Slavery and the Roman Imagination: Images of Servility in the *Georgics* and the *Confessions*

Donald McCarthy

Department of History and Classical Studies
McGill University, Montreal
July 2020

Table of contents

Abstract

Slavery was a defining characteristic of Roman social, economic, and cultural life from the Republican period to Late Antiquity. Slaves are pervasive in the historical record, appearing in brothels, at the theatre, in the amphitheatre, in the homes of the wealthy and on the farms of the surrounding countryside. Their place and influence in the literary history of the Latin-speaking world demands attention as well and this thesis will offer a discussion on the significance of slavery within two seemingly dissimilar texts: Vergil's *Georgics* and St. Augustine's *Confessions*. Vergil fashions the narrative of his didactic poem around shifting focalizations, forcing the reader to approach the agricultural world from many and varied perspectives, from the divine, to human beings, oxen, plants, soil, and tools. This presents a narrative wherein all elements of the agricultural world are become interconnected through a relationship of violence and domination. The personification and anthropomorphism of these disparate elements in combination with the slave language consistent throughout the poem, however, makes clear that Vergil is not presenting simply a violent world but the enslavement of all aspects of the farmer's world. In a similar fashion, Augustine anchors his *Confessions* around the internal enslavement he experienced in his journey towards conversion. Augustine finds himself in bondage to his carnal and earthly desires and ambitions which distract him from the spiritual path he will eventually take. This slavery is located entirely in the spiritual sphere and hinges upon the inner immaturity, the *pueritia*, of Augustine that persists long after his maturation in the external world. Slavery for both Vergil and Augustine is an issue of understanding the nature of things, for Augustine, the nature of the human soul and for Vergil, the nature of an imagined Roman world after the rise of Octavian to the principate. Slavery links these two authors and will provide the foundation for future studies of literary slavery throughout the Latin canon.

Résumé

L'esclavage fut un élément clé de la vie sociale, économique, et culturelle à Rome dès la période républicaine et au-delà des derniers jours de l'empire. Les esclaves se retrouvèrent dans tout espace public, figurant dans les bordels, au théâtre, dans les ménages urbains des aristocrates autant que sur les fermes rurales. Leur signifiance pour l'histoire littéraire de la langue latine mérite notre attention et cette étude offrira une analyse profonde de l'importance de l'esclavage pour deux textes provenant des contextes et des auteurs bien différents : les *Géorgiques* de Virgile, et les *Confessions* du saint Augustin. Quant à lui, le poème de Virgile tourne surtout autour des focalisations diverses forçant le lecteur de regarder le monde de l'agriculture de plusieurs perspectives y compris du divin à l'homme, de la flore à la faune, du sol aux outils. Cela présente un monde poétique où tous les éléments de l'agriculture deviennent entremêlés au travers d'une relation avec la violence et la subjugation. L'anthropomorphisme desdits éléments autant que le langage servile continuel insistent sur le fait que Virgile ne présente pas seulement un monde de violence, mais plutôt l'asservissement de tous les aspects du monde agricole. D'une manière semblable, Augustin centre ses *Confessions* autour de l'asservissement spirituel qu'il éprouve le long de son parcours vers la conversion. Il se retrouve captif de ses désirs charnels et ambitions mondaines qui le distraient de sa voie religieuse. Cet esclavage incorporel dont Augustin souffre provient de son immaturité spirituelle, la *pueritia* qui perdure longtemps après la maturation extérieure de l'homme. Pour Virgile et Augustin, la signifiance de l'esclavage porte un questionnement sur la nature des choses : pour Augustin sur la nature de l'âme, et pour Virgile sur la nature d'un monde romain imaginé après la montée d'Octavien au principat. Un traçage plus profond du lien entre ces deux auteurs à travers la littérature latine étoffera notre compréhension de l'importance de l'esclavage dans l'imaginaire romain.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest thanks to my supervisor, Professor Bill Gladhill, whose support, advice, and patience have helped me through my time at McGill and especially in writing this thesis. An excellent conversation partner and a wonderful teacher, I am sincerely grateful to have had the chance to work on this project with him.

I would also like to thank the entire McGill Classics department for the many opportunities and the constant support it has given me. I am especially indebted to Professors Lynn Kozak, Michael Fronda, Martin Sirois, Darian Totten, Naomi Kaloudis, Heidi Wendt, and Brahm Kleinman. Your teaching, humour, and passion have continuously pushed me to grow as a student and I will always be thankful for your tireless work.

To my friends and colleagues, I want to thank you for all you have done throughout my time at McGill. I would especially like to thank Daniel Whittle and Neha Rahman for their constant support and encouragement over the last two years.

I would like to also thank my family for their unfailing love and support in all circumstances. Mom, Dad, Bridget, and Louise, these last years would have been impossible without you. Lastly, but most importantly, I want to thank Theresa. You have been my constant companion in all of this, and nothing would ever have been possible without you. Thank you.

Introduction

Slavery is an endemic element of the Roman world and is fundamental to a study not only of the historical fabric of Rome from the foundation of the city into Late Antiquity and the Christian period, but also to the literary landscape of the Latin speaking world. The overt presence of slaves in literary texts would prove to be idiomatic of the first Roman poets and playwrights, and the theme would carry onwards across centuries and historical periods. Plautine comedy, our entryway into early Latin literature, is filled with slaves.[1] We see them bear the punishments and abuse of their masters in what could only have been a recognizable aspect of life outside of the theatre.[2] And yet, Plautus refuses to allow his slave characters to become simply props in his comedies, and they often become the central figures in the narrative, outwitting their otherwise oblivious superiors.[3] Why Plautus would have painted a picture of slavery that oscillated so much between comedy, brutality, and sympathy for his enslaved characters is a matter of interpretation.[4]

---

[1] "In the twenty-one plays of Plautus (counting the fragmentary *Vidularia*) there are forty slaves. In fact, there is no Roman Comedy without a slave. Of these forty slaves about fourteen could be called important to their plays; the rest have roles of varying importance" (Stace, "The Slaves of Plautus," 65–6).

[2] Examples of and references to slave abuse abound in Plautus. Cf. *Capt.* 888–9: *boiam terit*; the *boia* was a particular type of collar used especially to torture slaves (Richlin, *Slave Theatre in the Roman Republic*, 373). Or see too in *Amphitryon* the slave Sosia, confused because of Mercury's impersonation of him, lists all of the various bodily features he sees in the god and recognizes as his own, notably including his scarred back, marked by years of floggings (445–6): *... malae, mentum, barba, collus: totus. quid uerbis opust? | si tergum cicatricosum, nihil hoc similist similius.*

[3] Such is the case for instance in *Miles Gloriosus* where Palaestrio, originally owned by the sympathetic Pleusicles, the comedy's principal *amator*, but now enslaved to the boastful and clueless Pyrgopolynices (our *miles gloriosus*), manages to completely outwit his new master for the sake of Pleusicles. Pyrgopolynices is convinced to give away the Pleusicles' love interest, Philocomasium, based on nothing more than the contrivances of his slave. The entire piece revolves around the slave's wits and his master's foolishness. *Serui callidi* were a common trope in Plautus' work; cf. Stace, 66ff.

[4] Richlin highlights the possibility that much of the audience would have been comprised of enslaved or freed people, who would perhaps have recognized fictionalized versions of themselves onstage (37ff). Itgenshorst makes a similar observation about the intentional departure from reality in *Miles Gloriosus* in the laughter at the master's expense: "Was bedeutet das Gelächter über den Prahlerischen Soldaten? Einerseits war es ein Gelächter, das das Unwirkliche, ja Unmögliche des Gezeigten zum Ausdruck brachte. Die Lächerlichmachung des *miles* und sein Scheitern in der zivilen Gesellschaft der Komödie waren geradezu ein Gegenbild zur Realität der Zuschauer: Im Wirklichkeit was das öffentlich Leben in Rom bereits zu dieser Zeit durch die Darstellung von Kriegsruhm und Kriegstate geprägt" (Itgenshorst, *Tota Illa Pompa: der Triumph in der römischen Republik*, 54).

Nevertheless, it is clearly the case that slaves were a central part of Plautus literary imagination and production. This is true too of subsequent writers, with slavery playing an intimate role in love elegy,[5] bucolic poetry,[6] and even the early novel as epitomized by Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, a text wholly anchored in a slave narrative.[7]

The purpose of this thesis is to demonstrate that slavery is a defining aspect of both Vergil's *Georgics* and St. Augustine's *Confessions*, two texts separated by more than four centuries of time and cultural change. Despite the ample and obvious differences between the two works, ranging from the natural distinctions between prose and poetry, to the disparate historical and contextual circumstances unique to each, the following discussion shall endeavour to present a thread linking both texts together through their shared engagement with slavery. Locating slavery at the core of these texts will be essential for furthering our understanding of the authors' literary goals and achievements precisely because slaves do not often feature as openly as they do in other writers—if slavery exists in any significant fashion in the *Georgics*, it is as Vergil's overarching conception of the natural and supernatural worlds and filtered through the tumultuous changes that enveloped Rome at the fall of the Republic; likewise for Augustine's *Confessions*, slavery will take on new significance for his understanding of spirituality and the divine, as well as for his inner nature and the human soul.

---

[5] Tibullus will be the principal example of such. We shall consider in Chapter 3 especially the role of slavery in Tibullus 1.1, 1.5, 2.3, and 2.4.

[6] Vergil's *Eclogues* engage strongly with slavery albeit from a different perspective than is apparent in Roman Comedy. The clearest example is in *E.* 1, as two herdsmen, Meliboeus and Tityrus, compare their individual fortunes in the wake of what is suggested to be the land confiscations that accompanied Octavian's rise to power; Tityrus finds himself freed from slavery and at ease in the countryside with his livestock (1.40–5), while Meliboeus is banished and on the road (1.1–5).

[7] Cf. Lucius, transformed into an ass, working in the grueling conditions of the flour mill alongside human slaves (9.12): *dii boni, quales illic homunculi uibicibus liuidis totam cutem depicti dorsumque plagosum ... frontes litterati et capillum semirasi et pedes anulati ...* Lucius' colleagues are scarred from beatings (cf. Plautus above n.2), described as almost less than human (*homunculi*, "though hapax legomenon in Apul., this diminutive occurs in Plautus (*Capt.* 51, *Rud.* 154, *Trin.* 491)..." Hijmans et al., *Metamorphoses,* 9), and are branded or tattooed (*fronte litterati*) as was common for runaway slaves. Lucius the ass shares the same labour as the human slaves, thereby conflating him with them; cf. Hijmans et al., 115–24.

The *Georgics*, published in 29 BC and Vergil's second major work, occupies a unique place in Roman literature and is particularly unwieldy to modern interpretation. Professed as a didactic poem on agriculture and animal husbandry in the mould of Hesiod's *Works and Days*,[8] the *Georgics* are well removed from the martial epic and idyllic pastoralism we find in the poet's other works:[9] "If the *Georgics* is tightly woven into Virgil's *oeuvre* as a whole, it is probably true that for a modern audience it is the most difficult of the three poems with which to come to terms. We are still reasonably comfortable with pastoral and epic, but the genre of didactic has become strange…"[10] This is due in part to the misplaced modern expectation that Vergil attempted to actually teach agriculture in the poem—the function of ancient didactic poetry was not this straightforward. One would not meet with much success as a farmer in strictly following either Vergil's or Hesiod's advice in their respective works. Vergil did, of course, incorporate factual elements from agriculture and rustic observances into his poem, but he never approaches the same level of detail as could be found in the prose manuals.[11] Vergil's intent rather, centres around the

[8] One of several key models for the poem, though certainly the most evident in Book 1. Vergil drew extensively from the Greek tradition in all of his writing. The *Georgics* is most clearly based on the *Works and Days*, the *Eclogues* follows in the footsteps of the Greek bucolic tradition especially Theocritus' works, and the *Aeneid*, of course, aims to follow in the epic tradition of both Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The *Georgics* in particular was also heavily influenced by Callimachus, Homer, Aratus, Theophrastus, and Nikander on the Greek side, and Varro, Catullus, and Lucretius on the Latin. For the importance of Callimachus for Vergil, see especially the introduction to Thomas' commentary on the Georgics, esp. 6–9; "The influence of *Callimachus* is a special type. Virgil refers to him directly at certain points in the poem, and there is little doubt that such references would be seen to be more numerous if more of Callimachus had survived" (6). Cf. Thomas, "Callimachus, the *Victoria Berenices*, and Roman Poetry," 92–113. For Vergil's engagement with Lucretius, see especially Gale, 2000 and 2008.

[9] This is not, of course, to suggest that the *Eclogues* and the *Aeneid* are simple texts—far from it. The *Eclogues* for instance may be indebted to Theocritus' *Bucolica* but even at that early stage of his poetic career Vergil's poetic differentiates himself from his predecessor. Compared to Theocritus, Vergil cast a wider net within the pastoral genre, and "include[d] a wider range of experiences—politics and politicians, the ravages of civil war, religion, poetry, literary criticism—in a pastoral definition" (Clausen, *Eclogues*, xix–xx).

[10] Philip Hardie, *Virgil*, 29.

[11] Varro's *Res Rusticae* was Vergil's chief source for many agricultural details in the *Georgics*, and Vergil certainly owed many of the truly agronomic details in his poem to the fact that Varro's treatise was published not long before the *Georgics*. We should still, however, compare Vergil's poetry to the completely prosaic agricultural work carried out by Cato the Elder (*De Agricultura*) and much later Columella (*De Re Rustica*). Whether an aspiring farmer would find much success in following Varro's or Cato's directives either is also debatable, however, it is certainly true that these prose writers aimed for a higher degree of exactitude and fact in their accounts than did Vergil in his.

creation of a world wherein the divine and natural order is subverted in the wake of Octavian's rise to the principate. That Vergil directs his attention to the farmer's universe as the locus for this discussion is a calculated choice based upon the importance of agriculture and rusticity to the Roman imagination.[12] Within the *Georgics*, however, this rusticity pivots around the particular axis of slavery, thereby refocusing the nature of the world Vergil has described.

In the first chapter of the following discussion I shall examine how Vergil crafts the *Georgics* by consistently re-focalization of the poem's point of view. The poem, while ostensibly aimed directly at the aspiring farmer,[13] does not remain fixed or stagnant in this perspective and constantly shifts the lens through which Vergil presents the farmer's world. Vergil will bring us to look through the eyes of Octavian as a future god and his connection to the agriculture world from his place amongst the constellations (1.24–42). We are just as quickly, however, transported away from the ethereal and descend into the literal soil of the farmer's realm and embody not simply the *agricola* but the vermin and pests that impede his progress (176–86). And within the span of one book, we are returned to Octavian, now a mortal youth (*iuuenis* 500) once more, and we see a dark world on the brink of disaster and which the *princeps* can only save with divine support (438–514). These constant shifts allow Vergil to present the agricultural world from multiple perspectives, from the bottom up as well as from the top down, and makes it clear that this world is characterized by relationships of domination at all levels of existence.

Building upon the prevalence of these narrative focalizations and the anthropomorphism of the many and varied creatures and elements of Vergil's farm, we shall turn in Chapter 2 to a discussion of *labor* and *uis* in the *Georgics*, the elements that bind the disparate perspectives in

[12] On the rusticity in the origins of much of Latin vocabulary, see Palmer, *The Latin Language*, 69–73.
[13] Signalled at times by various didactic markers, such as an occasional shift to the imperative mood directed towards the reader (1.100–1): *Umida solstitia atque hiemes orate serenas, | agricolae ...*

the poem together. Vergil's conception of nature in the *Georgics* is defined by the concentrated and continual application of violence against external bodies in order to achieve the ideal of a "world tamed and disciplined by man."[14] This violence or the reaction to it is framed, however, as an issue of enslavement as the recipients of that violence, animals and plants, are made into human beings—oxen battle like gladiators, work and die fraternally, mourn for each other as humans do, horses love not as animals but as husbands and wives, and the farmer culls plant shoots not from tree trunks but from the embraces of their mothers (2.23–5). Slave punishments like branding, shackles, and beatings are then applied to these enslaved groups, normative language in some respects in discussions of farm work but transformed in the *Georgics* into specifically orientated towards slavery because of the humanized objects of agricultural violence. And it is not simply an issue of humanity's enslavement of the earth—the human farmers that Vergil places in the poem are themselves enslaved or are portrayed in such a way as to erase any meaningful class divide between themselves and slaves if they are free. Vergil is presenting an emphatically bottom-up vision of the world to the aristocracy of the fallen Republic.

Modern discussions of the *Georgics* have long circled the debate as to whether Vergil wrote a pessimistic or an optimistic poem.[15] The supporters of a pessimistic reading, the so-called Harvard School, from a variety of angles, Richard Thomas notably focusing upon the nefarious

[14] Hardie, 33. Cf. Ross, *Virgil's Elements*, 22–5. Ross interprets agriculture as the fundamental element of Roman life in an abstract sense: "... "nature," for the Romans, was the countryside of their farms and cultivated fields ... the storm that destroys and the pests that attack are un-natural, are forces dire and hostile like Mavors, wolves, and the terrifying *numina* of forest and thicket, whereas the grain and vine are the embodiment of the natural cycles of life" (22–3).

[15] In the optimists' camp we find Wilkinson (1969), Wilson (1979), and Jenkyns (2008) and opposite them we find the pessimists, foremost of whom Altevogt (1952), Thomas (1988), Boyle (1986), Perkell (1989), and Ross (1987) amongst others. The argument hinges upon Vergil's view of the entry of *labor* into the world—an optimistic interpretation emphasizes that necessity spurs human beings on to labour and thereby to the invention of *artes* (145: *tum uariae uenere artes*); the pessimists do not see anything inherently good or even productive in this *labor* and *artes* fixing rather on the negative nature surrounding *labor improbus*. Thomas translates 1.145–6 as "insatiable toil occupied all areas of existence," while Ross concludes in his study that "Virgil's poem is profoundly pessimistic; conflict is the ultimate reality ... The farmer must change the course of nature to create a balance, which is to say that he works with perversions, creating, with violence and unceasing labor, what is unnatural ..." (241).

agency and place of Jupiter within the poem.[16] To my knowledge, however, none of the principal studies and commentaries on the *Georgics* comprehensively addresses the issue of slavery in the poem. Erren gestures briefly to servile elements on occasion in his commentary,[17] as does Wilkinson.[18] Nevertheless, slavery is otherwise omitted from most discussions of the poem simply because Vergil himself does not draw out the subject overtly—he never uses the word *seruus* nor its synonyms, for instance, nor does he openly describe slavery itself. Everything rather is intimated through the animation and anthropomorphism of the objects of agricultural violence. Moreover, that there is no overt mention of slavery in the poem should itself arouse our suspicions.[19] Although Vergil did not intend to provide a true agricultural manual encompassing all the necessities of farm life, he does at least gesture, even if only briefly, to the majority of the main rustic themes. Wholly ignoring a subject as intertwined to the Roman economic and social world, in both the urban and rural spheres, as slavery is a glaring omission. Chapter 2 will demonstrate that this is precisely the point Vergil hopes to make in the *Georgics*—that he did not have to address slavery in the overt fashion that was common in other literature because in the world envisioned in his poem, slavery already imbues all areas of existence.

---

[16] See especially his comments on 1.124–5. That Jupiter brought *labor* and *ars* into the world does not presuppose his goodwill. Erren sees Jupiter in a similar light, insisting upon Jupiter's interest in aggrandizing his own kingdoms (*sua regna*) rather than benefiting human beings.

[17] Erren (2003). A major accomplishment in the recent history of scholarship on the *Georgics*, although Erren does not engage very forcefully with the ongoing discussion of the pessimism or optimism of the poem. His reading is on the whole positive, however, he does take a more cynical viewpoint at certain key juncture in the poem, such as at the infamous *labor improbus* (1.144–5): "Jupiter, wäre er der angenommene Verantwortliche wie Vergil ihn darstellt, hätte sich die Menschheit unterworfen wie ein Eroberer und tyrannisierte sie seitdem ohne erkennbaren Grund für immer."

[18] Wilkinson (1969). Surprisingly the first full-length studies of the *Georgics*, and still immensely relevant today. Wilkinson lays the foundation for many subsequent studies, and as such devotes much of his work to addressing fundamental issues in reading the *Georgics* such as structure and technical details, dispelling the misconceptions of the poem as actually intended to be instructive for the farmer (3ff.) and examining in depth the immense feeling Vergil expressed in the poem, particularly for man's relationship with nature (121ff.). For Wilkinson, "Virgil was more of a feeler than a thinker" (132).

[19] With regards to slavery, Wilkinson acknowledges only its absence in the poem, which he attributes to a desire on Vergil's part to present an image of farmer as a moral and independent figure (53–5).

In Chapter 3 we shall move from the end of the Republic and Vergil's imagined Italian countryside to the end of the 4th century AD and the spiritual turmoil of Augustine's path to conversion in the *Confessions*. Although the *Confessions* differ greatly both in content and form from Vergil's poetry, heralding in effect an entirely new literary form, Augustine's thought and literary output was indelibly intertwined with his classical education and foremost with his favourite writers, Vergil, Cicero, and Sallust. Despite the disparities between the cultural contexts of Augustan Rome and Augustine's Christian African, it is possible draw a clear thread from Vergil and his peers to Augustine, tracing the history of Latin literature. The goal of Chapter 3 will be to place slavery at the heart of Augustine's self-conception in the *Confessions*. Augustine's internal crisis is an issue of enslavement to his base and aberrant desires; however, he makes it clear that his inability to separate himself from earthly pleasures and pursuits is due to his own stunted spiritual growth. Augustine sees his internal self in an endless state of *pueritia* long after his maturation in the external world. That he is spiritually still a *puer* is for Augustine synonymous with being a *seruus*.[20] His only escape from this spiritual enslavement is through an internal education and maturation that will culminate ultimately in conversion. This will allow not only for a greater understanding of Augustine's own writing and thought but will also lay the foundation for further studies into the importance of slavery as a common topos throughout Latin literature.

Ultimately, this thesis should be only the first of many discussions on the nature of slavery in Latin literature. I hope here to demonstrate the importance slave imagery for both Vergil and Augustine in their understanding of the world and their own contemporary circumstances. That slavery can become the defining factor in a philosophical or spiritual exploration of both one's

[20] *puer* could in fact mean 'slave' rather than simply 'boy' or 'child'. Slaves were seen as *pueri* so long as they remained enslaved—they could not progress through the normative stages of adult life, transitioning only from infancy (*infantia*) to childhood (*pueritia*). Cf. Laes, "Child Slaves at Work in Roman Antiquity." *Ancient Society* 38 (2008): 235–83.

own inner self or a response to external factors beyond one's control will prove a fruitful jumping-off point for readings of slavery both real and imagined in Roman love elegy, epic, tragedy, and philosophy. Future studies on this subject will aim to trace a thread through all classical Latin literature, from the early poets and playwrights into the early Medieval period, documenting the common significance of slavery to the Roman imagination.

Chapter 1

Focalization, Violence, and Agriculture in Vergil's *Georgics*

> scilicet et tempus ueniet, cum finibus illis
> agricola incuruo terram molitus aratro
> exesa inueniet scabra robigine pila,
> aut grauibus rastris galeas pulsabit inanis
> grandiaque effossis mirabitur ossa sepulcris
> (Verg. *G.* 1.489–97)

A fundamental element of the *Georgics*' artistry is the joining of profound insights on human life, and the struggle for existence, with a veneer of agricultural didacticism. That at the close of Book 1, supposedly dedicated to field and crop care, Vergil combines farm work with a sombre vision of the detritus and repercussions of battle, is characteristic of the work as a whole. While the first four lines of the poem superficially confirm the didactic genre of the *Georgics*, Vergil quickly abandons all pretense of actually teaching agricultural principles and best practices. This abandonment of practical didacticism is entirely in keeping, however, with the tendencies of the wider genre. Hesiod constructs his *Works and Days* similarly, teaching his brother Perses ostensibly how to farm while never treating even an approximation of all the subjects necessary to actually succeeding as a farmer. Farming alone is obviously not Hesiod's real interest in writing; poetry demands a departure from reality. For Vergil, this departure from genuine instruction allows him to write an agricultural poem that considers greater themes, ranging from the socio-political circumstances of contemporary Rome, to cosmic and universal explorations of the nature of things. That the *Georgics* is a poem rather than an agronomist's handbook allows Vergil to signpost many of these profound issues through the subversion and suspension of reality all while remaining ostensibly rooted in an agrarian world.

This chapter will establish that the *Georgics* is structured around constant and rapidly shifting perspectives in Vergil's narrative as the poet focalizes and re-focalizes from the most minute elements of the agricultural world, such as ants and mice, to macroscopic views of the divine, mythical, or universal. In so doing, Vergil engages with Lucretius' scientific approach to nature and examines realistic aspects of farming, while also reintegrating surrealism and a divine hierarchy into nature, qualities which Lucretius had marginalized in his *De rerum natura*. Vergil places Roman myth and religion at the heart of the *Georgics*, however, he does this in such a way as to emphasize his own sombre vision of the world. By privileging myth's place in the poem, Vergil creates a surreal image of agriculture wherein all normative elements and characters take on new significances and are all bound together through an all-encompassing and pervasive hierarchy of violence and enslavement.

Vergil demonstrates his fascination in the *Georgics* with the opposition between great and small by shifting the focalization of the poem between micro- and macrocosmic perspectives.[21] The juxtaposition of the two is particularly clear in Vergil's descriptions of animals in relation to human beings. In his advice to the farmer about making and solidifying a threshing floor, Vergil warns of the dangers posed by various minor pests (1.176–86):[22]

> possum multa tibi ueterum praecepta referre,
> ni refugis tenuisque piget cognoscere curas.
> ...
> tum uariae inludunt pestes: saepe exiguus mus
> aut oculis capti fodere cubilia talpae,
> inuentusque cauis bufo et quae plurima terrae
> monstra ferunt, populatque ingentem farris aceruum
> curculio atque inopi metuens formica senectae.

[21] L. P. Wilkinson, *The Georgics of Virgil* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 127.
[22] Based generally on Varro's threshing floor (*RR.* 1.51.1–2).

Vergil first trivializes the importance of the work and the danger posed by the pests (*ni refugis*, *piget cognoscere*, *inludunt*, *exiguus*), then humanizes it through a mundane sort of anthropomorphism (*cubilia*, *inopi metuens senectae*), and finally amplifies it by transforming the pests into actual monsters (*monstra*, *populat*). Vergil links the monstrousness of these *pestes* to the Gigantomachy of 1.276–83; as the giants were born from the earth (*tum partu Terra nefando*), so too do Vergil's pests live underground and wreak havoc on the farmer's world.[23] The tension between macro- and microscopic is palpable here, and while the initial effect is essentially comic,[24] it is also indicative of the entire poem's play on the shifting perspective between great and small and a subversion of our expectations of these two categories. That the humble weevil destroys (*populat*) a "gigantic" pile of spelt (*ingentem farris aceruum*) is, for instance, a calculated exaggeration. Vergil leaves us unsure of whether he is aiming at laughter or is honestly highlighting the significant problems vermin and insects cause. What is more, beyond even the exaggerated description, the literary register Vergil employs undercuts our expectations for what a *curculio* is—*populat* transforms the weevil into not simply a destructive monster, but also a literary one. The grammarian Porphyrion cites this particular line to demonstrate the balance a poet must strike between the prosaic terms, such as *curculio* here, and a poetic register, as with *populor*, in his commentary of Horace's *Ars Poetica* (*ad* 47ff): *nam licet aliqua uulgaria sint, ait tamen illa cum aliqua conpositione splendescere. uerbi gratia 'curculio' sordida uox est, ornatu accedente uulgaritas eius absconditur hoc modo Populatque ingentem farris aceruum*. That the inherent vulgarity or rusticism baked into *curculio* "absconds" according to Porphyrion evinces Vergil's

[23] To be noted too that the Giants made their attack on the literal home of Jupiter and the other gods before being cut down (1.282: *frondosum inuoluere Olympum*).
[24] We should also, of course, compare *ingens* when applied to the weevil with *ingens arcus* of the rainbow at 1.380–1, also quoted above.

shifting both between images of great and small features of his georgic world, as well as between rhetorical or dialectical registers of language.[25]

Vergil also will often juxtapose the focus on minuscule creatures like rodents and insects with a shift in perspective to celestial bodies in order to turn the reader's view literally from the ground upwards. For instance, in Vergil's description of a storm in Book 1 the narrative shifts from ants to a rainbow (1.379–82):[26]

> saepius et tectis penetralibus extulit oua
> angustum formica terens iter, et bibit ingens
> arcus, et e pastu decedens agmine magno
> coruorum increpuit densis exercitus alis

[25] R.A.B Mynors *ad G.* 1.185 for the reference to Porphyrion as well as some further discussion on weevils ("a severe menace to grain and pulses ... when permanently stored in the granary ... The word would probably have been much more familiar to Roman ears than *bufo*"). In terms of dialectical language, we might gesture as well in the present passage to *talpae*, 'mole' here modified by *capti.* Vergil is taking *talpae* as a masculine noun whereas in all other classical authors the word is either feminine or unmodified (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 10.88.191: *liquidius audiunt talpae—obrutae terra*). Quintilian explains Vergil's unorthodox choice in gender here to a desire to encompass both the male and the female members of the species generally (9.3.6), though this rings somewhat unconvincing. We would expect to find this applied regularly not only to moles but other animals too which are grammatically feminine, e.g., (Ov. *AA.* 1.95): *apes saltusque suos et olentia nactae* ... Servius on the other hand offers no explanation at all while still remarking on the irregularity: *et mutauit genus: nam 'haec talpa' dicitur*. Servius does suggest a desire on Vergil's part to avoid homoeoteleuton when he pairs feminine *dammae* with masculine *timidi* at both *E.* 8.28 and again at *G*. 3.539. One wonders though if Vergil may have been affecting a dialectical irregularity to accentuate the rusticity of the passage. Mynors does, however, support Quintilian's explanation for this gender irregularity, and perhaps they are right. It may also simply be a question of Vergil's poetic sensibility and the formation of an obviously individualistic style of composition: "Vergil preferred to treat Latin as timeless, and as still fluid, that is, still more fluid than it actually was in his own time. He was not only using language, but creating language, as a poet should" (Knight, "Vergil's Latin," 40). See Knight's article as well for some further discussion on Vergil's lexical and grammatical idiosyncrasies, including both the poetic *populo* for *populor* and the masculine *talpae* and *dammae* in place of the feminine (39ff.). Whatever the reason for the grammatical discrepancy here, Vergil certainly knew that *capti talpae* would have given his readers pause and perhaps brought them to examine the nature of these moles, weevils, and ants with some suspicion.

[26] The anthropomorphism continues with the ant now living under a roof, the rainbow drinking, and an army of crows. Mynors on *tectis penetralibus* writes*:* "*penetralia* is used as a noun seven times in *A.* of palaces or shrines … Here, where it qualifies merely *tecta,* it still adds a solemn touch." We might then see here a sanctification of both heaven and earth and an attribution of human religion to ants. If ants are performing religious rituals, we might wonder if the failure of human religion in Book 3 (3.478–93) at the onset of the plague applies equally to them—Vergil certainly emphasizes the effects of the plague on animals as well as humans (3.494–7): *hinc laetis uituli uulgo moriuntur in herbis | et dulcis animas plena ad praesepia reddunt, | hinc canibus blandis rabies uenit, et quatit aegros | tussis anhela sues ac faucibus angit obesis*.

The narrow (*angustum*) ant trail contrasts starkly with the giant (*ingens*) rainbow; it is the calculated juxtaposition of extreme smallness with extreme grandeur.[27] The descriptor *ingens* is especially significant here in underlining the intended contrast because of its epic undertones: "[Ein] emphatisches Epitheton, nachdrücklicher als *magnus* ... es bedeutet „übermenschlich groß" in dem absoluten Sinn, daß die Sache ihrer Natur nach jede sichere Einschätzung und Beurteilung überragt..."[28] The proximity to *magno* in the following line and in the same metrical position highlights the weight of the rainbow's *ingens* compared to *magno* for the flock of birds. Moreover, the slight pause after *ingens* at the end of the line makes the enjambed *arcus* more jarring as we switch from a living creature to an aerial phenomenon and then back again, highlighting how much grander the view of the world is as we move from the ant's slight path upwards to the sky. In Vergil's universe nothing is just as it seems. The comparison becomes not just a matter of size but of aspect.

Finally, in returning to the tiny monstrousness of the *pestes*, we see a similar transformation of the agrarian into monstrous through the animation of the farmer's plough (1.169–72):[29]

> continuo in siluis magna ui flexa domatur
> in burim et curui formam accipit ulmus aratri.
> huic a stirpe pedes temo protentus in octo,
> binae aures, duplici aptantur dentalia dorso.[30]

The anatomical value of the plough's *pedes*, *aures*, *dentalia*, and *dorso* comes quickly to the fore in Vergil's description. Naturally, these are all terms perfectly suited to a technical description of

[27] Georges Ramain, "À Propos de Virgile, *Géorgiques* 3.416–439," *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature, d'Histoire Anciennes* 48, no. 3 (July 1924): 120.
[28] Erren *ad* 1.324–6: *ruit arduus aether | et pluuia ingenti sata laeta boumque labores | diluit.* An interesting line for its emphasis on *labor*, the rushing attach of *aether* against land, and the destruction of the *sata laeta* which recall the first line of the poem and the personified fields (*laetas segetes*). On *ingens* also see Ross (1987) esp. 115, for whom the epithet often means "native" and is semantically very close to *ingenium*. In the case of the rainbow, however, I believe Erren's definition is closer to the mark.
[29] Cf. Hes. *WD.* 427–36.
[30] We shall return to this passage in Chapter 2, specifically regarding *magna ui flexa domatur* and *formam accipit*.

a plough,[31] but the influence of the prior personification and animation of the *pestes* provokes a similar reading here. Instead of ploughshares and beams Vergil brings us to see the teeth, ears, legs, and back of an animal or monster.[32] Building the plough is a reorganization of nature into a new form or body meant to turn extreme force back against the earth as part of human labour. The introduction of the plough as one of the *duris agrestibus arma* makes clear that while it is in one sense simply a part of the agricultural landscape, Vergil has also presented an instrument of violence. As with the *pestes* which exist simultaneously as the normative and perpetual inhabitants of the farm but also as destructive monsters, the plough has an ambivalent nature both as an emblem of the realities of farming while also being imbued with violence and metamorphosized so fully as to refocus the narrative between those two extremes. What Vergil makes the plough into is a monstrous extension of the farmer's body which both evokes and subverts a mythic past. Harnessing this new creature and ploughing a field with it suggests similar narratives in myth, like Jason's harnessing the brazen bulls and ploughing Aeëtes' field (Appollon. *Arg*. 1278–407), or Herakles' capture of the Cretan Bull (Apollod. *Biblio.* 2.5.7). We should then look too to mythic 'farming,' including Jason's aforementioned sowing of serpent teeth behind the fire breathing bulls and then the slaughter of the earthborn men (γηγενέων ἀνδρῶν), or Cadmus' ploughing (Ov. *Met*. 3.104–5: *ut presso sulcum patefecit aratro, | spargit humi iussos, mortalia semina, dentes*), sowing of the serpent teeth, and the chthonic birth of the Spartoi (3.95–142 and Apollod. *Biblio.* 3.4.1). In this integration of myth into the plough and field, Vergil will not only animate the tools involved, but also starkly anthropomorphize the oxen alongside the farmer,[33] a key point in Vergil's portrait

[31] For a technical discussion of this passage including some very helpful diagrams and photos, see Aitkin, "Virgil's Plough," *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 46 (1956), 97–106. For a more in-depth overview of farming tools, esp. 123–45 for the plough, see K.D. White, *Agricultural Implements of the Roman World*, 1967.

[32] Together with Servius, we might also see *in burim* as a tail: *nam buris est curuamentum aratri*, *dictum quasi* βοὸς οὐρὰ, *quod sit in similitudinem caudae bouis*. See also Putnam, 37 and Hardie, 36–7.

[33] Vergil may be gesturing through both bulls and ploughs in the present case not only to mythic examples of ploughing and sowing, but even to the Minotaur and the conflation of man and animal.

of universal enslavement to which we shall return in Chapter 2. Vergil has tied mythic narratives and images to a demythologized context—the farm.

The ambivalent nature Vergil gives to the plough and the *pestes* extends to the overarching cosmic order of the *Georgics*, with Vergil subverting the normative divine hierarchy at the outset of the poem through the exclusion of Jupiter. The proem to Book 1 (1–42) is jarring for its shifting focalizations both within the 12-god invocation as well as afterwards to Octavian. Vergil begins after the programmatic first four lines with a prayer (*uos, o clarissima mundi lumina*) that brings together Olympians (*Liber et alma Ceres ... Neptune ... oleaeque Minerua inuentrix*) with the generally less exalted, but firmly pastoral, Pan and Silvanus alongside nameless fauns and dryads (*et uos, agrestum praesentia numina, Fauni ... Dryadesque puellae … Pan, ouium custos... et teneram ab radice ferens, Siluane...*), concluding with the literary figures Aristaeus and Triptolemus (*cultor nemorum, cui pinguia Ceae | ter centum niuei tondent dumeta iuuenci ... uncique puer monstrator aratri*).[34] All the while, however, Jupiter, a key figure in Book 1, remains absent. This is all the more striking for the emphatic inclusion of Jupiter in Varro's proem to the *Res Rusticae*, a fundamental source for Vergil in general and certainly a model for his own proem (Var. *RR*. 1.1.5: *Primum, qui omnes fructos agri ... continent, Iouem et Tellurem; itaque, quod ii parentes magni dicuntur, Iuppiter pater appellatur...*).[35] Indeed, while one expects a divine

[34] Servius on *puer monstrator aratri* writes: *alii Triptolemum, alii Osirim uolunt.*

[35] Thomas highlights that Vergil, despite the overt similarities between his proem and Varro's, a key source for the *Georgics,* does not truly imitate his predecessor. In his proem, Varro included deities bordering upon true obscurity (Varro, *RR*. 1.1. 5–7: *Quarto Robigum ac Floram, quibus propitiis neque robigo frumenta atque arbores corrumpit ... nec non etiam precor Lympham ac Bonum Eventum, quoniam sine aqua omnis arida ac misera agri cultura, sine successu ac bono eventu frustratio est, non cultura*), to say nothing of the hierarchical discrepancy between Pan and Silvanus, on the one hand, and Neptune and Minerva on the other. While Vergil does diverge from the Olympian gods, he does not drift into the obscurity of *Bonus Eventus* nor *Lympha*. We might even take this as a concession on Vergil's part that the poem will not be so fixedly agricultural and even didactic as one might expect—if it were, he might rightly have invoked those gods to whom the farmer had actual recourse. For *Robigus*, see also Varro *de ling. Lat.* 6.16., Augustine *civ. Dei* 4.21, Ovid *Fasti* 4.907. For *Bonus Eventus*, Pliny the Elder mentions the consecration of *simulacra* of the god (34.19.77 and 36.4.23) and Ammianus Marcellinus claims that there existed a temple to the god near the baths of Agrippa (*Res Gest.* 29.6.19). For *Lympha*, see Vitruvius 1.1.5.

invocation at a poem's outset, specifically naming twelve individual gods is unusual something which Varro acknowledges of himself as well (1.1.4): ... *prius inuocabo eos, nec, ut Homerus et Ennius Musas, sed duodecem deos consentis ... sed illos XII deos, qui maxime agricolarum duces sunt*. Vergil, however, goes a step further than Varro and uses this uncommon structure to convey the shifting of the cosmic order through the removal of Jupiter. The poet makes the choice emphatic through his allusions in the *Georgics* not just to Varro but to Aratus, whose poem *Phaenomena* was another of Vergil' models, particularly in *Georgics* Book 1.[36] The opening *quo sidere terram* | *uertere* (*G.* 1.1–2) points immediately to Aratus' astronomical poem and Vergil carries this link throughout the first book, attesting to the importance for the farmer of being able to read astronomical *signa* (351: *Atque haec ut certis possemus discere signis*). Furthermore, Vergil signposts his engagement with Aratus subtly in the proem through the meticulously placed *uertere* at the beginning of line 2. *Vertere* corresponds here to Aratus' ἄρρητον (*Phaen.* 1.2), set in the same position in his own poem and which acts as his literal signature to the *Phaenomena*. As posited by Joshua Katz, we must read Vergil's *uertere* as a multifaceted verb, both as a synonym for *arare*, "whose past participle is, of course, *aratus*,"[37] as well as through *uertere*'s other meaning, 'to translate.'[38] The identical position of the two words suggests that Vergil is alluding to Aratus and is 'translating' the *Phaenomena* into the *Georgics*. This appears slightly disharmonious, however, when considering Vergil's omission of Jupiter from his proem against Aratus' emphatic inclusion of Zeus (*Phaen*. 1–4):

Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτ᾽ ἄνδρες ἐῶμεν

[36] See especially *G.* 1.424–63 based on *Phaen.* 733–818. Thomas posits that Book 1 is in fact split structurally into Hesiodic and Aratean halves: "…[it] shows the influence of archaic Greek (Hesiod) in the first part, Hellenistic (Aratus) in the later portions" (7).

[37] Joshua Katz, "Vergil Translates Aratus: *Phaenomena* 1–2 and *Georgics* 1.1–2," *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, no. 60 (2008): 113.

[38] *OLD s.v. uerto* 24a. Cf. Suetonius on Augustus' limitations in Greek (89.1): *nam et si quid res exigeret, Latine formabat uertendumque alii dabat*. We might also think of the common use of the word to signal metamorphosis (Ov. *Met.* 4.593–4): *'cur non | me quoque, caelestes, in eandem uertitis anguem?'*

ἄρρητον· μεσταὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαί,
πᾶσαι δ᾽ ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί, μεστὴ δὲ θάλασσα
καὶ λιμένες· πάντη δὲ Διὸς κεχρήμεθα πάντες.

Aratus begins with Zeus and insists that he is both omnipresent and that his name never goes unspoken. That Vergil does not name Jupiter at all in his proem should be read then, in light of the influence the *Phaenomena* exerted on Vergil, as a response to and departure from Aratus, a departure which underlines the importance of the omission precisely for its originality.

Varro and Aratus aside, we would expect Jupiter to figure in Vergil's proem because of his otherwise key role in Book 1. He is both the creator of *labor* which sparks humanity's engagement with *ars* (*G.* 1.118–46), and also embodies his primordial place as a rain and weather god (1.417–19): *uerum ubi tempestas et caeli mobilis umor | mutauere uias et Iuppiter uuidus Austris | denset erant quae rara modo, et quae densa relaxat*...[39] Additionally, the conclusion *dique deaeque omnes* (21), a normative feature of prayer language,[40] does not account for the exclusion of Jupiter from the preceding deities and may in fact emphasize it. The generalisation of *dique deaeque omnes* should not in fact be taken as a widening of the invocation to include gods such as Jupiter whom Vergil has not called on hitherto by name, but rather as a recapitulation of the previously named deities.[41] The omission of Jupiter is signposted as an intentional break from Vergil's models as well as our expectations for the poem. It must be read in sharp contrast to Octavian's sudden

[39] Thomas, *ad* 418: "i.e. Jupiter Pluuius, here amounting to little more than 'rain.'" Cf. Tilly on Varro 1.1.5: "Jupiter is in origin the old Italian sky-god: he gives the rain and it is clearly in this connection that he is placed in Varro's catalogue…" Erren also highlights Zeus' weather god role for Hesiod: "Auch Hesiods Mythen sind Jahrtausende alt, und nach seiner Überlieferung ist der Wettergott (mit dem der griechische Zeus und der lateinische Jupiter identifiziert werden) Vater und aktueller Herrscher über alle Götter und Menschen, soweit sie auf der Erde leben" (Erren *ad G.* 1.125–8).
[40] Cf. Verg. *A.* 6.64, Prop. 3.13.41.
[41] "Man wird daher in den Worten v. 21–23 nicht eine Ergänzung und Erweiterung, sondern eine Zusammenfassung des vorher angerufenen Götterkreises zu sehen haben, und es verbleibt ein Götterkreis von 12 Einheiten." Georg Wissowa, "Das Prooemium von Vergils *Georgica*," *Hermes* 52, no. 1 (Jan., 1917): 93. Wissowa opposes Servius' assumption that Vergil intended just a general invocation of all the gods without necessarily naming them all: *post specialem inuocationem transit ad generalitatem, ne quod numen praeterat.*

appearance at line 24 (*tuque adeo*…)[42] in a separate invocation, but one which is equal in length (24–42) to the first (5–23) despite being addressed to only one figure rather than many. Vergil has intentionally ousted *Iuppiter omnipotens* in favour of the human *princeps*.[43] Nevertheless, he styles Octavian as an ambiguous figure and leaves unclear exactly what sort of god Octavian will be in Jupiter's stead. He will be a ruler, that much is clear. But it is still uncertain (*concilia incertum est*) whether he will preside over land (*urbisne inuisere, Caesar, terrarumque uelis curam*), sea (*an deus immensi uenias maris*), or sky (*anne nouum tardis sidus te mensibus addas*) with only the Underworld presumably forbidden, or at least considered undesirable (*nam te nec sperant Tartara regem, | nec tibi regnandi ueniat tam dira cupido*). The sinister insinuation of *regem* and *dira cupido regnandi* lends some ambiguity to the nature of Vergil's portrayal of Octavian; it is "a political phrase of the utmost opprobrium" and points to exactly the role Octavian ought not to want but which is framed by the looming realities of 29 BC.[44] The greatest emphasis seems, however, to be laid on Octavian's place as a new and rural god above all else, and it is the farmers' prayers that he must grow used to hearing (*agrestis | ingredere et uotis iam nunc adsuesce uocari*).[45] Vergil is sensitive to the shift not just in power but in the very structure of Roman politics with Octavian's triumph. This restructuring of the Roman world is portrayed as the establishment

[42] The commentators all point to the importance of *adeo*, here "mark[ing] a crescendo" (Thomas). Servius *ad loc.*: '*adeo' hic praecipue ... et iam Augustum adulatur ... nam cum omnes imperatores post mortem inter deos relati, Augustus uiuus diuinos honores emeruit...*

[43] In a similar vein, Thomas sees a connection between Octavian and Aeneas through the image of him thundering "in battle in the distant east (4.560–2)" (Thomas, 28). This is perhaps picked up later by Vergil in *Aeneid* Book 12 (12. 654–6): *fulminat Aeneas armis summasque minatur | deiecturum arces Italum excidioque daturum, | iamque faces ad tecta uolant*. Indeed, Hardie claims that Octavian's thundering at the end of the *Georgics* is a "suitable advertisement for the full-dress epic … that is to follow (Hardie, 28)." Within the *Georgics* the weight of *fulminat* looks not only forwards to epic but backwards to Jupiter as a weather god. The only other use of the verb *fulmino* in the *Georgics* occurs at 1.370 of the storm.

[44] Thomas *ad loc.* suggests that we might also read *ueniat* as jussive, creating a pointed tone to Vergil's predictions.

[45] Boyle, *The Chaonian Dove*, 41–2. Boyle proposes even that Octavian is the possible "actualisation of Virgil's Daphnis-ideal of *Eclogue* 5, the ideal of the hero-god who brings fruitfulness, harmony, peace and joy to the land."

of a new cosmic order in the poem through the reassignment of divine provinces, reminiscent of both Hesiod (*Th.* 885) and Homer (*Il.* 15.189–93):

> τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται, ἕκαστος δ᾽ ἔμμορε τιμῆς·
> ἦ τοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολιὴν ἅλα ναιέμεν αἰεὶ
> παλλομένων, Ἀίδης δ᾽ ἔλαχε ζόφον ἠερόεντα,
> Ζεὺς δ᾽ ἔλαχ᾽ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλῃσι·
> γαῖα δ᾽ ἔτι ξυνὴ πάντων καὶ μακρὸς Ὄλυμπος.

In contrast to Homer, however, Vergil's Octavian might now find himself master of each domain without the need to share the earth. The poet leaves the *princeps*' role ambivalent, but it is clear that Octavian's ascent heralds a reordering of all things.

The shift from the gods to Octavian to close the proem marks his intermediary role between the divine and the earth. The first four lines delineate the subject matter of each of the poem's books: farming, viticulture, animal husbandry, and beekeeping. The invocation of the gods then creates a remote, lofty viewpoint of the mortal sphere from the perspective of deities, though even within this section there exist varying degrees of divinity.[46] The turn to Octavian then shifts our attention implicitly back down to the physical world in which he has already made a permanent mark,[47] but with an eye fixed on his coming deification and the changes that will also come to the ethereal and celestial planes with it. In terms of the tangible world, Octavian's rise to power was not only defined by the bloodshed of the civil wars, but a permanent shift in the look and functioning of the social and political landscape. This entailed the wholesale slaughter of the established nobility and the rapid rise of new men,[48] while for many people Octavian's ascent was

[46] Naturally there is an element of subjectivity at play as a relatively obscure, rustic god will be far more important than an Olympian should the farmer need to pray to that one specifically, such as to Robigus in the hope of fighting off wheat leaf rust.

[47] See 1.490–1 for the shift to the civil wars; for Actium, cf. *A.* 8.700.

[48] Syme paints a sombre picture of Octavian's rise: "The Republic had been abolished. Whatever the outcome of the armed struggle, it could never be restored. Despotism ruled, supported by violence and confiscation. The best men were dead or proscribed. The Senate was backed by ruffians, the consulate, once the reward of civic virtue, now became the recompense of craft or crime" (201). As Syme highlights, the actual linguistic shifting in the family names of the new men who came to power during the civil wars attests to the downfall of the traditional order: "Among the

heralded by land confiscations for his veterans.[49] Furthermore, Vergil refers to Octavian in such a way as to actually conflate him with Rome in a broader sense. While according to Vergil, Octavian the god will eventually preside over either cities, lands, or seas (1.25–31),[50] the secondary implication points to the extent of Rome's power—a fact that will only be further emphasized by Octavian's triple triumph in 29 BC.[51] But the prediction of Octavian's apotheosis also turns our eyes upwards from the terrestrial politics imbued in any mention of the *princeps*, and then forces us to look at the world through his eyes as Vergil addresses him directly (1.25–7): *urbisne inuisere ... terrarumque uelis curam ... auctorem frugum tempestatumque potentem*... We see here Octavian's downward view of the land he now rules before turning to the *signa caeli* (1.33–5): *qua locus Erigonen inter Chelasque sequentis | panditur* (*ipse tibi iam bracchia contrahit ardens | Scorpius et caeli iusta plus parte reliquit*).[52] The scorpion may even look forward to those *pestes* that will threaten the farmer's threshing floor, or the snake that will kill Eurydice in Book 4. Yet here the *pestes* is visualized in the sky as a constellation alongside Octavian, now deified. The Scorpion's claws extended into the space where Libra would eventually be situated, and so their

consulars could be discerned one Claudius only, one Aemilius … no Fabii at all… New and alien names were prominent in their place, Etruscan or Umbrian, Picene or Lucanian" (244).

[49] Scullard, *From the Gracchi to* Nero, 209: "Some 100,000 veterans received gratuities and were settled in colonies, either old or new settlements, in Italy or in the provinces; twenty-eight were founded in Italy… As the land was bought, the settlement cost hundreds of millions of sesterces."

[50] We might even see in Octavian's potential rule over the sky and the stars (1.32: *anne nouum tardis sidus te mensibus addas*) a connection to Julius Caesar's calendar reform. "A whole series of measures was designed to improve administrative efficiency and to benefit Rome and Italy…. With the Advice of an Alexandrian astronomer Caesar added three (instead of the normal one) intercalary months to 46 B.C. and introduced a reformed calendar..." (Scullard, 143).

[51] Beard, *The Roman Triumph*, 303: "Here the three separate celebrations—the first for victory over Dalmatia and Illyricum, the second for victory at the battle of Actium, the third for victory over Egypt—appear as just two: for Dalmatia and Egypt, apparently separated by a day." To be noted as well that Vergil apparently read the *Georgics* to Octavian for the first time in August of 29 BC (Donatus *Vita Vergilii* 27).

[52] The scorpion may even evoke some similarities to the *pestes* that will threaten the farmer's threshing floor or the snake that will kill Eurydice in Book 4. Yet here the *pestes* is visualized in the sky as a constellation alongside the deified Octavian. Vergil's georgics universe encompasses

contraction and Octavian's catasterism result in the literal creation of a new constellation.[53] Vergil's georgic universe envelops all areas of existence but freely shifts elements from one sphere to another; the minute particulars and nuisances of the barn or threshing floor belong as much to the divine in this system as mythic characters and features belong in the agricultural world. In turning back to Octavian, however, his divinity is then cemented with the imperatives that close the proem (*da ... adnue ... ingredere ... adsuesce*) as Vergil begs his blessing both on the poem as well as the farmer's labour, foreshadowing the language Vergil uses to beseech the *di patrii Indigetes et Romule Vestaque mater* at the end of Book 1 to allow Octavian to save the world (1.500–1): *hunc saltem euerso iuuenem succurrere saeclo | ne prohibete!* By the end of the book Octavian has been re-transformed into a *iuuenis* and the recipient rather than the dispenser of divine aid. Even the term *iuuenis* is noteworthy here as Vergil uses it ambiguously of both humans and animals, heightening Octavian's mortal nature at the end of the book compared to the beginning.[54] Octavian's appearances as both man and god in the *Georgics* prepare us for a similar fluidity in other aspects of the poem as animals, plants, and soil become human beings, while human beings become animals and gods. A great part of the artistry in this lies in the quickly shifting viewpoint from macroscopic or ethereal to the diminutive elements of the earth. As quickly as Vergil moved to the divine and the *signa caeli* in the proem, he plunges back down to the dirty realities of the earth, ending the proem abruptly and turning to farming proper and the necessities imposed by springtime.

[53] The addition of Octavian both as a thirteenth god in Vergil's invocation and as a new constellation "provokes an act of imbalance" (Putnam, 24). The imitation of Varro's proem must be only superficial as Vergil dismantles the 12-god, agrarian scheme both in his choice of gods and with Octavian.

[54] Of note too is that this is the only use of the word *iuuenis* before Book 3 (105, 118, 165, and 258) and 4 (360, 423, 445, 477, and 522). All of the instances from Book 3 are intentional conflations of both animal and human beings, while in Book 4, three usages refer to Aristaeus, one the innocent youths and unmarried girls (476–7: *magnanimum heroum, pueri innuptaeque puellae, | impositique rogis iuuenes ante ora parentum*), and the last Orpheus.

Vergil then brings this ambivalent shifting in perspective at work in his presentation of Octavian and the other gods to bear on the farmer's labour as he draws our attention to both the subjectivity of the farmer's actions, as well as the forced reception of those actions by soil, animals, and tools. He animates these entities, thus creating a disconcerting sense of empathy for them without neglecting the farmer's own relentless struggle through *labor.* Once the proem to Book 1 ends, Vergil transitions seamlessly from the loftiness of the deities, and musings on Octavian's place among them, to the realities of spring and farm work. He shifts the poem's perspective rapidly downwards through the literal descent of water from mountains to the farmlands (1.43–6):[55]

> uere nouo, gelidus canis cum montibus umor
> liquitur Zephyro putris se glaeba resoluit,
> depresso incipiat iam tum mihi taurus aratro
> ingemere et sulco attritus splendescere uomer.

While the addressee of this section is the farmer,[56] he is focalized through the animals and implements at his service: the bull groans at the plough, the ploughshare gleams in the furrow, both subjects compelled to act for the *agricola* and transformed into extensions of his body.[57] The literal construction of the plough is supplemented with one continuous form fitted together from the ox to the wooden implement to the human body. The plough becomes an animated entity and the ox part of the tool. Vergil then animates the field itself, allowing it to speak and feel as the

[55] Erren *ad* 1.43–6: "Die Initiative geht von oben nach unten durch den Kosmos..." This is an issue of a cosmic view of the universe and then the place of agriculture therein.

[56] Not invoked directly as with the deities but implied from the context. The somewhat intrusive *mihi* signals the beginning of a didactic moment as the narrator specifies what he would have and have done for himself; cf. Thomas especially regarding *mihi* as a Dative of Interest, for which Erren specifies the deliberateness: "Über den reflexiven *mihi* wird sehr vorsichtig der „Landmann, der den Weg nicht kennt" angesprochen." This is confirmed naturally by the ensuing lines (1.47–8): *illa seges demum uotis respondet auari | agricolae*. The narrator's advice is picked up by the imagined farmer's obedience, and the final action is actually performed by the farm animals and the earth itself.

[57] Servius points out a possible connection to Lucretius 1.313–14: *uncus aratri | ferreus occulte decrescit uomer in aruis*.

farmer breaks the ground (1.47–8): *illa seges demum uotis respondet auari | agricolae, bis quae solem, bis frigora sensit*. The animation of *seges* recalls the poem's opening words *quid faciat laetas segetes*, signalling that Vergil's perception of fields in the *Georgics* has been centred from the outset not only on their fertility, the purported preoccupation of Book 1,[58] but also on their *sententia*. The verb *sentio* only appears four times in the poem, and three of those are in moments of personification.[59] This illustrates the *sententia* of plants and rivers both in regard to their reception of human actions, as well as their innate feelings as they existed in the Saturnian, pre-*labor* world. As with the field's *bis quae solem, bis frigora sensit*, a gesture to the farmer's carefully planned ploughing,[60] *sentio* describes the rivers' reaction to human *ars* when faced with the transformation of alders into ships (1.136–7): *tunc alnos primum fluuii sensere cauatas; | nauita tum stellis numeros et nomina fecit.* This also looks forward to the fashioning of the elm into its new form, the plough (1.169–72), as the alders are transformed here into new bodies, ships, which will then inflict themselves upon the rivers in the same manner as the plough cuts into the earth. While a departure from strict agriculture, the *artes* of shipbuilding and celestial navigation are equally tools in the human struggle to survive and are thus another example of the human exertion of force against the external world.[61] Finally, the personification of fruit trees in Book 2

[58] Cf. Lucr. 1.14–15: *inde ferae pecudes persultant pabula laeta | et rapidos tranant amnis.* There is a similarity between Lucretius' *pabula laeta*, a favourite phrase of his always occurring at the end of a line (1.257, 2.317, 364, 596, 875, 1159), and Vergil's *laetas segetes* (*G.* 1.1). While *pabula laeta* clearly carries the general meaning 'fertile,' Lucretius may also be animating the proem's *pabula* because of its philosophically charged context; the generative power of Venus, a force of nature for Lucretius, has struck the hearts of the natural world (13: *perculsae corda tua ui*), and all has been captured by her charm (15: *ita capta lepore*). Cf. Vergil's use of *pabula laeta* at *G.* 3.385.

[59] 1.48 of *seges*, 136 *fluuii*, and 2.426 *poma*. The only other occurrence of the verb is of Aristaeus' mother, Cyrene, who hears (*sensit*) her son's lament at the death of his bees (4.334–5). *Respondere* similarly is consistent with the theme of anthropomorphism, occurring twice in the poem (1.47 and 2.64), both of plants. The substantive noun *responsa* also occurs in Book 3 of a failed reading of the entrails of a sacrifice during the Noric plague (3.491).

[60] See Mynors *ad loc.* for discussion of the technicalities of *bis … bis* here. Cf. Varro *RR.* 1.27.2: *...neque eam minus binis arandum, ter melius*.

[61] Erren, *ad* 136–46: "Der Kampf ums Überleben zwang die Menschen, die Fähigkeiten ihres Verstandes zu nutzen. Die entstehenden Künste waren wir Waffen und Kriegslisten, mit denen der Mensch im Kampf gegen die Natur länger durchhalten konnte." Erren touches here on a key caveat to Vergil's portrayal of *labor*—mastery of *artes* may allow man to "länger durchhalten" but success can only be temporary (1.199–203): *sic omnia fatis | in peius ruere ac retro*

recalls the Saturnian age when the plants were not subject to human compulsion and violence (2.426–8): *poma quoque, ut primum truncos sensere ualentis | et uiris habuere suas, ad sidera raptim | ui propria nituntur opisque haud indiga nostrae.* In that age, the trees grew and produced fruit under their own power. The insistence on the independence of the trees and the spontaneity of their growth mark the change that Jupiter and *labor* have wrought, channelled through human force. While the trees grew *ui propria*, we should remember that the plough, a new breed of tree, was formed *magna ui flexa*.[62]

The further attribution of *patrios cultusque habitusque locorum* (1.52) reinforces the personification of both the fields and of all lands, creating an appropriately Roman sense of ethnography and domination of land, both foreign and domestic.[63] One almost has the impression that the poet is condensing the ethnographic penchant of other writers into a few verses, but rather than concentrating on the customs of people, attention is paid entirely to their homes. The land itself receives a lineage and history through *patrios cultus* and a distinctive appearance in *habitus.* On the latter word, one must not forget that while 'habit' or 'custom' must surely be the principal meaning in this context, the word can be equally used of literal clothing.[64] Vergil has now given the land a voice (*respondet*), sensation and perception (*sensit*), a lineage and culture (*patrios cultus*), and has even dressed it in clothing (*habitus*), creating a sense not just of animation but of

sublapsa referri, | non aliter quam qui aduerso uix flumine lembum | remigiis subigit, si bracchia forte remisit, | atque illum in praeceps prono rapit alueus amni. Thomas *ad loc*.: "And where is the *uis humana* which can throughout life and without respite row against an opposing current? And finally, where in the poem is *labor* applied with explicit success… This is not a passing touch of pessimism, nor is it embellishment, it is the very heart of the poem."

[62] R.O.A.M. Lyne, "*Scilicet et Tempus Veniet*… Virgil, *Georgics* 1.463–514," in *Virgil: Critical Assessments of Classical Authors*, ed. Philip Hardie (London: Routledge, 1999), 174–5.

[63] See Thomas, *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1982).

[64] The importance of one's *habitus* both in terms of pure recognition and as a status marker is marked clearly in Book 1 of Apuleius' *Met.* (1.24.7): '*Sed quid istud? uoti gaudeo. nam et lixas et uirgas et habitum prorsus magistratui congruentem in te uideo.*' See also 1.12.3 for the odd dress of the witches in Aristomenes' story.

anthropomorphism.[65]

The ambiguity in tone and focalizations between lofty and lowly is underlined by the consistent use of epic and military language for the farmer's struggle against the earth which challenges the humbleness of actual agriculture.[66] While examples of this imagery abound, the clearest instance is Vergil's description of the farmer's 'tools' (1.160–2): *dicendum et quae sint duris agrestibus arma, | quis sine nec potuere seri nec surgere messes: | uomis et inflexi primum graue robur aratri*.[67] Evidently *arma* here lacks the neutrality of *instrumenta*,[68] a word that never appears in Vergil's corpus yet 13 times in Varro's *Res Rusticae*.[69] *Arma* evokes not just the blueprint of a plough, but a Homeric arming scene.[70] This is marked in itself as Vergil not only weaves epic into agriculture but is perhaps dovetailing more broadly with Homer's tendency to use vegetal similes and imagery in the *Iliad.* Homer employs this technique at the moment of death to emphasize the youth and vitality of fallen soldiers compared to the violence of battle (4.475–87):[71]

---

[65] The anthropocentric characterization of nature is not, of course, exclusive to virtual and often recurs across artistic mediums. We might think for instance of Augustus' *Ara Pacis* and its Tellus panel.

[66] For a more comprehensive list of examples of militaristic language in the *Georgics.* See Boyle 82n3.

[67] The poetic, even perhaps epic, quality of these lines may have been intentionally emphasized through the archaic form of the ablative plural *quis* for *quibus* and the postpositive position of its preposition *sine* at the beginning of line 161, *quis sine.* For the anastrophe *quis sine*, cf. Manil. *Astron.* 4.133–4: *quis sine non poterant ullae subsistere gentes | uel sine luxuria.*

[68] Mynors on *arma* here: "an echo of the Greek ὅπλα, used of tools and tackle from Homer onwards; in Latin first found here (for though *armare* was normally used of ships, the noun was *armamenta*), and perhaps V.'s introduction."

[69] 1.5.4, 1.13.2, 1.17.1, 1.18.6, 1.19.1, 1.22.1–2, 1.22.4, 1.22.6, 1.23.1, 2.10.5, 2.10.7, 3.7.11. *instrumentum* was also notably Varro's equivalence of slaves to tools—vocal tools (1.17.1): *instrumenti genus uocale et semiuocale et mutum*. Conversely, Varro does not use *arma* particularly often, with the word appearing only twice in the *Res Rusticae* (2.2.4 and 3.2.4) neither of which is similar to Vergil's conflation of the term with implements. The word *armata* is used once (2.10.1) of the need for shepherds to be armed to protect their flocks. It should be noted that *arma* and *armatus* occurs 11 times in *De lingua latina.*

[70] Thomas *ad loc.*: "The use of *dicendum* reinforces this suggestion ... In *dicendum ... arma* there may even be an anticipation of the opening of the *Aeneid* (*arma ... cano*).

[71] Some other examples of vegetal imagery and similes in the *Iliad* include: the deaths of Orsilochus and Crethon (5.559–60), Asius (13.389–91), and Euphorbus (17.53–60). Similar similes are also attached to Achilles, highlighting the inescapability of his eventual death (18.56–60). For further discussion, see Moulton (1974), Schein (1984), and Tsagalis (2004). Of particular interest may be Schien's suggestion that the word ἥρως may be etymologically related to the word ὥρα: "… in Homer *hore* means in particular the "season of spring," and a "hero" is "seasonal" in that he comes into his prime, like flowers in the spring, only to be cut down once and for all" (69).

Ἔνθ᾽ ἔβαλ᾽ Ἀνθεμίωνος υἱὸν Τελαμώνιος Αἴας,
ἠίθεον θαλερὸν Σιμοείσιον ...
ὁ δ᾽ ἐν κονίῃσι χαμαὶ πέσεν αἴγειρος ὥς,
ἥ ῥά τ᾽ ἐν εἰαμενῇ ἕλεος μεγάλοιο πεφύκει
λείη, ἀτάρ τέ οἱ ὄζοι ἐπ᾽ ἀκροτάτῃ πεφύασι·
τὴν μέν θ᾽ ἁρματοπηγὸς ἀνὴρ αἴθωνι σιδήρῳ
ἐξέταμ᾽, ὄφρα ἴτυν κάμψῃ περικαλλέι δίφρῳ·
ἡ μέν τ᾽ ἀζομένη κεῖται ποταμοῖο παρ᾽ ὄχθας.

Simoeisius' death is emotive because it emphasizes his youth and the finality of death—he will not return home to his parents and domestic life. Homer then briefly recreates an image of peace through the craftsman's work, highlighting the incongruity between Simoeisius' death at Troy and domestic peace. Vergil, on the other hand, inserts war into the supposedly peaceful realm of farming, and thereby wholly subverts the poem's agrarianism. The epic quality of *G.* 1.160–2 looks forward to *Aeneid* 1.1, though more immediately it glances backward to the plough (1.45–9): *sulco attritus splendescere uomer*.[72] In hindsight, the farmer seems to have already been at war with nature from the moment the poem began—and nature responds in kind (1.316–23):

saepe ego, cum flauis messorem induceret aruis
agricola et fragili iam stringeret hordea culmo,
omnia uentorum concurrere proelia uidi,
quae grauidam late segetem ab radicibus imis
sublimem expulsam eruerent: ita turbine nigro
ferret hiems culmumque leuem stipulasque uolantis.
saepe etiam immensum caelo uenit agmen aquarum,
et foedam glomerant tempestatem...

The confluence of battle imagery here (*inducere*, *concurrere*, *proelia*, *expulsam*, *eruerent*, *agmen*) signals a continuation of the same theme introduced with the plough, however, now it is nature that exerts destructive force on human beings rather than the reverse. Of course, this is also simply

[72] We might compare the weapon like undertone of *splendescere uomer* to an extract from Apuleius' *Florida* (17.1): *Profecto ut gladius usu splendescit, situ robiginat, ita ...*

a factual part of agriculture—the danger storms pose. Nevertheless, the battle imagery insists that we look beyond farming to Vergil's literary predecessors, and especially to Homer's use of similar storm analogies. Wind imagery appears often in the *Iliad*, but we might compare here Agamemnon's rallying of the Greek troops in Book 2 (2.147–9): ὡς δ᾽ ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺ λήιον ἐλθών, | λάβρος ἐπαιγίζων, ἐπί τ᾽ ἠμύει ἀσταχύεσσιν, | ὣς τῶν πᾶσ᾽ ἀγορὴ κινήθη·[73] Vergil seems to be taking the Homeric model of analogizing warfare to natural events, but inverses the image and gives human characteristics to the winds. He signals this literary break from reality through the elevation of the language, and we might suspect even that *sublimem expulsam eruerent* is a marker intentionally placed to lift our eyes upwards once again to the sublime.[74] Additionally, this sublimity adds to the intriguing implications of *concurrere proelia*:[75] while the military imagery is apparent, it is notable that the winds are running into battle with each other and the farmer's woes are just collateral damage. The effect is to both enlarge and extend the theme of war

[73] Cf. Patroclus' aristeia (*Il.* 16.384–92). We might also think of the simile at *A.* 2.416–19 for the Greek attack on Troy: *aduersi rupto ceu quondam turbine uenti | confligunt, Zephyrusque Notusque et laetus Eois | Eurus equis; stridunt siluae saeuitque tridenti | spumeus atque imo Nereus ciet aequora fundo*. The naming of each of the winds that clash together (*confligunt*) reads as an explication of *omnia uentorum concurrere proelia*. See Horsfall, *Aeneid* 2, *ad loc.* for further discussion with ample references to similar passages in both the Latin and Greek tradition; cf. especially Hom. *Od.* 5.317, *Il.* 9.4ff, 16.150, and Hor. *C.* 1.3.13.

[74] For a discussion of ancient sublimity, though focused principally on Longinus, see Porter 2016: " … the sublime can be suggested by whatever appers in nature as preternatural, by a quality of the human that appears suprahuman and virtually divine, or by a magnitude that exceeds the bounds of all measure…" (6). All of these qualities of the sublime are certainly present in the *Georgics*. On the word *sublimem* in the present context, however, the commentators are generally quiet. The three other appearances of the word in the *Georgics* seem to corroborate the idea that it signifies not only literal height for Vergil, but an overarching spiritual significance. The first occurrence is at 1.242–3 in an "extremely odd" (Thomas) description of the two poles (*hic uertex nobis semper sublimis; at illum sub pedibus Styx atra uidet Manesque profundi*). While certainly odd, Servius is sure that Vergil is playing not just with poetic licence but philosophy here (*tamen sciendum est, eum poeticae licentiam inseruisse philosophiam*). At 1.404 the word is attached to myth through the story of Nisus and Scylla (*sublimis Nisus*) and the final occurrence (3.108–9) shows the excitement of the race track and the figurative more so than literal heights a horse and rider can soar to (*iamque humiles iamque elati sublime uidentur | aëra per uacuum ferri atque adsurgere in auras*). These verses once again are a reinterpretation of an Iliadic scene (23.368); cf. Erren for a word-by-word comparison with Homer. All four instances of *sublimis* in the poem point to meanings beyond the scope of pure description and advice.

[75] *concurro* appears 22 times in the *Aeneid* but only on 3 occasions in the *Georgics* (1.318, 1.489, 4.78), though the commentators are surprisingly quiet on its significance in the present example. Mynors points to an Ennian reference (*Ann.* 143–4 Sk.): *Postquam defessi sunt stare et spargere sese | hastis ansatis, concurrunt undique telis*. Better still is the only other use of the word by Ennius, in a storm simile (432–4): *Concurrunt ueluti uenti, quom spiritus Austri | Imbricitor Aquiloque suo cum flamine contra | Indu mari magno fluctus extollere certant*.

throughout the natural world, as well as to diminish the real stature and importance of the farmer therein—he exists only as a part of larger natural systems and the force he learns to exert on the earth through *ars* does not remove him from nature's reach. We ought to compare the farmer here to the bees in Book 4 (4.67–87):[76]

> Sin autem ad pugnam exierint—nam saepe duobus
> regibus incessit magna discordia[77] motu,
> continuoque animos uulgi et trepidantia bello
> corda licet longe praesciscere; namque morantis
> Martius ille aeris rauci canor increpat, et uox
> auditur fractos sonitus imitata tubarum.[78]
> … ergo ubi uer nactae sudum camposque patentis,
> erumpunt portis, concurritur, aethere in alto
> fit sonitus, magnum mixtae glomerantur in orbem
> praecipitesque cadunt …
> hi motus animorum atque haec certamina tanta
> pulueris exigui iactu compressa quiescent

A particularly rich passage whose full significance cannot be discussed here. The similarities between it and the battle of the winds should, however, be clear: *concurritur* is a marked reminiscence of *concurrere* and *aethere in alto* places us on the same lofty battlefield as the winds (*sublimem*), and the bees are even organized in much the same way as shown through the repetition of *glomerantur glomerant*.[79] Furthermore, the specification that the battling bee armies are allied to two warring kings (*duobus regibus*), besides being a revealing misconception the Romans had of bees,[80] reminds us of the *dira cupido regnandi* attributed to Octavian in Book 1. The ambiguous

[76] Again we ought to first look to Homer and *Iliad* 2 for his influence on Vergil's bees (*Il.* 2.84–94). The Greek troops assembling there are compared to swarms of bees emerging from "a hollow rock" (πέτρης ἐκ γλαφυρῆς).
[77] Civil war language; see Mynors *ad loc.* Cf. *E.* 1.71–2: *en quo discordia ciuis | produxit miseros*. See *G.* 2.496 and *A.* 12.583.
[78] *sonitus tubarum* highlights not only that the bees are performing human warfare but Roman warfare. Cf. Erren *ad loc.* See also Aristotle on bees' tendency to fight all and only flee and show restraint against each other (*Historia Animalium* 626a15): οὐδὲν δὲ φεύγουσι τῶν ζῴων ἀλλ᾽ ἢ ἑαυτάς.
[79] Of the four occurrences of *glomero* in the *Georgics,* two describe animals (3.117 and 4.79) and two the winds (1.323 and 2.311). Strictly speaking, 3.117 describes a horseman (*equitem*) learning to jump and ride in armour, however, as will be further discussed below, at this point "horse and rider have become completely conflated" (Thomas *ad* 116–17.
[80] A common misunderstanding apparently among ancient writers. Cf. Varro *RR.* 3.16.6–8: *Haec ut hominum ciuitates, quod hic est et rex et imperium et societas ... Regem suum secuntur, quocumque it ... quod eum seruare uolunt.* For a

shifting and equivocating between the human and the animal, the mortal and the divine within the whole poem suggests an implicit similarity between Octavian, Rome's contemporary ruler and a future deity, with the bees here. Still, that someone can quash the bees' epic battles with just a handful of dust (*pulueris exigui iactu*) quickly deflates the nobility of the scene, shifting our perspective once again. We see in it a bitter moment of ascent and descent as the suspense of *aethere in alto* is snuffed out with the realization that the bees were never very high at all if the farmer could reach them.[81] The bees' insignificance in the face of the utter dominance one person can exert on them recalls the same insignificance of the farmers opposed to the forces of the winds and gods throughout the first 3 books. These shifts in perspective define Vergil's conception of the nature of things,[82] focusing both upon the power people gain through *labor* and *ars*, without overlooking their utter weakness in the face of greater forces.

The rapidly shifting focalisations that characterize Vergil's *Georgics* force us to approach the poem's universe from many different angles. Through an ostensibly didactic interest in presenting the agricultural world, Vergil focuses our attention on the most minute actors in that world, soil, plants, insects, and animals, while also shifting our view towards enormous elements ranging from the celestial to the divine and from the political to the religious. The underlying effect of these focalizations is to reshape the natural hierarchy that dominates the universe, such as through Octavian's usurpation of Jupiter, as well as to transform the tissue of the agricultural world, the farmer's tools and animals especially, into animate and human actors from whose

fuller collection of references, both Greek and Latin, to the rulers of the beehive as kings (*rex*, *dux*, *ductor*, *imperator*, βασιλεύς, ἡγεμών, ἐσσήν etc.), see Hudson-Williams, "King Bees and Queen Bees," 2–4. Hudson-Williams does, however, cast some doubt as to how ubiquitous was the conviction that the queen bees were actually kings—a few sources do apparently use the feminine βασίλισσα or even μητέρες.

[81] Erren *ad loc.*: "Der Wurf kann nicht hoch in die Luft gehen, sondern trifft den abgestürzten und teilweise wieder auffliegenden Sammelschwarm von oben und von der Seite."

[82] The exploration of the 'nature of things' in the *Georgics* is deeply engaged with Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura.* For discussion thereon see Gale 2000, 2008, and Farrell 1991, esp. 169–207.

perspective we experience the farmer's struggle. In Chapter 2 we shall filter these elements of Vergil's world through the lens of *labor* in order to demonstrate that the unifying relationship between all matter in the *Georgics* is one of slavery.

Chapter 2

Labor* and Slavery in the *Georgics

In Chapter 1, we examined Vergil's penchant in the *Georgics* for shifting the reader's gaze between multiple aspects and levels of the agricultural world he has created within his didactic poem. Through the personification of the non-human elements of the farmer's surroundings, Vergil privileges a narrative based around re-focalization, giving the reader a shared perspective on the nature of things through the eyes of animals, plants, gods, and people. The unifying thread between these disparate elements is a ubiquitous infliction of and then in turn submission to slavery.

Within the shifting perspectives of the *Georgics,* the singular constant is *labor*. *Labor* is at the heart of what Vergil portrays as the conflict between man and nature and is the driving force in his refashioning and reordering of nature. For Vergil, Roman *natura* is the union of *labor* and *uis* for the domination of the physical world.[83] The ideal natural landscape for the Roman is "the world of cultivated growth within the farm's sacred *termini*."[84] The construction of this well-ordered cultivation is predicated on incessant *labor*, an imperative which Jupiter lays down at the dawn of the Iron Age in Vergil's theodicy (1.118–46):

> nec tamen, haec cum sint hominumque boumque labores
> uersando terram experti, nihil improbus anser
> Strymoniaeque grues et amaris intiba fibris
> officiunt aut umbra nocet. pater ipse colendi
> haud facilem esse uiam uoluit, primus per artem
> mouit agros, curis acuens mortalia corda
> nec torpere graui passus sua regna ueterno.

[83] We shall return to *uis* and *labor* in this section but see also Ross 78f. for the equivalence of *uis humana* and *labor improbus.*

[84] Ibid, 21. We might also extrapolate the *termini* of the farmstead to the sacred *pomerium* around Rome itself, significant especially for the triumphal ritual.

> …tum uariae uenere artes. labor omnia uicit
> improbus et duris urgens in rebus egestas.

These lines, the most hotly debated in the poem, demonstrate the imposition that *labor* was for humanity and Jupiter's dominant position in the Vergil's world. *Labor* literally frames Jupiter's role in the Iron Age (1.118 and 145). It is crucial to the subject of the poem that *labor* here is shared between human beings and animals (*hominumque boumque labores*),[85] demonstrating the similarities between the two in the natural world and the heightened anthropomorphism throughout the text. That animals are man's compatriots in *labor*, their servility to him notwithstanding, lies behind many of the actual images of *labor* in the poem (3.515–19):

> ecce autem duro fumans sub uomere taurus
> concidit, et mixtum spumis uomit ore cruorem
> extremosque ciet gemitus. it tristis arator
> maerentem abiungens fraterna morte iuuencum,
> atque opere in medio defixa reliquit aratra.

The ox's death from the plague reproduces both animal and human features, lending the ploughman a sense of pathos. The ox's death is felt fraternally, most clearly through the second ox yoked alongside the first to the plough,[86] but also in the ploughman as ox and man have been conflated in their shared labour. The labours of people and animals are then bookended in Vergil's theodicy with the realization that after Jupiter's interference *labor* came to dominate all existence (*labor omnia uicit* | *improbus*). The consequence of this primordial constraint is further subjugation perpetrated now by human beings (1.125–7): *ante Iouem nulli subigebant arua coloni;* | *ne signare quidem aut partiri limite campum* | *fas erat*. The militaristic sense of both *subigo* and

[85] See also above n. 9 for the repetition of *boumque labores* | *diluit* at 1.325–6. While Vergil specifies that it is the labour of oxen that the storm washes away there, naturally this labour is shared with the farmer as are the storm's consequences.

[86] Vergil suggests that the oxen are even raised together like children in school, being accustomed early in life to pulling makeshift ploughs and bearing the yoke and walking in time together, long before they are actually pressed into service in the field ((3.163–9).

colonus should not be overlooked here.[87] More important, however, is the notion of *fas* and its concomitant divine connotations. Toil only entered the world through Jupiter's will and Vergil ensures that the divine element of *labor* and *ars* continues to stand out with Ceres (147–9), Celeus (165), and Iacchus (166) appearing in quick succession after Jupiter's mandate.[88] The prevalence of divine and mythic figures in the *Georgics* is marked for its opposition to Lucretius' intense demythologizing while still treating in many regards the same subject—the nature of the universe. That Lucretius is imbedded into the *Georgics* is unmistakable,[89] signposted by references such as the programmatic beatitude (2.490–4):

> felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas
> atque metus omnis et inexorabile fatum
> subiecit pedibus strepitumque Acherontis auari:
> fortunatus et ille deos qui nouit agrestis
> Panaque Siluanumque senem Nymphasque sorores.

The words *rerum cognoscere causas* are tantamount to a direct reference to the title *De rerum natura*,[90] which in turns calls to mind many of Lucretius' own invocations to his foremost literary predecessor, Epicurus (*DRN* 3.1–3): *e tenebris tantis tam clarum extollere lumen | qui primus potuisti inlustrans commoda uitae, | te sequor, o Graiae gentis decus*.[91] Vergil undercuts

---

[87] For *subigo* cf. Plaut. *Curc*. 442–8. Erren on *coloni*: "Das ominöse Stichwort *coloni* macht den Satz zweideutig; es heißt eben auch "Siedler" im politischen Sinn wie Caes. *civ.* 1.14.4..."

[88] We should look ahead as well to similar mythic figures in the poem—Aristaeus in Book 4 is the most evident.

[89] *pace* Thomas, 4. While he does not deny Lucretius' presence in the *Georgics* entirely, he qualifies Lucretius' influence as centred generally around a certain didactic language and phraseology rather than philosophical substance. See, however, Farrell 1991: "Most of the Lucretian formulae that Vergil uses appear in the *Georgics* only once or twice. Their repetition is not a major factor either in Vergil's prosody or in his argument … to count each instance of *nunc age* or *praeterea* … is obviously misleading" (170). Farrell does not, however, discount Lucretius' importance for Vergil in general, for which see esp. 169–206.

[90] Thomas remains unconvinced of Lucretius' importance in these lines, though Erren insists that while *rerum cognoscere causas* is evidently not an exact transplant of *De rerum natura*, the semantics are close enough to dispel any doubt as to their meaning: "Nach Epikur und Lukrez sind die konkreten „Ursachen der Dinge" bekanntlich die kleinen Körper, die man nicht mehr teilen kann, die sog. atoma und ihre Mengen, Formen, Bewegungen und Berührungen, Verbindungen. Weil aus diesen Ursachen alles „geboren wird" was es gibt, ist *causas* auch Metonymie für *natura, rerum cognoscere causas* heißt *de rerum natura* studieren." See also Putnam 149–51.

[91] Bailey rightly draws a comparison between this passage and the *Graius homo* at *DRN* 1.66 and the invocation of Epicurus in the proem to Book 5 (5.1–9): *quis potis est dignum pollenti pectore carmen | condere pro rerum maiestate hisque repertis? ... dicendum est, deus ille fuit, deus, inclute Memmi, | qui princeps uitae rationem inuenit eam ...* Notice in this last passage the words *pro rerum maiestate*, itseld perhaps a reformulation of *De rerum natura*. Our

Lucretius' place in the poem, however, by balancing *felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas* (*G.* 2.490) against *fortunatus et ille deos qui nouit agrestis* (493). For Vergil, an understanding of *natura* is incomplete without also recognizing the gods' place therein, for better or for worse. Lucretius (somewhat notoriously) stopped just shy of actually denying the existence of the gods, content with relegating them to a vague ethereal place divorced from earth, and stripping them of essentially all contact with human beings; the gods may exist, but religion remains something detestable in the *DRN* (*DRN* 1.62–79). Vergil responds by reintegrating religion into the world through the insertion of active divinities, monsters, and myths throughout the poem.[92] While Lucretius does give some place to myth in the *DRN*, he often does so solely for the sake of juxtaposing faulty beliefs with true reason, such as with a description of the thunderbolt (6.379–422) where he throws into question Jupiter's control over lightning (406–7):[93] *praeterea si uult caueamus fulminis ictum, | cur dubitat facere ut possimus cernere missum?* In contrast, Vergil dispels any doubt as to Jupiter's personal authority over thunder and lightning (*G.* 1.328–30): *ipse pater media nimborum in nocte corusca | fulmina militur dextra, quo maxima motu | terra tremit*... The importance of the gods for the farmer is then underlined through the necessity of prayer (338–40): *in primis uenerare deos, atque annua magnae | sacra refer Cereri laetis operatus in herbis | extremae sub casum hiemis, iam uere sereno*.[94] Prayer, however, is never a guarantee of success.

attention is naturally drawn as well to the pointed use of *deus*, ascribed here to Epicurus. By elevating his Greek philosophical hero to the level of the gods, Lucretius simultaneously undermines further the distinct presence and significance of the divine vis-à-vis flesh and blood human beings.

[92] For the phrase "Remythologization" and for discussion of the role of myth and divinity in both the *Georgics* and the *DRN*, see Monica Gales "Virgil's Metamorphoses: Myth and Allusion in the *Georgics*" in *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies*, (ed.) Katherina Volk, Oxford University Press (2008), esp. 110–17.

[93] Bailey *ad* 379–422: "… Lucr. breaks off his scientific argument to insert a protest against the traditional theological view. In the present instance the digression is even more justifiable and indeed necessary, seeing that the belief that the lightning-stroke was the instrument of the gods, by which they punished offenders or declared their will, was not only a piece of popular superstition, but lay at the base of the whole system of auspice and augury, which formed a large part of the State religion."

[94] Cf. Putnam, 26: "Whatever dispensations they bestow arise from happy inspiration, are effected without effort, and stem only from volition… Their method of helping their human worshipers manifests the same synthesis of violence and productivity that will be seen to characterize the artful farmer's way."

While Vergil insists on the presence and power of the gods in contrast with Lucretius' scientific approach, he leaves fairly ambivalent the gods' actual volition and sympathy for human suffering.

While Vergil insists on the active participation of the gods in nature, he dismisses any notion of their benevolence or sympathy for human beings. The poem's addressee would do well to remember that the gods will more often than not ignore his prayers and allow the farmer to be destroyed despite his assiduous *labor* and ritual observances. Though we might see in the suffering imposed by the gods (particularly Jupiter) on humanity a benign push towards the development of *artes*, Vergil's language in its most straightforward sense suggests that Jupiter's imposition is aimed at his own benefit rather than ours (1.122–4): *haud facilem esse uiam uoluit ... nec torpere graui passus sua regna ueterno.*[95] Our attention ought to be drawn to *sua regna* in this passage as it points to Jupiter's fear for his own domain rather than a concern for human welfare: "...bei Vergil fürchtet Jupiter das Erlahmen und Altern nicht für die Menschen, sondern für seine Herrschaft, die er nicht so enden lassen will wie die seines Vaters Saturn geendet hat ..."[96] If we follow Erren's reading of this crucial passage, Jupiter remains integral to the Vergilian understanding of the universe, but we should not understand him as a beneficent force. Similarly, while Vergil counsels proper observance of the Cerealia (1.335–50), such veneration "offer[s] no palliative to the storm that has immediately preceded … and there is no suggestion in the *Georgics* that piety is of any use in the struggle between humanity and its environment."[97] Vergil has put the gods back into the fabric of the everyday world, but has instilled in them complete ambivalence or apathy to humanity's struggles at best, and at worst has made them into humanity's active opponents and

[95] Servius *ad loc.*: Veterno *pigritia: nam ueternum dicitur morbus intercus, id est* ὕδρωψ, *qui homines efficit pigros ... (ueterno) otio, quia plerumque otiosos solet hic morbus incessere.* This is not an especially negative reading by Servius but one which ignores two integral words of the verse—*sua regna.* Similarly, Thomas gestures to the "enormous ethical appeal" of the line without addressing *sua regna*, while Mynors writes only on *torpere*: "So Jupiter in Val. Flacc. 1.498ff."
[96] Erren, *ad* 1.118–24.
[97] Thomas *ad* 1.335–50.

destroyers. While Jupiter introduced the necessity of work into the world, he gave no promise of labour's success, and generally we see in the *Georgics* that all things decline, spiralling quickly into failure and oblivion, a reality the narrator has seen for himself (1.193–200):

> semina uidi equidem multos medicare serentis
> et nitro prius et nigra perfundere amurca,
> ... uidi lecta diu et multo spectata labore
> degenerare tamen, ni uis humana quotannis
> maxima quaeque manu legeret. sic omnia fatis
> in peius ruere ac retro sublapsa referri …[98]

Despite man's best efforts all things often turn out for the worst through *fatis*. This is the bleak picture Vergil paints of humanity's relationship with nature—nothing comes easily nor can *labor* ensure anything. Furthermore, not only does the burden of *labor* guarantee nothing, but the god who foisted toil on man has also placed additional obstacles in his way, even destroying him at times: in the same moment that Jupiter introduced *labor* (1.118–46), he also gave venom to snakes (*malum uirus serpentibus addidit atris*),[99] and set wolves prowling (*praedarique lupos iussit*). *uirus* is particularly significant in the *Georgics*, appearing again at 3.281 in an odd description of hippomanes, and at 3.419 of snake venom. And though the word *uirus* is omitted, we should remember as well that a snake's bite killed Eurydice in Book 4 (4.457–9),[100] and so we might see Jupiter lurking there behind her death. Moreover, Vergil foreshadows the snake bite and advises caution around the tall grass in Book 3, just before the first signs of the plague (3.435–8): *ne mihi tum mollis sub diuo carpere somnos | neu dorso nemoris libeat iacuisse per herbas, | cum positis nouus exuuiis nitidusque iuuenta | uoluitur* … Mortals ought to take care around the grass because

[98] For the pessimism of this image see esp. Putnam and Thomas *ad loc.*
[99] Of note too is the similarity and proximity of *uirus addidit* (129) and *frumentis labor additus* (150).
[100] On the rationality of the snake's position *alta in herba,* Erren concludes that Eurydice would not have noticed the snake in time, regardless of whether she had been fleeing Aristaeus or not, implying that the danger of the snake supersedes Aristaeus himself: "Aristaeus war in keiner Weise Verursacher ihres Todes." This conclusion may go slightly too far. As highlighted above, *uirus* denotes in the *Georgics* not only venom but animal sex and mania. Book 3 emphasizes especially the equivalency of *amor* and disease and we might see both at play in Eurydice's death.

of Jupiter. The poet ostensibly advises against sleeping in the grass, but we might see a sexual image forming here (*mollis somnos ... libeat iacuisse ... uoluitur*), perhaps even a violent one (*carpere*).[101] The tragedy is in part that Eurydice initially heeded Vergil's warning: she tried to avoid the destructive force of '*amor*' by fleeing Aristaeus, but still fell prey to the snake. In rereading this passage, Vergil's advice cannot but sound tinged with pessimism for its ultimate futility, which is made all the worse for Jupiter's subtle presence, both in the snake's venom and literally above the grass, *sub diuo.*[102] Vergil specifies not to sleep (love?) in the tall grass underneath the open sky (*sub diuo*), but obviously there is a divine implication therein, and Jupiter's position as sky god easily places him here. Finally, beyond just imposing burdens and dangers on humanity, when things do decline (1.199–200: *sic omnia fatis | in peius ruere*) the gods often will not intervene (3.486–8): *saepe in honore deum medio stans hostia ad aram, | lanea dum niuea circumdatur infula uitta, | inter cunctantis cecidit moribunda ministros*. At a loss for what to do in the face of the plague (3.440–556), a sacrifice is offered, but to no avail. We are drawn back here through *hostia* to the Cerealia in Book 1, the only other place in the poem where the word occurs (1.345). While in that case the sacrifice was performed successfully, the gods remained ambivalent. The failed sacrifice of Book 3 highlights the breakdown of religion against the overwhelming force of the natural world but is doubly pessimistic because we are compelled now to wonder whether a successful sacrifice is even possible, or if it would have made any difference at all. If an optimistic reading of *labor* in the *Georgics* is possible, it is through reading

[101] For the juxtaposition of fragility and violence with *carpere*, cf. Cat. 62.39–48: *ut flos in saeptis secretus nascitur hortis, | ignotus pecori, nullo conuolsus aratro ... idem cum tenui carptus defloruit ungui...* Cf. the phonetically similar ἁρπάζω in the sense of kidnapping and rape, as often in Herodotus' account of the beginning of the conflicts between East and West (1.1–3): τὴν δὲ Ἰοῦν σὺν ἄλλῃσι ἁρπασθῆναι ... φασὶ τῆς Φοινίκης ἐς Τύρον προσσχόντας ἁρπάσαι τοῦ βασιλέος τὴν θυγατέρα Εὐρώπην ... ἁρπάσαι τοῦ βασιλέος τὴν θυγατέρα Μηδείην ... ἐθελῆσαί οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος δι' ἁρπαγῆς γενέσθαι γυναῖκα ...

[102] Erren *ad loc.* "*sub divo:* Vulgarismus, hier Übers. für αἴθριος, s. zum Vorigen." Cf. Varro *LL.* 5.66.

Jupiter's imposition of *labor improbus* (1.145–6)[103] as a benevolent compulsion for people to develop *ars* and avoid sloth.[104] This, however, does not seem to resolve the inexorable discomfort and ultimate failure of *labor* in the poem, nor does it address the natural comparison that should be made between Hesiod's (and to a lesser extent, Aeschylus' in *Prometheus Bound*) Zeus and Vergil's Jupiter. Hesiod portrays the gods' abandonment of humanity as a punishment for their faults,[105] impiety foremost (*WD.* 180–201):[106]

> Ζεὺς δ᾽ ὀλέσει καὶ τοῦτο γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,
> ... σχέτλιοι, οὐδὲ θεῶν ὄπιν εἰδότες· ...
> καὶ τότε δὴ πρὸς Ὄλυμπον ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης
> λευκοῖσιν φάρεσσι καλυψαμένω χρόα καλὸν
> ἀθανάτων μετὰ φῦλον ἴτον προλιπόντ᾽ ἀνθρώπους
> Αἰδὼς καὶ Νέμεσις· τὰ δὲ λείψεται ἄλγεα λυγρὰ
> θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποισι, κακοῦ δ᾽ οὐκ ἔσσεται ἀλκή.

Hesiod, like Vergil, emphasizes the continual degeneration and decadence of h umanity, but for him it is humanity's impiety that spurs the gods' departure. Vergil's Jupiter introduces suffering into the world unprovoked and when the gods are called upon with due reverence they do not answer, leaving man with only *labor* as recourse, which will eventually fail. Vergil's addressee must now confront the fact that the little the farmer can realistically accomplish must be done through unceasing labour and unremitting violence without divine help.[107] The irony too is that while humanity's only recourse is to labour, they will find inevitably become themselves the victims of labour as well—either their work will not produce sufficient results to sustain them, or

[103] There is not space here to respond to the many arguments as to the meaning of these lines. In the main I am in agreement with Thomas' pessimistic reading of these lines, though see also Jenkyns (1993) for a tempered approach.
[104] Campbell, 568. That Jupiter is called *pater* (1.121) "suggests benevolence…"
[105] Ibid. "The myth of the ages dramatizes the role of moral and physical evil in the evolution of society. Hesiod states that the gods inflicted adversity on men … and suggests punishment as cause."
[106] Cf. Aratus (129–34) who has Δίκη abandon humanity in the Bronze Age (… καὶ τότε μισήσασα Δίκη κείνων γένος ἀνδρῶν | ἔπταθ᾽ ὑπουρανίη). See Morgan, 108–12.
[107] Putnam, 220: "Religion's collapse before nature's strange spontaneity increases man's loneliness in the face of death."

the interminable toil will surpass their own bodies. That *labor omnia uincit* applies to all the objects of human *uis* including human beings themselves.

If *labor* for the Roman farmer is the ordering and controlling of nature, this control can only be achieved through violence. The violence applied to trees as the farmer prepares to plant and graft surpasses the military metaphors that are so persistent in the poem. It becomes clearly a matter of dominance in man's search to fashion an ordered world (2.23–5): *hic plantas tenero abscindens de corpore matrum | deposuit sulcis, hic stirpes obruit aruo, | quadrifidasque sudes et acuto robore uallos*. Ripping children from their mothers is a remarkable image, more at home in describing the sack of a city than arboriculture.[108] Varro describes the same process of collecting and planting shoots prosaically, using the emotionally neutral verb *deplantare* where Vergil has the *abscindere.*[109] Instead of a plant shoot, Vergil makes us see a caesarian.[110]

The violence applied to trees and vines is not only emotive but subversive because of the *adynata* to which Vergil's brutality guides the farmer. The poet turns to grafting and presents seven separate potential grafts, introducing the first two in a tried format (2.32–4): *et saepe alterius*

[108] Andromache and Hector with Astyanax atop the walls of Troy is the first image that comes to mind (Hom. *Il.* 6.466–81). Ovid gives us the actual moment of violence, highlighting the rupture of the parent-child relationship (*Met.* 13.415–17): *mittitur Astyanax illis de turribus, unde | pugnantem pro se proauitaque regna tuentem | saepe uidere patrem montratum a matre solebat*. Cf. the bitter image of Catullus' love uprooted like a flower by Lesbia's adultery (11.21–4): *nec meum respectet, ut ante, amorem, | qui illius culpa cecidit uelut prati | ultimi flos, praetereunte postquam | tactus aratro est.* Vergil was evidently inspired by Catullus when describing Euryalus' death (*A.* 9.435–6): *purpureus ueluti cum flos succisus aratro | languescit moriens…*

[109] While *abscindere* need not absolutely denote violence (cf. Verg. *A.* 5.685), it often does (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 15.69.11: *clauditur cubiculo, praesto est medicus, abscinduntur uenae, uigens adhuc balneo infertur, calida aqua mersatur, nulla edita uoce qua semet miseraretur*). The pathos here evidently suggests violence rather than neutrality. Conversely, Varro's *deplantare* leaves little room for emotion (*RR.* 1.40.4): *Tertium genus seminis, quod ex arbore per surclos defertur in terram, si in humum demittitur, in quibusdam est uidendum ut eo tempore sit deplantatum ... et quae de arbore transferas ut ea deplantes potius quam defringas, quod plantae solum stabilius, quo latius aut radices facilius mittit*. Tilly sees wordplay in the *solum* of the shoot which would indicate an interesting moment of anthropomorphism on Varro's part here. However, Varro clearly is giving fairly neutral advice, cautioning restraint and gentleness (*deplantare* rather than *defringere*) rather than Vergil's insistence on violence (*abscindere*). Vergil deemphasizes the actual exigencies of arboriculture to focus instead on his persistently violent and pessimistic worldview. Cf. Ov. *Met.* 12.361–2 where it is actually a tree that *abscidit* a human being: *non tamen arbor iners cecidit; nam Crantoris alti | abscidit iugulo pectusque umerumque sinistrum*.

[110] Compare Ovid's description of Myrrha transformed into a tree, and the painful birth of her son Adonis (10.512–13): *arbor agit rimas et fissa cortice uiuum | reddit onus, uagitque puer.*

ramos impune uidemus | uertere in alterius, mutatamque insita mala | ferre pirum, et prunis lapidosa rubescere corna. The formulation *saepe uidere* appears often in the *Georgics* in order "to impart *fides*" and strengthen the didactic value of what the poet is about to address.[111] This didacticism is consciously erroneous or fantastic, and Vergil will often mark such instances as θαῦμα either through formulaic phrases like *mirabile dictu*, as he does here when he introduces grafting—*quin et caudicibus sectis (mirabile dictu) | truditur e sicco radix oleagina ligno* (2.30–1)—[112]or through clear moments of surrealism and myth such as at 1.471–3 with the Cyclopes. The extraordinariness that Vergil signals here is marked for its subtlety—the impossibility of the grafts he recommends. Of the seven (two at 2.32–4 and five from 69–72), only the first is conceivable while the others are "impractical or grotesque."[113] There is no chance that Vergil was unaware of this as Varro had already documented some of the restrictions on grafting (1.40.5–6) and Vergil had actually used a few similarly impossible grafts in his eighth *Eclogue* (52–4) to intensify the impression of a world gone awry. The actual impracticality of these grafts has no bearing though on their likelihood within the *Georgics*—from the accession of Octavian in the proem to Book 1, Vergil has signalled that the nature of things has been reordered—the poem's transformed landscape cannot be expected to adhere to normative rules. Vergil separates arboriculture and viticulture from the realities of farming, thereby highlighting the transformative power of *labor* (2.61–2): *scilicet omnibus est labor impendendus, et omnes | cogendae in sulcum*

[111] Thomas *ad* 1.316–18. The formulation or approximate equivalents also occur at 1.365, 451, 471–2, 2.32, 186–7. *Saepe* itself naturally appears far more often (32 times) and several of these moments that do not include *uidere* or a similar verb still impute a comparable significance, such as 3.274–9 (*saepe sine ullis | coniugiis… | diffugiunt*). The device, ostensibly used to introduce a didactic moment, signals through its pairing with the extraordinary the replacement of *fides* with *diffidentia* (Thomas *ad* 2.32).

[112] *mirabile dictu* occurs three times in the poem: 2.30, 3.275, and 4.554 of the bugonia (*hic uero subitum ac dictu mirabile monstrum | aspiciunt, liquefacta boum per uiscera toto | stridere apes utero*...).

[113] Ross (1987), 105. Thomas asserts that two are in fact plausible though admittedly improbable (apple with pear (33) and chestnut with beech (71)). For a brief explanation of the technical theory of grafting applied to these examples, see Ross 1980.

ac multa domandae. The introductory *scilicet* implies certainty in the truth of the statement.[114] *Labor* now becomes a tool of domination for humanity, though humanity is still itself under the dominion of Jupiter. We ought to recall the construction of the plough (1.169–70): *continuo in siluis magna ui flexa domatur | in burim et curui formam accipit ulmus aratri*. The juxtaposition of *in siluis* with *magna ui domatur* signals a division between what we might consider the idyllic or pre-human nature,[115] and the georgic *natura* of the farmer defined by control and domination. Moreover, the phrase *formam accipit* naturally provokes an Ovidian image of profound metamorphosis rather than quotidian handiwork.[116] In the case of grafting, *labor*'s penchant for mutation is concluded by the anthropomorphism of the grafted tree now animated and conscious of its own multifariousness (2.80–2): *plantae immittuntur; nec longum tempus, et ingens | exiit ad caelum ramis felicibus arbos, | miratastque nouas frondes et non sua poma*. The tree marvels at the foreign fruits that hang from its branches, though the humanizing *miratast* compels us to ask if it is also contemplating its metamorphosized human nature. Furthermore, the ambiguity that is so prevalent in the poem generally is particularly strained here as it is unclear whether the tree's astonishment is "a happy smile … or [if] one can see it shrinking in disbelief at the perversion worked upon it, at its mutation."[117] *Labor* is not just toil but the exertion of *uis* on external bodies and the reordering of the natural world into Roman *natura*.

---

[114] Thomas *ad loc.*: "The more ironical sense, 'to be sure', 'it is true', would require some sort of qualification, which is not forthcoming…"

[115] The yet untamed forests suggest perhaps the otherness of *Aeneid* 6, or even *selva oscura,* something tinged sinister: "First, one must venture into the woods (*in siluis*), that enemy of the georgic existence and last recourses of the (figuratively) degenerate" (Putnam, 36–7).

[116] Without examining Ovid in any detail here, we might think to the opening lines of the *Metamorphoses* (1.1–2): *In noua fert animus mutatas dicere formas | corpora…*

[117] Ross (1987), 109. The humanness of the tree is also underlined by the description of its bark and trunk—tunics and their knotted folds (75–6): *et tenuis rumpunt tunicas, angustus in ipso | fit nodo sinus*. Cf. Ovid *Met.* 1.550–2 (*in frondem crines, in ramos bracchia crescunt…*)

The focalisations from great to small and dominator to dominated in the *Georgics*, coupled with ubiquitous anthropomorphism, reveal that the georgic universe is defined by slavery. The fact that slavery is practically never addressed overtly in the poem is itself a curiosity that demands exploration: "The astonishing thing about the *Georgics* is that in the whole poem there is no reference to slavery which was casually assumed by Hesiod and was the *sine qua non* of Varro's treatise."[118] Indeed, *labor* in the *Res Rusticae* might be wholly inextricable from slavery.[119] Vergil, of course, is quite comfortable adapting, cutting, and excluding from much of the material culled from his literary predecessors. We might think of the compressed description of the plough, a central agricultural implement, in comparison with Hesiod's.[120] He does leave a great deal in, however, and complete omissions of important concepts should be treated with suspicion.[121] One answer is that Vergil consciously avoided naming slavery because the concept itself lies at the heart of the poem but to call it by name would be to cheapen it and the poetic integrity of the work. In contrast, some argue that slavery is omitted on grounds of decorum: "Er [Vergil] mag aber an das Schmutzige und Verächtliche wie Esel und Schweine und Kastration so wenig erinnern wie

[118] Wilkinson, 53. Wilkinson explains the omission, which he rightly insists was intentional, as reflective of Vergil's "ideal, the old-fashioned yeoman—*vetus colonus*—revived. He must work for himself: the whole moral fabric of the poem is based on this" (54). Cf. Erren, Band 1, 16: "...die Existenz des Sklavenpersonals übergeht er völlig mit Schweigen..."

[119] *labor* surprisingly is not an overly frequent word in the *Res Rusticae*, occurring only 10 times. The labour that is referred to at all of those instances might very well allude to slave work, e.g., at 1.2.8 when referring to the production on Marcius Libo's estate, Varro writes that the produce depended on money and *labor* invested (*pro impensa ac labore*). It is hard to believe that *labor* could imply anything here but servile work. Varro of course makes a distinction at other times between slave and hired labour, advising that particularly difficult work is better done by free workers (1.17.2–3): *Omnes agri coluntur hominibus seruis aut liberis aut utrisque ... hoc dico, grauia loca utilius esse mercennariis colere quam seruis ...*

[120] Vergil's plough (1.169–75) is adapted from Hes. *WD.* 427–36. He has, however, "radically trimmed the Hesiodic account, giving the necessary details, but removing all asides and poetic embellishments, almost as if his concern was to complete the description as soon as possible" (Thomas *ad loc*.).

[121] Vergil practically ignores the care of the olive for instance, devoting only 5 lines to it (2.420–5). This has provoked discussion amongst the critics as an example of the impracticality of Vergil's text. But see Spurr (1986), who counters with the similar omissions, errors, and impracticalities of Varro, Cato, and Columella: "… even a rapid glance at the pages of Cato's *de agricultura* or Varro's *de re rustica* will reveal that the prose writers also were highly selective" (4). Spurr is right, of course, and the prose writers should not be considered as exhaustive sources on farming. Yet, it is beyond dispute that Vergil's poetry is playing a different game than the prose writers; cf. Seneca *Ep.* 86.15.

an den verpönten Reichtum der früher herrschenden Klasse, darum verliert er kein Wort über die Villa und die hochwertigen Spezialitäten der pastio villatica und spricht auch nicht vom käuflichen Erwerb eines Grundstücks; die Existenz des Sklavenpersonals übergeht er völlig mit Schweigen."[122] To illustrate this reluctance to refer directly to slavery, the actual word *seruus* never appears in the *Georgics*, whereas it occurs nine times in Varro's *Res Rusticae.* Yet Vergil makes explicit at times as part of his general technique of shifting focalisations that one must set decorum aside in the *Georgics* (1.79–81): *sed tamen alternis facilis labor, arida tantum | ne saturare fimo pingui pudeat sola neue | effetos cinerem immundum iactare per agros*. This provocative image of one of Vergil's farmers schlepping manure illustrates this; manuring was hands-on for the Romans who carried dung in wicker containers (Varro *RR.* 1.22.3, Cato *Agr.* 10.1 and 11.1) or scattered it by hand like birdseed (Col. *Agr.* 2.15.2): *secunda ratio est, ante quam sariat, more seminantis ex auiariis puluerem stercoris per segetem spargere; si et is non erit, caprinum manu iacere atque ita terram sarculis permiscere. ea res laetas segetes reddit*. Both methods are decidedly unpleasant to those unaccustomed to the work, the latter approach probably most so. I am inclined to prefer imagining Columella's method applied in the *Georgics* if for nothing else than the apposition of Columella's *laetas segetes* to *G.* 1.1 *Quid faciat laetas segetes*… While *laetus* evidently developed many meanings beyond 'fertile' or 'rich,' manuring remained so joined to the Roman conception of agricultural *laetitia* as to leave behind further linguistic markers of its origin, including the derivatives of *laetus*, *laetare* 'to manure' and *laetamen* 'dung, manure.'[123] In short, this is certainly not a task one would expect the rich landowner or noble amateur to take

[122] Erren, 16. Heitland (1921) also seems to fall into this category, but from the perspective that Vergil would not have wanted to tread into over provocative waters: "My belief is that the poet shirked these topics [*in nuce* slavery], relevant though they surely were, because he did not see how to treat them without provoking controversy or ill-feeling" (237).
[123] L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language*, 70. See also Palmer's general discussion of the rusticity in the origins of much Latin vocabulary (69–73).

upon himself and is indicative of servile labour.[124] The Greek perspective does not seem to differ on this point (Hom. *Od.* 17.296–9):

> δὴ τότε κεῖτ᾽ ἀπόθεστος ἀποιχομένοιο ἄνακτος,
> ἐν πολλῇ κόπρῳ, ἥ οἱ προπάροιθε θυράων
> ἡμιόνων τε βοῶν τε ἅλις κέχυτ᾽, ὄφρ᾽ ἂν ἄγοιεν
> δμῶες Ὀδυσσῆος τέμενος μέγα κοπρήσοντες...

Odysseus' loyal dog, Argos, lies neglected on a heap of manure (ἐν πολλῇ κόπρῳ) which it is explicitly the job of Odysseus' servants (δμῶες) to collect and use as fertilizer (κοπρήσοντες). Homer's focus on the servile connection to manuring undermines any possibility that Vergil's overt exclusion of slaves from the *Georgics* was an issue of preserving decorum. Indeed, if Vergil does not specify that a slave should handle *fimus* it is because he does not have to, it is the natural assumption. An immediate counterargument is that Vergil is writing specifically about farms and farmers too poor to own slaves. But if this is the case, it may simply mean that these poor farmers are effectively equivalent to or worse than literal slaves. Especially given the elite audience Vergil principally wrote for, portraying such an impoverished caste of society would have produced practically the same image as actual slaves would have. Furthermore, Vergil may in fact be envisaging a large-scale villa or *latifundia* rather than an individual homestead. The amount of choice Vergil underlines in terms of soil and crops (1.50–61 and 2.177–258) as well as the possibility of using a rotation pattern (1.74f.) point to administrative luxuries not readily available on a small peasant farm.[125] But Vergil, of course, does not make the discrepancy between a slave and a farmer explicit, leaving the addressee's position ambiguous, and so we potentially have here

[124] Horace perhaps illustrates the disparity between his amateur interest in fieldwork in a letter addressed to one of his slaves; the neighbours laugh at him as he 'works,' not that this spoils Horace's fun. His correspondent naturally just wants to go into town and socialize (*Ep.* 1.14.37–40): *non istic obliquo oculo mea commoda quisquam | limat, non odio obscuro morsuque uenenat: | rident uicini glaebas et saxa mouentem. | cum seruis urbana diaria rodere mauis...*
[125] For more detailed discussion and examples, see Spurr (1986) esp. 171–5.

either a slave or an impoverished free person. However, the distinction loses its pertinence at this point as the *pudoris praefatio* transforms Vergil's listener into this slave figure.[126] This transformation is not reversed for the duration of the poem, and we see another instance of manuring in Book 2 but now emphatically unapologetic in tone (2.346–7): *quod superest, quaecumque premes uirgulta per agros | sparge fimo pingui et multa memor occulte terra*. This is the only other instance of *fimus* in the poem,[127] and while the fertilizer is equally important here as it was in Book 1, Vergil's syntax points to a change in the addressee. Instead of the polite distancing effect of the subjunctive (*ne pudeat*) at 1.80, here Vergil uses two imperatives (*sparge … occulte*). *spargere* also recalls the birdseed technique of manuring, and so we ought to see here the delegation of a very unpleasant task. The emphasis on *memor* also indicates that this is a task we ought to know already, because Vergil has previously taught it to us. This suggests that Vergil's addressee is now enslaved as well, and he is no longer teaching us how to manage a farm but is using us as servile labour. The imperative is all the more forceful in this case, not only because it emphasizes the distinction between master and slave, but because there is no need for an apologetic subjunctive—manuring is part and parcel of the slave's role.

The fertilization of soil remains a consistent issue in the first two books, however, Vergil re-focalizes the means and implications of the task through a transition to civil war. War is conflated with agriculture leading to a reinterpretation of Rome's crops as soldiers and its fertilizer as blood (1.489–97):

> ergo inter sese paribus concurrere telis
> Romanas acies iterum uidere Philippi;
> nec fuit indignum superis bis sanguine nostro
> Emathiam et latos Haemi pinguescere campos.

[126] Vergil resorts to a *pudoris praefatio* again at 176ff. before explaining the importance of the threshing floor.
[127] There are two more uses of the word in the *Aeneid,* both in Book 5 of Nisus (333 and 358). Nisus' fall into the manure obviously is meant to be a comic, shameful moment for a warrior athlete as opposed to the hardy necessity of interacting with *fimus* in the *Georgics.*

scilicet et tempus ueniet, cum finibus illis
agricola incuruo terram molitus aratro
exesa inueniet scabra robigine pila,
aut grauibus rastris galeas pulsabit inanis
grandiaque effossis mirabitur ossa sepulcris.

The fields are fertilized, fattened (*pinguescere*), now with Roman (*nostro* sanguine) blood,[128] and the word is emphatic on this point, a hapax legomenon for Vergil and a call to *pinguis*, a key word in the poem,[129] and one which modifies *fimo* both times the latter word occurs.[130] We are meant to see not only war here but also farming—*pila* exemplifies the Roman legionary, but the rust and scabbiness of the buried arms are redolent of the different types of soils (*terra*) described in Book 2 (2.219–20): *quaeque suo semper uiridi se gramine uestit | nec scabie et salsa laedit robigine ferrum.* The repetition of *robigine* and *scabie* for *scabra* links the two passages intimately, although the *ferrum* in Book 2 is just a plough, agriculture's weapon, rather than the arms and armour of civil war.[131] While the rust here is attacking the ploughshare just as it did the *pila*, the word alludes as well to that obscure deity, Robigus, invoked to keep 'plant rust,' mildew, away from crops; military and agricultural language are tangled and indissoluble from one another in the *Georgics*. The crop in Book 1, however, has changed and instead of *laetas segetes* or fat clods of earth*,* the farmer now turns over the detritus and refuse of battle, and instead of a harvest of

[128] Note, too, the wordplay with *Haemi* on the Greek αἷμα.
[129] 29 occurrences in the *Georgics* (8 in Book 1, 13 in Book 2, 3 in Book 3, and 5 in Book 4).
[130] In keeping with the poem's consistent anthropomorphism, we might think to the implications of the *Parilia* for Vergil's view on fertilizer and transforming it. Vergil gestures to the importance of Pales for agricultural work at 3.1 (*Te quoque, magna Pales ... canemus*) and we must assume that Vergil's farmers are performing the rites of Pales, celebrated on the 21st of April, the traditional birthday of Rome: "Es ist kein Zweifel, daß die Römer bei der feierlichen Anrede an Pales in einem so bezeichnenden Zusammenhang das Parilienfest und den damit verbundenen *dies natalis* am 21. April assoziierten" (Buchheit, 93). Cf. the significance Varro attributes to the *Parilia* as well (*RR.* 2.1.9): *Non ipsos quoque fuisse pastores obtinebit, quod Parilibus potissimum condidere urbem?* As part of the rites, both a horse and a calf needed to be sacrificed and their ashes used as a means of purifying the land (Ov. *Fasti.* 4.731–4). If the same rites are being performed in the background of the *Georgics,* might we be seeing human sacrifice through the conflation of man and animal?
[131] Note, too, the humanizing *uestit*; even the iron here is clothed in the same as Vergil's lands and animals above. Cf. 2.38 (*olea magnum uestire Taburnum*), Cic. *ND.* 2.98 (*riparum uestitus uiridissimos*), and Lucr. *DRN.* 5.889 (*molli uestit lanugine malas*).

wheat he reaps the huge bones of long dead soldiers. The buried bones have replaced the *fimus* that needed to be hidden inside the earth (2.347); human beings have become fertilizer and soldiers have become Italy's crop.[132] This looks ahead to the culmination of the *laudes Italiae* (2.167–72):

> haec genus acre uirum, Marsos pubemque Sabellam
> adsuetumque malo Ligurem Volscosque uerutos,
> extulit, haec Decios Marios magnosque Camillos,
> Scipiadas duros bello et te, maxime Caesar,
> qui nunc extremis Asiae iam uictor in oris
> imbellem auertis Romanis arcibus Indum.

The list of Roman heroes builds to a climax of *Romanitas* in the figure of Caesar, the culmination of "the Italian tribes in their entireties (Marsi, Sabelli, Ligures, Volsci) to specific Roman warriors in double numbers—Decii, Marii, Camilli, Scipiades, plural, though our minds might dwell on an individual within each group. Finally, we reach that unique hero, greatest Caesar."[133] The emphasis on historical war heroes, whose culmination Octavian now represents, is a reminder that the ultimate *laus Italiae* lies not in the natural resources of the land but in its people, and their ability to exert dominance on foreign lands highlighted by Octavian's conquest of Asia in this case. This very Roman preoccupation with conquest, to which we shall return below, is a natural extrapolation of the importance of violence and force in the farmer's conquest of the land.

Violence in the *Georgics* is framed specifically as the use of force (*uis*) against animated bodies. This is a thematic constant throughout the *Georgics* that creates a servile portrait of anthropomorphized animals and plants dominated by agriculture. Vergil describes branding, a practical punishment equally at home among Roman slaves as livestock, twice in the poem (1.261–

[132] We might see a related passage in the description of the stage and the Britannic warriors who, painted on the stage curtains, rise up from the ground (3.24–5): *uel scaena ut uersis discedat frontibus utque | purpurea intexti tollant aulaea Britanni*; cf. Ov. *Met.* 3.111–14. "The Britons serve as an example of the extent of Rome's power" (Thomas *ad* 3.24–5).

[133] Putnam, 102. Cf. Erren: "Kinder der Mutter Italien sind die Menschen, die es kultivierien, und ihre geschichtlichen Leistungen; in diesen muß die Beschreibung des Landes gipfeln."

3): *durum procudit arator | uomeris obtunsi dentem, cauat arbore lintres. | aut pecori signum aut numeros impressit aceruis*. Here, branding is a task specifically to be done in poor weather, while the second occurrence (3.157–8) is the very first thing Vergil recommends that the farmer do to calves: *post partum cura in uitulos traducitur omnis; | continuoque notas et nomina gentis inurunt*. The verb *inuro,* a more technical term than the initial *numeros impressit* of Book 1, takes on some extra meaning now. While it is certainly appropriate to livestock branding, it is also used of slave branding and metaphorically of one ostracized from the Roman community, as Cicero of Catiline (*Cat*. 1.6.13): *quae nota domesticae turpitudinis non inusta uitae tuae est?* The rhetorical question uses the language of slavery to highlight the sign (*nota*) that the censors would place beside the names of citizens to mark disgrace.[134] The branding element further dehumanizes Catiline as was the intention of all literal slave branding. We see a glimpse of this in Plautus' *Aulularia* in an argument between two cooks (325–6): *tun, trium litterarum homo, | me uituperas? fur*. The 'man of three letters' is a reference to either a tattoo or a brand that the cook was given as a permanent punishment for thieving (*fur*).[135] The brand was meant to define the slave as their crime. Legally, branding could permanently prevent even a manumitted slave from obtaining citizenship, alienating them from society.[136]

---

[134] Dyck, *ad loc.*

[135] Jones, "*Stigmata:* Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity," 153. The history of penal tattooing extends pretty far it would seem despite the relative paucity of clear source material. It is certainly the case, however, that slaves would find themselves tattooed or branded for criminal behaviour, especially for running away: "The tattooing of delinquent slaves, often runaways, is frequently mentioned in Attic comedy … in the [Hellenistic] period there first appears a practice which may be as old as punitive tattooing itself, that of tattooing delinquent slaves with the name of their offence" (147–8). Jones concedes, however, that Plato first mentioned branding as the punishment for criminals (*Laws* 854D: Ὃς δ' ἂν ἱεροσυλῶν ληφθῇ, ἐὰν μὲν ᾖ δοῦλος ἢ ξένος, ἐν τῷ προσώπῳ καὶ ταῖς χερσὶ γραφεὶς τὴν συμφορὰν... Note, of course, Plato's emphasis on criminal slaves and foreigners (δοῦλος ἢ ξένος), outsiders from the community). On the scene from *Aulularia,* see too Richlin, *Slave Theatre in the Roman Republic*, 410n81.

[136] Gardner, *Slavery and Roman Law*, 429: "… certain slaves, even if manumitted, were never to be allowed citizenship (Gai. *Inst.* 1.13–15, 25–7). This applied to those who had been put in bonds by their masters as a punishment, or branded, those questioned under torture about some crime of which they were found guilty, and those handed over to fight with gladiators or wild beasts…" For some further discussion of slave punishments, see Bradley 1987, esp. 113–37.

Roman slavery was predicated on the natal alienation of captives,[137] and we might see traces of this Roman attitude in the *Georgics* both in Vergil's description of handling young animals and plants, as well as in imagery of the Roman triumph. The triumph was the public profession of Rome's dominance over her enemies and was defined by the conquest of foreign peoples; it was considered an abomination to march in triumph over other Romans in civil war.[138] Captives were usually paraded before the triumphator's chariot into the city, often chosen specifically for their impressive or exotic appearances.[139] There are occasional references to the triumph in the *Georgics,* and we might imagine that the aftermath of the ritual and the influx of slaves into Rome after a foreign conquest plays into the constant theme of Roman domination in the poem. In the *laudes Italiae*, Vergil quickly shifts from the praise of Italy's fruits, wine, olives and livestock (2.143–4) and presents the warhorse accompanied by a sacrificial bull (145–8):[140]

> hinc bellator equus campo sese arduus infert,
> hinc albi, Clitumne, greges et maxima taurus
> uictima, saepe tuo perfusi flumine sacro,
> Romanos ad templa deum duxere triumphos

[137] For the term "natal alienation" and discussion thereon, see Patterson 1982 esp. 1–77. The social alienation of slaves applies particularly to those persons who were brought to Italy from abroad as opposed to the homegrown slave population (*uerna*). It is generally thought that the proportion of foreign to domestic born slaves decreased substantially over time, however, the capture of slaves abroad played a significant part in the acquisition of slaves especially in the era of widespread expansion of the middle Republic. See Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero*, 323; Scheidel 1997, 2005, and 2011.

[138] Valerius Maximus 2.8.7: *Verum quamuis quis praeclaras res maximeque utiles rei publicae ciuili bello gessisset, imperator tamen eo nomine appellatus non est, neque ullae supplicationes decretae sunt, neque aut ouans aut curru triumphauit, quia ut necessariae istae, ita lugubres semper existimatae sunt uictoriae, utpote non externo sed domestico partae cruore.* Cf. Lucan *Bellum Civ.* 1.12: *... bella geri placuit nullos habitura triumphos?*

[139] Jos. *BJ*. 7.118. See also Appian *Hisp*. 98 for Scipio Aemlianus' selection of captives after taking Numantia: Ἐπιλεξάμενος δ' αὐτῶν πεντήκοντα ὁ Σκιπίων ἐς θρίαμβον, τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀπέδοτο καὶ τὴν πόλιν κατέσκαψεν. While, on the one hand, just part of the theatricality of the triumph, the emphasizing of new captives' origin and unique characteristics was a significant concern for slave dealers, and it eventually became law that a slave's *natio* had to be honestly provided at the moment of purchase (Wiedemann, 103).

[140] Servius on white bulls: *maxima taurus uictima quia triumphantes de albis tauris sacrificabant.* See, too, the connection Servius makes between *duxere* and assumed *captiuos: si equi*, *duxerunt, id est minauere ante se, quod admodum enim militum uictoria equis reputatur; ergo dum milites ducebant captiuos et triumphos, ita et equi eorum.*

The procession of the sacrificial bulls *ad templa deum* "ist Antonomasie für *capitolium*" in keeping with the ritual,[141] however, the triumph and temple imagery recall much of Octavian's place in the poem, leading us back to the end of Book 1 and then forward to the proem of Book 3. The only other occurrences of the word *triumphus* in the poem (1.504 and 3.33)[142] are in reference to Octavian (1.503–5): *iam pridem nobis caeli te regia, Caesar, | inuidet atque hominum queritur curare triumphos, | quippe ubi fas uersum atque nefas*... Vergil is alluding here to the triumphs Octavian will enjoy in 29 BC over the Illyrians and Cleopatra's Egypt. Octavian's engagement with the mortal sphere is emphasized here through the gods' begrudging of it in contrast to his apotheosis in the book's proem. The allusion to Octavian's triple triumph of 29 is picked up in the proem to Book 3, however, there Octavian's divinity is re-established through the building of a temple (3.16–33):

> in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit:
> illi uictor ego et Tyrio conspectus in ostro
> centum quadriiugos agitabo ad flumina currus.
> cuncta mihi Alpheum linquens lucosque Molorchi
> cursibus et crudo decernet Graecia caestu.
> ... iam nunc sollemnis ducere pompas
> ad delubra iuuat caesosque uidere iuuencos
> ... addam urbes Asiae domitas pulsumque Niphaten
> fidentemque fuga Parthum uersisque sagittis,
> et duo rapta manu diuerso ex hoste tropaea
> bisque triumphatas utroque ab litore gentes.

Both Octavian and Vergil are portrayed as victors here, the latter poetically,[143] the former militarily. The adoration of Octavian in the temple deifies him once again while the emphasis on the ritual sacrifice (*caesosque uidere iuuencos*) recalls the sacrificial bulls from the *laudes Italiae.* The prominent place given to both games (*cursibus et crudo decernet Graecia caestu*) and defeated

[141] Erren *ad* 2.148.
[142] The word also occurs five times in the *Aeneid* (4.37, 6.814, 8.626, 714, and 11.54).
[143] The phrase *qua me quoque possim | tollere humo uictorque uirum uolitare per ora* (3.8–9) illustrates Vergil's own ambitions, foreshadows his future epic, and alludes to Ennius (*Ep.* 2.18: *cur? uolito uiuos per ora uirum*).

nations (*urbes Asiae domitas*) points the narrative towards the literal victims and captives of a triumph which colours our reading of the rest of Book 3.[144] The book's principal focus, animal breeding, is, as practically all aspects of the poem, complicated through its consistent anthropomorphism. Bulls, frenzied by *amor*, fight each other for cows but they are painted as gladiators rather than animals (3.215–34):

> carpit enim uiris paulatim uritque uidendo
> femina, nec nemorum patitur meminisse nec herbae,
> ... et temptat sese atque irasci in cornua discit
> arboris obnixus trunco, uentosque lacessit
> ictibus, et sparsa ad pugnam proludit harena.

The anthropomorphism of the bulls and cow (*femina*) is so stark here that the only identifying animal characteristic in the episode is the word *cornibus* at line 218.[145] The sand recalls the arena while the verb *proludo*, like the *pestes*' *inludunt* (1.182), gives to the battle a slight suggestion of the games. Through the triumphal and festive imagery of the proem, the bulls might be reimagined here as gladiators,[146] and when coupled with Vergil's prior insistence on branding (3.156–7), we must imagine that the bulls here are also branded and competing in a professional fight as slaves. The language also allows us to interpret the bulls as professional soldiers at 3.229: *ergo omni cura uiris exercet*.[147] In the epic tradition, animal similes appear exceedingly often in descriptions of battle,[148] and it should be noted that there is a definite affinity between the role of soldiers and of

[144] For slavery and Roman expansion, see Hopkins 1978, esp. 1–98.
[145] Erren *ad* 215–18.
[146] For a discussion of gladiators as generally enslaved or marginalized people, see Wiedemann 1992, esp. 102–27.
[147] Erren comments: "Auch die Legionen exerzieren im Winterläger und anderen Feldzugspausen."
[148] "[Homer's] similes are drawn overwhelmingly from the world of nature: beasts, trees and plants, and scenes from inanimate nature (mountains, sun, moon, stars, fire, clouds, sea, snow, etc.) account for roughly five-sixths of the material in the similes of the *Iliad*" (Moulton, "Similes in the *Iliad*," 383). Cf. Ajax at 11.548–9, who becomes a lion, but is then driven off by the Trojans who have themselves become watchdogs: ὡς δ' αἴθωνα λέοντα βοῶν ἀπὸ μεσσαύλοιο | ἐσσεύαντο κύνες τε καὶ ἀνέρες ἀγροιῶται ... Vergil follows on this tradition in the *Aeneid*, even just in Book 9 where Turnus becomes a wolf (9.59–66), Nisus a lion (339–41), Helenor a beast (*ut fera* 551), Turnus then becomes a tiger (727–30), and finishes the book as a lion (792–8). See Turnus again as a lion at 10.452–6, but there fighting a bull and, finally, the last animal simile in the *Aeneid* (12.715–19), Aeneas and Turnus rush into battle like two bulls (*duo tauri*) fighting for control of the herd (*pecus omne*). See Breen, "The Shield of Turnus," 69–71 for the animal imagery and Turnus.

slaves in the Roman context: "The army was one place where the dividing lines of honor broke down, for there the free could be beaten as well as slaves, and not all their scars were from battle."[149]

Branding the calves is particularly striking as the *cura in uitulos* is the culmination of a section dealing with the care of horses and cattle together, beginning with mating, then the appropriate care of the males, the females, and finishing here with the young. The language is marked, however, as the mating is described in wholly human terms, presenting marriage (125: *et pecori dixere maritum*), and human desire and sex (130: *ubi concubitus primos iam nota uoluptas*). Pregnancy then becomes the focus but the animals are described not as males and females, but as mothers and fathers (139–40): *rursus cura patrum cadere et succedere matrum | incipit*.[150] The conscious humanizing of the animals is not simply intended to be poetic or emotive but is indicative rather of the wider themes of the poem, and the ultimate effect here is to see the *uitulos* not as calves and foals but human children. The conflation of children with the servile labour of the poem's anthropomorphized animals points to the realities of breeding and raising slaves on Roman estates. Accurate estimates of the sources of slaves in the Roman period are difficult to come by, however, by the imperial period "it is hard to imagine that [natural reproduction] was not at least as important as all other sources of slaves combined."[151] Vergil emphasizes in the *Georgics* the benefits of acclimatizing young animals and plants to work at an early age (3.163–9):

> tu quos ad studium atque usum formabis agrestem
> iam uitulos hortare uiamque insiste domandi,

[149] Richlin, *Slave Theatre*, 103.
[150] Thomas *ad* 125 rightly highlights the divergence from Varro who consistently uses appropriate animal terms such as *mas/femina*.
[151] Scheidel, "The Roman Slave Supply," in *The Cambridge World History of Slavery Volume 1,* eds. Keith Bradley and Paul Cartledge (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 308.

dum faciles animi iuuenum, dum mobilis aetas.
ac primum laxos tenui de uimine circlos
ceruici subnecte; dehinc, ubi libera colla
seruitio adsuerint, ipsis e torquibus aptos
iunge pares, et coge gradum conferre iuuencos.

The focus on the young minds of the animals, literally youths (*faciles animi iuuenum*), is clearly suggestive of a child's education.[152] That these children have first been branded, however, makes clear that the education they receive is a slave's, entirely in keeping with the Roman attitude to child slaves, who were probably expected to begin working by the age of five.[153] The insistence that the calves become used not just to work or ploughing but to servitude (*seruitio adsuerint*) is emphatic of their place as human slaves as opposed to just oxen. Strangely, Servius passes silently over the word as do the commentators, and yet it is the only instance of *seruitium* in the *Georgics.*[154] It is emphatic nonetheless that Vergil's vision of the young oxen is here of their entry into full slavery. With that realization the *laxos circlos* tied around their necks transform into iron slave collars. Slave collars were common amongst the Romans and were often fitted permanently to misbehaving slaves and inscribed with instructions for any third party that should happen to come across the slave and suspect them of trying to escape.[155] An example of such a slave collar

[152] Cf. 2.360–1 of plants: *uiribus eniti quarum et contemnere uentos | adsuescant summasque sequi tabulata per ulmos.* Mynors *ad* 361: "The picture was familiar enough to a Roman reader for Quintilian (1.2.26) to use it as an image of education."

[153] "For free Roman boys the seventh year constituted an important caesura: the start of primary school and the transition from *infantia* to *pueritia*. The life of a slave only knew two caesuras: the age of five as the end of *infantia* and the age of thirty, when one could formally be freed, as a possible end of *pueritia.* Those who did not obtain this privilege remained *puer* for the rest of their life…" (Laes, "Child Slaves at Work in Roman Antiquity," *Ancient Society* vol. 38 (2008): 241.

[154] *seruitium* also appears twice in the *Aeneid* (1.285 and 3.327) as well as once in the *Eclogues* (1.40). See esp. *A.* 3.321–31 as Andromache laments to Aeneas: *'o felix una ante alias Priameia uirgo … iussa mori, quae sortitus non pertulit ullos | nec uictoris heri tetigit captiua cubile! | nos patria incensa diuersa per aequora uectae | stirpis Achilleae fastus iuuenemque superbum | seruitio enixae tulimus … me famulo famulamque Heleno transmisit habendam'* The term *heri* rather than *domini* emphasizes the servile context, as do the following *famulo famulamque.* On *seruitio enixae* Williams specifies, "'bringing forth a child in slavery', cf. Eur. *Andr.* 24f."

[155] The collar was a permanent fixture of the slave's body once fitted around the neck. Examples of these collars have been found still attached to the corpses of such slaves (Thurmond, "Some Roman Slave Collars in *CIL*," 465 and 467f.).

found in southern Gaul contains the abbreviated inscription *T.M.Q.F.—tene me quia fugio.*[156] Vergil makes his addressee aware of the reality of runaway slaves, reminding us of either the risk or the opportunity to flee servitude in what is tantamount to the only overt reference to slavery in the poem (1.286): *nona fugae melior, contraria furtis.*[157] Servius tries to assure the reader that these lines need not necessarily refer to slavery, as flight (*fugae*) could be used of many different situations.[158] Servius' criticism seems overly defensive: Vergil may not have been endeavouring to actually champion slave runaways, but Servius' concern seems unfounded and there is no reason not to read slavery into *fugae* here,[159] a common term for slave-escapes.[160] We may even see a gesture to preventing such escapes or recapturing escapees through a few lines later as Vergil enumerates tasks that the farmer should see to during the relatively restful winter (305–7): *sed tamen et quernas glandes tum stringere tempus | et lauri bacas oleamque cruentaque myrta, | tum gruibus pedicas et retia ponere ceruis ...* While hunting was certainly an expected part of country life, we might look to the possible subtext transmitted by *retia ponere ceruis*. Some of the extant slave collars show references to deer, such as the bronze collar *CIL* 15.7183 on the bottom of which has been clearly engraved an antlered deer. Thurmond suggests that "we should at least note the possibility that the ligature refers to the wearer's fugitive status, since *cervus* was a common

[156] Wiedemann, *Greek and Roman Slavery* (London: Routledge, 1981), 187.
[157] Thomas explains the benefit of the ninth being that the moon was "approaching its full state."
[158] *non, ut stultis uidetur, Vergilius aut fugam seruis suadet, aut eis indicat dies, quibus se a rapinis abstineant: nam et fugam de profectione et cursu legimus ... et fuga potest etiam honesta esse, ut siquis hostem, siquis imminentem tyrannum, siquis saeuum iudicem fugiat.*
[159] Erren reads slavery into *fugae* as well, though he does acknowledge the odd (skurril) change in subject at this juncture of the poem: "Diese a Sklaven gerichteten Empfehlungen wirken hier skurril, was auch auf den „Gigantenkampf" der Titannen und der Aloiden zurückwirkt."
[160] Cic. *Off.* 3.71 on the details that slave dealers must divulge to potential buyers: *qui enim scire debuit de sanitate, de fuga, de furtis, praestat edicto aedilium.* Cf. Apuleius' *Metamorphosis* 6.26 where Lucius, transformed into an ass, contemplates escaping the bandits who have taken him captive: '*... habes summam oportunitatem fugae, dum latrones absunt ... sed quo gentium capessetur fuga uel hospitium quis dabit?*' Though not in human form, it is obvious throughout the *Metamorphosis* that Lucius is comparable as well to a human slave, as evidenced by his work in grueling conditions of the flour mill alongside slaves (9.12). For another non-fictional account of slaves and runaways, see too Cicero's complaint of a slave who ran away, taking with him several of Cicero's books (*Fam.* 13.77): *Dionysius, meus seruus ... cum multos libros surripuisset nec se impune laturum putaret, aufugit.*

slang expression for a runaway."[161] The consistent anthropomorphism of animals throughout the *Georgics*, while certainly most apparent in Book 3, should give us pause whenever Vergil presents animals to us. Should the deer be conflated here with human beings, especially on the heels of Vergil's advice that *nona fugae melior*, we are naturally tempted to compare the runaway deer to runaway slaves, and the farmer, at rest now in winter from his hoeing and ploughing, can devote time to their recapture. There is a sombre undertone throughout the *Georgics* that all existence is subject to servitude of some sort, whether it is plants to the farmer, the manure strewing slave to his owner, or human beings to Jupiter. The conflation of animals with human beings, however, makes the link to Roman slavery and violence applied against the natural world clearest.

All of the figures presented in the *Georgics* are allied and anchored by Vergil to human beings through the constant imposition of *labor* and slavery onto all areas of existence. By animating the inanimate and anthropomorphising the unhuman, Vergil makes clear that slavery in the sense that permeated his contemporary society applied equally to all matter within the *Georgics*. Not only do animals and plants become human but through the acquisition of *sententia* and perception they are able in Vergil's narrative to suffer alongside human beings the tortures and toils reserved for slaves. This imbues the work with a sombre ambiguity in the wake of Octavian's rise to power and the disappearance of the Republic.

[161] Thurmond, 476. Festus seems to allude to this appellation as well when describing the Ides of Auguste, apparently considered a slave festival (460 L): *Seruorum dies festus uulgo existimatur Idus Aug., quod eo die Ser. Tullius, natus seruus, aedem Dianae dedicauerit in Auentino, cuius tutelae sint cerui; a quo celeritate fugitiuos uocent ceruos.* Cf. Martial 3.91.11–12.

Chapter 3

Slavery in St. Augustine's *Confessions*

In the previous chapters we examined the importance of slavery in Vergil's *Georgics* for crafting a post-civil war world defined by dominance and servitude. For Vergil, slavery imbued the relationships between farmers and plants, animals, and the divine with the lines between these categories wholly blurred through persistent anthropomorphism. In the following discussion, we shall shift from Augustan verse to late fourth century prose and from the political turmoil of Octavian's rise to power to the spiritual world of St. Augustine's conversion. Slavery remains, nonetheless, a critical facet of Augustine's self-conception vis-à-vis both his pre- and post-conversion lives. Augustine's understanding of spiritual slavery is informed both by the religious and cultural context of fourth century N. Africa as well as the literary tradition of the Latin-speaking world to which he remained intimately connected over the course of his life. An examination of servitude, self-abasement, and bondage in the *Confessions* will raise new questions as to the importance of slavery for the Roman literary landscape that at one moment looks to slavery to explain the external world, and at another turns inward in an attempt to understand the spiritual world through its enslavement.

In his *Confessions,* Augustine filters the development of his relationship with and understanding of God, as well as his conception of his own body and soul, through the imagery and language of slavery. An oft remarked feature of the *Confessions* is the sharp division of the work into distinct sections: Books 1–9 encapsulate Augustine's autobiographical self-reflection;[162]

[162] Autobiography and self-reflection are of course oversimplifications of what Augustine does in the *Confessions.* It is certainly the case that most of Augustine's readers, both among his contemporaries as well as today, read the *Confessions* in part "because of the knowledge of another human being they hoped to glean from it" (Kotzé, *Augustine's* Confessions, 68). There is no reason to doubt unnecessarily the historicity of the biographical details in

Book 10 begins a philosophical enquiry into memory and is a palpable break from the narrative of Augustine's life; and Books 11–13 explore the nature of time, in which Augustine transitions to the beginnings of a commentary on Genesis. These section breaks delineate Augustine's path and progression through the various stages of life, both physically and spiritually. Book 1 centres on Augustine's infancy and early childhood, spanning from breastfeeding to language acquisition and primary schooling; Book 2 continues into his adolescence at Thagaste, youthful escapades and transgressions, including the infamous pear theft (2.4.9–2.9.17), as well as the physical onset of puberty (2.3.6); Book 3 marks Augustine's arrival at Carthage, the beginning of more advanced academic study, involvement with the Manichaeans, and what Augustine himself believed at the time to be maturity;[163] Book 4 covers Augustine's 'adult' life from ages 19 to 28,[164] during which he worked as a teacher at Carthage, published his first book,[165] and fathered a son, Adeodatus, with his forever unnamed partner (4.2.2); Book 5 reveals Augustine's growing disenchantment with Manicheanism and his disappointment upon meeting the Manichean 'bishop' (*episcopus*) Faustus in Carthage (5.3.3–5.7.13). Augustine will abandon his mother and journey to Rome (5.8.15) and thence to Milan, signalling a break from his natal bonds to Africa as well as a nascent

---

the work. Nevertheless, the work's underlying purpose is much more nuanced than simple biography and Augustine is clearly not overly preoccupied with providing an accurate and exhaustive account of his life. He is obsessed rather with painting a broader portrait of human nature and society reflected through his own failings and sins and refracted through other characters whom he portrays almost at times as mirror images of himself. This is especially true of Alypius, whose brief biography enveloped within the *Confessions* effectively retells Augustine's own. Recounting Alypius' failings, however, affords Augustine an added layer of separation from the personal, and a more overt examination of human nature. What distinguishes Augustine's portrayal of Alypius' seduction by the violence of the amphitheatre (6.8.13) is "the ardor of the dramatic human struggle it represents… [Augustine] feels and directly presents human life, and it lives before our eyes" (Auerbach, *Mimesis,* 148). For discussion of Augustine's conflation of Alypius at the amphitheatre with the general human mass (*unus de turba*), see Auerbach, 143–50. Moreover, Augustine's 'self-reflections' and memories are often engineered to be pointed particularly against certain groups such as the Manichaeans, who Augustine presumed would be a primary audience for the *Confessions.* See Kotzé for a deeper analysis of Augustine's intent and audience, especially for the place of the Manichaeans and *curiositas* in the *Confessions* (esp. 197–249).

[163] 3.5.9: *... sed ego dedignabar esse paruulus et turgidus fastu mihi grandis uidebar.*

[164] 4.1.1: *Per idem tempus annorum nouem, ab undeuicensimo anno aetatis meae usque ad duodetricensimum...*

[165] The lost *De pulchro et apto.* Writing the book seemed at the time to the young Augustine a very mature accomplishment (4.14.23: *et tamen pulchrum illud atque aptum, unde ad eum scripseram ... nullo conlaudatore mirabar*), yet to the bishop it was just one in a long series of misled wanderings away from God (4.15.24–7).

rediscovery of Christianity in Italy, principally through his encounters with the bishop Ambrose (5.13.23), who will become a quasi-paternal figure for Augustine, thereby undermining Augustine's sense of secular and social maturity;[166] Books 6–8 circle Augustine's growing separation from his previous life and gradual approach to conversion.[167] These books, particularly 8, re-emphasize Monnica's importance for Augustine, now less as an actual mother than a spiritual one. By the end of Book 9 and Monnica's death, Augustine has finally transitioned from spiritual *infantia*, *pueritia*, and *adulescentia* to adulthood, which allows him to then continue his *confessiones* from a substantially different perspective than in the initial 9 books of the work. The consequence, however, of this inner growth for Augustine is the reinforcement of the image of slavery as the defining feature of his life prior to conversion, and he makes it clear through Books 1–9 that before conversion his inner self was limited to a permanent state of *pueritia*. This *pueritia* is emphatically conceptualized as more than just a picture of Augustine's development. It is axiomatic to Augustine as he remembers that stage of his spiritual life that he was a slave, dominated not by God but by the corruptions of his body and soul, hampered by his own *uoluntates* and *superbia*. His eventual conversion is a spiritual rebirth that shakes off the chains which entangled him throughout the *Confessions* and allows him to approach God as a *seruus Dei*. For Augustine this is not simply an exchange of one form of servitude for another, but the return and manumission from his own self-inflicted slavery in this world, to God's eternal *requies*.

[166] Vaught, *The Journey toward God*, 135. Augustine highlights his human affection for Ambrose (5.13.23): *et eum amare coepi, primo quidem non tamquam doctorem ueri ... sed tamquam hominem benignum in me*. The force of *amare* here contrasts with the sinful *amare et amari* of Augustine's previous life in Carthage (3.1.1) as does his arrival at Milan. Milan is superfluous as it is really to Ambrose that Augustine has come (5.13.23: *et ueni Mediolanium ad Ambrosium episcopum*) recalling the stark opening words of Book 3—*Veni Carthaginem*.

[167] By Book 8, Augustine's development has reached a point where he no longer regresses from God but makes progress, even if only slowly at times (8.11.25): *iam paene faciebam et non faciebam, nec relabebar tamen in pristina sed de proximo stabam et respirabam*.

Slavery is one of the recurrent and central images Augustine uses throughout the *Confessions* to describe his spiritual state and is informed by his lifelong engagement with Latin literature. In particular, Augustine will use slavery to explain his relationship to sexuality pre-conversion (3.1.1): *rui etiam in amorem, quo cupiebam capi ... et perueni occulte ad uinculum fruendi, et conligabar laetus aerumnosis nexibus, ut caederer uirgis ferreis ardentibus zeli et suspicionum et timorum et irarum atque rixarum.*[168] He highlights here both the restraints (*uinculum*, *aerumnosis nexibus*) and punishments (*uirgis ferreis ardentibus*) that a Roman slave could regularly look forward to, or the expectations a prisoner of war (*cupiebam capi*) would have of their impending enslavement. War captives are an inextricable element of Roman conceptions of slavery, and Augustine's arrival in 3.1.1 both literally to Carthage and figuratively into servitude may even evoke a slave's march in triumphal procession up to the Capitoline. From Rome's earliest history triumphant generals or, later, imperial family members,[169] would march captured foreign enemies through the city as a symbol of conquest and domination.[170] Augustine, while already corrupted to some extent since infancy,[171] finds in Carthage an exacerbation of all his inner faults and his arrival there is a step towards complete enslavement. While the corrupting *amor*

[168] This paragraph interestingly begins emphatically with the indicative perfect *Veni Carthaginem* and the next indicative perfect verbs in the section are *rui ... perueni*, quoted above. The grammatical and aural consonance between the verbs reinforces a sense of connection between the otherwise separate actions and suggest that his headlong rush *in amorem* was wholly bound up with his arrival at Carthage. Augustine evidently enjoyed this sort of sound play which applies even more obviously to the pairing *Carthaginem ... sartago* in the first line: "*sartago* rhymed with *Carthago* (the distinction of sound between *t* and *th* was probably not noticed) …" (Clark, *Confessions*, *ad* 3.1.1).
[169] Cf. 8.3.7: *triumphat uictor imperator, et non uicisset nisi pugnauisset, et quanto maius periculum fuit in proelio, tanto est gaudium maius in triumpho.* In the imperial period, triumphs were effectively regulated to the imperial family alone to prevent potential political rivals from gaining unnecessary political clout (Beard, *The Roman Triumph*, 69).
[170] Returning *triumphatores* would often pick the most physically impressive or exotic enemy captives to march in triumph to show the wide reach of *romanitas*. Cf. J. *BJ*. 7.118 and Suet. *Cal*. 47. This was perhaps even more significant in the Republican period of Roman expansion between the third and first centuries BC; cf. slaves captured at Tarentum (209 BC, Liv. 27.16.7–8) and Epirus (167 BC, 45.34.3–7). See below note 25 on Tibullus 1.1.53–6 for the importance of spoils and conquest (*ut domus hostiles praeferat exuuias*) for slave imagery even in love elegy—the same holds true perhaps for Augustine.
[171] 1.7.11: *quis me commemorat peccatum infantiae meae, quoniam nemo mundus a peccato coram te, nec infans cuius est unius diei uita super terram?*

Augustine finds in Carthage is multifaceted, including both games and the theatre,[172] it is still clear that his thoughts are directed principally here to sexual love (3.1.1): *amare et amari dulce mihi erat, magis si et amantis corpore fruerer*.[173] Augustine's language dismisses the possibility of his predicament being only a habit or a youthful preoccupation—he sees himself in bondage, linking *corpore fruerer* in the same passage to *uinculum fruendi*.

The internal punishments that Augustine receives as a result of his enchainment to love clearly evoke the standard punishments of Roman slaves, both in fact and in literature, particularly love elegy. Metaphorical slavery is pervasive in that genre, where it dominates the relationship between lover and beloved. This literary connection informs the language that Augustine uses of himself in the *Confessions*. The elegiac trope of *seruitium amoris* hinges on the *amator*-poet's degradation and self-abasement to slave status before the object of his affection.[174] Tibullus, for instance, embraces degradation and humiliation, fantasizing in 2.3 that he is a field slave on his (rich) rival's estate, separated from his beloved but able if nothing else to look at her (2.3.5–10):[175]

---

[172] 3.2.2: *Rapiebant me spectacula theatrica, plena imaginibus miseriarum mearum et fomitibus ignis mei.* The domineering force of *rapio* is an important for Augustine generally in the *Confessions* and illustrates here the *concupiscentia oculorum* that also held Augustine's imagination once arrived in the African metropole. Cf. O'Donnell *ad* 3.2.2.

[173] Augustine had used the phrase *amare et amari* once already in the *Confessions* (2.2.2): *Et quid erat quod me delectabat, nisi amare et amari?* The only other classical writer to use this exact same construction is Cicero in describing Catiline and his gang (Cic. *Catil.* 2.23.2–4): *hi pueri tam lepidi ac delicati non solum amare et amari neque saltare et cantare sed etiam sicas uibrare et spargere uenena didicerunt.* Dyck *ad loc.* sees in the phrase the implication of "playing the passive rôle" in a sexual relationship. We might apply the same line of thought to Augustine, though this seems more nebulous than with Catiline.

[174] Lyne, "*Servitium Amoris*," 118.

[175] Also notable in 2.3 is the transformation of Apollo into a field hand as well, a retelling of the myth of Apollo and Admetus and the longest mythical excursus in Tibullus' corpus. For another account of the myth, see Call. *H*. 2.47–54); cf. Verg. *G.* 3.2 (*pastor ab Amphryso*) and Pind. *P.* 9.63–5 (Ἀπόλλων Νόμιος). As Lyne highlights, the idea of *seruitium amoris* seldom occurs in the extant Greek literature, or at least, not in the same way as it does among the Latin authors. The Greeks tend to see servility simply as an illustration of the captivating power of love (Lyne, 120), whilst Latin authors, especially the Augustan elegists, often focus on the degradation and humiliation that love and unfulfilled desire engender.

o ego, dum aspicerem dominam,[176] quam fortiter illic
uersarem ualido pingue bidente solum
agricolaeque modo curuum sectarer aratrum,
dum subigunt steriles arua serenda boues!
nec quererer quod sol graciles exureret artus,
laederet et teneras pussula rupta manus.[177]

This recalls the countryside Tibullus portrayed at 1.1 except rusticity has now changed from the poet's previously imagined idyllic place of *otium* into pure toil and destitution.[178] The reversal is further emphasized by the fact that Tibullus' unnamed rival and Nemesis' lover in 2.3, the owner of the country estate, is himself a former slave (2.3.59–60): *regnum ipse tenet, quem saepe coegit | barbara gypsatos ferre catasta pedes.* The word *catasta* refers to the platform on which slaves were presented, prodded, and purchased at a slave market:[179] imported slaves' feet would be whitened with gypsum while on the auction block to distinguish them from the homeborn *uernae*.[180] Tibullus' disdain for and jealousy of his rival is thus amplified through the man's previous position not just as a slave but also as a foreigner—a barbarian (*barbara catasta*). The external and corporeal realities of Tibullus' rival's slave experience are juxtaposed with the inner

[176] *domina*, a notable word, especially given the change in Tibullus' beloved from Delia in Book 1 to Nemesis at 2.3. It is repeated at the end of 2.3 (2.3.79: *ad imperium dominae sulcabimus agros*) and is part of Tibullus' general idiom (1.1.46, 1.5.26 and 40, 2.4.1, 19, and 25, 2.6.41 and 47). For the contrast between Delia and Nemesis, see Murgatroyd (1994) in his introduction to 2.3: "Nemesis is not presented as a creature of gentle emotions like Delia (1.1.61ff.) and she arouses in T. none of the tender sentiment that Delia did in 1.1. Instead … she is shown to be mercenary… T. does not appeal to Nemesis as he did to Delia, depicting a joyous dream-world, a modest, moral, and comfortable existence, but contemplates giving her expensive presents and decides on harsh slavery…"

[177] The reversal of fortune, as here between the successful former slave and current lover compared to the now servile and hopeless Tibullus, is a typical feature in poetry of the figure of Nemesis. Cf. Juster and Maltby, *Tibullus*, xviii for Nemesis' role in Book 2.

[178] At 1.1 Tibullus mocks the hard-working man who piles up wealth for himself, preferring the easy life (1.1.1–6): *Diuitias alius fuluo sibi congerat auro | et tenerat culti iugera multa soli, | quem labor adsiduus uicino tereat hoste ... me mea paupertas uita traducat inerti, | dum meus adsiduo luceat igne focus.* Cf. Lucr. 2.1–13. For the assiduous and thrifty work of Tibullus' imagined and contemned man, we might even recall Vergil's image of the mouse building up a home and storehouses for itself under the earth (1.181–2: *saepe exiguus mus | sub terris posuitque domos atque horrea fecit*).

[179] For the dehumanizing conditions of the slave market, cf. Sen. *Ep.* 80.9.

[180] Murgatroyd *ad loc.* For general discussion of historical *catastae* and similar structures, see Fentress, "On the Block," 220–1. For coating the feet in gypsum, cf. Juv. *S.* 1.109–11: *expectent ergo tribuni, | uincant diuitiae, sacro ne cedat honori | nuper in hanc urbem pedibus qui uenerat albis ...* For the figurative use of *catasta* in the Christian context, see *Passio Perpetuae* 5.6: *Hoc fiet in illa catasta quod Deus uoluerit.*

slavery and degradation now imagined by Tibullus of himself, culminating in the last lines of the poem with a fantasy of whips and chains that Tibullus suffers internally (2.3.79–80): *ad imperium dominae sulcabimus agros: | non ego me uinclis uerberibusque nego.* Nor is this an isolated link to slavery for Tibullus, as he begins the following poem in his collection, again dedicated to Nemesis, with the same image (2.4.1–5):

> Sic[181] mihi seruitium uideo dominamque paratam:
> iam mihi, libertas illa paterna, uale.
> seruitium sed triste datur, teneorque catenis,
> et numquam misero uincla remittit Amor,
> et seu quid merui seu nil peccauimus, urit.

Tibullus paints himself as wholly enslaved, suffering emotionally the same punishments that his rival in 2.3 could have expected to endure while actually enslaved. The chains and bonds (*catenis* and *uincla*) are a recognizable feature;[182] burning and branding (*urit*) more extreme, though still common, punishments. Literary branding is a unification of slave and animal bodies. 2.3.5 looks back to a previous branding Tibullus suffered either as an animal or slave at 1.5.3–5: *namque agor ut per plana citus sola uerbere turben | quem celer adsueta uersat ab arte puer. | ure ferum et torque ...*[183] The transformation into an animal is clear (*ure ferum*), however, there remains an implication of human slavery with *torque* conveying 'torture.'[184] Through this, we can then read into the spinning-top simile of the initial lines of this section further servile language. While the

[181] Following Murgatroyd (1994), Juster and Maltby (2012), *sic* (ms. *A.*) seems preferable to *hic* (*ψ*.) which is adopted by Postgate (1915). Murgatroyd argues convincingly for *sic* (see his critical appendix, p. 277) and reading *sic* "here as meaning 'so then' (*OLD* s.v. 9)." This emphasizes, of course, the transition from and so also the link back to 2.3 and thus the importance of servitude and bondage for Tibullus in 2.4.

[182] Murgatroyd *ad* 2.4.3–4. Cf. Val. Max. 6.8.7: *seruus ab eo uinculorum poena coercitus, inexpiabilique litterarum nota per summam oris contumeliam inustus...*

[183] Lyne uses this last line to contrast Tibullus's penchant for self-degradation with Propertius: while the latter "rarely if ever *invites* humiliation," the concept of *seruitium amoris* "appealed very much to Tibullus … [who] projects an acquiescent, at times effectively masochistic attitude to the degradation of love as a whole…" (Lyne, "*Seruitium Amoris,*" 128–9).

[184] Juster and Maltby *ad* 1.5.5: "The connection between the end of 1.4 and the beginning of 1.5 is confirmed by a number of verbal echoes: ... *torque(t),* 'torture(s)' in 1.4.81 and 1.5.5 ... As a slave of love, Tib. demands appropriate punishments for his wild rejection of love described in 1–2." For this definition, see *OLD s.v. torqueo* 4.

image is obviously on its surface of a child's game, the quick transition to branding in line 5 shifts the previous lines to an agricultural context—*uerbere* becomes a whip rather than a sling, *plana sola* becomes ploughed soil or a threshing floor instead of just flat ground, and the *celer puer* becomes a slave rather than simply a boy, driving his oxen and plough over a field. This may even hearken back to the agricultural slavery Tibullus evokes of himself at 2.3.5–10; he becomes both slave and animal before *amor.* This confluence of anthropomorphism and slavery in Tibullus appears as well in Augustine, signalling a similar fixation on self-abasement and degradation due to his inner turmoil and enslavement to his passions and heresies. Like Tibullus, Augustine becomes wild game (*ferum* above), poached by the Manicheans and their bishop 'Faustus, the Devil's great snare" (5.3.3: *Faustus nomine, magnus laqueus diaboli*).[185]

This Tibullian *seruitium* is at home in the *Confessions,* but comes forth there in the abstract and constant desire Augustine finds within himself as opposed to Tibullus' specific love for Delia[186] and then Nemesis (8.5.10):

> ...ligatus non ferro alieno sed mea ferrea uoluntate. uelle meum tenebat inimicus et inde mihi catenam fecerat et constrinxerat me. quippe ex uoluntate peruersa facta est libido, et dum seruitur libidini, facta est consuetudo, et dum consuetudini non resistitur, facta est necessitas.

[185] *laqueus* occurs also in the *Confessions* at 3.6.10, 5.7.13, 6.12.21, 10.31.44, 10.34.52, and 10.36.59; cf. Verg. *G.* 1.139: *tum laqueis captare feras ...* Augustine will, of course, slip this noose after grasping Faustus' complete lack of real knowledge or learning. Nevertheless, Augustine clearly feels in hindsight that he had been ensnared by Manicheanism before Faustus' visit. See too his idea of man as an animal before God (1.6.10): *unde hoc tale animal nisi abs te, domine?*

[186] We should not forget the slave imagery Tibullus uses in Book 1 in the Delia poems, such as his transformation into a (presumably) enslaved doorman (*ianitor*) while he pesters her outside of her home (1.1.53–6): *te bellare decet terra, Messalla, marique, | ut domus hostiles praeferat exuuias: | me retinent uinctum formosae uincla puellae, | et sedeo duras ianitor ante foras.* See Juster and Maltby *ad loc.* for the importance of the foreign spoils (*hostiles exuuias*) in constructing this slave image of Tibullus enchained.

Augustine discovers by Book 8 when he is on the brink of conversion that he had been enslaved and bound by his own will (*uelle meum tenebat inimicus*),[187] however, "[t]his does not mean that there is a negative principle working in him, but points to the bondage of the will that his own actions have produced."[188] This is a continuous progression from his admission of enjoying *amare et amari*, and of his enslavement to this internal and irrepressible pattern of lust rather than an individual and specific obsession like Tibullus experienced. This literary enslavement for Augustine extends beyond bonds and chains to whippings and beatings too. Literal beating and whipping of slaves, or at least the threat thereof, were standard fare in Roman literature, especially in comedy (Plaut. *Poen.* 23–7):

> serui ne opsideant, liberis ut sit locus,
> uel aes pro capite dent; si id facere non queunt,
> domum abeant, uitent ancipiti infortunio,
> ne et hic uarientur uirgis et loris domi,
> si minus curassint, quom eri reueniant domum.

The threat of the rod (*uirgis*) here as with Augustine is redolent of a genuine aspect of Roman slavery.[189] The specific infliction of red-hot rods and whips[190] described in the above passages is

[187] It is notable that Augustine sees the devil in his own will but not his substance. For the use of *inimicus* for *diabolus* in the early Church and in Augustine, see Mohrmann, *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermonen des hl. Augustin*, 100–2.

[188] Vaught, *Encounter with God*, 75. The *Confessions* emphasize Augustine's eventual rejection of dualism and Manicheanism. The evil that hounds Augustine is not an inherent fault of the corporeal world but the consequence of his own choices and failings, redeemable only by the grace of God.

[189] Admittedly, despite the high frequency of references to beatings and corporal punishment in Plautine comedy, the actual punishments are generally deferred; see Fitzgerald (2000), 33ff; Scott (2005), 46–50 for a brief overview of slave torture in Rome, especially with regard to extracting confessions in court cases.

[190] The whip is a mainstay in Roman sources. *flagellum* occurs 5 times in the *Confessions*: 2.2.4 of God's whip (*nec euasi flagella tua*); 5.8.15 of Monnica weeping when Augustine abandons her (*iusto dolorum flagello uapularet*); 5.9.16 figuratively of physical illness (*excipior ibi flagello aegritudinis corporalis*); 8.11.25 God's whip as Augustine wavers on the path to conversion (*flagella ingeminans timoris et pudoris*); and 9.4.12 the memory of God's chastisement (*nec silebo flagelli tui asperitatem*). For God's *flagellatio* see O'Connell, *Soundings*, 102–4: For comparison's sake, the more common word for 'whip' in most classical Latin authors is *uerber* used by Vergil for instance 11 times as opposed to *flagellum* which he uses only 5 times*;* Augustine uses *uerber* only twice in the *Confessions.* Cf. Netz, *Barbed Wire*, 5 for a comparison of the free and slave states in the U.S.: "We can mark the big divide as follows: between a northern country, where fields were controlled by the extensive use of the fence, and a

often generalized by Augustine through words like *uapulo*, 'to be beaten,' occurring more often in Augustine's work than in any other Latin author's.[191] Granted, *uapulo* only appears 5 times in the *Confessions* of which 4 occur in Book 1 of literal beatings at school: twice at 1.9.14 and twice again at 1.9.15, with the fifth instance occurring at 5.8.15 of Monnica. Even these sparse examples, however, mark a conviction on Augustine's part of what enslavement in this world looks like as opposed to servitude to God. Although he would go on to build a successful career as a *grammaticus*, Augustine describes schoolteachers as essentially slave drivers or masters, and students as their slaves (1.9.14): *inde in scholam datus sum ut discerem litteras, in quibus quid utilitatis esset ignorabam miser. et tamen, si segnis in discendo essem, uapulabam.* The 'use' in schooling of which Augustine claimed ignorance is the professional and secular gain he might eventually earn—production, and to that end he is beaten with his parents' approval (*ridebantur a maioribus hominibus usque ab ipsis parentibus ... plagae meae*). We might compare the beating of a slave cook who botched a meal (Mart. *Ep.* 8.23):

> Esse tibi uideor saeuus nimiumque gulosus,
> qui propter cenam, Rustice, caedo cocum.
> si leuis ista tibi flagrorum causa uidetur,
> ex qua uis causa uapulet ergo cocus?

The speaker's callous attitude in this epigram highlights the treatment slaves often endured.[192] The first four instances of *uapulo* in the *Confessions* reflect this clear connection Augustine makes between the physical punishment he received as a child and student with that of slaves. But it is

---

southern country, where fields were controlled by the intensive use of the whip." Similarly, Rome's ubiquitous use of slaves was predicated in part on a concentrated rather than passive application of violence.

[191] There are over 80 instances of the word in the Augustinian corpus with the next highest total being 38 for Plautus.

[192] It is difficult to say exactly what Martial's angle is here, whether he is criticizing his compatriots' treatment of their slaves, or just making a joke. The pejorative name given to the speaker's interlocutor, *Rusticus*, points to another layer of discourse on client-patron relations filtered through slavery (Fitzgerald, *Martial,* 225 nn. 39–40).

really with the fifth occurrence of the word that the link to slavery widens to all earthly attachments and emotions that run contrary to God's will. Augustine abandons Monnica on the shores of Africa and sails to Italy, leaving her in a state of insanity and distress when she realizes what he has done (5.8.15): *... in quo mane illa insaniebat dolore, et querelis et gemitu implebat aures tuas contemnentis ista, cum et me cupiditatibus meis raperes ad finiendas ipsas cupiditates et illius carnale desiderium iusto dolorum flagello uapularet.* This is not the first time that Monnica has appeared to lose control of her emotions on behalf of her son,[193] here, however, her desire that he remain with her clashes with what Augustine later surmises was God's plan for him. He acknowledges that his mother's love was both extreme and abnormal,[194] and while the allusion to Aeneas and Dido is certainly clear here and at home in the undercurrent of literary interplay in the *Confessions*, the emphasis on Monnica's *carnale desiderium* must doubtless recall Augustine's own faults, often sexual, in the rest of the *Confessions.*[195] While Augustine will not ultimately condemn corporeality in its entirety, flesh fixated him not least when Christianity began to fasten itself tighter onto him. He was "interested in the reality of Christ's flesh because his own had thus far eluded his efforts of control."[196] Monnica, too, has lost control of herself as her son abandons her and she is punished as a slave for her emotional excess (*iusto dolorum flagello uapularet*) just as Augustine

[193] Her appeal to the bishop at 3.12.21 is so unbridled as to actually provoke his anger, but she took his rebuke as a blessing rather than a true punishment: *ille iam substomachans taedio 'uade', inquit, 'a me. ita uiuas: fieri non potest, ut filius istarum lacrimarum pereat.' quod illa ita se accepisse inter conloquia sua mecum saepe recordabatur, ac si de caelo sonuisset.* Monnica here has the chance to reflect on the meaning of the bishop's words and concludes that they are felicitous and prophetic; she does not get the same opportunity in Book 5 nor does she realize then that God's wishes were running contrary to her own.

[194] In the same passage he compares her to other mothers, reminiscent of his self-comparison in Book 1 to other infants (5.8.15: *amabat enim secum praesentiam meam more matrum, sed multis multo amplius...*). We might even juxtapose this to the seeming indifference Monnica (and Augustine) had in the *Confessions* for Augustine's brother, Navigius (9.11.27). Kligerman's psychoanalysis of Augustine's relationship with his mother is pertinent here: "Emotionally alienated from her husband, she had grown especially close to her oldest son and pinned her hopes on him. Augustine tells us how she daily wept over him, praying for his soul. It is not hard to detect an erotic quality in such behavior" Kligerman, "A Psychoanalytic Study of the *Confessions* of Augustine," 474.

[195] *carnalis* is unsurprisingly a common word in the *Confessions,* occurring 20 times, often paired with *uoluntates* (4.15.25, twice at 6.16.26, and 8.5.10).

[196] Miles, *Desire and Delight*, 30–1.

was punished in school for learning too slowly and for his lack of self-discipline. She is as much a slave to her worldly desires as Augustine and will not be free of them until her son's conversion, at which point she is released from all disquiet and dies.[197]

Within the *Confessions* Augustine will sometimes do away with reticence or periphrasis and simply refer to himself as a *seruus*, thereby heightening the sense that he has been utterly captured by his faults (4.16.30): *Et quid mihi proderat quod omnes libros artium quas liberales uocant tunc nequissimus malarum cupidiatum seruus per me ipsum legi et intellexi, quoscumque legere potui? et gaudebam in eis…* In this passage, Augustine does not balk from relating his significant abilities as a student and scholar even at this early stage of his life; he had already mastered Aristotle's *Categories* unaided, for instance, and is only too happy to compare himself with his peers who can hardly grasp the book's contents even with a teacher's help (4.16.28). Augustine realizes he is a slave, however, to earthly desires and ambitions even in this minor self-satisfied transgression.[198] He attributes his academic success to his own nature rather than to God through whom, he later realizes, he had been nurtured since infancy and who had endowed him with his propitious abilities.[199] With this realization, *seruus* becomes a common self-descriptor for Augustine, occurring 38 times in the

[197] Kligerman suggests that part of Monnica's fixation on her son's entering the church and ideally living a celibate life, was "that he should belong to her forever" (475).

[198] The abstract *superbia* is another recurrent word and theme in the *Confessions,* occurring 15 times. The first instance juxtaposes earthly (and childlike) pride with God's mercy (1.11.17): *Audieram enim ego adhuc puer de uita aeterna promissa nobis per humilitatem domini dei nostro descendentis ad superbiam nostram, et signabar iam signo crucis eius...* The adjective *superbus* appears even earlier as opposite to God (1.1.1): *et laudare te uult homo … circumferens testimonium peccati sui et testimonium quia superbis resistis …* See O'Donnell *ad loc.* for relevant scriptural and classical references.

[199] Infants are not fed through a mother's or nurse's milk but through God's nourishment which is simply channelled through the woman's breasts (1.6.7). O'Connell especially has explored Augustine's fixation on the female breast in the *Confessions* as a seat of warmth and security and a link to God; see *Soundings in St. Augustine's Imagination*, esp. 119–39. Augustine's image of God fluctuates between paternal and maternal with the former often centring on reformative punishments in this life (see *flagellatio* above), and the latter by warmth and nourishment (4.1.1): *aut quid sum, cum mihi bene est, nisi sugens lac tuum aut fruens te, cibo qui non corrumpitur?* The only other occurrence of *sugere* in the *Confessions* is at 1.6.7 (*nam tunc sugere noram et adquiescere delectationibus*; O'Donnell *ad loc.* comments that "The infant is almost an Epicurean."). O'Connell touches especially on the importance of warmth and warming (*fouere*) for Augustine. Cf. Lane Fox, *Augustine: Conversions and Confessions*, 86–98 and O'Connell, *Images of Conversion in St. Augustine's* Confessions, 17–18. Miles suggests that the behaviour Augustine sees in infants at the breast is carried throughout adult relationships as well (29).

Confessions. He makes a distinction, however, with the word between moments of servitude or addiction to this world, always remembered with regret, as opposed to those times that he uses the term *seruus Dei* or *seruus tuus*, both of himself and of other devout people encountered in the *Confessions.*[200] The latter is an ideal Augustine presents as a comparison to his reality prior to conversion. He thereby creates a hierarchy of servitude. Indeed, the image of compulsion and bondage which so defines Augustine's addictive relationship with carnal sin does not disappear entirely even as he reaches spiritual fulfillment and conversion in God. Augustine still sees chains and fetters in conversion, but they are transformed from the bonds of *uoluptas* into bonds of *fides*, as he sees in his mother upon her death and his ultimate conversion (9.13.36): *ad cuius pretii nostri sacramentum ligauit ancilla tua animam suam uinculo fidei. nemo a protectione tua dirumpat eam; non se interponat nec ui nec insidiis leo et draco.* The use of *uinculo* is marked here as Augustine concentrates on the indestructibility and goodness of the chain of faith. This is in fact the last of 14 occurrences of *uinculum* in the *Confessions,* and the only one that carries a clearly positive meaning.[201] Before this moment at the close of Book 9 (an emphatic transition point as Augustine turns from semi-biography to the philosophy and exegesis of Books 10–13), all other instances of *uincula* were of bonds to this world, whether they be sexual habits (6.12.22: *nequaquam uictus libidine ... stupebat enim liber ab illo uinculo animus seruitutem meam*), the curse of original sin (5.9.16: *super originalis peccati uinculum quo omnes in Adam morimur*), or his fixation on human intimacy rather than a relationship with God (6.10.16: *adhaesit mihi fortissimo uinculo*).[202]

[200] Augustine uses *seruus* of himself as a servant of God 12 times: 1.5.6, 1.7.12, 2.3.7, 8.11.26, 9.1.1 x2, 9.10.26 (Monnica of Augustine), 10.22.32, 10.31.45, 12.24.33, 13.24.36, 13.29.44; of himself as a slave of lust or a runaway three times: 2.6.14, 4.16.30, 6.15.25; of others, both specific people and generalized *serui Dei* 18 times: 3.4.8 (Paul), 3.10.18, 7.9.14 (Jesus taking human, i.e., slave, form), 8.1.1, 8.2.4, 8.6.14–15, 9.2.3–4, 9.7.15 (Ambrose), 9.9.22 (Twice of Monnica et al.), 9.13.37, 10.4.6, 10.43.69, 11.3.5 (Moses), 12.15.20, 13.18.23; for literal slaves *seruus* occurs 4 times: 3.7.13, 7.6.8–9, 13.23.33.

[201] 3.1.1, 3.8.16, 5.9.16, 6.10.16, 6.12.22, 7.7.11, 8.1.1, 8.6.13, 8.8.20, 8.11.25, 9.1.1, 9.3.5, 9.12.32, 9.13.36.

[202] Augustine's life was often defined by his friendships and "to be a friend of Augustine's meant only too often becoming a part of Augustine himself" (Brown, 52). He was very possessive as a friend, and also intimately aware of

Conversion did not erased slavery but refocused it onto a servitude to God. And Augustine does not lack for models of spiritual slaves to emulate. There is a noteworthy variety of slave terms in the *Confessions* and Augustine does not seem to make clear hierarchical or qualitative distinctions between them. For instance, Monnica is referred to as both *famula* and *ancilla* throughout the work and *famula/famulus* in general, together with *famulor*, occur 20 times.[203] Of these 20 occurrences, 10 are of Moses,[204] 4 of Monnica, and 3 of Augustine himself. The fixation especially on Moses and Monnica as servants of God just as much as Monnica's handmaids were her *famulae*, is indicative of the ideal of spiritual servitude that Augustine set for himself post-conversion. To accede to spiritual servitude necessitates first that Augustine understand and then reject his enslavement to this world.

---

the perceptions his friends had of him, but also conscious of how his circle of friends could compliment him in his various endeavours (Brown, 195ff.). We can see this covetousness and the emotional investment Augustine had in his friendships in his reactions to his unnamed friend's death at Thagaste (4.4.7–9). We can see, too, the negative force his peers exerted on him as a boy (2.3.8: *ecce cum quibus comitibus iter agebam platearum Babyloniae*).

[203] 1.9.14 (*linguosis artibus ad honorem hominum et falsas diuitias famulantibus*—education as the slave of wealth and respect), 7.6.8, 9.8.17 (twice, of Monnica and her childhood maid), 9.8.18, 9.9.20 (gossiping maids), 9.13.34, 9.13.37, 10.35.56 (*deus meus, cui humilem famulatum ac simplicem debeo*), 11.2.3 (Augustine's *famulatum*), 12.9.9, 12.14.17, 12.15.22, 12.20.29, 12.23.32, 12.25.34, 12.26.36 (x2 Moses), 12.30.41 (x2 Moses). Similarly, *domesticus* occurs twice: 12.23.32 (Moses), 13.18.22 (mercy for house servants: *domesticos non despiciamus*); *seruulus* once at 7.6.8; *ancilla* 10 times: 2.3.7, 5.10.18, 7.6.8, 9.1.1, 9.7.15, 9.8.18–20, 9.12.33, 9.13.36. Of the 10 occurrences of *ancilla*, 6 describe Monnica, three are of literal slave girls, and one (9.9.19) is a generalization of married women as Monnica herself describes and advises her neighbours: "In what she clearly takes to be a joke hurled in the face of what is by no means a joking matter, she admonishes them [other wives] to regard themselves as "slaves" rather than as rivals of their "lords." … she is suggesting that the path of grace is more powerful than the path of resistance…" (Vaught, *Encounters with God*, 121).

[204] O'Donnell *ad* 12.9.9 comments on *famulus* as a description of Moses: "Virtually a proper title for him, even in scripture…" This is true, for instance, of the Vulgate translations of Joshua 1:13: *mementote sermonis quem praecepit uobis Moses famulus Domini dicens Dominus Deus uester dedit uobis requiem et omnem terram...* It is noteworthy that *famulus* here corresponds either to the Septuagint's ὁ παῖς or to the original Hebrew *eh'-bed* (עֶבֶד), 'slave/servant.' ὁ παῖς naturally corresponds closely to Latin *puer*, both referring potentially to either slaves or children, and both derived ultimately from the same IE root, *ph_2-u- 'smaller.' The Hebrew term does not appear to have any clear connotation of childhood and is derived from *aw-bad'* (עָבַד), 'to work/labour.' Suffice it to say that Augustine was not reading the Hebrew Bible. He was certainly, however, intimately acquainted with both the Latin and Greek translations of it as is obvious in the sheer volume of scriptural quotations and references, particularly to the Psalms, embedded within the *Confessions*.

Worldly enslavement is an issue of maturation for Augustine, and the future bishop ages in two distinct senses in the *Confessions*, both internally and externally. His internal development is crippled through his obstinate determination to dissociate himself from his mother's faith for the majority of the autobiographical books, leading to an arrested state of spiritual development. This is significant because permanent *pueritia* is a hallmark of Roman servility.[205] Augustine's obsession with slavery in the *Confessions* is not in fact a product of any particular corruption of his inner self such as sexuality, but the ensemble of his pre-conversion qualities and choices that stymied any spiritual development past *pueritia*. Augustine was in hindsight no better than a boy or slave, both inchoate human beings in Roman eyes, until his conversion and spiritual maturation. In contrast, Augustine details clearly the milestones and achievements of his life pre-conversion which define his external, or social, growth outside of the Catholic Church. These milestones largely encompass the secular successes of his youth and schooldays as well as the early, yet auspicious, accomplishments of his academic career. When Augustine wins a poetry contest and is crowned by the region's proconsul,[206] he achieves the professional recognition and technical proficiency in the skills he had been endeavouring to master since his schooling in Thagaste. He remembers specifically needing in school to turn a scene from the *Aeneid* into prose and perform

[205] "For free Roman boys the seventh year constituted an important caesura: the start of primary school and the transition from *infantia* to *pueritia*. The life of a slave only knew two caesuras: the age of five as the end of *infantia* and the age of thirty, when one could formally be freed, as a possible end of *pueritia.* Those who did not obtain this privilege remained *puer* for the rest of their life…" (Laes, "Child Slaves at Work in Roman Antiquity," *Ancient Society* 38 (2008): 241. Cf. Harlow and Laurence, *Growing Up and Growing Old in Ancient Rome*, 37. The present analysis is focused primarily on male children and their transition to full personhood with time or not in the case of slaves. Free Roman women, to say nothing of those who were enslaved, generally could expect less autonomy even long after physical and social maturation: "As far as legal definitions were concerned women were considered children all their lives because of their innate light-mindedness and general weakness" (Harlow and Laurence, 36). Cf. Gaius *Inst.* 1.104: *Feminae uero nullo modo adoptare possunt, quia ne quidem naturales liberos in potestate habent.*

[206] *Erat eo tempore uir sagax, medicinae artis peritissimus atque in ea nobilissimus, qui proconsul manu sua coronam illam agonisticam imposuerat non sano capiti meo, sed non ut medicus. nam illius morbi tu sanator, qui resistis superbis, humilibus autem das gratiam* (4.3.5). See above note 37 for the importance of *superbia* and *superbus* in the *Confessions.*

it for his peers (1.17.27).[207] We might see in his later winning the professional poetry contest at 4.3.5 a graduation from these school exercises, from prose to poetry and from interpretation to creation for Augustine, and yet it brings no inner maturation (*ut quid mihi illud, o uera uita, deus meus, quod mihi recitanti adclamabatur prae multis coaetaneis et conlectoribus meis? nonne ecce illa omnia fumus et uentus?*).[208] These achievements from childhood to the brink of Augustine's eventual conversion can be mapped onto a normative progression scheme through the stages of life as Augustine understood them as well as they were conceived more broadly in the Latin tradition.[209] While there is a significant range of variation between the descriptions of these stages by any given author, with many, Augustine included, employing different terminology, sequences, and divisions within their own descriptions, representations of the stages of life fluctuate generally between three and six distinct divisions through which one passes sequentially.[210] The most basic organization into three is generally split into *puer/pueritia*, *iuuenis/adulescens*, and

[207] *Sed figmentorum poeticorum uestigia errantes sequi cogebamur, et tale aliquid dicere solutis uerbis quale poeta dixisset uersibus.* For the superficiality that Augustine would eventually come to see in these exercises, see esp. Stock (1996), 31. Quintilian describes essentially the same exercise at *Institutio Oratoria* 1.9.2–3, remarking that the student who masters this can learn anything: *Quod opus, etiam consummatibus professoribus difficile, qui commode tractauerit cuicumque discendo sufficiet*. Evidently, Augustine did master the skill, but later realizes that it did his inner self no good.

[208] "...speaking of the "vanity" of his poetry studies … he sums them up as a "sacrifice offered to the transgressor angels" (1.27). Augustine's reasoning is that the vain "curiosity" which is deployed in the pursuit of the worldly "knowledge" … is a mocking *simulacrum* which draws the soul away from the salutary love for the Divine Truth" (O'Connell, 32).

[209] Cf. Hor. *Ars.* 156–78 for the changes that accompany the various stages of a person's life. He notably describes the ambition that seizes men in middle age as a sort of servitude (166–8): *conuersis studiis aetas animusque uirilis | quaerit opes et amicitias, inseruit honori, | commisisse cauet quod mox mutare laboret.*

[210] Some of the late-antique Christian writers even on occasion will give 7; see Eyben, 163 for four such cases. Ambrose subscribes to, or at least mentions, this formula as he learned it from Hippocrates, on one occasion in a letter to Horontianus, one of his frequent correspondents, wherein he explains that a man's life progresses from *infantia* to *senectus* in 7 stages, as an illustration of the wider significance of the number 7 (Amb. *Ep.* 44.12): *celebratur itaque hebdomas, eo quod per septem aetatum cursus uita hominum usque ad senectutem transcurritur, sicut Hippocrates medicinae magister, scriptis explicuit suis ... Est ergo infans, puer, adolescens, iuuenis, uir, ueteranus, senex*. This does not, however, appear to reflect common practice even amongst late-antique writers and when 7 stages of life are mentioned, it may be more indicative of an intellectual fixation, derived from the Greek tradition, than of true custom: "Die siebenteilige Gliederung hat in griechischen Altertum eine sehr große Rolle gespielt. Sie stützte sich auf die magische Kraft der Zahl sieben ... Die Überzeugung, daß der Zahl sieben eine magische Kraft innewohnte, fand ... auch in der westlichen Welt Eingang, doch hat die Einteilung in sieben Lebensalter hier praktisch keine Nachfolge gefunden. Die wenigen Beispiele, die wir angeführt haben, nehmen sich in der lateinischen Sprache fremd aus" (Eyben, 165).

senex/senectus, with some terminological variation. The further subdivision of these successive stages gives rise to more precise terms like *infantia*, *medium tempus*,[211] *ephebus*,[212] and *ueteranus*[213] amongst others. Augustine gives varied accounts of these stages, but generally he seems to have followed a six-stage progression in which man passed sequentially through *infantia*, *pueritia*, *adulescentia*, *iuuentus*, *senior*,[214] and finally *senectus*.[215] These divisions all play an overt role in the *Confessions* in delineating Augustine's biographical development both outwardly and inwardly, with the exception perhaps of *senectus*. The first stage, *infantia*, centres on Augustine's linguistic development and capacities which will play a definitive role throughout his life. The possessive and jealous zeal of Augustine's inner self is not limited to infancy and continues to define his interactions with the external world pre-conversion. In hindsight, Augustine connects his life at this point to Sallust's portrait of Catiline, especially in terms of the violence and perversion with which they both engaged with the world, as Augustine saw it (2.5.11).[216] The comparison between the two is heavily exaggerated, yet it underlines the gravity of Augustine's sin in sexual concupiscence and fornication, his most consistent fault in the work (1.13.21):[217] *non te amabam, et fornicabar abs te, et fornicanti sonabat undique, 'euge! euge!' amicitia enim mundi*

---

[211] Ov. *Met.* 15.221f. Cf. the comparable term *media aetas* (Cic. *Sen.* 1.20.76, Pl. *Aul.* 159, Ap. *Met.* 5.16).
[212] Prud. *Psych.* 845ff., Ov. *Ars.* 1.147, Aus. *Mos.* 220.
[213] Ambr. *Psalm.* 1.9, Sen. *Ep. ad Luc.* 11.3.
[214] The division between the final stage, *senectus*, and the penultimate *senior* is one of the more nebulous distinctions both for Augustine as well as generally amongst the schemas adopted by other writers. This is reflected occasionally in terminological discrepancies, such as for example, the relatively rare terms *senium* (Aug. *Serm.* 216.8) or *senecta* (Aug. *Psalm.* 70) used in place of *senior*, or even the free interchange between *senectus* and *senior/senium*, indicating a somewhat ambivalent distinction between the two: "An anderer Stelle setzt man das *senium* nach der *senectus* an. Augustinus zufolge besteht zwischen beiden Lebensaltern kein Unterschied" (Eyben, 162n24).
[215] Eyben, 161–2. For the variants *senecta* and *iuuenta* for *senectus* and *iuuentus*, cf. 166n41: "*senecta* (vgl. *iuuenta*) ist vornehmlich dichterisch und kommt nur relativ selten vor."
[216] Augustine binds himself tightly to Catiline in Book 2, actually quoting Sallust's text (Sall. *Catil.* 16.3): *scilicet ne per otium torpescerent manus aut animus, gratuito potius malus atque crudelis erat.*
[217] The persistence of sinful desire and sexuality as Augustine understands it is startling in the *Confessions*, eliciting sympathy more than anything. Even after effectively conquering his worldly faults and devoting himself to the Church, Augustine cannot escape the pervasive and intrusive sexual thoughts that yet enter his mind in sleep (10.30.41).

huius fornicatio est abs te et 'euge! euge!' dicitur ut pudeat, si non ita homo sit.[218] It is noteworthy that Augustine focuses three times in this passage on fornication, a key word in his corpus and one which occurs eight times in the *Confessions.*[219]

The importance of *fornicari* in the *Confessions* hinges on what its widespread integration into the narrative means for Augustine's portrait of his life prior to conversion. In essence, Augustine builds a narrative in which he is not just plagued by sexual desire, but he is actually a sexual slave or prostitute. The word *fornicari* stems from a root evocative of servility—*fornix*. While *fornix* in the strictest sense simply describes an arch or vaulted architectural structure, the word gained a pejorative connotation based on the sorts of people who would generally frequent the shadier of such places, and eventually came to mean 'brothel.' This usage was common at least from the Augustan period onwards,[220] and led in the Christian period to the increased use of related terms like *fornicaria* for 'prostitute.'[221] The jump from arches to prostitutes may have been facilitated by a linguistic connection, real or otherwise, to the Greek πόρνη.[222] A full discussion of the intersection of Roman slavery and prostitution is not possible here, however, suffice it to say that many of the *fornicariae* that could be found around the *fornices* would have been enslaved

[218] Clark on *fornicabar abs te:* "an Old Testament image ('whoring after strange gods') reinforced by the language of *amor*." See Vaught (2003), 45–6 for Plotinus' influence on Augustine's negative view on sexuality here.
[219] Fornication is a recurrent theme for Augustine with the verbal *fornicari* occurring 6 times (1.13.21, 2.3.7, 2.6.14, 4.2.3, and 5.12.22) and the noun *fornicatio* twice (1.13.21 and 2.2.2); cf. Tertullian, *De Pud.* 16. Both words are extremely frequent in the rest of Augustine's corpus, especially in his sermons.
[220] Hor. *S.* 1.2.28–30: *sunt qui nolint tetigisse nisi illas | quarum subsuta talos tegat instita ueste: | contra alius nullam nisi olenti in fornice stantem*. Cf. Juv. *S.* 3.156, Apul. *Met.* 7.10, and Jer. *In Isaim.* 1.2.35.
[221] This coinage stems from a long tradition in Latin of deriving occupational terms, especially of sex workers, from their place of work. For example, *prostibulum*, a term for prostitute meaning literally 'before the *stabulum*' (Plaut. *Aul.* 285) belongs to this category (Adams, "Words for 'Prostitute' in Latin," 330).
[222] On the formation of the word *fornicaria* in Christian Latin, Adams comments "that it was based ultimately on the chance phonetic similarity between Lat. *fornix* 'brothel' and the standard word for 'whore' in Biblical Greek, πόρνη" (337–8). Early scholarship points to a connection perhaps closer than 'chance' between *fornix* and πόρνη (Valpy (1838) s.*v. fornix* we see an etymological derivation of *fornix* from πόρνη). Modern etymological work seems to dismiss the connection (see *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* under $g^{w}her$- for the relationship between *fornix* and *fornax* 'furnace' and their shared derivation ultimately from the IE root $g^{w}her$- as opposed to *$perh_2$- 'sell' from which πόρνη originates (Beekes and van Beek, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, *s.v.* πόρνη). Cf. de Vaan, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin*, *s.v. fornus* 'oven.'

persons, whether that be in the full legal sense of true ownership or simply in the practical compulsions inflicted pimps and procuresses on prostitutes who were legally free.[223] Augustine's fascination with fornication points to his self-image as being retrospectively of a prostitute, and likely an enslaved one at that. We might even see an allusion to this aspect of his inner 'prostitution,' albeit lacking the actual word *fornicor/fornix*, in his memory of a youthful sexual transgression (or the preliminary stages of one) within the walls of a church (3.3.5):

> ausus sum etiam in celebritate sollemnitatum tuarum, intra parietes ecclesiae tuae, concupiscere et agere negotium procurandi fructus mortis. unde me uerberasti grauibus poenis ... uagatus sum praefidenti collo ad longe recedendum a te, amans uias meas, et non tuas, amans fugitiuam libertatem.

That the locus of Augustine's sin is specifically *intra parietes ecclesiae tuae* rather than simply *in ecclesia* is key to this passage. In following the occupational derivation *fornicaria* from the place of work, *fornix*, we should conceptualize Augustine's prostituting himself as being done through the flesh but with a spiritual consequence—he is only a prostitute before God and the *ecclesia*. The emphasis too on *parietes* is marked as well; the word is not especially common in the *Confessions*, occurring four times.[224] The pejorative undertone here of the concupiscence and sin within the walls evokes a descent into a place of corruption and ultimately death (*fructus mortis*) based perhaps on another image from the classical tradition (Sall. *Cat.* 55.3–4):

---

[223] That prostitutes were often slaves as can be seen in Plautus (*Pseud.* 50ff., *Poen.* 163–4 i.a.). Even technically free prostitutes would often find themselves in a state of indentured servitude, however, driven at times into insurmountable financial debt through the abuses of their pimps and madams. See McGinn, *The Economy of Prostitution in the Roman World,* 52–4. Cf. Gardner, "Slavery and the Roman Law," 434–6.

[224] 1.16.26 of a mural painting showing Jupiter as a golden shower, then at 3.3.5 quoted above, and then finally twice at 8.2.4 of a conversation between Simplicianus and Victorinus wherein Victorinus jokingly asks whether walls (of a church) make Christians; cf. O'Donnell *ad loc.* One thinks too of the sexual imagery surrounding Ovid's *parietes* in his telling of the myth of Pyramus and Thisbe (*Met.* 4.65–75): *fissus erat tenui rima, quam duxerat olim, | cum fieret, paries domui communis utrique. ... "inuide" dicebant "paries, quid amantibus obstas? | quantum erat, ut sineres toto nos corpore iungi | aut, hoc si nimium est, uel ad oscula danda pateres?"* A sexual implication to *rima* in this example is not noted by Williams (1998), but it was a known, if crude, term for the genitalia (cf. Juv. 3.96–7: *uacua et plana omnia dicas | infra uentriculum et tenui distantia rima*). For discussion on *rima* as a sexual term, see Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, 95–6. Could Augustine have been inspired by the sexual (albeit romantic as opposed to Augustine's lustfulness) escapades of Ovid's Pyramus and Thisbe when remembering his own dalliance between *parietes*?

> Est in carcere locus, quod Tullianum appellatur, ubi paululum ascenderis ad laeuam, circiter duodecim pedes humi depressus. Eum muniunt undique parietes atque insuper camera lapideis fornicibus iuncta; sed incultu, tenebris, odore foeda atque terribilis eius facies est.

The *fornicibus* in Sallust's description obviously refer to the word's original architectural meaning. Even so, the image of dankness and corruption in the descent to the death chamber[225] appears to have a definite affinity with Augustine's memory of the church. That Augustine characterizes his sin as a *negotium* also highlights the undertone of prostitution in his actions, linking this moment to the *fornicatio* throughout the *Confessions*. The word is, of course, even weightier for Augustine as it acts as the complete contrast to *requies* in God.[226] It is essential to Augustine's slave narrative, however, that the slavery he lives in this sexual *negotium* as effectively a *fornicarius* be also a flight away from the righteous servitude in God which Augustine will find later. He emphasizes that his servile *negotium* is itself a refuge from servitude making Augustine a fugitive from God (*fugitiuam libertatem*). We might recall here as well that just as fugitive slaves in the Roman context could be branded, tattooed, and permanently collared to prevent repeated escape attempts,[227] so too was Augustine marked in childhood as a catechumen of the church (1.11.17: *et signabar iam signo crucis eius, et condiebar eius sale iam inde ab utero matris meae*). The common thread of the narrative and language of the *Confessions* always returns to this dual embodiment of slavery in Augustine; when he is a slave to his passions and sexuality he is a runaway from God, and he will eventually be returned to God, who will in turn become his eternal refuge from sin.

---

[225] On the Tullianum as 'death chamber,' and a brief discussion of the historical elements of Sallust's description, see McGushin, *Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary, ad* 55.3–4.

[226] *requies* is key throughout the *Confessions* for what Augustine understands God and *fides* to be. The word occurs 14 times and is often attributed to God (e.g. 6.16.26: *dura sunt omnia, et tu solus requies*; or 9.4.11: *et tu es idipsum ualde, qui non mutaris, et in te requies obliuiscens laborum omnium* ...).

[227] See Bradley (1994), esp. 113–37.

The *Confessions* moves fluidly between Augustine's internal and external worlds, re-focalising, particularly in the first 10 books, the reader's attention from the state of Augustine's soul as opposed to his progress in the tangible world. A great part of this focalisation rests on Augustine's eventual recognition that his academic, rhetorical, and literary abilities did not allow him to make any progress in the spiritual world. He remains throughout the *Confessions* the same *puer* that he was at school in Thagaste. This creates a tension in his memory as he tries through writing the *Confessions*, having long since converted to Catholicism, to understand who he now is compared to his younger self. His schoolboy experiences are centred on his mastery of Latin, and his interactions with fictional worlds for the sake of realizing his parents' hopes for his career. Augustine signals, however, that even his aptitude for Latin was a stumbling block to his further growth, and while not the single the deciding factor for his stunted interior life, his reaction to literacy and literature in school demonstrates a persistent pattern of puerile resistance to internal *labor*. A significant part of his love for Latin as opposed to his hatred for Greek stems understandably from the natural ease with which he could engage his native tongue.[228] Augustine freely admits that what he loved in Vergil was equally present in Homer, and yet Homer was not stimulating for him. But on the other hand, he is sure that Greek schoolboys prefer Homer to Vergil

[228] "It is most unlikely that Augustine spoke anything but Latin" (Brown, 10). Doubtless, Augustine had at least some contact with Punic or Libyan, influenced by the imbedded cultural divides in Thagaste and felt throughout N. Africa generally: "One may regard Thagaste in the time of St. Augustine as typical of the decaying Roman towns of fourth-century North Africa. A few large town houses would be inhabited by Latin-speaking citizens. These were the landowners, such as Romanianus, or Alypius' family, who owned great estates outside the city, with whom Augustine, though himself the son of poorer parents, was closely associated" (Frost, "A Note on the Berber Background in the Life of Augustine," 190). Certainly Augustine's family was not as wealthy as Romanianus (6.14.24). Nevertheless, Augustine placed undue emphasis on the 'poverty' of his family. Patricius did struggle at times to pay for his son's education (2.3.6: *interposito otio ex necessitate domestica, feriatus ab omni schola cum parentibus esse coepi*), however, the household was wealthy enough to afford slaves (1.19.30 the *paedagogus* was probably enslaved) and there was a relatively substantial estate left for Augustine and his brother as an inheritance (Lössl, "Augustine's Family as a Space of Religious Experience," 406–5.). Lössl even attributes Augustine's need to briefly interrupt his schooling at the age of 16 as being due not to real poverty but "probably cash flow problems, serious no doubt, but temporary..." (405). If there was a noticeable socio-economic divide drawn between the Latin speaking, Roman elite versus the Punic and Libyan speaking groups, Augustine undoubtedly belonged squarely on the Latin side of the line.

for the same reason—Homer's language comes more naturally to them than does Vergil's (1.14.23). This is not, of course, to suggest either obstinacy or inability on Augustine's part to learn Greek;[229] while Augustine often did rely on Latin translations of Greek texts, he certainly could read Greek when necessary.[230] That Augustine is so self-deprecative regarding his ability in Greek, while surely rooted in some truth, is part of a broader point he tries to make about himself. The distinction Augustine makes between his enthusiasm for Latin and hatred for Greek is important rather for highlighting his susceptibility at this stage to pursuing the most natural avenues of pleasure that present themselves to him. In his reflections on his early schooling, he remembers that it was not only Greek that he hated but also arithmetic and basic literacy, the fundamentals for all further studies, but which were not of course as viscerally pleasurable or emotive as reading *Aeneid* 4 would be.[231] This childlike boredom and frustration extend into Augustine's spiritual life as an adult. Augustine's resistance to reading anything but the Latin classics s reflected in his first forays back into Christian study. He finds himself drawn to the Bible,

[229] Some of the scholarship on Augustine over-exaggerates his inability in Greek: "Augustine … will become the only Latin philosopher in antiquity to be virtually ignorant of Greek" (Brown, 24).

[230] *pace* Brown, Augustine did use Greek as an adult and the principle reason for his reluctance to do so when not absolutely necessary seems to have simply been a time-saving measure, at least while bishop: "Wir denken an die von allen Seiten auf den seeleneifrigen Bischof einstürmenden, unaufschiebbaren kirchlich-praktischen Arbeiten und erinnern uns daran, daß er wohl griechisch verstand, aber nur im Notfall und nicht gerade gern an das zeitraubende Studium von original griechischen Werken heranging" (Altaner, "Die Benützung von original griechischen Vätertexten durch Augustinus," 73). Oftentimes finding a seasoned translator of Greek philosophy or patristic texts was infeasible in places like Hippo and Augustine would have found it more expedient to serve the needs and questions of his Latin-speaking congregation by interpreting the texts himself. Cf. Stock (2010), 48n146. Even O'Donnell (*ad* 1.13.20) admits that Augustine's "own remarks are strongly marked by rhetorical self-depreciation" when it comes to his discomfort in Greek.

[231] Reflecting on his love for Vergil, Augustine tries to undercut the actual importance of Aeneas by calling him *Aeneae nescio cuius* (1.13.20). Cf. 3.4.7 when Augustine first discovers Cicero's *Hortensius*: *et usitato iam discendi ordine perueneram in librum cuiusdam Ciceronis, cuius linguam fere omnes mirantur, pectus non ita.* This line has incited some polemic (see O'Donnell *ad loc.*) and scholars differ on the degree to which one should read *cuiusdam Ciceronis* as derogatory or not. It seems clear in any case that Augustine is stepping somewhat lightly in his description here: "This is the Cicero who is described formally, even perhaps pejoratively … the orator whom bishop Augustine, mindful of his youthful errors, wished to keep at a respected distance" (Stock, *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge, and the Ethics of Interpretation,* 40). Cf. Clark (1995) *ad loc.*: "A. may be suggesting that Cicero, as a pagan writer, is of no real importance; but he refers to Paul as *quidam seruus tuus* (12.15.20), so perhaps the point is that no human being is important."

only to cast it away, disappointed in the scriptural language that seems so dull in comparison to Cicero or Sallust (3.5.9). And then again, years later and newly converted, Augustine asks his mentor Ambrose for advice on what to read and is suggested the prophet Isaiah, whom Ambrose considers a gentle introduction to scripture. Augustine finds himself again, however, incapable of finishing this reading, not now time out of contempt for its quality but because of the utter complexity he now sees in the work (9.5.13): *at ille iussit Esaiam prophetam, credo, quod prae ceteris euangelii uocationisque gentium sit praenuntiator apertior. uerum tamen ego primam huius lectionem non intellegens totumque talem arbitrans distuli repetendum exercitatior in dominico eloquio.* We must here recall the youthful *superbia* apparent in Augustine's memory of being the only student in his class who could read and understand Aristotle's *Categories* unaided (4.16.28). Augustine has now presented us a reversal of his education thus far—he is once again illiterate, though now a Catholic convert. Nevertheless, even simply reaching this state of illiteracy and a return to *pueritia*, or rather, a realization that he had never advanced past an internal state of *pueritia*, is an ordeal for Augustine. Even as he comes slowly closer in Book 8 to conversion, Augustine continuously resists, even when he knows that he does not actually want to (8.5.12):

> Ita sarcina saeculi, uelut somno adsolet, dulcitur premebar, et cogitationes quibus meditabar in te similes erant conatibus expergisci uolentium, qui tamen superati soporis altitudine remerguntur. et sicut nemo est qui dormire semper uelit omniumque sano iudico uigilare praestat, differt tamen plerumque homo somnum excutere cum grauis torpor in membris est, eumque iam displicentem carpit libentius quamuis surgendi tempus aduenerit: ita certum habebam esse melius tuae caritati me dedere quam meae cupiditati cedere, sed illud placebat et uincebat, hoc libebat et uinciebat.[232]

[232] For the image of the sleeping man being awoken to the truth cf. Plotinus, *Enn.* 5.5.11: οἷον εἴ τινες διὰ βίου κοιμώμενοι ταῦτα μὲν πιστὰ καὶ ἐναργῆ νομίζοιεν τὰ ἐν τοῖς ὀνείρασιν, εἰ δέ τις αὐτοὺς ἐξεγείρειεν, ἀπιστήσαντες τοῖς διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀνεῳγότων ὀφθεῖσι πάλιν καταδαρθάνοιεν.

He is still too weak to resist external stimuli and temptations. Augustine finds himself unable to take a harder path even when he recognizes the eventual benefit doing so would yield. In a sense, he is once again in the same difficulty as he found with reading Greek as a boy; he understands the ultimate good to be gained, but still obstinately sticks to the easier or more natural path. His friend Alypius, so often an exterior extrapolation in the *Confessions* of Augustine's inner turmoil, is used as a practical illustration of Augustine's wavering on the border of sin and piety. Alypius' friends force him to the amphitheatre ostensibly against his well, and while he tries to resist the temptation of opening his eyes and watching the bloody spectacle, his willpower fails, and he quickly becomes the member of the group most addicted to the sport (6.8.13).

For Augustine, his state of arrested development led him not only away from God, but towards a career path that leaves him stagnant in the same pleasures and nonsense (*nugae*) as enveloped him while in school. Indeed, the career Augustine would build as a rhetor and *grammaticus* would never amount to more than the *nugae* and *ludi* for which his teachers, whom he so despised as a child, reproached him (1.9.15):

> sed maiorum nugae negotia uocantur, puerorum autem talia cum sint, puniuntur a maioribus, et nemo miseratur pueros uel illos uel utrosque ... aut aliud faciebat idem ipse a quo uapulabam, qui si in aliqua quaestiuncula a condoctore suo uictus esset...

Augustine in hindsight links the games he played as a boy and which distracted him from his schoolwork to the 'business' (*negotia*) that occupied his teachers' lives; both were equally frivolous. And yet, it was precisely these same *negotia* that absorbed Augustine as he grew up and became a teacher himself.[233] Moreover, Augustine seems to connect the negative connotations of

[233] The practical side of academic life evidently was a great preoccupation for Augustine as can be gleaned even from the sparse references to his typical working life in the *Confessions.* In fact, the original impetus for moving to Rome was that Augustine had heard that students were better behaved there and were more likely to honour their tuition payments (5.8.14): *... sed illa erat causa maxima et paene sola, quod audiebam quietius ibi studere adulescentes et ordinatiore disciplinae cohercitione sedari ...*

his sexual *negotium* at (3.3.5) discussed above with the career ambitions that occupy him in school as both student and then teacher.[234] Both sides of Augustine's life become for him nothing but *nugae*. The word *nugae* occurs 9 times in the *Confessions,* though never in Books 10–13, the books of Augustine's true maturation.[235] And the final usage of the word especially emphasizes the finality of Augustine's conversion at the end of Book 8 and his progression therethrough to spiritual liberation and maturation (9.1.1): *quam suaue mihi subito factum est carere suauitatibus nugarum, et quas amittere metus fuerat iam dimittere gaudium erat*. Sweetness (*suaue*, *suauitatibus*) is a key idea here, hearkening back to the fictional pleasures of poetry,[236] as well as to Augustine's understanding of pleasure and sweetness throughout the narrative of his life; the greater the sense of absence or lack, the greater the pleasure upon filling that hole.[237] These pleasures are, of course, replaced, as is the case at 9.1.1, with the sweetness and eternal pleasure of God, whom Augustine so often refers to as *mea dulcedo* (1.6.9): *quid ante hanc etiam, dulcedo mea, deus meus?*[238]

---

[234] Career ambitions are another aspect of Augustine's sinful life that he filters through an examination of Alypius' path which so often runs parallel to Augustine's. Brown goes so far as to describe Alpyius as Augustine's "alter ego for the rest of their lives" (*Augustine*, 57). Alypius' parents sent him to Rome to study law, the 'earthly path' (*terrenam uiam*), and one which Alypius will eventually reject, just as Augustine gives up teaching soon after his conversion (6.8.13): *non sane relinquens incantatam sibi a parentibus terrenam uiam, Romam praecesserat ut ius disceret ...* See O'Donnell *ad loc.* for the possible negative implications of *incantatam* here.

[235] 1.9.16, 1.17.27, 3.10.18, 4.1.1, 6.4.5, 7.6.8, 8.11.26–7, 9.1.1.

[236] 1.14.23: *omnes suauitates graecas fabulosarum narrationum*; cf. O'Donnell *ad loc.*

[237] Miles, *Desire and Delight*, 65ff.

[238] On *dulcedo* and *suauitas* see O'Donnell *ad* 1.6.9: "Such metaphor is slippery when applied to God: it seems that we know of sweetness in ordinary life, and predicate a greater, more perfect sweetness of our conception of God. A. would hold that this procedure is a necessary consequence of the fall of language, but that insofar as the expression is true and useful it is rather that the sweetness that we know in ordinary life is a pale reflection of the authentic and original sweetness of God." For the impersonal *suaue* as well as the subsequent *suauitatibus carere* at 9.1.1, we might look as well to the proem to Book 2 of Lucretius' *De rerum natura* (2.1–4): *suaue, mari magno turbantibus aequora uentis, | e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem; | non quia uexari quemquamst iucunda uoluptas, | sed quibus ipse malis careas quia cernere suaue est*. Bailey introduces these lines in his commentary on the *DRN* as being representative of Epicurean moral theory: "The ultimate goal of the Epicurean moral theory was 'pleasure' (ἡδονή), but that did not mean the 'kinetic' pleasures of bodily and mental excitement, such as were recommended by Aristippus and the Cyrenaics, but the 'catastematic' pleasure of freedom from pain and care; the 'kinetic' pleasures were to be avoided, because they often produced pain as their consequence" (Bailey *ad* 2.1–61). Augustine was intimately familiar with the Epicureans, brushing quite close to adopting their philosophy himself after abandoning Manicheanism. A certain similarity seems to present itself here between the epicurean's search for ultimate pleasure

At the moment when Augustine does finally manage to reach and then cross the threshold of conversion, he signals an abrupt disruption in his command of language and thereby a departure from the internal *pueritia* that had gripped him since his schooldays. Despairing at the state of his soul, Augustine asks Alypius how it can be that the uneducated accede to God while they, masters of the *liberales artes*, are incapable of doing so and remain slaves to their passions (8.8.19): *'quid patimur? quid est hoc? quid audisti? surgunt indocti et caelum rapiunt, et nos cum doctrinis nostris since corde, ecce ubi uolutamur in carne et sanguine!'* This emotional outcry is the consequence of an internal struggle and self-flagellation[239] that Augustine endures but cannot express to his friend other than through "a language that violates the customs of speech."[240] Alypius is unable to respond, remaining quiet and stunned: *dixi nescio qua talia, et abripuit me ab illo aestus meus, cum taceret attonitus me intuens*. Alypius and Augustine are unable to communicate with one another at this pivotal juncture as language fails them and they are forced to witness "the other's change of heart from the outside."[241] Without language, the pair regress temporarily to a state of internal *infantia* corresponding to the literal infancy Augustine described in Book 1. This allows Augustine to move forward rapidly as he takes refuge in the garden outside of the house where he and Alypius are lodged and hears what he thinks is a child's voice (8.12.29): *et ecce audio uocem de uicina domo cum cantu dicentis et crebro repetentis, quasi pueri an puellae, nescio: `tolle lege, tolle lege.' statimque mutato uultu intentissimus cogitare coepi utrumnam solerent pueri in aliquo genere ludendi cantitare tale aliquid.* The ambiguous phrasing

through the removal of pain and the ultimate sweetness of *requies* that Augustine finds in his faith and conversion towards God.

[239] 8.7.18–8.19: *quibus sententiarum uerberibus non flagellaui animam meam .... tum in illa grandi rixa interioris domus meae, quam fortiter excitaueram cum anima mea in cubiculo nostro, corde meo, tam uultu quam mente turbatus inuado Alypium: exclamo 'quid patimur...'*

[240] Stock, *Augustine the Reader*, 103.

[241] Ibid, 104.

quasi pueri an puellae has solicited much scholarly debate,[242] but it seems likely that Augustine meant not that he had heard a literal child in the neighbouring yard, but rather a spiritual voice.[243] Moreover, that his first instinct is to search his memories for any childhood reference to a game that might correspond to those words suggests that Augustine is also at this moment a *puer* and that the divine is speaking to him internally in like form.[244] There is no game and there is no child; Augustine is spurred on in a moment of divine intervention to leave behind his internal *pueritia* and thus the bonds of slavery, through the acceptance of Christianity. That Augustine returns to the house, picks up the Bible, reads and both understands and is comforted demonstrates definitively that he has achieved the internal growth and spiritual education that were lacking in his previous attempts at reading scripture.

Saint Augustine crafts his *Confessions* through a unique admixture of biography, scripture and classical literature and is the work of a man wholly immersed in both the literary and spiritual worlds of Rome from the Republic to the fifth century AD. Everything within the internal universe Augustine shapes in the narrative hinges upon a state of enslavement that the writer emphasizes constantly through allusions to his literary predecessors and their engagement with slavery, through the language of servitude and punishment, and through his own self-abasement and reproach for tarrying so long in his return to God. One of Augustine's great realizations in the *Confessions* is that his enslavement to his own wandering pleasures and temptations in this world were the direct result not just of sin, but of an unwillingness to mature spiritually juxtaposed with a precocious rise as a scholar, writer, and teacher in his career within the external world. None of

[242] O'Donnell *ad loc.*
[243] Joly, "Notes sur la Conversion d'Augustin," 219.
[244] Courcelle, "Les 'Voix' dans les *Confessions* de Saint Augustin," 43: "...le '*Tolle, lege,'* est une 'voix' intérieure, l'appel des 'continents' qui l'invitent, suivant leur example, à saisir la leçon d'ascétisme contenue dans le Nouveau Testament."

this can compare, however, to the inner *pueritia* that leaves Augustine forever equal to a slave. His eventual salvation from this state lies in his rejection of the world he had allowed himself to be seduced by, in which he loved and was loved (*amare et amari*) and to learn a new, spiritual language. The *Confessions* is for Augustine the story not just of conversion but of liberation and maturation.

Conclusion

This thesis has presented a new reading of both Vergil's *Georgics* and St. Augustine's *Confessions* as texts constructed around an image of pervasive slavery. For Augustine, this enslavement is an intimate glimpse into what he considered to be the state of his soul before conversion. He sees an internal version of himself, suffering the whips, chains, and beatings of a slave by his master, however, it is Augustine's own carnal desires and obstinate refusal to become a Christian for most of his life before becoming bishop of Hippo, that wields authority over him. He is a slave to his own passions, many of which appear fairly harmless to a modern reader, just as they must have to many of Augustine's contemporaries,[245] and yet for Augustine, now in hindsight as a Christian, they were as debilitating and dehumanizing as any brand or iron fetters a slave would suffer. This is precisely because Augustine's fundamental issue was not that he was simply unable to resist temptation or was an addict to sexual pleasure. Rather, Augustine came to envision himself as never having matured spiritually and lived in an arrested state of *pueritia* internally despite his great successes as a man in the material world. He considered himself in this period to be an undeveloped and outcast person, a slave, because he was still a child. To escape this enchainment and achieve the *requies* and *libertas* in God would necessitate learning to read again, effectively acquiring a new language just as he had learned to speak through babbling as a baby in Book 1.

[245] Many readers scoff at the depth of Augustine's regret when remembering the pear theft in Book 2 (2.4.9–2.9.17), with O'Donnell going so far as to say that "[i]t is conventional to read the pear-theft narrative with naive bemusement." And yet, we should not discount the fear Augustine had of sin and transgression throughout his Christian life. He is equally preoccupied with the inherent good or evil of music even within the walls of the church: it brought him great pleasure but was this then a distraction from God even despite his own best intentions and the religious quality of the music (10.33.49)? Or again, Augustine becomes so fearful of regressing into his youthful habits that he worries that he allows himself to be distracted when he sees a dog chasing a hare, as if it were equally sinful as enjoying the thrill and savagery of the amphitheatre (10.35.57).

Vergil uses slavery in a similar fashion to Augustine, though rather than turning inwards and examining the individual soul through the lens of slavery, he applies the same image to the agricultural world. As demonstrated in Chapter 1, this is first a narrative issue in the *Georgics*, a text that lacks the clear narrative structure of the *Aeneid* or even the *Confessions* as well. Vergil endeavours, however, throughout the *Georgics* to fashion a narrative of agricultural labour told from shifting perspectives, funneling our vision at one moment downwards through the eyes of a god, then upwards from the perspective of a mouse or insect, and then through the visceral *sententiae* of animals, plants, and human beings all conflated together as partners in agriculture. In Chapter 2 we then examined how Vergil binds these disparate elements of the farm together through a shared and common suffering at the hands of *labor* and *uis*, ingredients for fashioning a typically Roman image of *natura*. The farmer's world is in fact the ideal form of *natura* for the Roman: the ordering and subjugation of a life through violence. That the non-human elements of the farm are starkly anthropomorphized transforms the perception of the violence applied to them—they become human actors subjugated to the yoke and thus become slaves. In reading the *Georgics*, it is imperative to consider the context in which Vergil was writing and that he presented this sombre view of an agricultural world encompassing all areas of existence and dominated by slavery, to Octavian and the Roman elite on the cusp of a violent and complete reorganization of the Roman world.

This discussion of slavery in Augustine and Vergil is a preliminary study to a broader and deeper study of Roman literary slavery throughout the classical period. From the founding of the city and through to the fifth century AD, agriculture and slavery remained definitive aspects of life under both the Republic and the empire and was wholly imbued in the Latin cultural imagination.

Tracing the thread of a slavery and servitude through Latin literature will prove a decisive element in deepening our understanding of Latin literature, spirituality, and philosophy.

Bibliography

Adams, J.N. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London: Duckworth, 1982.

———. "Words for 'Prostitute' in Latin." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Neue Folge* 126 (1983): 321–58.

Aitkin, Robert. "Virgil's Plough." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 46 (1956): 97–106.

Altaner, Berthold. "Die Benützung von original griechischen Vätertexten durch Augustinus." *Zeitschrift für Religions– und Geistesgeschichte* 1, no. 1 (1948): 71–9.

Anderson, W.S., ed. *Ovid's* Metamorphoses: *Books 1–5.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1998.

Auerbach, Erich. "*Sacrae Scripturae sermo humilis*." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 42, no. 2 (1941): 57–67.

———. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature.* 50th Anniversary ed. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Badian, E. *Publicans and Sinners; Private Enterprise in the Service of the Roman Republic.* Cornell University Press, 1972.

Bailey, Cyril, ed. *De rerum Natura.* 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Beard, Mary. *The Roman Triumph.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2007.

Bourke, Vernon J., ed. *The Essential Augustine.* 2nd ed. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1974.

Boyle, A.J. *The Chaonian Dove: Studies in the* Eclogues, Georgics, and Aeneid *of Virgil.* Leiden: Brill, 1986.

Bradley, Keith. *Slavery and Society at Rome.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Bradley, Keith and Paul Cartledge, eds. *The Cambridge World History of Slavery.* Vol. 1 *The Ancient Mediterranean World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Breen, Carolyn Clark. "The Shield of Turnus, the Swordbelt of Pallas, and the Wolf: *Aeneid* 7.789–92, 9.52–66, 10.497–9." *Vergilius* 32 (1986): 63–72.

Brown, Peter. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1992.

———. *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography.* 45th Anniversary ed. Berkeley: University of

California Press, 2000.

———. *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350–550 AD.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

———. *The Ransom of the Soul.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Buchheit, Vinzenz. "Augustinus unter dem Feigenbaum (zu *Conf.* VIII)." *Vigiliae Christianae* 22, no. 4 (Dec., 1968): 257–71.

———. *Der Anspruch des Dichters in Vergils* Georgika: *Dichtertum und Heilsweg.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.

Burton, Philip. *Language in the* Confessions *of Augustine.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Campbell, John Scott. "The Ambiguity of Progress: *Georgics* I, 118–159." *Latomus,* T. 41, Fasc. 3 (1982): 566–76.

Chadwick, Henry. *The Penguin History of the Early Church.* Revised ed. London: Penguin Books, 1993.

———. "Self-Justification in Augustine's *Confessions*." *The English Historical Review* 118, no. 479 (2003): 1161–75.

Clark, Gillian, ed. *Augustine:* Confessions *Books I–IV.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

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

Conte, Gian Biagio. *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Virgilian Epic.* Edited by S.J. Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Courcelle, Pierre. "L'oracle d'Apis et l'oracle du jardin de Milan." *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 139, no. 2 (1951): 216–31.

———."Source Chrétienne et Allusions Païennes de l'épisode du '*Tolle, lege*': Saint Augustin, *Confessions,* VIII, 12, 29." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religeuses* 32, no. 3 (1952a): 171–200.

———. "Les 'Voix' dans les *Confessions* de Saint Augustin." *Hermes* 80, no. 1 (1952b): 31–46.

———. "L'Enfant et les 'Sorts Bibliques'." *Vigiliae Christianae* 7, no. 4 (Oct., 1953):194–220.

Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages.* Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Dyck, Andrew R., ed. *Cicero: Catilinarians.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Erren, Manfred, ed. *Georgica.* Vol. 1. Heidelberg: Winter Universitätsverlag, 1985

———, ed. *Georgica.* Vol. 2. Heidelberg: Winter Universitätsverlag, 2003.

Eyben, E. "Die Einteilung des menschlichen Lebens in Römischen Altertum." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie,* Neue Folge, 116, no. 2 (1973): 150–90.

Farrell, Joseph. *Vergil's* Georgics *and the Traditions of Ancient Epic: The Art of Allusion in Literary History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Fentress, Elizabeth. "On the Block: *catastae, chalcidica* and *cryptae* in Early Imperial Italy." *Journal of Roman Archeology* 18, no. 1 (2005): 220–33.

Fitzgerald, William. *Martial: The World of the Epigram.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Flannery, Kent and Joyce Marcus. *The Creation of Inequality: How our Prehistoric Ancestors Set the Stage for Monarchy, Slavery, and Empire.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Flood, Emmet T. "The Narrative Structure of Augustine's *Confessions:* Time's Quest for Eternity." *International Philosophy Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (1988): 141–62.

Fowler, Don. "Deviant Focalisation in Virgil's *Aeneid*." Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society, no. 36 (1990): 42–63.

Frentz, Willi. *Mythologisches in Vergils* Georgica. Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain, 1967.

Frost, Maurice. "A Note on the Berber Background in the Life of Augustine." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 43, no. 171/172 (1942): 188–94.

Gale, Monica. *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The* Georgics, *Lucretius and the Didactic Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

———. "Virgil's Metamorphoses: Myth and Allusion in the *Georgics.*" In Volk, *Oxford Readings: Vergil's* Georgics, 94–127.

Gardner, Jane F. "Slavery and Roman Law." In Bradley, *The Cambridge World History of Slavery,* 414–37.

Gladhill, Bill. *Rethinking Roman Alliance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Hardie, Philip. *Virgil.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

———, ed. *Virgil: Critical Assessments of Classical Authors.* vol. 2: *Georgics.* London: Routledge, 1999.

———. *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Harlow, Mary and Ray Laurence. *Growing Up and Growing Old in Ancient Rome*: *A Life Course Approach*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Heitland, William E. *Agricola: A Study of Agriculture and Rustic Life in the Greco-Roman World from the Point of View of Labour.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921.

Hopkins, Keith. *Conquerors and Slaves.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Horsfall, Nicholas, ed. *A Companion to the Study of Virgil.* Leiden: Brill. 1995.

———, ed. *Aeneid* 2: A Commentary. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Hübner, Wolfgang. "Die *praetoria memoriae* im zehnten Buch der *Confessiones." Revue d'Études Augustiniennes et Patristiques* 27, no. 3–4 (Jan., 1981): 245–63.

Jenkyns, Richard. "*Labor Improbus.*" In Volk, *Oxford Readings: Vergil's* Georgics, 128–37.

Joly, Robert. "Notes sur la Conversion d'Augustin." *L'Antiquité Classique* 35, no. 1 (1966): 217–21.

Jones, C.P. "*Stigma:* Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 77 (1987): 139–55.

Katz, Joshua. "Vergil Translates Aratus: *Phaenomena* 1–2 and *Georgics* 1.1–2." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici,* no. 60 (2008): 105–23.

Kligerman, Charles. "A Psychoanalytic Study of the *Confessions* of St. Augustine." *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 5 (1957): 469–84.

Knight, W. F. Jackson. "Vergil's Latin." *Acta Classica* 1 (1958): 31–44.

Kotzé, Annemaré. *Augustine's* Confessions*: Communicative Purpose and Audience.* Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Laes, Christian. "Child Slaves at Work in Roman Antiquity." *Ancient Society* 38 (2008): 235–83.

Liebeschuetz, W. "Beast and Man in the Third Book of Virgil's *Georgics*." *Greece and Rome* 12, no. 1 (Apr., 1965): 64–77.

Lods, Marc. “La personne du Christ dans la ‘conversion’ de saint Augustin.” *Recherches Augustiniennes* 11 (1976): 3–34.

Lössl, Josef. “Augustine’s Family as a Space of Religious Experience.” *Augustiniana* 54, no. 1/4 (2004): 401–15.

Lyne, R.O.A.M. “*Servitium Amoris.*” *The Classical Quarterly* 29, no. 1 (1979): 117–30.

———. “*Scilicet et Tempus Veniet...*Virgil, *Georgics* 1.463–514.” In Hardie, *Virgil: Critical Assessments,* 162–83.

McGinn, Thomas. *The Economy of Prostitution in the Roman World: A Study of Social History & the Brothel.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.

McGushin, Patrick., ed. *Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary.* Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Mieke, Bal. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative.* 4th ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017.

Miles, Margaret R. *Desire and Delight: A New Reading of Augustine’s* Confessions. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1992.

Mohrmann, Christine. *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermonen des hl. Augustin.* Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1932.

Morgan, Llewelyn. *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil’s* Georgics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Moulton, Carroll. “Similes in the *Iliad.*” *Hermes* 102, no. 3 (1974): 381–97.

Murgatroyd, Paul, ed. *Tibullus:* Elegies II. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Mynors, R.A.B., ed. *Georgics.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

O’Connell, Robert J., S.J. *Images of Conversion in St. Augustine’s* Confessions. New York: Fordham University Press, 1996.

O’Donnell, James J., ed. *Confessions.* 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

O’Hara, James J. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay.* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996.

Ó'Meara, John. “Virgil and Augustine: The *Aeneid* in the *Confessions*.” *The Maynooth Review / Revieú Mhá Nuad* 13 (Dec., 1988): 30–43.

Palmer, L.R. *The Latin Language.* London: Faber and Faber, 1954.

Patterson, Orlando. *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Perkell, Christine G. *The Poet's Truth: A Study of the Poet in Virgil's* Georgics. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Plotinus. *The Enneads.* Translated by Stephen MacKenna. Abridged ed. with Introduction and Notes by John Dillon. London: Penguin Books, 1991.

Porter, James I. *The Sublime in Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Putnam, Michael C.J. *Virgil's Poem of the Earth: Studies in the* Georgics. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Quinn, John M. *A Companion to the* Confessions *of Saint-Augustine.* New York: Peter Lang, 2002.

Ramain, Georges. "À Propos de Virgile, *Géorgiques* 3.416–439." *Revue de Philologie, de Littérature, et d'Histoire Anciennes* 48, no. 3 (July 1924): 117–23.

Ramsey, J.T., ed. *Sallust's* Bellum Catilinae. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Ratzinger, Joseph. "Originalität und Überlieferung in Augustins Begriff der *confessio*." *Revue des études augustiniennes* 3 (1957): 375–92.

Rees, Roger, ed. *Romane memento: Vergil in the Fourth Century.* London: Duckworth, 2004.

Richlin, Amy. *Slave Theater in the Roman Republic: Plautus and Popular Comedy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Ross, David O. Jr. *Virgil's Elements: Physics and Poetry in the* Georgics. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Schäfer, Sabine. *Das Weltbild der Vergilischen* Georgika *in seinem Verhältnis zu* De rerum natura *des Lukrez.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996.

Scheidel, Walter. "Quantifying the Sources of Slaves." *JRS* 87 (1997): 159–69.

———. "Human Mobility: Slave population." *JRS* 95 (2005): 64–79.

———. "The Roman Slave Supply." In Bradley, *The Cambridge World History of Slavery,* 287–310.

Schein, Seth L. *The Mortal Hero.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Scullard, H.H. *From the Gracchi to Nero: A History of Rome from 133BC to AD 68.* 5th ed. London: Routledge, 1982.

Shaw, Brent D. "The Family in Late Antiquity: The Experience of Augustine." *Past and Present,* no. 115 (May 1987): 3–51.

Skutsch, Otto, ed. *The Annals of Q. Ennius.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Stock, Brian. *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge, and the Ethics of Interpretation.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1996.

———. *Augustine's Inner Dialogue: The Philosophical Soliloquy in Late Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Syme, Ronald. *The Roman Revolution.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939.

Thomas, Richard. *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry: The Ethnographical Tradition.* Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society, 1982.

———, ed. *Georgics.* 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

———. "The "Sacrifice" at the End of the *Georgics,* Aristaeus, and Vergilian Closure." *Classical Philology* 86, no. 3 (July 1991): 211–18.

Thomas, Richard F. and Jan M. Ziolkowski, eds. *The Virgil Encyclopedia.* Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd., 2014.

Thurmond, D. L. "Some Roman Slave Collars in *CIL*." *Athenaeum: Studi periodici di letteratura e storia dell'antichita*

Tilly, Bertha, ed. *Varro the Farmer: A Selection from the* Res Rusticae. London: University Tutorial Press, 1973.

Tsagalis, Christos C. "The Poetics of Sorrow: Thetis' Lament in *Iliad* 18.52–64." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, New Series, Vol. 76, no. 1 (2004): 9–32.

Vaught, Carl G. *The Journey toward God in Augustine's* Confessions: *Books I–VI.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.

———. *Encounters with God in Augustine's* Confessions: *Books VII–IX.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004.

———. *Access to God in Augustine's* Confessions: *Books X–XIII.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Vessey, Mark, ed. *A Companion to Augustine.* Chichester: Blackwell Publishing, 2012.

Volk, Katharina, ed. *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Vergil's* Georgics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

West, David and Tony Woodman, eds. *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

White, K.D. *Agricultural Implements of the Roman World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Wiedemann, Thomas. *Greek and Roman Slavery.* London: Routledge, 1981.

———. *Emperors and Gladiators.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Wilkinson, L.P. *The* Georgics *of Virgil: A Critical Survey.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Wissowa, Georg. "Das Prooemium von Vergils *Georgica.*" *Hermes* 52, no. 1 (Jan., 1917): 92–104.