

Proceedings  
of the  
Virgil Society  
1961 - 1962

---



PROCEEDINGS OF THE VIRGIL SOCIETY

1961-62

Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Notice	i
Lecture No.54 "Vergil's Secret Art" by W.F.JACKSON KNIGHT, M.A., F.R.S.L.	1
Lecture No.55 "The Realism of Virgil" by A.E.DOUGLAS, M.A.	15
Lecture No.56 "Virgil and Tacitus" by MISS N.P.MILLER, M.A.	25
Lecture No.57 "Vergil in Exile" by A.J.GOSSAGE, M.A., Ph.D.	35
Obituary (L.A.S.JERMYN)	46

---

(Duplicated and distributed for the Virgil Society by H.W.Walden and Co.,  
18, Station Approach, Clapham Junction, London, S.W.11. - September 1962)



VIRGIL SOCIETY

President (1962/63): Sir John Lockwood, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D.

Hon.Treasurer: D.M.Low, F.R.S.L., 99, Chatsworth Court, London, W.8.

Hon.Secretary: A.J.Gossage, M.A., Ph.D., King's College, Strand, London,  
W.C.2.

NOTICE

The Council of the Virgil Society recently decided that in future the lectures delivered at the Society's London meetings should be published annually in the form of Proceedings. The present volume is the first of its kind to be published by the Society.

Members will appreciate that this is likely to prove an expensive undertaking, which will depend on their full support for its success.

Extra copies of the Proceedings, at 12/6d per volume, or of separate lectures, at 3/6d each, may be purchased from the Hon. Secretary on application.

September 1962



VERGIL'S SECRET ART

The substance of a lecture delivered to The Virgil Society  
on 21st October 1961

by W.F. Jackson Knight, M.A., F.R.S.L.

A warning, as wise as authoritative, has lately been issued. It is our duty, and our delight, to read Vergil. Accordingly, some of the closer examinations of his text, especially some recent arithmetical explorations in which his poetry is shewn to be organized according to exactly corresponding numbers of lines, are not merely tedious but worse: they remove Vergil farther from our poetic enjoyment, and reduce him to a field for statistics.

In face of this, it is clear what would be the worst thing to do. That would be to abandon Vergil the inspired, and inspiring, poet, and to hand his text over to computers. It would be better to ignore the more damaging results of research, and continue as before, reading, enjoying, profiting. But there exist other people, who will not all be content to ignore the less attractive discoveries, all the more because these discoveries are mainly true facts, and can hardly now be disproved. A third way is best, to try to fit the new facts into their place in the whole scheme of Vergil's art. They might thus be cut down to size. It might then be possible to live with them, without excessive distraction from the deeper appreciation of his poetry.

After all, Vergil's achievements and abilities are already recognized to be so vast and so multifarious that no single further discovery concerning his methods should make more than a moderate difference to the general estimate. After a little adjustment, tentative and perhaps not very successful, each new wonder can recede into the whole immense mystery of Vergil, leaving it as, or nearly as, it has always been. "It is a strange peculiarity of Vergil," wrote Macrobius, "that he is invulnerable to criticism and unaffected by praise."

Vergil planned deliberately. It is now well known that the supposed intentions of a poet are by no means the most important question to be asked about him, if not indeed the question which is, of all questions, the least worth asking. Certainly the wind of inspiration bloweth where it listeth. It blew for Vergil. Yet Vergil had his intentions, and his plans, and a method in his inspiration; and much of all this was Vergil's secret, unknown to other people.

His literary biography is known in outline, and is very fairly reliable, since Vergil's own friends collected at least some material about him which was handed on to his ancient commentators and biographers, and has so reached us.<sup>1</sup> There are gaps and uncertainties, especially about dates, but they are

---

1. K. Büchner, P. Vergilius Maro, Der Dichter der Römer, Stuttgart, Druckenmüller, 1955, col.6-17.

not fatal. The information is, I think, ample to show that Vergil, whatever else he may have been, was a real poet, not a mere propagandist.

Modern methods can elicit enough internal evidence, even including style and feeling, to prove that Vergil's supposed early poems in the so-called Vergilian Appendix were not, except for perhaps three or four, written by Vergil.<sup>1</sup> Of these, one is the famous parody of Catullus IV, Catalapton X. Catullus had written a poem in praise of his yacht:

phaselus ille quem videtis hospites  
ait fuisse navium celerrimus

Vergil wrote a parody about the successful career of a mule-driver, "Sabinus", who actually became a consul:

Sabinus ille quem videtis, hospites  
ait fuisse mulio celerrimus

Vergil retained as many of the actual words of Catullus as he could, but changed the others to fit "Sabinus" the muleteer. He was already interested in fitting words together and solving verbal problems.<sup>2</sup> He began with humour, ingenuity, and a love of words. Another early poem, Catalepton V, almost certainly by Vergil, in which he says goodbye to the teachers of rhetoric because he is going to Naples to learn Epicurean science, shews the same propensities. The parody shews something else too. No one can certainly identify the muleteer who became a consul. Vergil already knew how to make his poetry ambiguous. He had begun to acquire what Keats called "negative capability".<sup>3</sup> "That is", wrote Keats, "when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after facts and reason"; Coleridge, he thought, would "let go by a fine isolated verisimilitude caught from the Penetralium (sic) of mystery, from being incapable of remaining content with half-knowledge". W.B. Yeats went further: "The more a poet rids his verses of heterogeneous knowledge and irrelevant analysis, and purifies his mind with elaborate art, the more does the little ritual of the verse resemble the great ritual of Nature, and become mysterious and inscrutable. He (that is, the poet) becomes, as all the great mystics have believed, a vessel of the creative power of God."<sup>4</sup> These ideas fit Vergil well, at least to some extent. Clearly this "negative capability", especially when on a smaller scale, often depends on a dexterous use of single words.

Taken together, these two interests, verbal manipulation and "negative capability", now constitute an important part of Vergil's characteristic style, already discernible, even before he wrote the Eclogues.

---

1. Ib. 41-160.

2. E.Fraenkel (Atti e Memorie della reale Accademia Virgiliana di Scienze, Lettere et Arti di Mantova, N.S. xix-xx, 1926-7, 217-27) well emphasizes the importance of the parody as an exercise for Vergil.

3. Rosamund E.Harding, An Anatomy of Inspiration, Heffer, Cambridge, 1946, p.71.

4. Ibid.

In his early years Vergil is said, no doubt truly, to have been interested in many subjects, as poets usually are, and including mathematics. He certainly had the good poet's ability to amass knowledge. His passionate love for his family, his home, the countryside of Italy near and far, and the old history of Roman glory, is not in doubt. He was soon planning his future poetry; and already he knew that he had to work his words hard, and make the reader do his part. At some time, but perhaps not quite yet, Vergil understood his own genius, and made his secret plans.

Presently he read the Greek pastoral poems of Theocritus and others. He was swept away by their music, as we are credibly told. From now on the music of words is so central to his art that it may even be paramount, and from now on Vergil's poetic method is determined. The purpose here is to try to see how Vergil can possibly have contrived so intricate an art as he did contrive. The Idylls and the Eclogues begin to shew Vergil's plan.

He was joining, of course, the world of the Greek Hellenistic poets, and their adherents the Latin "moderns", *neoterici*, who were producing free translations of Greek originals. Catullus freely translated Callimachus. Romans had been freely translating Greek poets for two hundred years. Free translation from the Greek can be found in Vergil. But so far as I know it is confined to small units of poetry, a line or two or less than a line, and is always part of a longer but not necessarily very long passage which is not merely a translation but much more than that.

The Idylls and the Eclogues provided Vergil with nearly all the main principles of his procedure, and started him on his characteristic coordination of hard thinking and inspiration. He now learnt, first, word-music, and then that balance of form in thought and expression which is central to pastoral poetry, in which characteristically one goatherd speaks or sings and another answers him. This addiction to balances pervades Vergil. He balances ideas, and, helped by Sallust, who was one of Vergil's more important teachers in the condensed use of Latin, carries the process so far that he regularly contrives to let two different and even contrasting meanings reside together in a single phrase or even a single word - as when he lets a word which he coined himself, "insomnia" (Aeneid IV 9), neuter plural, mean both sleeplessness, "insomnia" feminine singular, and dreams, "somnia", neuter plural. On the way to this extreme is the very important step taken when he did not translate Theocritus but blended two or more Idylls together. All the time he was helped by what he knew already, how to fit words together ingeniously, and also how to leave obscurities and ambiguities in his finished poetry. Surely all this, especially the care to avoid direct translation and to blend elements into something new, is based on conscious intention. It is deliberate policy. It seems also to be Vergil's own secret. Even Horace hardly understood it. He believed in putting words together ingeniously, "callida iunctura". But he thought that to mix different stories together was like blending Chian and Falernian wine together - something which perhaps some people could do, but not a practice to be recommended except in a last resort. Possibly Propertius might have understood: but he, like the others, presents a Sibyl who is a single, known, Sibyl, whereas Vergil makes his Sibyl a blend of several known Sibyls.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. J.H. Waszink, Vergil and the Sibyl of Cumae, *Mnemosyne*, Ser. IV, 1, i, 1948, 43-58.

Vergil consciously realized that, as André Gide wrote, "The whole problem lies just in that - how to express the general by the particular - how to make the particular express the general"<sup>1</sup>.

Vergil would have agreed with Coleridge's well-known requirement. Coleridge said that "the secondary or poetic imagination dissolves in order to recreate". But Vergil seems generally to begin with an exact combination of not less than two existing elements. The death of Priam is a simple example. One old Greek epic said that Neoptolemus, or Pyrrhus, dragged Priam from the altar to kill him. Another said that he killed Priam actually on the altar. Vergil as usual made these sources modify each other. He kept "altar" and kept "drag". But he made Pyrrhus drag Priam to, not from, the altar, and kill him there. There is a yet greater horror, and Vergil was also enabled to gain other poetic effects by the change. Goethe is said to have maintained that a poet ought to accept as much as possible from his sources, and alter everything so accepted, but always with the slightest possible alterations. It is strange how modern poetic theory fits Vergil so much better than most of the ancient beliefs about poetry. Vergil was an inventor.

But there were still more suggestions in Greek pastoral poems which Vergil could use. There was allegory, not very much of it but enough to shew that in a pastoral poem a countryman, a goatherd or another, could be made to represent some real person, perhaps a living poet. Obviously this suited Vergil. But he did not abandon his "negative capability" and his ambiguity. That is why there is so little agreement among those who try to identify the characters in the Eclogues with real people, poets or politicians especially; it has even been argued with exact learning and much intellectual power that Galatea is Sextus Pompeius and Amaryllis Marcus Antonius.<sup>2</sup> There is always at least some ancient evidence on which these identifications can be based. It still seems most probable that, as Servius thought, Vergil does not use allegory, but only suggestions emerging from partial similarities, with no exact equivalences. Vergil may even have hoped that several different schemes of suggestion would "shimmer through" - E.K. Rand's brilliant phrase -, leaving the choice to the reader. Certainly Tityrus and his mission in the First Eclogue appear as a blend of two distinct characters in two different situations. This example is simple. Less simple is the Fourth Eclogue, itself a combination of two poems of different kinds, where two or more schemes for the ages of man (of which at least one, Hesiod's, is inverted) are combined, and where a great number of identifications for the baby are possible. Here "negative capability" is so powerfully used that it is actually legitimate to identify the baby as the Messiah: such, by nature and design, is Vergil's art. Had Vergil - in Yeats's words - "become a vessel of the creative power of God?"

Vergil's set plan of combination, especially condensed combination, and of ambiguity with "negative capability", runs all through his work on all scales. It appears in single words, in the Eclogues and after, as when "depellere", of lambs, is "wean" or "drive down" - whereas "drive up" would have been expected in the context - and "insere", might be either "plant" or "graft". Vergil regularly chose words for this very reason.

If characters in the Eclogues, though not strictly allegorical, can suggest

---

1. I owe this quotation to Professor John H.J. Savage, Transactions of the American Philological Association xci, 1960, p.364, note 14.  
2. J.H.J. Savage, TAPA lxxxix, 1958, pp.151ff.; cf. ib., xci, 1960, pp.355ff.

real, living poets and politicians, and, quite legitimately, different people to different readers, there may still be much more to find in the Eclogues. They may be poems about poets and poetry. They can also be about human life and the wide world. It is gratifying to think, and likely enough, that the Sixth Eclogue is actually about the history of civilization and its phases.<sup>1</sup> There may be many simultaneous meanings in Vergil. And he certainly may have used even more technical methods of formal construction than had been discovered in his text before about a generation ago.

Patterns of structure in hexameter poetry, when a unitary passage of a certain number of lines is followed, immediately or after an interval, by another passage of exactly equal length, or of a proportionate length according to a fixed formula of proportion, were not invented by Vergil. They are not unknown in Homer, Apollonius Rhodius, and Catullus. They are often associated, of course, with "emboxing", when two passages of equal length about the same subject are separated by another passage about another subject, which may, itself too, be so divided. The practice is also recognized in Beowulf<sup>2</sup> and ancient Indian epic.<sup>3</sup> According to the most thorough examinations Vergil operated this method in the Eclogues very elaborately indeed.<sup>4</sup>

In deciding how long his paragraphs or line-blocks should be he certainly followed, often exactly but sometimes approximately, the "Golden Ratio", the ratio of 1:0.618. The application, that is, the exact numbers of the lines of course, varies: 13:8 (really 8.034) is frequent.

These balances by numbers of lines occur also in the Georgics and the Aeneid. They were first noticed in the First Georgics, where it was observed that the lines given to "Works" (Georgics I 43-203) are in "golden ratio" to the lines given to the "Days" (Georgics I 204-263).

There are also balances according to subject. Eight of the Eclogues stand in a returning symmetry about Eclogue V, which is itself outside the scheme, and is paired with Eclogue X; V is about a shepherd who has become a god and X about a friend who has become a shepherd: meanwhile, I and IX are about country life and the confiscation of a farm, II and VIII about love, III and VII about music and a singing match, IV and VI about important religious and philosophical subjects, IV being about the future and VI about the past. There are other schemes: for example, I, II and III correspond in subject to VII, VIII and IX respectively; all these are realistic, contrasting with IV, V and VI which are about gods and contain fantasy; and X, sharing the characteristics of all, reconciles the central group with the other two.

The Georgics have similar balances: I and III end gloomily, II and IV hopefully; the messages they give are I War II Peace III Death and IV Resurrection. Georgics I and II are about the less animated growths of vegetation, and

- 
1. Colin Hardie, Eclogue VI (V.S. Lecture Summaries, No.50).
  2. I wish to thank Mr.E.A.Slade for this information.
  3. I wish to thank Professor R. Murray Smith for this information.
  4. George E.Duckworth, Mathematical Symmetry in Vergil, TAPA xci, 1961, 185-220, with references. J.Perret, Virgil l'homme et l'oeuvre, Paris, Boivin, 1952, 14-29; 59-71, with references.

III and IV about the more animated creatures, the animals, birds and insects. Georgics I and II have long prefaces, III and IV short; I 231-253 give the geography of the sky and III 339-383 give the geography of Libya and Scythia; I 125-146 describes the labour of a farmer and IV 125-146 the labour of an old gardener; and I 2 and IV 2 mention Maecenas, and so do II 41 and III 41.

In the Georgics, then, some symmetries and balances have been firmly identified. Sometimes the track vanishes, as if there may well be more to find, when the right place to look is discovered. The Aeneid, naturally, has still more possibilities. It is being well explored, and results are already far-reaching, but it is too soon to write shortly about them. Nor is it prudent to write shortly about the now famous identification of themes and their resumptions in the Aeneid.<sup>1</sup>

Balance and symmetry belong to the arts. In some works, and most obviously in large musical works, there is a vast and various mathematical structure. In large poetic works a comparable structure should not cause surprise. It is present in T.S.Eliot's Four Quartets. But in poetry the underlying mathematics are harder to detect. They can yet contribute to aesthetic effect, even on readers unaware of them. Vergil especially, as Yeats advised, "purified his mind with elaborate art".

Such elaborate art must certainly involve conscious planning and calculation. Vergil positively decided to blend his sources, on a large scale and on a small, down to the scale of single words and even parts of words. He decided to condense his language down to an explosive compression. He deliberately adjusted his poetry to permit obscurities and ambiguities, leaving his readers to furnish themselves with precise meanings; and some of them were so expressive, and seemed so concrete, that they have been explained as allegorical. Further, Vergil planned his poems to allow an exactly balancing number of lines for unitary passages, arranging the answering line-groups in complex variety. He also had regard to the position of the word-accent in his lines, especially in the fourth foot of each hexameter, a technique apparently harmonizing with the general scheme for lines in numerical equivalence or other fixed proportion. He arranged poems and books to stand in a sequence patterned according to subjects, or themes, balancing and contrasting.

In all this patterning there seems little room, so far, for anything besides the method of conscious head-work, despised by Goethe and not admitted as even a possible method for true poetry by Plato in the *Ion*, total inspiration being essential. Ennius was more Platonic: he notoriously owed his poetry to sleep, and drink, obviously his way to inspiration. Poets certainly differ in their methods. But meanwhile Vergil, strange though it may be to recall in this context, is especially famous for the inspired kind of poetic creation. He "stepped into the stream of rhythm and harmony" as Plato would have wished. The dominance of his "auditory imagination" has been elaborately established. Even the highly patterned Eclogues grew from a passionate love for the word-music of Greek pastoral, enjoyed, no doubt, in what Schiller called "a musical mood", the first stage of oncoming inspiration for him. There are signs of this kind of mood in the many oddities of language in the Eclogues, where Vergil seems to have been too dreamy even for grammar or at least correct Latin.

---

1. V.Pöschl, Die Dichtkunst Virgils, Innsbruck & Vienna, Rohrer, 1950.

Schiller's second phase of inspiration is a vision of "picture-sparks". Perhaps they too intervened before Vergil returned to the highly rational adjustments which his poetry, especially, needed.

It is recorded that when he was writing the Georgics he used to deliver every morning "a great number of lines", and spend the rest of the day "licking them into shape", till he was left with a few, highly polished. In this he was perhaps like Milton, who also dictated poetry in the morning, having on the previous evening read some "choice poets", either for recreation or "to store his fancy against the morning", as his nephew, John Phillips, records.

That Vergil, like Coleridge and many more, composed poetry in "the deep well of unconscious cerebration" by the recombination of "hooked atoms of thought" has been argued persuasively. Some of his poetry came out, like Coleridge's *Kubla Khan*, without "going through" his "head at all", to use Noel Essex's description of her own poetic process. The problem was not how to create the poetry, but how to draw out into consciousness poetry already made but still in the unconscious mind. This is exactly the theme of the famous anecdote about the half-line "Misenum Aeoliden" (*Aeneid* VI 164) and how Vergil completed it with two successive flashes of insight while his secretary was reading the book to him. Vergil, surely, was like Coleridge, Milton, and also Ennius, but without the drink. He had no lack of sheer inspiration, if that is a fair term for poetry made by "the secondary imagination" "dissolving and recreating" material existing in the unconscious mind.

Vergil himself understood his own imagination, and applied conscious thought to his unconscious mental processes. That was an important part of his secret. His composition was, therefore, in stages. He first observed, and read. Secondly, he allowed his unconscious mind to work on its store of material. Thirdly, he dictated and corrected the poetry which came into his consciousness. The problem is to discover which parts of the work were done at each of the stages.

When Vergil was writing the *Aeneid*, he first prepared a prose version. Racine wrote a prose version of at least one of his plays. Alfieri regularly wrote a prose version: his stages were "ideare, stendere, verseggiare".<sup>1</sup> For his other works Vergil may or may not have first written prose: perhaps he wrote a little prose, sometimes, as W.B. Yeats did; and perhaps he kept long notes, from the books he read. Some operations clearly belong to a prose version or notes. Among them is the deliberate plan which Vergil made for the *Aeneid*. It was to be "a structure of great and heterogeneous complexity, including both Greek and Roman names and subjects, and designed to express both the legendary facts of early history and also the history of Augustus and his family". Vergil was now to operate, on a very large scale, exactly the same principles of combination, compression and multiple significance on which he had decided when writing the *Eclogues*. The whole scheme of the *Aeneid* works on the same principle as Vergil's invented word "insomnia". And it must have been consciously devised, often with the help of prose.

However, there are signs of versified preliminary work in the *Georgics*, where some passages (*Georgics* II 346-50, 350-53) appear to be short indications

---

1. I wish to thank Dr. P. J. Yarrow for this information.

of longer passages in Theophrastus.<sup>1</sup> Each is a kind of heading. Vergil intended to expand these headings, so covering in his own way the material in Theophrastus. This material had probably been consigned to the unconscious mind for dissolution and recreation. If these observations are correct, they suggest that Vergil sometimes wrote preliminary notes in verse.

On the whole Vergil seems to have planned all his outlines and at least his larger structures in a mood of conscious thinking. There was so much of this to do that he may have found the task of fixing exactly corresponding numbers of lines for balanced passages only one more task, and a task to him not unbearably arduous. He is already known to have matched lines with lines and passages with passages by his distribution of word accent, in coincidence with metrical ictus, in the fourth foot of his verse, "fourth-foot homodyne".<sup>2</sup> And now this patterning apparently harmonizes with the patterning by numbers of lines, a later discovery. The accentual symmetries had seemed spontaneous and unconscious. They now appear to be more conscious work, though no doubt liable, as is all conscious work, to sudden assistance from the unconscious. Here there are examples of a technique which must have been deliberate, and of another too, which, apart from this separate evidence, might have been spontaneous and not consciously willed.

How Vergil planned the Aeneid, and composed it by the careful direction of his own exceptional powers, is a problem both complex and subtle. He may have made elaborate notes with long extracts from books read, and the prose draft may have been long and full. Many lines may have been contrived by ingenious jigsaw-manipulation. Many delicate meanings may have been calculated thoughtfully. But the greatest passages do not look like this. They are surely discharged in a stream of inspiration. Quite evidently the sources are forgotten, and it is a re-creation, based on elements from them, which is present. They are sensuous, not intellectual; they are determined not by thought but by sound, and dominated by Vergil's "auditory imagination". Vergil knew that they would be, and prepared.

The more his preparation is understood, the more astounding it is. For his Dido, he may well have copied out earlier poetry concerning Ajax, Ariadne, Heracles, Medea, Nausicaa and even Dido herself, next learnt it by heart, and then slept on it, allowing his unconscious mind to dissolve the material and re-create it in a new combination, now becoming great poetry, and indeed depth poetry. This he may have dictated, after sleep, on each next morning, and then corrected. He must have known that Ennius drew his poetry from sleep, as Keats, very explicitly, did. General experience, however, suggests that more time is needed for gestation. Between the collection of the material and the dictation of the poetry five, ten or more years may normally have elapsed. But reading, on the evening before composition, could still be valuable for "working up" - Blake's phrase - "the vision".

The sources for Dido converge on Dido. This is normal. So is divergence. Sources are dislocated and dissolved; and their elements are redistributed. Convergence and divergence are complementary. Thus Vergil, most consciously aware of the law which he had created and accepted, broke up the Cassandra of the old Greek epic. He transferred elements from her to Laocoon, to Dido, to the

---

1. I wish to thank Mr.L.A.S. Jermyn for this suggestion: perhaps I may here express profound gratitude for his other kindnesses, especially his selfless service to the Virgil Society.

2. W.F.Jackson Knight, Accentual Symmetry in Vergil, Oxford, Blackwell, 1939 (re-issued 1950 and 1962).

Sibyl, to Helen in his sixth book, and to Amata. This is so tidy and economical that it looks deliberate. But dream-poetry, direct from the unconscious, can be tidy and economical too. Coleridge's Kubla Khan, certainly produced in sleep, is very tidy and economical, and very much compressed also.

Here and elsewhere a certain dream-association, or some sense of allure-ment linking memories together, some mysterious poetic attraction, perhaps, may have exercised an appeal at a very early stage in the process.<sup>1</sup> There is an astonishing example in some place-names intricately used by Vergil in his account of the beginning of the war in Latium. Two Latin heroes are killed, Almo and Galaesus (Aeneid VII 531-9). Both were at first rivers, the Almo near Rome and connected with Cybele, and the Galaesus flowing into the gulf of Tarentum, a place which interested Vergil when writing the Georgics. Soon after Vergil mentions another hero, also on the side of the Latins, Oebalus, son of Sebethis, nymph of the small river Sebethus which flows into the sea near Naples (Aeneid VII 733-6). Oebalus was also the name of a Spartan king, said to have been the founder of Tarentum, called by Vergil "Oebalian" in the Georgics, just before the mention of the river Galaesus there (Georgics IV 125-9).

The proposal is that Vergil associated these names together, perhaps quite early in his career. He had certainly seen all the three rivers before he wrote the Aeneid. At some unknown time a reason for the artistic association of the names occurred to Vergil. All the three localities were important in the Second Punic War, and associated with Hannibal. So Vergil, in recounting the war between Aeneas and the Latins, contrived to suggest also allusions to the Second Punic War, the war with Hannibal.

Now the Spartan King Oebalus was the father of Tyndareus by a water-nymph Bateia. Tyndareus was father of Helen. Bateia was also the name of Teucer's daughter. Teucer was a king of Troy, and by his daughter Bateia, whom Dardanus married, became the ancestor both of Paris and Aeneas, so helping Vergil to make the war in Italy fought by Aeneas parallel not only to the Second Punic War but also to the Trojan War itself. It is a kind of literary counterpoint.

Such is a small, uncertain, glimpse of an astonishing part of Vergil's secret art. He let his very complex structure arise not mechanically but organically. At certain stages there are unconscious associations, offering possibilities. These possibilities Vergil pursued with a keen sense of the relevant and an economy which forgot nothing. The result is like the veins on a leaf, but to say this is superficial, for the comparison needs many leaves, interpenetrating.

Meanwhile the movement is also a chain-reaction. Teucer's Bateia is the Myrine whose tomb was outside Troy; in Homer Aeneas leads Trojan forces past it on one side and Ascanius leads Phrygian forces past it on the other side (Homer, Iliad ii, 811-815, 819-821, 826-863). Vergil calls the place an ancient mound of Ceres, and it is used not for dividing a marching army but as a meeting-point for the refugees escaping from Troy (Aeneid II 713-6). The

---

1. The following paragraphs are based on Robert W. Cruttwell, Virgil's Mind at Work, Oxford, Blackwell, 1946.

smaller technique of variation continues. The genealogies are of course continually exploited. Aeneas arrived at the mound with his Penates, and Vergil calls them here "Teucrican Penates". Now Dardanus had a brother Iasus, Iasius, or Iasion. Both were born at Cortona in Italy. Dardanus married Bateaia at Troy. Iasius lay with Demeter-Ceres "in a furrow", according to some authorities in Crete. Their son was Plutus, "Wealth". Now Dionysius of Halicarnassus has a story that certain gods appeared to Aeneas in Italy, encouraging him. Vergil transferred the incident to Crete, where the Trojans landed by mistake. And he linked it with the tradition of Iasius. He combined the obscure gods who appeared to Aeneas in Italy with the Plutus who was the son of Iasius and Demeter-Ceres, and neatly turned them into the Penates, Teucrican and Roman. They speak to Aeneas, telling him to go to Italy, birthplace of Dardanus and their own father, Iasius (Aeneid III 147-171). The Aeneid grows like an oak from an acorn, according to the intricate and peremptory laws of its growth.

It is recorded that when Vergil could not solve a problem and create a good line he would write a temporary line, a "pitprop", "so that nothing might delay the onrush" of the poetry. Clearly, then, Vergil produced poetry in a spontaneous, rapid stream. The Romans used to ask whether poets were born or made, whether poets wrote "by nature" or "by skill", "poeta nascitur an fit?", "natura scribit (poeta) an arte?" Vergil characteristically reconciled the two functions, and directed his own inspiration. He was not content with the precepts of either Plato or Horace alone, or the practice of either Ennius or Catullus. He used both.

Longinus called Theocritus "the most felicitous of poets". Vergil could equal him in felicity but not all the time. His method of intense compression of meaning involved risk. Some years ago a distinguished scholar argued that Ovid's clear and precise poetry is the right sort, but Vergil's is the wrong sort, being less precise in outline and sometimes obscure. It is more likely that Vergil was simply doing something harder, and succeeding nearly always, but not quite always. He was not, as Longinus called Apollonius Rhodius, "dead safe". Longinus adds "But who would not rather be Homer?" We could add, "Or Vergil?"

Vergil's ardour for compression - "ut verba in compendium cogeret" says Servius - evoked the strictures of Gellius, or his character, the redoubtable Favorinus. To describe Etna, Vergil (Aeneid III 570-577) used Pindar's description (Pythian I 40-50), and, according to the accusation, made nonsense of it. Vergil, though famed for his incomparable elegance - this is conceded - has left many unpolished lines which are quite unworthy of him. The lines on Etna, says Favorinus, are the worst of all. Indeed, Vergil has hardly even begun to compose them. Pindar is luxuriant enough; Vergil is unbearably inflated. Pindar at least keeps to fact, and says that Etna emits smoke in the day-time and flames at night. But Vergil, being too busy looking for words noisy enough to satisfy him - a blow for "auditory imagination" - positively confused day and night together. Pindar's snake-like streams of lava are correct. Vergil's "black cloud smoking with a cyclone of pitch and white-hot ash" is just not in the scheme of things. What is white-hot cannot smoke, neither can it be black. Favorinus thinks that the best defence would be to accuse Vergil of a vulgar error in supposing "white-hot" to mean no more than "hot". When we come to

Vergil's "stones and rocks hoisted aloft", and then "melting, groaning, and crowding together in the sky", our experience as readers is infinitely more fantastic than any that the Trojans could have undergone on the spot. Gellius - or Favorinus - is very stern.

From a modern standpoint Vergil is easily defended. He was inventing a new kind of poetry, with richer meanings, closer reasoning, the effects of atmosphere, and a certain surrealistic impact. Ways are opened to metaphor, ambiguity, and "negative capability". Vergil behaved like Picasso, when Picasso shews together two things which in nature cannot be seen together, or develops Velasquez' portrait of Philip II to make his own version. Vergil of course did not copy Pindar. He used him to detonate his own imagination. As a painter, having seen an actual landscape, does not copy it but creates a poem in paint about the landscape which he has seen, so Vergil created his poetry partly as poetry about the poetry of the past. According to Goethe the best things in any work of art are what are taken over from tradition. Vergil found the right way to take them.

There is a view, held by Sir Joshua Reynolds, that artists must examine the great works of the past if they are to create good works themselves. Vergil made much use of earlier passages which are by no means great. He found many in Apollonius.

When Jason and Medea get married in a Cave of the Nymphs there is nothing mysterious.<sup>1</sup> Everything is clear and rational, a plain attractive narrative.

The comparison with Vergil is important:

speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eundem  
deveniunt. prima et Tellus et pronuba Iuno  
dant signum. fulsere ignes et conscius aether  
conubiis, summoque ulularunt vertice Nymphae

(Aeneid IV 165-8).

The Nymphs are obscurely remote: yet originally it was in their cave that the wedding took place. There is plenty more to notice, especially in what Vergil carefully does not say, and in his order of ideas. Several of Vergil's great and numinous passages make use of some very plain narratives in Apollonius.

Comparisons with Apollonius often illustrate Vergil's secret methods of thought and of choice. There are good examples in, and behind, the famous insomnia,

Anna soror, quae me suspensam insomnia terrent?

(Aeneid IV 9).

The complicated subtlety here was developed from some long, expansive expressions in Apollonius. After a description of all the rest of the world asleep (Argonautica III 744-50), Apollonius writes,<sup>2</sup> "In her yearning for Jason, fretful cares kept her (Medea) awake" (III 752). There is also: "Meanwhile the maiden lay on her bed, fast asleep, with all her cares forgotten. But not for long.

---

1. For this comparison with Apollonius Rhodius I acknowledge the help of Mr. Preshous and his thesis on the subject, which I hope will be published soon. (J.D.M. Preshous, The Sources of Vergil's Aeneid with special reference to Apollonius Rhodius, Bristol University Thesis, 1960).

2. I gratefully use Dr. E.V. Rieu's Penguin Translation.

Dreams assailed her deceitful dreams, the nightmares of a soul in pain" (III 616-18). There is, too, Medea's speech on awakening: "Chalciope, I am terrified for your sons. I am afraid that Father will destroy them out of hand, strangers and all. I had a little sleep just now, and in a nightmare that is what I saw" (III 688-91). If Vergil's line is rightly translated and understood, he is seen to have expressed in five words many lines of Apollonius, and added, by his peculiar art, a suggestive mystery which allows the reader to imagine far more, even, than can be found in the prolix Apollonius. A characteristic stroke of genius, in substituting a question for a statement, greatly helped. Besides the compression, that is, the convergence, there is as usual divergence. The thought "fast asleep with all her cares forgotten" (III 616 with 744-756) is transferred by Vergil to his picture of all the world, men and animals, asleep, but not Dido, and joined to a much altered version of the description in Apollonius of the sleeping world (Argonautica III 744-750: Aeneid IV 522-32). "Brevis esse laboro, obscurus fio" said Horace. Vergil, with his queer taste for paradox, discovered that he liked, and could use, obscurity. Medea in Apollonius could not keep her mind off Jason: "The whole scene was still before her eyes - how Jason looked, the clothes he wore, the things he said, the way he sat on his chair, and how he walked to the door. It seemed to her, as she reviewed these images, that there was nobody like Jason. His voice, and the honey-sweet words that he had used, still rang in her ears" (Argonautica III, 453-8). Vergil has

multa viri virtus animo multusque recursat  
gentis honos: haerent infixi pectore voltus  
verbaque nec placidam membris dat cura quietem.

(Aeneid IV 3-5)

and

quis novus hic nostris successit sedibus hospes,  
quem sese ore ferens, quam forti pectore et armis!

(Aeneid IV 10-11)

Again a question saves space and adds mystery. This time a great deal of Apollonius is suppressed: Vergil saw how prosaic all this literal detail was, and ignored it, as in the second Aeneid he reduced a long, dreary list of multifarious killing, which he found, apparently, in some old Greek poem on the sack of Troy, to

crudelis ubique  
luctus, ubique pavor, et plurima mortis imago

(Aeneid II 368-9).

These examples should be added to countless verbal usages, mainly metaphorical and resulting from combination and compression, such as "caeso sanguine", "blood from slain victims" (Aeneid XI 82), "tela exit", "avoids the weapons" (Aeneid V 438), and "occumbere morti", "meet death" (Aeneid II 62), a mixture of Ennius "morti occumbant obviam" (Enn. Sc. 135-6 Vahlen<sup>3</sup>) and "occumbunt multi letum ferroque lapique" (Enn. Ann. 395 Vahlen<sup>3</sup>).

Taken together, this material may be allowed to suggest how Vergil thought. He knew his own mind and his own laws for working. He read generally, and he read specifically. Particularly he read, for the poetry concerning Dido, the Argonautica of Apollonius. He or a secretary may have copied out many lines

of this poem as notes. Now the effect of the material from Apollonius is not only decorative; it is also structural. Therefore it must have been used already for Vergil's prose draft. It has been truly said that without Apollonius the Aeneid would have been entirely different.

It was mainly when Vergil turned his prose into verse that he effected his smaller combinations and compressions. Excision and abbreviation are characteristic of "head-work". Long gestation gave him a stream of verse each morning. Unconscious cerebration and memory had already adapted the source-material to fit - approximately - the new story, or the new form of the story. But compression, explosive power, and "elegance", as Gellius would say, were not perfect. It was principally while "licking his rough lines into shape" that the omissions, the abbreviations, and the compression were achieved, as Vergil said the lines over, aloud, to see what would come.

He always liked compression. But it is now known that he was subject to a further influence, which could have enforced it - the need to organize the parts of his work by "the golden ratio" in the number of their lines. Perhaps even this heavy additional burden was, to Vergil's enormous intellectual power, tolerable enough. To us, if it helped him to perfect his incomparably thoughtful style, it is a blessing.

There exists a very good short edition of the Fourth Aeneid with a commentary which almost or quite ignores the relation of Vergil to Apollonius. Certainly, Vergil had to depend on sources. But a reader may well ignore his dependence on them and treat other matters as so important that the interest of smaller-scale technique fades. The Dido whom Vergil created with such immense toil is eloquent, however little that toil is remembered. Like Allecto, Dido carries profound meaning for the nature and history of mankind.

Dido is a Graeco-Roman heroine, but still more she is, and had been, a Phoenician goddess, Anat-Elishat, her two names providing both Dido's other name Elissa and the name of Dido's sister, Anna.<sup>1</sup> Now in early times goddesses, not gods, had been dominant in Mediterranean lands. But, through the arrival of migrating peoples of Indo-European speech, gods everywhere prevailed over goddesses - everywhere except at Carthage. Carthage, therefore, represents an older order. It is supported by Juno the Roman goddess who is especially a goddess of women. Against Carthage and against Juno Rome and the Roman Jupiter must prevail.

There is surely some truth in the view advanced by Erich Neumann that rituals of initiation have as part of their intention the purpose of enlivening the progressive, masculine element in societies and preventing this from relapsing into a more static condition, the matrix of the feminine.<sup>2</sup> If such was the purpose, that is sufficient here. The purpose need not have been well conceived. Perhaps the feminine element is unjustly maligned as an influence for mere stability. Socrates thought it the source of prophecy. But the symbol existed; and is mightily used by Vergil. Rome has to go forward, and "pass the whole earth under laws",

totum sub leges mitteret orbem (Aeneid I 231)

- 
1. E. Paratore, Nuove interpretazioni del Mito di Didone, Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni, xxvi, 1955, 71-82; cf. G.C. Picard, Les religions de l'Afrique antique, Paris 1954, 26-55.
  2. E. Neumann, The Origins and History of Consciousness, Pantheon Books, New York, 1954, pp. 126, 140ff., etc.

Instinct and passion are not enough; clear judgment and will and cerebral control must lead. Vergil could have told the story without Dido. Others did. Or he might, with others again, have made Dido a heroine not of passion but of self-sacrifice. But he preferred to serve the deepest truth. Even then, the end is in, not victory, but reconciliation.

Perhaps we cannot see very clearly into the secrets of Vergil, his lonely art, which made him unique, the one and only Vergil whose power reaches always farther, and always, however his readers and their times may differ, prevails. The result of elaborate effort is often a simple enjoyment. There is a good poem, not pretentious, not often quoted, but well worth quoting, by Hal Summers, entitled Epitaph on a Schoolmaster:

It is an old schoolmaster  
Who ruled when we were young,  
Rolling the heavy-ended Latin  
Along his iron tongue.

From him the grammar came as smooth  
As a ploughshare in the clay,  
In the little farm of learning  
He tilled, day after day.

But there were certain flowers he passed  
Which seemed for ever new:  
Virgil, honour this ghost;  
He honoured you.

---

I am deeply grateful to the Council, Officers and Members of the Virgil Society for their great kindness to me and the honour they confer in inviting, and now publishing, this lecture.

THE REALISM OF VIRGIL

A paper read to the Virgil Society on  
18th November 1961

by A.E.Douglas, M.A.

I begin on very familiar ground. For perhaps a century or more, the status of the Aeneid as an unquestioned masterpiece has been frequently and energetically challenged. It is equally true that the Aeneid and, in particular, its problematical hero, Aeneas, have been vigorously and eloquently defended, more especially perhaps in recent years, and not least by some of those who have addressed this Society. I believe it to be true that disputants on both sides, though more frequently the hostile than the favourable critics, have tended to give inadequate emphasis to an aspect of Virgil's art which provides a clue with which we may extricate ourselves from some of the mazes of Virgilian criticism. The clue is a very simple one, but it is often ignored or at most only hinted at rather than fully stated and developed. But before I come to it, I should like to set out briefly the problems.

We may start with the view that what is wrong with the Aeneid is that it is after all a political poem, and that politics is not a fit subject for poetry. Rome and Augustus, however skilfully the pill be sugared with a coating of mythology and grandeur of style, could not provide the theme for a successful epic. To these broad generalizations it is not hard to find an answer, and the simplest answer to this basically romantic preconception about the proper subjects of poetry is an appeal to the practice of poets through the ages.

It is not so much, we shall be told, the mere fact that the Aeneid has a political content that causes offence. The weaknesses of the poem are the result of its being a product of political patronage of literature in a despotic society. Poetry produced to order cannot be as good as the poetry which is the product of unfettered inspiration. Here certain questions are begged about the relationship of the Augustan poets to Augustus and Maecenas, but even if we accept the view of that patronage here implied, it is perfectly possible to question with supporting evidence, say our own Elizabethan poets, the again romantically-inspired generalization on which the argument rests. But we are not yet out of the wood. 'We grant,' it may be said, 'that political achievements, and those of Rome and Augustus in particular, are fit subjects for poetry, that patronage may encourage, not stifle, inspiration: but in the end the Aeneid won't do because Virgil was the wrong man for this particular job. Virgil's very breadth of sympathies, and in particular his affection for the small and helpless, the defeated and the underdog, make him the most unsuitable poet imaginable to hymn the praises of the victorious and successful'. As Cicero said, intus intus inquam est equus Troianus. For this view has been stated with all the authority and eloquence of a past President of this Society, in a paper delivered in 1951.

Now let us turn to some more particular points. Point one: Dido. One may simply feel that Aeneas' desertion of Dido won't do, and there's an end of the matter. However, resourceful defenders of Aeneas' behaviour are not lacking.

The first line of defence is in essence that Aeneas and Dido are not human beings but symbols. Aeneas is the embodiment of Rome and Augustus, and a Stoic sapiens, to boot. Who is Dido? She is Carthage and Hannibal, she is Cleopatra, and she has more than a touch of the barbarian witch of Greek legend, Medea. If we are upset by Dido's fate, it is in sum our historical sense which is at fault. And we shall never get far with Virgil until we realise that pietas has little to do with either piety or pity as we moderns understand the terms.

But in reply to all this I shall make no appeal to an imaginary objector, for I myself feel most strongly that this line of defence will not hold. Surely such defences for all their elements of truth make of the Aeneid little more than an historical curiosity, and it is not as an historical curiosity but as a great poem that the Aeneid still retains its power. We are under no sort of obligation that I can see to admire Aeneas because he is a Stoic hero, if Stoicism entails behaving as Aeneas does to Dido. Equally Dido is for us Dido, queen and woman, not that strange compound of which I just spoke. If she is what she is for us, and she was something fundamentally different for Virgil and his contemporaries, the Aeneid becomes, as I have said, more a field for antiquarian study than a still living masterpiece.

I sympathize more with the approach which leaves antiquarianism on one side and points to the evidence of Aeneas' humanity. He behaves to Dido as he does because he is not perfect, and is still only dimly aware of his responsibility and his mission. Divine admonition is needed before pietas, the sense of where his real duty lies, triumphs over his own feelings.

But - with Dido there is always a 'but' - granted that the break was inevitable and right, need it have happened as Virgil depicts it? Let us leave Dido for the moment, and turn to other aspects of Aeneas' character and actions. The view that Aeneas fails as an epic hero because he could, in the poet's intention, do no wrong, but in fact constantly affronts us by his behaviour, has been effectively countered up to a point by the picture of the Aeneas of the first six books as a character developing and learning by experience. Less attention has been paid to the Aeneas of the second half of the poem, yet here too a battle has raged, not only violent but also confused. A paper read by Dr. Lockwood to this Society some years ago enhanced our understanding of Aeneas' own view of the events in which he takes part. But Professor Dudley in his 'Plea for Aeneas' here abandons his brief: the Aeneas of Books vii-xii is infallible and therefore 'as dull as a batsman who cannot be bowled'. Yet in 1951 Professor Maguinness subjected this 'infallible' Aeneas to close criticism from which Aeneas emerges with little credit. From the moment he lands on the Tiber, he puts not a foot right. While offering peace, he fortifies his position. War breaks out, because Ascanius wounds Silvia's pet deer, and Aeneas does shamefully little to prevent this trivial incident leading to major hostilities. And so forth. While we are looking at these last six books, we may refer to Mr. Dale's strictures on the conduct of the two heroes of Book ix, Nisus and Euryalus. In pursuing useless slaughter and plunder instead of their proper mission

they are guilty of inefficiency and, worse, dereliction of duty. Their mission anyway was ill-conceived and ill-organized.

Now I have presented these many different views of the Aeneid, related to its whole theme, its leading characters, or to smaller details, in the form of a debate pro and con. I hope I have not been unfair in my presentation of them (though I recognize that some of the papers I have cited may not necessarily represent the present views of their authors). Yet I feel that it is quite inappropriate to pose the questions that the Aeneid makes us ask, as they are so often in effect posed, in terms of prosecution and defence, and to ask 'Whose side are we on? Is it the same side that Virgil was on?' and then to deliver a final critical verdict between Virgil the poet of Empire (whom some, it is true, approve of, but most do not) and Virgil the poet of the tragic victims of Empire. In my view the dilemma is unreal. Neither Aeneas nor Virgil need be put in the dock, nor are we called upon to decide whether to turn thumbs up or down. It is this determination to take sides that gives rise to almost all the disapproving criticisms that I have mentioned, and equally drives outraged Virgilians to look in their turn to their weapons and to meet the critics on their own ground. Yet it is the wrong ground, whether we concern ourselves with theme or with character.

What Virgil has done is to present an unpartisan view of all the issues. He has told the truth. Rome's achievement was splendid; its cost was heavy - I have deliberately avoided inserting any conjunction between those statements, for they are great and equal truths. So too Aeneas was right - and fallible. In our human condition success, even the success of a righteous man, brings tragedy with it. Virgil is no shallow romantic optimist for whom everything is all right; he is no inverted romantic for whom all the glory is a hollow sham, and failure, tragedy, and, in the last resort, evil are the abiding realities. And as it is with human activities in the large, so with individual human character. Aeneas is no superman, nor is Virgil, either consciously or unconsciously, debunking him. Aeneas is a human being, but he is a great man, and great men learn, among other things, to be harsh on themselves and on others.

I should like now to see whether this very simple clue, that Virgil is in the strict meaning of the word a 'realist', can help to make sense of some of the problems I have mentioned and others like them. But I must first say that I am not one of those critics who expect and claim to find perfection in the literature created by imperfect human beings. Virgil, like his hero, could make mistakes, and his realism has its gaps, as I shall argue later. None the less, Virgil, despite any flaws and limitations, in general rises superior to us who criticize him in that most of the shocks he gives us are due to his essential truthfulness, that often results, as is the way with truthful people, in his telling us things which we do not much care to hear, and which we refuse to acknowledge when confronted with them.

I want to take first of the difficulties I have mentioned the one I referred to last, since here the moral issues involved are least complex, the story of Nisus and Euryalus. Let us accept all Mr. Dale's strictures on the conduct of the Trojans. The night patrol is ill organized, the participants turn to massacre and plunder instead of sticking to their assignment, the result is disaster. Certainly the poet himself seems unaware of all these

military deficiencies in his characters. Yet after all he has told the unpopular, unromantic truth about war, its incompetence muddle and illogicality - yet without denying the heroism.

Virgil's evident hatred of war has often provoked the criticism that the war-scenes of the last books lack the appropriate zest, though indeed the occasional catalogues of slaughter demanded by epic convention, dull and repellent as they are, are not duller nor more repellent than the Homeric equivalents. I concede to Virgil's critics that he never hints at that Homeric 'Joy of battle' which a fully realistic picture of war would demand, for it is certainly a real human experience. Virgil sees war simply as a loathsome necessity in which his hero takes a reluctant part. But all in all is this the wrong attitude to war? Do we really want it glorified and glamorized?

Virgil is also at much pains to show how war can spring from such trivial immediate causes as the accidental shooting of the pet deer, when other impulses, represented in Virgil by the 'celestial machinery', are already driving human beings into a war, even into a war they may think they wish to avoid. And in such a context, where irrational passions dominate, the criticisms that have been directed at Aeneas' conduct are in a strict sense misplaced. In other circumstances we might demand more of him, but here there is nothing he can do - except what he does, in arranging for the defence of his followers. There is nothing dishonourable in his preliminary fortification of a camp while he awaits Latinus' as yet unknown answer. (If he ends by taking a good deal more than he had originally asked for, again such things have been known to happen in war). So too the shooting of the deer is accidental, and Virgil makes it quite plain that the Trojans had no choice but to defend themselves against the Italian natives infected by irrational passion. Things soon got out of control. But the death of the melee of old Galaesus, the would-be mediator, reflects the brutality of war, not especial brutality on the part of the Trojans. In short, the suggestion that Virgil, intentionally or not, consistently shows the Trojans and their leader as in the wrong does not accord with my reading of the text.

For to my possibly unsophisticated way of thinking, the striking features of the last six books are those which Virgil appears to have intended to be striking. I mean of course such things as Aeneas' tenderness towards the youthful victims of war, Lausus and Pallas; and we notice, because Virgil asks us to, the significant brevity of Aeneas' final farewell to Pallas, which sums up so much of these last books:

'nos alias hinc ad lacrimas eadem horrida belli  
fata vocant; salve aeternum mihi, maxime Palla,  
aeternumque vale.' nec plura effatus ad altos  
tendebat muros gressumque in castra ferebat.

Nec plura effatus, Aeneas as so often goes on because he must.

We hear much of Virgil's sympathy for the helpless, but in truth all Virgil's main characters are in a sense helpless, even his hero. We want our epic hero to dominate and be in control, not, let us say, be reduced to faltering or silence by a woman's passionate eloquence - but of that more in a moment - yet even in the second part of the Aeneid, Aeneas, far though he has

travelled in body and spirit since the night of Troy's fall, can be caught up in events which he cannot dominate. What he does achieve he owes not to his own qualities alone but to divine guidance and strengthening. Now we are ready to see human helplessness in the tragedy of an Oedipus, though even here a kind of inverted human pride is reflected in the common mis-interpretation of Aristotle's 'hamartia' which claims that all such catastrophes are fully explicable in terms of the human character. But the helplessness of the successful is an idea harder to take. But I suggest that it is a Virgilian idea, and a true and important one.

Here I must leave the last six books. Retracing our steps through the problems I sketched earlier, we come back to Dido, and the question I left in the air. Granted that Aeneas must leave Dido, need it happen like this? I believe that there are real difficulties or weaknesses in the Fourth Book, but I do not find them where most critics do, in the final encounter of Aeneas and Dido, and Aeneas' subsequent behaviour. My difficulties are these. As every reader at once notices, we are shown so little of Aeneas as lover that the very words sound incongruous and unreal. All the meagre scattered hints of his real feelings come when it is too late to matter, as indeed do all the allusions to any physical relationship between the lovers (the references to the parvolus Aeneas, the notum cubile, and Mercury's description of Aeneas as uxorius) apart of course from the scene in the cave. Our only direct information about the early happy days of the relationship is supplied by Rumour, and Virgil explicitly tells us that Rumour can be unreliable - 'pariter facta atque infecta canebat'. Of Aeneas' feelings we know nothing, though elsewhere throughout the epic he is a far from unemotional character. I believe that Virgil's handling of this part of his story is defective, and that his purpose is in a measure defeated by that intense reticence on sexual matters which is so marked a feature of all his work. Here is a great gap in Virgil's realism, though one may feel content that later literatures have fully made good this deficiency, and now nothing remains unsaid or unsayable in this field of human relationships. Here, I think, was something that Virgil did not visualize with his usual clarity. Hence comes, for instance, the surprise we feel when Mr. Dale points out that if Dido and Aeneas were sharing a bed, it is strange that Dido has not heard earlier about the constant nocturnal visitations from Anchises. Mr. Dale hints that this proves Aeneas' allusion to the visitations to be lies. I think it more likely, as I have suggested, that Virgil has simply not visualized the implications of sharing a bed.

But perhaps an even greater difficulty lies in Aeneas' sudden volte-face after the appearance of Mercury. At once Aeneas ardet abire fuga dulcisque relinquere terras. Dulcis does not save the situation. Virgil shows us, I think very effectively, the conflict between Aeneas' resolution and his emotions in what follows. But I for one feel the resolution itself to be too easily formed, even though a messenger of such a kind could not lightly be ignored.

Yet from this point on, as Mr. Speaight has said to this Society, 'The psychology of the Fourth Book is unimpeachable. There are situations in which there is practically nothing a man can say'. Critics do not like Aeneas' furtive preparations for departure while he wonders how to tell Dido the news, quae prima exordia sumat. Yet I state with confidence that a good many men have sometimes wondered anxiously how to set about conveying to their wives news

or views not likely to be too well received, even when what they had to say was far less disturbing than what Aeneas had to tell Dido. Of the terrible last encounter itself, I shall only say that it seems to me supremely realistic - it is what would really happen. Dido's eloquence is passionate and uncontrolled. Aeneas is halting, unintentionally brutal, and truthful. If we pass censorious judgment on either, we are judging ourselves, and our criticism of Virgil should be not of the scene itself but of his failure to prepare us for its shattering realism.

I claim the same psychological rightness for the contrast between the tormented sleeplessness of Dido and the peaceful sleep of Aeneas on his ship, iam certus eundi. To high emotional tension sleep is not a rare or unnatural reaction, only an unromantic one. Aeneas sleeps; for him the issue is now settled. The issue is settled, that is, as far as it ever will be. For to quote Mr. Dale again, 'the tale goes on, but 'never glad, confident morning again'. Perhaps the love of Dido and Aeneas was never truly 'glad confident morning'. It was ill-starred from the first -

ille dies primus leti primusque malorum  
causa fuit.

It was no boy and girl affair. These are mature people, not only, as has often been stressed, with responsibilities for the future, but with tragedy in the past. Hence the deeper tragedy that their happiness is doomed to be fleeting. But it is true that after Dido, something goes out of the story; nothing will be the same again.

Now here surely is a real problem. Virgil, that careful unhurried craftsman, risked shattering the proportions of his work by introducing this tense and tragic episode with the story of its hero barely under way. Yet we can be sure there was nothing accidental about this. After all, as everyone knows, since Dido was some three or four centuries junior to Aeneas, Virgil was not obliged to invent or borrow the version of legend in which the two met. Had a forecast of the hostility of Rome and Carthage been his main or only purpose, he certainly chose the oddest way to achieve it. It is equally impossible to believe that he intended to depict a casual liaison of which the ultimate rupture would shock nobody, least of all his contemporaries, with their 'loose moral standards'. That such an argument could be used, as it has been by some who tell us that our historical sense is at fault when we criticize Aeneas' desertion of Dido, seems almost incredible. So far as Virgil is saying anything about Rome and Carthage or about casual love-affairs, it can only be first that even Carthaginians were human, and secondly that Eros is not to be trifled with.

So we are back with our problem, the placing of the episode in the whole poem. I suggest that Virgil put the story of Dido where he did and treated it with such fulness because life too does not place its tragedies with a neat regard for Aristotelian canons. True, the Fourth Book reaches its quiet close in approved tragic fashion. But it is only Dido who is at rest. Aeneas must go on, as ever, carrying now among his burdens whatever burden the loss of Dido inflicted on him.

'That Aeneas did suffer we must suppose. That he suffered like Dido, let him suppose who will.' So Mr. Dale, and assuredly Virgil does not suggest a different view. But I do not think that Virgil depicts Aeneas as he does at

this point, and again at the meeting with Dido in the underworld, primarily because of what Mr. Dale calls 'disillusion with the quality of victorious efficiency in high places', but simply because, even granted that the task of Aeneas or Augustus is necessary, beneficial, and righteous, only such a man can do it. Virgil's much talked-of compassion embraces the successful with that measure of ruthlessness and insensitivity that political success generally entails. They too have their tragedies. Indeed I find that when I think of Dido and then of Lavinia, it is not the familiar equation of Aeneas with Augustus that springs to my mind. I remember rather Tiberius, and how Augustus forced him to divorce the wife he loved and take in her place the deplorable Julia - as Suetonius says, non sine magno angore animi, and he goes on to relate how Tiberius once accidentally caught sight of Vipsania et tumentibus oculis prosecutus est. Augustus took care that they never saw each other again. Yet some people are surprised and censorious because in later days Tiberius tended to be morose. Virgil was dead before these events, but he knew all about dynastic marriages of convenience, and he never pretends that Aeneas' betrothal to Lavinia is anything more.

So we come to the political aspect of the poem. You will be prepared for what I have to say on this. There is no humbug about Virgil's praise of Augustus, about his patriotic feelings for Rome and for Italy. In no way does his patriotic message cramp his genius. But he knew what such achievements cost in human terms. Still he does not take sides. He is not glorifying Augustus without understanding the cost; nor is he trying to show the achievement and the ideals as a hollow sham. He holds the balance equal between the valour, the devotion, the pietas that leads to success, and its heart-rending consequences for victors and vanquished alike. Here as in other ways, Virgil seems to add a new dimension to Greek thought about human life, for no Greek, I think, shows us quite as Virgil does the inevitable cost not of human failure and wickedness but of human success in a righteous cause. It is precisely because Virgil in the Aeneid sounds simultaneously the bright notes of hope and achievement and the darker sounds of despair and sorrow that his work inevitably leaves so often the impression of discords unresolved. Within the human framework these discords cannot be resolved. I shall not pursue the point further: I need only refer you to the closing pages of Mr. Speaight's 1958 Presidential Address to this Society.

Now all that I have been trying to say Virgil himself said, better, of course, and a great deal more briefly. He said it, in fact, in the most famous lines of the whole Aeneid:

sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi;  
sunt lacrimae rerum, et mentem mortalia tangunt.

Professor Laughton some time ago recommended the Society to take the second line in its context and as referring only to the specific occasion of its utterance. It is no generalized statement about suffering. That we must take the two lines together I agree. But does not the rest of the argument overlook etiam? Here too, even here, are human beings who react in familiar human ways to human achievement and misfortune. There is certainly implied, though admittedly not stated, a general statement about humanity here. But it is not only about the 'vale of tears'. As Professor Laughton emphasized, Virgil's renowned 'melancholy' is only one side of the picture. There is fine achievement (laudi) and its due acknowledgment as well (praemia).

And is it not possible that mortalia refers to the praemia as well as the lacrimae rerum?

If Virgil then is a 'realist', he is one not in the one-sided sense of the word which refers to those who concentrate on the squalid and sordid, the debunkers and the 'angry', but because he presented a rounded picture of human life in its discordant complexity. I want now to consider briefly how his technique as a writer harmonizes with this interpretation of his view of life.

Technically, of course, realism is impossible. You cannot put the whole of life into a book, without some method of selection and presentation. There is some literal symbolism here, but there is also that at which the hair stands on end. There is too Aeneas' strange vision of the Phrygian penates in Book iii, where the borderline between sleeping and waking is curiously blurred. Professor Austin has shown how authentically dreamlike is the vision of Hector in Book ii.

In narrative, Virgil has one particular device for communicating the same effect of vivid visualization which is at the same time free from any artificial clarity untrue to our actual experience. Over and over again he introduces us to a new scene with an imperfect tense. This simple linguistic device gives an extraordinary sense to the reader of being shown the events as they happen, yet without the crisp definiteness of the preterite perfect. It is incidentally one of the many things in Virgil which suggest to me that aspects of his technique which are often called 'dramatic' are really 'cinematic'. His ability to project long mysterious vistas is one such aspect. Another is the tendency to write in short scenes with changes of time and place indicated by passages of powerful visual effect - in Virgil we find the highest development of this old epic device of ekphrasis. And this use of the imperfect tense does something which the cinema can do freely but the stage only at curtain-rise, that is, it shows us an action already under way.

Take the very beginning of the story:

vix e conspectu Siculae telluris in altum  
vela dabant laeti et spumas salis aere ruebant.

A little later,

corripuere viam interea qua semita monstrat,  
iamque ascendebant collem qui plurimus urbi  
imminet.

So comes Sinon (ecce...trahebant) and Cassandra (ecce trahebatur)  
So also Laocoon

sollemnis taurum ingentem mactabat ad aras.

Much later, the most impressive and familiar example of all:

ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbras.

There are many other examples. In sum, in his descriptive and narrative writing, Virgil is as truthful to our actual experience of the physical world as he is in his handling of theme and character truthful in representing other aspects of life.

The ambiguity of outlook to which Virgil was led by his grasp of the

complexity of human life is certainly reflected in the notorious ambiguity of his style in the more limited sense of that term, the choice and combination of words, to use an ancient classification. On this topic I have had confirmation at a down-to-earth level from a friend of mine, who worked for a time on a projected Latin Dictionary. No author gave so much trouble when it came to classifying his vocabulary under different significations. Virgil so often means several different things at once.

But in talking of Virgil's style, I take my main point from a curious ancient judgment on it. Donatus records that Agrippa described Virgil as novae cacozeliae repertorem non tumidae nec exilis sed ex communibus verbis atque ideo latentis, that is, as 'the inventor of a new sort of affected style, one neither turgid, nor meagre but made up of the normal vocabulary and so hard to detect'.

On Virgil's methods I shall make three points, the first two concern his narrative and descriptive technique, the third concerns his style in a narrower sense.

I do not need to demonstrate Virgil's great abilities in description and narration. But it is significant for my purpose that many of his greatest successes are in scenes of sombre or mysterious colouring. He has a feeling for the sea, for night and moonlight, for long vistas in space - and in time, too. Think of his characteristic use of such words as ingens, immanis, vastus, umbra. For him human experience of reality is not confined, as it largely was for the Greeks, to what can be sharply defined and fully known; it embraces also much that is blurred and ambiguous. He can be brilliant as well, as in Dido's first entry, the hunt, or the description of Elysium, but others could do that sort of thing too. Where he has no rival is in depicting, so far as it can be depicted, the mysterious and - the word is inevitable - the 'numinous', those aspects of reality on which the Greeks for the most part turned their back. (Their resolute rationalism was essential to their achievement, and a noble thing - but it leaves out some inescapable elements in our actual experience). To take an example, what a gulf separates the straightforward symbolical or allegorical dreams of classical Greek literature from Dido's authentic nightmare of desolation: on the one hand, Atossa in the Persae or Xenophon's oracular dream based on a pun on diabainein, on the other hand this:

agit ipse furem  
in somnis ferus Aeneas semperque relinqui  
sola sibi, semper longam incommitata videtur  
ire viam et Tyrios deserta quaerere terra.

Now we picture Agrippa as a man of action rather than a man of letters, and are not surprised to find him unhappy at the characteristics of what was after all for him 'modern poetry'. None the less he was able to express his opinion in the very exact terminology of traditional rhetoric. The basis of his judgment is the conventional doctrine that there are three styles, the grand, middle, and plain, and that the grand and plain tend towards vicious extremes, the grand towards bombast (tumidum) and the plain towards poverty (exile). The place of the middle style was always problematical, but probably because its inventor was Theophrastus, arguing like his master Aristotle that the Mean, in style as in all else, was the best, it does not normally appear to have attached to it any corresponding cacozelia. This is true even of

those who, like Cicero, rejected the idea that the middle or 'mean' style was actually the best. An exception is the anonymous author of the Rhetorica ad Herennium. But though this work is usually dated to about 85 B.C. I have recently argued elsewhere on quite other grounds that that date is too early, possibly much too early. Anyway Agrippa obviously did not know of the doctrine there found that there is a faulty style corresponding to the middle style, because his remark means that Virgil himself has invented such a style. That is, Virgil's style is faulty, but in neither of the accepted directions, towards bombast or meagreness, but in a subtle exaggeration of the smooth normality and harmoniousness which was the mark of the middle style according to the current teaching of his time.

I have explored Agrippa's meaning at some length not because I agree with it, but because it may serve to correct the idea that Virgil is above all, and must always have been regarded as, an exponent of the grand style, the proper style we should suppose for high epic. Modern scholars have indeed shown that Virgil's style is not all grandeur, and that alongside the archaisms (olli, infit, etc.) are elements even of the colloquial. Of course there are many things that Virgil prefers not to say, and many words that he does not care to use; his language is a literary one, not the language of Horace's Satires, still less that of Petronius. But I do not find it difficult to accept this much from what is implied by Agrippa's comment, that the style Virgil forged for his purpose was neither grand nor plain, but an as it were central all-purpose style adapted to cover the widest range of human experience, and so a fitting medium for what I have been trying to analyse under the title of the Realism of Virgil.

VIRGIL AND TACITUS

A paper read to the Virgil Society on 20th January 1962

by Miss N.P.Miller, M.A.

\* The notes to this article appear on pages 33 and 34.

-----

It is a commonplace of literary criticism that the influence of Virgil on the language and style of Tacitus is both deep and wide. Commentators<sup>(1)</sup>\* list words and phrases peculiar to the two authors, writers of literary studies<sup>(2)</sup> note affinities of style and temperament, scholars producing theses<sup>(3)</sup> make exhaustive and minute comparisons of parallels. And anyone who reads at all widely in the works of Tacitus will agree that echoes of Virgil are fairly frequent and fairly obvious. How frequent are they? and how significant? The older critics tended simply to note parallels and to speak generally of 'influence'; more recent work has tended both to question the genuineness of some of the parallels<sup>(4)</sup> and to suggest that the influence may be more than linguistic.<sup>(5)</sup> It is the purpose of this paper to review the evidence and the views of those who comment on it, and to suggest, firstly, that the lists of Virgilian parallels in Tacitus can be substantially cut: secondly, that in spite of that, the influence of Virgil on Tacitus is strong and deep: and lastly that Tacitus often makes deliberate and unexpected use of a Virgilian echo for his own purposes. For none of these propositions can a striking originality be claimed. But most writers on them have dealt with the problems piecemeal, as their own linguistic or historical interests demanded. It is hoped that by attempting a more general approach, a more comprehensive view of Tacitus' debt to Virgil may emerge.

Perhaps one should begin with the parallels. From my own and other people's observations, a list of some 500 Tacitean passages said to echo just over 400 Virgilian words or phrases can be compiled. The removal of repetitions and of slight or insignificant echoes reduces the lists to about 300 each. These examples range from single words like adsultus (Ann.ii,21 and Aen.v,442), eburnus (Ann.ii,83 and Aen. vi,647), facies (Hist.iii, 30 and Aen.vi,104) and globus (Ger.13 and Aen.ix,409), in whose form or use Tacitus is said to echo or imitate Virgil, through syntactical usage like et for inverse cum (Hist.ii,95 and Aen.v,858), sine fine used adjectivally (Hist.iv,8 and Aen.i,279), auro solidus (Ann.ii,33 and Aen.ii,765) and euadere with the accusative (Ann.xiv,6 and Geor.iv,485), to phrases such as belli commercium (Ann.xiv,33 and Aen.x,532), uisae per caelum rutilantia arma (Hist.v,13 and Aen.viii,528) and manus ac supplices uoces tendens (Ann.ii,29 and Aen.iii,176), where the reminiscence of a well-known Virgilian passage is fairly obvious.

But the evidence, viewed thus statistically, can be misleading. Many of the words and phrases said to be Virgilian can be found in poets before Virgil, and so are probably part of the general 'poetic' tradition affected by the Silver Latin prose writers. preces fundere e.g. (Ann.xiv,30) may be found in

Horace, Epod.xvii,53; haurio (Hist.i,41) in Lucr.v,1324; caelo aequare (Ann.iv,34) in Lucr.i,79; ingruo (Ann.xiv,61) in Plaut. Amph,236. Others appear in Sallust, and the influence of Sallust on Tacitus, though without the compass of this paper, is admitted to be considerable; so that facies belli and facies locorum (Hist.i.85 and Ann.xiv,10) are just as likely to come from Sallust, Jug.46,5 and 78,3 as from Virgil; as are such words and expressions as globus (Ger.13 and Hist.iii,68D) and aras cruore foedare (Hist.iii,84 and Sall.H.i,22D). Others again may be found in Livy, e.g., Curtius or Seneca (sometimes in more than one of these), or in Augustan poets other than Virgil; when globus e.g. appears in Livy i, 12 and Curtius x,7,1; extrema pati (Hist.ii,46) in Livy viii,25; locorum fraude (Ann.xii,33) in Curtius v,5,1 and obstruere auris (Hist.iv,69) in Seneca, Ben.iii,17; when too male fidus (Hist.i,52) can be found in Ovid, Trist.I,vi,13; eburnus (Ann.ii,83) in Horace, Sat.II,vi,103 and Propertius ii,13,21; and tegumen spinis consertum (Ger.17) in Ovid, Met.xiv,166, they may be assumed to fall well within the natural development of the language, the common literary stock of Silver prose. The beginnings of many so-called poetic constructions used by Tacitus can be found in Livy (et for inverse cum e.g. in xliii,4 and euadere with the accusative in xxi,32,13), and traced through writers such as Seneca (cf. praedico with impersonal subject in Hist.v,13 and Sen.Q.N.ii,32,5; adigo with the infinitive Ann.iv,29 and Sen.De Ira ii,36,6), thus indicating that apparent oddities of syntax are not necessarily imported straight from Virgil into Tacitean prose, but are to some extent the result of the natural changes of a living language. While even the phrases which seem so Virgilian may find echoes in e.g. Tibullus (cf. manus ac supplices uoces tendens, Ann.ii,29 with Tib.iii,4,64), Ovid (lac concretum Ger.23 with Met.xii,436) and Livy (argenti et auri pondus Ann.iii,53 with xxvi,49); so that the link between Virgil and Tacitus is perhaps not so direct as once it appeared. And examples of this kind can be multiplied.

Yet this does not seem to be the whole truth either. Even when allowances have been made for the indirect influence of Virgil on the language Tacitus was using - allowances for the use of his works as a text-book in the schools which trained later writers, for his status as the author of the great national epic (both facts which would make his words so familiar to the literate that they might well employ phrases with as little sense of significant quotation as many today use phrases from the Authorised Version and the Prayer Book); when we have allowed too for the natural development of the language which might make a word which was poetic to the Augustans normal usage to the Romans of a later age, the sheer number of such words and phrases which can be traced back to Virgil, together with those which do indicate direct borrowing, and certain factors in Tacitus' use of such phrases, suggests that the connection may still be significant.

To assess 'influence' is always a tricky business. There is the danger that the critic may exaggerate a connection because the coincidence of his own reading makes it appear more pointed and peculiar than in fact it is: so the word or phrase must be traced as far as possible in other relevant writers - and in dealing with ancient literature we do not always have the relevant writers; and if we do, their failure to use the word or phrase may be purely accidental, because of a difference of subject-matter or personal predilections: furthermore, in assessing the value of any connections observed,

as in most literary judgments, a certain subjective element is inevitable. On the other hand, the coincidence referred to may sharpen the critic's eye to appreciate a connection which he might otherwise have failed to see: and if the observations of many different critics, duly checked as far as our material allows and valued accordingly, combine to produce a formidable amount of evidence, we can, I think, safely assume that there is 'influence', and we may be able to distinguish aspects of it and assess their importance.

But if any assessment of influence is tricky, that of the influence of an Augustan poet on a particular writer of Silver Latin prose is especially so. The influence of poets on any period of prose was probably stronger than our somewhat artificial divisions would allow it to be: Cic. De Orat.i, 128 and Varro, L.L.ix,17 both imply an acceptance of poetic influence on ordinary language. But the writers of the Silver Age quite deliberately cultivated a style which borrowed vocabulary, syntax and form of sentence from the poets, and especially from the Augustan poets (Tac. Dial.20 advises the orator to use Horace, Virgil and Lucan - poeticus decor...ex Horatii et Vergilii et Lucani sacrario prolatus). So that it will be necessary to see whether Tacitus' use of Virgil differs either in quantity or kind from the practice of other writers of his age. Also, history was considered by the ancient critics to be a kind of prose poem (est proxima poetis et quodam modo carmen solutum Quint.x,1,31), and we must therefore try to discover how if at all his use of poetic diction etc. compares with that of other historians.

Sallust, Livy and Seneca (to take as 'controls' two historians of different types and a Silver prose writer, all stylists) all show fairly obvious signs of poetical influence and both Livy and Seneca have strong affinities with Virgilian Latin. Sallust<sup>(6)</sup> shows a number of words and phrases already known from Plautus, Terence and Lucilius (e.g. animos tollere Jug. 101,7 and Plaut. Truc. 640: Ter.Hec.507: Lucil. 779 Warm.), and others whose presence later in Horace, Virgil and Tibullus suggests a poetic character (cf. dis-simulator Cat.5,4 and Hor. Epp.I, ix,9; furta belli Hist.i, 86D and Virg. Aen.xi,515; gratiam reddere Jug.110,4 and Tib. II, i.36): there are also about twenty adjectives and a similar number of verbs which he appears to have been the first to introduce into prose (ferinus e.g., nemorosus, noxius, densere, foedare, stagnare): and a certain number of personifications and metaphorical usages. From Livy<sup>(7)</sup> we have a larger collection of similar 'echoes' - and a much larger field of writing in which to find them. Critics differ in their estimate of the amount of poetical vocabulary used by Livy, the more modern ones tending to be more conservative<sup>(8)</sup>. But there is admittedly a fair amount of poetic colouring, and some of it is Virgilian: more than used to be imagined is probably common literary stock, and some of it comes from colloquial rather than poetic sources. Seneca<sup>(9)</sup> constantly cites Virgil, in quotations of from one to six lines, and also shows Virgilian influence in vocabulary, syntax and usage: but the number of such expressions is very small compared with those quoted for Tacitus. The influence of Virgil on Seneca is strong, but it shows itself more in direct quotation than in any effect on his style, and so is hardly comparable with the problem of Virgil and Tacitus.

Sallust, then, uses poetic vocabulary rather as Tacitus does, but to a much smaller extent: his decor comes more from archaism than from poetic colouring. Livy writes in a period when prose was farther from poetry than it was in the Silver Age and when any influence tended to be more indirect: the poeticus decor is there, but it is less startling and less extensive. And Seneca uses

his Virgil in quite a different way. The difference between their use of the poets and Tacitus' use of Virgil is not merely one of quantity, however, nor even that Tacitus employs poetic figures and techniques as well as poetic vocabulary. He does employ these. He has an eye for metaphor, examples of which range from phrases like exuere Lepidum (Ann.i,2), erigere aciem (Ag.18), haurire animo (Hist.i,51) to the figurative use of nouns and adjectives (e.g. cruda ac uiridis senectus Ag.29; tacentes loci Hist. iii,84 and facies pacis Ann.xiii, 38). He uses personified abstract nouns freely (e.g. nox legiones pugnae exemit Ann.i,64; circumsteterat Palatium expectatio Hist.i,17; quos bellum aperuit Ger.1). He employs some of the archaic forms beloved by the poets (e.g. quis for quibus Ann.i,8, dative forms in -u (senatu Ann.iii,47), words like dissertare Hist.iv,69 and perduellis Ann.xiv,29). His syntactical usage is often more akin to the poets' than to that of other prose writers - his use e.g. of the accusative with eudere Ann.i,51, genitive of reference with adjectives (modicus uoluptatum Ann.ii,73), ablative of respect with adjectives (corpore ingens Ann.xiii,8: contrast ingenti corpore Sall.Hist.ii,47D) and his use of the infinitive (fuera animus iuuare Ann.i,56; propulsare famem adacti Ann.xiv,24): and it includes Graecisms like frigidus iam artus Ann.xv,64 and quibus bellum uolentibus erat Ag.18. All this, together with the instinct for brevity and variety of expression which Tacitus shares with the poets, and his pictorial presentation of much of his material (cf. the description of the field of Bedriacum Hist.ii,70 or of the camp of Varus Ann.i,61) produces a strong poetic colouring on the prose of Tacitus. It is, I think, considerably stronger than any comparable colouring in the works of Sallust, Livy and Seneca. Yet examples of metaphor and personification can be found in their writings: auaritia fidem subuortit Sall. Cat. 10,4; peditum equitumque nubes Livy xxxv, 49,5; rebus lassis Sen.Ben.vi,25,4. Sallust too, uses far more archaic words and forms than does Tacitus (words like obsequela Hist.ii,49D, forms like senati Cat.30,3 etc.). And many of the syntactical expressions and the Graecisms of Tacitus can be paralleled from one or more of these authors (cf. aeger animi Livy i,58,9; impello with the infinitive Livy xxii,6,6; ut militibus uolentibus esset Sall.Jug.100,4).

The difference still does not seem to me to be merely one of quantity. Admittedly the amount of poetic colouring must affect the impression we receive of any writer's style. But it does not explain the different quality of the impression. If one may risk rash generalisations, the essence of Sallustian Latin is rather antithesis and archaism than poetry: Livy is too diffuse in style to have much essential kinship with the poets: and Seneca, though brilliant and epigrammatic, has the mind of a rhetorician and not of a poet. And here, at last, is perhaps the clue. Does Tacitus have something of the temperament and mind of a poet? Does he show any trace of a poet's approach to his material? and if so, has he any special kinship with Virgil?

To make brief generalisations about prose style may have been rash: an attempt to define poetry may well be disastrous. And yet we must have more than a vague idea about the essential components of poetry (and especially of epic poetry) if we are to decide whether or not Tacitus has affinities with its writers. It is hoped that the statements which follow, while not pretending to be complete or definitive, are neither positively untrue nor actively misleading. Poetry, then, seems to be an imaginative presentation of a subject important to the poet, in clear, concentrated language and significant form, which crystallizes the writer's and affects the reader's emotions: its pattern may be impres-

sionistic rather than logical, its use of words should combine beauty with meaning: the rhythm of its language and the visual image it presents are both important.

Epic poetry may seem at first sight to fit this definition ill. Yet I think that a good epic poem falls well within it. How far epic poetry differs from narrative verse was seen long ago by Aristotle<sup>(10)</sup> when he contrasted the organic unity of Homer's epics with the confused detail of the Little Iliad: the length of the pattern is not of the first importance - what matters is that it should fit the poet's conception. A good epic poem is still an imaginative work, still concentrated, still significant: its epic pattern allows it to be enriched by episodes but the episodes are not (in a good epic) irrelevant. If the Aeneid does not tell us something of Virgil's feelings about Rome and the life of men, then I am much mistaken in it: and if we remain unmoved by our reading of it, we have our deserts. Narrative demands a reasonably logical pattern, but neither Homer nor Virgil is bound by the simple demands of a story: and both use the movement of their verse to help in the creation of the image they desire.

Are there any points of contact here between the epic poet and the imperial historian? I think there are. First, imaginative presentation of an important theme: very few people have ever seriously believed that Tacitus did not care about his subject or consider it important<sup>(11)</sup>: and the clue to the great problem of Tacitus as an historian - factual and non-factual material, emotional overlay, impressionistic treatment: call it what you will - may be precisely here. Tacitus was, I think, fundamentally a serious and careful historian, and many of his statements, once considered improbable, are on further investigation proving to be perfectly accurate.<sup>(12)</sup> But the problem of the presentation of his material remains, and it is here that the 'poetic mind' or 'poetic approach' may help to provide an explanation (whether it provides an excuse is a different matter). Poetry, you will remember, is more philosophic than history<sup>(13)</sup>, and when Tacitus presents his material in an impressionistic manner designed to suggest his interpretation of its significance, he is treating it as part of a universal, handling it in fact like a poet. Then, his presentation is certainly concentrated, words and phrases, episodes and books having the maximum meaning and the maximum emotional significance. He is writing about human life in his history of the Roman Empire, and he uses episodes and dramatic tableaux in the body of his narrative.<sup>(14)</sup> And in doing all this he is using, as we have seen, poetic language and poetic imagery.

Not only that: within the general framework of his likeness to the epic poets, he has a special affinity with Virgil, for which his education cannot be wholly responsible. Other poets too figured in the school curriculum, and other Silver writers, also trained on Virgil, do not use his words in the same way. Virgil and Tacitus have a certain fundamental melancholy in common, a brooding quality of mind, a grandeur of conception, a love of Rome. Tacitus, perhaps naturally, is more inclined to suspect the worst in human behaviour: but like Virgil he is interested in its motives, and like Virgil he sees and is affected by its sadness. Given then this fundamental kinship: given the status of Virgil and the natural development of Latin already indicated: given the 'poetic approach' of Tacitus and his instinct to present his material in a somewhat 'epic' form, a strong Virgilian colour is inevitable. Even the accidental coincidences of phrasing are not without significance, the unconscious reminiscences and the words and phrases which though part of the Silver Latin literary lan-

guage, can yet be traced back to Virgil. An odd echo or so of an earlier writer in a man's style may be indirect, accidental and so irrelevant; but large numbers of such echoes usually indicate a knowledge of the original source, however much the phrases may have become part of the common literary language. The Authorised Version and the Prayer Book may again illustrate this point: people say e.g. 'Till the day break and the shadows flee away' with only the vaguest notion of its context (which incidentally might surprise them), but a frequent use of such phrases surely indicates direct acquaintance with their source.

There are about 100 such words and phrases in Tacitus.<sup>(15)</sup> There are also just over half that number where the intermediate tradition (as far as our evidence goes) consists of isolated examples in writers like Statius, Silius and Lucan, where the suspicion must be strong that Virgil is the common and direct source<sup>(16)</sup>. And there are nearly 100 examples where the connection seems to be direct and often significant.<sup>(17)</sup>

These echoes appear fairly evenly throughout the works of Tacitus, and are drawn from all the works of Virgil, with the Aeneid, naturally, as the main source. The range of the echoes has already been discussed and the fact (it is hoped) established that the connection between Virgil and Tacitus is a strong one, even if it is of a somewhat different kind than was once imagined. It remains to ask whether we can discover to what purposes Virgilian echoes are put in the writings of Tacitus.

Firstly and most obviously, they are used as poetic words and phrases are used by all Silver prose writers - to give novelty, colour and interest to the prose style. Broadly speaking, Silver literary prose was written in short, abrupt sentences, which aimed at capturing the attention of the sophisticated. The shorter the sentence, the more arresting it has to be: and one of the standard ways of making it arresting was to use vocabulary and syntax borrowed from the poets. This is the poeticus decor recommended in the Dialogus, and in using it Tacitus is following the custom of the age. Some of these phrases (e.g. balsama sudantur Ger.45 and Geor.ii,118; also Ovid, Met.x,308 and Justin xxxvi, 3,4: ferro uiam inuenire Hist.ii,20 and Aen.ii,494; also Livy iv,28,4: undantem sanguinem Ann.vi,39 and Aen.x,908; also Livy xxiv, 38, and Stat.Theb.x, 716) can be traced through the work of intermediate writers, others (e.g. cruda ac uiridis senectus Ag.29 and Aen.vi,304 - the two halves of the phrase are found elsewhere (Sil.xvi,331: Stat. Sil.iii.1.174) but the whole phrase only in Virgil and Tacitus: recens caede Hist.iii,19 and Aen. ix,455: breuia Ann.i,70 and Aen.i,111) Tacitus seems to take straight from Virgil. Many echoes of this kind are probably of no great significance, except as an indication that Tacitus' style has affinities with the style of his age, and by their number, as a pointer to Tacitus' knowledge of and familiarity with Virgil's works. Both of these facts we knew already. But even in this category we can see signs that Tacitus is not always using poetic vocabulary merely to give colour and dignity to his style. Often the poetic word, while still performing that service, also draws attention to its context and points a remark or description. In Ann.i,4 e.g. aspectare attracts our attention to the statement omnes exuta aequalitate iussa principis aspectare, and it is difficult to believe that Tacitus did not mean it to do precisely this. And in Ann.ii,29 the picture of Libo manus ac supplices uoces ad Tiberium tendens impresses us strongly with its suggestion of the pathetic victim of an arbitrary tyrant: which is no doubt its intention.

Sometimes, again, poetic vocabulary is used to give economy of expression. This too is a characteristic not unknown in other Silver writers, and not unconnected with the desire to give dignity to a prose narrative. But here again the affinity between Tacitus and the poets is especially strong. The concentration of expression is especially dear to him, the technique of packing each separate word with its maximum meaning, and so placing it in its phrase that it both gives and acquires extra significance thereby. Both the accusative and genitive of respect with adjectives e.g. provide a neater, more striking and more significant form of expression than the normal methods used by classical prose. The adjective can be applied to the person, the whole expression is more concentrated and therefore more effective. clari genus Ann.vi, 9 has obvious affinities with Cressa genus Aen.v,285 and genus indecores Aen.xii, 25: so has egregius cetera Ag.16 with cetera Graius Aen.iii,594: and trepidus admirationis Ann.vi,21 with trepidae rerum Aen.xii,589. Here too belongs the poetic use of the infinitive, a shorter and more pointed construction than the subordinate clause of literary prose. Cf. adloqui animus erat Ann.v,7 and perficere est animus Aen.iv,639: coniectare erat Ann.xvi,34 and cernere erat Aen.vi,596: accingeretur nauare Ann.xv,51 and accingar dicere Geor.iii,46. Some of these constructions (e.g. genus, cetera, est with infinitive) are found in other poets and Livy: others, like accingor with infinitive, seem to be peculiar to Virgil and Tacitus. Here again we must recognise both the influence of the age and the effect of Tacitus' own personality: and here again the personal preference for Virgil is noticeable. It is of course natural that an historian who was at all poetically minded should find an epic poet a more fruitful source of poeticus decor than a lyric poet or a satirist. But occasional echoes of Horace and Ovid show that Tacitus knew their work<sup>(18)</sup> and it is clear that Tacitus was familiar with Lucan's great Silver epic.<sup>(19)</sup> Yet the number of poetic echoes which either originate from Virgil or are drawn directly from his works is, by comparison, impressive: and these echoes are by no means all of epic structure, epic approach or epic context (quite a number come from the Georgics). The conclusion seems clear that Tacitus both knew and liked Virgil best.

Finally, there are the passages where the Virgilian echo seems designed to remind the reader (who was also well-trained on Virgil and might be assumed to know the poems well enough to recognise reminiscences) of a specific Virgilian passage, and by this association to add overtones of meaning and significance to the Tacitean passage. To produce an effect by association is of course itself a poetic characteristic, and part of the conciseness and concentration which is natural to the art. And in some of the passages where such association is marked, Tacitus is using the device in just this way. Many of the passages already discussed show this characteristic, as do e.g. the account of the capture of Cremona (Hist. iii,28-33) and of the Sack of the Capitol (Hist.iii, 71). Both of these descriptions are full of echoes of the capture and sack of Troy as depicted in Aeneid ii. Not only verbal echoes like imagine mortium, in igne considerent, ingruere, miscere, but a similar pictorial approach and a common compassion help to link the two authors. uulnus adactum (Ann.i,61) recalls another famous example of folly punished in Aen.x,850: uisae per caelum rutilantia arma (Hist.v,13) gains in impressiveness by its reminiscence of Aen.viii,528: and the epic breuia for 'shallows' (cf. Aen.i,111) helps the description of the epic storm in Ann.i,70. These specific echoes are simply more particular examples of the categories already discussed, for they are giving, by means of the economy of association, colour and dignity and meaning to the

Tacitean passages.

Sometimes, however, the association is even more specific and pointed, and it is pointed in a peculiarly Tacitean way. When e.g. Tiberius' intention is described in Ann.i,47 as imotum fixumque, and we recall that the other famous use of the phrase is to describe (Aen.iv,15) Dido's intention never to wed again, we cannot but wonder if Tiberius' purpose will prove to be as unstable as Dido's: quae fiducia reo in Ann.iii,11, applied to Piso and recalling the similar fiducia (quae fiducia capto) of Sinon in Aen. ii,75 helps to suggest that Piso too is not to be trusted: the comparison with Drances (Aen.xi,340) implicit in seditionibus potens (Hist.ii,86) does not improve our estimate of the worth of Antonius Primus: and the appropriation of Aeneas' spe praesumite (Aen.xi,18) by advocates accused of illegally extorting fees (Ann.xi,7) cannot be other than ironical. There are too many examples of this kind (20) for them to be classed merely as products of the fevered imagination of literary critics wise after the event. Poeticus decor and especially Virgilian decor is an important element in Tacitus' presentation of his material, and therefore affects our estimate of him as an historian. It is undoubtedly one of the methods he employs to suggest his own interpretation of the facts he is recording: and it is to Virgil, and especially to the Aeneid, that he most frequently resorts when he is looking for a telling parallel or ironical contrast.

These passages, then, are deliberate reminiscences of Virgil. Many echoes in the first two categories (interest and economy) are probably quite unconscious. Verbal echoes, where one unusual word will often produce the other which accompanies it in a well-known passage: similar phrases produced by a similar context, especially when two writers are approaching their material in very similar ways: familiar poetic vocabulary coming naturally when a 'poetic' passage is required - all these may be so unconscious as to prove only that the language of Virgil is part of the fabric of Tacitus' literary language. It is of course possible to draw up rough lists dividing the echoes into categories of conscious and unconscious reminiscence: no one critic's list will ever agree with any other's, and they may well obscure the essential point, which is that there are reminiscences, conscious and unconscious, and that their number, range, contexts and the effects they produce show indisputably the influence of Virgil on Tacitus. On the other hand, the passages in the last category, where the effect depends on the association of a specific Virgilian passage, may reasonably be accepted as deliberate parallels. Twists to an original phrase, words from a significant context, an epic description consciously imported - these and similar practices help to produce the effect Tacitus is seeking, and show the use to which Tacitus is putting Virgil. The ambivalence of the title 'Virgil and Tacitus' was quite deliberate.

None of the parallels, whether unconscious or deliberate, whether providing variety of style, economy of language, illuminating comparisons or ironical contrasts, seems to me to be 'poetic colouring' as it is usually understood: they do not form a ribbon or bow attached to the fabric of prose to brighten it up or make it a little more impressive, they are one of the essential threads of the fabric itself. The decor Vergilianus of Tacitus has been absorbed and integrated from the work of one great writer into that of another.

NOTES.

1. e.g. Furneaux (Oxford 1896) p.74.
2. e.g. J. W. Duff, A Literary History of Rome in the Silver Age (London 1960) p.474: W. Y. Sellar, Virgil (Oxford 1897) p.63.
3. e.g. H. Schmaus, Tacitus ein Nachahmer Vergils (Diss. Erlangen 1884: Bamberg 1887): C. Grenville Cole, The Poetical Elements in the Diction and Syntax of Tacitus (New York 1909).
4. G. B. A. Fletcher in Ut Pictura Poesis (Leiden 1955) pp.75-86.
5. F. C. Bourne in Class.Journ. 1951, pp. 171-6: R. Syme, Tacitus (Oxford 1958) pp. 357sq.: B. Walker, Annals of Tacitus (Manchester 1952) p.71.
6. L. Constans, De Sermone Sallustiano (Paris 1880).
7. O. Riemann, Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Tite-Live (Paris 1879): K. Gries, Constancy in Livy's Latinity (New York 1949).
8. Cf. e.g. S. G. Stacey in Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie (1898) pp. 17-82 with Gries.
9. S. Consoli in Rivista di filologia (1921) pp. 456-67.
10. Poet. 1459<sup>a</sup>17 sq.
11. Bacha, Jerome and Fabia, perhaps.
12. See e.g. K. Wellesley in Rhein.Mus.(1960) pp. 272 sq.
13. Arist. Poet. 1451<sup>b</sup>, 5-7.
14. Cf. e.g. the description of the camp of Varus (Ann.i,61): the fire of Rome (Ann.xv,38 sq.)
15. e.g. urgentibus fatis (Ger. 33 and Virg. Aen.ii,653: also Livy v,36,6 and Lucan x,30): crudescere (Hist.iii,10 and Aen. vii,788: also Livy vi, 18 and Val. Flaccus ii,509): somno et uino (Ann.iv,48 and Aen.ix,236: also Ovid, Am.i, 4,53 and Her. xiv,33): locorum fraude (Ann.xii,33 and Aen.ix,397: also Ovid, Tr.IV, ii,33 and Curtius v,5,1): perosus (Ann.xiv, 26 and Aen. ix, 141: also Ovid, Met.viii,183: Livy iii,58,1 and Lucan ix,860).
16. e.g. uir uirum legeret Hist.i, 18 and Aen.xi,632: Suet. Aug.35: ubere agri Hist.iii,34 and Aen.vii,262: Lucan iii, 68: fatisco Ann.iii,38 and Georg. i,180: Sil.ii,316 and Stat. Theb. i, 217: lecta armis iuuentus Ann.xii,40 and Aen. viii,606: Stat.Theb. ii,484.

17. e.g. etiam uictis uirtus Ag.37 and Aen.ii,367: raresco Ger.30 and Aen.iii,411: insignis equo ostroque Hist.ii,20 and Aen.iv,134: angusta uiarum Hist.iii,82 and Aen. ii,332: trudis Ann.iii,46 and Aen.v,208: consiliis et astu Ann.vi, 32 and Aen.xi,704.
18. See Furneaux p.74 and G. B. A. Fletcher in C.R.1945 pp.45 sq. Cf. e.g. ex illo contaminatorum grege Ann.xv,37 with Hor. Od.i,37,9: impiger militiae Ann.iii,48 with Hor. Epp.II, i,124: culpam inuidia uelauisse Ann.vi,29 with Ovid. Her. v,131: ira citra ultima stetit Ann. xii,22 with Ovid. Tr.ii, 127.
19. See L. Robbert, De Tacito Lucani Imitatore (Göttingen 1917). Cf. praecipua concordiae fides Hist.ii,5 with Luc.ii,243: aemulatione fortunam moraretur Hist.iii,65 with Luc.i,393.
20. Cf. also the effect of expendere poenas Ann.xii,19, associating Mithridates with Turnus (Aen.x,669): the cruel twist in uictis solacia Hist.iii,84 - in Aen.v,367 it refers to a consolation prize: the ironical contrast between the sack of Troy (Aen. ii,765) and Roman luxury in Ann.ii,33: and many others.

VERGIL IN EXILE

The substance of a paper read to the Virgil Society  
on 17th February 1962

by A.J.Gossage, M.A., Ph.D.

The word "exile" is not used here in a strictly formal sense: that is to say, Vergil was not banished by a formal decree, never underwent deportatio or relegatio, and never suffered aquae et ignis interdictio. But there are degrees of exile, ranging from compulsory banishment, or enforced removal from one's native land, to a prolonged voluntary absence.

In the Greek world one's attachment to one's polis implied more than a simple physical habitation in a particular place. Travel was common enough, but the spiritual environment of the city was something that was always necessary, because it was that which gave the individual his stability in society. The Roman too stood near the Greek in feelings of this sort, for although the world was larger by the time of Augustus, and horizons, in all senses, had become broader, the individual was still firmly anchored to his spiritual home, which in most cases was also his physical home.

Together with this strong attachment of the Greek or Roman to his native soil one must bear in mind the many physical hazards to which the individual was exposed. Besides the Greek ostracism, the Roman relegatio and deportatio and other forms of exile officially imposed on political or criminal offenders, many people, from the earliest times, were compelled by such circumstances as war and poverty to leave their native lands. These often lived under oppression, as the Eretrians in the plain of Ecbatana, in the heart of the Persian Empire. Such were the displaced persons of antiquity, and there were many other groups who were forced to leave their homes and live elsewhere. In addition, groups or individuals went to live abroad more or less voluntarily - perhaps because they were unable to fulfil their most important needs in their own cities or because new lands called them to greater wealth and better opportunities. Thus the Greeks and Romans both sent out colonies - but the group-attachment and the elaborate precautions taken by the leaders to ensure divine protection in the deepest sense evidently prevented feelings of disorientation in these cases, and there was also still a strong tie connecting Rome and her colonies, and frequently an even stronger one connecting a Greek apoikia with the metropolis - (Thuc.i,38,3). Individuals on the other hand, whether they travelled for the sake of enquiry, like Xenophanes, Herodotus and Anaxagoras, and never returned to live in the city of their birth, or whether they were dissatisfied with the men of their own generation, such as Euripides, and went into voluntary exile, at least for a time, must surely have felt the nostalgia for something lost, and perhaps their intellectual pursuits enabled them to regain a sense of stability.

In later Hellenistic and Roman times tracts were composed from a philosophic point of view de exilio, suggesting helpful attitudes of mind towards this sort of misfortune. Men of powerful intellect, like Thucydides, might

turn their exile to good account by reliving in their historical works their most vivid experiences and by analysing the moral values of their contemporaries in the hope of discovering a lesson from which other men might learn. A similar thing was done by Polybius and even - to a lesser extent - by Xenophon, while Stoics and others who lived under the Roman Empire, for example C. Musonius Rufus and Dion of Prusa, treated the matter philosophically but in a different manner and in a different literary genre.

The spiritual suffering or disorientation caused by exile, in all senses of the word, is sometimes alleviated by being expressed in a work of art or in a fantasy that takes on a mythological or even a mystical and religious aspect, or the fantasy may actually constitute the subject-matter of a work of art. One might adduce Dante and Dostoevsky as examples of this process. The suggestion to be made in this paper is that Vergil likewise expressed a strong sense of exile in his poetry, and that most of his poetry is in fact coloured by his own inner experience.

The basic biographical facts about Vergil, as we learn them from the ancient Lives, are fairly easy to follow: He was born of humble parentage in 70 B.C. at Andes, near Mantua. He was educated at Cremona and then Milan and then Rome, where he attended the leading teachers of the day to learn rhetoric. But he eventually turned to philosophy and poetry, and these were his main interests throughout the rest of his life. Politically, this was a most unstable period in Rome, and the violence of the civil war must have been utterly repugnant to the sensibility of a man like Vergil; but when territory in the neighbourhood of Cremona and his own town Mantua was distributed in 42 B.C. to veterans of the civil war, he experienced at close quarters the uncompromising rigour of the Roman imperium. What actually happened to him is uncertain, and this is not the place to attempt to answer such questions as: "Did Vergil recover his paternal estate and lose it again?" or "Was he actually beaten up by one of the soldiers to whom part of that estate had been allotted?" It is, of course, easy to misinterpret what one finds in the Eclogues in accordance with a preconceived picture of the situation, but for the present purpose one might reasonably assume that Vergil was evicted, perhaps not without incident, from his home near Mantua, and that what he experienced during this short period of his life affected his whole spiritual orientation and left its mark on his poetry. This is clear in the 1st and 9th Eclogues; but much of the Georgics and the Aeneid can be seen as equal proof of what he experienced and continued to experience as a result of his eviction.

It is not known where Vergil lived immediately after the events of 42 B.C. He may have been in Rome, he may have travelled, and he certainly went to S. Italy. The Eclogues were published about 37 B.C. and the Georgics about 30 B.C. By the late thirties B.C. - that is to say, perhaps after his 35th year and certainly before he was 40 - he had settled in Pausilypon, overlooking the bay of Naples. This was his home for the rest of his life, and although he was travelling in Greece when he contracted the illness from which he shortly afterwards died, in 19 B.C., there is no reason to believe that he would have returned to live anywhere else after he had completed his travels. He must have been in Rome from time to time, but his home was no longer in or near Mantua.

One other biographical detail that should be mentioned is that Vergil composed the Georgics under the patronage and at the instigation of Maecenas - (Georg.iii,41). Augustus certainly showed interest in the Aeneid. But

although they may have treated him well and inspired his admiration - and the admiration expressed for Augustus in the Aeneid is probably not insincere - it does not necessarily follow that they excited any feelings of affection or were regarded as intimate friends. It would, in fact, be possible to belong to a literary coterie under patronage from an influential nobleman and to meet with great success as a poet without experiencing any close spiritual contact with other members of the coterie.

The poems of the Appendix Vergiliana belong generally to the earlier years of the poet's life, and a few of the Eclogues were probably composed before the distribution of land in 42 B.C., but the great bulk of Vergil's work was composed after that date. If it is assumed that Vergil was compelled by political and military circumstances to leave his native place and that he never returned to live there, it was in exile, in a special but important sense, that most of his work was composed.

The ten poems of the Eclogues, as they now stand, do not appear in the chronological sequence of their composition. Poems ii and iii were composed before v, and all these before i. Without discussing in detail the order of composition beyond this point, one might assert that the arrangement of the poems in their present order is deliberate, and that Vergil had a purpose in putting first a poem that was not composed first. The other three poems mentioned (ii,iii and v) may well have been composed before 42 B.C., but Ecl. i was not. The first five lines of Ecl. i state the theme of the poem and, in a sense, of the whole collection of Eclogues and even for the whole of Vergil's subsequent work. This may sound an extravagant claim, but it is not to be taken absolutely literally. The theme is not immediately apparent in the Georgics, but it lurks not far below the surface. As for the Aeneid, the correspondence is clear at once in Aen.i,2 (cf. Ecl.i,3-4).

The immediate business of Ecl. i is the pathetic contrast between Tityrus, still living his life of peace in the countryside, and Meliboeus forced to leave his fatherland. It has sometimes been said that Tityrus represents Vergil himself, happy in the assurance given him by Octavian that his land would not be confiscated for distribution; it has also been said that Menalcas in Ecl.ix represents Vergil, the unhappy man expelled from his family estate. But whatever the correct historical interpretation of the events behind these two poems may be, it is clear that a personal experience is being recorded, perhaps not quite as it actually occurred. Both Tityrus and Meliboeus in the first Eclogue may perhaps represent Vergil, but not both of them physically. Tityrus is addressed as fortunate senex in ll.46 and 51, and Vergil could hardly describe himself as senex when he was still only about 30. That, however, is not the point. Meliboeus represents the reality of exile (nos patriam fugimus - l.4) and Tityrus the old established order of life in the peaceful countryside (tu, Tityre, lentus in umbra). (Even the word umbra has a typically Vergilian vagueness, suggestive of the uita umbratilis.) One is the harsh reality and the other the serenity and peace that Vergil had known in his childhood and had now lost irrevocably. They form two aspects of Vergil himself and constitute a conflict in his spirit between the inevitability to which he must orientate himself and the ever-present memories of a happier and more peaceful world.

Other strands of thought and feeling often link up with this central conflict in Vergil's mind. Already in the Eclogues there is the concern

with his own development and his final mission as a poet. There is also a longing for political peace in the Roman world at large, which he must have shared with many of his contemporaries. These and several other important themes produce a complex which one might call "Arcadia" or "Sicily". The 18th century ideal of Arcadia gives a distorted picture of shepherds and shepherdesses living a life of ease and enjoying the pleasures of poetry, music, and love. This picture no doubt owes much to Vergil's presentation in the Eclogues but it omits much, too. The real Arcadia, in the heart of the Peloponnese, was and still is a land of mountains where a subsistence can be wrung out of the barren soil under the burning and exhausting heat of the sun only with much toil. Vergil knew this too, and the Georgics hint at similar conditions in some districts of Italy. But whereas the Georgics insist on labor, the Eclogues sing of amor. It is true that if one looks in the right places in the right mountain valleys in Arcadia and in Italy one can still find an amazing peace and contentment in the midst of toil. The peace and the toil are two aspects of one thing, and there is an important sense in which "Arcadia" does mean peace, both political peace and peace of mind. Consequently, the Arcadian scene is filled with emotional and spiritual meaning for Vergil, and the picture he gives is of a place in the countryside where life is undisturbed and peaceful and reasonably contented. Other characteristics of this place are the abundance of flowers, of honey and other produce, the joys of love and of seeing children and young men and women thrive, the softness of the evening shadows and the delight in poetry and song. Sometimes death or deceit appears, to be lamented or shunned, but in any case the whole image develops by distortion and exaggeration into a Golden Age in the reign of Saturn.<sup>1</sup> Thus the reality is far transcended to satisfy the troubled spirit; for into the reality of contentment another reality has abruptly and violently intruded - another complex, which one might call "Imperial Rome". This other complex brings other sorts of activity: ambition, strife, haud mollia iussa (Georg.iii,41), bewilderment, and the need to seek divine encouragement in the face of uncertainty. Yet there are things that one can admire in the concept of Imperial Rome, even if one is never fully convinced and reconciled. Octavian can, at a certain cost, bring about peace and order to a world of war and disorder.

The terms "Arcadia" and "Rome" will be used further in this paper to refer respectively to the complexes that have just been described. Broadly speaking, one of the mainsprings of Vergil's poetic inspiration is the inner need for the peace and security of Arcadia at conflict with the outer, practical need to come to terms with Imperial Rome. Whatever Vergil may have felt initially, this is what was brought about in him by his experience of the civil war and his own peculiar form of exile. In Ecl.iv there is an attempt to express the conflict and actually to reconcile the Imperial theme with the Arcadian Golden Age. The child would bring political peace and prosperity, in which Rome and Arcadia could exist side by side as satisfactorily as the herds and lions in the Eclogue itself (1.22). The child

---

1. For a recent discussion of the Golden Age in Vergil, cf. Inez Scott Ryberg, Transactions of the American Philological Association lxxxix, 1958, pp.112-131.

thus appears as a symbol of rebirth and integration. Vergil would be the poet of the new era, and his powers would not be dimmed by comparison with Orpheus, Linus, Apollo, and the poet of Arcadia, Pan (ll.53-9).

In Ecl. vi the song of Silenus is not at all easy to understand in its deepest significance, but here again the central Arcadian theme is clearly discernible. After the Creation there follows a Golden Age - the Saturnia regna of l.41 - and then corruption. A tone of restlessness is introduced in the words errans (l.52), errabunda (l.58), and errantem (l.64), not the peaceful browsing described by the same word errare in i,9, but the restlessness of a mind that knows no peace and seeks a new refuge. The poem ends in the restoration of the pastoral world, and evening brings home the sheep to the fold. This is the evening of Arcadia once more. The Golden Age image appears also in Ecl.viii,52ff., where the longing for peace is expressed in terms similar to those of Ecl.iv: "let the wolf now of his own accord flee from the lamb" (but notice that dissociation is not the same as reconciliation!), "let hard oaks bear golden fruit...." The ninth Eclogue expresses the poet's disillusionment at the ruin of his Arcadian world and conceals much unexpressed bitterness; the tragic view of the world gives its bewildered judgment in l.5: quoniam fors omnia uersat. By this time Vergil has already recognised the force that he must somehow contend with, in Rome and the violence of Rome's wars. Poetry has no power among the weapons of war, he says (Ecl.ix,11-13); and yet poetry is a solace (l.18). He must have known this well from his own experience. There is not space enough to discuss the tenth Eclogue in detail, but it should be mentioned that there is a note of sad regret in several passages in this poem, especially in the peaceful ending with its quiet evening scene. There Vergil ends the book; but it is not the end of Arcadia.

Labor and durus are key-words in the Georgics. Men are a durum genus (Georg.i,63), and Vergil has to face this reality. In a famous passage in the first Georgics there is a reference again to the prosperity of the Golden Age, followed by an account of the system of life under Jupiter's regime, in which

labor omnia uicit  
improbis et duris urgens in rebus egestas (145-6).

Then the poet describes the ways in which men may understand the pattern imposed by Jupiter and gain a livelihood under such conditions. The Golden Age promised in Ecl.iv never returned, after all, and men must adapt themselves to the toils of existence on the earth as it is, and so must Vergil himself, as their interpreter. But the poem suddenly bursts out (Georg.i, 463ff.) into an impassioned complaint about the state of the world, distracted as it is by war. Here is the reality of Imperial Rome seen in its worst aspect, and Vergil gives us a terrifying picture in these lines. It is the antithesis of the Golden Age. "Right and wrong are inverted....the plough does not receive its due honour..." (ll.505-7), and saeuit toto Mars impius orbe (511).

In the second Georgics Vergil seems to have realised that he must try to accept the situation as it is, and he begins manfully enough. He explains to Maecenas the purpose and limitations of his poem and says (ll.45-6) that he will not detain him carmine ficto - with a song of fancy. He clearly loves his subject now, and in ll.140-76 there is a magnificent passage in praise of Italy. In this there are several references to places near his new home at

Pausilypon, which indicates a more settled outlook on life. In ll.167ff. he praises the great heroes of Rome for the first time, ending with Octavian. Here we can mark a progress away from Arcadia in the direction of acceptance, and Imperial Rome has taken on a new aspect - the grimness has given way to glory. But towards the end of the poem the mood changes. We do not know the reason for this, but it may be that a liking for Imperial Rome had dawned upon Vergil during a peaceful episode in the thirties B.C., which vanished when war flared up again. At any rate, the last 85 lines of the second Georgics are composed in quite a different mood. First of all (l.458) there is the cry: O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint, agricolas! Tityrus, the Arcadian in Ecl.i, was fortunate senex. The word fortunatus is deliberately chosen; it is generally used by Vergil to describe either those who have won great glory in battle or those who live a settled life of peace and moderate prosperity, whether in this world or after death.<sup>1</sup> After the exclamation O fortunatos...agricolas! Vergil continues, in Georgics ii, with a description of the life that could be lived in the countryside if it were realised. All the toil, the labor that characterizes the Georgics, suddenly disappears, and there follows a beautiful Arcadian picture closely reminiscent of the fourth Eclogue. The earth produces an easy livelihood now - facilem uictum in l.460, in sharp contrast to the unremitting toil and the pressing poverty of Georg.i, 145-6 - and wool is pure and free from artificial dyes, as in Ecl.iv,42. But the most important thing of all is the peace and security of this Golden Age, and its honesty - at secura quies et nescia fallere uita (l.467). The poem continues with personal reflections. If Vergil is prevented by "the chill blood round his heart" (l.484) from studying astronomy and cosmology, he would prefer to enjoy the countryside and be inglorius (486). This failure of spirit and preference for peace and obscurity occurs again in other passages of the Georgics (e.g. at the end of Georg.iv) and can even be detected in the Aeneid. Next follows a description of the harsh realities of Imperial Rome that the pastoral world avoids, with its discordia, purpura regum, ferrea iura (ll.495ff.); and there is a poignant reference to the exile leaving the well-known places of his own home (511-12). Then again the happy pastoral life is depicted (513-40), and the Golden Age atmosphere is confirmed in the simple but effective line (538):

aureus hanc uitam in terris Saturnus agebat.

These 85 lines at the end of the poem are among the finest that Vergil ever composed. They form an Eclogue, or at least a bucolic episode, in themselves, and are absolutely convincing in their poetic intensity. This is the world which the poet knows best and loves best, to which he must return, at least in his memory and his imagination, to encourage his spirit when it quails before the concept of Imperial Rome. In the second Georgics, therefore, there is an acceptance of Rome to begin with, and a fusion of the Imperial concept - or at least of certain aspects of it - with the lost world of Arcadia, in the fine description of Italy; but at the end of the poem these two concepts are found to be incompatible after all; other, more hateful, aspects of Rome appear and are put in the strongest contrast to the Golden Age

---

1. E.g. Aen. vi,638-9 (Elysium), Aen.xi,252 (Italy before the coming of the Trojans). See further: Francis A.Sullivan,S.J., "Some Virgilian Beautitudes", American Journal of Philology lxxxii,1961,394-405.

of Saturnus and the picture of peace in Arcadia. This incompatibility was always in Vergil's mind; although Rome sometimes assumes the upper hand, Arcadia is the symbol of his deepest feelings. The inconsistency of Georgics ii, like that of some of the Eclogues, is found again in the Aeneid.

In the introduction to Book iii of the Georgics a new suggestion of compromise occurs. Vergil now realises that he must eventually fall in with the ways of Rome and describe the achievements of Caesar. As a self-conscious poet he must integrate his poetry with the Imperial task, and there are hints of epic poetry to come - but not yet. At l.40 he returns to the "woods of the Dryads" to execute the haud mollia iussa of Maecenas. In this book little else is said about Rome, but Vergil is happy enough in describing the rearing of cattle and flocks and herds. The familiar pastoral scenes are constantly in view, and almost as much loving care is devoted to the animals as is to the bees in Georgics iv. One has only to look at iii,291-3 to understand what Vergil's feelings were when he was writing this book.

In addition to the obvious Arcadian associations of bees and honey, Book iv contains two passages of importance for the present theme. The first is the description of rural contentment in ll.116-48. Vergil says that if he had the space he would write about gardens and smallholdings at greater length. As it is, his picture of the old Corycian, content with a few acres of unclaimed land, is absolutely convincing. This old man lived in peace, and regum aequabat opes animis (l32). The concept may owe something to popular philosophies of the day, but the whole passage, with its fine poetry and its love of flowers, is essentially another variation on the theme of Arcadia. It recalls for Vergil the peace that he had known in his own countryside near Mantua. Secondly, the final episode, containing the story of Orpheus and Eurydice, deserves special mention. The beauty and profundity of feeling in this episode were never surpassed by anything that Vergil subsequently wrote. Behind the myths, here told with such intensity, lies his own experience of losing an essential part of his spiritual self, that which inspired his finest poetry and could only be recaptured by contact with Arcadia and the Golden Age of his imagination. The receding image of Eurydice is the finest, loveliest, and most elaborate of all Vergil's receding feminine figures - by which is meant the supernatural appearance of Venus in Aeneid i, Creusa in Aen.ii, Dido in Aen.vi, and Juturna in Aen.xii, who all depart at a time of great spiritual crisis, when they are most desperately needed. These figures are an extension of the Arcadia image, or perhaps develop out of a special aspect of it, and represent in their own way the striving to recapture something long since lost and only to be recalled in the stirrings of the poetic imagination.<sup>1</sup>

The Aeneid is often said to contain two serious weaknesses, the alleged failure of Aeneas as an epic hero, and the alleged lack of interest in the second half of the poem. Despite these weaknesses - if weaknesses they really

---

1. For this aspect of Dido and Eurydice, see M.Bodkin, Archetypal Patterns in Poetry, pp.193ff.

are - the beauty and profundity of the poetry does not suffer. Vergil never composed his epic about Caesar, after all. Instead, he turned to the legendary past and found a theme that would bring glory to Rome and perhaps symbolize the triumph of Augustus in the figure of its hero - for anyone who wished to interpret it in that way. But the hero chosen, significantly enough, was not the greatest that legend could offer. Aeneas is the man with a quest, the exile in search of a new home. It was that, undoubtedly, which appealed first and foremost to Vergil; by finding a hero in his own spiritual plight he could perhaps discover a way to resolve his dilemma, the dilemma of Rome and Arcadia. In the person of Aeneas he could satisfy both the progressive and forward-looking element in his life, acceptance of Imperial Rome, and the retrogressive, backward-glancing preoccupation with the problems of exile and the satisfaction to be found in images of the Arcadian type.

The success of the first three books depends largely on this inner congruence between the situation and needs of Aeneas and those of Vergil himself. Throughout these books there is bewilderment, hesitation, and the constant need for spiritual guidance and re-assurance. To that extent Vergil can identify himself with his hero. The crux of the matter occurs in Book i, 8-11, and can be expressed in the question: "Why did a man outstanding for his pietas have to suffer so much?" The pietas of Aeneas has been the subject of much comment (often adverse), but its true function in the poem can be understood if these lines are kept in mind and if it is understood that the pietas is part of a problem, as much for Vergil as for Aeneas. The problem is stated more than once in Book i: first when Venus asks Jupiter why Aeneas should suffer so much (ll.231ff.), and what will be the end of his toils (241). At this point, indeed, Aeneas is at a very low ebb of his fortunes. He is not only a refugee from Troy seeking a home, but he has also suffered great loss in the storm, which drove him on to the coast of Libya; and yet he still tries to appear courageous in the presence of his men, although he is despairing himself (209). Venus makes the problem clear when she points out that others have been able to found new homes - new Troys - and have settled in peace (249), but Aeneas has not. She ends with the indignant question: hic pietatis honos? (253). Jupiter answers by revealing the divine purpose behind it all, and even speaks of Caesar and the Pax Romana. Secondly, the problem is stated again by Aeneas himself, when he meets his mother but does not recognise her. Critics have condemned the words sum pius Aeneas (378) as intolerable priggishness; but the tone and context in which they are spoken make all the difference. What is the point of being pius, he asks in effect, patiently carrying out divine orders, when all that comes of it is this exile in which he is Europa atque Asia pulsus (385)? Sum pius Aeneas is not a boast but a bitter complaint. He does not realise the identity of the person to whom he is speaking until she herself has spoken, and then he rebukes her for deluding him with empty appearances (407-8).

The discovery of Carthage serves to emphasize Aeneas' sense of exile. Dido herself was a refugee, but now she experiences the joy of founding a new city. Aeneas' reaction on seeing the building operations is expressed most effectively in one line (437): o fortunati, quorum iam moenia surgunt! It is a cry from the heart, and fortunatus has overtones of association for Vergil, as has already been mentioned. One might devote a whole lecture to the rest of the book, considering only this aspect of it; but all that can be added here is that the sympathy between Dido and Aeneas begins in Book i

and is based on a kinship of feeling in the face of exile.

The superb second book describes a most devastating experience, one which leaves its mark, on those who suffer it, for the rest of their lives. Arcadia is turned upside down, as it were, and everything is full of horror and evil fury on the last night of Troy. Even to describe it afterwards, says Aeneas, brings tears to the eyes. The overthrow of the hero's home is not only described in the narrative but is even foreshadowed by touches here and there such as the violent advent of night, in ll.250-2, and a similar description in l.360. This is the opposite of the gentle, bucolic evening associated with Arcadia. For the rest, there is the bewilderment that has been found in Book i, at a chronologically earlier stage of its development. Perhaps it began with the consciousness that the gods had abandoned Troy, a motif found in several places (e.g. 257,351-2, 402, 602ff.); and yet already the practical uselessness of pietas is suggested in 429-30, while in 536 Priam asks whether there is any pietas left in heaven.

The end of Book ii and the whole of Book iii portray Aeneas as the refugee seeking a new home. Long wanderings are foretold for him (ii,780), and he sets out with a wretched crowd of fellow-citizens who have survived the destruction of their city. The first twelve lines of Book iii contain the grief and bitterness of real exile. The book is full of unsuccessful settlements, of uncertainty, and prophecies. Somehow Aeneas has enough courage and faith in his destiny to persevere, but by the time he reaches Carthage, dispirited after seven years and further exhausted by the great storm, one can readily appreciate how glad he was to find some sort of peace and comfort. His sojourn in Carthage is another false settlement. These settlements are regarded by Aeneas as potential homes, and in Book iii, and again in v, 631ff., we meet what might be called the "mock Troy" motif: that is to say, a number of Trojans, either some of Aeneas' own party or others who have arrived independently after the sack of Troy, have founded homes in certain places after the image of Troy and even call local landmarks by familiar Trojan names, to make their new homes present a friendly appearance. In these places there is peace and some degree of spiritual reintegration. The "mock Troy" theme thus becomes a substitute for Arcadia. It is not the best Arcadia of the Golden Age, any more than the new settlements are the real Troy, but it is a working substitute. Over 200 lines of Book iii are devoted to an account of Aeneas' meeting with Helenus and Andromache at one of these settlements, Buthrotum. The mock Troy is described with tender feeling (e.g. 301-5,334-6,347-52, 497-9), and the whole episode contains many moving passages, especially the final speech of Aeneas (493-505). The exiles who had found a home at Buthrotum are felices, because they have found rest and peace (uobis parta quies - 495), while Aeneas must still wander.

In the love of Dido and Aeneas there are certain features that may be mentioned in the present context. Love is a bucolic theme and its effects are described in iv,66ff. in bucolic terms. But the command of Jupiter in 227-237 has the effect of showing that the destiny of Aeneas is to be an Imperial, not an Arcadian, character. It is perhaps Vergil's own dilemma as much as that of Aeneas - the reluctance to face up to what Imperial Rome implies, and the yearning for the lost Arcadia. In i,33 already the difficulty is foreseen: tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem; and now in Book iv there is an amplification of the difficulty. Consequently, although Dido is a tragic figure, we must not allow ourselves to be blinded by her tragedy. Aeneas wants to stay

in Carthage. He is actually helping with the foundation of the city (ll.265ff.), and when he is told by a divine message that he must go he experiences a great inner conflict (279ff.). The conflict is clear again in his speech to Dido in ll.333-61. He says, for example, with reference to Italy, hic amor, haec patria est (346); but, significantly, he ends his speech with a contradiction of this: Italiam non sponte sequor (361). What is Dido to believe? Aeneas wants a homeland and a home. He had almost found one in Carthage, but now he must go and face more uncertainties to find what is destined for him. He is torn in the depths of his spirit, but he cannot do otherwise than what is fated. From that point onward in the poem, when he has accepted the idea of his Imperial destiny, he becomes less attractive to us. Vergil now devotes his sympathy to Dido, and most of the rest of the book concerns her tragic situation while Aeneas is preparing to leave. In ll.522-7 there is a beautiful description of a bucolic night; but Dido is now infelix and cannot appreciate the beauty in her spirit (529-31). Behind this scene is Vergil's own situation again - the Arcadian world of beauty, peace and love into which the image of Rome has made its harsh intrusion.

Aeneas still looks back to Dido with affection from time to time, especially in the interview with her ghost in the underworld in Book vi. In Book v he is still the exile, bewildered at the uncertainties of life, but Italy is nearer now. He has made his choice. The great sixth book confirms him in this choice, when he visits the underworld and is initiated into the mystery that is Rome and Rome's glory. After that his acceptance is complete. His pietas has led him by the hard way of suffering to a fuller understanding of the mysteries. It was at Cumae that his initiation began, and Vergil himself lived only a few miles away from the same site. That again is not an accident.

A profound change now comes upon the poem. Vergil is aware that the situation in Book vii is different from what has gone before. He utters a new invocation to Erato, asking for guidance, and says: dicam horrida bella (vii,41), and maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo, maius opus moueo (44-5). Immediately after this profession he plunges into a description of Italy before the arrival of the Trojans. Once more it is a scene of peace, almost Arcadian. The Trojans are now not exiles but invaders, bringing war; and this fact is suggested with great subtlety in ll.38-9, where the poet says that he will describe the state of Italy, aduena classem cum primum Ausoniis exercitus appulit oris. Aeneas is represented here as an invader with an army and a fleet; it is so different from the first lines of Book i, where he is presented to us as fato profugus, multum...iactatus, and multa...passus, without any mention of comrades but singled out and isolated as a figure of pathos. The sympathy has shifted in Book vii. The exile has accepted the idea of Rome and turned invader. Vergil does not follow him because Aeneas no longer symbolizes his own spiritual need. Consequently, Aeneas becomes cold. It is this basically which makes Aeneas as a character a target for criticism, and this which explains the comparative lack of interest in the second half of the poem. The later books lack the intensity and cohesion of the first four books and the wonderful compelling power of the deep crisis in the sixth.

Many points in the development have had to be omitted here: for example, the more admirable aspects of Rome are extolled in two fine and well-known

passages in Books vi and viii; nor does the change that comes upon the poem occur quite so abruptly or completely as might appear from this brief account. But there is a development. Sympathy for the Trojans and for Aeneas is expressed at times in the second half of the poem, but far more for the young victims of destiny - Pallas, Lausus, Nisus and Euryalus, and Turnus. The last of Vergil's receding feminine figures, and not the least attractive, is Juturna, and she appears to Turnus, not Aeneas, the nominal hero of the poem. Aeneas himself is absent from the poem for the whole of Book ix and part of Book x, a fact commented on by both Venus and Juno in a strange way in the divine council in Book x (ll.25 and 85). Juno, in fact, wishes to keep Aeneas absent, in ignorance of what the Trojans are suffering. Stranger still is the way in which Jupiter, after urging on Aeneas with commands and encouragements in the earlier books, and with reminders of his destiny in Italy, says in x,112-13: rex Iuppiter omnibus idem. fata uiam inuenient. He resigns the responsibility of the whole affair. Had Vergil himself lost interest?

A few of the Arcadian touches in the latter part of the poem must be mentioned here. These indicate what Vergil's deepest feelings were. If Aeneas had changed, Vergil had not. The incident which aroused the first open hostilities between the Trojans and the Italians is described in vii,475ff. Iulus kills the pet stag of a girl, otherwise insignificant, called Silvia. Her name is bucolic, the setting is bucolic, and the tender emotions are bucolic. Here, indeed, is another Arcadian picture into which violence makes a harsh intrusion. If Silvia is a representative of Arcadia, Iulus is certainly a representative of Imperial Rome. This incident repeats for Vergil the situation of his own experience. As so often elsewhere, he relives it in his poetry, and such passages are written with a sincerity and intensity that is unmistakable. They are artistically true. In the same incident the just man, Galaesus, is killed. Galaesus is a name signifying, for Vergil, rural contentment and peace of mind, as is clear from its use in Georgics iv,126. Another land of peace, before the coming of the Trojans, was the kingdom of Evander. This is described in Golden Age language in viii,314ff.,351ff. - and the people themselves are descendants of the Arcadians of Greece. That again is no accident. While Aeneas is at Evander's court there is a bucolic description of the advent of evening (280), and then suddenly (369), at the end of the section, night falls fast "and embraces the earth with sable wings". The curtain comes down, as it were, on this glimpse of peace, and we return to thoughts of war. Again, in Book xi,252, we catch a glimpse of peace, when Diomedes addresses the envoys of Latinus: o fortunatae gentes, Saturnia regna... As elsewhere, this image is contrasted with the new reality of war; and the war is that which Aeneas and the Trojans have brought.

In conclusion, one might suggest that Vergil strove to adjust himself to the world as he found it, with its cruel realities, and sometimes experienced a strange hesitation, a bewilderment, and even a stagnation of spirit in the face of those realities; but he was able to find consolation in the recollection of a land of peace, the Arcadia and the Golden Age that his spirit longed for; this manifests itself throughout his poetry and is the explanation of much that might seem strange or inconsistent. Perhaps it explains why the Aeneid often appears to be an epic failure.



OBITUARY

LANCELOT AMBROSE SCUDAMORE JERMYN

It was with the deepest regret that we heard of the death of Mr.L.A.S. Jermyrn, one of the greatest friends of the Virgil Society, on 19th August 1962, in a Nursing Home at Salcombe, Devon, after an illness lasting for about a year. He was in his late seventies. His widow, Mrs.Agnes Jermyrn, is herself seriously ill.

Mr.Jermyrn, who came of a distinguished family, was educated at Glenalmond and at Keble College, Oxford. He taught in a number of places abroad, and for several years before the second world war was a senior officer in the Malay Education Service. When Japanese forces invaded Malaya he was taken prisoner, and for the remainder of the war he was in Changi gaol, Singapore. Mrs.Jermyrn had left Malaya shortly before the invasion. Their only son was killed early in the war. On their return to England after the war Mr. and Mrs.Jermyrn finally settled in Exmouth, where they lived until about a year ago.

Mr.Jermyrn's interest in poetry developed at an early age, and his studies in Classical and English literature and philosophy were a great consolation to him while he was a prisoner of war. In Changi he lectured and organized discussions among his fellow-prisoners, to whom in the most difficult circumstances and times of great physical hardship and mental distress he proved to be a tower of strength. It was there that he began and completed "The Singing Farmer", a verse translation of Virgil's Georgics, remarkable for its poetical qualities, its insight into Virgil's meaning, and the notes full of interesting comparisons with local Malayan lore. In more recent years he had published a number of articles on the Georgics, embodying many of his own observations of nature. He went so far as to make practical experiments according to the precepts given in the Georgics, often with illuminating results; but perhaps his most important contribution to Virgilian scholarship (unfortunately, not all of it published) was his study of Virgil's use of Theophrastus in the Georgics. A translation of Theophrastus on which he was working remains unfinished.

The Virgil Society owes Mr.Jermyrn a very great debt - how great, perhaps, can best be appreciated by the few who were his colleagues in office. He was Hon.Secretary of the Society from 1st January 1952 until 31st March 1955. During that period he served the Society with devotion and distinction, but at all times since he first became a member in 1945 he was one of its foremost friends and benefactors.

Mr.Jermyrn was a man of fine physique and heroic courage, both physical and moral. He triumphed over many difficulties, including the permanent effects of poliomyelitis, from which he suffered in his boyhood, and his experiences in Changi. One of his most conspicuous traits was his unfailing generosity and consideration of other people. By his friends, who were many, he was respected and loved as a man of deep feeling, loyalty, and good humour.

multis ille bonis flebilis occidit,  
nulli flebilior quam tibi, Vergili.





