευς κορυφὰ τελέσαι δόμον Ὡρομέδοντος,
καὶ Μοισάν ἄρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ Χῖον ἀοιδόν
ἀντία κοκκύζοντες ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι.
\end{quote}

(Id.7.44-48)

Lycidas (as the embodiment of the bucolic poetry) even knows about trends in contemporary literature (45-7) and clarifies his own attitude to it and even seems to understand what Simichidas is claiming about himself with his mention of two notable poets(40-41). However, he (as a bucolic character) does not talk about his own status as a poet in a society wider than the countryside or his esteem. He stays as one of the herdsmen in Theocritus’ \textit{locus amoenus}.

Lycidas the goatherd’s limited existence within the fictional pastoral realm corresponds with Simichidas’ comparing Lycidas with anonymous herdsmen, not with named poets, which indicates that rustic Lycidas’ poetic activity is evaluated only at a bucolic level. So, when Simichidas asserts he himself would do as well as Lycidas and is still inferior to Sicelidas and Philetas, he might be comparing his piping ability with that of Lycidas and his singing ability with those two ‘real’ poets. He never implies Lycidas is inferior to these two poets. The world of Simichidas with the two poets as his predecessors and that of Lycidas are separate. Not Asclepiades or Philetas, but rather the bucolic legendary predecessors, Daphnis and Comitas, arouse the thoughts of rustic Lycidas in his song.

\textsuperscript{149} See Hunter 1999: 179.
Interestingly, as he outlines Theocritus’ poetics, Lycidas mentions Homer (Χίον ἀοιδόν 47). Although Homer is not a Theocritean bucolic figure, this epic poet’s existence seems to have been naturalised into this bucolic level of discourse by this goatherd. We have seen that Comatas’ Homeric allusion in the end of Idyll 5 is integrated to this rustic herdsman’s speech by Theocritean humour. Likewise, Lycidas does not break out of the locus amoenus simply by mentioning Homer. Thus, there in Idylls 5 and 7, the two goatherds act as Theocritus’ messengers, conveying the poet’s attitude towards Homer.

We find another sign of his dual identity in that Lycidas performs ‘a little song’ he made in the mountain (ἐν ὄρει τὸ μελόδριον 51). Here, Lycidas shows himself as again a humble herdsman-character, who perhaps takes goats into mountain to pasture and meanwhile composes a humble bucolic song alone. At the same time, ‘a little song’ can stand for a small piece of poem, reflecting Callimachean poetics, which favour short poems with elaborate details (cf. ἄοιδε, τὸ μὲν θός ὑπεύχει τῷ πάχιστον / ἄπλιθῃ λεπταλέην Aetia fr. 1.23-4).

After the exchange of songs, Lycidas laughs merrily again and gives Simichidas the staff, crooked, made with wild-olive (ῥοικὰν δ’ ἔχεν ἀγριελαίῳ δεξιτεράν 18). Lycidas, being asked for an exchange of songs, promises to offer his staff to Simichidas, even before the singing (45), which makes this singing different from the singing competition seen in Idyll 5. This is another sign of Lycidas’ poetic superiority over Simichidas:

ό δ’ αἰπόλος ἁδὺ γελάσσας,
‘τάν τοι’, ἔφα, ‘κορύναν δωρύττομαι, οὕνεκεν ἐσσί
πάν ἐπ’ ἀλαθεία πεπλασμένον ἐκ Δίος ἔρνος.

(Id.7.35-37)

The rusticity of the staff is emphasised here, and this simple stick stands for the friendship blessed by the Muses (ἐκ Μούσαν ξεινήιον 129) or Zeus’ truth (πάν ἐπ’ ἀλαθεία πεπλασμένον ἐκ Δίος
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150 In Idyll 5.20-30, the two herdsmen argue over the equally valuable stakes each should offer.
151 Related to ‘truth’ and fiction, Hunter suggests the possibility that crookedness of the staff is a sign of ‘untruthfulness’. However, I would take the crookedness stands for rusticity of Lycidas and his poetry and this goatherd’s link to Pan. See Hunter 1999:157, 164.
Here Theocritus traces the Hesiodic initiation to poetry by the Muses:

Here, in Lycidas’ case, even lowliness and rusticity are idealised and come to acquire double meanings: not only simplicity, but also divinity, a firm connection to nature. In *Idyll* 3, rusticity of the goatherd’s life is more to laugh at, as something simpler and lowlier than what the readers enjoy in their own lives. However, in *Idyll* 7, rusticity is more about simple beauty or closeness to divinity, as represented with the wild-olive staff or the smelly goatherd himself yet with divine smile.

Simichidas and Lycidas share the same attitude to poetry, and can take the same route to enjoy themselves (ξυνὰ γὰρ ὁδὸς ξυνὰ δὲ καὶ ᾗως 35), profiting from each other, although they have different destinations. Lycidas appears from nowhere and disappears to somewhere else, when he takes the road leading to Pyxa, which is not necessarily to be understood as his destination (130). As for Simichidas, he continues the journey. In the opening of the poem, Simichidas starts by telling about the legendary ancestor of a high family in Cos, which he is visiting now, and after leaving Lycidas, he closes the account with a laudation for the beautifully arranged, delightful, rich harvest-home of the nobles (131-157). Lycidas broke into the journey (or, Simichidas did into Lycidas’ realm) temporarily and they left each other for different destinations.

When we think about Simichidas’ development, a question arises. As we have seen above, Simichidas’ encounter with Lycidas echoes the Hesiodic one with the Muses on Mt. Helicon,
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152 Here Lycidas may either take Simichidas’ saying as simply true (that Simichidas is inferior to the two poets he praised earlier), or, as some scholars have suggested, he meant ἐπ’ ἀλαθείᾳ πεπλασμένον as ‘invented for truth’ or ‘truthfulness’. See Segal 1981: 170, Gutzwiller 1991: 166. This seems one of the signs of the fictional status of Simichidas, as a creation of Theocritus, and is further pointing us to the inventedness of Lycidas, too.
Simichidas claims to have been herding once (βουκολέοντα 91). We take Simichidas claiming himself as a cowherd, as the verb βουκολέω is used in Theocritus and Pseudo-Theocritean Idylls, exclusively for ‘tending cows’. If Simichidas’ claim is true, it must give him the traditional authenticity as a bucolic singer, before his meeting with Lycidas. Perhaps his ‘life as a cowherd’ is, true or not, a means of presenting himself as a bucolic character in front of Lycidas, in order to fit into the bucolic world and enjoy the short journey with the goatherd (ἀλλ’ ἄγε δή, ξυνὰ γὰρ ὁδὸς, βουκολιασδώμεσθα, 35-6).
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153 The Nymphs often function as pastoral version of the Muses. Although the Muses’ grace is repeatedly recalled in Idyll 7, there is a preference for the Nymphs as pastoral deities when Simichidas says he has received initiation (to bucolic songs) from the Nymphs when herding (7.91-2), contrasted with the Hesiodic one.

154 Id 8.1, 20.38, 25.129 are all referring to cow-herding.

155 Hunter interestingly suggests ‘He does not expect Lycidas (or us) to believe that he is a cowherd, but he regards the mere form of words as necessary; perhaps in his (over-) sophistication, he regards Theogony 23 as also just a metaphor.’ Hunter 1999: 179.

156 Idylls reveal, in places, the self-awareness of the artificiality of the bucolic worlds in them. By specifying their own deed as ‘bucolic’, it is even amusing that the herdsmen talk as if they engage in their singing in a way they are supposed to, just because they are herdsmen by occupation. They are, interestingly, aware of their role sometimes and do play it for us. Here we may smell the artificiality of the bucolic poetry. Or, by stating clearly, the herdsmen may simply want to nail our eyes on their ‘bucolic’ singing which they are already proudly famous for.

As far as the each character is concerned, the level of self-awareness varies. For the goatherd in Idyll 3, for example, is utterly a part of the fictional world and does not see himself beyond the frame of the bucolic picture, due to his naïveté and ‘rustic ignorance’ to the eyes of urban readers.
He enters the bucolic realm as a ‘poet’. If Simichidas’ song is inferior to that by Lycidas, it may mean that Simichidas cannot be as close to the bucolic ‘nature’ as Lycidas is. Still, when he could step into the bucolic world, thanks to the Muses (σὺν Μοίσαισι εὕρομες 12), he met Lycidas for his further development as a singer. Simichidas is an ambitious young apprentice, symbolised with ἔρνος (43), who has much to go from now, but at the same time, is gifted with clear-sounding voice of the Muses (Μοισᾶν κατυρόν στόμα 37) and holds the possibility to be a better bucolic singer.

As for Simichidas’ (or Theocritus’) choice of cowherding over others as Simichidas’ bucolic experience in the past, we may consider the idea of ‘the bucolic metaphor’. Van Groningen suggests that, with le métaphore bucolique, when Hellenistic poets present metaphorical identification of themselves or others in their poems, they adopted those images mainly from cowherds. It seems related to the myth of Daphnis the cowherd as the first bucolic singer. Also, perhaps as one aim of the bucolic poetry is to illustrate rusticity often well represented in goatherds, when the poet places himself in the bucolic field of his own creation, he takes the form of a cowherd, in order to present his awareness of himself being distant from the earthiness he seeks from his goatherd. In this regard, we see that Simichidas as a character in the Idyll and Simichidas as the narrator have different views. Simichidas as a character intrudes into the imaginary bucolic world, choosing a role of a poet (himself) who was once a cowherd, and showing off his innocent boldness, not knowing for certain the identity of Lycidas. The narrator, fully understanding the meaning of Lycidas’ smile, casts self-ironic eyes at himself as not reaching the very bucolic poetry (which he himself creates), as not gaining the sense of earthiness as much as his created goatherd. The pair of one ‘cowherd’ and one goatherd works to let the pastoral genre hold both nobility as high poetry and earthiness as a new type of poetry, that is, to clarify Theocritus’ position in hexameter poetry, what his works have inherited from the traditional epic and what is new about his own creation.

When he sings an elaborate short song, we do not find his usage of the mythical motifs successful, which adds more comedy to the poem. On the other hand, when Comatas in Idyll 5 draws Melanthius to his own declaration of victory, the Homeric motif seems making a good sense and turning Comatas an effective agent of the bucolic poetics.

157 Van Groningen 1958: 306-310. See also Gutzwiller 1991: 158. ‘to the extent that the reader is induced to understand Simichidas as a pseudonym for Theocritus himself, the metaphorical identification of poet with cowherd—a generic marker in later Greek bucolic—is already present here’.
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Interim Conclusion

In the previous sections which dealt with each type of herdsmen, we learned that Theocritus applies different roles to each of different kind of herdsmen. The goatherds often represent the intensely rustic side of the *Idylls*, by their status, appearance, sexual desire and unsophisticated manners. The cowherds normally undertake a noble aspect of the *Idylls*, with a heroic feature and divine connection (in case of Daphnis). The shepherds seem to take the mid-point, from which they can be elevated to a sophisticated manner of cowherds, or dragged down to the lowliness of goatherds. Thus, we conclude that Theocritus irrefutably uses the concept of the pastoral hierarchy, according to which he characterises his herdsmen as lowly or noble.

The goatherds’ lowliness is, firstly, indicated in their social status and rustic guise. Comatas in *Idyll* 5 seems to be a slave, and the legendary Comatas in *Idyll* 7 also had a master to serve, although we do not know if the latter was a slave or a hired man.\(^{158}\) The other goatherds’ status is not clearly shown. Still, we occasionally find a goatherd- low status association, as the unnamed goatherd in *Idyll* 3, for example, deals with some ‘realistic’ working-class people, including a dark-complexioned hired girl (ἀ Μέρμνωνος ἐριθακὶς ἁ μελανόχρως).\(^{159}\)

In many of the *Idylls*, the goatherds’ humble and rustic guise often indicates their relatively lower status than the other types of herdsmen. The visible indicators of their lowly status are, for example, their smell, bare feet and goatskin as humble attributes.\(^{160}\) Besides their possessions, we find some physical features to mark a goatherd. In *Idyll* 3, the unnamed protagonist describes himself as προγένειος (9) and with a flat nose (σιμός 8). The word προγένειος means either ‘long-chinned’ or ‘with full beard’, which the goatherd suspect can be the reason of his beloved’s rejecting him, and the flat-nose presents him as an ugly, typical goatherd.\(^{161}\)

The goatherds’ lowliness certainly affects their inner character, speech and behaviour and many of the goatherds are shown as rustic and lowly in nature or lacking of sophistication. When Comatas argues with another slave, Lacon the shepherd and they accuse each other for theft, their
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\(^{158}\) See page 26.

\(^{159}\) See page 28.

\(^{160}\) See pages 26-7.

\(^{161}\) See pages 27-8.
agonistic nature and base ideas seem to have come from their low status.\textsuperscript{162} This theft motif in a goatherd’s speech appears also in \textit{Idyll} 4, where the loud, comical goatherd is described in a clear contrast to a calm, self-controlled cowherd.\textsuperscript{163}

A conspicuous characteristic of the goatherds is their sexuality. When Priapus mocks Daphnis for his struggle for love, He describes Daphnis as ‘being like a goatherd’ (νῦν δ’ αἰπόλω ἄνδρι ἔοικας. 86). Here, Daphnis’ love is compared to a goatherd’s passion, which is never to be satisfied.\textsuperscript{164} The goatherds’ passion appears in many ways, but it often well represents Theocritean motif of the unrequited heterosexual love. Comatas in \textit{Idyll} 5 is a sexually vigorous character, whose coarse passion is described to duplicate that of a he-goat. He tells of his homosexual intercourse he used to have with Lacon, but also sings of his present unrequited heterosexual love.\textsuperscript{165} Some other \textit{Idylls} feature the goatherds’ frustration in love affair more clearly. The goatherd in \textit{Idyll} 3 serenades to Amaryllis in the style of comical \textit{paraklausithyron}, while Battus of \textit{Idyll} 4 wails over the death of his Amaryllis.\textsuperscript{166}

In contrast to the goatherds, many of the cowherds appear as noble and sophisticated, although they are also ‘rustics’. Daphnis in \textit{Idyll} 1 is depicted as heroic and tragic. He is in love, but rejects to yield himself to the indulgence of love.\textsuperscript{167} He chooses his own fate, struggling against powerful \textit{Eros} and descending to Hades, knowing he will be remembered and mourned as the pastoral hero.\textsuperscript{168}

There is a ‘realistic’ counterpart to this mythical Daphnis: Daphnis the cowherd in \textit{Idyll} 6. This Daphnis is, in common with the rest of the cowherds, not tragic. The relationship between him and his fellow cowherd Damoetas is contradistinctive to the highly aggressive one between Comatas and Lacon in \textit{Idyll} 5.\textsuperscript{169} Daphnis and Damoetas pasture together and compose by exchanging half pieces of the song. They sing a tactical transaction between Polyphemus and Galatea, while they themselves enjoy peaceful romantic time with each other. The homosexuality

\textsuperscript{162} See page 29.
\textsuperscript{163} See pages 29-32.
\textsuperscript{164} See pages 32-3.
\textsuperscript{165} See pages 33-4.
\textsuperscript{166} See pages 34-6.
\textsuperscript{167} See page 52.
\textsuperscript{168} See page 53.
\textsuperscript{169} See page 54.
here is expressed quite mildly.\footnote{170}{See page 54-5.}

Theocritean shepherds seem to be in the mid-point in nature between goatherds and cowherds, and can be described as similar to either of these two extremes. Thus, they may vary in nature, as we see Thyrsis and Lacon are quite different, the former of whom is a singer and successor to Daphnis,\footnote{171}{See page 60 and note 144.} and the latter argues with a goatherd and is defeated in singing.\footnote{172}{See page 42.}

How do these differences of characters work in the \textit{Idylls}? Each of Theocritean bucolic poems amusingly varies in styles and tones, and the different kind of herdsmen act in order to convey different tones of seriousness.\footnote{173}{Halperin 1983: 183.} The cowherds tend to function for more sophisticated, serious aspects of the bucolic world and are shown as holding more traditional sense of value in literature, thus help to locate the bucolic genre in the wider current of hexameter poetry.\footnote{174}{See page 42.} The vulgar and loud goatherds, who hardly came to literary prominence before Theocritus (except the case of the negatively depicted Melanthius), serve to characterise the bucolic life as new, show more explicitly than the other types of herdsmen that the bucolic poetry covers new ground within hexameter poetry.\footnote{175}{See pages 55-6.} This is true, to some extent, even about some exceptional characters: the non-lowly goatherd Lycidas and the comical cowherd Aegon. Lycidas holds a dual character. He is, as he seems, a down-to-earth goatherd, and at the same time, a divine figure, who stands for the ideal bucolic poetry.\footnote{176}{See pages 36-8.} Aegon is a comical Heracles-like figure, but still his existence functions to remind us of the more traditional heroism, which is largely absent from the pasture where the two herdsmen chatter.\footnote{177}{See pages 45-50.}

What is interesting about the herdsmen is that, while Theocritus employs the hierarchy as a basic rule to his herdsmen’s nature, there is often something beyond the simple application of the rule to characterise some herdsmen, and this is the very point where Theocritus exhibits his uniqueness and his playful challenge to the tradition. When Comatas declares his victory over the shepherd, he speaks the name of Melanthius the Homeric goatherd, clarifying the difference between Melanthius and himself and asserting that he, a goatherd, is the hero of the new epic
genre. Similarly, Theocritus sees in Lycidas his poetics in the newly created bucolic world: the goatherd represents rusticity, an essence of bucolicism, which is no longer silly and funny, but rather elevated to be the essence of a new type of hexameter poetry.

The goatish bucolicism, or the aepolic (as we shall call it) side of the pastoral, is manifested also in the ecphrasis in Idyll 1. The ivy-cup, a symbol of the Theocritean poetics, is described through an unnamed goatherd’s mouth and is going to be given to a shepherd-ἀοιδός, Thyrsis, who sings of the bucolic version of epic-hero cowherd, Daphnis. The pastoral world becomes full and complete when the two elements aepolic and bucolic are intertwined.

In Idyll 7, where aepolic and bucolic meet in a different manner, Theocritus (Simichidas), taking the role of a former cowherd and inheriting from Daphnis (the generic maker of pastoral) the role of an ἀοιδός of bucolic genre, sees and dreams in Lycidas of the very earthiness, which the poet has not yet acquired.

We conclude that the hierarchy plays a considerable role in characterising herdsmen and also in building up Theocritus’ unique world by presenting both of the aepolic and bucolic sides of the pastoral to convey Theocritus’ poetics more fully.

---

178 See pages 43-5.
179 See pages 49-50.
180 See pages 64-6.
181 See page 73.
Chapter 3

The Pastoral Hierarchy after Theocritus

Theocritus influenced many later poets and, from there, some new ideas were added to nurture the bucolic genre. In this chapter, we shall read some bucolic poets later than Theocritus to see the ways in which the genre developed and how it was influenced by Theocritus’ presentation of the pastoral hierarchy. Our focus in each work and author will be on whether the hierarchy is present and how meaningful it is in understanding the characters or the author’s idea about the pastoral genre, as well as how the goatherds, who were complete ‘others’ before Theocritus and became the new bucolic heroes in Theocritus, are marked in the post-Theocritean literature.

3.1 The Hierarchy in the wider Theocritean corpus

In pastoral after Theocritus, we often find cases where the distinction between kinds of herdsmen (cowherd, shepherd or goatherd) is blurred. For instance, both of the pseudo-Theocritean Idylls 8 and 9 present Daphnis as a cowherd and Menalcas as a shepherd who also keeps goats and kids (e.g. 8.49-50, 9.16-17). The less clear distinction might be derived from the reality in herding life, as we assume one could keep sheep and goats mixed together, since they have the same origin and similar nature:

ἔνθ᾽ ὄις, ἔνθ᾽ αἜἱﳋὲὡζΐlὈγες διδυματόκοι, ἔνθα μέλισσαι
σμήνεα πληροὺσιν, καὶ δρύες υψίτεραι,

(Id.8.45-6)

Even though the difference between goats and sheep may small, this less pronounced distinction is
a clear sign of these *Idylls* not by Theocritus,\(^\text{182}\) and indicates that the hierarchy has become less important in shaping characters distinctively. Still, despite the blurred distinction, each of those *Idylls* seems to hold the sense of the hierarchy behind the characterisation to some extent, although it is difficult to read the author’s general view toward the hierarchy out of the sparing lines.

In *Idyll* 8, the narrator tells of a day when Menalcas the shepherd (μᾶλα νέμων 2) challenged Daphnis the cowherd (βουκολέοντι 1) on a mountain, and an anonymous goatherd judged their singing. The order in the hierarchy and the characterisation in the poem seem to be compatible from the following points: first, there may be a difference in their economic situation, where Menalcas is presented as a slightly more down-to-earth, ‘realistic’ herdsman, when he refuses to give a lamb for a stake, for fear of their parents, whereas Daphnis was willing to offer a calf (μόσχον ἐγὼ θησω 14):

\begin{quote}
οὐ θησω ποικα ἁμνόν, ἐπεὶ χαλεπὸς ὁ πατήρ μεν
χά μάτηρ, τὰ δὲ μᾶλα ποθέσπερα πάντ᾽ ἀριθημεῦντι.
\end{quote}

\((\text{Id}.8.15-16)\)

Secondly, some of the Theocritean cowherds’ characteristics are also found in this Daphnis and those of the shepherds and goatherds in Menalcas. That is, although both of Daphnis and Menalcas are pipers as well as singers (ἀμφω συρίσδεν δεδαημένω, ἀμφω ἀείδεν 4) and each agrees to choose a syrinx for a stake at the match, Menalcas is more often described as a rural piper, ὁ συριγκτὰς (9, 34), while Daphnis is an elegant (Δάφνις τῷ χαρίεντι 1) singer with sweet voice (αἴπερ ὁμοιόν / μουσίδει Δάφνις ταῦτα ἀηδονίσι, 37-8, 82-3), for which he was awarded victory by the goatherd and found the best of herdsmen (κῆκ τούτῳ πρᾶτος παρὰ ποιμέσι Δάφνις ἐγεντο, 92). This contrast is quite similar to what we saw in the ἀοιδὸς Thyrsis and the goatherd piper in *Idyll* 1 and also in the ἀοιδὸς Simichidas and the rustic Lycidas in *Idyll* 7.\(^\text{183}\)

Another point which sets the two herdsmen in contrast is their eroticism, since Daphnis loves Nais, a nymph, female, to whom he will successfully be married, according to the narrator (93), while the shepherd sings his love to a boy, which may not be lucrative, partly due to his goatish

---

\(^{182}\) Gow 1950: 170 and 185.

\(^{183}\) See page 68.
disadvantage of smell, and Menalcas’ part is narrated in a comical tone, with flat-nosed kids scuffling around (ὡ σμην ἐνύ ὑδωρ ἔριφοι):

ΔΑ. παντὶ ἔαρ, παντὶ δὲ νομοὶ, παντὶ δὲ γάλακτος 
οὐθατα πλήθουσιν, καὶ τὰ νέα τρέφεται,
ἐνθ’ ἀ καλὰ παῖς ἐπινίσσεται: αἱ δ’ ἄν ἀφέρητην,
χώ τὰς βόσκων φόρας μας καὶ βός αὐτός.
ΜΕ. ὃ τράγε, τὰν λευκὰν αἰγὸν ἄννερ, ὃ βάθος ὡλας 
μυρίον, (ὡ σμην ἐνύ ὑδωρ ἔριφοι) 
ἐν τήνῳ γὰρ τὸνος: ἵθ’ ὅ τι κόλε καὶ λέγε: Μίλων,
ὁ Πρωτεύς φώκας καὶ θεός ὁν ἐνεμε.

(Id.8.45-56)

This *Idyll* presents the two herdsmen as children (παιδες 29) rather than mature young men, and, unlike in some of the Theocritean *Idylls*, the difference between the two seems not so prominent as to convey different poetics or aspects of the pastoral world. The hierarchy is there mainly to show the two children’s characters as slightly different, one nobler, perhaps superior in singing and the other more rustic.

The same sort of contrast between Daphnis and Menalcas is even weaker, but still intended also in *Idyll* 9, when Daphnis sings of pastoral joy of music, whereas Menalcas boastfully sings of a rural affluence, the latter of which often stresses the lowliness of its speaker in Theocritus’ *Idylls* to urban readers’ ears (e.g. *Id*.11.33-7).

ΔΑ. Ἄδυ μὲν ἁ μόσχος γαρόταται, ἄδυ δὲ χὰ βούς,
ἄδυ δὲ χὰ σύριξ χώ βουκόλος, ἄδυ δὲ κηγών.

(Id.9.7-8)

ΜΕ. Ἀῖνα μάτερ ἐμὰ, κηγώ καλὸν ἄντρον ἐνοικέω

184 See Gow 1950: 170.
185 See also page 36 for the gift of apples from the goatherd.
κοίλαις ἐν πέτραισιν: ἔχω δὲ τοι ὅσσ᾽ ἐν ὀνείρῳ
φαίνονται, πολλὰς μὲν δις, πολλὰς δὲ χιμαίρας,
ὡν μοι πρὸς κεφαλὰ καὶ πρὸς ποσὶ κώεα κεῖται.

(Id. 9.15-18)

These features, in terms of different roles for different kinds of herdsmen, are perhaps designed by
the authors’ awareness of the hierarchy, but can merely be the unintended results of the authors’
taking over some of the Theocritean elements. We do not know further, if the authors intended the
use of the pastoral hierarchy for the expression of his poetics, like in Theocritus.

When we observe the goatherd character in Idyll 8, the author’s intention of the hierarchy is
slightly clearer. Whereas Menalcas and Daphnis are loosely associated with sheep/goats and cows
respectively, the goatherd is clearly defined as αἰπόλος repeatedly, though anonymous (e.g. Χοὶ
μὲν παῖδες ἄνευ, ὁ δὲ αἰπόλος ἦνθ’ ἐπακούσα 28) and he comes as a judge. In Idyll 5, we took it
that the two herdsmen, the goatherd and the shepherd, talk about calling a cowherd for their judge
as a sign of the hierarchy, in that the higher status of the cowherd would give him an authority in
judging over singing of lower-ranked herdsmen. 186 Idyll 8, then, seems to present a contrasting
picture: a cowherd and a shepherd of sheep and goats appoint a goatherd as their judge. This may
reveal that the author’s occasional disregard of the hierarchy, or more likely, that goatherds’
adoration for higher arts, which we occasionally found in Theocritus (e.g. Id. 1.12-14, 7.83-9), and
their intense bucolism is inherited here and makes the judge a good listener:

"Ὡς οἱ παῖδες ἀείσαν, ὁ δὲ αἰπόλος ὁ τοίς ἀγόρευεν:
ἀδύ τι τὸ στόμα τευ καὶ ἐφίμερος ὁ Δάφνι φωνά.
κρέσσον μελπομένω τευ ἀκουέμεν ἢ μέλι λείχειν.
λάζεο τὰς σύριγγας: ἐνίκασας γὰρ ἀείδων.
αἰ δὲ τι λῆς με καὶ αὐτὸν ἀμ ἀπολεόντα διδάξαι,
τήναν τὰν μιτύλαν δώσα τὰ διδακτρά τοι αίγα,
ἄτις ὑπὲρ κεφαλὰς αἰεὶ τὸν ἀμολγέα πληροί.

(Id. 8.81-87)

186 See page 23.
The goatherd praises Daphnis and asks the cowherd to teach him singing, while driving herds together, and then he would give Daphnis a she-goat. This strongly reminds us of the rustic gifts from the goatherd for Thyrsis’ singing in *Idyll* 1 and also the Lycidas’ dream of listening to the legendary Comatas sing in *Idyll* 7.  

**The Cowherds and the Girls in *Idylls* 20 and 27**

The spurious *Idylls*, to be sure, are not all the same in the way they feature herdsmen. *Idyll* 20 is a pastoral drama with a narrator, who narrates the event in the past (1-18) and is unique in that it manifests a collision between what is ‘rural’ and ‘urban’ as it portrays an unnamed cowherd (βουκόλος 3), who tried to kiss a city-girl called Eunica, was rejected and cursed her.  

The motif of unrequited love is very common in Theocritus and we assume many parts of the *Idyll* are modelled on Theocritean *Idylls* 3, 6 and 11. Some of the similar points are as follows: a male herdsman as a protagonist loves a girl and fails. The girl is indifferent or disdainful to the herdsman (3.6-7, 11.29 and 20.1-18). The herdsman tries to defend himself by listing his redeeming qualities (6.35-38, 11.33-49 and 20.19-29). He tells mythological love stories either in his trial to convince his beloved or to show that a female act of loving a herdsman could be justified (3.40-51 and 20.33-41). He also boasts of having female admirers for his own self-esteem (11.76-79 and 20.30-31).

However, when we think of the characters backed with the hierarchy, there is some apparent dissimilarity between *Idyll* 20 and the Theocritean *Idylls*. Firstly, the Theocritean rejected herdsmen are described as particularly lowly or having disadvantageous features, even compared to the other Theocritean herdsmen: the goatherd has physical disadvantages, perhaps because of his being ‘goatish’ (cf. a flat nose, σιμός, *Id*.3.8), which he himself is aware of to some extent (3.6-9), and the Cyclops in *Idylls* 6 and 11 is a monstrous Cyclops, not a normal human-shaped beauty, whereas the cowherd in *Idyll* 20 is a cowherd, not specifically a herdsman with lowly associations.

---

187 See page 66.
188 For arguments on the authorship, see Gow 1952: 364-365.
189 For a close analysis, see Fantuzzi in Paschalis (ed.) 2007: 13-38.
or a monster. Here I think it is appropriate to exclude the case of Daphnis’ love in *Idyll* 1, since Theocritus describes Daphnis as somehow wilfully choosing his own fate of not indulging himself in love and heroically dying in the fight against Eros, which sets him far apart from the rejected lovers against their will in *Idylls* 3 and 11.\(^{190}\) Thus, in the monstrous Cyclops’ case, even his positive self-assessment does not convince readers much, which results in the further amusement of readers. On the contrary, when the cowherd asks for affirmation of his beauty by his fellow herdsmen (*Id.20.19-20*), we may not deny his claim easily,\(^{191}\) because the points he is making are not mentioned by Eunica for denial. Rather, Eunica lists the points she dislikes about the cowherd, which are mainly the result of his being just a countryman:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{βουκόλος ὢν ἐθέλεις με κύσαι, τάλαν; οὐ μεμάθηκα} \\
\text{ἀγροίκως φιλέειν, ἀλλ' ἀστικὰ χείλεα θλίβειν.} \\
\text{μὴ τύγε μευ κύσσῃς τὸ καλὸν στόμα μηδ' ἐν ὀνείροις.} \\
\text{οὐδ' ἐξεὶς, ὅπποιδα λαλεῖς, ὡς ἄγρια παιδεῖς.}
\end{align*}
\]

(*Id.20.3-6*)

Secondly, the cowherd in *Id.20* appears as less ‘funny’ or ignorant than Theocritean comical rejected lovers. One of the amusing things in those Theocritean *Idylls* are that, in the course of trying to persuade their beloved or justifying themselves, the herdsmen (goatherd or shepherd) often exhibit further rusticity or lack of sophistication or knowledge. For example, when the goatherd in *Id.* 3 lists the mythological love stories between herdsmen and women/goddesses, he is unaware that his choice does not function properly to convince his beloved to love a herdsmen and his poor use of mythological materials even widens the gap between the lowly goatherd and the mythical heroes being narrated.\(^{192}\) On the other hand, the cowherd quite rightly employs some mythical love stories between cowherds and women:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{oὐκ ἔγνω δ', ὅτι Κύπρις ἐπ' ἄνερι μὴνατο βούτα}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{190}\) See pages 52-3.  
\(^{191}\) See Fantuzzi in Paschalis (ed.) 2007: 30 for his rejection of the idea that he is ugly. See also Bernsdorf 2006: 181.  
\(^{192}\) See page 36.
καὶ Φρυγίοις ἐνόμευσεν ἐν ὁρει καὶ τὸν Ὄδωνιν ἐν δρυμοῖς φύλασε καὶ ἐν δρυμοῖς ἐκκλαμεν. Ἐνδυμίων δὲ τίς ἤ; οὐ βουκόλος ἢ; γν σελάνα βουκολεόντα φύλασεν, ἀτ' Οὐλόμπω δὲ μολίσα λάθριον ἀν νάπος ἡλθε καὶ εἰς ἕνα παιδί κάθευδε. καὶ τῷ ῾Ρέα κλαίεις τὸν βουκόλον, οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ τῷ ω Κρονίδα διὰ παιδί βοηθόμον ὠρίς ἐπλάγχθης;

(Id.20.34-41)

The author’s choice of ‘cowherd’ for the character works well here, since he fully explains why a cowherd should not be left unloved. The hierarchy seems to be present, since the character has to be a cowherd, who has a mythical and heroic link, not another type of herdsman with lowly associations. What is more, another amusing feature in the Theocritus’ version, rustic gifts or boasts of affluence (e.g. cheese), which often marks the goatherd or shepherd as even rustic and laughable is absent in the cowherd in *Idyll* 20: he does not talk either of those rural objects. Rustic features of countryside are quite absent from his speech.

As we have observed, in some ways the *Idyll* 20 does not seem to easily fit into the category of ‘Beauty and the Beast’ poems like *Idylls* 3, 6 or 11. Perhaps the reason is that, unlike Theocritean beloveds, Eunica is a city-dweller and specifically called ἡταίρα (κακὰ ἑταίρα 18). Here the opposition is laid between the manners in the countryside and those in the city, in an erotic theme, not between ‘realistic’ herdsmen and idealised noble herdsmen. The idealised cowherd interestingly takes pride in his being countryman, and tries to refute Eunica, and calls her ‘a bad ἡταίρα’. According to Fantuzzi, the cowherd’s assertiveness and self-pride may imply the ‘the achieved autonomy of the bucolic genre’.

To sum up, as far as the hierarchy is concerned, the proud, non-funny cowherd is not inconsistent with the noble cowherd-characters in Theocritus, but unique in that he becomes a rejected lover: in Theocritus, a rejected lover was not particularly a cowherd’s quality, but a role for a disadvantaged herdsman, who belonged to a comical side of the rusticity or unsophisticatedness.

The cowherds were rather the remains of the noble past or perhaps a narrow link to the educated city-dwellers’ ideas.\textsuperscript{195} Although that is partly true of the cowherd in \textit{Idyll} 20 as well, the poem is intended to bestow on the cowherd a ‘rusticity’ which is modified to be less funny, so that he can represent the idealised ‘countryside’ strongly enough against ‘city’ in terms of sophistication and beauty. Here we see one case of development after Theocritus of the pastoral genre or pastoral poetics and the idea about the countryside.

\textit{Idyll} 27 is also a very rare piece, in that it presents a happy heterosexual love. We may be able to raise this point to support the idea that the \textit{Idyll} as well as \textit{Idyll} 8 is not by Theocritus, since Theocritean heterosexual love is almost inevitably unhappy and causes the herdsmen’s sufferings.\textsuperscript{196} Here, an eloquent cowherd named Daphnis courts a shepherdess and successfully persuades her into erotic intimacy:

\begin{verbatim}
ΚΟ. ὀδίνειν τρομέω: χαλεπὸν βέλος Εἰλειθυίης.
ΔΑ. ἀλλὰ τεὴ βασίλεια μογοστόκος Ἀρτεμίς ἐστιν.
ΚΟ. ἀλλὰ τεκεῖν τρομέω, μὴ καὶ χρόα καλὸν ὀλέσσω.
ΔΑ. ἢν δὲ τέκῃς φίλα τέκνα, νέον φάος ὄψεαι ὑ.
\end{verbatim}

\textit{(Id.27.29-32)}

As far as their status is concerned, the girl remains anonymous, but her parents’ names are given, which perhaps indicates that she is not a slave, as well as Daphnis (43). Daphnis appears as wealthy with some property (πᾶσαν τὰν ἀγέλαν, πάντ’ ἄλσεα καὶ νομὸν ἔξεις, 34)\textsuperscript{197} and of noble birth, according to the girl (ἐξ εὐηγενέων 43). The cowherd image is idealised and elevated to nobility, because of his wealth and eloquency, or intelligence, rather than connected to a goatherd-like comical heartbreak.

As we look back to the pseudo-Theocritean corpus, \textit{Idylls} 8, 9, 20 and 27, in its use of the hierarchy, we conclude that the different characterisation of the herdsmen based on the hierarchy is

\textsuperscript{195} See pages 55-6.
\textsuperscript{196} See page 34.
\textsuperscript{197} In line 47, Daphnis seems to have also some cultivated land (ἦρα). See Gow 1950: 491.
more or less there in each of these poems, thus the goatherds tend to appear lowlier and the cowherds nobler. However, the subtle use of it (by the blurred distinctions), the weaker contrast brought between the different kinds of herdsmen and also the large absence of the *aepolic* side of the pastoral, that is, the much less emphasised earthiness or comical rusticity mark these poems as non-Theocritean.\footnote{198} We may be able to say, through these features, that they occasionally show a more romanticised or idealised picture of the country, especially in *Idyll* 20.

\footnote{198 See also Bernsdorf 2006: 180-3.}
3.2 The Hierarchy in Bion and Moschus

Bion

Some of the bucolic poems of Moschus and Bion show similarities to some other post-Theocritean bucolic poems such as *Idyll* 20 which develop autonomous pastoral themes further for various expressions of emotions and personal experiences. In such poems the ‘realism’ employed in Theocritus for the amusement of urban readers is largely omitted and herdsman-characters often emerge as primarily erotic protagonists:

\[\text{ἔν μὲν γὰρ βροτὸν ἄλλον ἢ ἄθανάτων τινὰ μέλπω,} \\
\text{βαμβαίνει μοι γλῶσσα καὶ ὥς πάρος οὐκέτ' ἀείδει:} \\
\text{ἢν δ' ἀντ' ἐς τὸν Ἔροτα καὶ ἐς Λυκίδαν τι μελίσδω,} \\
\text{καὶ τόκα μοι χαίροισα διὰ στόματος ῥέει αὐδά.} \]

(Bion 9.8-11)\(^{199}\)

The beloved is named after a Theocritean herdsman, Lycidas, but nothing else is told about him as a herdsman or revealed about the lover (narrator)’s literary self-presentation as any kind of herdsman. The name seems to be used for convention.\(^{200}\) Likewise, even when the beloved is called a shepherd (\(χαῖρε φίλος, \text{kαὶ μοι ποτὶ ποιμένα κώμον ἄγοντι, Bion.11.4}\)), the type of herdsman referred does not seem very meaningful in understanding the character or the situation. In the first place, in Bion, although characters often bear bucolic names, they appear, in most cases, simply to represent a man who loves or is loved (perhaps passionately like bucolic characters in Theocritus) and sings of love, or sometimes of nature, according to the common bucolic association of the countryside and love. Fantuzzi discusses Greek minor bucolic poets like Bion as a bridge-builder between Theocritean love in opposition to pastoral peace and the happy bucolic

\(^{199}\) The numbering of the poems of Bion and Moschus is from Gow’s 1952 OCT (*Bucolici Graeci*).

\(^{200}\) See Reed 2006: 217-8.
love in Latin love elegy, such as Propertius 2.\textsuperscript{201}

In this type of bucolic erotic poetry, we note that the sense of the hierarchy is almost absent. So we deduce that, interestingly, there being no disadvantaged herdsman to suffer for unrequited love or the comical rusticity could result from there being no smell of funny goats or goatherds, or vice versa.

The disregard to the different kinds and roles of herdsmen holds true for the pastoral mimes with two herdsman-characters, such as Bion 2, where Cleodamus and Myrson talk and the latter of them sings about the best season of the year. There, again, we hardly find their association with any specific animal to herd or herding life in general. One exception where the protagonist is specified as a cowherd and the hierarchy may exist is Bion 10:

\begin{verbatim}
Ἁ μεγάλα μοι Κύπλις ἔθ᾿ ὑπνώντι παρέστα,
νηπίαχον τὸν ᾿´Ερωτα λαβών τὸν ᾿´Ερωτα δίδασκε.'

ὥς λέγε· χἩ μὲν ἀπ᾿ οὖν, ἐγὼ δ᾿ ὅσα βουκολίσαμεν,
νήπιος ὡς ἐθέλοντα μαθεῖν τὸν ᾿Επωτα δίδασκον,
ὡς εὗρε πλαγίαυλον ὁ Πάν, ὡς αὐλὸν Ἀθάνα,
ὡς χέλυν Ἐρμάων, κίθαριν ὡς ἁδὺς Ἀπόλλων.

ταῦτα νιν ἔξειδόσκον ὥς οὖκ ἐμπάζετο μόθων,
ἀλλὰ μοι αὐτὸς ἢδειδὲν ἐρωτύλα, καὶ μ᾿ ἐδίδασκε
θνατῶν ἀθανάτων τε πόθως καὶ ματέρος ἔργα.

κηγὼν ἐκλαθόμαν μὲν ὅσῳ τὸν ᾿Ερωταν,
ὅσσα δ᾿ Ἐρως μ᾿ ἐδίδαξεν ἐρωτύλα πάντ᾿ ἐδιδάχθην.
\end{verbatim}

The protagonist is a cowherd (βοῦτα 4), in whose dream Cypris appears. The goddess asks him to teach Eros to sing (μέλπειν 4). Then he tries but, in the end, forgets what he was teaching to Eros and acquires instead all the love songs (ἐρωτύλα πάντ᾿ 13) Eros taught him. This elegantly humorous poem reveals the poet’s inclination towards erotic poetry. The kind of poem he implies

\textsuperscript{201} Fantuzzi 2003.
he used to be engaged in before his encounter with Eros could be more heavily bucolic-themed one (ἐγὼ δ᾿ ὅσα βουκολίασδον, 5) or about divine deeds related to music (7-8).²⁰²

The choice of a cowherd for the protagonist may come from his nobility, the link to the mythical past,²⁰³ or probably is related to the bucolic metaphor, with which the poet could have presented his pastoral avatar as a cowherd-poet, since cowherds are often more closely associated with epic than the other types of herdsmen are in Theocritus.²⁰⁴

Moschus and Epitaph for Bion

In the limited number of Moschus’ poetic fragments, we hardly trace the existence of the hierarchy. The protagonists occasionally appear as mere rustics (ἄγροικοι), who makes us feel nostalgia for rural ease:

αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ γλυκὺς ὕπνος ὑπὸ πλατάνῳ βαθυφύλλῳ,
καὶ παγᾶς φιλέοιμι τὸν ἐγγύθεν ἄχων ἄκούειν,
.alias ᾖ παρέοισα τὸν ἀγροικόν, οὐχὶ ταράσσει.

(Moschus 1. 11-13)

The hierarchy is certainly important, however, in Epitaph for Bion, which also explores the greater sense of the autonomy of the bucolic genre. The poem is a monologue of the narrator/author, who seems to have been a pupil of Bion and sings of Bion’s death.²⁰⁵ It takes as its model Bion’s Lament for Adonis and Thyris’ song of Daphnis in Idyll 1 and builds up a bucolic motif of lament for a deceased herdsman-poet, which reveals an early stage of the tradition of later ‘pastoral lament’, in which a loved one is mourned and commemorated in a pastoral setting, such as Milton’s Lycidas.

²⁰² See Fantuzzi 2003: 5.
²⁰³ Also in Longus, Eros appears in a cowherd’s dream. See page 106.
²⁰⁴ See page 56.
²⁰⁵ This poem was once ascribed to Moschus, but later considered as without certain authorship. See Bernsdorf 2006: 171.
Here, Bion appears as a cowherd (βουκόλος 11) and as having lived a herdsman’s daily life (80-84), which shows him to be a qualified bucolic singer. Thus, Bion has some similarities with Theocritean cowherds. First, the author calls Bion καλὸς μελικτάς (7). μελικτάς (player or musician) seems quite close in meaning to συρικτάς (syrinx-player), but the former is used only once in Theocritus, where Corydon the cowherd calls himself so (Id.4.30), whereas συρικτάς is used once to refer to the goatherd Lycidas (7.28) and twice in the pseudo-Theocritean Idyll 8 (9 and 34), both of which referring to Menalca the shepherd of sheep and goats in contrast to the accompanying cowherd Daphnis. Συρικτάς is clearly an indicator of the rusticity of the goatherd-characters in Theocritus. Compared to this, μελικτάς for cowherds may sound less rustic and we assume the two words are distinguished in use: here in Epitaph for Bion, the word μελικτάς is chosen, to promote Bion’s association with the Theocritean noble cowherds.206

Secondly, which is more apparent and significant, Bion is described in a manner reminiscent of the image of Daphnis. In the same way as Daphnis was mourned, the author stresses the unity between Bion and the nature, which grieves Bion’s death (1-2):

Αἴλινα μοι στοναχείτε νάπαι καὶ Δώριον ὤδωρ,
καὶ ποταμοὶ κλαίοιτε τὸν ἱμερόεντα Βίωνα.

The poem continues to list the natural objects (flowers and animals) mourning Bion.207 The cowherd-Bion manifests the ideal bucolicism of noble and heroic Daphnis’ kind in his harmony with nature and also in his divine favour, especially from the Muses (πάντα τοι ὁ βούτα συγκάτθανε δῶρα τὰ Μουσάν 65). When Daphnis or Bion symbolises the bucolic singing, it is no longer a rustic deed by a rustic piper. The bucolic song becomes a high, sophisticated, new form of art within the epic tradition.208 Thus, the author’s intention in describing Bion after Daphnis also lies in that he commemorates his ‘bucolic’ master as a new Homer and no less (78-84):

χῶ μὲν Τυνδαρέοιο καλὰν ἄεισε θώγατρα

206 See pages 30-2.
207 On the pathetic fallacy in Epitaph for Bion, see Bernsdorf 2006: 196-7.
208 See page 65.
καὶ Θέτιδος μέγαν ὑδι καὶ Ατρείδαν Μενέλαον,
κεῖνος δ’ οὐ πολέμουσ, οὐ δάκρυ, Πᾶνα δ’ ἐμελπε
καὶ βούτας ἐλίγαινε καὶ ἄείδων ἔνόμευε
καὶ σύριγγας ἔτευχε καὶ ἀδέα πόρτιν ἄμελγε
καὶ παίδων ἐδίδασκε φιλήματα καὶ τὸν Ἐρωτα
ἔτρεφεν ἐν κόλποισι καὶ ἤρεθε τὰν Ἀφροδίταν.

The cowherd-figure functions properly to locate the bucolic poetry within the wider current of hexameter poetry, just as in Theocritean Idyll 7, where an ex-cowherd figure, Simichidas (the alter-ego of Theocritus) has a meaning going beyond the rustic frame of the pastoral world (of his own imagination) in the course of ensuring his own identity as an ἀοιδός.209

In conclusion, the elegant and intelligent presentations of the cowherds in Bion and Moschus do not differ greatly from Theocritus, although the different kind of characterisation or the gap between the noble cowherds and the rustic goatherds backed with the hierarchy became less important in marking the herdsmen. Moreover, the Theocritean ‘realistic’ comedy, the rustic smell and noise has faded away, which results in a less comical or ironical tone in these poems. This tendency was true also of the pseudo-Theocritean corpus, but becomes even more prominent in Bion and Moschus, since some of the poems treat the herdsmen all the same, regardless of their being cowherds or something else.

As far as the pastoral poetics are concerned, we are interested in how the various kinds of developments in the pastoral genre we observe in these poets are related to the use of the pastoral hierarchy. Some of them are achieved through the use of the hierarchy and its characterisation: in Lament for Bion, Bion’s assimilation to the cowherd Daphnis helps the strong assertion of the presence of the pastoral genre, and to create a new tradition of commemorating loved ones in a beautiful, sentimental pastoral picture.

At the same time, the developments without the apparent use of the hierarchy, with the lack of Theocritean goatish comedy, irony or earthiness contribute to the more sophisticated and romantic presentation of the herdsmen, as in Bion 9 and 10 and Moschus 1.

3.3 *The Hierarchy in Vergil’s Eclogues*

In Vergil’s *Eclogues*, the specification of the herdsmen (cowherd, shepherd or goatherd) is often unclear. Some of the herding characters seem to deal with more than one type of animal, (e.g. Tityrus in *Ecl.1* keeps cows and sheep, Meliboeus in 7 seems to keep all three kinds) and other herdsmen are described without any association with a specific animal (e.g. Menalcas in 5, unless he is not the same Menalcas as the one in 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>bos</th>
<th>agnus</th>
<th>capella caper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vitula</td>
<td>agna</td>
<td>capra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iuvenus</td>
<td>ovis</td>
<td>haedus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meliboeus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tityrus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corydon</td>
<td></td>
<td>O30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menalcas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Damoetas</td>
<td></td>
<td>O96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menalcas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mopsus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tityrus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meliboeus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corydon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thrysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Damon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alphesiboeus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lycidas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moeris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menalcas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

○: the animal the character seems to drive

△: the animal the character calls, or may accompany

The number: the lines in the poem which refer to particular animals

**Singing-match in a draw**

Because of there being several animals associated with one herdsman, the distinction between different kinds of herdsmen may not be so important in understanding the characters in
some Eclogues as in the Idylls. For example, although Eclogue 3 deals with emulation between herdsmen of perhaps different animals, we cannot see any clear sign of the hierarchy between them. This Eclogue is modelled after Theocritean Idyll 5 in that it begins with an abusive argument between two herdsmen and they proceed to a singing-match. Damoetas appears as herding mainly cows (29), but there is also his reference to goats (6). Likewise, although it is clear that Menalcas has goats (34) and sheep (94), he may also keep oxen (86).

Their status and characters are slightly different, but we do not know how much this is related to the hierarchy: Damoetas was willing to give a cow for a stake, while Menalcas, who seems younger than Damoetas (33), refuses to give even a kid (28-34). In addition, the former sings of heterosexual love (e.g. 64-5), whereas the latter, of homosexual one (e.g. 66-7). These facts may allow us to interpret that Damoetas as almost a cowherd-figure, richer or nobler, and Menalcas as almost a shepherd or goatherd, more down-to-earth and lowlier, as there seems to have been an association between goatherds or shepherds and homosexual love.\(^\text{210}\) However, both of them are equally involved in the bickering over rustic matters (1-25) and the match ends in a draw. The distinction between the two in terms of characters and singing abilities is not meant to be too clear,\(^\text{211}\) so that we may not be able to say for sure that the hierarchy functions significantly there in the characterisation within this Eclogue.

Eclogue 5 is also intriguing, especially as Menalcas tells in the end that he is the author of the Eclogues 2 and 3, which may reveal that he is Vergil himself in a pastoral guise.\(^\text{212}\) At the beginning of the poem, he introduces himself as a singer and Mopsus as a piper (\textit{tu calamros inflare leuis, ego dicere versus 2}), which reminds us of the contrast between the cowherd-singer and goatherd-piper in Theocritus.\(^\text{213}\) However, we do not know clearly what kind of herdsman Menalcas is in this Eclogue: in line 12 Menalcas tells Mopsus that Tityrus will look after kids (\textit{haedos}) while Mopsus sings. From this I think it is safe to assume Mopsus is a goatherd, but Vergil does not tell us more about their animals or herding practice. Menalcas might be a goatherd as well, if \textit{haedos} are the kids of Menalcas as well as of Mopsus, or if we take this Menalcas to be identical with the Menalcas in Eclogue 3. On the contrary, we could even take Menalcas as a

\(^{210}\) See page 33.
\(^{211}\) Clausen 1994: 91.
\(^{213}\) See page 68.
cowherd, assuming Vergil would have had in his mind the Theocritean contrast between the
cowherd-singer (=Menalcas) and goatherd-piper (=Mopsus).

In any case, the salient points are that Vergil here does not regard the hierarchy or the
difference between the animals of herdsmen as as important a norm as Theocritus did, and also that,
even if he implied Menalcas to be a certain kind of herdsman, goatherd or cowherd, the meanings
one kind of herdsman bears are perhaps different from those in Theocritus: Mopsus the goatherd
sings of the death of Daphnis and Menalcas the deification of Daphnis.\textsuperscript{214} In Theocritus, Thyris
was a shepherd, so that he was more qualified than a goatherd to be a successor of Daphnis and to
sing of Daphnis.\textsuperscript{215} Here in the \textit{Eclogue}, we do not quite see the disadvantage of a goatherd in
singing the themes of Daphnis, although we may be able to see a weak contrast between the lowlier
Mopsus, who sings of Daphnis as a human and the nobler Menalcas, who sings of Daphnis as a
divine.

\textbf{Land-confiscation and goatherds}

Still, the choice of a particular animal for a given herdsman to herd is more meaningful in
marking his role(s) in some of the poems. For example, there seems an intended contrast between
cow and sheep herding Tityrus, who has kept the right to stay in the countryside, and the goatherd
Meliboeus, who has lost his land and is leaving, in \textit{Eclogue} 1.

Vergil’s \textit{Eclogues} brought a wide range of subjects related to social life in reality (e.g. politics,
religion) into pastoral settings. \textit{Eclogue} 1 features two herdsmen: Tityrus, who tends sheep and
cows (8-9), and Meliboeus, a goatherd. The background of the poem is a historic event, the Battle
of Philippi (42 B.C.), which resulted in land-confiscations throughout Italy in order to distribute
land to the veterans.\textsuperscript{216} The poem highlights the contrast between Meliboeus, who, having lost his
land, is leaving his home country, and Tityrus, who met a \textit{deus} (6) in the city of Rome and is
allowed to continue his life in the countryside. Vergil seems to describe the unfortunate goatherd

\textsuperscript{214} Deification of Daphnis or other pastoral singer is not seen in either Theocritus’ \textit{Idyll} or \textit{Epitaph for Bion}. See Coleman 1977: 172-3.
\textsuperscript{215} See note 144.
\textsuperscript{216} Clausen 1994: 30.
with deep compassion.

Tityrus seems to have been one of those who marched to Rome to demand a fair treatment, to whom the *deus* or *iuvenis* (42), which implies Octavian, responded:

hi mihi responsum primus dedit ille petenti:
'pascite ut ante boves, pueri, submittite tauros.'

*(Ecl.1.44-45)*

Along with the land confiscations, the *Eclogue* brings in another Roman realistic matter: slavery and emancipation (*libertas* 27). Tityrus was a slave and was allowed to stay in the same place to pasture his oxen, so that he could collect enough money (*peculi* 32) finally to buy his freedom from his master:

ME. Et quae tanta fuit Romam tibi causa videndi?
TI. Libertas, quae sera tamen respexit inertem,
candidior postquam tondenti barba cadebat,
respexit tamen et longo post tempore venit,
postquam nos Amaryllis habet, Galatea reliquit.

*(Ecl.1.26-30)*

On the other hand, Meliboeus seems a free man, when he calls his place *patria* (*nos patriam fugimus* 4), and talks about the civil-war (*discordia* 71) in the position of a citizen (*ciuis* 71). Although the *Eclogues* tend to present a more vague distinction between kinds of herdsmen (cowherd, shepherd or goatherd) than the *Idylls*, social status (being slave or citizen) tends to be more clearly indicated (e.g. Menalcas in *Ecl.9*). Meliboeus has probably not been to Rome. He has spent his life in the countryside, but his rural life at home has now come to an end. That is, the goatherd seems to be more firmly connected to rurality than Tityrus, who dreamily tells of Rome, and therefore the tragic fate of the goatherd’s being dissociated from the rural life becomes

---

217 A slave does not have a *patria* in a socio-legal sense. See Coleman 1977:72.
218 Coleman 1977: 90.
ironically prominent. The opening of the *Eclogue*, featuring Tityrus’ piping, echoes the opening of *Idyll* 1, but the misfortune of Meliboeus is told soon afterwards to make the contrast (1-5). Meliboeus’ hopeless status is symbolised in his goats’ hardship: a she-goat gave birth to twins, but had to leave them dead, the twins which had been the hope for the flock (*spem gregis* 15).

Meliboeus is maturely calm, not casting any envious remark on Tityrus (*Non equidem invideo, miror magis*; 11). But once he starts to confess his sorrow and anger, it is directed at the civil war, which happened outside of his rural place, but terminated his life in the countryside. Here, the city is a threat to life in the countryside. Tityrus calls the city *ingrata urbs*, which does not allow herdsmen to bring much money home for the price of sheep or cheese (33-35). Now Meliboeus cries for his efforts not been paid:

\[\text{impius haec tam culta novalia miles habebit,} \]
\[\text{barbarus has segetes: en quo discordia civis} \]
\[\text{produxit miseros; his nos consevimus agros!} \]

(*Ecl.* 1.70-72)

The herdsman’s impotence against the turmoil the conflict brought is stressed here. Towards the ending, Meliboeus says farewell to his peaceful pastoral life and even to his song (*carmina nulla canam* 7). Then Tityrus offers a night of hospitality with food, which embodies the humble affluence of the countryside (79-83), all of which Meliboeus has to leave behind.

This role of a victim of the land-confiscation is given also to another goatherd, Moeris in *Eclogue* 6. This fact strengthens the possibility that Vergil sympathetically connected goatherd-characters with rusticity or innocent down-to-earth life more closely than other types of herdsmen, so that the tragedy of land-confiscation becomes most prominent. I think this is a rare case, as in *Idyll* 20 and the *Epitaph for Bion*, where we can almost certainly see the post-Theocritean authors’ intentional use of the hierarchy for the purpose of the expression of their poetics, or what they try to convey by means of their own new bucolic poetry.

---

219 Nauta 2006: 306-7. There, he also points out the similarity between Tityrus and the cowherd Bion in the *Epitaph for Bion*. 
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3.4 The Hierarchy in Calpurnius Siculus

In Calpurnius’ Eclogues, the distinction between kinds of herdsmen (cowherd, shepherd or goatherd) is presented slightly more clearly than in Vergil’s Eclogues, although still less so than in Theocritus. Eclogue 1 features two brothers, Corydon and Omytus, who have inherited cows (\textit{uaccae} 4) from their father (\textit{pater} 4), and tells of their discovery of a prophetic inscription on a beech tree by Faunus, which celebrates the coming of the Golden Age under a new emperor (\textit{deus 46}). Ecl.2 presents a singing-match between a shepherd (\textit{lanigeri dominus gregis} 2) and a farmer (\textit{dominus … Astacus horti} 2), which ends in a draw. In Ecl.3 cowherd (1-2) tries to regain his girlfriend’s love, which seems to have gone to a goatherd. Ecl.4 features two brothers Corydon and Amyntas, who tend sheep and goats, singing an amoebaean song dedicated to the emperor in front of their patron Meliboeus. Ecl.5 is a didactic monologue of a shepherd, who also keeps goats (5 and 15), toward his son about raising sheep and goats. Eclogue 6 presents two herdsmen’s conflict, but which animal they herd is uncertain. Their argument starts with Lycidas’ criticism of Astilus’ judgement over a singing match between Alcon (goatherd?) and Nyctilus, after Astilus declared Nyctilus’ win. They ask Mnasyllus to be a judge over their own match, but Mnasyllus declines and the poem ends there. Ecl.7 tells of a cowherd (\textit{tauri}, 3) having returned from his visit to the city while his friends (goatherds? 10) wait for him in the country and with excitement he tells his fellow herdsman about the amphitheatre he observed.

As we see above, some of the herding characters appear as herding cows. I think it is probable that different kinds of herdsmen bear different roles also in some poems of Calpurnius as we will see in Eclogue 3. However, the hierarchy as a norm is not consistent throughout the Eclogues, as we shall discuss later, largely because the herdsmen sometimes seem to be presented as more or less all the same.

The hierarchy seems to be vaguely there in Calpurnius, although it may not be as significant as in Theocritus in understanding the characters. First, we note that the conflict or contrast between different kinds of herdsmen, which we often observed in Idylls, is almost absent, thus we do not clearly see how the hierarchy works in the relationship between characters. Eclogue 3 is an exceptional piece which partly deals with the tension between two kinds of herdsmen and shows a
trace of the hierarchical order between herdsmen. This poem features Iollas and Lycidas, who are cowherds (1-2) and on good terms. Iollas comes in search for his heifer (iuuencam 1), wondering if she mingles with Lycidas’ bulls (tauris 2). Their friendly exchanges seem to show the same kind of harmonious relationship we saw in the cowherds in Idyll 6.

Lycidas confesses that his girlfriend Phyllis left him to love another herdsman Mopsus (8-9). Iollas entrusts the search for the cow to Tityrus (perhaps a subordinate to Iollas or Lycidas) and listens to Lycidas about his suffering and its cause:

en, sibi cum Mopso calamos intexere cera
incipit et puero comitata sub ilice cantat.
haec ego cum uidi, fateor, sic intimus arsi,
ut nihil ulterius tulerim. nam protinus ambas
diduxi tunicas et pectora nuda cecidi.
Alcippen irata petit dixitque: "relicto,
improve, te, Lycida, Mopsum tua Phyllis amabit."

(Ecl.3.26-32)

Lycidas saw his girlfriend making a pipe with Mopsus and beat her out of jealousy. After Iollas’ offer to be a messenger to his angry girlfriend, he rehearses some words of indulgence to Phyllis (indulgere puellae 37). In this cantus (45-95), he tells of his complete surrender along with his advantages against Mopsus.

sum quoque diuitor: certauerit ille tot haedos
pascere quot nostri numerantur uespere tauri.
quid tibi quae nosti referam? scis, optima Phylli,
quam numerosa meis siccutur bucula mulctris
et quam multa suos suspendat ad ubera natos.

220 Here as well as in Idyll 3, the name Tityrus is given to a person who tends the protagonist’s flock. However, we do not necessarily assume a slave-master relationship in this motif in Theocritus, since herding of other person’s flock may be a sign of friendship (e.g. Idyll 7.87-9)
sed mihi nec gracilis sine te fiscella salicto
texitur et nullo tremuere coagula lacte.

(Ecl.3.63-69)

He boasts of himself being richer than Mopsus, who tends kids (haedos 63). There seems a sense of the hierarchy between herdsmen according to the different values of animals. Then Lycidas continues to stress Mopsus’ disadvantage to contrast with his own sincerity, by describing manus:

quod si dura times etiam nunc uerbera, Phylli,
tradimus ecce manus: licet illae uimine torto,
si libet, et lenta post tergum uite domentur,
ut mala nocturni religauit bracchia Mopsi
Tityrus et furem medio suspendit ouili.
accipe, ne dubites, meruit manus utraque poenas.
his tamen, hic isdem manibus tibi saepe palumbes,
saepe etiam leporem decepta matre pauentem
misimus in gremium; per me tibi lilia prima
contigerunt primaeque rosae: uixdum bene florem
degustarat apis, tu cingebare coronis.

(Ecl.3.70-80)

Although it was Lycidas’ hands, manus, that have benefitted Phyllis many times, they still should be bound for having beaten the girl, in the same way as when Mopsus, the thief (74) had his hands caught by Tityrus.

In spite of the hierarchy behind the setting, it is still unclear how this hierarchy influences this erotic fight. Is she ever in love with Mopsus? In the previous description by Lycidas about Phyllis with Mopsus, we do not find in Mopsus a Theocritean goatherd’s typical apparent disadvantage (in appearance, etc.) or complete failure in heterosexual love, such as we saw in the goatherd of Idyll
3. Yet, again, the goatherd would fail. When the poem ends with Iollas’ setting out to see Phyllis as Lycidas’ errand, on Tityrus’ return with the missing heifer, we can expect Iollas’ successful return with the girl. Then, Lycidas the cowherd’s plea with a list of rustic gifts, which seems closely modelled after the helpless and desperate one by the Theocritean goatherd in *Idyll 3* or Polyphemus in 11, would work well here to recover the girl’s love away from a goatherd. Lycidas, then, would maintain his superiority over the goatherd, by never falling into the desperate goatherd’s role of the Theocritean comedy of *Idyll 3*.

In some other poems, the distinction between different kinds of herdsmen is often almost absent, for example, in *Eclogues* 2 and 6, due to the herdsmen’s general treatment as ‘rustics’. This occasional disregard of the hierarchy is seen more significantly in the several representations of Corydon, a possible pastoral mask of Calpurnius: the Corydons of *Eclogues* 1 and 7 are cowherds, and the Corydon of *Eclogue 4* is a shepherd of sheep and goats. Although we do not necessarily have to take these Corydons as identical, there is a common attitude in these characters, which is the ‘divine’ link, similar to what we occasionally saw in Theocritus’ cowherds. The divine link may tell of the existence of the hierarchy-based characterisation of the cowherds (except the case of *Eclogue 4*): the same sort of nobility and a slight distance from rusticity (compared to other kinds of herdsmen) as we found in Theocritean cowherds may apply to those in Calpurnius. Since the cowherds including Corydon in *Eclogue 1* find a mythical or divine link (Faunus and the Golden Age) on a tree, we may suspect that the epiphany of any kind of divine being is hardly described in pastoral unless it is related to cowherds (e.g. Hermes’ visit to Daphnis in *Idyll 1*, Tityrus’ encounter with ‘deus’ in Vergil’s *Eclogue 1*). Also, Corydon the cowherd’s visit to Rome in Calpurnius’ *Eclogue 7* can be interpreted as a version after Vergil’s Tityrus’ to Rome or the Theocritean Aegon’s heroic journey to Olympia. What we may call a divine link in the shepherd (of sheep and goats) Corydon is his wish that his song reach *deus*, the emperor. Corydon of *Eclogue 4*, humble as he is, hopes that his song will go beyond his rustic village and dreams of the imperial court (*forsitan augustas feret haec Meliboeus ad aures. 1.94*), as Corydon of *Ecl.1*, who also wishes Meliboeus would help his song be heard by ‘deus’ (94) does.

---

221 See pages 34-6.
222 See page 53.
This reveals that Calpurnius does not always distinguish shepherd from cowherd as precisely as Theocritus does, as far as the divine favour is concerned. Since Calpurnius often brings the contrast between ‘city’ and ‘country’ to his poems, especially in his encomiastic poems (1, 4 and 7), he emphasises that a cowherd is still a rustic to city-dwellers’ eyes:

outinam nobis non rustica vestis inesset;
vidissem propius mea numina!

(Ecl.7.79-80)

Still, the author’s particular choice of a shepherd of sheep and goats for the protagonist’s occupation certainly has some meanings: a shepherd of sheep and goats, Corydon is associated with rusticity or humbleness of life. In comparison with Theocritus, a shepherd or goatherd character here may not be a comedy with so severe an irony, but more like a symbol of the humble life with which the poet sympathises. When a poet appears as a bucolic character in his own poetry, it is interesting to observe what kind of herdsman he chooses to assume, bearing the hierarchy in mind. In Theocritus’ *Idyll* 7, as long as we take Simichidas as Theocritus himself, it was an ex-cowherd figure that the poet adopted, perhaps in order to show the distance between him and the very rusticity, which is often represented by goatherds, his poetry is yet to reach.223 In Calpurnius’ case, as I wrote briefly above, the role he took in *Eclogue* 4 seems to be a shepherd.

The *Eclogue* features three herdsmen: Corydon, his brother Amyntas and their patron Meliboeus. Although hardly anything is known for certain about Calpurnius’ life, the readers have tried to trace his life from his poetic lines. In this attempt, many have agreed that Corydon, who tells a long auto-biographical story (29-63), is probably a bucolic mask of Calpurnius himself, and some also say that Meliboeus might be Seneca, thus making Calpurnius a Neronian poet.224 The herdsmen Corydon and Amyntas seem to tend sheep (168) as well as goats (166), whereas there is no clear specification of what kind of animal Meliboeus herds. The choice of sheep and goats for the brothers’ animal perhaps implies their rusticity (as bucolic poets) and current humble status. Rusticity, *rusticitas*, is also Corydon’s character in poetry (*nunc mea rusticitas, si non valet arte*

---

223 See page 72-3.
polita / carminis, at certe valet pietate probari 14-15).\textsuperscript{225}

We note Corydon’s humble status when he speaks in praise of the new emperor, whose mercy saved him from giving up singing and leaving the country (\textit{non eadem nobis sunt tempora, non deus idem} 30).

\begin{quote}
opencite{225}
\begin{center}
o mihi quae tereti decurrunt carmina uersu
tunc, Meliboe, sonent si quando montibus istis
dicar habere Larem, si quando nostra uidere
pascua contingat! uellit nam saepius aurem
inuida paupertas et dicit: "ouilia cura!"
at tu, si qua tamen non aspermada putabis,
fer, Meliboe, deo mea carmina: nam tibi fas est
sacra Palatini penetralia uisere Phoebi.
\end{center}
\end{quote}

\begin{center} (Ecl.4.152-159) \end{center}

At the moment, Corydon, a hired worker without any farm of his own (44),\textsuperscript{226} is often urged by poverty (\textit{paupertas}) to direct all his attention to sheepfold (\textit{ouilium}). Still he asks Meliboeus to mediate between Corydon and the emperor (\textit{deus}), wishing the emperor will hear his song. The sheepfold in this poem seems to have a double meaning: the sheepfold in a literal sense, on which the survival of a shepherd’s means of obtaining a living depends, and the sheepfold in poetics, which stands for the humble theme of bucolic poetry.

\begin{quote}
opencite{226}
tum mihi talis eris, qualis qui dulce sonantem
Tityron e siluis dominam deduxit in urbem
ostenditque deos et "spreto" dixit "ouili,
Tityre, rura prius, sed post cantabimus arma."
\end{quote}

\par

\textsuperscript{225} Magnelli 2006: 471 takes Corydon of \textit{Ecl.7} is the same persona as Corydon in \textit{Ecl.4}, so that Corydon’s \textit{rusticitas} is also found in his outlook (\textit{rustica vestera 7.79}) as well as in his poems (4.14-15). However, as we have seen, Corydon of \textit{Ecl.7} seems to tend bulls (3). If we take the meanings of given animals seriously, the two Corydon are not the same person.

\textsuperscript{226} Keene 1887: 114.
The humbleness of the tiny sheepfold, ouile, represents the rusticity, rus, for a poet to sing prior to arma. When the poet takes a shepherd’s or goatherd’s mask in his own poem, he seems to express the humble status in which he currently is (financially in his real life and also as a poet) and from which he wishes to rise, with youthful ambition, so far as to trace the footsteps of Vergil, who is presented here as a legend, Tityrus.

carmina iam dudum, non quae nemorale resultent,
volvimus, o Meliboeae; sed hac, quibus aurea possint
saecula cantari, quibus et deus ipse canatur,
qui populos ubresque regit pacemque togatam.

(Ecl.4.5-8)

quicquid id est, silvestre licet videatur acutis
auribus et nostro tantum memorabile pago;
nunc mea rusticitas, si non valet arte polita
carminis, at certe valeat pietate probari.

(Ecl.4.12-15)

This poem illustrates the rusticity, or humbleness, of the ‘sheepfold’ as a starting point for an epic poet, more clearly than the Idyll 7 does. In Idyll 7, Simichidas tells he was once herding cows and is now an epic poet from town, wishing ambitiously for the recognision by Ptolemy.\(^{227}\) This reveals an important aspect of Calpumius’ Corydon’s idea about the countryside. Perhaps he rejects embracing ‘rusticity’ in himself and aspiring to be someone greater than a mere rustic,\(^{228}\) in some ways unlike Lycidas of Idyll 7, who is intensely rustic, compared to Simichidas. Corydon wishes to sing a song suitable for the new age under the emperor. After admitting that his song is rustic,

\(^{227}\) See page 68.
\(^{228}\) Newlands sees the Corydon in Eclogues 1, 4 and 7 as identical, and these poems demonstrates Corydon’s development as a singer and also his growing detachment in his mind to the country, although he is still a rustic. See Newlands 1987.
lacking of sophistication and art, he asserts that it should still win approval for its loyalty.

Likewise, Corydon of *Eclogue 7* shows a sort of rejection of rusticity in his attitude. He finds sophistication and attraction in the city Rome and its amphitheatre, having left there to home country somehow reluctant (7.13-18). The urban power seems to be invading the pastoral world occasionally in Calpurnius.

In conclusion, the hierarchy works in some of the Calpurnius’ poems to mark some cowherds as nobler, in a similar way as in Theocritus. It also helps shepherd or goatherd represents rusticity or humbleness, but in a less comical way than in some of the *Idylls*. However, the contrast between cowherd and lowlier herdsman is occasionally quite weak, which is a result of the author’s pursuit of describing the opposition of ‘city’ and ‘country’, and humbleness in a more general sense, where the herdsman-figure becomes more or less the same sort of rustic.
3.5 Longus and the Pastoral Hierarchy

In the pastoral romance, *Daphnis and Chloe*, the herdsman-characters are clearly distinguished as either goatherds, shepherds or cowherds, and the hierarchy seems to function in characterising these herdsmen clearly. Longus seems to adopt many bucolic motifs, including the hierarchy, from Theocritus and occasionally alludes to the *Idylls*, although the basic storyline follows that of a ‘foundling story’ with wealthy city-dwelling characters. The characterisation of each person is complex in this novel, as the elements of being high and low in status, urban and rural, are intertwined within some of the characters.

As we have seen earlier in Chapter 1, Longus presents the pastoral hierarchy due to the difference in the value of animals. However, the goatherds, Daphnis and their foster-parents, are depicted as very different in character, since Daphnis is a nobleman by birth. The hierarchy and its influence are most clearly seen in the characters of the genuine goatherds, shepherds and cowherds, as outlined below.

Daphnis’ foster parents, Lamon and Myrtale are the genuine slave goatherds in this novel. They are poor and apparently slaves. In their character, they are not as prominent as Daphnis. First, Lamon does not appear as an independent morally upstanding individual. When Lamon found the abandoned Daphnis, he thought of taking away only the tokens the baby had with him. On his second thought, he decided to take the baby home, because the she-goat taught him ‘philanthropia’ (εἰ μηδὲ αἰγὸς φιλανθρωπίαν μιμήσεται, 1.3.1). It is, however, a good characteristic of his to be teachable when he is encouraged by nature, which the she-goat represents here.

Second, his personality is not very developed as independent in his relationship to his master either. Lamon does not dare to have an intense loyalty, unlike Eumaeus and Philoetius in the *Odyssey*, who always display an absolute devotion to Odysseus even without the master’s presence. Lamon is a meddling slave, who tries to please his master when the master visits him (4.1.2), hoping to be freed in the near future. Besides, his skills in cattle-raising seem inferior to Daphnis’ (4.14). Later, he and his wife are liberated, largely because of their being Daphnis’ foster parents (4.33.2), although Dionysophanes appreciates Lamon’s own works as well to make promise to liberate him in the future (4.13.5).
Third, the uniqueness of the goatherd-couple is rather their ugly appearance and it is stressed repeatedly that Daphnis does not resemble them at all (ἐστι δὲ καλὸς καὶ οὐδὲν έοικὼς σιμῷ γέροντι καὶ μαδώσῃ γυναικί: 3.32.1. and 4.20). The word σιμῷ appears here as well as in *Idyll* 3 to express an ugly, rustic feature of goatherds. Thus, the goatherds seem less prominent or independent in their character and ‘realistically’ ugly in their appearance.

Probably due to the hierarchical order, the shepherds, Dryas and Nape, who raised Chloe, are not as poor as Lamon and Myrtale (3.26.4). Although their ugly appearance is not as emphasized as that of the goatherd-couple (4.30.4) either, their features are more or less the same. In Book 3, Lamon and Dryas try to gratify their cupidity for wealth and higher social status through Daphnis or Chloe’s marriage, making use of these two youths’ high birth. Their personalities are described with limitations. These shepherds and the goatherds mainly function as befitting foster-parents to Daphnis and Chloe, rather than individuals (compared to Daphnis and Chloe). They recognise that the two abandoned children are misplaced in the country and try to promote Daphnis and Chloe to where they should belong, giving the two youths enough education (1.8.1) and hoping their true parents will be found.

A positive aspect of these pastoral characters of goatherds and shepherds is in their relationship to nature and the gods. They are faithful to the gods, like Pan and Dionysus, just as Philetas (cowherd) is. Also, the vigour they gain through their work in fields is appreciated (Οἱ δὲ ἀντείχοντο σκληροὶ γέροντες καὶ χεῖ̂δος ἐκ γεωργικὰς ἔργων ἰσχυρὰς ἔχοντες, καὶ ἠξίουν δικαιολογήσασθαι περὶ τῶν γεγενημένων. 2.14.4), which strongly reminds us of the old fisherman’s strength described in the wooden cup by Theocritus in *Id.* 1.39-44. Also, they represent rustic, innocent, merry moments in the countryside when they dance (2.36, 4.38).

In the novel, there appear three cowherds and some descriptions of them give the contrast between them and the goatherds/shepherds. Philetas the old cowherd is surely someone superior to Daphnis’ foster-parents in his status and also in his character. He appears as a reliable arbitrator in the society (2.15.2) and tells Daphnis and Chloe about Eros’ epiphany to himself, as only Philetas could recognize Eros at his old age (2.5.5). He is a typical pastoral figure, being adept at piping.

229 Eros shows himself also to Lamon and Dryas in their dreams but neither of them could identify him as the love god (1.8). See also page 100.
second only to Pan (ἄλλος ὡς μόνου τοῦ Πάνος δεύτερα συρίσας 2.32.3).

The other two young cowherds are strong rivals to Daphnis because they are wealthier than Daphnis the goatherd. However, at the same time, their characteristics are inferior to those of Daphnis, as they function as ‘countrymen’ in contrast to Daphnis as a nobleman. They are depicted as arrogant and both of them resort to brutish attempts to win Chloe in vain (1.20.1, 4.7 and 4.28). In 1.20, Longus describes Dorcon’s guile as τέχνην ποιμένι πρέπουσαν. The meaning of ‘herdsman-like’ is not very clear. Morgan understands it as both ‘pastoral’ and ‘silly’. This is perhaps related to the general ancient view of herdsmen, which we observed in the tragedies in chapter 1. Later, however, they reconcile with Daphnis by Dorcon’s saving life of Daphnis at his own death (1.29) and Lampis’ playing aulos along with Philetas’ syrinx at Daphnis’ wedding, while the goatherd and the shepherd dance (Φιλητᾶς ἑσύρισε, Λάμπις ηὐλῆσε, Δρύας καὶ Λάμων ὡρχήσαντο, 4.38.3.) Both of the two young cowherds are good at piping. In particular, Dorcon says he taught a tune to Daphnis and has defeated many other cowherds and goatherds in piping (1.29). We understand that the three cowherds are more individualised and add a very Theocritean feature as pipers, compared to the genuine goatherds and the shepherds. They show a sort of rustic sophistication, compared to the the other lowlier herdsmen.

Because of their peculiar birth, Daphnis and Chloe are partly free from the characterisation based on the hierarchy. Although Daphnis is a lowlier and poorer herdsman than the cowherds, he is never portrayed as negative in his inner character. This is related to the fact that he has two sides: a poor goatherd and a nobleman, since he is raised to be a slave goatherd but a nobleman by birth.

Daphnis’ beauty, resembling Dionysus (ὡς ὁμοιὸν τῷ Διονύσῳ τὸ κάλλος 2.2.1.), constantly reminds us of his true identity: his beauty does not befit a rustic (καὶ κάλλος αὐτοῖς ἔξεφαίνετο κρείττον ἀγροικίας. 1.7.1) or a slave (Ἐγὼ δὲ σώματος μὲν ἔρω δοῦλο, κάλλους δὲ ἐλευθέρου. 4.17.4.). His rustic features are favourable and he is likable as a person, ‘ἀγαθὸν νεανίσκον’ (4.18.1.5) and holds pastoral ideals: He is portrayed as a talented piper (e.g. 2.37.3, καλῶ τε ὄντι αἰτόλω καὶ μουσικῶ 4.15.4), efficient in herding, who could double the number of goats (e.g. 3.29, 4.4.3).

231 See pages 14-15.
Since Daphnis’ association to goats is presented positively, he resembles a goat in a positive way, as active as a goat (Σιωπηλὸς ἢν ὁ πρότερον τῶν ἀκρίδων λαλιστερος, ἄργος ὁ περιττότερα τῶν αἰγών κινούμενος, 1.17.4). Also, according to Hunter, Longus chose Daphnis to be raised by goatherds in order that Daphnis would assume goatish features in his sexuality.232 His sexuality is marked as positive along with his youthful innocence.

On the other hand, negative aspects of being a goatherd are not taken into his nature seriously. In Daphnis’ counter charge with Dorcon, he tells that he is not smelly and his goat is as large as Dorcon’s cow (1.16.3). In spite of the fact that also in Daphnis and Chloe the rank smell of a goatherd is recognised as well as his particularly low status (e.g. 4.17.2), it is not considered an important feature of Daphnis, in the idealised portrayal of him. Thus, although Daphnis enjoys being in the country and loves his goats, his character is not very much like a goatherd, simply because he is not a goatherd by birth. He is described as rather a nobleman and superior in his character than a genuine slave goatherd.233

However, the concepts of goats and goatherds in this novel are not simple. As we have seen already, when Daphnis and Dorcon point out goatish features of each other to criticise one another, we find that the goats are still given negative images. However, there seem to be some positive images of goats and goatherds, in the course of idealising rusticity, and owing to the influence of Theocritus. The first point is, as we discussed before, the sexuality of Daphnis as a goatherd (3.13.1-3):

232 Hunter 1983: 22-4. Here, the hierarchy and the affinities between Daphnis and Pan are noted as well.
233 For the idealisation of Daphnis and Chloe, see MacQueen 1990: Chap.10.
The pleasant spring energises all the life in the pasture. There ewe-lambs leap, and he-goats mount she-goats, which has a direct impact on the goatherd. His passion gives us a pure impression, when it is restrained by their innocent lack of knowledge and youthful modesty. Interestingly, the erotic theme in Longus developed different concept of love from that in Theocritus: whereas in the *Idylls*, love often brings only frustration to herdsmen, Longus describes love also as gradually, healthily blooming according to Daphnis and Chloe’s maturity, leading them to the happy ending of consummation on the wedding-night.²³⁴ Here 'song as φάρμακον does not appear. Philetas tells Daphnis and Chloe that the only cure for love is the act of making love (2.7.7).²³⁵

Secondly, there seem to be some positive associations between goats and personas. Philetas, the learned old cowherd, who gives prayers to Pan, is depicted as wearing a goatskin (2.3.1):

Τερπομένοις δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐφίσταται πρεβύτης σισύρας ἐνδεδυμένος, καρβατίνας ὑποδεδεμένος, πήραν ἐξηρτημένος, καὶ τὴν πήραν παλαιάν. Οὔτος πλησίον καθίσας αὐτῷ ὠδέ εἶπε:

This first appearance of Philetas is loosely based on that of Lycidas in *Idyll* 7.²³⁶ Another association of him with goats is that Tityrus, his youngest son, is described being as lively as a goat (καὶ ἥλετο κοῦρα βαδίζων ὥσπερ ἔριφος 2.32.1), just as Daphnis is.

Thirdly, in Lamon’s speech in 2.33.3, an anonymous goatherd from Sicily (Σικελὸς αἵπόλος), who sang for him on Syrinx and Pan, appears, which is a clear allusion to the *Idylls*.²³⁷ Longus’ usage of the images of goat and goatherd is complex because he characterises the named goatherds with limitations, based on the concept of the pastoral hierarchy and, at the same time, under the influence of Theocritus, gives a positive meaning to goats/goatherd, as a symbol of idealised rusticity, pastoral energy and song.

Before closing this chapter, we shall address the issue of ‘country’ in Longus. In spite of the limited characterisation of some herdsmen, the idealisation of ‘countryside’ is more clearly seen in Longus than in Theocritus. For example, the goats taken good care of by Daphnis are rather

²³⁴ Morgan 2004: 6. However, Daphnis does not reveal Lycaenion’s instruction in sex to Chloe. For the gender roles of Daphnis and Chloe, see Morgan 2004: 12.
²³⁵ See also Di Marco 2006: 484 in Fantuzzi-Papanghelis 2006: 482.
romanticised as being great and sacred, ἱερὰν ἀγέλην (4.4.5). They are even considered as gods by Daphnis and Chloe, τὰς ἁγίας καὶ τὰ πρόβατα ποιμένων καὶ αἰπόλων ἰδίους θεούς (2.39.6) and appear as symbols of nature. Daphnis and Chloe’s mental attachment to the country life also adds to the non-ironical, idealised view of the countryside.
Conclusion

The herdsman is a unique being who holds various metaphorical meanings in literature. Before Theocritus, herdsmen occasionally appeared in poetry and the early poets suggested to later poets several ways of presenting literary herdsmen. They were associated with peace and vulnerability as humans in the *Iliad*,238 peace, order and justice in the *Odyssey*,239 functioning as intermediaries between beasts and gods as well as between human and nature, rusticity and poetic inspiration in the *Theogony*,240 eroticism (anti-heroism) and cunningness in the *Homeric Hymns*241 and wildness and ‘otherness’ in some tragedies.242

In the expansion of the subjects treated in hexameters in the Hellenistic age, herdsmen became Theocritus’ protagonists in his bucolic poetry. Some images of the earlier herdsmen are taken into Theocritus’ *Idylls*, after being partly modified, or sometimes radically changed, to make new types of characters in hexameters.

In shaping herdsman-characters, we observe a rule concerning their different status, as early as in the *Odyssey*: the concept of the so-called pastoral hierarchy seems to have been rooted in characterising herdsmen occasionally in Greek literature, and the hierarchical order, which places goatherd as the lowliest, shepherd as next and cowherd as the highest, seems to be derived from the different values of the animals they herd,243 and as far as goatherds are concerned, the negative images the goat might have had and negative side-effects which goat-herding could bring about (e.g. smell) seem to have affected the herdsmen’s low status.244

This status difference seems to result in the different characteristics of different kinds of herdsmen in the *Odyssey*, in which the goatherd is described as negative, whereas the blue-blooded swineherd and the cowherd are good and faithful slaves, who deserve a favourable treatment from their master (*Od*.21.203-230).245 Likewise, in many literary works before Theocritus, it seems cowherds are depicted as relatively positive, whereas we do not find positively marked goatherds

---

238 See pages 8-10.
239 See pages 10-12.
241 See pages 13-14.
243 See page 5.
244 See page 6.
245 See pages 16-20.
and shepherds are in between these two categories.\footnote{246}

In the Theocritean corpus, the distinction between different kinds of herdsmen is very clear, as far as the main herdsmen-characters are concerned. Theocritus specifies which type of herdsman, not only to add ‘reality’ to the setting the character is put into, but also to help each of the herdsmen take on different characteristics, according to the difference in occupation and status. Although Theocritus does not explain it to his readers clearly, we find several lines in the *Idylls* which imply the idea of the hierarchy between the herdsmen (e.g. ἤνθον τοὶ βοῦντα, τοὶ ποιμένες, ὑπόλοι ἤνθον *Id.*1.80)\footnote{247}. The hierarchy is certainly at the back of Theocritus’ characterisation of his herdsmen. Thus, we have explored some typical features each type of herdsmen represents, partly based on the idea of the hierarchy.

The goatherds’ lowliness is indicated in their social status and rustic guise. As for their status, Comatas in *Idyll* 5 seems to be a slave, and the legendary Comatas in *Idyll* 7 also had a master to serve, although the latter may not be a slave but a hired man\footnote{248}. We find goatherd- low status association elsewhere, as the unnamed goatherd in *Idyll* 3, for example, deals with some ‘realistic’ working-class people (e.g. ἤ Μέρμνων ἐριθακὶς ἤ μελανόχρως 35)\footnote{249}.

In many of the *Idylls*, the goatherds’ humble and rustic guise often indicates their relatively lower status than the other types of herdsmen. The visible indicators of their lowly status are, for example, their smell, bare feet and goatskin as humble attributes\footnote{250}. Besides their possessions, we find some physical features to mark a goatherd particularly rustic (e.g. προγένειος 3.9)\footnote{251}.

The goatherds are often described as lowly and rustic also in nature, behaviour and speeches, which is not contradictory to their low status in the hierarchy. The goatherd in *Idyll* 4 is, for example, loud, emotional, a comical character, compared to his cowherd-friend Corydon, who is calm and more sophisticated\footnote{252}.

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
\item 246 See pages 20-1.
\item 247 See page 22.
\item 248 See page 26.
\item 249 See page 28.
\item 250 See pages 26-7.
\item 251 See pages 27-8.
\item 252 See pages 29-32.
\end{itemize}
Here, the exaggerated comment on cows by Battus is refuted by Corydon’s fact-based realistic speech. A theft motif appears in his speech as well as in that between the goatherd and shepherd in *Idyll 5* to present these characters as lowly and coarse.\(^{253}\)

One important aspect of the goatherds is their sexual desire. Theocritus describes love as almost always frustrating and disturbing the state of mind and this is expressed well through a goatherd,\(^{254}\) when he suffers from love, although the sexual side of love or the character’s rustic way is focused often, so that even his agonising pain appears as comical.\(^{255}\)

In case of Comatas in *Idyll 5*, he is a sexually vigorous character, whose coarse passion is described to duplicate that of a he-goat. Here we find an association of goatherds to goats in rusticity or wildness.\(^{256}\)

The rusticity of the goatherds works to characterise the pastoral genre as unique, with an
often lowly and comical tone. Theocritus’ view towards goatish lowliness is complex, sometimes ironic from the position of an educated city-dweller.\textsuperscript{257} However, one of the most interesting things about Theocritus’ characterising of herdsmen with the hierarchy is that he occasionally changes the way the rule of the hierarchy is applied to his characters; the goatherds are not always simply lowly. The highly intertextual nature of Hellenistic poetry encourages him to make allusions to earlier literature, and even shows some attempts to contradict the tradition. When Comatas wins over the shepherd, we are tempted to take this as a playful challenge by Theocritus to Homer, in a way of describing a slave goatherd:\textsuperscript{258}

οὗτος ὁ λευκίτας ὁ κορυπτίλος, εἰ τιν' ὀχευσε
τὰν αἰγὸν, φλασσὼ τυ, πρὶν ἡ ἐμὲ καλλιερήσαι
tας Νύμφας τὰν ἀμνὸν. ὃ δ' αὖ πάλιν. ἀλλὰ γενοίμαν,
αἰ μὴ τυ φλάσσαιμι, Μελάνθιος ἀντὶ Κομάτα.

(Id.5.147-150)

Theocritus emphasises the difference between Melandius and his goatherd, the latter of whom is lowly, but eloquent enough to assert himself as a new protagonist of an epic poem.

Theocritus makes another allusion to Homer, in describing Lycidas, another goatherd. Theocritus duplicates his own goatherd’s appearance with that of Homeric goatherd/Athena in the \textit{Odyssey}\.\textsuperscript{259} This implies that Theocritus deliberately chooses goatherds to fashion them differently from the Homeric one, which leads to the difference of his poetics from that of Homer.

The cowherds, ‘rustics’ as they still are, appear nobler than the goatherds, and sometimes are described as heroic. The legendary cowherd, Daphnis, is commemorated in Thrys’ song in \textit{Idyll} 1, where Daphnis shows a Hippolytus-like sense of chastity and tenacious resistance to Eros, which leads him to death but to stand out as the only human who never gives up struggle with the powerful god, and marks himself and the Golden Age unity between herdsmen and nature/gods as

\begin{footnotesize}
257 See page 38.
258 See pages 39-45.
259 See pages 46-7.
\end{footnotesize}
something rooted firmly in the distant and irretrievable past, to be sung by later herdsmen with admiration.²⁶⁰

λήγετε βουκολικὰς, Μοῖσαι, ἵτε λήγετ' ἀοιδὰς.
νῦν ἵνα μὲν φορέοιτε βάτοι, φορέοιτε δ' ἀκανθαι,
ἀ δὲ καλὰ νάρκισσος ἐπ' ἄρκευθοισι κομάσαι,
pάντα δ' ἀναλλα γένοιτο, καὶ ἀ πίτυς δῖς ἡμέρας ἐνείκαι,
Δάφνις ἐπεὶ θνάσκει, καὶ τὰς κύνας ᾠλαιρος ἑλκοι,
kῆς ὅρεων τοι σκῶπες ἀγιός γαρόσαιντο.'

(Id.1.131-136)

The intensity of Daphnis’ love let Priapus compare him to a goatherd. However, Daphnis’ complicated attitude to love, or his attempt to be free from sexual desire, contrasts with a goatherd’s simple wish, as the goatherd longs for a sexual indulgence he never seems to reach (1.88).²⁶¹

The Daphnis of *Idyll* 6 does not have this heroic status, but shows an ideal, harmonious relationship to his fellow-cowherd Damoetas.²⁶² This contrasts with the argumentative relationship in *Idyll* 5 between the goatherd and shepherd, which is a result of their lowliness brought about largely owing to their low social status as slaves.²⁶³ This Daphnis functions as a ‘real-life’ or mundane version of the legendary Daphnis, and retains a part of his predecessor’s pastoral ideal of harmony and singing talent.

Theocritean shepherds do not seem to have one particular characteristic to distinguish them from the other types of herdsmen. Rather, they are placed at the mid-point of the goatherds and the cowherds, and can be described as similar to either type of the herdsmen: Thyrsis, who sings on Daphnis, may be understood as a similar singer to, or a successor of, the legendary cowherd.²⁶⁴ Lacon is perhaps categorised as similar to Comatas in *Idyll* 5, with his aggressive attitude and

²⁶⁰ See page 53.
²⁶¹ See page 52.
²⁶² See page 54.
²⁶³ See page 29.
²⁶⁴ See note 144.
'coarse' homosexual inclination.\textsuperscript{265}

The different characteristics of herdsmen deliver different aspects/messages of the \textit{Idylls}. Usually the goatherds more explicitly exhibit the motifs bucolic poetry has come to encompass as a new genre: the manners and habits of lowly people and their rusticity. They serve primarily for urban readers’ derisive laughter. When the goatherd in \textit{Idyll} 3 serenades his beloved in κῶμος, his failure consequently sets down his rustic manners far apart from urban, more sophisticated manners.\textsuperscript{266} Also, the herdsmen’s manner is opposed to more traditional, heroic motifs, which are more commonly seen in the earlier literature of epic and tragedy.\textsuperscript{267} In both cases of contra-urban and contra-heroic context, the goatherds, rather than cowherds, function well.

In order to analyse their rusticity and \textit{aepolic} or intensely pastoral nature, we directed much of our attention to the goatherds in this thesis. In its course, we discussed some goatherds in relation to Theocritus’ poetics. Lycidas, a mysterious goatherd, embodies two things: a down-to-earth goatherd-character in the bucolic picture and ‘the bucolic poetry’ itself with his intense bucolicism in the frame of the \textit{Idyll}.\textsuperscript{268} Here, rusticity is not the target of readers’ laughter, but is elevated to represent the bucolic ideal, closeness or harmony with nature. A goatherd as the symbol of rusticity and of bucolicism is seen also in \textit{Idyll} 1, where an anonymous goatherd describes an ivy-cup, which constitutes a bucolic version of \textit{ecphrasis}.\textsuperscript{269}

In his programmatic expression of his poetics, Theocritus often employed a pair of ‘one cowherd and one goatherd’ characters. There, the goatherds came to bear Theocritean most radical messages to assert the bucolic genre as a new kind of epic. At the same time, the cowherds’ nobility helps to locate the new pastoral within the wider current of the epic tradition.\textsuperscript{270} Theocritean pastoral poetics are systematically made of these two sides, \textit{aepolic} and \textit{bucolic}. Thus, we conclude that the study of the hierarchy and its influence on the characters certainly have served to our deeper understanding of the characterisations and also of Theocritus’ presentation of his pastoral poetics.

\textsuperscript{265} See page 33.
\textsuperscript{266} See page 38.
\textsuperscript{267} See pages 38-9.
\textsuperscript{268} See pages 70-1.
\textsuperscript{269} See pages 64-6.
\textsuperscript{270} See pages 64-7.
Theocritus laid much of the basis for the development of the bucolic genre in European literature. However, Theocritean bucolic is something in the process of creation and offers later bucolic poets a range of possibilities, rather than certainties. The hierarchy as a pastoral rule is inherited by some of the later poets, and the way the rule is applied differs in each poet. Generally, however, the hierarchical order seems to have become less prominent in characterising herdsmen than in Theocritus.

In the pseudo-Theocritean corpus, the distinction between different kinds of herdsmen (goatherd, shepherd, or cowherd) starts to become blurred (e.g. Menalca in *Idylls* 8 and 9 keeps both sheep and goats: 8.49-50, 9.16-17).\(^{271}\) Likewise in Vergil, the distinction is often very obscure, since many of the herdsmen appear as herding more than one kind of animal and the animals to herd are not even named for some herdsmen, so that the hierarchy or its distinctions, for example in *Eclogues* 3 and 5, can not be so important in understanding the characters as in Theocritus.\(^{272}\)

Moreover, we notice that the hierarchy is ignored in some authors’ works. In Moschus and Bion, the hierarchy is almost absent in the characters, largely because the herdsmen appear to represent ‘rustics’ with their romantic association with rural ease or nostalgia, or ‘passionate lovers’ (like Theocritean herdsmen), and being a cowherd or goatherd does not give them any particular difference in the features,\(^{273}\) although Bion 10 may be an exception, where the author depicts the character as a cowherd, due to the cowherd’s nobility, divine link or the bucolic metaphor (if the character is a pastoral mask of the author himself).\(^{274}\)

We also have investigated some other poems where the hierarchy seems to work to characterise the herdsmen. For example, *Idylls* 8 and 9 seem to present Daphnis the cowherd as nobler and Menalca more down-to-earth.\(^{275}\) Also, in case of *Idyll* 20 and 27, the cowherd-characters are idealised and associated with eloquence and intelligence, thus their noble characterisation is not inconsistent to that in Theocritus.\(^{276}\)

Also in Calpurnius, we find a use of the hierarchy in characterisation in *Eclogue* 3, where a

\(^{271}\) See pages 78-9.
\(^{272}\) See page 92.
\(^{273}\) See pages 87-8.
\(^{274}\) See page 88-9.
\(^{275}\) See pages 78-82.
\(^{276}\) See pages 82-6.
cowherd tries to regain his girlfriend’s love from a goatherd. The cowherd seems to maintain his superiority over the goatherd and this is perhaps derived from the hierarchical order between the herdsmen, because the cowherd never falls into the role of a Theocritean desperate goatherd-lover’s role.277

Perhaps Longus’ Daphnis and Chloe is one of the works whose characterisation of the herdsmen reflects the idea of the hierarchy most closely after Theocritus. We find the hierarchical order between the goatherds (Daphnis’ foster-parents),278 shepherds (Chloe’s foster-parents)279 and the cowherds (Philetas and the two youths)280 in their status and wealth, as well as in their appearance and their characters and abilities. The goatherds are less developed as individual characters and presents rusticity (e.g. ugly feature and less independent nature) more clearly than the other types of herdsmen. The cowherds are, on the other hand, more ideally Theocritean characters, so as to play pipes. Philetas is especially marked positive, sophisticated and intelligent.

In this novel, where the ‘urban’ and ‘rural’ elements intertwine in some of the characters, Daphnis is depicted as ‘unusually’ beautiful goatherd, because of his noble birth.281 The reasons of his being raised by the goatherds are probably to illustrate his sexuality,282 and also to create a gap between his true identity and humble rural life.283 However, the rusticity and lowliness in Longus is not all negative, since the romanticising and idealisation of the country in the novel seems to have much advanced since Theocritus. The goatherds and shepherds also hold positive characters, in their close relationship to nature and the gods.284 In addition to this, what we find most interesting are some positive goats/goatherds images in Longus, probably due to the influence of Theocritus (e.g. Philetas’ goat-skin and the anonymous goatherd-singer).285

As above, we found some cowherd-characters associated with nobility, and some goatherds, although less in number, with rusticity in several poets, which was not inconsistent to the Theocritean depictions based on the hierarchy. After Theocritus, however, there is generally the

---

277 See pages 98-100.
278 See pages 105-6.
279 See page 106.
280 See pages 106-7.
281 See pages 107-8.
283 See page 18.
284 See page 106.
lack of the contrast or conflict between different kinds of herdsmen and Theocritean goatish comedy, which results in the less ironical view towards the rusticity of the herdsmen and often contributes to the general, romanticised images of herdsmen and the country.²⁸⁶

Besides, it is sometimes not very clear whether the poets strongly intended to present the hierarchy or if it is the result of their taking over some elements from Theocritus, save for cases such as the *Epitaph for Bion* and *Daphnis and Chloe*, in both of which it is almost certain that the authors chose the characters’ occupation (cowherd, shepherd or goatherd) carefully. In *Epitaph for Bion*, Bion appears as a cowherd, probably in order to let Bion take in Daphnis-like nobility and his harmony with nature. Also Bion duplicates the image of the cowherd for his heroism in his death and also for the associations with epic: Bion has become a new Homer and his poems are understood as a new kind of epic.²⁸⁷

In Theocritus, the hierarchy functioned clearly not only for the characterisation of the herdsmen, but also for the poet’s presentation of his poetics. Contrary to that, the uses of the hierarchy by the later poets often do not seem to bear the depth in its meaning concerning their poetics, or their idea about the pastoral genre, except in some cases including *Idyll* 20, Vergil’s *Eclogue* 1 and Calpurnius’ *Eclogue* 4.

*Idyll* 20 employs a noble, intelligent cowherd with idealised rusticity, to assert effectively the autonomy of the pastoral genre and the pride of a rustic strongly against ‘city’.²⁸⁸

In *Eclogue* 1, Vergil seems to intend the use of the hierarchy between the herdsmen Tityrus and Meliboeus. Tityrus, who keep sheep and cows, marched to Rome to meet *deus* and kept his right to stay in the country, whereas Meliboeus the goatherd is forced to leave the country, never having left it before. By presenting Meliboeus as a goatherd with his deep attachment to the rural life, Vergil highlights the tragedy of a rustic and the irony of an innocent down-to-earth life being lost because of the urban threat.²⁸⁹

In *Eclogue* 4 by Calpurnius, we may read the poet’s ideas about his life as a poet more explicitly than others, and the hierarchy seems to work occasionally there, but not consistently.

---
²⁸⁶ See page 91.
²⁸⁷ See page 91.
²⁸⁸ See pages 84-5.
²⁸⁹ See page 96.
Corydon of *Eclogue* 4 is a shepherd of sheep and goats, which allows him to bear the rusticity.\(^{290}\) He is probably an alter-ego of Calpurnius and the humbleness of the goatherd/shepherd-character and his sheepfold (*ouilium*) manifests the poet’s current humble status, financially and also socially as a poet.\(^{291}\) However, there is also disregard to the hierarchy, or to the difference between herdsmen in Calpurnius, as he occasionally treat the herdsmen almost all the same rustics: Corydon, a humble shepherd as he is, who seeks the emperor’s favour, as well as the cowherd Corydon of *Ecl*.1 does. He may reject to embrace the rusticity (rural life and his fame only within the village) and wants to be acknowledged by the emperor, almost in the same way as the ex-cowherd Simichidas (the pastoral mask of Theocritus) of *Idyll* 7 does.\(^{292}\)

In our survey of the hierarchy in some post-Theocritean pastoral, their various uses of the hierarchy and its occasional absence tell us of the developments of the pastoral genre into diversity. Even the absence of the hierarchy itself helps us understand where the authors’ literary purposes are directed by means of the pastoral (e.g. ‘city’ and ‘country’ opposition in Calpurnius). Still, it is also probably appropriate to see some strong Theocritean influence in some significant descriptions of the goatherds, especially in Meliboeus of Vergil’s *Eclogue* 1 and the anonymous goatherds in *Idyll* 8 and Longus: the authors seem to have seen the very rusticity, the Theocritean intense bucolicism, in these goatherd-characters, and in the case of the unnamed goatherds, use their image as a tribute to Theocritus. We see that their literary meanings have been changed largely by Theocritus from their being completely ‘other’ to become figures to be sympathised with.

\(^{290}\) See page 101.  
\(^{291}\) See pages 102-3.  
\(^{292}\) See pages 100-1.
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