

Proceedings

of the

Virgil Society, No. 8

1968 - 1969

PROCEEDINGS OF THE VIRGIL SOCIETY1968-69

(Editor: H. MacL. Currie, M.A., Queen Mary College, Mile End Rd., London, E.1.)

	<u>Contents</u>	Page
	Lectoribus Editor	i
Lecture no. 88	"Virgil and Lucan" by Professor O.A.W. Dilke, M.A.	1
Lecture no. 89	"Horace's Virgil" by Professor L.A. Moritz, M.A., D.Phil.	13
Lecture no. 90	"The Games in <u>Aeneid</u> V" by Prof. H.A. Harris, M.A.	14
Lecture no. 91	"Tempo and Texture in <u>Aeneid</u> II" by Sir James Mountford, D.Litt., D.C.L.	26
Lecture no. 92	"Epic and Encomium" by D.W. Black, B.A., M.Litt.	38
<u>Articles</u>		
	"Molle atque facetum" by H.G. Mullens	49
	"Infixum stridit sub pectore vulnus" by F.L.D. Steel and L.A. Moritz	49
	" <u>Aeneid</u> VI, 384-476" by R.G. Austin	51
	<u>Book Reviews</u>	60

Lithographically produced and distributed for the Virgil Society by
H.W. Walden & Co. Ltd., 18 Station Approach, Clapham Junction, S.W.11.

LECTORIBUS EDITOR

The British Academy has once more made a generous grant from its Central Periodicals Fund towards the cost of producing this issue and for it we express our warm thanks.

We warmly thank also Sir James Mountford, now retired from the presidency, who during his tenure of office has rendered us noble service, not least with two excellent papers delivered from the chair. We welcome as his successor Professor F.H. Sandbach, M.A., F.B.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, a scholar of wide-ranging interests whom we are honoured to have at our head. Members will recall his learned lecture to the Society in 1965 entitled "Anti-anti-quarianism in the Aeneid" (published in The Proceedings 5(1965-66), pp.26-38). The Council recently decided that in future presidents will be asked for only one paper during their incumbencies - it is really quite onerous to have to produce two - and it is expected that Professor Sandbach will address the Society during session 1970-71.

After five years Mr. Currie has decided to resign from the post of Hon. Secretary, feeling that it is time to hand over to someone else. His successor will be Mr. Frederick Robertson, M.A., of Reading University. Mr. Currie remains editor of the Society's Proceedings.

Last autumn, after protracted negotiations, the Society achieved registration as a charity, which now means that we shall have income tax relief on some of our investments. Our best thanks are due to Dr. John Landels, a former Hon. Treasurer, who bore so well on our behalf the heat and burden of the day in the long correspondence with the authorities. The necessary amendment of the Society's constitution was formally passed at an extraordinary general meeting on October 19.

The one-day conference which we organised on the teaching of Virgil at the beginning of May in the Institute of Classical Studies, W.C.1., proved highly successful. Many members have requested that there be another next year, but it is felt that a longer interval would be suitable before the next one is held. Mr. R.D. Williams, Mr. Martin Thorpe and Mr. Maurice Balme made first-rate contributions, while the audience (numbering almost ninety) responded with lively questions and comments.

We have received the text of the first Jackson Knight memorial lecture which was given by Sir Basil Blackwell at Exeter University on March 8, 1968, under the title "Letters in the New Age". Sir Basil in graceful style comments appreciatively on Jackson Knight's contributions to learning and muses on the place of computers in literary studies. In the long run there is no substitute for the man of taste and judgment who brings all his experience, imagination and the resources of his scholarship to bear on the interpretation of a text. Jackson Knight would have gladly welcomed the aid furnished by machines to scholars nowadays.

In conclusion we send our usual greetings to members at home and abroad, thanking them for their support during the year.

OFFICE-BEARERS

Hon. Secretary: F. Robertson, M.A., Faculty of Letters, The University,
Whiteknights Park, Reading, Berks.

Hon. Treasurer: J.D.M. Preshous, M.A., 28 Mill Lane, Earley, Reading, Berks.

Editor, The Proceedings: H. MacL. Currie, M.A., Queen Mary College, London. E.1.

Chairman of Council: Dr. A.J. Gossage, M.A., King's College, London. W.C.2.

LUCAN AND VIRGIL

A lecture delivered to the Virgil Society
19th October 1968

by Prof. O.A.W. Dilke, M.A.

Lucan was a child prodigy. While he was still quite young, he obviously had an outstanding ability at writing the type of verse that appealed to his contemporaries. Like most child prodigies, he was conceited. According to the Suetonius Life, in the introduction to one of his poems he ventured to say 'et quantum mihi restat ad Culicem?' The sense of this is: 'I have written a gigantic amount of poetry by an age at which Virgil hadn't even written the Culex'. This is amplified by Statius, Silv. ii.7.36-74, who lists the poems Lucan wrote ante annos Culicis Maroniani. Whether we think the Culex genuine or not¹ does not affect the issue: Lucan and Statius did. If Vitelli and Kenneth Rose² are right in compressing the composition of the poem into a relatively short space of time at the end of Lucan's life, the prodigious nature of his accomplishment is increased; though why the latter should consider the hexameter a 'difficult meter' is past comprehension.

But to rival the minor works of Virgil, or to imitate Virgil in his own minor works (e.g. those on Troy and on the Underworld), was not enough for the prodigy. He had, he felt, to outdo the Aeneid and the relevant portions of the Georgics, though not at all in the same style - these are classical, his work we may call baroque. It would, of course, have been bad taste to proclaim this overall rivalry in his De bello civili, but he strongly hints at it in ix.984-6/, addressed to Julius Caesar:

quantum Zmyrnaei durabunt vatis honores,
venturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra
vivet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aevo.

No doubt Dante had this passage in mind when he made his anima naturaliter Christiana, Virgil, point out Lucan, with Horace and Ovid, as walking in the Inferno behind the prince of poets, Homer.³ Was Lucan conceited in saying he would be read as long as Homer? Only time can tell. At any rate the implication is that Homer was the only poet with whom he would happily couple his name. Again we have an amplification by Statius (ibid.75 f.): cedat Musa rudis ferocis Enni, followed by Lucretius, then the poet of the Argonautica (perhaps Varro Atacinus), Ovid's Metamorphoses, and as a final climax (ibid.79 f.)

ipsa te Latinis
Aeneis venerabitur canentem.

This, admittedly, is in an anniversary poem, where flattery of the dead friend was customary; but it shows at least that Corneille and the young Shelley were not the only poets to value Lucan above Virgil. The literary circle round Polla Argentaria, though hardly Statius himself, may have thought likewise.

If we add to this rivalry the many ways in which the two poets differed (for apart from their different ages and styles and opposing themes, the one constructive, the other destructive, Virgil has been called 'a shy lover of the country, gentle, sympathetic, quiet, contemplative, master of his learning, careful in selection, (who) weaves together his story unobserved and sets his imaginations in subtle harmonies of rhythm and style',⁴ whereas none of these phrases applies to Lucan), we may wonder first whether there is much Virgilian reminiscence and secondly, if there is, why there is. The pendulum has now gone far from Dean Merivale's rash statement⁵ that Lucan 'had never studied, one is almost tempted to imagine that he had never read, Virgil'. The Encyclopaedia Britannica⁶ tells us: 'He naturally imitated his great predecessor, Virgil'. We need both to clarify this and to qualify the word 'naturally'. The subtle architecture of Virgil's epic, with its six books of Odyssey-Aeneid followed by an equal measure of Iliad-Aeneid, its astonishing effects of parallel and contrast, its build-up by alternating books of piano and forte to a central climax at the end of Book VI, these and many more elegant effects are almost lacking in Lucan (there is a possible parallel to the central climax; see p.3 below). He has little of Virgil's sensitive use of callida iunctura, too often, as Friedrich Caspari⁷ was at pains to show, opting for a series of clauses linked merely by et or -que. His hexameter, as we shall see, is very different. He does away with divine machinery and with the naming of strings of unimportant warriors who bite the dust.⁸ But of the presence of imitation there is no doubt. Is there then, as Nisard⁸ thought, a constant fear by Lucan of imitating Virgil, a constant struggle to get away from Virgilian expression? This seems unlikely: literary imitation was such an accepted practice and Virgil such a popular poet, especially in the schools, that Virgilian reminiscence on a generous scale may have seemed 'natural' to contemporaries even when they realised what an iconoclast Lucan was.

Alternatively, was Mlle. Guillemin⁹ right in thinking that in Book VII Lucan deliberately changes his method and becomes anti-Virgilian, thereafter reverting to the more banal types of literary reminiscence typical of post-Virgilian writers who try to improve on Virgilian phrases? Admittedly he does have one or two passages in that book which show a determined effort to describe the battle of Pharsalia in terms totally different from all previous epic battles, e.g. (lines quoted by her, vii.632-4):

non istas habuit pugnae Pharsalia partes
quas aliae clades: illic per fata virorum,
per populos hic Roma perit.

Istas sounds as if it is criticising; but surely it is criticising all traditional epic battles,¹⁰ not merely Virgil's. In a passage which Mlle. Guillemin regards as pivotal, vii.391-6, the list of run-down settlements in Latium certainly contrasts with Virgil's list of similar places which in Aeneas's time are still to be (Aen. vi.773-6). But in its opening phrase, tunc omne Latinum fabula nomen erit, the significant word is surely not nomen but fabula. It reminds one of a passage from Lucan's third book which to my mind is even more anti-Virgilian. Among the allies of Pompey from Asia Minor are Trojans, who are not put off by Caesar's genealogical boasts (iii.212 f.):

nec fabula Troiae
continuit Phrygiique ferens se Caesar Iuli.

Here the sneering words are Phrygii (though Virgil himself uses this adjective in a neutral sense, as at Aen. iv.140) and ferens; while the genitive Troiae takes us back to the first line (or fifth, as I prefer to regard it¹¹) of the Aeneid, as well as to Aen. i.267 ff., a passage significantly 30 lines long¹², its first line ending cui nunc cognomen Iulo, its third beginning triginta magnos, and containing at lines 286-8 the climax

nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar,
imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris,
Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo.

To Lucan the man who was magnus was Cn. Pompeius Magnus. One has the feeling that our young poet, when his quarrel with Nero embittered him more (if that is the case) against Julius Caesar, may have wished that the metre permitted him to counter sum pius Aeneas by sum impius Caesar. In fact it is noticeable that (rather like the frequency chart of tyrannus in Lucan, quoted by Kenneth Rose, so that there may be a political undertone), of the 18 occurrences of impius in Lucan, no fewer than 16 are in Books VI-X, clearly the last five to be written, including the phrase socer inpius (viii.783).

But to stop at this point and content ourselves with ferreting out the contrasts with the Aeneid, which have caused Paratore¹³ to call Lucan an aspirant anti-Virgil, is insufficient. We should be searching both for similarities and contrasts. Let us look further into the architecture of the poem. The portion of the De bello civili that survives, almost certainly all that was written, amounts to $9\frac{2}{3}$ books. To suppose, as Haffter¹⁴ has, that only one or two hundred lines more would ever have been written to produce a complete poem, is absurd. The Alexandrian War concludes nothing. The poem must have continued at the very least to Cato's death, probably to Caesar's, and perhaps beyond. The mere fact that the Aeneid is in 12 books is of no significance: the Homeric poems had by that time been divided into 24 each, and Ennius' Annales, the other great historical epic in Latin, was in 18.

Now 18 books would have allowed Lucan enough space to cover as much as he wanted of the civil war; and apart from Ennius' total, there is perhaps an internal hint that this was the number he intended. About halfway through the Aeneid, roughly eight-ninths of the way through Book VI, Augustus Caesar appears in all his glory, fulfilling Virgil's plan for the centre of a symbolical temple: in medio mihi Caesar erit¹⁵. One may venture to think that Lucan's Julius Caesar appears in what was intended as a parallel position, roughly eight-ninths of the way through the longest book, Book IX, where instead of being about to lord it over Rome he surveys the thousand-year-old ruins of his allegedly ancestral Troy. It is here that the poet soars to unaccustomed flights in the passage already quoted, and like Ennius claims to be a second Homer, in whose epic posterity will read of the otherwise shadowy deeds of Caesar; we recall Horace's vixere fortes ante Agamemnona... Let us look, in the passages we are comparing, for parallelisms of language (words in italics occur in both; an asterisk denotes a word in the same position of the line). Virgil has:

hic Caesar et omnis* Iuli
progenies magnum* caeli ventura sub axem.
hic vir, hic est, tibi quem promitti saepius audis,
Augustus Caesar, divi genus, aurea condet
saecula qui rursus Latio regnata per arva
Saturno quondam... (vi.789-94)

Lucan's lines are:

o sacer et magnum* vatum labor! omnia* fato
eripis et populis donas mortalibus aevum.
invidia sacrae, Caesar, ne tangere fama;
nam, si quid Latiis fas est promittere Musis... (ix.980-3)

followed by the lines quoted earlier. Surely such a passage as this was intended as the halfway mark in an 18-book epic.¹⁶ At least Lucan, if he was thinking of writing this number of books, had better judgment than Nero, who fancied composing a long historical epic, which a courtier suggested should be in 400 books (Dio lxii.29)

Yet there is some indication of borrowing from books of the Aeneid with the same number. Book VI of both poems concerns itself with the Underworld; the one has a Sibyl, the other a Thessalian witch, though the amount of prediction by Lucan's Erichtho is extremely small in comparison to that of Virgil's Sibyl. No doubt, as Fraenkel¹⁷ suggested, Lucan drew for this book extensively on his lost Catachthonia. Book VII recounts in the Aeneid the first fighting, in Lucan's poem the great fight. Pompey's departure from Italy in Book III is the antithesis of Aeneas's first view of Italy in Aeneid III. But there is no over-all parallelism of this sort, nor even any indication that Lucan had thought out the architecture of the poem or of its parts as carefully as Virgil. Only in the passage relating to the Neo-Pythagorean Nigidius Figulus was Getty¹⁸ able to show what we may call the Le Grelle-Duckworth effect in Lucan. But one can point not only to the central pivot I have suggested, but to a close similarity between Books VII and VIII of his poem, and to the probable existence of roughly 200-line 'blocks', as evidence either of interest in poetic architecture or of a desire to make certain passages as fitting as possible to recitationes.¹⁹

From the point of view of versification there is the utmost disparity between the two. Lucan seems to take a delight in giving no prominence to the commonest Virgilian combinations of dactyl and spondee²⁰, in reverting to more end-stopped lines, fewer elisions, no hiatus, fewer spondaic fifth feet and no hypermetra. He might have written either Troiae qui primus or qui Troiae primus, and in general arranged his words with far less regard to metrical effect than the Augustans. He wanted to be an up-to-date poet; and the trend of the times, with Seneca as its forerunner, was towards rhetorical effect rather than metrical subtlety.

It is, then, more in the field of verbal reminiscence and a few parallels of situation than in other respects that we can discern Lucan's debt, conscious or unconscious, to Virgil. Here we must agree with Fraenkel that there is no

wholesale take-over of lines from Virgil similar to the latter's take-over from Ennius of unus qui nobis cunctando restituis rem (Aen. vi.846) from unus homo etc., and that, where we can compare lines between the two, Lucan's often look like a loud superlative against the measured tones of Virgil. Caspari's argument that Heitland's lists prove virtually nothing, and that anyone compiling such lists is trying to make the De bello civili into a sort of cento of Virgil, is most perverse. Hosius²¹ was right in distinguishing between common or likely combinations consisting of phrases that go easily into a hexameter, on the one hand, and unusual collocations on the other.

Isolated reminiscence is to many of us less interesting than sustained borrowing, especially where the latter is of a reasonably subtle nature. In several cases the borrowing is not isolated but drawn from a whole section of Virgil's works. In one example, given below, the borrowing of material, transferred to a different field, has only been noticed en passant by Syndikus²², and the verbal parallels have not been noticed. Indeed Caspari²³ actually goes out of his way to deny any such resemblance, saying: 'primum enim secernendae sunt pugnae navalis descriptio Pharsaliae III, 509-762, quippe cui nihil apud Vergilium respondeat, et cunctae monomachiae'.

The boat race in Aeneid V, as is well known, is to a large extent borrowed from a chariot race in Iliad XXIII. Lucan gives us a similar effect in Book III, where he borrows a scene of the naval battle off Marseilles from the cavalry engagement in Aeneid xi.597-647. Here the Trojan and Etruscan cavalry engage in battle with that of the Latins and their allies. They halt within a spear's throw of each other, then with a sudden shout rush forward to the attack. First the Trojans pursue the Latins, then the Latins rally. The Etruscans twice pursue the Rutulians before they are locked in close combat, in which warriors are unhorsed and killed by javelins and spears. Lucan is describing a sea-fight between Caesar and the Massiliotes. We start with the distant combat. In iii.514-52 Caesar's ships deploy and the Greeks change their course. Virgil ends his section with a simile (Aen. vi.624-8) from alternating currents causing an ebb and flow of sea on a rocky coast; Lucan ends his with a simile (iii. 549-52) of the current fighting the east and west winds and the waves going in different directions. Then Lucan has a short passage contrasting the Greek with the Roman ships, and gives instructions by Decimus Brutus, Caesar's admiral, for turning the battle into a hand-to-hand encounter. But in iii.567 he returns to his literary quarry and once more borrows from the cavalry battle, at this stage interlocked. A comparison of the two passages (see Tables I, II) will show that the borrowing is reflected in many points of verbal similarity, a number of these progressing from line to line in a manner otherwise hardly paralleled in Lucan. In the sea similes the ra-, re- alliteration is borrowed, but with different words. Six of the borrowed words, semianimes, clamore, gurgite, permixtum, sanguine, pectore, occur in the same portion of the line. So too does the warrior's name Tyrrhenum (Tyrrhenus with short final syllable in Virgil).²⁴ Of the remaining warriors, four named ones and the twin brothers of iii.603 ff. are from Virgil; but Lycidas in the Eclogues is a countryman, the name there having as its source Theocritus' goatherd. When we meet the name Lycidas, we immediately think of Milton, who obviously had the Eclogues in mind. Yet the fact that in Lucan Lycidas met his death at sea may have contributed to

inducing Milton to take the name over for a pastoral In Memoriam on his drowned friend Edward King²⁵.

Lucan's identical twins have their origin in Virgil's identical twins of Aen. x.390-96, whose parents actually enjoyed the confusion between the two. Virgil, with a gruesomeness more usually associated with the Silver Age, makes young Pallas cut off the head of one twin and the right hand of the other, its fingers still twitching as they grasp the sword. Yet some of the gruesomeness is already present in Ennius²⁶, two of whose lines Virgil imitates here with no visible improvement. In fact, some of the parallels between Virgil and Lucan may rather be accounted for by the possibility that both borrowed from a lost passage of Ennius. To revert to the twins, Lucan practically takes for granted the confusion between them, writing (iii.605 f.)

unumque relictum
agnorunt miseri sublato errore parentes.

His sense of pathos first leads him to think of the feelings of the mourning parents and brother. But he goes on, with the typical approach of his times, to describe in detail the fate of the twin who fell, recounting the cutting off first of the right hand and then of the left, and finally how, when the warrior was utterly defenceless, he actually caused a battered ship piled high with corpses to sink with the sheer weight of his body.²⁷

Thus, apart from the episode of the twins, which comes from Aen. X, the details of the sea fight come not only in each case from Aen. XI but in some sort of progression. Somewhat different from this technique is that employed in Lucan I, where very much is borrowed from the first book of the Georgics but either in smaller blocks or in isolated phrases. The prooemium cannot all follow Virgil, since Lucan is not going to invoke deities, so here the parallelism comes in at the invocation to the Emperor. The two invocations are compared in the article 'Lucan's Use of Virgilian Reminiscence', by Lynette Thompson and R.T. Bruère²⁸, to which I am also indebted for discussion of other passages (that article is deliberately confined to a consideration of certain parts of Lucan I, V and IX). As regards the prooemium, those who think that Lucan must have been sneering at Nero's physical deformities have not only failed to appreciate the style of Silver Latin literary flattery, but have perhaps not realised how grotesque even Virgil's invocation sounds in cold blood. The burning Scorpion voluntarily contracts his claws in Augustus' favour and abandons his excessive share of the sky. Perhaps Lucan read relinquit in his Virgil (Geo. i.35), not reliquit; he varies it to a future, and leaves the field more open, with

iurisque tui Natura relinquet
quis deus esse velis, ubi regnum ponere mundi (i.51 f.),

reverting for his model to Virgil's

tuque adeo, quem mox quae sint habitura deorum
concilia, incertum est.

Equally bizarre in our eyes is Virgil's

nam te nec sperant Tartara regem,
nec tibi regnandi veniat tam dira cupido.

The parallel to this negative wish is the more cosmological

sed neque in Arctoo sedem tibi legeris orbe
nec polus aversi calidus qua vergitur Austri (Lucan i.53 f.).

Virgil's 19 lines of invocation are surpassed in number by Lucan with his 21 $\frac{1}{2}$. There are, of course, other sources of Lucan's prooemium, including Manilius; but the opening of the Georgics constitutes the main inspiration.

The other sustained use of Georgics I in Lucan's first book, as has long been recognised, is in connection with prodigies, and here Ovid is also a source. Many of the prodigies are the same, and in some cases the same words occur at the same place in the line. While Virgil is content to say insolitis tremuerunt motibus Alpes (Geo. i.475), which might be thought to refer to the ancient belief in Alpine earthquakes, Lucan writes:

tum cardine tellus
subsedit, veteremque iugis nutantibus Alpes
discussere nivem (i.552-4).

The sense of cardine subsedit has been variously interpreted, but Housman seems right in referring it to the same supposed cause as in vi.481 f., where according to Lucan an irregularity in gravitation caused something like a deep hole in the earth. Whatever the exact interpretation, the expansion of this prodigy is due to a desire for geological exactitude. In Virgil, Etna boils out over the fields of the Cyclopes, rolling down balls of fire and lava. In Lucan, it sends flames not, he insists, up into the sky but down the mountain side facing Italy. Here there is no correction of Virgil, and the exactitude aimed at is probably faithfulness to Livy rather than any scientific correction; but there is an added suggestion that Vulcan (or, in Stoic terms, the natural force he stands for) is purposely directing the eruption towards the mainland where civil war is about to erupt. Nisard normally trounces Lucan; yet in a phrase of the latter's prodigy description, venientes comminus umbrae,²⁹ he is willing to concede superiority over Virgil, because the phrase corresponds to his own dreams. But it seems possible that even this detail was to be found in Livy.

Comparison has been made by several writers between the Hercules-Antaeus struggle in Lucan IV and the Hercules-Cacus story in the Aeneid. There are obvious parallels of situation, but little verbal similarity. Perhaps in this case the main source was a Roman adaptation of one of the episodic Heracleids of which Aristotle (Poet. 1451a) complains.

We have already seen that there is much worth comparing between Aeneid VI and Lucan VI. The question remains whether there is more borrowing of language here than elsewhere. Despite the many parallels given by Heitland, perhaps there is not. The sources clearly included Odyssey XI and Lucan's own poem on the Underworld already mentioned as well as Virgil; and there is no overall pattern taken over from Aeneid VI. But there is a fair amount of wording in common. Lucan vi.378-80 has

both Stygiis...paludibus and timorem (fear by the gods) where Aen. vi.323-4 has Stygiamque paludem and di...iurare timent. Lucan's words in vi.658 exanimi defixum lumina vultu are borrowed from Aen. vi.156 maesto defixus lumina vultu. Cerberus to Lucan was no doubt just another monstrosity of popular superstition; yet the poet makes Erichthod describe him in very Virgilian terms:

villosaque colla colubris
Cerberus excutiens (vi.664 f.)

for Virgil has, of the Sibyl watching Cerberus, horrere videns iam colla colubris (Aen. vi.419). In the enumeration of heroes (Republican only in Lucan) Camillum comes in each poet at the end of the line after that in which they have Decios, though in Lucan Drusos comes ten lines later³⁰. These are similarities, but there are also contrasts: thus Virgil makes Anchises qualify his prophecy of the civil war rivals with si lumina vitae attigerint (vi.828 f.), while the corpse in Lucan says, of the same two, ducibus tantum de funere pugna est (vi.811). And is it not rather an odd coincidence that the 165th line of each sixth book, Aen. vi.165 and Lucan vi.166 (the enumeration of lines is disturbed by a spurious line), are on the same topic and have endings respectively Martemque accendere cantu and succendunt classica cantu?

Along with the possible anti-Vergilian tendency already mentioned, there is some similarity of language between the seventh books of each poem, as shown by Heitland. Lucan vii.131 f. advenisse diem qui fatum rebus in aevum conderet humanis reminds us of Aen. vii.144 f. (here, as not infrequently, a similar distance through the book) rumor advenisse diem quo debita moenia condant. Moreover the preparations for the battle of Pharsalia are similar to Virgil's preparation passage, except that as usual in such borrowings Lucan abandons alliterative effects. The phrase omen erat following an infinitive is rare and thus very likely a conscious borrowing³¹. But these are details, and in general the two books are more noticeable for differences than similarities. To take one point, in Virgil the speeches that matter in Book VII are made by goddesses, not generals.

In Lucan IX an example of a limited amount of sustained borrowing is analysed by Miss Thompson and Bruère³². Caesar's visit to Troy after the battle of Pharsalia, postponed presumably for greater dramatic effect until after Cato's march through the Western Desert, is described in terms suggestive of Aeneas's visit to the future site of Rome. Although there is certainly both parallelism and contrast of situation, there is less verbal reminiscence than the authors would claim. Thus they say 'the assonance Hercules/Herceas may not be accidental'; but Hercules in the nominative will not go into a hexameter, and in fact Virgil uses the homonym Alcides. Moreover in comparing wording one must go by sound as well as derivation; and inplevit preserves little of the sound of expleri.

The treatment of storms by the various epic writers, has been adequately covered by Morford and others; in this field Lucan clearly owes much to declamation as well as to his epic predecessors. In geographical descriptions, such as that of the Po or the Straits of Messina, he deliberately incorporates scientific explanations, as we found in connection with prodigies.

As regards similes, Lucan sometimes follows traditional epic procedure, with features borrowed from Homer, Virgil and others, sometimes prefers a more "modern", scientific line, with similes from natural phenomena, industry etc. The similes most akin to Virgil's are those in Lucan vii.775-80, where Orestes and Pentheus occur in inverse order; Eumenidum occurs first place in one line, Orestes last in another (the natural place in a hexameter), both as in Virgil, though the former is attached not to Pentheus but to Orestes, who is called not Agamemnonius but Pelopeus.

To summarise, whereas Virgilian reminiscence is nowhere in Lucan so pronounced as to exclude inspiration from other writers (e.g. Homer, Ennius, Livy, Ovid and the prose works and tragedies of Seneca, as also declamatory rhetoric), and whereas it is nowhere confined entirely to one book of the Georgics or the Aeneid, there are not only many loci similes but several passages of sustained borrowing. One of these, the naval fight whose details had their origin in those of a cavalry fight, has up to now received only the barest of passing mentions and no analysis of language. However hastily Lucan's poem was composed, however incomplete it is, it has a good claim to be the best Latin epic other than the Aeneid³³. If the young Lucan felt the weight of Virgil's ghost pressing down on him, we can to some extent sympathise with his frustration - after all, quisque suos patimur manes.

Table I

Underlined words occur in both poets at these points; asterisked words occur at the same point in the line.

Aeneid xi

599-603	fremit aequore toto insultans sonipes et pressis pugnat habenis <u>huc</u> conversus et <u>huc</u> ; tum late ferreus hastis horret ager campique armis <u>sublimibus</u> ardent. <u>nec non</u> Messapus contra celeresque Latini ...
608-13	iamque intra iactum teli progressus <u>uterque</u> substiterat: subito erumpunt <u>clamore</u> * furentisque exhortantur equos; fundunt simul undique <u>tela</u> * crebra nivis ritu, caelumque <u>obtexitur</u> umbra. continuo adversis <u>Tyrrhenus</u> * et acer Aconteus conixi incurrunt hastis ...
624-8	qualis ubi alterno procurrens <u>gurgite</u> * pontus nunc ruit ad terram scopulosque superiacit unda spumeus extremamque sinu perfundit harenam, nunc <u>rapidus</u> <u>retro</u> atque <u>aestu</u> <u>revoluta</u> <u>resorbens</u> saxa fugit ...

- 633-5 tum vero et gemitus morientum et sanguine* in alto
armaque corporaque et permixti* caede virorum
semianimes* volvuntur equi ...
- 638-40 quo sonipes ictu furit arduus altaque iactat
vulneris impatiens arrecto pectore* crura,
volvitur ille excussus humi.

Table II

Lucan iii

- 516-7 nec non et Graia iuventus
omne suum fatis voluit committere robur.
- 526-7 Caesaris hinc puppes, hinc Graio remige classis
tollitur; impulsae tonsis tremuere carinae,
crebraque sublimes convellunt verbera puppes.
- 538-41 ut tantum medii fuerat maris, utraque classis
quod semel excussis posset transcurrere tonsis,
innumerae vasto miscentur in aethere voces,
remorumque sonus premitur clamore* ...
- 545-6 aëra texerunt ... emissaque tela*
- 549-52 ut, quotiens aestus Zephyris Eurisque repugnat,
huc abeunt fluctus, illo mare, sic ubi puppes
sulcato uarios duxerunt gurgite* tractus,
quod tulit illa ratis remis, haec rettulit aequor.
- 572-7 cruor altus in unda
spumat, et obducti concreto sanguine* fluctus.
et quas inmissi traxerunt vincula ferri,
has prohibent iungi conferta cadavera puppes.
semianimes* alii vastum subiere profundum
hauseruntque suo permixtum* sanguine* pontum.
- 587-91 terga simul pariter missis et pectora* telis
transigitur; medio concurrit pectore* ferrum,
et stetit incertus, flueret quo volnere, sanguis,
donec utrasque simul largus cruor expulit hastas
divisitque animam sparsitque in volnere letum.
- 588 corpore Ieverus (v. Housman).

709-11 stantem sublimi Tyrrhenum* culmine prorae
Lygdamus, excussae Balearis tortor habenae,
glante petens solido fregit cava tempora plumbo.

NOTES

1. A recent verdict based on metrical considerations is that of G.E. Duckworth, 'Studies in Latin Hexameter Poetry', TAPA 97 (1966), 67-113 (quotation from p. 108): 'The Culex, with its striking metrical similarities to the Eclogues, could be and probably is a youthful work of Vergil; there are also differences which are difficult to explain if the Culex is the work of a later forger imitating Vergil's technique'.
2. C. Vitelli, 'Sulla composizione e pubblicazione della Farsaglia', SFIC 8 (1900), 33-72; K.F.C. Rose, 'Problems of Chronology in Lucan's Career', TAPA 97 (1966), 379-96.
3. Inf. iv. 88-90.
4. Lucan, ed. C.H. Haskins (London, 1887), introd. by W.E. Heitland, p. cx.
5. C. Merivale, 'A History of the Romans under the Empire', vii (1862), 276. He is more correct in writing: 'He venerates no master; he follows no model'.
6. 1966 ed., s.v. Lucan.
7. De ratione, quae inter Vergilium et Lucanum intercedat, quaestiones selectae (diss., Leipzig, 1907).
8. J.M.N.D. Nisard, Études de moeurs..., ii. 282.
9. A. Guillemin, 'L' inspiration virgilienne dans la "Pharsale"', REL 29 (1951), 214-27.
10. See also Lynette Thompson and R.T. Bruère, 'Lucan's Use of Virgilian Reminiscence', CPh 63 (1968), 1-21, esp. p. 18.
11. R.G. Austin, 'Ille ego', CQ n.s. 18 (1968), 109-15, shows that the language of Aen. i. 1b-1d is open to criticism. The present writer believes that this indicates not a fabrication but a faulty reminiscence, after Virgil's death, of four lines written by Virgil and deleted by his executors.
12. O.A.W. Dilke, 'Do Line Totals in the Aeneid show a Preoccupation with Significant Numbers?' CQ n.s. 17 (1967), 322-6. There seems to be no parallel in Lucan to Virgil's evident preoccupation with such numbers.
13. E. Paratore, Storia delle letteratura latina (Florence, 1951), 601.
14. H. Haffler, 'Dem schwanken Zünglein lauschend wachte Cäsar dort', Mus.Helv. 14 (1957), 118-26.

15. Geo. iii. 16. Virgil modified his plans for writing about Augustus, but not this architectural feature.
16. If this is true, it follows that Lucan did not, despite M.P.O. Morford, The Poet Lucan (Oxford, 1967), p. 66, intend his Nekyia to be central to his poem.
17. E. Fraenkel, 'Lucan als Mittler des antiken Pathos', Vorträge d. Bibl. Warburg 1924-5 (publ. 1927), pp. 229-57, esp. 236-7.
18. R.J. Getty, 'Neopythagoreanism in Lucan', TAPA 91 (1960), 310-23.
19. O. Schönberger, 'Zur Komposition des Lucan', Hermes 85 (1957), 251-4.
20. For details see G.E. Duckworth, 'Five Centuries of Latin Hexameter Poetry: Silver Age and Late Empire', TAPA 98 (1967), 77-150.
21. C. Hosius, 'De imitatione scriptorum Romanorum, imprimis Lucani', in Festschr. d. Univ. Greifswald (1907), pp. 1-32; id., 'Lucan und seine Quellen', RhM 48 (1893), 380-97).
22. H.P. Syndikus, Lucans Gedicht vom Bürgerkrieg (diss., Munich, 1958), p. 31, nn. 7-8.
23. Ibid., p. 39.
24. Caspari, ibid., p. 41, doubted the borrowing from Virgil, claiming it was 'appellationem magis quam nomen proprium'. But (a) he did not spot the verbal reminiscences from Aeneid XI in Lucan III, (b) the name occurs in the same part of the line, immediately after the caesura.
25. E.E. Duncan-Jones, Notes & Queries 201 (1956), 249. The idea occurred to the present writer independently.
26. Ann. 501-2 Warmington = 472-3 Vahlen, 3rd ed.
27. Statius, Theb. ix. 292-5, varies the effect by making Hippomedon kill one brother and spare the other, saying solus abi, miseros non decepture parentes.
28. Pages 4-5 of article quoted in n. 10; cf. O.A.W. Dilke, 'Lucan's Political Views and the Caesars', forthcoming chapter in a volume of Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence.
29. Lucan i. 570; Nisard, op. cit., ii. 299.
30. Aen. vi. 824 f.; Lucan vi. 785 f., 795.
31. Aen. vii. 173 f.; Lucan vii. 340 f.
32. Pages 16-20 of article quoted in n. 10.
33. Face the title of Brooks Otis, Ovid as an Epic Poet (Cambridge, 1966), and his main theme that the Metamorphoses is an epic.

HORACE'S VIRGIL

Summary of a lecture delivered to the Virgil Society
23rd November 1968

by Prof. L.A. Moritz, M.A., D.Phil.

It can be established on various grounds that the Vergilius to whom Hor.Od.iv.12 (Iam veris comites) is addressed must, after all, be the poet Virgil. But the question then arises how Horace could have published this poem, with its mixture of elegiac description of spring and jocular invitation to his friend and fellow-poet, six years after the latter's death. This question in turn raises the wider problem of how Augustan poets addressed each other in their published work when they had the opportunity.

Elsewhere in the Odes (i.3 and i.24) Virgil, though established as a poet in the Satires, is neither the poet nor the fellow-member of Maecenas's circle, but simply the friend. When Varius Rufus (i.6), Iullus Antonius (iv.2), and Asinius Pollio (ii.1) are addressed as poets, or when Pollio (ibid.) and Maecenas (ii.12) are addressed as historians, Horace is concerned with the public nature of their work rather than with any private relationship, and Tibullus in i.33 is primarily the unhappy lover rather than the elegist. But while in the Carmina (as opposed to the Sermones) there is no explicit reference to Virgil's poetry, both the Carmen Saeculare and the fourth book of Odes are so full of echoes of the Aeneid, both in "public" and in less public poems, that they may rank as Horace's monuments to Virgil, even though nothing is said of Virgil the poet.

In addressing Virgil on the death of their common friend Quintilius Varus (i.24), Horace appears to echo in lines 13-18 the ending of the fourth Georgic, which itself probably had at least some associations with the death of the poet Gallus in 26 B.C. This, like other personal allusions in the Odes, however, is designed at least as much for the general reader as for the addressee personally - in sharp contrast to similar references in hellenistic or neoteric Latin poetry. In the whole of his lyric work Horace is careful, in addressing his fellow-poets, to avoid any impression of a poetic clique or of aiming solely or mainly at a select or learned audience, though he often unobtrusively keeps something in reserve for the learned. This appears to be an important characteristic of Augustan poetry generally.

The problem posed by Iam veris comites (once it is admitted that Vergilius is the poet) cannot be disposed of by assuming that the poem is a "left-over" from an earlier period. Its first half, with its Virgilian pastiche, recalls especially the pastoral Arcadia of the Eclogues (with, possibly an implication that even Arcadia is not immune from death), while the second half, modelled as it is on Catullus 13, suggests - exceptionally for Horace - a pre-Augustan neoteric atmosphere. If the poem was written, after Virgil's death, for the second

collection of Odes, it must be considered Horace's private and intimate tribute to his dead friend, placed in the context of his more public monument. And if we find the ode difficult and in some ways unsatisfactory, it may well be because it is a neoteric poem in an Augustan book.

(A full version of this lecture is to be published in Greece and Rome xvi.(1969), No.2.).

V.S. Lectures, No. 90

THE GAMES IN AENEID V

A lecture delivered to the Virgil Society

18th January 1969

by Prof. H.A. Harris, M.A.

In general, the first six books of the Aeneid have been more highly esteemed than the second half of the poem, and among the first six, unlike the Beethoven symphonies, the even numbers have enjoyed more favour than the odd. This may be partly because each of these three books has an obvious central theme, the Fall of Troy, Dido, the Underworld. Books I and III have no such unifying element. They get the action started and keep it going with a variety of brief episodes. Alone among the odd numbers, Book V can properly be given a title from the event which supplies the bulk of it - the Funeral Games.

We have now so many epics which contain descriptions of such Games that it might seem unnecessary to ask why Virgil included them in his Aeneid. The obvious answer, and no doubt part of the right one, is that he found them in Homer and followed his great exemplar in this as in many other details. Yet in Virgil's own time, Funeral Games may not have seemed such a sine qua non of an epic as they do to us. It is worth noting that they are not to be found in the one epic which has survived from the period between Homer and Virgil, the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius. For his sporting interest, Apollonius was content with a description of a boxing match between Polydeuces and the barbarian king Amycus of the Bebrycians. He performed his task with so little spirit that Theocritus was moved to attempt a rival account of the same fight (Id. XXII), and rather surprisingly for the poet of the placid pastoral scene, he produced the most vivid description of a boxing match that has come down to us from the ancient world. The example of Apollonius shows that when Virgil embarked on the Aeneid, Funeral Games were not considered essential to an epic, but after Virgil almost every epic poet felt compelled to include them. Statius and Silius Italicus in Latin and Quintus Smyrnaeus and Nonnus in Greek follow Virgil's example. The only important exception is Valerius Flaccus, who in his Argonautica accepts the lead of Apollonius in this as in many other details. If Virgil, like Apollonius, had failed to follow Homer by including Games in the Aeneid, his successors might well have imitated him here as elsewhere; it is

possible to argue that the tradition of Games in epic owes at least as much to Virgil as to Homer.

It is particularly surprising that Apollonius Rhodius avoided this path which Roman Virgil was later to tread. He belonged to the Greek world, where athletics and chariot racing as spectator sports aroused the same violent enthusiasm that football evokes to-day. His native Rhodes had a great athletic tradition. In the 5th century B.C. it produced the greatest family of athletes in history, that of Diagoras and Dorieus. If we draw up a 'League Table' of Greek cities which produced known Olympic winners during the seven centuries of the Hellenistic and Roman Imperial periods from the death of Alexander to 369 A.D. when records peter out, Rhodes comes second in the list, excelled only by Alexandria in Egypt. It is quite certain that Virgil had no such strength of tradition behind him, and that he could not rely on any comparable enthusiasm, for athletics at any rate, among his Roman readers. It is interesting to enquire what knowledge of the subject he could expect in those to whom he was addressing his poem.

The earliest Roman ludi were limited to equestrian events. Livy (I.35) tells us that the elder Tarquin extended the programme by introducing boxers from Etruria. In 364 B.C. (Livy VII.2), ludi scenici were performed, to expel a plague from Rome, by ludiones also from Etruria, dancing to the music of pipes. Gladiatorial exhibitions, no doubt Etruscan in origin, were at first given only as part of funeral games. According to Valerius Maximus (II.iv.7), the earliest gladiatorial show given in Rome apart from such funeral rites took place in 264 B.C., and Livy states (XXVIII.21) that in 206 B.C. P. Scipio Africanus gave funeral games at Carthage, including gladiators, in memory of his father and uncle, killed five years earlier. The first Greek games at Rome, according to Livy (XXXIX.22), were given by M. Fulvius Nobilior in 186 B.C. We hear of other Greek games offered by Sulla in 81 B.C., by M. Aemilius Scaurus in 58, by Pompey in 55, by M. Curio in 53, and in 46 by Julius Caesar. There is no reason to suppose that these were the only occasions.

How far these Greek games in the Republican period produced enthusiasm for athletics among the Romans is uncertain, but presumably popularity-hunting politicians would not have continued to give them if the people had not enjoyed them. The evidence from contemporary literature is scanty. There are some allusions to athletics in Terence and Plautus, but we have to remember that both these authors were translating or adapting Greek plays. However, neither of them would have retained words or phrases which were meaningless to their audiences, particularly Plautus, who obviously Romanised his material freely. There is an interesting reference in the two surviving prologues of Terence's Hecyra. The first production of the play had apparently resulted in a fiasco, and in these prologues Terence is at pains to explain the failure; he attributes it to the rival attractions of a tight-rope walker, gladiators, and what he calls 'pugilum gloria', a phrase which suggests that even in those days boxers had good publicity agents. In the Eunuch (315) Chaereas complains about the fashionable pencil silhouette of the girls of his day; 'Their mothers try to make them bottle-necked and flat-chested so that they shall look slender; if one of them happens to be a bit more curvaceous, they call her a boxer, and put her on a slimming diet'. Twice in Plautus someone

enquires about the health of an absent person. In one case the answer is 'Pancratice atque athleticce' (Bacch.248), in the other, 'Pugilice atque athleticce' (Epid 20). We must not attach too much importance to these. The phrase 'Fit as a fiddle' does not necessarily imply a wide knowledge of music in the one who uses it. But the former phrase suggests that even as early as Plautus' time, most Romans had some idea of what a pancratiast was, as well as a boxer. In Bacchides (423 ff.) there is a much more significant passage. In words strongly reminiscent of Aristophanes' 'Clouds', Lydus is regretting the passing of old-fashioned education; 'In those days, if you did not arrive at the palaestra before sunrise, you were severely punished by the Head of the gymnasium. Then things grew tougher and tougher. They got their exercise by running, wrestling, javelin-throwing, discus-throwing, ball-play and jumping'. In a similar passage in 'Mostellaria' (151) the rake Philolaches regrets his lost youth; 'Then there was no keener or more outstanding athlete among the young men than I. Discus, javelin, ball-play, running, weapon-drill, horsemanship, - that was the life. I was a model of toughness and strict training. All the others looked on me as an example'. In these two passages Plautus includes every event of the Greek athletic programme except boxing and the pankration. He would hardly have retained all this from his originals if the terms had not been understood by his audience. Even more conclusive are the words of a threat in Rudens (721); 'I'll make a punch-ball of you and hang you up and go for you with my fists'. At the beginning of the second century B.C., a Roman audience was clearly familiar with the details of a boxer's training.

(A minor point of interest is that references to ball-play are much more frequent in Latin than in Greek literature. The Romans used a Latin word for it, 'pila', though when they provided a special place for it, they called it by the Greek term 'sphaeristerium').

We get less enlightenment than we might have hoped from Cicero's letters. He himself makes quite clear the reason for this. In July 44, less than 4 months after the murder of Caesar, Brutus gave Games in Rome. Cicero writes to Atticus (Att. XVI. 5); 'It is rumoured that at the opening of the Greek Games there were not many spectators. That did not disappoint me in the least, for you know what I think of Greek Games'. Earlier, when his brother Quintus was governor of Asia, Cicero had congratulated him (QF I.1) on his edict prohibiting the spending of public money on Games, - which in Asia would have been mainly athletic meetings. In 55 he wrote to M. Marius about the Games given by Pompey; 'Seeing that you despise even gladiators, why should I suppose that you minded missing the athletes? Pompey himself admits that the effort and oil he expended on them were wasted'. (Ad Fam. VII.1) (Tyrrell's notion that 'oil' here means 'Midnight oil' is nonsense. One of the most important duties of an Agonothete was to supply olive oil for the competitors, who by this time had become highly critical in this matter; on occasion they were appeased with scented oil).

There is, however, one very significant passage in Cicero's letters. In August 44, undecided about what he ought to do in the confused situation after Caesar's death, he set out for Greece but turned back before arriving there. He tells Atticus (XVI.7) that Brutus and his friends were particularly glad about his return, because he had thereby escaped the imputation of being thought to be going

to the Olympic Games. (Quod eam vituperationem effugissem, me existimari ad Olympia). No conduct, he adds, would have been more disgraceful at any crisis of the state; in this one it would have been ἀνατιολογητόν. The last sentence disposes of any idea that Cicero was being facetious. The implication surely is that many Romans did in fact go off to Olympia that August. And if this happened in that summer, far more Roman tourists must have visited the Games in Olympic years of less political tension. The colloquial phrase used by Cicero, me existimari ad Olympia, in itself suggests that the practice was well established - 'He's off to Olympia'.

It may be added that, slight though Cicero's enthusiasm for Greek sports may have been, his house in Rome possessed a palaestra and a sphaeristerium.

Other authors of the Republican period give little help. Catullus has nothing, the description in Propertius of the scandals of women's athletics at Sparta is scarcely relevant, and Lucretius provides only the famous simile from the torch race. But we have seen enough evidence to suggest that when Augustus came to set the Empire in order, there was already in Roman circles some interest in Greek athletics, and it is clear that he did something to foster this interest. When he founded Nikopolis in honour of his victory at Actium, he reconstituted an ancient athletic festival there as a quadrennial meeting, the Aktia, and built a stadium for it. He also inaugurated Ludi Actiaci at Rome; Dio Cassius reports that well-born men and boys took part in the chariot racing, which suggests that this was an innovation in a Roman sport which had previously been entirely professional. Dio also states that on this occasion Augustus had a wooden stadium constructed in the Campus Martius for the γυμνικὸς ἀγών. This is the first mention of a stadium in the western Roman world; earlier athletic contests in Rome appear to have been held in the Circus, probably as part of a mixed programme. Now the conventional Greek programme was followed, probably at Rome and certainly at Nikopolis, whose Aktia, as we know from inscriptions, at once assumed an importance equal to that of the four great 'Crown' meetings in Greece itself.

It was natural enough that Augustus should take this line. He was well aware of the fission between the Latin and Greek halves of his dominions and of the necessity of integrating them as far as possible; our own times have shown the value of a shared sport in maintaining links between peoples. Nearly two centuries before Augustus, the Romans had shown that they realised the importance of athletics meetings in Greek eyes when in 196 Flaminius chose the Isthmian Games as suitable occasion for proclaiming the liberty of Greece. Apart from the question of 'integration', pro-consuls and pro-praetors with their staffs were regularly being sent out from the Latin west to govern the Greek-speaking provinces, and it was obviously desirable that they should know as much as possible about the life of that world.

We can catch glimpses of this fresh impetus to the Roman interest in Greek sport in the pages of Horace. In Odes I.8, where he complains that young Sybaris is being ruined by Lydia, he asks; 'Why does he avoid olive oil more carefully than if it were vipers' blood - Sybaris who was once renowned for hurling the discus out of the ground (trans finem)?' In Odes III.6, Hebrus, beloved of Neobule, is

described as 'A better horseman than Bellerophon himself, unbeaten at boxing and running'. Horace could rely on his readers understanding an allusion to the pankratiast Glykon of Pergamum, who was an Olympic victor probably in 32 or 28, and also, as an inscription tells us, a winner at the Aktia of Nikopolis (Ep.I. ii.30). Two metaphors in the Epistles also presume an acquaintance with athletics in his readers. Summing up his gospel of aurea mediocritas (Ep.I.ii.70), he writes; 'If you set a slow pace in the race, I shall not lag behind with you, and if you exert every effort to take the lead, I shall not run at your shoulder'. Again (Ep.I.19.46), he declares his refusal to argue with his critics in these words; 'For fear of being scratched by the sharp nail of my opponent (luctantis), I cry "Displicet iste locus" and demand "Diludia"', This passage contains the only reference in ancient literature to what must always have been a danger to a wrestler - the sharp nails of his opponent, a danger which must surely have been guarded against by the rules. The phrase 'Displicet iste locus' is our only evidence that a wrestler who did not approve of the piece of ground chosen for the ring could refuse to fight on it. Diludia is found nowhere else. Acron says that it was a postponement of a match by up to 5 days granted to gladiators. Horace could clearly rely on his readers understanding these technicalities.

Generally, however, Horace mixes the Greek athletic events with others which he regards as Roman. Thus in the Lydia ode he asks, 'Why does Sybaris fear to touch the tawny Tiber? Why are his arms no longer black and blue with bruises from weapons?' - an obvious allusion to fencing and other military exercises. Hebrus too bathes in the Tiber and is expert in hunting. In Ars Poetica (371), to drive home his point that skill and training are needed in everything, he writes; 'The man who knows nothing of games keeps away from the weapons of the Campus, and being ignorant of ball-play, the discus or the hoop, he keeps quiet, for fear that the spectators may justifiably roar with laughter at his efforts'. He admits Greek superiority at their own sports, for he gives as an example of an absurd statement by Romans about themselves, 'We are better at wrestling than the oil-smearing Greeks' (Ep.II.i.32). He is even willing to grant that these Greek sports demand arduous preparation (A.P.412); 'The man who wishes to achieve the longed-for victory in a race must as a boy have trained long and hard, have sweated and groaned, and abstained from wine and women'. But from time to time the Roman contempt for the Greek colours his thought even on this subject. Dealing with the Greek love of novelty, he writes; 'It was when Greece laid aside her wars and began to devote herself to trifles (nugari), and prosperity began to degenerate into vice, that enthusiasm for athletics and horses flared up'. Historically of course this is nonsense, but the Roman attitude is plain. Again, praising the simple life (Sat. II.2), he advises hare hunting or horse-breeding, and then goes on; 'Or, if Roman pursuits wear you out because you are used to playing the Greek (Graecari), try the quick ball-play, which by its excitement makes you forget your exhaustion, or if you prefer discus-throwing, then aim high in the yielding air with your discus'. Even more open is his contempt in Od.III.24.54, where he is lamenting the degeneracy of Roman youth, ignorant of horsemanship and hunting, 'more skilled at playing with a Greek hoop, or, if you would rather, with illegal dice'.

But, allowing for this traditional feeling about Greeks, there can be little doubt that a fashion for Greek athletics did spread among Roman youths of good family in the Augustan age. That it was no mere flash in the pan is clear from

many allusions in later Latin literature, which do not concern us now. A final example from Augustan times must suffice. Ovid, recalling in *Tomi* the joys of spring in distant Rome, includes; 'Now they are riding their horses, now they are fencing or playing with ball or hoop. Now the young men, streaming with slippery oil, bathe their weary limbs in the *Aqua Virgo*' (Tr.III.12).

It is clear from these quotations that the Romans of Virgil's time were no slavish followers of the narrow Greek athletic programme; they gave free rein to their own preferences, as for ball-play and swimming. The latter is particularly interesting. The Greeks obviously took the ability to swim almost for granted; their phrase for the Three Rs was γράμματα καὶ νηχέσθαι. Yet references to swimming are rare in Greek literature, especially to swimming for pleasure or exercise. But Horace clearly delighted in it. We have seen that Sybaris and Hebrus were keen swimmers; in *Od.*III.7 he says of Enipeus that 'no-one swam so fast in the waters of the Tiber', which seems to imply swimming races, if only informal ones. And in the *Satires* (II.i.7) he advises those who want sound sleep to swim the Tiber three times. Like ball-games, hoop-bowling figures more in Latin than in Greek literature, but it is called by its Greek name. Ovid throws an unexpected sidelight on this variety in Roman sporting interests. He devotes the whole of Tr.II to complaining about his ill-treatment at the hands of Augustus; in particular he protests that exception had been taken to his *Ars Amatoria*, while other poets had written with impunity on far more socially dangerous themes, such as gambling. The mention of gambling leads him on to call attention rather irrelevantly to other games which had been treated in verse without evoking protest, and he ends this section with the intriguing line; *Hic artem nandi praecipit, ille trochi.* (Tr.II.486). When we are mourning all the missing masterpieces of Greek and Latin literature, we might perhaps spare a small sigh for that lost Latin poem 'On Bowling a Hoop'.

Possibly then it was this enthusiasm for sport among his readers that led Virgil not to follow Apollonius Rhodius in being content with a simple boxing match in his epic, but to go back to his Homeric exemplar and include a more comprehensive programme of Games. He is not likely to have been influenced by memories of any very active participation in sport in his own youth. In the famous description of the Journey to Brundisium in the *Satires* (I.v), Horace reveals that at Capua, when Maecenas went off after dinner to his ball-game, he and Virgil went to bed, 'For ball-play is no friend to the short-sighted and dyspeptic'. But Virgil may well have been aware that Augustus would view with approval the introduction into his poem of this encouragement to healthy exercise.

By deciding to include these games in his epic, he was facing one of the most difficult tasks of literature. It has often been noted with surprise that the Christian religion has inspired so little poetry of the highest excellence. In the same way, sport has produced little verse that is even passable, and not much more in the way of memorable prose.

Football, for instance, arouses men's wildest enthusiasm all over the world; yet, though it is the subject of vast quantities of writing every day, it has evoked hardly anything that rises above the commonplace, and most of the output is drivel.

Rugby in its primitive form gave us one classic, the game in Tom Brown's Schooldays, but that is all. Rowing has inspired a few good descriptions of races; athletics hardly any. The exceptions are chariot-racing and steeplechasing and above all cricket, which has produced a considerable literature to which its votaries can return with pleasure time and time again.

The reason for the difficulty of sporting literature is summed up in a single line of Ovid in his splendid description of Atalanta's race (Met.X.560 ff). He excuses the abrupt end of his account with the words; 'Lest my story be longer than the race itself' (Neve meus sermo cursu sit tardior ipso. 679). Herein lies the secret. It is rarely possible to match the pace of sport with the pace of narration. Football, for instance, at its best consists of a rapid succession of exciting moments, each involving the position and movements of perhaps a dozen players. The eye can take it all in at once. But by the time the swiftest narrator has described the whole situation, the excitement has vanished. Cricket on the other hand is a slow-moving game; even its most thrilling moments depend for their intensity on a certain deliberateness in the action. Description can eliminate the boring stretches and match the pace of the climaxes; Cobden's Over can be recounted in just the time that it must have taken to bowl. The difficulty with athletics is obvious. Field events are hopeless material for literature. X jumps or throws further than Y, and there is an end of it. Short races are over too quickly for description to keep up with them. With races over longer distances, chariots and steeplechases have clear advantages. An account of spills and crashes can fill up the early stages of the story, before the exciting final dash for the line. Moreover in these early stages, drivers and riders can call out to one another, and so characterisation is made easier. But runners in a long-distance race have no breath to spare for such exchanges. The 'Stream of Consciousness' technique offers the best hope of combining the inevitable Loneliness of the Long-distance Runner with the excitement required in sporting literature.

The writers of the ancient world were not yet masters of this technique, but they were well aware of the problems. Homer, after spreading himself over 270 lines for his chariot race, devotes 58 to the footrace, 48 to boxing, 40 to wrestling. He can spare only 24 for the discus, and disposes of the javelin in 9, without a javelin being thrown at all. Sophocles showed his realisation of the difficulties even more clearly. In the supposed appearance of Orestes at the Pythian Games (El.681 ff.), he made his hero win every athletic event of the Games in 10 lines, leaving himself 60 for the chariot race. Virgil profits from his reading of Homer to restrict his programme of events on land; he includes only a foot-race, boxing and archery. At the first mention of the Games he promises javelin-throwing (V.68, aut iaculo incedit melior), but wisely he forgets all about it.

The ancient writers were not merely aware of the problems; they also knew some tricks for increasing interest. In any contest, especially a race, a better effect is achieved if the winner comes from behind, preferably from an apparently hopeless position. A runner or driver may keep out of trouble by going ahead from the start and steadily increasing his lead, but this produces a race dull to watch and even duller to read about. The winner may be held back in the early stages by his own conception of the best tactics, or by an accident, as in John Masefield's

steeplechasing poem 'Right Royal', in which the hero is thrown and remounts before riding to victory. Mention of accident reveals a difference between our outlook on sport and that of the Greeks and Romans. A certain element of chance is inevitable in any game. For us, bad luck must happen to the hero, and he must conquer in spite of it. It is quite unacceptable for him to win through an accident to one of his opponents. For the Greeks and Romans, winning was all-important, and it did not matter in the least how victory was achieved. In the most famous race of antiquity, that between Atalanta and the last of her suitors, Hippomenes prevailed only by the most flagrant bribery of his opponent; but perhaps that belongs to the literature of Romance rather than of athletics. In Homer's foot-race, Odysseus won because Ajax when leading slipped in a mess of blood and dung. Virgil uses the same accident in his race, but from our point of view makes matters even worse by making the final result depend on a deliberate foul. Nisus when leading slips just as Ajax does in Homer; lying on the ground, he realises that his boy friend Euryalus is now second, so he cunningly trips the new leader Salius, leaving Euryalus to finish first. To the reader's surprise, Salius' protest is disregarded by Aeneas, and Salius receives only a consolation prize, as does also the guilty Nisus. Even more disconcerting is the fact that all the spectators are on Euryalus' side, because he is a good-looking boy and bursts into tears at the thought of losing the first prize. 'Tutatur favor Euryalum lacrimaeque decorae' (V.343).

(I doubt if Mr. Williams is right in explaining these lacrimae decorae as 'modest' in the sense of not offending against Roman propriety. Statius makes his Parthenopaeus behave in exactly the same way, and says of him, 'Accessit lacrimarum gratia formae').

Virgil's example here had deplorable results for the future of epic athletics. In Silius Italicus the winner of the foot-race in the funeral games achieves his prize by grasping the hair of a rival runner and pulling him back; there is no objection or protest. In Statius the same foul is perpetrated; this is at least followed by a protest but not, as might be expected, by disqualification; the race is re-run.

It is impossible to form a consistent mental picture of Virgil's race. The reason is that he closely follows Homer's corresponding event which is equally unsatisfactory. Homer appears to have envisaged a straight race without a turn. 'Achilles pointed out the finish to the runners' (Il.XXIII.757. σήμηνε δὲ τέρματ' Ἀχιλλεύς must imply this. If the race had been out-and-home, a *dioulos*, the runners would have been standing on the finishing line, and there would have been no need to indicate it to them. The race is therefore the stade of later Greek athletics, a sprint; yet Odysseus employs in it the tactics of a long-distance runner, dropping in behind Ajax and running at his shoulder. Virgil nowhere makes clear the length of his race, but if he had had a turn in mind, he would surely not have missed the opportunities it offered for description of spills and tactical skill in racing. As in Homer, although a straight and therefore short race seems to be implied, much of the description fits only a long-distance race. At the start, he tells us, the runners leaped from the line 'effusi nimbo similes'. This is an admirable image for the bunch of runners in a distance race. In a straight

furlong the runners do not bunch but maintain a line which becomes increasingly ragged as the race goes on. Virgil makes the same mistake as Homer in his account of the tactics of the race. Helymus is lying third; directly behind him comes Dioces, 'treading on his heels and running at his shoulder', excellent strategy in a distance race but hopeless in a sprint. In the absence of marked lanes and in the jungle world of ancient athletics, Helymus with a short lead might well have tried to 'bore' Dioces off the track by steadily edging in front of him, using the tactics which Cicero quoting Chrysippus deplores (de Off. 3.42), 'Qui stadium currit supplantare eum quicum certet aut manu depellere nullo modo debet', but no sprinter would ever drop in behind another.

Virgil's vagueness about the distance of his race is partly responsible for the difficulty of the chief crux of the passage - simul ultima signant (317). The words occur immediately after the start, limenque relinquunt, and are followed by the picture of Nisus taking the lead. Four interpretations have been suggested, which may be grouped according to whether simul is adverb or conjunction.

A. Simul as adverb. The words then look back.

1. Conington. 'At the same time they mark out the finishing line'. This may be rejected on grounds of common sense and awkward change of subject.
2. Sc. 'oculis'. 'At the same time they fix their eyes on the finish'. Servius' first interpretation. This would make it certain that Virgil envisaged a straight race. The phrase is then the equivalent of Homer's σήμηνε δὲ τέρματ' Ἀχιλλεύς.

It is permissible to ask why this change of direction of sight should have happened after the start; we might have expected an eager gaze at the finishing post to be part of the nervous tension of runners awaiting the signal. There is a possible explanation. Homer and Virgil do not, of course, envisage the use of a starting gate for their races, but it remains true that every race which Virgil himself watched in a stadium was started from such a gate. Runners at the gate must have been strongly tempted to keep their eyes on the bar to catch the first signs of its movement of release. The change of direction of the gaze would then come naturally during the first few strides of the race. The same thing must have happened to charioteers starting from the carceres. Virgil then may be unconsciously transferring a phenomenon of his own day to the heroic age.

B. Simul as conjunction. The words then look forward.

3. Sc. 'pedibus'. 'As soon as they entered the last stage'. More applicable to a distance race than a furlong. Matches Homer's ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πύρατον τέλειον δρόμον. (Il. XXIII.768). Servius' second interpretation. F.H. Sandbach, C.R. 1957.
4. Henry. 'When the last blast of the trumpet rang out'. If we could be sure that the race was one of several laps, this might be the best interpretation. Pausanias reveals that at Olympia a trumpet was sounded to indicate the last lap in horse races.

It is not easy to choose between 2, 3 and 4. I am coming to the conclusion that Virgil had picked up a colloquial term of racing, like our 'at the bell' or that curious horse-racing phrase 'at the distance', and incorporated it in his account, perhaps not quite accurately.

There are some memorable phrases in Virgil's race, notably in his account of Nisus' fall;

Hic iuuenis iam uictor ouans uestigia presso
haud tenuit titubata solo.

Perhaps simply 'As he trod on the spot', or possibly 'though he pressed against the ground' (in the hope of regaining his foothold). R.D.Williams. The words presso solo have not always been fully appreciated. Poets, Virgil among them, often speak of runners skimming the ground and hardly marking the track with their footprints. This is nonsense. A sprinter's foot hits the ground very hard; he depends for speed upon thrust, and the greater the speed, the fiercer is this piston-like thrust. Presso solo brings this out vividly, but it defies translation. 'As he pounded along' gives the sense, but is more suggestive of policemen than of high poetry. 'As he thrashed the track' might perhaps serve. Possibly concessive, as R.D.W.

To add interest to his boxing match, Virgil employs another cliché of sporting literature by pitting a crafty old veteran against a brash and over-confident youngster and thus enlisting the sympathy of his readers for the former right from the start. Lovers of Tom Brown's Schooldays, a work invaluable to students of the history and literature of sport, will remember that Hughes uses the same device in his account of the back-sword contest at the Cotswold 'Veast'. Virgil contrives to give adequate length to his description by an account of the two sets of boxing gloves produced by the competitors, of the metal-loaded pattern familiar to his readers, for whom boxing was usually part of a gladiatorial show. They are rejected in favour of 'caestus aequos', 'paribus armis', by which Virgil probably wishes us to understand the more civilised Greek pattern. The tactics of the boxers are well contrasted, the veteran Entellus necessarily economical of movement, while Dares tries to exploit his youthful nimbleness of foot. The poet then turns to another stock device, the early set-back to the hero. Entellus aims a mighty blow at Dares but misses completely and falls to the ground. He recovers from this so satisfactorily that Aeneas is compelled to stop the fight in order to save Dares' life. This might appear tame, but Virgil achieves a splendid climax to the episode by making Entellus kill the ox he receives as prize with a single blow of his fist.

A minor point of interest in this passage is that it reminds us that in the epic tradition Priam's son Paris was a great boxer. Dares is described as 'The only man who could hold his own with Paris' (solus qui Paridem solitus contendere contra. 370). Generally we base our conception of Helen's paramour on Hector's contempt for him as a carpet knight and lounge lizard, and forget the story that he proved himself to be Priam's son by his victory in Games at Troy.

The archery contest which follows the boxing is dull, possibly because it sticks so closely to Homer. Virgil tries without much success to enliven it by adding the supernatural incident when the final arrow bursts into flames in mid-air. He avoids the feeble anti-climax of Homer's funeral games by ending his programme with the Lusus Troiae, apparently a kind of Lancers on horseback, which doubtless meant more to his readers that it does to us. But, like Homer, Virgil missed the opportunity of securing a strong climax, as a modern writer would do, by placing his best event at the end of the meeting, for undeniably the great glory of his Games is the boat-race, as the chariot race is in the Iliad.

There is no reason to doubt Hyginus' statement that Virgil was the first to include such a race in an epic. Had he been following some lost Hellenistic poem, the ancient commentators would surely have known of it. In view of his success, the wonder is that he found no imitators; the next account of a boat race in literature other than journalism appears to be the brief description of the Cambridge Mays at the end of Fitzgerald's Platonic dialogue Euphranor (1851). Virgil must have had a strong motive to induce him to abandon his great master in this way. Probably it is to be found in a wish to please Augustus, who had added a regatta to his Aktia at Nikopolis, a reasonable item in the celebration of a naval victory. He must have felt tempted to try to rival Homer's chariots, but chariot racing needed no recommendation to Romans; boat racing did. Moreover he cunningly made the best of both worlds by introducing chariot racing in the vivid simile which describes the start of his boat race; 'Not so speedily do the chariots dash out onto the track as they leave the starting-traps for the race; not so eagerly do the drivers shake the waving reins as they give the horses their heads or strain forward over their teams to lash them on' (144-7).

Though we have no descriptions of boat races in Greek literature, there is Thucydides' statement (VI.32) that the ships of the Athenian fleet setting out for Sicily raced as far as Aegina (ἄριλλαν ἐποιούοντο). More formal races seem to be implied in the lines of Plato Comicus, quoted by Plutarch at the end of his life of Themistocles, that the tomb of the great statesman at the Peiraeus looked out at ἄριλλαν νεῶν. And we might infer from Catullus' claim for his yacht, phaselus ille, that she was the fastest of all boats afloat, whether under sail or oar, that the Romans enjoyed boat racing.

How valuable it was for Virgil to escape from Homer's tutelage is shown by the fact that, while it is impossible to form a clear mental picture of his foot-race, it is easy to do so with the boat-race. He seems to be describing a race which he had himself witnessed with keen enjoyment but without any knowledge of racing technique. For while incident follows incident with vivid realism, many of them would not in real life have happened for the reasons which the poet assigns to them. His course, like that of Homer's chariots, is out-and-home, with a left-hand turn round a rock rising from the sea at some distance from the shore. He describes with great sympathy the nervous tension of the crews awaiting the start; 'Their fluttering hearts are drained of their strength by shuddering panic mingled with keen anxiety to win', words which produce an answering flutter in the heart of anyone who has ever sat in an eight awaiting the gun. Then comes the start, and thereafter Virgil wisely concentrates on the tactics at the turn, which in the event are decisive. Such a turn is unknown in modern rowing, though it is standard in punting races and frequent in sailing. The techniques of turns are completely different

in rowing and in sailing vessels. Under sail, the aim is to maintain maximum speed to the last moment and then to use the helm as vigorously as possible without overturning, to take way off the boat, to bring her round and to get the sails filled on the new course. With oar-propelled vessels the rudder must be used as little and as gently as possible, and the oars must help the boat round the bend. In Virgil's race, it would appear to the uninstructed spectator or the unskilled helmsman that during the first leg the point to aim for was immediately to the right of the rock, i.e. if he was approaching from 6 o'clock, he should try to graze the rock at 3 o'clock. But if the helmsman does this, he cannot begin to use rudder for the turn until his port-side oars have cleared the rock. He is therefore bound to overshoot, and he will be strongly tempted to use rudder violently to bring the boat round and so will lose speed. The proper course is to take water out to the right on the first leg so that the helmsman can begin the turn early and come in close under the rock at 12 o'clock with the turn half completed. This no doubt was what was in the mind of Gyas' steersman Menoetes when he took this course, and not, as Virgil says, fear of 'caeca saxa'. But Gyas knew better. Every coach of an eight must sometimes have longed, as he watched a race from the bank, to throw the cox overboard and take his place; every owner or trainer of a horse must have yearned in the same way to jettison a jockey in mid-career when he disapproved of his tactics. They fortunately are helpless. Not so Gyas, who yielded to the impulse. He was clearly no expert at the helm, and his Chimaera lost the race which she ought to have won; 'Cedit, quoniam spoliata magistro est'. It was the sight of Cloanthus taking the inner - and inferior - line which had infuriated Gyas, but Cloanthus almost missed victory by doing so. The slower boats, those of Sergestus and Mnestheus, approached the turn. Sergestus, leading by half a length, took the same poor line as Cloanthus, went too close and crashed. Mnestheus, either by design or perforce because he was deprived of the inner position by Sergestus took a wider sweep and therefore a better course, and so closed up on Cloanthus. Virgil makes this the result of an impassioned appeal to his crew by Mnestheus, reminding them of former glories. It is a magnificent piece of rhetoric and we would not be without it. In real life, however, Mnestheus would have been calling on his star-board oars for an extra effort to bring the ship round the turn; they are the right-hand trace-horses, the δεξιόστροι, in the chariot-racing of the sea. Indeed, this may be the force of the line 'agmine remorum celeri uentisque uocatis' (211), often regarded as ablatives of attendant circumstances; 'with oars fast-dipping and winds at his call' (Mackail). It is at least as likely to be a temporal abl. abs., 'summoning to his aid the swift bank of oars and the winds'.

And now the scene is set for a desperate finish between Mnestheus and Cloanthus. Virgil works up the excitement superbly; we are all agog for the result of the final dash for the line; and then he lets us down with a dreadful bump. Scared apparently at his own temerity in departing so far from his great pattern, he now reverts to the example of Homer's foot-race and makes the issue depend on the direct intervention of a god. Once again we are confronted by the wide gulf between ancient and modern ideas of sport. We are constantly adjured from the pulpit that religion should pervade every aspect of life, but even the most profoundly religious sportsman to-day would probably not wish to achieve success as the result of a special grace descending on him in response to prayer. He would be content that Divine Justice should maintain the principle 'May the best man win', a sentiment

very close to that uttered by Mnesteus in his exhortation to his crew, 'Superent quibus hoc, Neptune, dedisti'. When we see a Latin-American sprinter devoutly crossing himself on receiving the starter's order 'On your marks', the spectacle is apt to appear to us slightly comic, and the comic is a great solvent of excitement. But for Homer and Virgil there is obviously nothing funny in the situation, and these incidents in their Games are important evidence for the attitude of Greeks and Romans towards their gods. That, however, takes us into a realm far beyond to-day's brief.

This paper lies well outside the current of Virgilian criticism fashionable at the moment - the exploration of the writer's unconscious mind by the analysis of the symbolism of his imagery. Perhaps there is no need to apologise for this. That a book of the Aeneid can be used as the starting point of an attempt to throw light on the place of sport in the social life of Rome and on some problems of the whole literature of sport may be regarded, even if sport and its literature are not of the first importance in the great sum of things, as at least a tribute to the many-sidedness of our poet.

V.S. Lectures, No.91

TEMPO AND TEXTURE IN AENEID II

Presidential Address delivered to the Virgil Society
15th February 1969

by Sir James Mountford, M.A., D.Litt.

Before I had mastered my declensions and conjugations or been initiated into the contructions with quin and quominus, a school-boy admiration for Virgil had been aroused by John Dryden's translation of the works of the poet into heroic couplets. It is with a sense of sadness therefore and even of disloyalty that I begin this paper by quoting his rendering of a famous simile from the second book of the Aeneid:

"Rent like a mountain-ash, which dared the winds,
And stood the sturdy strokes of labouring hinds.
About the roots the cruel axe resounds;
The stumps are pierced with oft-repeated wounds:
The war is felt on high; the nodding crown
Now threatens a fall, and throws the leafy honours down.
To their united force it yields, though late,
And mourns with mortal groans the approaching fate:
The roots no more their upper load sustain;
But down she falls, and spreads a ruin through the plain."

Nor is a later Poet Laureate, Mr. C. Day Lewis, at his best, though less diffuse and improvisatory than Dryden, in his rendering of this same passage:

"Imagine a veteran ash-tree upon some mountain top,
When woodsmen are working to fell it, with blow upon blow of
 their axes
Vigorously hacking: the tree seems always about to fall;
It nods, and the topmost leaves are shivered by each concussion:
Little by little their blows master it, till at last
With a great groan it snaps off and falls full length on the
 hillside."

The Latin lines on which these versions are based are of a very different quality and would find a place in any anthology of Virgil's greatest passages. Here they are:

ac veluti summis antiquam in montibus ornum
cum ferro accisam crebrisque bipennibus instant
eruere agricolae certatim; illa usque minatur
et tremefacta comam concusso vertice nutat,
vulneribus donec paulatim evicta supremum
congemuit traxitque iugis avulsa ruinam. (626-31).

It is by no means piety alone towards the founder of this Society which leads me to prefer above other renderings the dignified prose of W. Jackson Knight: "Like an ancient rowan tree high up among the mountains, which, hacked away with stroke after stroke of iron axes by farmers vying all round to dislodge it, begins to tremble and continues threatening while the crest shakes and the high boughs sway, till gradually vanquished it gives a final groan, and at last overcome by the wounds and wrenched from its place it trails havoc down the mountainside."

In this passage of the Aeneid we have Latin at its tensest and most compact and Virgil writing at the height of his powers. In a single long complex sentence the full weight of meaning is concentrated in nouns, verbs and participles; within the six lines, there is only one preposition, two subordinating conjunctions and (apart from the introductory ac veluti) only two unobtrusive connectives; and each of the three adverbs, certatim, usque and paulatim adds cumulatively to the effect. Not a word is otiose in any way; every detail of the scene is deeply etched; and sound and rhythm are accommodated to the sense. The graceful chiasmus of summⁱs antiquam in montibus ornum is followed by the unusual word accisam and the bold turn of phrase in instant eruere. Nor is it fanciful to see in the triple elision of the line:

eruer(e) agricolae certat(im) ill(a) usque minatur

a representation of the arduous efforts of the woodsmen and, possibly, in the dactylic tremefacta comam the fluttering of the topmost leaves. In the last three lines the consonant 'c', already noticeable in accisam crebris and agricolae certatim begins to dominate with its repeated blows and in counterpoint with 'v' ('u')

et tremefacta comam concusso vertice nutat
vulneribus donec paulatim evicta supremum
congemuit traxitque iugis avulsa ruinam.

And in the last line the present tenses of instant, minatur and nutat give way dramatically to the instantaneous perfectives congemit and traxit. Here in the fabric of these six lines all the greatest qualities of the Latin language are interwoven: weightiness, sonority, economy of means and precision; and all the subtlety and power of the Latin hexameter are wondrously displayed.

Horace, you will recall, warns the young Pisones in his Ars Poetica (15) against the decorative excrescence:

purpureus, late qui splendeat, unus et alter
adsuitur pannus.

Virgil has no such purple patches: when he is magnificent he is so with a purpose. And our simile is no exception; for, like the closing bars of an organ fugue of Bach it reverberates at the very climax of a passage of great and increasing intensity.

Let us then put the simile in its setting by starting from the point where Aeneas, separated from his comrades, has caught sight of Helen and is minded to wreak vengeance upon her. His divine mother, Venus, however, appears to him, restrains his anger, urges him to take heed rather for the safety of Anchises, Creusa and Iulus (in that order), and reveals to him the prime cause of the downfall of Troy:

non tibi Tyndaridis facies invisita Lacaenae
culpatusve Paris, divum inclementia, divum
has evertit opes sternitque a culmine Troiam. (601-3)

But it is not by words alone that Venus will unfold the truth of Troy's destiny to her son; it is her purpose to vouchsafe to him what Professor R.G. Austin has well described as an apocalyptic vision; and this is how she prepares him for it:

(aspice) namque omnem, quae nunc obducta tuenti
mortalis hebetat visus tibi et umida circum
caligat, nubem eripiam. (604-6)

Words which in sense go together are deliberately separated in a threefold chiasmus: the second word omnem is as far as possible from the penultimate noun nubem which it qualifies, obducta is separated from umida and, at the core, tuenti from tibi. Divine revelation merits its prelude in words that are highly stylised and have more than a hint of a magic formula. In this way we, the readers, are emotionally conditioned to share with Aeneas the vision itself. All human action ceases; and we see almost as in a vast picture by Titian or Veronese the gods arrayed against the city. The four great deities are clearly differentiated in language of great dignity and sonority:

hic, ubi disiectas moles avulsaque saxis
saxa vides, mixtoque undantem pulvere fumum,
Neptunus muros magnoque emota tridenti
fundamenta quatit totamque a sedibus urbem
eruit. hic Iuno Scaeas saevissima portas
prima tenet sociumque furens a navibus agmen
ferro accincta vocat.

iam summas arces Tritonia, respice, Pallas
insedit nimbo effulgens et Gorgone saeva.
ipse pater Danais animos virisque secundas
sufficit, ipse deos in Dardana suscitatur arma. (608-18)

For a moment the tension slackens and the language becomes more simple and direct as Venus departs, with advice and a promise:

'eripe, nate, fugam finemque impone labori.
nusquam abero et tutum patrio te limine sistam'.
dixerat et spissis noctis se condidit umbris. (619-21)

Then in just eight words of tremendous power Virgil expresses the chill terror of the scene and suggests as it were the thunder roll of divinely destined destruction:

apparent dirae facies inimicaque Troiae
numina magna deum. (622-3)

Aeneas now knows beyond all hope that the fate of Troy is sealed:

tum vero omne mihi visum considerare in ignis
Ilium et ex imo verti Neptunia Troia;
ac veluti summis antiquam in montibus ornum
.....
congemuit traxitque iugis avulsa ruinam. (624-31)

We are here in the presence of inspired writing where the superlatives of literary criticism and the probings of linguistic and stylistic analysis are trivial impertinences. Nowhere in Virgil, perhaps, is there a simile more splendidly placed or one which itself derives more from its setting or one which by its own excellencies adds more to its context.

I have dwelt at some length on this section of the Aeneid, beginning with non tibi Tyndaridis (601) and embracing just some thirty lines, because it illustrates an aspect of Virgil's art of which at every reading I have become increasingly conscious: I mean the relationship between the narrative, dramatic, descriptive and reflective content of the epic at its various parts, and the subtle variations in the texture of the language Virgil employs. From the Vita of Donatus we know something of Virgil's method of composition, how he shaped the twelve books prosa oratione and through the space of eleven years worked on this section and that as the spirit moved him. Even without this testimony, no reader could fail to sense how conscious was the artistry with which the poet's inspiration was finely and firmly controlled. The Aeneid is clearly structured not only in its broad outline as a narrative of the hopes, fears, wanderings, tribulations and achievements of its hero; it is dramatically fashioned also in its characterisations of the many personae, both human and divine, who have their place in Virgil's large canvas; and above all, the poem is emotionally patterned both to arouse and hold the sympathies of the reader and to convey directly and indirectly the poet's reflections on the destiny not only of his hero but of all mankind. In no particular is Virgil's deliberate artistry more in evidence than in the counterpoint between the form of

expression on the one hand and the tempo of the action or the intensity of feeling on the other.

When I chose the title of this paper it had been my intention to range over the whole of the Aeneid to illustrate what I had in mind; but I finally decided that my point would be more effectively made, not by taking a bit here and a bit there, but by tracing this relation between tempo and texture within a single book. So, since I have started with a part of book II, I will ask you to bear with me if the remainder of my paper is based also on that book, despite the fact that it is one of the best known books of the whole epic.

But perhaps I ought first to say a little more about the terms I am using. Tempo is obvious enough. Basically an epic is a tale that is told. The poet, of course, may be using the tale also as a vehicle for other things, such as the fostering of patriotic sentiments or the justifying of the ways of God to man. But all his purposes are frustrated if the hearer or reader loses interest. Action and dramatic colloquy therefore are the prime constituents. But there is a place too for passages of description or reflection designed to point the action by creating a sense of suspense, or to keep the various parts of the action in perspective, or to induce in the reader an emotional attitude to the tale itself, or to suggest some deeper level of thought. The intermingling of such passages with the action and the colloquy and the changes of tempo which arise from them, is an important aspect of epic technique. When his story requires it, Virgil's narrative, as in the funeral games in book V, is as speedy as Homer's; when the subject is of a more serious kind, as generally in book VI, his pace is notably slower and the separate incidents are presented with a greater deliberation. In his variations of tempo Virgil's practice repays the closest study, not only as an artistic device but also as an indication of the emphasis or feeling he intends to convey. And in passing I may remark that some of the passages in the later books which we find less gripping than did Virgil's contemporaries can be better understood and appreciated if we are sensitive to the clues which Virgil's choice of tempo provides.

When I speak of texture I have in mind the countless variations of complexity and tenseness which the fabric of Virgil's language displays. Its gamut is of enormous range, from the plain simplicity of conticuere omnes to the simile we have just examined. Though closely related to content, texture is something which can be apprehended, studied and enjoyed in its own right. The range of vocabulary and the choice of words and the order in which they are placed enter into consideration; so do economy of expression, the length of sentence or phrase, the involution of the syntactical structure, poetic turns of phrase, figures of speech, rhetorical emphases, the coincidence of lines and sense, the flexible and changing rhythms of the hexameter and the deliberately emotive use of initial and medial alliteration and assonance, and the pattern of vowels and their harmonies. But though the individual threads can often be clearly traced and their combination perceived, the total effect is something to be sensed rather than described. Therefore, I shall be asking you to listen to Virgil himself rather than heed the slight framework of my remarks.

The second book of the Aeneid, as you will agree, consists of three main sections. First come the preliminaries to the sack of Troy which are focused on

the wooden horse and its entry into the city. The second and longest section is the sack of Troy itself. The third is the aftermath of the sack and is concerned with the more personal impact of events on Aeneas himself, his care for his father Anchises, the loss of his wife Creusa and the gathering of the exiles for their long journey.

Notice how quietly the narrative opens with the horse standing on the shore. The Latin is simple and direct:

fracti bello fatisque repulsi
ductores Danaum tot iam labentibus annis
instar montis equum divina Palladis arte
aedificant, sectaque intexunt abiete costas;
votum pro reditu simulant; ea fama vagatur. (13-7)

The Trojans come forth from the city to view it and are divided in their opinions until Laocoon warns them against it and smites it with his spear. Here briefly the narrative pauses and the language become more tense as Aeneas makes his comment:

et, si fata deum, si mens non laeva fuisset,
impulerat ferro Argolicas foedare latebras,
Troiaque nunc staret, Priamique arx alta maneres. (54-6)

There is some alliteration; laeva does double duty with fat deum and with mens; and the change of person from staret to maneres suggests by its apostrophe the deep affection of Aeneas for his lost city. It is in still weightier and more highly contrived words than before that Aeneas again ponders on impending disaster at the end of the next scene when the captive Sinon with his skilfully planned tissue of lies has swayed the Trojans:

talibus insidiis periurique arte Sinonis
credita res, captique dolis lacrimisque coactis
quos neque Tydides nec Larisaeus Achilles,
non anni domuere decem, non mille carinae. (195-8)

The omission of est and sunt in the second line, the long 'i' sounds, the alliterations with 'c', 'l' and later with 'm', and above all the emotionally charged proper names emphasise for his audience the grief Aeneas still feels.

A dread event is now at hand. The Trojans are already persuaded to take in the horse when tragedy befalls Laocoon and confirms the Trojans in their ill-fated decision. But first, with telling effect, the grim horror of the situation is presented to the audience of Aeneas and their forebodings are aroused, by the highly alliterative passage in which the sea-serpents are described:

ecce autem gemini a Tenedo tranquilla per alta
(horresco referens) immensis orbibus angues
incumbunt pelago pariterque ad litora tendunt;
pectora quorum inter fluctus arrecta iubaeque
sanguineae superant undas; pars cetera pontum
pone legit sinuatque immensa volumine terga.

fit sonitus spumante salo; iamque arva tenebant
ardentisque oculos suffecti sanguine et igni
sibila lambebant linguis vibrantibus ora. (203-11)

The tempo then quickens again and it is in phrases of a contrasting crispness that the death of Laocoon and his two sons is vividly depicted:

diffugimus visu exsanguis. illi agmine certo
Laocoonta petunt; et primum parva duorum
corpora natorum serpens amplexus uterque
implicat et miseros morsu depascitur artus. (212-5)

Indeed, the only slackening of pace in this entire episode is the brief simile where the cries of Laocoon himself are compared with those of a sacrificial bull escaping from the altar. Nor, apart from the striking exclamation:

o patria, o divum domus Ilium et incluta bello
moenia Dardanidum (241-2)

with its reminiscence of Ennius, is the entry of the horse into Troy elaborated. Virgil even refrains from making more than a passing reference to the prophetic utterances of Cassandra, an opportunity which a poet of the Silver Age could scarce have foreborne to seize. The operation of taking the horse into the city and the jubilation of the Trojans take no more than fifteen lines and the language is terse and direct.

Night falls, the Trojans sleep, the Greeks sail in from Tenedos, Sinon releases the warriors in the horse; all this again in ten straightforward lines, to which Virgil appends an impressive list of names, as if to underline the might of the Greeks.

The stage is all set for the overwhelming of the city. But before the slaughter and devastation begin, there comes one of Virgil's masterly strokes. Aeneas is awakened by a vision of none other than Hector who warns him of the danger. In Hector and his brutal end are summed up the earlier sorrows of Troy and it is from his lips that Aeneas first learns of his own destiny as the founder of a Troy reborn. The inherent pathos of this scene is matched by the sad dignity of the language:

maestissimus Hector
visus adesse mihi largosque effundere fletus,
raptatus bigis ut quondam, aterque cruento
pulvere perque pedes traiectus lora tumentis.
ei mihi, qualis erat, quantum mutatus ab illo
Hectore qui redit exuvias indutus Achilli. (270-5)

The brief reply which Hector makes to the dazed enquiries of Aeneas begins with a concise urgency:

'heu fuge, nate dea, teque his' ait 'eripe flammis.
hostis habet muros; ruit alto a culmine Troia (289-90)

and it is only in the prophetic part of his utterance that the texture appropriately changes, with an emphatically placed magna and an involved word-order in the last line:

sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia penates;
hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quaere
magna, pererrato statues quae denique ponto. (293-5)

The sack of the city is the central panel of the triptych. Structurally, I presume, the main problem was the organisation of a scene of unmitigated carnage and destruction. Virgil's solution has been to group incidents and descriptions around a small number of persons, some of whom narrate what is happening, while others are shown in action. In the earlier part, from line 298, the main supports are Panthus, the despairing priest of Apollo, Coroebus the lover of Cassandra who suggested that the Trojans should deceive the Greeks by putting on their armour, and Androgeos the Greek who was taken by surprise. Then at line 469, which it is worth noting is almost exactly half-way through this section of the book, Pyrrhus becomes the dominant figure and the sense of tragedy is concentrated on the slaughter of Polites, the son of Priam, and of Priam himself.

As one reads the book uninterruptedly the greater tension of the central section is unmistakable, as is the more elaborately woven texture of the language in general. It is significant that, whereas there is scarcely a simile in the first part of the book, there are seven important ones in this middle part. It is worth while looking at the setting of some of them.

At the outset of the sack, when Aeneas has been awakened by Hector and climbs to the high part of the palace, he is appalled by what he hears. Yet before he tells us of the details, he sets the emotional tone by the double simile of a raging fire in a cornfield and a mountain torrent in spate:

excitior somno et summi fastigia tecti
ascensu supero atque arrectis auribus asto:
in segetem veluti cum flamma furentibus Austris
incidit, aut rapidus montano flumine torrens
sternit agros, sternit sata laeta boumque labores
praecipitisque trahit silvas: stupet inscius alto
accipiens sonitum saxi de vertice pastor. (302-8)

The sound pattern here is especially intricate.

When Aeneas has gathered his comrades around him and like ravening wolves they have set upon the enemy, they come upon the Greek Androgeos who too late perceives that they are foes. It is wholly characteristic of Virgil that he should here check the action and spare a thought for the unwary warrior:

obstipuit retroque pedem cum voce repressit.
improvisum aspris veluti qui sentibus anguem
pressit humi nitens trepidusque repente refugit
attollentem iras et caerula colla tumentem.
haud secus Androgeos visu tremefactus abibat. (378-82)

Here the placing of anguem, improvisum and attollentem and the involved alliteration bind together the fabric of the simile.

But the tempo of the individual incidents which follow is quick, the description is remarkably vivid and the language is concise and all but unadorned:

haerent parietibus scalae postisque sub ipsos
nituntur gradibus clipeosque ad tela sinistris
protecti obiciunt, prensant fastigia dextris.
Dardanidae contra turris ac tota domorum
culmina convellunt; his se, quando ultima cernunt,
extrema iam in morte parant defendere telis;
auratasque trabes, veterum decora alta parentum
devolvunt; alii strictis mucronibus imas
obsedere fores; has servant agmine denso. (442-50)

Similar variations of tempo and texture are to be observed in the second half of Virgil's account of the sack. It is typical of his technique that immediately following the first mention of Pyrrhus in line 469, Virgil prepares the reader's mind for the foulness that is to ensue by comparing Pyrrhus with a snake that has just renewed its skin and recaptured its vigour:

qualis ubi in lucem coluber mala gramina pastus,
frigida sub terra tumidum quem bruma tegebat,
nunc positis novus exuviis nitidusque iuventa,
lubrica convolvit sublato pectore terga
arduus ad solem, et linguis micat ore trisulcis. (471-5)

Three of the five lines in this passage are slightly modified versions of lines which in a different order Virgil had already written in book III of the Georgics; but that does not in the least detract from their effectiveness here.

The havoc wrought by Pyrrhus and his comrades holds our attention for a while and then comes what, in the context, is a line of deliberate and chilling simplicity:

forsitan et Priami fuerint quae fata requiras (506),

and the pathetic picture of the aged king is lovingly sketched:

arma diu senior desueta trementibus aevo
circumdat nequiquam umeris et inutile ferrum
cingitur ac densos fertur moriturus in hostis. (509-11)

Here and in the description of Hecuba and her daughters taking refuge at the altar:

praecipites atra ceu tempestate columbae (516),

there is a slow and resigned sadness.

The brutal slaughter of Polites follows and the bold and reckless taunts of Priam which provoke his own murder. There is a quick tempo and the angry exchanges

of insulting words between Pyrrhus and Priam are brief and pointed. But the texture thickens again as Aeneas reflects on what he has just witnessed:

haec finis Priami fatorum, hic exitus illum
sorte tulit Troiam incensam et prolapsa videntem
Pergama, tot quondam populis terrisque superbum
regnatorem Asiae. iacet ingens litore truncus,
avulsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus. (554-8)

The placing of illum, videntem and superbum gives a long sweep to the sentence, the double elision of the last syllables of Troiam incensam is particularly effective, and regnatorem at the beginning of a line makes the contrast with the lifeless corpse all the more stark.

There are those who have doubted whether the ensuing passage about Helen and the impulse of Aeneas to slay her could have been written by the gentle Virgil. As for the lines themselves, I cannot believe that any but Virgil could have written them. The incident in itself seems to me to be absolutely crucial to the structure of the book. Virgil after all, though no one would deny his deep humanity and tenderness, was not namby-pamby and was as aware of ill-considered and ignoble thoughts and motives as of noble; and if there is one thing to be said about the character of Aeneas it is that he was as complex as any hero in either epic or tragedy, torn by his own inner conflicts, not always steadfast in the pursuit of his mission and his duty, and achieving his goal only after torments of indecision. That Aeneas in his distraught state of mind should feel moved to uncontrollable anger against Helen as the cause of all these woes is psychologically convincing. The appearance of Helen at this point in the narrative is indeed an unexpected and dramatic stroke which to the first readers of the Aeneid must have come with a tremendous impact. We are so familiar with the pattern of this book that we run the risk perhaps of taking it too much for granted and so fail to recapture the emotions with which Virgil's contemporaries read it. It was Venus the mother of Aeneas who brought Paris and Helen together; and there is an inevitable kind of propriety in giving to Venus the role of restraining Aeneas and guiding him at this crisis in his destiny: and, within this context, it is equally fitting that her appearance should be linked with Helen.

Aeneas does not describe Helen as he sees her lurking - of all places - in the temple of Vesta; but in four concentrated and memorable lines he sums up all the charges against her:

illa sibi infestos eversa ob Pergama Teucros
et poenas Danaum et deserti coniugis iras
praemetuens, Troiae et patriae communis Erinys,
abdiderat sese atque aris invisa sedebat. (571-4)

For the rest, the episode continues with the angry thoughts of Aeneas, expressed with all Virgil's mastery of pointed and emotive rhetoric. Is she, unharmed to see Sparta again and ancestral Mycenae? And as Aeneas resolves the doubts still lingering in his mind the texture becomes closer:

non ita; namque etsi nullum memorabile nomen
feminea in poena est nec habet victoria laudem,
exstinxisse nefas tamen et sumpsisse merentis
laudabor poenas, animumque explesse iuvabit
ultricis flammae et cineres satiasse meorum. (583-7)

And now, when excitement and suspense are almost unbearable, the appearance of Venus herself:

talia iactabam et furiata mente ferebar,
cum mihi se, non ante oculis tam clara, videndam
obtulit et pura per noctem in luce refulsit
alma parens, confessa deam, qualisque videri
caelicolis et quanta solet. (588-92)

How striking is the interplay of nominatives and accusatives and how startling is the postponement and eventual juxtaposition of alma parens and confessa deam.

We are now back again at the point from which this paper began, the terrible spectacle of the gods themselves arrayed against Troy and the tremendous simile with which the passage ends.

With a sudden change of texture the third part of the book opens:

descendo ac ducente deo flammam inter et hostis
expedior; dant tela locum flammaeque recedunt. (632-3)

The theme is now the preparation for the future and the interest is directed mainly on Aeneas and his family. The whole picture is in quieter colours and the tension never again rises so high as to demand a simile. This however is not to say that the texture is uniform. Far from it; for this section is full of incident and of varying emotions. First Anchises must be roused from his despair and dull resignation; and one notes how at the end of his persuasions, the words of Aeneas become more weighty and involved as he recalls his encounter with Venus:

hoc erat, alma parens, quod me per tela, per ignis
eripis, ut mediis hostem in penetrabilibus utque
Ascanium patremque meum iuxtaque Creusam
alterum in alterius mactatos sanguine cernam. (664-7)

You will note the skill with which son, father and wife are mentioned in a single line and the effect of holding back mactatos sanguine and cernam.

It is the prodigy of the crest of flame on the head of Iulus which sways the issue for Anchises. The texture is notable:

namque manus inter maestorumque ora parentum
ecce levis summo de vertice visus Iuli
fundere lumen apex, tactuque innoxia mollis
lambere flamma comas et circum tempora pasci. (681-4)

No less textured is the description of the omen which follows:

de caelo lapsa per umbras
stella facem ducens multa cum luce cucurrit.
illam summa super labentem culmina tecti
cernimus Idaeae claram se condere silva
signantemque vias; tum longo limite sulcus
dat lucem et late circum loca sulphure fumant. (693-8)

The gliding of the meteor is admirably suggested by the dominant alliteration of the 'l' sound in counterpoint with 'c' and 's'; and it cannot be accidental that in these five and a half lines there is only one elision. Anchises is prevailed upon, arrangements are made for Aeneas and his household to foregather at the ancient temple of Ceres and they set out. All is vividly and clearly pictured and in simple language. What indeed could be more direct than these lines:

iamque propinquabam portis omnemque videbar
evasisse viam, subito cum creber ad auris
visus adesse pedum sonitus, genitorque per umbram
prospiciens 'nate' exclamat 'fuge, nate; propinquant'. (730-3)

It is in this unelaborated vein too that the loss of Creusa is related:

nec prius amissam respexi animumve reflexi
quam tumulum antiquae Cereris sedemque sacratam
venimus: hic demum collectis omnibus una
defuit. (741-4)

There is only a brief and almost trite expression of sorrow:

quem non incusavi amens hominumque deorumque,
aut quid in eversa vidi crudelius urbe. (745-6)

Some lovers of Virgil have been pained by and critical of what to them seems a callous restraint. Yet it is surely right to assume that whatever reasons Virgil had for dealing with the incident in this way, lack of human feeling was not one of them. It is worth remembering that Aeneas had Creusa in mind at the very height of the sack (subit deserta Creusa, 562) and care for her was one of the duties Venus had placed upon him. I certainly cannot accept the suggestion once made that it was courteous of Aeneas, when recounting his adventures to one lady, not to stress his affection for another; for Aeneas was not yet in love with Dido nor did he realise that she was falling in love with him. There can be little doubt that it is the tempo of the narrative on which Virgil had decided that determined the treatment here of Creusa. We have still to see Troy when the sack has been completed. Aeneas was not convinced that Creusa was lost for good and it was to seek her that he risked his life again by returning to the city. As he looks upon the Greeks now guarding the treasure they have collected and the captive women standing around, he calls Creusa's name:

implevi clamore vias, maestusque Creusam
nequiquam ingeminans iterumque iterumque vocavi. (769-70)

In this setting she miraculously appears to him and we can now see, I think, why Virgil had not paused unduly in the earlier part of the narrative. Creusa has a distinctive role to play, not only by consoling Aeneas about her own fate, but, like Hector and Venus previously, by foretelling his own destiny. The passage is full of an unhurried dignity:

quid tantum insano iuvat indulgere dolori
o dulcis coniunx? non haec sine numine divum
eveniunt; nec te hinc comitem asportare Creusam
fas aut ille sinit superi regnator Olympi.
longa tibi exsilia et vastum maris aequor arandum
et terram Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva
inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Thybris. (776-82)

And as the vision of Creusa fades and the book draws to its close there is a gently stylised passage with reminiscences of Homer, beginning with a mild archaism and ending in one of Virgil's most liquid lines:

haec ubi dicta dedit lacrimantem et multa volentem
dicere deseruit, tenuisque recessit in auras.
ter conatus ibi collo dare bracchia circum;
ter frustra comprensa manus effugit imago,
par levibus ventis volucrique simillima somno. (790-4; cf. VI 700)

All I set out to do in this paper was to try, and share with you one aspect of Virgil's art which, amongst so many others, gives me pleasure; and if I have been doing no more than indulge my own fancies, we have at least read some Virgil together.

V.S. Lectures, No.92

EPIC AND ENCOMIUM

A lecture delivered to the Virgil Society
15th March 1969

by D.W. Black, B.A., M.Litt.

It is an obvious and familiar statement that the Aeneid invites comparison with the Homeric epics. Even before the death of Virgil - to say the completion of the Aeneid begs some question - Propertius had written nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade¹. And at every level, the influence, imitation or emulation of Homer is evident at a cursory reading. We can, with Servius, divide the Aeneid into a Roman Odyssey and a Roman Iliad at a major structural level. Lesser episodes have their clear Homeric models: to take one example from many, the story of Nisus and Euryalus in Aeneid IX is in some sense founded on the Doloneia of Iliad X. At yet

another level, the line-initial phrases voce vocans and voce vocat² recall to my mind the Homeric ἄσπεσσι ἄσπεσσι³; similarly, the two forms of accusative Daren and Dareta and the variation of form in tegmina and tegimen⁴ are exploitations, within the limits of Latin, of morphological plurality such as we find so much more frequently in Homer, and which is so confusing to the beginner reading Homer.

It is however at least as clear that the Aeneid is no mere imitation, in the modern sense, of either or both of the Homeric epics. There is at the very least 'modulation' of the Greek exemplar: the cases of imitation cited above will show this; so too, in the first book of the Aeneid, Virgil introduces the singer Iopas - a sufficiently Homeric scene - but the subject-matter of his song is unthinkable in Homeric epic:

hic canit errantem lunam solisque labores,
unde hominum genus et pecudes, unde imber et ignes,
Arcturum pluviasque Hyada geminosque Triones;
quid tantum Oceano properent se tingere soles
hiberni, vel quae tardis mora noctibus obstet. (742-746)

"He sings of the course of the moon and the work of the sun; of the origin of man and beasts, or rain and fire; about Arcturus and the rainy Hyades and the two Bears; why the sun in winter so hastens to sink in the Ocean, or what delays nightfall when it is late."

Mr. Preshous has shown that there are two sources other than the Odyssey for this song - Apollonius Rhodius and Lucretius⁵. The ultimate model is Homeric, but the Virgilian final form shows considerable modification or modulation of its original.

But at this point it is convenient to turn our attention to a trick of style in which, it seems to me, Virgil so far diverges from the Homeric model as to run counter to it. At certain points in his narrative, Virgil suddenly introduces a new factor whose relevance to the course of the narration is not immediately obvious and is only revealed later. There is no expressed link, only a leap to a new point in order to begin an advance along a new axis; and later the new path will intersect with the line of the preceding narrative, giving retrospective relevance to words which seemed, at first, irrelevant.

The feature may be illustrated from a passage in Aeneid VI. Daedalus, ut fama est, fugiens Minoia regna: the mention of Daedalus is an abrupt turn in the narration. There is here nothing to indicate why the approach of Aeneas and his companions to the Triviae lucos atque aurea tecta of the preceding line should suggest or lead us to Daedalus. After some five lines, we are told that he constructed immania templa, and we are left to understand that the tecta of v. 13 and the templa of v. 19 are the same. No great demands are made on the reader's intelligence in appreciating the identification and the retrospective relevance of Daedalus: nevertheless, it is retrospective and there has been an abrupt change of direction. The device may seem a simple one, but it is not isolated: transitions similarly abrupt at first hearing occur elsewhere. The time of the action is so altered in Aeneid IV, 522 - nox erat et placidum carpebant fessa soporem / corpora; in Aeneid XI, 522 the device marks a change of place - est curvo anfractu valles;

and a rather different change of subject is made in Aeneid VII, 601 with the words mos erat Hesperio in Latio.⁶ Even in Aeneid II, 21 the words est in conspectu Tenedos are reminiscent of this device, although in this case the transition is not so clearly distinct from Homeric patterning.

A leap in order to change the immediate subject of discourse and to approach the continuation of the narrative from another angle is remote from the Homeric style; it is not that of the poet of the Iliad; it is not even a mark of the more sophisticated methods of the poet of the Odyssey (more sophisticated in that the latter was able to relate simultaneous events without imposing on them a false temporal succession). The conditions of Homeric composition and the general usage of Greek are such that an overt, if at times untrue or forced, expression of linkage is to be expected. Admittedly, the link in Homer is sometimes weak, reduced to a mere $\delta\epsilon$. Some link, however, there is and an abruptness deliberately sought, as it is in Virgil, is quite un-Homeric. If we look at the lines containing the most violent change of direction in the Homeric epics, the lines at the end of Odyssey IV and the beginning of Odyssey V where the 'Telemachy' is broken off and the story of Odysseus himself is introduced, we shall see something far different:

Μνηστῆρες δ' ἀναβάντες ἐξέπλεον ὕγρὰ κέλευθα,
Τελεμάχῳ φόνον αἰκῶν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ὀρμαίνοντες.
ἔστι δὲ τις νῆσος μέσση ἀλί πετρήεσσα,
μεσσηγῶς Ἰθάκης τε Σάμοιο τε καιπαλοέσσης,
Ἄστερις, οὐ μεγάλη. λιμένες δ' ἐνὶ ναύλοχοι αὐτῇ
ἀμφίδυμοι. τῇ τὸν γε μένον λοχῶντες Ἀχαιοί.
Ἦώς δ' ἐκ λεχέων παρ' ἀγαυοῦ Τιθωνοῖο
ὄρνυθ', ἴν' ἀθανάτοισι φῶς φέροι ἠδὲ βροτοῖσιν.
οἱ δὲ θεοὶ θῶκόνδε καθίζανον

(Odyssey IV, 842 - V, 3: "The suitors embarked and sailed the watery paths, planning fell death to Telemachus, and there is a rocky island in the midst of the sea between Ithaca and rugged Samos, Asteris, not very large: there are harbours to take ships there, twinned; there the Achaeans waited for him in ambush. And Dawn rose from bed beside noble Tithonus to bring light to immortals and mortals. And the gods went to council....")

The business which Athena puts before the assembly of the gods is discussion of the sufferings of Odysseus, and we are to hear no more of Telemachus until the beginning of Odyssey XV. It would not be easy to guess from these lines the magnitude of the transition they contain; one might even object that there is something improper in the attempt to smooth it. But the link between the night-ambush and the meeting of the gods, between 'Telemachy' and 'Odyssey', is there and is sought, as a necessity in compositional technique. It is a real achievement for the poet to have produced it here, where he might have abandoned the effort to link overtly. This poet would scarcely have sympathised with Virgil when he, in the passages cited supra, stresses a break in narration. The device in Virgil appears to be not only un-Homeric but counter-Homeric.

There is of course much in Virgil which is not taken from Homer. Amongst other precursors whose work he used, attention has been particularly focused upon the Hellenistic poets, especially Apollonius Rhodius, and on Latin models, especially Ennius⁷. These additional sources of influence are, in a sense, un-Homeric (although Apollonius is a most obvious example of a Homerist), but they are not necessarily counter-Homeric: they do not of necessity add anything inconsistent with Homeric epic.

But in the Aeneid we have observed a technical device which is counter-Homeric. The device alone is of little real importance. It may arouse interest, nevertheless, since it appears symptomatic of a spirit governing the conception and composition of the Aeneid which is also counter-Homeric. Distinguishing the Virgilian epic from the Homeric there is an encomiastic strain, a feature to which Heinze draws attention in speaking of the influence of Hellenistic historians upon Virgil⁸. There is an element of encomium, of the giving of praise, in the very structure of epic. And in the Homeric epics, Patroclus in the Iliad and Demodocus in the Odyssey both sing κλέα ἀνδρῶν, as does Phemius in the first book of the Odyssey, although the phrase is not found there⁹. The κλέα ἀνδρῶν and what Cato called carmina de clarorum virorum laudibus¹⁰, sung by an ἄοιδος or a vates, appear to be a common inheritance of the Greeks and Latins from their distant ancestors - a literary form which can, not improbably, be traced back into the prehistory of the Indo-European language groups as an element in the prehistory of literature¹¹. Epic itself cannot be so traced back, but that epic grew from such songs is scarcely open to question. But the encomiastic element that this implies is of so indeterminate a kind that it is proper to make distinctions between Homer and Virgil in their encomiastic intent.

It is perhaps worth reflecting that it is not an easy task to praise some-one effectively. On a number of occasions, Virgil describes Aeneas as pius, but that is not enough to convince the reader that Aeneas is praiseworthy. Yet the quality of pietas might in itself command more general approbation than some other value-judgments which are nevertheless employed to convey praise. It is necessary that there be some rapport between the laudator and his audience in order that commendation be acceptable. The laudator must achieve this, and in order to persuade or convince his audience he may need to show that his laudandus does in fact possess certain qualities, and also that these qualities are worthy of admiration. If he is a poet, the laudator must do this without ceasing to hold the attention of his audience and without distracting it too far from the laudandus. We should expect that the difficulties inherent in carrying out a task which must be common would lead to the development of established forms of procedure whereby the audience may be persuaded.

Among these forms, we would find the device generally known under its German name of "Priamel". Sappho, wishing to single out as especially valuable the object of love, wrote: οἱ μὲν ἱππῶν στρότον οἱ δὲ πέσδων

οἱ δὲ νῶν φαῖσ' ἐπὶ γᾶν μέλαιναν
ἔμμεναι κάλλιστον, ἔγω δὲ κῆν' ὄτ-
τω τις ἔραται

(fr. 16, 1-4: "Some say it is a troop of cavalry, some a company of infantry, some a squadron of ships that is the finest thing on earth: but I say it is whatever one loves.") When Sappho says this, it is not an intellectual, but an emotional reaction to find the final term of the priamel, the final contrastive term or "cap", more acceptable than would be the simple statement, unadorned by the "foil" of the first three terms¹². The priamel focuses the attention in such a way that its final term is enhanced by comparison and by contrast, briefly, by association with the others. It is not an arcane device, and was known to and employed by Virgil, although not in the Aeneid. There are several examples amongst the Eclogues. At some length, we find in the second Eclogue (8-12):

nunc etiam pecudes umbras et frigora captant;
nunc viridis etiam occultant spineta lacertos,
Thestylis et rapido fessis messoribus aestu
alia serpyllumque herbas contundit olentis.
at mecum raucis, tua dum vestigia lustris,
sole sub ardenti resonant arbusta cicadis.

Here there are three items of foil leading to the cap, strongly marked by the adversative at and the pronoun following. Although there is no element of encomium in these lines, the device is employed, as in Sappho, to concentrate attention on the closing term. Similarly, but in a briefer, more compressed form, attention is focused on the last term in two lines from Eclogue III (80-81):

triste lupus stabulis, maturis frugibus imbres,
arboribus venti, nobis Amaryllidis irae.

It is, I think, clear why the priamel is not carried over to the broader canvas of the Aeneid: not because Virgil, having essayed the form, was dissatisfied with it, but because it is essentially a compression, a reduction to bare essentials of the setting for the principal term. Within the epic, the foil and cap need not be so compressed: terms of contrast and comparison, actual and implied, may be stated in far greater leisure, at much longer extent and with less insistence on their functional relevance. The hero or heroes of the epic are commended to the reader in virtue of their associations, but these associations are the rest of the epic, their setting and foil. In this respect, the Homeric epics and the Aeneid are both encomiastic: they do recommend their heroes. But since the setting is less compressed and less formalised than the foil of the priamel, there are from time to time doubts about the personages: who is hero, and who is part of the setting. Such doubts find expression in argument about the relative merits of Achilles and Hector in the Iliad and even of Turnus and Aeneas in the Aeneid.

Argument about the identity of the hero is ill-founded in these cases, although not entirely worthless, but it is ill-founded for different reasons. It was not the poet's intention to persuade his audience to admire Achilles or Hector above the other, and therefore argument about the identity of the hero of the Iliad lacks validity. Even in the Odyssey, where there is no room for doubt that Odysseus is the principal actor, the hero who stands out from his setting, it is by no means clear that it was the purpose of the epic to make him stand out so. The relative prominence of characters of the Homeric epic is the result partly of the cultural

background and partly of the nature of the story told: the poet's intention was to produce an interesting and entertaining story. But in the Aeneid, Aeneas' superiority to Turnus is not an incidental effect of a thrilling tale told for its intrinsic interest. From the opening lines, the intention of the poet is not in doubt: he calls Aeneas insignem pietate virum, he tells us that Aeneas' wanderings came about saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram, he asks amazed tantaene animis caelestibus irae?¹³ The position of Aeneas is central, and Virgil was not indifferent to the identity of his hero: instead, the identity of the hero, to be commended to the reader, determines the epic story.

Virgil was setting out to write an epic in a literature heavily influenced by Greek tradition when he began the Aeneid, and it is therefore appropriate to consider a hypothetical problem in a Greek context: suppose a Greek poet to ask himself what sort of poem he should write in order to make his audience think well of his principal character. His answer will not be 'Homeric epic', although it will depend upon the identity of the supposed hero. What then are the appropriate forms for laudatory poems in Greek? We may begin with a slight misapplication of Pindar's τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; (O1.II, 2). In the fifth century, one might quickly think of a hymn for a god, of tragedy for a hero. For a man (in whom, as the priamelian form shows, Pindar was most interested in Olympian II), differing circumstances would suggest different answers. The Attic scholion in honour of Harmodius and Aristogeiton exemplifies one type; not very remote from this are the "encomia" of the Alexandrian classification¹⁴. But of the possible forms, I wish to consider only the occasional verses of the epinician ode since, as I shall try to show, the epinician casts some light on the Aeneid¹⁵.

There survive more than fifty epinician odes, written by Pindar and Bacchylides: none of those written by Simonides, the originator of the form, are extant, and it is difficult to make any estimate of the extent of our loss. But sufficient examples there are to give confidence that we can define with enough precision the demands and limits of the genre. Indeed, it is only necessary to consider one typical, but by no means exceptional, ode from those that survive to recall some frequent features. Such an ode is Pindar's Isthmian VI, a poem of some seventy-five verses, written on the occasion of the victory of an Aeginetan boy, Phylacidas, in the pancration at an Isthmian festival not long before 480 B.C.¹⁶. The ode falls into three fairly clearly defined sections: an introductory section enables the poet to indicate the occasion for the poem, and further to recall the victory of the boy's brother at the Nemean games; he tells us who Phylacidas' father and grandfather were, and wishes the family well for the future. The final section is concerned with subjects much the same as these: there is a further catalogue of successes in athletic contests, and there is more about the kinfolk of the young victor, with some particular compliments to Lampon, his father, who commissioned this and other odes from Pindar¹⁷. Enshrined between these two sections, there is a mythic section which demands our closer attention. This comparatively short excursus, extending from v. 19 to v. 56 of the ode, contains a wealth of allusion as it proceeds rapidly from the invocation of the Aeacids to Hercules' prophecy about Telamon's son, Ajax. To produce from these a clear, consecutive narrative would involve considerable lengthening and destroy the proportions of the ode and, more importantly, obscure its relevance and effect¹⁸. Pindar finds it his duty to mention the Aeacids since the ode was written for an Aeginetan, and the city and island of Aegina had an especial connexion in myth and religious cult with the

heroes of this family. There is no such obvious appropriateness in the introduction of Hercules, but within the myth the overt subject is Hercules, the grammatical subject and the moving personage. But the function of Hercules in the myth is analogous to the function of the myth in the epinician ode. Whilst Hercules is in the centre of the stage as a reference-point, the focus of attention is on the Aeacids - principally Telamon, but also Peleus and, to a greater degree, Ajax. The latter are the personages of real interest in the myth. So too the myth itself bulks largely in the ode, framed within passages concerning the Psalychiadae, and thus serves as a reference-point for these more important personages, the victor and his family.

Within the myth, the temporal sequence of events is of little significance beside the importance of concentrating on the most relevant points in their most effective order. From the mention of Telamon, it falls into two parts of which the earlier is, temporally, subsequent to the second. The myth thus rises to its climax with peculiar appropriateness in prayer and prophecy about Ajax, son of Telamon: Pindar's client was Lampon, father of the victor, and the gently implied analogy between the two father-son pairs is nonetheless unmistakable; similarly, the words of Hercules in v. 48 *πρῶτον ἀέθλων κτεῖνὰ ποτ' ἐν Νεμέσῳ* recall the non-mythic words in vv. 3-4 *ἐν Νεμέσῳ μὲν πρῶτον ... ἄωτον δεξάμενοι στέφανων* where the success was that of Pytheas, the elder brother of Phylacidas.

This ode, although typical, does not present a universal exemplar of epinician form: not all epinician odes contain a mythical narrative, as Isthmian VI does: Olympian XIV is a particularly charming example of a short epinician without a myth. The myth does not necessarily take us back to the heroic age: Bacchylides III uses the story of Croesus instead - admittedly, as exceptional a choice as the subject of Aeschylus' Persae. It is not always so easy to detect multiple lines of connexion between the myth and the occasion of the poem: it can happen that the myth appears to be connected to the ode in general by the merest chance, at least in the state of our knowledge or ignorance of all the circumstances of its composition - the vexed Pythian XI provides one example. There is not always the same apparent proportion between the myth and the remainder of the ode in sheer length, although the myth is commonly between a third and a half of the ode. The ordinariness of Isthmian VI renders it more useful than these exceptions for illustration of the Aeneid of Virgil. In this ode, there is a manifestation of a method of encomium by association; in it, the myth functions rather as foil in the priamel, but the whole is more convoluted than the relatively simple priamel. Hercules stands in the centre, a hero to all the Greeks and an earnest of the real worth of the Aeacids. No Aeginetan could, in any case, seriously doubt this worth, since their own mythical ancestors were unquestionably great and praiseworthy. The Aeacids in turn set off the Psalychiadae, the victor and his kin, and thus the whole context of real worth includes them and redounds to their credit.

Now let us consider again Virgil and his Aeneid. In the Georgics, Virgil had indicated an intention of writing a work in praise of Augustus:

mox tamen ardentis accingar dicere pugnas
Caesaris et nomen fama tot ferre per annos
Tithoni prima quot abest ab origine Caesar.¹⁹

Virgil tells us of an intention of writing an historical work, presumably following the example of Ennius' *Annales*, although we have no evidence that he began the project in a serious way. Had he carried out his apparent intention, we would have had, I suppose, a poem from him rather more closely analogous to Lucan's *Pharsalia* than to the Homeric epics, and had Virgil selected Ennius as his principal exemplar, he would, I submit, have written within a more severely Roman tradition than he did. As it is, the *Aeneid* is very much in the Greek tradition. Its author had no need to be reminded, with others, vos exemplaria Graeca / nocturna versate manu, versate diurna²⁰. Virgil did know and read his Greek poets, and it would be dangerous to underestimate the range of his reading which was certainly not confined to those poets whose influence upon his work is marked and well-known. There is demonstrable evidence in his own work that he devoted care and attention to his reading of Homer and Apollonius Rhodius. We must assume that he had read some works whose influence has not been unequivocally detected in his own work, if only because so much of ancient literature, Greek and Latin, has not survived. If Virgil did, as he says he did, seriously contemplate a laudatory poem on Augustus, his attention must surely have been drawn to the epinician form, offering as it did an established model for work of this kind. He did not in fact produce a Latin epinician, and speculation about his reasons is not very profitable. He did produce the *Aeneid*, and we can find in this some points of contact with the epinician genre.

From the first lines, the essential unity of the companions of Aeneas, the Aeneads, and the contemporary Romans of the poet is stressed. At first, Aeneas is the founder of that city from which Rome drew its ultimate Italian origin, but by v. 33 the task of the Aeneads has become clear - Romanam condere gentem, a notable task. Already in *Georgic* I, 501-502 we find the equation of the Roman people with the Trojan: satis iam pridem sanguine nostro / Laomedontae luimus periuria Troiae. In this case, it is only a passing remark, alluding to the commonplace of tradition that the Roman people was of Trojan origin. But in the *Aeneid*, the essential unity is further emphasised by particular connexions. Iulus, whose name was changed from Ilus, was progenitor of the Julii and hence of Augustus; no reason is offered for the change of name, not even a pun, such as that of aietos and Aias in Pindar's *Isthmian* VI. In *Aeneid* V, three Roman gentes are traced back to three individual companions of Aeneas:

mox Italus Mnestheus, genus a quo nomine Memmi,
ingentemque Gyas ingenti mole Chimaeram,
urbis opus, triplici pubes quam Dardana versu
impellunt, terno consurgunt ordine remi;
Sergestusque, domus tenet a quo Sergia nomen,
Centauru invehitur magno, Scyllaque Cloanthus
caerulea, genus unde tibi, Romane Cluenti. (117-123)

In the same book, we find Atys, genus unde Atii duxere Latini (568), and the very improbability of these etymologies only reinforces their effect. The lines of connexion are drawn deliberately and of set purpose so that from time to time the reader is reminded that it is not only ancient history, but ancient history

intimately connected with the present that he reads²¹. The relationship of mythical to contemporary life is comparable to that which impelled Pindar to write in Isthmian VI:

ὕμνε τ', ὦ χρυσάρματοι Αἰακίδαι,
τέθειρόν μοι φανί σαφέστατον ἔμμεν
τάνδ' ἐπιστεῖχοντα νάσον βαινόμεν εὐλογίαις.

(19-21)

In larger set-pieces in the sixth and eight books of the Aeneid, the poet has further opportunities to present the relationship. But these long excursuses appear to be qualitatively different. To read the Dardanium prolem quae deinde sequatur / gloria of Aeneid VI, 766-886 and the res Italas Romanorumque triumphos of VIII, 626-728 is to be presented with a selected number of explicit intermediate points in the history of the Roman people between the age of the heroes and the present. These intermediate points do link the heroic period to the present, but they are conceived as history, not myth (their actual truth or falsehood is irrelevant). Thus they form, as it were, a family history. In the epinician ode too we find family histories: they are, as in the sixth Isthmian, outside the myth, and are indeed a more essential element than the myth, for they are indicated in those epinicians, most of them short, which lack narration of myth. It was a necessary part of the task of the epinician poet to celebrate not only the immediate occasion, but also other notable events in the recent history of the family of the victor or laudandus. Usually, our attention is drawn to other victories at athletic festivals, but other notable events are also recorded. In the very short Pythian VII, Pindar refers to the facing of the temple of Apollo at Delphi with marble, the expense of which was borne by the Athenian Alcmeonid family, for one member of which this ode was written. Similarly, the foundation of the city of Aetna by Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse, and the success of members of Hiero's family in the battle of Himera against the Carthaginians in 480 B.C. find a place in surviving epinicians. Such achievements may seem small things to set beside Roman history: but the fifth century was closer in time to the beginnings of writing in Greece²² and hence there was less recorded history; and epinicians were written for small groups, for families in whose life a victory in the Olympic games might loom as large as the conquest of a new province in the life of an empire. The recall of achievements outside the scope of the myth and distinct from the immediate occasion of the epinician ode shares a quality of non-mythic historicity with the parade of future Romans and the description of the shield of Aeneas in the Roman epic, and I therefore suggest that they are analogous.

Earlier, the disturbance of strict temporal order in the narration of the myth in Pindar's Isthmian VI was mentioned. The disturbance permits an ordering of events determined by the emphasis which the poet seeks in each case, and is particularly valuable to the poet in easing the transition from a given situation, the occasion of the poem and the identity of the victor, to a freely chosen mythical subject. Other effects may also be sought, and thus in the ode here used as an exemplar the prophecy of the birth of Ajax occurs fittingly at the close of the myth. We may feel at times that the poet has disturbed the temporal order solely from habit and without sufficient reason, particularly in the long Pythian IV, but there are proper uses for disturbance in some cases, not vitiated by misuse. Virgil too, although certainly not in this imitating the epinician poets, disturbs strict temporal order with the initial plunge in medias res. To start in the middle of

his story demands of a narrator a conscious choice amongst several possibilities, for there may be only one beginning, but there are several medial points in a narrative. Virgil chose to begin in such a way that two important and connected features might be presented from the outset as immediately relevant in addition to their more pervasive, less specific relevance elsewhere: these are the character of Juno and the city of Carthage. I am reminded of the transitions to be found in epinician poetry and I am tempted to ask whether Virgil was conscious of any similarity of technique.

There do, however, appear to be real similarities in technique and spirit between epinician poets and Virgil in the stressing of relationship between the heroic age and the time of writing and in the peripheral family histories outside the major myth. If these similarities are the result of mere chance, it is a strange chance that they are equally counter-Homeric features, for the connexions established between Homeric heroes and later Greek cities are the work of later commentators and interpreters, not of the poets who composed the Homeric epics. It may be objected that if Virgil were really influenced by epinician poets, we should expect to find observable verbal reminiscences of these poets in his work, and it is true that there are few verbal reminiscences of Pindar in the Aeneid. Commentators adduce few examples, and I have not been able to add to their number. Servius cites Pindar as an authority on the myth of the Centaurs²³ and Virgil's fulva...de nube is at least parallel to Pindar's ξανθὰ νεφέλα²⁴. The most notable case is the parallel between the description of Aetna in Aeneid III, 571-582, which is itself a reworking of Virgil's own Georgic I, 472-473, and Pindar's description in Pythian I, 18-28²⁵. There are considerable differences between the two passages, and there is further an inherent likelihood of similarity at some point of description by two men of something which both had seen. Nevertheless, there are some striking phrases which, whilst not imposing conviction, persuade me that the Virgilian passage is related to the Pindaric, a relationship of which Jackson Knight says that Virgil has here used Pindar "to detonate his own imagination"²⁶. These points of contact between Pindar and Virgil, slight as they are, suffice to demonstrate what is in any case inherently probable, that Virgil was open to the influence of epinician form.

Since this is so, it is pertinent to wonder whether the classical Greek form of encomiastic poem may have influenced the Roman poet in his approach to the epic in the light of the epinician ode. They are distinguished in scale to such a degree as to be almost incommensurate, and of course distinguished in verse form. They are distinguished too by the presence in the text of the epinician of an explanation of its occasion and the lack of so overt a contemporary motive in the epic. But if we consider only the myth of the epinician, the similarity of attitude of the epinician poets and Virgil is striking: is it too much to consider for a few moments the Aeneid as the myth of an epinician poem, and ask then who is the hero of this work? In such a comparison, the hero must be external to the myth, and for the Aeneid only one answer remains possible: Augustus. Servius stated that it was the aim of Virgil Augustum laudare a parentibus; the application of the epinician ode to the Aeneid suggests a justification for this statement within the norms of classical literature, and we may see in the Aeneid a poem really in praise of Augustus, really both epic and encomium.

1. Prop. II, xxxiv, 66.
2. Aen. VI, 247; XII, 483.
3. Il. V, 31; 455.
4. Aen. V, 455, 460; VII, 632, 666.
5. Proc. Virg. Soc. 4 (1964-1965), p. 6.
6. For further examples, see Aen. III, 73; V, 124; VII 563; VIII, 26; XII, 845.
7. Cf. M.Hügi: Vergils Aeneis und die hellenistische Dichtung; J.D.M. Preshous: "Apollonius Rhodius and Virgil", Proc. Virg. Soc. 4 (1964-5) 1-17; E.Norden: Vergilius und Ennius.
8. R. Heinze: Vergils epische Technik, pp. 474 ff.
9. Il. IX, 189; Od. VIII, 73; Od. I, 325 ff.
10. Cic. Brutus 75; T.D. IV, ii, 3.
11. Cf. R. Schmitt: Indogermanische Dichtersprache, pp. 340-343.
12. For the terminology employed, see E.L. Bundy: Studia Pindarica I, p. 5 fn.
13. Aen. I, 10; 6; 11.
14. The Pindaric examples are well edited by B.A. van Groningen: Pindare au Banquet.
15. Since scolia and encomia lack any mythic narration, they are obviously less relevant for the study of epic.
16. For the date, E. Gaspar: Essai de chronologie pindarique, p. 56; Wilamowitz: Pindaros, p. 179 suggests the summer of 480 B.C.
17. Pindar, Nemean V and Isthmian V.
18. Length alone is not an insuperable barrier: that of Pythian IV, 9-261 is comparable with the epyllion.
19. Geo. III, 46-48.
20. Hor., A.P., 268-269.
21. Cp. also Aen. VII, 707-8 (Clausus and the Claudii). Other proper names of characters in the Aeneid suggest connexions with later Rome, without further insistence by the poet, e.g. Arruns, Caeculus (cp. Caecilius), Camilla, Cethegus.
22. I exclude of course the pre-alphabetic Minoan and Mycenaean scripts.
23. ad Aen. VIII, 293.
24. Aen. XII, 792 and Pindar O1. VII, 49.
25. Cf. Heinze, op. cit., p. 250.
26. I am grateful to Mr. H.M. Currie for pointing out to me this striking phrase: Proc. Virg. Soc. 1 (1961-1962), pp. 10-11.

Molle atque Facetum

Ineptiae mihi barbam tondenti quot et quales in mentem incidere solent.
Exemplum hoc accipe.

stridenti miserum stipula disperdere carmen

(Verg. Ecl. III.27)

Sic chartae omnes et recte. At quid si poeta non solum perdere sed etiam pedere subaudire nos volebat? Enimvero dis- praefixum aptius esse ad hoc quam ad illud videtur. Ac ne quis cum hoc carmine hisque cum pastoribus notionem salaciorem parum convenire autumat. Eodem fortasse lusu aures nostras titillare in animo habebat Plautus apud quem haec verba invenimus:

bibe, es, disperde rem

(Cas. 248)

An me convincet aliquis delirationis et medico committet qui ex ambagibus mentis faecem penitus immersam quasi sentinaculo exhauserim?

Royal Masonic School,
Bushey.

H.G. MULLENS.

INFIXUM STRIDIT SUB PECTORE VULNUS (Virg. Aen. iv.689)

When Dido, after inflicting the fatal wound, is found by her sister 'with life nearly gone', Anna 'caught (her) to her heart...and tried sobbingly to warm her and to dry the black gouts of blood with her dress'. Then Dido 'made an effort to raise her heavy eyes to meet her, and fell fainting'. (Aen. iv.686-9; translations from R.G. Austin's commentary).

The words that follow, infixum stridit sub pectore vulnus, with their echo of tacitum vivit sub pectore vulnus of a very different wound earlier in the book (line 67) and also perhaps of Juno's aeternum...sub pectore vulnus at the beginning of the whole work (i.36) are among the most poignant in the whole passage; but their precise connotation is far from certain, and they have been interpreted in a great variety of ways. An attempt to look at them from the physiological point of view may therefore be not without value, especially in the eyes of those who admit that accurate observation and description are among the ingredients of much of the greatest poetry.

To a large extent the difficulty hinges on the nature of the sound denoted by stridit. A glance at the dictionary is enough to show that the word itself can do little to help. The extremely wide definition offered by Lewis and Short -- 'to utter any harsh, shrill, hissing, whistling, grating, or creaking sound; to creak, hiss, whizz, whistle, rattle, buzz' -- is fully borne out by the examples cited,

which cover the noises made by inter alia flying spears, hot metal quenched in water, snakes, saws, the wings of swans, the hinge of a door, the waves of the sea, ropes in the wind, and the pipe (tibia) of Bacchic worship. The most characteristic verb used by translators of the present passage, revived most recently (and in spite of much earlier condemnation) by P. Dickinson in 1961, is 'to gride', which the Oxford English Dictionary defines as 'to pierce through..., cut, scrape, or graze along, with a strident(!), grating, or whizzing sound, or so as to cause rasping pain'. The prominence of this verb (which, apparently, was first used by Spenser in this sense) in the context with which we are here concerned appears to be directly due both to the similarity of its sound to that of stridere and to its adoption by Milton in a well-known passage of Paradise Lost (vi.327): 'so sore the griding sword with discontinuous wound passed through him (viz. Satan)'.

Yet, as has been pointed out many times, if a sword can 'gride', a wound cannot. Indeed, it seems at least possible that Anna had removed the sword before drying up the blood with her dress, which would have been the natural (though perhaps not the wisest) thing to do -- unless, of course, Dido had herself removed it earlier (cf. sparsasque manus, 665). In any case, and quite apart from the grammatical subject of stridit, the sword, in inflicting a wound of the kind described could hardly have gone through the sternum: it would probably have been gripped by the tissues in an intercostal space, and would then have moved with the bony cage without any grating sound. In fact the sword is unlikely to have made any noise, at any rate after its first entry; and vulnus must be the real, as well as the grammatical, subject of stridit.

But if a wound cannot 'gride', what kind of sound -- within the wide range of meaning covered by stridit -- can it make? The answer to this question, unless we take the description to be entirely fanciful, must clearly depend on the nature of the wound.

Dido, when her companions found her ferro collapsam (663-4), had evidently put the point of the sword against her chest and fallen forward. The natural assumption that this would cause a direct and penetrating wound of the heart is rendered improbable both by the direction which a sword entering the body in this way would take and by the death agony which followed the infliction of the wound. We may, of course, assume that Dido's death is delayed merely in order to enable Anna to 'sing an aria' to her dying sister; but it is at least possible that Virgil here describes accurately something which he may himself have seen and which at least some of his readers may have seen also. His description, we suggest, is such as to make the latter assumption not merely possible but highly probable.

The emphasis throughout this description is on the respiratory aspect of Dido's difficiles obitus (694). Indeed, this phrase itself appears to imply an echo of the struggle which respiratory distress causes even in the moribund. And the first instinct of a person in respiratory distress is to get from a lying to a sitting position: ter sese attollens cubitoque adnixa levavit (690). The colour of the atri cruores emanating from the wound, moreover, suggests severely cyanotic blood, which can look almost like ink, and which would strike an observer very forcibly. All this is entirely consistent with clinical experience if the wound is a stab-wound, comparatively superficial, penetrating the chest wall and causing a pressure

pneumothorax in which the effect of the wound would lead to the presence of air in the pleural space, and the heart and great vessels would be pushed across to the other side until the heart is prevented from working. Air would enter, rather than leave, the wound, and it would do so with a hissing sound -- and Anna could, in fact, probably have saved her sister's life quite easily, if only she had been familiar with the comparatively simple treatment for pneumothorax. (A wound of the lung itself, on the other hand, would have led to haemoptysis, of which there is no mention).

Nor does this passage stand alone in Virgil in its clinical accuracy. The use of singultans of the blood 'gulping' from the body of Remus after his head is struck off (Aen. ix.332-3) can hardly be due to anything but accurate observation; for the behaviour of a severed artery is not something which could have been deduced or imagined at a time when the circulation of the blood was not yet understood. And when Virgil wants to describe a penetrating wound of the heart, as he apparently does in the case of Euryalus (ix.431-4), he again does it accurately -- and in terms very different from those he uses in connexion with Dido or, for that matter, with Camilla (ix.816-31).

We are, then, in a position to say that our difficult line must mean 'the wound thrust beneath her breast(bone) hissed aloud'; and Virgil can be given high marks as a clinical observer; though it is hardly as a clinical observer that he would wish to be judged. Yet an accurate description can at times strike chords in a reader which the conventional or fictitious description cannot strike, especially perhaps when it comes at an 'unbearable climax' in the poem and when the description is of something which all too many of Virgil's readers may themselves have seen in the turbulent days that preceded the pax Augusta. And in highlighting the sound of the wound in the present passage, by contrast with the tacitum vulnus earlier in the book, Virgil provides an admirable example of the integration of accurate observation with the highest poetic imagination.

F.L.D. STEEL, M.B., B.S., M.Sc., Senior Lecturer in Anatomy, and L.A. MORITZ, M.A., D.Phil., Professor of Latin, University College, Cardiff.

VIRGIL, Aeneid vi. 384-476

It is useful sometimes to consider a passage of Virgil in a more leisurely and discursive way than is possible within the normal limits of a commentary. I have chosen a familiar piece, which falls into two parts, each different in ethos and technique. It is preceded by some lines that well illustrate Virgil's particularizing method: he might have continued directly from 332 to the encounter with Charon, but instead he shows us, among the vast concourse of indiscriminate ghosts jostling for a place in the ferry-boat, three of Aeneas' own companions to whom Charon has refused a crossing, two of them long since lost at sea, the other his helmsman Palinurus whose recent death has brought him special sadness. In this way

the general misery of the inops inhumataque turba is more sharply defined for Aeneas personally: ergo (384) sums up his unspoken thoughts as he reflects upon the implications of Palinurus' narrative and upon the terrible finality of the Sibyl's words (376), in the face of which he is himself powerless to bring help or comfort to the dead.

Charon has been described already (299 ff.), in a passage where Virgil acts as commentator, another aspect of his technique. The separation is effective: the grim figure of Charon can be visualized, with its eternal menace for Palinurus, throughout the scene. Now, out in mid-stream, he is alert to danger ('theme and variation' are marked here -- iam inde: Stygia ab unda; ire: pedem advertere; prior corresponding with ultro; adgreditur dictis stiffened into increpat). Charon's tristitia (cf. 315) comes out in his speech (Virgil does such things well; cf. Aeolus, i.76 ff., or Pyrrhus, ii.547 ff.). He has recognizable affinity with the Porter in Macbeth -- old, vigorous, grumbling: he is offensively conscious of official authority, not unlike an unintelligent policeman hoping to make an arrest -- Aeneas is armed, he must be up to no good ('nihil pium molitur', Servius on 388). Nostra ad flumina: this is how a slave in Comedy speaks; cf. Plautus, Truc. 256 'quis illic est qui tam proterve nostras aedis arietat?'. The brusque fare age quid venias recalls Mercury's rough demand of Sosia (Amph. 377) 'loquere, quid venisti?' (cf. Truc. 258 'quid tibi ad hasce accessio aedis est?'), with the epic fare taking the place of the more ordinary verb. Istinc too belongs to Comedy (e.g. Plaut. Capt. 603 'istinc loquere, si quid vis, procul') and conversational style (Catullus 76.11). A study of Virgil's awareness of Comedy would be rewarding: thus, in the charming scene in i.321 ff., where Venus in disguise asks Aeneas if he has seen one of her 'sisters' pass that way, describing her appearance and dress, with Aeneas' reply 'nulla tuarum audita mihi neque visa sororum', there is an epic dressing-up of a passage such as Rudens 313 ff.:

(Trachalio) 'ecquem adulescentem huc, dum hic astat, expedite,
vidistis ire strenua facie, rubicundum, fortem,
qui tris semihomines duceret chlamydatos cum machaeris?

(Fishermen) 'nullum istac facie ut praedicas venisse huc scimus'.

Umbrarum hic locus est, somni noctisque soporae: Charon speaks as a servant might to a visitor who has come to the wrong door ('This is the ghosts' house; no live visitors allowed'), but umbrarum and soporae, impressively framing the line, and the highly poetic word soporus, give appropriate epic pomp (so above, comprime gressum is epic, not conversational). Umbrarum and corpora viva are carefully placed for emphasis; vectare perhaps suggests a heavy load (cf. xi.138 'plaustris...vectare gementibus ornos', the only other occurrence of the verb in Virgil), and the frequentative form adds a certain piquancy (one would be bad enough, but to make a practice of it...). The characterization now (392) takes a new turn: the old man soliloquizes, as an old man might, thinking aloud about previous visitors whom he would have done better to turn away. There is wry humour in Virgil's words nec sum laetatus as applied to Charon, that navita tristis, even for a reader who is unaware of the Greek idiom adapted here and of the possibility of word-play on Charon's name (see Norden, and cf. Aristophanes, Frogs 184 $\chi\alpha\iota\rho\prime\omega\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\nu, \chi\alpha\iota\rho\prime\omega\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\nu, \chi\alpha\iota\rho\prime\omega\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\omega\nu$), in the light of Servius' comment that the ferryman was so scared by Hercules that he took him across at

once, and spent a year in chains for punishment: no wonder that he meant to stand no nonsense from this formidably armed stranger. Charon draws a pathetic picture of the crimes with which this previous trio of god-born ruffians (may not the subjunctive essent in 394 suggest scepticism?) violated the domesticity of his master's quiet home, and his style becomes more markedly epic (Tartareum custodem, 395; and the impressive alliteration in 396-7). Hercules, he says, behaved like a common burglar, dragging Cerberus away, poor frightened beast; trementem is amusing, and we can see too the curious way in which Virgil can echo himself in a widely different context, for when Pyrrhus killed Priam, 'altaria ad ipsa trementem / traxit' (ii.550 f.; cf. ii.209 with vi.477, ii.485 with vi.427). Where was Cerberus at this moment? The natural interpretation of Virgil's words is that he was not at his usual post (cf. 417) but actually beside the king's throne. Norden objects to the inconsistency, and will have nothing of Servius' reasonable explanation ('ad naturam canum referendum est, qui territi ad dominos confugiunt'); relying on a tradition preserved by Apollodorus (bibl.ii.5.12) that Hercules first went to Pluto and demanded the dog of him, he takes ipsius a solio regis to refer to this request (petivit). But this is surely impossible to get out of the Latin: petivit a solio regis is very different from petivit a rege, and Norden takes no account of ipsius (which is pointless on his interpretation), nor of the clear parallel to solio in the next line (thalamo). Virgil may well have been aware of Apollodorus' tradition, but I do not think he was using it here: he has simply made the grumbling old Charon tell his tale as effectively as possible and with picturesque detail suitable to his alarming story, just as any aggrieved underling might do. If there is a problem, I think Servius has the right answer (or did Cerberus, perhaps, rush boldly to protect his king's person, only to regret his show of bravery?). Charon reaches a climax of artistic horror as he remembers the villainy of Theseus and his friend, attacking the Mistress herself; and then he ends abruptly, but his unspoken thought is clear: if this man is allowed alive across his river, anything might happen, and he, Charon, would get the blame. In this brief speech Virgil has, as it were, fitted into epic a character from Comedy or Satire; he just hints enough to let us see something of the Charon of Aristophanes or Lucian, but at the same time gives him the serious significance of a personage sufficiently important to be bypassed by supernatural means alone.

The Sibyl -- Amphrysia vates, another high-sounding periphrasis -- handles the old man expertly. She almost teases him, but she recognizes that he is after all only doing his duty. She mocks gently at brave Cerberus, barking for all eternity at bloodless shadows, and rather less gently at Proserpina's concern for her chastity (servet limen, 402 -- 'she can go on being a model wife, to her uncle'). Then she impressively explains this new living visitor: no robber, no rapist, but a loving son and godfearing: Pietate insignis is more than a 'label' for Aeneas, it is in stern antithesis to the impieties that Charon has described (and still fears), as well as in rebuke of his uncompromising nefas (391). Slowly then and dramatically she reveals the Golden Bough. We must imagine a pause after imago (405): then, after the slow deliberate at ramum hunc, a second pause as she uncovers the Bough and holds it out to him (hunc): then the meaning silence that follows the sharp, abrupt jussive agnoscas. The parenthesis aperit ramum qui veste latebat is elaborately casual, in a pattern repeated in a solemn passage at xii. 206 f. (Latinus' oath at the treaty-making, 'ut sceptrum hoc' -- dextra sceptrum nam forte tenebat -- /"numquam fronde levi fundet virgulta"); it is very much in the manner of Ovid (cf. Her. 11.95 "Aeolus hunc ensem mittit tibi" -- tradidit ensem -- '; Ars ii.131 ff. 'ille levi virga -- virgam nam forte tenebat -- /quod

rogat, in spisso litore pingit opus': F. iv.691 f. "'hoc" ait "in campo" -- compungue ostendit -- "habebat / rus breve cum duro parca colona viro"). It has two functions: by repeating ramum (first with elided termination, then with full syllabic value) Virgil stresses the significance of the Bough; and the crucial moment is made far more dramatic than it would have been if the Sibyl's production of the Bough had been described factually in a clause outside her words.

Charon knows his place at once; his resentment dies down immediately at agnoscas, and the Sibyl (always economical of words) needs to say no more (nec plura his, 408). The clause tumida ex ira tum corda residunt is well explained by Norden as parenthetical, parallel in structure and rhythm to the previous parenthesis, and complementary to it -- both are, as it were, stage directions adapted to the epic narrative manner. The detail in longo post tempore visum (409) is a clever piece of circumstantial invention, and a most vivid touch. Charon turns his boat (caeruleam implies, as often, a dark colour; cf. Servius on iii.64), which is off-shore, loaded up with ghostly passengers. But this late comer is no flimsy phantom, but a big and solid man who needs room; the ghosts are pitched out (deturbat, 412, suggests rough treatment, characteristic of the navita tristis; cf. v.175 'in mare praecipitem puppi deturbat ab alta'), presumably to wait for the next trip. Virgil surely smiles as he describes Aeneas' ponderous embarking: the heavy spondees in ingentem Aenean contrast him with the dactylic phantoms of 411, and the pause before gemuit is effective. Ingentem ('our author's maid of all work, cook, slut, and butler at once...Seville's famous barber was never busier; it is Ingens here, Ingens there, everywhere Ingens' -- Henry on v.118, with much more in like vein), marking the incongruity between the living man and the insubstantial shades, again illustrates a strange Virgilian self-echoing -- viii.366 f. (of Evander) 'dixit et angusti subter fastigia tecti / ingentem Aenean duxit', where it is not easy to justify the epithet.

The boat is sutilis (413). The position of the adjective draws attention to the primitive character of the craft, and the elision in multam accepit suggests the seeping of the water into it. The traditional idea that the boat resembled an ancient British coracle, constructed of sewn hides, has lately been questioned by L. Casson, who argues cogently that Virgil means a craft of sewn planks (cf. Pacuvius, trag.fr. 250-1 R; see CR n.s. xiii, 1963, pp.257 ff.). It is a slow crossing, and an anxious one. For a modern parallel, let me quote Fitzroy Maclean, Eastern Approaches, p.359: he is describing a perilous river-crossing in Jugoslavia: 'the raft was a minute, flimsy affair, not much larger than a big soap-box, on which there was barely room for one passenger besides the aged ferryman, who, grumbling to himself as he went, propelled it across the rapid current with vigorous but erratic strokes of his pole. Eventually, after a series of individual journeys, each of which landed the passenger, soaked to the skin, at a different point on the opposite bank, we were all across. We bid farewell to the boatman, still grumbling to himself in the darkness, and set out for our next target, the village where we were to find reliable guides'. The slowness of the journey is marked by tandem (415; the isolated spondaic word beginning the line should be noted; if Virgil had chosen to write 'trans fluvium tandem', the slowness would have been played down). Servius engagingly speculates on the cause: was it because Aeneas was so heavy? or because the palus was so huge? or because the mud was so thick?: he prefers the first explanation, and so,

I think, may we. Charon, however, knows his job, and lands them both safe, 'prophetess and hero' (the double -que, linking related concepts as it does, marks Aeneas as no ordinary vir); 416 -- informi limo glaucaque exponit in ulva -- is a notable line, with its stodgy spondees and oozy triple -1- sound. It is often instructive to compare Virgil with later poets on the same theme (e.g. Ovid's handling of the Orpheus and Eurydice legend, Met. x.1 ff., or of the story of Dido, Her.7). Here we may consider Seneca, Hercules Furens 773 ff.: Hercules, about to cross the Styx, and duly checked by Charon, threatens him with his own pole and climbs unceremoniously into the boat: 'cumba populorum capax / succubuit uni' -- one single person's weight is too much for the craft that can accommodate whole nations -- 'sedit et gravior ratis / utrimque Lethen latere titubanti bibit' -- the boat gets lower in the water and 'gulps down Lethe on either side with tottery timbers'. Virgil's picture has been dressed up to supply 'point' (populorum...uni); 'sinking' is done in three different ways (succubuit, sedit, gravior...bibit), Virgil's paludem has become the more mannered and less graphic Lethen, and his rimosa has been developed into latere titubanti. The epic directness has vanished, and fussiness has taken its place.

The grim humour continues a little longer. Virgil's description of Cerberus may be seen in its full artistry by comparing it with Seneca, Herc.Fur. 783 ff., or Apuleius, Met. vi.19, or Dante Inferno vi. He is less concerned with the beast's horrid appearance than with his size and sound. Cerberus' barking is endless and inescapable; it echoes in the lines, latrAtu trifAUci, recubANS immANis in ANtro; 'trifauci' (a Virgilian neologism) is clearly onomatopoeic (cf. Lucretius' baubantur, v. 1071, and the au au of the dog in Aristophanes, Wasps 903); and there is a harsh assonance in ingENS, recubANS, vidENS (the two last in the same position in the line). The creature's size is stressed by deliberate chiasitic repetition; ingens and immanis (417-8), immania and ingens (422-3): Cerberus is monstrous when on guard and monstrous when sprawled in his doped sleep -- and Virgil adds, for good measure, fusus humi and toto extenditur antro, to leave no possible doubt of the immeasurable bulk of the monster who might have frustrated all Aeneas' hopes, or of the immense power of the Sibyl who could so promptly anaesthetise so frightful a beast. The administering of the drug is admirably described; the very noise of barking seems hushed directly it is produced, in the muted line (419) melle soporatam et medicatis frugibus offam (the elision gives the effect of a fading-off after the slowed polysyllable soporatam); the characteristic run-over to obicit, with the sharp pause that follows, marks the dramatic moment of the throw, and then Cerberus, famishing, as if he never had a meal before (how like a dog), snaps up the titbit (obicit...obiectam shows how little time he lost); the final syllable of obiectam vanishes as the monster gulps the offa down, and he is immediately unconscious. The scene is depicted in one of the miniatures in Vat.lat.3225 (F, fourth century): the offa, held out by the Sibyl, is marked as such, but its nature is not identifiable; Cerberus is reddish-brown, with three heads, the tongues painted red; he is at the entrance to a cavern, behind which are two figures marked infantes (see J.de Wit, Die Miniaturen des Vergilius Vaticanus, Amsterdam, 1959, p.108).

Aeneas, like a practical soldier, sees his chance and takes it. The military picture in occupat aditum is continued in custode sepulto, a remarkable example of Virgilian compression: the phrase looks back to Ennius (Ann. 292 'hostes vino domiti somnoque sepulti'), with a glance at Lucretius (i. 133, v. 975); Virgil uses the full borrowing in ii. 265 'invadunt urbem somno vinoque sepultam', but here he telescopes

the whole concept of a drugged or vinous sleep into the single verb sepelire. Evaditque celer ripam is an extension of occupat aditum: by 'seizing upon' the approach-road guarded by Cerberus, Aeneas passes beyond (evadit) the river-bank. The epithet inremeabilis (425) is a Virgilian coinage, in the high epic style, not only high-sounding and remorseless and emotional, but appropriate also: for Aeneas himself does not cross that river again. And so the scene ends, drawn by Virgil with such delicate skill, partly hinting at the tradition of Comedy, yet in no way lessening for that reason the terror and the mystery of this ordeal of the dead. Such relief, indeed, as Aeneas could feel at his safe crossing and his safe passing of the guard is quickly over. For immediately he comes to that special place in the ghost-world where the prematurely dead dwell; and Virgil now takes us to scenes based indeed on myth, but reaching out into universal human experience, and culminating in wounding sorrow for Aeneas himself, yet of a kind not to be interpreted through Aeneas' eyes alone.

Continuo auditae: there is no interval of time before this thin wailing is heard. The grief in these four lines (426-9) is unmistakable: the repeated -i-, the echoing auditAE...animAE...vitAE (all in the same position, but vitae dying away in elision), then vocES...flentES...diES, and limine, ubere, funere: it suggests the music of a piper's lament. Line 429 was drawn on often for grave-inscriptions (see R.P. Hoogma, Der Einfluss Vergils auf die Carmina Latina Epigraphica, Amsterdam, 1959, p.285); in funere acerbo Virgil has used an epic phrase from Plautus (Amph.190, Asin.595) and his own emotion is plain from his use of this very line in the passage on the death of the young Pallas (xi.29). In what follows, there is the same sadness of sound: note crimine (430) echoing limine (427), mortis with sorte (431), taking us back to exsortis (428). Silentium (432) marks not only the blank silence of that ghostly assemblage but also the fact that in this 'trial' no voice can be raised in self-defence. Virgil's compassion for the suicides would be clear even without his reminiscence of Homer's famous lines (Od. xi.488 ff.): perosi and proiecere testify to it, and even more the notable comment insontes. But his fullest pity is kept for those in the lugentes campi, stretching in vast solitariness to shelter the victims of love: the name -- 'the Broken-Hearted Fields' (James Elroy Flecker), 'the large feildis wyde And boundis of Complaynt' (Gavin Douglas) -- is explicitly attributed to some literary tradition (sic illos nomine dicunt, 441) by Virgil himself: had he not said this, we might well have felt no surprise if so startling a phrase had come from the poet of the Georgics, for whom the good earth shares human happiness and sorrows. It is in this way that we are prepared for one of the greatest passages in the whole Aeneid.

For Virgil now particularizes, in his manner, listing those fields' inhabitants, still suffering their intolerable pain of love. Here, as elsewhere in this Book, the gulf between him and Lucretius is dramatically plain: 'curae non ipsa in morte relinquunt' (444): Lucr. iii.904 f. 'tu quidem ut es leto sopitus, sic eris aevi / quod superest cunctis privatu' doloribus aegris'. It is a strange list, much discussed: some sinful, some innocent: the names carefully place, no casual string of characters from myth: the passionate Phaedra and the treacherous Eriphyle on either side of the simple Procris, the devoted Evadne and the loving Laodamia on either side of the unnatural Pasiphae: and finally, the man-woman Caeneus is given more attention than any of the others. It is true that line 445

is a 'contamination' of two lines of Homer (Od. xi.321, 326), but the choice is Virgil's, and Virgil has rejected Homer's epithet of horror for Eriphyle and has substituted his own, maestam. This last, deliberately chosen adjective adds point to the whole setting of pity (and even Pasiphae is termed virgo infelix in Gallus' song, Ecl.6.47). Virgil seems to imply that there is no simple way of judging or defining sinfulness. In an interesting and ingenious paper (Revue des Etudes latines, xlii, 1964, pp.247-61) J. Perret suggests that in Virgil's choice of names we may see, as it were, a projection of his attitude to Dido. The most puzzling figure in the list is Caeneus: and the most ambivalent. Perret sees here the warrior Dido, dux femina facti, now wholly woman once more. Whatever Virgil meant to convey -- but who can say what message his allusiveness would have had for his contemporary readers? -- we may be very sure that in a passage so carefully and imaginatively wrought as this there was reason and anxious thought in the poet's mind as he chose these particular figures for the company of Dido.

For with sudden, intense dramatic impact, Dido comes, recens a vulnere (it is hardly possible not to see some intention to take the mind back to Eriphyle, nati monstrantem vulnera). To Aeneas, those other ghostly women were legendary: Dido he had known, and loved. It is a measure of Virgil's creative power that we too feel the shock as we read: those others are figures from a classical dictionary, Dido is real, Dido of Carthage confronting Aeneas of Troy (the adjectives, deliberately balanced, add both emotion and colour). It is a measure, too, of the supreme and central import that Virgil attached to Dido's entry into Aeneas' life, that he planned this meeting here, in the heart of the most significant book of the Aeneid. Errabat silva in magna: the spondees, the strong clash of ictus and word-accent, the pause delayed to the fourth foot, all indicate the labouring of this "wanderer" in the dark, secret wood. The famous simile that follows (note the emphasis on obscuram, and the way in which Virgil has delayed the significant word lunam as long as possible) is a whole world away from the passage of Apollonius Rhodius that suggested it (iv.1479 ff.). Dido, whom Aeneas last saw (iv.390) beautiful and vivid and fierce, storming at him in bitter rage -- this Dido is now a dim phantom, glimmering faintly before him, so faintly that he can scarcely at first be sure that he sees her at all.

As every reader knows, Aeneas' speech is full of reflections of the Fourth Book. Dulci amore (455): so, in happier days, Dido had known his love (iv.317 f. 'si bene quid de te merui, fuit aut tibi quicquam / dulce meum'), and on the pyre she turned at last to his dulces exuviae. We may remember that adfari is often used of tender, affectionate address (e.g. ii.775, G.iv. 281). Infelix Dido: her own self-address (iv.596); Virgil has shown her as infelix from the start, long before Aeneas left her (i.712, 749, iv.68), and now her misery comes home to him at last. Ergo: again summarizing thoughts: he has always been troubled by this 'nuntius', wondering if it were true -- and now he knows it was true. Funeris heu tibi causa fui?: 'death -- was that what I brought upon you?': but has he never really known this, never admitted it to himself? When, sailing away, he saw from the sea the red glare of fire (v.4), did he really not guess its meaning? What was the nuntius, if it was not the message of those flames? Virgil surely intends us to know -- but obliquely, in his way -- that Aeneas in his heart of hearts knew what he had done to Dido: but correspondingly he shows us Aeneas' own suffering, the unsuccessful smothering of conscience. Once more Aeneas protests what he had protested in Italiam non sponte sequor (iv.361): invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi: just as

in Dido's dying speech there is a reminiscence of Catullus (64.171 f.; iv.657 f.), so here Virgil has borrowed from Catullus (66.39), but far more remarkably (a reader quite ignorant of chronology, confronted with the two passages, might reasonably conclude that Catullus had parodied Virgil), and with great effect -- the borrowing is one of those strange manifestations of the working of a poet's mind that nowadays could start an acrimonious correspondence in the Times Literary Supplement. Iussa deum (461): so Dido (iv.378) had flung in Aeneas' teeth the horrida iussa of Iuppiter. The dismal terror of this meeting-place is well suggested by the assonance in deUM...nUNc...UMbras..cogUNT...profUNDam, and by the uncanny loca senta situ (from some early tragic poet?): long ago, fighting down her passion for Aeneas, Dido had prayed (iv.25 f.) 'pater omnipotens abigat me fulmine ad umbras, / pallentis umbras Erebo noctemque profundam / ante, pudor, quam te violo', and now Iuppiter has taken her at her word, and this is where Aeneas finds her. As Aeneas continues (463), we remember Dido's words to Anna when she now saw the end of everything (iv. 419 f.) 'hunc ego si potui tantum sperare dolorem, / et perferre, soror, potero'. Virgil seems to turn over his own memories, with now this, now that uppermost, to bring out the full poignancy of the situation that he has devised. In the words 'nec credere quivi / hunc tantum tibi me discessu ferre dolorem', Aeneas has returned to the nuntius and to the naggings of his conscience: Servius well comments that his meaning is 'si credidissem, forte etiam deorum iussa contemnerem'. Siste gradum: the words are used on a number of Roman gravestones (see Hoogma, op.cit. p.288), pleading with the traveller to stop and read (as Gray pleads in the Elegy), in the manner of such inscriptions from earliest times: they ring almost like an epitaph here too, but one of which the passer-by who matters most takes no heed. For already Dido shrinks away: Aeneas' cry to her, quem fugis?, painfully recalls her cry to him, mene fugis? (iv.314). Extremum fato quod te adloquor hoc est, he tells her, begging her to stay and hear: she had once sent a message to him through Anna, begging him to hear and stay, 'quo ruit? extremum hoc miserae det munus amanti' (iv.429).

Talibus Aeneas ardentem et torva tuentem / lenibat dictis animum lacrimasque ciebat. The remarkable expression torva tuentem animum has displeased some commentators, who prefer the emendation animam. But Norden defends animus as a personification after the Greek tragic fashion (pointing out that the construction torva tueri is itself a Grecism, first appearing in Lucretius and taken over in a number of passages by Virgil), quoting Soph.Ai. 955 κελαινώσαν θυμόν and Aesch.Cho. 854 φρένα ἄρματαμένην, to which one might add Soph. Phil. 1013 f. ἡ κακῆ σὴ διὰ θυγῶν βλέπουσ' αἰεὶ/ψυχῆ . It is not Dido's ghost but Dido's heart that is 'blazing and grim-gazing'. Lenibat is clearly conative: what then of ciebat? If this too is conative (as one would expect), then the lacrimae are Dido's. This, however, involves extending the use of ciere (elsewhere in such phrases, e.g. iii.344, G.iii.517, always of emotion felt by the subject of the verb) to affect a person other than the subject. If this is impossible, the verbs are not parallel, lacrimasque ciebat must be taken as explanatory, an equivalent simply of lacrimans, and the tears are those of Aeneas (cf. prosequitur lacrimis, 476). Against this it can be argued that Aeneas ahead 'demisit lacrimas' in 455, but the point has little weight: the two expressions are complementary, framing the speech, as it were. Servius already noted the ambiguity

(cf. the lacrimae inanes of iv.449, a much greater problem), and it can only be left to each reader's personal feeling. But the antithesis in 469 ff. would be more pointed if both verbs could be taken as conative: Aeneas 'tried to soften her heart, tried to make her tears start'. If the question is asked, why should he expect her to weep, there is an answer in Dido's own speech in iv.369 f., where she reproaches Aeneas for his stony heart: 'num fletu ingemuit nostro? num lumina flexit? / num lacrimas victus dedit aut miseratus amantem est?'

Dido's refusal was plain while he was speaking, as the tense of tenebat (469) shows. She would not look at him, just as before in life while he was speaking 'taliam dicentem iam dudum aversa tuetur' (iv.362). She listens expressionless (470), as he did once to her messages (iv.438 f. 'sed nullis ille movetur / fletibus'); she is like the hard flinty cautes to which she had once likened his birthplace (iv.366); stet is rock-like in sound and sense (cf. Propertius iv.11.4 'non exorato stant adamantem viae'); Marpesia particularizes the cautes, marble, pale and cold. It is with an effort that she wrenches herself away (tandem: so iv.333, of Aeneas, mastering himself to speak after Dido's torrent of words, 'tandem pauca refert'). She runs into the shadows, inimica, 'with gesture stern' as Matthew Arnold puts it in the Scholar Gipsy. And she runs to Sychaeus, her dead husband, who 'answered all her cares and equalled all her love' (so Dryden, beautifully). It is a marvellously imaginative moment. In life, Dido had so deeply felt that in desiring Aeneas she had been untrue to Sychaeus (iv.552, cf.28); and here, in death, she finds him at her side to comfort her. Because he had died untimely, and by violence, his place in the general scheme of this part of the Underworld is easily explained; but his presence in the Lugentes Campi suggests that he had come there for Dido's sake, to protect and tend her. Virgil, in his quiet way, makes it seem so natural, so inevitable that Sychaeus and Dido should be reunited. In one way it is his ultimate judgment of Dido, and it is not a condemnation. Nothing could better express his belief in a continuance of feeling beyond the grave than this touching picture: again so different from Lucretius, who counters the pain of severance in death from wife and family with the bleak statement that the dead will know no need of them any more:

'iam iam non domus accipiet te laeta, neque uxor
optima, nec dulces occurrent oscula nati
praeripere et tacita pectus dulcedine tangent'...
illud in his rebus non addunt, 'nec tibi earum
iam desiderium rerum super insidet una'. (iii.894 ff.)

There are some lines of Robert Bridges that, in their own way, help towards a realization of Virgil's vision; they are from his Elegy on a Lady whom grief for the death of her Betrothed killed:

And thou, O lover, that art on the watch,
Where, on the banks of the forgetful streams,
The pale indifferent ghosts wander, and snatch
The sweeter moments of their broken dreams, --
 Thou, when the torchlight gleams,
 When thou shalt see the slow procession
 And when thine ears the fitful music catch,
Rejoice, for thou art near to thy possession.

Aeneas watches her path to the husband who did not reject her, casu concussus iniquo.

But whose is the casus that shatters him? Formally it is Dido's; yet here too there is an ambiguity that each reader must interpret for himself: for Aeneas' casus too was iniquus, and he has no-one to give him comfort. This we must always remember, as he plods on, almost mechanically, in grief (inde datum molitur iter, 477; there is a long pause after the words).

Virgil has used all his art and emotion to bring the tragedy of Aeneas and Dido flooding back. It had seemed over and done with for ever. But here in the world of ghosts the past has caught Aeneas up again: there is no escape. He knows now that the demands of pietas are more complex and ruthless than even he had realized before. This is the scene that T.S. Eliot felt to be 'not only one of the most poignant, but one of the most civilized passages in poetry'. It is the climax of the Book, in so far as it relates an experience that touches Aeneas most personally. The dim world beyond the Styx held for him something harder to bear than anything he could have imagined, the worst of all reckonings, a reckoning with self.

R.G. AUSTIN

BOOK REVIEWS

EGIL KRAGGERUD, AENEISSTUDIEN. Symbolae Osloenses Fasc.
Supplet. XXII. 1968. Pp. 247. Paper.

This is a leisurely book, never obscure, often prolix, sometimes repetitive. Perhaps its most annoying feature is that almost a third of its bulk consists of footnotes, never obscure, often prolix, sometimes repetitive, and incidentally incorporating a very great deal of other people's half-sense.

K.'s basic thesis is that although "as a character in the modern sense Aeneas is indeed always the same" (pp. 104 f.), it is his changing, deepening relationship to the will of Fate which gives dynamic impulse to the narrative of the Aeneid, of which he is the supremely dominating figure - except of course when he is not: so K. devotes the second major part of his book to an examination of the Games in Sicily, where secondary characters play a primary role. Between these two major parts there is an attempt (pp. 106-117) to resolve the old problem of Aeneas' lost weekend (?) in Carthage: a summary of this may serve as a specimen of K.'s argumentation, which lacks neither imagination nor a grasp of the cultural background.

Dido welcomes Aeneas by saying that it is now the septima aestas since he has been wandering (1,755 f.); Iris, disguised as Beroe, tells the Trojan women: septima post Troiae excidium iam vertitur aestas (5, 626). Time has apparently stood still from the beginning of Aeneas' tale of the fall of Troy to the end of the Sicilian Games. Some ancient commentators believed that it did indeed; most moderns believe that Virgil would have removed this inconsistency (not, after all, an isolated phenomenon) in a final revision. K. believes that Aeneas spent a considerable time, including hiems in its seasonal sense, with Dido in Carthage; that the Games to mark the anniversary of Anchises' burial strongly recall the

festival of the Parentalia whose dates (13-21 February) may have been in Virgil's mind as the date of the Games; further, Virgil may have borne in mind that February marked the end of the old Roman calendar year. Now Virgil sometimes uses aestas = annus; the addition of the numeral convinces K. that this is the case here. So there is no inconsistency: Dido welcomes Aeneas within that same twelve month whose end, about the end of February, sees the burning of the ships. All very well if one could bring oneself to believe that instead of saying e.g. post Troiae excidium exigitur iam septimus annus, Virgil chose to say septima ... vertitur aestas at the precise point where the usual meaning of aestas would make the most nonsense: he wants to say that the year is coming to an end when in fact winter is coming to an end and so he refers to ... summer.

K.'s outlook and method are entirely conditioned by the Virgilian criticism of the last two decades. He is honestly and judiciously sceptical of its more extreme tendencies. Duckworth's rigid scheme of structural correspondences rests, at least in part, on "parallels without significance" (p.11, n. 3). Pöschl's extravagant fantasies are more than once (e.g. p. 43, n. 103) criticised or discarded. Knauer's relentless search for Homeric parallels is conducted in a manner which obscures the significant and exalts the incidental (p. 121, n.3). Putnam is rebuked *en passant* (pp. 126 ff.). Here, one thinks, is a man after one's own heart, who believes that even in the criticism of Virgil est modus in rebus. So one thinks -- but not for long. For he cannot resist the excess he has just denounced, particularly the excess of symbolic analogy.

When Aeneas views the pictures on the doors of the temple of Apollo at Cumae (Aen. 6, 20 ff.), he beholds a symbol of his own experiences, not only in broad outline, but also, according to K., in minute detail. Not only does he see that he and Daedalus were both desperate refugees who after a perilous journey had reached Cumae, and that a man named Androgeos had played an important role in the past lives of them both (Aen. 2, 370 ff., 6, 20), but under the figure of Pasiphae he sees Dido, and in the Minotaur the symbol of the monstrously hybrid offspring which would have resulted from the union of Trojans and Carthaginians had he yielded to Dido's wishes: "in particular he perceives that a union with Dido would have been impossible for him" (p. 69). Similarly, in the bee-simile of Aen. 1, 434 f. are prefigured the two possible kinds of reception Aeneas himself may meet from the Carthaginians: will they relieve him of his burden? or will they drive him away? K. presses his interpretations dangerously near to a reductio ad absurdum. Did Aeneas complete the equations and identify himself in the first situation with a disdainful bull and in the second with a lazy drone? Cloanthus receives as his prize a cloak on which is embroidered the rape of Ganymede (Aen. 5, 254 ff.); this, according to K., recalls the push given to Cloanthus' ship by Portunus to ensure his victory (Aen. 5, 239 ff.) (pp. 146 ff.). I hesitate to suggest that the only common factor in the two situations is a divine impulse.

But K. is also capable of sensitive and balanced criticism. Again, three examples must suffice. In the overall structure of the first third of the poem K. stresses the important consequences which follow Aeneas' acquiring of patria potestas on the death of Anchises: all of his life up to this point is presented indirectly, in the narrative to Dido; the epic opens at the point where he has just become fully answerable and responsible for his family and people, a situation which gives added point to his first despairing words. In the detail of how Aeneas slashes the mooring-rope with his sword, swiftly and decisively, to set sail from Carthage (Aen. 4, 579 f.), K. plausibly sees the outward expression of his resolve

to break with Dido (retinaculum). The way in which Virgil lists the competitors for the ship-race (Aen. 5, 114 ff.) would tell any attentive listener how to lay his bet: Cloanthus, whose entry contains the apostrophe Romane is bound to come first, as surely as the founding of Rome is the ultimate destiny of the whole undertaking (K. incidentally wishes to punctuate 5, 123 caerulea, genus unde tibi, Romane, Cluenti (genitive)); Mnestheus, Italus, must come second; Gyas, with three rows of oarsmen and three verses allotted to him, will be third; Sergestus is doomed to fail, having only one-and-a-half lines' description, and being the founder of the gens Sergia, which had recently produced Catiline.

The reader of K.'s book who is patient and discriminating will find some valuable insights into the Aeneid.

P.T. EDEN.

THE THIRD BOOK OF HORACE'S ODES, edited with translation and running commentary by Gordon Williams, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1969. 12/-.

This is an experimental edition, aimed largely at giving sixth formers and undergraduates an insight into the meaning and purpose of Odes III. Consequently Professor Williams is concerned not so much with the often self-contained difficulties which have tended to dominate earlier commentaries but with treating each poem as a whole and expounding Horace's process of thought.

The introduction is strictly functional and is divided into five sections. The first is a short but adequate survey of Horace's life and works, and this is followed by an account of the political situation between 42 and 23 B.C. Both require little previous knowledge from the reader. The third deals with the poet and the community. There Williams makes the important point, as do too few editors, that Horace modifies the traditional material to suit the mood of the moment and does not write poems for real social occasions. The poet of the Odes is a vates whose own personality does not appear, despite, of course, the odd autobiographical reference. The fourth and longest section raises the question of style, with discussions of Horace's originality, changes of tone, ornamentation and structural technique. The reader is urged to co-operate imaginatively with the poet and is provided with most of the necessary information. However, the last section, which deals with metre, is extremely brief. There is a specimen of each metre that occurs in Odes III and a few points of interest are added in the commentary, but nothing is said about the factors governing caesura, while a note on the occasions when a short syllable is found at the start of the first three lines of an Alcaic stanza is tucked away in the explanation of the reading inauspicatos in 6.10. Clearly only an outline could be expected, but more information on the principles behind the metres would be welcome.

After a list of ten books for further reading, the text is printed, with a translation and running commentary attached to each Ode. There are six important divergences from the Oxford Classical Text. Bibet is read for bibit in 3.12, limina Pulliae for limen Apuliae in 4.10, trahenti for trahentis in 5.15, inauspicatos for non auspicatos in 6.10, illa for illi in 20.8 and terrenum...publicum for Tyrrenum...Apulicum in 24.4. The choice is justified, except in 4.10 and 24.4.

festival of the Parentalia whose dates (13-21 February) may have been in Virgil's mind as the date of the Games; further, Virgil may have borne in mind that February marked the end of the old Roman calendar year. Now Virgil sometimes uses aestas = annus; the addition of the numeral convinces K. that this is the case here. So there is no inconsistency: Dido welcomes Aeneas within that same twelve month whose end, about the end of February, sees the burning of the ships. All very well if one could bring oneself to believe that instead of saying e.g. post Troiae excidium exigitur iam septimus annus, Virgil chose to say septima ... vertitur aestas at the precise point where the usual meaning of aestas would make the most nonsense: he wants to say that the year is coming to an end when in fact winter is coming to an end and so he refers to ... summer.

K.'s outlook and method are entirely conditioned by the Virgilian criticism of the last two decades. He is honestly and judiciously sceptical of its more extreme tendencies. Duckworth's rigid scheme of structural correspondences rests, at least in part, on "parallels without significance" (p.11, n. 3). Pöschl's extravagant fantasies are more than once (e.g. p. 43, n. 103) criticised or discarded. Knauer's relentless search for Homeric parallels is conducted in a manner which obscures the significant and exalts the incidental (p. 121, n.3). Putnam is rebuked en passant (pp. 126 ff.). Here, one thinks, is a man after one's own heart, who believes that even in the criticism of Virgil est modus in rebus. So one thinks -- but not for long. For he cannot resist the excess he has just denounced, particularly the excess of symbolic analogy.

When Aeneas views the pictures on the doors of the temple of Apollo at Cumae (Aen. 6, 20 ff.), he beholds a symbol of his own experiences, not only in broad outline, but also, according to K., in minute detail. Not only does he see that he and Daedalus were both desperate refugees who after a perilous journey had reached Cumae, and that a man named Androgeos had played an important role in the past lives of them both (Aen. 2, 370 ff., 6, 20), but under the figure of Pasiphae he sees Dido, and in the Minotaur the symbol of the monstrously hybrid offspring which would have resulted from the union of Trojans and Carthaginians had he yielded to Dido's wishes: "in particular he perceives that a union with Dido would have been impossible for him" (p. 69). Similarly, in the bee-simile of Aen. 1, 434 f. are prefigured the two possible kinds of reception Aeneas himself may meet from the Carthaginians: will they relieve him of his burden? or will they drive him away? K. presses his interpretations dangerously near to a reductio ad absurdum. Did Aeneas complete the equations and identify himself in the first situation with a disdainful bull and in the second with a lazy drone? Cloanthus receives as his prize a cloak on which is embroidered the rape of Ganymede (Aen. 5, 254 ff.); this, according to K., recalls the push given to Cloanthus' ship by Portunus to ensure his victory (Aen. 5, 239 ff.) (pp. 146 ff.). I hesitate to suggest that the only common factor in the two situations is a divine impulse.

But K. is also capable of sensitive and balanced criticism. Again, three examples must suffice. In the overall structure of the first third of the poem K. stresses the important consequences which follow Aeneas' acquiring of patria potestas on the death of Anchises: all of his life up to this point is presented indirectly, in the narrative to Dido; the epic opens at the point where he has just become fully answerable and responsible for his family and people, a situation which gives added point to his first despairing words. In the detail of how Aeneas slashes the mooring-rope with his sword, swiftly and decisively, to set sail from Carthage (Aen. 4, 579 f.), K. plausibly sees the outward expression of his resolve

to break with Dido (retinaculum). The way in which Virgil lists the competitors for the ship-race (Aen. 5, 114 ff.) would tell any attentive listener how to lay his bet: Cloanthus, whose entry contains the apostrophe Romane is bound to come first, as surely as the founding of Rome is the ultimate destiny of the whole undertaking (K. incidentally wishes to punctuate 5, 123 caerulea, genus unde tibi, Romane, Cluenti (genitive)); Mnestheus, Italus, must come second; Gyas, with three rows of oarsmen and three verses allotted to him, will be third; Sergestus is doomed to fail, having only one-and-a-half lines' description, and being the founder of the gens Sergia, which had recently produced Catiline.

The reader of K.'s book who is patient and discriminating will find some valuable insights into the Aeneid.

P.T. EDEN.

THE THIRD BOOK OF HORACE'S ODES, edited with translation and running commentary by Gordon Williams, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1969. 12/-.

This is an experimental edition, aimed largely at giving sixth formers and undergraduates an insight into the meaning and purpose of Odes III. Consequently Professor Williams is concerned not so much with the often self-contained difficulties which have tended to dominate earlier commentaries but with treating each poem as a whole and expounding Horace's process of thought.

The introduction is strictly functional and is divided into five sections. The first is a short but adequate survey of Horace's life and works, and this is followed by an account of the political situation between 42 and 23 B.C. Both require little previous knowledge from the reader. The third deals with the poet and the community. There Williams makes the important point, as do too few editors, that Horace modifies the traditional material to suit the mood of the moment and does not write poems for real social occasions. The poet of the Odes is a vates whose own personality does not appear, despite, of course, the odd autobiographical reference. The fourth and longest section raises the question of style, with discussions of Horace's originality, changes of tone, ornamentation and structural technique. The reader is urged to co-operate imaginatively with the poet and is provided with most of the necessary information. However, the last section, which deals with metre, is extremely brief. There is a specimen of each metre that occurs in Odes III and a few points of interest are added in the commentary, but nothing is said about the factors governing caesura, while a note on the occasions when a short syllable is found at the start of the first three lines of an Alcaic stanza is tucked away in the explanation of the reading inauspicatos in 6.10. Clearly only an outline could be expected, but more information on the principles behind the metres would be welcome.

After a list of ten books for further reading, the text is printed, with a translation and running commentary attached to each Ode. There are six important divergences from the Oxford Classical Text. Bibet is read for bibit in 3.12, limina Pulliae for limen Apuliae in 4.10, trahenti for trahentis in 5.15, inauspicatos for non auspicatos in 6.10, illa for illi in 20.8 and terrenum...publicum for Tyrrhenum...Apulicum in 24.4. The choice is justified, except in 4.10 and 24.4.

The translation is generally literal, since the editor wishes to provide the shortest possible explanation of the original. Thus tui plenum (25.1-2) is rendered 'filled with you' and valentium...vertere (25.15-6) 'strong to uproot'. On the other hand, fidens...horrida bracchiis (4.50) becomes 'trusting in its forest of hands' and such versions as 'desirable' for the dulce of dulce et decorum est pro patria mori (2.13), 'ghostly' for luridum (4.74), 'dangerous' for gravibus (5.4) and 'pretty' for insignem (20.6) are a little misleading. 'Your tantrums and your heated recriminations' sounds strange for irarum calidaeque rixae in 27.70. But these are minor criticisms. The translation is satisfactory, within its limits.

The commentary is lucid and almost always fulfils its purpose admirably; in some cases, it is an expansion of the author's remarks in his work on Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry, published by the Clarendon Press in 1968. In examining the long and significant fourth Ode, for instance, he agrees with Fraenkel that it is closely related to Pindar's Pythian I (the relevant passages of this and other Greek poems are included, with translations, in an appendix) and explains the autobiographical details of 9 ff. as the result of this correspondence. Horace writes personal, not choral, lyric and so, while Pindar favours an objective description of the power of music, he prefers to illustrate the power of poetic inspiration from his own life. He speaks of his miraculous escapes from death and, with this more serious note, passes to the names of current trouble-spots in the empire and so to Caesar himself. It is unfortunate that Williams, like Fraenkel, accepts without comment the doubtful reading limina Pulliae in v.10 and says that 'what makes the account remarkable is the authentic note of autobiography given by the name of his nurse, Pullia'. Limen Apuliae, the reading of most manuscripts, is certainly not very satisfactory and raises points of scansion and poetic technique, while Porphyrio adds to the confusion by appearing to read Apuliae but interpreting it as a personal name. Nevertheless, the difficulty affects the general understanding of the poem and deserves no less attention than the problem of male ominatis in 14.11, which is discussed at some length. Sicula Palinurus unda (v.28) is rendered 'cape Palinurus in Sicilian waters' and is said to refer to an escape from 'drowning off Sicily (otherwise unknown)'. Williams thus follows Pseudo-Acron in claiming that there was a Palinurus in Sicily, although there is little doubt that the scholiast is making a guess to explain Sicula...unda. Yet, as T. Dyer points out in 'Horatian Chronology', Classical Museum ii (1845) 206-7, we learn from combining the accounts of Appian, Dio and Velleius Paterculus that in 36 Maecenas experienced a disastrous storm off the known Palinurus, the promontory south of the bay of Velia, in operations against Sextus Pompeius and, in all probability, Horace, his faithful companion, was with him at the time. E. Wistrand develops this view in Horace's Ninth Epode and its Historical Background (1958), pp. 16-7, and shows that there is ample justification for Sicula...unda as hostile waves coming from the island of the enemy. The interpretation of the phrase is a detail in a commentary of this kind, but it is one that should not be overlooked.

Such shortcomings are few and detract little from the value of the book as a whole. Professor Williams has made a useful contribution to Horatian literature in producing a refreshing and informative work at so reasonable a price.

Gordon Williams: Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry
(Oxford University Press, 1968: £4.10s.0d)

"No poet, no artist of any art," T.S. Eliot wrote in one of his best-known essays, "has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead. I mean this as a principle of aesthetic, not merely historical, criticism."¹ His words have a special relevance to any study of Roman poetry, in which tradition had a special vitality, in which we are presented with a remarkably organic literary achievement. I use the word organic deliberately, for medical metaphors of birth, atrophy, death are usually misleading in criticism. Transformation and renewal there must be; but the tradition itself remains living and coercive. Professor Gordon Williams has presented us with a volume of 810 pages in which he sets out "to demonstrate, by detailed analysis, the essential nature of Roman poetry and the ways in which individual poets, belonging to, and conscious of, an identifiable tradition....achieved an originality of their own". The two ideas of 'tradition' and 'originality' are in no sense opposed, but complementary.

The author has fixed as his terminus ad quem the death of Horace in 8 A.D. He faces the period in which Roman poetry emerges in all the stunning richness of the Augustan era: and not so long afterwards Quintilian, in his famous survey of Greek and Roman literature, could, without fantasy, measure and weigh the achievements of Rome against those of Greece. To trace and to analyse this blossoming of literature is a weighty undertaking. Professor Williams' book is not to be rapidly assimilated. Scholars will wish to have it by them to test, to evaluate, to dispute. For dispute there will be. No student of Roman poetry can expect to subscribe to all Professor Williams' views. But the discussion will be profitable and the wealth of material contained within the compass of one volume is both remarkable and encouraging. But let the reader be warned: he must be prepared to give the author his closest attention. The analyses and discussions are often minute and demanding; they require a thorough familiarity with the relevant text. This is greatly assisted by the printing of Latin and Greek texts in full, with a prose translation appended. This, together with a painstaking system of cross-referencing and adequate indices, is of much help in utilising so large a book.

In a recent and stimulating article, Professor Charles Segal has acutely stated problems and outlined recent trends in criticism of ancient texts. He sees that there is a dichotomy - one which is likely to widen - between two major schools of criticism, which (for want of better terms) we may designate the Old and the New.² He makes a rational critique of both systems, remarking that "no critical methodology, whether new or old, can make up for the critic's knowledge and sensitivity and his ability to fuse both into a valid insight. Criticism is after all probably an art rather than a science..." He adds: "The classical critic needs not so much a methodology... as a free, independent judgment and what Pöschl has called 'the aures religiosissimae for the essence of poetry' - combined with as much Latin and Greek as he can get."³ All this is very true; but a methodology is useful - Professor Williams has one. He also has, as we should expect, a profound knowledge of Latin and Greek; yet, it must be said at the outset, that he is primarily an adherent and exponent of the older school of criticism. It is

the older school at its best as it appears, for example, in Fraenkel's Horace,⁴ to which Professor Williams makes frequent reference.⁵ In treating Catullus, there is no mention of Quinn, in treating Horace, no mention of Commager, in treating Virgil, no mention of Pöschl;⁶ this is not necessarily a criticism but it enables a potential reader to understand the general critical attitude of this book, of the insights which it will offer on Roman poetic activity. Professor Williams, for instance, has no time for what he describes as "a type of investigation which has become very popular with scholars in recent years: this is the discovery of patterns of arrangement, balances and harmony, contrast and similarity between the Eclogues in the position to which Virgil has assigned them in the complete collection." (p.328). In the same way the author dismisses as "not...very profitable" the work of Skutsch and Otis on the arrangement of Propertius' Monobiblos⁷ (for Williams believes, and argues at length, that Books I-III of Propertius were published as a single unit). I still find their ideas helpful. In short, Professor Williams' approach may be termed historicist; he is deeply conversant with the political background of Augustan poetry and investigates it with thoroughness. Such an approach brings its rewards: the chapter on "the poetry of institutions" is, to this reviewer, one of the most interesting in the book, with its learned demonstration of "the capacity of Roman poets - and especially the great poets of the Augustan age - to exploit poetically the emotive force of their own institutions." This sets the Roman poets apart from their Greek predecessors, and it is what one would expect from a great law-making nation, conservative and tenacious of their own ancient customs and rights. In the light of this, Professor Williams' discussion of Books IV and VI of the Aeneid, in comparison and confrontation with Propertius IV, 11, is valid and enlightening and will lose nothing by combination with other, post-Heinzean analyses of the same Books.

One of the great merits of this work lies in this process of confrontation: by examining various facets of Roman poetry in each chapter, the author has juxtaposed together poems that one has perhaps previously only considered in isolation. The light which they shed on each other - and on the "identifiable traditions" of Roman poetry - is valuable and convincing. This is true all through the book; it is especially apposite, for example, in the chapter "Imagination and Interpretation: the Demand on the Reader" - which shows that the demand made on a reader wishing to enter into the factitious and self-contained world of a poem is far greater than our simplicist ancestors would have thought. The reader must be prepared to weigh all the subtleties, all the nuances, all the variations in tone and emphasis which operate within a single poem. (I may say here that I still remain obstinately unconvinced of the unity of Catullus 68, despite Williams' cunning arguments to the contrary in this chapter.)⁸ Another factor any reader of Roman poetry will have to face is the complex integration of Greek and Roman, to which Professor Williams devotes a perceptive chapter. This might have been profitably enlarged by a discussion of ancient theories of imitatio, with all their important implications.⁹ The chapter begins with an examination of Catullus 51: I think that the author underestimates the savage irony and bitterness underlying the sudden transition from translation to self-address in this remarkable poem. It is easily forgotten just how shameful Catullus' life of poetic otium was to old-fashioned, respublica-centered Romans.¹⁰ Poetry, it will be remembered, was classified by Cicero among the leviores artes,¹¹ and the phrase cum dignitate otium was in its day a startling paradox. The novi poetae were struggling to give poetry a place in a society which as Herman Fraenkel has written, "strangely misconceived the nature of poetry

and invariably associated it with idleness."¹² It is to the credit of Augustus and his associates (as Professor Williams shows in his chapter on "the poet and the community") that they provided poets with a new and honoured place and a dignitas of their own (of which Propertius for one, with his use of sacral language of his own creative activity,¹³ was so fully aware); but old concepts die hard, as the debate between Aper and Maternus in the Dialogus shows.

Catullus above all revealed that, within a powerful tradition, the poet remains an individual. Roman poetry, in general, gives an impression of introspection different from any found in Greek. We have of course long passed the days that viewed Roman poetry - and particularly Horace and the elegists, as well as Virgil's Eclogues - as suitable material for crude biographical investigation; such an approach is as out of date as speculation on the number of Lady Macbeth's children. 'Sincerity' is a dangerous word to use in literary criticism. Professor Williams shows himself to be aware of that in his chapter on "truth and sincerity". There is nothing more corrupting in criticism of Roman poetry - or for that matter of Elizabethan poetry¹⁴ - than naive romanticism. As Eliot remarked: "The only cure for romanticism is to analyse it."¹⁵ Analysis has certainly killed romantic attitudes to the elegists, although books tinged by outmoded viewpoints still circulate among the young and innocent. The 'sincerity' of a Roman poem lies in its authenticity of expression and form, not in its autobiographical exactitude: it is not necessary to labour a theme discussed by A.W. Allen in a well-known essay.¹⁶ The Romans would have sympathised with Sir Philip Sidney, when, in An Apologie for Poetrie, he describes poets as "speaking not (table talk fashion, or like men in a dreame) words as they chanceably fall from the mouth, but peyzing each sillable of each word by iust proportion according to the dignitie of the subjecte." The Romans, like the Elizabethans, had a thoroughly objective attitude to poetry. J.R. Newman has recently stated the fact in bold and uncompromising terms. "Poetry is art;" he writes, "art is artificial....in criticising ancient poetry, does it make sense to ignore the truth that all poetry is artificial....and substitutde a distinction between 'subjective' and 'objective' which has the disadvantage of suggesting that some poetry is not artificial....?"¹⁷ Williams takes a rather different view from Newman, but time and again he undermines the notions of undisciplined realism by showing how, despite the presence of elements taken approximately from the poet's own life and situation, much else was added: "the poet constructs a world for himself which is more or less imaginary." And yet Professor Williams devotes a considerable amount of space to proving that the love-elegists "normally conceived themselves as addressing ladies of reasonably high social standing, who, because they are ex hypothesi attractive, are also married ..." (p.542) This is a true and useful corrective to old fashioned notions on the subject. But does it really help our understanding of the elegists? I think not, any more than I believe debates on the identity of Lesbia to be a proper field for literary critics (in the same way, is the historical identity of the Fair Youth and Dark Lady of Shakespeare's Sonnets really of any assistance in coming to grips with the aesthetics of the poems?) Professor Williams continues with the assertion that "for Propertius both ancient tradition and his own poetry combine to create a strong conviction that Cynthia to some degree conceals a real person. In the case of Tibullus, the reality of Delia is asserted by ancient tradition but it would have been impossible to assert it on the evidence of his poetry alone." But Corinna "had no real existence" - as Ovid himself suggests (Tristia II, 339-40). The

distinctions are to me of small importance. Septimius and Acme in Catullus 45 are credible people, even if their existence is restricted to the imaginative construct of the poem: the same is true of Lesbia, Cynthia, Delia, Corinna. 'Sincerity' must be judged as an objective term: the way in which a poet reacts to and evokes a situation will depend on his own psychological and intellectual qualities. Autobiographical reality - in a rigidly historical sense - has little or no relevance to our understanding of a poem. As Williams remarks of apparently autobiographical poetry: "Judgment...requires, above all, a sympathetic understanding of its subtle complexity and of the range of its imaginative comprehension." A.W. Allen has summed the matter up: "This does not mean that erotic poets were never in love, but it does mean that classical literary doctrine did not assume any specific and normal connexion between personal poetry and the actual experience of the poet. The doctrine insisted upon the independence of the poet, and his right freely to choose fitting material wherever he might wish, provided only that it accorded with the kind of poetry he was writing..."¹⁸ In the light of this attitude, I am dubious about the validity of Williams' view that "the framework which Catullus finds may be the product of his eagerness to give the sharpest possible expression to emotion which he feels in himself, while Propertius may be writing to enjoy the drama of imagining himself in a novel situation." (p.577) The distinction is verging on romanticism, and is certainly capable of distortion.

A review of this length cannot hope to do justice to a book such as this. Professor Williams has done a real service to the study of Roman poetry. His erudite book will be of the greatest value to all students, amateur and professional; it is a volume which no reader of Roman poetry can afford to be without.

D.W.T.C. VESSEY

1. T.S. Eliot, 'Tradition and the Individual Talent', in Selected Essays (London, 1951), 15.
2. Charles Segal, 'Ancient texts and modern criticism: some trends in classical studies', Arethusa 1 (1968), 1-25.
3. ibid., 19, quoting V. Pöschl, 'Ovid und Horaz', RCOM 1 (1959), 21.
4. E. Fraenkel, Horace (Oxford, 1957).
5. Williams dedicates his book to Professor Fraenkel. It may be pointed out here that in this book the author has rigidly restricted his references to other works. He writes: "Consequently there is no bibliography as such but only a list of those works to which I have referred....I have been ruthless and have only mentioned works which helped me particularly or which express a point of view which I reject." (p.vii) This avoidance of the external impedimenta of scholarship makes for easier reading.
6. K. Quinn, The Catullan Revolution (Melbourne, 1959 and Cambridge, 1969); S. Commager, The Odes of Horace (New Haven, 1962); V. Pöschl, Die Dichtkunst Virgils (Innsbruck, 1950) = The Art of Vergil: Image and Symbol in the Aeneid (trans. G. Seligman, Michigan, 1966).

7. O. Skutsch, 'The structure of the Propertian Monobiblos', CPh 58 (1963), 238-9; B. Otis, 'Propertius' Single Book', HSCP 70 (1965), 1-44.
8. For another subtle attempt to prove unity, see H.W. Prescott, 'Unity of Catullus 68', TAPA 71 (1940), 473-500.
9. Mlle. A. Guillemin's 'L'imitation dans les littératures antiques', REL 2 (1924), 35-57, still remains basic.
10. On the Roman attitude to poetry, see the remarks of H. Fraenkel, Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds (Berkeley, 1945), 9-10.
11. Cicero, Brutus I, 3 (with A.E. Douglas' note in his edition, Oxford, 1966, 3).
12. H. Fraenkel, o.c., 9.
13. cf. G. Luck, The Latin Love-Elegy (London, 1959), 124 ff. There are useful remarks in J.P. Elder, 'Non iniussa cano: Virgil's Sixth Eclogue', HSCP 65 (1961), 110-125.
14. Cf. the remarks of R. Tuve in his essay "'Imitation" and images' in Elizabethan Poetry: Modern Essays in Criticism (ed. P.J. Alpers, Oxford, 1967): "Extreme pleasure in poetry as a craft probably closed the Elizabethans to kinds of poetic pleasure which the Romantics placed very high; it certainly operated to make this age impatient of artless reportage." (p.42)
15. T.S. Eliot, The Sacred Wood (Oxford, 1928), 27.
16. A.W. Allen, "'Sincerity" and the Roman elegists', CPh 45 (1950), 145-160, reprinted under the title 'Sunt qui Propertium malint' in Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric (ed. J.P. Sullivan, London, 1962), 110-125.
17. J. Newman, Augustus and the New Poetry (ed. Latomus, Brussels, 1967), 366-7.
18. Allen, I.c., 146-7.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE AENEID by W.A. CAMPS

Oxford University Press, 1969. Boards edition 25/-; paperback 12/-.

This is a sensible and workmanlike approach to the subject, comparable with J.Perret's compendious and excellent "Virgil, l'homme et l'oeuvre" (Paris 1952), though more limited in scope. There are eleven chapters with five appendices and a small map of the voyages of Aeneas, the whole being contained in well under two hundred pages. The book is addressed to students of Virgil and of literature in general, including those who may be coming to the Aeneid for the first time. The reader need not know any Latin.

Mr. Camps has selected for discussion certain topics with the intention of conveying through these a balanced impression of the nature of the poem as a whole, and he has succeeded in his object. There is a reasonable apportionment of space between fact and opinion; the unavoidable personal element never becomes obtrusive.

Several passages treat sensitively the imaginative process in Virgil and the evocative properties of his poetry, while the observations on Virgil's 'religious' feeling and belief (pp. 42-50) are particularly helpful. The chapter on language and sensibility presents much useful material in a succinct and clear manner.

As critic Mr. Camps is independent, allying himself neither with symbolists nor allegorists - very wisely. Symbolism and allegory he does recognise in the poem, but he exercises reason and restraint. In chapter 10 and Appendix 5 he considers possible echoes of contemporary history. On the sacrificial slaughter by Aeneas at Pallas' funeral of captives, what Suetonius relates, Augustus 15, is cited - that Octavian had three hundred senators and knights slaughtered at a specially erected altar in honour of the dead Julius after the fall of Perusia in 41 B.C. The Homeric incident (see Il. 21.27 ff. and 23.175-6) does not account, says Mr. Camps, for what Aeneas is made to do. One wonders. Suetonius' story is only a rumour (scribunt quidam....); ancient biography tended to include the rumores also.

Mr. Camps remarks that Aeneas is conceived in general by the poet "as humane by nature as well as controlled by self-discipline". True, but the best of men are only men at best. They have their breaking-points, and Aeneas' sense of pietas has been unspeakably outraged. And this furious anger blazes out again at the very end of the poem for a connected reason when Aeneas notices the belt which Turnus took from Pallas. Pity vanishes and he stabs Turnus to death. Probably Homer and his own dramatic conceptions were enough to guide the poet's hand.

But it seems more than likely that Aeneas was intended somehow to suggest Octavian-Augustus; to what extent is the question. D.L. Drew went much too far in his essay published in 1927, "The Allegory of the Aeneid". Mr. Camps puts before us a good deal of the evidence (or 'considerations', perhaps a better expression here), but properly concludes that no consistent pattern of correspondences is to be detected in the allusions to contemporary events or persons. Symbol and allegory both play a part in the Aeneid, but we must beware of attempting to build a dogmatic theology on either.

The discussion of the "ille ego..." problem in Appendix 2 (which also deals with another passage said to have been similarly excised by the first editors, the Helen episode in Book 2) would have benefited if R.G. Austin's important paper (C.Q. n.s. 18(1968), p.109 ff.) had been available. Austin's attack is on linguistic grounds, though Camps's general arguments are persuasive. The lines are not authentic.

The lack of explicitness in much of Virgil's poetic procedure leads to diverse interpretations of character and incident at different levels which, if the judge is competent, have their own validity whatever their actual relation to the writer's intention. Mr. Camps stresses this point. His own reading of Aeneid 6 (already familiar to readers of The Proceedings from his lecture to the Society, P.V.S. 7(1967-68), p.22 ff.) makes him question

the traditional exposition of it: Aeneas' new assurance comes not propter his visit to the Underworld but simply post it; immediately after his ascent he reaches journey's end in the promised land. There has been no formative spiritual experience; the hero is cheered up by having got there at long last. What then we ask, is the point of Aeneid 6? Why is it there? The commentator must distinguish between what Virgil says and what he implies; the reader is allowed to concentrate on the implications. Factually Mr. Camps appears to be right, but readers will, on Mr. Camps's own showing, be forgiven for taking a more 'mystical' view and finding a deeper import in the poet's words. We are here on the verge of large metaphysical problems concerning the ontological status of a work of art. Virgil seems usually to say as little as possible so as to give us the widest possible field of inference. Mr. Camps has sounded a rationalist note of warning which we should gratefully acknowledge without necessarily abandoning the notion of the poem's larger life.

This book contains much of great value both for beginner and mature student. The tone is always humane and courteous. May it have the success which it deserves!

H. MacL. CURRIE.

QUEEN MARY COLLEGE,
University of London.

