ANALECTA ROMANA
INSTITUTI DANICI

XXXVIII

ANALECTA ROMANA

INSTITUTI DANICI

XXXVIII

2013

ROMAE MMXIII

ANALECTA ROMANA INSTITUTI DANICI XXXVIII

ISSN 2035-2506

Published with the support of a grant from:
Det Frie Forskningsråd / Kultur og Kommunikation

Analecta Romana Instituti Danici. — Vol. I (1960) — . Copenhagen: Munksgaard. From 1985: Rome, «L'ERMA» di Bretschneider. From 2007 (online): Accademia di Danimarca

ANALECTA ROMANA INSTITUTI DANICI encourages scholarly contributions within the Academy's research fields. All contributions will be peer reviewed. Manuscripts to be considered for publication should be sent to: accademia@acdan.it Authors are requested to consult the journal's guidelines at www.acdan.it

Contents

Galathea, Amaryllis, and Fictive Chronology in Petrarch's *Bucolicum Carmen*

by Trine Arlund Hass

Abstract. Reconstructing Petrarch's conception of the primary model for *Bucolicum carmen* can offer an insight into the narrative discourse of his work. The example that will underpin the discussion in this article is an examination of how Servius' explanation of Vergil's use of the name Galatea, used by Petrarch as the title of his eleventh eclogue, may offer a key to the interpretation of the general structure of the work. According to Servius, Vergil uses Galatea and Amaryllis as allegories of Mantua and Rome in the poem. These allegories are used to indicate when Tityrus, the shepherd Vergil used to represent himself, obtained his freedom. Transferring the opposition between Rome and the countryside and the concept of temporal limitation from Vergil's *Eclogues* to *Bucolicum carmen* provides the basis for a general consideration of Petrarch's representation of himself and his career in this work. Through analyses of how, in the discourse of the fiction, factual aspects of Petrarch's life and career are manipulated into a different sequence than they had in reality, this article attempts to read the self-representation in the work as a fictive chronology of Petrarch's development as a humanist and poet.

Introduction

The importance of Vergil as a model for humanist writers in general is indisputable, and for the Father of Humanism, Petrarch, the importance of Vergil for his own literary production is well documented on several levels. A famous example is the letter on imitation written to Boccaccio, in which Petrarch argues that he knows the text of Vergil's *Eclogues* so intimately that he sometimes mistakes Vergil's words for his own:

> Hec se michi tam familiariter ingessere et non modo memorie sed medullis affixa sunt unumque cum ingenio facta sunt meo, ut etsi per omnem vitam amplius non legantur, ipsa quidem hereant, actis in intima animi parte radicibus, sed 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.
>
> I have thoroughly absorbed these writings, implanting them not only in my memory but in my marrow, and they have so become one with my mind that were I never to read them for the remainder of my life, they would cling to me, having taken root in the innermost recesses of my mind. But sometimes I may forget the author, since through long usage and continual possession I may adopt them and for some time regard them as my own; and besieged by the mass of such writings, I may forget whose they are and whether they are mine or others'. (Petrarch, *Familiares* 22.2.13)[1]

Petrarch's copy of Vergil's works, Ambrosiana ms. S.P.10/27, is another indicator of the impact Vergil had on Petrarch. This codex includes an exquisite and precious painting

on the frontispiece by Simone Martini, which is suggestive of a truly treasured possession, as are the meticulous annotations made to the text. The insertion of a note on Laura's death seems to show that Petrarch really did absorb the works of Vergil and made them part of himself, even to the degree that he registers important events of his own life in his codex of the texts. But if we consider Laura to be Petrarch's construction, the note demonstrates, rather, that Vergil played an important role in how Petrarch represented himself and his life to the world.

This paper is concerned with the influence of Vergil on Petrarch's own writing. But rather than analysing concrete quotations or allusions to Vergil in Petrarch's writing the paper, instead, focuses on Vergil's influence on the conception of genre evident in Petrarch's work. Developments in genre norms can be seen as an interaction between *great writers* and *minor writers*. Great writers challenge existing norms in their writings and break with them, whereas minor writers follow the path set by greater writers thereby confirming these changes and consolidating them as new norms.[2] In this connection, Vergil is surely a great writer as it was he who selected elements from the *Idylls* of Theocritus that he then used to create a more uniform pastoral universe. The Vergilian version of bucolic poetry became an inspiration for humanist writers to such a degree that the genre became more popular among them than it ever was in Antiquity. One would therefore expect Vergil to be the primary model for Petrarch's pastoral poetry. But in order to examine the influence of Vergil it is necessary to consider the humanist writers' conceptions of Vergil and his poetry. In Petrarch's case, we are fortunate to have his own copy of Vergil at hand. Here, we have access to Petrarch's notes on Vergil's texts, but the codex also shows us that Petrarch's reading of Vergil was influenced by Servius. Servius is featured in Martini's painting as the revealer of meaning, and on the pages of the book Vergil's text is surrounded by Servius' commentary. This shows us that any reading of Vergil in this volume would have included a reading of Servius' interpretation as well.[3]

The hypothesis of the paper is that reading *Bucolicum carmen* with the late-antique commentators, and particularly Servius, in mind is a way to reconstruct Petrarch's horizon of expectations and thus hopefully a way to bring us closer to an understanding of his genre conception as well as of the work itself.

The analysis is going to have a quite narrow focus, namely on the significance of Petrarch's use of the name Galathea. It will examine how an interpretation of the name based on Servius' explanation of Vergil's use of it can contribute to the understanding of Petrarch's *Eclogues* 10 and 11, and, in a further perspective, how this can contribute to an understanding of the general narrative sequence of the work. More specifically, the interpretations of the significance of the name Galathea will form the basis for the suggestion that Petrarch constructs a fictional version of the chronology of his own career through the narrative discourse.

I use the narratological distinction between *discourse* and *story* as a conceptual, underlying principle in this study. The point of departure of the analysis is the discourse, the fictionality, rather than the historical reality of the story. Only after a consideration of the narrative discourse, based on a reconstructed horizon of expectations regarding the primary literary model, will the perspective be broadened to consider the relationship between the narrative discourse and the factual story of events presented.

Bucolicum carmen, a pastoral sequence of twelve poems, was begun by Petrarch between 1346 and 1347 and finished in 1357. It is preserved in autograph in ms. Vat.lat. 3358 which also contains Petrarch's subsequent corrections of the text. As we shall see later, Petrarch describes in his *Familiares* 8.3 how the idea for the work suddenly came to him in Vaucluse and how he composed it in no time. Each poem in the collection works as an independent entity, but the title, *Bucolicum carmen*, in singular, has been seen as an

indication that the twelve poems of the work form some kind of unity. The poems treat such themes as choice of a secular career versus a career within the church, mourning a patron of the arts, Italian versus French poetry, unrequited love, satirical critique of the Papal curia, lament of the plague and lament of war. A full resume shall not be given here; for that I refer to Carrai.[4]

Galathea

Galathea is the title of and main character in *Eclogue* 11 of Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen*. Galathea is dead, and in the eclogue the nymphs Niobe, Fusca, and Fulgida mourn Galathea. Fulgida eventually encourages the other two to stop crying because Galathea is in a better place now, and the poem concludes with an epitaph celebrating her eternal life. In many analyses of the structure of *Bucolicum carmen*,[5] *Eclogue* 11 is grouped with *Eclogue* 9, a general lament about the devastating plague with an offering of hope through faith, much like in *Eclogue* 11, and *Eclogue* 10, *Laurea occidens*, a more specific lament for the destruction of the shepherd Silvanus' laurel. It has often been argued that the laurel mourned in *Eclogue* 10 represents the same person whose death is mourned in *Eclogue* 11, and, moreover, that this person is identical with Laura in the *Canzoniere*.[6] This interpretation implies that there is a progression within these three poems from a general lament about the destructions caused by the plague, through a particular lament about an uprooted laurel tree, to the funeral of a female character at which the interlocutors take comfort in her eternal life in heaven.

That a person or personalized theme is represented with different names in different eclogues is a characteristic of this work - Petrarch himself is represented as Silvius in the first and second eclogue, Stupeus in the third, Tirrenus in the fourth, Amiclas in the eighth, and Silvanus in the tenth. Therefore it would not be surprising if both the laurel and Galathea represent Laura or poetry.[7] In fact, Laura is represented by a third name in *Eclogue* 3 where Stupeus adores a female character by the name of Dane, for Daphne, the Greek word for laurel.

Although such groupings are useful for an identification of structure and themes in the work, they give us no indications as to why poetry is represented by the particular name of Galathea in *Eclogue* 11; for there is no direct connection between the name Galathea and poetry as there is in the cases of Dane, laurea, and Laura.

The name Galatea - usually spelled without an *h* - is by no means strange in a pastoral context, on the contrary: it was introduced by Theocritus who narrates the story of the Cyclops Polyphemus' unrequited love of the sea-nymph Galatea in *Idylls* 6 and 11, also known from Ovid.[8] The name also occurs in Vergil's *Eclogues* 1, 3, 7, and 9, but Vergil has extracted it from the Theocritean-Ovidian narrative about Polyphemus. In humanist eclogues, the name is used by Dante as well as later in Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen*. After Petrarch, several writers of bucolic poetry, such as Boccaccio, Sanazzaro, Castiglione, Battista Mantuanus, Helius Eobanus Hessus, Euricius Cordus, Johannes Stigelius, and Erasmus, also used the name. It thus seems fair to say that Galatea was quite a common name in bucolic texts.

Carrai, Carrara and Berghoff-Bührer, among others, read the use of the name Galathea in Petrarch's *Eclogue* 11 as a way to symbolize a Christian transformation of Laura through apotheosis. Carrara, Matucci and Berghoff-Bührer argue for this interpretation by comparing the use of Galathea in Petrarch's poem with the use of the name in the ninth-century *Ecloga duarum sanctimonialium* written by the monk Pascasius Radbertus to lament the deceased abbot of Corbie, Adalhard, who died in 826. In the monk's eclogue, characters by the names of Galathea and Philis are used as allegories for different characteristics of human nature. The connection between Pascasius' and Petrarch's poems is not discernible from direct quotations, but Berghoff-Bührer considers the similarities in genre and form

to be so striking that she has no doubt that Pascasius' poem influenced Petrarch's *Eclogue* 11.[9] Bergin explains, with Martellotti, that a supporting argument for this interpretation can be extracted from the word itself: that Petrarch's spelling reflects an (erroneous) etymology presented in Servius' commentary on Vergil, *Eclogue* 3.73 which explains gala-thea as meaning milky-white goddess.[10]

These are interesting suggestions for the meaning of the name in the particular context of the poem's own meaning. They explain how using the name Galathea enhances the feeling of progression in this group of poems: the meaning of the name is the conclusion of *Eclogue* 11, the apotheosis, that concludes the narration about the plague and its victim, Laura, and even if this is not a typical use of this particular name, at least there are precedents. However, I would suggest that another Servian commentary on the use of the name in Vergil may help explain the connection between the laurel in *Eclogue* 10 and the character Galathea, as well as her name.

In the first Vergilian eclogue, the most iconic poem of the collection and, perhaps of his entire works, the author, according to Servius, describes how he lost and then regained his land,and he gives thanks to Augustus through the dialogue between Tityrus and Meliboeus. Here, Vergil writes the following about Galatea:

> Libertas, quae sera tamen respexit inertem, /candidior postquam tondenti barba cadebat, /respexit tamen et longo post tempore venit, /postquam nos Amaryllis habet, Galatea reliquit. / namque - fatebor enim - dum me / Galatea tenebat, / nec spes libertatis erat nec cura peculi.
>
> Freedom, which, though belated, cast at length / her eyes upon the sluggard, when my beard / 'gan whiter fall beneath the barber's blade / cast eyes, I say, and, though long tarrying, came, / now when, from Galatea's yoke released, / I serve but Amaryllis: for I will own, / while Galatea reigned over me, I had / no hope of freedom, and no thought to save. (Vergil, *Eclogue* 1.27-32)[11]

In this poem, Galatea is presented as the girlfriend that Tityrus left in order to pursue Amaryllis. Galatea appears in Tityrus' explanation of how he obtained his freedom that allows him to relax peacefully in the shadow of the beech. Servius interprets the relevant lines as follows:

> et longo post tempore venit, postquam nos amaryllis h. g. r. iungendum est hoc totum: nam / duplici ratione tempus ostendit, quo eum libertas aspexerit, id est quando coepit secare / barbam, et relicta Galatea Amaryllidis amore detineri. allegoricos autem hoc dicit, / postquam relicta Mantua Romam me contuli: nam Galateam Mantuam vult esse, Romam / Amaryllida. et bene tempora, quasi rusticus, computat a barbae sectione.
>
> *And, though long tarrying, came, now when, from Galathea's*...: All this must be connected, for he / indicates the time when liberty had cast her eye upon him in two ways, i.e. when he started / shaving his beard, and when he was captured by love for Amaryllis after he had left / Galatea. But here is what he says allegorically: "afterwards, when I had left Mantua, I / turned towards Rome", where Galatea is Mantua and Amaryllis Rome. And he indicates / the span of time in a nice manner, almost as a peasant, by his shaving. (Servius on Vergil, *Eclogue* 1.29, p. 9 line 10-17)[12]

Here, Servius states that Vergil is using this passage about girlfriends to date the time when he obtained his freedom. The dating is first presented, in Servius' interpretation, as the time when Tityrus/Vergil started shaving his beard, but it is expanded with a statement

of place: it was the same time as when he left Mantua and went to Rome. This means that Galatea refers to his time in Mantua and, consequently, that his time with Galatea and Amaryllis respectively divides Vergil's life into different periods spent in different places.

The application of the Servian interpretation of Galatea to Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen* will first focus on the meaning of location. In the following it will be suggested that there is a parallel focus on location in *Bucolicum carmen* which may support the argument for the connection between the laurel in *Eclogue* 10 and Galathea in *Eclogue* 11. For the theme of *Eclogue* 10 is not the destruction of the laurel alone, but also of the delightful setting that it provided for its owner, his *locus amoenus*. In the beginning of *Eclogue* 10, Silvanus describes his first encounter with this place and how it affected him:

> Verum inter scopulos nodosaque robora quercus / creverat ad ripam fluvij pulcherrima laurus. / Huc rapior, dulcisque semel postquam attigit umbra, / omnis in hanc vertor; cessit mea prima voluptas. / Rusticus ardor erat, sed erat gratissimus ardor / ille michi insueto, qui me, mortalia prorsus / oblitum immemoremque mei, meminisse iubebat / hanc unam, curasque et totum huc volvere tempus.
>
> And in a rocky country, where mighty oaks with their knotted / Trunks grew and flourished, I spied by the shores of a river a laurel. / Quickly I made my way towards it and shortly reaching its fragrant / Shadow I held myself by it, forsaking all other pleasures. / Call it a rustic obsession – but a new one to me and most welcome. / There did that laurel command me to put from my mind every worldly / Thing and forget myself; it bade me to fix my heart only / On that one tree and to give it my care in the years that were left me.
> (Petrarch, *Eclogue* 10.20-27)[13]

Silvanus describes how he found the laurel, a delicate, exquisite plant, in a rough landscape of rocks and mighty oaks. In the fiction, the laurel takes over his life. It compels him to forsake his duties as a farmer of the rugged land, i.e. his obligations,[14] and to commit himself entirely to its care which must mean the development of his poetical skills. Silvanus even goes abroad to learn new gardening techniques in order to take better care of the laurel – this is the famous "katabasis"[15] in v. 45-346 which presents a catalogue of ancient writers, and it is exactly when he returns with all his new knowledge and well-developed skills that he finds the *locus amoenus*, including its most important factor, the laurel, destroyed. It seems likely that this *locus amoenus*, with its inspirational powers, could be a poetic version of his country cottage in Vaucluse, not least due to the description in *Familiares* of how this particular place inspired him to write his *Bucolicum carmen* and many other of his works:

> Illic –"iuvat" enim "meminisse"– Africam meam cepi, tanto impetu tantoque nisu animi, ut / nunc limam per eadem referens vestigia, ipse meam audaciam et magna operis fundamenta / quodammodo perhorrescam; illic et pystolarum utriusque stili partem non exiguam et / pene totum Bucolicum carmen absolvi, quam brevi dierum spatio si noris, stupeas.
>
> It is pleasing for me to recall that it was there that I started my *Africa* with such great / energy and effort that now, as I try to apply the file to what I started, I seem to shudder at / my boldness and at the great framework I laid. There also I completed a considerable / portion of my letters in both prose and poetry and almost all of my *Bucolicum carmen* in such / a brief period of time that you would be astounded if you knew.
> (Petrarch, *Familiares* 8.3.11)[16]

In prose, the importance of the setting for the literary production is presented clearly, and it is basically the same argument as in *Eclogue* 10: the location, described as a *locus amoenus*, was important for the inspiration of Petrarch/Silvanus.

Eclogue 10 describes the story of Silvanus' attachment to his *locus amoenus* from his first discovery of it (flash back), to the present when it has been destroyed. This means that the place played an important role in his life, in a phase of his life that has now reached its end. In that sense, the story of this eclogue resembles the interpretation of Vergil's use of Galatea in Servius' commentary: the name of a female character is used to designate a past phase of the narrator's life. There is some variation; the most striking difference is that Petrarch's Galathea has not been left by her love – she has died, i.e. there is an emphasis on the pain connected to the ending of this phase which we do not find in Vergil's text. But the general concept is the same. The peculiar thing here is that the characteristics of Vergil's Galatea, as described by Servius, is attached to the laurel in *Eclogue* 10 rather than to the character by the name of Galathea in *Eclogue* 11. If we accept that the connotations of Galat(h)ea are projected onto the laurel in *Eclogue* 10, it seems likely that the characteristics of the laurel should also be reflected by Galathea. This analysis displays Petrarch's use of the Galatea figure as a way of playing with reader expectations which is consistent with the description of his famous statement about the main principle behind his imitation in *Familiares* 22.2.20, *similitudo non identitas*: the qualities of Vergil's Galatea are there, but they are presented before the name is used. However, this can also be seen as a way of strengthening the progression of the narrative. That will be examined in the next section.

Amaryllis?

Viewing *Eclogues* 9, 10 and 11 as a group creates a narrative progression from a prelude, to use Martellotti's term,[17] in 9, through 10 where we are presented with the destruction of the *locus amoenus*, to 11 where the loss is mourned and some closure and comfort is provided. It also gives us an increasingly nuanced view of the female person presented: first, in *Eclogue* 9, the theme of the plague is evoked. Anyone acquainted with Petrarch's vernacular poetry would be immediately aware that Laura was mourned here as a victim of the plague and therefore inclined to think of her also when reading about the laurel in *Eclogue* 10 and about the funeral of the female character, Galathea, in *Eclogue* 11.

If we move on from the textual level to consider the figurative meaning, and if we rely on Servius and accept that Galatea bears the connotations of a place, it seems quite clear that the place Galathea represents must be Vaucluse, a perfect parallel to Vergil's Mantua. But what Galathea and the laurel stand for in the fiction must be more than the place alone. The description of how Silvanus seeks new knowledge in order to take better care of it and the persons he consults indicate that the laurel must be the physical laurel, the *locus amoenus*, as well as the poetry inspired by it. But if the devastated place described as Galathea is a place as well as poetry, it seems logical to ask whether this poetry is restricted to a certain kind of poetry, in the same manner as the place most probably is a specific one. Perhaps here, the strong pastoral connotations of the name Galatea could be taken as an indication of the quality of poetry in question: pastoral poetry.[18] The genre specific name, combined with the analysis presented above that *Eclogues* 10 and 11 describe the destruction of the *locus amoenus* and the burial of the poetry it inspired, would, then, suggest that by burying Galathea in *Eclogue* 11, Petrarch is taking leave of his pastoral poetry.

In order to examine the validity of this suggestion I shall continue to discuss Servius' commentary on Vergil *Eclogue* 1.30-31, but I shall support my argument with another Servian passage, and of course with indications in the *Bucolicum carmen* itself. In addition, the arguments will show how reading Petrarch

with the Servian conception of Vergil in mind may bring structural and conceptual principles of *Bucolicum carmen* to light.

Let us first return to Vergil and Servius, for Galatea is only half of the statement of time and place in the second *ratio* of Servius' explanation of Vergil, *Eclogue* 1.30-31. Galatea works as a designator of time because she is set against Amaryllis, the allegoric representation of Rome and the present time, but there is no character by the name Amaryllis in Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen*, and even though poetry is represented in three different ways (as Dane, laurea, and Galathea, as mentioned in the previous section), they appear to be different representations of the same thing and not opposites. However, Rome, which Amaryllis represents according to Servius, plays an important role in *Bucolicum carmen*:[19] Rome is present throughout the work as a symbol of Antiquity and of the humanistic idea: In *Eclogue* 3, where Stupeus pursues Dane, he dreams that he will be crowned with a laurel wreath on the Capitoline; in *Eclogue* 4 Cola di Rienzo's idea of reintroducing the Roman republic is celebrated; and, as Skafte Jensen has shown, in *Eclogue* 8 Petrarch takes leave of Avignon and his patron there and describes the journey to Italy that lies before him.

The journey to Rome unfolds specifically in *Eclogue* 10. Czapla has identified three levels of it: a physical journey, a journey towards Rome through Classical literature, and a journey towards Rome through quotations of Classical authors, especially Vergil. Czapla reads the last verses of *Eclogue* 10 as an indication that Rome is the new home of the laurel: [20]

> Vidimus his oculis superos, Silvane, verendos / leniter avulsam meliori in parte locantes.
> (Sil.) Vidisti? An mesto solamen fingis amico?
> (So.) Vidi equidem, et comperta / loquor. Vestigia suplex / consequere, atque preclare aditum, verbisque caveto / invidiam conflare dejs; quod honestius opta / transire in terras, ubi nunc tua gloria vivit.
> (Sil) Dij faciant, precor ecce humilis, / semperque precabor.
>
> With my own eyes, Sylvanus, I saw the mighty Immortals / Find a happier site for that tree, which they had gently uprooted.
> (Syl.) You saw them? Or are you but seeking to cheer a sad friend with a fiction?
> (So.) What I have told you is true. And now it behooves you to follow / Humbly upon its traces and to pray for the right to be near it. / Let not rash words arouse the gods' displeasure, but rather / Hope to pass into that land where now your glory is dwelling.
> (Syl.) Oh, may the gods so will—so I humbly pray now and forever.
> (Petrarch, *Eclogue* 10.404-411)[21]

This passage answers the question asked in despair by Silvanus: "Hei michi! Quo nunc fessus eam? Quibus anxius umbris/recreer aut ubi iam senior nova carmina cantem?" (Alas, whither now shall I turn, being weary? What sheltering refuge/ Will solace my pain. At my age to whom shall I venture to offer/ New songs? v. 385-386),[22] and the answer partly lies in its resemblance to Vergil, *Eclogue* 1 where Tityrus has found that the god in Rome was the answer to his suffering. The home of Silvanus' laurel will not be Vaucluse anymore; it is going to reside in Rome. This must be the point of *Eclogue* 10 and the way to look at Galathea's counterpart, Amaryllis: In *Bucolicum carmen*, Rome is present as a goal in both a physical and ideological sense, but the goal has not been reached or achieved yet.

Taking into consideration the already discussed link between Vergil and Servius and the *Bucolicum carmen*, the use of the name Galat(h)ea raises an expectation of the occurrence of her counterpart, Amaryllis. This expectation can be played with, and perhaps that is what Pascasius does in his

eclogue where Galathea is accompanied not by Amaryllis, but Philis. The point is that Galathea is presented together with an opposite; she does not stand alone. If, indeed, Petrarch is playing with the expectations caused by the model, he does it in a different way: he appears to remove the allegorical veil of Amaryllis by presenting Rome as Rome, but, as Czapla shows, he does not remove the symbolism. Attached to Rome are all the connotations of Antiquity and Petrarch's humanist ideology. Rome, then, is a symbol, but in order to function conceptually here, Rome has to be a parallel of Galat(h)ea, like Amaryllis is in the Vergilian passage. Therefore 'Rome' would have to refer to a place – which it does – as well as to a certain kind of poetry. A broad interpretation of 'Rome' as the one presented allows for many kinds of poetry or literature, but the late-antique commentators may offer us a conceptual framework that helps us narrow the possibilities down to a clearer parallel, a framework for which there are indicators in the text and structure of *Bucolicum carmen*.

In the *prooemium* of his commentary, Servius presents the schematic classification of Vergil's works by the rhetorical levels of style that he has taken over from Donatus:

> tres enim sunt characteres, humilis, medius, grandiloquus: quos omnes in hoc invenimus poeta. nam in Aeneide grandiloquum habet, in georgicis medium, in bucolicis humilem pro qualitate negotiorum et personarum: nam personae hic rusticae sunt, simplicitate gaudentes, a quibus nihil altum debet requiri.
>
> there are, namely, three modes: humble, mediocre, and grandiloquent, all of which can be found in this poet's works. For in the *Aeneid* he uses the grandiloquent, in the *Georgics* the mediocre, and in the *Bucolics* the humble about the nature of things and persons, for the persons here are rustic, they enjoy simplicity, and nothing lofty should be required of them.
> (Servius, *Prooemium* p. 1 l. 16 - p. 2 l. 5).

This presentation of Vergil's bucolic poetry, widely known from the Middle Ages and onwards as the *Rota Vergiliana*, presents the three epic genres represented in Vergil's writings as three aspects of an entity, three stages of a hierarchy which is basically a career model. Pastoral is the first and lowest stage of this course; heroic epic is the last and highest.[23] The broad acceptance of this classification means that it is likely to consider this progressive system of epic genres as part of Petrarch's and his contemporaries' horizon of expectations, that is to say that to them humble bucolic poetry would include an aspiration towards the grandiloquent heroic epic on the writer's behalf.

As noted above, there is plenty of documentation proving that Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen* draws on Vergil for inspiration. Among the extrinsic documentation is the aforementioned letter to Boccaccio about imitation (*Fam.* 22.2) in which Petrarch asks Boccaccio to insert a revision of an allusion to Vergil's *Eclogue* 10 because he feels it resembles the wording found in Vergil's work too closely.[24] This suggests that Petrarch finds inspiration in Vergil's textual structure as well as in the imagery. Intrinsically, there are allusions and quotations, as the example of the letter demonstrates, but the title of the first eclogue: *Parthenias* also seems to signify that the work finds its inspiration in the writings of Vergil. As it is known from Donatus' vita, the inhabitants of Naples allegedly called Vergil, Parthenias.[25] The title of the first eclogue, along with the programmatic content of it, which we shall consider in the next section, brings Vergil to the reader's mind. Moreover, due to the prominent place of the title at the very beginning of the work, it could also be considered a sort of *Lesersteuerung*.

Carrai suggests that there is another indicator of influence in the formal arrangement of *Bucolicum carmen*: the division

of the work into twelve eclogues may be a reference to the number of books in Vergil's masterpiece, the *Aeneid*.[26] As we know from the *Familiares* where Petrarch describes himself as an Odysseus venturing on a symbolic journey through 24 books, the exact same number of books as the *Odyssey*, Petrarch is aware of and uses this type of symbolism.[27] It likewise supports Carrai's suggestion that the theme of *Eclogue* 12, *Conflictatio*, is war, the Hundred Years' War between France and England. If we follow the figurative readings discussed so far that means that the bucolic poetry dies in *Eclogue* 10, is mourned in *Eclogue* 11, and in *Eclogue* 12 its replacement is presented. Since Vergil has only ten eclogues, a reader would probably expect *Bucolicum carmen* to end at *Eclogue* 10. *Eclogue* 11 becomes a sort of interlude between the end point as defined by the great writer's model and the actual end of the work, the presentation of heroic epic themes in *Eclogue* 12. This presentation is, however, kept within a pastoral framework: The war is discussed by shepherds, and its main characters are given bucolic masks; Pan represents the king of France, and Arthicus the king of England.

This must bring us to a more specific definition of Galathea's parallel: if Rome or Amaryllis, the goal in this work, should represent a certain kind of poetry, it would have to be heroic epic, the finest of the Vergilian genres. The counterpart of Galathea, Amaryllis, is represented directly as Rome in *Bucolicum carmen*, but Rome has different symbolic meanings. Rome is the concrete, physical goal of Amiclas' journey in *Eclogue* 8, but as Silvanus makes clear in *Eclogue* 10 Rome is also Classical Rome with all its learning. Yet, in the analysis of the narrative progression of *Bucolicum carmen* Rome represents one particular kind of poetry, the goal indirectly stated in the title of the first *Eclogue*, the summit of the hierarchal genres of the *Rota Vergiliana*: heroic epic. This aspect of the Roman goal seems to be reflected in the formal as well as the narrative arrangement of the work.

Further perspectives: A fictive chronology?

Earlier, I argued that by reading *Bucolicum carmen* mediated by Servius's commentary on Vergil one will see the work as a metafictional progression from bucolic poetry towards heroic epic. Eclogues 10 and 11 may be read as a farewell, not to Avignon, as *Eclogue* 8, but to Vaucluse and bucolic poetry, and *Eclogue* 12 as an announcement of the new, serious theme of the next work. However, it was stated that the welcoming of epic was kept within a bucolic framework, that is, genre conventions were followed. But this means that there is a discrepancy between Petrarch's self-representation and his actual life which the poems are supposed to depict. As the quotation above from *Familiares* clearly states, Petrarch was working on his heroic epic during his time in Avignon and Vaucluse. The description of Vaucluse's positive effect on Petrarch's literary production explicitly mentions *Africa* – in fact, it is stated that he had already begun writing *Africa* when he was suddenly inspired to write *Bucolicum carmen* which then became a pleasant break from his work on *Africa*. This either means that Petrarch is not very particular about facts in his *Bucolicum carmen*, or that the suggested readings are wrong – mine as well as Carrai's – or that Petrarch is taking advantage of the fictional character of his work to apply the same principle at the figurative level as for the imitations: *similitudo non identitas*. We shall consider the latter, for as Barolini writes about *Rerum Vulgarum Fragmenta* "In truth, chronology and history are often violated by Petrarch...".[28] Since Petrarch has a creative approach to chronology in the *Canzoniere,* perhaps it is not unlikely that chronology would be used to convey a message in the *Bucolicum carmen* too. In the following, it will be examined how *Bucolicum carmen* can be seen to present Petrarch's poetic career constructed into a pattern fitting the Vergilian model as set forth by the *Rota Vergiliana*, and how this fictional chronology also appears to emend the chronological sequence of Vergil's *Eclogues*.

In his first eclogue Petrarch presents a

situation similar to the situation of Vergil's *Eclogue* 1: there is a happy and an unhappy shepherd; the happy shepherd is well at ease in his *locus amoenus* while the unhappy shepherd is forced to leave it. In Vergil's poem the traditional identification, as found in the late-antique interpretations, is that the happy shepherd, Tityrus, is a mask for Vergil, and that his resting happily in his *locus amoenus* is the result of Octavian's kindness towards him: he describes in the poem how he went to town and saw the god who gave him his freedom. Thereby the first eclogue is interpreted as a description of how Octavian returned Vergil's confiscated properties in Mantua to him.

In Petrarch's eclogue, however, even though the fictional exposition is similar, there is a difference when it comes to the assumed identities of the masks. In this poem the unhappy shepherd who ends up leaving the *locus amoenus* is Silvius, Petrarch's mask, while the shepherd resting safely in his *locus amoenus* is Monicus, a mask for Petrarch's brother Gherardo who was a monk. His bliss is a result of his choice of a monastic life, he is one-eyed, *monicus*, in the sense that he only looks towards heaven; he sings pastoral songs in the style of David in the *Old Testament*.[29] Silvius is invited by Monicus to share his *locus amoenus* like Meliboeus is by Tityrus in Vergil's poem, before he has to leave. But Silvius chooses to leave and follow a different path, the path of the ancient poets, of Homer and Vergil.

By changing which of the two characters represents the author, Petrarch changes the premise of the poem: Vergil's *Eclogue* 1 is, thematically and chronologically speaking, a concluding poem. When interpreted on the figurative level, the events presented, the happy ending of the business of the confiscated land, are preceded by the events featured in the other autobiographical poem, *Eclogue* 9, the penultimate poem of the collection, in which the confiscation takes place. But Petrarch sets the chronology straight in his work. By taking the place of the unhappy Meliboeus, instead of that of the happy Tityrus, his poem becomes programmatic rather than concluding: he sets out on a journey which is discernible throughout the work, and which ends, as has been mentioned already, with the ruined *locus amoenus*, the death of Galathea, and the dismissal of pastoral poetry. This correction of Vergil's chronology may also explain why Galathea is moved out of the context of the first *Eclogue* and placed at the end of the collection, after *Eclogue* 10 which, as already mentioned, would have been where the work would be expected to end. Galatea represents Vergil's rural phase, a phase presented as part of the past in the conclusive first eclogue, although the events presented in his *Eclogue* 9 clearly pertain to this phase.

Just like Vergil, Petrarch appears in his work behind different masks. But interestingly there is some similarity between his masks in *Eclogues* 1 and 10: Silvius and Silvanus. Both are clearly adjectives derived from the substantive *silva*,[30] and this similarity would encourage one to seek some kind of connection between the two poems in which the two names occur. As implied, I would see Petrarch's *Eclogue* 10 as the parallel to Vergil's conclusive *Eclogue* 1. The correspondence between the two poems indicated by the similarity of the masks used by the author may indicate that there is a thematic connection between the two, maybe one meant to mirror the autobiographic connection between Vergil's *Eclogues* 1 and 9. It is interesting for this reading to notice Martellotti's identification of a hypotext from Vergil's *Eclogue* 1.67-69. This means that Silvanus models his words after Meliboeus when he returns to his laurel from his quest for learning and skills in *Eclogue* 10.347-349.[31] Similarly, it seems worth noticing here that the mask Silvanus is barely a mask at all since it was a nick-name used for Petrarch by his friend outside the bucolic context.[32] This may be another way of showing that the journey he began in *Eclogue* 1 is about to reach its end – or at least that the pastoral phase of it is.

The inverted Vergilian model provides a logically progressing narrative order of the corrected chronology of Petrarch's career. The outline is as follows: the programmatic

statement of the choice of the Antique models instead of the Christian at the beginning of the work, and the concluding dismissal of bucolic poetry and welcoming of heroic epic at the end. In the following we shall consider two occasions in between when facts from Petrarch's real life are manipulated to fit into the fictive chronology.

The first eclogue to take up the theme of poetry and poetic progression after *Eclogue* 1 seems to be *Eclogue* 3, although Silvius does make an appearance in *Eclogue* 2 mourning the loss of a patron of the arts. In *Eclogue* 3 he is Stupeus who is in love with Dane. Dane comes to him in a dream and leads him to a mountaintop where he is crowned with a wreath of laurel by the muses. This has to be a representation in fiction of the event of 8 April 1341 where Petrarch was crowned with laurel on the Capitoline.[33] The event presented in the poem was, thus, very real, and it had already taken place when Petrarch started composing his bucolic poems, but in the narrative discourse it is moved out of Stupeus' reality and into his dreams. It becomes a possibility or ambition rather than a factual experience of the past.

After *Eclogue* 3 follows the claim of superiority of Italian poetry compared to French due to the Classical inheritance of the Italians, then, in *Eclogue* 5, Petrarch presents the positive idea of Rome in Cola di Rienzo's vision of the revived republic. This revival was attempted in 1347, again before Petrarch started writing *Bucolicum carmen*, but in the narrative discourse it is presented as an open possibility, not as an idea that failed when attempted. Hereafter follows the satirical critique of the Papal Curia of Avignon in *Eclogues* 6 and 7 – again the negativity is connected to France – before, in *Eclogue* 8, Amiclas/Petrarch presents his decision to leave Avignon and set out for Italy for Ganimedes/Giovanni Colonna. The poem contains a description of the Alps in v. 41 which has been analysed by Skafte Jensen. She categorizes the Alps as having "a specially emotional status", underlining the high value attributed to Italy which shines even brighter on the background of the critique of France and Avignon. Skafte Jensen's interpretation is based on her identification of the description as an echo of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* 21.37.2, the description of Hannibal's invasion of Italy.[34]

The hypotext draws focus to the description which is analysed as an emotional celebration of the longed-for homeland. In its original context, the hypotext's description is part of Livy's account of Hannibal's attempt to invade Italy, the theme of Petrarch's *Africa*. It must, therefore, be relevant to consider whether the allusion to Livy also works as an allusion to *Africa* which we know Petrarch was working on at the time, cf. *Fam.* 8.3 quoted above. If it is, it is a faint and cautious allusion, since its significance lies not in the actual passage alluded to by Petrarch, but in its original context. I would suggest that the effect of this allusion is similar to that of the use of the dream in *Eclogue* 3 in that it provides a means to make a chronological correction, although the distance between the textual fiction and the factual 'event' is larger and the connection less evident in *Eclogue* 8 than it is in *Eclogue* 3. The result in both cases is that a factual aspect of Petrarch's career is manipulated slightly in order for it to fit the general plan of his narrative discourse and its portrayal of a Vergilian career path.

The indirectness of the allusion to *Africa* in *Eclogue* 8 could be taken as a sign of the lengths Petrarch goes to meet the demands of the Vergilian model: to keep his bucolic poem bucolic and maintain his attempt at the heroic epic as a future venture. This makes it relevant to consider one more possible Servian impact, this time on the title of the work, *Bucolicum carmen*. That the title is singular has been taken as an indication of how the work must be considered an entity and has inspired several analyses of structural patterns and symmetry[35] But *bucolicum carmen* is also a term used by Servius in his *prooemium*:

nec numerus hic dubius est nec ordo

librorum, quippe cum unus sit liber: de eclogis multi dubitant, quae licet decem sint, incertum tamen est, quo ordine scriptae sint. plerique duas certas volunt ipsius testimonio, ultimam, ut <X 1> "extremum hunc", (et primam, ut) in georgicis <IV 566> "Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi"; alii primam illam volunt <VI 1> "prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu". sane sciendum, vii. eclogas esse meras rusticas, quas Theocritus x. habet. hic in tribus a bucolico carmine, sed cum excusatione discessit, ut in genethliaco Salonini et in Sileni theologia, vel ut ex insertis altioribus rebus posset placere, vel quia tot varietates implere non poterat.

There is neither doubt about the number nor the order of the books, for there is only one book. Many are in doubt about the eclogues; although there are ten of them it is uncertain in which order they were written. Most people are certain about two poems because of their own testimonies: the last because it says <10.1>: "This now, the very latest" (and the first because) in the *Georgics* it says <4.566>: "sang in saucy youth/Thee, Tityrus, 'neath the spreading beech tree's shade."; others consider this to be the first <6.1>: "first my Thalia stooped in sportive mood/ to Syracusan strains". It can safely be said that 7 eclogues are completely rustic; of this type Theocritus has 10. Vergil differs from bucolic song in three eclogues, but with an excuse, like in Saloninus' birthday poem and in the theology of Silenus, or in order that he could flatter by means of the inserted higher themes, or because he could not include enough variation otherwise. (Servius, *Prooemium* p. 3 l. 14-24).[36]

In the quotation, the term *bucolicum carmen* is used as a way of designating the eclogues in Vergil's collection which are truly bucolic in the sense that they do not push the limits of the generic environment by treating lofty themes. Even though Servius defends Vergil in the three cases where he challenges the limit of the genre, it would be consistent with the previously presented analyses based on Servius if the use of the Servian term *bucolicum carmen* in the title serves as a designator of the poetry presented in the work, as a way of stating that the work is entirely bucolic. In that sense, Petrarch would be challenging his model on one more level, by signalling that contrary to Vergil he manages to stick to the *decorum* of the genre, even though he is able, at the same time, to suggest further literary goals.

In Ambrosiana ms. S.P.10/27 Petrarch has written "hanc sequor" next to the excuse "… posset placere" in Servius' *prooemium*.[37] He thus seems to follow the positive explanation of the deviation from the bucolic discourse, accepting the introduction of loftier themes within a work adhering to restrictions of bucolic decorum, and accordingly that these require a loftier treatment. The note in his codex of Vergil show that Petrarch is aware of what Servius sees as a challenging of the bucolic discourse in Vergil's collection, and that he has an opinion about it.

Conclusion

The ambition of the analyses presented in this paper is to suggest how reading humanist pastoral poetry from the point of view of a reconstructed horizon may open new perspectives of genre conceptions. These perspectives work in a reciprocal way, for if the results of the analyses are accepted they show how the hypothesis works: that Servius and the conceptions of Vergil's poetry can be used as a source to humanists' view on pastoral *decorum* and norms. In this case, reading with Servius as a key to the interpretation of the autobiographical narrative of the work seems exceptionally fruitful, since it points to a metafictional reflection about genre in the work itself that supports the general lines of the interpretation: the meta-reflection

seems to be part of the general narrative structure. Reading with Servius connects other observations regarding *Bucolicum carmen*, such as Carrai's identification of the formal arrangement of *Bucolicum carmen* as an allusion to heroic epic, to contemporary ideas about poetry and poetic career. In the case of the formal arrangement, considering the significance of the name Galathea based on Servius' explanation of Vergil 1.30-31, it seems that the preoccupation with genres is not only part of the formal arrangement, but of the textual arrangement, too, and, consequently, the message.

The reflection about genre that I have identified within the work raises the option for a consideration of work structure and the use of autobiography based, again, on Petrarch's use of Vergil as a model for his work, still taking the meaning of Galathea as the point of departure. Moving the designator of the author's rural period to the end of the collection whereby it is separated from the initial choice between two lifestyles shows how the chronological arrangement of the work is different from the model's: there is no explicit conclusion in Petrarch's work, only suggestive hints. There is a programmatic statement of intent in the beginning where Petrarch chooses the path of the Classical poets, and particularly that of Vergil. He treads this path throughout the work, but towards the end something is not right anymore. In *Eclogue* 8 he leaves his patron, and in *Eclogue* 10 when he returns from a pastoral version of a grand tour, his *locus amoenus* and his poetical inspiration is destroyed—maybe the real problem is that Vaucluse is located in France, but that is not stated in the fictional description of *Eclogue* 10. We can, however, see in *Eclogue* 10 that Silvius has changed: he has become Silvanus, a mask used outside of the work which may be an indication that Petrarch is in the process of leaving the pastoral. What is certain is that the pastoral poetry inspired by the rural *locus amoenus* is over and done with; it is set free in *Eclogue* 11. Galathea is dead, the pastoral phase is over, but the poems may live on in all eternity independent of the author who is free to move his poetry to a new place and a new level.

The analyses show how the Servian reading of Vergil's Galatea, which I have called a hypotext for Petrarch's use of the name, reflects a particular conception of genre on one hand and a very conscious use of a fictional version of himself as a vehicle for a self-fashioning, on the other. The result differs from the actual story of Petrarch's career, but in the narrative discourse it matches the Vergilian ideal and, thus, the poetic *decorum*.

Trine Arlund Hass
Assistant Professor
Aarhus University
klftjah@cas.au.dk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avena, A. (ed.)
1906 *Il Bucolicum carmen e i suoi commenti inediti*, Padua.

Barolini, T.
2009 "The Self in the Labyrinth of Time". In: Kirkham, V. & Maggi, A. (eds.), *Petrarch. A Critical Guide to the Complete Works*, Chicago, 33-62.

Berghoff-Bührer, M.
1991 *Das Bucolicum Carmen des Petrarca. Ein Beitrag zur Wirkungsgeschichte von Vergils Eclogen*, (*European University Studies. Series 15. Classics* 52), Bern-New York.

Bergin, T.
1974 *Petrarch's Bucolicum carmen*, New Haven & London.

Carrai, S.
2009 "Pastoral as Personal Mythology". In: Kirkham, V. & Maggi, A. (eds.), *Petrarch. A Critical Guide to the Complete Works*, Chicago, 165-177.

Carrara, E.
1909 *La Poesia pastorale*, (*Storia dei generi letterari italiani*), Milano.

Charlet, J.-L.
2004 "L'architechture du *Bucolicum Carmen* du Pétrarque", *Res Publica Litterarum* 27, 30-41.

Corti, M.
1978 "Literary Genres and Codifications". In: *An Introduction to Literary Semiotics* (trans. Bogat, M. & Mandelbaum, A.), Bloomington & London, 115-146.

Czapla, B.
2005 "Petrarcas 'Katabasis' zu den Dichtern der Antike". In: Auhagen, U. *et al.*(eds.), *Petrarca und die römische Literatur,* (*Neolatina* 9), Tübingen, 157-175.

Donatus, A.
1997 *Vita Vergilii*, *Vitae Virgilianae Antiquae: Scriptores Graeci et Latini* (eds.: Brugnoli, G. & Stok, F.), Rome.

Donatus, A.
2008 *Life of Vergil* (trans.: Wilson-Okamura, D.) (www.virgil.org, accessed November 2013).

Enenkel, K.
1990 see Petrarca, F. 1990.

François, M. & Roudaut, F.
2001 see Petrarca, F. 2001.

Greenough, J. B. (ed. & trans.)
1900 *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics of Vergil*, Boston.

Houghton, L.
2008 "Virgil the 'Renaissance Man' and his Medieval Antecedents", *The Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 26, 89-104.

Kegel-Brinkgreve, E.
1990 *The Echoing Woods. Bucolic and pastoral from Theocritus to Wordsworth*, Amsterdam.

Krautter, K.
1983 *Die Renaissance der Bukolik in der lateinischen Literatur des XIV. Jahrhunderts. Von Dante bis Petrarca*, Munich.

Martellotti, G.
1951 "Egloghe". In: Bianchi, N. *et al.* (eds.), *Rime, Trionfi e poesie latine*, Milan & Naples.

Martellotti, G.
1968 *Laurea occidens. Bucolicum carmen X*, (*Note e discussioni erudite a cura di Augusto Campana* 12), Rome.

Mazzotta, G. F.
2009 "Petrarch's Epistolary Epic". In: Kirkham, V. & Maggi, A. (eds.), *Petrarch. A Critical Guide to the Complete Works*, Chicago, 309-319.

Nichols, F. J.
1969 "The Development of Neo-Latin Theory of the Pastoral in the Sixteenth Century", *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 18, 95-114.

Petrarca, F.
1975-1985 *Francesco Petrarca. Letters on Familiar Matters. Rerum familiarium libri* 3 vols., (trans. Bernardo, A.S.), Baltimore.

Petrarca, F.
1990 *De vita solitaria* 1(ed.: Enenkel, K. A. E.), (*Publications romanes de l'Université de Leyde* 24), Leiden.

Petrarca, F.
1997 "Epystole familiares". In: Stoppelli, P. (ed.), *Opera Omnia*, Rome (from www.bibliotecaitaliana.it, accessed November 2013).

Petrarca, F.
2001 *Bucolicum carmen. Texte latin, traduction et commentaire* (eds.: François, M. & Roudaut, F.), (*Textes de la renaissance sous la direction de Claude Blum* 43), Paris.

Petrarca, F.
2006 *Le postille del virgilio Ambrosiano* 2 vols. (eds. Baglio, M. *et al.*), (*Studi sul Petrarca* 33-34), Rome & Padua.

Servius Honoratus, M.
1887 *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii* 3 (ed. Thilo, G.), Leipzig.

Skafte Jensen, M.
1997 "Petrarch's Farewell to Avignon. *Bucolicum Carmen* VIII". In: Pade, M. *et al.* (eds.), *Avignon & Naples. Italy in France-France in Italy in the Fourteenth Century*, (*Analecta Romana Instituti Danici. Supplementum* 25), Rome, 69-82.

NOTES

1 Translation by Bernardo (1985), see Petrarca 1975-1985.
2 Based on Corti 1978.
3 On the theme of Vergilian commentaries as a source of theory on pastoral, see Nichols 1969.
4 Carrai 2009, 165-167.
5 E.g. Berghoff-Bührer 1991; Charlet 2004; François & Roudaut 2001, 202; Krautter 1983, and similarly Martellotti 1968, although he is concerned with *Eclogue* 10 alone.
6 E.g. Charlet 2004, 36; Czapla 2005, 165; Berghoff-Bührer 1991, 300-301; François & Roudaut 2001, 199; Martellotti 1968, 7.
7 Cf. Martellotti 1968, 8: "... in quanto il lauro di cui si parla non simboleggia soltanto la donna amata, ma anche e sopratutto la poesia."
8 Carrai mentions Ovid's version as inspiration for parts of Petrarch's *Eclogue* 11 (Carrai 2009, 171).
9 Carrai 2009, 175; Carrara 1909, 107; for Matucci, see Berghoff-Bührer 1991, 301-303.
10 Bergin 1974, 248, with reference to Martellotti 1951, 826; see also Kegel-Brinkgreve 1990, 264 note 82. The etymology is also explained in this manner in the commentary on Petrarch's *Bucolicum carmen* by Francesco Piendibeni da Montepulciano (ms. Vat.pal. 1729, see Avena 1906, 285 and François & Roudaut 2001, 243-244. François & Roudaut also present a more correct etymology).
11 Translated by Greenough 1900.
12 Translations are my own unless otherwise indicated. Here, the translation of Vergil *Eclogue* 1.30-31 is by Greenough (see above).
13 Translation from Bergin 1974.
14 The commentary of Benvenuto da Imola (ms. 33 Plut. 52 Laurenziana) explains that the oaks are the prelates and the rocky country Avignon (Avena 1906, 228).
15 Martellotti 1968 explains the allusive presentation of the catalogue of ancient writers in his commentary, as does Czapla 2005. The term "katabasis" is a loan from Czapla who compares the passage to Dante's travels in the *Divine Comedy*.
16 Translation by Bernardo 1975. Skafte Jensen 1997, 71 presents the parallel in her reading of *Eclogue* 8 in which Petrarch leaves Giovanni Colonna and Avignon. This eclogue and other elements of Skafte Jensen's study will be discussed briefly in the last section of the paper.
17 Martellotti 1968, 7.
18 Cp. Martellotti 1968, 7: "L'egloga XI, intitolata *Galathea*, è in certo modo più vicina ai modelli della bucolica classica, e precisamente alla V di Virgilio, in morte di Dafni...". François & Roudaut 2001, 247-249 do not believe in the destruction of poetry, but rather interpret that "La blanche, l'immaculée Galatée ne peut être visée ici. Elle demeure hors d'atteinte. Le couac d'une césure trochaïque anticipée éclate dans la derision … mais laisse Galathée intact, insoupçonnable."
19 Cf. e.g. Berghoff-Bührer's structural analysis of the work. Here, Rome is described as a structuring factor holding the work together: She groups the poems into three sections of each four poems, 1-4: "Dichtung, Ruhm: Aufstieg", 5-8: "Rom in Zentrum", and 9-12: "Klage. Ruhm: Niedergang". Berghoff-Bührer 1991, 72-77.
20 Czapla 2005, 163-173.
21 Translation from Bergin 1974.
22 Translation from Bergin 1974.
23 See, for instance, Houghton 2008, 99.
24 Petrarch, *Familiares* 22.2.23-24.
25 "Cetera sane uita et ore et animo tam probum constat, ut Neapoli 'Parthenias' uulgo appellatus sit, ac si quando Romae, quo rarissime commeabat, uiseretur in publico, sectantes demonstrantesque se suffugere<t> in proximum

tectum." (For the rest, all are thoroughly agreed that his life was upright, both in mouth and mind, with the result that he was commonly known in Naples as *Parthenias* ["the Virgin"]. And if perchance someone should spot him in public at Rome (which he passed through very rarely), he would seek refuge in the nearest house, cut off from those who were pointing him out.). Donatus, *Vita Vergilii* 11, translation by Wilson-Okamura 2008.

[26] Carrai 2009.

[27] Mazzotta 2009, 312-314.

[28] Barolini 2009, 37. The observations made by Barolini about the arrangement of Petrarch's vernacular poetry and his active use of work structure as a way to "dramatize and explore ideas"(*Ibid.*, 41) offer an interesting parallel for the suggestions about the *Bucolicum carmen* presented in the following: "In a way that I would argue is stunningly new, Petrarch makes time for the protagonist of his book of poetry. Time is continually present in the *Fragmenta* through the text's orchestrated narrativity: its deployment of the categories of (unstable) beginning, middle, and end, its dialectically interwoven *contamination* of lyric and narrative drives. The poet introduces narrativity through chronology and tenous thematic linkages, but most of all through various forma measures such as the novel device of dividing his lyric collection into two parts." (*Ibid.*, 43).

[29] For the interpretation of Monicus cf. Cod. 33 Plut. 52 Laurenziana in Avena 1906, 169.

[30] For this it may be interesting to note that Krautter reads Petrarch's use of *silvae* as a synonym for pastoral (Krautter 1983, 111).

[31] Martellotti 1968, 82-83, on Petrarch, *Eclogue* 10.347-349.

[32] For an account of the pseudonym see Enenkel 1990, 252-253.

[33] See e.g. Charlet 2004, 31.

[34] Skafte Jensen 1997, 79.

[35] See note 5.

[36] Translations from the *Eclogues* by Greenough 1900.

[37] f. 2^{r} and Petrarca 2006 2, 464.