

ALLEGORY OF THE SELF:
Boccaccio's *Buccolicum carmen*



Adir de Oliveira Fonseca Junior
Wolfson College
University of Oxford
Classical Languages and Literature

A thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Trinity 2021

Abstract

This thesis sets out to provide an interdisciplinary study of four of the sixteen hexameter poems in Giovanni Boccaccio's pastoral *Buccolicum carmen* (ca. 1362/63). It argues that the *Buccolicum* is a coherent book of poetry that displays an allegory of Boccaccio's autofictional self, constructed through different bucolic characters and themes which symbolise different fragments of Boccaccio, as well as different steps in his literary and ethical ascent. Consequently, it intends to dispel the unhelpful dichotomy between autobiography and fiction which has dominated most commentaries and studies on the *Buccolicum*. It also investigates the place of the *Buccolicum* (Boccaccio's only book of Latin poetry) in his literary career. Reflecting Boccaccio's theoretical approach towards pagan literature, developed especially in the *Genealogie deorum gentilium* (ca. 1359–74), the *Buccolicum* engages with the classical tradition, and particularly with Virgil's *Eclogues*, to support an autofictional narrative of conversion. In the wake of Petrarch's own *Bucolicum carmen*, Boccaccio presents the pastoral world as the earthly world of temporary pleasures, sin and sorrow. In sum, the present study aims to provide a thorough examination of a selection of four of Boccaccio's eclogues, each focusing on one key theme of the *Buccolicum* (love, politics, poetry, and religion). At the same time, this thesis scrutinizes the processes of reception, mediation and allusion to classical texts which shed light on Boccaccio's bucolic autofiction, as well as on the classical texts themselves.

Keywords: Giovanni Boccaccio; *Buccolicum carmen*; intertextuality; autofiction.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to many people who have contributed, in one way or another, to the writing of this thesis, as well as to my academic trajectory so far. I would like first and foremost to thank both of my supervisors, Prof. Stephen Harrison and Prof. Simon Gilson, for their unstinting support throughout the whole of my DPhil, but even more so during the difficult times of the COVID-19 pandemic. It is no exaggeration to say that, without Prof. Stephen Harrison's continuous guidance and reassurance since 2015, I would never have been able to get into Oxford. I also thank him for his valuable comments, suggestions and corrections on the various stages of this work – not to mention his incredible patience in dealing with Brazilian bureaucracy! To Prof. Simon Gilson, I acknowledge his ever-enriching lessons on Italian literature and culture, his meticulous readings of my texts, his generous advice and kindness.

To this list of special mentors, I would like to add the names of Prof. Bianca Morganti and Prof. Isabella Cardoso, my former tutors, from the Federal University of São Paulo and the University of Campinas, respectively. To Prof. Bianca Morganti, I owe a great debt for having first shown me the path to the Greek and Latin authors. To Prof. Isabella Cardoso, I am thankful for always encouraging me to think “big” but critically. Without both of them also, this DPhil would not have been possible; and I would certainly be in a very different place right now.

I owe special thanks to Prof. Martin McLaughlin and Prof. Gesine Manuwald for agreeing to be the examiners of this work, and for their very helpful questions, comments and suggestions during the viva. I am also grateful to Prof. Richard Rutherford, Dr. Matthew Robinson, Prof. Fiona Macintosh, and Dra. Kalina Allendorf, for their constructive criticism during my Transfer and Confirmation of Status. Thanks to Dr. Jason Houston and Dr. Samuel Huskey, for kindly sending me their forthcoming translation of Boccaccio's *Buccolicum carmen*, and for giving me permission to cite it in this thesis. Thanks to Prof. Talita Janine

Juliani, for being the sweetest Boccaccian interlocutor I could have. Thanks to Prof. Paulo Sérgio de Vasconcellos (*magister optimus*), Prof. Gregory Hutchinson, Dr. Michael Malone-Lee, the staff of the Taylorian Library, and my Italian teachers at Oxford, Tania Batelli-Kneale and Vilma de Gasperin.

Moreover, I would like to thank all my friends and colleagues who have made my period in Oxford a more enriching (and less lonely) experience. Thanks, Fabiana Silveira (Fabi), for being such a supportive friend, and for always being there for me whenever I was feeling lost, anxious or inadequate. Thanks, Wesley and Tamy Corrêa, for making me feel at home whenever (and wherever) I am with you. Thanks, Eduardo Queirós, for the companionship and peer-support in my first years of Oxford. Thanks, Alex Mazzanti, Tadeu Andrade, Camilla Paulino, Caio Aguida, and José Alfaro, for the friendship mainly, but also for making me proud of being a Latin American classicist. Thanks, Andrzej Stuart-Thompson and Sebastian Dale, for unlocking the doors of what seemed to me an impenetrable world (a.k.a. English cultural and social life), as well as for your generous help with proofreading. Thanks, Carla Faria, Mari Sauka, Gustavo Venâncio, Tomi Plesa, Ivan Ferreira, Bru Corsatto, Gui Miralha, Stefano Poma, Laura Loporcaro, Pedro Ambra... for all the love, companionship, and support.

Finally, I would like to thank my family *lato sensu*, but especially my “sister-cousin” Jéssica, my brother Alex, and my parents Adir and Leia, who have always given me what they did not have.

This research was funded by the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES/Brazil – Full PhD Abroad, Grant 88881.128259/2016-01).

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
CHAPTER 1: <i>Galla</i>	65
CHAPTER 2: <i>Alcestus</i>	111
CHAPTER 3: <i>Saphos</i>	157
CHAPTER 4: <i>Phylostropos</i>	222
CONCLUSION	284
INDEX OF INTERTEXTS	294
BIBLIOGRAPHY	324

INTRODUCTION

Though now best known for his vernacular works, especially for his *Decameron* (1349–51/53; rev. 1370–1), Giovanni Boccaccio (Certaldo/Florence, 1313 – Certaldo, 1375) also has a prolific output in Latin. Regarded as one of Italy’s “three crowns” (“tre corone”), along with Dante Alighieri (1265–1321) and Francesco Petrarca (better known in English as Petrarch, 1304–74), Boccaccio occupies a prominent place in the history of European literature and scholarship. Among his main contributions is the consolidation (some would say “invention”) of certain modern prose genres, from the psychological novel to the short story. Moreover, his fifteen-book encyclopaedia on the ancient gods, the *Genealogie deorum gentilium* (ca. 1359–74), may be considered one of the first major works of modern scholarship; its books fourteen and fifteen, in particular, form the basis for many and influential Renaissance and Romantic defences of poetry. Yet, though still largely underestimated when compared to his other works, the *Buccolicum carmen* (ca. 1362–63) is probably Boccaccio’s most significant *opus* in terms of his self-fashioned career and life. Intertextually engaging with several classical and Christian models (especially with the eclogues of Virgil, Dante, and Petrarch), Boccaccio’s *Buccolicum* can be singled out for its autofictional thread, which provided a model for subsequent bucolic works, such as Mantuan’s *Adulescentia* (1498), and Edmund Spenser’s *The Shepheardes Calender* (1579).¹

Over the course of its fifteen (plus one) eclogues, the *Buccolicum carmen* displays Boccaccio’s autofictional evolution from an infatuated youth into a politically experienced man, and then from an aspiring poet into a devout Christian. This ascending pattern reflects a

¹ See Spenser, *The Shepheardes Calender* (ed. Oram 1989: 18) “As young birdes that be newly crept out of the nest, by little first to prove theyr tender wyngs, before they make a greater flyght. So flew Theocritus ... Virgile ... Mantuane ... so Petrarque. So Boccacce; so Marot, Sanazarus, and also divers other excellent both Italian and French Poetes, whose foting this Author every where followeth” – see Combs-Schilling (2019: 94). On the history of the bucolic genre in Europe, see Patterson (1988), and Ford & Taylor (2006: 5-16).

moral scheme which was widely diffused throughout Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, both in the form of allegorical exegeses and biographies. Boccaccio was familiar with both these genres. He had access to (and often quoted from) the manuscripts of Fulgentius' *Expositio virgilianae continentiae* (written in the late fifth or early sixth century CE), and of the commentary on the first six books of the *Aeneid* commonly attributed to Bernard Silvestris (twelfth century). He possessed a copy of the Suetonian-Donatan *Vita Virgilii*, while he himself wrote biographies on Dante, Petrarch, and Peter Damian.²

Moreover, as an allegorical narrative of self-transformation and progress, Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* adopts a psychological framework that recalls Prudentius' *Psychomachia*, Alan of Lille's *Anticlaudianus*, and Dante's *Commedia*.³ Boccaccio was well acquainted with these three poems; and, before the *Buccolicum*, he explicitly engaged with this tradition in a vernacular work, the *Amorosa visione* (1342–43). Presenting itself as a dream vision (first set in a wasteland, and then inside a labyrinthine castle), the *Amorosa visione* allegorically depicted a journey full of deviations and distractions which impeded the Boccaccian pilgrim from pursuing heaven and God.⁴

While Boccaccio was innovative in the way he incorporated these patterns into his own eclogues, the relationship between the bucolic genre and allegory had been already cemented in the fifth century by Maurus Servius Honoratus, and later by medieval authors who exercised themselves in the sub-genre of *conflictus*. On the one hand, Servius' allegorical approach to Virgil's works made them more palatable to the Christian sensibility. For instance, Servius

² See Houston (2010: 140-7), Osgood (1956: 27-36), and Kirkham (1992: 233-53). On Boccaccio's personal "little library" (his so-called *parva libraria*), see Mazza (1996: 1-74).

³ Drawing on the ancient Greek words for "soul" (ψυχή) and "battle" (μάχη), Prudentius' *Psychomachia* (ca. 405 CE) was an early-Christian Latin poem which depicted an epic-style combat between animated virtues and vices. Prudentius was part of the medieval grammar school curriculum; and even though Boccaccio did not attend such a school (see below), his library collection contained a copy of Prudentius' *Psychomachia*, as well as of Alan of Lille's *Anticlaudianus* (1181–4 CE), which was a prestigious Christian epic deeply influenced by Prudentius. On the possible issues involved in the classification of Prudentius' *Psychomachia* as "an Early-Christian allegory", see Smith (1976: 3-28). On the Latin authors in Italian schoolrooms, see Black (2001: 200-25). On the *Anticlaudianus*, see Wetherbee (2013: xxviii-xxxvii).

⁴ Branca (in Hollander, 1986: xix).

interpreted Virgil's *Eclogue* 2 (which was markedly homoerotic) as an allegory of Virgil's devotion to Augustus.⁵ On the other hand, the medieval *conflictus* (or "tenzone") was a literary form which adopted the dialogical structure and themes associated with the bucolic genre to debate polemical topics allegorically.⁶ A well-known example of *conflictus* is the eleventh-century (or perhaps earlier) *Ecloga Theoduli*. Partly modelled on Virgil's *Eclogue* 7, the *Ecloga Theoduli* presented a singing contest between the shepherd Pseustis ("Liar"), who sang of Greek myths, and the shepherdess Alithia ("Truth"), who responded with similar stories from the Old Testament.⁷ Unsurprisingly, at the end of the poem, Phronesis ("Prudence") appoints Alithia as the winner. Following a similar tradition, two of Boccaccio's earliest fictional works in the vernacular, the *Caccia di Diana* (1338) and the *Comedia delle ninfe fiorentine* (alternatively called the *Ameto*, 1341–42), also mixed allegorical and bucolic elements, creating what has been often labelled by critics as "pastoral allegories".⁸

Besides employing allegory as a literary device in most (if not all) of his own fictional works, Boccaccio also developed a theoretical framework which explained and validated the use of allegory in poetry. In his *Trattatello in laude di Dante*, for instance, Boccaccio took on the task of convincing his readers (among whom was Petrarch) that Dante's *Commedia* was an honourable book, compatible with the most important works of literature. Establishing a direct link between poetry and theology, Boccaccio presented the *Commedia* as an allegorical fiction with Christian truths.⁹ Then, approximately twenty years after the first redaction of the *Trattatello*, Boccaccio employed similar arguments in his public lectures on Dante's

⁵ See Serv. *ad Buc.* 2.1: *Corydonis in persona Vergilius intellegitur, Caesar Alexis in persona inducitur* – discussion in Guy-Bray (2002: 42–8), and Wilson-Okamura (2010: 115).

⁶ See Lorenzini (2011: 4), and Stotz (1999: 165–87).

⁷ See Herren (2007: 199–230). Boccaccio certainly had access to Servius' commentary; and he may well have read both the *Ecloga Theoduli* and its late eleventh-century commentary by Bernard of Utrecht, which were very common school texts also – see Gianferrari (2017); and "Genre" below.

⁸ On the *Caccia*, see, for instance, Hollander (1977: 20), and Cassell & Kirkham (1991), and Saiber (2014: 109–17). On the *Comedia delle ninfe*, see, for instance, Velli (1977: 67–80), Smarr (2002: 237–54), and Tylus (2014: 133–144).

⁹ *Tratt.* 154: "la teologia niun'altra cosa è che una poesia di Dio". See also *Tratt.* 177 and 179; *Gen.* 14.7.1–7; *Esp., Acc.* 17–22 and 30–31 – discussion in Kriesel (2019: 26–31).

Commedia, commissioned by the City of Florence, and subsequently published as the *Esposizioni sopra la Commedia di Dante* (1373–74). In this exegetical work, Boccaccio proposed two complementary readings of the *Commedia*: a literal reading (“esposizione litterale”) and, wherever pertinent, an allegorical one (“esposizione allegorica”).¹⁰

Whereas in the *Trattatello* and *Esposizioni* Boccaccio focused particularly on Dante’s *Commedia*, in the *Genealogie* he proposed to outline a more general theory about allegory and literature. Thus, in *Genealogie* 1, Boccaccio offered an etymological definition of “allegory”, explaining that the term derived from the Greek word ἄλλος, meaning “other” or “different”, and thereby indicating anything that diverged from its historical or literal sense.¹¹ Subsequently, in *Genealogy* 14, Boccaccio discussed the different concepts of *fabula*, considering their different relationships with allegory. Resorting to Isidore of Seville (*Etymologiae* 1.40.6), Boccaccio defined *fabula* as an argument that illustrated or demonstrated something through the lens of fiction.¹² Then, drawing on Macrobius’ (fl. ca. 400) commentary on the “Dream of Scipio” (recounted in Book 6 of Cicero’s *De re publica*), Boccaccio distinguished between four types of *fabula*: 1) the *fabula* as a fantastic story which apparently bore no resemblance to reality, yet which still conveyed some truthful and meaningful ideas, as in the case of Aesop’s *Fables*; 2) the *fabula* as a mixture of fiction and reality, as in some myths from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*; 3) the *fabula* as a mixture of fiction and history, as in the epic poems of Homer and Virgil; and 4) the *fabula* as a made-up tale which contained nothing

¹⁰ *Espos.* Accessus 7: “per ciò che altro soggetto è quello del senso litterale e altro quello del senso allegorico, li quali nel presente libro amenduni sono, sì come manifestamente aparirà nel processo” – see discussion in Papio (2009: 3–35). Since Boccaccio’s lectures on the *Commedia* were interrupted in January 1374, his expositions went only as far as lines 10–18 of *Inferno* 17 – see Gilson (2013: 253).

¹¹ *Gen.* 1.3.9: *nam allegoria dicitur ab allon, quod alienum Latine significat, sive diversum, et ideo quot diversi ab hystoricali seu licterali sint sensu, allegorici possunt, ut dictum est, merito vocitari.*

¹² *Gen.* 14.9.4: *fabula est exemplaris seu demonstrativa sub figmento locutio, cuius amoto cortice, patet intentio fabulantis.*

true or morally edifying, but which could be useful nonetheless as a therapeutic medicine for afflicted souls.¹³

Particularly regarding the bucolic genre, Boccaccio maintained that, without allegory, the eclogues were reduced to mere trifles. Commenting on Petrarch's own *Bucolicum carmen* (ca. 1346–7, published 1357, and later revised with the aid of Boccaccio, in the late 1350s), in his *Genealogia* 14, Boccaccio claimed that under no circumstance would a poet of such renown and wisdom spend so much of his energy and time writing about “silly shepherds” (*delirantes pastores*, *Gen.* 14.10.5).¹⁴ Yet elsewhere, in his *Epistola* 23 (ca. 1374), Boccaccio argued that the overburdening use of allegory could potentially disfigure the bucolic genre. In fact, though the *Buccolicum carmen* was highly allegorical, Boccaccio explained in his *Epistola* 23 that the reason he had chosen to emulate the *Eclogues* of Virgil, rather than those of Petrarch, was because he preferred not to ascribe a specific allegorical meaning to all of his bucolic characters and titles.¹⁵

Though Boccaccio's interest in allegory can be attested to in his earliest compositions, the *Buccolicum carmen* uniquely displays the *fabula* of Boccaccio's own life and career.¹⁶ Written in the early 1360s – while he was concomitantly working on the *Genealogie* and on the second redaction of the *Trattatello* – the *Buccolicum* is Boccaccio's only book of Latin poetry, and probably his final book of fiction, too.¹⁷ At that point in time, Boccaccio found himself at a vantage point from which he could look back upon, select and re-create the crucial

¹³ See Macr. *Somnium* 1.2.9; Bocc. *Gen.* 14.9.3–10 (cf. Petr. *Inv.* 3.111) – discussion in Kriesel (2019: 44–5). See also *Dec. Pr.* 13.

¹⁴ It is a convention, generally accepted by Petrarch and Boccaccio critics, to spell Petrarch's *Bucolicum* with one “c” (as in standard classical Latin), and Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* with two.

¹⁵ Bocc. *Ep.* 23.2: *Virgilium secutus sum, quapropter non curavi in omnibus colloquentium nominibus sensum abscondere*. Note, moreover, that Boccaccio applies a similar approach to allegory in his late *Esposizioni*, where he does not propose an allegorical reading for every single passage of the *Commedia*. See more on this in “Genre” below.

¹⁶ See, for instance, Boccaccio's allegorical encounter with Poetry in one of his first extant compositions, the *Epistola* 2 (1339) – discussion in Fonseca Jr. (2020a).

¹⁷ On the dating of the *Buccolicum*, see discussion below (“Dating the *Buccolicum carmen*”). If we accept the year 1355 (and not 1365, as proposed by Padoan) as the date for the *Corbaccio*, then the *Buccolicum carmen* would be definitely Boccaccio's final book of fiction – see Sapegno (1960), Padoan (1978), and Hollander (1988).

moments of his literary, political and religious trajectory. He went on to choose the lowly bucolic genre as the suitable medium to narrate and conclude that trajectory. Though inverting the traditional Virgilian *cursus*, this choice significantly marks Boccaccio's autofictional break with his "Ovidian" past, while also fitting with his self-presentation as a humble poet.¹⁸

In addition, the Virgilian bucolic allowed Boccaccio to explore a variety of themes and stories within a single book of Latin poetry (similarly to what he did in the *Decameron*, in vernacular prose). Indeed, drawing on Theocritus' *Idylls* (third century BCE), Virgil's *Eclogues* featured political (*Ecl.* 1 and 9), erotic (*Ecl.* 2 and 10), religious (*Ecl.* 4 and 5) and literary (*Ecl.* 6 and 8) themes; yet, in spite of this wide variety of subjects, there was a general sense that they formed a unitary whole. Servius, for instance, held the opinion that, though ten in number, Virgil's *Eclogues* formed a single coherent whole: *nec numerus hic dubius est nec ordo librorum, quippe cum unus sit liber (ad Buc., Pr. 58-60)*.¹⁹ Moreover, it has been observed that Virgil's *Eclogues* displays a metapoetic scheme, starting with Virgil's revisionary challenge to Theocritus in *Eclogues* 1-3, moving on to his transgression of bucolic norms in *Eclogues* 4-6, and finally ending with the affirmation of his own poetic voice in *Eclogues* 7-9 – with *Eclogue* 10 recapitulating the three movements.²⁰ To some extent, Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* has a similar revisionary purpose, as it both takes up and challenges the Virgilian notion of the pastoral. Writing from a Christian perspective, Boccaccio presents the bucolic

¹⁸ As an example of Boccaccio's characteristic modesty, after discussing and praising the allegorical contents of Petrarch's eclogues, in the *Genealogie*, Boccaccio advertises his own *Buccolicum carmen*, yet not without rhetorically diminishing himself and his work: *Possem preterea et meum Buccolicum carmen inducere, cuius sensus ego sum conscius, sed omittendum censui, quia nec adhuc tanti sum ut inter prestantes viros misceri debeam, et quia propria sunt alienis linquenda sermonibus* (*Gen.* 14.10.4-6).

¹⁹ Curiously, in his own commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*, Benvenuto da Imola (1320?-88) stated that Servius did not believe in the continuity of the *Eclogues*: *dicit Servius hic quod nunquam debet peti continuatio in Eglogis, quia quilibet Egloga habet materiam per se* (Ottob. lat. 1262, fol. 7rb; quoted in Lord, 2002: 299). As Lord observes, though, "Benvenuto believes so firmly in the continuity of the *Eclogues* that he apparently invents an opposing statement in Servius with which he can make a point of disagreeing" (*ibid.*). After a careful search in Servius (as well as in the scholia of Philargyrius and in the *scholia Bernensia*, which were ordinarily confused with Servius' commentary in Italian manuscripts), Lord has failed to find any such statement attributed by Benvenuto to Servius.

²⁰ See Hubbard (1998: 46).

world not only as a world of sorrow, but also as the earthly world of sin and temporary pleasure.²¹ Thus, throughout its sixteen eclogues, the *Buccolicum carmen* exhibits a clear progression of themes which represents an autofictional and psychological ascent redolent of Christian, non-bucolic works, such as Prudentius' aforementioned *Psychomachia*, Dante's *Commedia*, and Boccaccio's *Amorosa Visione*.²² Furthermore, as a book composed of different poems with an autofictional framework, Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* partly engages with Dante's *Vita nova*, and especially with Petrarch's *Canzoniere* (*Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*).

This idea that the *Buccolicum carmen* is a unitary book, and not simply a collection of assorted eclogues, was partly brought to attention by Giacomo Lidonnici, who, in 1914, suggested that the work was constituted of two distinct parts, formed by eclogues 1-10 and 11-16.²³ However, Lidonnici implied that Boccaccio wrote his eclogues in different periods of his life, and only after 1363 decided to piece the earlier compositions together, add a few others, and confer an aspect of unity on the book.²⁴ Since then, this view has been reproduced, more or less uniformly, by a number of scholars, such as Pier Giorgio Ricci, who, despite the lack of material evidence, advocated that the *Buccolicum* was written during a long period of time (from mid-1340s until the late 1360s).²⁵

The first scholar to contest Lidonnici's theory more explicitly was Silvia Labagnara, in the late 1960s, in a monograph which has unfortunately had a very limited circulation and impact in Boccaccio studies. Labagnara proposed that the balanced structure and symmetry of the *Buccolicum* could be neither a coincidence nor the product of a later reshaping of the work, but rather the fruit of a meticulous and well-thought out simultaneous project by Boccaccio.²⁶

²¹ The concept of a pastoral world of sorrow has been explored by Lambert (1976).

²² See Santagata (1993), and Peterson (2016). Zak (2016: 36-62, esp. 39) also suggests a similar reading of Petrarch's *Bucolicum*, but focused on the theme of consolation.

²³ See Lidonnici (1914: 249-52).

²⁴ See Lidonnici (1914: 288-89).

²⁵ See Ricci (1985: 50-66). See more on this below, in "Dating the *Buccolicum carmen*".

²⁶ See Labagnara (1968: 37, italics mine): "Ma una così equilibrata struttura, una così sagace simmetria non può essere dovuta né a casuale coincidenza, né ad un riordinamento posteriore, ma deve essere stata ricercata e prestabilita dallo stesso poeta".

Moreover, though Labagnara suggested a direct correspondence between the content of the *Buccolicum* and Boccaccio's life, she was the first to hint at the notion that the *Buccolicum* could be read as a psychological and spiritual allegory, thus laying the groundwork for an autofictional approach.²⁷

More recently, David Lummus has proposed a crucial shift of viewpoint. Instead of focusing on the supposed autobiographical truths behind the *Buccolicum*, Lummus lays special emphasis on the artistic manipulation of autobiographical material in that work, arguing that "Boccaccio restructures the arc of his life to coincide with the ideal of the Christian conversion story".²⁸ Lummus does not explicitly cite Labagnara (except in the first of his endnotes where he provides a general bibliography on the *Buccolicum*), nor does he utilise the concept of autofiction to articulate his argument. Nevertheless, he presents with utmost clarity the idea that the *Buccolicum carmen* displays a narrative of self-transformation loosely based on Boccaccio's life and career.²⁹

Expanding on the readings of Labagnara and Lummus, the present study seeks to demonstrate both the thematic diversity and the allegorical unity of Boccaccio's *Buccolicum carmen*. Whereas previous scholars have either devoted introductory essays or abbreviated commentaries to the *Buccolicum*, this thesis aims to provide a detailed analysis of Boccaccio's eclogues, without losing sight of the common thread linking all of them together. For this purpose, four poems of the *Buccolicum* – namely *Galla*, *Alcestus*, *Saphos* and *Phylostropos* – will have an entire chapter devoted to each of them. Indeed, Boccaccio's autofictional pastoral is not told in the first person; but it is rather constructed through different bucolic characters

²⁷ See Labagnara (1968: 31-41, and especially p. 39): "Le [linee fondamentali del *Buccolicum carmen*] trovano singolare corrispondenza nella storia intima del poeta (...). Da tale corrispondenza, e dall'intendere, come noi facciamo, il *Buccolicum carmen*, come una sorta di autobiografia intima, risolta in periodi essenziali e trasferita su di un piano fantastico, può derivare una ricca messe di osservazioni psicologiche, per cui il poema può condurre a una più profonda comprensione della vita del Boccaccio e, la sua vita, a quella del suo poema".

²⁸ Lummus (2013: 155).

²⁹ Lummus (2013: 156-60).

and themes which symbolise Boccaccio's different masks, as well as different stages in his literary and ethical ascent. By selecting these eclogues, then, this thesis anticipates throwing light on four significant facets of the Boccaccian subject: the lover, the citizen, the poet, and the Christian man. Relying on a range of theoretical perspectives (from intertextuality to career criticism), this thesis markedly distinguishes itself from all the previous studies on the *Buccolicum*, both in English and Italian.³⁰ Besides its autofictional approach, this thesis is the first of its kind to consider and analyse the *Buccolicum carmen* with a central focus on the classical tradition and scholarship. Combining the modes of running commentary and thematic essay for the main chapters, this study has two main objectives. The first is to thoroughly analyse the above-mentioned eclogues of Boccaccio, discussing how they interact with one another and with other compositions, thus providing a unique assessment of Boccaccio's engagement with both classical and postclassical texts.³¹ The second objective is to closely examine how each of these selected eclogues symbolises a specific step in Boccaccio's allegorical itinerary, from being an erring slave of his passions to a devout follower of God.

³⁰ The currently available editions of the *Buccolicum carmen* in Italian are: Lidonnici (1914), Massèra (1928), and Perini (1994, bilingual); plus a partial edition (containing Boccaccio's eclogues 1, 3, 14 and 16) by Ricci (1965, bilingual). In English, we have the bilingual edition by Smarr (1987), and the less scholarly translation by Slavitt (2010). A new English edition for the *I Tatti Renaissance Library* series is being prepared by Jason Houston and Samuel Huskey, who have kindly allowed me to use their unpublished translation in this thesis. In France, Claire Chauvin is also preparing a bilingual edition of the *Buccolicum carmen*, with notes and commentary, to be published by the Classiques Garnier. The most relevant studies on the *Buccolicum carmen* produced in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries are: Resta (1975: 59-90), Ricci (1985: 50-66), Smarr (2002: 237-54), Piacentini (2013: 203-8), Lummus (2013: 155-69), and Combs-Schilling (2019: 94-111). As far as I have investigated, the only published book/monograph focused exclusively on Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* is Labagnara (1968). The doctoral thesis by Combs-Schilling (2012, online), in turn, focuses on the history of the pastoral genre in fourteenth-century Italy, and has one entire chapter dedicated to Boccaccio's *Buccolicum*. Yet, more recently, Combs-Schilling has also published a paper on the *Buccolicum* in Eisner & Lummus (eds., 2019: 94-111). My Master's dissertation (Fonseca Jr. 2016a, published online, in Portuguese) focused particularly on Boccaccio's eclogue fourteen, *Olympia*, and consisted of an extensive study accompanied by the first annotated translation of the poem into Portuguese. I have also published one article on Boccaccio's *Olympia* and Virgil's *Aeneid* 6 (2016b). For other important studies on Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* prior to 2010, see Lorenzini (2010: 153-65).

³¹ Here I adopt Ziolkowski's definition and application of the term "postclassical" to broadly designate "Late Latin for the stretch between 200 and 500, Medieval Latin for the expanse between 500 and 1300, and Neo-Latin for everything thereafter" (2000: 544).

Scope and outline

For the purpose of providing a close examination and reading, this thesis uses the form of a running commentary with an expanded summary, introduction and literary analysis on each of the four representative poems. Besides enabling a deeper look at Boccaccio's neo-Latin text, this structure also allows us to explore the literary complexities, effects and intertexts of the *Buccolicum*. In doing so, this thesis intends to contest past views that have unfairly represented the *Buccolicum* as one of Boccaccio's minor works, whose value is limited to its autobiographical contents.³² At the same time, the selection of eclogues by theme (love, politics, poetry and religion) sheds light upon the autofictional thread that permeates the whole book. Hence, for reasons which will be further elaborated below, I have opted to focus on Boccaccio's eclogues 1 (*Galla*), 6 (*Alceustus*), 12 (*Saphos*) and 15 (*Phylostropos*).

As the first eclogue of the book, *Galla* fulfils a programmatic role in terms of both allegory and genre. From its title, *Galla* immediately alludes to Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, which has the elegiac Roman poet Cornelius Gallus as its protagonist. Moreover, Boccaccio's title simultaneously recalls the female character Galla from Martial's *Epigrams*; the bucolic nymph Galatea; and the eponymous word "Gallic", which powerfully suggests a metaliterary reading of Boccaccio's *Galla* as a symbol of vernacular (particularly French-inspired) literature. Then, by introducing the young character Damon roaming around a barren land, *Galla* calls to mind the beginning of Boccaccio's *Amorosa visione* and *Corbaccio*, as well as that of Dante's *Commedia*, thereby suggesting the beginning of a spiritual quest. At the same time, Damon's lovesickness and suicidal tendencies make him both sinful and effeminate according to ancient Roman and Christian discourses. Indeed, Damon not only resembles the typical male lover of

³² For this notion of the *Buccolicum* as a "minor work", see Labagnara (1968: 6), and Lummus (2013: 155). The idea that the *Buccolicum* was defective in form but useful in content is apparent in Grant (1965: 110): "As with Petrarch's eclogues, these [Boccaccio's] poems, cluttered though they are with allegory, cryptic allusions, and medieval artifice, are interesting and valuable because of the light which they cast upon the psychological development of the author; for the student of Giovanni Boccaccio and in particular for the student of his difficult and confused biography, the sixteen eclogues [were] invaluable".

ancient Roman elegy and of early Italian lyric poetry; but also, in many ways, he acts like the classical female characters Dido and Phaedra. **Chapter 1** explores the effects of these amalgamations in the poem, while focusing on the themes of lovesickness, suicide and betrayal.

Boccaccio's youthful obsession with erotic love continues in his second eclogue, *Pampinea*, only to be exceeded by a more mature concern with contemporary politics in eclogues 3-11. Within this larger section of the *Buccolicum*, the sixth eclogue, *Alceus*, plays a crucial role. Not only does this poem summarize and resolve the Neapolitan war sequence (eclogues 3-6); but it also serves as an important transitional piece in the book, which precedes the political accounts involving Florence and the Roman Catholic Church (eclogues 7-11).³³ Furthermore, it is significant that *Alceus* constitutes the only political panegyric of the whole *Buccolicum*, which is a relevant mode within the classical bucolic genre. Taking these issues into account, **Chapter 2** provides a historical overview of the political conflict at the core of *Alceus*, starting with the assassination of Queen Johanna's first husband, Andrew of Hungary, in 1345, and culminating in the return of the Angevin court to Naples, in 1348. The chapter's main analysis focuses on the intertextual relationship between *Alceus* and Virgil's *Eclogues* 5 and (to a lesser extent) 8, particularly concerning the themes of absence, return and celebration.

Moving away from the political sphere, the third stage in Boccaccio's autofictional journey will be devoted to poetry. This section of the *Buccolicum* consists of eclogues 12 and 13. The latter, *Laurea*, presents an allegorical debate between poets and merchants; while the former, *Saphos*, dramatizes Boccaccio's literary ambition and vocation. Considering the poem's special relationship with Boccaccio's self-fashioned career, as well as its intense engagement with classical and contemporary models, **Chapter 3** is dedicated to *Saphos*. The chapter's introduction investigates Boccaccio's very partial knowledge of the Greek poet

³³ I borrow the term "Neapolitan war sequence" from Bergin (1981: 259).

Sappho, her role in the *De mulieribus claris* (ca. 1361–75), and the meanings behind the characters of the eclogue. The main analysis surveys some important *topoi* related to poetry and poets, employed in *Saphos*, as well as in passages from Dante, Giovanni del Virgilio and Petrarch. It then proposes an original comparison between Boccaccio's *Saphos*, Virgil's Sibyl and Dante's Siren. The chapter also reads specific passages from *Saphos* as condensed arguments in defence of poetry which resonate with Boccaccio's *Genealogie* 14 and 15. Finally, the chapter discusses the importance of Virgil and Petrarch (represented as Minciades and Silvanus in the eclogue) for Boccaccio's autofictional literary journey.

The next and final section of the *Buccolicum* deals with faith, death and God. Whereas eclogue 14, *Olympia*, presents a supernatural dialogue about the afterlife, eclogue 15, *Phylostropos*, depicts the process of Boccaccio's conversion guided by Petrarch.³⁴ Considering that Boccaccio's eclogue 16, *Aggelos*, functions as a dedicatory epilogue of the *Buccolicum* to Boccaccio's friend, the grammar and rhetoric teacher Donato Albanzani (1328?–1411), **Chapter 4** is devoted to *Phylostropos*, which effectively represents the final step in Boccaccio's autofictional allegory. This chapter is particularly concerned with how *Phylostropos* conflates classical and Christian models, presenting itself as a confessional work in the same vein as Petrarch's *Secretum* and Augustine's *Confessions*. The chapter's introduction comments on the names and effects associated with the characters Typhlus and Phylostropos; and examines some compelling intertexts between the poems *Phylostropos*, *Olympia*, and Virgil's *Eclogue* 10. The analysis which follows discusses Boccaccio's metaphors of winter and blindness, his mini-catalogues of mythical and historical *exempla*, and his female personifications of greed and lust. The last section of the chapter explores the metaphor of spiritual chains, the final stages in the process of the Christian conversion, and its

³⁴ On Boccaccio's *Olympia*, see Fonseca Jr. (2016a; 2016b).

meaningful implications for the *Buccolicum carmen*, as well as for Boccaccio's literary career as a whole.

Besides the chapters mentioned above, a notable feature of this thesis is the **Index of Intertexts**. In addition, there are two **Appendices** which contain 1) the Latin texts of the relevant eclogues of Boccaccio, taken from the standard modern edition by Bernardi Perini (1994); and 2) corresponding English translations, kindly made available to me by Jason Houston and Samuel Huskey, editors of the forthcoming *I Tatti* edition of the *Buccolicum carmen*.

The **Index of Intertexts** is an important element in this thesis, and a unique tool which has not been provided in any previous study on the *Buccolicum carmen* (or, apparently, on any of Boccaccio's Latin works in general). This Index has two main objectives. The first is to underpin the analyses provided in each of the chapters, assembling the intertexts discussed in an ordered list, so that the reader can appreciate and compare the passages identified more promptly. The second is to encompass a significant number of other intertexts which were not discussed as such in the chapters, thus supplying a more comprehensive catalogue of each poem's literary network. The lists are not – and perhaps inevitably cannot be – exhaustive; and they are arranged in five different categories: *A* (intertexts with classical Latin eclogues), *B* (postclassical Latin eclogues), *C* (classical non-bucolic texts), *D* (postclassical Latin, including biblical passages from the Vulgate; and also, occasionally, Italian non-bucolic texts), and *E* (Boccaccio's neo-Latin and, less often, Italian texts). The choice of an Index of Intertexts – instead of a more conventional Index Fontium – is not only consistent with the methodological approach adopted in this study; but also enables us to incorporate some important references to works which may indeed have been available to Boccaccio, albeit not demonstrably so. This is the case, for instance, with Lucretius' *De rerum natura*, Catullus' poems, Propertius' and Tibullus' elegies, and Ovid's *Heroides* 15 (the so-called *epistula Sapphus*). Despite the lack of

concrete evidence of Boccaccio's access to or ownership of these works, it is worth countenancing the possibility that their intertextual presence in the *Buccolicum* might elucidate their transmission history. Ultimately, it is expected that both classicists and medievalists can benefit from this Index of Intertexts; and that even the readers who are not directly interested in Boccaccio, but rather perhaps in the bucolic genre, or in the reception of classics more broadly, might gather some useful information from it.

Finally, a word on the texts. In this thesis, I have made the deliberate choice of not standardizing Boccaccio's texts according to the conventional Latin spelling for classical texts. The most conspicuous difference is probably the contracted diphthongs: for instance, Boccaccio's text reads *dure* instead of classical *durae*, *prestat* instead of *praestat*, *Melibeus* instead of *Meliboeus*. Other differences include *michi* instead of *mihi*, *staurat* instead of *instaurat*, *sydera* instead of *sidera*. It is worth noting that, in the chapters, this choice of keeping Boccaccio's spelling intact has sometimes affected the English too, particularly in the case of some proper names of Greek origin. For instance, Boccaccio uses the forms *Tindarus* instead of *Tyndarus*, *Amintas* instead of *Amyntas*, *Saphos* instead of *Sappho*, *Caliope* instead of *Calliope*.³⁵ Thus, the reader might find, in the same paragraph, the words "Saphos" (referring to Boccaccio's eclogue and character) and "Sappho" (the Greek poet) in English; but this kind of shift in spelling will not occur without some warning within each chapter.

The reasons for this choice are both practical and methodological. Since I am not proposing a new edition of Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* in this thesis, I have opted to follow entirely the orthography of the standard neo-Latin text of Perini. Similarly, passages from other texts by Boccaccio are taken from the other editions published in the collection *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, directed by Vittore Branca. Besides this pragmatic factor, in line with

³⁵ For general information about neo-Latin spelling and punctuation, see Deneire (2014: 959-62). On Boccaccio's orthography, see the notes by Zaccaria (1998, vol. 2: 1599-1603).

re-evaluations made in neo-Latin studies, this thesis considers Boccaccio's neo-Latin text in its own right.³⁶ Rather than adopting ancient Latin texts as a parameter for judging the quality and relevance of fourteenth-century texts, I am interested in looking at how these texts, produced at very different times and in disparate circumstances, interact with one another. While neo-Latin *is* Latin, it is definitely not *classical* Latin.³⁷ Thus, particularly regarding spelling and other linguistic features, comparisons between classical and postclassical Latin, in the chapters, will be restricted to the purpose of clarifying potentially ambiguous passages of Boccaccio.

Methodology

Both the analyses presented in the chapters and the information displayed in the Index are rooted in an intertextual approach, which recognises the centrality of the reader in the process of selecting and interpreting the relationships between texts. Though the practice of identifying similarities between different texts is as old as the history of literary and philological scholarship, the consolidation of intertextuality as a distinct methodological approach is relatively recent, and still deserves some consideration.³⁸

Particularly in classical studies, the beginnings of the debate on intertextuality and allusivity can be traced back to as far as the publication of the article “Arte allusiva” by Giorgio Pasquali, in 1942. There, Pasquali proposed a not very clear set of distinctions between quotations, reminiscences, imitations and allusions, arguing that the last were intentional and played a crucial role in erudite poetry.³⁹ Thus, on the one hand, Pasquali advanced the idea that

³⁶ See, for instance, Moul (ed. 2017).

³⁷ See Moul (2017: 1-13).

³⁸ I have provided a more extensive debate on allusion, intertextuality and poetic memory in Fonseca Jr. (2016a: 36-54). Here, I am briefly summarising some ideas I have set out there. Gian Biagio Conte has an excellent summary of the history of intertextual studies in *Dell'imitazione: furto e originalità* (2014; published in English as *Stealing the club from Hercules: on imitation in Latin poetry*, 2017 – see esp. Part 2, “A critical retrospective: method and its limits”, pp. 35-61). See also Conte (1986).

³⁹ See Pasquali ([1942] 1951: 11) “In poesia culta, dotta io ricerco quelle che da qualche anno in qua non chiamo più reminiscenze ma allusioni, e volentieri direi evocazioni e in certi casi citazioni. Le reminiscenze possono essere inconsapevoli; le imitazioni, il poeta può desiderare che sfuggano al pubblico; le allusioni non producono

allusions were not a mere decoration, but rather an integral part of the text. Yet, on the other hand, his strong emphasis on intentionality posed its own set of problems.

Before Pasquali, the founder of linguistics Ferdinand de Saussure had conceived language as a structured system of signs and a social phenomenon. In his *Course in general linguistics* (first published in 1916, after death), Saussure emphasised that “contrary to what might appear to be the case, a language never exists even for a moment except as a social fact, for it is a semiological phenomenon”.⁴⁰ Subsequently, the literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin would propose a dialogic notion of discourse, according to which every utterance is a social and interactive act in continual dialogue with other utterances. In his seminal work *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (first published in Russian in 1929, and in English in 1963), Bakhtin maintained that “almost no word is without its intense sideward glance at someone else's word”.⁴¹ Then, in the 1960s, Roland Barthes would radically advocate the “death of the author”; and, implicitly evoking the Latin etymology of the word “text” (*textum*, “a woven fabric”, “a piece of plaited work”), argue that every text was a tissue of quotations, never original, never individual.⁴² Yet, the concept of intertextuality as such would be coined and formalised by Julia Kristeva in 1966, in her essay “Word, dialogue and novel”. Promoting the ideas of Bakhtin and Barthes, Kristeva proposed to replace the notion of intersubjectivity with that of intertextuality, claiming that “each word (text) is an inter-section of other words (texts) where at least one other word (text) can be read”.⁴³

Engaging with these theories, some classicists have gradually started to use the term “intertext” instead of “allusion”, thus drawing attention to the texts and their readers, rather

l'effetto voluto se non su un lettore che si ricordi chiaramente del testo cui si riferiscono”. See also Barchiesi (1997: 211).

⁴⁰ Saussure ([1916] 2013: 90).

⁴¹ Bakhtin ([1929] 1984: 203).

⁴² See Barthes ([1967] 1977: 146): “the text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture. (...) [T]he writer can only imitate a gesture that is always anterior, never original. His only power is to mix writings, to counter the ones with the others, in such a way as never to rest on any of them”. See also Foucault (1969) on “what is an author”; and definition of the Latin words *texo* and *textum* (1 and 2) in *OLD*.

⁴³ Kristeva ([1966] 1980: 66).

than on the psychological motivations of the author.⁴⁴ In his article “On the shoulders of giants: intertextuality and classical studies” (first published in 1997), Don Fowler has summarised the conceptual differences between allusion and intertextuality in the following table:

<i>Allusion</i>	<i>Intertextuality</i>
In the author’s mind	In the (system of) the text(s)
Private	Public
Single	Multiple
Additional extra	Inescapable element
Special feature of “literature”	General feature of language and other semiotic systems
Difference from model significant	Difference and similarity (“traces”) significant
Extratextual act (pays homage etc.)	Intratextual act (creates meaning)

Fowler went on to explain that intertextuality was a property of the literary system, and that therefore it was public; and the very act of identifying any relationship between texts as an “allusion” necessarily depended on the public competence of readers.⁴⁵ Yet, while openly defending an intertextual approach, Fowler also introduced some nuance to the debate. One of his key points was that even the notion of an “alluding subject” was built upon texts, and could not exist outside the literary system. What is more, Fowler suggested that an intertextuality-oriented analysis did not preclude the idea of source-texts; instead, it questioned the pre-established notion of hierarchy of reference, where “source-text A” was considered more important than “source-text B”.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ See, for instance, Barchiesi (1997: 209-26), Edmunds (2001), Vasconcellos (2001), Orr (2003), and Prata (2007).

⁴⁵ Fowler ([1997] 2000: 117-19).

⁴⁶ Fowler (2000: 118-19).

A more overt attempt to bridge the allusion-based and intertextual approaches has been made by Stephen Hinds, in his book *Allusion and intertext* (1998). In it, Hinds addressed the issue that most Latin philologists were then obsessively attached to the idea that “the *only* kind of intertext worth studying” was that of the “deliberate allusion of one author to the words of a previous author”.⁴⁷ Yet, Hinds innovatively suggested that a more productive mode of inquiry could emerge from situating that circumscribed notion of allusion within the larger theoretical framework of intertextuality. Hinds then proposed an intermediate (and deliberately “inexact”) method, defining *allusion* as a type of self-annotation which draws attention to itself and the text(s) it is alluding to.⁴⁸ Paraphrasing Charles Martindale’s well-known statement “all meaning is constituted or actualized at the point of reception”, from *Redeeming the text* (1993), Hinds defended the idea that an allusion was “always, in practice, something (re)constructed *by the reader* at the point of reception”.⁴⁹

Hinds proceeded to argue that, though pragmatically convenient, the distinction between a “clearly defined” allusion and an “accidental confluence” of language (which partly calls to mind Pasquali’s notion of “unconscious reminiscences”) was a problematic one.⁵⁰ Indeed, one of the features that renders allusive art so attractive to both artists and scholars is precisely its dynamics of concealment and revelation.⁵¹ Furthermore, the process of appropriating and refashioning a certain work is intrinsic to art, and artists may deliberately opt to dissimulate their borrowings. Though there is a fine line between creative imitation and plagiarism (of which ancient critics were all too aware), in his *Ars Poetica* (12–8 BCE), Horace already contended that “common material will become private property if you do not (...)”

⁴⁷ Hinds (1998: xi).

⁴⁸ See Hinds (1998: 1).

⁴⁹ Martindale (1993: 3), and Hinds (1998: 10). See also Batstone (2006: 14-20).

⁵⁰ Hinds (1998: 20).

⁵¹ Hinds (1998: 23).

render word for word as a (too-)faithful translator” (*publica materies privati iuris erit, si/ non (...) verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus/ interpres*, *Ars P.* 131-4).⁵²

Another layer of complexity is added when we consider that not every “clearly defined” allusion is necessarily intended. In this respect, we may briefly recall Petrarch’s *Epistola* 22.2 (dated 8 October, 1359), too. In it, Petrarch admitted to Boccaccio that the more he himself knew and was familiar with some authors, the more likely it was for him to quote them unwittingly.⁵³ Thus it happened that it was only upon a later rereading of his own eclogue *Laurea occidens* that Petrarch realised that some of his lines were very similar to or identical with those of Virgil and Ovid. Because of this, he instructed Boccaccio (who was then revising Petrarch’s *Bucolicum carmen*) to slightly alter them. Afterwards, on 28 October 1366, Petrarch would write another letter to Boccaccio, this time blaming him for having left unnoticed, in Petrarch’s eclogue 6, *Pastorum pathos* (line 193), a phrase that was identical with the end of Virgil’s *Aeneid* 6.607 (*atque intonat ore*), and which was perceived by a very young man.⁵⁴

In theory, the concepts of intertextuality and intertext would avoid the interference of such issues, particularly concerning the processes of literary creation and imitation, in the analysis of literary texts. Yet, as observed by Hinds, the latter approach too could result in extreme consequences:

Just as there is a philological fundamentalism which occludes broader discursive dynamics in its privileging of tight authorial control, so there is an opposite kind of fundamentalism – an intertextualist fundamentalism – which privileges readerly reception so single-mindedly as to wish the alluding author out of existence altogether. (Hinds, 1998: 48)

⁵² See also Sen. *Suas.* 3.7; Macr. *Sat.* 5.15.16, and 5.18.1; and Hinds (1998: 22-4).

⁵³ *Ad Familiares* 22.2.13: *interdum obliviscar auctorem, quippe qui longo usu et possessione continua quasi illa prescripserim diuque pro meis habuerim, et turba talium obsessus, nec cuius sint certe nec aliena meminerim*. A similar *topos* is employed in Petrarch’s *RVF* 35 (“Solo et pensoso i più deserti campi”), where Petrarch intently tries to avoid the footsteps of his predecessors – discussion in Feng (2017: 113-14). See also Quintilian, *Institutio* 2.7.4; and Conte (2017: 13-4).

⁵⁴ *Fam.* 23.19.16-7: *idque tibi nuntiare disposui, non quod ullus correctioni amplius locus sit, carmine illo late iam cognito ac vulgato, sed ut te ipsum arguas, qui michi errorem meum hunc indicari prius ab alio passus sis, vel si id forsitan ignotum tibi hactenus fuit, notum esse incipiat*. See Martellotti (1968: 9-11), and Burrow (2019: 146-55).

In this way, Hinds encourages intertextualists to consider the subjective dimensions of writing without necessarily abandoning a text-focused approach. Indeed, as both Gian Biagio Conte and Umberto Eco have shown, even a “text-and-reader-oriented intertextuality” allows some space for authorial subjectivity.⁵⁵ As paradoxical as this may sound, an intertextual reading can be one of the ways through which a reconstruction of the authorial voice is possible and viable. Partly recalling Fowler’s considerations about the “alluding subject” above, such a reconstruction is ultimately a *construction* based on the rapport between readers (with their own subjectivities) and texts. Equally, as Hinds points out, “the author thus (re)constructed is one who writes towards an implied reader who will attempt such a (re)construction”.⁵⁶

Thus, while keeping in mind Conte’s valuable lesson that “‘method’ is simply the route after you have traversed it”, the present thesis adopts an intertextual approach which incorporates the concepts of allusion, literary imitation and model.⁵⁷ In agreement with Hinds, this study privileges a text-and-reader orientation, but also critically encompasses a “rhetoric of allusivity” – that is, a reading that takes into consideration the alluding poet and the meanings generated by/in the texts and intertexts.⁵⁸ Besides the advantage that the term “allusion” can be easily converted into the verb “to allude”, I understand intertext and allusion as complementary rather than opposing terms, and as referring to one and the same process. For this reason, while analysing the relationships between the texts of Boccaccio and other authors in the chapters, I will use both terms interchangeably. In either case, rather than attempting a reconstruction of the “authorial voice” or “intention” (terms used by Hinds), I am particularly interested in how

⁵⁵ See Hinds (1998: 49), Eco (1990: 58-9; 1992: 64), and Conte (1994: 133-8; 2017: 47-51).

⁵⁶ Hinds (1998: 49).

⁵⁷ Conte (2013: vii).

⁵⁸ Hinds (1998: 49-50). See also Conte’s definition of the allusion as a literary trope that generates new meanings and effects on the text (Conte 2013: vii); and McLaughlin’s (1995: 6) use of the term “imitation”: “I am interested in ‘rhetorical imitation’, that is to say, the process whereby one writer consciously or unconsciously borrows from another text, and that borrowing effects a significant intertextual echo”.

Boccaccio fashions himself through his texts, projecting an autofictional image that does not necessarily correspond to its empirical author.⁵⁹ However, for the sake of convenience, I will occasionally make use of the name “Boccaccio” to refer to the historical man and author, too – for instance, when I discuss questions related to Boccaccio’s sources and knowledge of specific texts, his historical context, and the dating of the *Buccolicum* (below).

This brings us to two other key concepts used in this thesis, namely those of “autofiction” and “literary career”. Coined by the French writer and critic Serge Doubrovsky in 1977, with reference to his own novel *Fils* (the first in a series of seven autofictional novels), the term “autofiction” has been used by literary critics ever since to designate a specific genre, mode or practice which is on the threshold between autobiography and fiction.⁶⁰ Though more commonly associated with postmodern literary studies, the general concept of autofiction also engages with the notions of self-fashioning, literary *persona* and the lyric self, which are probably more familiar to (and preferred by) classicists and medievalists.⁶¹ Yet, as I will try to demonstrate in the analysis of Boccaccio’s eclogues, “autofiction” reveals itself as the more useful term while describing the complex (and often ambiguous and hybrid) relationships between reality, autobiography and fiction. As the life-writing critic Max Saunders puts it,

⁵⁹ In doing this, I adopt a similar approach to that used by Manuwald (2006: 219) reading Propertius: “In spite of the poetry’s ‘subjectivity’ both lover and beloved as described in the poems are (at least to some extent) fictitious constructs. Accordingly, one has to distinguish between the poet Propertius and the lover/persona/speaker acting in the poems, even if the persona calls himself ‘Propertius’ several times (though not in Book 1, but throughout Books 2–4), quite often in amatory contexts and more rarely in poetic ones. That contributes to the poetic fiction and endows the persona with a unity of character; it does not mean that identity between the narrated experiences of the lover and Propertius’ personality as a poet can be assumed. For the sake of convenience, however, the name ‘Propertius’ will be employed without reservation in what follows”.

⁶⁰ Doubrovsky (1977, back-cover blurb): “Fiction, d’événements et de faits strictement réels; si l’on veut, autofiction” (“Fiction, of events and facts strictly real; autofiction, if you will”). On autofiction in general, see for instance Doubrovski *et al.* (1993), Colonna (2004), Gasparini (2004), Faedrich (2016), and Wagner-Egelhaaf (2019).

⁶¹ On the concept and uses of *persona* in Roman love elegy, see Vasconcellos (2016); on “literary subject”, see Conte (2017: 44); on “self-fashioning” in the Renaissance, see Greenblatt (2005); on the “lyric self” and authorship in Provençal and Italian literature, see Holmes (2002). So far as this research has gone, autofiction has not been used as part of a framework in other classical studies, except in Goldschmidt (2019, esp. 10-21), and Bitto & Gauly (ed., 2021) – the latter was published shortly after I had completed my thesis manuscript. I myself have also used the concept of autofiction in an article on Virgil’s *Eclogue* 10 (Fonseca Jr., 2020: 1-22). In medieval literary studies, we have Gust’s book (2009) which is entirely dedicated to the investigation of authorship and autofiction in Chaucer.

autofiction indicates “both that auto/biography can be read as fiction, and that fiction can be read as auto/biographical”.⁶² Thence, the concept of autofiction enables us to analyse more accurately some of the mechanisms at play not only in the works of Boccaccio, but also in those of Dante, Petrarch, and even Virgil.⁶³ Ultimately, autofiction provides us with a helpful vocabulary to reassess the subtle interactions, which many critics have struggled to define, between the lives of these poets and their writings. Rather than the “facts”, the term “autofiction” emphasizes the story that authors (and humans in general) create to talk about their “own” selves – which are always elusive and, to a great extent, fictional.⁶⁴

Particularly when considering the classical literary tradition, the concept of autofiction engages with the notion of a self-fashioned literary career, which has led to the emergence of a whole branch of study known as “career criticism”. Since at least the publication of *European literary careers* (2002), edited by Patrick Cheney and Frederick De Armas, career criticism has been used as an interpretive methodology to analyse the most diverse authors and periods. As Cheney points out in their Introduction, literary career studies encompass notions such as authorship and agency, genre, politics, religion, imitation, and intertextuality.⁶⁵ Along the same lines as Cheney, in *Classical literary careers and their reception* (2010), Philip Hardie and Helen Moore stress that career criticism takes into consideration “the totality of an author’s textual output”, as well as the “extra textual conditions of production”, such as political and cultural structures, which might be relevant to the analysis of career patterns.⁶⁶ Yet, career criticism should not be confused with an outdated life-and-works approach – an approach which has dominated assessments of Boccaccio’s work, and more particularly of his

⁶² Saunders (2010: 8).

⁶³ On Dante’s *Commedia* as an example of autofiction, see Genette (1993: 77).

⁶⁴ See Gust (2009: 38-42); and also Freud ([1917] 1974: 326): “the ego (...) is not even master in its own house, but must content itself with scanty information of what is going on unconsciously in its mind”.

⁶⁵ Cheney & De Armas (2002: 12). Previously to Cheney and De Armas’ book, critics such as Lipking (1981) and Helgerson (1983) had already touched on the topic of literary careers and self-fashioning. On literary careers in the modern era, see the more recent volume of Davidson & Evans (2015).

⁶⁶ Hardie & Moore (2010: 1).

Buccolicum. Moreover, Hardie & Moore claim that, though “career criticism is unabashed in making the author its focus”, it nevertheless recognises (in the wake of intertextual theories) that “the author is mediated through texts, which in turn are always received by readers”.⁶⁷ The present thesis agrees with this premise; thus, while focusing on four poems of the *Buccolicum*, it also pays attention to Boccaccio’s other works, as well as to the relevant conditions of their production and reception.

Boccaccio through texts

In the Preface to his *Genealogia* 1, Boccaccio painted himself as a “little man, absent of strength, with a slow wit, and a weak memory” (*brevis sum homuntio, nulle michi vires, ingenium tardum, et fluxa memoria*, *Gen.* 1.Pr.10). In this way, Boccaccio presented himself as the extreme opposite of his master Petrarch, with his “divine genius and unfailing memory” (*homo quippe est celesti ingenio preditus et perenni memoria*, 21). In these specific passages, Boccaccio is comparing the state of his own health in old age to that of Petrarch’s. Yet, elsewhere in the *Genealogie*, and more particularly in *Genealogia* 15.10, Boccaccio further suggests that his intellectual and poetic weakness was mainly due to his deficient training in Latin grammar and literature.

Besides providing a catalogue of Boccaccio’s main literary sources and models, the *Genealogie* also displays an autofictional narrative which engages in dialogue with the *Buccolicum*.⁶⁸ As stated at the beginning of this Introduction, the two final books of the *Genealogie* present a defence of poetry and poets which is very personal in content and tone. In *Genealogia* 15.10, Boccaccio argues that people have different vocations, received as gifts from nature and God. Though he recognises that some studies are more honourable than others

⁶⁷ Hardie & Moore (2010: 1). See also Saunders (2010: 6): “life-writing is fundamentally intertextual”.

⁶⁸ We will develop this discussion in Chapter 3, on *Saphos*.

(*studia sublimiora*, 3), he nevertheless maintains that all occupations, from shoe-making to theology, are relevant in their own way. Boccaccio goes on to accept that we are all endowed with free will, and thereby we are not necessarily fated to pursue our vocation, if we choose not to do so. At the same time, he emphasizes that very few people can actually overcome the power of their natural inclinations:

Non quidem adeo ignarus sum, quin noverim liberi arbitrii, quo omnes valemus, potentia possimus nature superare vires; quod egisse non nullos legimus. Opus profecto inter raro contingentia numerandum: tam grandi et fere invincibili necessitate trahimur in quod nascimur! (*Gen.* 15.10.5).

Boccaccio then provides a personal example to support this argument. In *Genealogia* 15.10.6, he affirms that he himself was predestined to become a poet, and that he was clearly born for that: *ad poeticas meditationes dispositum ex utero matris eduxit et meo iudicio in hoc natus sum*.⁶⁹ In what follows, Boccaccio recalls that he had scarcely learned how to read and write when he was seized by a natural impulse to compose little poems:

Nam satis memor sum, non dum ad septimum etatis annum deveneram, nec dum fictiones videram, non dum doctores aliquos audiveram, vix prima licterarum elementa cognoveram, et ecce, ipsa impellente natura, fingendi desiderium affuit, et si nullius essent momenti, tamen aliquas fictiunculas edidi, non enim suppetebant tenelle etati officio tanto viris ingenii. (*Gen.* 15.10.8)

In this way, Boccaccio presents a naturalistic idea of poetic *ingenium* which relates with the classical notion of rhetorical *ingenium*, as displayed in Cicero's *De officiis* (a work that Boccaccio possessed in his own personal library).⁷⁰ In short, Boccaccio holds that the poet is

⁶⁹ Note that this idea of the inborn artist is partly evoked in the prophetic dreams of Virgil's and Dante's mothers, recounted in Suetonius-Donatus' *Vita Virgilii* 3, and in Boccaccio's *Trattatello in laude di Dante* (1) 212, respectively – see Chapter 3, “The bay”.

⁷⁰ See *Off.* 1, chs. 30-34 – discussion in Douglas (1969: 261-98, esp. 269-71). On Boccaccio's copy of Cicero's *De Officiis*, see Mazza (1966, item II.8).

born with an innate disposition towards letters, which can be perfected through study and practice.

In the passage above, Boccaccio also briefly mentions that he learned how to read and write when he was six years old (*non dum ad septimum etatis annum deveneram*); and he passingly mentions his teachers (*doctores*), only to downplay their influence on his own literary vocation. Boccaccio does not explicitly reveal who his first teacher was; yet, according to the Florentine chronicler and biographer Filippo Villani (ca. 1325–1407/1409), as a child, Boccaccio studied with the father of the poet Zanobi da Strada (1312–61), Giovanni di Domenico Mazzuoli da Strada, who owned a private school.⁷¹ Whether Boccaccio did study with Mazzuoli or not, as an elementary pupil, he certainly went through the three basic stages of standard elementary education in medieval and Renaissance Italy, which were based on three textbooks: the *tavola* (containing alphabet and syllable sheets), the *salterio* (select psalms and some other religious texts), and the so-called *donato* or *donadello* (also referred to by modern scholars as the *Ianua*, which was a medieval grammar textbook focused on morphology, and only loosely modelled on Donatus' *Ars minor*).

Though these elementary textbooks were all written in Latin, they did not require an active knowledge or use of the classical language from the pupils. Indeed, during this first stage of learning, the children were expected to simply read and memorise the texts; while advanced topics such as Latin syntax, composition and literature (*auctores*) were studied only at a secondary level, by those who eventually attended a grammar school.⁷² Actually, most of the *doctores puerorum* of the fourteenth century belonged to the artisan class, and they knew little or no Latin at all.⁷³ However, particularly regarding the teaching and practice of versification,

⁷¹ Villani, *De origine civitatis Florentie et de eiusdem famosis civibus* (ed. Solerti, p. 672): *dum puer sub Johanne magistro, Zenobii poete patre, non plene gramaticam didicisset* – see Branca (1977: 10-11); and also Matteo Villani (ed. 1995: 641-42). The information that Mazzuoli owned a school can be inferred from Petrarch's *Ad Familiares* 12.3; and in his *Epistola* 19, Boccaccio suggests that Zanobi later took charge of his father's school.

⁷² See Black (1991: 141-5; 2001: 29, 48).

⁷³ Black (2001: 35-6).

it is worth noting that, even in the Italian grammar schools, pupils were not typically encouraged to write poetry; and poetic treatises such as Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Poetria nova* (ca. 1208–13) were primarily used in the classroom to teach prose composition and style.⁷⁴ Thus, taking into account this pedagogical context, but especially the text from the *Genealogie*, we may conclude that, as a boy, Boccaccio acquired a very basic knowledge of the classical Latin language, literature and versification.

In the *Genealogia* 15.10, Boccaccio recounts how his father (the merchant Boccaccino di Chellino) made every effort to direct him towards the world of business. First, he constrained him to study arithmetic; and then, he entrusted his education in commerce to a famous banker:

Satis enim memini apposuisse patrem meum a pueritia mea conatus omnes, ut negociator efficerer, meque, adolescentiam non dum intrantem, arismetica instructum maximo mercatori dedit discipulum, quem penes sex annis nil aliud egi quam non recuperabile tempus in vacuum terere. Hinc quoniam visum est, aliquibus ostendentibus indiciis, me aptiorem fore licterarum studiis, iussit genitor idem, ut pontificum sanctiones, dives exinde futurus, auditurus intrarem. (*Gen.* 15.10.7)

Here, Boccaccio makes explicit that he did not attend a grammar school, but instead followed the alternative path of arithmetic and commerce, which was the expected course for the sons of merchants and other traders in the Italian Trecento. Thus, after concluding the elementary cycle of education with a *doctor puerorum* (which was typically completed by around the age of ten or eleven), Boccaccio immediately started studying with a *maestro di abaco*.⁷⁵ Unlike

⁷⁴ See Black (2001: 344); and also Witt (2000: 196-8): “as for grammar-school education, the fact that a student like Coluccio Salutati, who completed his secondary education in Bologna in the late 1340s, had no serious contact with pagan authors during his years in grammar school raises doubts about the availability of such training at that level in Italy’s largest university center”. Boccaccio possessed a personal copy of Vinsauf’s *Poetria nova* (there named as *Poetria novella completa*), yet we do not know when exactly he acquired it – see Mazza (1966, item I.8). On the influence of the *ars notaria* and the *ars dictaminis* in Boccaccio’s style, see De Blasi (1993: 262-6; 273). On Boccaccio’s epistles in general, see Petoletti (2013: 233-41).

⁷⁵ Høyrup (2007: 27): “Accepting Villani’s numbers at face value and taking infant mortality into account we would find that well above half of all children learned to read; that at least 10% of all boys frequented the mercantile ‘abbacus school’; and that another 5% or so attended the Latin-based grammar school. According to Paul Grendler [1989: 72], each abbacus school is likely to have had at most c. 40 students, which suggests real numbers to have been appreciably lower; still, data from 1480 (where nothing suggest percentages to have changed very much) indicate that more than one third of all Florentine boys between ages 6 and 14 went to school [Grendler 1989: 77 f]. Some 5% could have passed through an abbacus school”.

the *magistri grammaticae*, the *maestri di abaco* taught mathematics through treatises written in the vernacular – such as Jacopo da Firenze’s *Tractatus Algorismi* (1307), which partly resembled the *Liber abaci* (1202) of Leonardo Pisano (better known as Fibonacci).⁷⁶ At the age of twelve or so, the pupils were ready to become apprentices in a commercial firm, as Boccaccio himself confirms he did.

In his *Epistola* 13 (addressed to Francesco Nelli, and dated to 1363), Boccaccio recounts that he lived in Naples from childhood to manhood (“io sono vivuto, dalla mia puerizia infino in intera età nutricato, a Napoli”, *Ep.* 13.37).⁷⁷ Consequently, Boccaccio would have undertaken part of his commercial training in the Angevin capital, which was one of the richest and most effervescent cultural environments of the Italian Trecento. As he recounts elsewhere in his *Genealogia* 15.6, during his youthful years in Naples (thanks to his father’s professional links with the Angevin court), Boccaccio became acquainted with the early humanists Barbato da Sulmona and Giovanni Barrili, who were both members of Charles’ (Duke of Calabria) entourage; as well as with other influential people of the Neapolitan intelligentsia, such as the librarian and scholar Paolo da Perugia, the Greek teacher Barlaam of Calabria, and the renowned astronomer Andalò del Negro.⁷⁸

Though immersed in this highly cultural environment, in *Genealogia* 15.10, Boccaccio regretted that he was unable to pursue poetry until he was an adult. In the passage above, Boccaccio bitterly recalls how his father entrusted him to a reputable merchant (*maximo mercatori*), with whom he wasted six years of his life. Indeed, Boccaccio was quite slow to realise that his son was unfit for business. And even when this finally dawned on him, he

⁷⁶ See Black (2001: 29), Witt (2000: 194-5), and Høyrup (2007: 62).

⁷⁷ According to the medieval notion of the ages of man, *pueritia* ended at fourteen – see, for instance, Hrabanus Maurus (c.780-856) in *De universo* 7.1, and discussion in Garver (2005: 68). Moreover, taking into account the external evidence that Boccaccio sold his house in Florence in 1327, Branca (1977: 12) traced Boccaccio’s move from Florence to Naples back to this same year (when Boccaccio was thirteen or fourteen years old).

⁷⁸ On 4 February 1328, Boccaccio was appointed counsellor and chamberlain to the King Robert of Naples – see Branca (1977: 12-14). On Boccaccio’s acquaintance with these intellectual figures, see *Gen.* 15.6.8, 7 and 4, respectively.

decided that it would be best for Boccaccio to study canon law, which was a more humanistic, but still profitable career (*ut pontificum sanctiones, dives exinde futurus, auditurus intrarem*, above). Once again, Boccaccio had no choice but to follow his father's orders; and so he started studying canon law (presumably at the Neapolitan *Studium*), where he wasted another six years of his life (which was the estimated period for the completion of a canon law degree at that time).⁷⁹

At least in this instance, however, Boccaccio was not alone. The idea of Boccaccio as an inborn artist, who was impeded from following his vocation by his father, finds a parallel in the biographies of both Ovid and Petrarch. Drawing on Eusebius-Jerome's *Chronicon*, in his literal exposition on Dante's *Inferno* 4, Boccaccio recounted that "from his earliest years, Ovid demonstrated a remarkable intellect suited to the study of science" ("dalla sua fanciulleza maravigliosamente fu il suo ingegno inchinevole agli studi della scienza"). Here, "scienza" denotes the type of knowledge shared by philosophers and poets, as when Dante referred to Virgil as the man who honoured "science and art" ("O tu ch'onori scienza e arte", *Inf.* 4.73).⁸⁰ Then, Boccaccio proceeds to tell us that Ovid's father constrained him to study law; but, because of his innate disposition, whatever Ovid tried to write sounded like poetry. Boccaccio openly paraphrases two passages from Ovid's *Tristia* to support this idea: first, *Tristia* 4.10.26 (*quidquid conabar scribere versus erat*, which in the Ovidian original reads *quod temptabam scribere versus erat*); and second, *Tristia* 4.10.21-2 (*saepe pater dixit: studium quid inutile temptas?/ Maeonides nullas ipse reliquit opes*). Nevertheless, despite his father's reluctance, Ovid "wholly dedicated himself to the study of poetry" ("Per la qual cosa, eziandio contro al piacer del padre, si diede tutto alla poesia", *Espos.* 4.lit.118), and eventually became an honourable poet at Rome.

⁷⁹ See Branca (1977: 30-1), and Brundage (2008: 219-82).

⁸⁰ See Boccaccio's explanation of this passage at *Espos.* 4.lit.80-2 (based on Albert the Great's commentary on Aristotle's *Ethics* 6.3-13) – Papio (2009: 633).

Similarly, in his *De vita et moribus domini Francisci Petracchi*, Boccaccio reported that Petrarch too was forced by his father to study civil law, first at Montpellier, and then at Bologna. Interestingly, Boccaccio's text alludes to those same lines from Ovid's *Tristia* (4.10.21-2) in the speech of Petrarch's father. In his *Ad Familiares* 20.4, and especially in his *Epistola Posteritati*, Petrarch confirmed Boccaccio's account; however, in both these works, Petrarch places less emphasis on his father's tyrannical tendencies than Boccaccio does in the *Vita Petracchi*. In the first epistle, Petrarch simply says that he was "destined" by his father to study civil law from an early age (*illi studio puer destinatus a patre, Fam. 20.4.3*); while in the latter one, he very briefly suggests that, as soon as he became independent from his parents (*mox ut me parentum cura destituit, Post. 14*), he chose to abandon civil law. Instead of openly blaming his father for having wasted a precious period of his life, Petrarch preferred to highlight the wickedness of lawyers as the main reason for his change in career.⁸¹

The parallel between Petrarch's and Boccaccio's trajectory as law students was observed early by biographers, such as Giannozzo Manetti in his *Vita Ioannis Boccacii* (dated to 1440).⁸² However, besides Boccaccio's difficult relationship with his father, his abandonment of canon law was markedly more dramatic than Petrarch's abandonment of civil law. At the end of *Genealogia* 15.10, Boccaccio recounts that one day he finally rebelled not only against his father, but also against his university teachers, and even against his closest friends, who tried to dissuade him from abandoning the canon law course:

Fastidiebat hec animus adeo, ut in neutrum horum officiorum, aut preceptoris doctrina, aut genitoris autoritate, qua novis mandatis angebar continue, aut amicorum precibus seu obiurgationibus inclinari posset, in tantum illum ad poeticam singularis traebat affectio! (*Gen. 15.10.7*).

⁸¹ See *Post. 14*: *Ego vero studium illud omne destitui, mox ut me parentum cura destituit, non quia legum michi non placeret autoritas, que absque dubio magna est et Romane antiquitatis plena, qua delector, sed quia earum usus nequitia hominum depravatur. Itaque piguit perdiscere, quo inhoneste uti nollem et honeste vix possem, et, si vellem, puritas inscitie tribuenda esset* – discussion in Enenkel (1998).

⁸² Manetti *Vita Bocc. 2*: *Quocirca rursus e taberna institoria ad cognitionem iuris pontificii (non iniussu patris, ut cetera) invitatus in canonicum gymnasium detruditur; quod Petrarchae in iure civili itidem in eius vita contigisse diximus* – see edition and introduction by Baldassarri & Bagemihl (2003).

In this autofictional account, Boccaccio complains about having had to spend so many years studying useless subjects, instead of devoting himself completely to the study of grammar and literature. On the other hand, it is worth noting that the canon law course required an outstanding mastery of the Latin language, for not only the standard legal textbooks (such as the *decreta* by Gratian, Gregory IX and Boniface VIII), but also the lessons and university exams were written and/or delivered in Latin.⁸³ Furthermore, the students were expected to master the *ars notaria* (the art of writing legal documents) and the *ars dictaminis* (the art of writing letters). Though both these *artes* primarily served official and professional purposes, they occasionally incorporated some literary techniques and theories into their manuals (such as the theory of the levels of style, with a general preference for the *genus humilis*).⁸⁴ Similarly, the *artes notaria* and *dictaminis* (but especially the latter) could be used for artistic purposes, too. This will be particularly evident in Boccaccio's earliest Latin epistles; but also in his fictional works, including the *Decameron*, which display a variation of long and short sentences, creating cadential rhythms (*cursus*) which were typically employed in the *dictamina*.⁸⁵

However, Boccaccio suggests that, had he started composing when he was younger and more malleable, he would have certainly achieved the same level of excellence as the great poets of his own age. Since he began writing relatively late in life, that was impossible; and he would always be one step behind the successful poets: *nec dubito, dum etas in hoc aptior erat, si equo genitor tulisset animo, quin inter celebres poetas unus evasissem* (*Gen.* 15.10.8). In fact, Boccaccio saw his own poetry as deficient; and this idea would be allegorically expressed

⁸³ See Brundage (2008: 219-82).

⁸⁴ See Witt (2005: 68-83).

⁸⁵ See De Blasi (1993: 273).

in the *Buccolicum carmen*, too (as we will see below, in *Aggelos*, Boccaccio referred to his own eclogues as sick, skinny sheep).

To a large extent, Boccaccio's self-criticism shaped the critical reception of his works. In the fifteenth century, for instance, Leonardo Bruni (expressing Niccolò Niccoli's opinion) said in his *Dialogi ad Petrum Paulum Histrum* (ca. 1406) that Boccaccio did not have much control over his Latin, and that all his works contained many vices.⁸⁶ Similarly, in the *De hominibus doctis* (1489), Paolo Cortese would describe Boccaccio's style as disordered, defective and feeble (*totum genus inconditum est et claudicans et ieinum*).⁸⁷ Afterwards, in the late nineteenth century, Gustav Körting thought that Boccaccio's Latin grammar and versification were terrible; and then, in 1905, Walter Greg claimed that Boccaccio's eclogues showed "that as a metrist Boccaccio fell almost as far short of his friend [scil. Petrarch] in the learned as in the vulgar tongue".⁸⁸

While recognising his own weaknesses, Boccaccio made clear that his linguistic and poetic faults were not due to a lack of effort or motivation; quite the contrary. In the *Genealogia* 15.10, he intimated that, though he had not received a proper education in grammar while he was young, his passion for poetry was so great that he was determined to make double the effort to become a poet (an idea that is suggested in his eclogue *Saphos*, too).⁸⁹ In this way, Boccaccio presented himself as an eternal neophyte and amateur poet, but only in the etymological sense that the modern word "amateur" (*amator*) implies – that is, of a person who

⁸⁶ See Bruni *Dialogi* (ed. Baldassari) 1.49-50. Note, however, that in the second part of Bruni's dialogue, Niccoli praised Boccaccio's Latin works (including his *bucolica carmina*) – see *Dialogi* 2.87, and discussion in Kircher (2012: 90). Furthermore, Coluccio Salutati (1331–1406) praised the elegance of Boccaccio's eclogues, comparing them with classical Latin eclogues (yet not with those of Petrarch, which he thought of as superior): [Boccaccio] *amodo pascua cantabit atque pecudes, que sexdecim eclogis adeo eleganter celebravit, ut facile possimus eas, non audeo dicere Bucolicis nostri Francisci, sed veterum equare laboribus vel preferre?* (*Ep.* 25.10-3).

⁸⁷ Cortese *De hominibus* (ed. G. Ferrau, p. 116). See also Smarr (1987: l).

⁸⁸ Körting (1880: 698-700), and Greg (1905: 24). Among the defenders of Boccaccio's Latin versification and prosody, see Hortis (1879: 68) – discussion in Smarr (1987: li-lii).

⁸⁹ See discussion in Chapter 3, "How to reach Saphos".

pursues something not necessarily because he is good at it, or because he expects to receive something in return, but rather because he loves it.

Boccaccio's earliest fictional books in the vernacular (*Caccia di Diana*, *Filostrato* and *Filocolo*) date from between 1333 and 1338, while he was still living in Naples. The *Caccia* (already mentioned above) is a poetry book in *terza rima* which allegorically presents a group of prominent Neapolitan court women turned into nymph huntresses, who eventually rebel against their goddess Diana in order to take part in the cult of Venus. The *Filostrato* (meaning "defeated by love", according to a pseudo-Greek etymology), in turn, is written in royal octaves (*ottava rima*), and is composed of eight cantos.⁹⁰ It tells of the love of Troilo (Troilus, youngest son of Priam of Troy) for the faithless Criseida (daughter of the Trojan prophet Calcas). The third, *Filocolo* ("affliction of love"), is Boccaccio's first prose romance – and considered by some as Italy's first great novel.⁹¹ Its plot is based on the popular medieval tale of Florio and Biancifiore. Around the same period, or perhaps a little earlier (1332–34), Boccaccio also produced a few works in Latin: four fictional letters (*Epistole* 1-4) written in the *dictamen* style; a poetic dialogue named *Verba puellae sepultae ad transeuntem* (better known as the *Elegia di Costanza*), based on the ancient epitaph of Homonea (first century CE); and a short prose composition, partly constituting a *cento* of the first two books of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, entitled *De mundi creatione* (*Allegoria mitologica*).⁹²

⁹⁰ As Boccaccio himself explains in the rubric which precedes the proem of *Filostrato*, he took the Greek word φίλος ("friend", "lover") as meaning "love", and στρατός ("army", "hosts") as meaning "defeated": "Filostrato tanto viene a dire quanto uomo vinto e abbattuto d'amore".

⁹¹ Boccaccio again takes φίλος as meaning "love", and χόλον (nominative χόλος, "bile", "anger") as meaning "fatigue" or "burden": "Filocolo è da due greci nomi composto, da 'philos' e da 'colon'; e 'philos' in greco tanto viene a dire in nostra lingua quanto 'amore' e 'colon' in greco similmente tanto in nostra lingua risulta quanto 'fatica': onde congiunti insieme, si può dire, trasponendo le parti, fatica d'amore" (*Filoc.* 3.75.5-6). See Branca (1977: 45).

⁹² The epitaph of Homonea was apparently unknown in Boccaccio's epoch, but would afterwards become a literary sensation among the humanists – see Velli (2013: 55-6). Often regarded as a juvenile literary exercise, the *Elegia di Costanza* represents an important piece in Boccaccio's output which engages with both classical and medieval models (from Ovid and Seneca, to Boethius and Alan de Lille); some of its elements would be later incorporated in Boccaccio's eclogue *Olympia* – see Fonseca Jr. (2016a: 89-93). The original text of the epitaph of Homonea and Atimetus has been edited and published in Garrod (1912, item 230).

As Boccaccio briefly suggests in his *Epistola* 5, addressed to Niccolò Acciaiuoli, and dated to 1341, at the end of the previous year he was obliged to return to Florence with his father against his will: “dell’essere mio in Firenze contra piacere niente vi scrivo” (*Ep.* 5.6). His perennial love for the Angevin capital is also expressed in the *Decameron* 3.6, where he describes Naples as a “very ancient city, which is perhaps as delectable a city as any to be found in Italy” (“Napoli, città antichissima e forse così dilettevole, o più, come ne sia alcuna altra in Italia”).⁹³ Yet, though always nostalgic about his golden years in that city (and in spite of his hopes of becoming a court poet there, as inferred especially from his *Epistola* 13), it is in Florence that Boccaccio meets Petrarch, writes most of his literary works, and achieves a reputation as a political and literary figure.⁹⁴ Among his post-Neapolitan vernacular works are the already mentioned *Comedia delle ninfe fiorentine* (1341–42), and *Amorosa visione* (1342–43); followed by the *Elegia di Madonna Fiammetta* (ca. 1344), the *Ninfale fiesolano* (ca. 1344–46), the *Decameron* (1349–51/53; rev. 1370–71), the *Teseida delle nozze d’Emilia* (ca. 1350), the *Corbaccio* (ca. 1355/65?), the *Trattatello in laude di Dante* (1351–55, 1360, 1373) and the *Consolatoria a messer Pino de’ Rossi* (1360–63). Among his Latin works are the *De vita et moribus domini Francisci Petracchi de Florentia* (1348–50?), the *De Canaria* (ca. 1350), the *Pauca de T. Livio* (ca. 1351), the *De montibus, silvis, fontibus, lacubus, fluminibus, stagnis seu paludibus et de nominibus maris liber* (ca. 1355–60), the *De casibus virorum illustrium* (ca. 1356–74), the *Genealogie deorum gentilium* (ca. 1359–74), the *De mulieribus claris* (ca. 1361–75), the *Vita sanctissimi patris Petri Damiani* (ca. 1362), and the *Buccolicum carmen* (1362–

⁹³ See Lee (2013: 7).

⁹⁴ After a sojourn in Ravenna (1346), and then in Forlì (1347), Boccaccio would perform many public duties on behalf of Florence: in 1348 he is elected one of six communal *Ufficiali delle gabelle* (indirect tax collectors); from 1350 to 1355, he is elected *Camerlengo della Camera del comune* (communal treasurer), *Difensore del contado* (overseer of the territorial state), *Ufficiale delle gabelle del pane* (collector of indirect taxes on bread), *Ufficiale di torre* (communal overseer of public works), and *Ufficiale dei difetti* (auditor of mercenary troops); in 1364–5, *Ufficiale dei castelli* (overseer of fortifications); and in 1367, *Ufficiale della condotta* (overseer of mercenary troops) – see Armstrong *et al.* (2015: xxix–xxxv). On Boccaccio’s *Epistola* 13 and his relationship with Naples, see Morosini (2012:69–88), and Houston (2018: 81–97).

63). Finally, as was also stated above, Boccaccio dedicates the later years of his life to the preparation of his *Esposizioni sopra la Commedia di Dante* (1373–74).⁹⁵

Considering that the first half of his output is dominated by vernacular works, and the second by Latin, scholars such as Francesco Bruni have established and maintained an artificial (but to some extent convenient) dichotomy between a vernacular (young) Boccaccio and a Latin (mature) Boccaccio.⁹⁶ On the one hand, it is important to highlight that this division is not so clear-cut. Indeed, Boccaccio's earliest Latin letters and poems engage in a rich dialogue with Ovid and Apuleius; and his *Epistola* 2, in particular, allegorically describes his encounter with Poetry conducted by Virgil.⁹⁷ The reverse is also true and well documented: even after 1350, while most of his Latin prose works were in circulation, Boccaccio was concomitantly working on the *Corbaccio* and revising the *Decameron*. On the other hand, of equal or perhaps greater importance than trying to “demystify or “deconstruct” the idea of the two Boccaccios, is the task of analysing the autofictional mechanisms used in Boccaccio's texts to sustain such an idea. As this thesis will try to show in the chapters, Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* significantly reinforces this image of a poet who attempts to convert himself from an erotic vernacular poet into an aspirant *vates*, and finally into a saintly man who abandons poetry altogether to focus on heaven.

In short, while analysing the *Buccolicum* and its intertexts, the division of Boccaccio's career and output into two phases seems critically justified; yet not so much in terms of an

⁹⁵ For the chronology of Boccaccio's works, I have followed especially Tanturli & Zamponi (2013: 62–4), and Armstrong *et al.* (2015: xxix–xxxv). Besides the works mentioned here, Boccaccio also wrote other epistles, *rime* (sparse poems in Italian) and *carmina* (sparse poems in Latin) throughout his life. On the dating of the *Buccolicum carmen*, see the section “Dating the *Buccolicum carmen*” below.

⁹⁶ Bruni (1990) divides Boccaccio's production into two distinct phases: the “primo Boccaccio” (where Boccaccio is focused on the production of a “letteratura mezzana”, that is, an intermediary kind of fiction that incorporates low and high forms of literary expression), and the “secondo Boccaccio” (where Boccaccio shifts his attention to the philosophical and hermeneutical aspects of high literature). Against this idea of a “divided Boccaccio”, see, for instance, Eisner (2017: 179–99).

⁹⁷ I develop this allegorical interpretation of Boccaccio's *Epistola* 2 in Fonseca Jr. (2020a: 119–22). Moreover, it has been plausibly conjectured that Boccaccio wrote many more letters in Latin than the twenty-five pieces which have come down to us – see Auzzas (1992: 816, n. 1), and Fonseca Jr. (*ibid.*: 117–18).

objective and fixed shift, but rather as an autofictional shift based on classical and Christian models (mainly Virgil and Petrarch). In this sense, dialoguing with Petrarch's *Canzoniere* (as briefly suggested above), the *Buccolicum carmen* is a work which allegorically condenses Boccaccio's fragmentary selves into one coherent self, creating a meaningful narrative of experience from distinct literary pieces.⁹⁸ Ultimately, the autofictional story displayed in the *Buccolicum carmen* is a development of the same story which is succinctly evoked in Boccaccio's self-authored epitaph (written in 1374); that is, the story of a humble man whose earthly works brought him closer to God, and who cultivated a genuine love for poetry:

*Hac sub mole iacent cineres ac ossa Iohannis,
mens sedet ante Deum meritis ornata laborum
mortalis vite; genitor Boccaccius illi,
patria Certaldum, studium fuit alma poesis.
(Carmina 10)*

Dating the *Buccolicum carmen*

Since its publication in 1985, Pier Giorgio Ricci's study on the dating of Boccaccio's *Buccolicum carmen* has been used as a reference point for many scholars.⁹⁹ Collecting information from the poems themselves, and linking them to specific historical or political events, Ricci determined three groups of eclogues, each related to a different period: 1346–48 (eclogues 1-6), 1355 (7-10), and 1367 (11-16). Ricci's method, however, is not without its problems and contradictions. Particularly in the case of fictional works, seeking traces of historical evidence in the text in order to establish a precise date of composition can be rather ineffective. Whereas the account of historical events, even in fiction, obviously cannot precede the date in which these same events took place in reality, nothing prevents the author from writing about them in retrospect many years after they have occurred. To this issue one should

⁹⁸ See Mazzotta (1978: 271-96).

⁹⁹ See Ricci (1985: 50-66), followed by Smarr (1987), and Piacentini (2013: 203). For previous attempts of dating Boccaccio's *Buccolicum*, see Hauvette (1896), Lidonnici (1914: 159-312), and Massèra (1938: 262-2).

add the challenge of defining, in the first place, what a clear reference to a historical event or person actually is: sometimes the parallels found between a fictional text and history rest on matters of interpretation, and this can be especially difficult in highly allusive and allegorical works.¹⁰⁰

Although Ricci himself is all too aware of these chronological difficulties, he nevertheless fails to avoid some other problems.¹⁰¹ When discussing Boccaccio's *Galla*, for instance, Ricci interprets what could be simply conventional bucolic features as unmistakable metaphors for something else. Thus, he confidently argues that the description of a big cave (*antrum grande*), in line 54, signifies the ostentatious villa located at the foot of the hill of Montughi, near Florence; and that the character Egon, in the following line, refers to the bishop Angelo Acciaiuoli. Based on these and other "veiled allusions" ("velate allusioni"), Ricci concludes that 1346 is "undoubtedly" the year ("l'anno indubitabile") in which the narrative is set.¹⁰² A similar logic is applied to the other eclogues as well. In effect, while Ricci recognises that many of his conclusions are conjectural, he does not hesitate to classify others as "absolutely precise", and such assertions make his final chronological scheme less credible as a whole.¹⁰³

Even what Ricci regards as the only secure point of reference for the dating of the *Buccolicum* is disputable. He strongly maintains that Boccaccio's final eclogue *Aggelos* must have been written between the years 1367 and 1368. He deduces this from the fact that Solon Albanzani, the son of Donato Albanzani explicitly alluded to in the last line of the poem (*nostro hoc tu iungito, Solon, Agg. 144*), was born in 1361 and died in 1368. Since Solon plays a shepherd in the eclogue, Ricci argues that he could not have been represented there as less than

¹⁰⁰ On interpretation and overinterpretation, see Eco (1992).

¹⁰¹ Ricci (1985: 51): "datate gli avvenimenti narrate dalle egloghe non significa datate quest'ultime".

¹⁰² Ricci (1985: 55).

¹⁰³ See, for instance, Ricci (1985: 63, italics mine): "Ecco dunque determinata *con precisione assoluta* la data degli avvenimenti cui l'egloga si riferisce".

six years old, nor as older than seven (after the real Solon's death). Yet, here too Ricci establishes a rather arbitrary relationship between fiction and reality. Hypothetically, it is not impossible that Boccaccio imagined the baby Solon as an older shepherd in his poem, though it is indeed less likely that he wrote about him before his birth. Therefore, instead of proposing the year 1368 as the definite *terminus ante quem*, Ricci could have simply suggested 1361 as the possible *terminus post quem* for the composition of *Aggelos*.¹⁰⁴

In addition to that, a more compelling argument against Ricci's theory has been brought forth by Marco Cursi. Openly dismissing Ricci's motivations as "rather weak" ("piuttosto deboli"), Cursi proposes the date 1362–63 for Boccaccio's autograph Riccardiano 1232, in which the *Buccolicum carmen* was transmitted.¹⁰⁵ By comparing specific letters from several of Boccaccio's autographs (including the one just mentioned), Cursi was able to trace the evolution of Boccaccio's handwriting, and establish a date for groups of manuscripts according to the recurrence or absence of certain features in them. On the one hand, there is little doubt that the palaeographical method adopted by Cursi can only inform us of when the *Buccolicum* was transcribed, but not when its eclogues were composed. On the other hand, it provides us with a more reliable point of reference than Ricci's for the dating of the work.

¹⁰⁴ Ricci (1985: 51-2): "non possiamo di sicuro dire che questo: che l'ultima egloga, la sedicesima (*Aggelos*), fu composta prima dell'estate del 1368 quando si ammalò e morì quel figlio di Donato Albanzani ivi ricordato appunto come vivo. E poiché a questo figlio, nato nel 1361, bisogna dare il tempo di divenire quel pastorello che nell'egloga raccoglie le pecore, l'egloga potrà essere al più presto del 1367 o di quel intorno". See also Massèra (1928: 261-2, n. 3),

¹⁰⁵ See Cursi (2013: 30). The manuscript Riccardiano 1232 was identified as an autograph by Oscar Hecker in 1902. All the (few) modern scholarly editions of Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* (from Lidonnici to Perini) are based on its text. Besides the Riccardiano 1232, there are other eleven (non-autograph) codices of Boccaccio's *Buccolicum carmen*, most of them concentrated in Florence and dated to the fifteenth century: Florence, BML, 39.26 (end of fourteenth century); Florence, BML, 34.49 (dated 1379); Florence, BML, 52.29 (fifteenth century); Florence, BML, Ashb. 851 (fifteenth century); Florence, BNC, Magl. Misc. 8, s. 2, t. 1 (before known as Magl. 1313; partial; seventeenth century); Kynžvart Zámecká knihovna, 2.D.4 (dated 11 April, 1403); London, British Library, Harley 5421 (dated 1408); Paris, BnF, lat. 8389 (partial; fifteenth century); Oxford, Bodl. Library, Bodley 558 (fourteenth century; autograph by Domenico Silvestri); Siena, Bibl. Comunale degli Intronati, H.6.23 (beginning of fifteenth century); Viterbo, Bibl. Capitolare, cod. 44 (partial; fifteenth century). The *editio princeps* is dated to 1504, and is a collated edition containing the eclogues of Pomponio Gaurico, Virgil, Calpurnius, Nemesianus, Petrarch, and Battista Mantovano – see Piacentini (2014: 204).

Besides the full version of the work copied in the autograph Riccardiano 1232, the only extant evidence relating to the *Buccolicum carmen* is the piece conventionally referred to as *Tempus erat placidum*. Regarded as a first version of *Faunus* (the third eclogue of the *Buccolicum*), this poem was transmitted through one of Boccaccio's notebooks, the Zibaldone Laurenziano (BML, 29.8), which is dated to 1348/9, and also contains Boccaccio's *Postquam fata sinunt*, Dante's and Giovanni del Virgilio's *Eclogues*, Petrarch's eclogue *Argus*, Giovanni del Virgilio's eclogue to Albertino Mussato, among other non-pastoral works. Yet, despite the striking correspondences between the two poems, *Tempus erat* and *Faunus* are in fact quite distinct in purpose and form. While the former has the structure of an eclogue-epistle to Checco di Meletto Rossi, displaying reported dialogues filled with *verba dicendi*; the latter has a more Virgilian style, adopting the dramatic format of the song exchange from Virgil's *Eclogues* 3, 5, 7, 8 and 9. The single figure of Menalcas from *Tempus erat* is split into two shepherds, Pamphylus and Palemon, in *Faunus*. Moreover, *Faunus* is 128 lines, thus being considerably shorter and less descriptive than *Tempus erat*, which is 186 lines. Finally, unlike *Tempus erat*, *Faunus* contains a small prologue, opening with Palemon's line *Pamphyle, tu patrio recubas hic lentus in antro*, in an allusion to Virgil's *Eclogue* 1.1. Ultimately, though *Faunus* preserves several elements from *Tempus erat*, it is nevertheless a complete rewriting (and not merely a revision) of the latter composition.¹⁰⁶

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to establish the exact date of the composition of Boccaccio's *Buccolicum*. However, perhaps we should not discard the possibility that all or most of Boccaccio's eclogues were composed, and not simply revised and collected, in the period proposed by Cursi. Ricci himself recognises that the final text of the *Buccolicum carmen* is quite homogeneous, and actively engages with the other works that Boccaccio wrote in the

¹⁰⁶ For a more complete comparison between both texts, see Lorenzini (2011: 27-43) – note, however, that Lorenzini follows Ricci in the dating of Boccaccio's *Buccolicum*.

early 1360s; and yet, Ricci and other scholars are unabashed to defend that Boccaccio spent one or two decades of his life working on the *Buccolicum*.¹⁰⁷ As we will see in more detail in the following chapters, Boccaccio's first eclogue *Galla* (which is traditionally considered one of the earliest eclogues of the *Buccolicum*, written in 1346) has some strong links with the *Corbaccio* (whose dating is also controversial, but is nowadays generally acknowledged as being later than 1355).¹⁰⁸ Additionally, other features in the poem might indicate Boccaccio's acquaintance with Martial (whose manuscripts were discovered by Boccaccio in Montecassino, in 1362–63). Another element to be considered is that Boccaccio's *Epistola* 23 suggests that the eclogue *Alceus* (which is often believed to have been written in 1346–48) was actually written near or after Louis of Taranto's death (which was in May, 1362). Finally, it is significant that, apart from his twelfth eclogue *Saphos*, Boccaccio only invokes Sappho in his *Genealogie* and in his *De mulieribus claris* (which were also later works). Thus, while it is not absurd to conceive of the *Buccolicum* as the product of a large span of time (as was certainly the case for other works of Boccaccio), there is no extant proof to confirm this. Therefore, to perpetuate this information uncritically means, firstly, to neglect what Cursi's analysis of the autograph Riccardiano 1232 has plausibly demonstrated, as well as the balance of evidence above. Secondly, it endorses the opinion that the *Buccolicum* is a miscellaneous collection such as his *carmina*, rather than a unitary and well-thought book of eclogues.

Genre

According to the late-antique and medieval system of genres and styles, the bucolic genre was classified as a lowly or humble (*humilis*) genre. This notion appears, for instance, in the works of the ancient scholars and commentators Valerius Probus (ca. 20/30–105 CE), Aelius Donatus

¹⁰⁷ Ricci (1985: 51, and esp. 56-7): “Nel '46 il Boccaccio si accostò per la prima volta alla poesia pastorale; quando, cioè, le egloghe del Petrarca cominciarono a diffondersi extravaganti; ed a comporre egloghe il Boccaccio proseguì nel biennio successivo”. See also Hauvette (1896: 154-75), and Smarr (1987: xxix-xli).

¹⁰⁸ See, for instance, Padoan (1978), Hollander (1988), Veglia (1998: 22, 38), and Rico (2002: 299-320).

(fourth century CE), Maurus Servius Honoratus (late fourth – early fifth century CE), and Iunius Philargyrius (probably fifth century CE); as well as in the medieval commentaries or literary treatises of Bernard of Utrecht (eleventh century CE), John of Garland (ca. 1195–ca. 1272), and Geoffrey of Vinsauf (fl. ca. 1200). Regarding the sequence of Virgil’s works more specifically, the *Eclogues* were conceived as stylistically lower than both the *Georgics* (“middle” or *mediocris* in style) and the *Aeneid* (“weighty” or *gravis*). Biographers of Virgil were particularly attached to this idea, for it suggested an appealing link between Virgil’s ageing, social progress, and poetic ascent. According to the Suetonian-Donatan *Vita Virgiliana*, one of the reasons why Virgil cultivated the three genres in that sequence, starting with the bucolic and ending with the epic, was to reflect the order of the human ages (*ordinem temporum secutus est circa vitam humanam*, *Vita Virg.* 58).¹⁰⁹

Here, however, an important distinction must be made between poetic ascent and progression of genres, since one is not necessarily dependent on the other. As David Wilson-Okamura has argued, the famous concept of the “wheel of Virgil” (*rota Virgilii*), which originated with John of Garland’s *Parisiana poetria* (ca. 1231–35), is often misunderstood by modern scholars: rather than establishing a linear hierarchy, the *rota* implied a spectrum of styles, and its main purpose was to teach decorum, that is, obedience to each genre’s main qualities and style.¹¹⁰ From this it follows that, in emulation of Virgil’s literary path, the climax of a poet’s career *could* coincide with the writing of an epic, but did not necessarily have to do so. In theory, what was expected of a good poet was his mastery of different genres and levels of style.

This said, it is true that, at least in fourteenth-century Italy, the writing of epic enjoyed higher prestige than the writing of other literary forms. Petrarch’s laureate coronation (on 8

¹⁰⁹ See Wilson-Okamura (2010: 89-90). On the controversial dependency of Donatus’ *Vita Virgiliana* on a hypothetical lost work of Suetonius (ca. 69–ca. 150 CE), see Wilson-Okamura (2010: 49-50), and Peirano (2012: 77).

¹¹⁰ See *Par. Poet.* 5.86 (ed. Lawler, 1974); Wilson-Okamura (2010: 90-1).

April, 1941), for instance, was largely motivated by the early sections of his Latin epic poem *Africa*.¹¹¹ However, this cult of the epic also seems to reflect, more than an overvaluation of the epic genre itself, the intellectual and cultural value placed on Virgil's poetic career. This is illustrated in the hexameter letter which would initiate the bucolic correspondence between the Bolognese professor of Latin Giovanni del Virgilio and the poet Dante (1319–20). What is particularly at stake in this correspondence is the choice of language and the fact that Dante is writing in the vernacular: del Virgilio suggests that Dante, in devoting his efforts to the writing of the *Commedia*, runs the risk of being appraised as a mediocre poet of the crowd. Thus, inciting Dante to write a Latin poem worthy of a *vates* (*carmen vatisonum*), del Virgilio expresses an elitist concern with Dante's literary status and readership. Though del Virgilio associates this type of worthy poetry mostly with epic features, his reference to flowers and ploughmen (*flores... arator*), in line 27 below, seems to include other inferior genres too, particularly the didactic:

At, precor, ora cie que te distinguere possint
 carmine vatisono, sorti comunis utrique.
 Et iam multa tuis lucem narratibus orant:
 dic age quo petiit Iovis armiger astra volatu,
 dic age quos flores, que lilia fregit arator,
 (...)
 Si te fama iuvat, parvo te limite septum
 non contentus eris, nec vulgo iudice tolli.
 (Giov. Virg.-Dante *Ecl.* 1.23-34)

Subsequently, Giovanni del Virgilio presents himself as “Maro's house-slave spokesman” (*vocalis verna Maronis*, 35), and makes clear that the type of poetry he is advocating is Virgilian in essence. Nevertheless, in this first letter, del Virgilio does not make any direct reference to bucolic poetry. It is perhaps ironic, then, that Dante chooses to reply to del Virgilio

¹¹¹ See Martinez (2015: 87); and also Regn & Huss (2009: 86-102).

with an eclogue. While this literary choice could be interpreted as an attempt by Dante to enter into a polemical debate on the same grounds as that of the medieval *conflictus*, it also potentially implies Dante's preference for Virgil's lowest genre. In fact, though in *Inferno* 1 Dante champions the *Aeneid* very strongly, in *Purgatory* 22.57 he refers to Virgil as the singer of bucolic compositions ("cantor de' buccolici carmi"); and then, in *Purgatory* 22.64-72, Dante (now speaking through the figure of Statius) praises Virgil as the visionary author of *Eclogues* 4.¹¹²

From Dante's first eclogue-epistle to del Virgilio, it might be inferred that Dante planned to write a total of ten or so eclogues to del Virgilio (Mopsus): *hac implebo decem missurus vascula Mopso* (Giov. Virg.-Dante *Ecl.* 2.64).¹¹³ Struck down by death in August or September 1321, however, Dante ended his career with only two eclogues composed, among a total of four compositions which formed his bucolic correspondence with Giovanni del Virgilio.¹¹⁴ Thus, it is difficult to determine the role that these eclogues play in Dante's literary output and self-fashioned career. In reality, Dante's eclogues only come down to us through Boccaccio, who personally copied and preserved them, together with Giovanni del Virgilio's pieces, in his own *Zibaldone Laurenziano*.

Just like Dante's *Egloge*, the *Buccolicum carmen* is Boccaccio's final work of poetry, yet with the significant difference that the latter work was fully completed and transcribed by Boccaccio himself. The *Buccolicum* autograph is beautifully decorated: the major initials of each poem are painted in blue with red filigrees; the minor initials, indicating the alternation

¹¹² Note, moreover, that in his *Epistola a Cangrande* (32), Dante associates the comedy with the bucolic, elegiac and satiric genres – see Petoletti (2016: 496).

¹¹³ On the different possible meanings of this passage (which alludes to Virgil *Eclogues* 3.70-1, and is alternatively understood to mean cantos of the *Commedia*), see Petoletti (2016: 565-6, with bibliographical indications).

¹¹⁴ Throughout this thesis, I adopt Petoletti's editorial convention of referring to the bulk of del Virgilio's and Dante's correspondence as *Egloghe/Eclogues* 1-4, understanding *Egloga* (i.e. *Epistola*) 1 as del Virgilio's first non-bucolic letter to Dante (*Iohannes de Virgilio Danti Allagerii*); *Egloga* 2 as Dante's first reply, in the form of an eclogue, to del Virgilio (*Dantes Alagerii Iohanni de Virgilio*); *Egloga* 3 as del Virgilio's eclogue-epistle to Dante (*Iohannes de Virgilio Danti Alagerii egloga responsive*); and *Egloga* 4 as Dante's second and final eclogue-epistle to del Virgilio (*Egloga Dantis Allagerii Iohanni de Virgilio missa*) – see Petoletti (2016: 513-4).

of speakers within each eclogue, are alternatively coloured in red and blue, also with filigrees; the titles, headlines and names of speakers are presented in red; and the capital letters at the beginning of each line are highlighted in yellow. Though Boccaccio later made some changes and self-corrections in his manuscript, his first version was already of high quality. Moreover, the book had an unusual small format (mm 158x112), which closely mirrored Petrarch's autograph of his own *Bucolicum carmen* (Vat. lat. 3358).¹¹⁵ What is more, in terms of language and content, Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* met some of the most important criteria associated with the (early) humanist literature of his period: the use of Latin, active engagement with classical models, and the use of allegory for morally edifying purposes.

From these features, it is possible to conclude that, though the product of a humble genre, Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* was designed as a refined and honourable work, aimed at the most erudite readers. Ultimately, it represents an ambitious literary and life project, and potentially the culminating point in Boccaccio's career. Yet, the fact that Boccaccio autofictionally chooses to conclude his career with a bucolic and not, for instance, an epic poem is also quite revelatory with regard to the type of literary identity he was constructing for himself. Taking further the poetic statement made by Dante to del Virgilio in the *Egloge*, Boccaccio humbly declines the very idea of mingling with the eminent poets of epic and tragedy in Latin, such as Petrarch and Mussato. At the same time, in the *Buccolicum carmen*, Boccaccio presents himself as equally capable of engaging with the highest expressions of classical poetry, from Virgil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, to Lucan's *Bellum civile* and Seneca's tragedies.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ See images of this autograph at <http://www.autografi.net/dl/resource/2820> (last accessed 10 June, 2021); and descriptions in Piacentini (2013: 209-11).

¹¹⁶ See Raffa (1996: 275): "The primary goal of Dante's engagement with mythic and literary material from classical literature is to refuse Del Virgilio's generous offer of the laurel crown yet show himself eminently worthy of receiving it".

Though Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* takes Virgil's *Eclogues* as its primary model, it nevertheless also plays with loftier genres, in a manner that is characteristic of Boccaccio's *ars combinatoria*. It should be noted, however, that by incorporating elements from different genres, Boccaccio is fundamentally adopting a Virgilian practice. Consider, for instance, the beginning of Virgil's *Eclogue* 4, where the poet-narrator prominently manifests his wish to sing of "things somewhat loftier" (*paulo maiora canamus*, *Ecl.* 4.1). Similarly, the opening lines of Virgil's *Eclogue* 6 suggest that the poet-narrator was firstly aiming at the epic genre, before Apollo admonished him to concentrate on smaller compositions: *cum canerem reges et proelia, Cynthia aurem/ vellit et admonuit: "pastorem, Tityre, pinguis/ pascere oportet ovis, deductum dicere carmen"* (*Ecl.* 6.2-4). Finally, Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 is generically enriched with strains of Gallan love-elegy. Hence, the inclusion of non-bucolic elements into Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* could ultimately be seen as a complex form of intertextuality with Virgil's *Eclogues*.¹¹⁷

Moreover, we should not overlook that the relationship between Boccaccio's *Buccolicum carmen* and Virgil's *Eclogues* was deeply mediated through the Virgilian exegetical tradition, especially through Servius. Although nowadays most classical scholars tend to avoid interpretations based on allegory, it is undeniable that the allegorical mode dominated the interpretation of Virgil's *Eclogues* from late Antiquity up until at least the eighteenth century. Particularly in Boccaccio's times, Servius's authority as an exegete of Virgil's poetry was well established.¹¹⁸ By then, the name of Virgil was almost indissolubly connected with that of Servius; and Servius' commentaries, very widely circulated since late

¹¹⁷ On the generic complexities of Virgil's *Eclogues*, see Harrison (2007: 34-74).

¹¹⁸ Among Servius' critics from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were, for instance, the above-mentioned Benvenuto da Imola, and also Giovanni da Firenze. Whereas Benvenuto was more emphatic than Servius in reading the *Eclogues* as a *liber unus* based on a single and continuous allegory of Virgil's life, Giovanni da Firenze thought that the theory of the *magnus annus* (which involved a perpetual cycle of ages), defended by Servius in his commentary on Virgil's *Eclogue* 4, was "false, heretical and impossible" – see Lord (2002: 287-362) and Zabughin (1921-23: 84).

Antiquity, have profoundly shaped the ways of reading not only the *Eclogues*, but also the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*.¹¹⁹

The interdependence between Virgil's works and Servius' commentaries, in the Trecento, was literally tangible, for they were often transmitted together in a single manuscript.¹²⁰ An example of this is Petrarch's *Codex Ambrosianus*, the so-called "Ambrosian Virgil" (or *Virgilius Ambrosianus*). Dated to the early fourteenth (or perhaps the end of the thirteenth) century, this large manuscript contains the text of Virgil's *Eclogues*, *Georgics* and *Aeneid* surrounded by the commentary of Servius.¹²¹ It also contains, after the *Aeneid*, a portion of Statius' *Achilleid* surrounded by an anonymous commentary; four odes of Horace (2.3, 2.10, 2.16, and 4.7), with scholia; and two medieval commentaries, incomplete at the end, on Aelius Donatus' *Barbarismus*.¹²² The manuscript contains, especially on the text of Virgil, marginal and interlinear notes by Petrarch, many of which consist of allegorical interpretations.¹²³ Another compelling feature of Petrarch's "Ambrosian Virgil" is its frontispiece, which has an emblematic illustration by Simone Martini (1244–1344). This illustration depicts a young bearded blond man (traditionally identified as Servius), opening a semi-transparent curtain behind which lies a shepherd (notionally Virgil) under a tree, with a book on his lap and a pen in hand.¹²⁴

¹¹⁹ See, for instance, Macr. *Sat.* 1.2.15: *hos Servius inter grammaticos doctorem recens professus, iuxta doctrina mirabilis et amabilis verecundia*.

¹²⁰ However, in fifteenth-century Italy there were also "manuscripts of pure Servius (i.e. with no text of Virgil)", which only corroborates Servius' popularity – see Wilson-Okamura (2010: 33, quoted); and also Marshall (1997: 14-7).

¹²¹ As observed by Lord (1982: 254), "except for certain passages on the *Aeneid*, Books 2 and 3", the commentary of Servius presented in the *Codex Ambrosianus* is not the enlarged version of the *Scholia Danielis* (also known as *Servius Auctus*, or *Servius Danielis*). It was, therefore, the so-called *Servius Simplex*.

¹²² Lord (1982: 254-5).

¹²³ Lord (1982: 260).

¹²⁴ See this frontispiece at: <https://www.ambrosiana.it/opere/il-virgilio-ambrosiano-di-francesco-petrarca/> (last accessed 10 June, 2021); and discussion in Patterson (1988: 19-23).

As far as we know, Boccaccio did not own a personal copy of Servius' commentaries.¹²⁵ Yet, his close contact with Petrarch at the very least suggests that he had relatively easy access to these writings. What is more, Boccaccio's knowledge of Servius is extensively attested to in the *Genealogie*, where there are more than a hundred occurrences of Servius' name.¹²⁶ It is striking, moreover, that Boccaccio's *Epistola* 23 (ca. 1374) closely alludes to some passages from Servius. Initially written as a private reply to his personal friend and religious guide Martino da Signa, Boccaccio's *Epistola* 23 represents a form of mini-commentary on the *Buccolicum carmen*, and an important piece in the reception of this work.¹²⁷ Some scholars have rightly noticed similarities between this letter and Petrarch's *Ad Familiares* 10.4. By proposing to explain the meanings behind the titles and character-names from his eclogues, Boccaccio partly emulates and extends Petrarch's explanation of his first eclogue *Parthenias* to his brother Gherardo. It has gone unnoticed, however, that Boccaccio's *excursus* on the bucolic genre, at the beginning of *Epistola* 23, has multiple points of contact with Servius' preface to his commentary on Virgil's *Eclogues*.

Servius points out that Virgil intended to imitate Theocritus, who was superior to Moschus and other bucolic poets: *intentio poetae haec est, ut imitetur Theocritum Syracusanum, meliorem Moscho et ceteris qui bucolica scripserunt* (*ad Buc.* pr.1.30-2). Yet, while Servius regards Theocritus' poetry as very simple and literal in meaning, he suggests that Virgil preferred to add figurative meanings into some passages of the *Eclogues*, mostly as a way of paying homage to Augustus and other prominent men:

et aliquibus locis per allegoriam agat gratias Augusto vel aliis nobilibus (...) in qua re tantum dissentit a Theocrito: ille enim ubique simplex est, hic necessitate compulsus

¹²⁵ As noted by Mazza (1996: 58), the inventory of Boccaccio's *parva libreria* contains a reference to Servius' commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid*; however, their respective *incipits* do not match.

¹²⁶ See Delvigo (2014: 133-43).

¹²⁷ Martino da Signa was appointed one of the executors of Boccaccio's will, and inheritor of his personal library, the so-called *parva libreria*. On Boccaccio's will, see Regnicoli (2013: 387-93), and Papio (2013: 341-51).

aliquibus locis miscet figuras, quas perite plerumque etiam ex Theocriti versibus facit, quos ab illo dictos constat esse simpliciter (*ad Buc.* Pr.1.33-8).

At the beginning of his *Epistola* 23, Boccaccio makes a similar comparison between Virgil and Theocritus. Although Boccaccio (again, as far as we know) did not have access to the texts of Theocritus, he indirectly knew of his fame from the accounts of the ancients:

Theocritus Syragusanus poeta, ut ab antiquis accepimus, primus fuit qui greco carmine bucolicum excogitavit stilum, verum nil sensit preter quod cortex ipse verborum demonstrat. Post hunc latine scripsit Virgilius, sed sub cortice nonnullos abscondit sensus, esto non semper voluerit sub nominibus colloquentium aliquid sentiremus. Post hunc autem scripserunt et alii, sed ignobiles, de quibus nil curandum est, excepto inclito preceptore meo Francisco Petrarca, qui stilum preter solitum paululum sublimavit et secundum eglogarum suarum materias continue collocutorum nomina aliquid significantia posuit. Ex his ego Virgilium secutus sum, quapropter non curavi in omnibus colloquentium nominibus sensum abscondere; et ob id, cum desideres tam titulorum quam etiam nominum colloquentium in eglogis meis sensum, nolo mireris, magister optime, si absque significato nonnulla colloquentium nomina comperies: de titulis non sic, omnes enim accurate apposui. Nunc autem ad optatum tuum deveniens dico. (*Ep.* 23.1-4)

Here, Boccaccio accepts Theocritus as the founder of bucolic poetry (*primus fuit*), and repeats Servius' opinion that Theocritus was quite literal in sense (*nil sensit... demonstrat*). Like the late antique grammarian, who contrasts Theocritus' simplicity with Virgil's moderate use of allegory (*aliquibus locis miscet figuras, ad Buc.* Pr.1.36), Boccaccio claims that Virgil concealed *some* meanings beneath the surface of his eclogues (*sub cortice nonnullos abscondit sensus, Ep.* 23.1).¹²⁸ Then, just as Servius briefly mentions Moschus and other poets in his proem, Boccaccio tells of other undistinguished writers, those who came after Virgil and whose bucolic poetry should not be taken into account (*scripserunt et alii, sed ignobiles, de quibus nil curandum est, 1*).¹²⁹ However, Boccaccio "updates" Servius' account, and adds one important

¹²⁸ See also Suet-Donat. *Vita Virg.* 66: *In Bucolicis Vergilii neque nusquam neque ubique aliquid figurate dici, hoc est per allegoriam. Vix enim propter laudem Caesaris et amissos agros haec Vergilio conceduntur, cum Theocritus simpliciter conscripserit, quem hic noster conatur imitari.*

¹²⁹ See Huguccio (Hugh of Pisa), *Derivationes: Nobilis componitur ignobilis -e, quasi non nobilis, qui fere non cognoscitur, cuius nomen et genus ignoratur* – Piacentini (2015: 170-1).

name to that bucolic canon: Petrarch. At the same time, Boccaccio concedes that Petrarch raised the lowly style of the pastoral slightly above the usual (*stilum preter solitum paululum sublimavit*); and that Petrarch continually added meanings to the names of his bucolic characters. Because of this, Boccaccio declares to Martino that he has chosen to follow the example of Virgil, and so has not tried to conceal a meaning behind the name of each of his characters.

Though in his *excursus* Boccaccio is particularly concerned with bucolic titles and names, his initial statements also seem to cover the bucolic genre as a whole.¹³⁰ Note, for instance, that when he mentions the “bark” of Theocritus’ words (*cortex ipse verborum*, *Ep.* 23.1), he ostensibly refers to Theocritus’ style in general, and not specifically to his characters. Moreover, Boccaccio does not explain Petrarch’s elevation of the genre exclusively on the basis of Petrarch’s allegorical characters; instead, he presents these two aspects as complementary (*Petrarca, qui stilum preter solitum paululum sublimavit et secundum...*, 1 above). This observation has an important effect upon the reception of Boccaccio’s *Buccolicum carmen*, as well as on his self-fashioned literary career. By proclaiming Virgil as his primary bucolic model in *Epistola* 23, while subtly suggesting that Petrarch has stretched the boundaries of the bucolic genre rather too far, Boccaccio implies that his book of eclogues is more “classical” than that of his *preceptor*, and further presents himself as a direct continuator of the Virgilian tradition.

Still, it might strike us as intriguing that Boccaccio tacitly passed over names such as Calpurnius Siculus (and Nemesianus), Giovanni del Virgilio and Dante in his *excursus*.¹³¹ These poets were influential not only in the history of the bucolic genre, but also in Boccaccio’s

¹³⁰ See Piacentini (2015: 147-76), who presents some persuasive arguments defending that Boccaccio is exclusively concerned with bucolic names and titles in his *excursus*.

¹³¹ On Boccaccio and Calpurnius (and Nemesianus), see Castagna (1976, *ad indicem*), and Petoletti (2015: 105-21; esp. p. 117, n. 39).

own literary training – unlike Petrarch, Boccaccio knew and had copies of all these texts.¹³² However, Boccaccio’s omission of these poets’ names in his *Epistola 23* has a significant effect. Indeed, by omitting these poets who were less well known (*ignobiles*) as bucolic poets, Boccaccio consequently sets himself up as competing with the greatest bucolic poets.¹³³ Contrasting with the *Genealogie* and *Aggelos*, Boccaccio’s *Epistola 23* actually leads the reader to compare the *Buccolicum carmen* with the more classical or representative eclogues of Theocritus, Petrarch and, above all, Virgil. Ultimately, both the idea that Boccaccio passes over those “minor” bucolic poets, and the idea that he explicitly dismisses Theocritus and Petrarch, could be seen as two aspects of the same autofictional strategy.

Scholars generally assume, with good reason, that Boccaccio’s eclogues were mainly inspired by those of Petrarch.¹³⁴ Besides the formal similarities between Boccaccio’s and Petrarch’s autographs mentioned above, it has been noted that, on the occasion of his visit to Petrarch’s house in Milan in 1359, of all the many Latin works possessed by Petrarch, Boccaccio chose to make a copy of Petrarch’s *Bucolicum carmen*.¹³⁵ Before then, Boccaccio had already encountered some of Petrarch’s eclogues, in circulation since the late 1340s, and from these compositions he probably drew the stimulus to write some of his political and moral eclogues. Boccaccio’s eclogue-epistle *Tempus erat placidum* and its later recreation *Faunus* mentioned above, for instance, have clear points of contact with Petrarch’s *Argus*, which also presents a lament on the death of King Robert of Naples. Moreover, as we will see in the chapters, Petrarch is allegorically mentioned by Boccaccio in several of his eclogues. Particularly at the end of *Saphos*, Boccaccio (Aristeus) is resolved to seek Petrarch (Silvanus),

¹³² See Cooper (1977: 38-40), and Hubbard (1998: 236, n. 49).

¹³³ See Lummus (2013: 156): “If Petrarch’s *Africa* was a modern *Aeneid*, and his twelve-book *Bucolicum carmen* sought to sublimate the bucolic to the heights of epic, then Boccaccio situates his own pastoral work as the modern-day standard-bearer of the ancient *modus humilis*”.

¹³⁴ See, for instance, Houston (2012: S48): “Boccaccio doubtlessly followed Petrarch’s lead, particularly in his Latin works: (...) Petrarch’s *Bucolicum Carmen*, especially the *Argus*, inspired Boccaccio’s *Bucolicum [sic] Carmen*”.

¹³⁵ See Zak (2015: 143).

who is considered the best poet after Virgil (Minciades) – although this allegorical *fabula* should be interpreted more broadly, as referring to Petrarch's influence on Boccaccio's literary activity as a whole, and not specifically on his *Buccolicum*. Furthermore, Boccaccio's admiration for Petrarch's *Bucolicum* is markedly expressed in *Genealogia* 14. Refuting the false opinion of the ignorant, according to which poets only wanted to show off their eloquence by means of useless and deceitful stories, Boccaccio mentions Virgil, Dante and Petrarch in order to prove that their powerful eloquence is based on philosophical and divine reasoning. Particularly in regard to the bucolic genre, Boccaccio mentions Virgil's *Eclogues* as an example of "philosophical" work, and Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen* as one of gravity and elegance: *si Buccolici sui carminis gravitatem, si ornatum, si verborum exquisitum decus pensemus* (*Gen.* 14.10.5).

It is undeniable that Petrarch (as well as Dante, Giovanni Del Virgilio, Calpurnius and Nemesianus) exerted a significant influence in Boccaccio's *Buccolicum*. Yet, this influence perhaps operated more at a "conceptual" level, by shaping the Christian allegorical thread that runs through the work, than at the level of composition. For instance, as a political eclogue that praises Louis of Taranto and the Neapolitan court, Boccaccio's *Alcestus* (like *Faunus*) bears some thematic resemblance to Petrarch's *Argus*; yet, at a structural and textual level, it has more in common with Virgil's *Eclogue* 5 (and also with Calpurnius Siculus' *Eclogue* 4). Another example of this tendency is Boccaccio's fifteenth eclogue: as a poem of emotional conflict and religious conversion, *Phylostropos* shares a common background with Petrarch's eclogue *Parthenias*, and especially with Petrarch's non-bucolic work *Secretum*; however, the poem has more textual links with Virgil's *Eclogues* than with those two works.

The *Buccolicum carmen*: summary and allegory

After the introductory *excursus* on the bucolic genre in *Epistola* 23, Boccaccio briefly explains each of his eclogues and their allegorical significance. He asks da Signa not to worry about the titles and speakers of his two introductory eclogues, *Galla* and *Pampinea*, claiming that they do not relate to any specific circumstances, but only broadly deal with his “youthful lecheries” (*iuveniles lascivias meas*, *Ep.* 23.4). From this it is possible to infer that Boccaccio’s *Galla* and *Pampinea* are allegorical only in relation to the larger autofictional framework of the *Buccolicum*, as they symbolise an immature state of *servitium amoris*, yet do not allude to any particular historical events or persons. Regarding their plots, **eclogue 1, *Galla***, begins with a casual meeting between Damon and Tindarus in the arid landscape of the Arno Valley. Whereas Tindarus is herding bulls, Damon is seeking death, because he was abandoned by his lover Galla. Tindarus then tries to console Damon; but his attempts are useless, since Damon is burning with a poisonous passion. **Eclogue 2, *Pampinea***, presents the first and only monologue of the *Buccolicum*. As Palemon foolishly tries to trace the footprints of his lover Pampinea, he confesses his mad passion to the woods. Though knowing that Pampinea has left him in order to pursue Glaucus, Palemon still worries about her. Yet, since no one responds to or attends to his desperate calls and prayers, Palemon finally begs the rural deities and nymphs to allow him to die. While he awaits death, Palemon is determined to spend the rest of his life seeking Pampinea through the mountains, forests and fields.

With regard to **eclogue 3, *Faunus***, Boccaccio explains that its title refers to Francesco Ordelaſſi (ca. 1300–74), the Ghibelline ruler of Forlì (1333–59). However, Boccaccio deliberately does not attribute any particular meaning to his characters Palemon, Pamphylus and Meris (*nominibus autem collocutorum nullum significatum volui*, *Ep.* 23.6). The association between Faunus and Ordelaſſi indicates that the eclogue deals with the tumultuous circumstances involving Ordelaſſi’s departure from Forlì, in the autumn of 1347, to join forces

with King Louis of Hungary, in the latter's mission to invade Naples and avenge the murder of his brother Andrew (Queen Johanna's first husband). Thus, *Faunus* starts with Palemon informing Pamphylus that their forest is in a state of utter chaos, but neither of them knows the details behind it. Palemon has only heard Testilis shouting in the woods, when she was trying to impede Faunus from travelling to chase dangerous bears and wolves. Then, Meris comes and reports the rumours to Palemon and Pamphylus: the young Alexis has been brutally killed at night, either by a pregnant wolf, or by a group of lions and violent beasts. Because of this, Alexis' brother, Tytirus, now seeks revenge; and he is supported by many men, including Faunus who, despite the laments of Testilis, is determined to depart.

Eclogue 4, *Dorus*, introduces the characters Montanus, Dorus and Phytias. As Boccaccio equivocally explains in *Epistola* 23.7-8, the name "Dorus" derives from a Greek word equivalent in meaning to the Latin *amaritudo*; and it refers to Louis of Taranto (Queen Johanna's second husband) in a state of "bitterness" after his escape from Naples.¹³⁶ Montanus, in turn, refers to an unspecified inhabitant of Volterra, where Louis of Taranto sought temporary refuge; and Phytias, to the grand seneschal Niccolò Acciaiuoli, the faithful advisor of Louis of Taranto and Johanna. The plot of the eclogue is as follows: knowing that Dorus desperately wants to flee from his homeland, Montanus kindly offers his own cave as a shelter to him. Dorus at first resists the offer, but Phytias advises him to accept it. Montanus then invites both Dorus and Phytias to enter his cave. There, Dorus explains that Alexis was the successor to the wise ruler Argus, until he fell victim to a cruel death. Alexis was then replaced by Dorus, who married Liquoris with the support of Phytias. Meanwhile, however, the savage Polyphemus rushed down from his ancestral land and, being filled with anger and the desire

¹³⁶ *Ep.* 23.7: *Quarte egloge titulus est Dorus hanc ob causam: tractatur enim in ea de fuga Lodovici regis Sicilie; et quoniam liquisse proprium regnum eidem regi amarissimum credendum est, ut satis in processu egloge percipitur, ab amaritudine eam denominavi, nam grece doris, amaritudo latine sonat.* See Perini (1994: 947): "in realtà il Boccaccio prendeva per vera indicazione etimologica l'aggettivazione riservata da Virgilio alla ninfa oceanica Doride in *Ecl.* X 5: *Doris amara*". See also *Gen.* 8: *alii vero dicunt amaritudinem intelligi, et id circo Nereo marino deo nuptam, quia amarum sit mare.*

for vengeance, destroyed everything and everyone on his way. In the midst of this chaos, shepherds, flocks and herds tried to escape in fear, while Dorus and Phytias fled together to Montanus' land. The eclogue ends with Montanus putting himself and his woods at Dorus' disposal, and assuring him that better times would come.

Eclogue 5, *Silva cadens*, allegorically treats the fall of Naples after the departure of Louis of Taranto and the Neapolitan court. According to Boccaccio, the speakers Caliopus (adapted from Καλλιόπη, “good sound”) and Pamphylus (πᾶν + φίλος, “all loving”) respectively refer to an eloquent narrator and a certain Neapolitan citizen.¹³⁷ The eclogue opens with Pamphylus lying comfortably on the grass and singing of his love for Chalcidia. After knowing from Caliopus that his lover is weeping in sorrow, however, Pamphylus gets alarmed. Caliopus tells him that he himself has seen Chalcidia sobbing, and beating her breast and face with her hands, as she lamented the fall of her once glorious woods. She also regretted the fact that the sheep and goats fell sick, while the shepherds scattered among the lairs of wild beasts, and Alcestus and Liquoris sailed away with fear. Caliopus finally tells Pamphylus that he could not comfort Chalcidia with words, for he feared that Polyphemus might have been lurking around; yet, he advises Pamphylus to go and seek his beloved.

Eclogue 6, *Alcestus*, depicts the return of Louis of Taranto and the Angevin court to Naples. As Boccaccio explains in his *Epistola* 23, he chose the name “Alcestus” (ἄλκη, “virtue” + *aestus*, “fervour”) to indicate the virtuous and spirited character that the King adopted at the end of his life.¹³⁸ The names of the speakers Amintas and Melibeus, however, have no specific meaning here.¹³⁹ The poem starts with Melibeus complaining about the deplorable condition of his woods. Yet, Amintas comes with the good news that the savage Polyphemus has

¹³⁷ *Ep.* 23.10: *Pro Caliope ego intelligo aliquem optime recitantem damna desolate civitatis, nam caliopes grece, bona sonoritas est latine, que bona sonoritas in aliquo esse non potest nisi debito ordine dicenda dicantur. Pro Pamphylo autem accipi potest quem maluerimus ex Neapolitanis civitatem suam integre diligentem, cum pamphylus grece, latine totus dicatur amor.*

¹³⁸ See “Dating the *Buccolicum carmen*” above.

¹³⁹ *Ep.* 23.11-12 (quoted in Chapter 2).

departed, and Alceus is finally returned. The two shepherds rejoice and celebrate. Melibeus proposes that they spend the rest of the day enjoying dance and music, and so they do – until they are scared by the barking of the sheepdogs.

Eclogue 7, *Iurgium*, stages a quarrel between Daphnis (representing the emperor Charles IV) and Florida (Florence).¹⁴⁰ At the beginning of the poem, Daphnis complains that Florida neglects her sheepfold, but does not allow him to look after it. Florida promptly replies that Daphnis is a thief, and drove a stolen flock to the Alphean wood. Daphnis defends himself, saying that the sheep were his, but Florida protests, saying that he did not have the permission to go there, and that his titles are empty. Daphnis then responds that Galathea herself is preparing a laurel wreath for him, and Florida finds this absurd. She regrets having bestowed the whole forest on Daphnis, and her embraces and kisses with him in the past. Yet now those times are over, and Florida declares her independence. Daphnis replies that Florida pretends she is free, when in fact she has liaisons with many men. Florida retorts that he is a liar, and that no one trusts him. Daphnis concludes that it is useless to contend with Florida, and promises to prevail over her. Florida in turn responds that she has her own allies and, with their help, she will placate Daphnis' rage and shatter his dreams.

In *Epistola 23*, Boccaccio is rather elusive about the allegorical content of his **eclogue 8, *Midas***. He limits himself to explaining what is probably obvious to the reader: that Midas was the mythological king of Phrygia, famous for his avarice. Then, regarding the speakers Damon and Phytias, Boccaccio alludes to the account of Valerius Maximus, and simply describes them as very close friends.¹⁴¹ Most commentators, including Smarr and Perini, however, link Midas to Niccolò Acciaiuoli, who in 1355 went to Florence with an elaborate

¹⁴⁰ *Ep. 23.14: Pro Daphni ego intelligo imperatorem (...). Florida Florentia est.*

¹⁴¹ *Ep. 23.15-6: Octave egloge titulus est Midas: fuit enim Midas rex Frigie avarissimus, et quoniam in egloga ista de quodam domino avarissimo habeatur sermo, eundem Midam dicere et eglogam titolare placuit. Collocutores duo sunt, Damon et Phytias, idest duo amicissimi homines uti illi fuerunt, de quibus Valerius ubi supra. See Valerius Maximus, Facta et Dicta Memorabilia 4.7.1.1.*

retinue seeking to establish an alliance between the free city and the Neapolitan Kingdom. Niccolò's tactic involved flattering a number of prominent Florentines, among whom was Boccaccio, who was given false hopes by Niccolò of coming to replace Zanobi da Strada as court poet in Naples.¹⁴² Accordingly, the Phytias of *Midas* probably symbolises Boccaccio himself; and Damon represents Boccaccio's friend Barbato da Sulmona, who dissuaded Boccaccio from showing up at the Neapolitan court in 1355.¹⁴³ Thus, the eclogue starts with Damon advising Phytias to collect his flock and not to trust Midas. He explains that this man enticed a widowed nymph from Chalcis and, after the deaths of Argus and Alexis, managed to take on lofty titles. Damon also alerts Phytias that Midas has deceived many people, and now longs to be called a Maecenas. Phytias suddenly realises that his flock has diminished, and he does not know what to do now. He does not want to praise unworthy men with his songs, and he would rather live a simple and safe life. Finally, Damon invites Phytias to stay in one of his caves. Phytias accepts the offer, and bids farewell to Lupisca and her fields.

Eclogue 9, *Lipis*, receives its title in reference to the Greek word λύπη, meaning grief, or rather anxiety, as Boccaccio explains in *Epistola* 23; more particularly the anxiety of Florence at the imperial coronation of Charles IV, King of Bohemia, at Rome. The first speaker is called Batracos in association with the Greek βάτραχος ("frog"), thus impersonating the stereotype of a Florentine man who talks too much but acts very little. The second speaker is Archas, who represents a foreign man.¹⁴⁴ In the eclogue, Archas introduces himself as a former Arcadian shepherd (from this, it is clear that his name is a toponym); and he brings the news that Circius is going to receive the ancient crown. Batracos gets indignant that this sluggish

¹⁴² See Perini (1994: 979), Brucker (1962: 147), and Hankins (2019: 11).

¹⁴³ See Smarr (1987: 225), and Perini (1994: 979-80).

¹⁴⁴ *Ep.* 23.17-8: *None egloge titulus est Lipis, in qua fere per totum de anxietate civitatis nostre ob coronatum imperatorem mentio fit, et ideo Lipis dicta est, quia lipis grece, latine dicitur anxietas. Collocutores duo sunt, Batracos et Archas. Pro Batracos ego intelligo Florentinorum morem: loquacissimi enim sumus, verum in bellicis nil valemus, et ideo Batracos, quia grece batracos, latine rana sonat; sunt enim loquaces plurimum rane et timidissime. Archas autem pro quocunque homine extero potest accipi, et ideo nullam nomini significationem propriam volui.*

northerner will have his brows bound with Italian bays. He remembers that, in the past, the ancestors of Circius cut down the Latian forests and were hostile to the Latian sheep. What is more, Circius is the heir of Daphnis, who had once fought with Egon, the greatest shepherd in Latium. At the time, Batracos took Egon's side, and now he fears that Circius may revive the old quarrel. Archas calls Batracos weak, and prompts him to act and protect his sheepfolds. Yet, he also comforts him, by recalling a prophecy according to which Circius would spend the rest of his life near the Rhine.

Eclogue 10, *Vallis opaca*, is possibly the most enigmatic composition of the *Buccolicum*.¹⁴⁵ In *Epistola* 23, Boccaccio laconically presents it as a poem about the infernal regions. The speakers are Lycidas (λύκος, “wolf”) and Dorilus (pseudo-Greek *doris*, “bitterness”).¹⁴⁶ While the former character is vaguely described by Boccaccio as “a tyrant from the past” (*quendam olim tyrannum*), the latter is depicted as “a prisoner in constant sorrow” (*quidam captivus cum assiduo merore*, *Ep.* 23.19-20). Of all the modern interpretations proposed for this eclogue, the one by Torraca is the most convincing (though also subject to much debate). According to this scholar, Lycidas would represent Ostasio da Polenta (died 1346), the lord of Ravenna who housed Boccaccio in his court in the years 1345 and 1346. Dorilus, in turn, would represent the lyrical poet Menghino Mezzani (ca. 1295–1375/6), imprisoned by Ostasio's son Bernardino, who is referred to as Polipus in the eclogue.¹⁴⁷ The eclogue starts with Lycidas asking Dorilus the reason for his grief. Dorilus replies that once Jupiter struck his fields with a fiery thunderbolt, making all the flocks and shepherds run in fear. A certain man then took advantage of the situation to disturb the sheep, disperse the goats, and rape women. This same man decided to condemn Dorilus because of

¹⁴⁵ On *Vallis opaca*, see Ricci (1985: 57): “si tratta dell’egloga più oscura, più misteriosa di tutte, quella che resistendo ad ogni tentativo di sensata e meditata interpretazione, ha indotto gli studiosi alle più sfrenate ipotesi”; Bergin (1981: 260): “[*Vallis opaca*] is certainly one of the more enigmatic items in the series”; Smarr (1987: 233): “at all events, the eclogue remains obscure”.

¹⁴⁶ See explanation on eclogue *Dorus* above.

¹⁴⁷ See Torraca (1912: 180-84), and Perini (1994: 997).

his shameful love objects, and bound him with chains in a dark cave. At this point of his account, however, Dorilus recognises who Lycidas is, and this gives him some hope. He expects the latter to restore everything that Polipus has confiscated from him; yet, Lycidas responds that he too has been deprived of light. Hearing this, Dorilus loses all hope again, and imagines a stranger looking after his own pastures and folds, while he himself is kept imprisoned, even though he has committed no crime. Lycidas encourages Dorilus to think of pleasant things, and to try to live in peace; after all, he was taught by the Muses to do this. Then, asked by Dorilus, Lycidas describes to him the dreadful valley where he was sent for having stolen Micon's sheep and seduced boys. There he will suffer for eternity, and no prayers can change his fate. At the end, before leaving at sunrise, Lycidas guarantees to Dorilus that he will regain his freedom and lands, for Polipus will soon fall.

Eclogue 11, *Pantheon*, indicates in its title that it deals with divine subjects (πάν, “all” + θεός, “god”). Boccaccio explains in *Epistola* 23 that the characters Mirtilis and Glaucus represent the Church and the apostle Peter, respectively.¹⁴⁸ The figure who recounts their dialogue in the poem, however, is the Author himself (*Auctor*). It is worth noting that, unlike the subsequent eclogues *Olympia* and *Phylostropos*, the subject of *Pantheon* is not directly related to faith and religion, but rather to the history, institution and power of the Roman Catholic Church. For this reason, *Pantheon* can be best placed alongside the historical and political eclogues of the *Buccolicum*.¹⁴⁹ In the poem, Mirtilis hopes that her father Glaucus, with the help of Amintas, may complete the work which he has begun; and she asks him to look after her flocks. Glaucus replies that he has but a little fodder to feed a few lambs;

¹⁴⁸ *Ep.* 23.21-2: *Undecima egloga dicitur Pantheon a pan, quod est totum, et theos, quod est deus, eo quod per totam de divinis sermo sit (...). Pro Mirtile ego intelligo Ecclesiam Dei, quam a mirto denomino (...). Pro Glaucio autem ego intelligo Petrum apostolum; fuit enim Glaucus piscator (...) sic et Petrus piscator fuit.* On this use of Glaucus in a Christian sense, see Dante *Par.* 1.67-72.

¹⁴⁹ Labagnara (1968: 36) otherwise separates both *Vallis opaca* and *Pantheon* from the previous political eclogues, and includes them in the second group of “religious and aesthetical eclogues” (“ecloghe religiose ed estetiche”, 10-16). She describes the theme of both *Vallis opaca* and *Pantheon* as “celebration of faith” (“celebrazione della fede”).

moreover, he is old, scorned by all the Arcadians, and the cause of Cacus' rage.¹⁵⁰ Mirtilis then promises a bicolored myrtle-wreath to Glaucus, and encourages him to raise his voice to the forest. Glaucus accepts Mirtilis' offer, and begins singing about the unity between Jove, Jove's son and the holy wind (the Trinity); then passing to the creation of things, the laws of nature, and the history of humankind, from the first cruel man to the arrival of the maiden's son. After being wounded to death, the maiden's son underwent resurrection and ascended to the stars, sending his bright light down to his comrades, who subsequently set off to different regions of the world. Glaucus concludes his song exalting the nymph to whom many temples, gifts and praises are dedicated; and with the promise that one day Codrus will come to put an end to all things and give rest to his herdsmen. The Author says that, after Glaucus' song, Mirtilis' cattle ran into a stream to wash their own dirt and be reborn. Finally, the Author asks some boys to gather their goats and return home, while he himself will pick up bays.

Eclogue 12, *Saphos*, allegorically depicts Boccaccio eager to become a poet. The title evidently refers to Sappho of Lesbos, and in this poem Boccaccio takes her as a symbol for poetry. As described in *Epistola* 23, the speaker Caliope means (like Caliopus, from *Silva cadens*) "good sound", and Aristeus represents Boccaccio.¹⁵¹ The eclogue opens with Caliope censuring Aristeus for invading her sacred grove and furtively plucking her bays. Aristeus apologises and reveals his real intent: to meet the divine Saphos. Caliope recognises the young man and mocks his ambition. Aristeus tells her that, ever since he has overheard the account of Silvanus and Minciades about Saphos, he has longed to embrace her. Caliope then presents herself as one of Saphos' attendants, and describes her lady's secret dwellings. Finally,

¹⁵⁰ Smarr (1987: 240) suggests that Cacus might refer to the devil, but also to the King of France, "who has stolen the pope and cardinals from Rome, and would make war if there were any attempted restoration". See also Serv. *ad Aen.* 8.190.4-5: *novimus autem malum a Graecis κακόν dici: quem ita illo tempore Arcades appellabant. postea translato accentu Cacus dictus est.*

¹⁵¹ *Ep.* 23.23-4 (quoted in Chapter 3).

realising Aristeus' genuine love for Saphos, Caliope advises him to approach Silvanus and ask for his help.

Boccaccio explains to da Signa that the title of his **eclogue 13, *Laurea***, refers to the laurel wreath, which symbolises the honourable art of poetry. The speakers are Daphnis (meaning any distinguished poet), Stilbon (a certain Genoan merchant with whom Boccaccio argued in the past, and thus named in allusion to the planet and god Mercury, associated with commerce), and Critis (κριτής, a judge).¹⁵² *Laurea* details the dispute between Daphnis and Stilbon. Whereas Stilbon despises Daphnis' devotion to the Muses and poverty, Daphnis repudiates Stilbon's love for Crisis and greed. In order to avoid them fighting, however, Daphnis suggests that he and Stilbon present their respective arguments in song, having Critis as their judge. Accepting the challenge, Stilbon sings of his love for Crisis, his abundant flocks, fields, wines, honey, and incense. Daphnis, in turn, sings of his love for Saphos, the knowledge granted by Pallas to him, his Orphean ability to influence the gods, purify the forests and to recall the dead with songs. He argues, moreover, that the songs of poets are preserved by the Muses, while a single rock can undo a sailor. At this, Stilbon replies that Mars has also destroyed a thousand scrolls and transformed papyri into ashes. Daphnis then responds that Stilbon's treasure is subject to shipwrecks and sackings. Critis finally decides to intervene, declaring a draw and putting an end to Daphnis and Stilbon's quarrel.

Eclogue 14, *Olympia*, allegorically discusses the quality of the heavenly region. The main speakers are Silvius and Olympia. From *Epistola* 23, we know that Silvius refers to Boccaccio himself, who allegedly had the idea for the eclogue while he was in a forest (*silva*).

¹⁵² *Ep. 23.25-6: Tertiadecima egloga Laurea nuncupatur a serto laureo, quod est insigne poetarum, et hec ideo sic dicta est, quia in ea plurimum de honorificentia poetice sermo fiat (...). Pro Daphni ego unumquemque poetam insignem accipio, eo quod poete eadem corona honorentur (...). Stilbon pro quodam ianuense mercatore pono, cum quo disceptationem quandam iamdudum Ianue habui (...) quem Stilbonem vocito a Mercurio mercatorum deo, qui et Stilbon dicitur. Critis grece, latine iudex est, et ponitur pro quodam assumpto hic in iudicem litigii iam dicti. On Stilbon (Στίλβων, "gleaming", "glittering") as a name for the planet Mercury, see, for instance, Cic. Nat. D. 2.53.4-6: infra hanc autem stella Mercuri est (ea Στίλβων appellatur a Graecis).*

Olympia, in turn, represents Boccaccio's departed little daughter Violante, who then became a citizen of heaven (Olympus).¹⁵³ The poem also introduces Silvius' attendants, Camalus and Therapon. Boccaccio explains that the first name derives from Greek and means "lazy" or "sluggish", whereas he has forgotten about the origin of the second.¹⁵⁴ The eclogue *Olympia* starts with Silvius calling out to Camalus and Therapon to investigate why his dog was so agitated. Therapon then hastens back to Silvius reporting a fire in the woods. They all become terrified, until Silvius realises that the trees are not actually burning. Soon afterwards, an unusual odour pervades the whole place, and Olympia emerges from that supernatural light, saluting her father. Silvius gets startled and questions his own sanity; but he eventually recognises his daughter and his two other lost sons, Marius and Iulus, who were accompanying her. At some point, Silvius asks Olympia to describe her dwelling. She then presents Elysium as a marvellous region, far better than the Elysium once sung of by Minciades. After describing the many beauties of the place, its inhabitants and their customs, Olympia encourages her father to perform the services which will allow him to reach Elysium. At the end, the ghost of Olympia suddenly disappears, and Silvius is again alone with his servants.

Eclogue 15, *Phylostropos* (φίλος, "lover" + τρόπος, "conversion"), depicts Boccaccio's conversion from his love of earthly things to the love of heavenly ones. The speakers are Phylostropos (Petrarch) and Typhlus (τυφλός, "blind", referring to Boccaccio as spiritually blind).¹⁵⁵ The eclogue focuses on Phylostropos' attempts to convince Typhlus to abandon his decaying home and deceptive lovers. Typhlus, however, obstinately refuses to see the dangers

¹⁵³ *Ep.* 23.28: *Pro Silvio me ipsum intelligo, quem sic nuncupo, eo quod in silva quadam huius egloge primam cogitationem habuerim (...). Pro Olympia intelligo parvulam filiam meam olim mortuam ea in etate in qua morientes celestes effici cives credimus: et ideo, ex Violante dum viveret, mortuam celestem idest Olympiam voco.*

¹⁵⁴ *Ep.* 23.18: *Camalos grece, latine sonat hebes vel torpens, eo quod in eo demonstrentur mores torpentis servi. Therapon huius significatum non pono, quia non memini, nisi iterum revisam librum ex quo de ceteris sumpsi, et ideo ignoscas: scis hominum memoriam labilem esse, et potissime senum.* About the name "Camilus", Hecker (1902: 72) observes that Boccaccio must have thought of the Greek word χαμηλός ("on the ground", "low-spirited"). Perini (1994: 1055), however, does not discard the possibility of κάμηλος ("camel"). Though Boccaccio declares to have forgotten the meaning of "Therapon", it should refer to the Greek θεράπων ("servant", "slave") – see Ricci (1965: 672).

¹⁵⁵ *Ep.* 23.29-30 (quoted in Chapter 4).

to which he is vulnerable, and is rather content with his current life. Phylostropos strongly advises Typhlus to seek the pleasant and unchangeable woods. Eventually, Typhlus can see everything with a new clarity, and is ready to abandon his old lifestyle and embark in this new journey with Phylostropos.

The title of **eclogue 16**, *Aggelos*, comes from the Greek word ἄγγελος, meaning “messenger”. This final poem is described by Boccaccio in *Epistola 23* as “the announcer and leader of the preceding eclogues”, and as the one that offers them as a gift to Donato Albanzani. The speakers are Appenninus (Donato Albanzani, who, according to Boccaccio, was born and raised at the foot of the Appennine mountains) and Angelus (the eclogue itself acting as the *envoi* of the book).¹⁵⁶ The eclogue presents Angelus approaching Appenninus with a modest flock of fifteen she-goats. Angelus explains that these animals were sent to Appenninus as a gift from the poor Cerretius (that is, the man from Certaldo, Boccaccio). Yet, Appenninus believes that the lame flock should be sent to Silvanus instead, for he would be better able to treat them. Angelus then responds that Cerretius was too ashamed to offer such a small gift to such a great shepherd, but for some reason he expected that Appenninus would appreciate the feeble she-goats. Appenninus thinks that Cerretius has turned mad under Dyone’s influence. Yet, Angelus assures him that Cerretius is no longer concerned with women, and that he only cares about his modest fields, where he can enjoy his freedom. Eventually, Appenninus accepts Cerretius’ lame flock, and is happy to see that one of the she-goats is pregnant.

¹⁵⁶ *Ep. 23.30-1: Sextadecima et ultima egloga titulatur Aggelos, quasi nuntia et precedentium ductrix atque oblatrix ad amicum ad quem illas mitto; nam aggelos grece dicitur quod nos angelus latine nuncupamus, et angelus etiam latine sonat nuntius. Collocutores duo sunt, Appenninus et Angelus. Pro Appennino amicum meum ad quem mitto intelligo, quem ideo Appenninum voco, quia in radicibus Appennini montis natus et altus sit. Pro Angelo, ut dictum est, ipsam eglogam more nuntii deducentem atque loquentem intelligo.* See Smarr (1987: 260); and Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 1: *Galla*

Summary

Damon asks Tindarus what has compelled him to climb the snowy Alps and choose the sterile plains of the Arno, instead of the pleasant fields of Vesuvius and the forests of Gaurus (1-7). Tindarus replies that he must drive bulls to the forest of Alceus, and asks Damon what he is doing in that inhospitable region, too (8-16). Damon responds that he was dragged there by Fortune, and there he must die (17-21). Tindarus kindly invites Damon to take some rest in his cave, and orders Phorbas to bring them some wine. In the meantime, he suggests that Damon talk about his troubles (22-27). Damon accepts this invitation, though his story will probably make Tindarus sad (28-30). Damon then recounts that he was once captivated by a beautiful nymph, with whom he spent a great amount of time, embracing and kissing her; but now she has forgotten him, and so he is determined to die (31-49). Tindarus tries to comfort his friend, and suggests that perhaps Damon is wrong in his judgment (50-52). Yet, Damon replies that he is absolutely convinced of Galla's infidelity, for he himself saw her with Pamphylus (53-81). Tindarus reassures Damon that his heartbreak will soon pass, just as everything in nature also passes. Fortune works by turns, and the day will come when Damon will regard himself as the best shepherd in his forest. However, if even then Damon does not attract Galla back to him, Tindarus knows how to recall a lover with incantations and herbs (82-98). Damon replies that no song, art, or herbs are enough to move the heart of Galla. In fact, he himself has already prayed, kneeled, and sent gifts to the gods, but his beloved only grew crueller (99-109). Tindarus realises that Damon's heart is burning with a terrible passion, yet he hopes that this flame will extinguish (110-14). Damon enviously thinks of Pamphylus. How is it that the latter pleases the gods so much, moves mountains, and can control love with his own hands and mind? Finally, Damon prays that Galla will grow pale, wrinkled and alone; or rather that he

himself die and put an end to his burning pain (115-35). Hearing this, Tindarus concludes that love is harsh, and is always the disease of the young. Damon faints. Tindarus calls to his attendants to bring some water, so that he may revive his grieving friend (136-8).

Context and characters

As was stated in the Introduction, in his *Epistola* 23 Boccaccio associates the content of *Galla* and *Pampinea* with his own “youthful lecheries” (*iuveniles lascivias*). In the complete passage where this phrase appears, however, Boccaccio advises Martino da Signa not to search for allegorical meanings behind the titles and characters of those two individual eclogues: *de primis duabus eglogis seu earum titulis vel collocutoribus nolo cures: nullius enim momenti sunt, et fere iuveniles lascivias meas in cortice pandunt* (Ep. 23.4). Before analysing the text of *Galla*, it may be helpful to discuss the implications of this passage more thoroughly, taking into account two aspects in particular. The first, and perhaps more prominent, is the addressee of the letter; the second is the specific type of allegory concerned there.

Regarding the first point, it should be noted that, from the heading of *Epistola* 23, Boccaccio makes clear his reverence for da Signa, whom he addresses as “the Reverend Father in Christ Friar Martino da Signa, of the Order of Hermit Friars of St. Augustine, Master of the Sacred Scriptures” (*reverendum in Christo patrem fratrem Martinum de Signa ordinis fratrum Heremitarum sancti Augustini, sacre pagine professorem*, Ep. 23.Intr.).¹⁵⁷ It is no surprise, then, that Boccaccio does not comment on the erotic contents of his two introductory eclogues in detail. Rather, he tries to diminish their importance in the *Buccolicum*, and ambiguously employs the adverb *fere* to suggest that *Galla* and *Pampinea* only “partially” reflect his younger self. On the other hand (and this regards the second point), we should not assume from this that

¹⁵⁷ Similarly, in his will, Boccaccio refers to da Signa with formal respect: *venerabili fratri Martino de Signa magistro in sacra theologia, conventus Sancti Spiritus ordinis Heremitarum Sancti Augustini*. On Boccaccio’s will, see Regnicoli (2013: 387-93), and Papio (2013: 341-51).

Boccaccio is trying to conceal certain shameful facts about his private love life from da Signa. Instead, within the allegorical framing of the *Buccolicum*, *Galla* and *Pampinea* dramatize a state of dependence on erotic love which is characteristic of youth, and the beginning of Boccaccio's autofictional quest. By claiming that those eclogues broadly conceal his boyish desires in his *Epistola* 23, Boccaccio consequently discourages a purely autobiographical reading of his *Buccolicum*, and highlights their autofictional character. In addition, we must bear in mind that Boccaccio begins his *Epistola* 23 explaining that he chose to emulate Virgil's *Eclogues* precisely because he did not want to conceal an allegorical meaning beneath all of his bucolic characters and titles. This is particularly evident in *Galla* (and *Pampinea*), where most of the characters represent fictional types, drawn mainly from classical poetry.¹⁵⁸

The title and name *Galla* traditionally evokes a lascivious, and/or adulterous woman.¹⁵⁹ As it has been noted before, particularly in relation to Martial's *Epigrams* (86–103 CE), the character Galla is "almost always (...) depicted negatively in the context of sexual relations or marriage".¹⁶⁰ In the first of the sixteen poems in which she appears, for instance, Galla performs the role of a deceitful woman, who never gives but always promises:

Das numquam, semper promittis, Galla, roganti.
Si semper fallis, iam rogo, Galla, nega.
(Martial 2.25)

Engaging with this Latin epigrammatic tradition, Boccaccio innovatively introduces the character Galla in the bucolic genre, presenting her through the perspective of a frustrated male lover.¹⁶¹ Indeed, prior to the publication of the *Buccolicum*, neither ancient Roman (Virgil,

¹⁵⁸ *Ep.* 23.1 – see Introduction, "Genre", and also Crescini (1887: 249-50). As we will see below, the exceptions to this are the references to Petrarch as Menalcas, and to Virgil as Tytirus, at *Galla* 28 and 83.

¹⁵⁹ See, for instance, Propertius 3.12.1, 4, 15 etc.; Juvenal *Satires* 1.125-6; and Ausonius *Epigrams* 14.1.

¹⁶⁰ Williams (2004: 103).

¹⁶¹ While we have examples of female speakers in other of Boccaccio's eclogues, they all (with the exception of Silvius' daughter, in *Olympia*) represent voices of something other than a woman: Florida, in *Iurgium*, represents the City of Florence; Mirtilis, in *Pantheon*, the Catholic Church; Caliope, in *Saphos*, poetic elocution. On Boccaccio's knowledge of Martial, see Billanovich (1947: 263-4), Mazza (1996: 1-74), and Petoletti (2006: 103-

Calpurnius Siculus, Nemesianus) nor Trecento poets (Dante, Giovanni del Virgilio, Petrarch) had mentioned any Galla in their eclogues. Yet, precisely because of her erotic connotations in the poem, it is almost impossible not to associate Boccaccio's Galla with Virgil's Gallus. Thus, by merging the wicked woman Galla from Martial's epigrams with the fictionalized version of the elegiac poet Gallus from Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, Boccaccio's *Galla* involves an elaborate interplay of genres and genders.¹⁶² For while this double allusion suggests a continuation of Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 mediated through the love elegiac and epigrammatic genres, it also proposes a seeming inversion of gender roles.¹⁶³ In fact, though Galla resembles Gallus in name, and has a prominent function in Boccaccio's poem, she is nevertheless more akin to Lycoris, the unfaithful lover of Gallus in Virgil's eclogue. What is more, Boccaccio's Galla also recalls, in both name and character, Virgil's Galatea, described at *Eclogues* 3.64 as *lasciva puella* (the same adjective used by Boccaccio to refer to Galla in lines 60, 69, and 102 of his poem).¹⁶⁴

Finally, besides the connotations mentioned above, it is significant that "Galla" could also mean a "Gallic woman", thus evidently indicating her French origin. Both Boccaccio and Petrarch had played with this geographical sense of the Latin word *Gallus* in other works. In his *De casibus*, for instance, Boccaccio pejoratively referred to Charles of Valois, king of France, as Gallus Sicamber (Intro.8). Moreover, Boccaccio used "Galeotto" as the subtitle of

84). After Boccaccio, humanist poets (Panormita, Verino, Poliziano, Folengo) would employ the name "Galla" in similar erotic and pastoral contexts – see Perini (1994: 917).

¹⁶² A similar operation can be attested to at Propertius 3.12, where Postumus' chaste wife Galla at once recalls the character Gallus, from Propertius' first book of elegies, and Gallus the elegiac Roman poet – see Wallis (2011: 120–1). Although this has been disputed, Boccaccio could have read Propertius through the mediation of Petrarch – see, for instance, Ullman (1911: 282–301; 1973: 177–96), and Gavinelli (2006: 403).

¹⁶³ See Lummus (2013: 157). Boccaccio apparently does not make a distinction between the elegy and the epigram. In his *Elegia di Costanza* (c. 1332–34), for instance, Boccaccio establishes a continuum between the epigram and the love elegy, as he draws on the content and dialogic structure of the anonymous *Epitaph of Homonoëa* (1st century AD). On the associations between funerary epigram and elegy already in Antiquity, see Braden (2010: 155), and Keith (2011). On the intergeneric engagement in Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, see Conte (1986: 100–29), and Harrison (2007: 60–74). On the elegiac (and comic) intertexts in Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 3, see Karakasis (2016: 123–54).

¹⁶⁴ Galatea is also present in Petrarch's eclogue eleven, *Galathea*, where she is identified by some commentators as Laura – see Bergin (1974: 248–9).

his *Decameron*, perhaps linking this work to the Old French romance tradition. Indeed, Galeotto (Galehaut) was the character who arranged Lancelot and Guinevere's first kiss in the French *Lancelot* romance; and in Dante's *Inferno* 5, Francesca blamed this book for fuelling her adulterous liaison with Paolo.¹⁶⁵ Then, to some extent, the character Gallus from Petrarch's fourth eclogue, *Dedalus*, similarly points to the French literary tradition. Indeed, in this poem, Gallus is presented as an untalented poet who vainly wishes to obtain lyric skill through easy means.¹⁶⁶ Thus, it is possible that Petrarch is criticising the French poets who wanted to achieve glory without having talent, and without being the direct inheritors of the classical tradition.¹⁶⁷ In this context, it is equally plausible that Boccaccio's Galla represents an allegory of Old French literature, which notably influenced Boccaccio's early works.¹⁶⁸ In this way, particularly engaging with Dante's *Inferno* 5, Boccaccio's first eclogue would suggest that the root of Damon's lovesickness is French (or rather French-inspired) literature – an idea that also takes us back to Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, where Gallus' lovesickness is mainly rooted in his relationship with elegiac poetry.¹⁶⁹

Let us consider now the two speakers of Boccaccio's *Galla*: Damon and Tindarus. Damon is the lovesick protagonist of the eclogue, similar to Virgil's Gallus; and it is through him that we learn about the existence of Galla in the poem. Though he bears the name of a conventional (non-Theocritean) bucolic character, Boccaccio's Damon has little in common

¹⁶⁵ See *Inf.* 5.124-42, esp. 137: "Galeotto fu 'l libro e chi lo scrisse"; and also Boccaccio's commentary on this passage in the *Esposizioni*: "E così [Francesca] dire che quello libro [di Lancialotto], il quale leggevano Polo ed ella, quello officio adoperasse tra lor due che adoperò Galeotto tra Lancialotto e la reina Ginevra; e quel medesimo dice essere stato colui che lo scrisse, per ciò che, se scritto non l'avesse, non ne potrebbe esser seguito quello che ne seguì". On Boccaccio's choice of "principe Galeotto" as the subtitle of the *Decameron*, see Battaglia Ricci (1987: 179-98), and Veglia (2013: 21-31).

¹⁶⁶ See Bergin (1974: 223-4).

¹⁶⁷ On Petrarch's bucolic Gallus, see Bergin (1974: 223-4), and Hubbard (1986: 233). In the *Invective contra eum qui maledixit Italie* (53), Petrarch played with the double meaning of the Latin word *gallus*, describing his French opponent as a Gallic rooster: *Aperiat nunc aurem Gallus et cristam insolentie demittat... atque ut veris tandem opinionibus locus sit, concretum pulverem erroris e cauda gallice levitatis excutiat* – see Marsh (2015: 174-5).

¹⁶⁸ Particularly on the influence of Old French romances in Boccaccio's *Filocolo*, see Smarr (1978: 26-43), and Kirkham (2000); and in the *Ninfale fiesolano*, see Balduino (1964: 25-80).

¹⁶⁹ See Fonseca Jr. (2020b: 1-22).

with either the Damon from Virgil's *Eclogue* 3 (where he is briefly mentioned by Menalcas as the real owner of Damoetas' goat), or the Damon from Virgil's *Eclogue* 8 (a skilled shepherd-singer).¹⁷⁰ Nevertheless, he indirectly calls to mind the unnamed protagonist of the latter's song, who was abandoned by his beloved Nysa, and was resolved to kill himself.¹⁷¹ In addition, Boccaccio's Damon is fused with the homonymous legendary companion of Phintias (or Phytias, as Boccaccio spells it).¹⁷² The latter character, however, is mentioned only in passing in line 57 of *Galla*; and Tindarus is the one who incidentally plays the role of Damon's confidant in the poem.

Tindarus is, like Galla, an unconventional bucolic character. In fact, his name matches that of the loyal slave from Plautus' *Captivi* (rather spelled there as "Tyndarus").¹⁷³ Yet interestingly, even though Tyndarus was the personal slave of Philocrates, both of them had been imprisoned and taken as war slaves in Plautus' play. Similarly, in Boccaccio's *Decameron*, the character Tindaro played the role of Filostrato's servant, and Filostrato himself was a man defeated by love.¹⁷⁴ By linking these homonymous characters, the Tindarus of *Galla* seems to represent a type of bucolic servant whose very presence calls our attention to Damon's slavery to love.

The idea that Tindarus plays the part of a bucolic servant is also implicit in lines 12-13 of *Galla*, where Tindarus claims that he has taken on the task of driving bulls to the woods of

¹⁷⁰ See Virg. *Ecl.* 3.16-24, and *Ecl.* 8 (esp. ll. 1-5).

¹⁷¹ *Ecl.* 8.59-60.

¹⁷² Perini (1994: 917). See Bocc. *Ep.* 23.15-6 (quoted in Introduction, "The *Buccolicum carmen*: summary and allegory").

¹⁷³ On Tyndarus' unique part in Plautus' *Captivi*, see Stace (1968: 67, 71, and 73), and Moore (1998: 187). It is worth noting that, before 1429, eight plays of Plautus were known (*Amphitruo*, *Asinaria*, *Aulularia*, *Captivi*, *Curculio*, *Casina*, *Cistellaria*, *Epidicus*) – see Bloemendal & Norland (2013: 53). In the *Genealogia* 14, Boccaccio cites Plautus (alongside Terence) as an exceptional and honourable poet, contrarily to other comic playwrights: *quos inter et si non nulli honesti fuerint homines ut Plautus et Terentius* (*Gen.* 14.20.21). Not much has been written yet about the reception of Plautus in Boccaccio. On Boccaccio and Terence, however, see Finazzi (2013: 81-133); and on Petrarch's knowledge of both Plautus and Terence, see Prete (1952: 85-94).

¹⁷⁴ See *Decameron*, 1.Intro.99: "Tindaro al servizio di Filostrato" – Perini (1994: 917). Note also that, in the *Decameron*, Tindaro has some bucolic traits, and performs the role of a pipe bag player on two occasions (6.concl.48; 7.concl.8).

Alceus: *hinc igitur tauros curo deducere silvis/ Alceus: sic atra iubet voluitque cupido*. This passage immediately implies Tindarus' subordination to another person, particularly to Alceus, who in this case seems to represent a generic Tuscan man (unlike the Alceus from Boccaccio's sixth eclogue).¹⁷⁵ However, the subsequent reference to an "obscure passion" (*atra cupido*) potentially indicates Tindarus' subjection not to a specific person, but mainly to his own greed.¹⁷⁶ This reading is strengthened by the fact that Tindarus has his own cave and attendants in the poem (ll. 22-4, 98, and 138). What is more, something that has been overlooked by commentators is the relationship between Tindarus' *atra cupido* and Boccaccio's account of Pluto and his horses in the *Esposizioni*. In his allegorical exposition on Dante's *Inferno* 7, Boccaccio interprets Pluto's chariot as a symbol of the greedy impulse to travel for money; and the three horses that pull this chariot would represent the three characteristics of those who travel throughout the world in search of wealth. The first of them (which is particularly relevant to us) is Metheus. Boccaccio defines this name as "dark" ("oscuro"), associating it with the ignorance of the greedy who always plan to acquire more than what is necessary, and who let themselves be dragged anywhere without regard to the consequences.¹⁷⁷ This passage from the *Esposizioni* helps us to understand the *atra cupido* of Tindarus not simply as pure greed, or an excessive desire for wealth; but more specifically as the "anguish and anxiety" ("l'angosce e l'ansietà", *Espos.* 7.all.17) of those who fear to lose their riches, and are constantly drawn to labours and travels as a result of that. Though this aspect of Tindarus' personality is not fully developed in *Galla*, the idea of him as a man troubled by money fits well into the autofictional pattern of the *Buccolicum*. Indeed, as

¹⁷⁵ Smarr (1987: 208).

¹⁷⁶ Against Crescini (1857: 250-1) – partly followed by Lidonnici (1917: 317) – see Smarr (1987: 208).

¹⁷⁷ *Espos.* 7.all.19: "Chiamasi adunque il cavallo primo Meteo, il quale è interpretato *oscuro*, per lo quale s'intende l'oscura, cioè stolta, diliberazione d'acquistare quello che non è di bisogno, dalla quale il cupido, senza riguardare il fine, si lascia tirare". See also *Gen.* 8.6.

suggested by Smarr, Tindarus and Damon would represent the two desires that Boccaccio later rejects in *Phyllostropos*: the desire for wealth, and the desire for love.¹⁷⁸

To conclude, as observed by Perini, the name “Tindarus” echoes in its first syllable and overall shape that of “Tityrus”, the famous shepherd from Virgil’s *Eclogues*.¹⁷⁹ The resemblance between the two names becomes especially apparent at the beginning of *Galla*, where we have the opening vocative *Tindare*, which overtly alludes to Virgil’s initial *Tityre*. Yet, by replacing Tityrus with Tindarus, Boccaccio’s text not only proposes a poetic variation, but also highlights the different positions that each of these two characters has in the *Buccolicum*. Elsewhere in the work, Boccaccio reserves the name “Tytirus” to refer to important literary or royal figures, such as Virgil (briefly mentioned at *Galla* 83), Louis of Hungary (*Faunus* 95, and 103), and Robert of Naples (*Dorus* 56-7). By preserving the elevated status of Tityrus in these poems, and replacing him with a lower character from Plautus’ comedy in *Galla*, Boccaccio adopts a *ratio nominis* which ostensibly relies on Servius. Indeed, in his commentary on Virgil’s *Eclogues*, Servius explained that *tityrus* was a Laconian word that indicated the leading ram of a flock; but he associated the simplicity of this name with that of comedy characters: *Laconum lingua tityrus dicitur aries maior, qui gregem anteire consuevit... sicut etiam in comoediis invenimus... personae, sicut supra dixi, rusticae sunt et simplicitate gaudentes* (*Ad Buc.* Pr.1.82-6). In this way, Servius provided the clue for the type of character that Boccaccio might be looking for as a substitute for Tityrus in *Galla*.

¹⁷⁸ While Ricci (1985: 53) interpreted Tindarus as a merchant (the profession of Boccaccio’s father), Perini (1994: 919) instead preferred to associate Tindarus’ *atra cupido* with the mercantile activity more broadly. Smarr (1987: 208), in turn, has briefly suggested that Tindarus could be on a commercial trip. On Boccaccio’s financial worries, see Petrarch’s *Seniles* 17.2 (discussed in Chapter 4).

¹⁷⁹ See Perini (1994: 917).

The landscape of desire

Besides alluding to Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 through its title, and Virgil's *Eclogue* 1 through Tindarus, *Galla*'s opening line (below) also alludes to both Virgil *Eclogues* 2.14 (*nonne fuit satius*) and Calpurnius *Eclogues* 3.7 (*non satis attendi*), which contribute to set the elegiac tone of the poem. Indeed, while the former poem deals with Corydon's love lament for the scornful Alexis, the latter focuses on Lycidas' lament for his breakup with Phyllis. Moreover, *Galla* begins with a fortuitous encounter between Damon and Tindarus, which is a traditional opening motif in the bucolic genre.¹⁸⁰ Yet, this encounter will have similar consequences as in Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 3 – where Iollas suddenly meets Lycidas in a valley while he is searching for one of his heifers, and unexpectedly becomes the advisor to Lycidas in his love troubles.¹⁸¹ In *Galla*, Damon and Tindarus run into each other as they wander through the sterile plains of the Arno:

Damon. Tindare, non satius fuerat nunc arva Vesevi
et Gauri silvas tenera iam fronde virentes
incolere ac gratos gregibus deducere rivos
quam steriles Arni frustra discurrere campos?
Quid stolidus moneo? Prudens es. Dic tamen, oro:
que te cura gravis iussit superare nivas
alpes et fluvidas valles transire coegit?
Tindarus. O Damon Damon, quantum sibi quisque beavit
qui potuit mentis rabidos sedare tumores
et parvas habitare casas, nemora atque remota!
Quod nequeam, dure de me voluere sorores.
Hinc igitur tauros curo deducere silvis
Alcesti: sic atra iubet voluitque cupido.
Sed quid tristis ades? Fervet nunc limpidus aer
et fugiunt virides inter spineta lacerti.
Quid tu solus agis? quid pascua torrida queris?
(*Gal.* 1-16)

¹⁸⁰ See Alpers (1996: 81-2).

¹⁸¹ See Karakasis (2016: 123-56). For other instances of pastoral "convenings", see Virg. *Ecl.* 1.1-5, 5.1, 7.1-2, 9.1; and Calp. 2.4-6, 5.1-2.

Deploying some emblematic features of Campania and Tuscany (Mounts Vesuvius and Gaurus, and the river Arno respectively), Boccaccio's text establishes a symbolic division between these two Italian landscapes. Though some scholars (such as Smarr) have associated this passage with Boccaccio's unwilling return from Naples to Florence in 1341, the poem discourages such a purely autobiographical reading. Whereas the subsequent political eclogues of the *Buccolicum* describe Naples as an opulent woodland (thus allegorically illustrating the Neapolitan court which Boccaccio frequented as youth), Tindarus' speech above, instead, calls attention to the simplicity of Campania, with its "humble huts and groves remote" (*parvas... casas, nemora atque remota*, 10).¹⁸² At least in *Galla*, the exaggerated opposition between Campania and Tuscany suggests different dispositions of the mind, rather than actual geographic locations. Hence, the former region emerges as a symbolic *locus amoenus*, allusive to Virgil's pastoral, with its tender fields (*arva tenera*), verdant woods (*silvae virentes*) and pleasant streams (*grati rivi*, 1-3).¹⁸³ Tuscany, in turn, appears as an "anti-Arcadia", which starkly contrasts with Gallus' chosen retreat in Virgil's *Eclogue* 10.

The difference between the Boccaccian and the Virgilian settings is further accentuated by the weather. Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 depicts Arcadia during winter, reflecting both Lycoris' cold-heartedness and the end of his bucolic cycle.¹⁸⁴ Boccaccio's *Galla* conversely presents the image of an arid and hot Tuscany during summer (*steriles... campos*, 4; *fervet... aer*, 14; *pascua torrida*, 16), thereby reflecting the intense passions of his characters, and marking the beginning of his autofictional journey.¹⁸⁵ The image of the *steriles campi*, in particular, alludes

¹⁸² See, for instance, the description of Naples with its "thousand golden flocks" (*flavos... mille... greges*, *Bucc.* 3.71-2); its valleys rich in cattle, and its superiority over all woods (4.58-60); its prosperity and greatness (*silva hac letior aut maior*), its distinguished oaks (*quercubus insignis*), and caves naturally hidden by limestone (*antraque perpetuis non arte recondite tophis*, 28-43). On Boccaccio's relationship with Naples, see Introduction, "Boccaccio through texts".

¹⁸³ See Virg. *Ecl.* 10.42: *hic gelidi fontes, hic mollia prata... hic nemus*. The phrase *deducere rivos* (*Gal.* 3) alludes to *rivos deducere*, from Virg. *G.* 1.269.

¹⁸⁴ See Virg. *Ecl.* 10.13-20, 42-9; and also Perkell (1996: 138).

¹⁸⁵ In his tenth eclogue, *Laurea occidens*, Petrarch similarly uses the adjective *sterilis* and *inculta* to metaphorically describe Florence as an infertile place (in terms of literary activity) – see Bergin (1974: 247, n. 11).

to Lucan *Bellum civile* 9.382 (*in campos steriles*) – also evoked at Dante *Inferno* 14.13 (“lo spazzo era una rena arida e spessa”). This double allusion in *Galla*’s introduction anticipates the hardships that the Boccaccian pilgrim will have to go through in the *Buccolicum*.¹⁸⁶ What is more, the lines above bring to mind the beginning of Boccaccio’s *Corbaccio*, where the narrator finds himself, in a dream, wandering in a desert of solitude and despair (“in una solitudine diserta, aspra e fiera”, 31). Likewise, in *Galla*, both Tindarus and Damon are fated to roam in a land which is as empty and suffocating as their own obligations and wishes.¹⁸⁷

Damon is surprised to find Tindarus in such a hostile place. Recalling Iollas’ question to Lycidas in Calpurnius’ *Eclogue* 3 (*nunc age dic, Lycida, quae vos tam magna tulere/ iurgia?*, 22-3), Damon asks Tindarus about his concern (*dic tamen, oro:/ que te cura gravis iussit...*, 5-6). Yet, the image of Tindarus climbing the “snowy Alps” (*superare nivas/ Alpes*, 6-7) again alludes to Lucan’s *Bellum civile*, particularly to a scene in Book 1 where Caesar is said to have “surmounted the icy Alps” (*iam gelidas Caesar cursu superaverat Alpes*, 183).¹⁸⁸ Though redolently epic, this military image is not uncommon in erotic poetry. In Virgil’s *Eclogue* 10, for instance, Gallus tells that Lycoris is crossing the “Alpine snows” with her beloved soldier (*Alpinas, a! dura nives*, 47); and in Ovid’s *Amores*, the narrator similarly suggests that he would climb the “windy Alps” (*ventosas... Alpes*, 2.16.19) for his lover.¹⁸⁹ In this intertextual context, it seems that Boccaccio’s Damon thinks that Tindarus is, like himself, oppressed by a love problem (*cura*), and that this is why he went to that barren land.¹⁹⁰

At first, Tindarus’ reply suggests that he *is* suffering from love. His initial “sigh” (*o*

328-30). In Boccaccio’s eclogue eight, *Midas*, Phytias conversely describes Florence as Arcadia (l. 26). As we will see in Chapter 4, Boccaccio sets the narrative of his eclogue fifteen, *Phyllostropos*, in winter.

¹⁸⁶ On the Dantean intertext with Lucan (mediated through Virgil’s and Ovid’s texts), see Tarantino (2012: 90-126).

¹⁸⁷ See also Petr. *Buc.* 1.1-3: *Monice, tranquillo solus tibi conditus antro,/ et gregis et ruris potuisti spernere curas;/ ast ego dumosos colles silvasque pererro* – and discussion in Greene (1986: 18-45, esp. 22).

¹⁸⁸ See also Petr. *Afr.* 2.162 *atque Alpes subito iussus transire nivas*.

¹⁸⁹ See Cucchiarelli (2017: 502), and McKeown (1998: 344). See a similar *topos* at Catull. 11.9, and Hor. *Epod.* 1.11.

¹⁹⁰ On the elegiac uses of *cura*, see Pichon (1991: 120-1).

Damon Damon, 8) markedly recalls the end of Virgil's *Eclogue* 2, where Corydon questions his own sanity (*a Corydon Corydon, quae te dementia cepit?*, 69). However, the fact that Tindarus cries Damon's name (and not his own) highlights that Damon is the one who is mad with love, while Tindarus himself is tormented by anxiety (*mentis rabidos... tumores*, *Gal.* 9). Indeed, employing a *makarismos*-form similar to that of Horace's *Epodes* 2.1 (*beatus ille qui...*), Tindarus seems to have obtained the knowledge that people are happier when they live a calm and carefree life in a humble hut.¹⁹¹ Nevertheless, he feels driven by a deep, obscure desire (*atra cupido*, 13) to keep on working, and receiving orders from other people (the Alcestus above). Instead of love, what actually concerns Tindarus is his job and money. Blaming the Parcae (*dure... sorores*, 11) for his destiny, he describes his present condition as one of necessity and obligation, rather than one of personal choice.¹⁹² Thus, while denying individual responsibility, Tindarus acts like the people depicted by the chorus of Seneca's *Hercules furens*: people who feel the need to constantly subject themselves to hard work (*labor durus*) and anxiety (*omnes/agitat curas*, *HF* 137-8). Though death is inevitable, since the brutal sisters (*durae sorores*) eventually finish their spinning, those people are always rushing to meet their fates, unsure of themselves (*durae peragunt pensa sorores... at gens hominum fertur rapidis/ obvia fatis incerta sui*, 182-4). Note, however, that Seneca (like Horace) idealizes the happy simplicity of shepherds in their small huts (*et laeta suo parvoque domus*, 161), painting a reality that contrasts with the one chosen by Boccaccio's Tindarus for himself.¹⁹³

Tindarus then turns his attention back to Damon, and asks him why he went to that wasteland in sorrow (*sed quid tristis ades?*, *Gal.* 14). The place is so hot that even the lizards have raced among the brambles (*et fugiunt virides inter spineta lacerti*, 15) – another allusion

¹⁹¹ See Perini (1994: 918); and also *Fiamm.* 5.30.1: "O felice colui il quale innocente dimora nella solitaria villa, usando l'aperto cielo!"

¹⁹² On the Parcae, see Bocc. *Gen.* 1.5. See also Bocc. *Bucc.* 11.170 (*sevasque... sorores*) – note the contrast with the Muses (*sacrasque sorores*, 8.101).

¹⁹³ See also Virg. *G.* 2.458-60, 500-4, and *Ecl.* 1.51-8; Harrison (2007: 116-8).

to Virgil's *Eclogue 2* (*nunc viridis etiam occultant spineta lacertos*, 9). Tindarus observes that Damon has come to those torrid pastures alone. Interestingly, Tindarus' question *quid tu solus agis?* (at *Galla* 16 above) alludes to Ovid *Ex Ponto* 4.2.39, *sed quid solus agam...?*. This allusion immediately brings to mind Ovid's exile in Tomis, which was partially caused by the publication of his *Ars amatoria* – a work that Ovid himself regarded as an error in the *Tristia* (*carmen et error*, *Tr.* 2.1.207).¹⁹⁴ As a result of this allusion, in addition to those with Virgil's *Eclogue 10*, perhaps we could think of Boccaccio's Damon, as well as his autofictional character, as exiles of love too (an idea that will gain special force in *Phylostrompos*, as we will see in Chapter 4).

Love, death and Fortune

Like Ovid in the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*, Damon also calls Fortune to account for his troubles. From the first poem of *Tristia*, the Ovidian narrator complained that Fortune, who was once his ally, no longer favoured him (*non ita se praebebat nobis Fortuna secundam*, *Tr.* 1.1.51). And particularly in *Tristia* 5.8 and *Ex Ponto* 2.3, Ovid established a direct association between Fortune's changes and his own wanderings (*passibus ambiguis Fortuna volubilis errat... nos quoque floruius, sed flos erat ille caducus,/ flammaque de stipula nostra brevisque fuit*, *Tr.* 5.8.15-20; *diligetur nemo, nisi cui Fortuna secunda est... en ego... in mediis lacera nave relinquo aquis*, *Pont.* 2.3.23-8). In *Galla*, Damon similarly suggests that, since he let himself be subject to love, he must now submit himself to Fortune and accept its consequences. Wherever she drags him, there he must go to die:

Ne rogit: stat corde mori. Mors ipsa quietem
sola dabit fesso; mors est inimica laborum.

¹⁹⁴ See Bocc. *Espos.* 4.lit.124: "La seconda cagione dice che fu l'avere composto il libro *De arte amandi*, il quale pareva molto dover adoperare contro a' buoni costumi de' giovani e delle donne di Roma". For a discussion on the charges brought against Ovid, see Green (1982: 202 ff.). See also Petr. *Rvf* 35.1 "Solo et pensoso i più deserti campi" (and discussion in Introduction, "Methodology").

Tuque tuus facito sis, fac quoque semper amores
effugias volucres, et diras sperne pharetras.
Quo Fortuna trahet miserum, moriturus abibo.
(*Gal.* 17-21)

On the one hand, the thematic engagement with Ovid could be taken as another indicator of Boccaccio's unwilling move from Naples to Florence, which would be compared to an exile – and this detail has been surprisingly overlooked by the supporters of an autobiographical reading of *Galla*. Yet, on the other hand, it could reinforce the idea above that Boccaccio is autofictionally departing from vernacular (Franco-Italian) literature and love, which represent, like the *Ars Amatoria* to Ovid, the cause of Boccaccio's ruin. In this sense, Damon assimilates Virgil's Gallus too, who sought to escape from his elegiac suffering in the Arcadia of *Eclogue* 10, as if deliberately imposing exile on himself. However, unlike the latter character, by following Fortune, Damon accidentally arrives in a bucolic world of labour and sorrow.¹⁹⁵ From the very start, Damon surrenders himself to his mad passion and, refusing the possibility of calming his anxious mind in a peaceful setting, he sees no remedy for his personal tragedy except in death.

In depicting Damon as a young foolish man who longs to kill himself, Boccaccio's text engages with a lifelong philosophical, theological and literary discussion on love and suicide. Whereas Christian writers were ready to condemn suicide as a sin equivalent to murder, ancient Roman philosophers took a rather more flexible view of the issue.¹⁹⁶ In his philosophical writings, Seneca (ca. 4 BCE–65 CE), for instance, approved the notion of a rational death, that is, a self-inflicted death under specific circumstances, as when the individual was faced with extreme political, social or moral threats.¹⁹⁷ Yet, like most philosophers influenced by Hellenistic schools (especially the Stoa, but also the Academics and Epicureans), Seneca

¹⁹⁵ Compare this with *Ecl.* 10.35-43, 55-6 – see Cucchiarelli (2017: 499, 505). On the bucolic world as a “world of sorrow”, see Lambert (1976).

¹⁹⁶ See, for instance, Augustine *De libero arbitrio* 3.6.18, and *De civitate Dei* 1.20 – Sato (2015: 135-42).

¹⁹⁷ See, for instance, Sen. *Ep.* 30 and 77. For other examples and passages, see Hill (2004: 145-82).

regarded erotic self-killing as illogical, absurd or trivial. In his *Epistle* 4 (ca. 62–5 CE), Seneca argued that to be indifferent to death was an honourable thing; the problem was that some people, amongst whom lovers, scorned life for trifling reasons. Then, imagining a scene that was redolent of elegiac discourse, Seneca abominated the idea of a male lover hanging himself before the door of his mistress.¹⁹⁸

According to this rationale, erotic desire constituted a threat to human freedom, wisdom, and happiness. Blinded by *eros*, and attached to a false notion of good, lovers devoted themselves entirely to external objects, allowing their lowest impulses to conduct their thoughts and actions.¹⁹⁹ For this reason, love acted as a disease that affected both the soul and the body of the lover. Thus, engaging with the writings of Sphaerus (285/65–221 BCE), in his *Tusculan Disputations* (45 BCE) Cicero defined erotic love – more specifically, the excessive fondness for women (*mulierositas*) – as an illness of the soul (*aegrotatio animi*) which, just like greed (*avaritia*) and the desire for fame (*gloriae cupiditas*), was anchored on lust (*libido*) and delight (*laetitia*).²⁰⁰ In addition, in his *Etymologies*, Isidore used the term *femineus amor* to indicate a “love beyond measure” (11.2.24); thereby suggesting, in consonance with ancient and medieval normative discourses, that excessive love was characteristic of women, and made men feminine.²⁰¹

What is more, the idea of lovesickness (*aegritudo amoris*) dominated medical discourses from Antiquity up to the Middle Ages. Curiously, a prominent influence on this tradition was Valerius Maximus (fl. early 1st c. CE). In his *Facta et dicta memorabilia*

¹⁹⁸ Sen. *Ep.* 4.4: *Non vides, quam ex frivolis causis contemnatur? Alius ante amicae fores laqueo pependit.* Interestingly, the early thirteenth-century Old French translator of Ovid’s *Ars amatoria* employed this same image of young lovers hanging themselves to justify the validity of reading Ovid’s erotic poetry as a way to learn more about love and mitigate its dangerous symptoms – see Wack (1990: 15). Though the topic of amatory suicide had a prominent role in the Roman love elegy, the act of erotic self-killing was rarely contemplated by the male elegiac *persona* himself, but was instead associated with myth and particularly mythical women – see Hill (2004: 93).

¹⁹⁹ See Hill (2004: 89).

²⁰⁰ *Tusc.* 4.25. See also *Tusc.* 3.24–5.

²⁰¹ See Wack (1990: 13): “For passionate love to be ‘womanly love’ meant that ancient and medieval culture saw excessive love as characteristic of women, yet women are with few exceptions absent from medical accounts of love. ‘Womanly love’ befell men, who were the subjects of medical discourse”.

5.7.ext.1, Valerius narrated the anecdote of Antiochus, the son of King Seleucus, who fell in love with his stepmother Stratonice, and became severely ill because of *summa cupiditas*. Antiochus was about to die, but he finally recovered once his father allowed him to have sex with Stratonice, as prescribed by the physician. Yet, while recounting this anecdote, Valerius also described a number of physiological symptoms associated with love. When Antiochus was near Stratonice, he blushed all over, his breath came faster, and his pulse grew rapid; but as soon as she went out, Antiochus turned pale, he slowly recovered his breath, and his pulse was languid. In fact, his physician was only able to reach a conclusion after examining Antiochus' pulse on both occasions.²⁰² The story of Antiochus was retold by Plutarch, and became widely diffused in the Middle Ages, being deployed in both medical and literary texts, such as the anonymous *Aegritudo Perdicae* (probably fifth century CE), Bernard de Gordon's *Lilium medicinae* (second half of thirteenth century), Dino del Garbo's *Scriptum super cantilena Guidonis de Cavalcantibus* (same period), and even Boccaccio's *Decameron* (particularly in the tale of Giachetto and Giannetta in *Dec.* 2.8).²⁰³

In Christian moral writings, however, erotic love was not commonly seen as a disease to be cured – and certainly *not* a disease that could be cured with therapeutic intercourse, as in the case of Antiochus.²⁰⁴ Rather, it was considered a sin that should be either extinguished or, at least, used for procreation in the context of marriage.²⁰⁵ The apostle Paul (a key figure in the

²⁰² Valerius Maximus was well studied in the fourteenth-century. In his commentary on Valerius' *Dicta*, for instance, the monk Dionigi da Borgo San Sepolcro (with whom Boccaccio was acquainted) "explained the physiological reasons for the accuracy of the pulse test" – Wack (1990: 18; 270, nn. 44 and 45); Dionigi da Borgo San Sepolcro 1470, 5.7 (no foliation).

²⁰³ Plutarch *Vita Demetri* 38, esp. 4: "whenever Stratonice came to see him, as she often did, either alone, or with Seleucus, lo, those tell-tale signs of which Sappho sings were all there in him – stammering speech, fiery flushes, darkened vision, sudden sweats, irregular palpitations of the heart, and finally, as his soul was taken by storm, helplessness, stupor, and pallor" (trans. Perrin). In one of his glosses to the *Teseida* (7.50), Boccaccio mentions both Guido Cavalcanti's poem "Donna me prega" (discussed below), and Dino's commentary. Moreover, as demonstrated by Quaglio (1964: 336-68), the only manuscript where Dino del Garbo's glosses are preserved is Boccaccio's autograph Chigiano 50.6.176 (cc. 29r.-32v) – see Ciavolella (1970: 508-13), and Usher (2004: 1-19).

²⁰⁴ Despite the official Church morality, therapeutic intercourse was widely recommended by medieval physicians, and it was considered a serious form of treatment for lovesickness before it degenerated into melancholy – see Wack (1990: esp. xv, and 10-11).

²⁰⁵ On early Christian sexuality, see Gaca (2014: 558-73).

development of Christian sexual norms) explicitly condemned sexual desire; and, though expressing a clear preference for celibacy, advocated marriage as a mechanism to extinguish the flames of passion (*quod si non se continent, nubant. Melius est enim nubere, quam uri*, 1 Cor. 7:9).²⁰⁶ Following the same opinion, Augustine wrote a treatise on virginity (*De sancta virginitate*, 401 CE), where he argued that virginity was angelic, and surpassed conjugal fidelity in merit.²⁰⁷ And, in a more personal tone, in his *Confessions* (397–ca. 401), Augustine regretted his own “past foulness and carnal corruptions” (*foeditates meas et carnales corruptiones*, *Conf.* 2.1.1), associating them with a period of his life characterized by darkness and slavery.²⁰⁸

Finally, the idea that excessive love was a form of madness that drove lovers to death was present in many Duecento and Trecento literary texts, which could adopt either the medical or the Christian discourse more strongly, sometimes mingling both in the same text. Guido Cavalcanti’s (d. 1300) philosophical poem “Donna me prega” is a prominent example of the first case. Popularly known for his Epicurean and atheist views (reported by Boccaccio in his *Decameron* 6.9), Guido ostensibly rejected the idea of an afterlife, and was more concerned with the destructive force of love, as well as with its physiological and psychological effects on lovers.²⁰⁹ Thus, in “Donna me prega”, Guido extensively engages with the medical tradition of lovesickness. There he describes love as an accident, an irrational emotion generated in the darkest part of the mind, but which uses reason for its own purposes; and its power can become so strong that it often leads to death: “Di sua potenza segue spesso morte” (35).

²⁰⁶ See also Mt 19:12, 22:30, and Rev 14: 4-5; discussion in Hubbard & Doerfler (2014: 178), Gaca (2014: 564-6), and Martin (2006: 201-2).

²⁰⁷ See Aug. *De sanc. virg.* (ed. Walsh, 2001), and also Jer. *Ep.* 22 – discussion in Hubbard & Doerfler (2014: 177), and Bloch (1991: 97-101).

²⁰⁸ Augustine’s *carnales corruptiones* call to mind Boccaccio’s *iuvenciles lasciviae* (*Ep.* 23.4, above), which is another indicator that Boccaccio’s *Buccolicum* is engaging with the autofictional tradition – we will return to this issue in Chapter 4. On the *Confessions* as an example of autofictional work, see Breuer (2019: 520-31).

²⁰⁹ See *Dec.* 6.9.9: “Guido alcuna volta speculando molto abstratto dagli uomini divenia; e per ciò che egli alquanto tenea della opinione degli epicuri, si diceva tralla gente volgare che queste sue speculazioni erano solo in cercare se trovar si potesse che Iddio non fosse”. See also Dante *Inf.* 10; and discussion in Barański (2004: 14-52), and Barolini (2018c).

While in the *Commedia* (particularly in *Inferno* 10, but also elsewhere) Dante implicitly criticised Guido for his materialistic views, in the *Vita Nova* he suggested that he was good friends with him (“primo amico”, *Vita Nova* 3). Early on in his poetic career, moreover, Dante wrote lyrics that were Cavalcantian in essence. For instance, Dante’s *canzone* “Lo doloroso amor” (often relegated to a marginal position within Dante’s lyric output) was deeply influenced by Cavalcanti, and significantly started with a reference to death: “Lo doloroso amor che mi conduce/ a fin di morte”.²¹⁰ Similarly, in his *rime petrose*, though adopting a more aggressive tone, Dante described the physical effects of his lovesickness, such as pain, pallor, and the desire to die.²¹¹

Then, in the *Commedia*, Dante explicitly explores the Christian consequences of erotic love. In *Inferno* 5, Dante devotes the second circle of hell to the punishment of the “carnal sinners” (“i peccator carnali”, *Inferno* 5.38), and a ring in the seventh circle to the graver punishment of the suicides (*Inf.* 13). Interestingly, however, Dante puts Dido in the former circle, and refers to her as the woman “who killed herself for love, and betrayed the ashes of Sichaeus” (“colei che s’ancise amorosa,/ e ruppe fede al cener di Sicheo”, *Inf.* 5.51-2).²¹² Thus, recognising the actions of lovers mainly as the fruit of blindness and lack of free will, Dante dispatches Dido, as well as Cleopatra and other lustful characters, to a place devoid of light

²¹⁰ See Barolini (2017: 41-65). The words “amore” and “morte” were closely linked in the Duecento lyric poetry – see, for instance, Guittone d’Arezzo: “Amore quanto a morte vale a dire” (Contini 1960, vol. 2:193); and also Dante *Inf.* 5.106: “Amor condusse noi ad una morte”. Yet, as noted by Durling (1990, ch. 5, n. 65, n.p.) this *topos* has its roots in Virgil’s *Aeneid* 4: *nec iam furtivum Dido meditatur amorem* (171); *sese interea, quando optima Dido/ nesciat et tantos rumpi non speret amores* (291-2); and *tum vero infelix fatis exterrita Dido/ mortem orat* (450-1).

²¹¹ See, for instance, Dante’s “Così nel mio parlar” (*Rime* 46.44-52): “allor mi surgon ne la mente strida;/ e ’l sangue, ch’è per le vene disperso,/ fuggendo corre verso/ lo cor, che ’l chiama; ond’io rimango bianco./ Elli [Amor] mi fiede sotto il braccio manco/ sì forte che ’l dolor nel cor rimbalza;/ allor dico: ‘S’elli alza/ un’altra volta, Morte m’avrà chiuso/ prima che ’l colpo sia disceso giusto”.

²¹² See Aug. *Conf.* 1.13.21: *Didonis mortem, quae fiebat amando Aenean*. In Virgil’s *Aeneid* 6, Aeneas encounters Dido in a part of Hades especially for suicides (*lucemque perosi*, l. 435; Dido in 450-76) – see Murray (2011: 309). In his literal commentary to *Inferno* 5.61-3, Boccaccio defends Dido as an honourable woman, who killed herself not because of love, but rather to safeguard her chastity – see also *De mul.* 42; and *Gen.* 6.53.

and swept by violent windstorms (“loco d’ogne luce muto,/ che mugghia come fa mar per tempesta”, *Inf.* 5.28-9).²¹³

In several of his works, from the *Trattatello* to the *Corbaccio*, Boccaccio reflected Christian misogynous and misogynistic attitudes on love.²¹⁴ However, Boccaccio’s relationship with erotic love was complicated by his relationship with classical elegy and philosophy, on the one hand, and with vernacular lyric poetry and medieval medical discourses, on the other. Particularly in *Galla*, Boccaccio’s Damon partly embodies the stereotype of the insane, unmanly, and blind lover. Controlled by an obsessive passion, his decision to die is not based on the cool reflection of the mind, but rather on the heated emotions of his heart (*stat corde mori*, *Gal.* 17 above). His lovesickness is so fierce that he cannot carry on living. Yet, though admitting defeat, Damon realises the root of his problem, and advises Tindarus to do what he himself was not able to do: to be a master of himself (*tuque tuus facito sis*); and to escape the winged loves (*amores... volucres*) and dreadful quivers (*diras... pharetras*, 19-20) before it is too late. The first part of Damon’s counsel has a distinctively Stoic flavour, alluding to Seneca’s famous words to Lucilius: *te dignum putas, qui aliquando fias tuus* (*Ep.* 20.1), as well as the content of the Nurse’s speech to Phaedra, in Seneca’s tragedy: *quisquis in primo obstitit/ pepulitque amorem, tutus ac victor fuit* (*Ph.* 132-3).²¹⁵ The second part, however, calls

²¹³ As a scholar, Boccaccio disagrees with this view, claiming that, if we humans possess reason, then we naturally possess free will (*Espos.* 5.2.77-78). Note, however, that Boccaccio incorporates several elements from Dante’s *Inferno* 5 (and especially from the Francesca and Paolo episode) into his Decameronian *novella* about Nastagio degli Onesti (*Dec.* 5.8), which also treats of love and suicide – see Russo (1956: 194-206), and Asaro (2013: 85-93).

²¹⁴ See, for instance, *Tratt.* (1) 51 (on how Dante was robbed of his “sweet contemplations” by his wife): “ora non solamente dalle contemplazioni dolci è tolto quante volte voglia ne viene alla nuova donna, ma gli conviene essere accompagnato di compagnia male a così fatte cose disposta”; and *Corb.* 194 (on the shameful subjection of the male narrator to a woman): “Come così t’avvilisci? Come t’hai tu così poco caro che tu ad una femina iniqua, insensatamente di lei credendo quello che mai non le piacque, ti vada a sottomettere?” – discussion in Díaz (2018: 164-88). For an overview of misogamy and misogyny in ancient and medieval literature (from Juvenal to Chaucer), see Wilson & Makowski (1990).

²¹⁵ See also Phaedra’s words at Ovid *Heroides* 4.26: *cui venit exacto tempore, peius amat*. A volume containing all the 124 letters of Seneca is listed in the inventory of Boccaccio’s *parva libreria* – see Mazza (1996: 16). It is believed, however, that Boccaccio did not possess a complete copy of Seneca’s letters until he was editing the *Esposizioni* (1373-74) – see Constantini (1974: 84-6), and Gittes (2008: 255, n. 45). On Boccaccio’s knowledge of “Seneca *tragicus*”, see Kriesel (2016: 415-48).

to mind the image of Cupid, and more particularly the beginning of Ovid's *Amores* 2.5, where the poet-narrator repels the quivered Cupid (*pharetratus Cupidus*), and also prays for death as he recalls his *puella*'s infidelity.²¹⁶

Damon has disposed of all his weapons against love and, overthrowing reason, he subjects himself entirely to Fortune. As suggested above, the idea of randomly following Fortune to a foreign land alludes to Ovid. Yet, the idea of Damon abandoning himself to Fortune and death after losing his lover is strikingly Virgilian, and brings to mind the tragic fate of Dido. Indeed, in her last speech before dying, in *Aeneid* 4, Dido emphatically says that her life is done, and that she has finished the course that Fortune gave to her: *vixi et, quem dederat cursum Fortuna, peregi* (*Aen.* 4.653).²¹⁷ Similarly, in the passage from Boccaccio's *Galla* above, Damon is resolved to let Fortune guide him towards death (*quo Fortuna trahet miserum, moriturus abibo*, *Gal.* 21).²¹⁸ In both Dido's and Damon's speeches, Fortune is negatively associated with irrational feelings – note that, when Dido prepares her own pyre and sword, she is in a state of violent madness (*trepida... effera... furibunda*, *Aen.* 4.642-6).²¹⁹ From this association, we could establish a strong connection between erotic love and Fortune – and here we could refer again to the example of Phaedra. In line 584 of Seneca's tragedy, the Nurse is afraid of what will befall Phaedra, and where her madness will conduct her: *quo se*

²¹⁶ See *Am.* 2.5.1-4.

²¹⁷ On his comment to this Virgilian passage, Servius links *Fortuna* to the chance that governs uncontrollable disasters, such as downfalls, fire and shipwrecks: *Fortuna, id est casu, qui ad omnia pertinet quae extrinsecus sunt, ut ad ruinam, incendia, naufragia* (Serv. *Ad Aen.* 4.653). See also *Aen.* 5.22-3: *superat quoniam Fortuna, sequamur;/ quoque vocat vertamus iter*; and 5.709-10: *quo fata trahunt retrahuntque sequamur;/ quidquid erit, superanda omnis fortuna ferendo est*. On the goddess and concept of Fortune in ancient Rome (and particularly in Virgil), see Champeaux (1979), Gagliardi (2011: 61-87), and Nash (2017: 135-59).

²¹⁸ See also Bocc. *Fiamm.* 1.7: "seguirai l'appetito"; Dante *Rim.* 116.61: "Così m'hai concio, Amore, in mezzo l'alpi"; 106.90: "Morte, che fai? che fai, fera Fortuna...?"; and *VN* 10: "sì come dalla Fortuna menato".

²¹⁹ See Cic. *Nat. D.* 3.61: *Fortuna... quam nemo ab inconstantia et temeritate seiunget*; Cic. *Div.* 2.18: *nihil enim est tam contrarium rationi et constantiae quam fortuna* – discussion in Nash (2017: 142). Petrarch held a similar view on fortune, and thought that one should fight it with virtue: *quod illud est bellum quamque perpetuum, quod cum fortuna gerimus? Cuius nos facere poterat virtus sola victores* (*Rem. fort.* Pr.). See also Boeth. *Cons.* 2.P.8.1-2; Petr. *Fam.* 17.3.48 – Rawski (1991, vol. 2: 5).

dabit fortuna? quo verget furor?.²²⁰ Though in this case *fortuna* is not being employed as a personification, the passage at issue can still illuminate that connection.

Evidently, in the Christian production, Fortune acquires a distinct meaning from that of the ancient Romans.²²¹ Though Boccaccio draws on several classical sources to describe Fortune, in *Galla* as well as in other of his works (such as *Filocolo* 4.125, and *De casibus* Pr. 8), he relies mainly on Dante to present Fortune as the personification of a divine law, indifferent to human emotions and responsible for the balanced distribution of earthly treasures.²²² In *Inferno* 7, Dante (through Virgil) speaks of her as God's "general minister and guide" ("general ministra e duce"), who handles and distributes the "vain goods" ("ben vani") among nations, families and individuals.²²³ As Boccaccio later explained in his *Esposizioni*, by "ben vani", Dante referred to the transitory riches and titles which did not contribute to one's salvation or stability. Yet, in his fictional works, Boccaccio extends the notion of vain goods to other sorts of impermanent things and pleasures, including erotic pleasure. In canto 32 of his *Amorosa visione*, for instance, he presents the "venereal pleasure" ("venereo piacer") as one of the several "vain delights" ("van diletiti") pursued by men and controlled by Fortune.²²⁴

Just as Tindarus places the responsibility for his troublesome life on the Fates (*Gal.* 11), Damon seems to partly blame Fortune for his state of misery and his desire to die: *mors ipsa quietem/ sola dabit fesso; mors est inimica laborum* (17-18 above).²²⁵ The fact is that, however powerful and implacable the Fates or Fortune may be, their blows are felt all the more intensely

²²⁰ Boccaccio's Fiammetta is similarly depicted as possessed by a "furioso amore" – see discussion in Smarr (1986: 135-6).

²²¹ In her analysis of Dante's *Inferno* 7, Barolini (2018b) briefly discusses this process of "de-classicizing – Christianizing – of Fortuna".

²²² See *Inf.* 7.73-81 (and Boccaccio's literal commentary on this passage, in his *Esposizioni*); and also Boeth. *Cons.* 2.9-11 – discussion in Cioffari (1947: 1-2). On Fortune in medieval literature, see Patch (1927), and Badolini (1983: 521-39). Particularly on the role of Fortune in the *Decameron*, see Cioffari (1940: 129-37).

²²³ *Inf.* 7.77-81.

²²⁴ *Espos.* 7.1.78.

²²⁵ See also Sen. *HO* 1021: *mors sola portus dabitur aerumnis meis*; and Petr. *Rvf* 8.11: "un sol conforto et de la morte avemo"; Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.71-2: *verum hec sententia cordis,/ hanc animam exuere et placide hec dare membra quieti*;

by those who place their happiness in worldly and ephemeral treasures. In other words, if Damon and Tindarus are walking in circles in an oppressive barren land, it is because they themselves have chosen to follow the path of their empty wishes.

Confession

The rest of the poem will be more clearly focused on Damon's love troubles. Calling his friend back to the reality of the bucolic world, Tindarus suspends his own activities, and proposes to help Damon. In this way, he partly acts like the Arcadians trying to console Gallus in Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 (21-30); and like Iollas too, who calls on Tityrus to look for his lost heifer while he himself is to listen to Lycidas' troubles, in Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 3 (18-23):

Esne tui compos? Paulum requiesce sub antro;
est equidem veteris michi grandis copia bachi.
Perge, precor, Phorba; crateras fronde corona;
en pendent ansis patulam, si cernis, ad alnum.
Interea que dira lues michi pandito, Damon,
te cruciet. Leviat mentes recitasse dolores.
(*Gal.* 22-7)

On hearing that Damon wishes to die, Tindarus immediately questions his friend's sanity. Just as Apollo reproached Gallus for his madness at Virgil *Eclogues* 10.22 (*Galle, quid insanis?*), Tindarus interrupts Damon, asking whether he is in his right mind (*esne tui compos?*, *Gal.* 22 above). From this we may imply that, though Tindarus himself is enslaved by work (13), he is nonetheless able to recognise the pathological state of Damon; and, as an older person (cf. l. 136 below), he feels entitled to advise the lovesick youth, who is on the verge of committing suicide. Following the bucolic custom, Tindarus then invites Damon to come and have some rest in his cave, while they will drink a cup of vintage wine (22-3).²²⁶ At this point, a third (but invisible) character is introduced into the eclogue: Phorbas (24). Though an unusual figure in

²²⁶ See, for instance, Virg. *Ecl.* 1.79-81, and Nemes. *Ecl.* 4.46-8.

the bucolic genre (like Tindarus and Galla), the dramatic function of Phorbas in the narrative is apparent. Since his Greek name (φορβάς) means “giving pasture” or “fodder”, and alludes to the homonymous shepherd from Seneca’s *Oedipus*, Phorbas must play the part of an old bucolic servant in *Galla*.²²⁷

After requesting Phorbas to bring them wine, Tindarus encourages Damon to disclose his feelings to him, saying that it soothes the mind to recount one’s torments (*leviat mentes recitasse dolores*, 27). The strategy of singing to minimize the pain of love is strongly bucolic, and goes back to Theocritus’ *Idyll* 11.²²⁸ In Virgil’s *Eclogue* 2, Corydon, burning with passion (*ardebat*, 1) for the cruel Alexis, would constantly play and sing his lament to the hills and woods (1-5); and, in Nemesianus’ *Eclogue* 4, Lycidas and Mopsus decide to sing of their destructive loves for Meroe and Iollas, ending their respective turns with the refrain: *cantet, amat quod quisque: levant et carmina curas* (25 ff.).²²⁹ The passage of *Galla* just mentioned closely alludes to the latter part of Nemesianus’ refrain. Yet, the general notion of a “logotherapy” is pervasive in many of Boccaccio’s works, bucolic and non-bucolic.²³⁰ For instance, in the eclogue *Dorus*, the character Montanus urges Dorus to talk more about the downfall of his woodland, using the expression *iuvit narrasse labores* (*Dor.* 112); and in *Olympia*, Silvius similarly emphasizes the balsamic effect that the words of his angelic daughter will have on him: *audire fuit persepe laborum/ utile solamen* (*Olymp.* 168-9). Furthermore, the whole *Decameron* is built on the underlying premise that one can fight Fortune with fiction; and, in the Preface to the work, the narrator himself claims that a simple

²²⁷ See Bocc. *De cas.* 1.8.4. Boccaccio also employs the name Phorbas in his eclogues 4, *Dorus* (l. 120), 6, *Alcestus* (l. 50), and 13, *Laurea* (l. 48). In the first and last poems, however, Phorbas is linked to a higher-rank character. In classical literature, Phorbas also referred to other mythical and epic figures, as in Homer (*Il.* 9.665 and 14.490), Virgil (*Aen.* 5.842), Ovid (*Met.* 5.74, 11.414, 12.322), and Hyginus (*Fab.* 14.9.3, 18.1.5). In his *Genealogia* 6.39, Boccaccio dedicates a chapter specifically to the hero Phorbas, son of Priamus and Epythesias (following Servius’ commentary on Virgil’s *Aeneid* 5.842) – Perini (1994: 919-20).

²²⁸ See Theocr. *Id.* 11.1-18: “There is in nature no remedy for love, Nicias – neither an ointment, I believe, nor a powder – other than the Pierian Muses. (...) But he discovered the remedy; and, sitting on a high rock, he would sing in this way as he gazed out to sea” (trans. Hopkinson).

²²⁹ See Hubbard (1986: 236).

²³⁰ See Wack (1990: 7).

conversation with a friend was enough to prevent him from dying of love.²³¹ However, the following lines of *Galla* possibly imply the special role of Petrarch in the dissemination of that idea:

Dam. Quis neget? Audieram solitum cantare Menalcam.
Ast ego si dicam, mecum lacrimaberis ipse.
Tin. Sic volo. Quem letis tantum dicemus amicum?
(*Gal.* 28-30)

Damon agrees with Tindarus that sharing the story of his misfortune might help him to go through it, and he remembers having heard Menalcas preaching the same. Unlike Tindarus, Galla and Phorbas, Menalcas is a conventional bucolic character. He plays the prominent role of speaker in Virgil's *Eclogues* 3 and 5, and his name is mentioned in several other poems.²³² Particularly in Damon's line above, however, the shepherd-singer Menalcas seems to represent Petrarch, who famously advocated, in his *Canzoniere*, that "pain becomes less bitter though singing" ("cantando il duol si disacerba", *Rvf* 23.4).²³³

The Golden Age

Though Damon acknowledges the therapeutic benefits of song and conversation, he is afraid that his sorrow might be contagious for Tindarus (*Gal.* 29).²³⁴ The latter is nevertheless unshaken and, alluding to Ennius' proverbial expression *amicus certus in re incerta cernitur* (quoted by Cicero in his treatise on friendship), defends that one cannot recognise a true friend in times of happiness (30).²³⁵ Reassured by these words, and without further ado, Damon starts his confession:

²³¹ *Dec.* Pr.13 – see Perini (1994: 920, n. 1. 27). See also *Corbaccio* 409.

²³² See Virg. *Ecl.* 2.15, 9.10, 16, 18, 55, 10.20; Calp. *Ecl.* 4.11; Bocc. *Bucc.* 6.144, 10.23, 11.195, 16.47.

²³³ On the idea of "healing eloquence", in Petrarch and other humanist authors, see McClure (1985: 317-46).

²³⁴ See Dante *Inf.* 5.126 ("dirò come colui che piange e dice"), and 33.9 ("parlare e lagrimar vedrai insieme") – Perini (1994: 920).

²³⁵ See En. *Trag.* 351 (quoted by Cicero in *Laelius* 64.8) – Perini (1994: 30).

Nympha fuit silvis totis pulcherrima nostris;
et quantum lauro cedit funesta cupressus,
cupresso mirtus bicolor mirtove mirice,
Tindare, huic tantum cedit Galathea Miconis.
Hec facilem placidis quondam me cepit in annis
has inter fagos, pulchris comitata napeis.
Heu! quibus hec oculis, roseo suffusa rubore,
impulit in pectus flammis quibus uror, et auxit
blanda nimis! Nobis volucres nunc ferre sagittas,
nunc solita et catulos, nunc retia tendere cervis,
dissuadere truces ursos ac dentibus apros
ne sequeretur sevos, lata et venabula furtim
surripere ut vacuo lenes apponeret arcus.
Indignor memorans, quercus michi testis amorum est:
amplexus centum cui iunximus, oscula centum,
nunc alios, oblita mei, sic temperat ignes
ut moriar. Permite mori; moriemur amando.
Sed videant silve montes arbusta fluenta
et memores nympha reddant pro munere munus.
(*Gal.* 31-49)

While earlier in the poem Damon had only vaguely insinuated the reason for his suffering (19-20), here he finally introduces his beloved. Without revealing her name yet, he presents Galla as the most beautiful nymph in his woods (*Nympha fuit silvis totis pulcherrima nostris*, 31). Comparing her to the bay tree (ranked higher than all other trees), Damon suggests that his *puella* surpasses even Galathea in beauty (32-4).²³⁶ This comparison seems to carry a metapoetic connotation, reinforcing the association between Galla and Boccaccio's vernacular erotic production suggested above. Though the bay tree was not representative of this type of literature, it is as if Damon had a distorted view of it, impudently ranking the vernacular above classical poetry (represented as the classical bucolic nymph Galathea).²³⁷ What is more, though

²³⁶ Boccaccio's ranking of plants in a hierarchical order from tamarisk to the bay tree alludes to Virgil *Eclogues* 1.24 (*quantum lenta solent inter viburna cupressi*); and, more generally, 5.16-18 (*lenta salix quantum pallenti cedit olivae, / puniceis humilis quantum salicunca rosetis, / iudicio nostro tantum tibi cedit Amyntas*). The image of the *funesta cupressus*, in turn, recalls Virg. *Aen.* 3.62-4 (*funus... atraque cupresso*), 4.506-7 (*fronde... funerea*), 6.216 (*feralis... cupressos*); and also Ov. *Tr.* 3.13.21 (*funeris ara mihi, ferali cincta cupressu*). Finally, the phrase *mirtus bicolor* is employed at Ov. *Met.* 10.98 (*et bicolor myrtus*).

²³⁷ The characters Micon and Galatea (*Gal.* 34) are cited in different passages of Virgil's *Eclogues* (the former in 3.10, and 7.30; the latter in 1.30-1, 3.64, 3.72, 7.37, and 9.39). Additionally, Micon appears in the eclogues of Calpurnius Siculus (5.1 and 6.91), and Nemesianus (3.1); and Galatea in those of Dante (2.78), and Petrarch (*Buc.* 11) – not to mention her important role in other non-bucolic works, such as in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (13.738 ff.). In the *Buccolicum*, besides Galla, Micon appears only in eclogue 10 (46, 143). Boccaccio adopts the medieval spelling of Galathea (following Dante and Petrarch), and establishes a false etymology between her name and the

the description of Galla's beauty and rosy cheeks (*roseo suffusa rubore*, 37) is peculiarly Ovidian (*Am.* 3.3.5), her character rather brings to mind the nymphs Lia and Mensola from Boccaccio's *Commedia delle ninfe fiorentine* and *Ninfale fiesolano*, respectively. In fact, Damon acts like the young male protagonists of these works. Just like Ameto in the former, and Africo in the latter, Damon too was walking in the woods (*has inter fagos*, 36) when he first saw his beloved nymph accompanied by a group of other nymphs.²³⁸ Even though all these nymphs were beautiful (*pulcris... napeis*, *Gal.* 36), Damon was easily captured (*facilem... me cepit*, 35) by Galla. Moreover, in a manner akin to how Ameto and Africo fell in love with Lia and Mensola, Damon was in the spring of life when he met Galla. That moment marked the end of his "peaceful years" (*placidi anni*, 35), and the beginning of a new stage of madness and servitude, symbolised in the poem by the hot summer.²³⁹

The scene described above is paradigmatic of how Boccaccio associates the awakening of erotic love with the end of childhood. A similar idea is presented in the first part of Virgil's *Eclogue* 8, where the shepherd-singer Damon, taking the voice of a heartbroken man to himself, says that from the moment he met Nysa, at the age of twelve, he lost his heart, and a fatal frenzy swept him away (*alter ab undecimo tum me iam acceperat annus/ ... ut vidi, ut perii, ut me malus abstulit error!*, 39-41). Yet, it is mainly Dante and Petrarch that we think of as representatives of that *topos*. At the beginning of his *Vita nova* (ca. 1292–95), Dante recounts how his first meeting with Beatrice, when they were both only nine years old, incited the *spirito*

Greek words γάλα ("milk") and θεά ("goddess"), as implied in his *Genealogia* 8.14: *Galathea, idest lactis deam* – see Perini (1994: 920-21).

²³⁸ See *Com. ninf.* 3 (esp. 3.2-3): "fra gli strabocchevoli balzi, surgeva d'alberi, di querce, di cerri e d'abeti un folto bosco... in questa selva sovente Ameto, vagabundo giovane... solea visitare"; *Ninf. fies.* 26-9 (esp. 28): "infra le fresche fronde". The Napaeae were the nymphs of wooded valleys, but they are not present in Virgil's *Eclogues* – see, however, Virg. *G.* 4.535 (and Servius *ad loc.*), Nemes. *Ecl.* 2.20, and Stat. *Theb.* 4.255. The phrase *has inter fagos*, in turn, is not particularly elegiac, but acquires some erotic colour in association with Virg. *Ecl.* 2.3 (*inter densas... fagos*) – besides being present at Petr. *Buc.* 4.20 (*inter... fagos*). Note also that, in the opening line of *Saphos*, Boccaccio uses the phrase *has inter lauros*, establishing a more elevated type of setting than that of *Galla* – see Chapter 3.

²³⁹ See Ov. *Her.* 4.25: *ars fit, ubi a teneris crimen condiscitur annis*; and Nemes. *Ecl.* 4.58: *teneris... in annis*. See also Bocc. *Cac. Dian.* 1.1-6: "Nel tempo adorno che l'erbette nove... mi gian d'amor il cuor con duolo amaro".

animale within him, and made him a slave to love.²⁴⁰ Likewise, Petrarch, in his *canzone* 23 (already mentioned above), presents the beginning of his love for Laura as the beginning of his exile and suffering, and consequently as the end of the subjective Golden Age of his first youth:

Nel dolce tempo de la prima etade,
che nascer vide et anchor quasi in herba
la fera voglia che per mio mal crebbe,
perché cantando il duol si disacerba,
canterò com'io vissi in libertade,
mentre Amor nel mio albergo a sdegno s'ebbe.
(*Rvf* 23.1-6)²⁴¹

It should be noted, however, that while Beatrice acts as Dante's guide towards heaven and God (as is evident in the *Commedia*), Laura sometimes represents, though in ambiguous forms, Petrarch's ruin and sin (as is clear especially from his *Secretum*).²⁴² In this sense, while Boccaccio's *Galla* engages with the Latin elegiac and medieval medical traditions to present love as the root of Damon's madness and suffering, overall the *Buccolicum carmen* adopts a Christian/Petrarchan position. Indeed, it is only through the transformation and rejection of erotic love (rather than through its sublimation and spiritualisation) that Boccaccio's autofictional pilgrim will be able to pursue true happiness and achieve salvation in *Phylostropos*.

Damon believes that he has left his golden years behind, and that now, without his beloved, he will never again find joy.²⁴³ He confuses the excitement of love with happiness,

²⁴⁰ Dante *VN* 1.6-8: "In quel punto lo spirito animale... si cominciò a maravigliar molto... D'allora innanzi, dico che Amore signoreggiò la mia anima". See also Bocc. *Tratt.* 1.30: "Nel tempo nel quale la dolcezza del cielo riveste de' suoi ornamenti la terra".

²⁴¹ "In the sweet time of my first age, which saw born and still almost unripe the fierce desire which for my heart grew – because, singing, pain becomes less bitter – I shall sing how then I lived in liberty while Love was scorned in my abode (trans. Durling). See Zak (2011: 35 ff.; 61).

²⁴² In his *Vita Petracchi* (26), Boccaccio suggested that Petrarch's Laura was an allegorical symbol of poetic glory, but Petrarch himself (*Fam.* 2.9) refuted this idea – see discussion in Chapter 3, "Searching for Saphos". On the Dantean concept of spiritual love (modelled on the neoplatonic, French, and Sicilian traditions), see Bryson & Movsesian (2017: 295-351).

²⁴³ This implicit association between the Golden Age and childhood goes back to ancient Greek literature – see Segal (1986: 77-8).

and attaches importance even to the things he hated the most about Galla. Using the language of fire characteristic of love elegy and love eclogues, but also prominent in the descriptions of Dido's and Phaedra's feelings, Damon remembers the sensation of his heart burning in flames (*in pectus flammas... uror*, *Gal.* 38).²⁴⁴ In the beginning, Galla reciprocated Damon's love, and accompanied him in his hunts, often carrying his arrows, dogs and nets. Meanwhile, she would advise Damon (as did Venus with Adonis, in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*) not to chase ferocious bears and wild boars, and would secretly snatch away his spears, and give him a pliable bow instead (40-3).²⁴⁵ Thus, taking up Cupid's arms herself (*volucres... sagittas*, 39), Galla not only impeded Damon from hunting as he wished; but she also made him her own prey, ultimately diminishing his masculinity, and denying him the possibility of ever finding some temporary leisure or distraction from love in hunts.²⁴⁶ Whereas in Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 Gallus contemplates going on dangerous hunts as a way to forget about Lycoris, Damon's idea of hunting is now so intertwined with his memory of Galla that he can no longer see it as a recreational activity.²⁴⁷ Though this makes him safe from the fiery beasts, Damon is nevertheless all the more exposed to death, since he is trapped by a violent love.

As Damon recalls those tricks that Galla used to play on him, he feels offended (*indignor memorans*, 44); yet, he can only think of Galla's embraces and kisses. As the hazels were witnesses of the nymphs' weeping for Daphnis in Virgil's *Eclogue* 5, so the oak was a

²⁴⁴ The long-established practice of linking love to fire can be traced back as far as Sappho (see Sappho 31.10 – imitated by Catullus 51.9-10). In the Roman love elegy, this *topos* appears at Tib. 2.4.6-7; Ov. *Am.* 1.1.26, and 2.4.12. In the bucolic genre, see Virg. *Ecl.* 2.1, 8.83; Calp. *Ecl.* 3.7-8; and Nemes. *Ecl.* 4.65. The loves of Dido and Phaedra are described in similar ways – see, for instance, Virg. *Aen.* 4.68 (*uritur infelix Dido*); Ov. *Her.* 7.23-4 (*uror, ut inducto ceratae sulphure taedae, / ut pia fumosis addita tura focus*); *Her.* 4.20 (*urimur, et caecum pectora vulnus habent*); and Sen. *Ph.* 119-20 (*quis meas... iuvare... flammas queat?*). On the language of fire in Seneca's *Phaedra*, see Segal (1986: 29-59).

²⁴⁵ See Ov. *Met.* 10.537-41; Virg. *Ecl.* 10.56-60, *G.* 1.307 (*retia ponere cervis*); Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.80f. (*retia cervis/ ponere*), 7.58ff. (*retia cervis... tendere*), and also *Com. ninf.* 5.26 (“io fortissimo le porterò per gli alti boschi l’arco e la faretra e le reti, e di quelli scenderò sopra i miei omeri la molta preda”).

²⁴⁶ The phrase *volucres sagittas* (classical Latin: *sagittas*) in reference to Cupid is evocatively Ovidian – see, for instance, Ov. *Am.* 1.1.25 (*certas habuit puer ille sagittas*). Yet, the same phrase appears in epic contexts: Virg. *Aen.* 5.242 (*citius volucrique sagitta*), 11.858 (*volucrem... sagittam*), 12.415 (*volucres... sagittae*); Petr. *Afr.* 3.167 (*volucresque... sagitte*).

²⁴⁷ *Ecl.* 10.56-60 – see Coleman (1977: 290). On masculinity and hunt, see Bates (2013: 1-43).

witness of Damon's loving moments with Galla in Boccaccio's poem (*quercus michi testis amorum est*, 44).²⁴⁸ Now, however, since Galla has forgotten Damon and restrains her passion (*nunc alios, oblita mei, sic temperat ignes*, 46), he is resolved to die. Thus, Damon intends to act like Dido and Phaedra, taking his own life because of his disease of love (*moriemur amando*, 47). He literally plans to carry out that which – according to Ovid's *Ars amatoria* – was supposed to be a mere game for a man to conquer a woman, that is, to *pretend* that he was “dying of love” (*et insano iuret amore mori*, 1.372).²⁴⁹ Note, however, that Boccaccio's Damon wants to make a spectacle of his death, becoming a symbol of unrequited love, and perhaps even achieving immortality through love. Like Daphnis in Virgil's *Eclogue* 5, Damon expects that the forests, mountains and rivers may witness his death (*sed videant silve montes arbusta fluenta*, 48); but also that the nymphs may know of Galla's betrayal and treat her as she deserves (*et memores nympha reddant pro munere munus*).²⁵⁰ Hence, establishing an extravagant analogy between his own idealized death and that of the mythical shepherd Daphnis, Damon hopes to be mourned and remembered by the inhabitants of his wood.

In some ways, Damon's irrational thoughts and excessive emotions are forgivable in view of his youth. In the same way, Boccaccio's earlier erotic works should be regarded as the product of his reckless young self. In fact, Boccaccio not only usually adopts a sympathetic attitude towards his fictional young lovers, but also incorporates the stereotype of the young lover in his earlier self-presentations.²⁵¹ Yet, just like Cicero, Ovid, and Petrarch (to mention a

²⁴⁸ *Ecl.* 5.21.

²⁴⁹ See Virg. *Aen.* 4.669-70 (*moriemur inultae, / sed moriamur*); Sen. *Ph.* 258 (*decreta mors est*); and also Ov. *Met.* 10.426 (*certa mori tamen est, si non potitur amore*). As Hills (2004: 93) has observed, examples of suicide in Roman love elegy are surprisingly rare, and they are usually “confined to the realm of myth”, particularly to mythical women. See, however, Propertius 2.34.91-2 (on Gallus' erotic self-killing): *et modo formosa quam multa Lycoride Gallus / mortuus inferna vulnera lavit aqua!* – discussion in Fabres-Serris (2018: 37-50, at 38). On Dido and Phaedra as examples of lovesick women, see Wack (1990: 6, 176), and Toohey (1992: 265-86, esp. 278-9).

²⁵⁰ See Virg. *Ecl.* 5.21: *vos coryli testes et flumina Nymphis*. On the myth of Daphnis, see also Ov. *Met.* 4.276-78; Serv. *Ad Buc.* 5.20; and Bocc. *Gen.* 7.35. Though employed in very different contexts, the expression *munus (pro)* verbally alludes to Ov. *Tr.* 3.11.49, Mart. *Epigr.* 9.94.5, Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 10.27, and 21.788.

²⁵¹ See, for instance, *Ninf. fies.* 2: “Amor è que' che mi guida e conduce/ nell'opera la qual a scriver vegno;/ Amor è que' ch'a far questo m'induce,/ e che la forza mi dona e lo 'ngegno”; and also Ov. *Ars am.* 1.17: *ego sum praeceptor Amoris* (cf. *Tr.* 1.1.67: *non sum praeceptor Amoris*).

few examples), Boccaccio consistently rejects the figure of the *amans senex* in both his scholarly and literary works.²⁵² In the *Trattatello*, for instance, after extensive praise of Dante's virtues, Boccaccio awkwardly exposes Dante's one sin; and regrets that his admired poet let himself succumb to lust, not only in his early years, but also throughout his old age, which was unacceptable.²⁵³ Similarly, in the *Corbaccio*, the spirit-guide reproaches the protagonist-narrator for his foolish infatuation at forty, which autofictionally suggests that, by that age, Boccaccio was still struggling with his own erotic impulses.²⁵⁴ Only in *Phyllostropos* Boccaccio will definitely realise, with the aid of Petrarch, that he must escape the fate of Dante; and in *Aggelos*, he makes it clear that he, as an old man, has once and for all abandoned his concern with love.²⁵⁵

Galla's treachery

Tindarus tries to suppress Damon's desire to die, and wonders whether the latter's case is real or illusory. Alluding to Dido's love for Aeneas (artfully implanted by Venus, in the *Aeneid*), Tindarus then questions both Damon's motivation for suicide and the essence of his love for Galla:

Tin. Absit, mi Damon! Nimium falluntur amantes.
 Quid nosti cur ista feras? Stat sepe sub umbra
 ignis; dum pallet, iuvenis tum fervet Adonis.
Dam. Erras, non sic est: fraus hec notissima nobis.
 Antrum grande manet silvis sub colle virentis
 Montis Ugi, quo forte greges contraxerat Egon,
 et pastos gracili solus refovebat avena.
 Huc ego dum, Phytia pecori custode relicto,

²⁵² See, for instance, Cic. *Cael.* 42, *Off.* 1.123, *Sen.* 47; Ov. *Am.* 1.9.4 (*turpe senex miles, turpe senilis amor*); Petr. *Rem. fort.* 2.83, and *Sen.* 12.1.

²⁵³ See *Trattatello* (1) 172: "Tra cotanta virtù, tra cotanta scienza, quanta dimostrato è di sopra essere stata in questo mirifico poeta, trovò ampissimo luogo la lussuria, e non solamente ne' giovani anni, ma ancora ne' maturi" – discussion in Díaz (2019: 237-38).

²⁵⁴ See *Corb.* 118-21 – Díaz (2019: 232).

²⁵⁵ *Agg.* 67-71: Appenninus. *Senis est dimittere mores/ nonnunquam iuvenum; lusit Galathea potentem/ viribus, enervem faciet quid lusca Dyones?// Angelus. Absit; nulla seni talis nunc cura, doletque/ obsequio quondam nimiumque vacasse Liquoris.* See also Petr. *Ep. Post.* 6; and discussion in Chapter 4, "Context and characters".

errans advenio (sic me malus ardor agebat)
 presensi timuique dolos. Nam mixta puellis
 Galla choros antro festos lasciva trahebat;
 nec secum Egoni quicquam cur luderet antro.
 (Gal. 50-61)

Note that Tindarus's phrase "lovers are excessively deceived" (*nimum falluntur amantes*, 50) both alludes to and reverses the meaning of Virgil's rhetorical question "who could deceive a lover?" (*quis fallere possit amantem?*) at *Aeneid* 4.296. Thus, on the one hand, Boccaccio's text immediately implies that Tindarus has a lower view of lovers' cognition than the Virgilian narrator in the *Aeneid*. In fact, Tindarus suggests that Damon's assumptions are perhaps wrong, and that the love that Galla feels for him might not be so obviously apparent.²⁵⁶ In this sense, Tindarus' statement above evokes also a passage from Seneca's *Phaedra*, where Phaedra herself recognises that love is deceitful (because it generates false hopes in lovers): *o spes amantum credula, o fallax Amor* (Ph. 634).²⁵⁷ On the other hand, when Damon rebuts Tindarus (*erras, non sic est*, 53), the previous allusion to *Aeneid* 4 is consequently resemanticized in the text. For just as Dido at first had an intuition about Aeneas' departure (*regina dolos... praesensit*, *Aen.* 4.296-7), and then confirmed her suspicions, Damon too could sense and fear Galla's betrayal (*presensi timuique dolos*, Gal. 59) before he could confirm it (*fraus hec notissima nobis*, 53).²⁵⁸ The latter phrase, in turn, significantly alludes to another Senecan passage, not from *Phaedra* though, but from Creon's speech in *Medea* (*nota fraus, nota est manus*, 181), as if suggesting an exaggerated comparison between Galla and Medea. Ultimately, by linking Damon to Dido, and Galla to Medea, Boccaccio's text doubly engages

²⁵⁶ Perini (1994: 922) reads Boccaccio's phrase *dum pallet, iuvenis tum fervet Adonis* as a reference to Macrobius' astronomical interpretation of the myth of Adonis (*Sat.* 1.21), also discussed by Boccaccio in his *Genealogie* 2.53. According to that interpretation, Adonis would symbolise the sun, Venus the southern hemisphere, and Proserpina the northern hemisphere. Thus, Venus would enjoy Adonis' love in spring and summer, while Proserpina would enjoy his love in autumn and winter.

²⁵⁷ See also Virgil *Ecl.* 8.26: *quid non speremus amantes?* – Clausen (1994: 247).

²⁵⁸ See also *Aen.* 4.85 (*infandum si fallere possit amorem*) – which, in turn, recalls *Aeneid* 2.3 (*infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem...*), as if Dido's *infandus amor* for Aeneas was to some degree compared to the hero's *infandus dolor* for the fall of Troy – see Gildenhard (2016, n.p.).

with the misogynistic discourse propagated in the Roman lyric and elegy. In both these genres, male lovers were depicted as soft, irrational, and womanly; while women were considered dangerous, selfish, and treacherous.²⁵⁹

While Dido started raving through the city with Bacchic fury before confirming that Aeneas would depart, Damon was similarly propelled by an evil feeling to roam through the woods (*errans... sic me malus ardor agebat*, 58).²⁶⁰ Leaving the sheep for his friend Phytias to guard, he eventually came near a large cave, beneath Mount Hugo, where he saw the shepherd Egon gathering his flock, and then playing his slender reed pipe alone (*gracili... avena*, 56).²⁶¹ Soon afterwards, Damon caught sight of his “wanton Galla” (*Galla... lasciva*, 60) – and here her name is finally disclosed – leading a festive group of nymphs towards that same cave. He did not attach much importance to this, until he spotted Pamphylus:

Pamphylus interea dum cogeret inde capellas
ad salices, tacitus meditans sub rupe sedebam
invisus. Petiit verum ille secreta salicti
et, stipula doctus pariter fidibusque canoris,
carmen inauditum cepit: tunc sistere silvas
cantu et stare capros et ludere saltibus edos
vidisses. Quid multa feram? iam certus amorum
in longum tenuit donec lasciva per umbras
venisset iuvenis. Timidos quis fallat amantes?
Venit et illa quidem catulis sociata duobus,
illis illudens manibus succinctaque ramis,
voce ciens comites ne forsan longius iret
Pamphylus. At postquam coram lenique sub umbra
ylicis argute consedit, et ylice teste
pastorem flagrans cepit spectare canentem,

²⁵⁹ The idea of effeminate love is famously displayed in Catullus’ *carmen* 16, where the poet curses both Aurelius and Furius for thinking him less manly because of his love verses: *vos, quod milia multa basiorum/ legistis, male me marem putatis?* (Catullus 16.12-13). See also Propertius 1.7; discussion in Veyne (1987: 178-9), and Kennedy (1993: 24-45). The example of Medea as a cruel female lover is also suggested in Boccaccio’s *Phylostropos* – see discussion and references in Chapter 4, “Lust”.

²⁶⁰ See *Aen.* 4.300-1: *totamque incensa per urbem/ bacchatur*.

²⁶¹ See *Virg. Ecl.* 1.2: *tenui... avena*. As was stated above (in “Context and characters”), the non-bucolic character Phytias (Phytias, for Boccaccio) appears in classical literature as the faithful companion of Damon. For reasons which I have presented in the Introduction, I reject Ricci’s (1985: 55) interpretation of Egon as the bishop of Florence, and the cave as his luxurious summer villa in Montughi. Though Boccaccio uses the name “Egon” elsewhere in the *Buccolicum* to designate distinguished clerics (*Bucc.* 9.141; 16.97), here in *Galla* it makes more sense to think of him as some wealthy bucolic personage (in direct allusion to Virgil’s Aegon, the master of Damoetas and owner of his flock, in *Eclogue* 3.1-2). The same name is employed at *Virg. Ecl.* 5.72, *Calp. Ecl.* 6.83, and also at *Stat. Theb.* 5.56, 88 – always at the end of the line.

o! sibi quos oculos, actus quos quosque reflexus
auricomi capitis, quos risus quosque rubenti
obtulit amplexus facie! Vix illa profecto
abstinuit quin, visa prius, se conderet altis
in silvis. Nec plura loquar. Mors, eripe flammās.
(*Gal.* 53-81)

Though Pamphylus is not a traditional bucolic character, his name is familiar to a reader of Boccaccio. Besides its transparent Greek etymology (πᾶν + φίλος = “all loving”, “full of love”), the character Pamphilus also played a prominent part in Terence’s *Andria* and *Hecyra*, as well as in the popular medieval poem *Pamphylus De Amore*.²⁶² For these reasons, Boccaccio gives him (or his vernacular counterpart, Panfilo) a role in many of his literary works. In the *Elegia di Madonna Fiammetta*, Panfilo is the self-given pseudonym of Fiammetta’s deceptive lover.²⁶³ In the *Decameron*, however, Panfilo appears as one of the ten members of the *onesta brigata* (the group of virtuous young women and men who leave Florence to flee from the plague), thus not sharing a dishonest character with his *Fiammetta* double. Finally, in the *Buccolicum*, we encounter the same name in the eclogues *Faunus* (where Pamphylus plays one of the main speakers), *Dorus* (briefly mentioned in line 121, representing one amongst other Neapolitan noblemen), and in *Silva cadens* (speaker).

Based on Damon’s account above, the Pamphylus of *Galla* is probably closer to the Panfilo of *Fiammetta*, since both perform the role of irresistible young men who seduce committed women. As soon as Damon sees him, he grows alarmed. He immediately hides himself under a ridge, and starts to ponder as he secretly watches every single move of his rival (63-4).²⁶⁴ After gathering his she-goats, the latter seeks the seclusion of a willow (*petit... ille secreta salicti*, 64) – which is an inviting place for sexual encounters.²⁶⁵ There, Pamphylus

²⁶² *Ep.* 23.10: *Pamphylus grece, latine totus dicatur amor*. On the dramatic poem *Pamphylus, de Amore*, a pseudo-Ovidian production which was highly influential during the twelfth century (and certainly known to Boccaccio), see, for instance, Garbaty (1967: 108-34).

²⁶³ See *Fiamm.* 1.23.

²⁶⁴ See Virg. *Ecl.* 10.14 (*sub rupe iacentem*); and also Calp. *Ecl.* 4.1-2 (*tacitus... sub hac platano*).

²⁶⁵ See Clausen (1994: 107); Virg. *Ecl.* 3.64-5, 10.40; and also Ov. *Her.* 4.97.

begins to play an unusual song, skilfully alternating between the reed pipe (*stipula*) and the lyre (*fidibus*, 65). The choice of these instruments seems not arbitrary, but rather indicates the symbolic instruments of bucolic and lyric poetry, respectively. Indeed, though the *stipula* is mentioned only once in the *Eclogues* of Virgil and Calpurnius, in both these works it is used as a synonym for the more common word *avena* (which is also invoked at *Galla* 56 above, in connection with Egon).²⁶⁶ The *fides*, in turn, are often mentioned in Horace's *Odes*, being particularly associated with Sapphos at *Odes* 2.13.24-5 (*Aeoliis fidibus querentem/ Sappho puellis de popularibus*). Furthermore, Boccaccio's phrase *carmen inauditum*, used to describe Pamphylus' song, strikingly calls to mind Horace *Odes* 3.1.2-3 (*carmina non prius/ audita*), which suggests poetic originality, as well as loftiness of theme and tone.²⁶⁷

From Boccaccio's passage above, we can infer that Damon thinks that Pamphylus is the opposite of Virgil's Damoetas (called *indoctus* by Menalcas at Virgil *Eclogues* 3.24). Instead, he implicitly depicts him as Orpheus, who was famously known as the mythical inventor of the lyre, and symbol of the lyric genre.²⁶⁸ On the one hand, this association between Pamphylus and Orpheus is strengthened by the intertext with Virgil *Aeneid* 6.119-20 (already pinpointed by Perini): *Orpheus/ Threicia fretus cithara fidibusque canoris*. Yet, note that Boccaccio replaces the *cithara* with the *stipula*; and uses the phrase *fidibusque canoris* in the exact same metrical position as Virgil.²⁶⁹ On the other hand, Pamphylus also possesses

²⁶⁶ See Virg. *Ecl.* 3.27, Calp. *Ecl.* 5.116, and Serv. *Ecl.* 1.2.1 (on *tenui avena*): *culmo, stipula, unde rustici plerumque cantare consuerunt*. Virgil employs the word *stipula* more often in the *Georgics* (1.85, 289, 315, 321, 3.99, and 297). Note that, in Virgil's *Eclogue* 3, the *stipula* has a negative connotation (meaning something like "straw squeaker"), and is contrasted to the more conventional *fistula* – see Smith (1970: 504-6), and Van Sickle (2004b: 344-5). Boccaccio, however, seems to follow Servius, without making such a distinction.

²⁶⁷ The word *fides* (3rd decl. pl.) indicates "lyre" since at least Plautus – see *OLD* (*fides*, 2), and Harrison (2017: 163). Regarding Horace's *Ode* 3.1, note that the beginning of the poem contrasts with its end, where the poet himself questions the need for innovation and ambition: *cur invidendis postibus et novo/ sublime ritu moliar atrium?/ cur valle permutem Sabina/ divitias operosiores?* (45-8) – see Oliensis (1988: 132-3).

²⁶⁸ See Bocc. *Gen.* 5.12. Particularly on the legend of Orpheus' head and lyre reaching Lesbos, see *Gen.* 5.12.3: *et eius caput in Hebrum proiectum cum cythara in Lesbos usque delata sunt*; and Serv. *Ad G.* 4.522: *constat caput Orphei in Hebrum proiectum et fluctus in Lesbos insulam detulisse*. On the idea of the *poeta indoctus*, see Chapter 3, "Singing at the crossroads".

²⁶⁹ See also Bocc. *Bucc.* 5.68 (*nunc stipulis auctos, fidibus nunc arte canoris*), 9.83 (*et tyrios apros stipulis domuere canoris*), 13.139 (*fidibus stipulisque canoris*).

Orpheus' wonderful gift of enchanting the woods and animals. Damon thus establishes a sharp distinction between himself and Pamphylus. In contrast with the latter, Damon implies that he does not master either the bucolic or the lyric genre, and presents himself as *indoctus* (like Virgil's Damoetas). This particular aspect of Damon might autofictionally indicate something important about Boccaccio's relationship with those genres, and especially with lyric. Indeed, from Petrarch's *Seniles* 5.2 (dated to 1364–66), we know that Boccaccio regarded his own vernacular lyric production as worthless. For this reason, he decided to dispose of most of his earlier compositions, which were ostensibly influenced by the *stilnovisti* Guido Cavalcanti, Dante, and Cino da Pistoia.²⁷⁰ Yet, perhaps like Ovid (who continued writing elegy, though of a different kind, in his exile), the evidence shows us that Boccaccio too continued writing his *rime* until the very end of his life (1373–5).²⁷¹

Damon recounts that Pamphylus continued to play music for a long while, until he finally saw Galla (*lasciva iuvenis*) coming through the shadows (*per umbras*, 69). Though the latter phrase is commonly employed in the epic genre, here it has a sexual connotation, which reminds us of a controversial passage from the *Ars Amatoria*, where Ovid instructed girls to walk through dark porticoes and temples to pick up men (*at licet et prodest Pompeias ire per umbras*, 3.387).²⁷² What is more, this sexual connotation of the *umbrae* is subsequently reinforced in lines 74–5 of *Galla* (*sub umbra/ ylicis*), which in turn allude to Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 3 (*et puero comitata sub ilice cantat*, 27).²⁷³ Then, implying that Pamphylus was aware of Galla's reciprocal love already (*iam certus amorum*, 68), Damon ironically asks: "who

²⁷⁰ See Berté (1998: 10), Kriesel (2019: 211–12); and also Bocc. *Ep.* 20 (1372): *vulgaria et profecto iuvenilia poemata*. As Kriesel observes, Boccaccio might have copied Petrarch's *Canzoniere* around 1363 (the so-called Chigi form, 1359–62; BAV, Chigi L.V. 176) – see also Billanovich (1947: 266–8), and Eisner (74–94). I will briefly return to this discussion in Chapter 3, "Singing at the crossroads".

²⁷¹ See Berté (1998: 11); and Introduction.

²⁷² As Gibson observes (2003: 259–60): "the line ending is Virgilian (*Aen.* 6.461), but are the ominous associations of the Underworld to be imported here?". The same question can be applied to Boccaccio's passage. Particularly in the *Buccolicum*, Boccaccio applies the phrase *per umbras* mainly (but not exclusively) within erotic contexts (e.g. *Bucc.* 2.31, 52; 10.144; 12.61), always at the end of the line.

²⁷³ See also Virg. *Ecl.* 6.54 (*ilice sub nigra*), 7.1 (*sub arguta consederat ilice Daphnis*); Calp. *Ecl.* 2.12 (*umbrosa... sub ilice*), and 6.60 (*sub ilice Musae*).

would play a trick on shy lovers?” (*timidos qui fallet amantes?*, 70). This question, besides echoing Tindarus’ statement above (*nimum falluntur amantes*, 50), alludes to Virgil *Eclogues* 8.26 (*quid non speremus amantes?*), too. Note that the latter statement is employed by Virgil’s Damon in the context of a series of *adynata*, reinforcing the idea that lovers are capable of doing the most unpredictable things, as Nysa did by marrying Mopsus. Yet, Boccaccio’s poem suggests that, while Galla was not exactly “tricked” by Pamphylus’ seductive game (for she was already in love with him), Damon himself could be deceived by Galla’s unmistakable treachery.

Damon proceeds to recount how he saw Galla playing with two puppies, and calling her friends aloud so that Pamphylus would not go too far. Then, she finally approached him, subtly sat under the shade of a holm-oak, and began watching him closer (*sub umbra/ ylicis argute consedit, et ylice teste/ pastorem flagrans cepit spectare canentem*, 74-6).²⁷⁴ Thus, in the same way that the oak-tree had once witnessed Galla’s passion for Damon (*quercus michi testis*, 44), now the holm-oak can witness her current passion for Pamphylus (*ylice teste*, 75). The text gives special emphasis to the sense of vision: *invisus* (64), *vidisses* (68), *postquam coram* (74), *spectare* (76), *visa* (80).²⁷⁵ Ultimately, it is mainly from Galla’s gestures and signs (the glances, the tossing of hair, the smiles and embraces that she offered to Pamphylus) that Damon discovers her infidelity.²⁷⁶ Convinced by such “irrefutable” proof, Damon again invokes death to remove his love (*mors, eripe flammis*, 81).²⁷⁷

As suggested above, the general circumstances involving Damon’s alleged discovery of Galla’s affair alludes to Calpurnius’ *Eclogue* 3: just as Damon saw Galla watching Pamphylus from a holm-oak, so did Lycidas see Phyllis watching Mopsus. Precisely because

²⁷⁴ See Virg. *Ecl.* 7.1: *sub arguta consederat ilice Daphnis*.

²⁷⁵ This scene of Damon watching Galla and Pamphylus also reminds us of Polyphemus (not yet blinded) watching Galatea and Acis in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* 14 – see, for instance, 874: *me videt atque Acin*, “*video*” *que exclamat* (874); and discussion in Hutchinson (2007: 31). See also Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.75-81.

²⁷⁶ See *Fiamm.* 5.2.10: “*invidiosa che da lei si aperti segnali d’amore verso Panfilo si mostrassero*”.

²⁷⁷ The phrase *eripe flammis* is also employed at Virg. *Aen.* 2.289 (*eripe flammis* – referring to the firing of Troy).

of this allusion, we could be highly suspicious of Damon's version of the story. Indeed, Calpurnius' poem is mainly about jealousy: when Lycidas sees Phyllis near Mopsus, he gets so furious that he violently beats her (29-30). After this incident, Phyllis refuses to see Lycidas, threatening to abandon him forever, and to definitely replace him by Mopsus (*irata petit dixitque: "relicto,/ improbe, te, Lycida, Mopsum tua Phyllis amabit"*, 31-2). Thus, as the character Iollas perceives and points out in Calpurnius' poem, the whole quarrel between Lycidas and Phyllis was provoked not by Phyllis' infidelity, but rather by Lycidas' jealousy and rage (*a te coeperunt tua iurgia*, 36). In sum, even though Damon is sure of Galla's treachery in Boccaccio's poem (and the setting also contributes to reinforce the sexual tension between Galla and Pamphylus), the allusion to Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 3 probably suggests the opposite, and calls into question the entire account of Damon.²⁷⁸

The turns of Fortune

Though initially sceptical, Tindarus finally seems to accept Damon's version of the facts. Thus, he changes his strategy and, instead of focusing on the reasons behind his friend's suffering, he tries to offer him some hope for the future. Arguing that weeping is useless, Tindarus responds to Damon with a (fictional) quotation:

Nequicquam lacrimas fundis. Narrare solebat
 Tytirus, heu! nobis quondam, dum dulcior etas:
 "Non lacrimis satiatur Amor, non rore cicade,
 non cythiso pecudes eque nec prata fluento".
 Quid facies igitur? flebis? Quas sordidus ulmis
 abstulit autumnus cernis ver reddere frondes,
 et zephyrus placat quas undas turbidus auster
 miscuit, et pandos delphynes ludere sepe
 vidimus in pelago quod sorbserat ante carinas.
 Sic peragit Fortuna vices: nunc livida vultu
 prosternit miseros, relevat nunc fronte serena.

²⁷⁸ Besides the shadows and the holm-oak mentioned above, the image of the willows (*secreta salicti*, *Gal.* 64) alludes to the erotic contexts of Virgil's *Eclogues* 3.64-5 (*Galatea... fugit ad salices*) and 10.40 (*inter salices*). Then, the phrase *altis in silvis* (*Gal.* 80-1), though employed in different contexts, is peculiarly Ovidian – see, for instance, *Am.* 3.9.23 (*in silvis... altis*), 10.35 (*silvis... in altis*), and 13.19 (*silvis... sub altis*).

Est reditura dies qua dicas, non tibi primus
 pastorum silvis sit; fletus hos pone, precamur.
 Nam si non redeat, sunt et medicamina mille:
 carmine sevis amor sacro revocatur et herbis;
 carmina sunt nobis, et gratas novimus herbas
 iamdudum. Veterem Phorbas iam portat hyacum.
 (Gal. 82-98)

By explicitly announcing that Tindarus will quote the words of an external character (*narrare solebat*, 82), the text makes apparent its intertextual device. Indeed, the Tityrus mentioned by Tindarus evidently stands for Virgil. Besides the traditional association between that character and Virgil (established by Virgil himself at the end of the *Georgics*), the “quotation” itself reinforces such an identification.²⁷⁹ Moreover, the indication of a “sweeter age” (*dulcior etas*, 83) seems to allegorically represent Roman Antiquity, besides evoking the *placidi anni* mentioned earlier (Gal. 35), as if suggesting an idealised view of Virgil’s times as the Golden Age of literature and civilization. However, it is striking that Tindarus’ speech above does not actually correspond to any lines of Virgil’s Tityrus (nor of Calpurnius’ or Nemesianus’ Tityrus for that matter).²⁸⁰ Instead, it recalls the speech of Pan addressed to Gallus at Virgil *Eclogues* 10.29-30: *nec lacrimis crudelis Amor nec gramina rivis/ nec cytiso saturantur apes nec fronde capellae*.²⁸¹ What is more, Boccaccio’s text incorporates a minor verbal allusion into that main one, adding the expression *rore cicade*, originally spoken by Menalcas at Virgil *Eclogues* 5.77, at the end of Tindarus’ quotation above (Gal. 84).²⁸² Yet, the very fact that neither of these allusions refer to any of Tityrus’ speeches from Virgil’s *Eclogues* only serves to highlight that

²⁷⁹ See, for instance, Virg. *G.* 4.563-66; and Serv. *Ad Buc.* 1.1.4-6: *hoc loco [= Ecl. 1] Tityri sub persona Virgilium debemus accipere; non tamen ubique, sed tantum ubi exigit ratio*. After Daphnis (thirty-three occurrences), Tityrus (thirteen) is the name that is most frequently cited in Virgil’s *Eclogues*, followed by that of Menalcas (eleven) – Cucchiarelli (2017: 136). See also Hubbard (1998: 51): “Tityrus is a programmatic figure for the emergence of Vergil’s pastoral vision”; and Vasconcellos (2016: 111-14).

²⁸⁰ See Virg. *Ecl.* 1, 3.20, 96 etc.; Calp. *Ecl.* 3.19, 74, 97 etc.; Nemes. *Ecl.* 1.1, 2.84. The character Tityrus is also present at Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 2.6, 24, 46, 3.11 etc.; but surprisingly, he does not appear in Petrarch’s *Bucolicum*. For full references, see our Index of Intertexts.

²⁸¹ Coincidentally, Virgil’s *Eclogue* 10 alludes to Theocritus’ *Idyll* 1, yet Hermes (*Id.* 1.76-7) is replaced by Apollo (*Ecl.* 10.21-3), and the pair Priapus and Aphrodite (*Id.* 1.81-98) by Silvanus and Pan (*Ecl.* 10.24-30) – see Harrison (2007: 65).

²⁸² See Perini (1994: 924).

the Tytirus mentioned by Tindarus in *Galla* refers to Virgil the poet, and not to the Virgilian bucolic character. Finally, through the main allusion to Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, Boccaccio's text sheds light on the function of Tindarus in *Galla*: just as Pan acts as an adviser to Gallus in Virgil's poem, Tindarus acts as the adviser of Damon in Boccaccio's eclogue.

Tindarus tries to convince Damon that, as sure as spring follows winter, and as the calm follows the storm, his suffering too will give way to happiness (*Gal.* 86-9 above). As a rule, Fortune works by turns: one day she angrily prostrates the wretched, on another she calmly uplifts them (*sic peragit Fortuna vices: nunc livida vultu/ prosternit miseros, relevat nunc fronte serena*, 91-2).²⁸³ Thus, evoking the emblematic image of the wheel of Fortune, Tindarus suggests that what Damon is experiencing now is simply a downturn. Soon, however, he will rise again to the top, and believe that no shepherd in the forest is better than him (93-4). Moreover, there are a thousand ways by which Damon could recover his cruel Galla, such as by charms and herbs (*carmine sevis amor sacro revocatur et herbis*, 96). In this way, just as the country-woman from Alpheisiboeus' song knows how to call Daphnis back to her by magic in Virgil's *Eclogue* 8 (64-109), Tindarus claims that he himself knows how to perform the rites to recall a stray lover in Boccaccio's *Galla* (97). Meanwhile, Tindarus' phrase *sunt et medicamina mille* (95) vividly calls to mind a passage from Book 3 of Ovid's *Ars amatoria*, dedicated to women, and treating drugs that induce their vigilant guardians to fall asleep (*sunt quoque, quae faciant altos medicamina somnos*, 3.647).²⁸⁴ In sum, Tindarus presents himself both as a type of sorcerer and an experienced lover, one who encourages Damon to regain the love of Galla with special tricks that are usually employed by women to attract men.

Tindarus' speech is suddenly interrupted by Phorbas' arrival, as he brings the wine which was requested earlier (*Gal.* 98). Damon uses this opportunity to speak:

²⁸³ See this *topos* especially at Hor. *Carm.* 1.34.12-6 (and its commentary *ad loc.* by Nisbet & Hubbard: 1989: 377-8, 384-6).

²⁸⁴ On Ov. *Ars Am.* 3.647-8, see Gibson (2013: 246): "The use of drugs and poisons appears to have been a feature of mime, possibly including the adultery mime".

Cum capreis pascetur ovis, lupo acer ybisco,
 gurgite cum vultur vivet cumque ethera piscis,
 cum freta sulcabit vomer, cum pascua navis,
 tunc servare fidem incipiet lasciva puella;
 carmine tunc Gallam revocabimus, arte vel herbis.
 Ydaliū petii culmen sanctumque Cytheron
 et Paphi mirteta dolens, oscillaque ramis
 suspendi, pia thura dedi, precibusque potentes
 tentavi nymphas, votis superosque vocavi
 postque preces supplex ingentia munera misi;
 incassum: crudescit amor, crudescit et ipsa.
 (Gal. 99-109)

Invoking a series of *adynata*, which verbally alludes to Virgil *Eclogues* 1.59-60 (*ante leves ergo pascentur in aethere cervi/ et freta destituent nudos in litore piscis*), Damon is convinced that no song, art, or herbs (*carmine... arte vel herbis*, 103) can bring his lascivious *puella* back to him. In fact, he admits that he himself has performed all the possible rites to no avail: seeking Venus' sanctuaries in Idaliū, Paphos, and Cithaeron (104-5); offering votive masks and pious incense (105-6); praying to the powerful Nymphs; and calling on the gods with vows and gifts (106-9).²⁸⁵ Modifying Gallus' words at Virgil *Eclogues* 10.54 (*crescent illae, crescetis, amores* – that is, as the young trees on which Gallus carved his love for Lycoris grow, so will his love for her continue to grow), Damon pessimistically concludes, with an analogous anaphora, that love only grows crueller, and so does Galla grow crueller towards him (*crudescit amor, crudescit et ipsa*, 109). What is more, the *topos* of the cruel woman is amply employed by Dante in his *rime petrose*, where his lady is described as a beautiful, but inexorable stone. In “Amor, tu vedi ben”, for instance, Dante recounts that, the more he desired his beloved lady, the more she knew it and became cruel to him: “d’ogni crudeltà si fece donna” (Dante *Rime* 102.6); “così di tutta crudeltate il freddo/ le corre al core, ove non va tua luce” (38-9). And as

²⁸⁵ Cithaeron, a mountain range located between Attica and Boeotia, was actually a place of Dionysian cult, but during the Middle Ages it was often confounded with the island Cythera, where it is said that Venus was born. Boccaccio seems to incur in the same mistake. See, for instance, his gloss to *Teseida* 1.134: “Citerea si è Venere, così chiamata da uno monte ch’è sopra Tebe c’ha nome Citerone, nel quale Venere è adorata”; and also his entry “Cytheron” in the *De montibus: secundum autem alios Venus eamque dicunt ab eo Citheream fuisse vocatam* – Perini (1994: 926).

a result of her cruelty and coldness, the Dantean narrator thinks he will die: “sarò di morte freddo” (24); “questa gentil petra/ mi vedrà coricare in poca petra” (56-7).²⁸⁶

Love, the disease of the young

Tindarus laments that Phorbas has brought the vintage wine and chestnuts in vain, for Damon’s face and strength have collapsed.²⁸⁷ Indeed, Damon’s love for Galla is more than crazy (as is the love of Gallus for Lycoris in Virgil’s *Eclogue* 10); it is ominous, and fateful (*dirus*, 112 below).²⁸⁸ It is as if he, Tindarus, was trying to move rocks. On the one hand, this metaphorical image once again brings to mind the figure of Pamphylus/Orpheus, who can literally move inanimate objects with his song (something that neither Damon nor Tindarus can do).²⁸⁹ Yet, on the other hand, the same image also evokes Dante’s *rime petrose* mentioned above, though in this case it is Damon (and not the lady) who is compared to a stone, because of his torpor:

Heu michi! nequicquam defers Amarillidis olim
castaneas, Phorba, nobis, bromiumque vetustum.
Frons cecidit viresque animi; precordia dirus
urit amor misero: saxis, heu! verba movemus.
Attamen expecta si cesserit impius ignis.
(*Gal.* 110-14)

Tindarus’ description of Damon’s dizziness, his face and strength falling, and his insides burning with cruel love is reminiscent of classical and medieval medical discourses. Overall,

²⁸⁶ See Durling & Martinez (1990: 138-64).

²⁸⁷ The “chestnuts of Amaryllis” (*Amarillidis olim/ castaneas*, *Gal.* 110-11) is a reference to Virgil *Eclogues* 2.52: *castaneasque nuces, mea quas Amaryllis amabat*. See also Bocc. *Ninf. fior.* 26.31: “le piacevoli castagne... state già care ad Amarille”, and other examples in Index of Intertexts. *Bromius* is a name of Bacchus (*Βρόμιος* – see “Bromius” in *OLD*), and is being employed above as a metonym for wine, as at Calpurnius *Eclogues* 4.123 (*Bromium... vino*), and similarly to *Galla* 23 (*veteris... bachi*) – see also *Alcestus* 4.

²⁸⁸ See Virg. *Ecl.* 10.44: *nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis...* The phrase *dirus amor* is not commonly found in classical texts, but it occurs at Sen. *Agam.* 590 (referring to men’s love for life, *vitae dirus amor*). See also *dirae spei* (*Ph.* 131, mentioned below).

²⁸⁹ On the *topos* of moving rocks, see, for instance, Petr. *Buc.* 2.75 (*quis michi voce feras quercusque et saxa movebit*); Hor. *Ars* 395 (*saxa movere sono testudinis*); Ov. *Am.* 3.7.57-8 (*illa graves potuit quercus adamantaque durum/ surdaque blanditiis saxa movere suis*), and Her. 6.88 (*illa loco silvas vivaque saxa movet*). For other intertexts, see our Index of Intertexts.

it recalls the widely disseminated story of Antiochus discussed earlier (in “Context and characters”), as well as that of the lovesick Giachetto in *Decameron* 2.8.²⁹⁰ Moreover, the passage above strikingly alludes to one of the initial scenes from Seneca’s *Phaedra*, not only on a thematic but also on a verbal level. In it the Nurse hopes to extinguish Phaedra’s “terrible hope” (*dirae spei*, 131), and to restrain her “flames of love” (*compesce amoris impii flammis*, 165), just like Tindarus too hopes that Damon’s wicked fire (*impius ignis*, 114) can be extinguished in Boccaccio’s *Galla*. Yet, without listening to Tindarus, Damon gets completely absorbed in his own imagination and, picturing Pamphylus before his eyes, directs the following words to him:

O quantum natura parens tibi, Pamphyle, rerum
 posse dedit nemori! Tu sertis nectere flores,
 tu cantu recreare greges fluviisque quietem
 ponere, tu validas ornos cautesque movere
 novisti, et mulcere deos et flectere montes:
 o quantum! Neque sevis amor sua iura negavit
 ipse tibi; nam velle tuo, ni fallor, habenas
 nunc manibus, nunc mente regis, quod forte Tonanti
 non licuit quondam, silvis dum captus amaret.
 Quis, nisi tu, placidam fusca sub veste per arva
 Egonis Gallam nuper traxisset in antrum?
 quisve inter salices et densa vepreta volentem?
 (*Gal.* 115-26)

It is interesting to notice that, in this imaginary (perhaps hallucinatory) dialogue, Damon is confronted with the crude reality of his passivity and impotence. Rather than hating Pamphylus for having “stolen” his beloved woman, Damon seems to *envy* him for having so many qualities that he himself does not have.²⁹¹ For this reason, Damon does not wish to defeat Pamphylus.

²⁹⁰ See esp. *Dec.* 2.8.42: “Laonde avvenne che per soverchio di noia egli [Giachetto] infermò, e gravemente; alla cura del quale essendo più medici ricchi e avendo un segno e altro guardato di lui e non potendo la sua infermità tanto conoscere, tutti comunemente si disperavano della sua salute”, and 47: “La sanità del vostro figliuolo non è nell’aiuto de’ medici, ma nelle mani della Giannetta dimora, la quale, sí come io ho manifestamente per certi segni conosciuto, il giovane focosamente ama, come che ella non se ne accorge, per quello che io vegga” – see also Dante *Rime* 46.44-52 (mentioned above); and Bocc. *Dec.* 4.8 (Girolamo and Salvestra), discussion in Ciavolella (1970: 496-99).

²⁹¹ See *Fiamm.* 8.17.10: “chi porta invidia è più misero che colui a cui la porta”.

Instead, he wished he could *be* Pamphylus – a man blessed by nature and the gods; a man who can weave flower garlands, and sing so beautifully that he can move mountains and delight the gods (*tu cantu... mulcere deos et flectere montes*, 117-9). But also, and more importantly in this case, a man who has the power to control love with his own hands and mind (*habenas/nunc manibus, nunc mente regis*, 121-2).²⁹² In other words, at least in Damon's head, Pamphylus is endowed with all the virtues that a bucolic and elegiac character could possibly wish to have. In this sense, to return to the example of Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 3, we could say that Damon's feelings of inferiority in relation to Pamphylus starkly contrast with Lycidas' inflated ego, as the latter describes himself not only as a better musician, but also as more beautiful and richer than his supposed rival Mopsus.²⁹³

For Damon, therefore, it was inevitable that Galla should replace a mediocre man like himself with a perfect one. As a result, Damon seems to bitterly conclude that, of all the persons involved in Fortune's equation, it was Galla who made the best profit: whereas Damon himself ended with no erotic capital whatsoever, Galla was able to climb one step up in the ladder of love. Perhaps mainly because of this, Damon ultimately hopes to get revenge not on Pamphylus, but on Galla:

Te, Silvane pater, precor hec: fac cernere possim
 quos pectit croceos crines per tempora canos,
 et rugis roseas plenas pallescere malas,
 et tacitis nemorum iaceat neglecta sub umbris,
 ut ludam tremulos gressus oculosque gementes.
 Hoc si forte neges, patiaris ut ultima saltem
 me rapiat mors atra, meo positura quietem
 fervori, corpusque tegant sub cespite sicco
 pastores miseri, signent et carmine bustum.
 (*Gal.* 127-35)

²⁹² The *topos* of the *habenae/catenae* will be recovered in *Phylostrompos* – see Chapter 4.

²⁹³ Calp. *Ecl.* 3.59-62: *torrida Mopsi/ vox et carmen iners et acerbae stridor avenae... formosior illo dicor... sum quoque divitior* – see discussion in Karakasis (2016: 140-44).

Here, resorting to a typically elegiac *topos* (which again alludes to book three of Ovid's *Ars amatoria*), Boccaccio develops a short invective of the neglected male lover against his heartless beloved.²⁹⁴ Since Damon can no longer have Galla, he expects her to be punished with ugliness and loneliness. Hurt in pride, Damon uses his last reserves of energy to fervently pray that Galla, who is now the most beautiful nymph of the forest, may one day see her golden hair turn white, her rosy cheeks grow pale and wrinkled, until she lies completely ignored in the shadows, being mocked by her wobbly steps and weeping eyes (*Gal.* 127-31 above).²⁹⁵ If by any chance, however, Silvanus denies this to him, at least let him die, be buried, and have his tomb marked with verse (*signent et carmine bustum*, 135). While this passage vividly recalls the funerary rites in honour of Daphnis, described at Virgil *Eclogues* 5.42 (*et tumulum facite, et tumulo superaddite carmen*), it also alludes to Lycidas' speech in Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 3. Like Boccaccio's Damon, Calpurnius' Lycidas would rather die than live without his lover; yet, he wants the cause of his death to be affixed in a tree (*hi... ante mala figentur in arbore versus*, 89), and known by all.²⁹⁶

These were the last words that Damon was able to utter before losing consciousness, as we may deduce from Tindarus' final lines below:

Trux Amor, et iuvenum semper certissima pestis.
Heu! cecidit. Lymphas manibus portate recentes,
o pueri, si forte queam revocare dolentem.

²⁹⁴ See *Ars am.* 3.69-74: *tempus erit, quo tu, quae nunc excludis amantes, / frigida deserta nocte iacebis anus, / nec tua frangetur nocturna ianua rixa, / sparsa nec invenies limina mane rosa. / quam cito (me miserum!) laxantur corpora rugis, / et perit in nitido qui fuit ore color*. See also Prop. 3.25.11-18; and notes of Perini (1994: 927), and Gibson (2003: 109-10). In "Cosi nel mio parlar", Dante also imagines himself getting revenge on his lady (yet in a more violent, almost sadomasochistic way): "e non sarei pietoso né cortese, / anzi farei com'orso quando scherza; / e se Amor me ne sferza, / io mi vendicherei di più di mille. / Ancor ne li occhi, ond'escon le faville / che m'infiammano il cor, ch'io porto anciso, / guarderei presso e fiso, / per vendicar lo fuggir che mi face; / e poi le renderei con amor pace" (*Rime* 103.70-8) – see Durling & Martinez (1990: 175-9).

²⁹⁵ This *ekphrasis* of the old woman (familiar from Propertius and Ovid, but also widely used in medieval poetry) is present at Bocc. *Rim.* 44.2-5 "che le chiome d'oro / vegga d'argento, ond'io or m'innamoro, / e crespo farsi il viso di costei / e cispi gli occhi bei" – see Giannetto (1983: 23-49), and Branca (1992: 235).

²⁹⁶ See also Ov. *Met.* 2.325-6 (on Phaethon's death): *Naidēs Hesperiae trifida fumantia flamma / corpora dant tumulo, signant quoque carmine saxum*; and Bocc. *Rime* 46.12-14: "o crudel morte, perché non m'uccidi? / tu sola puoi il mio dolore amaro / finire e pormi forse in lieta pace". The phrase *mors atra*, in particular, recurs at Hor. *Carm.* 1.28.13 (*morti... atrae*); and also at Stat. *Theb.* 4.528, and Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 1.1.18, 3.17.22.

Tindarus sententiously concludes that “love is harsh, always the surest plague of youth” (*trux amor, et iuvenum semper certissima pestis*, 136).²⁹⁷ In this way, while alluding to one of Virgil’s most iconic lines (*omnia vincit amor: et nos cedamus amori*, *Ecl.* 10.69), Boccaccio seems to restrict the experience of erotic love to one specific period of a person’s life, and implicitly questions whether men should yield to it. Drained of all reason and strength by his virulent disease, Damon tragically (and perhaps comically) faints.²⁹⁸ Besides evoking the scene of Phaedra fainting with love in Seneca’s tragedy (*Phaedra* 585-88), the passage above also brings to mind Dante fainting after hearing the love story of Francesca and Paolo, at the end of *Inferno* 5; and also Dante imagining his own fainting in some of his *rime*, such as in “Lo doloroso amor” (*Rime* 68), and in “Amor, da che convien” (*Rime* 116).²⁹⁹ Thematically engaging with these texts, Damon’s syncope thus represents both a mark of his “womanly” character and a severe symptom of his lovesickness. Furthermore, besides symbolising death by love, particularly in the context of the bucolic genre, Damon’s physical “black-out” might metaphorically represent nightfall too: as the end of an eclogue often coincides with the falling of the night, *Galla* ends with Damon falling out of consciousness.³⁰⁰ Tindarus then calls his attendants (*pueri*), not to gather the flocks and return to their homes, but rather to bring fresh water so that he may revive Damon.

To conclude, *Galla* presents erotic love as an overwhelming emotion and illness that affects both an individual’s mental and physical capacities. Particularly in the case of young

²⁹⁷ For Boccaccio’s construction of love as *pestis*, see discussion in Veglia (1996: 79-100).

²⁹⁸ We have comic examples of (feigned) erotic fainting at Plautus *Miles gloriosus* 1260 (unknown to Boccaccio), and *Casina* 634. More generally, there is also a scene in Plautus’ *Curculio* (307-14), where Curculio pretends to be fainting from hunger, and is then helped with water by Lyco.

²⁹⁹ Dante *Inf.* 5.142: “E caddi come corpo morto cade” – discussion in Barolini (2018a); *Rime* 68.22: “sì ch’io cadrò freddo”; and 116.46-51: “Qual io divegno sì feruto, Amore,/ sailo tu, e non io/ che rimani a veder me senza vita;/ e se l’anima torna poscia al core,/ ignoranza ed oblio/ stato è con lei, mentre ch’ella è partita”.

³⁰⁰ See, for instance, Virg. *Ecl.* 1.83, 2.67, 6.86, 10.75-6; Calp. 4.168-9, 5.119-21; Nem. 1.86-7, 2.88-90, and 3.67-8. On this traditional bucolic closure, see Curtius (1990: 90-1).

men like Damon, the awakening of sexual desire marks a crucial transition from childhood (represented as a kind of Golden Age) to adolescence. Though its flame is light and pleasant at the beginning, erotic love can then evolve into a devastating fire that rapidly spreads and grows out of control. As a result, the individual in love cannot see anything beyond that fire, and his perception of reality is distorted. Even the slightest signs of rejection generate suspicion, confusion, and madness. Thus, love supplants reason, and conducts lovers towards an aimless path that may eventually end in death. Such a negative view of love will pervade the *Buccolicum* as a whole, but will be more prominently featured in Boccaccio's following eclogue, *Pampinea*: just like Damon, Palemon will be driven by mad love through wandering ways, and call on death to remove his youthful madness.³⁰¹ Yet, as the autofictional subject of Boccaccio's pastoral becomes more mature in the subsequent eclogues, his youthful concern with love will be, if not replaced, at least outweighed by one with politics; and his erotic suffering will be temporarily overshadowed by the fear of tyranny.

³⁰¹ See, for instance, *Pamp.* 9-10: *me miserum male sanus amor per devia solum/ distrahit*; and 138-9: *veni, venias precor, impia, nostros/ exime quos nequeo iuvenis iam ferre furores*.

CHAPTER 2: *Alceus*

Summary

Amintas announces the coming of spring, which brings happiness to all shepherds, except to Melibeus (1-7). The latter continues to lament over the disappearance of Alceus and the devastation of their woodland, now ruled by a monster (8-11). Amintas replies that there is no longer need for tears, for Polyphemus has left and Alceus has returned, accompanied by the wandering shepherds and straying flocks. The old order is restored, and everybody is celebrating (12-22). Melibeus remains sceptical, and refuses to believe in the good news (23-30). Yet, Amintas assures him that his words are true: nature confirms and rejoices at Alceus' return, and Amintas himself saw Alceus embracing and kissing his mother and sisters on the Euboean shores (31-41). Melibeus is finally convinced, and expresses extreme joy. He commands his attendants to build altars, offer sacrifices, and look after the sheep. As for himself and Amintas, they should spend the day in song and dance (42-65). Amintas accepts this, and proposes that Melibeus start singing about Phyllis' loves, Alceus' praises, or Phytias' trials (66-72). Melibeus chooses the second topic, and recounts in song the harsh fate of Alceus, who was forced to withdraw from his beloved forest, causing pain and despair to all its inhabitants. After enduring uncertain conditions and the power of Fortune, however, Alceus had his labours ended, and was finally restored to his ancestral woods (73-99). Amintas praises the sweetness of Melibeus' song, and takes his turn to celebrate Alceus' triumphal return with an extensive panegyric (100-40). Melibeus praises Amintas' talent and offers him a special vessel, made by the famous Ylas and never touched by human lips (141-52). In return, Amintas presents Melibeus with a staff, which once belonged to Lycidas (153-58). Suddenly, Amintas hears an echo resonating through the woods. He recognises the barking of his dogs, and fears that a violent wolf, or perhaps even a more savage animal, might be

attacking the sheepfold. He proposes to go there and see what is happening, and will call Melibeus if he needs help (159-66).

Context and characters

Unlike *Galla*, the whole narrative of *Alcestus* is based upon a historical episode and revolves around a historical figure. As was anticipated in the Introduction, *Alcestus* is part of and closes the Neapolitan war sequence of the *Buccolicum*, which includes eclogues 3 (*Faunus*), 4 (*Dorus*) and 5 (*Silva cadens*). This sequence deals with some critical events that radically shaped the political situation of the Kingdom of Naples (the “Regno”) during the 1340s. Those eclogues then allegorically display the feelings of anxiety and fear that marked that period in particular, but also the fourteenth century as a whole in Europe, which has been described by some historians as an “age of adversity”.³⁰²

The historical events related in *Alcestus* date back to 1348, thus preceding the poem’s composition by more than a decade.³⁰³ Boccaccio uses this chronological gap in his favour, reflecting on the several transformations that took place since that year. Let us remember that, in his *Epistola* 23, Boccaccio states that the reason for his calling Louis of Taranto “Alcestus” (ἀλκή, “virtue” + *aestus*, “fervour”) in the poem was because of the virtuous character adopted by that king *near the end of his life* (*circa extremum tempus vite sue*).³⁰⁴ Accordingly, we can infer that the behaviour of Louis of Taranto, and especially his popularity, evolved over time. As for Amintas and Melibeus, the speakers in the poem, however, Boccaccio assigns no deep meaning to them:

³⁰² See Bergin (1981: 1), and Lerner (1976).

³⁰³ See Ricci (1985: 51), and discussion on the dating of the *Buccolicum* in the Introduction.

³⁰⁴ According to the Liddell-Scott Greek Lexicon, the word ἀλκή refers, more specifically, to the qualities of “strength”, “prowess” and “courage”. As Perini (1994: 961) pointed out, Alcestus is not the masculinised version of Alcestis (the mythical daughter of Pelias), who in Boccaccio’s *Genealogie* is presented as “Alchista” – see *Gen.* 13.1.

Sexta egloga *Alceus* dicitur, eo quod de reditu regis prefati [scil. Louis of Taranto] in regnum proprium loquatur, quem regem ego hic “Alceum” voco, ut per hoc nomen sentiatur quoniam circa extremum tempus vite sue optimi regis virtuosus mores assumpserat: et Alceus dicitur ab “alce”, quod est “virtus”, et “estus”, quod est “fervor”. Collocutores duo sunt, Amintas et Melibeus, pro quibus nil penitus sentio. (*Ep.* 23.11-12)

In this way, considering that these characters do not bear any particular allegorical significance, but are rather standard bucolic personages representing generic Neapolitan men, Amintas and Melibeus probably have more in common with Damon, from *Galla*, than with Alceus. Yet, among the several other eclogues in which they appear, it might be worth highlighting that, besides Boccaccio’s poem, Amyntas and Melibeus (to use their conventional classical spellings) are featured together as speakers only in Calpurnius Siculus’ *Eclogue* 4.³⁰⁵ There, Amyntas plays the role of Corydon’s younger brother, and engages with him in a song-exchange in front of Melibeus, Corydon’s patron. Though *Alceus* for its part presents Amintas and Melibeus as friends, and omits the character Corydon altogether from the narrative, it nonetheless shares with Calpurnius’ poem the structure of a peaceful song-exchange which culminates in a political panegyric. In fact, just as Calpurnius’ *Eclogue* 4 praises the emperor Nero, Boccaccio’s *Alceus* champions the King Louis of Taranto.³⁰⁶

Another important element for consideration is that, in his *Comedia delle ninfe fiorentine* (written, as we have previously seen, between 1341 and 1342), Boccaccio introduces a character who has the Italian equivalent name of Alceus, and who shares with him some relevant points of contact. Like in the *Buccolicum*, the Alceus from the *Comedia delle ninfe fiorentine* also plays an allegorical role, yet not of a political kind. He is referred to as “Alceus d’Arcadia”, and enters in a moral debate, reminiscent of the medieval sub-genre of *conflictus*,

³⁰⁵ Amyntas also appears in Virgil’s *Eclogues* 2, 3, 5 and 10; and in Nemesianus’ *Eclogues* 3 and 4. Melibeus, in turn, appears in Virgil’s *Eclogues* 1, 3 and 7; Calpurnius’ *Eclogue* 1; Nemesianus’ *Eclogue* 1; as well as in Dante and Giovanni del Virgilio’s *Eclogues* 2, 3 and 4. While Boccaccio uses the first name abundantly in the *Buccolicum*, he uses the second one only in *Alceus*. For more information on the specific *loci* where these characters appear, see our Index of Intertexts.

³⁰⁶ On Calpurnius 4, see Champlin (1978: 105-7), Paschalis (2016: 307-8), and Karakasis (2016: 48-86).

with the shepherd “Acaten, d’Academia venuto” (13.3). While the former character represents the ascetic life, the latter represents the worldly one.³⁰⁷ It is no surprise, then, that Alcesto turns out to be the winner in that debate. At the beginning of his song, Alcesto describes his sheepfold as small in number, well-fed, and as peaceful animals which do not fear the wolf’s attack (“pasconsi quivi timidette e mite,/ e servan lor grassezza con tal forma/ che non curan di lupo le ferite”, *Ninf. fior.* 14.7-9). As Antonio Quaglio observed, these verses have a clear symbolism: Alcesto’s sheep represent the Christian souls, strengthened by virtue, and thus immune to the temptations of sin and vice.³⁰⁸ This type of pastoral imagery evidently aligns with that of Christianity: at John 21:17, for instance, the resurrected Jesus famously tells Peter to “feed his sheep” (*pasce oves meas*).

The image of the wolf, in particular, was associated with diabolic greediness in both the Christian exegetical and bestiary traditions, on which Dante drew his description of the she-wolf at the opening canto of the *Inferno*, and Boccaccio, his description of the wolf head in the allegorical fountain of his *Amorosa visione*.³⁰⁹ Yet, it is noteworthy that wolf imagery also had political significance. At Jeremiah 5:6, there is a reference to the “wolf in the evening” (*lupus ad vesperam*), which Jerome interpreted as an indication of the Medes and the Persians overtaking Babylon.³¹⁰ At Augustine *Epistola* 228.6, the mention of the diabolic wolf seems to imply the Vandal conquest.³¹¹ And in Dante’s *Commedia*, in addition to the image of the “lupa”

³⁰⁷ In this sense, the debate between Acaten and Alcesto, in the *Comedia delle ninfe*, reminds us of Petrarch’s first eclogue *Parthenias* (which was written a few years later), too. On the medieval sub-genre of *conflictus*, see Introduction.

³⁰⁸ Quaglio (1967: 930, n. 3).

³⁰⁹ See Dante *Inf.* 1.49-51: “ed una lupa, che di tutte brame/ sembiava carca ne la sua magrezza,/ e molte genti fê già viver grame”; and Bocc. *Am. vis.* 39.28-31: “ove mirando, parve ch’io vedesse/ che lupo fosse, e questa se ne già/ or qua or là, nê pareva che tenesse/ en l’andar suo nulla diritta via”. In the twelfth-century *Aberdeen Bestiary* (Aberdeen University Library MS 24, 16v-17v), we have the following definition of *lupus*: *lupus a rapacitate dicitur (...). Lupi figuram diabolus portat, qui semper humano generi invidet, ac iugiter circuit caulas ecclesie fidelium, ut mactet et perdat eorum animas*. See also Isid. *Etym.* 12.2.23: *lupus... rapax autem bestia et cruoris appetens*.

³¹⁰ *Commentaria in Ieremiam* 5:6: *lupus ad vesperam vastavit eos Medos Persasque significans* (Graves, 2011: 34). Jerome also described the apostle Paul before his conversion as a ravening wolf from the tribe of Benjamin, which persecuted the Christians: *Paulus, lupus rapax et Benjamin adulescentior* (Jer. *Ep.* 38.1). See also Tert. *Adv. Marc.* 5.1.5 – discussion in Hannah (2016: 610-27).

³¹¹ Aug. *Ep.* 228.6: *veniet enim lupus, non homo sed diabolus* – discussion in Fournier (2017: 699).

from *Inferno* 1 – which is often understood as a symbol of avarice and the Devil himself –, the “lupo” (in the masculine) was used in other passages to represent mainly the people of Florence (*Purg.* 14.50-1, *Par.* 25.1-6) and the simoniac popes (*Par.* 9.127-36, 27.55), blamed for dispersing the flocks of God.³¹² In this patchwork of religious and political associations, the Alcestus of Boccaccio’s sixth eclogue represents the protector of the Neapolitan shepherds and flocks against the savage Polyphemus, and the restorer of their peace and safety, which will be threatened by a wolf at the end of the poem.³¹³

It must then be clear from the above that, if we wish to understand more closely the allegorical and autofictional significance of *Alcestus*, we should take into consideration its historical background, starting with the events that immediately preceded and followed Louis of Taranto’s succession to the Kingdom after his union with Queen Johanna. Johanna was the granddaughter of the illustrious King Robert of Anjou. After the latter’s death in January of 1343, she was crowned as the Queen of Naples.³¹⁴ Two years later, Johanna’s cousin and first husband, Andrew of Hungary, was assassinated in Aversa. According to some debatable but widely spread accounts, Andrew was strangled by Johanna herself, who refused to accept him as co-ruler.³¹⁵ While the death of Robert had been already perceived as disastrous by the public opinion – since it meant the passing of his power into the hands of the inexperienced Johanna and Andrew (described by Petrarch as “two lambs among a multitude of wolves”) –, the scandal of Andrew’s murder was seen as the last straw that threw the Regno into a state of sheer confusion and instability.³¹⁶

³¹² See Bocc. *Espos.* 1.all.123-42; and discussion on Dante in Ledda (2019: 55).

³¹³ See ll. 96-9, and discussion in “Happiness in suspense” below.

³¹⁴ Casteen (2015: 4): “in 1343, Johanna succeeded Robert ahead of nine male cousins who could (and did) stake claims to her throne”.

³¹⁵ See Casteen (2015: 30): “although no evidence definitively links Johanna to Andrew’s murder, it has remained the defining characteristic of her reign in historical memory. Modern scholars have tended to exculpate Johanna, arguing that she gained little from Andrew’s death and that there is no proof that she was involved. Others have argued, while she may well have been complicit, nothing exists to indicate her direct guilt”.

³¹⁶ *Ad Familiares* 5.1.3 (dated to May 29, 1343, and addressed to Robert’s formal secretary, Barbato da Sulmona): *agnos duos multorum custodie luporum creditos video, regnumque sine rege*. See discussion in Casteen (2015: 37-8).

A few weeks after the slaying of Andrew, in late 1345, Johanna (then pregnant with Andrew's son, Charles Martel) requested a papal dispensation to marry her cousin Robert of Taranto. When her wish was denied, she immediately negotiated to marry Robert's brother, Louis of Taranto. Despite Pope Clement VI's refusal to allow their marriage, Johanna secretly married Louis anyway, on 22 August, 1347. This secret union only served to fuel the previous rumours that Johanna was having an adulterous affair with both Tarantine princes, and that they were all involved in Andrew's brutal murder.³¹⁷ Meanwhile, the brother of the deceased Andrew, Louis of Hungary, sought revenge. In the winter of 1347, Hungarian forces and ranks of supporters moved to invade Naples, forcing Johanna (pregnant with her second child) and Louis of Taranto to flee separately to Avignon. Their departure provided the perfect occasion for Louis of Hungary to capture the Regno, send his nephew Charles Martel (born Christmas Day, 1345, and abandoned by Johanna to a papal guardian) to Buda (where the infant would die in 1348), and quickly establish himself as the ruler of Naples. With Johanna and Louis of Taranto absent, Louis of Hungary did not hesitate to avenge himself on the rest of the royal family.³¹⁸ Chaos ensued.

To make the situation worse, Johanna and Louis of Taranto's stay in Avignon did not pass by smoothly. Johanna's infamy, broadcast as swiftly and mercilessly as by Virgil's Rumour in the *Aeneid*, had already reached the papal city. In effect, the news of the assassination of Andrew would acquire such ominous renown in Europe as to be viewed as the very cause of the Plague.³¹⁹ Still, notwithstanding the pressure from the Hungarian party, Clement VI finally conceded the dispensation for Johanna and Louis of Taranto's marriage, and delegated a commission to investigate the charges against them. In the end, not only did Johanna have her name cleared by the Curia, but also, on 30 March, the Pope awarded Louis

³¹⁷ See Casteen (2015: 48).

³¹⁸ My account here follows closely the text of Casteen (2015: 48-9).

³¹⁹ See, for instance, Louis Heyligen's *Breve chronicon clerici anonymi* – Casteen (2015: 49, n. 79).

of Taranto the Golden Rose, which was the highest papal honour. Subsequently, in early May, Clement paid Johanna a sum of 80,000 florins, so that she could prepare her return to Naples. In exchange, Johanna granted the Pope rights over the city of Avignon, which she ruled as countess of Provence.

Louis of Hungary remained in the Angevin capital until August of 1348, when, possibly to escape from the bubonic plague pandemic, but also to avoid being cut off from his own kingdom by the Venetians, he suddenly left for Hungary, leaving some of his troops behind.³²⁰ This unexpected withdrawal made it possible for Johanna and Louis of Taranto to return to Naples. This return – of the king, more than that of the queen – is the subject of Boccaccio's *Alceus*.³²¹

One of the most striking features about the *Buccolicum*'s Neapolitan war sequence is the ostensible contrast between their political positions.³²² For instance, while *Faunus* seems in favour of Louis of Hungary, *Alceus* clearly supports his direct opponents, Louis of Taranto and Johanna. Though these apparent contradictions could be taken as a sign that Boccaccio wrote his eclogues 3-6 in different periods of his life, we could otherwise accept that he strategically incorporated some shifts in his texts to display changes in public opinion. In other words, as the historical events allegorised in eclogues 3-6 developed, so the *dramatis personae* were reassessed in each piece.³²³ This would explain, for instance, why Johanna was depicted as a “pregnant she-wolf swollen with rage” (*gravidam... lupam rabieque tremendam*) in *Faunus* (l. 84) – as well as in *Tempus erat placidum* (l. 148).³²⁴ For even if we take into account the

³²⁰ See Smarr (1987: 219).

³²¹ Gaining the sympathy of his wife, Louis of Taranto was the only one of Johanna's four husbands to actually rule in his own name, while for the most part of her life Johanna ruled as sovereign – Casteen (2015: 6).

³²² Particularly on Boccaccio's shifting portrayals of Johanna, see Casteen (2018: 219-45).

³²³ See Lorenzini (2011: 30).

³²⁴ See Introduction, “Dating the *Buccolicum carmen*”. Some scholars prefer to identify the *lupa* with Sancia de' Cabanni (the daughter of Johanna's nurse, Filippa Catanese, and allegedly Andrew's lover). Precisely because of her pregnancy, Sancia was tortured and executed by Louis of Hungary in 1347, as one of the conspirators of Andrew's murder– see Smarr (1987: 212), and Perini (1994: 944). Against this interpretation, see Casteen (2018: 240, n. 23).

evidence that Boccaccio wrote *Tempus erat placidum* in 1348/49, and then recreated it as *Faunus* in 1362/63, it would still be difficult to make sense of why he chose to keep that reference intact in the final version of the *Buccolicum*. Indeed, the description of Johanna as a “savage beast” (*sevissima*, l. 86) and the possible murderer of Andrew (Alexis) in *Faunus* radically clashes with her portrayal as an honourable and virtuous woman in the final chapter of the *De mulieribus claris*.³²⁵

However, this contradiction is resolved as soon as we realise that Meris (the character who mentions the *gravida lupa*) actually performs the role of a spokesman in *Faunus*, reporting to Palemon and Pamphylus rumours rather than facts. Note that Palemon explicitly asks him about such rumours: *quis nostris, obsecro, nuper/ rumor inest silvis?* (*Faun.* 35-6). Then, Meris agrees to outline briefly the recent tumult (*tumultum/ expeditur paucis*, 65-6), and to recount what he has heard (*audivi*, 72). After narrating the scene of the she-wolf attacking Alexis, Meris concludes with the words “that’s what is said” (*hoc fertur*, 89), and subsequently presents an alternative version of the story. According to many people (*plerique volunt*, 89), Alexis was killed not by the she-wolf, but by lions and other ferocious beasts (*dirasque feras*, 90) – probably a reference to the suspected noblemen who accompanied Andrew and Johanna on their hunting trip in Aversa.³²⁶ On the one hand, these vocabulary choices suggest that there is more nuance in Boccaccio’s presentation of Andrew’s murder than some have argued; and that Boccaccio is actually using the literary device of *personae* (identified by Servius in Virgil’s *Eclogues*) to express an erroneous view through one of his characters.³²⁷ On the other hand,

³²⁵ See Introduction, “Dating the *Buccolicum carmen*”. Yet, perhaps a more substantial evidence that Boccaccio did briefly support the Hungarian vendetta is his *Epistola* 6 (1348), addressed to Zanobi da Strada. In this letter, Boccaccio indicates his plan to follow his host Francesco degli Ordellaffi, ruler of Forlì, in an expedition to the south, not as a soldier but as an observer of Louis of Hungary’s fair war (*arma iustissima*, *Ep.* 6.9).

³²⁶ The phrase *hoc fertur* was also employed in *Tempus erat placidum*, but instead of *plerique volunt*, we have *multique ferunt*.

³²⁷ Serv. *ad Buc.* 3.8-13: *novimus autem tres characteres hos esse dicendi: unum, in quo tantum poeta loquitur, ut est in tribus libris georgicorum; alium dramaticum, in quo nusquam poeta loquitur, ut est in comoediis et tragoediis; tertium, mixtum, ut est in Aeneide: nam et poeta illic et introductae personae loquuntur. hos autem omnes characteres in bucolico esse convenit carmine* – see also Isid. *Etym.* 8.7.11. In the *Esposizioni*, Boccaccio

one could still plausibly argue that Louis of Hungary (Tyrtus) is portrayed as a righteous avenger in *Faunus*, one who left his own kingdom behind to castigate those involved in his brother's murder. This opinion was shared by many of Boccaccio's contemporaries, who thought that Louis of Hungary's vendetta was legitimate.³²⁸ However, it is significant that the text of *Faunus* already hints at some of Louis of Hungary's and his allies' signs of monstrosity (*infrendens*, 99; *furentem*, 103; *ira rabieque frementes*, 106), intimating that his rage and actions became disproportionate to his initial aim (which was to punish those who were directly involved in his brother's assassination).

The following eclogues of the *Buccolicum* depict how Louis of Hungary came to be gradually recognised as a violent beast. In *Dorus*, the deceased Andrew is described as a bad ruler with tyrannical tendencies in life, with the subtext that his murder, deplorable as it was, was perhaps almost as justified as Louis of Hungary's consequent desire for revenge (*iusta rabie succensus et ira*, 66).³²⁹ Thus, Louis of Hungary appears in *Dorus* as the savage Polyphemus, raised on the milk of wild beasts (*lacte ferino*, 64), and more ferocious than a serpent (*truculentior angue*, 76). Here, Boccaccio's text markedly departs from the Theocritean version of the naive, ugly Polyphemus, unreciprocated in love by Galatea, and gets closer to the Virgilian description of the Cyclops in the *Aeneid*. In this way, Boccaccio partially follows the example of Dante, who draws on Virgil to depict the Cyclops as a fearful tyrant in *Egloge* 4, thus possibly indicating his fear of persecution by the Guelphs of Bologna, or perhaps more

uses the theory of the *personae* to justify why Dante had "erroneously" placed Ovid, Avicenna and Averroes in Limbo (4.all.49) – see discussion in Gilson (2013: 265-6), Gust (2009: 12), and Fowler (1997: 73-8).

³²⁸ *Faun.* 100-03: *saltus infandam tendit discerpere silvam,/ atque lupam captare petit flavosque leones/ ut penas tribuat meritis: nam frater Alexis/ Tyrtus iste fuit*. The Florentine chronicler Giovanni Villani (ca. 1280–1348), for instance, interpreted Louis of Hungary's vendetta as a fair reaction to Johanna's sexual immorality – see Villani *Nuova cronica* 3.417 ff.; Casteen (2015: 58).

³²⁹ *Dorus* 53-5: *miserandus Alexis/ qui, gregibus nimium durus silvisque molestus/ imperitans, abiit crudeli funere pulsus*. As Léonard (1944: 42) observes, in *Dorus*, Andrew is transformed into a tyrant whose death is the result of his own deeds – see also Perini (1994: 950). Although written much later, it might be worth noting that, in Lope de Vega's play *La reina Juana de Nápoles* (1597-1603), Andrew is similarly depicted as a cruel tyrant, who intends to murder the heroic Juana and usurp her throne. Juana then kills Andrew as a sacrifice, in order to protect herself and her people – see Casteen (2015: 31).

particularly his fear of Fulcieri de' Calboli (then recently elected *capitano del popolo* in Bologna).³³⁰ Yet, in the *Buccolicum*, Boccaccio modulates those differing visions of the Cyclops. Rather like Ovid, who in the *Metamorphoses* presents an intertextually complex and complicated version of Polyphemus (enraged after Galatea's "betrayal"), Boccaccio similarly depicts Louis of Hungary as a pitiful, but nonetheless monstrous creature.³³¹

Thus, in *Dorus*, Polyphemus appears as a cruel avenger (*sevo... sub vindice*, 71), who indiscriminately punishes not only the guilty, but also the guiltless and children (71-4). Driven by anger rather than by a sense of justice, his vendetta loses its original purpose and becomes a pretext for demonstrations of power. Then, the eclogue *Silva cadens* conveys an even sharper criticism of Louis of Hungary (*malus Polyphemus*, 126), claimed to be responsible for the flight of Louis of Taranto and Johanna, as well as for the crushing devastation of Naples.³³² Finally, *Alcestus* will celebrate Louis of Hungary's departure from Naples, and present a fulsome praise of his main antagonist, Louis of Taranto.

This general picture of the Neapolitan war demonstrates that the desire for revenge can be much more dangerous than the desire for love, since the former's consequences are deleterious to a far greater number of people. Whereas Damon's passion in *Galla* seemed to affect only himself, the anger of Polyphemus affected everyone around him. Like many of his contemporaries, Boccaccio too acknowledged the motives behind Louis of Hungary's attacks

³³⁰ The gloss copied by Boccaccio on Dante *Egloge* 4.75 reads: *Cyclops fuit, de quo Virgilius En(eydos) III^o circa finem* – see Alighieri (2016: 647 – *Glosse* 4.75); discussion in Lummus (2020: 90), and Stocchi (2012: 206-7). Dante also speaks of Fulcieri de' Calboli (nephew of Rinieri da Calboli) at *Purgatorio* 58-66: "Io veggio tuo nepote che diventa/ cacciator di quei lupi in su la riva/ del fiero fiume, e tutti li sgomenta.// Vende la carne loro essendo viva;/ poscia li ancide come antica belva;/ molti di vita e sé di pregio priva.// Sanguinoso esce de la trista selva;/ lasciala tal, che di qui a mille anni/ ne lo stato primaio non si rinselva".

³³¹ See Theoc. *Id.* 11, Virg. *Aen.* 3, Ov. *Met.* 13 and 14 – discussion in Hutchinson (2007: 22-39). See also Bocc. *Gen.* 8.14 (on Acis): *Dicit enim Ciclopem tyrannum apud Syculos fuisse, cui maximum erat pecus, lacte cuius plurimum eius augebantur substantie, et ideo Galatheam, id est lactis deam, amasse dicitur*; and 10.7 (on Polyphemus), esp.: *solam enim suam rem tyranni curant, nil in deum, nil in proximum, nil in subactam plebem respiciunt*.

³³² *Silva cadens* 113-15: *Alcestus trepidans abiit, tremebunda Liquoris/ in dubium liquit silvas evecta per altum./ Omne decus periit luctusque laborque supersunt*. Note that Johanna is here (as in *Dorus* 56) called "Liquoris", thus alluding to the Lycoris from Virgil's *Eclogue* 10. This association is based on the fact the Johanna fled from Naples to Avignon (just as Virgil's Lycoris fled to a cold land).

on the Regno. Yet, the sequence of his eclogues suggests that Louis of Hungary's desire for vengeance escalated quickly, turning into a madness with devastating effects for all the Neapolitan people.³³³ The eclogue *Alcestus* ultimately intimates how the unscrupulous means and insane actions of Louis of Hungary affected the lives of the common citizens (represented by Amintas and Melibeus), who suffered from fear and anxiety, and expected the return of Louis of Taranto and Johanna to restore the previous order. *Alcestus* thus deals with a different type of earthly concern than *Galla*, based on the *polis* rather than on *eros*.³³⁴ In this way, Boccaccio portrays an important aspect of his trajectory as a poet embedded in the political life of his times, as well as his views on what the relationship between poetry and the city should be.³³⁵

By inscribing the political complexities and shifts of a turbulent period within the bucolic framing, Boccaccio's text fundamentally draws on Virgil's *Eclogues*, and more particularly on *Eclogues* 1, 4 and 5. Indeed, though some scholars have proposed a more self-enclosed and aestheticizing reading of the *Eclogues*, one of the key features of Virgil's pastoral is its engagement with politics and social memory.³³⁶ Hence, just as some of the *Eclogues* contain references to political changes that took place during the Roman Triumviral period (such as the land confiscations after the Battle of Philippi, in 42 BCE), some pieces from the *Buccolicum* encompass shifts which similarly reflect the political vicissitudes of the Trecento.³³⁷ As suggested above, moreover, Boccaccio's *Alcestus* thematically engages with

³³³ On the relationship between anger and madness, see, for instance, Sen. *De ira* 1.3.

³³⁴ See Stierle (2007: 305), on Petrarch's *Rvf* 128 ("Italia mia"): "La poesia non è solamente un *medium* per esprimere se stessi, ma ha anche una forza civilizzatrice, dato che crea una coerenza culturale contro i poteri distruttori della fortuna".

³³⁵ See Lummus (2020: 156-216).

³³⁶ For example, comparing the Roman love elegy to bucolic poetry, Veyne (1988: 101) argued that both these genres take place "outside the world". Similarly, Snell (1953: 294 and 308) defended that Virgil was "always careful not to get involved in the slippery problems of political action", and that the *Eclogues* "represent the first serious attempt in literature to mould the Greek motifs into self-contained forms of beauty whose reality lies within themselves" – see discussion in Martindale (1997: 107-24).

³³⁷ As Meban (2009: 100) points out, at the same time that Virgil frequently champions Octavian in the *Eclogues*, "in poems 1 and 9, for example, he addresses and fastens in Roman memory the effects of the upheavals in the Italian countryside caused by civil war".

Calpurnius Siculus' *Eclogue* 4, a political panegyric which also alludes to those Virgilian eclogues to celebrate Nero's *aurea saecula* and the emperor's ability to secure peace. To explore these and other links, the following analysis will now focus on the political upheavals allegorically displayed in *Alcestus*, taking into consideration the poem's relationship to history (viewed from a Christian perspective), as well as to other literary texts.

Spring: the return to normality

Like Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 4, *Alcestus* is also placed in a central position in Boccaccio's book of eclogues.³³⁸ Closing the Neapolitan chapter (*Faunus*, *Dorus*, and *Silva cadens*) and preceding the Florentine one (*Iurgium*, *Midas*, and *Lipis*), *Alcestus* promotes an important thematic shift within the larger political section of the *Buccolicum*. At the same time, *Alcestus* is itself an eclogue of shifts, as it gradually moves from lament to hope, and finally from hope to fear. The first shift is performed mainly through the character Melibeus, who at first responds negatively to Amintas' happy news of spring festivities:

Amintas. Pastores transisse nives et frigora leti
sub divo veteres stipula modulantur amores,
esculeas hedera nectunt de more corollas,
crateras Bromio statuunt et vina salutant
cantibus et multo protendunt carmine sacrum.
Tu, Melibee, quidem plangoribus omnia solus
confundis. Que tanta tibi nunc causa doloris?
Melibeus. Silva vetus cecidit, lapsa est, cui preluit Argus;
custodes abiire gregum, periire sequaces.
Nostris an vivat nobis Alcestus in oris
incertum, et clausas disiecit belua septas.
(*Alc.* 1-11)

Amintas' opening lines already point to a significant shift of seasons: cruel winter has finally passed, and now gives place to spring. Like in *Galla*, *Alcestus* starts with an indication of the

³³⁸ See Davis (1987: 32).

weather. Yet, unlike that poem, the evocation of spring here marks not an early stage in the life of an individual, but rather the end of a harsh period and the expected renewal of a political reality that is common to many people. Thus, in *Alceustus*, spring represents not the beginning of something new, but rather the return to a pre-established order that brings happiness to everyone.³³⁹ What is implied here, then, is that both Amintas and Melibeus (unlike the youthful Damon in *Galla*) have already gone through an entire cycle of seasons together, and are about to re-start that process. This idea is also reinforced by the mention of snows and frosts (*nives et frigora*, 1), which alludes to the wintry setting of Virgil *Eclogues* 10.47, and suggests the end of a gloomy period (though in politics, not in love). In this sense, the return of spring in *Alceustus* is more akin to the return of the Golden Age in Virgil's *Eclogue* 4, which also symbolises an era of political peace and justice – yet one which, being itself part of a pre-established cycle, is naturally destined to be once again replaced by the silver age, and so on (an idea that also evokes the wheel of Fortune).³⁴⁰ Though this political aspect of Virgil's *Eclogue* 4 was often overshadowed by its prophetic and Christianising interpretations produced in the Middle Ages (as at Dante *Purgatorio* 22.70-2, for instance), Boccaccio's *Alceustus* seems to anticipate the later political uses of that poem made by panegyrists during the Medici period and beyond.³⁴¹

While in *Alceustus* all the shepherds celebrate the beginning of spring with music, wine and rites, Melibeus strangely remains sad: *tu, Melibee, quidem plangoribus omnia solus/*

³³⁹ In reading this poem of *Alceustus* as an allegory of spring with psychological effects, I disagree with Perini (1994: 961), who, though recognising the unmistakable elements of spring contained in Boccaccio's description, still tries to associate it with the actual date of Louis of Taranto's return to Naples, on the 17th of August (therefore, in summer).

³⁴⁰ Virgil's *Eclogue* 4 partly draws on a cosmological and Stoic model, suggesting that, just like the seasons, history is also cyclical, and each particular age is followed by another – see Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.51; Serv. *Ad Buc.* 4.6-8; and Nisbet (1978: 60).

³⁴¹ See Houghton (2019: 44-66). Note, moreover, that in his *Vita Petracchi* Boccaccio alludes to Virgil's *Eclogue* 4 to describe the period of literary revival ushered in by Petrarch: *ipse id nempe omnibus visum puto, iam multo ante lapsa felicia tempora ac regna saturnia rediisse* (16-17). See also Bocc. *Ep.* 18 (to Iacopo Pizzinga), and discussion in Houghton (*ibid.*: 30), and Eisner (2013: 25): "Boccaccio uses Virgil's fourth eclogue (...) to celebrate his age and the future".

confundis (6-7). This line markedly recalls the beginning of Virgil's *Eclogue* 1, and particularly the vocative phrase *tu, Tityre* (*Ecl.* 1.4). Note, however, that Boccaccio proposes an inversion of meaning based on the Virgilian text. In Virgil's *Eclogue* 1, Meliboeus laments the invasion of his homeland by foreign soldiers, and is surprised to meet Tityrus lying peacefully under the shade of a beech tree (*patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi*, *Ecl.* 1.1), playing songs about his beloved Amaryllis (*formosam resonare... Amaryllida*, 5; *ludere... calamo*, 10) while everyone else is preparing to depart (*nos patriam fugimus*, 4). In *Alcestus*, on the contrary, it is Melibeus' melancholy that causes estrangement among the other shepherds, who are cheerfully playing old love songs under the open sky (*sub divo veteres stipula modulantur amores*, *Alc.* 2).

Moreover, *Alcestus*' introduction has some significant intertexts with the beginning of both Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 4 and Lucan's *Bellum civile*. The former poem similarly starts with Meliboeus asking Corydon why he is sad and silent (*quid tacitus, Corydon, vultuque subinde minaci...?*, 1).³⁴² Thus, by initially presenting Melibeus as the unhappy character in *Alcestus*, Boccaccio seems to propose yet another "inversion" of roles.³⁴³ Additionally, Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 4 also displays spring-related motifs in a political context (though not at the beginning, but rather in the middle of the poem), and includes libations in honour of Bacchus-Bromius (*et intacto Bromium perfundere vino*, 123 – see *Alc.* 4 above: *crateras Bromio statuunt et vina salutant*).³⁴⁴ Then, Melibeus' account of the destruction of Naples, in lines 8-11 of Boccaccio's poem above, strikingly evokes Lucan's imagery of architectural ruin at the beginning of the *Bellum civile*.³⁴⁵ Note that the Lucanian narrator speaks of the city walls tumbling (*Italiae lapsisque ingentia muris*, Lucan 1.25), stones lying on the ground (*saxa iacent*, 26), and

³⁴² On Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 4.1-4, see Voza (1994: 71-92).

³⁴³ See Chapter 1, "Context and characters".

³⁴⁴ See, for instance, Calp. *Ecl.* 4.112-14: *illius ut primum senserunt numina terrae,/ coepit et uberius sulcis fallentibus olim/ luxuriare seges...*; and also Virg. *Ecl.* 7.53-6 – discussion in Karakasis (2016: 72-3). On Bromius, see Galla 111. Yet, as observed by Perini (1994: 960), Boccaccio's verse *crateras Bromio statuunt et vina salutant* closely alludes to Virg. *Aen.* 1.724 (*crateras magnos statuunt et vina coronant*).

³⁴⁵ See Roche (2009: n.p.).

uninhabitable houses (*rarus... habitator*, 27). Likewise, using pastoral vocabulary to describe a similar picture of destruction, Boccaccio's Meliboeus presents a collapsed woodland (*silva... lapsa est*, *Alc.* 8) with broken fences (*clausas disiecit belua septas*, 11) and almost desolate, since most herdsmen have left, and their followers have perished (*custodes abiire gregum, periere sequaces*, 9).

Melibeus explains that his ancient woodland was once governed by Argus, but is now ruled by a monster (*belua*), and the fate of Alcestus is still unknown.³⁴⁶ Here, like in *Faunus* and *Dorus*, Argus represents Robert of Anjou, the late king of Naples, who was praised by both Boccaccio and Petrarch, and famously known as a "second Solomon".³⁴⁷ Under Robert, the powerful Neapolitan Regno reached its cultural zenith, asserted its political hegemony and showed imperial ambitions.³⁴⁸ Melibeus' speech above hence recalls the situation narrated in the previous eclogue of the *Buccolicum*, *Silva cadens*, where we are told that, after the departure of Louis of Taranto (Alcestus) and Johanna (Liquoris), Naples descended into a hopeless state of doubt.³⁴⁹ In both *Silva cadens* and *Alcestus*, the old Naples of Robert (Tyrtus/Argus) is contrasted with the current state of Naples, invaded by Louis of Hungary (Cyclops/Polyphemus), and deserted by the Angevin court.³⁵⁰

Polyphemus' departure

In response to Melibeus' lament above, Amintas happily announces that the savage Polyphemus has left their woods, and that Alcestus has come back, together with his retinue of shepherds and flocks:

³⁴⁶ Note that, while in *Faunus* the murderers of Andrew are described as *ferae*, here in *Alcestus* it is Louis of Hungary who is presented as a *belua*.

³⁴⁷ See Kelly (2003).

³⁴⁸ See Casteen (2015: 8).

³⁴⁹ See *Silva cadens* 113-15 (quoted above), and Smarr (1987: 219).

³⁵⁰ See *Silva cadens* 56, 57 and 126.

Parcendum lacrimis, nam trux Poliphemus abivit.
 Alceustus rediit nobis, rediere vagantes
 pastores oviumque greges, rediere priores,
 letitiaque virent silve vallesque resultant,
 omnis ager pubet, redeunt sua sydera pratis,
 frondes arbustis, edis quoque cornua surgunt,
 cornupetant campis lunata fronte iuveni,
 Massicus et Gaurus florent pulcherque Vesevus
 innovat arbustis vites stauratque Falernus
 ulmis iam colles, stringit Vulturnus et undas;
 surge ideo letumque diem psallentibus auge.
 (*Alc.* 12-22)

Again using nature as a means to convey certain feelings and dispositions of the mind, Boccaccio's text paints a colourful spring landscape which simultaneously reflects and amplifies the excitement and happiness of his Neapolitan shepherds. With Alceustus' return, the first signs of spring appear, and the entire forest starts to renew itself: auspicious stars appear in the sky (*redeunt sua sydera pratis*, 16), fresh leaves in the trees (*frondes arbustis*, 17), and flowers and vineyards on the hills (*Massicus et Gaurus florent, pulcherque Vesevus/ innovate arbustis vites*, 19-20). Note that, as already observed for the previous lines, Amintas' speech alludes to Virgil's description of the return of the Golden Age in *Eclogue* 4. Compare, for instance, *Alceustus rediit nobis, rediere vagantes/ pastores* (*Alc.* 13-4) with *iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna* (*Ecl.* 4.6). In this context, the return of Louis of Taranto to Naples is compared to the return of Astraea (the goddess of Justice, who left the earth in disgust during the Iron Age to become the constellation of Virgo) and of Saturn (the ruling god of the Golden Age).³⁵¹ Whereas Virgil associates the beginning of this cosmic change with the consulship of Pollio (*teque adeo decus hoc aevi, te consule, inibit,/ Pollio*, 9-11), thus calling attention to the role of Rome in that process of renewal, Boccaccio in turn resorts to topographical elements characteristic of the Campania region (the mountains Massicus, Gaurus, Vesuvius and

³⁵¹ See Virg. *G.* 2.473-4, and Ov. *Met.* 1.149-50 (Astraea); Virg. *G.* 2.538, *Aen.* 6.792-4, and Ov. *Fast.* 1.235-8 (Saturn) – Cucchiarelli (2017: 248-9). See also Bocc. *Gen.* 4.53. The motif of Astraea's return will be evoked again at *Alc.* 109 (see below).

Falernus, as well as the river Volturno), situating the reader in the Naples of Louis and Johanna.³⁵²

Melibeus, however, remains sceptical about Alcestus' return, for "belief in great things is always slow to come" (*lenta fides magnis semper prestatur*, 23), and the gods are clearly raging against Alcestus (*Pan deus a silvis oculos avertit et omne/ sevit in Alcestum dira vertigine celum*, 25-6). He asks Amintas to leave him alone with his tears (*meque meis lacrimis sinito miserisque querelis*, 30). Yet, Amintas does not give up, and tries to use other arguments to persuade his friend that his words are true:

Si Corinna meo sedeat, Melibee, sub antro,³⁵³
vera loquor: vidi Cyrceum vertice flammis
fulgentem in reditu; sic et Garganus et ingens
Appenninus heri fumabant culmine summo
letitia et, multis quod forsane credere durum,
Ethna quidem plausu fumos convertit in ignes.
Et si nulla fides dictis, hunc suspice collem
quam vireat, squalentem olim pallore. Quid ultra?
His oculis, iuro, calcantem litora vidi
euboica et matrem amplexu pulchrasque sorores
suscepisse pio, letis ac oscula dantem.
(*Alc.* 31-41)

Here, Amintas first resorts to an erotic analogy: just as he wishes his Corinna were in his grotto, so is he speaking the truth to Melibeus. This is the first and only time that Corinna, known mainly as the elegiac *puella* of Ovid's *Amores*, makes an appearance in the *Buccolicum carmen* – or even, for that matter, in all bucolic poetry prior to Boccaccio.³⁵⁴ Although her name is mentioned only in passing by Amintas, it broaches an important aspect of *Alcestus*: even though

³⁵² See *De mont.* 335 (Massicus), 257 (Gaurus), 566 (Vesuvius), 229 (Falernus), and *De flum.* (Volturnus).

³⁵³ This line strongly recalls Virgil *Eclogues* 9.30 (*sic tua Cyrneas...*), but the use of *si* by Boccaccio seems oddly peculiar. As the Boccaccian autograph clearly reads *si*, one might wonder if Boccaccio deliberately attempted to "correct" Virgil's passage, or accidentally wrote *si* instead of *sic*. Perini does not comment on this point.

³⁵⁴ There is no mention of Corinna either in the eclogues of Virgil, Calpurnius Siculus and Nemesianus, or in those of Dante, Giovanni del Virgilio and Petrarch. Besides *Alcestus*, Boccaccio only mentions the character Corinna at *Esposizioni* 4.lit.125 (ed. Papio), where he (following some medieval *testimonia*) suggests that she might have been Livia, the wife of Augustus. On the latter rumour – which was recounted in the *accessus* to the *Tristia* in elm 19475 (Munich, twelfth century) – see Hexter (2002: 433-4), and also Thibault (1964: 51-2).

this is a political eclogue, which allegorically displays the earthly concerns of adult citizens about the health of their community, it nevertheless points to a connection with the previous stage of erotic suffering, characteristic of adolescence and prominent in *Galla*. In other words, in *Alcestus*, the impulses of love and lust are not completely suppressed, but rather outweighed by political anxiety.

Then, expanding his arguments, Amintas relates changes in nature as concrete evidence of Alcestus' return. He assures Melibeus that he himself has seen the peaks of Mounts Circeo, Gargano, Apenninus, and even Etna smoking and shining with flames of joy (32-6).³⁵⁵ As Perini points out, taking up the previous catalogue of Neapolitan mountains in lines 19-21, the present list of mountains from southern Italy completes the demarcation of the Angevin territory.³⁵⁶ In the sequence, Amintas calls Melibeus' attention to the verdant aspect of their own hill (*hunc... collem*), which before was barren and pale (*squalentem olim pallore*, 37-8). Lastly, Amintas emphatically swears that he himself saw, with his own eyes (*his oculis... vidi*, 39), Alcestus walking on the Euboean (that is, Cumaean) shores, embracing and kissing his mother and sisters.³⁵⁷

Alcestus' return

Quid verbis opus est multis, mi dulcis Aminta?
 Floribus ut Titan nocturno frigore lapsis,
 dictannus capreis pecorique Favonius egro
 utque salus arvis estu sitientibus imber,
 sic cordi tua dicta meo. Te, summe, precamur,
 Phebe pater, te, leta Pales; da cepta secudent.
 Non silvis unquam, nunquam pastoribus usquam
 illuxit tam grata dies. Tu cespitem vivo
 erige propter aquas nobis altaria, Phorba,
 et lauro et sertis hedere mirtoque corona;

³⁵⁵ See *De mont.* 157 (Circeo), 253 (Gargano), Appenninus (52), and 223 (Etna).

³⁵⁶ Perini (1997: 963).

³⁵⁷ Naples was originally a settlement of Cumae, which itself was founded by Greeks from the Euboean city of Chalcis – see Bocc. *De div. nom. mar.* 41; and Perini (1997: 950). A similar phrase is used at Virg. *Aen.* 9.710 (*in Euboico Baiarum litore*), and Lucan 5.231 (*litoris Euboici*).

inde et ydumeas fer palmas, postque bidentes
 in sacrum niveas deduc ac omnia serva.
 Tu mestas pecudes herbis et fonte, Lycophron,
 et calamis refove: nosti quam turpis Orion
 leserit has dudum, lacrimis dum tempora flerem.
 (*Alc.* 42-9)

At this point, we can observe a central shift in *Alcestis*: once Melibeus realises that Amintas is telling the truth to him, he suddenly changes his attitude and is delighted at the prospect of Alcestis' return. Like Ajax, in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (*quid verbis opus est?*, 13.120), Melibeus dismissed the use of other arguments. Unlike that Greek hero, though, who takes part in an ardent contest with Ulysses for the arms of the dead Achilles, Melibeus will subsequently engage in a friendly song-exchange with Amintas. Thus, despite the differences in tone, one context reflects the other.

Using a number of similes related to spring (flowers, dittany, the west wind and refreshing rain), in the passage above, Melibeus expresses his satisfaction at hearing Amintas' words. The phrase *floribus... nocturno frigore*, in particular, recalls Dante's "fioretti dal notturno gelo", as the Dantean pilgrim reacted to Beatrice's speech, previously recounted by Virgil:

Quali fioretti dal notturno gelo
 chinati e chiusi, poi che 'l sol li 'mbianca
 si drizzan tutti aperti in loro stelo,

tal mi fec' io di mia virtude stanca,
 e tanto buono ardire al cor mi corse,
 ch'i' cominciai come persona franca

(...)

Tu m'hai con disiderio il cor disposto
 sì al venir con le parole tue,
 ch'i' son tornato nel primo proposto.
 (*Inf.* 2.127-38)³⁵⁸

³⁵⁸ "As little flowers, which the chill of night/ has bent and huddled, when the white sun strikes/ grow straight and open fully on their stems, // so did I, too, with my exhausted force; / and such warm daring rushed into my heart/ that I – as one who has been freed – began: // (...) You, with your words, have so disposed my heart/ to longing

Thus, like Dante who here accepts the proposal of undertaking a journey through the underworld, Melibeus finally accepts the truth and sweetness of Amintas' news about the return of Alceus.³⁵⁹ This thematic allusion is strengthened in line 46 of *Alceus* above (*sic cordi tua dicta meo*), which vividly brings to mind *Inferno* 2.136-7. Amintas prays that this new beginning may be favoured by Phoebus and Pales – the classical pair of pastoral deities, as at Virgil *Eclogues* 5.35; but here probably meaning Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary, as at Boccaccio *Olympia* 172 and *Phyllostropos* 200. In what follows, Melibeus calls on Phorbas to set up adorned altars and prepare the due rites; and on Lycophron to look after the exhausted sheep (49-56). The former character seems to perform the same role of a servant as the Phorbas from *Galla*; the latter, however, seems more peculiar. Although unusual, there is probably a connection between him and the poet Lycophron of Chalcis (fl. third century BCE), whom Boccaccio discovered through Leontius Pilatus, around the same time he was writing the *Buccolicum*, the *Genealogie* and the *De mulieribus*.³⁶⁰ The link between Melibeus' attendant and the Greek poet would then be merely toponymic – as we have seen in lines 39-40, Boccaccio associates the ancient city of Chalcis, in the island of Euboea, with Naples because of Cumae's supposed Euboean origins.³⁶¹

The intertextual engagement of *Alceus* with Virgil's *Eclogue* 5 goes further than the correspondence pointed above. While the shifts in nature observed before in the poem were more evocative of Virgil's *Eclogue* 4, now Melibeus' psychological shift from sorrow to joy will be based on Virgil's *Eclogues* 5 and, to a lesser degree, 8.³⁶² In effect, *Alceus* closely follows the pattern adopted by Virgil in those poems, which are both centred on a song-

for this journey – I return/ to what I was at first prepared to do" (Mandelbaum). The phrase *nocturno frigore* (*Alc.* 43) also appears, in the same metrical position, at Lucan 9.844 – Perini (1994: 963).

³⁵⁹ Note, moreover, a contrast between Dante's passage above and the tragic elements of floreal imagery at *Aen.* 9.433-7. Boccaccio does not comment on this Virgilianism in his *Esposizioni*.

³⁶⁰ See *Gen.* 5.44.1: *dicat tamen Leontius Lycophronem grecus poetam dicere*; *De mul.* 40.13: *Lycophron quidam, novissimus poetarum ex Grecis*. The name Lycophron was also added by Boccaccio in the "B text" of the *Amorosa visione* (5.41, ed. Branca 1974). See more on Leontius Pilatus in Chapter 3, "Context and characters".

³⁶¹ See Perini (1994: 964).

³⁶² See Smarr (1987: 219).

exchange: the first starting with mourning for the death of Daphnis, and culminating with celebration of his heavenly ascension; and the second starting with a report of a love complaint, and ending with Daphnis' long-awaited homecoming.

Right at the start of Virgil's *Eclogue 5*, the shepherd Menalcas invites the younger Mopsus to sit down with him among the hazels and elms, and proposes that the latter plays the panpipes, while he himself will sing: *cur non, Mopse, boni quoniam convenimus ambo/ tu calamos inflare levis, ego dicere versus,/ hic corylis mixtas inter consedimus ulmos?* (1-3). Mopsus humbly accepts the offer, but expresses his preference to move to a cave. Then, Menalcas remarks that, among their hills, only Amyntas can compete in song with Mopsus: *montibus in nostris solus tibi certat Amyntas* (8). Boccaccio's *Alcestus* deploys a very similar frame, though near the middle, rather than at the beginning of the eclogue. From line 57 to 65 below, Melibeus proposes to Amintas that they should spend the day in song and dances, as a way of celebrating the return of the beloved king. After all, he says, they are both skilled in playing pipes and singing, and there is only one shepherd-singer in the "Sicilian fields" who can surpass them.

Yollas

Nosque diem celebrem cantu deducere, Aminta,
et delubra deum festis ambire choreis,
credo, decet: viridis foliis ornatus olive,
tu primus sacrum gracili perflabis avena;
ast ego, populea redimitus fronde, secundus
carmina cantabo. Stipulis et carmine docti
ambo sumus, nobis nemo nunc prevalet agris
in siculis, ni forte gravis certaret Yollas:
hic alios superat quantum vepreta cupressi.
(*Alc.* 57-65)

Since in Virgil's *Eclogue 5* Amintas is referred to by Menalcas as the only possible rival of Mopsus, it seems that, by featuring the former character in *Alcestus*, Boccaccio is consequently

selecting one of Virgil's best shepherd-singers to feature prominently in his own poem. Hence, on the one hand, if we consider that Virgil's Amyntas is described there as an unbeatable singer, whose only rival is Apollo (*Ecl.* 5.9), an intertextual reading of those two poems might suggest that Boccaccio's Amintas is superior to both Virgil's Mopsus and Menalcas. On the other hand, as the passage above demonstrates, *Alceus* introduces another personage to take the role of the greatest singer: Yollas.

Like Amintas and Melibeus, the name Yollas/Iollas is equally borrowed from Virgil's *Eclogues* (2.57 and 3.76-9), and is also present in the pastoral of Calpurnius (3, 4.59, 6.91) and Nemesianus (4.4, 20, 72), as well as in the bucolic correspondence of Giovanni del Virgilio and Dante (3.80-1 *Iollas/ comis et urbanus*, 4.95 *callidus... Iollas*, representing the lord of Ravenna, Guido Novello da Polenta, in both these instances).³⁶³ Scholars have speculated, but without strong supporting evidence, that Boccaccio's Yollas refers to Petrarch.³⁶⁴ Perini, for instance, noted that the *agri siculi*, mentioned in lines 63-4 above, indicate the bucolic genre, rather than Sicily itself.³⁶⁵ However, as Perini himself observed, at Calpurnius *Eclogues* 4.59, Iollas is described by Corydon as the beneficiary of Tityrus' panpipe and as a man who is *doctus*. On the one hand, this allusion could be an indicator that Yollas (ostensibly *doctior* than Amintas and Melibeus) indeed stands for Petrarch, considering Boccaccio's representations of Petrarch (in the wake of Petrarch's own self-fashioned statements) as a continuator of the classical tradition and a learned poet.³⁶⁶ On the other hand, it is noteworthy that Boccaccio typically reserves the adjectives (*pre*)clarus, optimus and inclitus (but never *doctus* or *gravis*)

³⁶³ See the gloss copied by Boccaccio on Dante-Giov. 3.80: [*Iollas*] *idest dominus Guidus Novellus de Polenta tunc Dominus Ravenne* – Stocchi (2012: 193).

³⁶⁴ See Lidonnici (1914: 323), Smarr (1987: 220), Perini (1994: 964), and Combs-Schilling (2012: 102-3).

³⁶⁵ See Virg. *Ecl.* 2.21 (*Siculis... in montibus*), and Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.72 (*montibus in Siculis*). Note, moreover, that Boccaccio's phrase *diem celebrem cantu deducere* (l. 57 above) alludes to a passage from Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* (*die festo alii alios per speciem celebrandarum cantu/ epularum invitant*, 9.30.8.1-2), where Livy recounts an incident involving Roman flute-players.

³⁶⁶ See, for instance, Bocc. *Vit. Petr.* 16-17 (quoted above); and Petr. *Fam.* 1.8.

to describe Petrarch in his works.³⁶⁷ Yet, in his *carmen* 5, *Ytalie iam certus honos* (which accompanied a copy of the *Commedia* sent to Petrarch around 1353, and then revised after 1359), Boccaccio explicitly uses the adjective *doctus* to describe Dante (*Dantis opus doctis*, 3; *doctumque... poetam*, 37).³⁶⁸ Moreover, it is significant that Giovanni del Virgilio refers to Dante's old age in their bucolic correspondence (*divine senex*, 3.33); thus, Boccaccio's description of Yollas as *gravis* could be actually evoking this same notion of Dante as an old man.³⁶⁹ This is reinforced by the intertextual links between lines 62-5 of *Alceus*' above and Del Virgilio's *Egloge* 3.49-51: *simul cantabimus ambo:/ ipse levi calamo, sed tu gravitate magistrum/firmitus insinuans, ne quem sua deserat etas*.³⁷⁰

These observations complicate the role of Yollas in *Alceus*. Though the identification of him as Petrarch seems plausible in the context of the *Buccolicum carmen*, the vocabulary in the passage above evokes Dante even more powerfully. At any rate, regardless of a possible allegorical meaning for Yollas, this character has an important function in the dynamics of Amintas' and Melibeus' amoeban song (since it is common in this type of bucolic composition to invoke an absent rival). Besides, it has an implication on Boccaccio's self-fashioned career, while reflecting his well-known modesty *topos*.³⁷¹ Indeed, as an effect of the intertext between

³⁶⁷ See, for instance, *Vit. Petr.* 1 (*Franciscus Petracchi poeta, vir illustris ac vita moribusque et scientia clarus*), *Ep.* 10 (*preclarissimo*, Intro.; *preceptor inclite*, 1; *preceptor optime*, 4), 11.intro. (*clarissimo... preceptor optimo domino Francisco Petrarce*, Intro.), 15 (*preceptor inclite*, 1), 18 (*inclitus preceptor meus Franciscus Petrarca*, 11), 19 (*vir inclitus Franciscus Petrarca preceptor meus*, 29), 20 (*inclitum preceptorem meum Franciscum Petrarcam*, 31), 23 (*inclito preceptore meo Francisco Petrarca*, 1), 24.1 (*incliti patris et preceptoris nostri Francisci Petrarce*), and *Gen.* 4.44 (*preclarissimus preceptor meus, Franciscus Petrarca*, 22), and 15 (*Franciscum Petrarcam... venerandissimum preceptorem*).

³⁶⁸ On Boccaccio's *Ytalie iam certus honos*, see Piacentini (2014: 185-222).

³⁶⁹ As noted by Stocchi (2012: 186), Del Virgilio's image of Dante as an old man alludes to Virgil's portrayal of Tityrus as a *fortunatus senex*, at Virgil *Eclagues* 1.46 and 51 (yet, see Servius commentary on these lines: [*fortunate senex*] *non ad aetatem Vergilii refert, sed ad fortunam futuram, praesago usus verbo*). At the time of the composition of his *Egloge*, Dante was in his fifties, which was the "fifth age of life" according to the biographical medieval tradition – see, for instance, Isid. *Etym.* 9.2.6: *id est gravitas, quae est declinatio a iuventute in senectutem; nondum senectus sed iam nondum iuventus... Quae aetas a quinquagesimo anno incipiens septuagesimo terminatur* (quoted at Stocchi, *ibid.*).

³⁷⁰ Note, however, that at *Gen.* 14.10.5 Boccaccio describes the *gravitas* of Petrarch's eclogues – see Introduction, "Genre".

³⁷¹ On Boccaccio's modesty as a characteristic feature of his works and literary career, see, for instance, Juliani (2016: 114-21); and Introduction.

the passage from *Alcestus* above and Virgil's *Eclogue* 5, the idea that Boccaccio's Amintas can compete with Virgil's Mopsus immediately suggests that Boccaccio is presenting his own pastoral as equal or perhaps even superior to that of Virgil.³⁷² Yet, the inclusion of Yollas as a potential rival of Amintas and Melibeus underpins that assumption, and reveals that Boccaccio's bucolic poetry is *not* the best (and is actually far from it, as will be suggested later in the *Buccolicum*, in the eclogue *Aggelos*).

In the following lines, Amintas returns his compliments to Melibeus:

Ergo alacres dignum calamis et carmine festum
cantemus; tu primus eris, tu carmine maior.
Esculeo dudum descriptos cortice rastro
Phyllidis incipies, vel quos mage duxeris, ignes
seu magis Alcesti laudes: non dignior ullus;
seu magnos Phytias quos pertulit ante labores,
qui meruit versus qua Stilbon flabat avena.
(*Alc.* 66-72)

The recognition by Amintas that Melibeus' singing talent is superior to his own (*tu carmine maior*) verbally alludes to Mopsus' phrase *tu maior*, spoken to Menalcas at Virgil *Eclogues* 5.4. The connotation of *maior* in each of these passages, however, is different. Whereas Boccaccio's Amintas is evidently referring to Melibeus' qualities as a singer, Virgil's Mopsus is more likely talking about Menalcas' greater age.³⁷³ Nevertheless, Boccaccio seems to accept Servius' explanation that, by *maior*, Virgil ambiguously referred either to Menalcas' age or his merit (*vel natu vel merito*, *Ad Buc.* 5.4). In fact, Boccaccio's text plays with both these possibilities of interpretation. While in line 66 above he leaves no doubt regarding the meaning of *maior* (for the ablative of specification *carmine* makes such clarification), previously, in line 24, Melibeus refers to himself as an aged swineherd (*annosum... subulcum*).

³⁷² See Combs-Schilling (2012: 102).

³⁷³ See Clausen (1994: 155), and Cucchiarelli (2017: 285).

Another point of contact between *Alcestus* and Virgil's *Eclogue* 5 is the initial hesitation about who should start singing. In both eclogues, the singers show an exchange of courtesies and a mutual admiration, which reflect the harmonious nature of their song-exchange – different, for instance, from the agonistic disputes seen in Virgil's *Eclogue* 3 and Boccaccio's eclogue 13, *Laurea*.³⁷⁴ A similar structure is also seen in Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 4, which also displays a harmonious type of amoebean song, based on Meliboeus' and Corydon's common praise of Caesar. What is more, in Virgil's *Eclogue* 5, Menalcas gives three options of subject for Mopsus to start singing: the loves of Phyllis, the merits of Alcon, or the quarrels of Codrus (*incipe, Mopse, prior, si quos aut Phyllidis ignes/ aut Alconis habes laudes aut iurgia Codri, Ecl.* 5.10-11). Similarly, in Boccaccio's *Alcestus*, Melibeus suggests that Amintas be the first to play a song upon the reed-pipe (*tu primus, Gal.* 60), while he himself will follow him in singing (*ast ego... secundus carmina cantabo*, 61-2). Then, after responding with that phrase *tu primus eris, tu carmine maior* (67), Amintas proposes three different themes for Melibeus: the loves of Phyllis, the honour of Alcestus, or the labours of Phytias, as they were sung by Stilbon.

Though the catalogue just mentioned is highly intertextual, the names of Phyllis and Phytias, alongside that of Alcestus, have raised suspicions from some scholars, who have thought that they too might be used here in a specific allegorical sense. Lidonnici (followed by Perini) proposed that Phyllis represent Johanna. Hence, the reference to Phyllis' fires carved in oak bark not long ago, besides evoking Virgil *Eclogues* 5.13-4 (*quae cortice fagi/ carmina descripsi*), would also indicate her marriage with Louis of Taranto – which, at the time of their return to Naples, had been recently sanctioned by the Pope.³⁷⁵ The character Phytias in turn probably signifies, like in *Dorus*, Niccolò Acciaiuoli (1310-65), the faithful advisor of Johanna

³⁷⁴ See Casanova-Robin (2014: 126).

³⁷⁵ Lidonnici (1914: 202), and Perini (1994: 965).

and Louis, who fled with them during the Hungarian invasion, and who was nominated as Naples' grand seneschal in 1348.³⁷⁶ His *labores* should be understood as the many practical difficulties Acciaiuoli had to deal with in order to regain control of the Regno and ensure that Louis would rule over it.³⁷⁷ Finally, Stilbon (Στίλβων, “gleaming”, “glittering”) was associated with the planet Mercury, and consequently with the mythical messenger of the gods. In this case, he probably represents Zanobi da Strada, court poet at Naples and secretary to Acciaiuoli.³⁷⁸

Yet, Smarr provides a compelling hypothesis for the passage above, which does not necessarily exclude, but rather complements the one offered by Lidonnici. Indeed, Smarr suggests a metapoetic link between Phyllis' loves and Boccaccio's erotic eclogues 1 and 2, and also between Phytias' trials and eclogue 4, *Dorus*. In this way, she argues, “Boccaccio may be offering here a brief catalogue of his own work so far, demonstrating the variety of its themes”.³⁷⁹ In the autofictional framing of the *Buccolicum*, Smarr's reading is particularly appealing, and is yet another argument in favour of the thematic cohesion and allegorical evolution of the work.

A song for Alcestus

Phyllis in agresti se iactet cespite ludens;
expectet Phytias cui, credo, magna paratur
posteritas, si vera sonat deus ethere levo;

³⁷⁶ Lidonnici (1914: 202), and Perini (1994: 965). On the meaning of Phytias in *Dorus*, see Boccaccio's explanation at *Ep.* 23.8. It is well known that Niccolò Acciaiuoli played a crucial role in the military and administrative success of the Neapolitan Regno, and actively “worked to make Louis Naples's king in the fullest sense of the word” (Casteen, 2015: 82).

³⁷⁷ Casteen (2015: 82).

³⁷⁸ See Bocc. *Ep.* 23.26 (on the character Stilbon from his eclogue *Laurea*): *Stilbonem vocito a Mercurio mercatorum deo, qui et Stilbon dicitur*. The same name recurs at *Bucc.* 11.101 (as an angel of God), and 16.113 (an authentic merchant). See also Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.53.4-6: *infra hanc autem stella Mercuri est (ea Στίλβων appellatur a Graecis)*; and Bocc. *Gen.* 2.12: *Stilbon appellatus est, quod velox latine sonat*. On the identification of Stilbon as Zanobi da Strada in *Alcestus*, see Hortis (1879: 19), Lidonnici (1914: 290), Smarr (1987: 220), and Perini (1997: 965). On Boccaccio's troublesome relations with both Zanobi and Acciaiuoli, see, for instance, Léonard (1944: 56-69), Branca (1977: 98 ff.), and Lee (2013: 13).

³⁷⁹ Smarr (1987: 220).

nos tamen Alcesto dignas per secula voces,
ut dabitur, cantare decet. Cantabimus ambo;
Libetrides nostrum tollant ad sydera carmen.
(*Alc.* 73-8)

Melibeus voices his wish to sing a song worthy of future ages in honour of Alcestus, and prays that the Muses (Libetrides) raise his song up to the stars.³⁸⁰ The phrase *per secula voces* is reminiscently epic – evoking, for example, the expression *per saecula nomen*, employed at Virgil *Aeneid* 6.235, Lucan *Bellum civile* 7.589, and Statius *Thebaid* 2.486 and 5.747. Yet, Melibeus’ following phrase, *nostrum tollant ad sydera carmen*, is typically bucolic, alluding to both Virgil *Eclogues* 5.43 (*Daphnis... ad sidera notus*) and 62-3 (*ipsi laetitia voces ad sidera iactant/ intonsi montes*). Through these intertextual links, Boccaccio’s Alcestus emerges as a Daphnis *redivivus* – an idea which will be furthered throughout the poem. Indeed, as an effect produced by *Alcestus*’ pronounced intertextual engagement with Virgil’s *Eclogue* 5, Louis of Taranto’s exile and subsequent “resurrection”, in the former poem, acquires the same significance that Daphnis’ death and apotheosis has to Menalcas and Mopsus, in the latter one.³⁸¹ The two eclogues are thus presented as poetry of some elevation, and share a messianic tone.³⁸²

Moreover, by using the bucolic version of the myth of Daphnis as the relevant fictional equivalent to portray a political event, Boccaccio’s text converses with an influential reading of Virgil’s *Eclogue* 5, already present in Servius, and according to which the deified Daphnis represented the new *divus* Julius Caesar.³⁸³ In this way, the reception of Virgil’s *Eclogue* 5 in *Alcestus* is also mediated by the diffused allegorical interpretation of that poem.

³⁸⁰ The Libetrides Nymphs were linked to the Muses of poetry already at Theocritus *Idylls* 7.92, and then at Virgil *Eclogues* 7.21. They were more commonly associated with Libethra, a fountain of Magnesia, in Thessaly, situated at the foot of Mount Olympus – see Serv. *ad Buc.* 7.21, Bocc. *De font.* 78, and notes of Cucchiarelli (2017: 384).

³⁸¹ See Perini (1994: 964).

³⁸² See Casanova-Robin (2014: 123, 135-7), and also Virgil’s *Eclogue* 4.

³⁸³ See Serv. *ad Buc.* 5.56: *et quibusdam videtur per allegoriam Caesarem dicere, qui primus divinos honores meruit et divus appellatus est*; and Meban (2009: 117): “it is thus possible to interpret the subject matter of the songs Mopsus and Menalcas perform within the context of the comet of July 44 B.C.E, understood by some to

Alcestus' fall

After meeting all the necessary requirements for their musical leisure (the shade, the divine rites, the welfare of the animals, and the quietness of the fields), Amintas encourages Melibeus to start singing. The latter then begins recounting what had happened after Alcestus' departure from their woodland:

Am. Ecce, puer, placida pariter residemus in umbra
et superis gratos mittunt altaria fumos,
ruminat omne pecus, pueri campique quiescunt.
Quid trahis in longum conceptos iam tibi versus?
Mel. "Alcestum postquam silvis abstraxit amatis
fatorum predura lues, flevere dolentes
Parthenopes nymphe nec vidit Daunia sulcos,
vitibus obstupuit Bacchus, periere iuvence
Vulturnusque senex ingentia saxa revolvens
excessit ripas, luteus demissus ab urna;
montibus obiectum nebulis fumoque cacumen
vidimus et valles ululatu flere dolenti;
tunc quos clara dedit tellus rugire leones
non ausos laqueosque graves sentire coactos
venantum primo, lyncis quoque lumen ademptum.
Ha quantum potuit de te Fortuna quibusque
casibus in dubios te traxit seva meatus!
Ast ego, Phebe decus celi, posuisse labori
Alcesti finem et patriis post reddere silvis
dignatus, meritos nymphe tibi semper honores
carmine perpetuo resonent precor atque bubulci."
(*Alc.* 79-99)

The disastrous consequences of Alcestus' exile are not very different from the consequences of Daphnis' death in Virgil's *Eclogue* 5. For instance, Melibeus' description of the mourning of nature and animals above closely resembles Mopsus' account in Virgil's poem. Just as Daphnis was cut off (*exstinctum... crudeli funere Daphnin, Ecl.* 5.20) by a cruel death, so Alcestus was suddenly withdrawn from his beloved woods (*silvis abstraxit amatis, Alc.* 83). In both passages we find the images of nymphs weeping (*Nymphae... flebant, Ecl.* 5.20-1; *flevere*

herald the ascension of Caesar into the heavens, the formal deification of the former dictator in January 42 B.C.E., and the games and birthday celebrations held in his honour in July of 42". See also Clausen (1994: 152), Smarr (1987: 219), and Fonseca Jr. (2016a: 96).

dolentes... nymphe, Alc. 84-5), rivers (*flumina*, Ecl. 5.21 and 25; *Vulturnus*, Alc. 87), and the figures of Bacchus (Ecl. 5.30; Alc. 86) and Phoebus Apollo (Ecl. 5.35; Alc. 96). More significantly, the glory of Alceus is paired with the glory of Daphnis, and both deserve to have it immortalised in verse – compare the verses *pastores (mandat fieri sibi talia Daphnis),/ et tumulum facite, et tumulo superaddite carmen* (Ecl. 5.41-2) with *meritos nymphe tibi semper honores/ carmine perpetuo resonent precor atque bubulci* (Alc. 98-9). As we can see, however, while Mopsus urges his fellow-shepherds to build a tomb for Daphnis, Melibeus is now certain that Alceus is alive, and proposes that the nymphs and herdsmen celebrate his return (*Alcesti finem et patriis post reddere silvis/ dignatus...*, Alc. 96-8).

At the same time, other intertexts seem to work as *oppositio in imitando*, highlighting the contrasts rather than the similarities between the Virgilian and the Boccaccian passages. Thus, whereas the African lions moaned over Daphnis' death (*Daphni, tuum Poenos etiam ingemuisse leones/ interitum montesque feri silvaeque loquuntur*, Ecl. 5.27-8), the lions "born from the gleaming earth" remained quiet after Alceus' departure, and hence became, for the first time, vulnerable to the hunters' traps (*tunc quos clara dedit tellus rugire leones/ non ausos laqueosque graves sentire coactos/ venantum primo*, Alc. 91-3). Moreover, besides functioning as an *adynaton* to express grief, like in Virgil's *Eclogue 5*, the lions mentioned by Melibeus in *Alceus* seem to have an allegorical meaning. Like in *Faunus* (89 and 101) and *Silva cadens* (47), the reference to the *leones* is probably alluding to Johanna's relatives, more particularly the Durazzeschi and the Tarantini, who were caught and punished by Louis of Hungary for their supposed involvement in the murder of Andrew. And in the lynx, subsequently mentioned, Boccaccio is perhaps alluding to Johanna's brother-in-law, Duke Charles of

Durazzo (1323-48), who was also among Louis of Hungary's first victims, being executed in Aversa, the same place where Andrew was murdered, in January 1348.³⁸⁴

Finally, let us go back a few lines to consider an important allusion and its thematic effects in the *Buccolicum*. At the very beginning of the passage above, Melibeus says that Alceus had been carried away from his forests by a "harsh pestilence of the fates" (*Alceus postquam silvis abstraxit amatis/ fatorum predura lues...*, 83-4). These lines firstly allude to Virgil *Eclogues* 5.34, where Mopsus similarly refers to Daphnis as taken by death from the world (*postquam te fata tulerunt...*). However, while Virgil deploys the verb *fero* (*aufero*, "to take away", "carry off") with a euphemistic connotation, Boccaccio uses the verb *abstraho* ("to drag off", "withdraw", "divert") in a more literal sense, referring to the actual departure of Alceus from Naples.³⁸⁵ Yet, in this context, the invocation of the fates also has a deeper meaning, representing another political symbol of civil war, besides relating to the concept of Fortune.³⁸⁶ This association is subsequently reinforced in lines 94-5, where Melibeus blames Fortune for the adversities (*casibus*) and perilous travels (*dubios... meatus*) that she had imposed on Alceus. While this idea evidently brings to mind Boccaccio's *De casibus virorum illustrium*, as though suggesting a link between the temporary fall of Alceus and that of other famed figures, it also takes us back to the erotic discussion of *Galla*.³⁸⁷

Being the personification of a divine force that controls the redistribution of earthly goods among individuals or nations, we saw that Fortune was portrayed in *Galla* as the agent behind Damon's loss of his lover, while here, in *Alceus*, she is said to be responsible for (or

³⁸⁴ See Perini (1994: 966), and Casteen (2015: 48, 70-1). Just as the wolf, the lion and the lynx also had symbolic connotations in Christian and medieval texts – see, for instance, Isid. *Etym.* 12.2.1-21; Dante *Inf.* 1; and Bocc. *Espos.* 1.al.21-3: "per la lonza il vizio della lussuria e per lo leone il vizio della superbia e per la lupa il vizio dell'avarizia". Furthermore, as demonstrated in the Index of Intertexts, the passage from *Alceus* at issue also contains a number of intertexts with classical non-bucolic texts, such as Virgil's *Aeneid*, Lucan's *Bellum civile*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Horace's *Carmen Saeculare* and *Odes*.

³⁸⁵ See Serv. *ad Buc.* 5.34.2: *Tulerunt pro abstulerunt* – see Clausen (1994: 163), and Cucchiarelli (2017: 300).

³⁸⁶ See, for instance, Lucan 1.70 (*invida fatorum series*); discussion in Roche (2009: Introd. §5), and Jal (1963: 65-6). On the association between the f/Fates and Fortune, see also Bocc. *Gen.* 1.5.

³⁸⁷ See Chapter 1, "Love, death and Fortune".

at least conniving in) Alceus' ruin. From this it becomes evident that, wherever there are human beings and human desires, there we will find Fortune ready to alter whatever reality people used to take for granted. The implication of this idea in the *Buccolicum* is that, just as erotic love was a transitory good for Damon in *Galla*, so was political power and peace in *Alceus*. The only difference is that, while in *Galla* we saw Damon at the very bottom of Fortune's wheel, in *Alceus* we are witnessing the cyclical return of the king and his people to the top (an idea that is also evoked through spring imagery at the beginning of the poem). Note, moreover, that in the same way that Damon was involuntarily taken to a barren land by Fortune, Alceus is said to have been dragged to doubtful paths by her. In this way, Boccaccio's text invites some reflection on the role of Christian providentialism in the *Buccolicum*, implying that all these different trials were sent by God to test his faith.

Alceus' comeback

Amintas praises Melibeus' song, saying that it was more pleasing to him than thyme to bees, tender hibiscus to the lambs, or clover to goats: *non thymus est apibus, non agnis lenis ybiscus,/ non cythisus capris quantum tua carmina nobis* (*Alc.* 100-1). These two lines, too, allude to Virgil's *Eclogue* 5, yet they combine motifs from different passages. The first relates to the moment at which Menalcas pays a compliment to Mopsus' song, comparing it to what sleeping on the grass means to the weary, and drinking water to the thirsty: *tale tuum carmen nobis, divine poeta,/ quale sopor fessis in gramine, quale per aestum/ dulcis aquae saliente sitim restinguere rivo* (*Ecl.* 5.45-7). The second recalls Menalcas talking about the rites of Daphnis, which should be conducted so long as the boar loves the mountaintops and the fish the streams, as the bees feed on thyme and the cicadas on dew: *dum iuga montis aper, fluvios dum piscis*

*amabit,/ dumque thymo pascentur apes, dum rore cicadae,/ semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt (Ecl. 5.76-8).*³⁸⁸

From here on, Boccaccio's text starts to incorporate some elements from Virgil's *Eclogue* 8, too. In Chapter 1, we have seen that *Galla* also engaged intertextually with this eclogue – mainly with its first half, sung by Damon and concerning the betrayal of Nysa. In *Alcestus*, however, the focus is on the second half of the same poem, sung by Alpheisiboeus. Indeed, as Boccaccio's text proposes to celebrate the return of Alcestus, the song of Alpheisiboeus, which culminates with the return of Daphnis in Virgil's *Eclogue* 8, seems a more suitable model. Though the latter Daphnis hardly corresponds to the Daphnis of Virgil's *Eclogue* 5, Boccaccio conveniently combines these two models into his characterization of Alcestus – a man who, like the straying lover from Virgil's *Eclogue* 8, is not dead and eventually returns to his homeland. And yet, this returning lover is one whose temporary absence has a political significance and is felt by all the inhabitants of the woods, as in Virgil's *Eclogue* 5.

Following his compliment to Melibeus, Amintas will propose to make a reply of his own and will sing an extensive panegyric in honour of Alcestus, one which is structured around the same exhortative refrain: *plaudite iam colles, et vos iam plaudite montes:/ redditus est nostris Alcestus, redditus antris (Alc. 103-4, 113-4, 120-1, 128-9, 139-40)*. A similar pattern is deployed in Virgil's *Eclogue* 8. First, in a recurrent line from Damon: *incipi Maenalios mecum, mea tibia, versus (Ecl. 8.21, 25, 31, 36, 42, 46, 51 and 57, with a slight adaptation in line 61: desine Maenalios, iam desine, tibia, versus)*. And afterwards, in Alpheisiboeus' song, as he recites the sorceress's spell to bring her Daphnis back home: *ducite ab urbe domum, mea carmina, ducite Daphnin (Ecl. 8.68, 72, 79, 84, 90, 94, 100, and 104).*³⁸⁹

³⁸⁸ See also *Aeneid* 1.607-9: *in freta dum fluvii current, dum montibus umbrae/ lustrabunt convexa, polus dum sidera pascet,/ semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt*.

³⁸⁹ This kind of pastoral refrain is reminiscent of Theocritus (*Id.* 1.64 etc.), and Moschus (*Epit. Bion.* 8 etc.) – see Clausen (1994: 256), Coleman (1977: 232), and Cuchiarelli (2017: 418). A similar pattern is hinted at Virgil

At the end of her incantation, the Virgilian anonymous sorceress sees her Daphnis coming back home from the city, and she suddenly concludes her speech saying: *parcite, ab urbe venit, iam parcite, carmina, Daphnis* (*Ecl.* 8.109). As at the start of *Alceustus*, this abrupt ending marks a shift from sorrow to joy, as the sorceress finally has her wish fulfilled.³⁹⁰ However, that line is constantly evoked from the beginning to the end of Amintas' song, particularly in the second part of his strophic unit (*redditus est nostris Alceustus, redditus antris*). Thus, on the one hand, Amintas emphasizes that his Alceustus has already returned, and there is no need for incantations of any sort, just celebrations. On the other hand, that same allusion recalls and contrasts with *Galla* 95-7, where Tindarus suggested the use of song and herbs to recall magically Damon's beloved. As a result, Amintas' song highlights the fact that, concerning earthly issues, the wheel of Fortune acts independently of humans' prayers. While in *Galla* Damon tried in vain all the rites to call his beloved woman back to him (99-109), in *Alceustus* the king was surprisingly restored to his homeland, in spite of the hopelessness of his people.

As in Melibeus' song, which though mainly fashioned after Virgil's *Eclogue* 5 still incorporated elements drawn from other poems, in Amintas' too we can point out other relevant allusions besides those to Virgil's *Eclogue* 8:

Plaudite iam colles, et vos iam plaudite montes:
redditus est nostris Alceustus, redditus antris.
Litora iam plausu surgant et flumina certent
nunc plausu complere polos. Hic spernere terras
occiduas, solisque vias celumque serenum
cernere et obliquos Phebes mirarier orbes
cepit et Astream silvis revocavit abactam:
hac tauris curru iunget cervisque leones
armentisque lupos, serpentum sibila sulcis

Eclogues 6.25 (*carmina... carmina vobis*), and also at Calpurnius *Eclogues* 2.70-5 (*si venias, Crocale, totus tibi serviet annus/hortus*) – see Clausen (1994: 187), and Karakasis (2016: 211). In Boccaccio's *Buccolicum*, we have other examples of refrains at 5.77 and 116 (*Plangite... mecum*) and 14.91, 96, 101, 106 and 111 (*Vivimus... Codri*). As Smarr (1987: 253) has noted, this feature is neither present in Dante's nor Petrarch's pastoral – which suggests Boccaccio's direct engagement with Virgil.

³⁹⁰ See Coleman (1977: 253).

auferet et meritos Musis concedet honores.
(*Alc.* 103-12)

The description above alludes to Virgil's *Eclogue* 4, again implying that the return of Alcestus/Louis of Taranto to Naples is equivalent to the return of the Golden Age. In Virgil's poem, the restoration of this primeval age coincides with the consulship of Pollio at Rome (*te consule... Pollio*, *Ecl.* 4.11-12), and is marked by the return of the Virgin Astraea to the earth (*iam redit et Virgo*, *Ecl.* 4.6). Then, following the birth of the *puer*, the cattle will not fear the lions (*nec magnos metuent armenta leones*, *Ecl.* 4.22), and the poisonous snakes and plants will be extinguished (*occident et serpens, et fallax herba veneni/ occident*, 23-4). Similarly, in Boccaccio's poem, Amintas grants to Alcestus the successful return of Astraea (*Astream... revocavit*, *Alc.* 109), and he also speaks of a peaceful era, where the deer and lions, wolves and cattle will live together in harmony, and where dangerous snakes will no longer exist (*iunget cervisque leones/ armentisque lupos, serpentum sibila sulcis/ auferet*, 110-12).

Note, moreover, that Amintas' speech above combines different images and vocabulary related to the cosmological and divine spheres. The phrase *spernere terras occiduas* (*Alc.* 106-7), for instance, alludes to both Virgil *Eclogues* 4.14 (*solvent... terras*) and Calpurnius *Eclogues* 4.42 (*occiduas impellere... harenas*). Then, the syntagm *solisque vias* (*Alc.* 107) is also present at Virgil *Aeneid* 6.796, in a passage where Anchises announces the coming of a new Golden Age (*aurea... saecula*, *Aen.* 6.792-3) ushered in by Augustus Caesar.³⁹¹ The pair *caelum serenum* (*celumque serenum*, *Alc.* 107), in turn, is employed in different classical texts, including at Virgil *Georgics* 1.260, *Aeneid* 3.518 and 5.870 (but not anywhere in the *Eclogues*, though). Subsequently, the image of Alcestus yoking a chariot of bulls (*hac tauris curru iunget*, *Alc.* 110) alludes, firstly, to Daphnis teaching the herdsmen of *Eclogue* 5 to yoke their chariots with tigers while he was still alive (*Daphnis et Armenias curru subiungere tigris/ instituit*, *Ecl.* 5.29-30). In Virgil's text, the chariot drawn by tigers is associated with the traditional

³⁹¹ See Horsfall (2014: 540-1).

iconographical representations of Dionysus-Bacchus, suggesting that Daphnis' capacity for taming nature was comparable to that god's power.³⁹² In Boccaccio's text, the image of the chariot with bulls is a sign that Alcestus is equally endowed with civilizing qualities, and is able to reverse the disordered state to which his woodland was reduced during his absence. Thus, Boccaccio's text proposes a restructuring of Virgil's chronological order of his account of Daphnis. For unlike Virgil's Mopsus, who nostalgically recalls Daphnis' achievements in life, Boccaccio's Amintas rather imagines what Alcestus is about to do now that he is back. Secondly, this same image strikingly brings to mind the mythical scene of Jason yoking the bulls in Colchis with the aid of Medea – which is an interesting parallel since Louis of Taranto too had a powerful female coadjutor (Johanna).³⁹³

Finally, the association between Alcestus/Louis of Taranto and a Roman statesman is further established by an allusion to Lucan's *Bellum civile*. As Perini observed, Boccaccio's phrase *obliquos Phebes mirarier orbis/ cepit* (*Alc.* 108-10) strongly recalls Lucan's *fratri contraria Phoebe/ ibit et obliquum bigas agitare per orbem/ indignata diem poscet sibi* (1.77-9). Not only do these lines have clear verbal and imagistic links, but they are also inserted in very similar (yet contrasting) contexts. Whereas Boccaccio's text suggests the return of a Golden Age, Lucan's text proposes the return of an even earlier stage of humanity, dominated by primitive chaos (*antiquum... chaos*, 74). Lucan describes the constellations clashing in confusion, the stars dropping into the sea, the moon (*Phoebe*) moving in opposition to the sun, and all the natural laws collapsing. Lucan associates this (literally) chaotic image with the envious Fates and Fortune (70 and 84), but also with the excessive ambition of the first Roman

³⁹² See Cucchiarelli (2017: 298).

³⁹³ See, for instance, Hor. *Ep.* 3.10-12 (*Medea... tauris... iuga... Iasonem*), Ov. *Her.* 12.93 (*iungis... tauros*); and also Bocc. *Gen.* 13.26.3 (on Jason): *cui cum clam se maritum futurum spopondisset, ab ea doctus est quo pacto eripedes tauros et domare et iugo subigere posset*. As Perini pointed out (1994: 967), in the *Buccolicum*'s autograph we read the original word *tauros* altered by Boccaccio's own hand to *tauri*. This self-correction could imply an attempt of Boccaccio either to overlap *tauros* with Virgil's *tigris* (which is in fact an accusative plural), from *Eclogues* 5.29 above; or to make an incomplete adjustment in view of the following word: *tauris curru(s)*.

triumvirs Pompey, Crassus and Julius Caesar. Yet, despite its dreadful consequences, Lucan suggests that the civil war was perhaps a necessary evil for the arrival of the quasi-divine Nero, who finally brought peace to Rome (61-3). Amintas' following lines in *Alcestus* will reinforce the intertextual engagement with Lucan:

Plaudite iam colles, et vos iam plaudite montes:
redditus est nostris Alcestus, redditus antris.
Dum mare fluctivagos pisces tellusque tenebit
quadripedes, aer volucres et sydera Olympus,
Alcestus silvis pastoribus atque puellis
sit lumen semperque decus nec limina Ditis
conspiciat; moriens, superis sit Delphycus alter.
(*Alc.* 113-9)

After the refrain, Amintas lists a number of natural observations (the sea has fish, the earth has four-footed animals, the air has birds, and high heaven has stars) in order to express his conditional wish that, so long as those things continue to exist, Alcestus may live and rejoice in glory. These compounded *sententiae* and images of permanence markedly recall the sequence of the passage from Lucan's *Bellum civile* mentioned above. However, though similarly structured, Lucan's sequence of images (the earth supporting the sea, the air supporting the earth, night following day, and the Zodiac signs regularly following one another) will have a pessimistic conclusion, as he proposes that, so long as nature follows this normal course, "loyalty will be impossible between sharers in tyranny":

dum terra fretum terramque levabit
aer et longi voluent Titana labores
noxque diem caelo totidem per signa sequetur,
nulla fides regni sociis, omnisque potestas
inpatiens consortis erit.
(*Bel. Civ.* 1.89-93)³⁹⁴

³⁹⁴ See also Sen. *Med.* 401-6 (on vengeance).

Boccaccio's text thus incorporates these Lucanian motifs into its bucolic panegyric, providing a positive inversion of Lucan's negative idea, while using images and vocabulary more closely linked with Virgil's *Eclogues* (*Alc.* 115-18 *dum... semperque... ~ Ecl.* 5.76-8 *dum iuga montis aper... semper honos*; *Alc.* 117-8 *silvis... decus ~ Ecl.* 5.34 *tu decus omne tui*; *Alc.* 119 *sit Delphycus alter ~ Ecl.* 5.65-6 *sis bonus... Daphni, duas altaria Phoebo*).³⁹⁵ These thematic associations with Lucan's text have two deeper implications in *Alcestus*. Though Louis of Taranto is presented there as the desired ruler (as opposed to the tyrants listed by Lucan), it is as if the danger of tyranny was still lurking in Boccaccio's eclogue – as will be confirmed at the end of the poem.

Celebration

In the two final strophic units of his song, Amintas first gives instructions for the festivities, and then celebrates the immortal glory of Alcestus:

Plaudite iam colles, et vos iam plaudite montes:
 redditus est nostris Alcestus, redditus antris.
 Nos agnam mactare decet (nos cernat ovantes
 Alcestus) taurumque sibi, dum tempora victor
 umbrabit lauro: veniat lux illa, precamur,
 et suris vinctis saltabimus inde coturno
 elicietque sonos stipulis tyrenus Asylas:
 astabunt coram Damon Phytiasque canentes.
 Plaudite iam colles, et vos iam plaudite montes:
 redditus est nostris Alcestus, redditus antris.
 Vix, Alceste decus nostrum, vix credere fame
 post nos ruricole poterunt, sed cortice duro
 posteritas tua facta leget; te populus ingens,
 te corilus sculptum, servabit te quoque fagus,
 dum fluet Eridanus, dum montes vallibus umbras
 prestabunt, dum grata salix, dum gratus ybiscus
 nascetur capris. Crescent ea nomina quantum
 ipsa quidem fagus crescet. Mirabitur Arnus
 atque colet gratis linquens tua facta futuris.

³⁹⁵ Note that Virgil's *Eclogue* 4 seems to do the same with the negative *adynata* of Horace's *Epode* 16, which are there symbolic of disastrous civil war, but in *Eclogue* 4 of a new era of peace – see Harrison (2007: 133-5). At *Alc.* 119, Boccaccio associates Alcestus with Phoebus Apollo ("Delphycus"), as Virgil does with Daphnis – see Bocc. *Gen.* 11.17: *inde redeunte Mercurio a Cylleno monte et Phebo a Delphis*.

Plaudite iam colles et vos iam plaudite montes;
redditus est nostris Alceustus, redditus antris.
(*Alc.* 120-40)

Amintas proposes to his fellow countrymen that they slaughter a lamb and a bull for Alceustus. The first type of sacrificial killing was more frequently staged in Latin poetry – appearing, for instance, at Horace *Odes* 2.17.32 (*nos humilem feriemus agnam*), and Calpurnius *Eclogues* 4.166 (*nos... tenerum mactabimus haedum*). The second one was usually reserved for the greatest ceremonies, and was thereby more commonly invoked in the epic – for instance, at Virgil *Aeneid* 2.202 (*sollemnis taurum ingentem mactabat ad aras*), 3.20-1 (*superoque nitentem/ caelicorum regi mactabam in litore taurum*), and 3.118-9 (*meritos aris mactavit honores... taurum tibi, pulcher Apollo*; compare this with *Alc.* 123: *Alceustus, taurumque sibi*).³⁹⁶ Thus, in including the bull sacrifice as part of the ritualistic ceremonies to Alceustus, Amintas makes clear the magnitude of this event, and depicts Alceustus as a divine leader, not only worthy of the lower lyric and bucolic poetry (symbolically implied through the *agnam*), but also of loftier genres, such as the epic (*taurum*).³⁹⁷

Yet, more generally, the passage above also interacts with the beginning of Book 3 of Virgil's *Georgics*. There, the poet-narrator champions his own literary career, and imagines his successful return to his homeland, Mantua, where he will build a shrine to Augustus Caesar by the waters of the river Mincius:

primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas,
et viridi in campo templum de marmore ponam
propter aquam, tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat
Mincius et tenera praetexit harundine ripas.
in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit
(Virg. *G.* 3.12-16)

³⁹⁶ See Virg. *G.* 2.146-7: *maxima taurus/ victima*.

³⁹⁷ See Harrison (1995: 125-7), who proposes a similar interpretation for the *decem tauri* and the *tener vitulus* of Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.53-6.

Then, Virgil imagines a triumphal procession, where he himself, his head adorned with olive-leaves (*ipse caput tonsae foliis ornatus olivae*, 21), will conduct the crowd and assist in the rites, which include the slaughter of young bullocks (*iuvat caesosque videre iuencos*, 23). Virgil's text thus anticipates the return and triple triumph of Caesar in August 29 BCE, after the Actium campaigns; and links Virgil's own poetic fame with the political success of Caesar, with a possible hint at the *Aeneid*.³⁹⁸ As we have seen above, in Boccaccio's poem, the return of Alcestus will be similarly celebrated with animal sacrifice, but there is more than that. While Virgil suggests the construction of a shrine near the Mincius in honour of Augustus Caesar, Boccaccio's Amintas refers the Arnus as the witness of Alcestus' deeds (*Mirabitur Arnus/ atque colet gratis linquens tua facta futuris*, *Alc.* 37-8 above).³⁹⁹ In fact, this particular intertext had been already anticipated in lines 48-53 of *Alcestus*, where Melibeus sang of building altars with the palms of Idumaea near the waters (*erige propter aquas nobis altaria... et ydumeas fer palmas*), thus alluding to *Georgics* 3.11-14 above.⁴⁰⁰ Note, however, that Boccaccio's choice of Arnus not only hints at his Tuscan origin; it also implies that the fame of King Louis of Taranto had already reached central Italy.

What is more, whereas in *Georgics* 3 Virgil suggests the future writing of a panegyric epic to Caesar, Boccaccio's text emphasizes that the glory of Alcestus will be carved in the rough bark of his bucolic poetry instead: *sed cortice duro/ posteritas tua facta leget* (131-2). Indeed, while the idea of immortalising one's fame in poetry was a widely diffused *topos* in classical literature (also present in Lucan's *Bellum civile* 1, for instance), the idea of writing on trees was traditionally bucolic.⁴⁰¹ Nonetheless, it might be striking that Alcestus' deeds and

³⁹⁸ See Harrison (2007: 154-5).

³⁹⁹ Particularly on Boccaccio's phrase *tempora victor/ umbrabit lauro* above, see also Virg. *Aen.* 5.539-40 (*cingit viridanti tempora lauro... victorem*), and Stat. *Theb.* 5.554 (*nuper Olympiacis umbratus tempora ramis*).

⁴⁰⁰ Moreover, at *Alcestus* 59, the phrase *foliis ornatus olive* literally echoed the end of *Georgics* 3.21.

⁴⁰¹ See Virg. *Ecl.* 4.26-7 (*at simul heroum laudes et facta parentis/ iam legere et quae sit poteris cognoscere virtus*), 5.13-4 (*quae cortice fagi/ carmina descripsi*), and Calp. *Ecl.* 1.20 (*descripta est pagina fago*). Particularly on *Alcestus* 136-7 (*crescent ea nomina quantum/ ipsa quidem fagus crescet*), see Virg. *Ecl.* 10.54 (*crescent illae, crescetis, amores*). On the allegorical notion of *cortex*, see Bocc. *Ep.* 23.1, and our discussion in the Introduction.

name will be preserved on *three* different trees (namely on the poplar, the hazel, and the beech trees), which could be an indication of the Neapolitan war trilogy in the *Buccolicum*.

Finally, it is worth noting that Amintas imagines dancing (*et suris vinctis saltabimus inde coturno*, *Alc.* 125), and lists other men (the Tyrrhenian Asylas, Damon and Phytias) who will perform celebratory songs in front of Alcestus. In this particular context, Amintas' *coturni* probably indicate hunting boots – which are a prominent feature of Diana's iconography, as observed at Virgil *Eclogues* 7.29-32 (*Delia... puniceo stabis suras evincta coturno*).⁴⁰² Yet, it is also possible that Boccaccio is ambiguously playing with the tragic and the bucolic meanings of the *coturnus* there, suggesting that the theme of Alcestus' return is suitable to both lower and loftier genres.⁴⁰³ In fact, those three names mentioned by Amintas refer to characters of different status. Asylas symbolically alludes to the eminent Etruscan hero and diviner from Virgil's *Aeneid*, and he is normally associated in the *Buccolicum* with dignified elderly personages.⁴⁰⁴ Damon and Phytias, in turn, represent the celebrated pair of friends; but they are presented as lower in status than Asylas in the *Buccolicum carmen*.⁴⁰⁵ Thus, in the final stanza of Amintas' song above, Boccaccio's text weaves various multigeneric strands together into a meaningful whole, linking the idea of the political triumph with that of the poetic one (presumably with thoughts of the contemporary laureate coronations of Petrarch, too).⁴⁰⁶ Meanwhile, the passage above suggests that Boccaccio's bucolic book is the *cortex* on which the great deeds of Louis of Taranto – as well as Boccaccio's own autofictional loves and labours – will be allegorically preserved.

⁴⁰² See Clausen (1994: 224-5), and Cuchiarelli (2017: 389, and 391). On the association between the *cothurnus* and tragedy, see e.g. Hor. *Ars P.* 80.

⁴⁰³ A similar reading has been proposed for Venus' hunting boots at *Aeneid* 1.337 (*purpureoque... suras vincere coturno*) – see Harrison (1973: 10-24).

⁴⁰⁴ See, for instance, Virg. *Aen.* 10.175 (*hominum divumque interpres Asilas*), 11.620 (*princeps... Asilas*), 12.127 (*fortis Asilas*), and Serv. *ad Aen.* 12.127.1 (*Asilas Etruscum nomen*). In Boccaccio's *Buccolicum*, Asylas is briefly mentioned also at 4.119, among other noblemen; and at 14.225-7, as Violante's grandfather (*placido vultu cantabat Asylas*). See Perini (1994: 953).

⁴⁰⁵ See Chapter 1, "Context and characters".

⁴⁰⁶ See, for instance, Petr. *Coll. Laur.* 11.1: *laurea igitur, et Cesaribus et poetis debita, est sertum ex frondibus laureis intextum*; and Bocc. *Ep.* 7.8.

Exchanging gifts

The next section of *Alceus* displays an exchange of gifts between the two shepherd-singers.

While Melibeus offers Amintas one of the two vessels that the Spartan Ylas has made, Amintas

awards Melibeus a fine staff, which was once given to him by the Cyprian Lycidas:

Mel. Est michi conspicuum signis, quod condidit olim⁴⁰⁷
Ylas spartanus, quamvis duo vasa fuissent,
dum placido nobis victus concessit amore.
Horum aliud nuper rapuit gratissima Phyllis;
tu reliquum, quanquam tanto sit munus agreste,
suscipe, sed noscas nulli tetigisse labellum.
Am. Sat video te cogat amor, dum munera tanti
concedis puero: non parva teneret Yollas.
Tu ne sperne, precor, baculum quem cyprius olim,
dum iuvenis frigias agitare arundine dammas,
concessit Lycidas sumptum de rupe Camandri,
nodis insignem nec non et cuspidem fulva.
(*Alc.* 147-58)

As far as the figures mentioned in this passage are concerned, they do not seem to refer to any specific historical persons. The name “Ylas” is an Hellenised version of the mythological Hylas, mentioned in Virgil’s *Eclogue* 6, where he carries an erotic connotation also hinted at in Boccaccio’s text (*placido... victus... amore*, 149).⁴⁰⁸ In line 150 above, we have a new reference to Phyllis. However, though again invoked in the context of love (as in lines 69 and 73), here she hardly corresponds to Queen Johanna. Rather, in this case, she seems to perform the non-allegorical role of a bucolic *puella*, as in the eclogues of Virgil and Calpurnius, as well as in Boccaccio’s *Saphos*.⁴⁰⁹ Then, Amintas mentions Yollas, who is probably the same Yollas

⁴⁰⁷ Perini (1994: 764) follows Lidonnici’s lesson (1914: 57), accepting that the ablative plural *signis* complements the meaning of *conspicuum*, in relation to the images displayed on the vessel: “possiedo un vaso adorno di figure”. Smarr’s translation (1987: 102), however, brings *insignis* instead of *signis*. In this way, she adopts Massera’s view (1928: 270), taking *insignis* as an adjective that modifies *Ylas spartanus*, in the following line: “I have an excellent thing (*conspicuum*) which once the famous Spartan Ylas (*insignis... Ylas spartanus*) made”. After analysing the digitalised autograph of the *Buccolicum* (in the ms. Riccardiano 1232), I tend to agree with Perini’s choice for *signis*.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ecl.* 6.43-4: *his adiungit, Hylan nautae quo fonte relictum/ clamassent, ut litus “Hyla, Hyla” omne sonaret* – see Perini (1994: 968-9).

⁴⁰⁹ See Perini (1994: 968). Though apparently odd to find this principle applied in the same eclogue, role shift is a common practice in the *Buccolicum*: in eclogue 9 (*Lipis*), Daphnis refers to both Julius Caesar (l. 74) and Charles

of line 64, described as Amintas' and Melibeus' rival in music; and finally Lycidas, who, like Yollas (Iollas), is a character from Virgil's *Eclogues*, being briefly mentioned in *Eclogue 7* (*Lycida formose*, l. 67), and then as Moeris' younger interlocutor in *Eclogue 9*.

Now, regarding the scene above as a whole, Boccaccio's text employs the traditional bucolic motif of the gift-exchange, and establishes some striking allusions to passages from Virgil's *Eclogues*.⁴¹⁰ For instance, the image of Melibeus gifting Amintas with a vessel (*vasum*), made by Ylas and never used before (*noscas nulli tetigisse labellum*, 152), calls to mind Virgil *Eclogues* 3.36-48, where both Menalcas and Damoetas stake two embossed cups (*pocula*), all four of them made by Alcimedon, and equally untouched by human lips (*necdum illis labra admovi*, 43 and 46).⁴¹¹ However, the Virgilian text additionally presents the ekphrastic details contained in these objects. The cups owned by Menalcas are decorated with vine stems and clusters of ivy, and in their centre display the astronomers Conon and possibly Eudoxus (*in medio duo signa, Conon et – quis fuit alter?*, 40).⁴¹² The cups owned by Damoetas feature acanthus leaves around their handles, and in the middle they exhibit Orpheus with the woods following him (45-6). Boccaccio's text omits such details, thus detaching the bucolic vessels from the didactic connotations that these same objects had in Virgil's ekphrastic descriptions.⁴¹³ Instead, it emphasizes that one of Melibeus' vessels was snatched by Phyllis (reinforcing the erotic symbolism of the vessels); and that the other one, which Melibeus is

IV (ll. 143 and 147). Similarly, as we will see in our next chapter, in eclogue 12 (*Saphos*), Petrarch appears as both Mopsus (l. 17), and Silvanus (l. 67 ff.). Now, comparing different eclogues of Boccaccio, we saw that, in *Galla* 57, Phytias was generically employed to refer to a friend of Damon, like in *Alcestus* 127. However, in Boccaccio's eclogue 4 (*Dorus*), and perhaps in *Alcestus* 71-4, the same character allegorically represents Niccolò Acciaiuoli; in eclogue 8 (*Midas*), Boccaccio himself; and in 10 (*Vallis opaca*, l. 16), he is probably a friend of the notary Menghino Mezzani (Ravenna, ca. 1295–1375/6) – the latter interpretation is Perini (1994: 999). Such procedure is not atypical in the bucolic genre: we have already seen in Virgil that the deified Daphnis of *Eclogue 5* does not correspond to the strayed lover of *Eclogue 8*. See also Chapter 1.

⁴¹⁰ The same motif is present in Theocritus – see, for instance, Theoc. *Id.* 1.27-56, 6.43-6 and 7.42; discussion in Coleman (1977: 113, 171), and Cucchiarelli (2017: 213-14, 316-17). On gift-giving as a symbol of poetic succession in Theocritus, see Hubbard (1998: 21-3).

⁴¹¹ The two *pocula* were typically used together – see Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.47; Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.117; and notes of Cucchiarelli (2017: 213).

⁴¹² Cucchiarelli (2017: 216).

⁴¹³ See Hubbard (1998: 72), and Karakasis (2011: 88-95).

offering to Amintas, is quite rustic (*munus agreste*, 151). The staff (*baculum*) that Amintas donates to Melibeus, in turn, evokes the crook (*pedum*) that Mopsus bestows upon Menalcas, at Virgil *Eclogues* 5.88-90 – which is a humble symbol of poetic investiture.⁴¹⁴ Both these objects are marked with knots (*nodis insignem*, *Alc.* 158; *formosum... nodis*, Virg. *Ecl.* 5.90;). Yet, while Amintas' staff has a golden tip (*cuspidē fulva*), Mopsus' crook is adorned with bronze (*aere*).

Happiness in suspense

As was argued from the beginning of this chapter, *Alceustus* is fundamentally an eclogue of shifts. Firstly, considering its allegorical relationship with the previous eclogues of the *Buccolicum*, *Alceustus* marks a shift in public opinion, from the initial support of Louis of Hungary's vendetta, to the subsequent criticism of his violent actions, followed by a general adhesion to Louis of Taranto's side.⁴¹⁵ Secondly, within the poem itself, we have a psychological shift in Melibeus' state from sorrow to excitement – and this psychological shift, in turn, promotes a thematic and structural shift in the eclogue, which starts as a lament, and then evolves into a song-exchange and panegyric. At the end of *Alceustus*, we can observe yet another type of shift. In fact, when everything seemed to be going well, Amintas hears his dogs Melampus and Licisca barking, a sign that his sheepfold might be in great danger:⁴¹⁶

Sed sta, care, precor, modicumque adverte: quid, oro,
 personuit silvis echo? Non, oro, latratus
 concipis ipse canum? grandis non ille Melampus?
 non gregis, heu, custos latrat? non illa Licisca?
 Est equidem, nosco: timeo ne sevis ovili
 nunc lupus insultet seu belua sevir; ibo
 ut videam et manibus tollam ne ledat hiulcus.

⁴¹⁴ See Hubbard (1998: 99); and Fest. 249 (ed. Müller): *pedum est baculum incurvum, quo pastores utuntur ad comprehendendas oves, aut capras a pedibus: cuius meminit etiam Vergilius in Bucolicis*.

⁴¹⁵ A similar contrast of ideological images is also displayed in Virgil's *Eclogues* – see Van Sickle (2004a: 41-8).

⁴¹⁶ On Melampus and Lycisca (which are both classical names of dogs), see Ov. *Met.* 3.206-8 (Melampus), 320 (Lycisca), and Virg. *Ecl.* 3.18 (Lycisca). See also Bocc. *Bucc.* 3.9, 5.131; and Dec. Intr. 100; 6 introd. 5ff., concl. 4, 6.

Tu venias queso, si te fortasse ciebo.
(*Alc.* 159-65)

With this ending, Boccaccio's eclogue thus departs from the expected closure of a friendly song-exchange. Unlike Virgil's *Eclogue* 5 or Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 4, *Alcestus* does not end with the amicable giving of gifts or with sundown, but rather with its sudden interruption by an echoing and frightening noise. However, it partially alludes to the end of Virgil's *Eclogue* 8, where the anonymous sorceress interprets the barking of Hylax as a sign that her Daphnis has returned home, but immediately questions herself: *et Hylax in limine latrat./ Credimus? An, qui amant, ipsi sibi somnia fingunt?* (*Ecl.* 8.107-8). In this passage, Virgil suggests that lovers invent their own fantasies of happiness – an idea that also recalls Tindarus' speech to Damon, in *Galla* (*nimum falluntur amantes*, 50).⁴¹⁷ Yet, the ending of Boccaccio's *Alcestus* implies not that Amintas might have been wrong about Alcestus' return from the start, but that his hope of peace and stability on earth was illusory like a dream. Unlike Alcesto's fearless sheep in the *Commedia delle ninfe fiorentine* (who represented the Christian souls fortified by virtue), Amintas' and Melibeus' flocks are unsafe, since they are vulnerable to a "savage wolf or an even more savage beast" (*sevus... lupus... seu belua sevir*). Thus, the poem unusually concludes with Amintas hastening to see what is happening.⁴¹⁸

Ultimately, drawing on the image of the destructive wolf familiar from the biblical and bestiary traditions, Boccaccio's passage above could be allegorically understood as the fear of the Neapolitans of suffering another invasion. It is known that, when Louis of Hungary departed from the Angevin Regno back to Hungary, he left a number of his troops behind, at a

⁴¹⁷ On Virgil's passage – which, in turn, alludes to Lucr. 1.104-5 (*quippe etenim quam multa tibi iam fingere possunt/ somnia*) – see Clausen (1994: 265).

⁴¹⁸ See *Ninf. Fior.* 14.7-9: "Pasconsi quivi timidette e mite,/ e servan lor grassezza con tal forma/ che non curan di lupo le ferite" – discussion in "Context and characters" above. See also Vulg. Acts 20:29: *ego scio quoniam intrabunt post discessionem meam lupi rapaces in vos, non parcentes gregi*; Aug. *Serm.* 178.1.9.10: *lupus venit ad ovile ovium, quaerit invadere, quaerit iugulare, quaerit devorare: vigilant pastores, latrant canes*.

relatively small distance from Naples.⁴¹⁹ At the same time, this passage could be interpreted as an allusion to the shadow of Charles IV of Luxembourg, who in 1346 had been elected king of Bohemia in opposition to Louis IV, then becoming also the king of the Romans. Indeed, by the time that Johanna and Louis of Taranto had returned to Naples, Charles was threatening to enter Italy and receive the imperial crown. Actually, between the return of the Angevin court to Naples until the announcement of Charles' descent to Italy, that coronation would not take too long. In 1355, the king of Bohemia would be crowned Holy Roman Emperor, a position he would keep until his death, in 1378. In this context, the representation of Charles IV as a savage wolf, in the final lines of *Alcestus*, seems particularly compelling. Boccaccio, embracing the Florentine ideals of autonomy, was openly against Charles IV's aggressive imperial policy – and it does not seem a coincidence that this ideological conflict will be thematised in the *Buccolicum*'s following eclogue, *Iurgium*, where Charles IV appears as Daphnis, a “dreadful thief” (*fur pessimus Daphnis, Iurg. 4*).⁴²⁰

Not only *Iurgium*, but also the following eclogues *Midas*, *Lipis* and *Vallis opaca* will continue to depict feelings of anxiety, anger, fear and despair rooted in political disputes about power. These sufferings will be then partially smoothed by Glaucus' divine song, in *Pantheon* – a poem which, besides presenting a brief account of Christian history and reminding the original purpose of the Church, champions not political figures such as Alcestus, but the poet-vates instead (*vati vos plaudite, colles, Pan. 239*). A new conscience will then start to emerge in the *Buccolicum*: the conscience that makes the human soul crave to elevate itself over all that earthly chaos, and find in poetry an intermediary form of salvation between the world of uncertainties governed by Fortune and the perfect and immutable world of God. Endowed with this new conscience, Boccaccio's autofictional pilgrim will pass onto the next stage of his

⁴¹⁹ Smarr (1987: 221).

⁴²⁰ See Lidonnici (1914: 205), Smarr (1987: 221), and Perini (1994: 969-70). Regarding Boccaccio's choice of the name “Daphnis” for Charles IV, see *Ep.* 23.14.

bucolic quest, searching no longer for a lover or a political leader to grant him the worldly happiness that he expects to obtain; but rather his artistic Muse, who will help him to pursue a nobler poetic path.

CHAPTER 3: *Saphos*

Summary

Caliope is appalled to find the young Aristeus prowling about her bay-trees (1-4). Ashamed, he swears that he has picked only three of their smallest leaves (5-7). Caliope censures him nevertheless, saying that those leaves are reserved for select poets (8-14). Aristeus reveals that he is searching for Saphos (15-25). Caliope exposes the absurdity of such an aim: how can he, a filthy boy, dare to encounter Saphos (26-37)? Aristeus retorts that he is neither too young, nor lowly born (38-45). Caliope then finally recognises the youth as the vulgar singer whom she once saw performing in front of the common rabble (46-9). Aristeus admits that it was him, but now he has changed and pursues nobler goals (50-3). Caliope also remembers that, not too long ago, Aristeus was tongue-tied, but now suddenly he seeks the summit of Parnassus (54-7). Aristeus begs Caliope to reveal the way to Saphos; but she suggests that he quit and go after his vulgar lovers, Phyllis or Lupisca, instead. Actually, Caliope is rather surprised that Aristeus knows about Saphos at all (58-66). Aristeus explains that he has overheard Silvanus and Minciades singing praises in her honour. He wonders if Caliope might be the one for whom he is looking (67-82). Yet, she humbly presents herself as one of Sapho's attendants and the guardian of the Castalian wood (83-94). Aristeus insists on knowing where Saphos dwells (95-9). Caliope partially gives in and says that her chaste lady inhabits the heights of Nysa, but the sight of her is not allowed to everyone (100-27). Since some people have tried to stain her innocence, Saphos now prefers to stay retired in the mountains (128-64). Aristeus stubbornly asks Caliope what is the easiest way to climb up Parnassus, and see Saphos singing (165-75). Caliope replies that greed and concern for wealth have made the paths of the mountain neglected for ages (176-82). Though effort alone is not enough to succeed, she finally advises Aristeus to approach Silvanus, one of the few who has been able to reach the inaccessible peak

(183-200). Aristeus gladly accepts her advice, and plans to take two piglets as a gift for him (201-2).

Context and characters

After closing the political section of the *Buccolicum* with eclogue 10 (*Vallis opaca*), Boccaccio makes one step further in his autofictional journey. From eclogue 11 (*Pantheon*) onwards, Boccaccio starts relinquishing the common desires and anxieties of the earthly world, in order to concentrate on the nobler callings of his soul: namely, poetry and religion. Structurally speaking, in the same way that Virgil's *Eclogue* 6 can be seen as a turning point in the *Eclogues*, Boccaccio's *Pantheon* could be seen as a turning point in the *Buccolicum* – a poem that similarly proposes an elevation of tone and theme based on a cosmological narrative, yet through the Christian perspective.⁴²¹ In addition, the eclogues that follow *Pantheon* are more distinctively personal in tenor. Though the whole *Buccolicum* can be read as an autofictional narrative, there is little doubt that eclogues 1-10 are predominantly “fictional”, whereas eclogues 12-16 are predominantly “auto-”. That is, while in the erotic and political sections of the *Buccolicum* Boccaccio deploys a number of character types to represent different aspects of his allegorical trajectory, in the poetic and religious sections Boccaccio includes himself in the poems in more explicit ways. As a result of this choice, Boccaccio ends by blurring the events of his past life – a life that he himself saw as mediated through the imperfect eyes of the flesh –, and disclosing his poetic and religious revelations with powerful clarity.

⁴²¹ On the division of Virgil's *Eclogues* into two halves (1-5; 6-10) with a symmetrical “recessed panel”, see Otis (1964: 132), and Steenkamp (2011: 110-11). Particularly regarding the *Buccolicum carmen*, Labagnara (1968: 36) has proposed the poem *Vallis opaca* as the turning point of the work. Yet, as I have argued in the Introduction, *Vallis opaca* is a predominantly political poem. The eclogue *Pantheon*, in turn, is thematically more ambivalent, introducing the topics of elevated poetry and religion which will dominate the following pieces. However, since its main focus is the history and influence of the Catholic Church, rather than faith, I would place it within the political section of the *Buccolicum* too.

To make this transition possible, in *Pantheon*, the Auctor invokes Clio (the Muse of history, also associated with fame and the desire for knowledge) to join him beneath the green boughs of his pastoral (*nec te sedisse parumper/ has subter virides... pudebit*, 4-5).⁴²² Yet, it is to Mopsus (Petrarch) that the Auctor dedicates his song, whom he expects to dispel the clouds from his work.⁴²³ Then, eclogue 13, *Laurea*, presents an energetic debate between the poet Daphnis and the merchant Stilbon. To some extent, this piece seems to deal with Boccaccio's determination to pursue a literary career in spite of his father's opposition; but also, more generally, it portrays the battle that all artists need to fight in order to survive in a world ruled by profit.⁴²⁴ One of the main arguments used by Daphnis in defence of poetry is that it offers both the possibility to imagine divine things and to know the cause of things.⁴²⁵ Standing in the middle of these two eclogues, the poem focused on in this chapter, *Saphos*, promotes a reflection about the poetic vocation and what it takes to be a prophet-poet, a *vates*.

Judging by its title, one could assume that *Saphos* is directly concerned with the ancient female poet from Lesbos.⁴²⁶ However, while Boccaccio dedicates a biography to Sappho in his *De mulieribus claris* (chapter 47), in this eclogue he rather elevates her to an allegorical personification of poetry, and is little or not at all interested in the historical Sappho, let alone in her actual texts. In fact, though Boccaccio mentions Sappho in a couple of his other later

⁴²² See *Gen.* 11.2: *Clios enim Grece fama dicitur, et quoniam nullus scientiam querit, nisi in qua fame sue protelet dignitatem, ob hanc rem prima Clio appellata est, id est cogitatio querende scientie* – and discussion in Gross (2005: 20-4, esp. 23).

⁴²³ *Panth.* 6-8: *decantanda michi veniunt tua carmina Mopso;/ sis fautrix, mecumque chelim tu tange Arethuse:/ Mopsus enim pellet nebulas a carmine flabris*. According to Perini (1994: 1011), Petrarch appears here as the future reviser of Boccaccio's *Buccolicum carmen*, as suggested also at *Aggelos* 26-7 and 60-1. Though we know that Boccaccio read and revised Petrarch's book of eclogues, we do not have evidence if Petrarch ever read Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* – see Introduction, "Methodology".

⁴²⁴ On Boccaccio's (complicated) relationship with his father, see Introduction, "Boccaccio through texts".

⁴²⁵ See *Laur.* 87-8: *currit in amplexus, quotiens libet ire per umbras/ etheri nemoris, nostros mea lesbia Saphos;* and 111-14: *quis celum primus dederit, quis sydera celo,/ quis frondes silvis prestet, quis semina rerum,/ fortunas nemorum cantataque damna tropheis/ designat radio Pallas pulcherrima nobis*. As we will discuss in our analysis of *Saphos* below, these are also key themes of Boccaccio's *Genealogie* 14 and 15.

⁴²⁶ For the sake of convention, I will henceforth adopt Boccaccio's spelling "Saphos" to refer to the character of his eclogue, while maintaining the standard English "Sappho" to denote the poet from Lesbos. Note, however, that Boccaccio does not make such distinction in his works – whether allegorical or historical, he always spells "Saphos" with one *p*.

works (*Epistola* 19.18, *Laurea* 87, and *Genealogia* 4.44.6), it seems very unlikely, if not altogether impossible, that he had ever read any of her original poems or fragments.⁴²⁷ Moreover, considering Boccaccio's enthusiastic but all-too-narrow familiarity with Greek language and literature, it is even more improbable that he had any contact with, say, the production of Antipater of Sidon (fl. ca. 100 BCE). In two of his extant epigrams, Antipater praised Sappho as a skilful singer who was able to inspire the goddesses of inspiration themselves; and he famously pleaded that she be given the place of a tenth Muse – an idea which, to some extent, reverberates in Boccaccio's eclogue.⁴²⁸

It is more reasonable to suppose that Boccaccio derived his knowledge of Sappho partly from his private Greek teacher and friend Leontius Pilatus (whom he had met in the early 1360s);⁴²⁹ and partly from diverse testimonies or brief mentions in Latin, like those of Cicero (*In Verrem* 2.4.125-7), Horace (*Odes* 2.13.25, and *Epistle* 1.19.28), Servius (on *Aen.* 3.274.11, 6.21.6, 42.6, and on *Georg.* 1.31.14), Jerome's translation of Eusebius (*Chronicon, Olympiad* 45.1), Isidore (*Etymologiae* 1.39.6), and especially Ovid's *Heroides* 15 (but also Ovid *Ars amatoria* 3.331, *Remedia amoris* 761, and *Tristia* 2.1.365-6).⁴³⁰ Furthermore, we cannot underestimate the role that the various legends, ideas and clichés about Sappho, running from Antiquity up until the fourteenth century, played on Boccaccio's (as well as in other poets')

⁴²⁷ Sappho's Fragment 1 appeared "in a very early printed edition of Dionysius of Halicarnassus produced in Venice by Aldus Manutius in 1508, and Fragment 31 in the first printed edition of Longinus' *On the Sublime* made in 1554" – Reynolds (2000: 84). It was around the same time these texts started to circulate again that the *editio princeps* of Catullus' *Liber* (a key source for the reception and indirect transmission of Sappho's poetry) was published, in 1472, in Venice – see Wiseman, "Catullus", in *Brill's New Pauly* (2006). Most of Sappho's extant fragments were found at the end of the nineteenth century, during the excavations at Oxyrhynchus. On the reception and transmission of Sappho in Roman Antiquity and beyond, see Greene (1996), Reynolds (2000), Hunter (2019: 45-60), Thorsen & Harrison (eds., 2019).

⁴²⁸ See *Greek Anthology* 7.14, and 9.66 (quoted in Penrose Jr., 2014: 416); see also Reynolds (2000: 70).

⁴²⁹ See *Gen.* 15.6.9; and Introduction, "Dating the *Buccolicum carmen*".

⁴³⁰ Sappho's fictional letter to Phaon was intriguingly not included in the two earliest medieval manuscripts of Ovid's *Heroides* (*Codex Parisinus* 8242 and *Codex Etonensis*), and this contributed to the questioning of its authenticity (a hypothesis which has been refuted by Thorsen, 2014). Yet, it was included in a third manuscript, the *Codex Francofurtanus*, dated to the thirteenth century – see Reynolds (2000: 82). On Ovid's *Heroides* 15 and Boccaccio's *De mulieribus* 47, see Juliani (2016).

imagination of her.⁴³¹ By drawing from these widespread sources, either omitting or highlighting some details for his own purposes, Boccaccio was able to formulate, quite independently from the texts of Sappho, two different – though to some extent similar – versions of the Greek lyricist: Sappho-the-poet and Sappho-as-poetry.

In the *De mulieribus*, Boccaccio describes Sappho as a young woman born from an honourable and illustrious family (*ex honestis atque claris parentibus genitam*, 47.1). Gifted with a special soul, but not content with simply knowing how to “put letters together” (*non contenta solum literas iungere novisse*, 2), she was compelled by an intense fervour and a strong intellect to ascend the heights of Parnassus (*ampliori fervore animi et ingenii suasa vivacitate... Parnasi vertice celso... immiscuit*, 2). Then, at a very early age, she traversed a wood of bay trees and withdrew to Apollo’s temple, daring to take up Phoebus’ plectrum, play the cithara and compose melodies that even the most learned men perceived as difficult (*studiossimis viris difficilia plurimum visa sunt*, 2). Thus, it is no surprise that Sappho became so renowned, surpassing the greatest kings, popes and conquerors in honour (*non clariora sunt regum dyademata, non pontificum infule, nec etiam triumphantium lauree*, 3). Yet, though Sappho was extremely successful in the realm of art, she was miserable in love (*uti feliciter studuit, sic infelici amore capta est*, 4), as she burned with passion for a youth who did not reciprocate her feelings.⁴³² As we will see throughout this chapter, even though they are not directly connected, Boccaccio’s bucolic version of Sappho nevertheless shares some features with the biographical Sappho from the *De mulieribus*. Indeed, both of them are associated with bays and Apollo, and more particularly with the idea (ostensibly originating with Boccaccio) that they chose to live in isolation on the top of Parnassus. The indication of unrequited love,

⁴³¹ On the legends based on Sappho, see Gallavotti (1947: 27-52), and Penrose Jr. (2014: 415-36). Petrarch alludes to Sappho in his *Triumphus Cupidinis* 4.25; *De remediis utriusque fortune* 1.69; *Ad Familiares* 21.8.6, and 24.10.2-3, and also in his *Bucolicum carmen* 10.89-91.

⁴³² See Ov. *Her.* 15.

however, is evidently omitted from the highly idealised description of the allegorical Saphos – in fact, it is the boy Aristeus who falls desperately in love with her in the eclogue.

In his *Epistola* 23, Boccaccio explicitly indicates that, by Saphos, he understands poetry. As for the two speakers of the eclogue, Caliope and Aristeus, Boccaccio reveals to da Signa that the first name means “good sound” (*bona sonoritas*), while the second refers to himself:

Duodecima egloga titulatur *Saphos*, eo quod de hac Saphu omnis sermo sit egloge; quam ego Saphon pro poesi intelligo, eo quod Saphos, puella quedam lesbia, plurimum evo suo in poesi valuerit. Collocutores autem duo sunt, Caliopes et Aristeus. Pro Caliope, ut alias est dictum, pro “bona sonoritate” accipio, eo quod in bona prolatione modulis regulata poeticis omnis videatur poetice fere vis consistere. Aristeum pro me pono avidum ad poeticam devenire, et ideo “Aristeum” me nomino ab Aristeo quodam, qui usque ad adolescentiam suam linguam adeo impeditam habuit, ut vix posset aliquid satis exprimere plene; demum, solutis lingue nexibus, eloquens factus est. (*Ep.* 23.23-4)

By saying that he has already explained the meaning of *Caliopes* elsewhere (*ut alias est dictum*), Boccaccio refers to a previous passage of the same letter, where he commented on his eclogue 5, *Silva cadens*, and offered the same etymology of “good sound” for his male character Caliopus.⁴³³ Boccaccio resorts to this same explanation in his *Esposizioni sopra la Comedia di Dante*, where he mentions Fulgentius (460–533 CE) as the main source for his account of the Muses.⁴³⁴ Indeed, in his *Mitologiarum libri*, Fulgentius explained that the name “Calliope” indicated the Muse with the best voice (*nona Calliope, id est optimae vocis*, 1.15). A very similar notion is displayed in Petrarch’s eclogue 2, *Amor pastorius*, with which Boccaccio’s *Saphos* notably engages on a thematic level. There, Calliope is implicitly invoked

⁴³³ *Ep.* 23.10 (see Introduction, “The *Buccolicum carmen*: summary and allegory”). Boccaccio consistently drops one *l* from the classical name “Calliope”, probably on the basis of his etymological understanding of the word, as he derived *Caliope* from καλός/καλή – see Perini (1994: 1035-6).

⁴³⁴ *Espos.* 2.1.28-9 – see Auzzas (1992: 840, n. 14). Boccaccio also mentions Caliopes/Caliopè at *Com. Ninf.* 35.90, *Tes.* 12.72.8, *Carm.* 1.36, *Ep.* 4.12, *Bucc.* 14.120, *Gen.* 5.12.4-5, 7.20.7, 11.2.9; and its respective adjective, *caliopeus*, at *Ep.* 1.1.6, 2.5.14, and *Petr.* 10.

as the Muse who stands out from her sisters because of her sweetest voice: *una sonantior omni/ex numero* (Petr. *Buc.* 2.92-3).

What is more, Boccaccio's Caliope strikingly shares some features with Propertius' Calliope, from Propertius 3.3. In this poem – which Boccaccio may have known through Petrarch – the Propertian narrator is advised by Calliope not to sing of arms, wars and deaths (thus evidently indicating the epic genre), but rather of lovers and their romantic strategies (thus implying erotic elegy).⁴³⁵ Boccaccio's *Saphos* evokes and, at the same time, subverts the content of Propertius' poem, since there Caliope actually tries to diminish the vulgar poetry of Aristeus (though in this case, what is at issue is not so much the genre of the composition, but rather its language and readership). Finally, Aristeus' description of Caliope's beautiful and divine appearance, in line 82 of *Saphos* (*nam gestu facieque deam verbisque fateris*), also alludes to a passage from the Propertian poem, where the narrator plays upon the false Greek etymology κόλλος ("beauty") + ὄψις ("face"): *e quarum numero me contigit una dearum/ (ut reor a facie, Calliopea fuit)* (Prop. 3.3.37-8).

As for Aristeus (classical Latin: Aristaeus), Boccaccio briefly describes him in the passage from *Epistola* 23 above as a man who was tongue-tied during adolescence and afterwards became eloquent. Yet, in *Genealogia* 5.13, Boccaccio offers a more detailed exposition on this semi-mythical figure. Drawing mostly on Justin, Boccaccio explains that Cyrus, king of the island of Coramis, had a son named Battus due to a stammer (*propter linguae oblicationem*, *Gen.* 5.13.2).⁴³⁶ Seeking advice about his son's condition, Cyrus went to the Delphic oracle, where he discovered that Battus, in order to gain full use of his tongue, should travel to Africa and found the city of Cyrene there. Since his home island was extremely

⁴³⁵ See Prop. 3.39-50. On Petrarch's knowledge of Propertius, see Gavinelli (2006: 397-415). For a more general discussion on the influence of Propertius in Petrarch's *Canzoniere*, see also Mann (2000: 17-42, esp. 27).

⁴³⁶ Extant information about Justin, the second-century epitomator of Pompeius Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae*, is scarce – see, for instance, the brief notes of Conte on him (1994: 551-2). At Just. 13.7.1-2, Battus is conversely described as the son of Grinus, King of Thera: *Battos propter linguae oblicationem fuit. Huius pater Grinus, rex Therae insulae*. The Liddell-Scott Greek Lexicon defines βάρτος as "stammerer, lisper".

isolated, though, Cyrus was unable to send off colonists to the place indicated by the oracle immediately. But after some time there was a plague, so a few of his countrymen were forced to sail, in a single ship commanded by Battus, to Africa. Upon arriving there, the crew decided to settle on Mount Cyra, where Battus finally had the knots of his tongue loosened (*solutis lingue nodis*). Mindful of the oracular promises, he decided to found the city of Cyrene there. Only afterwards, people made up the story that the nymph Cyrene was raped by Apollo, and taken to that same mount which had been previously colonised by Battus. There, she was impregnated by the god, and gave birth to four sons, among whom was Aristeus.⁴³⁷ Boccaccio does not dismiss the latter version completely (*in hac nil fere fictionis est*, 5.13.5). However, he clarifies that Cyrene was actually the daughter of Speus, King of Thessaly; and that, while Aristeus' brothers decided to return to Thessaly, Aristeus himself ruled over a large territory of Arcadia. There, he taught the people how to keep bees and produce honey, as well as to make cheese and olive oil. Thus, according to Boccaccio, Virgil's version of Aristeus' (Aristaeus') story in the fourth *Georgic* was not completely absurd (*non absurde Virgilius fabulam Aristei, de recuperatione apium, in fine Georgicorum descripsit*).⁴³⁸

Both these aspects of Aristeus (namely, his connection to Battus, and his symbolic association with virtue) are conflated in *Saphos*. In it Aristeus is portrayed as a man who once had his tongue tied, but now is trying to convert his vulgar passions into sublime ones through eloquence.⁴³⁹ Strikingly, the first idea is also reminiscent of Petrarch's *Amor pastorius*, whose protagonist Stupeus (representing Petrarch) is initially described as inarticulate; but afterwards, encouraged by Calliope, he loses his fear of speaking: *tremor omnis abibat/ posse loqui* (95-

⁴³⁷ Boccaccio seems to have a special interest in the figure of Aristeus, as he mentions him not only in the *Buccolicum* and *Genealogie* (5.12-16; 7.9, 28, 65; 14.10), but also in the *Esposizioni* (4.1.318-9), and, more briefly, in the *De casibus* (1.6.6), and *De montibus* ("Hemus").

⁴³⁸ Though Boccaccio does not mention the Virgilian episode of Aristeus pursuing Eurydice in vain in *Genealogia* 5.13, he does this in *Genealogia* 5.12 (on Orpheus), where he allegorically links Aristeus to virtue, and Eurydice to the earthly desires – see *Gen.* 5.12.7: [*Euridicem*] *per prata vagantem, id est per temporalia desideria, amat Aristeus, id est virtus, que eam in laudabilia desideria trahere cupit*.

⁴³⁹ See *Gen.* 5.12.8: *cum naturalis concupiscentia ad inferos, id est circa terrena, omnino lapsa est, vir prudens eloquentia, id est demonstrationibus veris, eam conatur ad superiora, id est ad virtuosam, reducere*.

6). Then, the idea of pursuing a nobler love is also present in Petrarch's eclogue, as well as in his *Collatio laureationis*, which both allude to Virgil's *Georgics* 3. At *Georgics* 3.291-2, the Virgilian poet-narrator autofictionally says that, "over the lonely slopes of Parnassus", he was "driven by sweet love" (*sed me Parnasi deserta per ardua dulcis/ raptat amor*).⁴⁴⁰ Petrarch famously quotes and comments on these Virgilian verses in his *Collatio*; and alludes to them in Stupeus' speech to Dane, in lines 46-7 of *Amor pastorius*: *sed cogit amor, perque ardua vinctum/ luctantemque rapit*. To a greater or lesser degree, Boccaccio's *Saphos* thematically interacts with all these works.

The bay

Just as in *Galla* and *Alceus*, *Saphos* starts *in medias res*, with a question: Caliope interrogates Aristeus as to what he, *stultissimus puer*, is doing among her sacred bays, without the consent of Quiris:

Quid, puer, has inter lauros, stultissime, queris,
nunc has nunc illas carpens? Temerarie, nescis
sacrilegum violare nemus nisi conscia Quiris
optatas frondes merito concesserit ante?
(*Saph.* 1-4)

Quiris, in line 3, probably refers to Rome – and not to Juno, as proposed by Smarr.⁴⁴¹ As Perini observed, in this context, *conscia Quiris* seems to refer to the authority of Rome in the laureation of both emperors and poets – as previously suggested also in Boccaccio's eclogue 9, *Lipis*: *his Quiris veteri sancivit lege coronas* (l. 90).⁴⁴² The Latin word *Quirites* (less

⁴⁴⁰ See Perkell (1989: 60); and Looney (2009: 131-140).

⁴⁴¹ See Smarr (1987: 129): "What seek you, foolish boy, among these laurels,/ plucking now these, now those? Do you not know,/ bold fellow, that to violate this grove is sacrilege unless, conscious of merit,/ Juno before has granted the wished-for leaves?". Smarr's confusion was probably with *Quiritis*, a common surname of Juno – see term "Curritis", in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.

⁴⁴² See Perini (1994: 1031). Curiously, in this case, Smarr (p. 93) translates *Quiris* as "Rome": "to these men/ Rome consecrated crowns by ancient law".

frequently applied in its singular form, *Quiris*) was not only employed as a toponym strictly (meaning citizens of the Sabine town of Cures), but it was also used in collective sense to indicate citizens of Rome, as at Virgil *Georgics* 4.201.⁴⁴³ Hence, in the passage above, Caliope's reproaching Aristeus for his audacity in plucking bay-leaves without Quiris' approval could be initially understood as Boccaccio's self-blaming for pursuing a poetic career without the prospect of receiving official recognition from Rome. In this way, Boccaccio distances himself from the laureate poets Albertino Mussato (crowned at Padua, in December 1315) and Zanobi da Strada (Pisa, May 1355); but more especially from Petrarch, whose coronation at the Roman Capitol, in April of 1341, was championed in Boccaccio's *De vita et moribus Domini Francisci Petracchi*.⁴⁴⁴

Yet, the act of distancing himself from those poets and presenting himself almost as an outsider (or rather, like Aristeus in the eclogue, an intruder in the realm of poetry) could be seen from two different angles. On the one hand, throughout his works, Boccaccio deliberately adopts the attitude of an irrevocable neophyte. This attitude was sometimes followed by resentment, sometimes by pride and contempt. As we have seen in the Introduction ("Boccaccio through texts"), in *Genealogia* 15 Boccaccio lamented the fact that, despite him showing a natural inclination for poetry since he was a child, he was not allowed to study Latin language and literature until he was a grown man; and, for this reason, he would never be able to compete with his fellow writers who had received a classical education from the cradle.⁴⁴⁵ Nevertheless, from his lower position, Boccaccio was able to foresee the dangers and

⁴⁴³ See Serv. *ad G.* 4.201.1: *Quirites, cum proprie Romani sint*; and also Bocc. *Gen.* 9.41: *Plinius tamen, ubi De viris illustribus, dicit Romulum a Curibus, Sabinorum oppido, Romanos appellasse Quirites*. Note that Boccaccio is here referring to the *Liber de viris illustribus urbis Romae* by Pseudo-Pliny, probably written in the fourth century, and extremely popular in the Middle Ages – see discussion on the authorship and dating of this work in Sage (1980: 83-100); and for the specific passage quoted by Boccaccio, see *De vir. ill.* (ed. Sherwin, 1973), p. 6. For Quiris as a toponym, see Virg. *Aen.* 7.710, Livy 1.24.5.3, 1.32.11.3 etc., and Ov. *Met.* 15.572, *Fasti* 1.69 etc.

⁴⁴⁴ See Bocc. *Petr.* 15. Boccaccio briefly mentions Mussato's tragedy *Ecerinis* at *Espos.* 12.lit.99, and he had also copied and glossed Giovanni del Virgilio's eclogue to Mussato into his Zibaldone Laurenziano (Plut. 29.8, 46v–50r) – see Papio (2009: 693, n. 50), and Lorenzini (2011: 175-210).

⁴⁴⁵ See *Gen.* 15.10.7.

constraints to which these other poets were exposed at the height of success. Though he himself had once wished to become a court poet in Naples – and was utterly disappointed when Zanobi was appointed to that role –, Boccaccio later cherished his poetic autonomy and rejected any kind of servile relationship to a patron.⁴⁴⁶ He ultimately took this liberty as an ethical principle. As an example of this, in his *Epistola* 10 (1353), Boccaccio boldly criticised his master Petrarch, suggesting that the latter was a hypocrite for defending a virtuous life in his writings, while shamefully associating himself with Giovanni Visconti, the so-called “tyrant” of Milan. In consonance with this attitude, moreover, Boccaccio usually preferred to dedicate his works (among which, the *Buccolicum*) to close friends rather than to royal or other prominent political figures.⁴⁴⁷

On the other hand, while lamenting that he was not able to compete with the great poets of his times, Boccaccio actually expresses, between the lines, a desire to be like them. To loosely paraphrase Boccaccio’s own words about Petrarch, in *Genealogia* 14.10, it would be absurd to think that a poet would spend so much of his time and effort writing poetry just for pleasure (or, as we would say, making “art for art’s sake”), without any expectation of honour, whether material or symbolic.⁴⁴⁸ Thus, even if Boccaccio considered it nearly impossible for him to achieve the crown (or at least that is what he advocated), the mere challenge of pursuing it seemed worthy to him – and that is exactly what he, dressed up as Aristeus, does in *Saphos*. Indeed, for the medieval Christian poet, poetry was not an end in itself, but rather a noble means to obtain wisdom and, ultimately, the knowledge that was thought to be paramount in the salvation of the soul. As illustrated by Dante in *Inferno* 4, through their wisdom and honour

⁴⁴⁶ On Boccaccio and Zanobi, see our comments on *Midas* in the Introduction (“The *Buccolicum carmen*: summary and allegory”).

⁴⁴⁷ Boccaccio’s disdainful attitude towards patronage was pinpointed early by his biographers. Leonardo Bruni, for instance, said about him: “tenere fu di natura e disdegnoso, la qual cosa guastò molto i fatti suoi, perché né da sé aveva, né d’essere appresso a’ principi e signori ebbe sofferenza” (“he was delicate by nature and disdainful, which damaged his affairs very much, because he did not have by him, and could not suffer to have near him, princes or noblemen” – in Daniels, 2018: 55-6). See also *Gen.* 15.13.3. Particularly on Boccaccio’s *Epistola* 10, see Fonseca Jr. (2020a: 117-28).

⁴⁴⁸ See *Gen.* 14.10.5; and discussion in Introduction.

alone, some of the ancient poets were spared from severe punishments in hell, and their names gained heaven's grace, even though they were not Christians.⁴⁴⁹ Similarly, in his *Epistola* 7 (1351), Boccaccio claimed that, through the study of poetry, a mortal man could achieve immortality – and by “immortality” he meant more than just an enduring fame on earth (as implied, for instance, in Horace's *monumentum aere perennius*). Like Dante and Petrarch, Boccaccio was concerned with the continuation of life in heaven, too.⁴⁵⁰ Partly engaging with a classical (mostly Ciceronian) discussion about the relationship between virtue and glory, this notion is further elaborated (through fiction) in the *Buccolicum*.⁴⁵¹ As we will see in this and following chapter, the search for poetry in *Saphos*, though essentially rooted in an earthly desire, serves as an important step towards the heavenly journey of *Phyllostropos*.

In the light of these considerations, the association between the bays (*inter lauros*, *Saph.* 1) and Rome (*Quiris*, 3), at the beginning of *Saphos*, might be interpreted as Boccaccio's first attempt to compose “divine” poetry in Latin, fuelled by (but not limited to) his desire for honour.⁴⁵² Indeed, Aristeus appears as a bold young man who dares to enter the higher realms of poetry uninvited. Though aware of his own inexperience, he nevertheless feels compelled to pick three tiny leaves from Caliope's bay, and have at least a little taste of the poetic glory: *o scelus! ex minimis tris forsitan captus odore/ excerptsi* (5-6). Within this allegorical framework, the fact that Aristeus plucks three leaves might be seen as a symbolic gesture too, though its

⁴⁴⁹ See Dante *Inf.* 4.76-8: “L'onrata nominanza/ che di lor suona sù ne la tua vita,/ grazia acquista in ciel che sì li avanza”; and Bocc. *Espos.* 4.lit.80-6. On the idea of poets as wise – such as Virgil was viewed in the Middle Ages – see Comparetti (1997: esp. 96-103).

⁴⁵⁰ See Hor. *Odes* 3.30.1; and Bocc. *Ep.* 7.8: *qui e mortalibus immortales se fecerunt... hii divini atque excellentissimi studii viribus ac pallentibus oculis*. On Horace's *monumentum exegi* topos in Boccaccio and Petrarch, see Usher (2007a: 1-30).

⁴⁵¹ See, for instance, Cic. *Tusc.* 1.45.109: *etsi enim nihil habet in se gloria cur expetatur, tamen virtutem tamquam umbra sequitur*; and Off. 2.42: *omni igitur ratione colenda et retinenda iustitia est cum ipsa per sese (nam aliter iustitia non esset), tum propter amplificationem honoris et gloriae* – discussion in Sullivan (1941: 382-91), Hardie (2012: 1-47), Chang (2013: 110-34). See also Sen. *Ep.* 79.13, and Petr. *Fam.* 1.2.25 – discussion in Morganti & Araújo (2016: 59-82).

⁴⁵² It is worth noting that, already in one of his very first extant letters (*Epistola* 2, dated to 1339), Boccaccio presented a fictional narrative where he encountered a Lady near the tomb of Virgil, in Naples. As I have argued in an article, this Lady (like *Saphos*, in the eclogue) could be interpreted as an allegorical representation of poetry – see Fonseca Jr. (2020: 119-22); and Introduction, “Boccaccio through works”.

meaning cannot be immediately recovered. Is it perhaps an allegorical reference to Virgil, Dante and Petrarch, the three main poet-guides who instigated Boccaccio to pursue a poetic career, and even venture into the bucolic genre?⁴⁵³ Or could it be an indication of the holy trinity, in which Boccaccio wishes to partake through poetry?⁴⁵⁴ Or maybe a deliberate mixture of the two? In any case, Caliope's disapproval marks a gap between Aristeus' ambition and his immaturity, both in literary and spiritual terms.

More generally, the image of the bay, besides its links with the official ceremonies of laureation, evokes a significant passage from the *Trattatello in laude di Dante*, where Boccaccio narrates the prophetic dream of Dante's mother.⁴⁵⁵ Partly alluding to the oracular dream of Virgil's mother from Suetonius-Donatus' *Vita Virgilii* 3, Boccaccio recounts there that Dante's mother once dreamed that she was giving birth to a boy at the foot of a very tall bay; and that this bay was an augury of the future honour and eloquence of her son.⁴⁵⁶ It is worth noting, however, that Dante (an exile from 1302 until his death, in 1321) never actually received the laurel crown. In fact, as discussed in the Introduction, Dante's bucolic correspondence with Giovanni del Virgilio (initiated around 1319) served as a kind of statement, both of pride and courage.⁴⁵⁷ For one thing, Dante (who was probably finishing the *Paradiso* then) did not bend himself to the demands of a conservative elite, Latin educated readership. Standing firm in his project of finishing the *Commedia*, he refused to devote himself

⁴⁵³ Boccaccio mentions Virgil, Dante and Petrarch together in *Gen.* 14.10.

⁴⁵⁴ The number three had theological, astronomical and arithmetic symbolism. It was considered a perfect number representing the beginning, the middle and the end – see Isidore, *De numerorum* 4, “De ternario numero”. The relevance of the number three in Dante's *Commedia* has been amply discussed – see Bufano & Saroli (1970: n.p.), Hopper (1938: 136-201), Logan (1971: 95-8), and Kaske (1988: 164). As we know, Dante's poem was written in *terza rima*, was divided into three books (*Inferno*, *Purgatorio*, *Paradiso*), and presented three influential guides (Virgil, Beatrice and Bernard). Moreover, at *Par.* 14.28-30, we find an explicit reference to the Trinitarian symbolism: “Quell'uno e due e tre che sempre vive/ e regna sempre in tre e 'n due e 'n uno, / non circunscritto, e tutto circunscribe”. Similarly, in his allegorical *Amorosa visione*, Boccaccio used the metrical pattern of the *terza rima*, opened the book with three acrostic sonnets and presented three important figures throughout the narrator's journey (the Lady guide and the two young men who end up diverting him from the right path).

⁴⁵⁵ *Tratt.* (1) 212.

⁴⁵⁶ See *VSD* 3: *Praegnans eum mater somniavit enixam se laureum ramum*; and Kirkham (1992: 241-2).

⁴⁵⁷ See Introduction, “Genre”.

to the writing of an epic (or perhaps another grandiloquent poem) in Latin, which would immediately bring him honour and approval.⁴⁵⁸ Thus, by replying to del Virgilio with a humble eclogue, Dante re-affirmed his poetic autonomy in the face of his critics, while also proposing “new” literary standards based on the Romans’ own engagement with the Greeks. As a result, Dante ultimately promoted a different type of poetic *cursus* from that of Mussato, one that was less dependent on the external approval of some narrow-minded authorities. Recognising his own *Commedia* as elevated, Dante crowned himself with a symbolic (rather than a real) bay wreath.⁴⁵⁹ In Boccaccio’s *Saphos*, Aristeus (impudently) tries to achieve the same honour by himself.

The oak

Aristeus apologises to Caliope for his crime. He immediately perceives her divine aspect; but, just like Aeneas before Venus in *Aeneid* 1, he is unsure whether the woman in front of him is a nymph or a goddess.⁴⁶⁰ As a compensation for having plucked some leaves from her bay, he naively invites Caliope to go and shake his own oaks, and gather all the acorns she wants. Yet, the very suggestion that his oak trees can be in any way compared to her bays outrages Caliope. Evoking the influential Sermon on the Mount – where Jesus teaches his disciples not to cast pearls before swine –, Caliope insinuates that Aristeus is unworthy of her precious bay leaves, and should content himself with his rustic acorns.⁴⁶¹ While these are destined for pigs, her bays are reserved for select poets:

⁴⁵⁸ See Raffa (1996: 271-91).

⁴⁵⁹ See *Par.* 1.26-7: “e coronarmi de le foglie/ che la materia e tu mi farai degno”; and also *Par.* 25.1-12, and *Bocc. Carm.* 3.5-7 (*Ytalie iam certus honos*): *nec tibi sit durum versus vidisse poete / exulis... / frondibus ac nullis redimiti*.

⁴⁶⁰ See *Aen.* 1.328-9: *o, dea certe! / an Phoebi soror? an Nympharum sanguinis una?*; and also *Petr. Buc.* 2 (*Amor pastorius*) 11: *dubius hominemne deamne viderem*; *Bocc. Rim.* 4.9: “angela forse, o ninfa, o dea”.

⁴⁶¹ *Vulg. Mat.* 7:6: *nolite dare sanctum canibus, neque mittatis margaritas vestras ante porcos, ne forte conculcent eas pedibus suis, et conversi dirumpant vos*. Giovanni del Virgilio alludes to this same biblical passage in his *Eclogue* 1: *nec margaritas profliga prodigus apris, / nec preme Castalias indigna veste sorores; / at, precor, ora cie quae te distinguere possint / carmine vatisono, sorti communis utrique* (*Giov. Virg.-Dante, Ecl.* 1.21-4). In this case, however, Giovanni del Virgilio is suggesting that Dante is above most of the unlearned readers of the

Arist. Seu nympha loci seu sis dea, nostras
 excute tu quercus ac omnes collige glandes.
Cal. Cogis ut in risum veniam. Sic, obsecro, quercus
 equiparas lauris? Non illas Iuppiter olim
 extulit in tantum, quanquam sibi prisca dicarit
 illas religio. Nescis, stolidissime, porcis
 servantur glandes et laureaserta poetis?
 quos nemori fontique sacro pulchrisque Camenis
 et cytharis plectrisque suis prefecit Apollo.
 (*Saph.* 6-14)

In Virgil's *Eclogues*, the oak tree (*quercus*) is sometimes accompanied by adjectives of hardness, such as *dura* (4.30 and 8.52) and *rigida* (6.68); but there is one instance where it is described as *sacra*, in *Eclogue* 7 (*eque sacra resonant examina quercu*, 13). Indeed, in ancient Roman literature (particularly in Virgil), the characterization of the oak as sacred was not unusual.⁴⁶² At *Georgics* 3.332, this tree stood out as lofty, ancient and worthy of Jove (*magna Iovis antiquo robore quercus*).⁴⁶³ Then, in *Aeneid* 4, Aeneas, because of his determination to follow his mission and abandon Dido, was compared to an oak tree, with its roots firmly grounded on earth and resistant to the most severe winds.⁴⁶⁴ Finally, it is significant that, in *Aeneid* 8, Venus chooses to leave the arms for Aeneas beneath an oak tree.⁴⁶⁵ Likewise, in the passage from Boccaccio's *Saphos* above, Caliope herself recognises that, "in the ancient religion" (*prisca... religio*, 10-11), the oak was consecrated to Jupiter (at Dodona); nonetheless, its value never matched that of the bay laurel – and this idea also resonates with classical texts.

Since Antiquity, the sacredness of the oak was perceived as rather different from the sacredness of the bay. Whereas the oak tree had "earthly" connotations, associated with its tough bark and nutritious acorns, the bay tree had "heavenly" connotations, associated with its

Commedia, whom he refers to as wild boars. Because of this, Dante should aim at a higher type of poetry, to distinguish himself from the common rabble. See Introduction, "Gemre"; and also Petr. *Contr. Med.* 3.192.

⁴⁶² In other of his eclogues, Boccaccio also applies the adjective *sacra* to qualify the oak – see *Bucc.* 4 (*Dorus*), 84, and 7 (*Iurgium*), 112; but also 5 (*Silva cadens*), 31: *quercubus insignis*.

⁴⁶³ See also *Ecl.* 1.17 (*de caelo... quercus*), and *Ov. Met.* 7.623 (*sacra Iovi quercus*) – Cucchiarelli (2017: 482).

⁴⁶⁴ *Aen.* 4.441-9; see discussion in O'Hara (2012: 351).

⁴⁶⁵ *Aen.* 8.616; see also *Aen.* 10.423, *Liv.* 1.10, and *Plin. HN* 16.6-7 – Lowe (2011: 115-17).

ornamental character and evergreen leaves.⁴⁶⁶ Thus, on the one hand, Virgil and Ovid conceived of acorns as the food of primitive man, subsequently replaced by grain, after Ceres taught humans how to plough the earth with iron. In this framework, then, even though the oak retained its status as a sacred tree (mostly associated with the oracular oaks of Dodona, the site of a sanctuary of Zeus/Jupiter, in Epirus), the act of shaking oaks for food was seen as a degrading sign of poverty, hunger and bestiality.⁴⁶⁷ Particularly at *Georgics* 2.72 and 520, Virgil referred to acorns as food for pigs. The passage from *Saphos* engages with this same tradition, while also anticipating the motif of the swineherd, considered to be the lowest of all the pastoral occupations.⁴⁶⁸

The bay, on the other hand, was connected to all things sublime and immortal. The connection between the bay tree and Apollo can be traced as far back as the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (7th to 6th centuries BCE), where it is said that the god gave his oracles “from the bay tree down in the glens of Parnassus” (ἐκ δάφνης γυάλων ὑπο Παρνησοῖο, *h. Ap.* 396). Furthermore, it is emblematic that, in the *Aeneid*, Virgil portrayed Elysium as a “grove fragrant with bays” (*odoratum lauris nemus*, *Aen.* 6.658). Though scholars have proposed different sources and interpretations for this passage, it is possible that Virgil innovatively combined the image of Elysium with that of the garden of Phoebus Apollo (the god of the sun), which was traditionally described as a bay grove.⁴⁶⁹ Similarly, in Boccaccio’s *Saphos*, Caliope’s realm is described as a grove filled with bay trees, whose scent enthralls Aristeus.

⁴⁶⁶ See Plin. *NH* 15.39-40, and 16.3.

⁴⁶⁷ See Virg. *G.* 1.7-8, 159; and Ov. 3.10.9. Seneca also mentions the shaking of oak-trees (and holm-oaks) as a last resource in the event of a famine: *fame laboratur, et manus ad antiqua alimenta porrigitur; qua illex est et quercus, excutitur* (Sen. *Nat.* 3.27.5) – see Mynors (1990).

⁴⁶⁸ There is only one occurrence of *subulcus* in Virgil’s *Eclogues*, namely at *Eclogues* 10.19, among a list of other characters who try to console Gallus. As Klingner observed (1967: 167), the distinct appearance of the *subulci*, as well as of the *upilio* (“herdsman”), in Virgil’s *Eclogue* 10, marks a sharp contrast between these rustic characters and the sophisticated Gallus – see also Lipka (2001: 143). Moreover, Virgil includes himself in that group of rustic characters, as implied by the mention of Menalcas (an autofictional character at *Ecl.* 5.86-7), who comes from a “mast of acorns” (*de glande*, *Ecl.* 10.20); and especially by the use of *ipsi* at *Ecl.* 10.26 (*quem vidimus ipsi*). By referring to Aristeus as a *subulcus* in *Saphos*, then, Boccaccio is portraying himself as a humble poet, while subtly identifying himself with Virgil, too.

⁴⁶⁹ See, for instance, Fontenrose (1943: 278-85), and Horsfall (1993: 156-8).

In sum, like Virgil, Boccaccio contrasts the earthly qualities of the oak with the heavenly qualities of the bay. On a more symbolic level, he opposes the worldly life, devoted to the fulfilment of basic needs (represented by the crude acorns), to a life of literary study, devoted to Apollo and the Muses (associated with the everlasting bay).⁴⁷⁰ Yet, this opposition will be more explicitly advanced in Boccaccio's *Laurea*. There, while the merchant Stilbon proposes to offer his reed-pipes to an oak tree if he wins the competition, the poet Daphnis proposes to offer the same presents to his bay tree.⁴⁷¹

Another relevant point for the present discussion is that Virgil establishes Elysium as the afterlife destination not only for semi-divine heroes (as is the case of Hesiod's Islands of the Blessed and Homer's Elysian Fields, both located in the remotest regions of the Earth); but also for priests and prophet-poets (*vates*), whose words were worthy of Phoebus (*sacerdotes casti... pii vates et Phoebos digna locuti*, *Aen.* 6.661-2).⁴⁷² In this sense, Virgil's text suggests that it is possible to achieve Elysium – the aspired realm of the virtuous souls which Boccaccio takes as the equivalent symbol for Christian heaven, in *Olympia* – also through divine poetry, that is, by making oneself a *vates*. As we will see more carefully, in *Saphos* 18 below, one of Aristeus' aspirations is to meet (and join) the select group of *vates*.

The *vates*

Virgil employs the term *vates* to refer to different characters endowed with prophetic and/or poetic skills, from the shepherd-singer Thyrsis in the *Eclogues*, to the Sybil in the *Aeneid*.⁴⁷³

⁴⁷⁰ See *Gen.* 1.Pr.2.2: *conveneram igitur mecum omnes animi vires et e sublimi mentis speculo omnem fere orbis intuebar ambitum* – discussion in Lummus (2012: 734-5).

⁴⁷¹ *Laur.* 81-2: *Stil. Hos calamos tibi, sacra, damus, si vicero, quercus.// Daph. Tuque, virens semper, nostros, mea laurus, habeto*. This dualistic debate calls to mind Petrarch's *Parthenias* (see Introduction), and also anticipates the final battle between earthly and heavenly desires in Boccaccio's *Phylostropos* (see Chapter 4).

⁴⁷² See Hes. *WD* 166-73, and Hom. *Od.* 4.561-8. Note, however, that Pindar (*Ode* 2.58-83) devotes his Island of the Blessed to those who remained virtuous after passing through both the realms of earth and Hades for a total of six times. As Harrison (2015: 169-94) has observed, Virgil's inclusion of priests, prophets and poets in the Underworld of *Aeneid* 6 points to the Orphic hexameter tradition.

⁴⁷³ See *Aen.* 6.12, 65, 78 etc., and *Ecl.* 7.27: *baccare frontem/ cingite, ne vati noceat mala lingua futuro*. Note that Thyrsis chooses to crown himself with foxglove, a charm against the "evil tongue" that could impede him from

Particularly at *Aeneid* 7.41, Virgil calls himself a *vates*, consequently placing himself in the same category as those divinely inspired figures and semi-mythical poets, such as Orpheus and Musaeus, whom Aeneas had previously encountered in Elysium (*Aen.* 6.645 and 667).⁴⁷⁴ As Hardie has observed, Virgil connects the word *vates* to the notion of a primitive poet-theologus, and thus proposes, alongside other Augustan poets (especially Horace), “the romantic reconstruction of an imagined ideal of the poet in the remote past”.⁴⁷⁵ This concept of the *vates*-poet will have an important place in early humanist writings and revalorizations of poetry. In his *Collatio laureationis*, for instance, Petrarch clearly established links between poetry, divine inspiration, and the remote past (which he traced back to the ancient Greeks and Romans).⁴⁷⁶

In the *Genealogie*, we can see how all these intertwined ideas about the bay, Phoebus and the *vates* similarly operate in Boccaccio’s poetical framework. In *Genealogia* 7.29, Boccaccio expounds the myth of Daphne (Dane), the nymph transformed into a bay tree (Δάφνη, “bay”) while she tried to escape from Phoebus Apollo.⁴⁷⁷ Boccaccio draws on Isidore and Rabanus to establish an etymological association between the Latin words *laurus* and *laudo* (“to praise”), which explained why both the honourable emperors and poets of Rome were crowned with bay leaves (*Gen.* 7.29.7).⁴⁷⁸ Because of its evergreen leaves, the bay symbolised

becoming a *vates* in the future. See also *Ecl.* 9.32-4. For other Virgilian uses of *vates*, see the relevant entry in the *Virgil Concordance* (ed. Warwick, 1975).

⁴⁷⁴ Note that, intertextually engaging with Virgil’s *Aeneid* 6, Boccaccio’s eclogue 14 (*Olympia*) similarly suggests that Boccaccio himself (represented as Silvius) might inhabit Elysium after death – see Fonseca Jr. (2016a; 2016b). In the same poem, Codrus (Christ) is described as crowned with both laurel and oak (*lauro quercuque refulgens*, 104), thus symbolising the union of his human and divine natures (hypostasis).

⁴⁷⁵ Hardie (1986: 16). On the concept of *vates* from Antiquity to the Renaissance, see also Newman (1967), Gordon (1968: 31-101), Greenfield (1981: 25-8), Boyle (1991: 44-73), Usher (2013: 147-74), and Witt (2015: 450-61).

⁴⁷⁶ See especially Petr. *Coll. laur.* 2.7 (drawing on Cic. *Arch.* 8.18-19): *Quanta, inquam, sit naturaliter difficultas propositi mei ex hoc apparet quod, cum in ceteris artibus studio et labore possit ad terminum perveniri, in arte poetica secus est, in qua nil agitur sine interna quadam et divinitus in animum vatis infusa vi*; and 9.5 (quoting Macr. *In Somn.* 2.10.11): *Homerus, divinarum omnium inventionum fons et origo*. See also discussion on Petrarch and Cicero in Morganti (2019: 151-79).

⁴⁷⁷ See Ov. *Met.* 1.452-567.

⁴⁷⁸ Isid. *Etym.* 17.7.2; Raban. *De univ.* 19.6 (*P.L.* 111.512A) – Zaccaria (1964, vol. 2: 1664). Servius proposes this same etymological connection (*ad Buc.* 8.12.11-12). On the bay crown as the common crown of emperors and poets, see also *Gen.* 14.4.25: *hanc vates semper, laureis insigniti, prosequuntur, hanc imperatores, palmatis induti tunicis*; and Petr. *Coll.* 11.3 (quoted by Boccaccio in *Gen.* 7.29.6).

perennial glory, indestructible by the fire of envy (*sic talium glorie viriditatem ab invidie fulmine ledi non posse*, *Gen.* 7.29.8). Then, Boccaccio speaks of the sacred character of the bay, explaining that Apollo adopted it as his plant because of its hidden properties of divination (*sacra insuper hec arbor Apollini ideo est, eo quod occultam quandam divinationis videatur habere virtutem*, 8). And finally, he reports an ancient superstition, according to which those who slept with a bay leaf beneath their heads could have prophetic dreams inspired by Apollo.⁴⁷⁹

Drawing on Isidore, Boccaccio conceives of the *vates* as a poet who, through the artistic development of a natural and divine inspiration, is able to convey sacred truths in a suitable poetic form and language.⁴⁸⁰ As he suggests at *Genealogia* 14.7.2, a poet must possess both the poetic *furor* and the necessary skill to convert it into writings about wars and fleets, lands and seas, adorned maidens, excellent men, “and many other things” (*et huiusmodi plura*).⁴⁸¹ In this way, like Dante, Boccaccio authorises a variety of genres and styles, expanding the possibilities of poetic creation, without limiting the activity of the *vates* to the loftier genres – an idea which also evokes the concept of the *rota Virgilii*.⁴⁸²

To some extent, this diversity of poetic choices reflects, moreover, the several different symbols associated with Phoebus Apollo. Besides the bay tree, in *Genealogia* 5.3 (on Apollo) Boccaccio lists other seemingly disconnected symbols of Apollo, such as “Hyperborean griffins, the crow, and the bucolic song” (*laurum arborem, et Yperboreas gryphes, et corvum, et buccolicum carmen*, 3). It might be merely coincidental, but nonetheless intriguing, that Boccaccio’s two final literary works were the *Corbaccio* (presumably, the vulgar pejorative

⁴⁷⁹ See Raban. *De univ.* 2.9, 5.5; and also Petr. *Coll.* 11.12.

⁴⁸⁰ See FitzGerald (2017: 79). Like Isidore (*Etym.* 8.7.3), besides *furor*, Boccaccio makes use of words such as *vaticinia* (*Gen.* 14.22.8) and *vis mentis* (14.8.12) to describe the process and source of poetic inspiration.

⁴⁸¹ See Lummus (2015: 66), and Osgood (1930). See discussion on Boccaccio’s notion of poetry and allegory in Introduction.

⁴⁸² See Wilson-Okamura (2010: 90-1).

form of the word “crow”) and the *Buccolicum carmen*.⁴⁸³ What is more, in the eclogue *Faunus*, Pamphylus at some point says to Meris: “let the swineherds worry about the crows;/ let us sing for ourselves, for Mopsus, and for the Muses” (*corvos observent mente subulci;/ nos equidem nobis Mopso Musisque canamus*, 52-3).⁴⁸⁴ In this way, the crow is associated with a lower class of poets (*subulci*) – the same class to which Aristeus belongs in *Saphos*. Elsewhere in the *Buccolicum*, Boccaccio distinguishes these *subulci* from the *pastores* who, though equally humble, can sing of honourable things (and are thus worthy of the bay).⁴⁸⁵

This ample network of connections may help us understand, in the autofictional (and metapoetic) framework of *Saphos*, what Aristeus’ status as a *subulcus* signifies. Through his self-characterisation as a swineherd, Boccaccio presents himself as a mediocre poet, yet one who desires to elevate himself and to become a *vates* through the bucolic genre. Perhaps just like the mythical Daphne transforming herself into the bay tree, Boccaccio saw the bucolic genre as a symbol of transformation from humility to sublimity.⁴⁸⁶

Searching for Saphos

Partly confirming Caliope’s rhetorical question above (*nescis, stolidissime, Saph. 11*), Aristeus realises that he has unwittingly received what he wished for, and confesses his true intention:

⁴⁸³ On the title of *Corbaccio*, see Cassell (1970: 83-91), Hollander (1988: 33-5), Illiano (1991: 13-21), and Zaccarello (2014: 179-94).

⁴⁸⁴ Boccaccio probably draws on Ovid’s version of the myth of Apollo and Coronis (Ov. *Met.* 2.531-632; Bocc. *Gen.* 5.19) to present this image of the crow as a chattering bird, which he associates with verbose and second-hand poetry. See also *Bucc.* 4 (*Dorus*), 143-4; and especially 8 (*Midas*), 132, where the chattering crow (*garula cornix*) appears linked to the oak tree (*e quercu veteri nuper michi garrula cornix*). Just a few lines before, in the latter eclogue, the character Phytias (Boccaccio) had said that he did not intend “to change the brambles into laurels... or to sing of swineherds as gods” (*nolebam vertere vepres/ in lauros, fateor, neque... dives cantare subulcos*, 127-8). Boccaccio also associated the crow with bad omens and, following Fulgentius, claimed that this animal had fifty-four different voices – see *Gen.* 4.68, and 5.3.

⁴⁸⁵ To mention a few examples of the distinctive character of the poet-pastor, in the *Buccolicum*, see *Faunus* 70, *Saphos* 128 and 197, *Phylostropos* 194-5.

⁴⁸⁶ See the sequence of *Gen.* 5.3.3, quoted above: *et buccolicum carmen illi* (scil. Apollo) *sacrum fecere*. Daphne also has a prominent role in Petrarch’s eclogue *Amor pastorius*, and especially in his *Canzoniere* (e.g. *RVF* 6, 22, 23, 34, 41, 43, 51, 115) – see discussion in Hainsworth (1979: 28-44), Hardie (1999: 254-70), and Mann (2000: 17-42).

Ergo sacrum Phebi nemus hoc, pulcherrima virgo?
 Nescius optatum teneo. Quis denique prestet
 quo visurus eam laudatam carmine Mopsi
 egregiumque gregem vatum nymphasque canentes?
 (*Saph.* 15-18)

Without revealing Sappho's name yet, Aristeus declares his wish to meet "the maiden who was praised in Mopsus' song, the exceptional company of poets, and the singing nymphs" (*eam laudatam carmine Mopsi/ egregiumque gregem vatum nymphasque canentes*, 17-18). Mopsus is a common pastoral name, found in the eclogues of Virgil, Calpurnius, and Nemesianus, as well as in those of Dante and Giovanni del Virgilio. Yet, in Boccaccio's passage above, this character ostensibly represents Petrarch (later referred to in the poem as Silvanus).⁴⁸⁷ Consequently, the maiden praised by him could be identified as Laura – in fact, Boccaccio was one of the first critics to propose that Petrarch's Laura was not a real woman, but rather represented an allegory of poetic glory (like Sapphos in Boccaccio's poem, and Daphne in Petrarch's *Amor pastorius*).⁴⁸⁸ In addition, Boccaccio's line 18 above alludes to Petrarch's tenth eclogue, *Laurea occidens*, where the Greek poet Sappho is praised as a *docta puella* who stands out from "the chorus of learned men" (*docta puella, choris doctorum immixta virorum*, *Laur. occ.* 89). Note that Boccaccio places Sapphos together with a *grex egregius vatum*, which alludes not only to Petrarch's *chorus doctorum virorum*, but also to Petrarch's "nobili poeti" in his *Triumphus Cupidinis*; as well as to Boccaccio's *studiosissimi viri* in the *De mulieribus* 47.2 (quoted in "Context and characters" above).⁴⁸⁹ Thus, though the Sapphos from Boccaccio's eclogue overtly represents an allegory of poetry, at least at some points her figure overlaps with

⁴⁸⁷ On role shifting in Boccaccio's *Buccolicum*, see Chapter 2, "Exchanging gifts".

⁴⁸⁸ *Vit. Petr.* 26: *prout ipsemet et bene puto, Laurettam illam allegorice pro laurea corona quam postmodum est adeptus accipiendam existimo*. In *Ad Familiares* 2.9, Petrarch himself defended Laura's real existence; yet, as Eisner (2013: 170, n. 31) has pointed out, "Petrarch's defense of Laura's reality is connected to his attempt to recover the classical past, which suggests that she may simply have another or different allegorical significance from that which Boccaccio attributes to her in the *De Vita*". This latter view of Laura also reinforces her identification with Sapphos in Boccaccio's eclogue. See also Santagata (1992: 93-4), Tonelli (2003: 515-39), and Falkeid (2012: S64-S71).

⁴⁸⁹ *Petr. Tr. Cup. (Trionfo d'Amore)* 4.25-7: "Una giovene Greca a paro a paro/ coi nobili poeti iva cantando,/ et avea un suo stil soave e raro" – Perini (1994: 1031).

that of the historical Lesbian poet, as portrayed elsewhere in Petrarch's and Boccaccio's works. Rather than something purely abstract, Saphos is portrayed as a real woman – in the same way that Petrarch (in Boccaccio's opinion) portrayed poetic fame as a real woman (Laura). Imagining her as the most beautiful and honourable maiden, Aristeus loves and desires Saphos perhaps with the same intensity as Damon loved and desired Galla in Boccaccio's first eclogue. In both cases, the type of love is similarly erotic in essence; what changes is the object of desire – as though, in *Saphos*, Boccaccio had partly sublimated his base sexual drives into a more elevated artistic project.

Though he was able to locate Phoebus' grove almost intuitively, Aristeus recognises that now he will need some guidance to find what he really wants (*quis denique prestat...?*). However, it is only after Caliope's question that he reveals that he has been looking for Saphos:

Cal. Quid queris, nemorisque mei quid conspicias umbras?
Arist. Ut videam Saphon. Nostin? Da, nympa, recessus
 quis nunc lenta diem vertat ludendo per herbas.
 (*Saph.* 19-21)

Aristeus, now referring to Caliope as *nympa*, asks her to show him the recesses where Saphos lazily passes the day playing in the grass (*da, nympa, recessus/ quis nunc lenta diem vertat ludendo per herbas*). The verb *ludo* here seems to carry a metapoetic connotation, meaning the writing of lighter forms of poetry, such as elegiac and bucolic poetry.⁴⁹⁰ In Virgil's *Eclogues*, we have examples of this same verb being employed in a similar way. At Virgil *Eclogues* 1.9-10, Tityrus rejoices at the fact that he has been spared from exile, and can play whatever he wants on his bucolic reed pipe (*et ipsum/ ludere quae vellem calamo permisit agresti*). This allusion is also reinforced by the link between Boccaccio's phrase *lenta diem* above and Virgil's *lentus in umbra* at *Eclogues* 1.4. Then, at Virgil *Eclogues* 6.1-2, the poet-narrator

⁴⁹⁰ See *OLD*, "ludo" 8.

claims that his Muse Thalia had initially condescended with him sporting in Sicilian strains, thus suggesting that he was innovative in writing bucolic poetry (*Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu/ nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalea*).⁴⁹¹

Besides these, we can mention three other prominent instances where the verb *ludo* is used, with analogous effects, in different classical texts. The first is the beginning of the *Culex* – a pastoral epyllion that Boccaccio, like many other poets and readers before him (such as Statius, Donatus and Servius), attributed without doubt to Virgil.⁴⁹² *Culex*’s opening verb *lusimus* (“we have played”) announces its trivial subject: a gnat, after being killed by a shepherd, returns to haunt him in dream. Yet, as the poet-narrator makes clear, his poetic trifle is not without art. In fact, slender Thalia has shaped his verses (*gracili modulante Thalia*, 1); and despite the lighter content and tone of his song, he still expects it to be learned (*lusimus: haec propter culicis sint carmina docta*, 3). The second instance which might be worth mentioning is the end of *Georgic* 4. In it Virgil, speaking *in propria persona*, alludes to his own *Eclogues*, saying that, when he was young and “blossomed in the pursuits of undistinguished leisure”, he “played the songs of shepherds”, and sang of Tityrus “beneath the cover of a spreading beech” (*illo Vergilium me... studiis florentem ignobilis oti,/ carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuventa,/ Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi*, G. 4.563-6).⁴⁹³ Finally, the third instance is Horace *Odes* 1.32. The poem is addressed to the lyre (*barbite*, 4;

⁴⁹¹ Cucchiarelli (2017: 324). This metaliterary sense of *ludo/lusus* is also prominent in neoteric poetry, and derives from the Hellenistic concept of *παίζω/παίγνιον* – see, for instance, Pind. *Ol.* 1.16; Callim. *Epigr.* 16.1 Pf.; and Catull. 50.2.

⁴⁹² See Stat. *Silv.* 2.7.74, Don. *Vit. Virg.* 17, Serv. *Ad Aen.* 1.Pr.12. On the possible transmission of Statius’ *Silvae* before Poggio Bracciolini, see Facchini (2020: n. 86). In his *Miscellanea Laurenziana* (Pl. 33, 31), Boccaccio transcribed and heavily annotated some poems of the so-called *Appendix Vergiliana*: *Culex*, *Dirae*, *Lydia* (which follows *Dirae* as a single unit, without its own title) and the *Priapeia*. Regarding the latter, Sabbadini noted that, although the title on Boccaccio’s manuscript is *Diversorum auctorum Priapeia*, there is a rasura in both the *incipit* and *excipit* which says that the original title was *Virgilii Priapeia* – see Sabbadini (1905: 31), Elomaa (2015: 8, n. 19). On Boccaccio and the *Appendix Vergiliana*, see Lord (1991: 127-97), Usher (2002: 312-23), and Black (2011: 113-28). The authorship of the *Appendix Vergiliana* has been disputed in modern scholarship, and the work is now regarded as a collection of varied provenance – see Schiesaro (2012), Reeve (1983: 437-40), and Holzberg (2005).

⁴⁹³ See Farrell (2019: 299-325). The translation above was taken (and slightly adapted) from Farrell.

testudo, 14), which was first handled by the Greek poet Alcaeus (*Lesbio primum modulate civi*, 5), and is now leisurely played (*si quid vacui sub umbra/ lusimus*, 1-2) by Horace himself to produce Latin poetry (*age dic Latinum... carmen*, 3-4). In this way, Horace's text autofictionally suggests that the poet is continuing with the Lesbian lyric tradition in the *Odes* (where he, like Boccaccio in the *Buccolicum* after him, includes serious topics of politics, too).⁴⁹⁴

Though thematically and generically unconnected, all these references have some features in common with Boccaccio's *Saphos*. Besides the notion of poetic leisure implied in the verb *ludo*, they share some kind of pastoral background, the autofictional ("authorial") voice of the poet, the idea of divine inspiration embodied by the Muses, and/or the contrast between lighter, unpretentious poetry and serious, learned poetry. What is more, against this background, Aristeus' image of Saphos "lazily playing in the grass" might reveal something important about the *Buccolicum carmen* as a whole. Indeed, Boccaccio idealises Saphos as the symbol of the noblest kind of poetry – a poetry which necessarily draws on the Greco-Roman classical tradition, and which distinguishes itself from the so-called vulgar (vernacular) literature of his time. Nonetheless, Boccaccio chooses to "play" in the humble bucolic genre as the medium to achieve the high poetic ideals represented by Saphos. Though this might seem like a paradox, we have already discussed how the bucolic genre perfectly fits into Boccaccio's perspectives on allegorical poetry, as well as into his self-fashioned career as a modest poet.⁴⁹⁵ In this framework, the choice of Saphos as the allegory of poetry in the *Buccolicum* makes even more sense. For in the same way that the Greek female poet was able to elevate herself to the highest standards of honour through lyric, Aristeus-Boccaccio similarly desires to elevate himself from the crowd of vulgar poets through a lower classical genre. Unlike Virgil's

⁴⁹⁴ See Nisbet & Hubbard (1970, 1.32). For some other relevant uses of *ludo*, see Index of Intertexts. As I will discuss in Chapter 4, Boccaccio opens *Phyllostropos* with *lusimus*, where it acquires a special connotation.

⁴⁹⁵ See Introduction.

Eclogues 4 and 6, which propose an elevation based on genre, Boccaccio's *Saphos* proposes an elevation from vernacular to classical (and Christian allegorical) poetry. However, in the poem, Caliope implies that Aristeus' lack of experience and talent does not match his ambition:

Cal. Quid tibi cum Saphu, cum sis puer atque subulcus?
Arist. Heu, quid? Quid iuveni credis cum virgine pulchra?
 Uror et amplexus cupio, turmasque reliqui
 invisam ut videam, nec quorsum querere novi.
 (*Saph.* 22-5)

Taking up the previous association between Aristeus' acorns and pigs (11-12), Caliope now re-emphasizes his inferior status and explicitly refers to him as a *subulcus*. Alluding to Martial *Epigrams* 1.76 – where the narrator cynically discourages Flaccus from pursuing the penniless Muses, and insinuates that he must avoid their home of Cirrha at all costs (*quid tibi cum Cirrha?*, 11) –, Caliope asks Aristeus what he has got to do with Saphos (*quid tibi cum Saphu...?*).⁴⁹⁶ Aristeus then replies with another question, impudently intimating that he, as a young man, obviously wants to engage in sexual intercourse with Saphos. This idea is reinforced in the subsequent line, where Aristeus confesses to be burning and longing for Saphos' embrace. The verb *uror*, in particular, immediately brings to mind the image of Damon burning with erotic love for Galla in Boccaccio's first eclogue.⁴⁹⁷ Yet, unlike Damon, Aristeus has never seen his loved one (*invisam*), and does not even know where to find her. It was the idea of her, rather than her actual existence, that made Aristeus leave the crowds (*turmasque reliqui*), and embark on a journey for which he does not quite know the destination.

⁴⁹⁶ Cirrha is a city near Delphi, devoted to Apollo. In several works (e.g. Lucan 1.64, 5.115, 166; Sen. *Oed.* 269; and Juv. 13.79), it appears connected with *vates*. See also Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 2.17.6 ff. (*quid tibi cum Musis?*).

⁴⁹⁷ See Chapter 1, "The Golden Age".

Singing at the crossroads

In lines 26-8, Caliope mocks Aristeus by comparing his foolish attempt to embrace Saphos to impossible and absurd events, such as pigs touching the stars, foxes flying, or a crane and a goose pulling a chariot. Then, in lines 30-7, she lists many of the repulsive jobs performed by a swineherd: cleaning pigsties, touching mange, getting dog bites and scratches with bare hands, preparing potions for the pigs to cleanse their bowels, and grass for them to roll in. The first series of *adynata* is typical of Virgil's *Eclogues* (1.59-61, 4.21-3, 8.26-7 and 52-5); while the second *enumeratio* is allusive to Virgil *Georgics* 3.440-51, which contains a didactic exposition on animal diseases, their causes and tokens. Resorting to these rhetorical devices, Caliope makes it clear that Aristeus has no business to aspire to deal with Saphos:

Tu cupis amplexus Saphu? Nunc sydera lambant
quos trahis ipse sues volitentque per ethera vulpes,
grux trahat ac anser pariter per rura quadrigas!
Si memini, tu nuper haras mundare solebas,
et scabiem morsusque canum seu vulnera veprum
nunc manibus purgare palam nunc gurgite turpi,
unguine nunc vario succisque potentibus atque
galbaneis fumis nigrique bituminis offa;
viribus ellebori stillaque dolentis amurce
vel potu tristes alvi depellere sordes,
ac herbis variis formare volutabra porcis:
et nunc Saphon amas? Expectet te quoque Pallas!
(*Saph.* 26-37)

After reminding Aristeus of his due place, Caliope finishes her attack with the rhetorical question "and now you love Saphos?" (*et nunc Saphon amas?*), leaving no doubt that Aristeus' recent past (*si memini, tu nuper...*) as a swineherd is incompatible with his present wish to meet Saphos. She then sarcastically remarks that the goddess Pallas (Minerva), too, may be just waiting for him. To this censure, the stubborn youth responds that Caliope is certainly taking him for Argus. He proudly confesses that both Galathea and Phyllis have loved him:

Erras; Argus erat. Sed quid non Saphon amarem?
 Me Galathea diu, me quondam Phyllis amavit,
 et mollis lanugo genas nunc serpere cepit,
 tradidit et calamos nobis Pan doctior olim
 et cantus docuit. Nec plebis fece creatus:
 Cyrenes genitrix est nobis, thessala nympa;
 nomen Aristeus; glandes et mella vetusti
 archados accipio nemoris. Te nosse putabam.
 (*Saph.* 38-45)

Here, by Argus, Boccaccio is possibly referring to Dante Alighieri (as in *Vallis opaca* 64), indicating, with the hundred eyes of that mythological monster, the hundred *canti* of the *Commedia*.⁴⁹⁸ With this analogy, Boccaccio's text manifests the general opinion (voiced by Giovanni del Virgilio in his first letter to Dante) that Dante deliberately chose to be a writer of and for the populace. Though, on the one hand, this reading might conflict with Boccaccio's self-confessed admiration for the *Commedia*, as well as with his defence of Dante's choice of the vernacular in the *Trattatello*; on the other hand, his very choice of the name Argus (which he only applies to eminent figures in the *Buccolicum*, such as King Robert of Anjou) highlights that admiration.⁴⁹⁹ Thus, Perini wonders if Boccaccio could be referring to Dante here as a model for himself having produced poetry in vernacular, a model that he has now abandoned.⁵⁰⁰

⁴⁹⁸ This interpretation is strengthened by the fact that, in the *Trattatello* ([1] 224-5), Boccaccio allegorically links the hundred *canti* of Dante's *Commedia* with the "hundred eyes" of a peacock's tail – see Perini (1994: 1002). Furthermore, at *Purgatorio* 29.94-6, Dante uses the image of Argus' eyes to describe the four visionary evangelists Matthew, Mark, Luke and John; and, at 32.64-9, he invokes the Ovidian episode of Argus being put to sleep by Mercury (*Met.* 1.714-21) as an analogue of his own visionary "waking sleep". As Barolini (1987: 216-19) has pointed out, Dante aspires to the same clarity of vision as that of John; and, marking a transition from the eyes of Argus to the eyes of Christian visionaries, his text suggests that he sees better than Ovid.

⁴⁹⁹ At *Tratt.* (1) 190, Boccaccio argues that Dante, having started to write the *Commedia* in Latin, soon realised that this would be like "giving bread to newborn babies", and decided to adopt the vernacular instead ("immaginando invano le croste del pane porsi alla bocca di coloro che ancora il latte suggano, in istile atto a' moderni sensi ricominciò la sua opera e perseguilla in volgare") – see also Papio (2009: 410). Note that this idea once again recalls the biblical proverb "do not cast pearls before swine", evoked (with the opposite purpose) by Giovanni del Virgilio in his first epistle to Dante – see Perini (1994: 1033). It is noteworthy, moreover, that Dante too presented himself as a "different" type of vernacular poet, claiming that he, unlike most vulgar poets, followed the classical rules – see *De vulgari eloquentia* 2.4.3. On the divergent views regarding Dante's popular appeal, see Gilson (2005); and on Boccaccio's concern to present Dante as a poet who concealed his classical erudition under a vernacular shell, see Gilson (2013: 250-82, esp. 268-70).

⁵⁰⁰ Perini (1994: 1033). It is clear that this renunciation of Dante as a model is merely autofictional. In the *Buccolicum*, Boccaccio chooses to associate himself with Virgil and Petrarch, consequently distancing his own image as an older poet from the shadows of Ovid and Dante. However, this renunciation does not effectively reflect in the text of the *Buccolicum* (which often alludes to Dante's poetry) – see Piacentini (2015: 147-76), Fonseca Jr (2020a: 126-7); and Introduction, "Genre".

Yet, the association between Argus and a swineherd, and the previous allusions to Virgil's *Georgics* in Caliope's speech, may also suggest the identification of Argus as an author of didactic literature – such as perhaps Pietro de' Crescenzi (1230-1305), writer of the influential agricultural treatise *Ruralia commoda* (c. 1305), which Boccaccio certainly knew. Although the latter hypothesis seems less likely, either identification would contribute, in different ways, to the allegorical debate on poetry at the core of *Saphos*: the first implying a hierarchy of language (Latin over vernacular); the second, a hierarchy of genres or literary forms (poetry over didactic prose).

Then, evoking the two objects of Damoetas' lust in Virgil's *Eclogue* 3, the names Galathea and Phyllis in *Saphos* 39 represent inferior female characters, like Galla and Pampinea in Boccaccio's two introductory eclogues. In this way, Boccaccio autofictionally indicates his earlier literary tastes: as an adolescent, he used to write erotic poems in the vernacular.⁵⁰¹ But after a certain age, as soon as a beard appeared on his cheeks (*mollis lanugo genas nunc serpere cepit*, 40 above), and a learned master taught him how to write poetry (*tradidit et calamos nobis Pan doctior olim/ et cantus docuit*", 41-2), he started to pursue higher forms of composition.⁵⁰²

It is significant, nevertheless, that even though Galathea and Phyllis are presented as much inferior to Saphos, Aristeus does not seem to regret his past connection with them. Indeed, he thinks that the fact that these women once loved him has somehow prepared him to love and be loved by Saphos, thus implying that his vernacular erotic production led him towards honourable classical poetry.⁵⁰³ Moreover, contesting Caliope's assertions, Aristeus denies that he was lowly born (*nec plebis fece creatus*, 42), and introduces himself as the son

⁵⁰¹ For the choice of the term "adolescent" here see, for instance, Isid. *Etym.* 11.2.4: *tertia [aetas], adolescentia, ad gignendum adulta, quae porrigitur usque ad vigesimum octavum annum.*

⁵⁰² *Mutatis mutandis*, a similar ascent in terms of literary career is found in Ovid, and more particularly in his *Heroide* 15, which marked a decisive step in his early career – see Thorsen (2014: 69), and also Juliani (2016: 64-70).

⁵⁰³ See Petr. *Rvf* 129.22-3: "Forse anchor ti serva Amore/ ad un tempo migliore".

of Cyrene.⁵⁰⁴ Finally, he tells her that he gathers “acorns and honey in the old Arcadian wood” (*glandes et mella vetusti/ archados accipio nemoris*, 44-5), which is evidently a reference to the classical bucolic genre. In this way, Aristeus makes clear that his acorns are not totally worthless, as Caliope had initially suggested. Ultimately, in a metapoetic reading, these acorns could be seen as Boccaccio’s own eclogues, modelled on Virgil, and the honey as the elegiac flavour that some of them (particularly *Galla* and *Pampinea*) contain.⁵⁰⁵

Caliope then pretends to take Aristeus’ words seriously, and sarcastically compares him to Orpheus (Ysmarius) and Paris (Critis Yde).⁵⁰⁶ She immediately asks why she saw Aristeus singing a vulgar song at the crossroads to the applause of the common rabble:

Nunc ego te teneo. Sic est, novisse decebat.
Ysmarius tu grandis eras, tu Critis es Yde!
Non ego te vidi pridem vulgare canentem
in triviis carmen, misero plaudente popello?
(*Saph.* 46-9)

This short passage presents some relevant intertexts. The first (and perhaps more evident) is with Virgil *Eclogues* 3.26-7: *non tu in triviis, indocte, solebas/ stridenti miserum stipula disperdere carmen?*. Compare the phrase-beginnings *non tu* and *non ego te*, as well as *in triviis... carmen* and *in triviis carmen*.⁵⁰⁷ Furthermore, Virgil’s vocative *indocte*, employed by Menalcas to refer to Damoetas’ musical incompetence, finds an echo in Caliope’s criticism of Aristeus’ poetic incapacity and vulgarity. Finally, the complexity of this intertextual dialogue gains more force when we consider that, just as Menalcas had previously accused Damoetas of

⁵⁰⁴ See section “Context and characters” above.

⁵⁰⁵ At *Genealogia* 3.22.5, Boccaccio mentions honey as one of the symbols of Venus, associated with sex and lust. The combination of acorns and honey, moreover, recalls Virgil *Eclogues* 4.30 (*et durae quercus sudabunt roscida mella*) – though what is being described there is a miraculous sign of the Golden Age. See also Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.44 (*poetica mella*) – interestingly, this poem of Horace also presents a discussion on producing poetry to the crowds.

⁵⁰⁶ As the myth goes, Orpheus used to sing on Mt. Ismarus in Thrace; and while herding his sheep on Mt. Ida, Paris received the hard task to judge (κρίνειν, hence κριτής = Critis) the divine beauty contest between Juno, Minerva and Venus. See references in Index of Intertexts.

⁵⁰⁷ Perini (1994: 1034).

hacking at Micon's trees and tender vines (*Ecl.* 3.10-11), Caliope blamed Aristeus for plucking her precious bays (*Saph.* 1-4).

In addition to these Virgilian intertexts, the word *popellus*, in line 49 above, alludes to Horace *Epistles* 1.7.65, as well as Persius *Satires* 4.15 and 6.50.⁵⁰⁸ Besides these three occurrences, which carry a derisive social and moral dimension associated with the hustle and bustle of Rome, we do not find any other instances of the term in canonical classical Latin texts.⁵⁰⁹ In the Trecento, Petrarch seems to recover and resemanticize this Latin term: in his *Epistola metrica* 10.10 and *Contra medicum* 2.77, for example, he employs *popellus* to refer to the mass of ignorant people. Yet, particularly regarding ignorant readers, the kind of *popellus* invoked by Caliope, in the passage from *Saphos* above, brings to mind the expression *gens ydiota*, used by Giovanni del Virgilio to refer to the illiterate people who watched lousy comic actors performing at the crossroads (*in triviis... coaxat/ comicomus nebulo*, del Virg.-Dante *Ecl.* 1.12-13). In *Genealogia* 14, Boccaccio employs a similar image to criticise the fake scholars who regurgitate whatever they have memorised from the wise at the crossroads, in front of the ignorant rabble (*in triviis, ignaro ascultante popello*, 14.3.3).⁵¹⁰

In response to Caliope, Aristeus admits that he did sing some “vulgar songs” when he was a boy, but he defends himself saying that not all people keep the same intentions unchanged throughout their entire lives. In truth, his greater age has revealed different kinds of love to him:

Vidisti, fateor. Non omnibus omnia semper
sunt animo, puero carmen vulgare placebat.
Illud Lemniadi claudio concessimus; ast nunc
altior est etas, alios que monstrat amores.
(*Saph.* 50-3)

⁵⁰⁸ Perini (1994: 1034).

⁵⁰⁹ See *popell-* in *TLL*, *OLD* and *PHI*. Boccaccio copied and glossed Persius' *Satires* in his *Miscellanea Latina* (Pl. 33.31) .

⁵¹⁰ See Lummus (2020: 179-80). A further discussion on *Genealogia* 14.3 will be developed below.

By saying that he has granted his vulgar song to “the Lemnian cripple” (*Lemniadi claudo*), in line 52, Aristeus-Boccaccio means that he has burned his youthful, lascivious works – the *Lemnius claudus* evidently standing for Vulcan, the Roman god of fire who became crippled after his parents, Jupiter and Juno, hurled him from Olympus onto the island of Lemnos.⁵¹¹

This dramatic image of the author burning his own writings is, to some extent, “classical”. The anecdote that Virgil, on his deathbed, had given express orders to Varius and Tucca to burn the supposedly unrevised manuscript of the *Aeneid* is well known.⁵¹² Similarly, in *Tristia* 4.10, Ovid claimed that he had set all his defective poems on fire.⁵¹³ Yet, among the humanists, starting with Boccaccio and Petrarch, behind the author’s intention to burn his faulty works, lay also an important Christian dilemma: should his works jeopardise the salvation of his or other people’s souls, did he have the moral obligation to burn them? Indeed, to cite David Marsh, this is precisely the “burning question” that Franciscus-Petrarch, challenged by Augustinus-Augustine, is faced with in the *Secretum*.⁵¹⁴

On the other hand, the bold and extreme resolution of an author to burn his own works could be motivated, instead, by rather selfish and proud ends. For instance, upon hearing from Donato Albanzani that Boccaccio intended to burn his earlier vernacular works, Petrarch insinuated, in his *Seniles* 5.2, that this demonstration of humility was actually rooted in pride. For since Boccaccio could not bear a second or third place, being ranked behind Dante and possibly Petrarch himself, he desperately tried to get rid of his vernacular poetry.⁵¹⁵ In his *Epistola* 20, Boccaccio agreed with Petrarch’s opinion, and humbly admitted to Pietro da

⁵¹¹ As pointed out by Perini (1994: 1034), *Lemnias –adis* is a rare Ovidian (*Her.* 6.1 etc.) and Statian (*Theb.* 5.29 etc.) form, but only used in the feminine – mostly with reference to Hypsipyle, and Boccaccio seems to be aware of this (see *Gen.* 5.29). See also *Gen.* 12.70.1.

⁵¹² See Suet.-Don., *Vit. Virg.* 40-1; and also Catullus’ use of this *topos* in his poem 36.

⁵¹³ *Tr.* 4.10.61-2: *multa quidem scripsi, sed, quae vitiosa putavi, / emendaturis ignibus ipse dedi.*

⁵¹⁴ Marsh (2009: 211-18).

⁵¹⁵ See Eisner (2017: 180, n. 4).

Monteforte that, by burning his vernacular and especially his youthful compositions, he attempted to conceal the fact that he was not a great poet.⁵¹⁶

Particularly in *Saphos*, however, Aristeus decides to consign his “vulgar poetry” (*carmen vulgare*) to the fire as a symbolic act of transition, from his boyish interests of the past, to his nobler aspirations of the present.⁵¹⁷ In this context, it is significant that he uses the expression *altior est etas*, which immediately brings to mind Damon’s *placidi anni*, as though the deceptive infatuation of a boy with a girl, in *Galla*, gave place to the honourable devotion of a young artist to poetry in *Saphos*.⁵¹⁸

From Battus to Aristeus

Caliope remembers that, until very recently, Battus could barely loose his tongue, but now suddenly, having become Aristeus, he begs for the summits of Parnassus and the love of goddesses:

Cal. Ecastor! memini, nuper dissolvere linguam
vix poterat Bathos; subito nunc culmina poscit
Parnasi, stolide captus fervore dearum,
factus Aristeus. Sed quid non fecit Olympus?
Arist. Quid loqueris nunc ipsa tibi? Da, nympa, precamur,
virginis antra mee; crucior, me fervor adurit.
(*Saph.* 54-9)

Evoking the myth of Battus mentioned earlier, the text suggests that Aristeus-Boccaccio passed through a process of evolution: from an inarticulate young man who “was hardly able to untie

⁵¹⁶ Curiously, however, Boccaccio did not contemplate the idea of a third place: *cum in primum locum pervenire non possem non sufficientibus ingenii viribus, ardens mea vulgaria et profecto iuvenilia nimis poemata, dedignari visus sum in secundo utinam meo convenienti ingenio consistere* (*Ep.* 20.44).

⁵¹⁷ The theme of changing loves as one grows older is also present in Petrarch’s eclogue 8, *Divortium*, 76-8: *sed iam cum tempore sensim/ omnia mutantur; studium iuvenile senectae displicet, et variant cure variante capillo*. An anonymous gloss to Piendibeni interprets this passage as an allegorical reference to poetry – Bergin (1974: 233 ad loc.)

⁵¹⁸ See Chapter 1, “The Golden Age”.

his tongue” (*dissolvere linguam/ vix poterat*, 54-5), to an eloquent and ambitious poet.⁵¹⁹ Perhaps we could link this autofictional idea to *Genealogia* 15.10, where, as we have seen in the Introduction, Boccaccio takes on the subject of his early education and vocation to poetry: forced by his father to study mathematics and then canon law, Boccaccio was not able to dedicate himself to literature until he was already a grown man. What is more, Boccaccio’s self-fashioned statement there that his poetic *fervor* was never actually matched by his *ingenium* is also paramount in *Saphos*. Indeed, what we see in the eclogue is Aristeus pursuing poetry, not actually reaching it. Ultimately, rather than a poet, Boccaccio preferred to present himself as a lover of poetry. This notion is suggested even in Boccaccio’s auto-epitaph, which highlights his labours rather than his achievements, and his devotion to poetry rather than the poems he produced in life (*studium fuit alma poesis*, *Carm.* 10.4).

It is perhaps ironic that Caliope’s speech so far is the opposite of sweet, being full of sarcasm, deprecatory, and humorous notes – quite different from her speech in Petrarch’s *Amor pastorius*. The interjection (*m*)*ecastor* above, for instance, is typical of Roman comedy, being often employed by Plautine and Terentian female characters in the context of oaths.⁵²⁰ This expression is rarely found in Trecento texts – Petrarch employs it once, but as a quotation of Plautus *Cistellaria* 69, at *Ad Familiares* 9.4. Boccaccio, in turn, employs it in two other of his works, putting it in the mouths of his own characters: first, at *De casibus* 3.1; and second, at *De mulieribus* 103. In relation to *Saphos*, the first is particularly relevant, as it is uttered by Fortune in a contest with Poverty. The latter is described as sitting at a crossroads, while Fortune, laughing at her, accuses Poverty of being “squalid, scabrous, scabby and pale” (*macie*

⁵¹⁹ See *Gen.* 5.13.3 (*Bathos, solutis lingue nodis*, quoted above), and *Just.* 13.7.6 (*Battos... linguae nodis solutis*) – Perini (1994: 1034); *Ov. Ib.* 586 (*ut laesus lingua Battus ab ipse sua*); and also *Petr. Buc.* 2.22 (*vix sicco vocem pulmone revulsi*).

⁵²⁰ See Adams (1984: 48, 50). For a few examples of the use of *ecastor* in Plautus and Terence, see our Index of Intertexts.

obsitam, scabrosam, scabiosam, pallentem) – a description that is consonant with Caliope’s view of Aristeus as a filthy swineherd.

Aristeus continues to beg Caliope to reveal Saphos’ grotto (*virginis antra, Saph. 59*) to him, saying that he is burning with a *fervor* (*me fervor adurit*, l. 60). Here, again, the feeling of burning is emphasized – remember that, at *Galla* 133-4, Damon’s last words were a cry for death to quench his erotic fervour.⁵²¹ Yet, as suggested above, though Aristeus’ fervour seems as intense as Damon’s fervour, they are qualitatively different kinds, and each is projected towards a different object, which can be classified as more or less worthy according to the classico-Christian tradition. In fact, recognising this fundamental difference, Caliope herself makes a distinction between the passion for noble objects (*fervore dearum*, 56 above) and the passion for base objects, symbolised in the figures of Phyllis and Lupisca:

Cal. Querere credo putes Phyllim seu forte Lupiscam,
quas nemorum pomis trahitis quandoque per umbras.
Hec dea, magna quidem, paucis et cognita dudum.
Arist. Meonius pastor potuit vidisse Tonantis
consortem natasque duas sub quercubus altis,
exuviis nudas: quid non ego cernere Saphon?
Cal. Sic illis visum. Dic, tu quo noveris illam?
(*Saph.* 60-6)

As we have seen in line 39, Aristeus himself had confessed that, in the past, he was a lover of Phyllis – a classical name that, in *Alcestus* 69, was also connected with love (*Phyllidis... ignes*). Lupisca, in turn, is apparently an invention of Boccaccio, based on the word *lupa* (meaning

⁵²¹ The word *fervor* appears in only three poems of the *Buccolicum*: besides *Saphos* (ll. 56 and 59 above), and *Galla* (l. 34), it is used by Florida (Florence) at the end of eclogue 7, *lurgium* (l. 137), to refer to Daphnis’ (Charles IV’s) thirst for war. Yet, these three instances significantly point towards three of the four kinds of human “fervours” at the core of the *Buccolicum*: erotic, political, and poetic – the fourth one being religious fervour. Likewise, in the *Genealogie*, Boccaccio speaks of the “fervour of the young” (*fervores iuvenum*, 3.22.12), “libidinal fervour” (*fervorem libidinis*, 5.30.5) and “concupiscent fervour” (*fervor... concupiscentie*, 9.3.13); the fervour of Pyrrhus’ soul to colonise the seas (*animi fervore impulsus... mare navibus infestavit*, 11.53); poetic fervour (*Poesis... est fervor*, 14.7); “divine fervour” (*calori divini fervoris*, 1.22.1) and “celestial fervour” (*vi fervoris celestis*, 3.3.2). The dichotomy between carnal love and heavenly love in Boccaccio’s early fiction was discussed by Hollander (1977), although his view has been in part questioned in more recent scholarship – see, for instance, Kriesel (2019: 154).

“she-wolf”), and consisting of a Latin adaptation of the Greek *Lycisca* (a conventional name for a dog, as at Virgil *Eclogues* 3.18, as well as at Boccaccio *Alcestus* 162).⁵²² Thus, Boccaccio is probably trying to avoid a confusion between that woman and a female dog, while still suggesting a misogynistic link between the two. Then, the idea that Aristeus can easily entice these women to follow him into the shadows (*Saph.* 61 above) is euphemistically sexual, and brings to mind *Galla* 69, when Damon saw Galla coming through the shadows to watch Pamphylus performing a song. Unlike these characters, however, Caliope presents Saphos as a great goddess (*dea, magna quidem*) whose sight is reserved only to a select few.

Aristeus finally tries to disarm Caliope resorting to a mythological *exemplar*: why can he not see Saphos, if even Paris (*Meonius pastor*) was once allowed to see Zeus’ wife and his two daughters completely naked (63-5)? In establishing this comparison, however, Aristeus seems to ignore the irony of Caliope’s previous words, when she mockingly compared him to Orpheus and Paris (*Critis*, 47). Nevertheless, Caliope limits herself to calmly replying that, in the eyes of those deities, that seemed the best thing to do (*sic illis visum*). Yet, she is curious: how did Aristeus get to know about Saphos?

Minciades and Silvanus

Minciadem Silvanus heri, qua Sorgia saxo
 erumpit Vallis currens per devia Clause,
 convenit, placidaque simul sedere sub umbra
 ylicis antique. Quos postquam fronde virenti
 umbrasse esculea frontes et carmine vidi
 certantes ambo ferrent super ethera cantum,
 accessi: et tacitus mediis vepretibus altis
 delitui, porcis Gethe siliquisque relictis.
 Laudibus hi Saphon, resonantibus undique saxis,
 vocibus et calamis pariter super astra ferebant.

⁵²² In Boccaccio’s eclogue 8, *Midas*, *Lupisca* also appears as a second-rate shepherdess, being harshly described by Phytias as a “greedy old prostitute” (*meretrix anus et avara Lupisca*, l. 118). On the name *Lupisca*, see Perini (1994: 980), and Cucchiarelli (2017: 209). See also Horace’s allusion to an effeminate, tender boy named *Lyciscus*, at *Epod.* 11.23-8. On the negative connotations of the *lupa* in the *Buccolicum*, see Chapter 2, “Context and characters”.

Miratus, fateor, confestim a Phyllide mentem
 diverti, sensique novos ambire furores
 intentum modulis pectus; captusque repente
 exquiro Saphon, cupiens quibus ipsa moretur
 antra videre oculis.
 (*Saph.* 67-81)

In the passage above, Aristeus recounts that he has overheard Silvanus and Minciades singing praises in honour of Saphos. The name “Silvanus”, which traditionally refers to a rural deity, here unmistakably stands for Petrarch, who in his tenth eclogue, *Laurea occidens*, named himself in the same fashion.⁵²³ “Minciades”, in turn, evokes Virgil, because of his traditional association with the Italian city of Mantua, and its river Mincius.⁵²⁴ Aristeus describes the encounter between these two shepherd-poets taking place in an idyllic pastoral scene, and more particularly in Vaucluse (*Vallis... Clause*, 68), which was famously known as Petrarch’s literary refuge. Indeed, as Petrarch describes in one of his *Epistolae Metricae* to Dionigi del Borgo (1.4) – and as Boccaccio, too, recounts in his *Vita Petracchi* –, that “Enclosed Valley” (*Clausa... Vallem*, *Ep. Metr.* 1.4.14) was adorned with many natural beauties. There, by the transparent waters of the river Sorgia, Petrarch embraced his contemplative solitude, and wrote several of his celebrated works, including the *Africa* and the *Bucolicum carmen*.⁵²⁵ It is within this same *locus amoenus*, then, that Aristeus secretly watched Silvanus and Minciades singing, and playing reed-pipes in a rival manner (*certantes*, *Saph.* 72).⁵²⁶

The image of two shepherds singing under the shade of a holm-oak is conventionally bucolic – alluding, for instance, to Virgil *Eclogues* 7.1, as well as to Calpurnius Siculus

⁵²³ At *Ad Familiares* 10.4.20, Petrarch explains that, because of his love for the woods (*amorem... silvarum*), his friends often called him “Silvius”, and so he adopted this name for himself in his first eclogue, *Parthenias*. Boccaccio employs the name “Silvanus” (a variation of “Silvius”) in reference to Petrarch also at *Bucc.* 8.148, 13.96 and 16.26 ff. In *Olympia*, though, Boccaccio applies the name “Silvius” to himself.

⁵²⁴ See Virg. *G.* 3.12-5: *primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas, / et viridi in campo templum de marmore ponam / propter aquam, tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat / Mincius et tenera praetexit harundine ripas*. See also Bocc. *De flum.*, “Mincius”. Boccaccio calls Virgil “Minciades” also in *Olympia* (*Bucc.* 14.160 and 167). For other uses of the names Silvanus and Minciades in classical and postclassical literature, see our Index of Intertexts.

⁵²⁵ See Bocc. *Petr.* 10-11, *Petr. Fam.* 8.3.11, and also Martínez (2015: 87-99).

⁵²⁶ This scene, in turn, alludes to Petrarch’s eclogue 2, *Amor pastorius*, where Stupeus listens to the Muses singing in Parnassus: *subito vox contigit aures / dulcior humana. Stupui: levis unda nitentes / per pronum herboso volvebat calle lapillos*.

Eclogues 2.12, 3.27 and 6.60. Yet, the idea of an *ancient* holm-oak (*sub umbra/ ylicis antique*, *Saph.* 69-70), in particular, seems to symbolise the classical bucolic genre, which in Boccaccio's opinion (expressed in *Epistola* 23) had Virgil as its main representative, and Petrarch as his most relevant follower.⁵²⁷ Thus, following the indication that it was under that symbolic holm-oak that Minciades and Silvanus raised Saphos to the stars, the text firstly implies that Virgil and Petrarch were able to elevate poetry through the Latin bucolic genre. Secondly, since their song had an impact on Aristeus and made him forget about Phyllis, we could infer that Boccaccio felt inspired to follow the example of those two poets, turning away from his vernacular production in order to pursue a nobler kind of poetry through the bucolic path.⁵²⁸

Another important point of consideration is that Aristeus sees Silvanus and Minciades crowned with green oak-leaves (*fronde virenti/ umbrasse esculea frontes*, 70-1), which takes us back to our previous discussion on the bay and the oak. In this case, Boccaccio alludes to Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.449 – one of the few instances in classical Latin literature where we find the poetic adjective *aesculeus* employed. There, Ovid described the ancient Pythian Games, established after the killing of the monstrous serpent Python by Phoebus. As the Ovidian account goes, the victorious athletes of such games received “the glorious crown of an oak-wreath”, for “the laurel had not yet appeared” (*aesculeae capiebat frondis honorem./*

⁵²⁷ See Introduction, “Genre”. Note that Horace's *Epode* 2, describing the joys of the countryside and *otium*, mentions the deities Priapus and Silvanus, followed by the image of ancient holm-oak: *qua muneretur te, Priape, et te, pater/ Silvane, tutor finium!/ libet iacere modo sub antiqua ilice* (21-3).

⁵²⁸ Accordingly, one might imply that Boccaccio started writing his own eclogues after he read (and possibly while he was revising) Petrarch's *Bucolicum* – that is, between 1359 and 1366 (see Introduction, “Methodology”). Though this observation actually fits the dating of the *Bucolicum* in the early 1360s (see Introduction, “Dating the *Bucolicum carmen*”), there is no reason for us to take it so literally; after all, it is very likely that Boccaccio read some of Petrarch's individual eclogues before then. Moreover, the characterisation of Aristeus as a young man in the poem could pose its own set of problems. I tend to understand it allegorically, as referring to Boccaccio's inexperience as a writer of (neo-)Latin poetry, rather than to his actual age. But even if we do want to understand Aristeus as a representation of the young Boccaccio in the poem, this would not, in any way, contradict the thesis that the *Bucolicum* was written in the early 1360s (when Boccaccio was in his fifties). In an autofictional reading of the *Bucolicum*, what matters is the narrative that Boccaccio is telling about himself, whether this narrative corresponds to autobiographical reality or not.

nondum laurus erat, 449-50, trans. Raeburn).⁵²⁹ Alluding to this ancient mythical custom in *Saphos*, then, Boccaccio's text suggests that both Virgil's and Petrarch's bucolic works preceded their fame, but were nonetheless powerful and reached heaven (*ethera*, *Saph.* 72 above).⁵³⁰

Finally, we can find yet another link between *Saphos* and *Galla*. In the passage above, confirming what Caliope has said before about Aristeus being a *subulcus*, Aristeus says that he had left his pigs and husks for his colleague Getha to guard, and then he hid himself among tall brambles to secretly listen (*tacitus mediis vepretibus altis/ delitui*, *Saph.* 73-4) to Silvanus and Minciades singing of *Saphos*.⁵³¹ Similarly, we saw that in *Galla* Damon left his cattle for Phytia to guard, and then he hid himself underneath a cliff (*tacitus meditans sub rupe sedebam/ invisus*, *Gal.* 63-4) to watch Pamphylus singing while he spied on his lover. Yet, while Damon's action fatally marked the end of his relationship with *Galla*, Aristeus' action marked the beginning of his love for *Saphos*. Impressed by the content of Minciades' and Silvanus' song, Aristeus immediately turned his mind from Phyllis, and was possessed by a new kind of *furor*.⁵³² Since then, he has been captivated by *Saphos*, and longed to see her with his own eyes.

⁵²⁹ The adjective *aesculeus* (from *aesculus*, the tallest species of oak) also appears at Ov. *Met.* 8.410; and Horace (*Carm.* 1.22.14) uses the noun *aesculeti* to refer to forests of oaks – see relevant entries in *OLD*. I have not found any uses of (*a*)*aesculeus* in Dante or Petrarch; and Boccaccio himself only employs it in the *Buccolicum* (5.65, 6.3 and 68).

⁵³⁰ While Boccaccio's phrase *Saphon... super astra ferebant* (*Saph.* 75-6) alludes to Virgil *Eclogues* 5.52 (*Daphnin ad astra feremus*), the phrase *ferrent super ethera* (*Saph.* 72) is not typically bucolic; but alludes, instead, to Virgil *Aeneid* 1.379 (*fama super aether notus*), spoken by Aeneas about himself.

⁵³¹ As Perini noted (1994: 1035), "Getha" is a name borrowed from Terence's plays *Adelphoe* and *Phormio*, where we have the slave Geta, suggesting a connection between himself and the Thracian tribe of the Getae, known as hostile and wild – see, for instance, Hor. *Carm.* 3.24.11 (*rigidi Getae*), Ov. *Tr.* 3.10.5 (*fera gens, Bessique Getaeque*), and 5.10.38 (*et rident stolidi verba Latina Getae*). Thus, Boccaccio's choice of this character (who does not appear elsewhere in the *Buccolicum*) as an acquaintance of Aristeus reinforces the inferior status of the latter.

⁵³² Interestingly, at *Gen.* 3.22,12, Boccaccio considers *furor* as the violent manifestation and development of unrestrained fervor: *sino fervores iuvenum, qui nisi legum autoritate sopirentur, seu potius coercerentur, in pestiferos profecto furores excederent*. Unlike Plato or the second generation of humanists (Ficino, Landino, Poliziano), Boccaccio does not conceive of the poetic faculty as a *furor*. In fact, at *Gen.* 14.16.2, he maintains that poetry is actually a remedy for *furor*: *Davit, solitus dulcedine carminis furores sedare Saulis*. See Branca (1983: 50-4, 321); and particularly on the relationship between *furor* and the *vates*-poet, see Greenfield (1981: 25).

Caliope

Since he has unwittingly found Phoebus' grove (15-6), Aristeus now wonders whether he has not accidentally found the woman he was searching for, too. Indeed, judging by her gestures, beauty and words, he could easily take Caliope for a goddess. Yet, Caliope clarifies that she is a mere attendant of Saphos, and would never compare herself to her lady. Then, she warns Aristeus about the enormous labour that lies before him, as he is impulsively entering into the realm of lofty and challenging love:

Arist. Quid si tu forsitan esses?
Nam gestu facieque deam verbisque fateris.
Cal. Non ausim, iuvenis, Saphon me dicere, cum sim
obsequiis iniuncta suis. Si inspexeris illam,
longe aliud dices. Verum tibi maximus instat
ante labor. Nimum celsos intratis amores
precipites, cum turpe nimis sit vertere gressus.
Arist. Quid Saphos, si tanta tibi reverentia vultus?
Non equidem silvis Phyllis, non Delia celo
pulchrior. Ast nobis nomen, pulcherrima virgo,
pande genusque tuum, si nostras venit ad aures.
Cal. Caliope vocitor, magni Iovis inclita proles,
castalii nemoris custos fontisque sonori;
ut reor, omnino vestris incognita silvis.
(*Saph.* 81-94)

Observing that Caliope herself is more beautiful than the earthly Phyllis (*silvis Phyllis*), or even than the heavenly Delia (*Delia celo*, that is, Diana), Aristeus refers to her as a *pulcherrima virgo*, and inquiries about her name and ancestry.⁵³³ It is only at this point that Caliope abandons her sarcastic attitude and finally reveals her name, a gesture that could be seen as a watershed in the poem – just as in *Galla* the disclosure of Galla's name by Damon, around the middle of the poem (l. 60), also marked a turning point in the narrative. Caliope then presents herself as a descendant of Jupiter, and as the guardian of the Castalian wood and resounding

⁵³³ As Perini noted, the phrase *pulcherrima virgo* appears at Ovid *Metamorphoses* 9.9 (describing Deianira). See also Prop. 3.3.37-8 (mentioned in "Context and characters" above).

spring (*castalii nemoris custos fontisque sonori*).⁵³⁴ She believes that she is unknown in Aristeus' woods (*ut reor, omnino vestris incognita silvis*).

As we have seen above, Boccaccio explains in his *Epistola* 23 that Caliope personifies *bona sonoritas*, which is related to the Greek concept of “euphony” (εὐφωνία), that is, the quality of speaking beautifully.⁵³⁵ Thus, by suggesting that Caliope is a subordinate of Saphos, Boccaccio's text consequently establishes a hierarchical distinction between euphony – or, more generally, poetic eloquence – and poetic inspiration. In other words, though the quality of speaking beautifully is indispensable to poetry, this should not be confused with poetry itself.⁵³⁶ Indeed, a true poet is not merely someone who has acquired the capacity to articulate his thoughts and stories in a harmonious and pleasant style, for this is in the domain of the *ars/artificium*, and can be achieved through study and effort. A poet is also, and firstly, someone endowed with a special *fervor* to conceive divine, complex allegorical compositions.⁵³⁷ In *Saphos*, through Caliope, Boccaccio questions whether he himself can be called a poet in this sense; yet, through Aristeus, he expresses his intense desire (*fervor*) to achieve the same level of excellence as Virgil and Petrarch.

In the following lines, Aristeus replies that he has learned about Caliope also through the songs of Minciades and Silvanus:

Imo equidem memini: grandis sic ante canebat
Minciades grandisque simul Silvanus in antro.

⁵³⁴ As Perini observed, Castalia actually refers to the *fons* of Parnassus; thus, the *nemus* is a “bucolic pleonasm” (“*nemus* è pleonismo bucolico”, p. 1036). However, see Lucan 5.125 (*Castalios circum latices nemorumque recessus*); and Sen. *Oed.* 276 (*frondifera sanctae nemora Castaliae*), and 712 (*Castalium nemus*).

⁵³⁵ See, for instance, Hugh of St Victor *Didascalicon* 2.8 (755D): *euphonia, id est, bona sonoritas*; and Isid. *Etym.* 3.20.4: *euphonia est suavitas vocis*. Though Boccaccio seems to be familiar with this concept, he himself does not use the term “euphonia” (or its Italian equivalent, “eufonia”) anywhere in his output.

⁵³⁶ In Plato's *Phaedrus*, Socrates refers to Calliope and her companion Urania as the two “Muses who are most concerned with heaven and with thought divine and human and whose music is the sweetest” (τῶν Μουσῶν περὶ τε οὐρανὸν καὶ λόγους οὔσαι θεῖους τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνους ἴασιν καλλίστην φωνήν, *Ph.* 259d, trans. Fowler).

⁵³⁷ See *Gen.* 14.7.2: *si quis autem ex his, quibus hic infunditur fervor, hec minus plene fecerit, iudicio meo laudabilis poeta non erit*; and 4: *et, quoniam ex fervore hoc, ingeniorum vires acuate atque illustrante, nil nisi artificiatum procedit ars ut plurimum vocitata poesis est. Cuius quidem poesis nomen non inde exortum est, unde plurimi minus advertenter existimant, scilicet a poio pois, quod idem sonat, quod fingo fingis, quin imo a poetes; vetustissimum Grecorum vocabulum Latine sonans exquisita locutio* – see discussion in Andrei (2017: 64-7).

Tu silvas resonare doces, tu maxima Saphu
voce refers concepta sacri tibi pectoris hausta.
Sed dic quas teneat sedes pulcherrima Saphos.
(*Saph.* 95-9)

According to these shepherd-singers, Caliope is the one who teaches the woods to resound and, taking Saphos' voice for herself, conveys the greatest things conceived in her sacred breast.⁵³⁸ This means that Saphos represents the source of the noblest, divine ideas; she is the poetic fervour which derives from the bosom of God.⁵³⁹ Caliope, in turn, represents the medium, that is, the technical faculty or instrument which gives form to those divine ideas and, at the same time, gives access to them.⁵⁴⁰ In other words, Saphos-poetry belongs to the realm of heaven, whereas Caliope-euphony belongs to the realm of earth – not the “low earth” though, but somewhere between human and divine.

Saphos' ambivalent nature

In the second half of the poem, Caliope partially yields to Aristeus' insistent queries, and starts to describe her goddess Saphos and her dwelling in more detail. What is especially prominent in this description is the resemblance between Saphos and Virgil's Sibyl of Cumae (*Aeneid* 6), who represented a widely diffused model of female prophet, particularly appealing to Christian authors.⁵⁴¹ In fact, both are chaste, semi-divine women who live on sacred mountains; both are *vates* who are linked with Phoebus Apollo, and produce *carmina*:

Panis nata dei celsum tenet optima Nyse
Saphos, gorgonei residens in margine fontis.
Huius sydereos oculos faciemque serenam

⁵³⁸ Note that, at Ovid *Heroides* 15.27, it is the Muses who dictate songs to Sappho: *at mihi Pegasides blandissima carmina dictant*.

⁵³⁹ See *Gen.* 14.7.1: *fervor... ex sinu Dei procedens*.

⁵⁴⁰ See *Gen.* 14.7.7: *piis hominibus poesim facultatem esse, et ex Dei gremio originem ducere*.

⁵⁴¹ As far as I have researched, no scholar has commented on these intertexts before, which endorse what I have already stated elsewhere, regarding *Olympia*: that Boccaccio meaningfully incorporates Virgilian epic material into his pastoral – see Fonseca (2016a; 2016b). For the Sibyl as a Christian prophet see, for instance, Aug. *Civ. Dei* 18.22.

concessum paucis dudum vidisse bubulcis;
 laureaserta tegunt et velum frontis honeste.
 Cuius in obsequium circumsumus inde sorores
 Pyerides omnes; sibi cantat pulcher Apollo.
 (*Saph.* 100-6)

Saphos is described as the daughter of Pan (*Panis nata*), and as inhabiting the heights of Nysa (*celsum... Nyse*) – one of the peaks of Mount Parnassus, in Phocis, consecrated to Bacchus (the other is Cirrha, associated with Apollo).⁵⁴² More specifically, she dwells on the bank of the Gorgonian spring (*Gorgonei... in margine fontis*) – that is, Hippocrene, a spring on Mount Helicon, a continuation of the Parnassus range which, according to the myth, was formed by the hooves of Pegasus, the sacred horse of the Muses born from the blood of the Gorgon Medusa.⁵⁴³ The sight of Saphos' starry eyes and serene face has been allowed only to a few herdsmen; her fair brow is covered with laurel wreaths and a veil; all the Muses (*sorores/ Pyerides omnes*) are in her entourage, and even the beautiful Apollo sings to her.

By mentioning Pan, Nysa, the Gorgonian spring, and Phoebus Apollo in a sequence, Boccaccio makes a collage of different places and figures which all have a mythical connection with poetry.⁵⁴⁴ The linking of Saphos with both Bacchus and Phoebus, however, might seem particularly striking, as these gods have an antagonistic nature, and exert an opposite influence on humans: while Bacchus is traditionally connected with irrational ecstasy and frenzy, Phoebus is otherwise associated with order and clarity.⁵⁴⁵ Yet, though seemingly paradoxical, since Antiquity, both Bacchus and Phoebus were recognised as complementary gods, especially regarding their respective roles in poetry. As intimated at Juvenal *Satires* 7.53-65 (which begins with a reference to the *vates egregius*, previously alluded to by Boccaccio at

⁵⁴² See *Gen.* 12.24.2: *Nyse, altero ex Parnasi montis verticibus Bacho*; and also *Gen.* 5.25, and *De mont.* "Nisa" and "Cirra".

⁵⁴³ See *Gen.* 10.27.7: *Dicit ergo Pegasum ex Meduse sanguine nasci... Fontem autem Musis ungula aperuisse ideo fingitur*; and also *Gen.* 14.20.1: *antri Gorgonei aditus, honesta penetralia venerande poesis*.

⁵⁴⁴ Compare this sequence with Virgil *Eclogues* 4.55-7: *non me carminibus vincet nec Thracius Orpheus/ nec Linus, huic mater quamuis atque huic pater adsit,/ Orphei Calliopea, Lino formosus Apollo*.

⁵⁴⁵ In modern philosophy, the dichotomy between Dionysian and Apollonian drives is famously developed by Friedrich Nietzsche, in *The birth of tragedy* (1872).

Saphos 18), poetry was not only the product of a free and undisturbed mind, but also of a heart that trembled with song, and that was carried away by both Phoebus and Bacchus (*dominis Cirrhae Nysaeque*).⁵⁴⁶

Likewise, Virgil's characterisation of the Sibyl encompasses both Bacchic and Apollonian tendencies. Although her behaviour and prophetic ravings are rather like those of a Bacchic cult leader, she is nonetheless presented as a priestess of Apollo,⁵⁴⁷ whose secret cavern is located on the heights of Cumae, where Apollo has a temple.⁵⁴⁸ In Putnam's words, the Sibyl is "part Apollo and part Bacchus, τέχνη and μανία, *ars* and *ingenium* combined, active fashioner of words but passively molded by Apollo himself (*fingit*, 6.80)".⁵⁴⁹ As we have seen above, these two aspects reflect not only in Boccaccio's distinction between Caliope (euphony or, more generally, *ars*) and Saphos (divine inspiration, or *fervor*); but also in Saphos herself, since she encompasses both the idea of inspiration (traditionally associated with Bacchus) and of tranquil meditation (features of Apollo).

Yet, it is noteworthy that the honourable Saphos of Boccaccio's eclogue paradoxically shares some features of the deceiving Siren from Dante's *Purgatorio* 19, too. On the one hand, Boccaccio describes Saphos' semblance as serene (*faciemque serenam*, 102) and honest (*frontis honeste*, 104), though rarely exposed. On the other hand, Dante's Siren shows herself as sweet (*dolce serena*, 19), using false attributes to cover her horrendous appearance and seduce men. What is more, while the Siren was able to divert Ulysses from his voyage towards Ithaca with her singing ("io volsi Ulisse del suo cammin vago/ al canto mio", 22-3), Saphos, through the songs of Minciades and Silvanus, was similarly able to divert Aristeus' mind from

⁵⁴⁶ See also Lucan 1.63-5: *nec, si te pectore vates/ accipio, Cirrhaea velim secreta moventem/ sollicitare deum Bacchumque avertere Nysa*.

⁵⁴⁷ See *Aen.* 6.78-81, and 98-101; and Mac Góráin's reading of these passages (2021-13: 221-2). Mac Góráin (pp. 203-4) notes that an overlap of these two tendencies (Apollonian and Bacchic) can be traced already in Virgil's *Eclogues*. In *Eclogue* 4, for example, the Golden Age is mainly associated with Apollo (*ultima Cumaei venit iam carminis aetas*, l. 4; *tuus iam regnat Apollo*, l. 10); but there is a juxtaposition of Bacchic motifs (*hederas... baccare... acantho... ipsa tibi blandos fundent cunabula flores*, ll. 18-23).

⁵⁴⁸ *Aen.* 6.9-12.

⁵⁴⁹ Putnam (1995: 6).

Phyllis (*confestim a Phyllide mentem/ diverti*, 77-8).⁵⁵⁰ Thus, though the Siren traditionally has negative connotations, Boccaccio's text seems to present Saphos as a "good" Siren, who attracts, even without revealing herself too easily, a small number of men towards the noble path of poetry.⁵⁵¹ Moreover, in the same way that the dream of the Siren marks a transition from lower purgatory to upper purgatory in Dante's *Commedia*, the indirect contact of Aristeus with Saphos, in the *Buccolicum*, marks an autofictional transition from Boccaccio's vulgar poetry to classical poetry.⁵⁵²

In what follows in the eclogue, Aristeus asks why his beloved lady lives on the mountains, spurns cities and prevents her beautiful face from being seen:

Arist. Quid montes habitat Saphos? quid respuit urbes?
quid faciem formosa tegit renuitque videri?
Cal. Hec sibi, dum vigilat, nemorum meditatur honores,
atque sedens fuscis Plutarchi visitat ortos,
concipiens nigre fletus et dissona silve;
vel pelagi secreta notat lucosque sub undis,
Phorcynidumque choros trahit et persepe napeas;
vel petit elysios colles et gramina leta
conspicit et placidos flores frondesque virentes
ac avium cantus et pulchri sydera celi,
visaque sublimi complectitur omnia plectro
et viridis complexa libri sub tegmine ponit.
(*Saph.* 107-18)

Caliope replies that, while awake, Saphos can reflect on the glories of the woods; and while sitting still, she can visit Plutarch's (i.e. Pluto's) dark gardens (*fuscis Plutarchi... ortos*, 110),

⁵⁵⁰ Boccaccio also alludes to the Dantean Siren elsewhere, as in *Rime* 5 (describing his female loved one), *Rime* 35 (Partenopè), *Tes.* 3.10-12 (Emilia), and *Dec.* 8.4.28-37 (Ciutazza) – see Gambera (2006: 53-4), and Brown (2020: 103-5). On the different treatments of the Siren's myth from Homer to the Renaissance period, see De Rachewiltz (1983).

⁵⁵¹ There are some striking links between Boccaccio's Aristeus and Dante's Siren, too. Indeed, the Siren initially appears to Dante, in dream, as an ugly, stammering woman ("femmina balba", *Purg.* 19.7). But then, as an effect of Dante's lustful eyes, she has her tongue loosened, and transforms herself into a beautiful woman singer ("così lo sguardo mio le faceva scorta/ la lingua... com' amor vuol, così le colorava.// Poi ch'ell' avea 'l parlar così disciolto,/ cominciava a cantar", 12-17). Similarly, as we have seen above, Aristeus is described by Caliope as Bathos because of his tongue-tie (*nuper dissolvere linguam/ vix poterat Bathos*, 54-5).

⁵⁵² On *Purgatorio* 19, see Barolini (1992: 105-9; 2014).

the secret places of the sea, or the Elysian hills.⁵⁵³ Thus, while allegorically referring to the unlimited power of poetry, as well as to the infinite possibilities offered by the poetic mind, the text is also metapoetically indicating three of the four dimensions encompassed in the *Buccolicum*: the earthly world symbolised by the woods (eclogues 1-9), hell (eclogue 10), and heaven (eclogue 14). On an intertextual level, moreover, in the passage above we can again find some relevant links between Saphos and Virgil's Sybil, who is allowed to guide Aeneas through the dark regions of the Underworld, starting with those of black Tartarus.⁵⁵⁴ More particularly, Sapho's imaginary Elysium alludes to Virgil's Elysium, similarly described in *Aeneid* 6 as a pastoral *locus amoenus*, composed of happy green pastures (*locos laetos et amoena virecta*, 638).⁵⁵⁵

It is significant that Saphos "embraces all that she sees with her sublime plectrum, and she puts what she has embraced under the cover of a green-hued book" (*Saph.* 117-18 above). The phrase *sub tegmine*, on its own, immediately alludes to the opening line of Virgil's *Eclogue* 1, where we find the same phrase in the exact same position. Yet, Boccaccio's text subverts the reader's expectation, for *tegmen*, in this case, refers to the cover of a green-bark book (*viridis... libri sub tegmine*, *Saph.* 118), and not to "the canopy of a spreading beech-tree" (*patulae... sub tegmine fagi*, *Ecl.* 1.1), or of any other tree for that matter.⁵⁵⁶ At the same time, Boccaccio's text innovates while introducing the book as a bucolic object, which brings two

⁵⁵³ As Perini observed (1994: 1000), here Boccaccio uses the form *Plutarci* (instead of *Plutonis*, as one would normally expect as the genitive for *Pluto*) due to a general onomastic principle of the *Buccolicum*. Accordingly, some classical names remain intact when referring to a historical figure, but the same name is modified when referring to the corresponding mythical figure. A good example of this is Boccaccio's uses of Hercules in *Phylostropos*: in line 108, the "historical" Hercules is called Alcides; whereas in 122, the mythical (and pagan) Hercules appears as Alcidas (see Chapter 4, "Between the desire and fear"). In the specific case of Plutus/Plutarchus, though, we only find the second form employed in the *Buccolicum* (10.25 *Plutarci*; 10.109 *Plutarchus*; 11.167 *Plutarchus*; 14.99 *Plutarci*), which makes a comparison impossible. However, Boccaccio does use the correct form *Plutonis* (never *Plutarci*) in his *Genealogie*. See also Lidonnici (1914: 329).

⁵⁵⁴ See *Aen.* 5.733-6. Boccaccio could be alluding here also to Horace's *Odes* 2.13, where we find a reference to Sappho in the Underworld.

⁵⁵⁵ Boccaccio's *Olympia* allegorically portrays Christian heaven as a better version of the Elysium sung by Minciades-Virgil (159-69).

⁵⁵⁶ See also Virg. *G.* 4.566: *Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi* (a clear allusion to Virg. *Ecl.* 1.1).

implications. Firstly, it subverts the classical bucolic and elegiac *topos* of carving love verses on trees (present at *Galla* 44 and *Alceste* 68-9), thereby highlighting the more elevated and durable content of Saphos' poetry.⁵⁵⁷ And secondly, as Combs-Schilling has already suggested, Saphos' book serves as a synecdoche for the *Buccolicum carmen* as a whole, intimating that "pastoral, at least theoretically, could contain all things".⁵⁵⁸

Considering the intertextual relationships between Boccaccio's Saphos and Virgil's Sibyl above, it is worth noting that, while the former records her visions in a book, the Sibyl randomly writes her prophetic *carmina* on leaves (*in foliis descripsit carmina virgo*, *Aen.* 3.445). In fact, these two different modes and mediums of writing reveal a fundamental discrepancy between the personalities of the Sibyl and Saphos. Whereas the former acts insanely (*insanam vatem*, *Aen.* 3.443) and chaotically, without caring to collect her scattered writings (*nec revocare situs aut iungere carmina curat*, 451), the latter otherwise prefers order and avoids confusion. In other words, perhaps as an inversion of the Virgilian Sybil, who in many ways resembles a Bacchante, Boccaccio's Saphos has predominant Apollonian features.

Finally, by describing Saphos' solitary retreat, Boccaccio is introducing the first element of a dialogue between *Saphos* and the *Genealogie* which will be developed further in the following lines of the eclogue. Indeed, the passage from *Saphos* above implies a relationship between Saphos' choice of living on the mountains and her processes of contemplation and creation. In so doing, Boccaccio's text engages with a tradition (notably shared by Petrarch) that sees silence and solitude as two fundamental prerequisites for poetic composition. Yet, as Boccaccio makes clear in *Genealogia* 14.11, the fact that most poets preferred to isolate themselves in the countryside or in the woods did not mean that they were

⁵⁵⁷ See, however, Calp. *Ecl.* 4.130-1: *et cantus viridante licet mihi condere libro/turbida nec calamos iam surdant classica nostros*.

⁵⁵⁸ Combs-Schilling (2019: 104).

incapable of living in society, as some detractors of poetry so often insinuated.⁵⁵⁹ Listing examples of poets who historically played an important role in politics (from Euripides to Virgil to Dante and Petrarch), Boccaccio maintained that, if poets preferred to live in solitary places, it was because it was impossible to think and write in the chaos of cities.⁵⁶⁰ A peaceful and silent place, near nature, gives strength to the intellect (*ingenium... in vires revocare*), and inspires the imagination to think and compose the most sublime things (*in desiderium meditationis sublimium et aviditatem etiam componendi*, 7). Thus, in the eclogue, it is no coincidence that Saphos prefers to remain on her summits, where she is allowed to meditate and imagine all things sublime without external interference. However, this is not the only reason why she has escaped from the world.

The detractors of Saphos

The second half of Caliope's speech promotes a discussion on the relationship between Saphos and society. Evoking some lifelong opinions about poetry, and resorting to some of the key arguments used in the final books of his *Genealogie* (particularly of *Genealogia* 14), Boccaccio ultimately proposes, through Caliope's praise and defence of Saphos, a mini-defence of poetry in his eclogue:

Anne putas vulgus stolidum seu garrula turba
auritos tondens asinos permetteret ista?
Non equidem: clamore gravi, dum stringeret hyrcos,
omnia turbaret. Montana ergo ocia dulci
pace sibi plena expetiit mea fulgida diva;
et quia quos querit frustra lasciva puella
Chyroni flores pedibus calcamus euntes
vere novo, Saphos celso se condidit antro

⁵⁵⁹ *Gen.* 14.11.1: *dixi hos obstrepentes insuper dicere poetas rura, montes, et silvas incolere, eo quod urbanitate et moribus non valerent.*

⁵⁶⁰ *Gen.* 14.11.4: *Ast si nesciunt sussurrones hi, ob id solitudines incolunt et coluere poete, quia non in foro cupidinario, non in pretoriis, non in theatris, non in capitoliis aut plateis, publicisve locis versantibus, seu turbelis civicis inmixtis, vel mulierculis circumdati sublimium rerum meditatio prestatur, absque qua fere assidua nec percipi possunt, nec perfici percepta poemata.* See *Hor. Epist.* 2.2.65-66, 79-80, 84-6 (quoted by Boccaccio); and also *Petr. De vit. sol.* 11.7.2 – Zaccaria (1998: 1708, n. 128).

atque sacros lauro texit castissima vultus.
(*Saph.* 119-27)

The “stupid mob” (*vulgus stolidum*) and the “garrulous throng” (*garrula turba*) recall the idea of the *popellus* – previously mentioned in the poem (*Saph.* 49), as well as in *Genealogia* 14 (*ignaro ascultante popello*, 14.3.3) –, thus indicating that Saphos has fled precisely from that group of people which Aristeus himself used to entertain. Then, the image of the “long-eared asses” (*auritos... asinos*, *Saph.* 120 above) seems a direct borrowing from Ovid; and evokes the myth of King Midas, who, after poorly judging Pan’s music as superior to that of Phoebus, was punished by the latter with an ass’s ears.⁵⁶¹ Yet, more generally, this context also brings to mind Proverbs 23:9: “speak not in the ears of a fool: for he will despise the wisdom of your words” (trans. King James).⁵⁶² Indeed, Caliope intimates that Saphos’ sacred words were scorned by fools. For that reason, and because she wanted to escape from the noisy shouts and confusion of the crowds, she sought out the tranquillity of the mountains (*montana... ocia*, *Saph.* 122 above).

Caliope describes her lady Sapho as a “resplendent goddess” (*mea fulgida diva*, 123) and as a “very chaste” woman (*castissima*, 127), whose face is veiled with bay-leaves.⁵⁶³ As Perini suggested, this image of Sapho sharply contrasts with that of the “wanton girl” (*lasciva puella*) in line 124, thus implying that lofty poetry rejects erotic themes. However, this reading gains another layer of complexity if we remember that, in his first eclogue, Boccaccio described Galla also as a *lasciva puella*; and that, in his *Epistola* 23, he referred to his two introductory eclogues as dealing with his own *lasciviae* (*lascivias meas*, *Ep.* 23.4). Accordingly, we could

⁵⁶¹ Ovid uses the phrase *auritus asellus* at *Am.* 2.7.15, *Ars Am.* 1.547 and *Fast.* 6.469, but recounts the myth of Midas’ and the ass’ ears at *Met.* 11.172-93 – see Smarr (1987: 247), and Perini (1994: 1037). The adjective *auritus* (rarely used in Trecento texts) is also employed, in a different context, at Petrarch *Bucolicum* 10.152 (*auritaque rura*); and at Boccaccio *Buccolicum* 2.19 (*auritos lepores*) – the latter is an allusion to Virg. *G.* 1.308.

⁵⁶² Vulgata: *in auribus insipientium ne loquaris quia despicient doctrinam eloquii tui.*

⁵⁶³ Note that Virgil too describes the Sibyl as chaste (*casta Sibylla*, *Aen.* 6.735). Curiously, in his chapter of the *De mulieribus* dedicated to the Sibyl of Cumae, Boccaccio ascribes her wonderful gift of prophecy not to Apollo – as Virgil and other poets did – but rather to the “merit” of her virginity alone (*De mul.* 26.2).

infer that the kind of poetry represented by Saphos does not encompass *Galla* and *Pampinea*, and perhaps not even the political eclogues of the *Buccolicum*. Though seemingly paradoxical, this notion reinforces the view that the *Buccolicum* can be read as an autofictional narrative of transformation, where the initial and intermediary pieces symbolise temporary stages that must be overcome within the book itself.

From Caliope's lines 124-6 above, it is possible to infer that, by Chyron (Chiron), she refers to the Centaurus constellation, notably associated with winter. Consequently, the image of a wanton girl seeking flowers in winter, while Caliope can easily walk along and trample the flowers in springtime, might metaphorically indicate that lovers are always seeking rewards in vain (as the *ben vani* discussed in Chapter 1). Moreover, it is significant that this passage alludes to Ovid *Metamorphoses* 5.551-63, where the narrator questions why the Sirens (*Acheloides*) have the feathers and feet of birds, but maidens' features (*virginis ora; virginei vultus*). He wonders if this is because the Sirens (*doctae Sirenes*), who were originally among Proserpina's companions, once sought her in vain while she was gathering spring flowers; but since they could not find her anywhere on earth, they prayed that they could fly above the waves to search, and the gods acquiesced. On the one hand, this Ovidian allusion offers a relevant comparison between the *lasciva puella*'s vain search for flowers in winter and the Sirens' vain search for Proserpina, without establishing a direct comparison between these women. On the other, it also highlights the previous links between Saphos and Dante's *serena*, anticipating the false accusation that Saphos is a Siren, as we will see in line 145 below.

In the following lines, Aristeus remembers the tragic fates of Socrates and Scipio Africanus. The allusion to the Greek philosopher may be inferred, firstly, because of his connection with Attica through Aracynthus (*Aracyntho*), a range of mountains which was often placed in that region; and, secondly, because of the mention of the hemlock (*cicuta*), which is

famously known as the poisonous plant used to kill Socrates. The allusion to Scipio, in turn, is suggested by his associations with Punic lions (*Penos... leones*):⁵⁶⁴

Arist. Vidi ego conflantem carmen celeste Aracyntho
pastorem celebrem primo, tandemque cicuta
sublatum; et latiis se pulsum vidit ab arvis
qui penos septis contriverat ante leones.
Sat vidisse oculis semel est mirabile quodque.
Cal. Sic est, sic sanctum nimio contemnitur usu.
Preterea vultu quidam carpsere minaci
innocuam maculisque piam depingere frontem,
si possent, ausi; que postergasse necesse est.
(*Saph.* 128-36)

Though recognising the meaning of Aristeus' speech as obscure, Perini suggested that it might imply that Saphos did well in isolating herself, for one can easily pass from a state of glory to a state of ignominy, as both the examples of Socrates and Scipio would demonstrate.⁵⁶⁵ In my view, however, the passage at issue deals not so much with the ephemerality of glory, as with the ignorance and ingratitude of the *vulgus stolidum* who unjustly punish the wise and brave. Accordingly, in the same way that Socrates was condemned in Athens, and that Scipio Africanus was forced by enemies to withdraw from Rome, Saphos had to flee from the foolish crowd in order to preserve herself. Boccaccio's argument, moreover, seems to expand on Giovanni del Virgilio's advice to Dante in *Eclogue* 1, regarding how the vulgar multitude often disdains what is precious, just as the swine disdain pearls – a theme that is also explored in Boccaccio's *Trattatello*, particularly in relation to Dante's unjust exile.⁵⁶⁶ Caliope's response seems to support this reading, as she regrets the fact that, after too much use, anything sacred

⁵⁶⁴ On Aracynthus, see, for instance, Virg. *Ecl.* 2.24 (and Servius' respective commentary); and Bocc. *De mont.*, "Aracynthus": *Aracynthus mons est Minerve sacer et celebris carminibus poetarum. Verum veteres in qua sit regione non concordant: nam alii dicunt eum Attice regionis montem, quidam eum esse Thebanum, non nulli Ambrachium, et alii Arcadum.* On Socrates and the cicuta, see, for instance, Sen. *Ep.* 13.14.4: *cicuta magnum Socratem fecit.* On Scipio and the lions, see Petr. *De vir.*, "Sc. Afr." 4: *Castulonenses, cesis Scipionibus, fidem simul cum fortuna comuni hominum more mutaverant et ad Penos defecerant.*

⁵⁶⁵ See Perini (1994: 1037).

⁵⁶⁶ *Tratt.* 5-6.

is treated with scorn (*sic sanctum nimio contemnitur usu*, *Saph.* 133).⁵⁶⁷ She then claims that certain men have menaced and slandered Saphos, trying to stain her innocent character. Though Caliope would rather omit these things, Aristeus insists that she goes on:

Arist. Imo age, nympa, precor; maculas ostende nefandas.
Cal. Mendacem et stupris fedam morumque ruinam
hanc plures dixere deam, scenasque colentem
dixerunt alii mimamque ambire theatra;
soccos nonnulli damnant veteresque coturnos;
hi, superum fidibus dicunt quia cantet amores
et facie ficta gestus designet avitos,
pellendam patria quasi regnans occupet urbes;
syrenam vocitant alii lucrique voracem,
cum nequeant renuantque suos cognoscere cantus.
His etiam commota, volens sua culmina servat.
(*Saph.* 137-47)

The text above not only hints at an ancient tradition, according to which Sappho was viewed as a *hetaira*,⁵⁶⁸ but also at a lifelong quarrel between poets and other groups, who accused the former of being liars, immoralists and anti-Christian. While in *Genealogia* 14 Boccaccio reacts against these accusations as a scholar, having recourse to an ample repertoire of rhetorical strategies and erudite examples to defend poetry and poets, in *Saphos* instead he uses poetry to defend poetry. As we have briefly seen above, and will see more thoroughly in the next paragraphs, many of the arguments which Boccaccio develops in prose detail in the *Genealogie* are succinctly and creatively displayed in *Saphos*.

In *Genealogia* 14.13 (entitled *Poetas non esse mendaces*), for instance, Boccaccio argues against the notion that poets are liars, as insinuated by some insolent men (*insultantes*, 1), as he calls them. According to these, poets can only write about absurd metamorphoses and false gods, besides distorting facts. Boccaccio, then, refers to Augustine's definition of lying,

⁵⁶⁷ Boccaccio uses a similar *topos* in his *Epistola* 7, where he argues that Petrarch is not admired enough by his contemporaries, and that people often neglect the great products of their times: *O rem detestandam, ut audita potius quam visa laudemus!* (*Ep.* 7.10).

⁵⁶⁸ See, for instance, Nymphodorus of Syracuse in Athenaeus' *The Learned Banqueters* 13.70; and Seneca's *Epistles* 88.37 – Thorsen & Berge (2019: 311-12, 344). See also Most (1996: 15), and Reynolds (2000: 73).

and maintains that poets create fictions, not lies, for they do not have the intention of deceiving people.⁵⁶⁹ For this and other reasons, Boccaccio demonstrates that such an attack is groundless. In *Saphos*, Caliope invokes the same idea, suggesting that many men had unjustly called her lady a liar (*mendacem*).

Then, in *Genealogia* 14.20 (*Musas infici non posse ob defectum lascivientis cuiusquam ingennii*), Boccaccio criticises the detractors of poetry who, presenting themselves as very learned and erudite philosophers, misquote the words of the revered Boethius to validate their own foolish opinions. Taking his ideas out of context, these fake scholars pejoratively refer to the poetic Muses as “theatrical little prostitutes” (*scenicae meretriculae*) – the same words used by Lady Philosophy, at the beginning of the *Consolatio Philosophiae*, when she finds out that Boethius, who was sick in bed, had sought help from these pernicious Muses.⁵⁷⁰ However, Boccaccio argues that those men who insist on quoting that phrase have never actually read Boethius, since they missed the main point of his critique, which was not addressed to poetry in general, but rather to popular theatre.⁵⁷¹ In fact, in the *Consolatio*, Lady Philosophy has her own Muses and, in order to cure Boethius, she herself has recourse to verses and poetic fiction.⁵⁷² Similarly, evoking this same debate in the passage from *Saphos* above, Caliope reports the opinion of some men who think that Saphos “cultivates the stage and goes into the theatres as a mime actress” (*scenasque colentem/ dixerunt alii mimamque ambire theatra*). Here, as in *Genealogia* 14.20, the text intimates that, for the critics of poetry, even the most elevated kinds of poetic fiction were taken as obscene and cheap forms of entertainment.

⁵⁶⁹ *Gen.* 14.13.1-3; *Aug. De mend.* 14.25 – Zaccaria (1998: 1709, n. 146).

⁵⁷⁰ *Cons. Phil.* 1.26. See also *Petr. Contr. Med.* 1.141 – discussion in Morganti (2008: 187-9).

⁵⁷¹ *Gen.* 14.20.6: *ex quibus satis possunt, quod ignorabant, videre poetis infesti, Boetium scilicet, dum Musas meretriculas scenicas vocitabat, de theatriali Musarum specie intellexisse*. See also *Espos.* 1.lit.110 – Zaccaria (1998: 1714, n. 235). Since Antiquity, theatre and actors were highly stigmatized, and the word *mima* (pantomime actress), in particular, “was a term of opprobrium approximately equivalent to *meretrix* (prostitute)” – Richlin (1992: 10).

⁵⁷² *Gen.* 14.20.7.

Another argument against poetry, set out in both *Genealogia* 14 and *Saphos*, was that poetry propagated the loves of the ancient gods. In *Genealogia* 14.14 (*Stulte damnatur, quod minus sane intelligitur*), Boccaccio reports the opinion of those who loathe and despise poetry; and who think that all poems (not only inferior comedies) should be “cancelled”. In their opinion, all poetic compositions dealt with the lecheries and trifles of the pagan gods: *volunt insuper atque clamitant, execrantes poeticum nomen, omnino abolenda esse poetarum carmina, eo quod lasciviis et nugis deorum gentilium referta sint* (1). For this reason, those critics used Plato to condemn poets to exile, ignoring the fact that the unworthy poets had been banished by the Church already (*quos semideus Plato urbe pellendos iusserat, et adversus quos hi nostri veritatis ignari clamitant, iam exterminati sunt et abiecti*, 5-6).⁵⁷³ In similar ways, in the passage from *Saphos* above, Caliope recounts that some men have condemned her lady to exile because she would sing, with her lyre, the loves of the gods (*hi, superum fidibus dicunt quia cantet amores... pellendam patria*, 142). Additionally, they condemned Saphos’ use of ancient slippers and buskins, as well as her dramatic portrayal of ancient deeds. In other words, they condemned everything related to poetry, especially pagan poetry, from the lowest to the loftiest genres.⁵⁷⁴

Then, building on previous intertexts, in lines 145 and 146 of *Saphos*, Caliope explicitly reports the false accusation that her lady was a greedy Siren (*syrenam... lucrique voracem*), whose songs no one could understand, or were such that they refused to try to do so. On the one hand, the comparison between Saphos and a Siren reflects an opinion against which Boccaccio vigorously argues in *Genealogia* 14; namely that poets, just like the Sirens, were

⁵⁷³ At *Gen.* 14.14.4-5, Boccaccio himself criticised some popular dramatic genres, especially the comic ones, which put on stage mimes, histrionics and parasite types. Yet, according to him, these base genres, which were contrary to the Christian faith, had been long extirpated by Constantine and Pope Sylvester I. On Plato and the poets, see *Pl. Rep.* 3.398a, 607b, 9, transmitted in *Aug. De civ.* 2.14 and 8.13 – Zaccaria (1998: 1705, n. 49). This Platonic idea is developed further by Boccaccio in *Gen.* 14.19 (*Minime poetae omnes iussu Platonis pellendi sunt urbibus*).

⁵⁷⁴ On the slipper (*soccus*) and buskin (*coturnus*) as symbols of comedy and tragedy respectively, see, for instance, *Hor. Ars P.* 80, and *Ov. Rem. am.* 375-6. See also *Bocc. Alc.* 125, and discussion in Chapter 2, “Celebration”.

“seducers of minds” (*mentium seductores*, 14.16.1), who managed to pour all their follies into the readers with sweet song, pleasant talk, careful and elegant speech.⁵⁷⁵ Likewise, the idea that poets were obscure is also treated in *Genealogia* 14.12 (*Damnanda non est obscuritas poetarum*), where Boccaccio, though admitting that some poems can indeed be obscure, nevertheless maintains that this is not necessarily a fault, nor is it an exclusive feature of poetry, since philosophy and even the Sacred Scriptures are full of obscurities and ambiguities. Though the difficulty of understanding those texts makes the knowledge of them even more precious (as suggested by Augustine and Petrarch), some people prefer to blame poets for their own laziness.⁵⁷⁶

On the other hand, the insinuation that Saphos is greedy for wealth apparently has no correlation with the debate of *Genealogia* 14. As a matter of fact, Boccaccio dedicates an entire chapter of that book to respond to the *opposite* accusation; namely that poets, in the opinion of some ignorant lawyers, were not very wise as they consumed all their time and energy in unprofitable and useless works.⁵⁷⁷ Similarly, in *Laurea*, Boccaccio opposes Daphnis’ disinterested love for Saphos to Stilbon’s utilitarian love for Crisis.⁵⁷⁸ Thus, perhaps the unusual characterisation of Saphos as greedy, in the passage from *Saphos* above, only proves that her critics were constantly talking nonsense. For all these reasons, Saphos voluntarily fled from the crowds.

⁵⁷⁵ *Gen.* 14.16.1: *poetas esse mentium seductores, eo quod dulcisono carmine, lepido sermone, accurata atque ornata oratione, ineptias suas legentibus ingerunt.* In Boethius’ *Consolation*, Lady Philosophy not only calls the Muses prostitutes, but also Sirens (1.41). Boccaccio does not comment on this passage in *Gen.* 14.14, but he quotes it at *Espos.* 1(1)110. I will come back to this discussion on the Siren in Chapter 4, while analysing Boccaccio’s description of Crisis in *Phylostropos*.

⁵⁷⁶ See *Aug. Doctr.* 2.6.7; *Petr. Coll.* 9.8: *eo tamen dulcior fit poesis, quo laboriosius quesita veritas magis atque magis inventa dulcescit.* See discussion in Kennedy (1999: 174-82), Camper (2013: 58-81), and Gilson (2013: 269).

⁵⁷⁷ *Gen.* 14.4.3: *pauperrimos homines fuisse poetas... quia non divites fuere, nullius pretii eorum extimanda facultas sit.* See Perini (1994: 1038).

⁵⁷⁸ See *Laur.* 83-90; and also *Tratt.* (1) 22, and *Gen.* 1.Proh.1.29

The Ericole

Aristeus at first believes that those detractors of Saphos were actually drunks who, even during the most sacred rites, often vomit up things for which nobody should care. Yet, Caliope refutes him, saying that some of the most prestigious men in the woods, the so-called Ericole, have tried to dishonour Saphos:

Arist. Dum porcam Cereri, Bacho dum cedimus hyrcum,
forte graves vino ludentes talia quidam
eructant curanda parum, pereuntque per auras.
Cal. Non sic; conati nemorum maculare priores.
Arist. Qui, precor? An sano tanta est insania cuiquam?
Cal. “Ericolas” tales merito dixere veteri.
Arist. Non satis accipio qui sint. Tu, credo, Platoni,
nympha, putes nunc verba loqui magnove Ligurgo
rusticus et paucis assuetus, nympha, rudisque.
Cal. Qui nuper raptas pecudes ex ore luporum
dentibus excerpunt, magnos audentque boatus
vendere simplicibus; qui sese noscere causas
infecti pecoris, fontes herbasque salubres,
et celi mutare vices nemorumque fatentur;
qui superum sedes describunt voce superbi
et sentire deum sensus causasque moventes
in silvas fulmen, sacra atque piacula dicunt.
(*Saph.* 148-64)

Admitting that he is not as clever as Plato or Ligurgus (Lycurgus), Aristeus does not fully grasp the meaning of the term “Ericol(a)e” – a neologism invented by Boccaccio, ostensibly based on the Greek word *eris* (ἐρίς), meaning strife, quarrel, discord; plus the suffix *-cola/ae*, from the Latin verbal root of *colere* (“to cultivate”).⁵⁷⁹ Thus, the Ericole represent cultivators of discord. From Caliope’s description of these men above, moreover, we can infer that they represent lawyers (157-9); physicians and astrologers (159-61); philosophers and theologians (162-4).⁵⁸⁰ Though in the *Genealogia* 14 Boccaccio attacks the first and third categories by

⁵⁷⁹ Lycurgus was a Spartan lawgiver, whom Boccaccio numbers among other *gravissimi* lawgivers in his *De cas.* 3.10. The name also appears at *Bucc.* 8.65, 70, and 11.181, always indicating an exemplar of wisdom and justice – Perini (1994: 982). Perini (p. 1039) also suggests that the name “Ericola” might derive from *(a)es*, *(a)eris*, meaning *pecunia*.

⁵⁸⁰ Perini (1994: 1039).

name (particularly in 14.4 and 5), his arguments there (like those of Petrarch in *Contra medicum*) can be nevertheless applied to all the so-called men of science; and perhaps more specifically to the so-called *moderni*, who fervently, and sometimes unreflectively, preached a *logica modernorum* based mainly on the Aristotelian and Averroist philosophies.⁵⁸¹

While distinguishing these pseudo-intellectuals from mere drunkards, the text of *Saphos* is again dialoguing with *Genealogia* 14. Indeed, before developing his defence of poetry in the latter work, Boccaccio finds it relevant to define his enemies first. Thus, in *Genealogia* 14.2-3, he points out the existence of two major categories of critics of poetry: the ignorant, and the falsely wise. The first are basically vulgar and insane men who are proud to devote their lives to feasts, lust and inert idleness.⁵⁸² As they hold glasses of wine, with their filthy mouths, they condemn all the studies and efforts of the erudite. Nevertheless, they are harmless and should not be a great concern for the poet. Meanwhile, the second category of critics is formed by a more perfidious sort of men, who are respectable in their manners, but whose intelligence is not any better than that of the previous group.⁵⁸³ According to Boccaccio, they are persons who like to call themselves philosophers and to be revered as such, just because they have heard the names of a few philosophers.⁵⁸⁴ They use pretentious and complex words while speaking of the most superficial and irrelevant things. In order to keep their status as intellectuals, they often frequent the houses of the truly learned men, but only so that they can afterwards scorn, criticise and wrongly quote them before an audience of ignorant people.

⁵⁸¹ On the *logica modernorum*, see Morganti (2008: 36-78), Trinkaus (1987: 11-21), and Garin (1960: 181-95). At *Contr. med.* 3.103, Petrarch also associates the *moderni* to certain infamous (anti-Christian) philosophers, such as the Epicureans. He pejoratively compares the members of the latter group to pigs, using the phrase *Epicuri de grege porcum* (borrowed from Hor. *Epist.* 1.4.16) to describe the person who follows them – see Morganti (p. 118). This adds yet another layer to Caliope's portrayal of Aristeus as a *subulcus* in *Saphos*, as though she was implying a connection between him and the *moderni* too.

⁵⁸² *Gen.* 14.2-3: *vulgus, homines quidam insani... comesationibus, libidinibus et inerti ocio vacare existimantes.*

⁵⁸³ *Gen.* 14.3.1: *species hominum altera, moribus forte minus redarguenda priore, sed prudentia non maior.*

⁵⁸⁴ *Gen.* 14.3.1: *hi sunt, qui, ante visum scholarum limen, se, quia quandoque phylosophorum quorundam audivere nomina, putant esse phylosophos.*

Particularly when it comes to poets, this group will promptly condemn them even without having read their works thoroughly.

In the passage from *Saphos* above, it is significant that Caliope emphasizes the reporting verbs *fatentur* (161) and *dicunt* (164) to suggest that the Ericole profess to do more than what they can actually do. In this sense, the word *boatus*, used in line 158 in reference to the lawyers' loud and empty utterances, is also meaningful. Indeed, in at least three instances in *Genealogia* 14 (9.1, 18.10 and 21), Boccaccio uses the unusual term *boatores* to refer to the detractors of poetry. What is more, Caliope employs an evocatively didactic language, as she highlights the Ericole's obsession to know the causes of things (*qui sese noscere causas/ infecti pecoris*, 159-60; *causasque moventes/ in silvas fulmen*, 163-4). Particularly in the first case, the text overtly alludes to Virgil *Georgics* 2.490-3, which suggests that those who succeed in learning the laws of nature are happy (an idea also present in Lucretius).⁵⁸⁵ However, the sequence of Virgil's *makarismos* indicates an alternative path which can be equally (if not more) fulfilling:

felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas
atque metus omnis et inexorabile fatum
subiecit pedibus strepitumque Acherontis avari:
fortunatus et ille deos qui novit agrestis
Panaque Silvanumque senem Nymphasque sorores.
(Virg. *G.* 2.490-94)

Servius reads these lines as an indication that both philosophers and countrymen can achieve happiness alike.⁵⁸⁶ Yet, it is clear that this passage in the *Georgics* also acquires metapoetic significance. As a writer of didactic poetry of Lucretian type, Virgil proposes to learn and describe the laws of nature; however, he does not deny himself the possibility of writing other

⁵⁸⁵ See Hardie (2007: 115).

⁵⁸⁶ Serv. *Ad G.* 2.490.1-3: *repetitio est superioris coloris; nam hoc dicit: et rustici felices sunt, et qui tribuunt operam philosophiae. "Rerum causas" id est physicam philosophiam.*

kinds of poetry too, or perhaps even to go back to the lower bucolic genre – as the mention of Pan, Silvanus and the Nymphs, as well as the implicit idea of pastoral contentment, might imply. In fact, as suggested in the previous lines of *Georgics* 2, Virgil made his choice to be a poet and, as such, he expects to be welcomed and taught by the divine Muses. But, at the same time, he wants to follow his own poetic instincts and desire, choosing the topics of his preference without caring for renown.⁵⁸⁷

What effect can this Virgilian allusion have on Boccaccio's *Saphos*, then? It might be that, while Virgil's text suggests a wide view of knowledge and happiness, one which encompasses different life choices, Boccaccio's text otherwise intimates that the *Ericole* have a much narrower perspective, since they cannot admit any other occupations and kinds of knowledge besides their own. Actually, this idea is explicitly developed in *Genealogia* 15.10 (*Ut plurimum studia sequimur, in que prona videntur ingenia*), where Boccaccio argues against the theologians who try to devalue all other fields. Without denying that some studies are nobler than others, Boccaccio (partly engaging with Dante's *Paradiso* 8) claims that the diversity of occupations reflects the diversity of natural inclinations; and that humans are allowed to choose whatever suits their personal desires and needs, according to the free will which was granted to each one of them by God.⁵⁸⁸ In *Saphos*, a similar argument reverberates in the following lines of Aristeus:

Quid, precor, agricolis est cum pastore? Per agros
ille boves terram cogit rescindere aratro,
hic cogit virga pecudes in pascua; cogit

⁵⁸⁷ G. 2.475-86: *me vero primum dulces ante omnia Musae,/ quarum sacra fero ingenti percussus amore,/ accipiant caelique vias et sidera monstrent/ ... sin has ne possim naturae accedere partis/ frigidus obstiterit circum praecordia sanguis,/ rura mihi et rigui placeant in vallibus amnes,/ flumina amem silvasque inglorius.* See the contrasting readings of Thomas (1988, ad 2.475-94) and Volk (2002: 142-5) on this passage. See also Hor. *Epode* 2.1-8 (*Beatus ille qui procul negotiis...*); and discussion in Harrison (2007: 238).

⁵⁸⁸ See *Gen.* 15.10.3; and Dante *Par.* 8, esp. 118-23: “‘E puot’ elli esser, se giù non si vive/ diversamente per diversi offici?/ Non, se ’l maestro vostro ben vi scrive’./ Si venne deducendo infino a quici;/ poscia conchiuse: ‘Dunque esser diverse/ convien di vostri effetti le radici’”, and 133-5: “Natura generata il suo cammino/ simil farebbe sempre a’ generanti,/ se non vincesses il proveder divino”. On Dante's *Paradiso* 8, see Barolini (1984: 57-84; 1992: 191-2; 2014, n.p.).

vinitor ut certo consistant ordine vites,
 lac premit iste manu quod sumpsit ab ubere pingui:
 rancidulus nil ergo videt de iure bubulci
 rusticus, et pastor nescit de more bufulci.
 Nullum sorte sua contentum liquit Erinis;
 hinc peragunt rixas tauri seivique leones.
 (*Saph.* 165-73)

Resorting to a predominantly Virgilian vocabulary and structures (taken from both the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*), Aristeus talks about the different occupations and respective responsibilities of a shepherd and a farmer, and how one is ignorant of the other's customs.⁵⁸⁹ He also describes the activities of a vinedresser, as well as those of a cheesemaker. The evocation of an Erinis (Erinys), in line 172, reinforces the connection between the Ericole and ἔρις above; but, more generally, this line displays the topic of *mempsimoiría* (discontent with one's own lot), alluding to Horace's *Satire* 1.⁵⁹⁰ While Horace's poem suggests a split between urban and rural life, with an implicit hint at Stoic and Epicurean philosophers, Boccaccio's passage above opposes mainly the *agricole* (symbolising the "modern" writers of scientific, logical and didactic prose) to the *pastores* (poets). As in *Genealogia* 15.10, Aristeus implies that both vocations are relevant. Yet, since each of them is absorbed in its own instruments and tasks, they overlook each other and, like bulls and lions, they often quarrel.⁵⁹¹

⁵⁸⁹ Compare, for instance, *Saph.* 165-6 (*agricolis... terram... rescindere aratro*) ~ Virg. *G.* 1.494 (*agricola incurvo terram molitus aratro*), and 2.513 (*agricola incuruo terram dimovit aratro*); *Saph.* 165-6 (*pastore... cogit virga pecudes in pascua*) ~ Virg. *Ecl.* 6.4f. (*pastorem... pascere oportet ovis*), and *G.* 3.322-3 (*aestas/ in saltus utrumque gregem atque in pascua mittet*); *Saph.* 168 (*ordine vites*) ~ Virg. *Ecl.* 1.73 (*ordine vitis*); *Saph.* 169 (*lac premit*) ~ Virg. *Ecl.* 1.81 (*pressi copia lactis*). See more examples in Index of Intertexts.

⁵⁹⁰ *Sat.* 1.1.1-3: *Qui fit, Maecenas, ut nemo, quam sibi sortem/ seu ratio dederit seu fors obiecerit, illa/ contentus vivat, laudet diversa sequentis?*. See Perini (1994: 1040). On Erinys, see Boccaccio's gloss to *Teseida* 9.5: "Erinis... infernale furia" – Agostinelli & Coleman (2015: 274). On the theme of *mempsimoiría* and the divided existence in Horace, see Harrison (2007: 235-8), and Freudenburg (1993: 3-51, esp. 10-11).

⁵⁹¹ See *Bucc.* 4 (*Dorus*), 61: *nos iurgantes pueros agitare Erinis*. In *Contra Medicum* (3.136), Petrarch, freely paraphrasing from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (5.8, 1133a, 16-17), compares the anonymous physician addressed in his invective to a farmer: *nolo autem indigneris quod vos et agricolas iuxta pono; fecit idem Aristotiles: "Non ex duobus medicis fit commutatio", inquit, "sed ex medico et agricola"* – Bausi (2002: 67-111), and Morganti (2008: 76, 364-5).

How to reach Saphos

Near the end of the eclogue, Aristeus makes a final attempt, and asks Caliope what is the easiest way to reach Saphos. The Muse replies that the paths leading to her lady's summits have become full of obstacles, since greed for wealth has made them neglected for ages:

Arist. Sed da, queso, viam qua possim lenius alta
scandere Parnasi Saphonque videre canentem.
Cal. Turbavere quidem vestigia longa viarum
et nemorum veteres rami cautesque revulsi,
implicite sentes pulvisque per ethera vectus;
velleris atque fames et grandis cura peculi
neglexit latos montis per secula calles.
Hinc actum ut, scrobibus visis, in terga redirent
iam plures peterentque suos per pascua fines.
Arist. Non ego convertar facilis; nam sepe nivosi
conscendi rupes pedibus scopulosque Lycei.
Omnia continui superant, michi crede, labores.
(*Saph.* 174-85)

This passage advances the notion, suggested above, that poetry and greed are incompatible. In this particular context, the term *cura peculi* ("concern for wealth", 179), although also present at Virgil *Eclogues* 1.32, alludes more directly to Horace *Ars Poetica* 330-33. There, Horace employs the same phrase to argue that, if Rome lacks good and young poets, it is because of its excessive lust for money.⁵⁹² Thus, in Boccaccio's poem, by claiming that the paths of Saphos' mountain have been neglected for a long period of time, Caliope seems to recognise that the poetic activity has been devalued since at least ancient Rome.⁵⁹³ Because of this, many people have turned their backs on Saphos' inaccessible summits, and focused on other objects which were easier to attain. Indeed, as Boccaccio argues in *Genealogia* 15.10, not everyone

⁵⁹² See Oliensis (1998: 209). Boccaccio's phrase *velleris fames*, in turn, evokes Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* 6.150 (*velleris ardor*). It is worth noting, however, that prior to Poggio's discovery of the *Codex Sangallensis* in 1416, excerpts from Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* circulated only (or mostly) in *florilegia* – see Zissos (2006: 170), and also Billanovich (1958: 155-243).

⁵⁹³ See also Petr. *Coll.* 4.2-4: *Fuit enim quoddam tempus, fuit etas quedam felicior poetis, quando in honore maximo habebantur. (...) Hodie vero, ut videtis, mutata sunt omnia* – discussion in Lummus (2020: 117-8).

has the capacity to follow their natural inclinations. It is not easy to achieve that which one desires, and many talents are destined to perish.⁵⁹⁴

Yet, Aristeus is determined not to give up. He has often climbed on foot the ridges and rocks of snowy Lycaeus – an image that calls to mind Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, where we see the icy rocks of Mount Lycaeus weeping for Gallus (*et gelidi fleverunt saxa Lycaeï*, 15). Moreover, this allusion gains double force in the expression of Aristeus' line: the phrase *omnia continui superant labores* overtly evokes Virgil's *omnia vincit Amor* (10.69) – besides Virgil's self-allusion at *Georgics* 1.145, *labor omnia vincit* (where *labor*, however, has a negative connotation, associated with violence).⁵⁹⁵ Thus, on the one hand, the allusion establishes a fundamental opposition between Virgil's Gallus and Boccaccio's Aristeus. For while the former gives in to love at the end of Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, recognising all his attempts to move away from elegy as futile, the former otherwise believes that he has already traversed the obstacles of erotic poetry, and thinks that now he can move to nobler kinds of composition. On the other hand, the same allusion suggests that Aristeus-Boccaccio, just like Virgil in *Eclogues* 10, might be also referring to his bucolic journey thus far. Indeed, the indication of winter, implicit in the adjective *nivosi* (*Saph.* 83), contrasts with both the summer of *Galla* and the spring of *Alceus*, intimating that Boccaccio's autofictional journey is coming to an end – but not quite yet, since it is only in *Phyllostropos* that we will see its final closure.

Though Aristeus optimistically believes that his persistent efforts can overcome anything, Caliope nonetheless maintains that natural talent (*ingenium*) often beats strength, and that effort alone sometimes is not enough – an idea which engages in dialogue with Boccaccio's discussion in *Genealogia* 15.10, as well as with Petrarch's *Collatio laureationis*. Caliope says that Arpinas, for instance, sweated in vain to reach the top with voice and pipes:

⁵⁹⁴ *Gen.* 15.10.2: *Attamen non adeo facile est, ut existimant aliqui, velle omnia, que debemus, et longe acrius consequi, si velimus... sic et natura parens, cui inexhauste vires et perfectum ingenium est, producit hec peritura diversis officiis apta.*

⁵⁹⁵ Mynors (1990 ad loc.).

Cal. Vicit et ingenium vires: non talia quivit
exuperare labor. Frustra sudavit in altum
ferreus Arpinas, calamis et voce sonorus.
Arist. Mens illi non ista fuit nec carminis ardor.
Nascimur in varios actus, quos optima virtus
si sequitur, facili ducetur ad ultima cursu.
(*Saph.* 186-91)

Arpinas signifies Cicero, the great orator from Arpinum, whose attempts to write poetry could never match his gift for oratory.⁵⁹⁶ In fact, Caliope's speech evokes an argument used by Cicero himself, and one that is mentioned by Boccaccio in *Genealogia* 14.7. Describing Cicero as a "philosopher rather than a poet" (*Tullius Cicero, homo phylosophus non poeta*), Boccaccio cites *Pro Archia* 8.18 to support his claim that poetry, unlike rhetoric and other arts, is not made up of studies, doctrine, and precepts alone. Instead, poetry is essentially rooted in nature and born of God: *atque sic a summis hominibus eruditissimisque accepimus. Ceterarum rerum studia et doctrina et preceptis et arte constare, poetam natura ipsa valere, et mentis viribus excitari, et quasi divino quodam spiritu inflari etc.* (*Gen.* 14.7.6).⁵⁹⁷

In *Saphos*, though Aristeus does not go as far as saying that he is endowed with the poetic *furor*, he nevertheless thinks that he has a strong passion for poetry (*carminis ardor*, 189 above) which Arpinas did not have. Sure of his poetic vocation and destiny, he argues that each individual is born to play a different character; and as long as this is followed by means of virtue, the ultimate goal is easily achieved. Partly swayed by Aristeus' words, Caliope then finally advises him to go and seek out Silvanus:

Cal. Si tibi tantus amor fontis Saphuque videndi,
accipe consilium: nam quenquam ducere nobis
ipsa quidem vetuit Saphos, et lege perenni.

⁵⁹⁶ Perini (1994: 1041). Cicero's bad reputation as a poet in Antiquity was attested by Juvenal (*Sat.* 10.122-6), for instance. On Cicero's poetic output and its (negative) reception in Antiquity, see Gee (2013: 88-106), and Bishop (2018: 137-59).

⁵⁹⁷ See also Petr. *Coll. Laur.* 2.6-7 (mentioned above), and *Contr. Med.* 1.120 – Zaccaria (1998: 1706), and Morganti (2008: 184-5; 2019: 151-79). For a general discussion on the topic of poetry, divine inspiration and knowledge in Boccaccio, see, for instance, Gilson (1964: 253-82), Canetti (2011: 179-95), and Andrei (2017: 37-92).

Solus inaccessum potuit conscendere culmen
 nuper Silvanus, nobis nec carior alter
 Minciadis post fata fuit; non pastor Opheltis,
 Aonii pecoris stragem qui carmine pinxit.
 Hunc adeas; dabit ipse tibi quibus usus amicis
 et quibus ipse viis conscendit culmen amatum
Arist. Ibo quidem et geminos mecum portabo suellos,
 Silvanum si forte queam divertere donis.
 (*Saph.* 192-202)

If Aristeus has such a strong desire to see Saphos, he must do it by following another man who has succeeded in the same task. Recently, only Silvanus was able to climb up to the inaccessible peak. After the death of Minciades, no one was dearer to Saphos and her entourage than him – not even the shepherd of Opheltes, who sang the slaughter of the Aonian flock.⁵⁹⁸ It is Silvanus, therefore, who will show Aristeus which friends and paths he used to scale the beloved peak. In this way, Boccaccio alludes to Petrarch's self-presentation as Stupeus in *Amor pastorius*, where he was welcomed by the Muses (especially Calliope) as their favourite one; and they willingly offered him a laurel bough so that he could pursue Daphne.⁵⁹⁹

Most of the commentators of the *Buccolicum* have assumed that the *pastor Opheltis* above meant Lucan, whose epic poem *Bellum civile* tells of Caesar's defeat of Pompey. The fact that Boccaccio refers to Pompey by the name Opheltes in his eclogue 9, *Lipis* (l. 66), contributed to this reading.⁶⁰⁰ Yet, it is striking that, for Boccaccio, Lucan was more a historian than a poet, which makes a comparison between him and Virgil rather unlikely.⁶⁰¹

⁵⁹⁸ It might be perhaps disconcerting that, in the passage at issue, Calliope refers to Minciades as a dead shepherd from the past, while previously, at *Saphos* 67-9, Aristeus says that Silvanus met Minciades just the day before (*Minciadem Silvanus heri... convenit*). It is clear, though, that Boccaccio is more concerned with the allegorical and moral connotations of his characters, even when this implies some inner inconsistencies in the narrative.

⁵⁹⁹ See Petr. *Buc.* 2.85-125 – Hubbard (1986: 232). In his eclogue *Laurea occidens*, too, Silvius-Petrarch similarly planned to achieve the heights of poetry by emulating the greats (the first of whom was Virgil) – see Petr. *Buc.* 10 (*Laurea occidens*), 36-45.

⁶⁰⁰ See Hortis (1879: 52, n. 3), Lidonnici (1914: 338), Smarr (1987: 248), and Perini (1994: 1041). According to this reading, then, the “Aonian flock” (*aonii pecoris*, l. 198) would refer not to the Thebans specifically, but rather to the Romans. On Dante and Statius, see, for instance, Lewis (1956: 133-9), and Barolini (2014d).

⁶⁰¹ See *Espos.* 4.1.88-90, and *Gen.* 14.13.14: *Lucanum, quam ob causam multi eum potius metricum hystoriographum quam poetam existimant* – Martellotti (1967: 265-70). In *Inferno* 4, Dante mentions Lucan as the last in a line of great poets from Antiquity: “quelli è Omero poeta sovrano;/ l'altro è Orazio satiro che vene;/ Ovidio è 'l terzo, e l'ultimo Lucano” (85-93) – for a more nuanced discussion on Dante's view of Lucan, see Facchini (2020: 1-22).

Alternatively, following Jonathan Usher, it is more plausible to think of Boccaccio's "shepherd of Opheltes" as Statius, who in the *Thebaid* (1.34 ff.) gives us a narrative of Theban slaughter, uses *Aonia* in relation to Thebes, and narrates the story of the death of the infant prince Opheltes (4.729 ff.).⁶⁰² What is more, Statius (Stazio) has an important role in Dante's *Commedia*, particularly in *Purgatorio* 22, being portrayed there as a convert to Christianity, and a friend (and disciple) of Virgil. Indeed, unlike Lucan, Statius openly praised Virgil's *Aeneid*, and tried to follow in Virgil's footsteps in his own epic.⁶⁰³

Thus, the meaning of Caliope's final words, in *Saphos*, is apparent: if Aristeus-Boccaccio wants to reach divine poetry, he must do it by emulating the greats, and there is no better model available to him than his own contemporary Silvanus-Petrarch, who after Minciades-Virgil may be considered the poet that has gone the farthest, surpassing even the shepherd of Opheltes-Statius. Yet, perhaps the allegorical comparison between Petrarch and Statius, in this context, could be read in a more specific sense, as a reference to the bucolic genre: whereas Statius followed Virgil as a model of epic, Petrarch imitated the Mantuan in both the bucolic and the epic. In other words, Petrarch was able to get closer to Virgil as a writer of bucolic poetry, rather than of epic (which other illustrious poets, Statius among them, had already accomplished). Implicit in Caliope's advice to Aristeus, then, is that the most viable way for him to become a *vates* worthy of Saphos is by following the bucolic path previously traced by Virgil and Petrarch.⁶⁰⁴

Saphos ends with Aristeus resolved to meet Silvanus, and perhaps win over the latter with twin piglets. On the one hand, while reminiscently bucolic, this plan of Aristeus leaves

⁶⁰² See Usher (2007b: 187-9).

⁶⁰³ See *Theb.* 12.815-16: *vive, precor: nec tu divinam Aeneida tempta/ sed longe sequere et vestigia semper adora* (*Theb.* 12.815-16) – Piacentini (2015: 161). Furthermore, scholars have claimed that, in the *Commedia* (esp. *Inf.* 4 and 25), Dante implicitly regarded Virgil and Statius as superior to Lucan and Ovid – see Facchini (2020: 4-5).

⁶⁰⁴ At *Gen.* 14.19.15, Boccaccio calls Petrarch "a second Parthenias" – a traditional nickname assigned to Virgil (Don. *Vit. Virg.* 11.19), associated with virginity, and used as the title of Petrarch's first eclogue: *pius, mitis, atque devotus, et adeo verecundus, ut iudicetur parthenias alter*. See Piacentini (2015: 63).

space to doubt: has he really understood that Saphos, and consequently her honourable followers, could never be approached through easy means, such as gifts, especially the gifts of a *subulcus*? As Caliope has extensively demonstrated throughout the eclogue, the only way to achieve what her lady represents is through effort, devotion, and talent. On the other hand, in a more autofictional key, Aristeus' final lines could be also read as an indication of the process that resulted in the *Buccolicum*, implying that Boccaccio had shown two of his earliest pastoral compositions (perhaps *Postquam fata sinunt* and *Tempus erat placidum*) to Petrarch.⁶⁰⁵ In this case, Boccaccio would be signalling Petrarch's influence in his own literary ascent, particularly regarding the composition of the *Buccolicum*. Yet, as we will see in our next and final chapter, Boccaccio found in Petrarch more than just a poetic model and teacher who promoted a change in his own literary tastes and career. In addition, he found in Petrarch a religious guide who helped him to convert all his previous desires into the love for God; and who ultimately showed him, through literature, the path to spiritual salvation.

⁶⁰⁵ The metapoetic idea that swine could stand here for poems evokes the end of Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 (as well as *Eclogue* 1.74), where, as some scholars have suggested, the she-goats (*capellae*) symbolically represent Virgil's bucolic *liber* – see, for instance, Casanova-Robin (2014: 268), and Cucchiarelli (2017: 514-15). As we saw in the Introduction, in his final eclogue *Aggelos* Boccaccio refers to his own eclogues as skinny goats.

CHAPTER 4: *Phylostropos*

Summary

Winter is coming, and threatens the sheep. Phylostropos urges Typhlus to look at the mountains, but Typhlus cannot see the slightest sign of snow (1-6). Phylostropos tries to persuade him to move to another place while there is still time; but Typhlus is not worried at all, and thinks that spring will soon return (7-22). Phylostropos admonishes Typhlus not to trust Crisis and Dyone, for these two seductive women can play tricks on him (23-9). The former keeps Typhlus always busy with work, while she herself is seeking new lovers (30-56). Typhlus calls Phylostropos envious and bitter, and challenges him to name at least one of Crisis' lovers (57-65). Phylostropos lists a number of them, and Typhlus acknowledges his error (66-96). What about Dyone, though? Phylostropos responds that she is charming but cruel, and has also turned the heads of many people. He asks Typhlus to abandon such enemies and go away before winter has come (96-113). Typhlus is rather moved by his friend's admonitions, yet still reluctant to leave; he wishes to go on playing his reed pipe, singing, and enjoying Crisis' rewards and Dyone's fiery passion (114-25). Phylostropos warns about the dangers to which Typhlus will be exposed, but the latter says he is not afraid of death (126-33). Phylostropos then recalls the merciful acts of Soter, who cleansed the infected flocks with his own blood, so that the innocent could find happiness in the dwellings above (134-44). Yet why, asks Typhlus, would one replace the certain with the uncertain? Phylostropos insists that nothing is certain, and that everything is subdued by time, except in Theoschyry's far-off grove (145-63). Typhlus considers himself unworthy of this place, and he is fearful of Theoschyry (164-73). Phylostropos assures him that, as long as he confesses his sin and prays for forgiveness, Theoschyry will be merciful to him (174-91). Typhlus is convinced; he wants to go there. But how did Phylostropos acquire all this knowledge? From some ancient shepherds, who were

allowed to climb the peak, he answers (192-95). Now Typhlus can finally see the signs of winter. He prays for Theoschyus' indulgence, and longs to leave the frozen valleys where he currently lives to search for those distant woods. He only needs to break the chains which cruel women have put around his feet and neck (196-205). Phylostropus encourages Typhlus to maintain mental firmness and break these chains in order to recover himself. Typhlus hesitates a little again, wondering if the journey might be too hard; but Phylostropus replies that Soter will give him strength. Typhlus accepts Phylostropus' advice, and wishes farewell to his bay tree and goats (206-20).

Context and characters

If the earlier *Saphos* presented Boccaccio's autofictional attempt to become a poet-vates, now *Phylostropos* will present his autofictional process of religious conversion, displaying some of his main ideas on old age, death, and Christian salvation.⁶⁰⁶ As suggested in the Introduction, though it is followed by *Aggelos*, *Phylostropos* may be justly conceived as the final narrative eclogue of the *Buccolicum carmen*, the piece which concludes Boccaccio's allegorical pastoral. Indeed, *Aggelos* presents itself as a type of paratextual poem, functioning as an epilogue to the whole book. An indication of this is offered at the beginning of *Aggelos*, where Appenninus (representing the dedicatee of the work, Donato Albanzani) points out that Angelus (the messenger who acts as the dedicatory eclogue itself) is bringing "no more than fifteen she-goats" (*ter quinque capellas, / nec plures*, 11-12) to him, thus implying that the core of the *Buccolicum* is formed by the fifteen preceding eclogues.⁶⁰⁷ In this way, though Boccaccio incorporates many features from Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 into *Phylostropos*, he transposes the idea

⁶⁰⁶ Boccaccio adopts a similar strategy in his *Esposizioni* – see Padoan (1959: esp. 73-89).

⁶⁰⁷ See Bocc. *Ep.* 23.31-2, and Introduction, "The *Buccolicum carmen*: summary and allegory".

of an epilogue from that piece (where Virgil concludes his work, and pays tribute to Cornelius Gallus) to *Aggelos*.

In addition, it is noteworthy that *Phylostropos* occupies the fifteenth position in the *Buccolicum carmen*. As has been noted by Simone Marchesi (regarding Dante's work), in medieval numerology, the number fifteen was connected with Jerusalem and the temple at its centre. In his treatise *De numerorum*, Isidore of Seville interpreted this number as a symbol of the unity of the Testaments (*hic numerus societatem significat Testamentorum*, 16.78). Moreover, he observed that fifteen was the number of steps around the temple of Jerusalem – the steps “through which, gradually rising, one may complete the ascent to the Temple of the celestial Jerusalem” (*per quos a terrenis paulatim crescendo usque ad templum Ierusalem superne conscenditur*, 79).⁶⁰⁸ With this in mind, it seems no coincidence that *Phylostropos* contains references to the heavenly Jerusalem; and represents, in the context of the *Buccolicum*, Boccaccio's final step towards salvation.

As Boccaccio explains in his *Epistola 23*, *Phylostropos* deals with his personal process of renouncing the love of earthly pleasures, to focus on the love of heaven. For this reason, *Phylostropos* is a portmanteau name formed from the Greek words φίλος (broadly defined as “love” by Boccaccio, though more accurately translated as “lover”) and τρόπος (“conversion”). The speakers are Phylostropus and Typhlus. The first refers to Boccaccio's *gloriosus preceptor*, Petrarch, whose advice helped him redirect his mind from ephemeral to eternal things. The second refers to Boccaccio himself, or to any other man whose sight has been darkened by the mist of earthly matters, since the Greek word τυφλός means “blind”:

Quintadecima egloga dicitur *Phylostropos*, eo quod in ea tractetur de revocatione ad amorem celestium ab amore illecebri terrenorum; nam *Phylostropos* dicitur a “*phylos*”, quod est “*amor*”, et “*tropos*”, quod est “*conversio*”. Collocutores duo sunt, *Phylostropus* et *Typhlus*. Pro *Phylostropo* ego intelligo gloriosum preceptorem meum Franciscum Petrarcam, cuius monitis sepiissime michi persuasum est ut omissa rerum

⁶⁰⁸ Marchesi (2016: 97-8).

temporalium oblectatione mentem ad eterna dirigerem, et sic amores meos, etsi non plene, satis tamen vertit in melius. Typhlus pro me ipso intelligi volo et pro quocunque alio caligine rerum mortalium offuscato, cum “typhlus” grece, latine dicatur “orbis”. (*Ep.* 23.29-30)

While the names “Phylostropus” and “Typhlus” seem to be lexical inventions of Boccaccio, coined specifically for this eclogue and not found in any other texts, it is beyond doubt that both the metaphor of vision and the theme of conversion had been previously explored by Christian authors.⁶⁰⁹ Already in the Gospel of John, for instance, we find the well-known account of Jesus healing the eyes of a man born blind – a passage which could be understood both literally and allegorically, as if Jesus represented not only a source of concrete miracles, but also the light that removed man’s spirit from the darkness of ignorance, by showing him the divine truths: *me oportet operari opera ejus qui misit me donec dies est venit nox quando nemo potest operari/ quamdiu in mundo sum lux sum mundi* (Vulg. Ioan. 9:4-5).⁶¹⁰ Similarly, in *Purgatorio* 11, Dante speaks of the mist of worldly sin (“la caligine del mondo”, *Purg.* 11.30), which souls brought with them to Purgatory, and had to clean off before ascending to heaven; and he also spoke of the fog of sin that clouded the vision of the highest heaven (“nebbia che di colpa velo”, *Purg.* 30.3).⁶¹¹ Then, in the *Paradiso*, as the Dantean pilgrim neared God, he also neared the end of all desires; and his own sight, becoming pure, was finally able to perceive the ray of true and exalted light (“lo raggio de/ l’alta luce che da sé è vera”, *Par.* 33.54).⁶¹²

⁶⁰⁹ Yet, note Boccaccio’s two names and titles “Filostrato” (“defeated by love”, according to a false etymology) and “Filocolo” (“sadness” or “burden of love” – in Italian, “fatica d’amore”), used in his previous works. On vision and light in medieval literature and theology, see, for instance, Gilson (2000), Akbari (2004), and Whidden (2014).

⁶¹⁰ See Aug. *Tract. in Ioan.* 44 (Ioan. 9), 5: *Ecce ipse est dies. Lavet oculos caecus in die, ut videat diem. Quamdiu, inquit, in mundo sum, lux sum mundi*; and also Aquinas *Super Ioan.* 8.2, esp. 1142: *sic lux illa intelligibilis intellectum facit cognoscentem. Quia quidquid luminis est in rationali creatura, totum derivatur ab ipsa suprema luce.*

⁶¹¹ See Singleton (1973, vol. 2: 226).

⁶¹² See Gilson (2000: 217).

Before Dante, one of the most influential works about conversion was Augustine's *Confessions* (397-ca. 401), an example of spiritual autobiography, where the bishop of Hippo set out, particularly in the first nine of its thirteen books, the gradual process of his complete adherence to Christianity.⁶¹³ Augustine divided his life into two significant phases, before and after conversion, describing the first as a period of spiritual blindness, and the second as one of lucidity. In Book 2, for instance, Augustine revealed that, when he was young, he blindly sought the approval of his foolish and lustful companions: *nesciebam et praeceps ibam tanta caecitate ut inter coetaneos meos puderet me minoris dedecoris, quoniam audiebam eos iactantes flagitia sua* (*Conf.* 2.3.7). Yet, afterwards, God listened to the prayers of Augustine's mother, and rescued his soul from deep darkness (*de hac profunda caligine eruisti animam meam, Conf.* 3.11.19).

Though Boccaccio possessed manuscripts of both Augustine's *De civitate Dei* and *Expositio Psalmorum* in his personal library, and extensively quoted from these works in his *Genealogie* and *Esposizioni*, we have no material or textual evidence that he read Augustine's *Confessions*.⁶¹⁴ However, this does not exclude the fact that the *Confessions* was one of the most widespread works in the Middle Ages, and was among Petrarch's favourite books. In his *familiar* letter 4.1 (better known as *The ascent to Mount Ventoux*, and dated to the early 1350s), Petrarch revealed that this book was given to him as a present by the Augustinian monk and scholar Dionigi da Borgo San Sepolcro (to whom that letter was addressed).⁶¹⁵ Then, from Boccaccio's *Epistola* 5 (1342), we can infer that Boccaccio was also close to Dionigi, whom

⁶¹³ See Mazza (1966: items 1.2, 1.12, and 1.13).

⁶¹⁴ We also know, from a note in Petrarch's manuscript of Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, that he had received it from Boccaccio: *Hoc immensum opus donavit mihi vir egregius dominus Iohannes Boccacci de Certaldo, poeta nostri temporis, quod de Florentia Mediolanum ad me pervenit. 1355, aprilis 10* – see Billanovich (1947: 198-9), Gerosa (1966: 330), and Coppini (2004: 20).

⁶¹⁵ *Fam.* 4.1.26: *visum est michi Confessionum Augustini librum, caritatis tue munus, inspicere; quem et conditoris et donatoris in memoriam servo habeoque semper in manibus*. See also Petr. *Sen.* 8.6 (addressed to Donato Albanzini, to whom Boccaccio dedicates his *Buccolicum*), and 15.7 (to Ludovico Marsili); discussion in Saak (2020: 263), and Ullman (1973: 118-19, and 132). On the important role that Dionigi da San Sepolcro represented in both Petrarch's and Boccaccio's early humanistic training, see Suitner (ed. 2001).

he referred to as his “reverend father and master” (“il reverendo mio padre e signore maestro Dionigi”, *Ep.* 5.7); and from his *Epistola* 2 (the so-called *Mavortis miles*), it has been inferred that Boccaccio firstly got to know about Petrarch through Dionigi, who is referred to there as a friend from Avignon.⁶¹⁶

The paradigmatic experience recounted by Augustine in the *Confessions* is recalled in works as diverse as Dante’s *Commedia* and Petrarch’s *Secretum*.⁶¹⁷ The latter, in particular, is a key reference for the reading of *Phyllostropos*. For, besides performing the role of Boccaccio’s fictional guide in the poem, Petrarch provides (along with the Augustinian tradition) a compelling model for the plot of *Phyllostropos*, which originally presents itself as a confessional eclogue.⁶¹⁸ Dated around 1347-53, the *Secretum* consists in a Latin prose dialogue, or rather a *familiare colloquium*, between Franciscus (Petrarch) and Augustinus (Augustine).⁶¹⁹ In its third and final book, Petrarch develops a substantial reflection on old age and mortality. While Augustinus concedes that it is a good thing to endure the physical signs of old age with equanimity, he strongly disapproves of those who try, at all costs, to delay or avoid that stage of life, ignoring that the final day will eventually come. Thus, Petrarch’s Augustinus further maintains that one should always be mindful of death, and that those who fail to see the swiftness of time are nothing but blind: *non videtis, o ceci, quanta velocitate volvuntur sidera, quorum fuga brevissime vite tempus devorat atque consumit, et miramini senectutem ad vos venire, quam dierum omnium rapidissimus cursus vehit* (*Secr.* 3.12.1).

Although ancient philosophers, especially Stoics, had cultivated *meditatio mortis* as a crucial practice for the care of the soul, it goes without saying that for Petrarch, as well as for

⁶¹⁶ See also Bocc. *Petr.* 10: *fratri Dyonisio de Burgo theologie magistro*; and Branca (1977: 36-7).

⁶¹⁷ On Dante and Augustine’s *Confessions*, see, for instance, Freccero (1986: 1-27), and Took (1990: 360-82).

⁶¹⁸ As far as I have investigated, Casanova-Robin (2017: 323-47) has been the first to pinpoint Augustinian and Petrarchan elements in Boccaccio’s *Phyllostropos*. Before her, Perini (1994: 1065) had observed the prevalence of an “Augustinian tone” in *Phyllostropos* (“accenti più agostiniani che petrarcheschi”), but he did not provide any further illumination on this aspect – except for a brief mention of Augustine’s formulation *in te ipsum redi* (*De vera relig.*, 72), when commenting on Boccaccio’s phrase *reddito teque tibi* (*Phyl.* 209).

⁶¹⁹ See Marsh (2009: 211). On Petrarch and Augustine, see, for instance, Luciani (1982), Gerosa (1966), Cardini & Coppini (eds. 2004), Gill (2004), and Lee (2012).

Boccaccio and most medieval authors, mortality was fundamentally regarded as a Christian concern. For them, the consciousness of death necessarily implied the consciousness of an afterlife, and the consequent need to prepare oneself for God's decisive judgment.⁶²⁰ In this context, then, the metaphors of vision and blindness, previously imbued with moral connotations in some Roman philosophical works, also receive a religious treatment in Christian literature.⁶²¹ Besides Petrarch's *Secretum*, we could mention his ninth eclogue, *Querulus*. Dealing with the theme of the plague (which by 1348 had reached the north of Italy), this poem displays a dialogue between the allegorical characters Philogeus (earth lover) and Theophilus (lover of God).⁶²² As Philogeus weeps over the devastation of his beloved lands and flocks, Theophilus encourages him to flee away to safer domains (*effugite, o ceci, securaque poscite regna*, 82-4), and to finally turn his eyes to heaven (*huc, huc volve oculos*, 90). Thus, it is not difficult to observe how Boccaccio's *Phyllostropos* thematically engages with both these works of Petrarch: similarly to Franciscus and Philogeus, Typhlus is portrayed as a blind man who cannot see the imminence of his own death (allegorised in the eclogue as winter).⁶²³

It might be striking, however, that neither Petrarch nor Boccaccio goes through a “complete” conversion in the Augustinian sense. In fact, the ambiguous end of Petrarch's *Secretum* has generated discussions about Franciscus' final decision.⁶²⁴ After a long

⁶²⁰ See Cic. *Tusc.* 1.30.74: *tota enim philosophorum vita, ut ait idem, commentatio mortis est* – quoted at Petr. *Secr.* 3.17.13, and *Fam.* 24.1.28-9. See also Isid. *Etym.* 2.24.5: *philosophia est meditatio mortis, quod magis convenit Christianis*; and Petr. *Secr.* 1.1.1 – discussion in Lee (2012: 74-81), Mazzotta (1986: 248), and Enenkel (2018: 58).

⁶²¹ For some examples of the metaphor of moral blindness in Roman philosophical texts, see Cic. *Tusc.* 1.87, 3.4.5, 3.11.2; Sen. *Ep.* 15.9.6 (*caeca cupiditas*), 16.9.5 (*caecam cupiditatem*), and especially *De vita beata* 1.1: *vivere, Gallio frater, omnes beate volunt, sed ad pervidendum, quid sit quod beatam vitam efficiat, caligant* – on the latter passage, see Casanova-Robin (2017: 337).

⁶²² See Bergin (1974: 234-5); and discussion of the plague in Chapter 1, “Love, the disease of the young”.

⁶²³ See also Petr. *Triumphus Mortis* 1.37-9: “io son colei che sì importuna e fera/ chiamata son da voi, e sorda e cieca/ gente a cui si fa notte inanzi sera”; 2.31-3: “mentre al vulgo dietro vai/ et a la opinion sua cieca e dura,/ esser felice non puoi tu già mai”.

⁶²⁴ See *Secr.* 3.18.7: *sed desiderium frenare non valeo*; discussion in Lee (2012: 69-73, 92), and Saak (2020: 272-3).

colloquium with Augustinus, Franciscus seems to go back to the point where he started (*in antiquam litem relabimur*, 3.18.8). Admitting that he is not ready to renounce his earthly desires (*desiderium frenare non valeo*) and follow the straight road to salvation (*rectum callem salutis*, 7), Franciscus finally prays that God may guide him in his detours (*et duce Deo integer ex tot anfractibus evadam*, 8).⁶²⁵ Similarly, though we leave *Phylostropos* with the impression that Typhlus has made the definitive choice of abandoning his life of pleasure and poetry, the passage from *Epistola* 23 above actually defies this reading, intimating that Boccaccio, like Petrarch in the *Secretum*, has only partially (*non plene*) renounced his objects of desire.⁶²⁶

Overlaying this Christian background, as was anticipated above, *Phylostropos* is highly allusive to Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, too. Firstly, both Gallus and Typhlus are portrayed as men clouded by love. Secondly, both poems celebrate the friendship and mutual influence between poets: while Virgil expresses his ever-increasing love and devotion to Cornelius Gallus (*Gallo, cuius amor tantum mihi crescit in horas*, *Ecl.* 10.73), letting his own eclogue be infused with elegiac content, Boccaccio displays his admiration for Petrarch in *Phylostropos*, elevating him from a literary master to a spiritual guide.⁶²⁷ Thirdly, it is significant that both poems play with different levels of autofictionality: in *Eclogue* 10, Virgil assumes the position of the narrator of Gallus' loves (*sollicitos Galli dicamus amores*, 6), but he eventually interferes in his own fiction (*quem vidimus ipsi*, 26); in *Phylostropos*, Boccaccio similarly displays himself and Petrarch as characters.⁶²⁸

⁶²⁵ A similar idea is displayed in Petrarch's *canzone* 264, *I' vo pensando*: "et veggio 'l meglio, et al peggior m'appiglio" – see Van Peteghem (2020: 249). On the *topos* of the *amans senex*, see Chapter 1, "The Golden Age". On Petrarch's rejection of love in old age, see, for instance, *Sen.* 18.1.2, and *Post.* 7-8; discussion in Baron (1985: 208-14).

⁶²⁶ Though we are dealing here with two different texts, from two different genres, it might be worth recalling that the reception of Boccaccio's epistle is indissolubly attached to the reception of his *Buccolicum* (and vice-versa), besides being an autofictional work in its own right which, like the rest of his output, has effects on his self-fashioned career – see Introduction, "Methodology".

⁶²⁷ For a metapoetical interpretation of Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, see Conte (1984: 13-42). On Boccaccio's deference to Petrarch as his preceptor, see our note on Yollas in Chapter 2 (*Alc.* 64).

⁶²⁸ The brief mention of Menalcas, who is widely interpreted as an *alter ego* of Virgil, at *Eclogue* 10.20 (*uivida hiberna venit de glande Menalcas*), could be seen as yet another autofictional element of the poem – see Coleman (1977: 281), Clausen (1994: 301), and Fonseca Jr. (2020b: 1-22).

In addition, we might finally ask ourselves whether Virgil's poem could be also read as an eclogue of "conversion". For if, on the one hand, *Phyllostropos* depicts a process of reorientation of the soul that culminates with Typhlus' rejection of the pastoral world, Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, on the other, has been extensively interpreted as a metaliterary text which stages Gallus' attempt to escape the pain of his elegiac love in the bucolic genre.⁶²⁹ In other words, Gallus' lovesickness at first prompts him to convert himself from an elegiac into a bucolic poet, as he wrongly believes that the loves of shepherds are less complicated and less frustrating than his own elegiac loves.⁶³⁰ Yet, Gallus' attempt ultimately fails, his bucolic fantasy dissipates, and (like Typhlus, in Boccaccio's eclogue) he ends up rejecting "all that is central to the pastoral genre: the woodland nymphs, forests, and song itself".⁶³¹ Thus, in the same way that Boccaccio's *Alceste* drew on Virgil's *Eclogue* 5 to narrate a political shift, *Phyllostropos* ostensibly picks up on the theme of literary conversion from Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 and adapts it to a theological discussion. Ultimately, this reading is in line with Boccaccio's approach to ancient poetry, as he proposed the reinterpretation of classical material, and more particularly of "pagan" mythology, in a Christian key.⁶³²

What is more, by taking the general outline from Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, Boccaccio's *Phyllostropos* consequently alludes to *Galla* – which, as we have seen in Chapter 1, is mainly modelled on that poem, too.⁶³³ As a result, *Phyllostropos* calls the reader to engage with the entire cycle of the *Buccolicum*, evoking a type of ring-composition structure which takes Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 as both its starting and ending points. However, despite this cyclical structure, Boccaccio's pastoral narrative is, like the biblical one, teleologically oriented.

⁶²⁹ On the concept of "conversion" as a "reorientation of the soul", see Nock (1933: 7). On the generic crossings and metaliterary features of *Eclogue* 10, see Kidd (1964: 54-64), Kenney (1983: 44-59), Conte (1986: 100-29), Chwalek (1990: 304-20), Perkell (1996: 128-40), Torlone (2002: 204-21), Harrison (2007: 60-74), Videau (2010: 235-54), Casanova-Robin (2014: 252-68), and Fonseca Jr. (2020b: 1-22).

⁶³⁰ *Ecl.* 10.35-41 – see Fantuzzi (2003, pp. 1-11), and Fonseca Jr. (2020b: 10-12).

⁶³¹ Davis (2012: 445). See *Ecl.* 10.62-3: *iam neque Hamadryades rursus neque carmina nobis/ ipsa placent; ipsae rursus concedite silvae*.

⁶³² See Barsella (2004: 120-39), Lummus (2012: 724-65), and Chapter 2.

⁶³³ See Chapter 1.

Through its allusions to *Galla* and Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, *Phylostopos* initially suggests a thematic move towards a primary stage of dependence on material and erotic desires; yet this move, rather than implying an intermittent cycle (such as the cycle of ages in Virgil's *Eclogue* 4), actually marks the end of Boccaccio's autofiction. In sum, in dialogue with the Augustinian opposition between *historia profana* (related to the temporary facts of the world and the succession of men) and *historia sacra* (related to the fixed and prophetic narrative of the Scriptures, centred on the economy of salvation), the end of the *Buccolicum* coincides with the end of Boccaccio's earthly life and the beginning of his eternal life.⁶³⁴

In fact, preceding *Phylostopos*, the eclogue *Olympia* had already anticipated that type of transition in the *Buccolicum*. Descending from Elysium, Olympia (Violante) tried to console her grieving father, Silvius (Boccaccio), with the promise of a happy afterlife. Yet, it is striking that, at the end of the poem, Silvius remained devastated nevertheless. Though trusting his daughter's words and the reality of his vision, as soon as her ghost vanished into the air, Silvius returned to his initial state of grief, and nothing could distract him from his miserable old age: *in mortem lacrimis ibo ducamque senectam* (284). From this, we can conclude that not even the angelic figure of his beloved little daughter was able to redirect Boccaccio's view from earth to heaven; it is only Petrarch, in *Phylostopos*, who will manage to carry through this task. Within this autofictional framework, however, Petrarch seems to represent more than just a teacher and friend of Boccaccio. To some extent, he is also his "double". Perhaps like the figure of Augustine, who has been interpreted by Marsh as a "doctrinal superego" of Petrarch in the *Secretum*, the character of Phylostopos, in Boccaccio's eclogue, could be similarly understood as a representation of both Petrarch and Boccaccio's "superego".⁶³⁵ Accordingly, while Petrarch remains recognisable as an individual character beneath the mask of

⁶³⁴ On the Bible as a cohesive literary work, see Alter (2011). On Augustine's notions of history (developed especially in his *De civitate Dei*), see Markus (1988: 1-22), Van Oort (2012), and Schmölz (1961: 308-21).

⁶³⁵ See Marsh (2009: 211).

Phylostropus, he also potentially embodies an inner voice within Boccaccio's soul, a voice which initially conflicts with, but finally prevails over, the sinful part of Boccaccio's self.

Winter, old age and death

Following this line of interpretation, the idea of Boccaccio's divided soul is hinted at especially in the introduction of the poem. Indeed, Phylostropus starts his speech using the first-person plural form of *ludere* – a verb which, as discussed in Chapter 3, carries markedly metaliterary connotations, often indicating the act of writing lightweight poetry.⁶³⁶ In this case, the metaliterary dimension is strengthened by the fact that *lusimus* appears as the opening word, immediately invoking the beginning of the Pseudo-Virgilian *Culex*.⁶³⁷ However, there is one fundamental difference separating these two poems from the start. For while the *Culex*'s narrator tries to elevate his poetic games, making them sound more erudite than they actually are (*carmina docta*, 1), Phylostropus, on the contrary, suggests that it is past the time that he and Typhlus should leave their trifles behind:

Lusimus et sertis nimium nymphisque vacatum est.
Instat hyemps sydusque malum, mi Typhle, minatur
exitium pecori: non cernis summa Cephei
iam texisse nives et silvas ponere frondes?
(*Phyl.* 1-4)

Connected to *lusimus*, the wreaths (*sertis*) and nymphs (*nymphis*) above suggest that both Phylostropus-Petrarch and Typhlus-Boccaccio have been excessively concerned (*nimum... vacatum est*) with glory and women. Indeed, in the previous eclogues of the *Buccolicum*, those traditional bucolic symbols were recurrently employed in the context of love, politics and poetry. For instance, in *Galla*, weaving flower wreaths was one of the many skills which made

⁶³⁶ See discussion in Chapter 3, "Searching for Saphos"; and also Casanova-Robin (2017: 338).

⁶³⁷ See also Virg. *Ecl.* 6.1: *prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu*.

Pamphylus so attractive, and which made him conquer the beautiful nymph Galla; in *Alcestus*, the act of weaving wreaths was a public demonstration of political stability; and, in *Saphos*, the bay wreath evidently symbolised poetic glory. Moreover, it is impossible not to think of Boccaccio's earlier pastoral-inspired works too, namely the *Ninfale fiesolano* and the *Comedia delle ninfe fiorentine*. Thus, alluding to both Boccaccio's and Petrarch's devotion to love and poetic glory, particularly manifest in their eclogues, the opening lines of *Phylostropos* imply beforehand that it is time for Boccaccio to finish his *Buccolicum*, in the same way that Virgil, in *Eclogue* 10, announced the end of his work (*extremum hunc... laborem*, 1; *haec sat erit*, 70).⁶³⁸

The fact that winter and the "evil star" (*hyemps sydusque malum*, *Phyl.* 2) are approaching seems to be the trigger point for *Phylostropus*' decision to move away with Typhlus in the poem. Contrasting with the summer of *Galla* and the spring of *Alcestus*, the coming of winter, in *Phylostropos*, symbolises physical decay and death (*exitium pecori*, 3).⁶³⁹ Besides these allegorical implications, the winter setting also brings to mind Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, with its snows (*nives*, 23) and icy rocks (*gelidi... saxa*, 15) similarly intensifying the feeling of an end – the end of Gallus' relationship with Lycoris, as well as of Virgil's book of eclogues.⁶⁴⁰ Yet, while Gallus is ultimately defeated by love in Virgil's *Eclogue* 10 (*omnia vincit Amor*, 69), Typhlus must be stronger than his passions and abandon his lovers forever in Boccaccio's *Phylostropos*. Thus, to some extent, Typhlus could be seen as another version of Gallus, a Gallus who is offered by Christianity the chance to repent for his error, and finally free himself from the chains of desire.

⁶³⁸ See Cucchiarelli (2017: 511), and Fonseca Jr. (2020b: 16-18).

⁶³⁹ See Virg. *Ecl.* 3.101: *amor exitium pecori*. Note that the spring of *Alcestus* represents a period of political rebirth, which is markedly different from the eternal spring of heaven, as will be depicted at *Phyl.* 180-91 (below). See the winter motif also at Dante *Rime* 101.1-4: "Al poco giorno e al gran cerchio d'ombra/ son giunto, lasso!, ed al bianchir de' colli,/ quando si perde lo color ne l'erba;/ e 'l mio disio però non cangia il verde" – discussion in Durling & Martinez (1990: 109-37). The opposition between spring and winter, moreover, is the theme of the ninth-century *Conflictus veris et hiemis* – see Zogg (2017: 125-40).

⁶⁴⁰ Smarr (1987: 256).

At a first stage, however, Typhlus is unable to see the snow and leafless woods mentioned by Phylostropus. His eyes can only discern fields turning golden and thickets quivering with the song of hoarse cicadas – images which allude to Virgil *Eclogues* 4.28 (*flavescet campus*) and 2.12-13 (*at mecum raucis... resonant arbusta cicadis*), as though suggesting a continuity between Typhlus' delusional perspective and the seemingly idyllic world of Virgil's pastoral.⁶⁴¹

Typh. Quid montes spectem? Video flavescere campos,
et cantu rauce quatiunt arbusta cicade.

Phyl. Falleris. Ast veniant segetes cantentque volucres:
nonne puer Yacintus erat, puer et Ciparissus?
Florebat iuvenis, cecidit dum pulcher Adonis;
et victor florebat herus calidonus apri.
Exarsere novi pratis iam frigore flores,
et cereris grando plenas vacuavit aristas.
Est mutanda quidem sedes, dum tempora cedunt.

Typhl. Quis neget incautos quosdam cecidisse puellus?
Ast ego si varios timeam quos astra minantur
armentis casus, nusquam michi pascua tuta.
Hic gelidi fontes, hic pascua pingua: quid plus?
Celum mite satis pecori, corilique frequentes,
glandifere quercus et celse vertice pinus;
novimus hic omnes saltus et lustra ferarum:
quid potius queram? Dissolvit more vetusto
sol glaciem pelletque nives frondesque redibunt.
(*Phyl.* 5-22)

Phylostropus argues that Typhlus is being deceived by his imperfect vision. Though winter and death seem to be a long way off, he reminds him of a number of well-known young men who, in spite of their age and healthy looks, were cut off from life without previous notice. Thus, the passage above draws on classical mythology to provide four different *exempla* of premature deaths, all of them described in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and recounted (sometimes in slightly different versions) in Boccaccio's *Genealogie*. The first of these exemplary figures is Hyacinthus (*Phyl.* 8), accidentally killed by Apollo with a discus (Ov. *Met.* 10.162-219; Bocc.

⁶⁴¹ See also Nemes. Ecl. 1.2, Ps.-Virg. *Copa* 27, and Virg. *G.* 3.328. On the realities of war and dispossession on Virgil's *Eclogues*, see Segal (1965: 237-66).

Gen. 4.58). The second one is Cyparissus (*Phyl.* 8), who died of grief after unintentionally killing his beloved stag (*Ov. Met.* 10.106-42; *Bocc. Gen.* 13.17). The third one, Adonis (*Phyl.* 9), was gored by a wild boar during a hunting trip (*Ov. Met.* 10.503-739; *Bocc. Gen.* 2.53). Finally, the fourth example is that of Meleager, described as the leader of the Calydonian boar hunt (*Phyl.* 10). According to the Ovidian account, Meleager's mother took revenge on him for killing her brothers, putting an enchanted wooden log, on which his life fatefully depended, upon the fire (*Ov. Met.* 8.260-546; *Bocc. Gen.* 9.19; and also Dante *Purg.* 25.22-7). Thus, with this mini-catalogue, Phylostropus hopes to demonstrate to Typhlus that death can come subtly and unexpectedly, even when its signs are not yet perceptible. For this reason, *memento mori* should be a constant practice, and man should take the path of eternal life as soon as possible, before it is too late, as suggested in line 13 above: *est mutanda quidem sedes, dum tempora cedunt*.⁶⁴²

Typhlus, nevertheless, attributes the deaths of those young men to their own imprudence, and is unwilling to move away from his woods. Recalling Gallus' description of Arcadia, at Virgil *Eclogues* 10.42 (*hic gelidi fontes, hic mollia prata*), Typhlus boasts about his cool streams and rich pastures (*hic gelidi fontes, hic pascua pingua, Phyl.* 17). In addition, the climate in his homeland is mild for the sheep; the hazel trees, oaks and pine trees are abundant with their fruit; and everyone around there knows exactly where the groves and haunts of wild beasts are located (*Phyl.* 18-20 above).⁶⁴³ Typhlus believes that he has got everything he needs and, for all that matter, winter will eventually pass (*Phyl.* 21-2). By this, the text initially suggests that Typhlus may repeat the fatal experience of Gallus in Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, while limiting his vision to his immediate surroundings. Phylostropus, however, promptly fights Typhlus' inertia, revealing the deceptiveness of his hopes and impressions.

⁶⁴² See Petr. *Secr.* 3.17.8 (Augustinus): *dic: "Nunc vita fugiente umbra mortis extenditur; iste tamen sol cras idem aderit; hec autem michi dies irreparabiliter effluxit"*; and also Rvf 50 ("Ne la stagion che 'l ciel rapido inchina") – Dotti (1993: xxxviii-xxxix).

⁶⁴³ See Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 3.72-6.

Crisis and Dyone, Daphnis and Argus

In what follows, Phyllostropus will tackle the real reasons that are holding Typhlus back from leaving his woodland: Crisis and Dyone. While the former woman promises to him the apples of the Hesperides, the springs of Ticinus, and the warm shadows of the Penean shore, the latter one ensnares him with her feigned whispers and tears:⁶⁴⁴

Hesperidum tibi poma Crisis fontesque Ticini
spondet et apricas penei litoris umbras;
murmure sic blando et lacrimis versuta Dyones,
heu, pedibus laqueos et collo vincula nectit.
Si sors illa tuum feriat caput impia que iam
pervigilem lucis Daphnim subtraxit et Argum
cognosces lacrimans quid nunc mea verba resultent.
(*Phyl.* 23-9)

Here, as in *Galla*, Boccaccio employs the elegiac *topos* of *servitium amoris*, yet he does so in the context of a religious discussion. Moreover, while Damon is enslaved by one *puella* in the former poem, Typhlus is enslaved by two women, Crisis and Dyone, who represent two different types of desire.⁶⁴⁵ Stemming from the Greek χρυσός (“gold”), Crisis personifies the love of wealth (besides being a hetaira-name from Terence’s *Andria*); and Dyone, traditionally identified as the mother of Venus or Venus herself in classical texts, symbolises the love of sexual pleasures.⁶⁴⁶ This is not the first instance where Boccaccio employs these names or slight variants of them, though. In the *Decameron*, the male character Dioneo is probably the

⁶⁴⁴ The Hesperides were the daughters of Hesperis and Atlas, and were guardians of a famous tree of golden apples (Bocc. *Gen.* 4.30). Ticino is a river, tributary of the Po, whose sand resembles gold (Bocc. *De flum.*, “Ticinus”). Peneus/Pineios, also a river, in Thessaly, whose surrounding area is described by Boccaccio as a *locus amoenus* (*De flum.*, “Peneus”).

⁶⁴⁵ See Chapter 1, “Context and characters”.

⁶⁴⁶ See Perini (1994: 946, and 1067), and Smarr (1987: 257-8). On the traditional associations between gold and the desire for wealth, see Bocc. *Amor. Vis.* (B) 12.55-60 (“con aurea gonna e aurea corona in testa,/ donna vi vidi in aureo tron locata,/ cinta d’aurei trofei, in gioiosa festa”), *Espos.* 7.all.56 (“è adunque l’avarizia, secondo che alcuni dicono, *aurei cupiditas*”), and also Th. Aq. *Summ. Th.* 2.2, q. 118, o. 1 (*dicitur enim avaritia quasi aeris aviditas*). For Dyone (Dione, in classical Latin) as the mother of Venus, see Cic. *N. D.* 3.59, and Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 3.433. For Dione as Venus herself, see Ov. *Fast.* 2.461, 5.309, *Am.* 1.14.33, and also Dante *Par.* 8.7-8 (“ma Dione onoravano e Cupido,/ quella per madre sua, questo per figlio”). For other references to Crisis and Dyone in the *Buccolicum*, see eclogues 3.12, 13.25 and 83; and 13.30.

most licentious narrator of the book, and his name underlines his “venereal” personality.⁶⁴⁷ The same name appears in the *Comedia delle ninfe*, to describe the son of Bacchus and Ceres (26.82-4), possibly suggesting an etymological connection (originally established by Boccaccio) between Dioneo and Dionysus as well.⁶⁴⁸ The name Crisis, in turn, is found in Boccaccio’s *Epistola* 10 (1353), a literary piece which, bearing interesting connections with the passage from *Phylostropos* above, deserves closer examination.

As briefly mentioned before, *Epistola* 10 exposes the controversial relationship between Petrarch and Giovanni Visconti (1290-1354), the so-called “tyrant” of Milan.⁶⁴⁹ To provide some further context, in 1351, Boccaccio had acted as an ambassador of the Commune of Florence, inviting Petrarch to fill the chair of a *magister* at the Studio Fiorentino, besides offering him the restitution of his father’s estate, confiscated since the latter’s exile from Florence. Petrarch declined the offer; yet afterwards, in 1353, he controversially accepted the proposal of Visconti to join his powerful court in Milan. Sharing the opinion of his friends, Boccaccio condemned Petrarch’s decision and hypocrisy. Thus, using bucolic language to soften the harshness of his words, in *Epistola* 10, he argued that Petrarch often presented himself as someone averse to money, who claimed to have renounced the love of wealth (Crisis) and its pleasures: *omnino et iamdiu Crisidem abdicasse* (*Ep.* 10.17). Finally, Boccaccio remarked that, while Petrarch had not been moved before by other powerful men such as King Robert of Naples, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV, Charles V of France, or Pope Innocent VI, he was nevertheless easily influenced by the infamous Giovanni Visconti and greed: *quod dudum senex Argus, maximus Daphnis, pastor Gallus et ipse Pan arcas presidens ceteris nequivere, potuit Egon infamis, potuit Crisis incesta?* (18).⁶⁵⁰

⁶⁴⁷ See Kirkham (1985: 3).

⁶⁴⁸ See Martinez (2004: 127).

⁶⁴⁹ See Chapter 3, “The bay”.

⁶⁵⁰ Following Massèra (1928: 138), Auzzas’ edition reads *pastor gallus* (“the Gallic shepherd”). Yet, I believe that *pastor Gallus* (“the shepherd Gallus”) is a better choice in this context, considering its position within a sequence of other names, each of them equally modified by an adjective (*senex Argus, maximus Daphnis... Pan*

Note that, at *Phylostropos* 23-9 above, Boccaccio mentions not only Crisis, but also Argus and Daphnis, thus calling our attention to a possible self-allusion to his *Epistola* 10. However, while Bernardi Perini identified the latter characters as Robert of Anjou and Charles IV in both texts, Smarr presented a more plausible reading, suggesting that, in *Phylostropos*, Argus represents Andrew of Hungary, and Daphnis stands for Julius Caesar.⁶⁵¹ Smarr has observed that, like the mythical figures mentioned earlier by Phylostropus (*Phyl.* 7-13), these two historical ones also constituted “examples of sudden death by murder”. Yet, it should be noted that, while the second identification is based on Virgil’s *Eclogue* 5, the *ratio nominis* behind the first one is less transparent, since nowhere else in the *Buccolicum* is Argus linked to Andrew.⁶⁵² A possible solution would be to adopt an intermediate position between the reading of Smarr and that of Perini. Considering that Charles IV died only in 1378 (therefore not only after the estimated date of composition of the *Buccolicum*, but also after Boccaccio’s own death), Daphnis could plausibly stand for Julius Caesar, and Argus for Robert of Anjou. Then, we would have two examples of historical personalities who, notwithstanding their power and prudence (*pervigilem*), eventually found death all the same, much like those *incauti puelli* mentioned earlier in the text (l. 14). Though King Robert died in old age, in *Faunus* his death is described as the product of “horrid fates” (*horrida tandem/ parca virum rapuit*, 78-9), and the cause of many tears (*fleverunt montes Argum, flevire dolentes/ et satyri faunique leves, et flevit Apollo*, 80-1). While also evocative of Virgil’s account of Daphnis’ death, in *Eclogue*

arcas... Egon infamis... Crisis incesta, *Ep.* 10.18). Corazzini’s edition (1877), instead, reads *pastor Gallus* in connection with *Daphnis*, thence *Daphnis pastor Gallus*, translated as “il pastore gallico Dafni” (p. 44). In either case, both “Gallic” and “Gallus” suggest the same identification with the king of France, Charles V of Valois, who is referred to as Gallus Sicamber in *De casibus* 1.8 – see Chapter 1, “Context and characters”. The latter conjecture is mine.

⁶⁵¹ See Perini (1994, 1067), and Smarr (1987: 258). Though Smarr’s identification of Argus as Alexis might seem confusing at first (since she does not specify to which Alexis she is referring), her explanation leaves no doubt that she actually means Andrew of Hungary (who is depicted as Alexis in *Faunus*, *Dorus* and *Midas*). See discussion in Chapter 2, “Context and characters”.

⁶⁵² As discussed in Chapter 2, in his historical eclogues, Boccaccio normally applies the name “Argus” to King Robert (*Faunus* 70, *Dorus* 47-8, and *Midas* 43). However, in the subsequent eclogues, he associates it with diverse characters, from Mercury (*Pampinea* 61, *Vallis opaca* 41), to the Joseph of Genesis (*Pantheon* 106), to Dante Alighieri (*Vallis opaca* 64, *Saphos* 38).

5, this description is very similar to the passage from *Phylostropos* above, which supports both the identification of Argus as Robert, and a link between his death and that of Julius Caesar.

A life of pleasure and pain

Typhlus confesses to be happy enough with the life he is leading, and that he has hope for even greater things.⁶⁵³ Yet, *Phylostropos* encourages his friend to see reality from a different angle, showing him that his life with Crisis is actually exhausting and painful:

Typh. Quid tandem, si vita placet? Sunt ocia nobis
exoptanda diis, et spes maiora reservat.
Phyl. Non prius humentem cantu secedere noctem
excubitor premonstrat avis, quam: “Surgito, Typhle! –
inquit amica Crisis – Pete pascua, solvito septas!”
Surgis iners, gelidas tenebrosa per invia valles
innixus baculo queris tectusque galero.
Hinc imbres quatiunt miserum lubricumque fatigat
inde solum; nunc terga tibi nunc pectora nudat
infestus Boreas, pelles iniuria vincit
etheris adversi.
(*Phyl.* 30-40)

Here, Typhlus’ speech reminds us of Tityrus from Virgil’s *Eclogue* 1. Both characters celebrate their bucolic lives, and are proudly devoted to their homelands and daily routines. However, a fundamental difference separates these two characters. Firstly, whereas in the political context of Virgil’s *Eclogue* 1, Tityrus’ permanence in his homeland is an indicator of freedom; in the religious context of *Phylostropos*, instead, Typhlus’ attachment to his familiar surroundings is just a proof of his voluntary slavery.⁶⁵⁴ Secondly, while Virgil’s Tityrus is grateful to his godlike benefactor for having secured his own peace and leisure (*deus nobis haec otia fecit*, Virg. *Ecl.* 1.6); Boccaccio’s Typhlus otherwise champions his own illusory state of self-

⁶⁵³ See Petr. *Tr. mort.* 1.128: “O umane speranze cieche e false!”.

⁶⁵⁴ See Casanova-Robin (2017: 330).

sufficiency, and thinks that the gods themselves must be envious of him (*sunt otia nobis/exoptanda diis*, Bocc. *Phyl.* 30-1).

Despite these divergences, it is striking that, in both these passages from Virgil's *Eclogue* 1 and Boccaccio's *Phylostrompos* above, the term *otia/ocia* has Epicurean connotations. On the one hand, it has been noted that, through *deus*, Virgil's text not only pays homage to Octavian; but also alludes to a passage from Lucretius' *De rerum natura*, where Epicurus is referred to as a god: *deus ille fuit, deus, inclute Memmi* (Lucr. *DRN* 5.8). The Lucretian allusion is strengthened by the repetition of *deus* and the use of *ille*, in Tityrus' following line: *namque erit ille mihi semper deus* (Virg. *Ecl.* 1.7). Additionally, like Virgil after him, Lucretius also employs the word *otia* in an evocatively pastoral context: *per loca pastorum deserta atque otia dia* (Lucr. *DRN* 5.1387).⁶⁵⁵ On the other hand, Boccaccio's text reiterates the Epicurean discourse by highlighting Typhlus' indifference to the gods. Thus, besides taking up an implicit discussion from *Saphos* (where there are hints at an anti-Epicurean and anti-modern tendency), Typhlus' speech also anticipates the mention of the *pastor Epy*, at *Phylostrompos* 132 (below). In line with the Epicurean tradition, Typhlus initially adopts a materialistic view on life, defending *amor vitae* as the source of happiness, and sensual pleasure as the highest good of all.⁶⁵⁶ In this way, Boccaccio seems to reflect in Typhlus his conflictual relationship with Epicurus, whom he regarded as a knowledgeable and honourable philosopher, yet one who had

⁶⁵⁵ See Rundin (2003: 159-76), and Cucchiarelli (2017: 143).

⁶⁵⁶ See Bocc. *Gen.* 3.22.18: *Epycuri vero venerem bonam rem exponunt, uti voluptatum professores, nam circa voluptatem summum existimant bonum consistere* – the same idea is expressed at Cic. *De fin.* 2.80.10-11. Here, it is important to make a distinction between Epicurus' philosophy and the Epicurean tradition. During the Middle Ages, there were many clichés about Epicurus circulating, and some scholars argue that his doctrine, particularly regarding the mortality of the soul, became closely linked to that of Averroes – see, for instance, Corti (1981: 81-2), and Veglia (2000: 17), refuted by Barański (2007: 40-1; 2020: 530). It is likely that Boccaccio (as well as Petrarch) drew most of his ideas on Epicurus from Cicero, Seneca and Augustine – see Barański (2012: 48; 2020: 531, 534). On Boccaccio as an “Averroist”, see Gagliardi (1999).

cultivated “some perverse and detestable opinions” (“alcune perverse e detestabili opinioni”, *Espos.* 10.10).⁶⁵⁷

If Typhlus adopts an Epicurean attitude in the poem, then, Phylostropus adopts an anti-Epicurean one, as he attempts to demonstrate that what Typhlus sees as pleasures are actually hindrances.⁶⁵⁸ Using a sequence of imperatives (*surgito... pete... solvito*, *Phyl.* 34-5 above), Phylostropus impersonates Crisis giving incessant orders to Typhlus, never allowing him to rest. The image that follows is one of exhausting labour, with Typhlus rising half-asleep to set off to work, while it is still cold and dark outside. This picture strongly alludes to the beginning of the Pseudo-Virgilian *Moretum*, which similarly describes the rustic Simulus waking up at the sound of the crowing rooster, and painfully starting his daily journey through a winter’s night.⁶⁵⁹ At first glance, the allusion might surprise us by establishing an association between Typhlus’ greed and Simulus’ poverty.⁶⁶⁰ In contrast to this, in his *Amorosa visione*, for instance, Boccaccio emblematically illustrated greed with the image of his father scratching at a mountain of gold with his own nails.⁶⁶¹ Yet, what that allusion to *Moretum* is suggesting is that Typhlus is not completely aware of his own financial condition; and that, in spite of all his individual efforts and work, he will probably never be as rich as he hopes to be (*spes maiora*

⁶⁵⁷ See Dante *Inf.* 10.13-15: “Suo cimitero da questa parte hanno/ con Epicuro tutti suoi seguaci,/ che l’anima col corpo morta fanno”. See Barański (2020: 531). Boccaccio also engages with the Epicurean tradition in two well-known tales of the *Decameron*, namely in 6.9 (about Guido Cavalcanti), and 10.8 (Tito and Gisippo).

⁶⁵⁸ It is no coincidence that, in his works, Petrarch strongly advocated against Epicurus’ theories – see, for instance, *Contr. Med.* 3.103 (briefly discussed in Chapter 3, “The Ericole”), *Rer. mem.* 3.77.18, and *De Ign.* 2.18: *quod de Epycuro sentit Cicero, cuius cum multis in locis mores atque animum probet, ubique damnat ingenium ac doctrinam respuit* (Barański, 2007: 49).

⁶⁵⁹ *Mor.* 1-7: *iam nox hibernas bis quinque peregerat horas/ excubitorque diem cantu praedixerat ales,/ Simulus exigui cultor cum rusticus agri,/ tristia venturae metuens ieiunia lucis,/ membra levat vili sensim demissa grabato/ sollicitaque manu tenebras explorat inertes/ vestigatque focum, laesus quem denique sensit*. Note also the intertext between *Phylostropos* 136 and *Moretum* 120 (*tectusque galero*); and the thematic connections between both these texts and Petr. *Rvf* 50 (mentioned in “Winter, old age and death” above). See discussion in Velli (1979: 67), and Perini (1994: 1068).

⁶⁶⁰ Unlike Virgil’s *Eclogues* or the *Georgics*, for instance, the *Moretum* unusually presented a portrayal of the life of the laboring poor, without “explicit glorification of poverty or labor” – Fitzgerald (1996: 390).

⁶⁶¹ *Am. Vis.* 14.34-45.

reservat, 31).⁶⁶² Thus, Phylostropus intimates that Typhlus' ambition is worthless and endless, for each season of life brings its own preoccupations:

Veniet sed mitior estas:
 insomnes noctes, radios dabit illa diurnos,
 intentos stimulis culices; et mungere capras,
 lac palmis pressare tuis, fluvioque lutosos
 nunc purgare greges manibus nunc vellera lappis.
 Quas animo fesse pecudes morboque iacentes
 inician curas taceo: spes omnia suadet.
 Nam tibi parta domi requies stratumque cubile,
 seu validas nemorum superare securibus ulmos,
 carpere seu messes seu terram vertere rastris
 cogeris in reditu. Sunt hec, precor, oia, Typhle,
 exoptanda diis? Non te Crisis optima linquit
 insudare iocis iuvenumque intrare palestras;
 non dum sacra diis fumant altaria ruris.
 Femina nulla minus voluit pensare labores
 non ut grata tue servet male parta quieti
 sed mechis quos ipsa novos exquirat anela.
 (*Phyl.* 40-56)

Though Typhlus is not worried about winter, Phylostropus reminds him that summer is not any better either, with its sleepless nights, heat and mosquitoes. He emphasizes the tasks that Typhlus will have to perform then: not only milk the goats and make cheese, but also wash off the dirty flocks, clean their fleece and treat the ill sheep. While the former tasks are typically bucolic, the latter ones are characteristic of the *Georgics* (like the tasks of a *subulcus* listed by Caliope, in *Saphos*).⁶⁶³ Moreover, behind these base activities lies an implicit notion of sin. Indeed, in both *Pantheon* and *Olympia*, Boccaccio used the biblical metaphor of the sick herd to represent the sinful, subsequently cleansed by Christ, commonly depicted in the New

⁶⁶² In fact, this will be the central argument of Petrarch's *Seniles* 17.2 (dated to 1373). In it, Petrarch reproaches Boccaccio for whining about his poverty, and defends that the pursuit of prosperity through work can be limitless and exhausting, bringing constant anxiety: *quo prosperiorem exitum laborum cernerem, eo acrius incumberem meque, quo sum animo, successus non segnem redderet sed sollicitum et ardentem* (*Sen.* 17.2.88). See discussion in Zak (2010: 153); and Chapter 1, "Context and characters".

⁶⁶³ Compare, for instance, *lac... pressare* (*Phyl.* 43) with *pressi... lactis* (Virg. *Ecl.* 1.81); and *fluvioque lutosos... purgare greges* (44-5) with *balantumque gregem fluvio mersare salubri* (*G.* 1.272). See Chapter 3.

Testament as “the good shepherd”.⁶⁶⁴ Thus, lines 45-6 above seem to similarly suggest that Typhlus’ soul is contaminated and needs treatment.

Phylostropus insists that no rest is assured, for even at home Typhlus is always condemned to work. The phrase *nam tibi parta domi requies*, in line 47, resonates with Virgil *Aeneid* 7.598, *nam mihi parta quies* (euphemistically spoken by King Latinus to refer to his own death).⁶⁶⁵ The actions that follow (chopping down the elms, gathering the crops, and ploughing the earth) again evoke the agricultural world of the *Georgics*. In particular, the phrase *validas nemorum superare securibus ulmos*, in line 48, alludes to Virgil *Georgics* 2.367-8 (*ubi iam validis amplexae stirpibus ulmos/ exierint*); while the expression *terram vertere*, in the sequence, is also present at *Georgics* 1.1-2 and 147. Then, Phylostropus rhetorically recalls Typhlus’ statement above (*Phyl.* 30-1), asking him if he still thinks that all those troubles could be seen as the leisure envied by the gods: *sunt hec, precor, ocia, Typhle,/ exoptanda diis?* (*Phyl.* 50-1).

Finally, Phylostropus argues that Crisis does not allow Typhlus to spend time on games or sports, while she herself refuses to do any work. Yet, it is not as if she were “saving her energy” for Typhlus, since she is constantly seeking new lovers (*Phyl.* 51-6). This picture of Crisis as a lazy and opportunist woman, never satisfied with whatever fruit she obtains from Typhlus’ labour, alludes to Virgil’s description of Galatea in *Eclogues* 1. There, Tityrus remembers how this woman once ruled him, spending all of his savings and leaving him no hope of freedom: *dum me Galatea tenebat,/ nec spes libertatis erat nec cura peculi* (Virg. *Ecl.* 1.31-2).⁶⁶⁶ Thus, in the same way that Galatea impeded Tityrus from buying his manumission in Virgil’s poem, Crisis is impeding Typhlus from obtaining his salvation in *Phylostropos*.

⁶⁶⁴ See *Panth.* 125: *et morbis assumpta malis armenta gregesque; Olymp.* 97-8: *sic priscas sordes, morbos scabiemque vetustam/ infecti pecoris preclaro sanguine lavit*; and also *Petr. Buc.* 6.178-80 – discussion in Coppini (2004: 19-38, esp. 23-4). For the biblical representation of Jesus as a shepherd, see *Vulg. Is.* 40:11: *sicut pastor gregem suum pascet*; and *Iohan.* 21:15: *pasce agnos meos* – see more below.

⁶⁶⁵ See also *Aen.* 3.495 (*vobis parta quies*) – Perini (1994: 1068), and Horsfall (2020: 389).

⁶⁶⁶ See Clausen (1994: 31, 45), and Cucchiarelli (2017: 151).

What is more, both Tityrus and Typhlus have two lovers: the former, Galatea and Amaryllis (*formosam... Amaryllida*, *Ecl.* 1.5); the second, Crisis and Dyone (*pulchra Dyones*, *Phyl.* 96).⁶⁶⁷

Greed

Crisis symbolises greed in all its insatiability and emptiness, as it consumes all of people's time and energy without offering them any permanent reward. Far from being an individual concern of Boccaccio, the Catholics included greed (*avaritia*) among the seven mortal sins, linking it especially with lust and gluttony, known as the sins of excessive desire or incontinence.⁶⁶⁸ Indeed, the Latin term *avaritia* was associated with *cupiditas* (which was a broader concept indicating "strong desire"); and it was used by Jerome as the equivalent for the Greek φιλαργυρία (which literally means "love of money").⁶⁶⁹ However, even before the Christians, Aristotle had discussed the political and ethical implications of pleonexia (πλεονεξία), which to him not only denoted an excessive desire to possess more; but also a distributive unfairness, an "overreaching" that necessarily involved injustice.⁶⁷⁰ Moreover, in his *Tusculanae Disputationes*, Cicero presented *avaritia* as an illness of the soul, rooted in lust and in a false sense of delight (as we have seen in Chapter 1); and in the *De officiis*, he listed greed for money (*pecuniae cupiditas*) as the main sign of a narrow and petty mind.⁶⁷¹ Later on, engaging with both Cicero and the Book of Ecclesiastes, Thomas Aquinas ranked greed as the worst sin of all

⁶⁶⁷ Note that Amaryllis replaces Galatea in Virgil's *Eclogue* 1; but Typhlus, in the sequence of *Phylostropos*, will consider leaving Crisis to focus only on Dyone. Moreover, note the intertext between *Phyl.* 53 (*fumant altaria*) and *Ecl.* 1.43 (*altaria fumant*); and the image of Typhlus making cheese (*Phyl.* 43), among other activities, partly recalls *Ecl.* 1.34 (*pinguis... premeretur caseus*).

⁶⁶⁸ See Greg. *Mor.* 31.17; and Th. Aq. *STh.* 1-2, q. 84, aa. 3-4.

⁶⁶⁹ Compare 1 Ti 6:10 BGT ρίζα γὰρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἡ φιλαργυρία ~ Vul. 1 Ti 6:10 *radix enim omnium malorum est cupiditas*.

⁶⁷⁰ See Arist. *EN* 5.1129a32-33, 1130a14-1130b5 – discussion in Balot (2001: 32-44, esp. 32-3), and Irwin (2019: 388-9).

⁶⁷¹ See Cic. *Tusc.* 4.25, and *Offic.* 1.68.3-6 – discussion in Graver (2002: 150-1); and Chapter 1, "Love, death and Fortune".

(*avaritia est gravissimum peccatorum*, *STh.* 2-2, q. 118, a. 5, arg. 1), equating it with *superbia*.⁶⁷²

In this context, it does not come as a surprise that, in the *Commedia*, Dante places the avaricious (mainly clerics, popes and cardinals) in the fourth circle of hell, where they are condemned to perform a labour which is as futile as their previous efforts in life: to roll great weights with their chests, striking against each other as they went from one side to the other, and then finally turning back to where they had started (*Inferno* 7.22-35).⁶⁷³ Yet, drawing also on Aristotle, rather than on a strictly Christian framework, Dante pairs avarice (“mal tener”) with prodigality (“mal dare”), displaying both of them as forms of excess and lack of *misura*.⁶⁷⁴ In *Phyllostropos*, though, Boccaccio ostensibly deals with a different type of greed than that of Dante’s *Inferno*. As the allusions to *Moretum* above suggest, Boccaccio associates his own greed with labour and excessive concern for money, rather than with an “overreaching” characteristic of tyrants. Indeed, as has been anticipated in Chapter 1 already, Typhlus’ love for Crisis calls to mind Tindarus’ *atra cupido* in *Galla*, which is related to the feelings of fear and anxiety generated by money, and the vain hope that one can get richer by working more.

In what follows, Typhlus cannot see the dangers to which he is exposed, and prefers to believe that his friend is envious of him:

Typh. Quos nequit amplexus sibi summere, damnat iniquus
invidus extemplo. Quot mechos, queso, puelle
usquam novisti, mordax Phyllostrope? Narra.
Phyl. Quod nolles audisse petis. Quot sydera celo.
Testantur veteres fagi, testantur et antra
silvarum flammis Crisidis cripteque scrobesque,
quotque lupis misere nudos canibusque reliquit.
Typh. Ex multis unum saltem, si dicere plures
forte piget, numera; Crisidis iam pande lupanar.
Phyl. Non piget; et clades pariter narrabimus ut quis

⁶⁷² See Vulg. Eccl. 10:9, quoted also at Petr. *De rem.* 2.105 – Rawski (1991, vol. 4: 420). See also Petr. *Rvf.* 7.

⁶⁷³ See Boccaccio’s commentary to *Inferno* 7 in his *Esposizioni*, and particularly 7.all.74-6, where he quotes the aforementioned passages from Cicero and Ecclesiastes, among others.

⁶⁷⁴ See *Inf.* 7.42: “con misura nullo spendio ferri”; 58-9: “Mal dare e mal tener lo mondo pulcro/ ha tolto loro, e posti a questa zuffa” – discussion in Barolini (2018b).

sit finis videas mechis, cultoribus atque.
 Auro qui nuper Pactoli tinxit harenas
 et frigios pavit vitulos, dilexit, et atro
 tandem succubuit potato sanguine tauri.
 Tymbreique ducem pecoris non dente molosus
 ex ulnis huius movit, silvasque ruinis
 argolicis turbo delevit missus ab antris?
 Pastorem eoum, cui Ganges grandis et Yndus
 potavere greges et longus culmine Taurus
 pavit, in arthoos flexus seu versus in austrum,
 e gremio Crisidis carpsit sus feta caputque
 sanguine respersit putrido truncumque cadaver
 exhibuit scithicis corvis milvisque ferisque.
 Silvarum predo pregrandis et arbiter olim
 pharsalicus Crisidem tenuit; post liquit amatam,
 adversis haustis deceptus iaspide succis.
 (Phyl. 57-82)

In response to Typhlus' incredulity, Phylostropus says that Crisis' lovers are as numerous as the stars in heaven: *quot sydera celo* (l. 60 above). Note that *sydera celo* is a classical set phrase which Boccaccio employs at *Saphos* 116, too. Yet, the idea of comparison implied in *quot* particularly alludes to *Tristia* 1.5.47, where Ovid compares the total sum of his misfortunes to the stars: *tot mala sum passus, quot in aethere sidera lucent*. Subsequently, the image of the inanimate beech-trees, caves, grottoes and ditches as real witnesses of Crisis' loves (Phyl. 61-2 above) alludes to Virgil *Eclogues* 5.21, where Mopsus similarly presents the hazels and rivers as witnesses of Daphnis' death: *vos coryli testes et flumina*. Finally, the idea of Crisis despoiling her lovers and exposing them naked to the wolves and dogs brings to mind Ovid *Amores* 2.9.14: *ossa mihi nuda relinquit amor*.

Still sceptical, Typhlus asks Phylostropus to name at least one of the clients of "Crisis' brothel" (*Crisidis... lupanar*, Phyl. 65).⁶⁷⁵ Phylostropus is not intimidated by this request, though; and uses this as an opportunity to present yet another mini-catalogue of examples, based on mythical and historical figures who eventually paid the price for their greed. The first

⁶⁷⁵ The word *lupanar* has a vulgar connotation and is unusual in the bucolic genre, being absent from the eclogues of Virgil, Calpurnius Siculus, Nemesianus, Dante, Giovanni del Virgilio and Petrarch. Boccaccio also employs it in *Buccolicum* 9 (*Lipis*), 153.

one is Midas, the king of Phrygia who tinted the waters of the river Pactolus with gold after touching them with his cursed hands, and who afterwards committed suicide by drinking a bull's blood (*Phyl.* 68-70). While the first part of this account matches that of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the element of Midas' suicide was probably taken from Eusebius'-Jerome's *Chronicon*.⁶⁷⁶ The second in the list is King Priam, famously murdered during the sack of Troy by the Greeks (*Phyl.* 71-3), as recounted also in Virgil's *Aeneid* 2, as well as in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.⁶⁷⁷ In this context, the "Thymbraean flock" (*Tymbreique... pecoris*, *Phyl.* 71) represents the Trojans through the link with Thynmbra (a place in Troas). The "Molossian hound" (*dente molosus*, 71) probably stands for Orcus or Death (as proposed by Perini), since Orcus was known to be the king of the Molossians, and the owner of Cerberus; and the "Argolic caves" (*argolicis... antris*, 73), Greece.⁶⁷⁸ The third figured mentioned by Phylostropus is Cyrus II, king of Persia, killed by Tomyris, queen of the Massegetae (from the region of Scythia), who vengefully dipped his severed head in a vessel of blood, and gave his corpse to birds of prey (74-9). Some possible sources for Boccaccio's knowledge of this story are Valerius Maximus and Justin.⁶⁷⁹ The fourth seems to be Alexander the Great, who died by poison, as suggested in line 82 above (*adversis haustis deceptus iaspide succis*), and also in the account of Justin.⁶⁸⁰ Against the interpretations of Lidonnici and Smarr, Perini plausibly argued that Boccaccio's description of Alexander as the "premier bandit" (*predo pregrandis*, 80)

⁶⁷⁶ Ov. *Met.* 11.84-144; Eus.-Jer. *Chron.* 92.16 – Perini (1994: 1068-9). See also Bocc. *De cas.* 2.19.3: *ut, tauri potato sanguine, sibi mortem consciverit*. The phrase *auro qui nuper Pactoli tinxit harenas*, in particular, alludes to Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.53: *qui... Pactolida tinxit arenam?*

⁶⁷⁷ Ov. *Met.* 13.404. See also Bocc. *De cas.* 1.13, and *Gen.* 4.14 – Perini (1994: 1069).

⁶⁷⁸ See, for instance. Serv. *Ad Aen.* 3.85.10-11 (*Thymbraeus Apollo dicitur a loco Troiae, id est agro vicino, pleno thymbra*), and Bocc. *De silv.* (*Thymbra silva est Troie propinqua sacra Apollini... Dicitur autem silva hec a thymbra herba qua abundat plurimum*); Eus.-Jer. *Chron.* 50.1 (*Fabula Proserpinae, quam rapuit Aedoneus, id est, Orcus, rex Molossorum, cujus canis, ingentis magnitudinis, Cerberus nomine...*); *De cas.* 1.10 (*Orco, Molossorum regi*), *Gen.* 3.5 (*qui apud Molossos est in regno quondam Plutonis*), 8.4 (*Orco Molossorum rege*), but also *Espos.* 12.litt.133-5 ("Grecia, la quale si chiamava il regno de' Molossi"); Virg. *Aen.* 2.55 (*Argolicas... latebras*), 78 (*Argolica de gente*) – some references are in Perini.

⁶⁷⁹ Val. Max. 9.10(ext).1-5; Just. *Epit.* 1. See also Bocc. *De cas.* 2.21. Perini suggests that the phrase *sus feta* (*Phyl.* 77) indicates not that Tomyris was pregnant, but rather that she had a son (killed by Cyrus).

⁶⁸⁰ Just. *Epit.* 12. See *De cas.* 4.11.1 and 12.30.

alludes to a passage from the *Bellum civile*, where Lucan explicitly refers to Alexander as a “lucky bandit”: *illic Pellaei proles vaesana Philippi,/ felix praedo* (Lucan 10.20-1). Accordingly, the invocation of Pharsalus through the adjective *pharsalicus* above (*Phyl.* 81) seems to indicate Macedonia, since the region of Thessaly (where the city of Pharsalus was) later became part of the Roman Empire as part of the province of Macedonia.⁶⁸¹ Lastly, the fifth lover of Crisis, called Dametas (below), possibly refers to Boccaccio’s contemporary, Zanobi da Strada (ca. 1312–61):

Nec tu Dametam gratum vidisse negabis
infande iuveni: cui dum Pan iussit abiret
exul in externos agros, concessit eunti
nec lacrimas, ommitto greges, non, pessima, vestes,
sed solum nudumque solo canibusque reliquit,
ni pia tunc gremio Cibeles cepisset amico:
et miserum risisse senem potuere subulci.
Quid numerem multos? Dudum Crisis impia nobis
obtulit obscenos, quercus has inter, amores.
(*Phyl.* 83-91)

In the passage at issue, Phylostropus says that the old Dametas accepted Pan’s order to go into exile, but then Crisis left him naked on the ground, until Cybele took him to her bosom.⁶⁸² As suggested by Lidonnici (followed by both Smarr and Perini), this description of Dametas seems to fit with Boccaccio’s later opinion of Zanobi, who, around 1358, left Italy for the post of papal secretary at Avignon, only to die of the plague soon thereafter.⁶⁸³ This identification is reinforced, moreover, by the allusion to Dametas, for in the same way that this character played the keeper of Aegon’s flock in Virgil’s *Eclogue* 3, Zanobi was elected as the “keeper” of the

⁶⁸¹ Perini (1994: 1069), *pace* Lidonnici (1914: 342) and Smarr (1987: 258), who propose that *pharsalicus* refers to Mithridates of Pontus because he was defeated by Pompey, hero of Lucan’s *Bellum civile* (a.k.a. *Pharsalia*).

⁶⁸² See Bocc. *Gen.* 4.68.29 (*Cybelem... quia cum terra sit*); and *Olymp.* 14.53-4 (*Cibelisque sacrato... gremio*).

⁶⁸³ Lidonnici (1914: 342-3), Smarr (1987: 258), and Perini (1994: 1070). See also Ferrau’s article on Zanobi da Strada in the *Enciclopedia Dantesca* (1970; available online). On Zanobi’s greed, see Petr. *Sen.* 5.6, and Boccaccio *Ep.* 9: [*Zenobius*] *tractus auri cupidine in Babilonem occidentem abiit et obmutuit*.

Pope's flock.⁶⁸⁴ The figure of Pan, in turn, probably represents not Pope Innocent VI (as proposed by Lidonnici), but rather the god of Arcadia symbolising the realm of poetry (as suggested by Perini). Thus, the text implies that Zanobi's greed was incompatible with his literary career, and that, in the end, he became an object of ridicule even among second-rank poets (*subulci*, 89).

After citing those examples, from Midas to Zanobi, Phylostropus suggests that he himself almost fell victim to Crisis, who recently offered her "obscene loves" (*obscenos... amores*, 91) to him. Considering that Boccaccio has been using erotic vocabulary to describe the seductive power of greed (*flammas Crisidis*, 62; *Crisidis... lupanar*, 65), the image of the oaks above (*quercus has inter*, 91) seems to acquire erotic tones too, alluding to Virgil's *Eclogue* 2.3 (*inter densas... fagos*), as well as to Boccaccio's *Galla* 36 (*has inter fagos*).⁶⁸⁵ Furthermore, as in *Saphos*, these oaks have earthly connotations associated with material gain, perhaps implying that Petrarch, just like Zanobi, had also received an offer that was financially rewarding, but not so honourable.⁶⁸⁶ In fact, Lidonnici reads the passage above as an indication of Petrarch's refusal to be a papal secretary. Yet, we might also think of that controversy involving Petrarch and Giovanni Visconti, exposed in Boccaccio's *Epistola* 10 (mentioned above). At any rate, the general implication of the passage is that no single human on earth is exempt from the influence of greed.

Lust

Phylostropus' words seem to finally reverberate in Typhlus' mind. For the first time, he starts questioning Crisis' fidelity, and blames himself for having made so many useless efforts in order to please her – such as snatching bear cubs from their mothers' teats, picking apples,

⁶⁸⁴ At *Lipis* 9.141-5, Boccaccio uses Egon to refer to the Pope – see discussion on this name in Chapter 1, "Galla's treachery".

⁶⁸⁵ See Chapter 1, "The Golden Age".

⁶⁸⁶ See Chapter 3, "The oak".

snaring the chicks of doves, and seeking awards in foot-races and javelin competitions. However, instead of tackling the root of his evil, Typhlus vainly tries to change the focus of his desire, and wrongly assumes that he can count on Dyone to soothe his cares:

Me miserum! quotiens ursis et ab ubere natos
eripui, quotiens tremulis pendentia ramis
mala tuli Crisidi, quotiens pullosque palumbis
subtraxi cursuque pedum iaculisque coronas
quesivi: mechis, video. Nunc pulchra Dyones
sola meas placido servabit pectore curas.
(*Phyl.* 92-7)

This short passage engages intertextually with several genres. The expression *ubere natos* is characteristically Virgilian, being employed, with some variations, in both the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, but not in the *Eclogues*. After Virgil, the same phrase appears in Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 3, and in Giovanni del Virgilio's *Ecloga ad Mussatum*, always at the end of the hexameter.⁶⁸⁷ Subsequently, the image of foot-racing above, besides calling to mind the epic games of *Aeneid* 5, evokes also the myth of Atalanta and Hippomenes, recounted in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.⁶⁸⁸ Finally, the picture of a lover offering presents to his loved one alludes to Virgil *Eclogues* 2.40-55, and more especially to Calpurnius' *Eclogue* 3, again. In this last poem, speaking on behalf of Lycidas in his reconciliatory love song, Iollas acknowledges his mistakes, but also remembers his good actions as a lover: for with the same hands he beat Phyllis, he has also put turtle doves and a newborn hare into her lap, after snaring their mother:

⁶⁸⁷ See Virg. *G.* 3.178, *Aen.* 3.392, 5.285, 7.484, 8.45, Calp. *Ecl.* 3.67 (*ad ubera natos*), and Giov. Virg. *Ecl. ad Muss.* 127 (*ubera natis*). See also *Aen.* 6.428 (*ab ubere raptos*), 7.484, employed at Ov. *Fast.* 4.459, Stat. 1.858, and Mart. *Epigr.* 9.7.3.

⁶⁸⁸ See Virg. *Aen.* 5.67-8 (*quique pedum cursu valet, et qui viribus audax/ aut iaculo incedit melior*), Ov. *Met.* 10.559-706 (especially 570: *victa prius cursu. pedibus contendite mecum*), and also Bocc. *Fiamm.* 5.6 ("Atalanta, velocissima nel suo corso, rigida superava i suoi amanti, infino che Ipomenès, con maestrevole inganno, come ella medesima volle la vinse").

his tamen, his isdem manibus tibi saepe palumbes,/ saepe etiam leporem decepta matre paventem/ misimus in gremium (76-8).⁶⁸⁹

What is more, Typhlus begins his speech with the interjection *me miserum!*, which was typically used in Roman comedy and love elegy, being particularly prominent in Ovid's output.⁶⁹⁰ In the context above, however, this phrase simultaneously alludes to Terence's *Eunuchus* and Petrarch's *Secretum*. Indeed, the *Eunuchus* introduces a dialogue between the young man Phaedria and his slave, Parmeno. Phaedria is confused and miserable (*me miserum sentio*, 71) because, even though he is aware that Thais is a scoundrel, he is nonetheless burning with love with her, and does not know what to do. Parmeno, on the other hand, attempts to convince his master that he should not trust the courtesan, and philosophically argues that one cannot think reasonably over an unreasonable matter: *quae res in se neque consilium neque modum/ habet ullum, eam consilio regere non potes* (57-8). Near the end of the *Secretum*, Petrarch quotes both these passages from Terence and, adding Cicero and Ovid, maintains that an old love can be replaced by a new one.⁶⁹¹ Yet, what Petrarch's Augustinus is mainly suggesting there is that one should aim at a nobler object of love – which is the exact opposite of what Typhlus intends to do, in Boccaccio's eclogue, by leaving Crisis behind to focus solely on Dyone. It is no surprise that Phylostropus will reproach this logic:

Phyl. Corporis exitium fugies mentisque ruinam
si blandam fugias nimium sevamque Dyonem.
Typhl. Quid meruit quia blanda fuit? Dilexit amantem.
Phyl. Quid meruit? Cernis quot gignant arbuta frondes?
Tot mala, tot mestis dedit ista pericula silvis.
Hec Nysi crinem dicteos iecit in agros,
Pasiphen tauro stravit Mirramque nefandis
ignibus incendit, privavit vellere Phasim
quondam dyrceo, flammis contorsit in Ydam,
lumina turbavit Mopso (sic Cyrcis honores),

⁶⁸⁹ See also Virg. *Ecl.* 68-9: *Parta meae Veneri sunt munera: namque notavi/ ipse locum, aëriae quo congessere palumbes* – Karakasis (2016: 145-7).

⁶⁹⁰ See, for instance, Pl. *Aul.* 721; Ter. *Andr.* 646, 882, *Phorm.* 187, *Ad.* 310; Ov. *Am.* 1.1.25, 4.59, 14.51, and *Ars am.* 3.73, 552, 736 – other references in Index of Intertexts.

⁶⁹¹ See Petr. *Secr.* 7.12-8.5, Cic. *Tusc.* 4.35.75, and Ov. *Rem.* 462.

abstulit Alcidi clavam. Quid multa recensem?
 Plura petis? Satis ista quidem: tu nescius erras,
 dum lacrimis credis, dum summis et oscula diris
 delinita malis. Has pestes mitte, precamur;
 hostes pelle, precor, diros, ne forte morentur
 sedibus his captos, pluvius dum surgat Orion.
 (*Phyl.* 98-113)

According to Phylostropus, Typhlus could not be more wrong, and he will do a great favour to both his body and soul if he avoids not only Crisis, but also Dyone. It is not without effect that Phylostropus makes use of the expression *mentis ruina*, also used by Medea to describe the origin of her downfall, at Ovid *Heroides* 12.32 (*illa fuit mentis prima ruina meae*). Hence, this intertext powerfully intimates that, if Typhlus does not shun Dyone promptly, he may suffer an ominous fate comparable to that of Medea. It is significant, moreover, that Phylostropus refers to Dyone as both *blanda* and *saeva*, which are typically elegiac adjectives used to describe a *puella* or *amor* itself.⁶⁹² Having recourse to this elegiac vocabulary at *Eclogues* 8.47, Virgil also describes love as *saevus*, and evokes the myth of Medea in a similar context: *saevus Amor docuit natorum sanguine matrem/ commaculare manus; crudelis tu quoque, mater*.⁶⁹³

Still, Typhlus cannot see what the problem with Dyone is, since she (unlike Crisis) actually gives him pleasure. His question then prompts Phylostropus to provide a third mini-catalogue of *exempla*, this time of female and male figures ruined by erotic desire. At the top of this list is Scylla (*Phyl.* 103 above), who betrayed her own father Nisus, king of Megara, by cutting off a magic lock of his hair and giving it to her beloved Minos, king of Crete. Though Ovid's *Metamorphoses* is probably the main source here, some additional references are found in Pseudo-Virgil's *Ciris* and in Virgil's *Georgics*.⁶⁹⁴ After Scylla comes Pasiphae (*Phyl.* 104),

⁶⁹² For *blanda*, see, for instance, Ov. *Am.* 2.2.34 (*blanda puella*), 3.2.55 (*blanda Venus*), 7.55, *Ars am.* 1.362 (*blanda... Venus*), *Rem.* 379 (*blanda... Elegia*), 717 (*blandae... puellae*). For *saeva*, see, for instance, *Am.* 1.4.62 (*ad saevas... fores*, used as hypallage), *Rem.* 53 (*saevas... flammis*), 446 (*saevaue... flamma*), and also *Met.* 1.453 (*saeva Cupidinis ira*). See Pichon (1991: 94, 256-8).

⁶⁹³ See Cucchiarelli (2017: 426-7).

⁶⁹⁴ See Ps.-Virg. *Cir.*, Virg. *G.* 1.404-9, and Ov. *Met.* 8.1-150. Boccaccio only briefly mentions the myth of Scylla in *Gen.* 11.26 – Perini (1994: 1070-1).

wife of Minos, whose abhorrent union with a bull is also recounted in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, besides being evoked in many other texts, including Virgil's *Eclogue* 6, and also in Dante's *Purgatorio* 26.⁶⁹⁵ The third character is Myrrha, punished by Venus with an incestuous desire for her own father, as exposed in the *Metamorphoses*.⁶⁹⁶ Then, Medea is more explicitly invoked through the mention of the "once-Theban fleece" (*vellere... quondam dyrceo*), as well as of the river Phasis, in Colchis (*Phyl.* 105-6).⁶⁹⁷ As can be inferred from his *Genealogia* 4, Boccaccio drew mainly on Ovid's *Heroides* for his account of Medea, but he also gathered some information from Solinus' *Collectanea rerum memorabilium* and Macrobius' *Saturnalia*.⁶⁹⁸ The examples that follow, in Phylostropus' list above, are of mythical figures. The mention of the flames on Mount Ida (*flammas... Ydam*, *Phyl.* 106) indicates the judgment of Paris: inflamed by love and the desire to have Helen, he favoured Venus, thus giving rise to the Trojan war, as narrated by Homer, and retold by Virgil and Ovid.⁶⁹⁹ In what follows, the image of the blind Mopsus seems to stand for Samson, who, according to the Book of Judges, was blinded by the Philistines after Delilah betrayed him in exchange for money and glory – thence, the reference to *Cyrcis honores* (*Phyl.* 107).⁷⁰⁰ Finally, Phylostropus indicates Hercules through his famous club (*Alcidi clavam*, *Phyl.* 108). As recounted in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*

⁶⁹⁵ Virg. *Ecl.* 6.45-7: *et fortunatam, si numquam armenta fuissent,/ Pasiphaen nivei solatur amore iuveni./ a, virgo infelix, quae te dementia cepit!*; Dante *Purg.* 26.41-2: "Ne la vacca entra Pasife,/ perché 'l torello a sua lussuria corra". See also Virg. *Aen.* 6.24-5, Ov. *Her.* 4.57, *Ars* 1.295, *Rem.* 63, *Met.* 8.132-7, 9.736-41, and Bocc. *Gen.* 4.10.

⁶⁹⁶ See *Met.* 10.309-502; and also *Ars am.* 1.285, Dante *Inf.* 30.37-9, and Bocc. *Gen.* 2.52.

⁶⁹⁷ Dyrce/Dircea was a fountain of Thebes, and could be referred to as a metonym for Thebes or even the entire region of Boetia – see "Dircaeus" and "Dirce" in *OLD*; and, for instance, Virg. *Ecl.* 2.24 (*Amphion Dircaeus in Actaeo Aracyntho*). For Phasis, see Bocc. *De flum.* "Phasis": *Phasis Colchorum fluvius est ingens... Penes eum Phrxi templum fuit et lucus ob aureum vellus veteri fabula celebratus. Medeam fugientem cum Iasone tulit* – Perini (1994: 1071).

⁶⁹⁸ See Ov. *Her.* 12 (and *Met.* 7.9-158), Sol. 2.30, Macr. *Sat.* 1.26 – mentioned at Bocc. *Gen.* 4.12.1, 6 and 7, respectively. See also Dante *Inf.* 18.96: "anche di Medea si fa vendetta". Boccaccio also tells the story of Medea in *De mul.* 16. On the reception of Medea in the Trecento, see Morse (1996).

⁶⁹⁹ See, for instance, Virg. *Aen.* 1.26-33 (and Serv. *ad Aen.* 1.27), Ov. *Her.* 5, Bocc. *De mont.* "Yda", and *Gen.* 6.22. On Boccaccio and Homer, see Lummus (2012: 101-67), and Signorini (2019: 13-26).

⁷⁰⁰ See Judges 16; Bocc. *De cas.* 1.17, and particularly 3.4.6. The identification of Mopsus with Samson is by Smarr (1987: 259), yet she links Circe to lust instead of Delilah. Boccaccio's identification of Delilah as Circe was probably based on Virgil's *daedala Circe* (*Aen.* 7.282). Other interpretations, such as those proposed by Hortis (Mopsus and Cyrcce representing Petrarch and Laura), or even Perini (Mopsus as Homer), seem less plausible and also problematic in this context. On Mopsus as Petrarch, see *Saphos* 17. The phrase *lumina turbavit*, in particular, alludes to Virg. *Aen.* 8.223 (*turbatumque oculis*), related to Cacus. On Circe, see *Gen.* 4.14.

and Seneca's *Hercules furens*, Hercules was forced by his mistress Omphale to lay his club and lion skin aside and dress up as a woman.⁷⁰¹ If Typhlus does not want to have the same fate as these figures, then, he had better leave Dyone behind.

Besides relying on the *Metamorphoses* as the primary source for the mythological stories above, Boccaccio's text is also enriched with two specific scenes from the Ovidian output. Firstly, the phrase *lacrimis credis* (*Phyl.* 110) alludes to Ovid *Heroides* 2.51 (*credidimus lacrimis*), as if Phylostropus were suggesting a link between Dyone's tricks to keep Typhlus as her permanent slave and Demophoon's strategies to seduce Phyllis, only to desert her later and lead her to death.⁷⁰² Secondly, Phylostropus' advice to Typhlus to drive away his "awful enemies" (*hostes pelle, precor, diros, Phyl.* 112) again evokes the story of Myrrha, but more particularly the speech that she receives from her old nurse, in the *Metamorphoses*: *multaque, ut excuteret diros, si posset, amores,/ addidit* (Ov. *Met.* 10.426-7). In this case, besides the connection between *hostes diros* and *diros amores*, interpolated by *precor* and *si posset* respectively, both Boccaccio's and Ovid's texts emphasize that erotic love is an irrational force which can be powerful and destructive, and thus must be attacked at its root.⁷⁰³ And ultimately, this notion brings to mind the first act of Seneca's *Phaedra* too, where Phaedra's nurse begs her to extinguish the flames of incestuous love, and to not let herself indulge in her terrible hope (*extingue flammam neve te dirae spei/ praebe obsequentem, Sen. Ph.* 131-2; *compesce amoris impii flammam, precor*, 165).⁷⁰⁴

Furthermore, Phylostropus' speech above contains two keywords for Boccaccio's literary production. The first is the verb *erro* (*erras*, 109), which recalls a whole chain of meanings associated with the act of wandering, central in the vernacular poetry of Dante,

⁷⁰¹ See Ov. *Met.* 9.13-88, *Fast.* 2.305-58, Sen. *Herc. Fur.* 784ff., Bocc. *Gen.* 13.1 (Hercules).

⁷⁰² See Bocc. *De cas.* 1.18.18-23: *Phyllis amore Demophontis inpatiens se suspendit*; and *Gen.* 11.25. On Ovid's *Heroides* 2, and particularly on the relationship between Ovid's Phyllis and Virgil's Dido, see Fulkerson (2002: 145-65).

⁷⁰³ See discussion in Chapter 1, "Love, death and Fortune". Boccaccio recounts the myth of Myrrha in *Gen.* 2.52.

⁷⁰⁴ On Boccaccio and Seneca's *Phaedra*, see Chapter 1.

Petrarch, and Boccaccio, but especially in Boccaccio's eclogue *Galla*.⁷⁰⁵ The second one is *pestis* (*pestes*, 111), also prominent in *Galla*, where it is used as a metaphor for love-sickness; and evidently in the *Decameron*, where the Italian term “peste” is more often used in a literal sense, to indicate the bubonic plague.⁷⁰⁶ In effect, though *pestis* can be primarily understood as a metaphor for love in *Phyllostropos*, it is inevitable not to think of that pandemic too, and the poem seems to play with both these meanings: by abandoning his objects of desire, Typhlus will obtain spiritual salvation, and consequently protect his soul against any physical harm which he may suffer on earth.

Finally, Phyllostropus advises Typhlus not to delay his escape, lest he become a captive “until stormy Orion arises” (*pluvius dum surgat Orion*, 112). This fragment significantly alludes to both Virgil *Aeneid* 1.535 (*adsurgens... nimbosus Orion*) and 4.52 (*dum pelago desaevit hiems et aquosus Orion*), bringing additional effects into Boccaccio's poem. While the former passage is part of Ilioneus' account of how the Trojans' voyage was hampered by storms, the latter refers to Anna's speech, as she encouraged her sister Dido to pray for the gods to send a storm that would impede Aeneas' departure.⁷⁰⁷ Thus, what these two intertexts suggest, in *Phyllostropos*, is that Typhlus' submission to Crisis and Dyone can similarly delay his arrival at his final destination (that is, Christian heaven).

⁷⁰⁵ See, for instance, Dante *Inf.* 1-3; Petr. *Rvf* 161 (“O passi sparsi, o pensier' vaghi et pronti”), 169 (“Pien d'un vago penser che me desvia”), 331 (“Solea de la Fontana di mia vita”); Bocc. *Am. vis.* 30.40-2: “tu t'abagli te stesso in falsa erranza/ con falso immaginar” – discussion in Kriesel (2019: 139-154). See also Bocc. *Corb.* 366: “ma in ciò mi pare che tu erri, e gravemente; primeramente in ciò: che tu, lasciando il vero, seguiti l'opinione del popolazo il quale sempre più alle cose apparenti, che alla verità di quelle, dirizano gl'occhi”; and *Dec.* 1.Intr.: “mortifera pestilenza”. On the image of erring in *Galla*, see Chapter 1. On the “wandering” metaphor in ancient Rome, see Short (2013: 139-68).

⁷⁰⁶ On the plague motif, see Chapter 1, “Galla's treachery”, and “Love, the disease of the young”.

⁷⁰⁷ See also Hor. *Carm.* 1.28.21, and 3.27.18.

Between desire and fear

Typhlus seems to slowly realise the weight of Phylostropus' words. However, perhaps like Aeneas divided between Dido and his mission, in Virgil's *Aeneid* 4, Typhlus too becomes divided between desire (*cupio*) and fear (*timeoque*, below):

Auribus ecce lupum teneo: quos damnat amores,
hos cupio, timeoque dolos et temporis ortum.
Premia quis linquat Crisidis? quis grata Dyonis
basia et amplexus ac dulces reprobet ignes?
quisve nives imbresque graves celumque superbum
perferet, et ventos et duras etheris iras?
Sed quid dimoveor? Nunc primum perdere frondes
vidimus has fagos nivibusque albescere montes.
Que tulit Alcidas, que passus grandis Osiris,
non ego ferre queam? Stipulis et carmine vitam
ducere consilium: Crisis assit et alma Dyones;
illa legat flores, imponat et altera sertum.
(*Phyl.* 114-25)

This passage marks a turning point in the poem. Typhlus expresses his indecisiveness by alluding to a Roman proverb, "I hold the wolf by the ears" (*auribus ecce lupum teneo*, 114).⁷⁰⁸ For the first time, he catches sight of the beech trees losing their leaves, and the mountains becoming covered with snow. He admits to fearing the heavy rain and winds. Yet, he questions his own fear: *sed quid dimoveor?* (120). Recalling a discussion from Boethius' *Consolatio* (particularly through the phrase *ventus... etheris iras*, 119), Typhlus is torn between his desire to carry on living in a state of blind happiness and the need to be prudent.⁷⁰⁹ He then wonders whether he might not have the same fate as Alcidas (Alcides) and Osiris (Serapis), implying

⁷⁰⁸ See Ter. *Phorm.* 505 – Perini (1994: 1072). See also Suet. *Tib.* 25.1.2, Varro *Ling.* 7.31.4; and especially Petr. *Contr. med.* 2.109: *piget hinc cepisse, pudet inde desinere: ita tergiversaris et incertus heres, atque, ut est in antiquo proverbio, auribus lupum tenes.*

⁷⁰⁹ Boeth. *Cons.* 2.metr.4.17-22: *quamvis tonet ruinis/ miscens aequora ventus,/ tu conditus quieti/ felix robore valli/ duces serenae aevum/ ridens aetheris iras.* Note, moreover, that Dante quotes from Boethius' *Consolatio* 2.4 in his *Inferno* 5, where the lustful are punished with opposing winds and a "hellish hurricane" ("bufera infernal", 31) – see Lombardi (2012: 179), and Bocc. *Espos.* 5.litt.121-3. See also Ov. *Am.* 1.9.15-16: *quis nisi vel miles vel amans et frigora noctis/ et denso mixtas perferet imbre nives?*

that he too could achieve immortality without giving up his lovers.⁷¹⁰ With this thought, Typhlus suddenly makes up his mind, and is not willing to leave either Crisis or Dyone (*alma Dyones*, 124).⁷¹¹

However, greed and lust are not the only obstacles impeding Typhlus' salvation. Through the indication of reed pipe and song (*stipulis et carmine vitam/ ducere consilium*, *Phyl.* 123-4 above), the text introduces a third type of earthly desire: namely, the desire for poetry. Indeed, permeating all of Boccaccio's production, as well as that of his Christian contemporaries, is the dilemma that, though the path of poetry is one of the noblest paths to follow, the desire to be a poet should not become the final goal of a person's life. Thus, in the previous chapter, we have seen how, in *Saphos*, Aristeus was anxiously trying to gather bay leaves even before he reached poetry. Similarly, in Petrarch's *Parthenias*, Silvius was presented as a lover of the earth, who craved poetic emulation and the pleasure of worthless fame (*emulus, et fame dulcedine tactus inani*, 19), which diverted him from the route to heaven. Finally, in Dante's *Purgatorio* 11, the personage of Oderisi da Gubbio (based on the eponymous miniaturist active in the thirteenth century) exposed the pride and vanity of all artists, including poets, who are always trying to exceed themselves and others with their art.⁷¹² Engaging with this literary system, Boccaccio's *Phylostropos* reveals that the love of poetry essentially belongs to the realm of the earthly passions and, just like the love of wealth and sexual pleasure, it can also threaten one's salvation. At the same time, following in the footsteps

⁷¹⁰ Following the same onomastic principle that transformed Pluto into Plutarch (*Saphos* 110), the name "Alcidamas" seems to be a distortion of "Alcides", as a way to distinguish the mythical Hercules from his "historical" counterpart (previously invoked at *Phyl.* 108) – see Perini (1994: 1072). This distinction is supported by *Genealogia* 13.1, where Boccaccio follows Theodontius' euhemeristic explanation of Hercules' myth: *dicit Theodontius in quibusdam Grecorum codicibus legisse Herculem Anphytrionis fuisse filium et non Iovis... ex quo sibi locum fecit fabula, eum scilicet ex Iove conceptum, quem ex viro mulier honesta conceperat*. Osiris' transformation from the man Apis into the Egyptian god Serapis (traditionally associated with Osiris since Hellenistic times), in turn, is described in *Genealogia* 2.4. While Hercules' death was motivated by his love affair with Iole, Osiris was killed by his wife Isis' brother, Seth. Both characters, however, reached immortality afterwards – and this seems to be the nexus between them in Boccaccio's passage above, as partly suggested by Smarr (1987: 258).

⁷¹¹ See *Ars* 3.3, and 769 (*alma Dione*), referring to Venus.

⁷¹² See *Inf.* 11.94-102; discussion in Barolini (1992: 127-9; 2014), and Clarke (2015: 203-21).

of Petrarch and Dante, Boccaccio presents the love of poetry as a potential sin; and, paradoxically, as his own gateway to heaven, since it is mainly through poetry (and other poets) that he can obtain the knowledge and mental strength necessary for his conversion.⁷¹³ Thus, Typhlus-Boccaccio needs another poet, Phyllostropus-Petrarch, to help him break through his resistances, and remind him of his imminent fate:

Decidet iste calor; pratis armenta peribunt;
infames stolidum rapient per devia nymphe,
teque Trinos Penosque trahent Thlipsisque Lipisque
in scotinas silvas, famuli pastoris Averni.
(*Phyl.* 126-9)

The herds (*armenta*) here suggest, like the sick flocks mentioned previously (*pecudes morboque iacentes*, 45), the mortal sinners who, according to the biblical narrative, are destined to perish on doomsday.⁷¹⁴ Subsequently, the image of infamous nymphs in remote places (*per devia*) represent prostitutes or, more symbolically, the erotic instincts and desires which drive people to aimless paths – as implied at the beginning of *Pampinea*, too.⁷¹⁵ Then, while the shepherd of Avernus (*pastoris Averni*, 129) evidently stands for Pluto, the characters Trinos, Penos, Thlipsis and Lipis are respectively based on Greek words indicating mourning, pain, sorrow and anxiety, as explained in Boccaccio's glosses to the passage at ms. Ricc. 1232, 81v: *Trinos grece luctum, Penos grece dolor et labor, Thlipsis grece mestitia, Lipis grece anxietas, and scotinos grece obscurus*. As we can see, Boccaccio also elucidates there that *scotinus*

⁷¹³ See discussion on the "Galeotto" in Chapter 1, "Context and characters"; and Petr. *Secr.* 3.1.2: Fr. *Duabus adhuc adamantinis dextra leuque premeris cathenis, que nec de morte neque de vita sinunt cogitare*; and then 3.2.1: Fr. *Quenam sunt quas memoras cathene?* Aug. *Amor et gloria*.

⁷¹⁴ See Rev. 20:12-15. For the biblical metaphor of sheep and goats, see also Vulg. Ier. 31:10: *Audite verbum Domini, gentes, et annuntiate in insulis quae procul sunt, et dicite: Qui dispersit Israel congregabit eum, et custodiet eum sicut pastor gregem suum*; and Mt. 25:31-3: *Cum autem venerit Filius hominis in maiestate sua, et omnes angeli cum eo, tunc sedebit super sedem maiestatis suae: et congregabuntur ante eum omnes gentes, et separabit eos ab invicem, sicut pastor segregat oves ab haedis: et statuet oves quidem a dextris suis, haedos autem a sinistris*.

⁷¹⁵ *Pamp.* 9-10: *me miserum male sanus Amor per devia solum/ distrahit*. See also *Saph.* 68 (and other references in Index of Intertexts).

means “obscure”. Consequently, the image of the dark forests (*scotinas silvas*) above immediately calls to mind the “selva oscura” at the start of Dante’s *Inferno*.⁷¹⁶ Additionally, the passage as a whole recalls the scene in *Aeneid* 6 where Virgil (combining strands from Homer, Hesiod, Empedocles, Ennius, Cicero, and Lucretius) mentions the abstracts Grief, Cares, Diseases, Age, Fear, Hunger, Want, Death, Distress, Sleep, Guilty Joys, War, Discord, and Strife – all of them standing at the shadowy entrance of the Underworld.⁷¹⁷ Thus, in Boccaccio’s passage above, Phylostropus intimates that Typhlus is leading himself to hell, and might suffer eternal penalties if he does not amend his life as soon as possible. Yet, ostensibly contradicting his own statement above, Typhlus will now dare to question the very idea of immortality and an afterlife.

The shepherd Epy

Typhl. Etatis placidos ludos, dum credis, amice,
teque simul perdis. Memini: cantabat inesse
pastor Epy, silvis quondam famosus apricis,
interitum menti pariter cum corpore cunctis.
Phyl. Typhle, precor, sanusne satis? Dic, improba credis
dicta senis damnata diu, cum dicat Ariston
et samius cantet pastor contentque bubulci
omnes romuleos qui mulcent pectine saltus,
eternas hominum mentes a numine lapsas
ethereo? firmetque Soter, qui sanguine silvas
infectosque greges pridem purgavit, in altum
scandere non sotes et letis sedibus uti,
sic alios post fata focos intrare typhleos?
Hos ego, si possem, mecum, mi Typhle, volebam
effugeres rupesque novas scopulosque videres.
(*Phyl.* 130-44)

⁷¹⁶ The actual Greek terms are θρήνος (“dirge”, “lament”), πόνος (“work”, “labour”, “trouble”), θλίψις (“castration”, “affliction”), λύπη (“pain”, “distress”), and σκοτεινός (“dark”, “obscure”). See Perini (1994: 1072).

⁷¹⁷ *Aen.* 6.268-81: *Ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram... vestibulum ante ipsum primisque in faucibus Orci/ Luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae,/ pallentesque habitant Morbi tristisque Senectus,/ et Metus et malesuada Fames ac turpis Egestas,/ terribiles visu formae, Letumque Labosque;/ tum consanguineus Leti Sopor et mala mentis/ Gaudia, mortiferumque adverso in limine Bellum,/ ferreique Eumenidum thalami et Discordia demens/ vipereum crinem vittis innexa cruentis* – see Horsfall (2013: 238).

Typhlus argues that, by narrowing his vision to death, Phylostropus is letting his life pass without any enjoyment, losing himself in his own system of beliefs. Seeming to ignore their old age, Typhlus suggests that they both continue enjoying their pleasant pastimes. Besides evoking the beginning of the poem through the term *ludus*, the phrase *etatis placidos ludos* (130) moreover alludes to Petrarch's *canzone* 23 ("Nel dolce tempo de la prima etade"), as well as to Boccaccio's *Galla* 35 (*placidi anni*), both discussed in Chapter 1.⁷¹⁸ Thus, the text implies that Typhlus-Boccaccio wants to keep producing the same kind of literary compositions from his youth, overlooking the deleterious effects of this choice. Indeed, Typhlus goes as far as doubting the immortality of the soul, giving credence to Epy, who thought that both body and mind disintegrated after death.

As was anticipated before, Epy is a mask for Epicurus. Partly recalling Caliope's critique against the *moderni*, called Ericole in *Saphos*, Phylostropus dismisses the "wicked teachings of that senile man" (*improba... dicta senis*, *Phyl.* 134-5 above), while standing by the authority of Ariston, the Samian shepherd, and other ancient herdsmen. By Ariston, Phylostropus probably means Plato (the son of Ariston); and by the Samian shepherd, Pythagoras of Samos. Subsequently, the *bubulci* (136), as hinted at by the "Romulean groves" (*romuleos... saltus*) and plectrum (*pectine*, 137), seem to represent some Roman poets who also defended the immortality of the soul, such as Virgil and Lucan.⁷¹⁹ Indeed, in *Georgics* 4, Virgil famously reported the theory that bees, as well as all other living beings, derived from heavenly ether (*aetherios*, *G.* 4.221), to which they eventually returned after death. Then, in *Aeneid* 6, Anchises explained to Aeneas that every living being was infused with divine seeds

⁷¹⁸ See Chapter 1, "The Golden Age".

⁷¹⁹ Opposing Lidonnici (1914: 343) and Smarr (1987: 259), Perini (1994: 1074) believed that the Ariston above referred to Aristotle. However, despite the closer affinity in sound between these two names, Plato still seems a more plausible reading. Note that Boccaccio uses that same name, in Italian, to allude to Plato at *Esposizioni* 4.1.133-5 ("Aristone lui giovanetto menò a Socrate... come Socrate vide Platone..."). On Plato's notion of a celestial reality (against Democritus' and Epicurus' theories on atoms and multiple worlds), see Petrarch's *De sui ipsius et multorum ignorantia* 86-7. Both Smarr (1987: 259) and Perini (1994: 1074) included Roman philosophers, alongside poets, among the *bubulci* above. Yet I think that the mention of the plectrum seems to indicate poets more specifically.

(*caelestis origo/ seminibus*, *Aen.* 6.730-1), but while attached to a body, the soul could not clearly discern the heavenly light (*auras*, 733). After death, each soul underwent punishment to cleanse their bodily traces (*corporeae... pestes*, 737), until they could go to Elysium and then finally be reincarnated, perpetuating the cycle.⁷²⁰ Similarly, at the beginning of the *Bellum civile* 9, Lucan recounted how Pompey's soul left its ashes to head for the eternal abodes of the blessed (*aeternos... orbis*, *Lucan* 9.9), within the moon's orbit, according to a Stoic belief.⁷²¹

Alongside those visionary men from Antiquity, Phylostropus mentions the decisive example of Christ. He reminds Typhlus that, thanks to Soter (σωτήρ, "saviour"), the infected flocks (*infectos greges*, 140) were cleansed; and the innocent will ascend on high to enjoy the "blessed seats" (*letis sedibus*, 141), while the rest shall suffer in fire. This passage overtly alludes to the image of the blessed souls washing their robes in the blood of the Lamb before entering the heavenly city, in the Book of Revelation – and also present in Boccaccio's *Olympia*.⁷²² Yet, while describing the Last Judgment, Boccaccio notably resorts to some classical elements too, thus presenting Christian heaven as a type of Elysium (*locos laetos... sedesque beatas*, *Virg. Aen.* 6.638-9); and Satan as Typhon, the rebellious Titan defeated by Jove and buried under the Aetna.⁷²³

Thus, allegorically suggesting Christian heaven, Phylostropus encourages Typhlus to escape with him to "new rocks and cliffs" (*effugeres rupesque novas scopulosque videres*, 144). This line in particular alludes to three different passages from Virgil, each of them adding a

⁷²⁰ Note, however, that Boccaccio's phrase *mulcent pectine... ethereo* (*Phyl.* 137-9) recalls Virgil's *Aeneid* 7.34, *aethera mulcebant cantu* (describing birds).

⁷²¹ See, moreover, *Tusculanae Disputationes* 1.77-81 (cited by Servius at *Aeneid* 6.727), where Cicero refuted the "ignorant philosophers" (*ignorantis*) who argued against the Platonic theory of the immortality of the soul; and also Dante *Inf.* 10.14-5: "con Epicuro tutti suoi seguaci..." (quoted in "A life of pleasure and pain" above).

⁷²² See *Vulg. Apoc.* 7:13: *Hi sunt, qui venerunt de tribulatione magna, et laverunt stolas suas, et dealbaverunt eas in sanguine Agni*; Chromatius Aquileiensis, *Tractatus in evangelium S. Matthaei* (*Patrologia Latina* 20, p. 330): *Dominus ac Salvator noster... dehinc totius mundi peccata purgavit*; and *Bocc. Olymp.* 98-9: *sic priscas sordes, morbos scabiemque vetustam/ infecti pecoris preclaro sanguine [Codrus] lavit*. See also *Bocc. Panth.* 190, and 225.

⁷²³ See *Bocc. Olymp.* 109-10: *sedibus illos/ perpetuis celoque novo*. On Typhon (Typhoeus), see, for instance, *Ov. Met.* 5.321-54, *Bocc. Gen.* 4.22, and particularly *Panth.* 91 (*flammasque typheas*).

different layer of meaning. The first allusion is to *Eclogues* 10.58-9, where Gallus gives up every hope of recovering from his lovesickness, and imagines himself living as a semi-human, travelling aimlessly in the deep forests, “traversing rocks and echoing groves” (*iam mihi per rupes videor lucosque sonantis/ ire*). The second allusion is to *Georgics* 3.253, where the phrase *scopuli rupesque* calls our attention to the broader context where it is inserted. Indeed, in lines 209-41, Virgil addresses the cattle keepers, and his main advice to them is that they try to restrain their animals’ sexual instincts at all costs. Yet, in lines 242-83, Virgil expands his argument saying that, just like bulls, all other animals (including humans) have this same tendency to rush into the fires of love (*in furias ignemque ruunt: amor omnibus idem, G. 3.244*); and that is why nothing can stop horses when they get sexually aroused; not even rocks or cliffs can refrain their passion (*non scopuli rupesque, 253*).⁷²⁴ Finally, the third allusion is to *Aeneid* 3, where Aeneas recounts how he and his crew have fled past the “rocks of Ithaca” (*effugimus scopulos Ithacae, Aen. 3.372*), referred to as the “motherland of the cruel Ulysses” (*terram altricem... saevi... Ulixi, 273*). Thus, note that the two first passages from the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* respectively show, through different perspectives, the consequences of extreme desire, while the latter passage from the *Aeneid* exposes the urgent need to escape from an enemy. Both these ideas are similarly present in Boccaccio’s *Phyllostropos*.

Doubt

In what follows, Typhlus makes clear that he is not willing to leave what is certain to pursue the uncertain. In response to this objection, Phyllostropus claims that what Typhlus holds as certain is, in reality, uncertain:

*Typhl. Quid faciam? Ridenda michi, Phyllostrope, suades:
certa sinam, non certa sequar? Quis, queso, sequatur?*

⁷²⁴ See also *Ov. Met.* 3.226 (*per rupes scopulosque*).

Phyl. Quid certum, dic, Typhle, tenes? Rapit omnia tempus:
 quas Amon vestit silvas, denudat Orion,
 et sub sole cadit quicquid sub sole creatum est.
 Verum ego perpetuos fontes umbrasque perennes
 ut videas teneasque loquor, pestesque furentes
 Chyronis fugias preponens firma caducis.
 (*Phyl.* 145-52)

It is striking that this opposition between what is certain and uncertain once again alludes to Terence's *Eunuchus*.⁷²⁵ Indeed, before arguing that one love could be replaced by a new one (as discussed above), Parmeno spoke these memorable lines: "if you try to impose certainty on uncertainty by reason, you'd achieve no more than if you set about going insane by reason" (*incerta haec si tu postules/ ratione certa facere, nihilo plus agas/ quam si des operam ut cum ratione insanias*, 61-3). Thus, the present allusion to Terence reinforces the previous one (in lines 92-7 above); and also, consequently, the intertextual links between Boccaccio's eclogue and Cicero's *Tusculans*.⁷²⁶ In fact, quoting this same passage from Terence, Cicero exposed the madness of lovers who subjected themselves to all inconsistencies and uncertainties, always oscillating between war and peace (*bellum, pax rursum*, Ter. *Eun.* 61; Cic. *Tusc.* 4.76). Though Boccaccio certainly had access to Terence's *Eunuchus*, and probably to Cicero's *Tusculans* too, his engagement with both these works in *Phyllostropos* is mediated through Petrarch's *Secretum*, where they acquire Christian overtones. Indeed, alluding to both Terence and Cicero in Book 3 of the *Secretum*, Petrarch's Augustinus argued that it was impossible to restrain what is irrational with reason, adding that one should abandon one's foolish passions to focus on the true and stable love of God (*Secr.* 3.7.8-10). Thus, in alluding to Petrarch alluding to Cicero and Terence, Boccaccio not only highlights the prominent role of the *Secretum* in his eclogue;

⁷²⁵ A similar opposition is found in Plautus' *Pseudolus* (*certa mittimus, dum incerta petimus*, 685), a play that was not known at Boccaccio's times – see Chapter 1, "Context and characters".

⁷²⁶ Though the allusions at issue are ostensibly mediated through Petrarch's *Secretum*, Boccaccio explicitly mentions this work (and quotes from it) in *Gen.* 1.14, 18, 19, 4.51, 12.2, 25; and *Espos.* 4.litt. On Petrarch's manuscripts of Cicero's *Tusculans*, see Rizzo (1996: 75-104). On Boccaccio's knowledge of Terence, see Chapter 1, "Context and characters".

but also his own approach to classical texts, which he saw as instrumental to the knowledge of Christian truths, as did Petrarch and Augustine.⁷²⁷

In the autofictional setting of *Phylostropos*, Petrarch teaches Boccaccio what he has learned from Augustine. Calling into question Typhlus' notion of what is certain, Phylostropus argues that time can steal all things (*rapit omnia tempus*, 147): the woods which Amon makes luxuriant, Orion strips bare.⁷²⁸ Amon is the Egyptian god, called *corniger Ammon* by Ovid, in reference to his ram's horns, a symbol of fertility, associated with the constellation of Aries and the beginning of spring.⁷²⁹ Orion, in turn, is the constellation associated with winter. Subsequently, Phylostropus mentions Chiron, thereby evoking the southern constellation of Centaurus, representing autumn, with its raging plagues (*pestesque furentes*, 151).⁷³⁰ As elsewhere in his production, but particularly in *Galla* and *Alcestus*, here too Boccaccio confers allegorical and moral symbolism on the changing seasons, suggesting that nothing on earth is permanent. Yet, instead of using this as an argument in favour of human resilience (as suggested in the erotic and political contexts of those poems), Phylostropus prefers to cut the problem off at its root, and to focus on the things that never perish.⁷³¹ Hence, alluding to the biblical aphorism *nihil sub sole novum* (Ecclesiastes 1:10), with the phrase *sub sole cadit quicquid sub sole creatum est* above (*Phyl.* 149), he ultimately proposes that real happiness is beyond the limits of the sun, in Christian heaven.

⁷²⁷ See Aug. *Doctr. Chr.* 2.18: *immo vero quisquis bonus verusque Christianus est, Domini sui esse intellegat, ubicumque invenerit veritatem.*

⁷²⁸ See Nem. *Ecl.* 4.32: *omnia tempus alit, tempus rapit.*

⁷²⁹ See Ov. *Am.* 3.789; *Met.* 5.17, 15.309.

⁷³⁰ Boccaccio uses the same terminology in the opening lines of his tenth eclogue, *Vallis opaca*, adding Cancer (the constellation of summer) to the list: *seu pluvias terris immittat Orion/ aut Amon flores vel Cancer rure cicadas,/ auferat aut frondes Chyron.*

⁷³¹ This idea of earthly cycles recalls Virgil's *Eclogue* 4, too: *et incipient magni procedere menses... inrita perpetua solvent formidine terras* (12-4).

Heaven

Typhl. In siculis Arethusa iugis hec pascua servat?
Phyl. Non equidem, nostris nemus hoc plus distat ab oris.
Typhl. Quis colit hoc igitur? Trax forsán, forte canopus?
Phyl. Surgit silva virens celi sub cardine levo,
aspera dumetis et saxo infixá rubenti.
Presidet insignis magnusque Theoschyus illi
pastor, et emissos lambunt de rupe liquores
selecte pecudes paucè domitique iuveni,
ac herbas tenues carpunt quas undique prestat
ipse lapis, dum longa quidem ieiunia solvant
quod mortale solum fecit per inania pingue.
(*Phyl.* 153-63)

Like Silvius enquiring of his daughter about Elysium, in *Olympia*, Typhlus becomes curious about the place mentioned by Phylostropus, in the passage above. He wonders if it is located within the Sicilian pastures of Arethusa – the fountain symbol of the pastoral genre, prominent at the start of Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, but here implying also the earthly world.⁷³² After Phylostropus responds that the place is farther from their shores, Typhlus asks him whether he refers to the distant lands of the Thracian (*Trax*) or Canopian (*canopus*) people – the latter indicating Egypt, through one of its famous coastal towns, Canopus.⁷³³ However, Phylostropus makes clear that he is talking about a special reality, outside ordinary boundaries. Presenting heaven as a “green wood rising under the left pole of the sky” (*silva virens celi sub cardine levo*, 156), the text evokes Dante's Mount Purgatory, similarly situated in the southern hemisphere (“l'altro polo... settentrional vedovo sito”, *Purg.* 1.23-6); but also, more particularly, Dante's Earthly Paradise in the last cantos of *Purgatorio*, which are a major source of inspiration and intertextual tesserae throughout Boccaccio's works.⁷³⁴ Like the heaven of

⁷³² See *Gen.* 7.18; and *De font.*, “Arethusa” (1).

⁷³³ For Trax/Thrax, see, for instance, *Juv. Sat.* 3.79. For Canopus, see *Virg. G.* 4.287 (and Servius ad hoc.), *Juv.* 1.26, 6.84, 15.46; and *Bocc. De div. nom. mar.* (“Egyptium”), *Bucc.* 7.114 (*Iurgium*), 11.178 (*Pantheon*), and 13.49 (*Laurea*). Compare this passage with *Bucc.* 14.164-70 (*Olymp.*): *Silv. Quos tenet iste locus montes? quibus insitus oris?... Olymp. Est in secessu pecori mons invius egro.*

⁷³⁴ As noted by Perini (1994: 1074), there is also the classical notion that good auguries come from the left side – see, for instance, *Virg. Aen.* 9.630-1 (*caeli genitor de parte serena/intonuit laevum*).

Olympia and Phylostropus, Dante's Earthly Paradise is infused with pastoral and idyllic elements, being described as a divine and lush forest ("divina foresta spessa e viva", *Purg.* 28.2), with rivers of pure water and perpetual shade ("ombra perpetua", *Purg.* 28.32 – see *perpetuos fontes umbrasque perennes* above, *Phyl.* 150).⁷³⁵

Therefore, though adopting the conventions of the bucolic genre, *Phylostropos*' heaven is depicted as a highly idealised and far-off wood, which assimilates both Dante's Earthly Paradise and *Olympia*'s Elysium (modelled on Virgil's Elysium), rather than the Empyrean of Alan of Lille or Dante, for instance.⁷³⁶ Moreover, there are some elements in Boccaccio's text which allude to biblical scenes. The image of the ruddy stone (*saxo... rubenti*, 157), in particular, brings to mind the heavenly Jerusalem, whose foundations were made of jasper, ruby and other different precious stones.⁷³⁷ Moreover, as John visualizes God sitting at a high throne and living among men (*et audivi vocem magnam de throno dicentem: ecce tabernaculum Dei cum hominibus, et habitabit cum eis*, Vulg. Apoc. 21:3), *Phylostropus* speaks of Theoschyrus presiding over his woods and selected flocks (*presidet insignis magnusque Theoschyrus illi/ pastor... selecte pecudes pauce*, *Phyl.* 158-60 above). Deriving from the Greek words θεός ("god") and κύριος ("the lord", "master"), Theoschyrus evidently represents God; and his description as a shepherd, besides suitable for an eclogue, is also redolently biblical.⁷³⁸ Then, the image of the water issuing from a rock (*Phyl.* 159-60) not only alludes to

⁷³⁵ On the intertextual relationships between Boccaccio's *Olympia* and Dante's *Purgatorio*, see Labagnara (1968: 97-100).

⁷³⁶ See Alan of Lille *Anticl.* 5. 373-543, and Dante *Par.* 30-33. I partly disagree with Perini (1994: 1074) when he claims that *Phylostropus*' mount has little in common with *Olympia*'s heavenly mountain. While Perini sees the Edenic landscape of *Phylostropos* as an allegorical representation of the state of blessedness possible to obtain in life, I tend to interpret the same landscape as an allegory of the promised heaven – the contrast between the place described by *Phylostropus* and hell (*pestes... Chyronis*, l. 152), and also the mention of Theoschyrus/God as its ruler (l. 158), for example, make this reading more plausible. However, *Phylostropos* suggests that conversion in life is a direct way to achieve salvation, without passing through purgatory.

⁷³⁷ See Rev. 21:11-21. Perini (1994: 1074), instead, relates the "ruddy stone" to Dante's description of a step in purgatory ("porfido mi pareo, sì fiammeggiante/ come sangue che fuor di vena spiccia", 9.101-2). Note, moreover, that *Phyl.* 157 (*aspera dumetis... rubenti*) verbally recalls a line from Seneca's *Hercules Furens*, where the chorus describes the death of Pentheus: *iam Cadmeis incluta Bacchis/ aspersa die dumeta rubent* (134-5).

⁷³⁸ See, for instance, Vulg. Psalm. 23; and Iohan. 10:14-16: *ego sum pastor bonus: et cognosco meas, et cognoscunt me meae... et fiet unum ovile et unus pastor*. Similarly, in Boccaccio's *Olympia*, God is presented as the shepherd Archesilas (from ἀρχή, "beginning", "origin", "sovereignty") – see *Olymp.* 200-12. For the

a scene from Numbers 20:10-11, where God commands Moses to strike a rock with his staff and give water to his people and flocks (as observed by Smarr); but also to the spring of the water of life, described in Revelation 21.⁷³⁹ The desert made to flourish (*Phyl.* 161-3), in turn, recalls Isaiah 51:3, where it is said that God would turn a desert into a garden; but also, again, the heavenly Jerusalem.⁷⁴⁰ Finally, the image of the desert brings to mind the sterile plains of Boccaccio's *Galla*, as if suggesting a continuity between the empty desires of Damon, Tindarus and Typhlus.

Shame and regret

Typhlus does not deny that the place described by Phylostropus is truly remarkable. Yet, he views it as impossible to be ever allowed there. Among his sins, he confesses to having stolen one of Theoschyrus' heifers, spurned sacred laws and rites, and thrown them to Dyone's pigs:

Quid frustra signare locum nemus atque laboras?
 An visurus ego veniam, Phylostrope, silvas
 huius, queso, senis, cuius rapuisse iuencam
 iamdudum memini, leges ritusque suorum
 iam pedibus calcasse meis manibusque nefastis
 carpendas porcis olim iecisse Dyonis?
 Non veniam; timeo vires irasque frementis.
 Preterea in saxum fecundas ducere capras
 precipis ut pereant macie scabieque geluque!
 Non faciam; potius nostris est vivere silvis.
 (*Phyl.* 164-73)

etymology of "Theoschyrus" above, I follow Pontani (*apud* Perini 1994: 1074), who suggests θεός + κύριος as an alternative to θεός + κοῦρος ("god" + "son" = the son of God = Christ), proposed by Hortis (1879: 60) and followed by Lidonnici (1914: 343), Smarr (1987: 260) and Slavitt (2010: 136). Hortis' etymology not only contrasts with the description of Theoschyrus as an old man (*huius... senis*, *Phyl.* 166) – as Lidonnici had already observed – but also as a father (*pater... Theoschyre*, 201). Note, moreover, that the word κύριος is used as a substitute for "Jehovah" in the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Bible (though it is also used in reference to Jesus, in the Greek New Testament) – see definition in Liddell-Scott (1888), but also in Bauer and Danker (2000-02).

⁷³⁹ See Vulg. Num. 20:10-11 (*de petra... egressae sunt aquae largissimae ita ut et populus biberet et iumenta*); and Apoc. 21:6 (*ego sitiendi dabo de fonte aquae vitae, gratis*).

⁷⁴⁰ See Vulg. Is. 51:3 (*et ponet desertum ejus quasi delicias, et solitudinem ejus quasi hortum Domini*), and Apoc. 22:1-5. Smarr (1987: 260) points out a similar contrast between barren and fertile lands in Boccaccio's *Comedia delle ninfe fiorentine* 14.49-51 and 109-11.

This passage, and particularly the reference to the *iuvenco* (166), has been subject to modern debate. Whereas Carrara and Torraca read it as a confession of Boccaccio's illicit involvement with a nun, Lidonnici and Smarr otherwise proposed a "general indication of wrongdoing".⁷⁴¹ Also opposing the first hypothesis, Perini related the lines above to Boccaccio's erotic production.⁷⁴² In support of this reading, it is significant that, through the swine motif, Boccaccio again recalls the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 7:6); and, consequently, the discussion on poetry in *Saphos*. But, whereas in the latter poem Caliope insinuated that Aristeus was a swineherd unworthy of her bays, in *Phylostropos* Typhlus himself confesses that he has thrown a sacred treasure to the pigs. Hence, to translate this in allegorical terms, while Aristeus was presented as a mere dilettante in *Saphos*, Typhlus appears as a committed poet in *Phylostropos*, yet one who is conscious of having wasted his poetic skills, granted to him by God, and perfected throughout his adulthood.

Overall, this metaliterary reading makes us think of the *Decameron* too (as Perini had already suggested); but, more especially, it makes us think of the *Decameron*'s last novella (10.10). Indeed, the idea of Typhlus blaming himself for stealing a female calf and throwing it to Dyone's pigs strikingly brings to mind the Griselda story – which is told by none other than Dioneo, the most subversive narrator of the *Decameron*. Dioneo describes Griselda as a "poor young woman" ("povera giovinetta", *Dec.* 10.10.9), who suffered a great deal in the hands of her "bestial" husband (cf. "matta bestialità", 3), Gualtieri. By the end of the tale, Gualtieri threw his virtuous wife half-naked ("in camiscia e scalza", *Dec.* 10.10.47) into the street, leaving her chaste body exposed to a vulgar crowd. Yet, afterwards, Gualtieri miraculously regretted his

⁷⁴¹ See Carrara (1900: 123), Torraca (1912: 112), Lidonnici (1914: 276), and Smarr (1987: 260, quoted above). Taking up Carrara's hypothesis, Torraca proposed a more specific identification of the *iuvenco* as Emiliana Tornaquini (the Emilia from the *Comedia delle ninfe*), who was allegedly in a convent before she was married. Lidonnici, however, dismissed both Carrara's and Torraca's readings as "indocte". Instead, he called the reader's attention to Boccaccio's intratext between *Phylostropos* (*rapuisse iuvencam/ iamdudum*, 166) and *Vallis opaca* (*iamdudum pecudes rapuisse*, 143), with the implication that Typhlus was a sinner just as the character Lycidas from the latter eclogue.

⁷⁴² Perini (1994: 1074-5).

behaviour, and asked Griselda to come back to him. Dioneo ascribes this transformation to divine forces which descended upon Gualtieri's wicked soul – just as the opposite can also happen, for we often see swineherds occupying high places. Not without some irony, though, Dioneo imagines a different ending to the story of Griselda, insinuating that she could have sought revenge by cheating on her husband, instead of patiently yielding to him.⁷⁴³

Perhaps we could read the Griselda tale as a literary example of “casting pearls before swine”: firstly because Gualtieri humiliated Griselda in the story; and secondly because Dioneo, by proposing an alternative ending of erotic nature to his tale, somehow corrupted its moral dignity. In the light of these considerations, in *Phyllostropos*, Typhlus' sin could be understood as an allegory of Boccaccio denigrating honourable characters and spurning religion (*leges ritusque*, *Phyl.* 167 above) as if they were *nugae* in his erotic vernacular works, especially in the *Decameron*.⁷⁴⁴ Indeed, though in the Proem to the *Decameron* the Boccaccian narrator defended the ethical utility of his work for his female readership, later on, in his *Epistola* 22 (dated to 1372), he otherwise condemned the immoral contents of the *Decameron*, and expressly advised women *not* to read it. Similarly, in his *Seniles* 17.3 (also dated to 1372), Petrarch argued that the Griselda story provided a solid example of Christian virtue which, nevertheless, contrasted greatly with the rest of the *Decameron*. For this reason, Petrarch himself took on the task of translating that Boccaccian tale into Latin, adapting it to a more suitable style (*stilo... alio*, 38).⁷⁴⁵ Though written a decade earlier than both these letters, the

⁷⁴³ See *Dec.* 10.10.68: “che si potrà dir qui? se non che anche nelle povere case piovono dal cielo de' divini spiriti, come nelle reali di queglii che sarien più degni di guardar porci che d'avere sopra uomini signoria” – see discussion in Lorenzini (2020: 210). On the Griselda story as an allegory of Christian virtue and its different responses, see, for instance, Thompson (1996: 279-312), and Clarke (2008: 183-208). On the moral opposition between Gualtieri and Griselda, and on the political elements of the tale, see Barsella (2013: 67-77).

⁷⁴⁴ See *Dec.* Pr.14: “le già dette donne, che queste [storie] leggeranno... utile consiglio potranno pigliare, in quanto potranno cognoscere quello che sia da fuggire e che sia similmente da seguire”; and *Ep.* 22.19: *sane, quod inclitas mulieres tuas domesticas nugas meas legere permiseris non laudo, quin imo queso per fidem tuam ne feceris* – discussion in Daniels (2011: 423-47), and Bragantini (2018: 328-30). Note also that, in that first statement, Boccaccio was programmatically using the same argument that some medieval critics used to justify the reading of Ovid – see Kriesel (2016: 419; 2019: 163); and Minnis, Scott & Wallace (1988: 20-30).

⁷⁴⁵ See Rossiter (2008: 156-82), Wallace (2009: 321-30), and Zak (2015: 139-54).

passage from *Phyllostropos* above suggests that Typhlus-Boccaccio recognised that, when he was younger (*iamdudum*, 167), he treated what was holy with scorn, thus acting just like Gualtieri and Dioneo in the *Decameron*.⁷⁴⁶

Besides these relevant links with the Griselda story, the autofictional idea of an old Boccaccio looking back at his erotic production with regret also markedly recalls an Ovidian pattern. Indeed, while this self-blaming attitude is most prominent in his so-called exile works, namely the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*, in his earlier *Amores* Ovid already gave some signs of regretting his voluntary submission to the chains of love (*catenas*), having sudden impulses to break free from elegiac couplets and trample love under his own feet: *vicimus et domitum pedibus calcamus amorem* (*Am.* 3.11a.1-5).⁷⁴⁷ In the passage from *Phyllostropos* above, Boccaccio similarly uses the Ovidian sequence *pedibus calcasse* (168), with the overt difference that Typhlus is confessing to neglect of Theoschyus' rules. Nevertheless, this intertext reinforces the idea that Typhlus' sin is related to his erotic production; and that, just like Ovid suggests in *Amores* 3.11a, he too needs to overcome his past completely.

The final implication of this reading is that, if Typhlus-Boccaccio wishes to convert himself and pursue heaven, he must abandon the bucolic genre, too. Indeed, the *fecunde capre* of line 171 above can be interpreted as a reference to the eclogues of the *Buccolicum carmen*, just as the *capreoli* and *capellae* of Virgil's *Eclogues* 2 and 10, for instance, seem to symbolise his poems. Hence, by saying that Typhlus' she-goats might die from "hunger, mange or icy cold" (*pereant macie scabieque geluque*, 172), the text allegorically implies that Boccaccio

⁷⁴⁶ See *Ep.* 22.: *Non enim ubique est qui in excusationem meam consurgens dicat: Iuvenis scripsit et maioris coactus imperio. Hec autem quantum etati mee convenient, sino studiis, tu nosti; et quanquam minus honestus sim et longe minus iamdudum fuerim, non facile vellem iudicio talium mulierum mea fedaretur fama vel nomen* – discussion in Daniels (2011: 439-40).

⁷⁴⁷ See also *Tr.* 5.8.10: *inposito calcas quid mea fata pede?*; and the striking Lucretian intertext (*DRN* 1.78): *religio pedibus subiecta vicissim*. Casanova-Robin (2017: 333) has also briefly noticed the presence of "échos lucretiens" in Boccaccio's *Phyllostropos*. On Lucretius in the Middle Ages, see Reeve (2007: 205-13).

will have to leave his own pastoral behind.⁷⁴⁸ Besides evoking a passage from *Saphos* (mediated by Virgil's *Georgics*), this notion is more explicitly developed in *Aggelos*, where Boccaccio's eclogues are depicted as skinny and sick she-goats, probably as a result of his having abandoned his work before its full completion. What is more, in the light of Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, where the well-fed she-goats (*saturae... capellae*, 77) seem to represent Virgil's eclogues "saturated" with elegiac content, we could perhaps understand Typhlus' fear as an indication that, without his elegiac influences, his bucolic work cannot survive.⁷⁴⁹

Theoschyry's mercy and rewards

Following one of the main teachings of Christianity, Phyllostropus assures Typhlus that, as long as he confesses his guilt and prays for pardon, like Glaucus and Amintas once did, Theoschyry will surely have mercy on him:

Non hominis mores nosti; miserebitur ultro
 si dicas peccasse sibi veniamque preceris.
 Quid Glaucus fecit, quid post hunc magnus Amintas?
 Sed sine deveniam quo tendit sermo priorum
 et demum, si iure potes, premissa refelle.
 Hinc faciles scandunt scabrosi culmina montis
 letaque comperiunt que dixi pascua fronde
 fontibus ac umbris longoque patentia tractu;
 non ibi fessa gelu pereunt armenta nec Auster
 aut pinguem Boreas adversis flatibus orbem
 concutiunt, non dira lues astrumve malignum
 infundunt pestes: Zephyrus sacer omnia mulcet.
 O tibi si referam quas nutriat illa puellas
 silva parens nymphasque, deas dryadesque frequentes!
 Ilico damnabis Crisidem turpemque Dyonem;
 sponte quidem dices: "Satyros dimitto iocantes
 et faunos cantusque avium placidosque colores
 herbarum florumque" simul tu forte videbis.
 (Phyl. 174-91)

⁷⁴⁸ See G. 3.441-3 (*turpis ovis temptat scabies, ubi frigidus imber/ altius ad vivum persedit et horrida cano/ bruma gelu*), and *Saph.* 30. Note, moreover, the intertext between *Phyl.* 171-2 (*preterea in saxum fecundas ducere capras/ precipis*) and Virg. *Ecl.* 2.40-1 (*praeterea duo nec tuta mihi valle reperti/ capreoli*).

⁷⁴⁹ See Casanova-Robin (2014: 268), and Fonseca Jr. (2020b: 18-9).

As inferred from this context, Glaucus and Amintas symbolise Peter and Paul, examples of men who sinned against Christ but afterwards repented.⁷⁵⁰ The choice of the first name is based on Ovid *Metamorphoses* 13.904-67, where Glaucus is presented as a fisherman changed into a sea-god, just as Peter was a fisherman who became a saint.⁷⁵¹ The second one is less obviously associated with Virgil's bucolic character, perhaps the Amyntas from *Eclogues* 5, who is described as an excellent and unmatched singer (8-9), just as Paul was known as a great orator, with a "veracious pen" ("verace stilo", Dante *Par.* 24.61).⁷⁵² Moreover, besides implying the notion of Christian repentance, the phrase *miserebitur ultro* above (*Phyl.* 174) also brings to mind a passage from Virgil's *Aeneid* 2, where Aeneas recounts the Trojans' mercy towards Sinon, which ultimately cost them their city: *his lacrimis vitam damus et miserescimus ultro* (*Aen.* 2.145).⁷⁵³

Then, Phylostropus proceeds with his account of the heavenly *locus amoenus*, starting at lines 156-63. Presenting his arguments in the form of "dialectical syllogisms", composed of logical premises which can be only refuted with reason or authority (*si iure potes, premissa refelle*, 178), he proposes to summarise the speech of the ancients (*sermo priorum*, 177).⁷⁵⁴ Similarly to Olympia, who not only praised but also "corrected" Minciades' account of Elysium (*Olymp.* 162-5), Phylostropus suggests that some of the ancients were partially capable of grasping the reality of those happy pastures (*leta... pascua*, 180) – a term that alludes

⁷⁵⁰ See Luke 22:55-62, and Acts 26, respectively. Against Lidonnici (1914: 344) and Smarr (1987: 160), Perini (1994: 1075) reads *post hunc* (*Phyl.* 176) as an indication of historical succession, thus he identifies Amintas as the figure of the Pope, who succeeded St. Peter in the Church. Though convincing, I find this possibility less likely than the simple, and more easily recognisable, solution Peter–Paul. The same applies to *Pantheon*, where the passage *semper Amintas... tecum [= Glaucus] vivat* (ll. 16-7) seems to indicate mutual collaboration between the two saints (rather than succession) in the foundation and maintenance of the Church (*pace* Perini, p. 1012).

⁷⁵¹ See Bocc. *Ep.* 23.22: *pro Glauco autem ego intelligo Petrum apostolum; fuit enim Glaucus piscator, et gustata quadam herba repente se proiecit in mare et inter deos maris unus factus est: sic et Petrus piscator fuit, et gustata Christi doctrina se inter fluctus, idest hostium christiani nominis minas et terrores, ultro proiecit.*

⁷⁵² See also Vulg. 2 Cor. 11:6: *nam etsi imperitus sermone, sed non scientia, in omnibus autem manifestati sumus vobis*; and Aug. *De doct. chr.* 4.7.15.

⁷⁵³ See Horsfall (2008: 148). An identical phrase is found at Ov. *Ars* 3.679 (*miserebitur ultro*).

⁷⁵⁴ Against Smarr, Perini (1994: 1075) understands *sermo priorum* as referring to Phylostropus' previous speech, hence Perini's Italian translation "discorso preliminare" (p. 889).

to Virgil's *Aeneid* 6 (*locos laetos*, 638; *laeta arva*, 744), as well as Seneca's *Hercules Furens* (*laeta... Elysii loca*, 744), and Martial's *Epigram* 12.52 (*loco laeta piorum*, 11). There, no death reduces the flocks, no hostile winds batter the earth, no plagues or harmful stars pour out pestilence; instead, the whole place is pervaded by trees, streams, shades, and soothing breeze (*Phyl.* 180-5). Though this description of heaven is highly stylized, it is worth noting that some of its most prominent features are equally present in Virgil's Elysium (*per campum pascuntur*, *Aen.* 6.653; *lucis... opacis*, 673; *prata recentia rivis*, 674), as well as in the biblical description of Eden (*paradisum voluptatis*, Vulg. Gen. 2:8; *omne lignum pulchrum*, 9; *fluvius*, 10).⁷⁵⁵ Moreover, this framework again resembles Dante's Earthly Paradise, which also contains many pastoral elements, such as the verdant forest, gentle breeze ("un'aura dolce", *Purg.* 28.7), shade and mountain ("u' la prim' ombra gitta il santo monte", 12), and leafy trees ("per le cime... intra le foglie", 14-7).⁷⁵⁶

Phylostropus' mention of girls, nymphs, goddesses and dryads (*puellas... nymphasquedeas dryadesque frequentes*, *Phyl.* 186-7) among Theoschyrus' woods is seemingly peculiar. Yet, on the one hand, the allusion to Jupiter's speech at Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.187-8 implies a fixed hierarchy between God and the blessed souls. On the other, by evoking those feminine semi-deities, Boccaccio's text also intimates, in accordance with Jerome and Augustine, that men and women will have their bodies and flesh preserved in

⁷⁵⁵ On the topos of the *locus amoenus*, see Curtius (1990: 195-7), and Schönbeck (1962). On Boccaccio's uses of this topos, see Raja (2003), and Fonseca Jr. (2016b).

⁷⁵⁶ Barolini (2014e) comments on these pastoral and idyllic elements in Dante's Earthly Paradise, and points out some relevant links between *Purgatorio* 28 and Cavalcanti's *Rime* 46 ("In un boschetto trova' pasturella"). Furthermore, the idea of a place untouched by winds, present in Dante's Earthly Paradise as well as in Boccaccio's pastoral heaven, evokes Homer's description of Olympus at *Od.* 6.41-6, and Lucretius' account of heaven in the Proem to *DRN* 3; but more directly some Christian sources such as Bede, Pietro Lombardo, and Bonaventura – see Nardi (1967: 318-23), and Leonardi (1994, vol. 2: 822). According to the early commentator Benvenuto da Imola (*Comentum super Dantis Aldigherij Comoediam*, ca. 1385; at *Purg.* 28.1-33), Dante's adise represented the state of perfect virtue and happiness which was possible to obtain in life: *Per istum ergo hortum tam floridum, tam amoenum poeta proponit nobis figuraliter statum felicem hominis positi in perfectione virtutis, quantum possibile est in hac vita miseriae: ideo bene ponit ipsum in loco altissimo omnium, propinquo coelo, remoto omnibus alterationibus, sine omni molestia, cum omni delectatione* – see Vernon (1889, vol. 2: 280-6). Yet, as we have argued above, Boccaccio's *Phylostropos* uses pastoral elements from Dante and Virgil to describe heaven instead.

resurrection.⁷⁵⁷ In this way, Phylostropus suggests that, in Theoschyus' heavenly pastures, Typhlus will also find women, but honourable ones, unlike Dyone and Crisis; and if only he renounces his old lovers and familiar pleasures, such as parties and music (189-191), he will be able to enjoy a different kind of happiness there. In this sense, Boccaccio's text also suggests that Typhlus can have a similar fate to that of Virgil's Gallus, who eventually renounced Hamadryads and songs, and said farewell to the bucolic world: *iam neque Hamadryades rursus nec carmina nobis/ ipsa placent; ipsae rursus concedite silvae* (Virg. *Ecl.* 10.62-3). The paradox is that, while Gallus lost his interest in those things because he was still obsessed with Lycoris, Typhlus must do the exact opposite, abandoning his earthly objects of desire through reason and faith, with the certainty that he will find better ones in heaven.

New light

Possibly caught by the idea of these new pleasures, Typhlus finally acknowledges his desire to ascend to Theoschyus' heavenly grove. However, like Caliope in *Saphos*, curious to find out how Aristeus became acquainted with her divine lady, Typhlus is eager to learn how Phylostropus got to know about that wonderful place:

Typhl. Iam cupio: sed, queso, refer quis sibilus auri
detulit ista tue seu si tu forsan adisti.

Phyl. Archades ac ytali firmant priscique sicani
pastores, quibus ante datum conscendere culmen.
(*Phyl.* 192-5)

⁷⁵⁷ See, for instance, Jerome *Contra Iohannem* 25 (41.13-16 F.): *Nos simplices et φιλοσάρκους, id est amatores carnum, dicere quod eadem ossa et sanguis, et caro, idem vultus et membra, totiusque compago corporis resurgat in novissimo die*; and 30 (55.24-5 F.): *ubi carnis structura, ibi sexus proprietas* – discussion in Pålsson (2019: 53-81).

Phylostropus' answer partly reflects Aristeus' reply to Caliope: while Aristeus reveals that he has heard of Saphos through Silvanus and Minciades (*Saph.* 67-81), the only men who have been allowed to climb up the goddess' inaccessible peak (*solus inaccessum potuit conscendere culmen*, *Saph.* 195), Phylostropus similarly tells Typhlus that he has learned of the blissful mount through the account of ancient shepherds, who were once allowed to scale Theoschyus' summit (*datum conscendere culmen*, *Phyl.* 195). The effect of this intratext is twofold. On the one hand, it implies that, like elevated and allegorical poetry, heaven is only disclosed to a select group. On the other hand, it intimates that some of the most elevated poetic and divine truths had been grasped by the ancients, before the advent of Christ. Evidently, the notion that there have been "pre-Christians" was not original to Boccaccio; but instead goes back to Augustine, and was thoroughly disseminated in medieval times, being developed by poets such as Dante, Mussato and Petrarch. Thus, without alluding to specific names, Phylostropus recalls the Arcadians, Italians and Sicilians of old (*Archades ac yтали... priscique sicani pastores*) in reference to the ancient Greek and Roman authors; but perhaps more particularly to Plato, Pythagoras and their Roman followers, among whom were Cicero and Virgil.⁷⁵⁸ To focus on the latter poet, we can think of an emblematic scene from Dante's *Purgatorio* 22, where Statius, alluding to Virgil's *Eclogue* 4, describes Virgil walking blind in the dark, yet still guiding, with a lamp on his back, the men who came after him.⁷⁵⁹

In the same way that those men of old have indirectly guided Phylostropus in the path of salvation, Typhlus now, with the help of Phylostropus, can see everything with new clarity:

⁷⁵⁸ See Aug. *Civ. Dei* 8.5.1: *nulli nobis quam isti [Platoni] propius accesserunt*; and Bocc. *Gen.* 14.15: *Plato, quem theologum nuncupamus*.

⁷⁵⁹ *Purg.* 22.64-72: "Tu prima m'inviassti/ verso Parnaso a ber ne le sue grotte,/ e prima appresso Dio m'alluminasti.// Facesti come quei che va di notte,/ che porta il lume dietro e sé non giova,/ ma dopo sé fa le persone dotte,// quando dicesti: 'Secol si rinnova;/ torna giustizia e primo tempo umano,/ e progenie scende da ciel nova'" – discussion in Comparetti (1997: 96-103), Eisner (2013: 25), Howard (2010: 64), and Houghton (2019: 175-191). See also Bocc. *Esp.* 4.lit.30-1, where Boccaccio refutes the idea that Virgil might have heard of God before Christianity. On the notion of the poet theologian, see Chapter 3.

Typhl. Que nova lux oculis venit, Phylostrope, nostris!
 Iam foveas et putre solum rupesque cadentes
 insidiasque graves et sevi gurgitis iras
 et pecoris pestes video, nymbosque minantes.
 Assis, pulchra Pales, supplex tua numina posco.
 Optime, da veniam, pater, oro, Theoschyre, lapso.
 Heu michi, quo fugiam? Gelidas has linquere valles
 infectosque greges cupio silvasque remotas
 querere, si possim duras fregisse cathenas
 quas posuere truces pedibus colloque puelle.
Phyl. Vir nuper fueras Poliphemi tractus in antrum
 obicibus fractis, et nunc es femina mollis.
 Frange trabes animo forti postesque revelle,
 reddito teque tibi; pueris aliena sinamus,
 et nostro meliora gregi nobisque petamus.
 (*Phyl.* 196-210)

Thus if, at the beginning of the poem, Typhlus was deluding himself, deliberately limiting his sight so as to view nothing but the earthly pleasures that he insisted on continuing seeing, now he can clearly make out all the dangers to which Phylostropus alerted him. Using images from Dante's *Inferno* – and especially from *Inferno* 12, dedicated to the “super-vice” of “blind cupidity” (“cieca cupidigia”, 12.49) –, Typhlus can finally discern “the pitfalls, crumbling soil, falling rocks, dangerous traps, the wrath of a violent whirlpool, plagues for the livestock, and threatening clouds” (*Phyl.* 196-9 above).⁷⁶⁰ Convinced by this new light, then, Typhlus prays for Pales to assist him in his quest, and begs Theoschyry for forgiveness. Here, as in *Alcestus* 47, Pales (traditionally known as the ancient Roman deity of herds and shepherds) means the Virgin Mary.⁷⁶¹ In establishing this link, Boccaccio follows the example of Petrarch, who, in his *Ad Familiares* 10.4, made even more explicit that his Pales, from *Parthenias* 12, was Mary: *Pales enim est pastorum dea; posset apud nos intelligi Maria, non dea sed Dei mater.*⁷⁶²

⁷⁶⁰ See Barolini (2018d, n.p.): “*cupidigia* is a ‘super-vice’: an unbridled desire that is a composite of three of the sins of incontinence; it embraces excess desire for carnal pleasure, excess desire for food, and excess desire for money, honors, and advancement”; and also Bocc. *Espos.* 12.litt.49-51: “*o cieca cupidigia*, cioè desiderio d’avere”, 12.all.10-27: “per ciò che naturalmente (...) desideriamo di peccare carnalmente e di mangiare e d’avere e ancora d’adirarci talvolta”. On Dante’s description of the seventh infernal circle, see, for example: *Inf.* 12.4 (“ruina”), 12.8 (“la roccia discoscata”), 11 (“la rotta lacca”), 28-9 (“scarco/ di quelle pietre”), and 52 (“un’ampia fossa”). Yet, note that *Inferno* 12 deals particularly with tyrants.

⁷⁶¹ See Chapter 2, “Celebrating Alcestus’ return”.

⁷⁶² See *Parth.* 11-12: *sic me venerata benigne/ aspiciat, spes nostra, Pales*; and Bergin (1974: 218).

Besides the idea that Mary acted like Pales as a protector of “shepherds”, it is worth noting that a Christian reading of the *Culex* also favoured this association, since Pales was already referred there as *sancta*.⁷⁶³ Nevertheless, the phrase *supplex tua nomina posco*, in the passage from *Phylostropus* above, closely alludes to Venus’ words to her son Cupid, at Virgil *Aeneid* 1.666.⁷⁶⁴ The entire sentence *optime, da veniam, pater, oro Theoschyre, lapso*, in turn, strikingly evokes an Ovidian pattern, used in prayers to Jupiter and Bacchus, at *Ars amatoria* 2.28 (*da veniam coepto, Iuppiter alte, meo*) and *Metamorphoses* 11.132 (*da veniam, Linaee pater! peccavimus*), respectively.⁷⁶⁵

Longing to leave his frozen valleys and sick herds forever, Typhlus desperately wants to break the iron chains (*duras... catenas*, 204) which Crisis and Dyone (*truces... puelle*, 205) have placed on his feet and neck. If, however, before Typhlus was a blind man, dragged into the cave of blinded Polyphemus (*Poliphemus... in antrum*, 206), now, says Phylostropus, he acts like a “soft woman” (*femina mollis*, 207), who lacks the courage to seek better things.⁷⁶⁶ While the adjective *mollis* is redolently elegiac, the metaphor of the chains, in turn, is both elegiac and Christian.⁷⁶⁷ Besides the relevant passage from the *Amores* mentioned previously (Ov. *Am.* 3.11a.1-5), there are other instances where Ovid employed the term *catena* in his output, either in a literal sense (as in the typical *paraclausithyron* situation) or in a figurative one, sometimes overlapping both. For instance, in *Amores* 1.6, the narrator (a slave of love) depends on the good will of a real slave, who acts as a doorkeeper and is “bound with iron chains” (*ianitor...*

⁷⁶³ Ps.-Virg. *Cul.* 21-3: *et tu, sancta Pales, ad quam ventura recurrunt/ agrestum bona fetura – sit cura tenentis/ aerios nemorum cultus silvasque virentis*. See Bocc. *Bucc.* 9.192 (*Lipis*): *o nostris mea sacra Pales gratissima silvis*.

⁷⁶⁴ Perini (1994: 1076).

⁷⁶⁵ More generally, the syntagm *da veniam* appears in several other passages from Ovid, being prominently employed in the *Heroides* – see, for instance, 4.156, 7.105, 17.225, 19.4 and 149.

⁷⁶⁶ The reference to the blinded Polyphemus evokes Homer *Odyssey* 9, Virgil *Aeneid* 3.668, and Ovid *Metamorphoses* 13.744-869. Boccaccio recounts the myth of Polyphemus in *Genealogia* 4.68.

⁷⁶⁷ For examples of *mollis* in Latin love elegy, and particularly of things or people made delicate through love, see Ov. *Her.* 15.126, *Ars. Am.* 1.352, *Rem.* 520, *Am.* 1.12.22, 2.1.22, 2.2.66. Other examples in Pichon (1991: 204-6).

dura religate catena, 1), to meet his mistress.⁷⁶⁸ In Boccaccio's passage above, Phylostropus similarly urges Typhlus to "break the beams and doorposts" (*trabes... postesque revelle*), yet with a rather different purpose from that of the Ovidian *exclusus amator*. For, instead of separating Typhlus from his mistresses, such obstacles are actually impeding him from taking hold of his own soul and reaching God.

It is noteworthy, moreover, that innumerable Christian authors have made use of the metaphor of the chains to illustrate a state of slavery to sin. For instance, in Boethius' *Consolatio* 3.10m, Lady Philosophy called out all those who were bound in the shameful chains of lust and earthly concerns (*capti/ quos fallax ligat improbis catenis/ terrenas habitans libido mentes*, 1-2), to seek refuge where they could find some rest and clear their sight (*inlustrent... caecos*, 11).⁷⁶⁹ Then, in his *Confessions*, Augustine similarly adopted the image of chains to describe his own past of voluntary servitude. Thus, at *Confessions* 8.5.10, he recounted how his will was bound by his iron-hard desire (*ligatus non ferro alieno, sed mea ferrea voluntate*), which took hold of him like a chain (*et inde mihi catenam fecerat et constrinxerat me*). But finally, thanks to the divine grace, Augustine started to develop a new type of love, directed to the spirit rather than the body; and this new love began to conflict and fight in his soul with that old vicious tendency: *ita duae voluntates meae, una vetus, alia nova, illa carnalis, illa spiritualis, confligebant inter se atque discordando dissipabant animam meam*. Likewise, as mentioned previously, in his *Secretum*, Petrarch resorted to the same metaphor of the chains to describe Franciscus' erotic passion and love of glory; but also, in his *Triumphus Cupidinis*, he described his attachment to Laura as a firm bond ("nodo").⁷⁷⁰ In Dante's *Purgatorio* 31, too, Beatrice asked the Dantean Pilgrim what ditches and chains ("quai fossi... o quai catene", 26)

⁷⁶⁸ See Turpin (2016: 71-4, 78).

⁷⁶⁹ See also *Consolatio* 3.5m.1-4: *qui se volet esse potentem/ animos domet ille feroces/ nec victa libidine colla/ foedis submittat habenis* – Smarr (1987: 260).

⁷⁷⁰ See Petr. *Tr. Cup.* 69-72: "tal per te nodo fassi, e tu nol sai;/ e prima cangerai volto e capelli/ che 'l nodo di ch'io parlo si discioglie/ dal collo e da' tuo' piedi anco ribelli" – discussion and other examples in Squarotti (1999: 487-503).

have kept him away from God. Thus, engaging with both the Roman love elegy and these Christian texts, Boccaccio deployed the image of the “catene d’amore” (or “amorose catene”) in *Phyllostropos* to refer to a state of slavery which not only deprived Typhlus of agency over himself, but also deprived him of God.⁷⁷¹

Subsequently, the notion of one’s return to oneself, implied in the phrase *reddito teque tibi* above (209), is primarily Stoic, since *conversio ad se* was regarded as the means through which individuals could achieve full autonomy and become active in life.⁷⁷² In Chapter 1, we have already explored some implications of this Stoic precept in Boccaccio’s *Galla* (*tuque tuus facito sis*, 19).⁷⁷³ But, in addition to the passages from Seneca discussed there, we could also briefly mention Augustine’s *Confessions* 7.10, as well as Petrarch’s *Ad Familiares* 1.9 and *Secretum* 3, where the notion of “conversion to self” is particularly prominent. In the first work, Augustine recounts how the reading of the Bible helped him “return to himself” (*redire ad memet ipsum*, *Conf.* 7.10.16), and see a new, brighter light with the eyes of his soul.⁷⁷⁴ In the second, Petrarch presents the “cure of the soul” (*cura animi*, *Petr. Fam.* 1.9.1) as the main task of the philosopher, and as a process which necessarily involves one’s dominion over one’s own desires.⁷⁷⁵ Finally, in the third, Augustinus urges Franciscus to abandon his literary projects to reflect on himself and death: *te tandem tibi restitue atque, ut unde movimus revertamur, incipe tecum de morte cogitare, cui sensim et nescius appropinquas* (*Petr. Secr.* 3.17.6).⁷⁷⁶ In *Phyllostropos*, the notion of one’s return to oneself entails a movement of the soul to find freedom; yet not through the conscious manipulation of the emotions, but rather through the renouncement of one’s deepest desires.

⁷⁷¹ See *Corb.* 322 (“catene d’amore”), *Dec.* 10.6.35 (“l’amorose catene”); and also *Fiamm.* 2.9: “con sì fatta catena ha il mio cuore Amore legato sotto la tua signoria”.

⁷⁷² See Ramos (1994: 26).

⁷⁷³ See Chapter 1, “Love, death and Fortune”.

⁷⁷⁴ See Casanova-Robin (2017: 345).

⁷⁷⁵ See Zak (2010: 82-4); and also Foucault (1997: 223-51), and Hadot (1995: 81-125).

⁷⁷⁶ See Baron (1985: 124).

The final path

Similarly to Franciscus, at the end of the *Secretum*, Typhlus confesses that the difficulty of the journey frightens him, and he thinks that his own strength is not enough.⁷⁷⁷ Afflicted by fear, he suddenly considers giving up; but Phylostropus encourages him to go on, and to break the bonds which have been tying him for so long. Calling Typhlus' attention to the ill-omened birds flying around him, Phylostropus asks him to resist and drive them away:

Typhl. Me quoque terret iter durum vertexque levatus;
deficient vires. Non est presummere sani,
quod non perficias, hominis; desistere mens est.
Phyl. Nondum fregisti laqueos: tua lumina circum
obscene volitant volucres. Obsiste, repelle;
est iter in primis durum, parvoque labore
vincitur inceptum. Vires prestabit eunti
ipse Soter; nunc surge, precor; sol vergit in undas.
(*Phyl.* 211-18)

Reinforcing the previous parallels between Christian heaven and Elysium, the phrase *iter durum* above (211) appropriately alludes to Virgil *Aeneid* 6.688, where Anchises celebrates the fact that Aeneas was able to cross the infernal regions to visit him, proving once more his filial devotion: *vicit iter durum pietas*.⁷⁷⁸ Then, the image of the ill-omened birds (*obscene volitant volucres*, *Phyl.* 215 above) also alludes to Virgil's epic poem, particularly to *Aeneid* 3.362 and 12.876, where both the Harpies and the Dira are similarly described as *obscenae volucres*.⁷⁷⁹ The fact that Phylostropus expects Typhlus to resist and repel (*obsiste, repelle*) these birds, however, favours the allusion to the Harpies, which Aeneas and his comrades were able to

⁷⁷⁷ See *Secr.* 3.18.7: *sed desiderium frenare non valeo*.

⁷⁷⁸ See Horsfall (2013: 308); and also *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 9.385 (*durum iter*). The phrase *deficient vires*, in the subsequent line, alludes to Horace's *Satire* 2.1 (*vires/ deficiunt*, 12-13), with the suggestion that, like Horace in that poem, Typhlus-Boccaccio too is considering abandoning his poetry. See also *Prop.* 2.10.5-6: *quod si deficient vires, audacia certe/ laus erit: in magnis et voluisse sat est*; and *Ov. Pont.* 3.4.79: *ut desint vires, tamen est laudanda voluntas*.

⁷⁷⁹ On Virgil's unusual use of the plural to refer to one single Dira, see Tarrant (2012, ad loc.).

drive off.⁷⁸⁰ In this way, unlike the death of Turnus (announced by the Dira, in the *Aeneid*), Phylostropus suggests that Typhlus' spiritual death is not inevitable: though the path to salvation is hard, it only takes a small effort (*parvoque labore*, 216) to overcome its beginning, and the rest will follow easily with the help of Soter-Christ. Thus, on the one hand, Phylostropus re-echoes Augustinus' words to Franciscus, at the end of Petrarch's *Secretum*, suggesting that the only thing impeding Typhlus from following the righteous path is his weak will.⁷⁸¹ On the other hand, his motivational speech contrasts that of Caliope, in *Saphos*, implying that, unlike the path of poetry, anyone can achieve heaven through effort, will and faith.⁷⁸²

Lastly, Phylostropus announces the advent of evening: *sol vergit in undas* (218). Though this type of closure is conventionally bucolic, the image of the sun sinking in the waves is particularly distinct, since the end of day is typically marked through the mention of shadows.⁷⁸³ However, Phylostropus' command for Typhlus to rise (*nunc surge*, *Phyl.* 218) strikingly alludes to Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, where the poet-narrator, perceiving the approach of evening, decides to rise and conclude his song (*surgamus: solet esse gravis cantantibus umbra*, *Ecl.* 10.75). He eventually bids farewell to his she-goats (*ite capellae*, 77), as does Typhlus in the final lines of Boccaccio's poem:

Urgeor insistam. Tu primus summito callem.
Laurea, sis felix, et vos estote, capelle;
imus ut ex syrio carpamus litore palmas.
(*Phyl.* 219-21)

⁷⁸⁰ See *Aen.* 3.225-62 and 12.843-86; and also Bocc. *Gen.* 10.61 and 3.6. Perini (1994: 1076) pointed out both these allusions to the *Aeneid*, yet he privileged the allusion to the Dira, overlooking the detail mentioned above.

⁷⁸¹ *Secr.* 3.18.8: *voluntatem impotentiam vocas*. On the role of *voluntas* in Petrarch and Augustine, see Lee (2012: 74-84).

⁷⁸² *Saph.* 185-7: Arist. *Omnia continui superant, michi credes, labores.* / Cal. *Vicit et ingenium vires: non talia quivrit/ exuperare labor*. See Chapter 3, "How to reach Saphos".

⁷⁸³ For the bucolic image of the coming of evening, see Virg. *Ecl.* 1.83, 2.67, 6.86, and 10.75-6 – see discussion on *Galla* 136-8, in Chapter 1, "Love, the disease of the young". Note that in the *Georgics*, however, we can find indications of the sun or other stars sinking under the waves (*sol... se condet in undas*, 1.438; *sidus... hibernas caelo descendit in undas*, 4.234-5).

Accepting that he needs to be brave and renounce all his temporal pleasures in order to be saved, Typhlus is ultimately determined to initiate his ascent, leaving behind his familiar surroundings to go with Phylostropus to Syrian shores. Here, as suggested by Perini, Syria metonymically indicates the East, the region of light, while the palms represent victory, as at Virgil *Georgics* 3.12 (*Idumaeas... palmas*).⁷⁸⁴ Moreover, it is noteworthy that both Syria and the palms are important Christian symbols, associated with pilgrimage.⁷⁸⁵ Then, Typhlus' plan of following after Phylostropus (*tu primus summito callem*) recalls Dante following after Virgil in the *Commedia*, and more particularly at *Purgatorio* 4.22-3: "... la calla onde saline/ lo duca mio, e io appresso, soli" ("the gap through which my guide and I, who followed after, climbed, we two alone", trans. Mandelbaum).

As indicated previously, at the end of Virgil's *Eclogue* 10, the *capellae* apparently have a metapoetic meaning, and the same seems to apply to the end of Boccaccio's *Phylostropos*. As Typhlus says goodbye to his she-goats, Boccaccio says goodbye to his Virgilian-inspired eclogues, and consequently renounces the possibility of poetic glory, symbolised by the bays (*laurea*). Thus, through *Phylostropos*, Boccaccio not only indicates the end of his bucolic autofiction, but also the end of his career as a poet.⁷⁸⁶ Nevertheless, it is striking that the choice of *estote*, in line 220, leaves some room for ambiguity: since Typhlus wishes his she-goats to be happy and continue to exist independently, the text allegorically implies that, even though

⁷⁸⁴ See Perini (1994: 1076); and also Bocc. *Gen.* 3.10: *palma ornatur, quia nunquam lignum palme corrumpitur frondesque viriditatem conservant, ut victoris auctum robur et nomen in longum virere intelligamus*; and Petr. *Rvf.* 359.49-52 (Laura): "Palma è vittoria, et io giovane ancora/ vinsi il mondo et me stessa; il lauro segna/ triunfo, ond'io son degna/ mercé di quel Signor che mi die' forza".

⁷⁸⁵ See, for instance, Bocc. *Gen.* 3.Pr.7: *ast ego attentus navigio in Egeum evehar mare, Celi prolem perquisiturus amplissimam. Ille autem iter prestat placidum qui ex Sabeis magos ad se orandum atque muneribus honorandum, stella duce, deduxit in Syriam*; Dante *Purg.* 33.77-8: "che 'l te ne porti dentro a te quello/ che si reca il bordon di palma cinto"; and also Petr. *Itinerarium ad sepulcrum Domini*.

⁷⁸⁶ Petrarch similarly concludes his *Seniles* 17.2 with the phrase: *Tu vale, mei memor, et vive feliciter ac viriliter persevera* – see Wallace (2009: 326-7).

Boccaccio is moving away from his poems, he expects them to have a long life and fortune – an interpretation that will be supported by *Aggelos*.⁷⁸⁷

⁷⁸⁷ See Combs-Schilling (2012: 122; and 2015: 10-11, 16-17) on Dante's engagement with futurity in his eclogues; and also Kania (2016: 156) on Virgil's *Eclogue* 10: "When Virgil insists that Gallus' trees and his new *Amores* will continue to change in the pastoral world, even as the *Eclogue* Book comes to its end, we must realise that text and fiction are not coterminous, a fact reflected also in the strongly implied past and future in *Eclogues* 1 and 9".

CONCLUSION

Though often labelled as a miscellaneous collection of eclogues, this thesis has argued (building on the work of Labagnara and Lummus) that Boccaccio's *Buccolicum carmen* is a coherent unified book of poetry. Over the course of its sixteen eclogues (the final one being an epilogue to the work), the *Buccolicum* displays a narrative of self-transformation which actively engages with both classical and medieval texts. Based on a teleological scheme, the *Buccolicum* presents a progression of themes which suggests an autofictional ascent from erotic love to God. The term "autofictional" here is central, as it brings into focus the literary mechanisms involved in authorial self-fashioning; and treats Boccaccio's poetic and biographic *personae* fundamentally as the effects of texts and intertexts.

More than being a mere question of vocabulary, the concepts of intertextuality and autofiction throw a new light on Boccaccio's *Buccolicum carmen*, and potentially on his other works, too. While the first concept has been amply discussed and employed in classical studies, the second one is still neglected, or perhaps deliberately avoided, by most classicists and medievalists. The combination of an intertextual approach with anything "auto-" may seem contradictory at first, since the term "intertext" (which draws attention to the texts and their readers) has been traditionally defined as the opposite of "allusion" (which allegedly focuses on the author, while privileging the "intentional" parallels between texts). Nevertheless, as this thesis has attempted to demonstrate (following in the footsteps of Hinds and, to a lesser extent, Conte), the notions of intertextuality and allusivity are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but rather complementary; and in practice, they can indicate the same thing. For in the same way that the recognition of any allusion depends on the reader's competence, the very idea of an "author" is always suggested and constructed in the texts (both in the author's "own" texts and in the texts that other authors write about him/her). Moreover, just as words and texts cannot

exist in isolation, and intertexts are fundamentally the product of language and discourse, so authors exist in relation to other authors and texts.

While intertextuality indicates that every text is intertextual, the concept of autofiction, in turn, indicates that any auto/biographical discourse is, to a great extent, fictional. Studies in career criticism (such as those of Cheney & De Armas, and Hardie & Moore) have already made the point that a literary career can be the object of analysis much as literary texts; and in fact, though this kind of analysis might take into account some extratextual dimensions, it cannot really separate authors from their outputs. Similarly, the concept of autofiction (partly recalling the classical notion of literary mimesis) broadly indicates that “reality” is always mediated through fiction, and vice-versa. Thus, even the works which manifestly present themselves as autobiographical have fictional components, and they do not wholly reflect the external reality of an author. Perhaps to a twenty-first century reader, this idea might seem self-evident. Yet, particularly regarding Boccaccio’s *Buccolicum*, the concepts of intertextuality and autofictionality problematize and offer a critique of two notions that have dominated earlier criticism at once: first, that the eclogues of the *Buccolicum* reflected chronologically, in their composition, the key events of Boccaccio’s biography and times; and second, that information about Boccaccio’s life could be collected from the *Buccolicum*.

As far as this research has discovered, with the exception of Lummus (whose short introductory essay on the *Buccolicum* has served as an important point of reference here), Boccaccio scholars have predominantly read the *Buccolicum carmen* through autobiography and history, either trying to establish the allegorical meaning and dating of each of Boccaccio’s eclogues, or attempting to reconstruct the details of Boccaccio’s biography based on them. In adopting this kind of approach, such scholars have overlooked the layers of fictionality that even the more “personal” eclogues of Boccaccio display (that is, the ones where he more openly includes himself in the poems, especially from eclogue eleven onwards). This is not to deny

the importance that studies such as those of Zumbini, Hortis, and Ricci (to mention only a few examples of that autobiographical approach) have had in the scholarly reception of the *Buccolicum*. Quite the contrary. Their studies (in addition to the editions of Liddonici, Massèra, Smarr, and Perini) have contributed greatly to our understanding of the *Buccolicum*, which was largely ignored by Italianists (and even more so by classicists) in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but less so nowadays.

On the one hand, as we have seen especially in the Introduction, the general contempt that some critics expressed towards the *Buccolicum carmen* reflected, to a great extent, Boccaccio's express attitude towards his own work. In his *Genealogie*, but especially in his final eclogue *Aggelos*, Boccaccio devalued the *Buccolicum*, describing it as defective, imperfect, faulty. On the other hand, even the scholars who recognised the significance of the *Buccolicum* (such as those mentioned above), read it through autobiography, and partly followed in the tracks of Boccaccio's *Epistola* 23, where he commented on the key exegetical points of his own eclogues. Yet, besides being an autofictional piece in its own right, it is noteworthy that *Epistola* 23 discouraged a purely autobiographical and allegorical reading of the *Buccolicum carmen*. In the *Genealogie*, Boccaccio – like Petrarch before him, in *Ad Familiares* 10.4 – advocated that, in order to understand the bucolic genre, the poet himself should provide the reader with some background information. However, in *Epistola* 23, Boccaccio emphatically advised his addressee Martino da Signa *not* to try and find a meaning behind everything he wrote in the *Buccolicum* (and, more specifically, behind his bucolic titles and characters). Indeed, Boccaccio declared that he had followed the example of Virgil, rather than that of Petrarch, in the composition of his own eclogues. For even though Petrarch was the most successful bucolic poet after Virgil, Boccaccio still thought that Petrarch's eclogues were excessively allegorical. Thus, Boccaccio (autofictionally) justified his choice of Virgil as his primary model, saying that he preferred to conceal *some* allegories under the “bark” of his

bucolic poetry. Then, particularly regarding his two introductory eclogues, *Galla* and *Pampinea*, Boccaccio suggested that they broadly dealt with the passions of his youth. Accordingly, Boccaccio's *Epistola* 23 implied that the *Buccolicum carmen* contained a mixture of allegory, fiction, and autobiography; in other words, that the *Buccolicum* was largely autofictional.

Besides incorporating shepherds, pastoral landscapes, and other conventional features from Virgil's *Eclogues* into its patchwork, the *Buccolicum carmen* also suggested a fictional continuum with that poem. Both Virgil's and Boccaccio's bucolic worlds represented microcosms of changes, encompassing the erotic, political, poetic, and religious spheres. However, as inferred especially from their final eclogues, while the Virgilian poet-narrator remained in his bucolic world, Boccaccio's autofictional pilgrim decided to move away from his familiar domains, abandoning his lovers, flocks and bay trees to pursue heaven and God. In this sense, though following Virgil as its primary model, the *Buccolicum* also markedly adopted a Christian and Petrarchan position for its autofictional framework, by suggesting a literary and ethical *cursus* whose final aim was the complete rejection of earthly passions. Yet, Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* innovatively transposed this conversion narrative to the bucolic genre, representing pastoral as an allegory of the earthly world of labour and sorrow.⁷⁸⁸ In this way, Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* adds some Petrarchan ideas from other works to the pastoral, in which Petrarch had not applied this idea thoroughly.

At the same time, Boccaccio's *Buccolicum* proposed an inversion of the traditional Virgilian career which had dominated early humanistic discourse. For whereas Virgil went on writing the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* after the *Eclogues* (as Petrarch worked on his *Africa* until the end of his life), Boccaccio humbly refused to do the same, preferring to crown his poetic career with a Latin book of eclogues. In so doing, Boccaccio partly followed Dante's

⁷⁸⁸ See Lambert (1976); and also Leach (1974).

predilection for the Latin bucolic over the Latin epic in his correspondence with Giovanni del Virgilio. What is more, Boccaccio incorporated elegiac and erotic materials into his *Buccolicum* to represent autofictionally his Ovidian and vernacular past, which he later rejected – just as Ovid himself rejected his earlier erotic output in his poems of exile. Yet, while Ovid rejected elegy with elegy, Boccaccio overcame his “youthful lecheries” with the humble, but honourable Virgilian bucolic – similarly to what the character Gallus had attempted to do in Virgil’s *Eclogue* 10. Consequently, Boccaccio opened up the way for a singular career path, which combined different career patterns, in the same way that he combined different elements and genres in his literary texts (his so-called *ars combinatoria*).

As different scholars have previously done with Virgil’s *Eclogues* and Petrarch’s *Canzoniere*, this thesis has attempted to show the variety in the unity of Boccaccio’s *Buccolicum*, and vice-versa. Taking into consideration both the autofictional thread that permeates the whole book and the details that distinguish each eclogue from the others, this study has combined the format of running commentary and thematic essay to analyse four individual eclogues of Boccaccio’s *Buccolicum*: *Galla*, *Alcestus*, *Saphos*, and *Phylostropos*. As demonstrated throughout the chapters, the intertextual engagement between these poems and classical works not only enriches Boccaccio’s book of eclogues, but also supports and gives shape to his autofictional narrative of conversion.

In *Galla* (Chapter 1), the allusions to Virgil’s *Eclogue* 10 reinforce the notion (also propagated in philosophical, medical, and elegiac discourses) that erotic love was a disease (*pestis*) that affected especially the young. Thus, the lovesick Damon is depicted in the poem as a version of Virgil’s Gallus, equally burning with love for an unfaithful woman (though the allusions to Calpurnius’ *Eclogue* 3 throughout *Galla* calls into question the very idea that Damon was betrayed). While in Virgil’s *Eclogue* 10, Gallus deliberately tried to seek refuge in Arcadia, in Boccaccio’s *Galla* Damon ends up in the bucolic world by chance, as he let himself

wander wherever Fortune dragged him to die. Yet, just as Gallus' suffering was intensified by love elegy, Damon's lovesickness was similarly fuelled by erotic literature, particularly Old French literature. Indeed, besides evoking Virgil's Gallus and the lascivious woman from Martial's epigrams, the name "Galla", in Boccaccio's eclogue, strikingly suggests an association with the French ("Gallic") production which influenced Italian Duecento and Trecento literature, including Boccaccio's earliest works. As a result, within the autofictional framework of the *Buccolicum*, *Galla* symbolises not only Boccaccio's *iuveniles lasciviae*; but also his *opere giovanili*, such as the *Commedia delle ninfe fiorentine*, the *Ninfale fiesolano*, and the *Elegia di Madonna Fiammetta*, which were also very erotic works. In this context, it is as though Damon's illness was both the product and cause of that kind of production, which made him even crazier and weaker than Virgil's Gallus. Rather resembling Dido and Phaedra in his madness, Damon was consumed by his fiery passion; yet, while ruminating in a desert-like land which was as empty and suffocating as his own desires, Damon eventually met Tindarus, and was able to talk through his pain. Without the comforting words and help from this friend, perhaps Boccaccio would not have been able to continue his autofictional journey, and follow a different path from the one taken by Gallus in Virgil's *Eclogues*. In the *Buccolicum*, love was not undefeatable; but it was an obstacle that Boccaccio needed to overcome in order to achieve maturity and pursue nobler goals.

While erotic love was the main cause of Damon's suffering in *Galla*, Fortune was the force and agent that subjected him to the earthly world; and clouding his reason, kept him wandering in a labyrinth of empty passions. The logic behind this is that the irrational man is constantly changing the objects of his desire, and seeking happiness in ephemeral goods. Hence, in *Alcestus* (Chapter 2), the autofictional Boccaccio temporarily redirected his focus from love to politics, trusting that he could obtain happiness from the public sphere. Through his characters Amintas and Melibeus, Boccaccio celebrates the end of the conflict between the

Sicilian and the Hungarian Kingdoms. After a long winter of darkness, fear and anxiety, those shepherds finally see the signs of a political rebirth. Though Melibeus is at first sceptical about this, Amintas assures him that the monster Polyphemus (Louis of Hungary) had left the Neapolitan woods, and that their leader Alcestus (Louis of Taranto) had returned with his entourage. Then, doing what they knew how to do best, Amintas and Melibeus sing of Alcestus' "resurrection", in a manner akin to how Menalcas and Mopsus sang of Daphnis' apotheosis in Virgil's *Eclogue 5* (which is often read as an allegory about Julius Caesar's death and deification). However, by depicting Alcestus as alive, Boccaccio's eclogue established a compelling link between the godlike Daphnis of Virgil's *Eclogue 5*, and the homonymous strayed lover from Virgil's *Eclogue 8*. Moreover, as we have seen throughout Chapter 2, Boccaccio's poem intertextually engages with other political eclogues, particularly with Virgil's *Eclogue 4* and Calpurnius' *Eclogue 4*, which similarly championed the coming of a new Golden Age at Rome under Pollio's consulship and Nero's empire, respectively. But, in describing the destructive effects of Louis of Hungary's invasion in Naples, *Alcestus* alludes to the beginning of Lucan's *Bellum civile*, too. Amintas and Melibeus think that their misery is over, and they are hopeful that Alcestus would reestablish the old order. Yet, at the end of the poem, they hear their dogs barking in an alarming way, possibly because a savage wolf is attacking the sheepfolds. This anti-climactic ending suggests that the stability brought by Louis of Taranto was ephemeral; and that, just like in the realm of love, no peace is guaranteed in the realm of politics either.

Afterwards, Boccaccio realises that he had been overly concerned with the vulgar crowd and mundane matters. Thus, in *Saphos* (Chapter 3), he partly sublimates his erotic desires and political preoccupations to focus on divine poetry. Under the influence of Minciades (Virgil) and Silvanus (Petrarch), the swineherd Aristeus (Boccaccio) develops a special love for Saphos (poetry), and starts looking for her mountain peaks. Within this

allegorical setting, the eclogue symbolises Boccaccio's aspiration to raise himself from a poet of low character to a poet-*vates*, inspired mainly by Virgil and Petrarch. At first, by proposing to elevate himself and his poetry through the bucolic genre, Boccaccio seems to follow the example of Virgil's *Eclogues* 4 and 6. However, while these poems started with a clear *recusatio*, where the poet announced his intent of singing of loftier subjects, Boccaccio's *Saphos* already starts with a failure. Indeed, Caliope humiliated Aristeus for daring to pluck three of her smallest bay leaves, and she emphatically warned him that he would never be able to climb up Parnassus. In this way, *Saphos* overtly departs from those eclogues of Virgil; as well as from Petrarch's third eclogue, *Amor pastorius*, where Petrarch depicted himself being warmly welcomed by the Muses of Parnassus as if he already belonged there. Rather than a poem about Boccaccio's literary achievements, *Saphos* is essentially an eclogue about his poetic desire and attempts, and the obstacles that he had to face to become an honourable poet. Through the voice of Caliope, Boccaccio allegorically articulates his own inexperience and lack of talent; yet, through Aristeus, he suggests that he is fully determined to try and become a better poet nevertheless. It is only after much insistence that Caliope advises Aristeus to look for Silvanus, who would show him the way to Saphos. Presenting the latter as a mixture of the Greek poet Sappho, Petrarch's Laura, Virgil's Sibyl of Cumae, and even Dante's Siren, Boccaccio allegorically describes his ideal of poetry as classical, enduring, prophetic, and mesmerising. At the same time, *Saphos* criticises those who attack poetry, and who try to tarnish the poets' reputation with groundless objections. Calling these men Ericole, Boccaccio represents the critics of poetry as pseudo-intellectuals who devoted themselves to sowing discord. Thus, besides being an eclogue about poetic vocation, *Saphos* also conveys a defence of poetry and poets which intertextually engages with Boccaccio's *Genealogie* 14 and 15.

Finally, we have seen that *Phyllostropos* (Chapter 4) stages the process of Boccaccio's autofictional conversion to Christianity conducted by Petrarch. The text depicts Boccaccio as

Typhlus, a blindfolded man who initially refuses to see the dangers to which he is exposed in the hands of Crisis (gold/money) and Dyone (Venus/erotic love). The constant references to winter and death throughout the poem allegorically suggest an old Boccaccio; but one who had not yet abandoned his passions and sins completely. From this we can infer that, even while the *Buccolicum*'s autofictional subject was involved with politics and divine poetry in the previous poems, his soul remained firmly attached to greed and lust (the prevalent desires of Tindarus and Damon in *Galla*). As we have seen in Chapter 4, this reading reflects a portrait that Boccaccio himself and other writers painted of him in other works. In his *Seniles* 17.2, for instance, Petrarch reprimanded Boccaccio for being greedy, in the sense that he was excessively worried about money; and in the *Corbaccio*, the Boccaccian narrator revealed that, even though he was in his forties, he was still infatuated with a widow. Moreover, *Phylostopos* starts with *lusimus*, which is a highly metapoetic verb, especially prominent at the beginning of the pseudo-Virgilian *Culex*; as if implying that Boccaccio, as well as Petrarch, had spent enough time "playing" with poetry, but now it was time for both of them to abandon such pastimes and think about death. In performing the role of Typhlus' interlocutor and guide, Phylostopos acts like Augustinus in Petrarch's *Secretum*, trying to redirect Franciscus' soul from earth to heaven. In this way, Boccaccio's *Phylostopos* uniquely presents itself as an eclogue of conversion, which thematically engages with Petrarch's *Secretum* and Augustine's *Confessions*, besides employing Christian *topoi* and alluding to biblical passages. In this sense, it is as though all the previous eclogues of the *Buccolicum carmen* had been preparing Boccaccio (and the reader) for *Phylostopos*, which is the most Christian eclogue of the entire work. Nevertheless, *Phylostopos* also engages with classical works, especially Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (for the purpose of *exempla*), and Virgil's *Eclogue* 10. By again drawing on Virgil's final eclogue, Boccaccio's poem suggests a type of mirroring pattern in the *Buccolicum*, which started with Damon submitting himself to love in *Galla*, and ended with

Typhlus refusing it in *Phylostropos*. Indeed, thanks to Phylostropos (Petrarch) Typhlus is able to finally open his eyes, and break the chains that were impeding him from salvation.

By moving away from his deepest passions, Boccaccio consequently has to move away from poetry, too. In this sense, the *Buccolicum carmen* represents Boccaccio's abandonment of poetry through poetry; a humble celebration and, at the same time, a farewell to his literary career. However, while the *Buccolicum* marks the end of Boccaccio's literary career, it certainly does not mark the end of his spiritual journey, which was supposed to continue in heaven. Like the nymph Daphne metamorphosing into the divine bay, the *Buccolicum carmen* symbolises Boccaccio's conversion and elevation through the lowly bucolic genre. Ultimately, Boccaccio's renunciation of poetry (his most powerful love) means his renunciation of earthly life itself for the sake of immortality in heaven.

INDEX OF INTERTEXTS

A = classical Latin pastoral | *B* = postclassical Latin pastoral | *C* = classical non-pastoral | *D* = postclassical/Italian non-pastoral | *E* = Giovanni Boccaccio

* = same position in the line | underline = additions to Smarr and/or Perini

1. *Galla*

Galla: *C* Prop. *El.* 3.12.1, 4, 15 etc.; Juv. *Sat.* 1.125f.; Mart. *Epigr.* 2.25.1f., 34.2, 3.51.2, 4, 54.1f. etc.; Aus. *Epigr.* 14.1. **Damon:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.17, 23, 8. **B** Giov. Virg. *Ecl. ad Muss.* 137, 140. *C* Aus. *Epist.* 23.22, 24.35. **Tindarus:** *C* Plaut. *Capt.*

1. **Tindare:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.1 *Tityre. non satius fuerat:* *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.14f. *nonne fuit satius tristis Amaryllidis iras | atque superba pati fastidia?*; Calp. *Ecl.* 3.7 *non satis attendi.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 7.2.

1f. **Vesevi | et Gauri:** *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 6.19, 8.28 (pairing).

2. **fronde virentes:** *C* Catull. *Carm.* 64.293 *molli... fronde vireret*; Virg. *Aen.* 6.206 *fronde virere nova*; Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.231 *fronde virent postes*; Ov. *Met.* 11.108 *fronde virentem**.

3. **deducere rivos:** *C* Virg. *G.* 1.269 *rivos deducere*; Man. *Astr.* 2.10 *deducere rivos**.

4. **steriles... campos:** *B* Petr. *Buc.* 10.330 *at sterilem... arenam.* *C* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 9.382 *in campos steriles*; Mart. *Epigr.* 1.107.7 *in steriles nolunt campos.* *E* Dante *Inf.* 14.13 *lo spazzo era una rena arida e spessa.*

5f. **Dic tamen... que... cura:** *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 3.22f. *nunc age dic, Lycida, quae vos tam magna tulere | iurgia?* *C* Ov. *Pont.* 3.5.57 *dic tamen**.

6f. **iussit superare nivas | alpes:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.47 *Alpinas, a! dura nives et frigora Rheni.* *C* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 1.183 *iam gelidas Caesar cursu superaverat Alpes.* *C* Ov. *Am.* 2.16.19 *ventosas... Alpes.* *D* Petr. *Afr.* 2.162 *atque Alpes subito iussus transire nivas.*

8. **O Damon Damon:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.69 *a Corydon Corydon.*

8f. **quantum sibi quisque beavit | qui...:** *C* Hor. *Epod.* 2.1 *beatus ille qui.*

9. **mentis... sedare tumores:** *C* Ov. *Pont.* 4.11.19 *sedavit vulnera mentis.*

10. **et parvas habitare casas:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.29 *atque humilis habitare* casas**.

11. **dure... sorores:** *C* Sen. *HF* 181 *durae... sorores*; Stat. *Silv.* 2.3.75 *duras... sorores.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 11.170 *sevasque... sorores**.

12. **tauros... deducere:** *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 16.36. **Alcesti:** cf. Bocc. *Bucc.* 6.

15. **et... lacerti:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.9 *nunc viridis etiam occultant spineta lacertos.* 16. **Quid tu solus agis?:** *C* Ov. *Pont.* 4.2.39 *sed quid solus agam.* *D* Petr. *Rvf* 35.1: *solo et pensoso i più deserti campi. pascua torrida:* *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 1.7 *torrida... ora.*

17f. **Mors... sola dabit fesso:** *C* Sen. *HO* 1021 *mors sola portus dabitur aerumnis meis.* *D* Petr. *RVF* 8.11 *un sol conforto, et de la morte, avemo.*

19f. **amores... volucres:** *C* Stat. *Silv.* 1.5.33 *volucrum... amorum.*

20. **diras sperne pharetras:** *C* Ov. *Am.* 2.5.1 *abeas, pharetrate Cupido!.*

21. Quo Fortuna trahet miserum... abibo: *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 3.18 *abibo**. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 4.653 *quem dederat cursum Fortuna, peregi, 5.709 quo fata trahunt, 12.677 quo dura vocat Fortuna sequamur.*

22f. requiesce sub antro | est... michi grandis copia bachi: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.79ff. *hic tamen hanc mecum poteris requiescere noctem | fronde super viridi: sunt nobis mitia poma, | castaneae molles et pressi copia* lactis, 7.10 requiesce* sub* umbra;* Nemes. *Ecl.* 4.46ff. *hic age pampinea mecum requiesce sub umbra; | hic tibi lene virens fons murmurat, hic et ab ulmis | purpureae fetis dependent vitibus uvae.* *C* Virg. *G.* 3.308 *hinc largi copia lactis;* Ps.-Virg. *Copa* 31 *requiesce* sub* umbra.* **sub antro:** *A* Nemes. *Ecl.* 2.26*. *C* Virg. *G.* 4.152*, *Aen.* 3.431*, 8.217*, 254*; Hor. *Car.* 1.5.3*, 2.1.39*; Stat. *Theb.* 10.821*; Juv. *Sat.* 7.59*. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 9.116. *E* Bocc. *Buc.* 6.31.

24. Phorba: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 5.842; Ov. *Met.* 5.74, 78, 11.414, 12.322; Sen. *Oed.* 838ff.; Stat. *Theb.* 7.253. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 4.120 *pecudum custos Phorbas, 13.48. fronde corona:* *C* Virg. *Aen.* 4.506 *fronde* coronat**; Hor. *Epist.* 1.18.64 *fronde coronet.* *D* Petr. *Afr.* 4.373 *fronde* coronat**.

26f. interea... michi pandito... te cruciet: *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 3.22f. *nunc age dic, Lycida, quae vos tam magna tulere | iurgia.*

26. dira lues: *C* Ov. *Met.* 7.523, 15.626; Stat. *Theb.* 1.601.

27. Leviat... dolores: *A* Nemes. 4.19, 25, 31 etc. *levant et carmine curas.* *B* Petr. *Buc.* 4.22 *hac casus solare tuos, hac falle laborem, 61 interea tristes fugiunt per nubile cure.* *D* Petr. *Ryf.* 23.4 *perché cantando il duol si disacerba.* *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 2.8 *cantuque gravem leviare laborem,* *Bucc.* 4.112 *iuvit narrasse labores, 14.168f. audire fuit persepe laborum | utile solamen.*

28. Quis neget?: *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 4.113*, 15.14*. **Audieram solitum cantare:** *B* Petr. *Buc.* 5.141 *audieram veteres narrare bubulcos.* **Menalcam:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.15, 3, 5, 9.10, 16, 18, 55, 10.20; Calp. *Ecl.* 4.11. *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 2.38, 3.39, 77, 137, *Bucc.* 6.144, 10.23, 11.195, 16.47.

29. si dicam, mecum lacrimaberis ipse: *D* Dante *Inf.* 5.126 *dirò come colui che piange e dice, 33.9 parlare e lagrimar vedrai insieme.*

30. Quem letis tantum dicemus amicum?: *C* Cic. *Lael.* 64.8 *amicus certus in re incerta cernitur* (cf. En. *Trag.* 351).

32ff. et quantum... tantum cedit: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.25 *quantum lenta solent inter viburna cupressi, 5.16ff. lenta salix quantum pallenti cedit olivae, | puniceis humilis quantum saliunca rosetis, | iudicio nostro tantum tibi cedit Amyntas.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 5.70ff., 6.65, 142ff.

32. funesta cupressus: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.62ff. *funus... atraque cupresso, 4.506f. fronde coronat | funerea, 6.216 feralis ante cupressos;* Ov. *Tr.* 3.13.21 *funeris ara mihi, ferali cincta cupressu.* *D* Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 3.10.15f. *cupressus | funereosque rogos.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 5.32 *funesta et pulchra cupressu.*

33. mirtus bicolor: *C* Ov. *Met.* 10.98 *et bicolor myrtus.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 5.81, 11.43, 13.129.

34. Galathea: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.30*, 31*, 3.64, 72, 7.37, 9.39 (*Galatea*). *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 2.78; Petr. *Buc.* 11. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 9.103; Ps.-Virg. *Cir.* 393*; Hor. *Carm.* 3.27.14; Ov. *Am.* 2.11.34, *Met.* 13.738*, 789*, 798* etc., *Fast.* 6.733; Stat. *Silv.* 1.4.76, 2.2.20; Mart. *Epigr.* 8.55.17 (*Galatea*). *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 2.2.23, *Bucc.* 4.31*, 152, 7.21, 39*, 43*, 12.39, 16.68*. **Miconis:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.10*, 7.30; Calp. *Ecl.* 5.1, 6.91; Nemes. *Ecl.* 3.1. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 10.46*, 143*.

35. placidis... in annis: *A* Nemes. *Ecl.* 4.58 *teneris... in* annis**. *C* [Tib.] *Carm. Tib.* 3.7.169 *placidus... annus**; *Ov. Her.* 4.25 *a teneris annis*.

36. Has inter fagos: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.3 *inter densas... fagos*. *B* Petr. *Buc.* 4.20 *inter... fagos*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 12.1 *has inter lauros*. **napeis:** *A* Nemes. *Ecl.* 2.20 *quae colitis silvas, Dryades, quaeque antra, Napaeae*. *C* Virg. *G.* 4.535 *et facilis venerare Napaeas*; Stat. *Theb.* 4.255 *Napaeas*, 9.386 *Napaeae*. *E* Bocc. 2.106 *napeas*, 5.65 *facilesque napeas*, 7.117 *stolidis... napeis*, 8.59 *napeas*, 13.26*, 16.44 *napeas*.

37. roseo suffusa rubore: *C* *Ov. Am.* 3.3.5*, *Met.* 3.482 *roseum* percussa ruborem**. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 9.325 *roseo vultum suffusa* rubore**.

38. flammis quibus uror: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.68 *me tamen urit amor: quis enim modus adsit amori?*, 8.83 *Daphnis me malus urit*; Calp. *Ecl.* 3.7f. *uror, Iolla, | uror, et immodice*; Nemes. *Ecl.* 4.65 *cum sic in Meroen totis miser ignibus urar?*. *C* *Ov. Am.* 1.1.26 *uror, et in vacuo pectore* regnat amore*, 2.4.12 *uror, et insidiae sunt pudor ille meae*, *Met.* 3.464 *uror amore mei: flammis moveoque feroque*; Sen. *Ph.* 119f. *quis meas miserae deus | aut quis iuvare Daedalus flammis queat?*.

39. volucres... sagittas: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 10.358 *volucresque sagittas**. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 5.242 *citius volucrique sagitta*, 11.858 *volucrum... sagittam**, 12.415 *volucres*... sagittae**; *Ov. Am.* 1.1.25 *certas habuit puer ille sagittas*, *Met.* 9.102 *volucrum... sagitta**. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 3.167 *volucresque... sagitte**.

40. retia tendere cervis: *C* Virg. *G.* 1.307 *retia* ponere cervis**. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.80f. *retia cervis* | ponere*, 7.58ff. *retia cervis*... tendere*.

40ff. Nobis volucres... dentibus apros... venabula... arcus: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.56ff. *aut acris venabor apros. non me ulla vetabunt | frigora Parthenios canibus circumdare saltus... libet Partho torquere Cydonia cornu | spicula*. *C* Lucr. *DRN* 1326 *dentibus apri*; Virg. *Aen.* 4.131f. *retia rara, plagae, lato venabula ferro, | Massylique ruunt equites et odora canum vis*; *Ov. Met.* 10.537ff. *hortaturque canes tutaque animalia praedae... a fortibus abstinet apris | raptosque lupos armatosque unguibus ursos | vitat et armenti saturatos caede leones... fulmen habent acres in aduncis dentibus* apri**. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 4.345 *sic, ubi vulnificis ferientem dentibus* aprum**.

44. quercus michi testis: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.21 *vos coryli testes et flumina Nymphis*; Calp. *Ecl.* 3.24 *tu testis, Iolla*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 7.111 *testis michi maxima quercus*.

45. Amplexus centum... oscula centum: *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 3.55ff. *Lycidas... cui dulcia saepe dedisti | oscula*. *C* Catull. *Carm.* 5.7 ff. *da mi basia mille, deinde centum, | dein mille altera, dein secunda centum, | deinde usque altera mille, deinde centum*.

46. oblita mei: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 8.4 *ingrate atque oblite mei*, 10.26 *oblitum immemoremque mei*. *C* *Ov. Her.* 10.42 *oblitos... mei*, *Met.* 13.276 *oblitos... meique*, *Tr.* 4.3.24 *oblitam... mei*, 10.105 *oblitosque mei*; Sen. *Med.* 560 *oblitos mei*. **temperat ignes:** *C* Hor. *Carm.* 3.19.6 *quis aquam temperet ignibus*.

47. ut moriar: *C* Prop. 2.3.46; Virg. *Aen.* 4.669f. *moriemur inultae, | sed moriamur*; *Ov. Tr.* 4.10.130. **moriemur amando:** *C* *Ov. Ars* 1.372 *et insano iuret amore mori*, *Met.* 10.426 *certa mori tamen est, si non potiat amor*; Mart. *Epigr.* 9.56.9 *moriatur amore*.

48. Sed videant silve montes arbusta fluentia: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.21 *vos coryli testes et flumina Nymphis*.

49. pro munere munus: *C* *Ov. Tr.* 3.11.49 *ut munus munere penses*; Mart. *Epigr.* 9.94.5 *dulce aliquis munus pro munere poscit amaro?*. *D* Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 10.27f. *munus munere... petere*, 21.788. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 4.104*.

50. mi Damon: *B* Giov. Virg. *Ecl. ad Muss.* 38 *mi Meliboeae*, 243 *mi Daphni*. *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 2.18 *mi Meris*, 37 *Meris mi digne*, 3.86, 143 *mi Meri*, *Bucc.* 4.111 *mi Dore*, 6.42 *mi dulcis Aminta*, 11.30 *mi Glauce*, 13.18 *mi Daphni*, 15.2, 143 *mi Typhle*. **Nimium falluntur amantes:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 4.85 *infandum si fallere possit amorem*, 296 *quis fallere possit amantem?* (cf. ll. 59, 70); *Sen. Ph.* 634 *o fallax Amor*.

51f. Stat sepe sub umbra | ignis: *C* Virg. *G.* 2.302ff. *nam saepe incautis pastoribus excidit ignis, | qui furtim pingui primum sub cortice tectus | robora comprehendit*.

52. dum pallet... tum fervet: *C* Ov. *Met.* 8.465f. *saepe metu sceleris pallebant ora futuri, | saepe suum fervens oculis dabat ira ruborem*.

53. fraus hec notissima nobis: *C* Mart. *Epigr.* 1.87.7f. *notas ergo nimis fraudes... tollas*; *Sen. Med.* 181 *nota fraus, nota est manus*.

54. Antrum grande: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 6.11 *antrum* immane*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 12.96 *grandisque... in antro*.

54f. sub colle... Montis Ugi: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 8.49 *solus ego ac sitiens nuper sub* colle* vagabar*, 10.142 *colle sub aonio*. *C* Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.61 *sub* collibus* Albae*, 4.2.65 *sub* collibus* Albae*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 16.6 *sub* colle* Lycei*.

55. Egon: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.1f. *cuium pecus, an Meliboei?* | *non, verum Aegonis; nuper mihi tradidit Aegon**, 5.72*; *Calp. Ecl.* 6.83*. *C* Stat. *Theb.* 5.56*, 88*. *D* Bocc. *Bucc.* 9.141, 145, 16.95, 107*.

56. gracili... avena: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.2 *tenui... avena**. *C* Ps.-Virg. *Aen.* 1a *ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena**. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 6.60. **refovebat:** *C* Ps.-Virg. *Cul.* 122 *dulci fessas refovebat* in umbra*, 213 *tu lentus refoves iucunda membra quiete*. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 3.170f. *dulcis odorifere lauri viridantis in auro | umbra novem placido refovebat tegmine Musas*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 6.55 *et calamis refove*, 13.15f. *his umbris equidem tecum refovebo capellas | quas habeo fessas*.

57. Phytia: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 2 *Pythias*. *C* Ter. *Eun. Pythias*; *Hor. Ars* 237f. *audax | Pythias*, 414. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 4, 6.71, 74, 127, 8, 10.16.

58. sic me malus ardor agebat: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 8.41 *ut me malus abstulit error*. *C* Prop. 3.11.49 *ardor aget*.

59. presensi timuique dolos: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 4.295f. *at regina dolos (quis fallere possit amantem?) | praesensit*.

60. Galla... lasciva: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.64 *Galatea... lasciva* puella*; *C* Hor. *Carm.* 4.11.22f. *puella... lasciva*; *Ov. Her.* 9.65, *Ars am.* 1.523 *lascivae... puellae*; *Mart.* 6.68.7f. *lasciva... nympha*, 9.67.1 *lascivam... puellam*. **choros... festos:** *C* Ov. *Met.* 8.582, 746 *festas duxere choreas*, *Tr.* 5.12.8 *festos ducat... choros*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 6.58 *festis ambire choreis*, 11.145 *satyros festasque agitare choreas*.

62. Pamphylus: *C* Ter. *Andr., Hec. Pamphilus*. *D* Ps.-Ov. *Pamph.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 3, 4.121, 5.

63. ad salices: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.64f. *Galatea... et fugit ad salices*.

63f. tacitus meditans sub rupe sedebam | invisus: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.14 *sub* rupe* iacentem*; *Calp. Ecl.* 4.1f. *tacitus... sub hac platano*. *B* Petr. *Buc.* 8.124 *solus... modulans sub* fronde sedebat**. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.310 *classem in convexo nemorum sub* rupe* cavata... occulit*, 2.574 *atque aris invisa sedebat*, 3.229 *rursum in secessu longo sub* rupe* cavata*, 6.548f. *respicit Aeneas subito et sub* rupe* sinistra | moenia lata videt*. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 9.10 *tacitus meditansque sedebat**.

64. Petiit... secreta salicti: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.54 *Hyblaeis apibus florem depasta salicti**, 3.64f. *petit... et fugit ad salices* (cf. 1. 63), 10.40 *inter salices*. *C* Virg. *G.* 2.415 *incultique exercet cura salicti**, *Aen.* 6.10f. *secreta* Sibyllae... petit*; *Hor. Ars* 298 *secreta petit loca*; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 2.602 *silvarum secreta petit*, 9.32 *Corcyrae secreta petit*; *Ov. Met.* 1.594 *nemorum secreta* subibis*, 11.363 *iuncta palus huic est densis obsessa salictis**; *Juv. Sat.* 11.67 *necdum ausus virgas humilis mordere salicti**. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 3.60 *in fontem cithysumque paret vaccisque salicta**.

65. stipula doctus pariter fidibusque canoris: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.26f. *indocte... stipula*. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 6.119f. *Orpheus | Threicia fretus cithara fidibusque canoris** *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 5.68 *nunc stipulis* auctos, fidibus nunc arte canoris**, 9.83 *et tyrios apros stipulis domuere canoris**, 13.139 *fidibus stipulisque canoris**.

66. carmen inauditum: *C* *Hor. Carm.* 3.1.2f. *carmina non prius | audita*.

69. in longum tenuit: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 9.56 *causando nostros in longum ducis amores. per umbras:* *C* Virg. *Aen.* 2.693*, 6.452*, 461*, 490*, 619*, 12.864*, 881*; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 3.31*, 7.459*, 8.717; *Ov. Am.* 1.8.13*, *Ars Am.* 3.387*; *Stat. Theb.* 1.94*, 2.350*, 4.372* etc. *D* *Petr. Afr.* 3.4*, 8.786* *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 2.31*, 52*, 9.40*, 164*, 10.144*, 12.61*, 13.87*, 14.44*.

70. Timidos quis fallat amantes?: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 8.26 *quid non speremus amantes?**. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 4.295 *quis fallere possit amantem?* (cf. 1. 59).

71. catulis sociata duobus: *E* *Bocc. Carm.* 3.23 *paucis sotiata* molosis*, 9.17 *Nayadum sociata choris*, *Bucc.* 3.28 *paucis sociata* molosis*, 7.73 *nullo sociata* marito*, 11.10 *septam sociatus* Aminta*, 13.26 *Nyse sociata* napeis*.

73. voce ciens: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.68 *et magna supremum voce ciemus*; *Stat. Theb.* 6.460f. *voce | nominibusque cient...* *D* *Petr. Afr.* 6.380 *Neptunum ter voce ciet*.

73f. ne forsan longius iret | Pamphylus: *B* *Petr. Buc.* 6.166f. *nec longius hinc iam... abest*. *C* *Ov. Met.* 5.414 *adgnovitque deam 'nec longius ibitis!' inquit*.

74f. sub umbra | ylicis argute consedit: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 6.54 *ilice sub nigra*, 7.1 *sub arguta consederat ilice Daphnis*; *Calp. Ecl.* 2.12 *umbrosa... sub ilice*, 3.27 *et puero comitata sub ilice cantat*, 6.60 *sub ilice Musae* *B* *Petr. Buc.* 12.6 *gelidaque sub ilicis umbra* *C* Virg. *Aen.* 6.208f. *opaca | ilice**, 8.43 *sub ilicibus*, 11.851 *opacaque ilice*; *Ps.-Virg. Copa* 31 *requiesce sub* umbra**. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 8.149 *ylice sub prisca*, 12.69f. *sedere sub* umbra** | *ylicis* antique*, 14.134 *sub ylice mensam*, 16.101f. *consedimus... ylice* sub viridi*.

75. ylice teste: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.21 *vos coryli testes*; *Calp. Ecl.* 3.24 *tu testis, Iolla*. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 7.111 *testis michi maxima quercus* (cf. 1. 44).

80. visa prius: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.65 *et fugit ad salices et se cupit ante videri* (cf. 1. 63).

80f. altis | in silvis: *C* *Ov. Am.* 3.9.23 *in silvis... altis**, 10.35 *silvis... in altis**, 13.19 *silvis... sub altis*, *altis habitavit femina silvis*, *Fast.* 4.41 *silvis... in altis**, *Pont.* 2.1.39 *in altis... silvis* *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 11.26*.

81. eripe flammis: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 2.289 *eripe flammis**. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 2.139. *exime... furores*.

82. Narrare solebat: *C* *Ov. Fast.* 4.689*.

83. Tytirus: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1, 3.20, 96, 5.12, 6.4, 8.55, 9.23f.; *Calp. Ecl.* 3.19, 74, 97, 4.62, 64, 161, 163; *Nemes. Ecl.* 1.1, 2.84. *B* *Dante-Giov. Virg. Ecl.* 2.6, 24, 46, 3.11, 36, 72, 87, 95, 4.7, 12, 25, 29, 44f., 64, 88; *Giov. Virg. ad Muss.* 9, 228. *C* Virg. *G.* 4.566; *Ov. Am.* 1.15.25; *Mart. Epigr.* 8.55.8. *E* *Bocc. Carm.* 3.160, 170, 177, *Bucc.* 3.95, 103, 110, 5.56f., 10.66, 13.33, 14.125. *dum dulcior etas:* *D* *Petr. Rvf.* 23.1, 70.50 (cf. 1. 35).

84f. Non lacrimis... fluento: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.29f. *nec lacrimis* crudelis Amor* nec gramina rivis | nec cytiso* saturantur apes nec fronde capellae.* *C* Virg. *Aen.* 12.156 *non lacrimis*.* **rore cicade:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.77 *rore* cicadae*.*

86f. sordidus... autumnus: *C* Ov. *Met.* 2.29 *Autumnus*... sordidus,* *Fast.* 4.897f. *Autumnus*... sordidus.*

88. turbidus auster: *C* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 1.234*, 498*.

89. pandos delphynes: *C* Ov. *Tr.* 3.10.43f. *tum neque se pandi* possunt delphines in auras | tollere.*

91ff. Sic peragit Fortuna vices: nunc... nunc...: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 2.54ff *sic leta dolendis | alternat fortuna ferox,* 8.97ff. *non una per omnes | est hominis Fortuna* dies.* *Nunc* mane quietum | turbida lux sequitur; nunc matutina serenus | nubila vesper agit.* *C* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 5.208 *ut peragat* fortuna*;* Ov. *Her.* 15.59 *an gravis inceptum peragit fortuna tenorem...?* *D* Petr. *Afr.* 7.221 *Fortuna variante vices*.*

92. fronte serena: *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 5.46*; Nemes. *Ecl.* 1.56f. *serena* | fronte,* 4.17 *fronte* serenas*.* *B* Petr. *Buc.* 10.290*. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 4.477 *fronte* serenat;* Aus. *Mos.* 384.

94. fletus hos pone, precamur: *C* Stat. *Silv.* 6.103 *pone, precor, questus;* Sen. *HO* 1497 *planctus pone funereos, precor,* 1969 *proinde planctus pone.* *D* Petr. *Afr.* 5.683 *pone modum lacrimis.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 14.146 *pone, precor, luctus.*

95. sunt et medicamina mille: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 9.33 *sunt et mihi carmina.* *C* Ov. *Ars Am.* 3.647 *sunt quoque... medicamina*, Met.* 7.116 *tantum medicamina possunt! (= 14.285).*

96f. carmine... carmina...: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 8.69f. *carmina* vel caelo possunt deducere lunam, | carminibus* Circe socios mutavit Vlix.* *C* Tib. *El.* 1.4.63 *carmine* purpurea est Nisi coma: carmina ni sint.*

96. sevis amor: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 8.47. *C* Ov. *Am.* 1.6.34 *saevus... Amor, Am.* 2.10.19*, *Rem. Am.* 530; Stat. *Theb.* 1.128. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.69. **et herbis:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 7.769 *paeoniis revocatum herbis et amore Dianae;* Ov. *Am.* 3.7.28 *num misero carmen et herba nocent.*

97. sunt nobis: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.80 *sunt nobis mitia poma;* Calp. *Ecl.* 7.45 *vilia sunt nobis.* *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 3.52 *sunt nobis dulcia poma,* *Bucc.* 16.51 *pascua sunt nobis.*

98. hyacum: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 6.15 *Iaccho,* 7.61*; Nemes. *Ecl.* 3.62*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 3.7*, 7.5*.

99ff. Cum capreis... piscis... navis...: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.59f. *ante leves ergo pascentur in aethere cervi | et freta destituent nudos in litore piscis*.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 14.12ff. *dum primos... servus.*

102. lasciva puella: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.64* (cf. l. 60).

103. carmine... arte vel herbis: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 8.69f. *carmina vel caelo possunt deducere lunam, | carminibus Circe socios mutavit Vlix* (cf. l. 96f.).

104f. Ydaliū... sanctumque Cytheron | et Paphi: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 10.51f. *est celsa mihi Paphus at-que* Cythera* | Idaliaeque domus,* 86 *est Paphus Idaliūque tibi, sunt alta Cythera*.*

105f. oscillaque ramis | suspendi: *C* Virg. *G.* 2.389 *oscilla ex alta suspendunt mollia pinu.*

106. pia thura dedi: *C* Ov. *Tr.* 2.59 *et pia tura dedi.* *D* Muss. *Obsid.* 2.196 *pia thura dabo.*

107. votis superosque: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 8.61 *supplicibus supera votis;* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 7.113 *apud superos votis.*

108. ingentia munera misi: *C* Mart. *Epigr.* 4.56.1 *munera... ingentia mittis.*

109. crudescit amor, crudescit et ipsa: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.54 *crescent illae, crescetis, amores.*

110. Amarillidis: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.5 *Amaryllida**, 30, 36, 2.14*, 52, 3.81*, 8.77f., 101, 9.22*; Calp. *Ecl.* 4.38. **B** Giov. Virg. *Ecl. ad Muss.* 7. *C* Ov. *Ars Am.* 2.267, 3.183, *Tr.* 2.1.537*. **E** Bocc. *Bucc.* 9.20ff.*, 172*.

110f. Amarillidis... castaneas: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.52 *castaneas*-que nuces, mea quas Amaryllis amabat* *C* Ov. *Ars Am.* 2.267f. *adferat aut uvas, aut quas Amaryllis amabat.* | *At nunc castaneas non amat illa nuces.* **E** Bocc. *Nin. Fior.* 26.31 *le piacevoli castagne... state già care ad Amarille*, *Bucc.* 10.33 *castaneis* nucibus pomis bromioque* fovebo.*

111. Phorba: cf. l. 24. **bromium:** *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 4.123 *et intacto Bromium perfundere vino.* *C* Ps.-Virg. *Copa* 20 *est amor, est Bromius.* **E** Bocc. *Bucc.* 6.4 *crateras Bromio statuunt et vina salutant*, 10.33*, 11.93, 185.

112. viresque animi: *D* Boeth. *Cons.* 5.4.31. **E** Bocc. *Bucc.* 7.75.

112f. dirus... amor: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.44ff. *nunc insanus amor duri me Martis in armis | tela inter media atque adversos detinet hostis.* *C* Sen. *Agam.* 590. **E** Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.19f. *sic dirus amantes | fecit amor**, 7.84.

113. saxis... movemus: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 2.75 *quis michi voce feras quercusque et saxa movebit**, 4.60 *plaudunt volucres et concava saxa.* *C* Hor. *Ars* 395 *saxa movere sono testudinis;* *Ov. Am.* 3.7.57f. *illa graves potuit quercus adamantaque durum | surdaque blanditiis saxa movere suis,* *Her.* 6.88 *illa loco silvas vivaque saxa movet*, *Met.* 6.547 *inplebo silvas et conscia saxa movebo**, 13.48 *saxa moves gemitu*, 14.338 *silvas et saxa movere**; *Stat. Silv.* 2.62 *et tu saxa moves.* **E** Bocc. *Bucc.* 6.146 *tunc saxa movebis**.

114. si cesserit impius ignis: *C* *Stat. Theb.* 5.685 *impius ignis**; *Sen. Ph.* 165 *compesce amoris impii flammas.*

115. natura parens: *C* *Sen. Ph.* 959 *o magna parens natura*; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 10.238 *sic iussit natura* parens**; *Claud. Rapt. Pros.* 1.250 *discrevit natura* parens**. **D** Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 1.10.60*. **E** Bocc. *Bucc.* 14.37*. **Pamphyle:** cf. l. 62.

116. sertis nectere flores: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 2.6 *nectere sertia canendo.* *C* Hor. *Carm.* 1.26.7f. *gaudes, apricos necte flores, | necte meo Lamiae coronam;* *Ov. Fast.* 5.219 *nectuntque coronas | sertaque.* **D** Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 3.1.80 *nectere sertia manu.*

120. sevus amor: cf. l. 96. **iura negavit:** *C* Ov. *Met.* 10.330f *et quod natura remittit, | invida iura negant.*

121. ni fallor: *C* Ov. *Fast.* 4.623; *Stat. Theb.* 2.656, *Achil.* 1.40. **D** Petr. *Afr.* 3.535*. **E** Bocc. *Bucc.* 7.131*, 8.13*, 14.1.

122f. quod forte... captus amaret: *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.60f. *his quoque Iuppiter olim | sepius in lucis captus.*

124. fusca sub veste: *C* *Stat. Theb.* 12.363 *atra sub* veste**. **E** Bocc. *Amor. vis.* 43.66 *di brun vestita e nel viso amorosa.* **per arva:** *B* Petr. *Buc.* 12.152. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 6.793*; *Ov. Am.* 1.7.8, *Her.* 12.46, *Met.* 11.62, *Fast.* 2.210, *Ib.* 444; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 6.13*, 572*; *Stat. Theb.* 6.5*, 11.27*. **D** Petr. *Afr.* 4.374, 7.1086. **E** Bocc. *Carm.* 2.14*, 3.98*, 147, *Bucc.* 2.17*, 3.71*, 83, 4.126*, 5.109*, 9.129*.

125. Egonis: cf. l. 55.

126. inter salices: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.40*. **vepreta:** *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 5.71*, 6.65*, 10.118, 12.73, 16.13.

127. Te... pater, precor hec: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 12.48ff. *hanc precor, optime... et nos tela, pater...*. **Silvane:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.24, *G.* 1.20, 2.494, *Aen.* 8.600; Calp. *Ecl.* 2.28; *Nemes. Ecl.* 2.56. **B** Petr. *Buc.* 10. *C* Hor. *Carm.* 3.29.23, *Epod.* 2.22, *Epist.* 2.1.143; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 3.403; *Ov. Met.*

1.193, 14.639; Stat. Theb. 6.111; Juv. Sat. 6.447; Mart. Epigr. 10.92.6. **E** Bocc. Bucc. 2.2, 8.148, 11.85, 12.67, 96, 196, 202, 13.96, 14.78, 16.26, 40f., 61 etc.

128. per tempora canos: **C** Ov. Met. 3.275 *ad tempora* canos**, 516 *tempora* canis**, 6.26 *in tempora* canos**, 8.568 *tempora* canis**, 12.465 *tempora cani*, 14.655*, 15.211 *tempora* canis**; Stat. Theb. 10.706 *tempora* canis**. **D** Petr. Afr. 1.517f. *extulit hunc natura senem, primoque sub evo | hanc habuit frontem, sic tempora cana genasque*, Ep. Metr. 1.7.67 *tempora* cani**.

129. et rugis roseas plenas pallescere malas **C** Ov. Ars Am. 3.69ff. *tempus erit, quo tu, quae nunc excludis amantes... quam cito (me miserum!) laxantur corpora rugis, | et perit in nitido qui fuit ore color*.

131. tremulos gressus: **D** Petr. Afr. 9.354 *tremulo ... gressu*.

131ff. Hoc si forte neges... signent et carmine bustum: **A** Calp. Ecl. 3.86ff. *quod si* turpis amor precibus, quod abominor, istis | obstiterit, laqueum miseri nectemus ab illa | ilice, quae nostros primum violavit amores. | hi tamen ante mala figentur in arbore versus: | “credere, pastores, levibus nolite puellis; | Phyllida Mopsus habet, Lycidan habet ultima rerum”*. **C** Catull. Carm. 64.363 *bustum**.

133ff. me... fervori: **E** Bocc. Rim. 46.12ff. *o crudel morte, perché non m'uccidi? | tu sola puoi il mio dolore amaro | finire e pormi forse in lieta pace*, Bucc. 2.71ff. *hec sententia cordis: | hanc animam exuere et placide hec dare membra quieti*.

133. mors atra: **C** Tib. El. 1.3.5 *mors atra**; Hor. Carm. 1.28.13 *morti... atrae*; Stat. Theb. 4.528*. **D** Petr. Ep. Metr. 1.1.18*, 3.17.22.

134f. corpusque... bustum: **C** Ov. Met. 2.325f. *Naides Hesperiae trifida fumantia flamma | corpora dant tumulo, signant quoque carmine saxum*.

135. signent et carmine: **A** Virg. Ecl. 5.42 *et tumulum facite, et tumulo superaddite carmen* **C** Virg. Aen. 3.287 *et rem carmine signo*. **E** Bocc. Bucc. 10.155 *reliquos tibi carmine signem*.

136. Trux amor, et iuvenum semper certissima pestis: **C** Sen. Ph. 290f. *iuvenum feroces | concitat flammas*. **E** Bocc. Bucc. 2.139 *iuvenis furores*, 10.112 *pestis certissima*.

137. Heu! cecidit: **D** Dante Inf. 5.142 *e caddi come corpo morto cade*. **Lymphas manibus portate recentes:** **C** Virg. G. 3.301 *fluvios praebeere recentes**, Aen. 6.635f. *corpusque recenti | spargit aqua*, 674 *prata recentia rivis*, 882f. *heu**, *miserande puer... manibus* date*. **E** Bocc. Carm. 2.33 *pascua rura pecus rivos umbrasque recentes**, Bucc. 5.42 *serpentes rivos fontesque lacusque recentes**.

138. pueri: **A** Virg. Ecl. 1.45, 3.111, 5.45. **E** Bocc. Bucc. 14.1, 24, 284.

2. Alceustus

***Alceustus**: *C* Ps.-Virg. *Cul.* 262. *E* Bocc. *Ninf. Fior.* 13ff., *Bucc.* 1.13, 5.113. **Amintas**: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.35, 39, 3.66, 74, 83, 5.8, 15, 18, 10.37f., 41; *Calp. Ecl.* 4; *Nemes. Ecl.* 3.1, 4.62. *C* Hor. *Epod.* 12.18. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 3.48, 4.93, 5.18, 8.74, 9.133, 11.10, 49, 228, 13.46, 143, 15.176. **Melibeus**: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1, 3.1, 7; *Calp. Ecl.* 1.94, 4; *Nemes. Ecl.* 1.17, 21, 37, 42, 49, 64, 72, 80. *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 2.4, 28, 34, 36, 67, 3.35, 61, 71; 4.29.

1. **transisse**: *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 4.150. **nives et frigora**: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.47*. *C* Stat. *Theb.* 12.518.

2. **sub divo**: *C* Virg. *G.* 3.435; Hor. *Carm.* 2.3.23, 3.2.5.

4. **crateras... salutant**: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.724 *crateras* magnos statuunt* et* vina* coronant**. **Bromio**: cf. 1.111.

6. **Tu, Melibee**: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.4 *tu*, Tityre, 1.6 *o Meliboee**. **plangoribus**: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 2.487, 4.668, 12.607; Stat. *Theb.* 1.592, 3.120. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 1.407.

7. **causa doloris**: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 9.216*; *Ov. Am.* 1.14.14 *tibi nullius causa doloris*, 2.6.10, *Her.* 15.119, *Met.* 1.509 *et sim tibi causa* doloris**, 736 *tibi causa* doloris**, *Fast.* 6.746, *Tr.* 3.8.32, 4.3.33; Mart. *Epigr.* 10.41.3. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 5.120 *video que sit sibi causa* doloris**.

8. **Silva vetus**: *C* *Ov. Met.* 3.28*, *Fast.* 4.649. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 6. 42 *vetus... silva*. **Argus**: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 2, 3.70, 10.372. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 7.791, 8.346; *Ov. Am.* 3.4.20, *Met.* 1.601f. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 3.70, 4.47f., 8.43, 15.28 [= King Robert of Naples] (cf. also 2.61, 10.41, 64, 11.106, 12.38, 13.47).

11. **belua**: *D* Dante *Purg.* 14.62 *antica belva*.

12. **Parcendum lacrimis**: *C* Virg. *G.* 2.363 *parcendum* teneris*; *Ov. Pont.* 1.5.23 *parcendum est animo miserabile vulnus habenti*; Sen. *HO* 1507 *parce iam lacrimis*. **Poliphemus**: *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.75f.; Petr. *Buc.* 1.115. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.641, 657 *pastorem Polyphemum*; *Ov. Met.* 13.765, 772 *terribilem Polyphemon*, 14.167, *Pont.* 2.2.113, *Ib.* 387; Stat. *Theb.* 6.716; Juv. *Sat.* 14.20; Mart. *Epigr.* 4.49.6, 7.38.1. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 7.837 *pastor Poliphemus*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 4.62, 5.126, 15.206 (cf. 5.57 *Ciclops*).

13. **rediit... rediere**: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 4.6 *iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna*. *C* *Ov. Her.* 13.29 *ut rediit animus, pariter rediere dolores*, *Met.* 9.583 *mens tamen ut rediit, pariter rediere furores*.

15. **vallesque resultant**: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 5.150 *colles clamore resultant**; 8.305 *colles-que* resultant**.

16. **omnis ager**: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.56. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 4.525; Stat. *Theb.* 10.174. **pubet**: *C* Virg. *G.* 2.390 *omnis* largo pubescit vinea fetu*; *Ov. Trist.* 3.12.7 *prataque pubescunt variorum flore colorum*. *D* Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 2.16.35 *pubescunt gramina flexu*.

16f. **redeunt... arbustis**: *C* Hor. *Carm.* 4.7.1 *redeunt* iam gramina campis*; *Ov. Fast.* 3.237 *arboribus redeunt detonsae frigore frondes*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.145 *en redeunt flores, redeunt et gramina pratis*.

18. **cornupetant... lunata fronte iuveni**: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.87 *cornu petat*. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 9.629 *cornu petat*; Stat. *Theb.* 6.267 *lunatis* fronte* iuvenis**; Mart. *Epigr.* 8.33.22 *talìa lunata splenia fronte sedent*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 13.95 *lunata* fronte* iuencos**.

19. **Massicus**: *C* Virg. *G.* 2.143, *Aen.* 7.726, 10.166. *E* Bocc. *Rime* 63.6, *Bucc.* 13.107. **Gaurus**: cf. 1.1f. **Vesevus**: cf. 1.1f.

- 20. Falernus:** *C* Virg. *G.* 2.96; *Hor. Carm.* 1.20.10, 27.10, *Serm.* 2.4.19f. etc. *E* *Bocc. Ninf. Fior.* 26, 35.
- 21. stringit... et undas:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.413; *Ov. Met.* 11.733 *stringebat... undas**. **Vulturnus:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 7.729; *Ov. Met.* 15.715.
- 23. Lenta fides magnis semper prestatur:** *C* *Sen. Tro.* 529 *sollicita Danaos pacis incertae fides | semper tenebit*.
- 25. Pan deus:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.26*. *C* Virg. *G.* 3.392*. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 14.23 *deus Pan*, 16.86 *Pan*que deus. oculos avertit:* *C* *Ov. Met.* 2.770*.
- 26. vertigine celum:** *C* *Ov. Met.* 2.70*.
- 27. Quis daret... volatum?:** *D* *Vulg. Psalm.* 54.6 *quis dabit mihi pennas sicut columbae; et volabo, et requiescam?*; *Petr. Ep. Metr.* 1.14.137f. *quis* dabit* ut pennas posita gravitate columbe | induar alta petens, et post tot dura quiescam?*, *Rvf.* 81.12f. *qual gratia... | mi darà penne in guisa di colomba*.
- 28. iras superum... placare:** *C* *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 1.617 *iram* superum**; *Stat. Theb.* 10.836 *superum... irae*, *Silv.* 3.3.184 *superum placavimus iras*.
- 30. miserisque querelis:** *C* *Ov. Met.* 2.342 *miseras... querellas**, *Fast.* 4.481 *miseris... querellis**.
- 31. Corinna:** *C* *Ov. Am.* 1.5.9, 11.5, 2.6.48 etc.; *Mart.* 5.10.10, 8.73.10, 12.44.6. **sub antro:** cf. 1.22.
- 32. Cyrceum:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.386 *insula Circae*, 7.10 *proxima Circaeae raduntur litora terra*, 798f. *collis | Circaeumque*; *Ov. Met.* 14.247 *litora Circes*, *Fast.* 4.70 *Circes nomina litus habet. vertice flammis:* *C* Virg. *Aen.* 10.270 *vertice* flamma**; *Stat. Theb.* 10.675 *vertice* flammis**, 12.431 *vertice* flammae**.
- 33. Garganus:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 11.247; *Hor. Carm.* 2.9.7; 2.1.202; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 5.380, 9.184. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 13.107.
- 34. Appenninus:** *B* *Giov. Virg., Ecl.* 1.42. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 12.703; *Hor. Epod.* 16.29; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 2.396; *Ov. Met.* 2.226. *D* *Petr. Afr.* 3.562, 5.310. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 16 (speaker). **fumabant culmine summo:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.82 *summa... culmina fumant*. *C* Virg. *G.* 1.402 *culmine summo*; *Aen.* 2.458 *summi... culminis*, 695 *summa... culmina*, 4.186 *summi culmine*, 7.512 *culmine summo**; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 8.8, 708 *summo de culmine*; *Ov. Met.* 5.291 *summae culmine*. *D* *Petr. Afr.* 7.331 *culmine summo**.
- 35. credere durum:** *C* *Tib. El.* 1.6.7 *credere durum est*; *Ov. Trist.* 2.1.447 *credere iuranti durum putat esse Tibullus*.
- 36. Ethna... in ignes:** *B* *Dante-Giov. Virg. Ecl.* 2.27 *sub Aetna*; *Petr. Buc.* 10.169 *calida... in Ethna*. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3. 579f. *Aetnam... flammam*; *Ps.-Virg. Aet.* 1 *Aetna* mihi ruptique cavis fornacibus ignes**.
- 38. Quid ultra?:** *C* *Juv. Sat.* 6.190*. *D* *Petr. Ep. Metr.* 2.15.105. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 14.195*.
- 39. His oculis... vidi:** *C* *Ter. Adelp.* 329 *hisce oculis... vidi. calcantem litora:* *C* *Sen. Ph.* 324 *saxa calcantem*.
- 39f.: litora... euboica:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 9.710 *in Euboico Baiarum litore*; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 5.231 *litoris Euboici*. *E* *Bocc. Carm.* 9.77 *Euboice rupes et circum litora Baias*.
- 41. oscula dantem:** *C* *Ov. Met.* 13.424*.
- 42. Quid verbis opus est:** *C* *Ov. Met.* 13.120. *mi dulcis Aminta:* cf. 1.50.

43. Floribus... nocturno frigore: *C* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 9.844 *nocturno* frigore**. *D* Dante *Inf.* 2.127 *fioretti dal notturno gelo*.

45. arvis estu sitientibus: *C* Ps.-Virg. *Dir.* 16 *aestu sitientia prata*; Claud. *Carm.* 18.115 *sitientibus arvis*. *D* Pau. *Nol. Carm.* 21.678 *sitientibus... arvis*.

46. sic cordi tua dicta meo: *D* Dante *Inf.* 2.136f. *tu m'hai con disiderio il cor disposto | sì al venir con le parole tue*.

47. Phebe pater te, leta Pales: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.35 *Pales... Apollo*. *C* Virg. *G.* 3.1f. *te quoque, magna Pales, et te... pastor ab Amphryso*; Ov. *Met.* 2.36 *Phoebe pater**. *E* Bocc. *Alleg. mit.* 21 *Phebe pater*; Bucc. 15.200f. *assis, pulchra Pales... optime, da veniam, pater. da cepta secudent*; *C* Virg. *G.* 4.397 *eventusque secundet*, Aen. 7.259 *di nostra incepta secudent*; Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 1.635 *di visa secudent*.

48f. Non silvis... illuxit tam grata dies: *C* Hor. *Epist.* 1.4.13f. *omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum: | grata superveniet quae non sperabitur hora*; Sen. *HO* 60 *illuxit dies*.

49. cespitem vivo: *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 5.25*. *C* Hor. *Carm.* 3.8.4; Stat. *Theb.* 6.259*.

50ff. erige... ydumeas fer palmas: *C* Virg. *G.* 3.12 *primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas*.

50. Phorba: cf. 1.24.

51. et lauro et sertis hedere mirtoque corona: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.54f. *et vos, o lauri, carpam et te, proxima myrte, | sic positae quoniam suavis miscetis odores, 7.25 pastores, hedera crescentem ornate poetam, 8.12f. atque hanc sine tempora circum | inter victricis hederam tibi serpere lauros*. *C* Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.29 *me doctarum hederæ præmia frontium, 2.2.22f. cui laurus æternos honores | Delmatico peperit triumpho*; Ov. *Ars Am.* 2.734 *sertaque odoratae myrtea ferte comae, Tr.* 2.1.172 *in nitida laurea sarta coma*.

54. Lycophron: *C* Ov. *Ib.* 531 *Lycophrona*. *E* Bocc. *Am. Vis.* (B) 5.41.

55. et calamis refove: cf. 1.56. **quam turpis Orion:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 7.719 *saevus... Orion**, 10.763 *quam* magnus Orion**; Hor. *Epod.* 15.7 *infestus Orion**.

58. delubra deum: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 2.428*. **festis ambire choreis:** *C* Ov. *Met.* 8.582, 746 *festas* duxere choreas**.

59. foliis ornatus olive: *C* Virg. *G.* 3.21 *foliis* ornatos* olivæ**.

60f. tu primus... ego secundus: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.58 *incipi, Damoeta; tu deinde sequere, Menalca, 5.10 incipi, Mopse, prior*; Calp. 4.81 *tu*-que prior, Corydon, tu proximus ibis, Amynta*.

60. gracili... avena: cf. 1.56.

61. ast ego: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.46*, 7.308*; Hor. *Epod.* 15.24; Ov. *Met.* 12.439*, 13.878*; Stat. *Theb.* 7.215*, 8.61* etc. **populea... fronde:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 5.134 *cetera populea velatur fronde iuventus*; Hor. *Car.* 1.7.23 *tempora populea fertur vinxisse corona*.

62f. Stipulis et carmine docti | ambo sumus: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.27 *stipula disperdere carmen, 5.1f. boni... ambo, | tu calamos inflare levis, ego dicere versus; 7.4f. Arcades ambo | et cantare pares et respondere parati*. *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 3.49 *simul cantabimus ambo*.

63f. agris | in siculis: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.21 *Siculis... in montibus*. *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.72 *montibus in Siculis*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 15.153 *in siculis... iugis*.

64. ni forte gravis certaret: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.9 *si idem certet Phoebum superare canendo. Yollas:* *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.57, 3.76, 79; Calp. *Ecl.* 3, 4.59 *doctus Iollas, 6.91; Nemes. Ecl.* 4.4, 20, 72. *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 3.80, 4.95.

65. superat quantum vepreta cupressi: *A* Virg. 1.25 *quantum lenta solent inter viburna cupressi**.

67. tu carmine maior: *A* Virg. Ecl. 5.4 *tu maior*.

69ff. Phyllidis incipies... labores: *A* Virg. Ecl. 5.10f. *incipie, Mopse, prior, si quos aut Phyllidis ignis | aut Alconis habes laudes aut iurgia Codri* (cf. ll. 60f.). **Phyllidis:** *A* Virg. Ecl. 3.76, 78, 107, 7.14, 59, 63, 10.37, 41; Calp. Ecl. 3.9, 10, 24 etc., 6.74. **B** Dante-Giov. Virg. Ecl. 3.45. **C** Hor. Carm. 2.4.14, 4.11.3; Ov. Am. 2.18.22, 32, Her. 2, Ars Am. 2.353, 3.38, 460, Rem. Am. 55, 591, 606f., Trist. 2.1.537, Pont. 4.16.20; Mart. Epigr. 10.81.1, 3, 11.29.8, 11.49.1 etc. **E** Bocc. Bucc. 10.15; 12.39, 60, 77, 89. **Phytias:** cf. 1.57.

69. mage: *C* Virg. Aen. 10.481 *aspice num mage sit*.

70. Alcesti laudes: *A* Calp. Ecl. 4.75 *laudat Alexin*. *C* Hor. Ep 1.16.29 *Augusti laudes*.

71. pertulit... labores: *C* Virg. Aen. 8.291ff. *duros mille labores... pertulerit*.

72. Stilbon: *E* Bocc. Bucc. 11.101, 13.1, 79, 16.113.

75. ethere levo: *C* Sen. Th. 698 *laevo aethere*; Stat. Theb. 5.307 *aethere laevo*.

76. Alcesto dignas per secula voces: *C* Virg. Aen. 6.235 *per* saecula* nomen*; Luc. Bel. Civ. 7.589 *per* saecula* nomen*, 8.330 *dignasque.. voces**, 9.56 *dignas... voces*; Stat. Theb. 2.486 *per* saecula* nomen*, 5.747 *per* saecula* nomen*.

78. Libetrides: *A* Virg. Ecl. 7.21 *Nymphae... Libethrides*. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 13.134, 137. **nostrum tollant carmen ad sydera:** *A* Virg. Ecl. 5.43 *Daphnis... ad* sidera* notus*, 62 *voces ad* sidera* iactant*, 9.29 *cantantes... ferent ad* sidera**; Calp. Ecl. 3.42 *ad sidera ferre*. *C* Virg. Aen. 1.93 *tendens ad* sidera* palmas | talia voce refert*; Luc. Bel. Civ. 7.11 *attollique suum... ad sidera nomen*. *D* Petr. Afr. 1.40 *tuos actus meritis ad* sidera* tollam*. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 11.50 *surgant ad* sydera* versus*.

79. in umbra: *A* Virg. Ecl. 1.4*, 5.70*; Calp. Ecl. 3.16*, 4.37*, 133*; Nemes. Ecl. 4.1*. **B** Petr. Buc. 6.71*, 207*. *C* Ps.-Virg. Cul. 108*, 122*, 157*; Hor. Epist. 1.7.50*; Ov. Am. 2.18.3*, Met. 5.336*.

80. mittunt altaria fumos: *A* Virg. Ecl. 1.43 *altaria* fumant*. *C* Ov. Her. 1.25 *altaria fumant*, Fast. 2.193 *fumant altaria*.

83ff. Alcestum... silvis abstraxit: *A* Virg. Ecl. 5.20ff. *exstinctum... crudeli funere Daphnin*.

83f. postquam... abstraxit | fatorum predura lues: *A* Virg. Ecl. 5.34 *postquam te Fata tulerunt*.

84f. flevire dolentes... nymphe: *A* Virg. Ecl. 5.20f. *Nymphae... flebant*. **Parthenopes:** *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. Ecl. 1.29 *classes Parthenopeas*. *C* Virg. G. 4.564 *Parthenope studiis*; Ov. Met. 15.712 *Parthenopen*. *D* Petr. Afr. 1.63 *inclita Parthenope*, 9.428f. *non dulcia limina quondam | Parthenopea*. *E* Bocc. Carm. 1.7 *in mea Parthenope*, Bucc. 5.26f. *syrene... Parthenopis*.

85. Daunia: *C* Virg. Aen. 8.146f. *crudeli Daunia bello | insequitur*, 12.785 *dea Daunia*; Hor. Carm. 1.22.13f. *militaris | Daunias*, 2.1.34, 4.6.27 *Dauniae*.

87. ingentia saxa: *C* Luc. Bel. Civ. 1.25f., 3.506 *saxa ingentia*; Stat. Theb. 10.856. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 4.70 *saxa... ingentia*; Carm. 9.46*.

88. excessit ripas: *C* Luc. Bel. Civ. 8.236 *excedat... ripam*. **demissus ab urna:** *C* Virg. Aen. 7.792 *caelataque amnem fundens pater Inachus urna**. *D* Petr. Afr. 2.130 *revocatus ab* urna**.

89. nebulis fumoque: *C* Virg. G. 2.217 *nebulam fumosque volucris*. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 10.82*.

90. et valles ululatu flere dolenti: *C* Virg. Aen. 4.667 *lamentis gemituque et femineo ululatu*, 9.477 *et femineo ululatu*, 11.190 *ululatus*que ore dedere*. | *spargitur et tellus lacrimis*; Stat.

Theb. 3.158 *nulloque ululata dolore*; 5.554f. *ululatus flebilis aures | impulit*, 7.677 *femineis ululatibus*.

91. tunc... rugire leones: *A* *Virg. Ecl.* 5.27 *tuum Poenos etiam ingemuisse leones**.

93. lumen ademptum: *C* *Virg. Aen.* 3.658*; *Ov. Trist.* 4.4.45*.

94f. Ha quantum potuit... Fortuna quibusque | casibus: *C* *Virg. Aen.* 1.240f. *eadem fortuna viros tot casibus actos | insequitur*; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 5.354 *heu, quantum* Fortuna umeris iam pondere*. Cf. 1.21.

95. in dubios... meatus: *C* *Ov. Her.* 7.116 *in dubias... vias*.

96. Phebe decus celi: *A* *Virg. Ecl.* 5.34 *tu decus omne tuis*. *C* *Virg. Aen.* 9.18 *decus caeli*; *Hor. Carm. Saec.* 1f. *Phoebe... lucidum caeli decus*. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 14.251 *celi decus*.

96f. posuisse labori... finem: *C* *Virg. Aen.* 2.619 *finemque impone labori**; *Ov. Met.* 6.240 *finem inposuere labori*.

97. patriis... reddere silvis: *C* *Virg. Aen.* 11.269 *patriis*... redditus aris*.

98. meritos... honores: *C* *Virg. Aen.* 3.118*, 3.264 *meritosque... honores**, 5.652 *meritos... honores**, 8.189 *meritosque... honores**. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 14.267 *Parthenu placide meritos cantamus honores*.

99. carmine perpetuo: *C* *Hor. Carm.* 1.7.6*.

100f. Non... quantum tua carmina nobis: *A* *Virg. Ecl.* 5.45ff. *tale tuum carmen nobis, divine poeta...*, 76ff. *dum iuga montis aper, fluvios dum piscis amabit, | dumque thymo pascentur apes, dum rore cicadae...*

102. silvis... tenebo: *C* *Ov. Met.* 6.546 *silvis... tenebor*.

103f. Plaudite... antris: *A* *Virg. Ecl.* 8.21ff. *incipi Maenaliis mecum, mea tibia, versus, 61 desine Maenaliis, iam desine, tibia, versus, 68ff. ducite ab urbe domum, mea carmina, ducite Daphnin*. *C* *Ov. Am.* 3.2.47ff. *plaudite Neptuno, nimium qui creditis undis!... | plaude tuo Marti, miles!...*. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 5.77, 116 *plangite, silvani veteres, heu! plangite mecum*.

104. redditus est nostris Alceustus: *A* *Virg. Ecl.* 8.109 *parcite, ab urbe venit, iam parcite, carmina, Daphnis*. *C* *Ov. Pont.* 2.8.1 *redditus* est* nobis Caesar*.

105f. Litora iam plausu... polos: *C* *Ov. Met.* 4.735f. *litora* cum plausu*... domos*.

106f. spernere terras | occiduas: *A* *Virg. Ecl.* 4.14 *solvent... terras**; *Calp. Ecl.* 4.42 *occiduas impellere... harenas*.

107. solisque vias: *C* *Virg. Aen.* 6.796. **celumque serenum:** *C* *Virg. G.* 1.260, *Aen.* 3.518, 5.870; *Hor. Ep.* 15.1, *Serm.* 2.4.51; *Ov. Met.* 1.168, 2.321 *caelo... sereno*. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 7.107*, 9.56*.

108. obliquos Phebes... orbes: *C* *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 1.77f. *Phoebe... obliquum... per orbem*.

109. et Astream... revocavit: *A* *Virg. Ecl.* 4.6 *iam redit et Virgo*.

110ff. hac tauris curru iunget: *A* *Virg. Ecl.* 5.29f. *Daphnis et Armenias curru subiungere tigres | instituit*. *C* *Ov. Her.* 12.93 *iungis... tauros, cervisque leones... auferet*: *A* *Virg.* 4.22ff. *nec magnos metuent armenta leones**. | *occident et serpens, et fallax herba veneni | occident*.

112. meritos Musis concedet honores: *C* *Virg. Aen.* 3.118 *meritos* aris mactavit honores**; *Man. Astr.* 4.334 *concedit honorem*.

115ff. Dum... semper: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.76ff. *dum iuga montis aper... semper honos* (cf. ll. 100f.). **Dum... tellusque... aer:** *C* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 1.89ff. *dum terra... terramque... aer. silvis... decus:* *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.34 *tu decus omne tui*.

119. sit Delphycus alter: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.66 *ecce duas tibi, Daphni, duas altaria Phoebo*.

122f. Nos agnam mactare... taurumque sibi: *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 4.166 *nos* tamen interea tenerum mactabimus haedum*. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.118f. *meritos aris mactavit honores... taurum tibi, pulcher Apollo* (cf. l. 112), 4.57 *mactant... de more bidentis, 8.85 tibi, maxima Iuno, | mactat sacra ferens et cum grege sistit ad aram*; Hor. *Carm.* 2.17.32 *nos humilem feriemus agnam*; Ov. *Met.* 4.755f. *mactatur vacca Minervae... taurus tibi, summe deorum, 15.124 ruricolam mactare suum*.

123f. tempora... lauro: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 5.539f. *cingit viridanti tempora lauro | et primum ante omnis victorem appellat Acesten*; Stat. *Theb.* 5.554 *nuper Olympiacis umbratus tempora ramis*.

124. veniat lux illa: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 10.244 *crastina lux* (cf. Serv. *ad Aen.* 10.244.1 *crastina lux deest 'veniat', hoc est crastina lux veniat tantum*).

125. suris vincitis... coturno: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 7.32 *suras evincta coturno**. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.337 *purpureoque alte suras vincire coturno*.

126. tyrenus Asylas: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 9.571, 10.175 *hominum divumque interpres Asilas*, 11.620, 12.127, 550. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 4.119, 14.225, 227.

127. astabunt coram: *D* Vulg. *Gen.* 45.1 *Ioseph multis coram adstantibus*, *Act.* 4.10 *adstat coram vobis*. **Damon Phytiasque:** cf. 1.Intro. and 1.57.

130. vix credere fame: *C* Ov. *Her.* 9.121 *non credere* famae**; *Pont.* 1.5.75 *vix credere**.

131. cortice duro... tua facta leget: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 4.26f. *at simul heroum laudes et facta parentis | iam legere et quae sit poteris cognoscere virtus*, 5.13f. *quae cortice fagi | carmina descripsi*; Calp. *Ecl.* 1.20 *descripta est pagina fago*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.141. *signabas cortice fagi*.

136f. crescent... crescet: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.53f. *malle pati tenerisque meos incidere amores | arboribus: crescent illae, crescetis, amores*.

138. gratis linquens tua facta futuris: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 4.53f. *o mihi tum longae maneat pars ultima vitae, | spiritus et quantum sat erit tua* dicere facta!*.

141. Munera... digna?: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.81 *quae tibi, quae tali reddam pro carmine dona?*.

142ff. Dulce viris...: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.16ff. *lenta salix quantum* pallenti cedit olivae, | puniceis humilis quantum saliuca rosetis, | iudicio nostro tantum tibi cedit Amyntas*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 5.70ff. *quantum cana salix alno quantumque mirice | quercubus et celsis cedunt vepreta cupressis, | huic omnis tantum cedebat silva nemusque*. Cf. 1.32.

144. Menalcam: cf. 1.28.

145. Yollas: cf. l. 64.

146. saxa movebis: cf. 1.113.

147ff. Est michi...: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.36 *est mihi**, 3.36ff. *pocula ponam | fagina, caelatum divini opus Alcimedontis... necdum illis labra admovi, sed condita servo*.

148. Ylas spartanus: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 6.43f. *Hylan nautae quo fonte relictum | clamassent, ut litus 'Hyla, Hyla' omne sonaret*. *C* Virg. *G.* 3.6; Ov. *Ars Am.* 2.110, *Trist.* 2.1.406 *Hylas Iliacusque puer*.

149. victus... amore: *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 2.8 *victus amore sui*. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 12.29; Ov. *Am.* 3.10.29, *Her.* 15.176, *Met.* 1.619, *Fast.* 2.585.

150. *Phyllis*: cf. l. 69.

153. *munera tanti*: C Ov. Her. 17.225*.

155. *ne sperne*: C Ov. Met. 2.550 ne sperne meae praesagia linguae, 6.30 consilium ne sperne meum. *baculum*: A Virg. Ecl. 5.89ff.

155ff. *cyprius...* *Lycidas*: A Virg. Ecl. 7.67 Lycida formose, 9; Calp. Ecl. 3, 6. C Hor. Carm. 1.4.19 tenerum Lycidan; Nemes. Ecl. 4.1, 4. E Bocc. Bucc. 10.

156. *dum... agitare...* *dammis*: C Virg. G. 1.308 tum figere dammas*.

157. *Camandri*: C Hor. Ep. 13.14 Scamandri flumina.

158. *nodis... cuspide fulva*: A Virg. Ecl. 5.90 [pedum] formosum paribus nodis atque aere C Ov. Met. 1.468ff. duo tela... quod facit [amorem], auratum est et cuspide fulget acuta. nec non et: B Nemes. Ecl. 3.1., 4.1.

160f. *latratus... Melampus*: A Virg. Ecl. 8.107 et Hylax in limine latrat. C Ov. Met. 3.206f. Melampus... latratu. E Bocc. Bucc. 8.95 rauco latrante Melampo (cf. Also Virg. G. 3.550, Aen. 10.320; Stat. Theb. 3.453, 546, 573; Bocc. Bucc. 2.159).

162. *Licisca*: A Virg. Ecl. 3.18 multum latrante Lycisca. C Ov. Met. 3.220 velox... Lycisce. E Bocc. Bucc. 3.9 grata Licisca, 5.131, 7.76 seva Licisca.

163f. *ovili... lupus insultet*: A Virg. Ecl. 3.80 triste lupus stabulis, 5.60 nec lupus insidias pecori. C Virg. G. 3.537 non lupus insidias explorat ovilia, 4.435 auditisque lupos accunt balatibus agni, Aen. 9.59 ac veluti pleno lupus insidiatus ovili.

166. *Tu venias queso, si te fortasse ciebo*: C Stat. Silv. 5.2.160ff. sed coetus solitos si forte ciebo... tu deris.

3. Saphos

Caliope: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 4.57. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 9.525; Ps.-Virg. *Catal.* 15.4; Hor. *Carm.* 3.4.2; Ov. *Met.* 5.339, *Fast.* 5.80 *Calliopea chori*, Tr. 2.1.568, *Ib.* 482 *Calliopes*; Sen. *HO* 1034 *Orpheus*, *Calliopae* genus; Stat. *Theb.* 4.35, 8.374, *Silv.* 2.7.38, 3.1.50; Juv. *Sat.* 4.34; Mart. *Epigr.* 4.31.8, 9.86.6. **D** Petr. *Carm.* 1.9, 52; *Afr.* 9.64, 322. **E** Bocc. *Carm.* 1.36; *Bucc.* 14.120. **Aristeus:** *C* Virg. *G.* 4.317, 350, 355, 437; Ov. *Fast.* 1.363, *Pont.* 4.2.9; Stat. *Theb.* 4.573.

1. *has inter lauros:* *C* Virg. *Aen.* 12.318 *has inter** voces.

2. *nunc has nunc illas:* *C* Virg. *Aen.* 5.441 *nunc** hos, *nunc** illos *aditus*, 10.355 *nunc** hi, *nunc** illi; Stat. *Theb.* 11.478 *nunc** his, *nunc** illis; Mart. *Epigr.* 9.46.3 *nunc** has*, *nunc** illas*.

3. *violare nemus:* *C* Ov. *Met.* 8.741 *nemus violasse*. **Quiris:** *C* Prop. *El.* 3.4.3. **E** Bocc. *Bucc.* 9.90 *his Quiris veteri sancivit lege coronas*.

3f. *conscia... concesserit ante:* *C* Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.35f. *merita decorus | fronde*. **E** Bocc. *Bucc.* 9.52ff. *has frondes pharetris Phebus victricibus olim | ac cytharis, lauro facta iam Dane, dicavit; | hinc veteres ytalis sacras fecere triumphis*.

6. *Seu nympa loci seu sis dea:* *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.328f. *o, dea certe! | an Phoebi soror? an Nympharum sanguinis una?*. **B** Petr. *Buc.* 2.11 *dubius hominemne deamne viderem*. **E** Bocc. *Rim.* 4.9: *angela forse, o ninfa, o dea*.

7. *omnes collige glandes:* *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 4.24 *i, potius glandes rubicundaque collige corna*.

8ff. *Silva vetus... lapsa est... clausas... septas:* *C* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 1.24ff. *moenia tectis | urbibus Italiae lapsisque ingentia muris... et antiquis habitator in urbibus errat*.

11. *Nescis, stolidissime...:* **B** Petr. *Buc.* 12.18 *nescis vires, stolidissime, nostras?*. *C* Ov. *Met.* 13.774 *o vatum stolidissime, falleris*. **E** Bocc. *Bucc.* 7.109 *nemo, stolidissime, credet*.

11f. *porcis | serventur glandes:* **B** Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 1.21 *nec margaritas profliga prodigus apris*. **D** Vulg. *Mt.* 7.6 *neque mittatis margaritas vestras ante porcos*.

12. *laurea sarta poetis:* *C* Prop. *El.* 1.3.19 *sarta** poetae; Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.29 *me doctarum hederæ præmia frontium*; Ov. *Ars Am.* 2.734 *sartaque odoratae myrtea ferte comae*; Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 7.42 *laurea sarta*; Ov. *Tr.* 2.172. **D** Petr. *Coll. Laur.* 11.1. **E** Bocc. *Ep.* 7.8, *Bucc.* 6.51.

13. *pulchrisque Camenis:* *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.59 *amant alterna Camenae**. **B** Petr. *Buc.* 1.40f. *nitar, si forte Camene | dulce aliquid dictare velint, 3.61 sonus atque camene*. *C* Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.257 *iunctae-que* Camenae**. **E** Bocc. *Bucc.* 8.99.

15. *sacrum Phebi nemus hoc:* *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 4.159 *sacra Palatini penetralia... Phoebi*. *C* Mart. 1.12.3 *rura nemusque sacrum dilectaque iugera Musis*. **pulcherrima virgo:** *C* Ov. *Met.* 9.9*.

17. *Mopsi:* *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5, 8.26, 29; Calp. *Ecl.* 3.9, 26, 32ff., 6.85; Nemes. *Ecl.* 1.16, 4.1, 4. **B** Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 2.6, 7, 18ff., 4.25, 65, 74, 97, 3.35, 39, 80, 87; Giov. Virg. *Ecl. ad Muss.* 182. **E** Bocc. *Carm.* 2.27, *Bucc.* 3.18, 53, 65, 11.6, 8, 13.47, 124, 14.126, 15.107.

18. *egregiumque gregem vatum:* *C* Juv. *Sat.* 7.53 *vatem egregium*.

19. *Quid queris:* *C* Hor. *Epist.* 1.10.8; Sen. *Oed.* 860, *HO* 754, 1320 *quid quaeris ultra?*; Juv. *Sat.* 2.134; Mart. *Epigr.* 12.32.23.

21. *lenta diem:* *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.4 *lentus in umbra. ludendo per herbas:* *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.9f. *et ipsum | ludere quæ vellem calamo permisit agresti, 6.1f. prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu | nostra neque erubuit silvas habitare Thalea*. **B** Petr. *Buc.* 6.75 *herbosis ludunt*. *C* Hor.

Carm. 3.18.9 *ludit herboso pecus omne campo*; *Ps.-Virg. Cul.* 115 *ludentes... in herba**. *E Bocc. Bucc.* 14.266 *mediis herbis ludentes*.

22. Quid tibi cum Saphu: *C Mart. Epigr.* 1.76.11 *quid* tibi* cum* Cirrha?*. *D Petr. Ep. Metr.* 2.17.6ff. *quid* tibi* cum* Musis?*. **subulcus:** *A Virg. Ecl.* 10.19 *tardi venere subulci**. *C Mart. Epigr.* 10.98.10 *subulci*.

24. Uror: cf. 1.38.

26. sydera lambant: *C Virg. Aen.* 3.574 *sidera* lambit**.

27. per ethera: *C Virg. Aen.* 8.526*; *Ov. Met.* 2.135*; *Stat. Theb.* 10.139.

29ff. tu nuper haras... volutabra porcis: *B Dante-Giov. Virg. Ecl.* 1.21ff. *nec margaritas profliga prodigus apris*, | *nec preme Castalias indigna veste sorores*; | *at, precor, ora cie quae te distinguere possint* | *carmine vatisono, sorti communis utrique* (cf. 1. 11). *C Virg. G.* 3.441ff.

30. scabiem morsusque canum seu vulnera veprium: *C Virg. G.* 3.441 *turpis ovis temptat scabies*, 444 *et hirsuti secuerunt corpora vepres*.

31. manibus purgare palam: *C Virg. G.* 3.455f. *medicas adhibere manus ad vulnera pastor* | *abnegat*.

31f. gurgite... unguine: *C Virg. G.* 3.446 *in gurgite**, 450 *unguine*.

33. galbaneis fumis: *C Virg. G.* 3.415 *galbaneo*... nidore*.

33f. nigrique bituminis... ellebori... depellere sordes: *C Virg. G.* 3.451 *elleborosque gravis nigrumque bitumen*; *Hor. Epist.* 2.2.137 *expulit elleboro morbum bilemque meraco*.

34. dolentis amurce: *C Virg. G.* 3.448 *tristi... amurca**.

36. volutabra porcis: *B Petr. Buc.* 6.76f. *volutabris segnes innata voluptas* | *conglomerat versatque sues*. *C Virg. G.* 3.411 *volutabris... apros*.

38. Argus: *B Petr. Buc.* 2, 3.70, 10.372. *C Virg. Aen.* 7.791, 8.346; *Ov. Am.* 3.4.20, *Met.* 1.601f. *E Bocc. Bucc.* 3.70, 4.47f., 8.43, 9.28 [= King Robert of Naples], 2.61, 6.8, 10.41, 64, 11.106, 12.38, 13.47.

39. Galathea: *A Virg. Ecl.* 1.30f., 3.64, 72, 7.37, 9.39. *B Dante-Giov. Virg. Ecl.* 4.78; *Petr. Buc.* 11, 11.14, 19, 22ff. *C Virg. Aen.* 9.103; *Hor. Carm.* 3.27.14; *Ov. Am.* 2.11.34, *Met.* 13.738, 789, 798 etc., *Fast.* 6.733; *Stat. Silv.* 1.4.76, 2.2.20; *Mart. Epigr.* 8.55.17. *E Bocc. Bucc.* 1.34, 4.31, 152, 7.21, 39, 43, 16.68. **Phyllis:** cf. 6.69.

40. et mollis lanugo genas: *C Virg. Aen.* 10.324 *flaventem prima lanugine malas*, 12.606 *et* roseas laniata genas**; *Ov. Her.* 10.44 *molles... genae*; *Stat. Silv.* 3.4.65 *ne prima genas lanugo nitentes* | *carperet*. *D Petr. Afr.* 4.200f. *vixdum teneras lanugine prima* | *exornante genas*. *E Bocc. Bucc.* 14.74f. *lanugine malas* | *umbratas* (cf. 1.34).

41f. calamos... Pan doctior... docuit: *A Virg. Ecl.* 6.69 *hos tibi dant calamos, en accipe, Musae*; *Nemes. Ecl.* 1.4f. *nam te calamos inflare labello* | *Pan docuit versusque bonus tibi favit Apollo*, 2.73 *Pan doctus*, 3.66 *haec Pan Maenalia pueros in valle docebat*.

43f. Cyrenes genitrix... Aristeus: *C Virg. G.* 4.317ff. *pastor Aristaeus... mater, Cyrene mater*.

44. glandes et mella: *A Virg. Ecl.* 4.30 *et durae quercus sudabunt roscida mella*.

47. Ysmarius: *A Virg. Ecl.* 6.30 *miratur et Ismarus Orpheia*. *C Virg. Aen.* 10.139. *E Bocc. Carm.* 3.118, *Bucc.* 11.41. **Critis es Yde:** *E Bocc. Bucc.* 5.36 *Ydaque iudicio Paridis*; 13 *Critis* (speaker).

48f. Non ego... carmen: *A Virg. Ecl.* 3.26f. *non tu in triviis, indocte, solebas* | *stridenti miserum stipula disperdere carmen?*.

49. popello: *C* Hor. *Epist.* 1.7.65; *Pers. Sat.* 4.15, 6.50.

50. omnibus omnia: *C* Lucr. *DRN* 1.172*, 2.337*, 340*, 694*, 724*, 1112*, 5.233*; *Man. Astr.* 1.215 omnibus* omnia* signa. *D* Vulg. *I Cor.* 9.22 omnibus omnia factus sum, ut omnes facerem salvos.

52. Lemniadi: *C* Ov. *Her.* 6.53 Lemniades, 139 Lemniadum; *Stat. Theb.* 5.29 Lemnias, 106 Lemniades, 131 Lemnia, 446 Lemniadum etc.

54. Ecastor: *C* Plaut. *Amph.* 508, 537, 663 etc.; *Ter. Andr.* 486; *Phorm.* 1050; *Hec.* 611 etc.

54f. dissolvere linguam... *Bathos:* *B* Petr. *Buc.* 2.22 vix sicco vocem pulmone revulsi. *C* Ov. *Ib.* 586 ut laesus lingua Battus ab ipse sua.

57. quid non fecit Olympus?: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.35 quid non faciebat Amyntas?.

59. me fervor adurit: *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 1.133f. meo positura quietem | fervori, 7.136f. his ergo tuo postremo medebor | fervori.

60. Phyllim: cf. 1. 39. *seu forte Lupiscam:* *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.18 latrante Lycisca. *C* Hor. *Ep.* 11.24 amor Lycisci. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 7.8 Lupiscus; 8.2 vel forte* Lupisca*, 27, 32 etc. Cf. 6.162.

61. per umbras: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 2.693*, 6.452*, 461*, 490*, 619*, 12.864*, 881*; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 3.31*, 7.459*, 8.717; *Ov. Am.* 1.8.13*, *Ars Am.* 3.387*; *Stat. Theb.* 1.94*, 2.350*, 4.372* etc. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 3.4*, 8.786*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 1.69*, 2.31*, 52*, 9.40*, 164*, 10.144 traxisse per* umbras*, 12.61*, 13.87*, 14.44* (cf. 1.69).

62. magna quidem: *C* Ov. *Her.* 16.19 praemia magna* quidem.

63. Meonius pastor: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 4.215f. Paris... Maeonia... mitra. *Tonantis:* *C* Ov. *Met.* 1.170*, 2.466 magni matrona Tonantis*, 11.198, *Fast.* 6.33 matrona Tonantis*.

64. sub quercubus altis: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 8.616 sub... quercu; *Ps.-Virg. Cat.* 9.17 sub... quercus. *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 3.5*, *Bucc.* 3.13*.

67. Minciadem: *B* Giov. Virg. *Ecl. ad Muss.* 27. *D* Giov. Virg. *Ep.* 5. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 14.160, 167. *Silvanus:* *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.24, *G.* 1.20, 2.494; *Calp. Ecl.* 2.28; *Nemes. Ecl.* 2.56. *B* Petr. *Buc.* 10. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 8.600; *Hor. Carm.* 3.29.23, *Epod.* 2.22, *Epist.* 2.1.143 etc.

67f. Sorgia... Vallis... per devia Clause: *D* Petr. *Ryf.* 135.92f. sotto un gran sasso | in una chiusa valle, ond'esce Sorga, 305.9 mira 'l gran sasso, donde Sorga nasce, *Ep. Metr.* 1.4.14 Clausa... Vallem, 6.168 Clausa sub Valle, 3.1.33 etc.

68. per devia: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 1.7*. *C* Stat. *Theb.* 5.248f.*, *Silv.* 3.1.75*. *D* Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 1.4.34, 6.218 per* devia* soli. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.9 per* devia* solum, 3.110, 8.97*, 10.131*, 162, 15.127.

69f. sedere sub umbra | ylicis antique: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 6.54 ilice sub nigra, 7.1 sub arguta consederat ilice Daphnis; *Calp. Ecl.* 2.12 umbrosa... sub ilice, 3.27 et puero comitata sub ilice cantat, 6.60 sub ilice Musae. *B* Petr. *Buc.* 12.6 gelidaque sub ilicis umbra. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 6.208f. opaca | ilice*, 8.43 sub ilicibus, 11.851 opacaque ilice; *Hor. Epod.* 2.23 libet iacere modo sub antiqua ilice; *Ov. Her.* 4.97 sub ilicibus, *Met.* 9.665 nigraque sub ilice. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 1.74f. sub umbra | ylicis argute consedit, 8.149 ylice sub prisca, 14.134 sub ylice mensam, 16.101f. consedimus... ylice* sub viridi (cf. 1.74).

70f. fronde virenti... esculea: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 6.206 fronde virere nova; *Ov. Met.* 1.449 aesculeae capiebat frondis honorem, 11.27f. vatemque petunt et fronde* virentes* | coniciunt thyrsos. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 9.110f. patiere virenti | fronde duces vatesque simul sacra tempora cingant. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 1.2 tenera... fronde* virentes*, 64f. fronte... esculea, 6.3 esculeas... corollas, 68 esculeo... cortice rastro.

72. super ethera: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.379 fama super* aethera* notus; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 1.678*; *Ov. Fast.* 3.347*.

73f. tacitus mediis vepretibus altis: *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 1.63f. tacitus* meditans sub rupe sedebam.

74. Gethe: *C* Ter. *Phor., Ad. Geta;* *Hor. Carm.* 3.24.11 rigidi Getae; *Ov. Tr.* 3.10.5-6 fera gens, *Bessique Getaeque, | quam non ingenio nomina digna meo; 5.10.38 et rident stolidi verba Latina Getae.*

75. undique saxis: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 8.233*.

76. vocibus et calamis: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.48 nec calamis solum aequiperas, sed voce magistrum. *B* Giov. Virg. *Ecl. ad Muss.* 186 clarisona fama calamis et voce profundum. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 9.22 et calamum et vocem tribuit mentemque poete. *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 3.121 vocibus* aut calamo*, *Bucc.* 3.78 vocibus* aut calamis* (cf. l. 188). **super astra ferebant:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.52 Daphnin ad astra feremus. *B* Petr. *Buc.* 1.102 fert super astra. *C* Stat. *Theb.* 6.93. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 2.187 nomenque Italum super* astra* levabit, 3.142 iuvenem super* astra* levabat, 4.103 fama virum super astra levans, 5.632; *Ep. Metr.* 1.6.17*.

78. novos... furores: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 5.670 quis furor iste novus?; *Ps.-Virg. Cir.* 130 novo*... furore*. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 7.134 novos* infundere amores.

79. captus: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 6.10 captus amore. *C* Virg. *G.* 3.285 capti... amore, *Aen.* 12.392 captus amore; *Ov. Am.* 2.17.15f. amore... capta, 3.2.40, *Her.* 1.76, 15.63 etc.; *Sen. HO* 372.

82. Nam gestu... deam... fateris: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.405 et vera incessu patuit dea; *Prop.* 3.3.77-8 e quarum numero me contigit una dearum/ (ut reor a facie, Calliopea fuit).

88. tanta tibi reverentia: *C* Mart. *Epigr.* 11.5.1 tanta tibi... reverentia. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 9.242 tanta* est reverentia* lauri.

89. Phyllis: cf. l. 39. **Delia:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 7.29. *C* Ps.-Virg. *Cul.* 110, *Priap.* 75.6; *Ov. Her.* 4.40, 20.95, *Met.* 5.639, *Fast.* 5.537, *Pont.* 4.14.57; *Stat. Theb.* 2.243, 3.201, 9.627; *Claud. De rapt. Pros.* 2.206, 3.285. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.112, 14.13.

90. pulcherrima virgo: *C* Ov. *Met.* 9.9*.

91. venit ad aures: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 2.81f. per-venit* ad* auris*... nomen, 119*; *Ov. Ars Am.* 2.449, *Met.* 5.256, 7.694 per-venit* ad* aures* etc.

92. Iovis inclita proles: *C* Ov. *Met.* 9.229*.

93. castalii nemoris: *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 5.125 Castalios... nemorumque recessus; *Sen. Oed.* 276 frondifera sanctae nemora Castaliae, 712 Castalium nemus. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 8.100f. silvas... castalias*. **nemoris custos... sonori:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 9.405 nemorum Latonia custos; *Hor. Carm.* 3.22.1 montium custos nemorumque, virgo; *Stat. Theb.* 4.34 o nemoris regina sonori, | Calliope; *Mart. Epigr.* 8.40.2 rari nemoris, Priape, custos. *D* Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 2.11.3 fontisque* sonori*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 14.119 nemoris* custos* regina canori | Caliope.

96. Minciades... Silvanus: cf. l. 67. **grandisque... in antro:** *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 1.54 antrum grande, 12.96 grandisque... in antro.

97. silvas resonare doces: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.5 resonare doces... silvas.

98. sacri... pectoris: *C* *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 9.255 erupere ducis sacro de pectore voces, 561f. tua pectora sacra | voce reple; *Stat. Theb.* 8.181 quanta sacra sub pectore virtus!.

100. celsum... Nyse: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 6.805 celso Nysae de vertice. *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 5.27 vertice Nyse, 9.119f. Nyse | culmina, *Bucc.* 3.76 Nyse... summa.

101. gorgonei... fontis: *C* *Prop. Eleg.* 3.3.32 Gorgoneo... lacu.

102. sydereos oculos: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 11.82 *sidereosque oculos*. *C* Ov. *Am.* 2.16.44 *oculos, sidera nostra, tuos*, *Met.* 1.499 *sideribus similes oculos. faciemque serenam*: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 1.80 *facieque* serena**; *Phaedr. Fab. Aes.* 4.18.4 *faciem ad serenam*.

103. bubulcis: *B* Dante-Giov. *Virg. Ecl.* 3.30 *audiat in silvis et te cantare bubulcum**; Petr. *Buc.* 5.141 *audieram veteres narrare bubulcos**, 9.71*. *C* Ov. *Tr.* 3.12.30, *Pont.* 4.7.10; *Juv. Sat.* 7.116*, 11.151*; *Mart. Epigr.* 10.7.5; *Auson. Epigr.* 55.3*. *E* *Bocc. Buc.* 2.102*, 3.98*, 4.88* etc.

104. laurea sarta: cf. l. 12. *laurea... tegunt... frontis honeste*: *C* Ov. *Fast.* 2.26 *ramo, qui caesus ab arbore pura | casta sacerdotum tempora fronde tegit*. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 6.54f. *Mirra pudore | frondibus ora tegens*.

106. Pyrides: *A* *Virg. Ecl.* 3.85*, 6.13, 8.63, 9.33*, 10.72*. *C* *Ps.-Virg. Cir.* 94*; *Hor. Carm.* 4.8.20; *Ov. Ars Am.* 3.548, *Fast.* 2.269, 6.798f., *Tr.* 3.2.3 etc.; *Juv. Sat.* 4.36*. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 7.500, *Ep. Metr.* 1.6.168. *E* *Bocc. Carm.* 9.108*. **pulcher Apollo:** *A* *Calp. Ecl.* 4.57 *pulcher... Apollo**. *C* *Virg. Aen.* 3.119*.

109. Hec... meditatur: *A* *Calp. Ecl.* 4.17 *haec* eadem nobis frater meditatur* Amyntas*.

110. Plutarci: *E* *Bocc. Buc.* 10.25, 14.99 (= *Plutonis*).

112. lucosque sub undis: *C* *Virg. Aen.* 7.81f. *oracula Fauni... lucosque* sub* alta... Albunea*; *Ov. Met.* 1.301 *sub aqua lucos*.

113. Phorcini dumque choros: *C* *Virg. Aen.* 5.240 *Phorcique chorus*; *Stat. Silv.* 2.2.19 *Phorci chorus*.

114. elysios colles: *C* *Virg. G.* 1.38 *Elysios*... campos*, *Aen.* 5.734f. *amoena piorum | concilia Elysium*que colo*; *Ov. Am.* 2.6.49 *colle sub Elysio**, 3.9.60 *in Elysia* valle*. *D* Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 2.16.45f. *Campis | Elysiis profugisque domus placidissima Musis*. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 11.224, 14.103, 158f., 165. **gramina leta:** *C* *Virg. G.* 2.525 *in gramine* laeto**.

115. et placidos... frondesque virentes: cf. ll. 69f. *placidaque... fronde virenti*.

116. avium cantus: *C* *Hor. Carm.* 3.1.20 *avium... cantus*; *Claud. in Ruf.* 1.214 *hic avium* cantus**, *labentis murmura rivi*. *D* Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 2.16.39 *hic avium* cantus* fontis cum murmure blandos*. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 15.190 *cantusque avium*. **sydera celi:** *A* *Nemes. Ecl.* 3.21 *sidera* caeli**. *C* *Virg. G.* 2.1, 4.58, *Aen.* 1.259; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 4.521*; *Ov. Met.* 7.580*. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 8.220 *sydera* celi**.

118. et viridis... libri... ponit: *A* *Calp. Ecl.* 4.130 *et cantus viridante licet mihi condere libro. sub tegmine*: *A* *Virg. Ecl.* 1.1*. *C* *Virg. G.* 4.566*; *Ps.-Virg. Catal.* 9.17*; *Luc. Bel. Civ.* 7.499. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 8.136.

119. vulgus stolidum: *C* *Virg. Aen.* 1.149 *ignobile vulgus*; *Ps.-Virg. Aet.* 366 *nec te decipiant stolidi mendacia vulgi*.

120. auritos... asinos: *C* *Virg. G.* 1.308 *auritos*que... lepores*; *Ov. Am.* 2.7.15 *auritus... asellus*, *Ars Am.* 1.547 *aurito... asello*, *Fast.* 6.469 *auritis... asellis*. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 2.19 *auritos lepores*.

122. omnia turbaret: *C* *Virg. Aen.* 11.400f. *omnia magno | ne cessa turbare metu*; *Ov. Met.* 6.537 *omnia* turbasti*. **otia:** *A* *Virg. Ecl.* 1.6 *deus nobis haec otia* fecit*, 5.61 *amat bonus otia* Daphnis*. *B* Petr. *Buc.* 1.48, 6.28*, 118* etc. *C* *Virg. G.* 2.468 *latis otia* fundis*, 3.377, *Aen.* 4.271*, 6.813 etc. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 1.8 *fluminaque et colles et apricis otia* silvis*, 5.494*, 8.9*, 9.77* etc. *E* *Bocc. Carm.* 2.40*, 3.10, 7.51*, *Bucc.* 3.20, 10.54*, 13.1, 15.30*, 50*.

122f. dulci | pace: *E* *Bocc. Carm.* 9.145 *dulci... cum pace*.

124f. et quia quos querit frustra... flores: *C* Ov. Met. 5.554ff. an quia*, cum legeret vernos Proserpina flores.

124. lasciva puella: *A* Virg. Ecl. 3.64 malo me Galatea petit, lasciva* puella*. *C* Hor. Carm. 4.11.22f. puella | dives et lasciva; Ov. Her. 9.65, Ars Am. 1.523 lascivae... puellae*; Juv. Sat. 6.32 lascivae... puellae*; Mart. Epigr. 7.91.3 lascivis... puellis*, 9.67.1 lascivam... puellam*.

125. Chyroni: *C* Virg. G. 3.550 magistri... Chiron etc.; Ov. Fast. 5.379 nocte minus quarta promet sua sidera Chiron. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 10.3 auferat aut frondes Chyron.

126. vere novo: *A* Virg. Ecl. 10.74.

126f. se condidit antro... castissima: *C* Virg. Aen. 3.445f. virgo... antro seclusa.

127. sacros... castissima vultus: *C* Ov. Met. 5.563 virginei vultus; Mart. Epigr. 8.24.5 sacros... vultus.

128. Aracinto: *A* Virg. Ecl. 2.24 in Actaeo Aracyntho*. *C* Stat. Theb. 2.239. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 9.136 pulcherque Aracanthus*, 11.39 Aracynthum*.

130. ab arvis: *B* Petr. Buc. 10.176*. *C* Ov. Met. 1.313*, 8.585, Fast. 3.151* etc.; Stat. Theb. 6.753*. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 4.62*, 5.45*, 9.58*.

131. penos... leones: *A* Virg. Ecl. 5.27 Poenos... leones*.

132. Sat vidisse... semel: *C* Virg. Aen. 3.431f. quam semel informem vasto vidisse sub antro | Scyllam, 6.487 nec vidisse* semel satis est; Claud. Carm. Min. 53.94 nam satis est vidisse semel.

133. sic sanctum nimio contemnitur usu: *D* Vulg. Eccl. 9.16 sapientia pauperis contemnitur, et verba eius non sunt audita.

134. vultu... minaci: *B* Calp. Ecl. 4.1 vultuque... minaci*. *C* Luc. Bel. Civ. 2.509 vultu... minaci, 4.164 vultusque... minaces*, 238 vultus... minaces*; Stat. Silv. 5.2.116 vultu dextraque minacem*. *D* Petr. Afr. 7.836 vultuque minaci*.

141. soccos... coturnos: *C* Hor. Ars P. 80 hunc socci cepere pedem grandesque cothurni; Ov. Rem. Am. 375f. tragicos decet ira cothurnos: | usibus e mediis soccus habendus erit, Pont. 4.16.29f. Musaque Turrani tragicis innixa cothurnis | et tua cum socco Musa, Melisse, levi; Mart. Epigr. 8.3.13 an iuvat ad tragicos soccum transferre cothurnos.

143. facie ficta: *C* Luc. Bel. Civ. 6.737f. vultu | ficta.

145. syrenam: *C* Virg. Aen. 5.864 scopulos Sirenum; Hor. Serm. 2.3.14 inproba Siren. *E* Bocc. Carm. 9.78, Bucc. 5.26, 10.99.

148. porcā Cereri, Bacho... hyrcum: *C* Ov. Fast. 349 prima Ceres avidae gavisā est sanguine porcae, 359f. [caper] tibi deditus... Bacche.

150. per auras: *C* Virg. Aen. 4.226*, 270*, 357*, 378* etc. *D* Petr. Afr. 3.275*, 9.37*. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 8.15*, 9.183*.

153. merito dixere: *C* Mart. Epigr. 8.75 merito dici. **veterni:** *C* Stat. Theb. 6.94 nec solos hominum transgressa veterno* | fertur avos.

155. Ligurgo: *E* Bocc. Bucc. 8.65*, 70*, 11.181*.

156. rusticus... rudisque: *A* Virg. Ecl. 2.56 rusticus* es, Corydon; Calp. Ecl. 2.61 rusticus* est. *C* Ps.-Virg. Priap. 68.1ff. rusticus* indocte si quid dixisse videbor, | da veniam: libros non lego, poma lego. | sed rudis hic dominum totiens audire legentem | cogor Homereas edidicque notas.

- 157. raptas pecudes ex ore luporum:** *B* Giov. Virg. *Ecl. ad Muss.* 74 *portet lupo ore capellam.* *C* Mart. *Epigr.* 10.48.14 *haedus, inhumani raptus ab ore lupi.*
- 158. magnos... boatus:** *C* Ap. *Met.* 3.3.1 *amplo boatu.* *D* Petr. *Afr.* 8.165 *tantoque boatu*.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 4.122*, 8.89*, 13.51*.
- 159. qui... noscere causas:** *C* Virg. *G.* 2.490 *felix qui potuit rerum cog-noscere* causas*;* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 4.591 *nominis antiqui cupientem noscere* causas*.*
- 160. infecti pecoris:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.50 *nec mala vicini pecoris contagia laedent.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 14.98*. **fontes herbasque salubres:** *B* Petr. *Buc.* 8.16f. *nec pocula fontis | tuta, nec herbarum morsus sucique salubres**, 10.54f. *legit ille salubre | herbarum genus et pecori bonus applicat egro.*
- 161. mutare vices:** *C* Hor. *Carm.* 4.7.3 *mutat terra vices.*
- 162. superum sedes:** *C* Ps.-Virg. *Cir.* 204; Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 10.15. **voce superbi:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 7.544 *voce* superba*;* Stat. *Theb.* 11.360 *voce* superba*.*
- 165ff. agricolis... terram... rescindere aratro:** *C* Virg. *G.* 1.494 *agricola incurvo terram molitus aratro*, 2.513 *agricola incurvo terram dimovit aratro*.* **pastore... cogit virga pecudes in pascua:** *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 5.24 *sed non ante greges in pascua mitte reclusos;* Nemes. *Ecl.* 2.71 *qui mane boves in pascua duco.* *C* Virg. *G.* 3.322f. *aestas | in saltus utrumque gregem atque in pascua mittet;* Ps.-Virg. *Cul.* 108 *pastor pecudes cogeabat.*
- 168. ordine vites:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.73 *ordine* vitis*.*
- 169. lac premit:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.81 *pressi copia lactis.* *B* Petr. *Buc.* 10.34 *lacte premens.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 8.37 *lac* pressum*, 9.30 *lactisque premendi*, 14.138 *lacque... pressum*, 15.43 *lac*... pressare.*
- 172. Nullum... Erinis:** *C* Hor. *Sat.* 1.1ff. *ut nemo, quam sibi sortem... illa contentus vivat.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 4.61 *Erinis.*
- 173. seivique leones:** *C* Virg. *G.* 2.151f. *et saeva leonum* | semina*, *Aen.* 9.792 *saevum... leonem**; Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 9.947; Stat. *Theb.* 9.16; Mart. *Epigr.* 1.51.1 *saevos... leones**. *D* Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 3.5.85 *sevos... leones*.*
- 174. da... viam:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 10.421f. *da nunc... fortunam atque viam.*
- 175. scandere Parnasi:** *D* Petr. *Ep. Metr.* 1.3.1f. *per iuga Parnasi scandentem summa videbis | Eneam.*
- 176f. Turbavere... vestigia... viarum... et nemorum:** *C* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 8.4 *vestigia turbat | implicitasque errore vias. pavet ille fragorem | motorum ventis nemorum;* Ov. *Met.* 8.160f. *turbatque notas et lumina flexum | ducit in errorem variarum ambage viarum.*
- 179. velleris... fames:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.57 *auri sacra fames;* Val. Fl. *Arg.* 6.150 *velletis ardor. cura peculi:* *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.32*. *C* Hor. *Ars P.* 330*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 4.114.
- 180. per secula:** *B* Petr. *Buc.* 2.3. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.445*, 6.235*, 12.826* etc. *D* Muss. *Carm.* 3.29*, *Ep.* 1.63, 7.15; Petr. *Afr.* 1.456*, 2.167*, 3.240* etc. *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 5.30*, 9.83*, *Bucc.* 6.76*, 14.105*.
- 181. in terga redirent:** *C* Stat. *Theb.* 10.199 *in* terga* redimus*, 12.735 *in* terga* reducit.*
- 183f. nivosi... rupes... Lycae:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.15 *gelidi... saxa Lycae**. *C* Virg. *G.* 1.16 *nemus... patrium saltus-que* Lycae**, 3.2 *silvae amnesque Lycae;* Ov. *Met.* 1.217 *gelidi pineta Lycae**; Stat. *Theb.* 4.250 *gelidique... Lycae*.*
- 185. Omnia... superant... labores:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.69 *omnia vincit Amor.* *C* Virg. *G.* 1.145 *labor omnia vicit.*

187. Frustra sudavit: *C* Hor. *Ars P.* 241 *sudet multum frustraue labore.*

188. calamis et voce sonorus: cf. l. 76.

189. Mens illi... nec carminis ardor: *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 2.92 *carmina poscit amor nec fistula cedit amanti.* *B* Petr. *Buc.* 1.43 *nec cura, nec ardor.* *C* Ov. *Tr.* 4.10.37 *nec patiens corpus, nec mens fuit apta labori.*

192. Si tibi tantus amor fontis: *C* Virg. *G.* 2.301 *tantus amor terrae*, *Aen.* 2.10 *si tantus amor casus*, 6.131 *si tantus amor menti, si tanta cupido est*, 11.323 *si tantus amor*; Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.10 *si tantus amor scribendi te rapit*; Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 1.21 *si tantus amor belli tibi*, *Roma.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 3.65 *si* tibi* tantus* amor* silvarum.*

193. accipe consilium: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 9.88*. *C* Ov. *Rem. Am.* 292*.

195. inaccessum... culmen: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 1.8f. *quis vel inaccessum tanto sudore cacumen | montis adire iubet...?* *C* Virg. *Aen.* 8.195 *inaccessos*... lucos*; Stat. *Silv.* 5.5.6 *inaccesso... luco*; Achil. 1.599 *inaccessum*-que viris... antrum.*

196f. Silvanus... Minciadis: cf. l. 67.

196. nobis nec carior alter: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 8.79 *nec* carior* alter**. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 12.639 *quo non... mihi carior* alter**; Ps.-Virg. *Catal.* 4.3 *si te fuerit mihi carior* alter**; Ov. *Tr.* 3.6.3 *nec te mihi carior* alter**, 4.6.46 *qua nulla mihi carior.* *D* Petr. *Afr.* 5.504 *non carior* usquam.*

197. Opheltis: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 9.201 *non ita me genitor, bellis adsuetus Opheltes**; Ov. *Met.* 3.605 *sociorum primus Opheltes**; Stat. *Theb.* 4.729 *sacrum... Ophelten**, 748; *Silv.* 2.1.182. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.107*, 5.130, 9.66.

199. Hunc adeas: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.456 *quin adeas* vatem.*

202. si forte queam: *B* Petr. *Buc.* 1.46 *o! si forte queas.* *D* Petr. *Afr.* 1.46 *etsi forte queas.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 1.138, 10.149.

4. *Phyllostropos*

1. **Lusimus:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 6.1 *prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu.* *C* Ps.-Virg. *Cul.* 1ff. *lusimus**, Octavi, *gracili modulante Thalia... lusimus**: *haec propter culicis sint carmina docta.*
2. **sydusque malum:** *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 2.9.93 *sydusque malum.*
- 3f. **non cernis... frondes?:** *C* Hor. *Carm.* 1.9.1ff. *vides ut alta stet nive candidum | Soracte nec iam sustineant onus | silvae laborantes geluque | flumina constiterint acuto.*
3. **exitium pecori:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 3.101 *amor exitium pecori.*
5. **flavescere campos:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 4.28 *flavescet campus.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 5.105*.
6. **et cantu rauce... arbusta cicade:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.12f. *at mecum raucis... resonant arbusta* cicadis**; Nemes. *Ecl.* 1.2 *raucis... rura cicadis**. *C* Ps.-Virg. *Copa* 27 *nunc cantu crebro rumpunt arbusta* cicadae**; Virg. *G.* 3.328 *et* cantu* querulae rumpent arbusta* cicadae**.
8. **puer Yacintus erat, puer et Ciparissus:** *C* Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 2.131ff. *Hyacinthe... Narcissusque... nunc incluta germina veris, | praestantes olim pueros.* **Yacintus:** *C* Ov. *Met.* 162ff. **Ciparissus:** *C* Ov. *Met.* 10.106ff.
9. **pulcher Adonis:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.18 *formosus... Adonis**; Nemes. *Ecl.* 2.73*. *C* Ov. *Met.* 10.503ff.
10. **herus calidoni apri:** *C* Ov. *Met.* 8.324 *Calydonius heros (= Meleagrus).*
13. **Est mutanda... sedes:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.161 *mutandae sedes.*
16. **pascua tuta:** *B* Petr. *Buc.* 5.129.
17. **Hic gelidi fontes, hic pascua pingua:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.42 *hic* gelidi* fontes*, hic* mollia prata.* *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 2.3.54 *hic* nemus et gelidi fontes et mollia prata; Bucc.* 3.46.
- 19f. **glandifere... saltus...:** *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 3.72ff. *huc ades, et nostros timeas ne, Tityre, saltus, | namque fidem celsae concusso vertice* pinus | glandiferae*-que etiam quercusque arbusta dedere: | non hic insidiae, non hic iniuria, quantas | esse putas. non ipse mihi te fidis amanti?*
19. **glandifere quercus:** *C* Ov. *Met.* 12.328 *glandiferam* quercum**. **celse vertice pinus:** *B* Petr. *Buc.* 10.283 *celsoque virens in vertice* laurus.* *C* Catull. *Carm.* 64.1 *vertice pinus**; Virg. *Aen.* 3.679f. *cum vertice celso... quercus, 10.230 vertice pinus**. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 11.117 *celso et ydumeo descriptas vertice* leges.*
20. **saltus et lustra ferarum:** *C* Virg. *G.* 2.471 *saltus* ac lustra* ferarum**, *Aen.* 3.646f. *inter deserta ferarum | lustra.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.76 *lustra* ferarum**, 5.111.
- 21f. **Dissolvit... nives frondesque redibunt:** *C* Ov. *Fast.* 3.235ff. *quid, quod hiems adoperta gelu tum denique cedit, | et pereunt lapsae sole tepente nives, | arboribus redeunt detonsae frigore frondes.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 1.86f. *quas sordidus ulmis | abstulit autumnus cernis ver reddere frondes.*
23. **Hesperidum... poma:** *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 7.134*, 9.85, 14.181. **Crisis:** *C* Ter. *Andr.* (Chrysis). *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 3.127, 13.25, 55, 83.
25. **versuta:** *C* Ov. *Am.* 2.19.9 *versuta* Corinna.* **Dyones:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 9.47 *Dionaei... Caesaris*; Nemes. *Ecl.* 2.56. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.19; Hor. *Carm.* 2.1.39 *Dionaeo sub antro*; Ov. *Am.* 1.14.33, *Ars* 2.593, 3.3, 769, *Fast.* 2.461, 5.309. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 8.149, 13.30, 16.66, 69.

- 26. pedibus laqueos:** *C* Ov. *Met.* 15.473 *retia cum pedicis laqueosque artesque dolosas. vincula nectit*; *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 6.23 *quo vincula nectitis?*, 8.76 *Veneris dic vincula* necto**.
- 28. Daphnim:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.26, 3.12, 5.20, 25, 27 etc., 7.1, 7, 8.68, 72, 76 etc., 9.46, 50; *Calp. Ec.* 2.94. *C* Ov. *Ars* 1.732, *Met.* 4.277. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 7 [= Charles IV], 9.74 [= Julius Caesar], 143, 147 [= Charles IV], 13 [= poet type], 14.70 [= mythic Daphnis]. **Argum:** cf. 6.8.
- 29. cognosces lacrimans:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.470 *agnoscit lacrimans**.
- 30. Quid tandem:** *C* Plaut. *Asin.* 928. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 3.31, 52*, 9.130*. **Sunt ocia nobis:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.6 *deus nobis haec otia* fecit*.
- 32f. humentem... avis:** *C* Ps.-Virg. *Moret.* 1f. *iam nox hibernas bis quinque peregerat horas | excubitorque diem cantu praedixerat ales*. *E* Bocc. *Com. Ninf. Fior.* 35 *e già l'uccello escubitore col suo canto avea dati segnali del venuto giorno*.
- 35. per invia:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.537 *perque invia* saxa*; *Stat. Theb.* 12.232 *per et invia* saxa*. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.14*.
- 36. tectusque galero:** *C* Ps.-Virg. *Moret.* 120*; Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 1.78*.
- 38. nunc terga... nunc pectora:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 5.586 *nunc terga... nunc spicula*.
- 40. Veniet sed mitior estas:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 7.47f. *iam venit aestas* | torrida*; *Man. Astr.* 4.152 *mitior aestas**.
- 43. lac... pressare:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.81 *pressi... lactis*.
- 44f. fluvioque lutosos... purgare greges:** *C* Virg. *G.* 1.272 *balantumque gregem fluvio mersare salubri*.
- 47. Nam tibi parta... requies:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.495 *vobis parta quies*, 7.598 *nam* mihi parta* quies*.
- 48. validas nemorum superare securibus ulmos:** *C* Virg. *G.* 2.367f. *inde ubi iam validis amplexae stirpibus ulmos* | exierint, tum stringe comas, tum bracchia tonde*.
- 49. terram vertere:** *C* Virg. *G.* 1.1f., 147.
- 52. insudare iocis:** *A* Calp. *Ecl.* 5.10 *insudare labori*.
- 53. fumant altaria:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 1.43 *C* Ov. *Her.* 1.25, *Fast.* 2.193.
- 60. sydera celo:** *C* Virg. *G.* 2.342 *sidera caelo**, *Aen.* 4.578*; *Ov. Tr.* 1.5.47 *tot mala sum passus, quot in aethere sidera lucent* (cf. 12.116).
- 61. Testantur... fagi:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.21 *vos coryli testes et flumina Nymphis*.
- 63. nudos... reliquit:** *C* Ov. *Am.* 2.9.14 *ossa mihi nuda relinquit amor*.
- 65. lupanar:** *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 9.153.
- 68. Auro... Pactoli tinxit harenas:** *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. *Ecl.* 4.53 *qui... Pactolida tinxit* arenam?*. *C* Virg. *Aen.* 10.142 *Pactolusque inrigat auro*; *Ov. Met.* 11.87f. *Pactolonque petit, quamvis non aureus illo | tempore nec caris erat invidiosus harenis*.
- 73. argolicis... missus ab antris:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 2.54 *Argolicas... latebras*, 10.799 *missus* ab* Argis*.
- 80. predo pregrandis:** *C* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 10.20f. *Pellaei proles... Philippi, | felix praedo*.
- 82. iaspide succis:** *C* Virg. *G.* 4.506 *ut gemma bibat*, *Aen.* 1.739 *et pleno se proluit auro*, 4.261 *iaspide* fulva*.
- 83. Dametam:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.37, 39, 3, 5.72.

88. pia... gremio Cibeles: *B* Petr. Buc. 2.79 *sacra Cibeles*. *C* Virg. Aen. 3.111 *mater... Cybeli*. *D* Petr. Afr. 3.232 *mater Cibeles*. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 14.53f. *Cibelisque sacrato... gremio*.

91. obscenos... amores: *C* Luc. Bel. Civ. 10.363 *obscenum*... amorem**. *D* Petr. Afr. 5.436 *obsceno*... amore**. *quercus has inter:* cf. 1.36.

92. me miserum: *C* Catull. Carm. 76.19*; Prop. El. 2.33b.35*, 3.23.19; Ov. Am. 1.1.25*, 1.4.59*, 2.5.8*, 2.17.8*, 3.2.69*, 3.11b.44*, Her. 20.133*, Ars 3.552*, 3.736* etc. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 7.127*, 8.20*.

92f. ab ubere natos | eripui: *A* Calp. Sic. Ecl. 3.67 *ad ubera* natos**. *B* Giov. Virg. Ecl. ad Muss. 127 *ubera* natis**. *C* Virg. G. 3.178 *ubera* natos**, Aen. 3.392 *circum ubera* nati**, 5.285 *sub ubere* nati**, 6.428 *ab* ubere* raptos*, 7.484 *ab* ubere* raptum*, 8.45 *circum ubera* nati**; Ov. Fast. 4.459 *ab* ubere* raptus*; Stat. Achil. 1.858 *leo, materno cum raptus ab ubere mores*; Mart. Epigr. 9.7.3 *ab* ubere* raptus*. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 8.107 *ab* ubere* natos**.

94. quotiens... palumbis: *A* Calp. Sic. Ecl. 3.76ff. *tibi saepe palumbes... misimus in gremium*.

95. cursuque pedum iaculisque: *C* Virg. Aen. 5.67f. *quique pedum cursu valet, et qui viribus audax | aut iaculo incedit melior*; Ov. Met. 10.570 *victa prius cursu. pedibus contendite mecum*.

97. pectore curas: *C* Virg. Aen. 1.227*, 4.448*, 5.701*; Luc. Bel. Civ. 1.272*, 3.52*. *E* Bocc. Bucc. 8.41*.

98. mentisque ruinam: *C* Ov. Her. 12.32 *illa fuit mentis prima ruina meae*.

99. blandam: *C* Ov. Am. 3.2.55 *blanda Venus*, 7.55; Ars am. 1.362 *blanda... Venus*. *sevam:* *A* Virg. Ecl. 8.47 *saevus Amor*. *C* Ov. Met. 1.453 *saeva Cupidinis ira*.

102. Tot mala, tot mestis... silvis: *C* Ov. Tr. 3.11.59 *tot mala sum fugiens tellure, tot aequore passus*.

103. Nysi crinem: *C* Virg. G. 1.404f. *apparet liquido sublimis in aere Nisus, | et pro purpureo poenas dat Scylla capillo*; Ov. Met. 8.8ff. *Nisus... crinis*.

104. Pasiphen tauro: *A* Virg. Ecl. 6.45ff. *et fortunatam, si numquam armenta fuissent, | Pasiphaen nivei solatur amore iuveni*. *C* Virg. Aen. 6.24f. *hic crudelis amor tauri... Pasiphae*; Ov. Her. 4.57 *Pasiphae mater, decepto subdita tauro*, Ars 1.295 *Pasiphae fieri gaudebat adultera tauri*, Rem. 63 *da mihi Pasiphaen, iam tauri ponet amorem*, Met. 8.136. *D* Dante Purg. 26.41f. *Ne la vacca entra Pasife, | perché 'l torello a sua lussuria corra*. **Miramque nefandis:** *C* Ov. Ars 1.285 *Myrrha patrem, sed non qua filia debet, amavit*, Met. 10.402ff. *Myrrha... nefas*. *D* Dante Inf. 30.37ff. *quell' è l'anima antica | di Mirra scellerata, che divenne | al padre, fuor del dritto amore, amica*.

105. ignibus incendit: *C* Virg. Aen. 1.658ff. *Cupido... donisque furem | incendat reginam atque ossibus implicet ignem*; Ov. Fasti 4.707f. *incendit... ignibus*.

105f. privavit vellere Phasim | quondam dyrceo: *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. Ecl. 4.1f. *velleribus Colchis... ferebant*. *C* Prop. El. 3.22.11 *Phasim**; Ov. Met. 7.1ff.; Luc. Bel. Civ. 2.591 *erepto vellere Colchi*; Mart. Epigr. 8.50.9 *Aeolio Thebani vellere Phrixi*. **dyrceo:** *A* Virg. Ecl. 2.24 *Amphion Dircaeus in Actaeo Aracyntho*. *C* Stat. Theb. 7.564 *Dircaea ad flumina*.

107. lumina turbavit: *C* Virg. Aen. 8.223 *turbatumque oculis*. **Mopso:** cf. 12.17. **Cyrcis:** *A* Virg. Ecl. 8.70 *carminibus Circe socios mutavit Vlix*. *C* Virg. Aen. 7.19f. *dea saeva... Circe*, 282 *daedala Circe*.

108. abstulit Alcidi clavam: *C* Ov. Her. 9.117 *instruxitque manum clava domitrice ferarum*, Fast. 2.325 *ipsa capit clavamque gravem*.

110. lacrimis credis: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 2.195f. *talibus insidiis periurique arte Sinonis | credita res, captique dolis lacrimisque coactis*; *Ov. Her.* 2.51 *credidimus lacrimis*.

111. pestes: cf. 1.136.

112. hostes pelle, precor, diros: *C* *Ov. Met.* 10.426 *ut excuteret diros, si posset, amores*; *Sen. Ph.* 165 *compesce amoris impii flammam, precor*.

113. pluvius dum surgat Orion: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.535 *adsurgens... nimbosus Orion**, 4.52 *dum... desaevit hiemps et aquosus Orion**; *Man. Astr.* 5.57f. *surgens... Orion*. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 10.1 *seu pluvias terris immittat Orion**.

114. Auribus ecce lupum teneo: *C* *Ter. Phorm.* 505 *auribus teneo lupum*.

118f. quisve nives... perferet...?: *B* *Petr. Buc.* 10.307f. *estus et frigora et imbres | assuetus perferre*. *C* *Ov. Am.* 1.9.15f. *quis* nisi vel miles vel amans et frigora noctis | et denso mixtas perferet imbre nives?*.

118. imbresque graves: *C* *Ov. Fast.* 2.300 *graves imbres et tolerare Notos*.

119. et ventos et duras etheris iras: *D* *Boeth. Cons.* 2.metr.4.18ff. *ventus... aetheris iras*.

122. Alcidas: cf. 1. 108 (Alcides). **Osyris:** *C* *Juv. Sat.* 8.29. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 7.104, 113, 11.118.

124. alma Dyones: *C* *Ov. Ars* 3.3 *alma Dione*, 3.769.

125. Trinos... Lipisque: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 6.274ff. *Luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae, | pallentesque habitant Morbi tristisque Senectus, | et Metus et malesuada Fames ac turpis Egestas*.

127. per devia: cf. 12.68.

128. Lipisque: *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 9.

129. in scotinas silvas: *D* *Dante Inf.* 1.2 *selva oscura*. **pastoris Averni:** *C* *Stat. Theb.* 4.457 *rektor Averni*.

132. pastor Epy: *B* *Petr. Buc.* 6.148, 205 [= Boniface VIII], 7 [= Clement VI]). **silvis... apricis:** *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 9.49 *apricis in collibus*; *Calp. Ecl.* 5.8 *in aprico... campo*. *B* *Petr.* 10.19. *C* Virg. *G.* 2.522 *in apricis... saxis*, *Aen.* 6.312 *terris apricis*; *Hor. Carm.* 3.18.2 *aprica rura*, *Ars* 162 *aprici... campi*. *D* *Petr. Afr.* 1.8. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 14.126f.

132. interitum... cunctis: *D* *Dante Inf.* 10.14f. *con Epicuro tutti suoi seguaci, | che l'anima col corpo morta fanno*.

134. sanusne satis?: *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 14.26 *sanusne satis sum?*.

134f. improba... dicta: *C* *Ov. Fast.* 5.686 *improba dicta Noti*.

137. romuleos... saltus: *B* *Petr. Buc.* 7.126 *romulei... saltus**.

137ff. mulcent pectine... ethereo: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 7.34 *aethera mulcebant cantu*.

139f. Soter... purgavit: *D* *Apoc.* 7.13 *et laverunt stolas suas, et dealbaverunt eas in sanguine Agni*. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 11.190 *purgentur vicio pecudes*, 14.98f. *sic priscas sordes, morbos scabiemque vetustam | infecti pecoris preclaro sanguine [Codrus] lavit*.

140f. in altum... letis sedibus uti: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 6.638f. *devenere locos laetos et amoena virecta | fortunatorum nemorum sedesque beatas*; *Hor. Carm.* 1.10.17f. *laetis... sedibus*. *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 14.108ff. *capros [Codrus] distinguet ab agnis, | hosque feris linquet, componet sedibus illos | perpetuis celoque novo*.

142. focos... typheos: *E* *Bocc. Bucc.* 11.91 *flammasque typheas*.

144. effugeres rupesque... scopulosque videre: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.58f. *iam mihi per rupes videor lucosque sonantis | ire.* *C* Virg. *G.* 3.253 *scopuli rupesque, Aen.* 3.272 *effugimus scopulos Ithacae; Ov. Met.* 3.226 *per rupes scopulosque.*

146. certa sinam, non certa sequar: *C* Ter. *Eun.* 61ff. *incerta haec si tu postules | ratione certa facere, nihilo plus agas | quam si des operam ut cum ratione insanias.*

147. Rapit omnia tempus: *A* Nemes. *Ecl.* 4.32 *omnia tempus alit, tempus rapit.* *B* Petr. *Buc.* 5.4f. *cuncta vorant anni volucres; domat omnia* tempus* | indomitum.* *C* Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 7.487 *rapit omnia casus.*

148. Amon vestit silvas, denudat Orion: *C* Ov. *Am.* 3.789 *corniger Ammon, Met.* 5.17, 15.309f. *medio tua, corniger Ammon, | unda die gelida est, ortuque obituque calescit.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 10.1f. *seu pluvias terris immittat Orion | aut Amon flores [cf. Bucc. 16.93 rusticus Amon (= Jupiter)].*

149. et sub sole cadit quicquid sub sole creatum est: *D* Vulg. *Eccl.* 1.10 *nihil sub sole novum.*

150. umbrasque perennes: *D* Dante *Purg.* 28.32 *ombra perpetua.*

152. Chyronis: cf. 12.125.

152. Arethusa: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 10.1 *C* Virg. *G.* 4.344, 351, *Aen.* 3.696; *Ov. Met.* 5.573ff. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 11.7.

155. Trax: *C* Juv. *Sat.* 3.79 *Thrax. canopus:* *C* Virg. *G.* 4.287f. *qua Pellaei gens fortunata Canopi | accolit effuso stagnantem flumine Nilum; Juv. Sat.* 1.26, 6.84, 15.46. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 7.114, 11.178, 13.49.

156. Surgit silva: *C* Virg. *Ecl.* 6.39 *silvae... surgere. celi sub cardine levo:* *C* Virg. *Aen.* 9.630f. *caeli genitor de parte serena | intonuit laevum; Ov. Ex Pont.* 2.10.45 *sub* cardine* mundi; Sen. HF* 1139f. *sub cardine | glacialis ursae. E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 5.35 *gelido sub* cardine* celi.*

157. et saxo... rubenti: *D* Vulg. *Apoc.* 21.19 *et fundamenta muri civitatis omni lapide pretioso ornata.*

158f. Presidet insignis magnusque... pastor: *D* Vulg. *Ap.* 21.3 *t audiivi vocem magnam de throno dicentem: Ecce tabernaculum Dei cum hominibus, et habitabit cum eis. E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 14.200f. *hac in gramineo summo sedet aggere grandis | Archesilas, servatque greges et temperat orbes.*

159f. emissos lambunt... liquores: *D* Vulg. *Num.* 20.10f. *de petra... egressae sunt aquae largissimae ita ut et populus biberet et iumenta.*

160. selecte pecudes pauce domitique iuveni: *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 14.185 *suntque boves taurique simul pingues-que* iuvence*.*

161ff. ac herbas... pingue: *D* Vulg. *Is.* 51.3 *et ponet desertum ejus quasi delicias, et solitudinem ejus quasi hortum Domini.*

165f. rapuisse iuencam | iamdudum: *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 10.143 *iamdudum pecudes rapuisse.*

168. pedibus calcasse: *C* Ov. *Am.* 3.11a.5 *pedibus calcamus amorem.*

169. carpendas porcis... iecisse: *D* Vulg. *Mat.* 7.6 *nolite dare sanctum canibus neque mittatis margaritas vestras ante porcos, ne forte conculcent eas pedibus suis et conversi dirumpant vos.*

170. vires irasque frementis: *E* Bocc. *Carm.* 2.3.174 *ira rabie-que* frementes*;* *Bucc.* 3.106 *ira rabie-que* frementes*.*

171. Praeterea... fecundas capras: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 2.40f. *praeterea duo nec tuta mihi valle reperti | capreoli, 10.77 saturae... capellae.*

172. scabieque geluque: *C* Virg. *G.* 3.441ff. *turpis ovis temptat scabies, ubi frigidus imber | altius ad vivum persedit et horrida cano | bruma gelu.* Cf. 12.30.

174. miserebitur ultro: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 2.145 *miserescimus ultro**; Ov. *Ars* 3.679*. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 5.238 *miserabitur ultro.*

175. si dicas peccasse: *D* Vulg. 1 Ioann. 1.9 *si confiteamur peccata nostra fidelis est et justus ut remittat nobis peccata et emundet nos ab omni iniquitate.*

176. Glaucus: *C* Ov. *Met.* 13.906ff.; *D* Dante *Par.* 1.67ff. **Amintas:** cf. 6 (*collocutores*) *Amintas* above. **Glaucus... magnus Amintas:** *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 11.10f. *sociatus Aminta* | Glaucus.*

179. scandunt... culmina montis: *C* Stat. *Theb.* 3.633 *secreta ad culmina* montis**, 11.319 *ad insani scandebat culmina* montis**.

180. leta... pascua: *C* Virg. 6.638f. *devenere locos laetos et amoena virecta | fortunatorum nemorum sedesque beatas, 744 laeta arva;* Ov. *Fast.* 4.476 *pascua laeta;* Sen. *HF* 743f. *vel caelum petit | vel laeta felix nemoris Elysii loca;* Mart. *Epigr.* 12.52.11 *loca laeta piorum.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 10.85f. *leta... pascua,* 14.191 *leta... loca.*

182. non ibi... mulcet: *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 14.190ff. *ver ibi perpetuum nullis offenditur austris... mors ibi nulla manet gregibus, non egra senectus, | atque graves absunt cure maciesque dolorque... dulcisono resonat cantu mitissimus aer.*

184. dira lues: cf. 1.26.

187ff. nymphasque, deas dryadesque... Satyros... et faunos: *C* Ov. *Met.* 1.192ff. *sunt mihi semidei, sunt, rustica numina, nymphae | faunisque satyrique et monticolae silvani; | quos quoniam caeli nondum dignamur honore;* Ps.-Virg. *Culex* 116 *et Satyri Dryadesque.*

190f. cantusque avium... florumque: *C* Hor. *Carm.* 3.1.20 *avium citharaeque cantus;* Ov. *Met.* 10.261 *et parvas volucres et flores mille colorum.*

192. sibilus auri: *B* Dante-Giov. Virg. 4.38 *sibilus... non venit ad aures**. *D* Vulg. 1 Reg. 19.12 *sibilus aurae.* *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 3.117*, 13.20 *sibilus* aure**.

194f. Archades... conscendere culmen: *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 12.195f. *solus inaccessum potuit conscendere culmen | nuper Silvanus.*

196. nova lux oculis venit: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 9.110 *hic primum nova lux oculis offulsit, 731 nova lux oculis effulsit.*

197. putre solum: *C* Virg. *G.* 2.204; Stat. *Th.* 7.811. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 2.90.

200. Pales: *A* Virg. *Ecl.* 5.35; Calp. *Ecl.* 2.36, 5.35, 7.22. *C* Virg. *G.* 3.1, 294; Ps.-Virg. *Cul.* 20, 77; Ov. *Fast.* 4.722f., 863; Stat. *Theb.* 6.111. *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 6.47 *leta Pales,* 9.192 *sacra Pales,* 16.30 *alma Pales* [= Virgin Mary]. **supplex tua numina posco:** *C* Virg. *Aen.* 1.666 *et supplex* tua* numina* posco**. *D* Petr. *Afr.* 5.81f. *per numina supplex | cunta, precor, 6.627 omnia numina supplex | deprecor.*

201. da veniam... Theoschyre: *C* Ov. *Ars* 2.38 *da veniam coepto, Iuppiter alte, meo;* Met. 11.132 *da veniam, Lenae pater! peccavimus.*

203. infectosque greges: cf. 1. 139f. **silvasque remotas:** *E* Bocc. *Bucc.* 14.170 *est in secessu... mons.*

204. duras fregisse catenas: *C* Ov. *Am.* 1.6.1 *dura religate catena, 47 in me durae transite catenae.*

207. obicibus fractis: *C* Virg. *G.* 2.480 *obicibus ruptis.*

209. reddito teque tibi: cf. 1.19.

211. iter durum: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 6.688; Luc. *Bel. Civ.* 9.385 *durum iter*.

212. deficient vires: *C* Hor. *Sat.* 2.1.12f. *vires* | *deficiunt*; Ov. *Pont.* 3.4.79 *ut desint vires, tamen est laudanda voluntas*.

215. obscene... volucres: *C* Virg. *Aen.* 3.241 *obscenas* pelagi ferro foedare volucris*, 262 *sive deae seu sint dirae obscenaque volucres* [= Harpies], 12.876 *obscae* volucres*.

217f. Vires prestabit... Soter: *D* Vulg. *Is.* 40.29 [*Deus*] *dat lasso virtutem et his qui non sunt fortitudinem et robur multiplicat*, 31 *qui autem sperant in Domino mutabunt fortitudinem*.

219. Tu primus summito callem: *D* Dante *Purg.* 4.22f. *che non era la calla onde saline* | *lo duca mio, e io appresso, soli*.

221. ex syrio... palmas: *C* Virg. *G.* 3.12 *Idumaeas... palmas**.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary bibliography

ALAN OF LILLE. (2013). *Literary works*, edited and translated by W. Wetherbee. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

ALIGHIERI, D. (1991–97). *Commedia*, 3 vols., edited by A. M. Chiavacci Leonardi. Milan: Mondadori.

_____. (2017). *Convivio*, translated by A. Frisardi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (1979). *Dante's Rime*, translated by P. S. Diehl. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

_____. (2012). *Epistole; Ecloge; Questio de situ et forma aque et terre*, edited by M. Pastore Stocchi. Rome: Antenore.

_____. (1966-7). *La Commedia secondo l'antica vulgata*, edited by G. Petrocchi, 4 vols. Milan: Mondadori.

_____. (1970-5). *The Divine Comedy*, translated with a commentary by C. S. Singleton. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

_____; DEL VIRGILIO, G. (2016). *Egloge*, edited by M. Petoletti; in D. Alighieri, *Le Opere*, edited by M. Baglio, L. Azzetta, M. Petoletti, and M. Rinaldi, vol. 5. Rome: Salerno: 489–650.

_____; DEL VIRGILIO, G. (1985). *Egloghe*, edited by G. Brugnoli, and R. Scarcia. Milan: Naples: Riccardo Ricciardi Editore.

ANONYMOUS. (1973). *Deeds of famous men (De viris illustribus)*, edited by W. K. Sheeran. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

AQUINAS, T. (2006). *Summa theologiae*, 61 vols., edited by T. Gilby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ARISTOTLE. (2019). *Nicomachean ethics*, 3rd ed., edited by T. Irwin. Indianapolis; Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.

AUGUSTINE. (1991). *Confessions*, translated with an introduction and notes by H. Chadwick. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (1995). *Confessions, Books 1-4*, edited by G. Clark. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____. (2014). *Confessions, Books 1-8*, edited and translated by C. J.-B. Hammond. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. (2001). *De bono coniugali and De sancta virginitate*, edited by P. Walsh. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (1996). *De doctrina Christiana*, edited by R. P. H. Green. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

BOCCACCIO, G. (1974). *Amorosa visione; Ninfale fiesolano; Trattatello in laude di Dante*, edited by V. Branca, A. Balduino, and P. G. Ricci; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 3. Milan: Mondadori.

_____. (1956). *Boccaccio on poetry: being the preface and the fourteenth and fifteenth books of Boccaccio's Genealogia deorum gentilium in an English version*, translation and introduction by C. Osgood. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- _____. (2009). *Boccaccio's expositions on Dante's Comedy*, translation and commentary by M. Papio. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
- _____. (1994). *Buccolicum carmen*, edited by G. P. Perini; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 5/2. Milan: Mondadori, 689–1085.
- _____. (forthcoming). *Buccolicum carmen*, translated by J. Houston and S. Huskey. Cambridge, MA: I Tatti Renaissance Library, Harvard University Press.
- _____. (1992). *Carmina*, edited by G. Velli; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 5/1. Milan: Mondadori, 375–492.
- _____. (1994). *Corbaccio*, edited by G. Padoan; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 5/1. Milan: Mondadori.
- _____. (1976). *Decameron*, edited by V. Branca; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 4. Milan: Mondadori.
- _____. (1983). *De casibus virorum illustrium*, edited by P. G. Ricci, and V. Zaccaria; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*. Milan: Mondadori.
- _____. (1998). *De montibus, silvis, fontibus, lacubus, fluminibus, stagnis seu paludibus et de diversis nominibus maris*, edited by M. P. Stocchi; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vols. 7-8/2. Milan: Mondadori, 1815–2149.
- _____. (1967). *De mulieribus claris*, edited by V. Zaccaria; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 10. Milan: Mondadori.
- _____. (1991). *Diana's Hunt/ Caccia di Diana: Boccaccio's first fiction*, edited and translated by A. K. Cassell, and V. Kirkham. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- _____. (1987). *Eclogues*, translated by J. L. Smarr. New York: Garland Pub.
- _____. (1992). *Epistole e lettere*, edited by G. Auzzas; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 5/1. Milan: Mondadori, 493–856.
- _____. (1965). *Esposizioni sopra la Comedia di Dante*, edited by G. Padoan; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 7. Milan: Mondadori.
- _____. (1914). *Il Buccolicum Carmen*, edited by G. Lidonnici. Città di Castello: Casa Editrice S. Lapi.
- _____. (1967). *Filocolo*, edited by A. E. Quaglio; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 1. Milan: Mondadori, 45–675.
- _____. (1964). *Filostrato; Teseida delle nozze d'Emilia; Comedia delle ninfe florentine*, edited by V. Branca, A. Limentani, and A. E. Quaglio; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 3. Milan: Mondadori.
- _____. (1998). *Genealogie deorum gentilium*, edited by V. Zaccaria; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vols. 7-8. Milan: Mondadori.
- _____. (2011). *Genealogy of the pagan gods*, Books 1-5, edited and translated by J. Solomon. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- _____. (1877). *Le lettere edite e inedite di Messer Giovanni Boccaccio*, edited by F. Corazzini. Florence: Sansoni.
- _____. (1928). *Opere latine minori: Buccolicum carmen; Carminum et epistolarum quae supersunt; Scripta breviora*, edited by A. F. Massèra. Bari: G. Laterza & Figli.

_____. (1992). *Rime*, edited by V. Branca; in *Tutte le opere di G. Boccaccio*, vol. 5/1. Milan: Mondadori, 1–374.

_____. (2015). *Teseida delle nozze d'Emilia*, critical edition by E. Agostinelli, and W. Coleman. Florence: Edizione del Galluzzo.

_____. (2010). *The Latin eclogues*, translated by D. R. Slavitt. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

_____. (1992). *Vite di Petrarca, Pier Damiani e Livio*, edited by R. Fabbri; in V. Branca (ed.), *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 5/1. Milan: Mondadori, 879–962.

BOETHIUS. (2008). *The consolation of philosophy*, translated by D. R. Slavitt. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

CICERO, M. T. (2014). *De officiis*, edited and translated by W. Miller. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. (2014). *De senectute; De amicitia; De divinatione*; edited and translated by W. A. Falconer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. (2002). *Cicero on the emotions: Tusculan disputations 3 and 4*, edited by M. R. Graver. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. (2014). *Tusculan disputations*, translated by J. E. King. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

CORTESIUS, P. (1979). *De hominibus doctis*, edited by G. Ferraù. Messina: Università degli Studi di Messina.

FESTUS, S. P. (1975). *Sexti Pompei Festi de verborum significatione quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*, edited by K. O. Müller. Hildesheim (repr.): Olms.

GARROD, H. W. (ed., 1912). *The Oxford book of Latin verse: from the earliest fragments to the end of the Vth century A.D.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

HARDIE, C. (ed., 1966). *Vitae Vergilianae antiquae: vita Donati, vita Servii, vita Probiana, vita Focae, S. Hieronymi excerpta*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

HORACE. (1970). *Odes, Book I*, edited by R. G. M. Nisbet, and M. Hubbard. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____. (2017). *Odes, Book II*, edited by S. Harrison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

_____. (2014). *Odes and Epodes*, edited and translated by N. Rudd. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. (2014). *Satires, Epistles and Ars poetica*, translated by H. R. Fairclough. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

HUGH, S.-V. (1991). *The Didascalicon of Hugh of St. Victor: a medieval guide to the arts*. New York: Columbia University Press.

ISIDORE OF SEVILLE. (1911). *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, edited by W. M. Lindsay. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2012). *Le livre des nombres (Liber numerorum)*, edited and translated by J.-Y. Guillaumin. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

_____. (2006). *The etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, edited by S. A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, J. A. Beach, and O. Berghof. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- JOHN OF GARLAND. (1974). *The Parisiana Poetria of John of Garland*, edited and translated by T. Lawler. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- JUSTINUS, M. J. (2010). *Epitoma historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- JUVENAL (2004), *Satires*; in *Juvenal and Persius*, edited by S. M. Braund. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- LUCAN. (2009). *De bello ciuili, Book I*, edited by P. A. Roche. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MACROBIUS, A. A. T. (2014). *Saturnalia*, edited and translated by R. A. Kaster. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- MANETTI, G. (2003). *Biographical writings*, edited and translated by S. U. Baldassarri, and R. Bagemihl. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- MARTIAL. (2004). *Epigrams, Book Two*, edited with introduction, translation and commentary by C. A. Williams. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MAXIMUS, V. (2000). *Memorable doings and sayings*, edited and translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- Nova Vulgata Bibliorum Sacrorum editio, editio typica altera* (1998). Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- OVID. (2016). *Amores (Book I)*, edited by W. Turpin. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
- _____. (1987-1998). *Amores: text, prolegomena and commentary, in four volumes*, edited by J. C. McKeown. Liverpool; Wolfboro: F. Cairns.
- _____. (2003). *Ars amatoria, Book 3*, edited by R. K. Gibson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1977). *Heroides and Amores*, translated by G. Showerman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- _____. (1979). *The art of love, and other poems*, edited and translated by J. H. Mozley, and revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- _____. (2014). *Tristia; Ex ponto*, edited by G. P. Goold; translated by A. L. Wheeler. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina* (1844-1891), edited by J. P. Migne. Paris: Migne.
- PETER DAMIAN. (1989–2005). *Fathers of the Church (medieval continuation): The Letters of Peter Damian*, edited and translated by O. Blum and I. Resnick, 6 vols. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.
- PETRARCH, F. (1974). *Bucolicum carmen*, translated and annotated by T. G. Bergin. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- _____. (2004). *Canzoniere*, edited by M. Santagata. Milan: Mondadori.
- _____. (1964). *De viris illustribus*, edited by G. Martellotti. Florence: Sansoni.
- _____. (2003). *Invectives*, edited and translated by D. Marsh. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- _____. (1968). *Laurea occidens: Bucolicum carmen X*, edited and translated by G. Martellotti. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.

- _____. (1974). *Le familiari, libri I-XI*, edited by U. Dotti. Urbino: Argalia.
- _____. (1991-94). *Le familiari*, 3 vols., introduction, translation, and notes by U. Dotti. Rome: Archivio Guido Izzi.
- _____. (2002–2015). *Lettres familières = Rerum familiarium*, 6 vols., edited by U. Dotti, translated by A. Longpré, F. La Brasca, C. Carraud, and A. Ph. Segonds. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- _____. (1976). *Le senili*, edited by G. Martellotti, translated by G. Fracassetti. Turin: Einaudi.
- _____. (2016). *My secret book*, edited and translated by N. Mann. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- _____. (1991). *Remedies for fortune fair and foul: a modern English translation of De remediis utriusque fortune*, with a commentary by C. H. Rawski, 5 vols. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- _____. (2006-14). *Res seniles*, 3 vols., edited by S. Rizzo, with the collaboration of M. Berté. Florence: Casa Editrice Le Lettere.
- _____. (1993). *Secretum*, introduction, translation and notes by U. Dotti. Rome: Archivio Guido Izzi.
- _____. (1998). *Senile V 2*, introduction, text and translation by M. Berté. Florence: Le Lettere.
- _____. (1968). *Triumphus*; in G. Ponte (ed.), *Francesco Petrarca: Opere*. Milan: U. Mursia & C.
- PLATO. (1914). *Euthyphro; Apology; Crito; Phaedo; Phaedrus*, translated by H. N. Fowler. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- PROPERTIUS, S. (1999). *Elegies*, edited and translated by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- SENECA. (2014). *Epistles*, translated by R. M. Gummere. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- SERVIUS. (1881). *In Vergilii carmina comentarii*, edited by G. Thilo and H. Hagen. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- SPENSER, E. (1989). *The Yale edition of the shorter poems of Edmund Spenser*, edited by W. A. Oram. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.
- VIRGIL. (2016). *Aeneid, 4.1-299: Latin text, study questions, commentary and interpretive essays*, edited by I. Gildenhard. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.
- _____. (2014). *Aeneid 6: a commentary*, edited by N. Horsfall. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.
- _____. (2000). *Aeneid 7: a commentary*, edited by N. Horsfall. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (2001). *Aeneid 7-12; Appendix Vergiliana*, translated by H. R. Fairclough; revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- _____. (2012). *Aeneid, Book 12*, edited by R. J. Tarrant. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (2014). *Bucoliques*, edited by E. de Saint-Denis, translated by A. Videau, with an introduction, commentary and notes by H. Casanova-Robin. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- _____. (1994). *Eclogues*, with an introduction and commentary by W. Clausen. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- _____. (1977). *Eclogues*, edited by R. Coleman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1999). *Eclogues; Georgics; Aeneid 1-6*, translated by H. R. Fairclough; revised by G. P. Goold. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- _____. (1988). *Georgics*, 2 vols., edited by R. F. Thomas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (2017). *Le Bucoliche*, translated by A. Traina, with an introduction and commentary by A. Cucchiarelli. Rome: Carocci Editore.

Secondary bibliography

- ADAMS, J. N. (1984). "Female speech in Latin comedy", in *Antichthon* 18: 43–77.
- AKBARI, S. C. (2004). *Seeing through the veil: optical theory and medieval allegory*. Toronto; London: University of Toronto Press.
- ALPERS, P. J. (1996). *What is pastoral?*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ALTER, R. (2011). *The art of biblical narrative*, revised and updated. New York: Basic Books.
- ANDREI, F. (2017). *Boccaccio the philosopher: an epistemology of the Decameron*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- ARMSTRONG, G.; DANIELS, R.; MILNER, S. J. (2015). "Chronology", in *The Cambridge companion to Boccaccio*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, xxix–xxxv.
- ASARO, B. (2013). "Boccaccio's Francescas: comparing *Inferno* V and the tale of Nastagio degli Onesti (*Dec.* V.8)", in *Women in hell: Francesca da Rimini & friends between sin, virtue, and heroism/ Donne all'inferno: Francesca da Rimini & Co. tra peccato, virtù ed eroismi*. Giornate Internazionali Francesca da Rimini. Atti del convegno, 85–93.
- BAKHTIN, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, translated by C. Emerson. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
- BALDUINO, A. (1964). "Tradizione canterina e tonalità popolareggianti nel *Ninfale fiesolano*", in *Studi sul Boccaccio* 2: 25–80.
- BALOT, R. (2001). "Aristotle's critique of Phaleas: justice, equality, and pleonexia", in *Hermes* 129: 32–44.
- BARANSKI, Z. G. (2020) "Boccaccio and Epicurus: from Epy to Tito and Gisippo", in *Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio: literature, doctrine, reality*. Cambridge: Legenda, 528–40.
- _____. (2004). "'Per similitudine di abito scientifico': Dante, Cavalcanti and the sources of medieval 'philosophical' poetry", in P. Antonello, S. Gilson (eds.), *Science and literature in Italian culture from Dante to Calvino: a Festschrift for Patrick Boyde*. Oxford: Legenda, 14–52.
- _____. (2007). "The ethics of ignorance: Petrarch's Epicurus and Averroës and the structures of the *De sui ipsius et multorum ignorantia*", in M. McLaughlin, L. Panizza, and P. Hainsworth (eds.), *Petrarch in Britain: Interpreters, Imitators, and Translators over 700 years*. Oxford: British Academy, 40–59.
- BARCHIESI, A. (1997). "Otto punti su una mappa dei naufragi", in *MD* 39: 209–26.

- BAROLINI, T. (2017). "A Cavalcantian *Vita nuova*: Dante's Canzoni *Lo doloroso amor che mi conduce* and *E' m'incresce di me sì duramente*", in M. Kilgour, E. Lombardi (eds.), *Dantean dialogues*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 41–65.
- _____. (1987). "Arachne, Argus, and St. John: transgressive art in Dante and Ovid", in *Mediaevalia* 13: 207–26.
- _____. (1984). *Dante's poets*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (2018a). "Inferno 5: What's love got to do with it? Love and free will", in *Commento Baroliniano, Digital Dante*. New York: Columbia University Libraries.
- _____. (2018b). "Inferno 7: Aristotle and wealth, with a note on Cecco d'Ascoli", in *Commento Baroliniano, Digital Dante*. New York: Columbia University Libraries.
- _____. (2018c). "Inferno 10: love in Hell", in *Commento Baroliniano, Digital Dante*. New York: Columbia University Libraries.
- _____. (2018d). "Inferno 12: Cupidigia/Tirannia", in *Commento Baroliniano, Digital Dante*. New York: Columbia University Libraries.
- _____. (2014a). "Paradiso 8: eros and astral influence", in *Commento Baroliniano, Digital Dante*. New York: Columbia University Libraries.
- _____. (2014b). "Purgatorio 11: After 1000 Years?", in *Commento Baroliniano, Digital Dante*. New York: Columbia University Libraries.
- _____. (2014c). "Purgatorio 19: epistemological incontinence", in *Commento Baroliniano, Digital Dante*. New York: Columbia University Libraries.
- _____. (2014d). "Purgatorio 21: *De Amicitia*", in *Commento Baroliniano, Digital Dante*. New York: Columbia University Libraries.
- _____. (2014e). "Purgatorio 28: the loss of springtime", in *Commento Baroliniano, Digital Dante*. New York: Columbia University Libraries.
- _____. (1992). *The undivine Comedy: detheologizing Dante*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1983). "The wheel of the *Decameron*", in *Romance Philology* 36: 521–39.
- BARON, H. (1985). *Petrarch's Secretum: its making and its meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America.
- BARSELLA, S. (2004). "Myth of Prometheus in Giovanni Boccaccio's *Decameron*", in *MLN* 119/1: S120–S141.
- _____. (2013). "Tyranny and obedience: a political reading of the tale of Gualtieri (*Dec.* X, 10)", in *Italianistica* 42/2: 67–77.
- BARTHES, R. (1977). "The death of the author", in *Image, music, text*, translated by S. Heath. London: Fontana, 142–54.
- BATES, C. (2013). *Masculinity and the hunt: Wyatt to Spenser*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- BATSTONE, W. (2006). "Provocation: the point of reception theory", in C. Martindale, R. F. Thomas (eds.), *Classics and the uses of reception*. Oxford: Blackwell, 14–20.
- BATTAGLIA RICCI, L. (1987). *Ragionare nel giardino: Boccaccio e i cicli pittorici del Trionfo della Morte*. Rome: Salerno.

- BAUER, W.; DANKER, F. W. (2000-02). *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*, 3rd. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- BAUSI, F. (2002). “Il *mechanicus* che scrive libri. Per un nuovo commento alle *Invective contra medicum* di Francesco Petrarca”, in *Rinascimento* 42: 67–111.
- BERGIN, T. G. (1981). *Boccaccio*. New York: Viking Press.
- BILLANOVICH, G. (1947). *Petrarca letterato. I: Lo scrittoio del Petrarca*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- _____. (1947). *Restauri boccacceschi*. Rome: Edizione di storia e letteratura.
- _____. (1958). “*Veterum vestigia vatium* nei carmi dei preumanisti padovani”, in *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 1: 155–243.
- BISHOP, C. (2018). “*Pessimus omnium poeta*: canonization and the ancient reception of Cicero’s poetry”, in *Illinois Classical Studies* 43/1: 137–59.
- BITTO, G.; GAULY, B. M. (eds., 2021). *Auf der Suche nach Autofiktion in der antiken Literatur*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.
- BLACK, R. (2011). “Boccaccio, reader of the *Appendix Vergiliana*: the Miscellanea Laurenziana and fourteenth-century schoolbooks”, in *Studies in Renaissance humanism and politics: Florence and Arezzo*. Farnham: Ashgate Variorum, 113–28.
- _____. (2001). *Humanism and education in medieval and Renaissance Italy: tradition and innovation in Latin schools from the twelfth to the fifteenth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1991). “The curriculum of Italian elementary and grammar schools, 1350-1500”, in D. R. Kelley, R. H. Popkin (eds.), *The shapes of knowledge from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*. Dordrecht; London: Kluwer Academic, 137–63.
- BLOCH, R. H. (1991). *Medieval misogyny and the invention of Western romantic love*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
- BLOEMENDAL, J.; NORLAND, H. (eds., 2013). *Neo-Latin drama and theatre in Early Modern Europe*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- BOYLE, M. O. R. (1991). *Petrarch’s genius: pentimento and prophecy*. Berkeley; Oxford: University of California Press.
- BRADEN, G. (2010). “Classical love elegy in the Renaissance (and after)”, in K. Weisman (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the elegy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 153–69.
- BRAGANTINI, R. (2018). “Petrarch, Boccaccio, and the space of vernacular literature”, in I. Candido (ed.), *Petrarch and Boccaccio: the unity of knowledge in the pre-modern world*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 313–39.
- BRANCA, V. (1977). *Giovanni Boccaccio: profilo biografico*. Florence: G. C. Sansoni Editore.
- _____. (1983). *Poliziano e l’umanesimo della parola*. Turin: Einaudi.
- BREUER, U. (2019). “Confessions”, in M. Wagner-Egelhaaf (ed.), *Handbook of autobiography/ autofiction*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 520–31.
- BROWN, K. (2020). “Monna Piccarda, Ciutazza, and the Provost of Fiesole: an absence of beauty (VIII.4)”, in W. Robins (ed.), *The Decameron Eighth Day in Perspective*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 89–107.

- BRUCKER, G. A. (1962). *Florentine politics and society, 1343-1378*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- BRUNI, F. (1990). *Boccaccio: l'invenzione della letteratura mezzana*. Bologna: Mulino.
- BRYSON, M.; MOVSESIAN, A. (2017). "The ladder of love in Italian poetry and prose, and the reactions of the sixteenth-century sonneteers", in *Love and its critics: from the Song of Songs to Shakespeare and Milton's Eden*. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 295–351.
- BUFANO, A.; SAROLI, G. R. (1970). "Numero", in U. Bosco (ed.), *Enciclopedia dantesca* (online). Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, Fondata da Giovanni Treccani.
- BURROW, C. (2019). *Imitating authors: Plato to futurity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CANDIDO, I. (2018). *Petrarch and Boccaccio: the unity of knowledge in the pre-modern world*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter
- CANETTI, L. (2011). "Boccaccio teologo: poesia e verità alla fine del Medioevo", in *Intersezioni*, vol. 31/2: 179–95.
- CAMPER, J. M. (2013). "The stylistic virtues of clarity and obscurity in Augustine of Hippo's *De doctrina christiana*", in *Advances in the History of Rhetoric* 16/1: 58–81.
- CARDINI, R.; COPPINI, D. (eds., 2004). *Petrarca e Agostino*. Rome: Bulzoni.
- CARRARA, E. (1900). "Un peccato del Boccaccio", in *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 36: 123–30.
- CASANOVA-ROBIN, H. (2017). "De la libération des passions à la spiritualité: l'églogue *Phylostropos* (Boccace, *Bucolicum Carmen*, XV)", in H. Casanova-Robin, S. G. Longo, F. La Brasca (eds.), *Boccace humaniste latin*. Paris: Garnier, 323–48.
- CASELL, A. K. (1970). "The crow of the fable and the *Corbaccio*: a suggestion for the title", in *Modern Language Notes* 85: 83–91.
- CASTAGNA, L. (1976). *I bucolici latini minori: una ricerca di critica testuale*. Florence: Olschki.
- CASTEEN, E. (2015). *From she-wolf to martyr: the reign and disputed reputation of Johanna I of Naples*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press.
- _____. (2018). "On she-wolves and famous women: Boccaccio, politics, and the Neapolitan court", in O. Holmes, D. E. Stewart (eds.), *Reconsidering Boccaccio: medieval contexts and global intertexts*. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 219–45.
- CHAMPEAUX, J. (1979). *Fortuna : recherches sur le culte de la Fortune à Rome et dans le monde romain des origines à la mort de César* (doctoral thesis). Paris: Université de Paris-Sorbonne.
- CHAMPLIN, E. (1978). "The life and times of Calpurnius Siculus", in *The Journal of Roman Studies* 68: 95–110.
- CHANG, K. E. (2013). *The community, the individual and the common good: Τὸ 'Ἰδὼν and Τὸ Συμδέεον in the Greco-Roman world and Paul*. London: Bloomsbury.
- CHENEY, P.; DE ARMAS, F. A. (2002). *European literary careers: the author from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
- CHWALEK, B. (1990). "Elegische Interpretationen zu Vergils Zehnter Ekloge", in *Gymnasium* 97: 304–20.

CIAVOLELLA, M. (1970). "La tradizione dell'*aegritudo amoris* nel *Decameron*", in *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* 147/460: 496–517.

CIOFFARI, V. (1940). "The conception of Fortune in the *Decameron*", in *Italica* 17/4: 129–37.

_____. (1947). "The function of Fortune in Dante, Boccaccio and Machiavelli", in *Italica* 24/1: 1–13.

CLARKE, K. P. (2015). "Humility and the (p)arts of art: *Inferno* X, *Purgatorio* X, and *Paradiso* X", in G. Corbett, H. Webb (eds.), *Vertical readings in Dante's Comedy*, vol. 1. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 203–21.

_____. (2008). "Reading/writing Griselda: a fourteenth-century response (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, MS Plut. 42,1)", in M. Carr, K. P. Clarke, M. Nievergelt (eds.), *On allegory: some medieval aspects and approaches*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 183–208.

COLONNA, V. (2004). *Autofiction & autres mythomanies littéraires*. Auch: Tristram.

COMBS-SCHILLING, J. D. (2012). *Pastoral at the boundaries: the hybridization of genre in the fourteenth-century Italian eclogue revival* (doctoral dissertation). Berkeley: University of California.

_____. (2015). "Tityrus in limbo: figures of the author in Dante's *Eclogues*", in *Dante Studies* 133: 1–26.

_____. (2019). "Under the cover of a green-hued book: Boccaccio's pastoral project", in M. Eisner, D. Lummus (eds.), *A Boccaccian Renaissance: essays on the early modern impact of Giovanni Boccaccio and his works*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 94–111.

CONSTANTINI, A. M. (1974). "Studi sullo Zibaldone Magliabechiano II: Il florilegio Seneciano", in *Studi sul Boccaccio* 8: 79–126.

CONTE, G. B. (2014). *Dell'imitazione: furto e originalità*. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale.

_____. (1994). *Genres and readers: Lucretius, love elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia*, translated by G. W. Most. Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

_____. (1984). *Il genere e i suoi confini: cinque studi sulla poesia di Virgilio*. Turin: Garzanti.

_____. (1994). *Latin literature: a history*, translated by J. B. Solodow; revised by D. Fowler and G. W. Most. Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins University.

_____. (2013). *Ope ingenii: experiences of textual criticism*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

_____. (2017). *Stealing the club from Hercules: on imitation in Latin poetry*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

_____. (1986). *The rhetoric of imitation: genre and poetic memory in Virgil and other Latin poets*. Ithaca: Cornell University.

COOPER, H. (1977). *Pastoral: mediaeval into Renaissance*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer; Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield.

COPPINI, D. (2004). "Petrarca, i Salmi e il codice Parigino Latino 1994 delle *Enarrationes* di Agostino", in R. Cardini, D. Coppini (eds.), *Petrarca e Agostino*. Rome: Bulzoni, 19–38.

CORTI, M. (1981). *Dante a un nuovo crocevia*. Florence: Sansoni.

CRESCINI, V. (1887). *Contributo agli studi sul Boccaccio; con documenti inediti*. Turin: E. Loescher.

CURSI, M. (2013). *La scrittura e i libri di Giovanni Boccaccio*. Rome: Viella.

- CURTIUS, E. R. (1990). *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- DANIELS, R. (2018). "Reading Boccaccio's paratexts: dedications as thresholds between worlds", in O. Holmes, D. E. Stewart (eds.), *Reconsidering Boccaccio: medieval contexts and global intertexts*. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 48–80.
- _____. (2011). "Rethinking the critical history of the *Decameron*: Boccaccio's *Epistle XXII* to Mainardo Cavalcanti", in *The Modern Language Review* 106/2: 423–47.
- DAVIDSON, G.; EVANS, N. (2015). *Literary careers in the modern era*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- DAVIS, P. J. (2012). "Reception of elegy in Augustan and post-Augustan poetry", in B. K. Gold (ed.), *A companion to Roman love elegy*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 441–58.
- _____. (1987). "Structure and meaning in the *Eclogues* of Calpurnius Siculus", in *Ramus* 16/1-2: 32–54.
- DE BLASI, N. (1993). "La prosa", in F. Brioschi, C. Girolamo (eds.), *Manuale di letteratura italiana: storia per generi e problemi*, vol. 1. Turin: Bollati Boringhieri Editore, 262–81.
- DELVIGO, M. L. (2014). "Ut ait Servius: l'auctoritas del commentatore virgiliano nelle *Genealogie* di Boccaccio", in A. Ferracin, M. Venier (eds.), *Giovanni Boccaccio: tradizione, interpretazione e fortuna. In ricordo di Vittore Branca*. Udine: Forum, 133–43.
- DENEIRE, T. (2014). "Editing neo-Latin texts: editorial principles; spelling and punctuation", in P. Ford, J. Bloemendal, C. Fantazzi (eds.), *Brill's Encyclopaedia of the Neo-Latin World*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 959–62.
- DE RACHEWILTZ, S. W. (1983). *De Sirenibus: an inquiry into Sirens from Homer to Shakespeare* (doctoral thesis). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- DÍAZ, S. E. (2018). "Authority and misogamy in Boccaccio's *Trattatello in laude di Dante*", in O. Holmes, D. E. Stewart (eds.), *Reconsidering Boccaccio: medieval contexts and global intertexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 164–88.
- _____. (2019). "Age, virility and vernacularity: Boccaccio's portraits of the artists as young men", in *Italian Studies* 74/3: 225–41.
- DOUBROVSKY, S. (1977). *Fils: roman*. Paris: Éditions Galilée.
- _____; LECARME, J.; LEJEUNE, P. (1993). *Autofictions & cie*. Nanterre: Université Paris X-Nanterre.
- DOUGLAS, R. M. (1969). "Talent and vocation in humanist and protestant thought", in T. K. Rabb, J. E. Seigel (eds.), *Action and conviction in early modern Europe: essays in honor of E. H. Harbison*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 261–98.
- DREW, D. L. (1922). "Virgil's fifth eclogue: a defence of the Julius Caesar-Daphnis theory", in *The Classical Quarterly* 16/2: 57–64.
- DURLING, R.; MARTINEZ, R. L. (1990). *Time and the crystal: studies in Dante's Rime petrose*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- ECO, U. (1992). *Interpretation and overinterpretation*, edited by S. Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1990). *The limits of interpretation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- EDMUNDS, L. (2001). *Intertextuality and the reading of Roman poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- EISNER, M. (2013). *Boccaccio and the invention of Italian literature: Dante, Petrarch, Cavalcanti, and the authority of the vernacular*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (2017). “A singular Boccaccio: defending poetry in the *Decameron* and the *Genealogie*”, in *Quaderni d’Italianistica* 38/2: 179–99.
- ELOMAA, H. E. (2015). *The poetics of the Carmina Priapea* (doctoral thesis). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- ENENKEL, K. (2018). “Sacra solitudo: Petrarch’s authorship and the *locus sacer*”, in I. Candido (ed.), *Petrarch and Boccaccio: the unity of knowledge in the pre-modern world*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 52–64.
- _____; JONG-CRANE, B.; LIEBREGTS, P. Th. M. G. (eds., 1998). *Modelling the individual: biography and portrait in the Renaissance; with a critical edition of Petrarch’s Letter to posterity*. Amsterdam; Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.
- FABRES-SERRIS, J. (2018). “Love and death in Propertius 1.10, 1.13 and 2.15: Poetic and polemical games with Lucretius, Gallus and Virgil”, in S. Frangoulidis, S. Harrison (eds.), *Life, love and death in Latin poetry, studies in honor of Theodore D. Papanghelidis*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 37–50.
- FACCHINI, B. (2020). “Lucan and Virgil: from Dante to Petrarch (and Boccaccio)”, in *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 27: 1–22.
- FAEDRICH, A. (2016). “Autoficção: um percurso teórico”, in *Revista Criação & Crítica* 17: 30–46.
- FALKEID, U. (2012). “Petrarch’s Laura and the Critics”, in *MLN* 127/1: S64–S71.
- FANTUZZI, M. (2003). “Pastoral love and ‘elegiac’ love, from Greece to Rome”, in *Leeds International Classical Studies* 2/3: 1–11.
- FARRELL, J. (2019). “Virgil’s intertextual *personae*”, in C. Martindale, F. Mac Góráin (eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Virgil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 299–325.
- FENG, A. (2017). *Writing beloveds: Humanist Petrarchism and the politics of gender*. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press.
- FERRAÚ, G. (1970). “Zanobi da Strada”, in U. Bosco (ed.), *Enciclopedia dantesca* (online). Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, Fondata da Giovanni Treccani.
- FINAZZI, S. (2013). “Le postille di Boccaccio a Terenzio”, in *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica*, 54: 81–133.
- FITZGERALD, B. (2017). *Inspiration and authority in the Middle Ages: prophets and their critics from scholasticism to humanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FITZGERALD, W. (1996). “Labor and laborer in Latin poetry, the case of the *Moretum*”, in *Arethusa* 29/3: 389–418.
- FONSECA Jr., A. O. (2020a). “Allusions to Virgil in Boccaccio’s *Epistole*”, in S. Zamponi (ed.), *Boccaccio e dintorni/Intorno a Boccaccio 2018*. Florence: University of Florence Press: 117–28.
- _____. (2016a). *Olympia de Giovanni Boccaccio: gêneros e memória poética virgiliana* (Master’s dissertation). Campinas: IEL/Unicamp.
- _____. (2020b). “Realidade, ficção e autoficção na *Bucólica* 10 de Virgílio”, in *PhaoS* 20: 1–22.
- _____. (2016b). “What the Mincian did not sing: Boccaccio’s *Olympia* and Virgil’s *Aeneid* 6”, in *New Voices in Classical Reception Studies* 11: 1–15.

- FONTENROSE, J. (1943). "The garden of Phoebus", in *The American Journal of Philology*, 64/3: 278–85.
- FORD, P.; TAYLOR, A. (2006). "Introduction: neo-Latin and the pastoral", in *CRCL* 33/1–2: 5–16.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1969). "Qu'est-ce qu'un auteur?", in *Bulletin de la Société Française de Philosophie*, 63/3: 73–104.
- _____. (1997). "Technologies of the self," in *Ethics: subjectivity and truth*, edited by P. Rabinow, translated by R. Hurley. New York: The New Press, 223–51.
- FOURNIER, É. (2017). "The vandal conquest of North Africa: the origins of a historiographical persona", in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 68/4: 687–718.
- FOWLER, D. (2000). "On the shoulders of giants: Intertextuality and classical studies", in *Roman constructions: readings in postmodern Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 115–37.
- _____. (1997). "The Virgil commentary of Servius", in C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Virgil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 73–8.
- FRECCERO, J. (1986). *Dante: the poetics of conversion*, edited with an introduction by R. Jacoff. Cambridge, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- FREUD, S. (1974). *Introductory lectures on psychoanalysis*, translated by J. Strachey. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- FREUDENBURG, K. (1993). *The walking muse: Horace on the theory of satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- FULKERSON, L. (2002). "Writing yourself to death: strategies of (mis)reading in *Heroides* 2", in *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 48: 145–65.
- GACA, K. L. (2014). "Early Christian sexuality", in T. K. Hubbard (ed.), *A companion to Greek and Roman sexualities*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 558–73.
- GAGLIARDI, A. (1999). *Giovanni Boccaccio: poeta, filosofo, averroista*. Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino.
- GAGLIARDI, P. (2011). "Fortuna in Vergilio", in *QUCC* 126: 61–87.
- GALLAVOTTI, C. (1947). "Sulla vita e la leggenda di Saffo", in *Saffo e Alceo: testimonianze e frammenti*. Naples: Libreria Scientifica Editrice, 27–52.
- GAMBERA, D. (2006). "Women and walls: Boccaccio's *Teseida* and the edifice of Dante's poetry", in T. C. Stillinger, F. R. Psaki (eds.), *Boccaccio and feminist criticism*. Chapel Hill: Annali d'Italianistica, 39–68.
- GARBATY, T. J. (1967). "Pamphilus, de Amore: an introduction and translation", in *The Chaucer Review* 2/2: 108–34.
- GARIN, E. (1960). "La cultura fiorentina nella seconda metà del 300 e i 'barbari britanni'", in *La Rassegna delle letterature italiana*, 64/7: 181–95.
- GARVER, V. L. (2005). "The influence of monastic ideals upon Carolingian conceptions of childhood", in A. Classen (ed.), *Childhood in the middle ages and the Renaissance: the results of a paradigm shift in the history of mentality*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 67–86.
- GASPARINI, P. (2004). *Est-il je? : roman autobiographique et autofiction*. Paris: Seuil.
- GAVINELLI, S. (2006). "The reception of Propertius in Late Antiquity and neo-Latin and Renaissance literature", in H.-C. Günter (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Propertius*. Leiden: Brill, 397–415.

- GEE, E. (2013). "Cicero's poetry", in C. Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Cicero*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 88–106.
- GENETTE, G. (1993). *Fiction & diction*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press.
- GEROSA, P. P. (1966). *Umanesimo cristiano del Petrarca: influenza agostiniana, attinenze medievali*. Turin: Bottega d'Erasmus.
- GIANFERRARI, F. (2017). *Dante and thirteenth-century Latin education: reading the auctores minores* (doctoral thesis). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame.
- GIANNETTO, N. (1983). "Il motivo dell'amata incanutita nelle rime di Petrarca e Boccaccio", in *Miscellanea di studi in onore di Vittore Branca, II: Boccaccio e dintorni*. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 23–49.
- GILL, M. J. (2004). *Augustine in the Italian Renaissance: art and philosophy from Petrarch to Michelangelo*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- GILSON, É. (1980). *History of Christian philosophy in the Middle Ages*. London: Sheed and Ward.
- _____. (1964). "Poésie et vérité dans la *Genealogia* de Boccace", in *Studi sul Boccaccio* 2: 253–82.
- GILSON, S. (2000). *Medieval optics and theories of light in the works of Dante*. Lewiston: E. Mellen Press.
- _____. (2013). "Modes of reading in Boccaccio's *Esposizioni sopra la Comedia*", in P. Nasti, C. Rossignoli (eds.), *Interpreting Dante: essays on the traditions of Dante commentary*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 250–82.
- GITTES (2008). *Boccaccio's naked muse: eros, culture, and the mythopoeic imagination*. Toronto; London: University of Toronto Press.
- GLARE, P. G. W. (2012). *Oxford Latin dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GOLDSCHMIDT, N. (2019). *Afterlives of the Roman poets: biofiction and the reception of Latin poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GORDON, W. (1968). *Tradition and originality in Roman poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- GRANT, W. L. (1965). *Neo-Latin literature and the pastoral*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- GREEN, P. (1982). "Carmen et error: πρόφασις and αἰτία in the matter of Ovid's exile", in *Classical Antiquity* 1/2: 202–20.
- GREENBLATT, S. (2005). *Renaissance self-fashioning: from More to Shakespeare*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
- GREENE, E. (ed. 1996). *Re-reading Sappho: reception and transmission*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- GREENE, T. M. (1986). "Petrarch viator", in *The vulnerable text: essays on Renaissance literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 18–45.
- GREENFIELD, C. C. (1981). *Humanist and scholastic poetics, 1250-1500*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.
- GREG, W. W. (1905). *Pastoral poetry and pastoral drama: a literary enquiry with special reference to the Pre-Restoration stage in England*. London: A. H. Bullen.
- GROSS, K. E. (2005). "Virgilian hauntings in Boccaccio's *De casibus virorum illustrium*", in P. M. Clogon (ed.), *Reengaging history*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 15–40.

- GUST, G. W. (2009). *Constructing Chaucer: author and autofiction in the critical tradition*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- GUY-BRAY, S. (2002). *Homoerotic space: the poetics of loss in Renaissance literature*. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press.
- HADOT, P. (1995). *Philosophy as a way of life*, edited by A. L. Davidson, translated by M. Chase. Oxford: Blackwell.
- HAINSWORTH, P. R. J. (1979). "The myth of Daphne in the *Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*", in *Italian Studies* 34/1: 28–44.
- HANKINS, J. (2019). "Boccaccio and the political thought of Renaissance humanism", in M. Eisner, D. Lummus (eds.), *A Boccaccian Renaissance: essays on the early modern impact of Giovanni Boccaccio and his works*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 3–35.
- HANNAH, D. (2016). "The ravenous wolf: the apostle Paul and Genesis 49.27 in the Early Church", in *New Testament Studies* 62/4: 610–27.
- HARDIE, P. (2007). "Lucretius and later Latin literature in Antiquity", in S. Gillespie, P. Hardie (eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Lucretius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 111–28.
- _____. (1999). "Ovid into Laura: absent presences in the *Metamorphoses* and Petrarch's *Rime sparse*", in P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, S. Hinds (eds.), *Ovidian transformations: essays on Ovid's Metamorphoses and its reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 254–70.
- _____. (2013). "Redeeming the text, reception studies, and the Renaissance", in *Classical Receptions Journal*, 5/2: 190–8.
- _____. (2012). *Rumour and renown: representations of fama in Western literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1986). *Virgil's Aeneid: cosmos and imperium*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____; MOORE, H. (eds., 2010). *Classical literary careers and their reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HARRISON, E. L. (1973). "Why did Venus wear boots? Some reflections on *Aeneid* 1.314f.", in *PVS* 12: 10–24.
- HARRISON, S. J. (2007). *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (1995). "Horace, Pindar, Iullus Antonius, and Augustus: *Odes* 4. 2", in *Homage to Horace: a bimillenary celebration*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 108–27.
- _____. (2015). "Vergil's metapoetic katabasis: the underworld of *Aeneid* 6 and the history of epic", in H-C. Günther (ed.), *Virgilian Studies: a miscellany dedicated to the memory of Mario Geymonat*. Nordhausen: Verlag Traugott Bautz, 169–94.
- HAUVETTE, H. (1896). "Sulla cronologia delle egloghe latine del Boccaccio", in *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana* 28: 154–75.
- HECKER, O. (1902). *Boccaccio-Funde: Stücke aus der bislang verschollenen Bibliothek des Dichters darunter von seiner Hand geschriebenes Fremdes und Eigenes*. Braunschweig: G. Westermann.
- HELGERSON, R. (1983). *Self-crowned laureates: Spenser, Jonson, Milton, and the literary system*. Berkeley; London: University of California Press.
- HERREN, M. (2007). "Reflections on the meaning of the *Ecloga Theoduli*: where is the authorial voice?", in W. Otten, K. Pollmann (eds.), *Poetry and exegesis in premodern Latin*

- christianity: the encounter between classical and Christian strategies of interpretation*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 199–230.
- HEXTER, R. (2002). “Ovid in the Middle Ages: exile, mythographer, lover”, in B. W. Boyd (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Ovid*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 413–42.
- HINDS, S. (1998). *Allusion and intertext: dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HILL, T. (2004). *Ambitiosa mors: suicide and the self in Roman thought and literature*. New York; London: Routledge.
- HOLLANDER, R. (1988). *Boccaccio’s last fiction, Il Corbaccio*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- _____. (1977). *Boccaccio’s two Venuses*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- HOLMES, O. (2000). *Assembling the lyric self: authorship from Troubadour song to Italian poetry book*. Minneapolis; London: University of Minnesota Press.
- HOLZBERG, N. (ed. 2005). *Die Appendix Vergiliana: Pseudepigraphen im literarischen Kontext*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- HOPPER, V. F. (1938). *Medieval number symbolism, its sources, meaning, and influence on thought and expression*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- HORSFALL, N. (1993). “*Odoratum lauris nemus* (Virgil, *Aeneid* 6,658)”, in *SCI* 15: 156–8.
- HORTIS, A.; PILATO, L. (1879). *Studiij sulle opere latine del Boccaccio con particolare riguardo alla storia della erudizione nel medio evo e alle letterature straniere*. Trieste: J. Dase.
- HOUGHTON, L. B. T. (2019). *Virgil’s fourth Eclogue in the Italian Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HOUSTON, J. (2012). *Boccaccio at play in Petrarch’s pastoral world*, in *MLN*, 127/1: 47–53.
- _____. (2018). “Boccaccio on friendship (theory and practice)”, in O. Holmes, D. E. Stewart (eds.), *Reconsidering Boccaccio: medieval contexts and global intertexts*. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press, 81–97.
- _____. (2010). *Building a monument to Dante: Boccaccio as Dantista*. Toronto; Buffalo; London: University of Toronto Press.
- HOWARD, L. H. (2010). *Virgil the blind guide: marking the way through the Divine Comedy*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- HUBBARD, T. K. (1998). *The pipes of Pan: intertextuality and literary filiation in the pastoral tradition from Theocritus to Milton*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- _____; DOERFLER, M. (2014). “From asceticism to sexual renunciation”, in T. K. Hubbard (ed.), *A companion to Greek and Roman sexualities*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 168–87.
- HUNTER, R. (2019). “Notes on the ancient reception of Sappho”, in T. Thorsen, S. Harrison (eds.), *Roman Receptions of Sappho*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 45–60.
- HUTCHINSON, G. (2007). “The monster and the monologue: Polyphemus from Homer to Ovid”, in P. J. Finglass, C. Collard, N. J. Richardson (eds.), *Hesperos: studies in Ancient Greek poetry presented to M. L. West on his seventieth birthday*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 22–39.
- ILLIANO, A. (1991). *Per l’esegesi del Corbaccio*. Napoli: Federico & Ardia.
- JAL, P. (1963). *La guerre civile à Rome : étude littéraire et morale*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

- JULIANI, T. J. (2016). *Vestígios de Ovídio em Sobre as Mulheres Famosas (1361-1362) de Giovanni Boccaccio* (doctoral thesis). Campinas: IEL/Unicamp.
- KANIA, R. (2016). *Virgil's Eclogues and the art of fiction: a study of the poetic imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KARAKASIS, E. (2011). *Song exchange in Roman pastoral*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.
- _____. (2016). *T. Calpurnius Siculus: a pastoral poet in Neronian Rome*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.
- KASKE, R. E.; GROOS, A.; TWOMEY, M. W. (eds., 1988). *Medieval Christian Literary imagery: a guide to interpretation*. Toronto; London: University of Toronto Press.
- KEITH, A. (ed., 2011). *Latin elegy and Hellenistic epigram: a tale of two genres at Rome*. New-Castle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- KELLY, S. (2003). *The new Solomon: Robert of Naples (1309–1343) and fourteenth-century kingship*. Leiden: Brill.
- KENNEDY, D. F. (1993). *The arts of love: five studies in the discourse of Roman love elegy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KENNEDY, G. A. (1999). *Classical rhetoric and its Christian and secular tradition from ancient to modern Times*, 2nd edition. Chapel Hill; London: The University of North Carolina Press.
- KENNEY, E. J. (1983). “Virgil and the elegiac sensibility”, in *Illinois Classical Studies* 8: 44–59.
- KIDD, D. A. (1964). “Imitation in the tenth Eclogue”, in *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 11: 54–64.
- KIRCHER, T. (2012). *Living well in Renaissance Italy: the virtues of Humanism and the irony of Leon Battista Alberti*. Tempe, Ariz.: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies.
- KIRKHAM, V. (1985). “An allegorically tempered *Decameron*”, in *Italica* 62/1: 1–23.
- _____. (2000). *Fabulous vernacular: Boccaccio's Filocolo and the art of medieval fiction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- _____. (1992). “The parallel lives of Dante and Virgil”, in *Dante Studies* 110: 233–53.
- KLINGNER, F. (1967). *Virgil: Bucolica, Georgica, Aeneis*. Zurich: Artemis Verlag.
- KÖRTING, G. (1880). *Boccaccio's Leben und Werke*. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag (R. Reisland).
- KRIESEL, J. C. (2016). “Boccaccio and the early modern reception of tragedy”, in *Renaissance Quarterly* 69/2: 415–48.
- _____. (2019). *Boccaccio's corpus: allegory, ethics, and vernacularity*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- KRISTEVA, J. (1980). “Word, dialogue, and novel”, in *Desire in language: a semiotic approach to literature and art*, edited by L. S. Roudiez, translated by T. Gora, A. Jardine, and L. S. Roudinez. New York: Columbia University Press.
- LABAGNARA, S. (1968). *Il poema bucolico del Boccaccio*. Rome: L. Ambrosini.
- LAMBERT, E. Z. (1976). *Placing sorrow: a study of the pastoral elegy convention from Theocritus to Milton*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- LEDDA, G. (2019). “An ethical and political bestiary in the first canto of Dante's *Comedy*”, in G. Gaimari, C. Keen (eds.), *Ethics, politics and justice in Dante*. London: UCL Press, 46–62.

- _____. (2018). "Dante Alighieri, Dante-poet, Dante-character", in Z. G. Barański, S. Gilson (eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Dante's Commedia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 28–42.
- LEE, A. (2012). *Petrarch and St. Augustine: classical scholarship, Christian theology, and the origins of the Renaissance in Italy*. Leiden: Brill.
- LEE, C. (2013). "Boccaccio's Neapolitan letter and multilingualism in Angevin Naples", in *Mediaevalia* 34: 7–21.
- LÉONARD, E. G. (1944). *Boccace et Naples*. Paris: Librairie E. Droz.
- LERNER, R. E. (1976). *The age of adversity: the fourteenth century*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- LEWIS, C. S. (1956). "Dante's Statius", in *Medium Aevum* 25/3: 133–39.
- LIDDELL, H. G.; SCOTT, R. (1940). *A Greek-English lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- LIPKA, M. (2001). *Language in Vergil's Eclogues*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- LIPKING, L. (1981). *The life of the poet: beginning and ending poetic careers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LOGAN, J. L. (1971). "The poet's central numbers", in *MLN* 86/1: 95–98.
- LOMBARDI, E. (2012). *The wings of the doves: love and desire in Dante and medieval culture*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- LOONEY, D. (2009). "The beginnings of humanistic oratory: Petrarch's *Coronation Oration* (*Collatio laureationis*)", in V. Kirkham, A. Maggi (eds.), *Petrarch: a critical guide to the complete works*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 131–140.
- LORD, M. L. (2002). "Benvenuto da Imola's literary approach to Virgil's Eclogues", in *Mediaeval Studies* 64/1: 287–362.
- _____. (1991). "Boccaccio's *Virgiliana* in the Miscellanea Latina", in *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 34: 127–97.
- _____. (1982). "Petrarch and Vergi's First Eclogue: The Codex Ambrosianus", in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 86: 253–76.
- LORENZINI, S. (2014). "Con le muse in Parnaso: classical and medieval mythography on the *Pierides* and a possible source for Giovanni Boccaccio", in *Medievalia et humanistica* 39: 63–86.
- _____. (2011). *La corrispondenza bucolica tra Giovanni Boccaccio e Checco di Meletto Rossi: l'egloga di Giovanni del Virgilio ad Albertino Mussato*. Florence: Olschki.
- _____. (2020). "Between Petrarch and Boccaccio: the rewriting of Griselda's Tale (*Dec.* 10.10): a rhetorical debate on Latin and vernacular languages", in *Heliotropia* 16-17: 205–27.
- _____. (2010). "Rassegna di studi sul Boccaccio bucolico", *Studi sul Boccaccio* 38: 153–65.
- LOWE, D. (2011). "Tree-worship, sacred groves and Roman antiquities in the *Aeneid*", in *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 27/1: 91–128.
- LUCIANI, É. (1982). *Les Confessions de Saint Augustin dans les lettres de Pétrarque*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes.
- LUMMUS, D. (2012). "Boccaccio's Hellenism and the foundations of modernity", in *Mediaevalia* 33: 101–67.

- _____. (2012). “Boccaccio’s poetic anthropology: allegories of history in the *Genealogie deorum gentilium libri*”, in *Speculum* 87/3: 724–65.
- _____. (2013). “The changing landscape of the self (*Bucolicum carmen*)”, in V. Kirkham, M. Sherberg, J. L. Smarr (eds.), *Boccaccio: a critical guide to the complete works*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 155–69.
- _____. (2020). *The city of poetry: imagining the civic role of the poet in fourteenth-century Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MAC GÓRÁIN, F. (2012-13). “Apollo and Dionysus in Virgil”, in *Incontri di Filologia Classica* 12: 191–238.
- MANN, N. (2000). “From laurel to fig: Petrarch and the structures of the self”, in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 105: 17–42.
- MANUWALD, G. (2006). “The first book”, in H.-C. Günther (ed.), *Brill’s companion to Propertius*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 217–43.
- MARCHESI, S. (2016). “Dante’s fatherlands: *Inferno*, *Purgatorio*, and *Paradiso* XV,” in G. Corbett, H. Webb (eds.), *Vertical readings in Dante’s Comedy*, vol. 2. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers, 77–99.
- MARKUS, R. A. (1988). *Saeculum: history and society in the theology of St. Augustine*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MARSH, D. (2015). “Petrarch’s adversaries: the *Invectives*”, in A. R. Ascoli, U. Falkeid (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Petrarch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 167–76.
- _____. (2009). “The burning question: crisis and cosmology in the *Secret*”, in V. Kirkham, A. Maggi (eds.), *Petrarch: a critical guide to the complete works*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 211–18.
- MARSHALL, P. K. (1997). *Servius and commentary on Virgil*. Asheville: Pegasus.
- MARTELOTTO, G. (1967). “La difesa della poesia nel Boccaccio e un giudizio su Lucano”, in *Studi sul Boccaccio* 4: 265–79.
- MARTINDALE, C. (1997). “Green politics”, in C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Virgil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 107–24.
- _____. (1993). *Redeeming the text: Latin poetry and the hermeneutics of reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MARTINEZ, R. L. (2015). “The Latin hexameter works: *Epystole*, *Bucolicum carmen*, *Africa*”, in A. R. Ascoli, U. Falkeid (eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Petrarch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 87–99.
- _____. (2004). “The tale of the monk and his abbot (I.4)”, in E. B. Weaver (ed.), *The Decameron first day in perspective*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 113–34.
- MAZZA, A. (1996). “L’inventario della parva libraria di Santo Spirito e la biblioteca del Boccaccio”, in *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 9: 1–74.
- MAZZOTTA, G. (2013). “Petrarca, Francesco”, in K. Pollmann, W. Otten (eds.), *The Oxford guide to the historical reception of Augustine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1533b–1536a.
- _____. (1986). *The world at play in Boccaccio’s Decameron*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- MCCLURE, G. W. (1985). “Healing eloquence: Petrarch, Salutati, and the physicians”, in *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 15: 317–46.

- MCLAUGHLIN, M. L. (1995). *Literary imitation in the Italian Renaissance: the theory and practice of literary imitation in Italy from Dante to Bembo*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MEBAN, D. (2009). “Virgil’s *Eclogues* and social memory”, in *The American Journal of Philology* 130/1: 99–130.
- MINNIS, A. J.; SCOTT, A. B.; WALLACE, D. (eds., 1998). *Medieval literary theory and criticism, c. 1100 –c. 1375: the commentary tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MOORE, T. (1998). *The theater of Plautus: playing to the audience*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- MORGANTI, B. F. (2019). “A leitura petrarquista do *Pro Archia* de Cícero e a defesa da poesia”, in I. T. Cardoso, M. Martinho (eds.), *Cícero: obra e recepção*. Lisbon: Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra, 151–79.
- _____. (2008). *Invective contra medicum, de Francesco Petrarca: tradução, ensaio introdutório e notas* (doctoral thesis). Campinas: IEL/Unicamp.
- _____; ARAÚJO, S. X. G. (2016). “A crítica da fama na epístola *Familiar* 1.2 de Francesco Petrarca”, in *Morus* 11/2: 59–82.
- MOROSINI, R. (2012). “La *bona sonoritas* di Calliopo: Boccaccio a Napoli, la polifonia di Partenope e i silenzi dell’Acciaiuoli”, in G. Alfano, T. d’Urso, A. P. Saggese (eds.), *Boccaccio angioino. Materiali per la storia culturale di Napoli nel Trecento*. Brussels: Peter Lang, 69–88.
- MORSE, R. (1996). *The medieval Medea*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- MOUL, V. (ed., 2017). *A guide to neo-Latin literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MURRAY, A. (2011). *Suicide in the Middle Ages, volume 2: The curse on self-murder*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- NARDI, B. (1967). *Saggi di filosofia dantesca*, 2nd ed. Florence: La Nuova Italia.
- NASH, C. (2017). “*fatum/a* and *F/fortuna*: religion and philosophy in Virgil’s *Aeneid*”, in *PVS* 29: 135–59.
- NEWMAN, J. K. (1967). *The concept of Vates in Augustan poetry*. Brussels: Latomus.
- NOCK, A. D. (1933). *Conversion: the old and the new in religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- OLIENSIS, E. (1998). *Horace and the rhetoric of authority*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ORR, M. (2003). *Intertextuality: debates and contexts*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- OSGOOD, C. (1930). “Boccaccio’s knowledge of the life of Vergil”, in *Classical Philology* 25/1: 27–36.
- OTIS, B. (1963). *Virgil: a study in civilized poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- PADOAN, G. (1959). *L’ultima opera di Giovanni Boccaccio: le Esposizioni sopra il Dante*. Padova: CEDAM.
- _____. (1978). *Il Boccaccio, le muse, il Parnaso e l’Arno*. Florence: Olschki.
- PALSSON, K. (2019). “Angelic humans, glorious flesh: Jerome’s reception of Origen’s teachings on the resurrection body”, in *Journal of Ancient Christianity* 23.1: 53–81.
- PAPIO, M. (2013). “An intimate self-portrait”, in V. Kirkham, M. Sherberg, J. L. Smarr (eds.), *Boccaccio: a critical guide to the complete works*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 341–51.

- PASCHALIS, M. (2016). "From pastoral to panegyric in Calpurnius Siculus", in P. Mitsis, I. Ziogas (eds.), *Wordplay and powerplay in Latin poetry*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 299–311.
- PASQUALI, G. (1951). "Arte allusiva", in *Stravaganze: quarte e supreme*. Venice: Neri Pozza, 11–20.
- PATCH, H. R. (1927). *The goddess Fortuna in medieval literature*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- PATTERSON, A. (1988). *Pastoral and ideology: Virgil to Valéry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- PEIRANO, I. (2012). *The rhetoric of the Roman fake: Latin pseudepigrapha in context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PENROSE Jr., W. (2014). "Sappho's shifting fortunes from Antiquity to the Early Renaissance", in *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 18/4: 415–36.
- PERKELL, C. G. (1996). "The 'dying Gallus' and the design of Eclogue 10", in *Classical Philology* 91: 128–40.
- _____. (1989). *The poet's truth: a study of the poet in Virgil's Georgics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- PETERSON, T. (2016). *Petrarch's Fragmenta: the narrative and theological unity of Rerum vulgarium fragmenta*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- PETOLETTI, M. (2013). *Epistole*, in T. De Robertis, C. M. Monti, M. Petoletti, G. Tanturli, S. Zamponi (eds.), *Boccaccio autore e copista. Catalogo della mostra: Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (11 ottobre 2013- 11 gennaio 2014)*. Florence: Mandragora, 233–41.
- _____. (2015). "Il Boccaccio e la tradizione dei testi latini", in *Boccaccio letterato. Atti del Convegno Internazionale Firenze-Certaldo, 10-12 ottobre 2013*. Florence: Accademia della Crusca, 105–21.
- _____. (2006). "Le postille di Giovanni Boccaccio a Marziale", in *Studi sul Boccaccio* 34: 103–84.
- PIACENTINI, A. (2013). "*Buccolicum carmen*", in T. De Robertis, C. M. Monti, M. Petoletti, G. Tanturli, S. Zamponi (eds.), *Boccaccio autore e copista: Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, 11 ottobre 2013-11 gennaio 2014*. Florence: Mandragora.
- _____. (2013). "Domenico Silvestri lettore del *Buccolicum carmen* di Giovanni Boccaccio", in *Studi sul Boccaccio* 41: 295–316.
- _____. (2014). "Il carme *Ytalie iam certus honos* di Giovanni Boccaccio", in *Boccaccio editore e interprete di Dante*. Rome: Salerno, 185–222.
- _____. (2015). "La lettera di Boccaccio a Martino da Signa: alcune proposte interpretative", in *Studi sul Boccaccio* 43: 147–76.
- PRATA, P. (2007). *O caráter intertextual dos Tristes de Ovídio: uma leitura dos elementos épicos virgilianos* (doctoral thesis). Campinas: IEL/Unicamp.
- PRETE, S. (1952). "Plauto, Terenzio e il Petrarca", in *Studi Petrarqueschi* 5: 85–94.
- PUTNAM, M. C. J. (1995). *Virgil's Aeneid: interpretation and influence*. Chapel Hill; London: University of North Carolina Press.
- QUAGLIO, A. E. (1964). "Prima fortuna della glossa garbiana a 'Donna me prega' del Cavalcanti", in *GSLI* 141: 336–68.
- RAFFA, G. P. (1996). "Dante's mocking pastoral muse", in *Dante Studies* 114: 271–91.

- RAJA, M. E. (2003). *Le muse in giardino: Il paesaggio ameno nelle opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- RAMOS, A. (1994). "Technologies of the self: truth, asceticism, and autonomy", in *Bulletin de la Société Américaine de Philosophie de Langue Française* 6/1-2: 20–9.
- REEVE, M. (1983). "Appendix Vergiliana", in L. D. Reynolds, P. K. Marshall, R. A. B. Mynors (eds.), *Texts and transmission: a survey of the Latin classics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 437–40.
- _____. (2007). "Lucretius in the Middle Ages and early Renaissance: transmission and scholarship", in S. Gillespie, P. Hardie (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 205–13.
- REGN, G.; HUSS, B. (2009). "Petrarch's Rome: the history of the *Africa* and the Renaissance project", in *MLN* 124/1: 86–102.
- REGNICOLI, L. (2013). "I testamenti di Giovanni Boccaccio", in T. De Robertis, C. M. Monti, M. Petoletti, G. Tanturli, S. Zamponi (eds.), *Boccaccio autore e copista*. Florence: Mandragora, 387–93.
- REYNOLDS, M. (2000). *The Sappho companion*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- RICCI, P. G. (1985). *Studi sulla vita e le opere del Boccaccio*. Milan: R. Ricciardi.
- RICHLIN, A. (1992). *The Garden of Priapus: sexuality and aggression in Roman humor*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- RICO, F. (2002). "La datación (petrarchesca) del *Corbaccio*", in *Studi sul Boccaccio* 30: 299–319.
- RIZZO, S. (1996). "Un nuovo codice delle *Tusculanae* dalla biblioteca del Petrarca", in *Ciceroniana* 9: 75–104.
- ROSSITER, W. (2008), "Translation of allegory or allegory of translation? Petrarch's redressing of Boccaccio's *Griselda*", in M. Carr, K. P. Clarke, M. Nievergelt (eds.), *On allegory: some medieval aspects and approaches*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 156–82.
- RUNDIN, J. (2003). "The Epicurean morality of Vergil's *Bucolics*", in *The Classical World*, 96/2: 159–76.
- RUSSO, L. (1956). *Lecture critiche del Decameron*. Bari: Laterza.
- SAAK, E. L. (forthcoming). "Augustine and Augustinianisms in the fourteenth century: The cases of Petrarch and Robert de Bardis." In J. Bartuschat, et al. (eds.), *Augustine, Augustinians, and Augustinianisms in the Italian Trecento*. Ravenna: Longo.
- _____. (2020). "Reception in the Middle Ages", in T. Toom (ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Augustine's Confessions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 263–76.
- SABBADINI, R. (1905). *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*. Florence: G. C. Sansoni.
- SAGE, M. M. (1980). "The *De viris illustribus*: authorship and date", in *Hermes* 108: 83–100.
- SAIBER, A. (2014). "The game of love (*Caccia di Diana*)", in V. Kirkham, M. Sherberg, J. L. Smarr (eds.), *Boccaccio: a critical guide to the complete works*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 109–17.
- SANTAGATA, M. (1992). *I frammenti dell'anima: storia e racconto nel Canzoniere di Petrarca*. Bologna: Mulino.

- SATO, M. (2015). "The prohibition of suicide for affirmation of human beings by Augustine", in *Scrinium* 11: 135–42.
- SAUNDERS, M. (2010). *Self impression: life-writing, autobiografiction, and the forms of modern literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SAUSSURE, F. (2013). *Course in general linguistics*, translated by R. Harris. London; New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- SCHIESARO, A. (2012). "Appendix Vergiliana", in S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth, E. Eidinow (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SCHMOLZ, F.-M. (1961). "'*Historia sacra et profana*' bei Augustin", in *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 8: 308–21.
- SCHÖNBECK, G. (1962). *Der locus amoenus von Homer bis Horaz* (Heidelberg diss.). Cologne: privately printed.
- SEGAL, C. P. (1986). *Language and desire in Seneca's Phaedra*. Princeton; Guildford: Princeton University Press.
- _____. (1965). "Tamen cantabitis, Arcades: exile and Arcadia in *Eclogues* one and nine", in *Arion* 4/2: 237–66.
- SHORT, W. M. (2013). "Getting to the truth: the 'wandering' metaphor of mistakenness in Roman culture", in *Arion* 3/21: 139–68.
- SIGNORINI, M. (2019). "Boccaccio as Homer: a recently discovered self-portrait and the 'modern' canon", in E. Morra (ed.), *Building the canon through the classics: imitation and variation in Renaissance Italy (1350-1550)*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 13–26.
- SMARR, J. (1986). *Boccaccio and Fiammetta: the narrator as lover*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- _____. (1978). "Boccaccio's *Filocolo*: romance, epic, and religious allegory", in *Forum Italicum*, 12: 26–43.
- _____. (2002). "Boccaccio pastorale tra Dante e Petrarca" in M. Picone (ed.), *Autori e lettori del Boccaccio: Atti del convegno internazionale di Certaldo (20-22 settembre 2001)*. Florence: F. Cesati, 237–54.
- SMITH, M. (1976). *Prudentius' Psychomachia: a reexamination*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- SMITH, P. L. (1970). "Vergil's *avena* and the pipes of pastoral poetry", in *TAPA* 101: 497–510.
- SNELL, B. (1953). "Arcadia: the discovery of a spiritual landscape", in *The discovery of the mind: the Greek origins of European thought*, translated by T. G. Rosenmeyer. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 281–309.
- SOLERTI, A. (1904). *Le vite di Dante, Petrarca e Boccaccio: scritte fino al secolo decimosesto*. Milan: F. Vallardi.
- SQUAROTTI, G. B. (1999). "Nodi d'amore: itinerario di un metafora nei *Trionfi*", in C. Berra, *I Trionphi di Francesco Petrarca*. Bologna: Cisalpino, 487–503.
- STACE, C. (1968). "The slaves of Plautus", in *Greece & Rome* 15/1: 64–77.
- STEENKAMP, J. (2011). "The structure of Vergil's *Eclogues*", in *Acta Classica* 54: 101–24.
- STIERLE, K. (2007). "Un manifesto del nuovo canto (*Rvf* 120-29)", in M. Picone (ed.), *Il Canzoniere: lettura micro e macrotestuale*. Ravenna: Longo, 295–312.
- STOTZ, P. (1999). "*Conflictus*: il contrasto poetico nella letteratura latina medievale", in M. Pedroni, A. Stäuble (eds.), *Il genere "tenzone" nelle letterature romanze delle Origini*. Ravenna: Longo, 165–87.

- SUITNER, F. (ed., 2001). *Dionigi da Borgo Sansepolcro fra Petrarca e Boccaccio: atti del Convegno, Sansepolcro, 11-12 febbraio 2000*. Città di Castello: Petrucci.
- SULLIVAN, F. A. (1941). "Cicero and Gloria", in *TAPA* 72: 382–91.
- TANTURLI, G.; ZAMPONI, S. (2013). "Biografia e cronologia delle opere", in T. De Robertis et al. (eds.), *Boccaccio autore e copista. Catalogo della mostra: Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (11 ottobre 2013- 11 gennaio 2014)*. Florence: Mandragora, 61–6.
- TARANTINO, E. (2012). "Fulvae harenae: the reception of an intertextual complex in Dante's *Inferno*", in *Classical Receptions Journal* 4/1: 90–126.
- Thesaurus Linguae Latinae (TLL) Online*. (2009). Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.
- THIBAUT, J. C. (1964). *The mystery of Ovid's exile*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- THOMPSON, N. S. (1996). *Chaucer, Boccaccio, and the debate of love: a comparative study of the Decameron and the Canterbury tales*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- THORSEN, T. S. (2014). *Ovid's early poetry: from his single Heroides to his Remedia Amoris*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____; BERGE, R. E. (2019). *Receiving receptions received: A new collection of testimonia sapphica c. 600 BCE-1000 CE*, in T. Thorsen; S. Harrison (eds.), *Roman Receptions of Sappho*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 289–402.
- TOOHEY, P. (1992). "Love, lovesickness, and melancholia", in *Illinois Classical Studies* 17/2: 265–86.
- TOOK, J. (1990). "Dante and the *Confessions* of Augustine", in *Annali d'Italianistica* 8: 360–82.
- TONELLI, L. (2003). "Laura, Fiammetta, Flamenca: la tradizione del nome", in *Critica del testo* 6/1: 515–39.
- TORLONE, Z. M. (2002). "From Daphnis to Gallus: the metamorphosis of genre in the Eclogues", in *New England Classical Journal* 24/4: 204–21.
- TORRACA, F. (1912). *Per la biografia di G. Boccaccio, appunti*. Rome: Società editrice Dante Alighieri di Albrighi, Segati e C.
- ULLMAN, B. L. (1973a). "Petrarch's acquaintance with Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius", in *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*. Rome: Via Lancellotti 18, 177–96.
- _____. (1973b). *Studies in the Italian Renaissance*. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura.
- _____. (1911). "The manuscripts of Propertius", in *Classical Philology* 6/3: 282–301.
- USHER, J. (2002). "A quotation from the *Culex* in Boccaccio's *De Casibus virorum illustrium*", in *Modern Language Review* 97: 312–23.
- _____. (2004). "Boccaccio, Cavalcanti's canzone 'Donna me prega' and Dino's glosses", in *Heliotropia* 2.1: 1–19.
- _____. (2013). "Petrarch's diploma of crowning: the *Privilegium laureationis*", in C. Caruso, A. Laird (eds.), *Italy and the classical tradition: language, thought and poetry 1300-1600*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- _____. (2007a). "Monuments more enduring than bronze: Boccaccio and paper", in *Heliotropia* 4/1: 1–30.
- _____. (2007b). "'Sesto fra cotanto senno' and 'Appetentia primi loci': Boccaccio, Petrarch and Dante's poetic hierarchy", in *Studi sul Boccaccio* 35: 157–98.
- VAN PETEGHEM, J. (2020). *Italian readers of Ovid from the origins to Petrarch: responding to a versatile muse*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- VAN OORT, J. (2012). "The end is now: Augustine on history and eschatology", in *Harvard Theological Studies* 68/1, n.p.

- VAN SICKLE, J. B. (2004a). *The design of Virgil's Bucolics*, 2nd ed. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- _____. (2004b). "Virgil *Bucolics* 1.1–2 and interpretive tradition: a Latin (Roman) program for a Greek genre", in *Classical Philology* 99/4: 336–53.
- VASCONCELLOS, P. S. (2001). *Efeitos intertextuais na Eneida de Virgílio*. São Paulo: Humanitas.
- _____. (2016). *Persona poética e autor empírico na poesia amorosa romana*. São Paulo: Editora Unifesp.
- VEGLIA, M. (1998). *Il corvo e la sirena: cultura e poesia del Corbaccio*. Pisa: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali.
- _____. (2000). *La vita lieta: una lettura del Decameron*. Ravenna: Longo.
- _____. (2013). "Messer Decameron Galeotto: Un titolo e una chiave di lettura", in *Heliotropia* 700/10: 2–31.
- _____. (1996). "Sul nodo culturale del Corbaccio", in *Studi e problemi di critica testuale* 52: 79–100.
- VELLI, G. (1977). "L'Ameto e la pastorale: Il significato della forma," in M. Cottino-Jones, E. Tuttle (eds.), *Boccaccio: secoli di Vita; Atti del Congresso Internazionale: Boccaccio 1975, Università di California, Los Angeles, 17–19 ottobre 1975*. Ravenna: Longo, 67–80.
- _____. (1979). *Petrarca e Boccaccio: tradizione, memoria, scrittura*. Padova: Antenore.
- _____. (2013). "Moments of Latin poetry (*Carmina*)", in V. Kirkham, M. Sherberg, J. L. Smarr (eds.), *Boccaccio: a critical guide to the complete works*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 53–62.
- VERNON, W. W. (1889). *Readings on the Purgatorio of Dante: chiefly based on the commentary of Benvenuto da Imola*. London: Macmillan.
- VEYNE, P. (1987). *A history of private life. Vol. I. From pagan Rome to Byzantium*, in P. Ariès, G. Duby (eds.), *A history of private life*. Cambridge, MA; London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- _____. (1988). *Roman erotic elegy: love, poetry, and the West*, translated by D. Pellauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- VIDEAU, A. (2010). "Le bucolique et l'élégiaque: tressage des genres et des passions amoureuses dans la Xème eclogue de Virgile", in *Aevum(ant.)* 10: 235–54.
- VOLK, K. (2002). *The poetics of Latin didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- VOZZA, P. (1994). "Un silenzio eloquente (*Quid tacitus...? Calpurnio Ecl. 4.1–4*)", in *BStudLat.* 24: 71–92.
- WACK, M. F. (1990). *Lovesickness in the Middle Ages: the Viaticum and its commentaries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- WAGNER-EGELHAAF, M. (ed., 2019). *Handbook of autobiography/ autofiction*, 3 vols. Boston; Berlin: De Gruyter.
- WALLACE, D. (2009). "Letter of Old Age: love between men, Griselda, and farewell to letters (*Rerum senilium libri*)" in V. Kirkham, A. Maggi (eds.), *Petrarch: a critical guide to the complete works*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 321–30.
- WALLIS, J. (2011). "Marriage and the elegiac woman in Propertius 3.12", in *Ramus* 40/2: 106–29.
- WARWICK, H. H. (ed., 1975). *A Vergil Concordance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

- WHIDDEN, D. L. (2014). *Christ the light: the theology of light and illumination in Thomas Aquinas*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- WILSON, K. M.; MAKOWSKI, E. M. (1990). *Wykked wyves and the woes of marriage: misogynous literature from Juvenal to Chaucer*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- WILSON-OKAMURA, D. S. (2010). *Virgil in the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WISEMAN, T. P. (2006). "Catullus", in H. Cancik *et al.* (eds.), *Brill's New Pauly: historical atlas of the ancient world*. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV.
- WITT, R. G. (2000). *In the footsteps of the ancients: the origins of humanism from Lovato to Bruni*. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. (2005). "The arts of letter-writing", in A. J. Minnis, I. Johnson (eds.), *The Cambridge history of literary criticism. Volume 2, The Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 68–83.
- _____. (2015). "The poeta-theologus from Mussato to Landino, in *The European Legacy Toward New Paradigms* 20/5: 450–61.
- ZABUGHIN, V. (1921-23). *Vergilio nel rinascimento italiano da Dante a Torquato Tasso*. Bologna: N. Zanichelli.
- ZACCARELLO, M. (2014). "Del corvo, animale solitario: ancora un'ipotesi per il titolo del *Corbaccio*", in *Studi sul Boccaccio* 42: 179–94.
- ZAK, G. (2015). "Boccaccio and Petrarca", in G. Armstrong, R. Daniels, S. J. Milner (eds.), *The Cambridge companion to Boccaccio*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 139–54.
- _____. (2010). *Petrarch's humanism and the care of the self*, Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (2016). "The ethics and poetics of consolation in Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen*", in *Speculum* 91/1: 36–62.
- ZIOLKOSKI, J. M. (2000). "Late Latin and postclassical Latin", in P. France (ed.), *Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 544–50.
- _____; PUTNAM, M. C. J. (2008). *The Virgilian tradition: the first fifteen hundred years*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- ZISSOS, A. (2006). "Reception of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*", in *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 13/2: 165–85.
- ZOGG, F. (2017). "Palaemon and Daphnis in a medieval poem: the Vergilian challenge of the *Conflictus Veris et Hiemis*", in *Vergilius* 63: 125–40.
- ZUMBINI, B. (1886). "Le egloghe del Boccaccio", in *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana* 7: 94–152.