Proceedings

of the

Virgil Society, No. 11

1971-1972

PROCEEDINGS OF THE VIRGIL SOCIETY

No. 11, 1971–72

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

Contents

		Page
Lecture No. 103	'Virgil and English Poetry: Some Thoughts on Affinities' by Dr. M.S. Silk (King's College, London)	1
Lecture No. 104	'Catullus and Virgil' by Prof. John Ferguson (The Open University)	25
Lecture No. 105	'Pietas in Virgil and Statius' by J.F. Burgess (University of Reading)	48
Lecture No. 106	*'Digna atque Indigna Relatu:* Observations on *Aeneid* IX' by Prof. R.P. Winnington-Ingram, F.B.A.	61
Articles	'Two Supernatural Incidents in the *Aeneid*' by Prof. F.J. Lelièvre.	74
	'Aeneidea' by Jonathan Foster	77
	'It' by Prof. H.H. Huxley	80
Obituary Notices		83

LECTORIBUS EDITOR

In succession to Professor Sandbach, *qui optime de nobis meritus est,* we welcome to the Presidential Chair Professor R.D. Williams of Reading University, a Virgilian of immense distinction for whose constant support over many years the Society is very grateful. His Presidential Address entitled 'Virgil Today' will be delivered at 3 p.m. on February 24th, 1973, at the Institute of Classical Studies, Gordon Square, W.C.1.

After a very long stint of running the affairs of the Society in one capacity or another, Dr. A.J. Gossage has asked to be relieved of the chairmanship of the Council. He will, we are glad to report, remain on the Council, but it will now be chaired by Dr. J.G. Landels, another very loyal friend and servant of the Society. Dr. Gossage's contribution to the growth and success of the Virgil Society has been outstanding and we are most grateful to him for all he has done over the years.

A new member of Council, elected at the last A.G.M., is Mrs. Carlotta Griffiths of King's College, London, and we are happy to welcome her. Readers will remember her learned and able paper to the Society published in *Proceedings* 9 (1969–70).

Professor Francis Berry's 1971 Jackson Knight Memorial Lecture, 'Thoughts on Poetic Time' (The Abbey Press, Abingdon-on-Thames, Berkshire; 30p; 6p extra for postage and packing in the U.K.) looks interestingly at some of the ways time is handled in dramatic or narrative contexts by Milton, Shakespeare, T.S. Eliot, and, of course, Virgil. Some reference to the chapter 'Virgil and the Subject of Secondary Epic' in C.S. Lewis's 'A Preface to Paradise Lost' (1942) would have been useful; Lewis's remarks on the sense of time in the *Aeneid* are perceptive and illuminating.

We close with greetings – and the request that members will not forget to send their subscriptions (60p, due on the 1st of January each year, 38p for full-time students) to the Treasurer as soon as they fall due or beforehand, if possible! We work on a very tight budget!

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

Hon. Treasurer: Dr. L. Watkiss, 106 Honey Lane, Waltham Abbey, Essex.

Editor of *The Proceedings:* H. MacL. Currie, M.A., Queen Mary College (University of London), Mile End Road, London, E.1.

Virgil and English Poetry : Some Thoughts on Affinities

Milton – this is probably the best way to begin – is *not* one of the English poets who manifest a significant affinity with Virgil. That Milton knew Virgil's works intimately hardly needs saying; the strong Virgilian influence is there throughout his work to attest it. In particular, *Paradise Lost* (Milton's masterpiece) was influenced by the *Aeneid* (Virgil's masterpiece?) both pervasively and profoundly. But such influence is not in itself a mark of affinity. The influence of the two Homeric epics on the *Aeneid* is comparable with the influence of the *Aeneid* on *Paradise Lost,* but no-one has ever plausibly suggested any real affinity between Virgil and Homer.

There is one central Miltonic characteristic which is conclusively alien to Virgil, the one conveniently suggested by this biographical comment of Johnson's in his *Life of Milton:*

> 'Milton, who appears to have had full conviction of the truth of Christianity and to have regarded the Holy Scriptures with the profoundest veneration, to have been untainted by an heretical peculiarity of opinion and to have lived in a confirmed belief of the immediate and occasional agency of Providence, yet grew old without any visible worship. In the distribution of his hours, there was no hour of prayer, either solitary or with his household.' [1]

In *Dover Beach* Matthew Arnold voiced the following well-known apostrophe:

> Ah, love, let us be true
> To one another! for the world, which seems
> To lie before us like a land of dreams,
> So various, so beautiful, so new,
> Hath really neither joy, nor love, nor light,
> Nor certitude....

Certitude: whoever else may or may not have had that, Milton had it. Not simply belief, but self-sufficient certitude on the grand scale: he hadn't any need for 'visible worship'. The certitude required even to *attempt* his greatest literary task was considerable: an epic of the Fall that must conform to, but also activate, a coherent and complex theology and thereby 'justify the ways of God to men' – a task incompatible with any fundamental doubt such as (to anticipate the argument) a writer with Virgil's sensibility had to cope with in his *Aeneid.*

I began by dissociating Virgil and Milton for the obvious reason that these two have often been bracketed in the past. There exists at least one book featuring both names in its title – and with some reason, even apart from Milton's specific debt to Virgil: *Paradise Lost* and the *Aeneid* are not only major works one of which heavily influenced the other; they are both epics.

All criticism and all characterization of literature requires comparison, though comparison is and must be frequently left implicit. 'This is a rather Romantic piece' is a characterization that presupposes comparison with unspecified but specifiable works, so-called

Romantic works, which would evidence the features or qualities in question. *Paradise Lost* and the *Aeneid* belong, as we say, to the same literary genre, epic; that is, to say that the *Aeneid* is an epic presupposes the feasibility of comparing it with Milton; but it also, effectively, presupposes the desirability and even the inevitability of such a comparison.

Comparisons, implicit or explicit, will be more or less new and their suggestiveness will be in some degree proportionate to their novelty, an idea we are familiar with in the case of the implicit comparisons that we call metaphors. These, as we say, can get tired and worn, may need reviving or replacing. The same is probably true of the habitual comparison by genres. I suggest that it may be more profitable – at least for once – to compare Virgil not with Milton and whoever else specifically wrote in the Virgilian genres, but with those poets who, whatever their genres, show an affinity with him; where by affinity, as will be apparent already, I mean something to do with matters of poetic sensibility.

I want now to consider in turn three extracts, one Virgilian, two by English poets, deferring for the moment the question of the interrelation of these passages. The first of them is that much-admired passage from the Eighth Eclogue in which the jilted lover summons up the circumstances of a first meeting in late childhood (or early adolescence). Boy meets girl in the garden, picking apples:

saepibus in nostris parvam te roscida mala
(dux ego vester eram) vidi cum matre legentem.
alter ab undecimo tum me iam acceperat annus,
iam fragilis poteram a terra contingere ramos.
(Ecls.8.37-40)

The piece is based on Theocritus, an innocuous piece of Theocritus (11.25-27). The relevant points of interest, it's fair to say, are pure Virgil. The wistful pathetic quality is most obvious, stemming from an idealized notion of love associated in its simplicity with the simplicity of childhood: Theocritus left the ages quite unspecified, Virgil locates them with *parvam* and *alter ab undecimo.* One other relevant characteristic: the situation is evoked with remarkable immediacy, with a particular sensuous immediacy in *iam fragilis ... ramos,* the sound pattern with its recurring 'r' and contrasting stops playing a part in the almost tactile effect *(contingere).* Yet all this vivid situation is evoked out of nothing: *saepibus* begins a self-contained stanza (so to speak); a scene, a situation is conjured up suddenly and in fact disappears as suddenly.

The second piece is the opening lines of Keats' fragmentary revised *Hyperion,* the so-called *Fall of Hyperion,* mature Keats – written at the age of twenty-four in 1819. The immediate and intense concern of the passage is fully representative of its author: a concern with transience; with death, if you like, but not with death as a cause of suffering, but a cause of impermanence.

Fanatics have their dreams, wherewith they weave
A paradise for a sect; the savage, too,
From forth the loftiest fashion of his sleep
Guesses at heaven; pity these have not

Traced upon vellum or wild Indian leaf
The shadows of melodious utterance,
But bare of laurel they live, dream and die.

'Bare of laurel', magnificent pun: no leaf to write on, no victory over the grave. Two possible paths to that victory, two modes of salvation, are in question: salvation via perpetuation, especially the word of poetry, the word that preserves and commemorates, this being the mode of salvation that Keats here endorses; and opposed to it, salvation via religion, metaphysical conviction, here damagingly dismissed: 'fanatics', 'dreams', 'sect'. As this passage serves to suggest, Keats could hardly be called a 'believer' in any orthodox sense, but the impressive intensity of his dismissal indicates his involvement in the whole issue of belief.

The next extract belongs to a fairly early poem by a former President of this Society, T.S. Eliot: *Preludes,* of which this is the fourth and last piece. It falls into three sections: an unappealing urban scene, giving way to a snatch of almost disembodied ('lyrical') yearning, giving way in its turn to a violent cynical deflation.

His soul stretched tight across the skies
That fade behind a city block,
Or trampled by insistent feet
At four and five and six o'clock;
And short square fingers stuffing pipes,
And evening newspapers and eyes
Assured of certain certainties,
The conscience of a blackened street
Impatient to assume the world.

I am moved by fancies that are curled
Around these images, and cling:
The notion of some infinitely gentle
Infinitely suffering thing.

Wipe your hand across your mouth and laugh;
The worlds revolve like ancient women
Gathering fuel in vacant lots.

The tonal contrast between the lyricism and what follows is powerful and witty, albeit exaggerated. It amounts, in any case, to a virtual paradox, that two so alien focuses of thought as the Infinite – the rather idealized Infinite – and the hand-wiping could coexist in any world that could be called meaningful. And this is the point, made duly explicit at the end: *vacant* lots, a meaningless ritual whose futility is palpable to everyone but those caught up in it, the 'eyes assured of certain certainties'.

These three passages were written, as it happens, at roughly comparable ages. The revised *Hyperion* was, as I mentioned, written when Keats was twenty-four, a year before his death. The *Preludes* are early Eliot, about the same age. The *Eclogues* were produced when Virgil was about thirty.

occasions present themselves. Why is Virgil so interested in him? Not for *who* he is, but plainly for *what* he is: his situation, young and vulnerable, and above all, and more profoundly, his symbolic significance as ancestor of Augustus and Aeneas' faintly precarious future. Virgil's interest is invested primarily in things and the 'things' in question include, besides 'situations', these large symbols and, inevitably, the moral abstractions associated with them that figure so prominently in the *Aeneid* – *pietas*, destiny *et alia* In *Aeneid IV*, while Aeneas is still at Carthage in love with Dido (*magno labefactus amore*, as Virgil later tells us), Mercury comes down with orders to get him moving; the god's speech takes eleven lines. Aeneas is struck dumb, terrified, in anguish – and prepares to obey. The description of this reaction and this agonized decision, the volte-face, is given in fifteen lines. The lines are magnificent lines, but fifteen is fifteen; there are certain matters that need a more patient exploration. To anyone reflecting on the brevity of this passage it should be apparent that Virgil is decisively more interested in Aeneas as the possessor of the well-known symbolic significance (*pius Aeneas* entails Rome) and in Dido as the complementary symbolic obstacle than he is in either of them singly as people; apparent, for the particular reason that by his brevity he effectively evades the matter that would exercise either of *them* most as people – their relationship. He is, obviously, involved with Dido in the outcome, but that means Dido in her melancholy, *isolated* state rather than Dido in her relationship. In fact, a detailed analysis of the whole Dido-Aeneas episode would show that their relationship hardly exists as a force in its own right (unlike *pietas* or destiny). They might as well be in love, separately, with two other people of the same names who never actually materialize: two people and one relationship makes three, but only two – or less – in Virgil.[3]

The place of these considerations in the overall scheme can best be indicated gradually, the first thing being to pursue them through the composite poet's other two guises. With Keats, even more than with Virgil, one could call the characters anonymous and the situations vivid. *The Eve of St Agnes*, that remarkable narrative poem from the annus mirabilis, 1819, has a simple but characteristically evocative beginning:

> St Agnes' Eve – Ah, bitter chill it was!
> The Owl, for all his feathers, was a–cold;
> The hare limp'd trembling through the frozen grass ....

The immediacy here is in fact closely related to the simplicity, being dependent on the informality of the implicit antithesis – unstructured and unforced. 'The owl, for all his feathers, was a-cold.' As Hunt commented, 'could he have selected an image more warm and comfortable in itself and therefore better contradicted by the season?' The opening is one of the memorable moments of the poem; the two characters, Porphyro and Madeline, two lovers, provide others without being themselves memorable (we find no unforced presentation of *them*); and the same goes for Keats' narrative pieces in general, which means the bulk of his poetry. (One too easily forgets that most of Keats is narrative: *Endymion, Lamia, Hyperion* and so on.) In 1819 at the height of his powers and with intense aspiration, he worked at two dramas, *Otho the*

Great and *King Stephen;* hardly with equivalent success. Drama, like narrative, deals with people, which is not where his strengths lie.

Keats, like Virgil, is fluent in the language of sensuousness: immediate, evocative; evocative of situations and things; experience of the world, or certain aspects of it, made to rebound back out of the verse. The Keatsian sensuousness is often languorous, insound and effect:

> Turn the key deftly in the oilèd wards
> And seal the hushèd casket of my soul.
>
> *(To Sleep)*
>
> It is as if the rose should pluck herself
> Or the ripe plum finger its misty bloom
>
> ('How fevered is the man ....')

but at his best languor makes way for a robust voluptuousness – as in an inimitable line and a half near the end of *Otho*,

> old Aetna's pulpy wine-presses
> Black stained with the fat vintage –

and in general a greater firmness, exemplified in the classic lines from *To Autumn*:

> To fill all fruit with ripeness to the core,
> To swell the gourd and plump the hazel shells
> With a sweet kernel .....

The strength of his sensuousness is apparent from its overwhelming force when he holds it back and springs it:

> But when the melancholy fit shall fall
> Sudden from heaven like a weeping cloud
> That fosters the droop-headed flowers, all,
> And hides the green hill in an April shroud;
> Then glut thy sorrow on a morning rose .....
>
> *(Ode on Melancholy)*

An otherwise more nominal feeling becomes intensely present with the concrete sound and sense of 'glut'.

To revert briefly to Virgil at this point, with him – as with Keats – sensuousness is sparked off by a great variety of occasions, but, as also with Keats, one kind of occasion seems peculiarly operative – the countryside, specifically the satisfying rural

richness and density:

To swell the gourd and plump the hazel shells .....

In Virgil this rich density is often evoked through the long spondee in its association with appropriate rhythmic and sound patterns (the fourth foot spondee with rhythmic coincidence predominates):

sunt *nobis* mitia poma,
castaneae molles et *pressi* copia lactis (Ecl.1.80-81)

Muscosi fontes et somno mollior herba (Ecl.7.45)

hinc omnis largo pubescit vinea fetu (Georg.2.390)

and the bees

cum gentis adultos

educunt fetus aut cum liquentia mella
stipant et dulci distendunt nectare cellas. (Aen.1.431-3)

Nature elicits his powers of apprehension and communication in a way that a human relationship can't.

Eliot's sensuous gift is less acclaimed but no less real. It's there in the unusually visual grasp of his imagery:

The worlds revolve like ancient women
Gathering fuel in vacant lots. *(Preludes)*

The river's tent is broken; the last fingers of leaf
Clutch and sink into the wet bank. *(The Waste Land)*

There in his highly individual and unnerving domestic silhouettes:

Madame de Tornquist, in the dark room
Shifting the candles; Fraulein von Kulp
Who turned in the hall, one hand on the door. *(Gerontion)*

There in whole scenes and even whole poems built of single scenes, notably *Portrait of a Lady*, where two literally anonymous characters of opposite sexes convey their – very separate – situations. And superlatively there in the shape of rhythmic enactment communicating the incommunicable religious reality, the mechanism being contrast between a kind of slow Ionic after running iambics:

We move above the moving tree
In light upon the figured leaf
And hear upon the sodden floor
Below, the boarhound and the boar
Pursue their pattern as before
But reconciled among the stars.

At the still point of the turning world. ... *(Burnt Norton)*

It's significant, at least symbolically, that Dryden and others have felt drawn to call the *Georgics* Virgil's best poem: the staple of that poem is things, ideals (such as *labor* and the blessings of *labor*), nature and the closely rendered situations of nature:

tum cornix plena pluviam vocat improba voce
et sola in sicca secum spatiatur harena. (Georg.1.388–9)

In the same way the few great odes of Keats are widely granted a special status within his total output: the odes that unlike the dramatic and narrative works contain no people. With Eliot the case is more complicated. His verse could be said to fall broadly into three main groups: first the earlier works, up to and probably including *Ash Wednesday*, written in 1930, the piece which decisively marks his conversion to Christianity; then the overtly religious and much admired *Four Quartets* (1935–1942); and finally the plays, *Murder in the Cathedral* in 1935, *The Family Reunion* in 1939 and the post-war comedies. Of these groups the first consists pre-eminently of what one critic[5] rightly called 'dramatic monologues', as *The Hollow Men, Gerontion, Prufrock, The Waste Land; Four Quartets* is apparently in propria persona, if in any, throughout; and the plays are – plays. The point of that tautology is that Eliot's plays, like Keats', don't demand any close attention here: with immediacy in mind again, one could fairly say that their immediacy varies inversely to their presentation of specifically human interactivity; the most immediacy, that is, is found, along with the greatest intensity, in the religiocentric deliberations (dramatized soliloquies and choral lyrics) of *Murder in the Cathedral*. *Four Quartets* obviously, for the immediate purpose, belongs with *Murder*, except that no question of 'human interactivity' arises at all, even formally, in its case. As for the early poems, with their tendency towards the 'dramatic monologue', *Gerontion* can serve as the representative instance. This is a poem with a speaker and a setting, both of them lightly indicated at the beginning:

Here I am, an old man in a dry month,
Being read to by a boy, waiting for rain.

Such lines are evocative and seem to rest on solid foundations, but the foundations are an ingenious illusion. The poem turns out to be essentially meditative, and not a meditation that tells us much about the old man (who does the meditating), except inasmuch as the old man is a symbol for an atrophying civilization; the meditation is about that. The old man is therefore less a person than a technical device. Eliot's successes, here as elsewhere, are not associated with the dramatic realization of people.

The peculiar limitations of the characters in the *Aeneid* stem directly from Virgil's sensibility. This is worth stressing. It isn't that Virgil wasn't really trying – an idea that might do for the people in the *Eclogues,* who obviously aren't the focus for much energy on his part but, like Eliot's 'old man', are simply adequate for their purpose; one couldn't say it of the *Aeneid,* where the creation and elaboration of the main figures clearly required a concentrated and prolonged effort. Again, the limitations can't be ascribed to any intransigence inherent in the epic medium as such, witness Homer; nor to the demands seemingly imposed by the imperial commission, which could, after all, have been discharged quite differently. As to the last point, no-one, I take it, would care to say explicitly that the characters in any epic involving the specific Augustan ideals would have had to come out exactly as Virgil's did, but formulations that might (more insidiously) *imply* something of the kind certainly exist: as perhaps with Sellar's suggestion that whereas with Homer 'the germ of the poems is the story ... [and] human action and character..., the germ of the *Aeneid*... is to be sought in the national idea and sentiment, in the imperial position of Rome, in her marvellous destiny and in its culmination in the Augustan Age. ... The real keynote of the poem is not the *arma virumque* with which it opens but the *tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem* with which the exordium closes. ... This is the main cause of the comparative tameness of the *Aeneid* in point of human interest.'[6] I must come back to Sellar's formulation later; for the time being we can more usefully start again from its basic, unassailable element. Virgil has written an epic *with* people, but not *about* people: true; and unlike Homer; and so (let us say) *contrary* to the 'natural' tendencies of the epic medium. And where, let us ask, does that leave the people – is there, for instance, any genre to which they would, as they stand, more 'naturally' belong? My earlier remarks about generic classifications notwithstanding, the question could repay examination, but only, no doubt, a long and thorough examination which would in effect be providing the material for a new (ad hoc) classification, but would inevitably be outside my present scope. In passing, a comparison made by Pöschl is worth recording: Virgil, he suggests, often makes one think of opera, a pointed comparison (and not just for Dido and Aeneas) with its suggestion of declamatory and highly coloured performance – the characters certainly aren't colour*less,* as critics often imply.[7] But take another and a more profitable question: to which genre would Virgil's characters, as they stand, *least* naturally belong? The answer is surely the novel. 'The Bible ... and Homer and Shakespeare: these are the supreme old novels.' That was D.H. Lawrence and his point is worth taking. One can see why Homer is on the list and also why Virgil – and our composite poet in general – could never be. 'The novel is the book of life', says Lawrence, 'the wholeness of a man, the wholeness of a woman, man alive and live woman.'[8] The novel, pre-eminently, centres on human life, its interactions and its possibilities of movement. The *Aeneid's* chief candidate for movement is destiny, as vested in Aeneas, and where there might have been interaction between him and, say, Dido, there is, instead, the painful removal of an obstacle from destiny's path.

The question whether or not to write a novel didn't arise for Virgil; the novel wasn't yet a going concern. It was precisely that in Keats' time and by Eliot's time it had become the dominant literary form. Eliot and Keats wisely chose to avoid the new

form and in fact neither evinces any great interest in it. This is demonstrably so with Eliot and it's at this point in the argument that matters peculiarly demonstrable in his case take on a decisive significance. It's also at this point, I may say, that the relevant differences between the three poets begin to appear (at first seemingly setting Keats furthest apart), but it's still Eliot who provides a convenient approach. 'I confess that personally I take so little interest in novels that I am inclined to deplore your devoting so much time to prose', he wrote to an acquaintance in the 1930's, and a few years earlier to another: 'I feel quite incompetent to judge novels and I confess a complete ignorance of human psychology.' The implications here are evident and unwelcome. 'At Naples', Donatus tells us, 'Virgil was commonly called Parthenias (Virginia). ... He spent most of his time in Campania or Sicily, where he could get away from people.' 'Eliot's poetry', says Dr. Leavis with characteristically unapologetic directness, 'hasn't a rich human experience behind it. It reveals, rather, a restriction; it comes, indeed, out of a decided poverty.'[9]

The relation between poetry and biography (or psychography) is always a delicate matter, whatever the issues, but the present case leaves little room for doubt. Eliot's 'poverty' underlies his inability to give a full realization of character; it further manifests itself in an unsatisfying *attitude* towards human relationships in general, and especially the man-woman relation; and within that particular relation it shows up most conspicuously as an unexplained – and thus artistically unwarranted – distaste for physicality. My suggestion (as the flirtatious dropping in of Donatus' Parthenias anecdote was meant to indicate) is that in these matters no less than in others Virgil presents a comparable picture, as indeed, up to a point, Eliot himself can tell us. In a talk he once gave on 'Virgil and the Christian World', he discussed some relevant points and in so doing revealed, as he was bound to, something of his own disposition. 'The term which one can justifiably regret the lack of in Virgil is *amor*. It is, above all others, the key word for Dante. I do not mean that Virgil never uses it. *Amor* recurs in the *Eclogues (amor vincit omnia)*. But the loves of the shepherds represent hardly more than a poetic convention. The use of the word *amor* in the *Eclogues* is not illuminated by meanings of the word in the *Aeneid* in the way in which, for example, we return to Paolo and Francesca with greater understanding of their passion after we have been through the circles of love in the *Paradiso*. Certainly, the love of Aeneas and Dido has great tragic force. There is tenderness and pathos enough in the *Aeneid*. But Love is never given, to my mind, the same significance as a principle of order in the human soul, in society and in the universe that *pietas* is given; and it is not Love that causes *fatum* or moves the sun and the stars. Even for intensity of physical passion, Virgil is more tepid than some other Latin poets, and far below the rank of Catullus.' It's pleasing to find Eliot speaking up for Catullus, but this shouldn't distract us from the remarkable emphasis he uses. 'Even for intensity of physical passion': the terms of this faintly condescending afterthought ('even') indicate a total separation between 'physical passion' and *amor* proper, including *amor* as 'a principle of order in the human soul'. He continues: 'Virgil was, among all authors of classical antiquity, one for whom the world made sense, for whom it had order and dignity and for whom, as for no-one before him except the Hebrew prophets, history had meaning.' But, he concludes, Virgil was still denied the ultimate Christian, and specifically Dantean, vision represented by a conception of *amor* as the universal 'principle of order'.[10]

'The general truth about him', says Dr. Leavis of Eliot, 'is that he can contemplate the relations between men and women only with revulsion or distaste – unless with the aid of Dante.'[11] To be respectable, then, such *amor* must be transcended in the Platonic-Dantean way (but it was Dante who had a positive influence) or at the very least contemplated – idealized – from a distance at which the reality of the precise context becomes more restfully elusive:

> 'You gave me hyacinths first a year ago;
> They called me the hyacinth girl.'
> – Yet when we came back, late, from the hyacinth garden,
> Your arms full, and your hair wet, I could not
> Speak... . *(The Waste Land)*

What happens at close range is exemplified in *East Coker* –

> The time of milking and the time of harvest
> The time of the coupling of man and woman
> And that of beasts. Feet rising and falling.
> Eating and drinking. Dung and death.

with a striking immediacy, despite all else. But such revulsion tends to exclude, rather than transcend; expressing itself in obsessive stereotypes, it creates a new kind of distance. When, for instance, Eliot thinks of the female as a physically operative being, he thinks of the being's smell: 'female smells in shuttered rooms' *(Rhapsody on a Windy Night),* the 'rank' and 'feline' smell of Grishkin *(Whispers of Immortality);* and this from one of the early drafts of *The Waste Lane,* recently published by the author's widow:[12]

> This ended, to the steaming bath she moves,
> Her tresses fanned by little flutt'ring doves;
> Odours, confected by the artful French,
> Disguise the good old hearty female stench.

So habitual is this association that it can colour even a rare positive expression. A late poem called *A Dedication to my Wife* contains the lines

> And the rhythm that governs the repose of our sleeping-time,
> The breathing in unison
> Of lovers whose bodies smell of each other...

which reads like a painfully ill-judged attempt to make amends, the obvious sincerity only making it worse.

In Virgil's attitude to 'men and women', the affinity with Eliot is apparent, as it was in the ultimately related deficiency in character-realization. This isn't to say that Virgil's attitude is identical. The same fundamental unease is certainly visible, but, in Virgil's case, as the key to a more complex variety. This variety, let me say, isn't simply a reflection of diverse Roman attitudes, if only because two of the most distinctive Roman attitudes

hardly figure in Virgil: the two that might for convenience be called the Terentian, which consists of a more or less indulgent indifference to a trivial aberration, and the Catullan, which, as well as catering for the 'intensity of physical passion', also, as Quinn pointed out, recognises the possibility of love 'giving a new meaning to life'.[13] Which attitudes, then, *do* figure in Virgil? To start with, of course, we have the 'poetic conventions' in the *Eclogues;* and then the violent Lucretian denunciation of *amor* as *furor* and *furiae* in *Georgic* III, a 'Roman' posture which Virgil adopts without any sign of discomfort:

> omne adeo genus in terris hominumque ferarumque
> et genus aequoreum, pecudes pictaeque volucres,
> in furias ignemque ruunt: amor omnibus idem. (Georg.3.242–4)

We have, similarly, what love does to Dido: it makes *laetissima Dido,* a serene figure, into a wild, hysterical, suicidal Dido. But love is also, as Eliot might have remembered, what Aeneas' mother Venus is goddess of; and love is what she uses in the allegory in *Aeneid* VIII to soften the god of fire into forging the arms that, by Aeneas' victory, make Rome possible. Which means that inasmuch as Rome 'is' destiny, *fatum,* love *does* in a sense 'cause fatum'. But love in this sense undeniably transcends, or rather excludes, the human relationship: gods, Virgil's gods, are not people. The 'love' that we see in operation here exemplifies, in fact, a transference of *amor* from the human to the extra-human plane of ideals, the same transference that Virgil epitomizes so memorably in his 'hic amor, haec patria est' (Aen.4.347); and *patria,* needless to say, excludes the *amor* of human relationship. Aeneas will have Lavinia, but Lavinia means nothing in terms of relationship. Dido is the human relationship, if there was to be any, and Dido is excluded.

But *amor* is also idealized in Virgil, as in Eliot, and on such terms a relationship is not excluded. Orpheus and Eurydice, for instance:

> te, dulcis coniunx, te solo in litore secum,
> te veniente die, te decedente canebat. (Georg.4.465–6)

The orchard scene in Eclogue VIII naturally belongs here, and its association of *amor* with childhood has its own special significance, evoking, as it does, a simpler and less painful world of relationships (compare in passing the reassuring simplicities of the countryside). One recalls how the idealized image of sacrificial youth obsesses Virgil: Pallas, Nisus and Euryalus, Lausus, Camilla, and of course Marcellus – not childhood here in every case, but something sufficiently close to it; and the 'precarious' Ascanius could almost be added to the list. It comes as no surprise that the word *puer* should figure again and again in a stereotyped idealizing context – melodious apostrophe with a strongly charged pathos:

> o formose puer, nimium ne crede colori... (Ecl.2.17)
> dum te, care puer, mea sola et sera voluptas... (Aen.8.581)
> quid tibi nunc, miserande puer, pro laudibus istis... (Aen.10.825)
> tene (inquit), miserande puer... (Aen.11.42)[14]

and most revealingly of all, from the Second Eclogue,

> huc ades, o formose puer: tibi lilia plenis
> ecce ferunt Nymphae calathis... (Ecl.2.45–6)

beside the Marcellus passage from the *Aeneid,*

> heu, miserande puer, si qua fata aspera rumpas,
> tu Marcellus eris. manibus date lilia plenis... (Aen.6.882–3)

Marcellus' situation is highly evocative, but Marcellus belongs painfully to real life; an unusual delicacy of treatment is required. That Virgil should find in the predominantly synthetic and idealized *Eclogue* world the natural expression for such an occasion says a good deal. Idealization is what he falls back on in this crisis, idealization and pathos.[15] And here, as in the 'puer' passages in general, the apostrophized word seems to carry its pathos as if by some natural law – but the 'nature' in question is Virgil's own, intermittently unbalanced by a private melancholia and devoting itself to doomed youth with the same poignant excess as it does elsewhere to the plight of Dido at the expense of her notional relationship with Aeneas.

Keats presents a kind of contrast. His portrayal of people is no happier and he has his related weakness regarding relationships, but the weakness is a different one: the one suggested by the famous cry from a letter of 1817, 'O for a life of Sensations rather than of Thoughts' and the injunction to 'gorge the honey of life' a year later – an over-indulgent relish in the senses.[16] In the context of relationships one finds this leading to over-sensuality and specifically a Gothic-erotic hysteria with more than a touch of cruelty. The heroines of *La Belle Dame sans Merci* (the femme fatale) and *Lamia* (the woman-demon) show one facet; another is shown by the curious instinct that led him to conceive his Grecian Urn as a 'still unravish'd bride of quietness' (does a groom have to *ravish* his bride?) and by the nature of the climax in *The Eve of St. Agnes.* Physical contact between the young lovers, Porphyro and Madeline, is about to take place in alarmingly charged circumstances; unknown to Madeline, Porphyro gains access to her chamber; he kneels beside her bed, while she sleeps, dreams of him and, still in her sleep, talks to him movingly:

> Beyond a mortal man impassion'd far
> At these voluptuous accents, he arose,
> Ethereal, flush'd, and like a throbbing star
> Seen 'mid the sapphire heaven's deep repose;
> Into her dream he melted, as the rose
> Blendeth its odour with the violet, –
> Solution sweet: meantime the frost-wind blows
> Like love's alarum pattering the sharp sleet
> Against the window-panes; St. Agnes' moon hath set.[17]

The symbolism – consummation inside suggested by 'the sharp sleet' outside – is reminiscent of the marriage episode in *Aeneid* IV, but Virgil has nothing to match the compressed sensuality (and gratuitous violence?) of the 'throbbing star' and the 'into her dream'. But Keats

was young; perhaps these were – or would have been, had he lived – only teething troubles. He was evidently aware of their existence. In a letter of 1818 he wrote, 'I am certain I have not a right feeling towards women ... When I am among women, I have evil thoughts, malice, spleen';[18] and in the astonishing preface to *Endymion* from the same year, he apologizes publicly for his immaturity and adds: 'the imagination of a boy is healthy and the mature imagination of a man is healthy; but there is a space of life between, in which the soul is in a ferment, the character undecided, the way of life uncertain, the ambition thick-sighted: thence proceeds mawkishness and all the thousand bitters... .' But though his aspiration was real enough, aspiration and achievement are different things; and one has to note that the evidence just given of his eroticism is all of a fairly late date – in fact, all from the golden year, 1819; and to confirm that point there is also what Matthew Arnold called the 'complete enervation' of the letters to Fanny Brawne throughout this period. The weakness, therefore, and the aspiration to overcome it co-existed: in the same letter that produced 'O for a life of sensations', with its hint of weakness, the poet enthroned his complementary aspiration alongside the poetic disposition itself. 'I am certain', he wrote, 'of nothing but of the holiness of the Heart's affections and the truth of Imagination.'[19] To be certain of nothing but that is to place a heavy burden on 'the heart's affections' – 'holiness' saddles them with the duty of salvation – but put in the context of the poet's conflict, it represents an impressive affirmation.

'Holiness' and 'salvation': I've approached this point several times already. 'Virgil', said Eliot, associating him with the Christian Dante, 'was one for whom the world made sense.' That, I suggest, is too simple – too simple for Virgil; quite misleading, as it happens, for Keats; for Eliot himself it can pass, just – for Eliot, who, we recall, juxtaposed his thoughts about Virgil and Christianity with his thoughts about Virgil and secular *amor*. When one talks, as I have, of problems regarding human relationships and then of religion and of 'making sense', it becomes immediately tempting to think in terms of an absence of personal fulfilment and religion arriving to fill the vacuum. This is a relevant line of thought, but it is, as it stands, at least suspiciously tidy. I doubt that this is quite the key. I would rather suggest that (in the case under consideration) the key, or something like a key, is to be found in a sense of general waste or impermanence which *correlates with* such a deficiency, is in a way co-extensive with it, may indeed be fed by it, but may be ultimately autonomous of it.

Life passes; all things, people included, come and go; what does their passage leave behind, what *can* it leave behind to give life meaning? – that sort of crude articulation can serve for the moment. The question doesn't, of course, worry everyone; not everyone is liable to such feelings; the poet, no doubt, is more liable than most. To the poet suffering from such feelings and asking the question – what might yield the meaning? – there are three relevant possibilities:

1) People known perpetuated by public memory, being in a tradition, by record, by the word.
2) People, more intimately known, more intimately perpetuated through the man-woman relationship and its natural fruit and symbol, children.

3) Metaphysics, religion, a creed: transcending the passage of life.

'The worlds revolve like ancient women...':— the three poets had best be taken in turn again, beginning with Eliot, the Eliot who gave voice to that sense of futility in the early *Preludes* and with it, we can now say, the complementary metaphysical yearning:

> The notion of some infinitely gentle
> Infinitely suffering thing.

The sense of futility is clearly stronger than the yearning, with Infinity overtaken by the women and their 'vacant lots': stronger and more strongly, sensuously grasped; but while a sensuous grasp can make experienced futility comfortlessly real, it can't do anything to change it. The sense of futility in fact grew stronger still through the early 1920's; such titles as *The Waste Land, The Hollow Men* are suggestive by themselves. In *The Hollow Men* the crisis reached its height:

> We are the hollow men
> We are the stuffed men...
> Our dried voices, when
> We whisper together
> Are quiet and meaningless
> As wind in dry grass...

The notion of hope does occur, religious hope, only to be dropped equivocally:

> Multifoliate rose
> Of death's twilight kingdom
> The hope only
> Of empty men.

This hope, if real, is apparently something external, as if presenting itself to the 'empty men' rather than issuing forth from them; and correspondingly Eliot spoke of himself, some years later, as one of those who 'believe that men cannot get on without giving allegiance to something outside themselves'.[20] Such extra-personal allegiance, therefore, was what was required to find stability amidst impermanence, 'the still point of the turning world'; but, of course, having called the allegiance 'extra-personal', one finds oneself confronted again with Eliot's particular 'personal' restrictedness. In 1930, the year of *Ash Wednesday,* he wrote, ostensibly apropos Baudelaire, of the 'reaching out towards something which cannot be had *in,* but which may be had partly *through,* personal relations. Indeed in much romantic poetry the sadness is due to the exploitation of the fact that no human relations are adequate to human desires, but also to the disbelief in any further object for human desires than that which, being human, fails to satisfy them.'[21] Eliot had by this time found his 'further object': *Ash Wednesday* is a Christian poem. But in his poetry hereafter this 'further object' for the most part simply excludes the 'human desires': not 'in' nor even 'through' human relations; an exclusion, not a Dantean transcending. The second epigraph to the 'Aristophanic Melodrama' *Sweeney Agonistes* is from

St. John of the Cross: 'hence the soul cannot be possessed of the divine union, until it has divested itself of the love of created beings.' This, then, is the ultimate significance of the juxtaposition of Christian and human *amor* in Eliot's essay on Virgil: not a real *juxta*position, but an essential *op*position. In retrospect one can see that a comparable configuration already exists in *The Waste Land,* when the Buddha and St. Augustine make a fleeting appearance after a (wilfully sordid?) seduction scene on the river, and even in *Preludes* with the alternation of visionary Infinite and grotesque 'ancient women'. Lawrence was able to think of the Bible alongside Homer and Shakespeare as 'the book of life' with its 'man alive and live woman'; in Eliot's *The Cocktail Party* (1950) religion and human desires are simply in opposite camps. The world of human desires is summed up by Reilly in that play in terms of

> Two people who know that they do not understand each other
> Breeding children whom they do not understand
> And who will never understand them.

A certain serenity *was* apparently achieved subsequently: there are signs of it in *The Elder Statesman,* Eliot's last play, whence the poem *To My Wife,* already mentioned; but it came too late to have any real artistic significance.[22]

But all this is only part of the picture. Eliot had his 'further object', his meaning, his belief; but this belief provided no rest. It was no easy or dogmatic belief, but a kind of questioning, hard-won, first-hand belief that manifested itself in painful paradoxes, the effort bringing as much discomfort as futility had before. The painful questioning is pursued relentlessly – not recorded but pursued, 'the poetry being in the pursuit' – in *Four Quartets:*

> In order to arrive there,
> To arrive where you are, to get from where you are not,
> You must go by a way wherein there is no ecstasy. *(East Coker)*

What is especially striking about the pursuit is that the reality of waste and impermanence is as strong and immediate as it had been without belief. It might even be said that the belief required to supply the meaning to the meaningless Waste Land makes the gulf between meaning – now a religious meaning – and meaningless life greater than ever:

> Words move, music moves
> Only in time; but that which is only living
> Can only die...

(One notes that even 'the world', unless the religious Word, belongs, in this poetry, with the things of impermanence.)

> Ridiculous the waste sad time
> Stretching before and after. *(Burnt Norton)*

The earlier apprehension is at any rate subsumed in the new outlook and not discarded. And for the 'waste sad time' to be rescued from the ridiculous, to be redeemed, requires from the believer

> A condition of complete simplicity
> (Costing not less than everything) *(Little Gidding)*

a simplicity to be fought for inch by inch without assumptions, as called for by an inseparable scepticism. 'Scepticism' isn't my gloss, but Eliot's own. In an essay on Pascal he wrote: 'every man who thinks and lives by thought must have his own scepticism' and referred to 'the demon of doubt which is inseparable from the spirit of belief'.[23] And he once remarked in conversation: 'my own beliefs are held with a scepticism which I never even hope to be quite rid of.'[24]

Turning now to Keats, one can begin by remembering that he certainly had the scepticism, in fact desired to make a positive virtue of it. In a famous passage from a letter of 1817 he wrote: 'it struck ne what quality went to form a man of achievement especially in literature and which Shakespeare possessed so enormously – I mean Negative Capability, that is, when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts without any irritable reaching after fact and reason.'[25] Whether this remark tells us much about Shakespeare is debatable; it certainly tells us something about Keats. 'I am certain of nothing but of the holiness of the heart's affections and the truth of Imagination.' He was sceptical of fact and reason divorced from immediate apprehension, of anything in the nature of 'cold philosophy'; he urged that 'axioms in philosophy are not axioms till they are proved upon our pulses'.[26] And he was of course deeply sceptical of religious beliefs: 'fanatics have their dreams...'. In a letter of 1819, speaking of the biblical account of Jesus, he laments that it was 'written and revised by men interested in the pious frauds of religion'.[27] And yet that particular painful apprehension that led Eliot towards religion, the apprehension of impermanence, Keats felt with a notorious, sensuous-immediate force. It obsessed him and it was a main spring of his own poetic activity:

> pity these have not
> Traced upon vellum or wild Indian leaf
> The shadows of melodious utterance,
> But bare of laurel they live, dream and die.

His own life, with his brother's early death and a growing sense of his own frail health, was in danger of seeming a race between poetry and impermanence:

> When I have fears that I may cease to be
> Before my pen has glean'd my teeming brain...

Poetry, the fruit of the 'truth of Imagination', thus acquires a redemptive significance of its own. But despite moments of confidence (the opening of the revised *Hyperion* is one of them), the obsession was inescapable; and in such a situation the 'uncertainties, mysteries, doubts' he espoused in the name of Negative Capability proved to be a mixed blessing.

At first he was able to assert disquiet away. *Endymion,* 1817:

> A thing of beauty is a joy for ever:
> Its loveliness increases; it will never
> Pass into nothingness.

But not for long. In the *Ode on Melancholy* (1819), these optimistic terms are precisely reversed:

> She dwells with Beauty – Beauty that must die;
> And joy whose hand is ever at his lips
> Bidding adieu; and aching pleasure nigh,
> Turning to poison while the bee-mouth sips....

The new mood led to some revealingly extreme assertions, notably

> Thou wast not born for death, Immortal Bird

(of the nightingale), and in the *Ode on a Grecian Urn* to a comparably extreme intensity at the thought of the permanence suggested by the changeless depictions on the urn:

> Ah happy, happy boughs! that cannot shed
> Your leaves, nor ever bid the Spring adieu;
> And happy melodist, unwearièd,
> For ever piping songs for ever new;
> More happy love! more happy, happy love!
> For ever warm and still to be enjoyed,
> For ever panting and for ever young;
> All breathing human passion far above,
> That leaves a heart high sorrowful and cloyed,
> A burning forehead and a parching tongue.

The pathos in these lines is excessive (compare Virgil's 'puer' passages?), in fact wild, at the furthest remove from any stability, even a sceptical stability, let alone the stability of – recalling Arnold's word – certitude. 'Ah, love, let us be true to one another' was Arnold's consolation for the lack of certitude, the lack, let us say, of what Eliot thought of as the product of external allegiance; but such truth, the truth of 'the heart's affections', was evidently not enough for Keats: 'more happy, happy love...for ever panting' has the intensity of desperation. A prosaic but necessary comment is that 'happy love' ought to presuppose a real relationship between people or at least a realisable relationship. But, as Keats' preference for the 'more happy love' on the urn over mere 'human passions' indicates, his disposition in these matters was towards a perfect, unrealisable Ideal (an 'abstraction' he often called it), this being, no doubt, the obverse of his eroticism, discussed earlier. This 'Idealism' is variously operative. It results in the famous equation of the *Grecian Urn,* 'Beauty is Truth', and some interrelatable remarks in the letters: 'those abstractions which are my only life' (1818); and from the same year, 'notwithstanding your Happiness and your recommendation I hope I shall never marry.... The mighty abstract Idea I have of

Beauty in all things stifles the more divided and minute domestic happiness'; and finally to Fanny Brawne a year later, 'all I can bring you is a swooning admiration of your Beauty... You absorb me in spite of myself ... I look not forward with any pleasure to what is called being settled in the world.'[28] The 'Idealism' can probably be related, in its turn, to another tendency: to pre-empt the terms of religion for expressing the affairs of the heart. 'The holiness of the heart's affections' is of course one instance; another comes in the *Ode to Psyche,* 'yea, I will be thy priest' (of the goddess whose sphere is the human soul in love); and another in a letter to Fanny Brawne late in 1819, 'I could be martyred for my Religion – Love is my religion – I could die for that ... My creed is Love.'[29] And the paradox, Keats being a sceptic, is indicative of ultimate irresolution.[30]

The truth of 'the heart's affections', then, was simply not enough; nor was the redemptive power of art (the truth of Imagination, the shadows of melodious utterance); nor was a combination of the two. Or not *yet* enough, as one must add, pointing, that is, to the two sad facts: that Keats died in 1821 at a time of life at which a good deal of development is possible; and that in the few creative years prior to that time his actual development, personal and artistic inextricably, is astonishingly rapid. A new maturity and stability of attitude is sometimes detected in the *Ode to Autumn* and the second *Hyperion,* the products of late in 1819 and thus representing his last serious work. But the basis of the supposed stability is unclear; and whether it was as profound, as comprehensive and as durable as it would have needed to be are all highly debatable points. At the time of his premature death, Keats, we should conclude, was still occupied with the painful question and still without any certain answer.

And what of Virgil? It might seem that what I am calling 'impermanence' hardly gets such direct expression in his case and is therefore less real to him than to Eliot or Keats. There is obviously some 'direct expression'. One instance would be the epitaph to Palinurus, 'naked on an unknown shore',

nudus in ignota, Palinure, iacebis harena (Aen.5.871)

therefore lost, meaningless altogether, pathetic (note the apostrophe). Still, one might say, this is pretty well a commonplace of ancient thought, though one would then have to grant that Virgil feels the commonplace with a personal intensity. But no: impermanence *is* real for Virgil, but predominantly takes a more indirect expression. At one extreme, it results in the long procession of transitory youth: Camilla, Pallas and Marcellus with the *Grecian Urn* pathos overwhelming him. And at the other extreme, it results in Aeneas. 'The notion of some infinitely gentle, Infinitely suffering thing':– retrospectively, Eliot's words prefigure a Christian martyr, Christ himself perhaps – and, up to a point, that semblance of the Christian martyr, Virgil's Aeneas. 'He is, in fact, the prototype of a Christian hero', said Eliot.[31] And Aeneas is the embodiment of hope against impermance as truly as Eliot's Christianity is against the grotesque futility of his 'ancient women'. Aeneas symbolizes, *is* Rome; and Rome is the eternal city, 'imperium sine fine'; the empire whose ordered, 'civilized', but, above all, *perpetual* existence redeems the colossal slaughter and suffering needed to erect it; the empire with a religious sanction, *iussa deum* and *fatum.*

This is certainly a creed, an external allegiance that could make sense of life. 'It's a creed, but is it Virgil's?' – is obviously the question. You'll have gathered what I've done: reinterpreted what Adam Parry called the two voices of the *Aeneid,*[32] the 'public voice' of faith in Roman onward progress and the private voice of regret and sympathy for the unfulfilled human actors, for Dido, for Turnus and the Italians, for Aeneas as well, the Aeneas that apparently might have been (insofar as Virgil's people can 'be' anyway), the man forcibly subordinated to the mission:

fata obstant placidasque viri deus obstruit auris (Aen.4.440)

Heaven blocks his ears, heaven makes him deaf to Dido, deaf to 'human desires' like Becket the martyr in Eliot's play: 'A martyrdom ... is never the design of man; for the true martyr is he who has become the instrument of God, who has lost his will in the will of God, and who no longer desires anything for himself, not even the glory of being a martyr.'[33]

I have reinterpreted the conflict between public and private voice as a conflict between religious hope, the hope in Aeneas as symbol of Rome, and the painful sense of waste, unredeemable suffering. (I speak only of the *Aeneid,* although the configuration is latent in the *Georgics.*)[34] And this is to say, in the light of my argument, that while Sellar was right to suggest that 'the germ of the *Aeneid'* was *not* 'human action', he was wrong to suggest that the germ was 'the national idea and sentiment'. When I say this, I'm not referring to the actual genesis of the actual epic: I mean that Virgil's sense of impermanence, his apprehension of waste, must precede his desire to redeem it; the private voice is prior to the public voice, the private voice is precisely what makes the public voice necessary. Dido and Turnus, therefore, in a sense come before Aeneas – that is, in their symbolic significance which, for Virgil, is virtually their primary significance; Aeneas, in *his* symbolic significance, is there to make their suffering meaningful. What else can make sense of such suffering, suffering apprehended with such immediate pain? Not 'the heart's affections': Dido must go under (and 'the man' Aeneas with her) and become herself a main instance of the waste that needs making sense of. And not merely the preservation of the name, the memory, the record; one could say that such consolation as Virgil finds here is subsumed under the heading 'Rome'. His hope must find repose in Rome, if in anything; this must be his allegiance, if anything is. But whether it *is,* in fact, ultimately his allegiance seems to me impossible to say. I can only say that he like Eliot – and perhaps like Keats, let us also say – exemplifies the need for some such (external) allegiance; this is the nub of their affinity; and the painful scepticism of Keats and the painful belief of Eliot demarcate the area within which Virgil may be felt to oscillate.

Virgil never achieved a Miltonic certitude; that I take as certain. Aeneas as destiny and as Rome is certainly an impressive reality in the *Aeneid.* But – to mention what must be the crucial instance – the final climax of the poem is impressive the other way: the *furor* of Roman Aeneas and the conspicuously wasteful killing of the defeated Turnus.

furiis accensus et ira
terribilis: 'tune hinc spoliis indute meorum
eripiare mihi? Pallas te hoc vulnere, Pallas
immolat... (Aen.12.946–9)

The peculiar complexity of this climax doesn't seem to be generally recognised. Aeneas' violence is, in the first place, normally at odds with his own Roman ideal. 'Pacique imponere morem' is part of that ideal, as definitively articulated by Anchises, and with it 'parcere subiectis' (6.852–3); is the killing of Turnus the 'civilised' reality to correspond to it? But Aeneas' act is also, symbolically, an act of self-liberation. For the first time since Book IV he *is* the 'active source' of his own actions. Aeneas was under an obligation to defeat Turnus and win Lavinia. Turnus has been defeated and accordingly 'tua est Lavinia coniunx' (12.937). Aeneas is under no such obligation to *kill* Turnus; this is an act of free choice, determined by one long-suppressed *human* feeling in conflict, as it happens, with another. The Roman creed and its servant suddenly make way for the man 'come to life' (such is the illusion – one should otherwise qualify expressions like 'suppressed feelings') as the main actor in a purely human drama. He kills Turnus – why? Not for Rome; for Pallas. But one wasted death hardly redeems another. The epic ends with waste in full view and redemption out of sight. Let us affirm the inescapable minimum: an epic with such an end couldn't possibly evince a total, Miltonic commitment to its ostensible creed.

Virgil never achieved a Miltonic certitude. At most it was a painful Eliotic faith, and even this may be a matter of aspiration as much as fully developed achievement. One couldn't be certain about Keats and one can't be certain about Virgil. It may, in fact, be proper to think that Virgil, like the tormented Keats, died before his creative development was sufficiently complete to answer all his, or all our, questions.[35]

King's College
University of London

M. S. Silk

NOTES

1. Samuel Johnson, 'Lives of the English Poets', ed. G.B. Hill, 1905, I.155f.
2. References in this paragraph: Brooks Otis, 'Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry', 1963, pp.51, 89; W.Y. Sellar, 'Virgil', 3rd ed. 1897, pp.161, 409, 401; Adam Parry, 'The Two Voices of Virgil's Aeneid', in 'Virgil', ed. S. Commager, 1966, pp.118f.; T.S. Eliot, 'On Poetry and Poets', 1957, p.128.
3. References in this paragraph: Aen.10.473; 7.378ff.; 4.265ff.; 4.279ff.; 4.395.
4. In his 'London Journal', 3 December 1834.
5. See A. Mizener, 'To Meet Mr. Eliot', in 'T.S. Eliot', ed. H. Kenner, 1962, pp.20ff.

6. Sellar op.cit., p.300.

7. V. Pöschl, 'The Art of Virgil' (trans. G. Seligson), 1962, p.176. Honest critics have always felt a difficulty in defining Virgil's mode of characterization: see, for instance, the contortions of R. Heinze, 'Vergil's Epische Technik', 3rd ed. 1914, p.138 (on Dido).

8. D.H. Lawrence in 'Phoenix', ed. E.D. McDonald, 1936, pp.536, 538.

9. References in this paragraph: 'T.S. Eliot: The Man and His Work', ed. Allen Tate, 1966, pp.58, 74; Donatus Vit. Verg.36, 43; F.R. Leavis, 'English Literature in our time & the University', 1969, p.144.

10. 'On Poetry and Poets', p.131.

11. F.R. Leavis, 'Lectures in America', 1969, p.42. Anyone acquainted with Dr. Leavis' recent work will hardly need to be told how much my discussion of Eliot owes to 'Lectures...', pp.29–55 and 'English Literature...' (n.9 supr.), pp.111–157.

12. See 'T.S. Eliot, The Waste Land, A Facsimile and Transcript of the Original Drafts', ed. Valerie Eliot, 1971, pp.23, 39.

13. See K. Quinn, 'The Catullan Revolution', 2nd ed. 1969, pp.70–84.

14. Note also Andromache's *puer* in Aen.3.487, which, though belonging to a less noteworthy line, leads up to the almost painfully melodious 489f.: '... Astyanactis imago. /sic oculos, sic ille manus, sic ora ferebat.' The plangent anaphora is recalled by Racine, Phèdre II.V, 'Il avait votre port, vos yeux, votre langage'; in Virgil himself, compare, more generally, Georg. 4.465f., mentioned above; a lesser instance of the same kind (Aen. 7.759f.) is discussed interestingly by Parry, op.cit. n.2 supr., pp.107–9.

15. Cf. the echo of the preciosity of Ecl.8.50, 'improbus ille puer: crudelis tu quoque, mater', in Aen.1.407, 'quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis', for Aeneas and Venus, the love-goddess who is also his mother. No question of allusion arises (nor does it with the Marcellus passage).

16. 'The Letters of John Keats', ed. H.E. Rollins (2 vols), 1958, I.185, 370.

17. The text given here is the usual printed version, but not the final manuscript version, which, though lacking the 'into', is generally more explicit and was in fact censored by Keats' publishers. (See e.g. J. Stillinger, *Studies in Philology* 58, 1961, pp.544f., and the letter from Woodhouse to Taylor in the Rollins edition of Keats' Letters (n.16 supr.), II.162f.

18. Letters I.341.

19. Letters I.184. 'The Heart's affections' is sometimes taken as virtually synonymous with 'Imagination', but (to mention only internal evidence) the sentence following adequately indicates parallellism, not synonymy: 'What the Imagination seizes as Beauty must be Truth ... I have the same idea of all our passions as of Love: they are all, in their sublime, creative of essential Beauty.'

20. T.S. Eliot, 'Selected Essays', 2nd ed. 1934, p.26. (Corrigendum: not 'some years later', but actually in 1923.)

21. 'Selected Essays', p.390.

22. My comments on the 'opposition' in Eliot's plays owe much to D.W. Harding, 'Experience into Words', 1963, pp.132–162.

23. 'Introduction to Pascal's *Pensées*', 1931.

24. Recorded by H.S. Davies, 'The Eagle' ('A Magazine Supported by Members of St. John's College, Cambridge'), vol.60, no.264, 1965, p.139.

25. Letters I.193.

26. *Lamia* II.230 and Letters I.279 respectively.

27. Letters II.80.

28. Letters I.370, 403, II.133.

29. Letters II.223f.

30. Cf. the following remarks in the letters on the subject of personal immortality: 'I have scarce a doubt of immortality of some nature or other' (II.4, Dec.1818, cf. Rollins ad loc.); 'I long to believe in immortality' (II.293, June 1820); 'Is there another life? ... There must be, we cannot be created for this sort of suffering' (II.346, Sept.1820).

31. 'On Poetry and Poets', p.128.

32. See n.2 supr. The dualistic interpretation is not original to Parry. See e.g. W.S. Maguinness, 'Some Reflections on the Aeneid', 1951.

33. *Murder in the Cathedral* (from Becket's Christmas sermon in the Interlude).

34. As in the tension between the 'degeneration' passages of *Georgic* I (199ff., 512ff.) and the otherwise predominant hope in regenerative Nature. The tendency of such passages is to undermine faith in any purely *human* solution to ultimate human problems – in the light of which Virgil's readiness to assimilate the secular saviour Octavian into his already eclectic religious apparatus (Georg.1.24–42, esp.27) has an equivocal significance. In any case, the eclecticism itself (eventually: Greco-Roman amoral polytheism, Orphism, Stoicism, purified quasi-moral Fate etc.) suggests straw-

clutching desperation. These matters are exceedingly complex, as indeed is the question of Virgil's religiousness in general. A satisfactory treatment would have to take account of (inter alia): the peculiar optimism of the 'messianic' Eclogue IV; the ostensible exclusion of (Lucretian-type) rationality in Georg.2.490ff. (cf. Keats?); Virgil's plan, frustrated by his death, to devote his later years to the study of 'philosophy' (Donatus Vit.Verg.126).

35. Besides the works already acknowledged, I should mention, as generally helpful to me, W. Clausen, 'An Interpretation of the Aeneid', HSCP 68, 1964, 139ff. and R.D. Williams, 'Virgil', 1967. One last point on Milton: the relation between him and the composite poet is actually more interesting than considerations of brevity have allowed me to suggest. In particular, it is more interesting than the 'Virgil to Milton' school are in a position to see, with their stress on the latter's supposed 'classicism' (often restricted to style). (A better term for Milton's style would be 'Protestant baroque', as suggested by K. Widmer in 'Milton's Epic Poetry', ed. C.A. Patrides, 1967, p.125.) More significant is Kermode's idea of Milton and Eliot as mirror opposites (ap. Allen Tate, see n.9 supr., pp.235f.); cf. Keats' well-known love-hate feeling for Milton.

CATULLUS AND VIRGIL[1]

1

We who value Catullus supremely as a lyric poet are apt to forget that he touched the central development of literature most deeply through his hexameters. In its immediate impact it is arguable that the 64th was his most significant poem. Mendell, a meticulous critic in this field, wrote "The *Peleus and Thetis* has a number of spondaic lines and some nationalized Greek words. It has a touch of learning and some minor obscurity of allusion. But these are far from being offensive even to the purist. What really characterizes it as new at Rome is, first, its relative brevity as a story, second, its lyric quality, its sensational picturesqueness and its almost melodramatic love element, and third, its artificial construction. It was destined to be in its subsequent influence one of the most important individual poems in Latin literature. Virgil, himself a follower of the new school in his younger days, was profoundly affected by it to the end; and Horace, who was the chief champion of opposition to the neoterics, fell definitely under its influence."

The impact upon Virgil is immediately discernible in the fourth eclogue[2]. This was dedicated to Pollio, that same Pollio whom Catullus had called

leporum
disertus puer et facetiarum.[3]

The Catullan allusion was itself a compliment. The parallel between the song of the Fates and the Virgilian prophecy has been examined by Slater, Hermann, Marion Smith, Rand and others. Macrobius long ago noted that the chorus of the Fates

> currite ducentes subtegmina, currite, fusi!

(which he quotes as *ducenti subtegmine*) has its echo in Virgil's

> 'talia saecla' suis dixerunt 'currite' fusis.[4]

Virgil, as Slater points out, alters the meaning and part of the context. In Catullus the Fates bid the spindles turn and be swift to spin the thread of Destiny; in Virgil it is the ages not the spindles which are commanded to run on. This makes it more probable that we have here a conscious allusion consciously adapted. The words which preface and close the song of the Fates breathe a similar atmosphere to the fourth eclogue; indeed both passages are filled with an air of propitious prophecy. It is noteworthy that Virgil has chosen to cast his poem into a length almost identical with the song of the Fates. It is difficult not to see in the lines

> te duce, si qua manent sceleris vestigia nostri,
> inrita perpetua solvent formidine terras

an echo of the lines that follow the Fates' song.[5] This is confirmed by the way Catullus's *praesentes* is picked up in Virgil's *videbit...et ipse videbitur illis.* The human and divine, as Slater says, are face to face. Catullus foreshadows the coming of Achilles, Virgil, so to speak, the Second Coming. Again, Virgil's *patriis virtutibus* comes from Peleus's *magnis virtutibus.*[6] If additional confirmation were needed that the 64th poem is in Virgil's mind it is provided by a reminiscence of an earlier part of the poem, for the line

> non rastros patietur humus, non vinea falcem

clearly comes from

> non humilis curvis purgatur vinea rastris,
> non glaebam prono convellit vomere taurus,
> non falx attenuat frondatorum arboris umbram.[7]

There are continual allusions. Thetis is used as a name for the sea[8]. The reference to Argo reminds us that Peleus was an Argonaut[9]. The superb phrase *magnum Iovis incrementum*[10] recalls Jupiter's passion for Thetis. Octavia in fact is given the divine attributes of Thetis, Antony is a second Peleus. So Slater.

There is, however, one significant difference. It is not, *pace* Rand, the contrast between the savage Achilles and the Prince of Peace[11]. Virgil, for all his Epicurean training and his love of peace, is not a pacifist, and Catullus too had Epicurean leanings. Virgil looks to civil peace but new conquests outside. The contrast is, as Rand this time justly remarks, in that Catullus is sighing for the past, whereas Virgil is looking with hope to the future. What I conceive happened was that Virgil, still a young poet, seeking to celebrate

the union of Antony and Octavia which gave hope of reuniting the Roman world, took as his starting-point the song of the Fates in Catullus and felt able to give it a new relevance.

It is worth adding that George Duckworth's monumental statistical researches into verse-technique show a remarkable coincidence between Virgil's practice in this eclogue alone, and Catullus. For his first pattern *dsss* the figures are Catullus 27.59%, Eclogue IV 24.19, other eclogues 12.09. For his first four patterns, adding *ddss, dsds, sdss* Catullus 67.90, Eclogue IV 72.58 other eclogues 39.71. For his first eight patterns, adding *ssss ddds ssds sdds* Catullus 90.98, Eclogue IV 91.93 other eclogues 68.28. The poems are alike in almost every technical respect, except in the frequency of the fourth foot homodyne, which is abnormally high in Catullus and abnormally low in the fourth eclogue.[12] Patrick Wilkinson has added one or two more stylistic details. For example, the fourth Eclogue follows *Peleus and Thetis* in being largely end-stopped, and lines 28–30 are built round a molossus:

> molli paulatim *flavescet* campus arista,
> incultisque rubens *pendebit* sentibus uva,
> et durae quercus *sudabunt* roscida mella.

This is true of more than half of the first twenty lines of Catullus's poem.[13] Jackson Knight has said "The Fourth *Eclogue,* perhaps the most Catullan of Virgil's certain poems, recalls the hexameters of Catullus in phrases, in the unity of single lines, in schematization of balanced word order, and in the quality of the verse groups."[14] It all adds up to Wilkinson's general dictum: "Virgil was certainly impressed by the *Peleus and Thetis:* he echoes it a number of times, and his *Pollio* is largely a response to it."[15]

There are on the whole few Catullan echoes in *The Georgics.* Lucretius among Roman poets was dominating Virgil's imagination at the time. None the less, there are a few. Jahn noted a number in the first book; it is significant that several are from the *Peleus and Thetis.*[16] They are none of them very telling, and probably none of them deliberate. We all of us have snatches of poetry floating about our minds, which affect our expressions, and we can easily underestimate the memory capacity of an age to which reference-books were less accessible than our own. They scarcely do more than reassert Virgil's familiarity with Catullus's poem. It is worth noting that they all fall into the earlier part of the book, that none of them comes from the song of the Fates, though there are possible reminiscences of the passages immediately before and after, and that the three agricultural lines which we have seen conflated in the Messianic eclogue appear in Virgil's mind here, and again in the third book.[17] We may note further that the terrible words

> gaudent perfusi sanguine fratrum

are a fusion of memoried Lucretius and Catullus; the memory extends to the context of the original, which is significant.[18]

The Georgics ends with a typical epyllion in the Aristaeus episode. It is curious that there are no obvious Catullan reminiscences of phrase, though Ariadne's staccato questions to herself are the origin of Orpheus's similar questions, seen at second hand, in a situation of similar desolation[19]. Perhaps also the recurrence of the name of Thetis in three consecutive lines, a rather mannered tour-de-force in Catullus, was the starting-point for Virgil's inexpressibly lovely use of the repeated cry of "Eurydice"[20]. Here we see Virgil's genius transcending that of his source. Still, the idea of a story within a story no doubt came from the *Peleus and Thetis*[21], and the drama and visual imagery of Catullus's treatment stirred Virgil to his own vividly concise narrative. Wilkinson has gone further. In a perceptive analysis he has suggested that the neoterics liked exploring incongruities, and that there is a powerful interplay of moods when Catullus brings the desertion of Ariadne into the context of a wedding, which Virgil echoes when he brings together the death-out-of-life episode of Orpheus and Eurydice, and the life-out-of-death episode of Aristaeus[22].

Echoes of the 64th poem in *The Aeneid* are not infrequent, as Schuster notes in his edition. Curiously he does not note the two most obvious borrowings

quid Syrtes aut Scylla mihi, quid vasta Charybdis profuit?

from

quae Syrtis, quas Scylla rapax, quae vasta Charybdis[23]

and the fairly startling *ferrugine Hibera.*[24] Nor does he comment on the important passage where Catullus renders the Homeric nod of Zeus, but does so with such profusion as to lose effect. Virgil twice uses the same passage, but he prunes it to three lines by fruitful gardening; *adnuit* is significantly common to all three versions.[25] Catullus's picture of seamanship, culminating in a line of golden type, did not escape Virgil's attention: it is indeed fine writing

ausi sunt vada salsa cita decurrere puppi,
caerula verrentes abiegnis aequora palmis.

We are not surprised that Virgil pays it the homage of a borrower, though again Schuster has missed the echo.[26] Another very curious example, which shows how much Virgil has this poem in mind, comes from the second book. Sinon is peaking:

sed quid ego haec autem nequiquam ingrata revolvo?

This comes from Ariadne's

sed quid ego ignaris nequiquam conquerar auris?

It is interesting that *ignaris* has suggested Virgil's *ingrata.*[27] In the same book we notice *Larisaeus*[28], and the repetition of a word from the end of one line to the beginning of the next *(lumina frustra/lumina),* a device used also by Lucretius, but found in *Peleus and Thetis (Iuppiter ipse,/ipse suos)*[29]. Most of the others are not very significant, apart from those

in Book IV[30]. One familiar device seemingly taken from Catullus is the so-called retained accusative after a passive verb, as *crinem de more solutae.* It was Catullus who made of this a verse-usage.[31] Generally when Virgil adapts he improves by increased precision; compare the change from *ostentant omnia letum* to *intentant omnia mortem.*[32] For all Catullus's Alexandrianism, Virgil is the more polished writer.

There are a certain number of reminiscences in Book VI. Most of these are verbal only, like *sub limina solis;* we may note an odd echo of *impia non verita est* in *impia non veriti.*[33] Two are of particular interest. In a short passage dealing with the Cretan legend Virgil drops immediately into Catullus's language. Catullus's *inobservabilis error,* a favourite rhythm with Virgil, has its precise echo, as does *filo vestigia.*[34] Much later in the book, after the encounter between Aeneas and Dido, Aeneas's tears are ended by a martial rout. Virgil's mind went straight to the Bacchic rout bursting in on Ariadne, and his language reflects this.[35] From the first Dido has brought this poem of Catullus to his mind, and her palace is described in Book I in Catullan language, which Virgil echoes of the halls of Hell.[36]

We come now to the fourth book of *The Aeneid.*[37] Virgil here went to Apollonius of Rhodes and to Euripides for his treatment, but Catullus's Ariadne was never far from his mind. "His purpose" says Rand "is both to learn from his model and surpass it." Macrobius again does not fail to notice that the Virgilian lines

> felix heu nimium felix si littora tantum
> numquam Dardaniae tetigissent nostra carinae

are derived from Catullus's

> Iuppiter omnipotens utinam non tempore primo
> Gnosia Cecropiae tetigissent littora puppes.[38]

Anderson, a conservative critic, who much underestimates the influence of Catullus on Virgil, allows three other echoes, which are indeed so loud as to be undeniable. Dido's biting *perfide* in her opening words to Aeneas is taken from Ariadne's.[39] Here in the bitter repetitions Catullus gives the words a sharper edge than Virgil. In the same speech

> per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos

follows Catullus's

> sed conubia laeta, sed optatos hymenaeos [40]

also in the same speech of Ariadne. The words have the same rhythm and the same chiasmic pattern, but Virgil's adjectives are more intensely felt and more carefully thought out. Later, words still applying to Dido

> magnoque irarum fluctuat aestu

are again taken from Ariadne

magnis curarum fluctuat undis.[41]

This parallelism is reinforced by other echoes. The first line of the book

at regina gravi iamdudum saucia cura

recalls Ariadne

multiplices animo volvebat saucia curas.[42]

In Dido's opening speech

quis novus hic nostris successit sedibus hospes

is complimentary, but it cannot fail to recall

nec malus hic celans dulci crudelia forma
consilia in nostris requiesset sedibus hospes

a brilliant touch.[43] In the next line *forti pectore* is from Catullus.[44] Within a few lines *fraterna caede* is an echo of Catullus.[45] So is *veteris vestigia* with the added point that *flammae* has replaced *poenae.*[46] Little trivialities of language betray where Virgil's mind is – the use of the word *mitra*[47]; the recurrence of bucolic diaeresis[48]; the occurrence of hypermetric *que*[49]; the little *quiane* recalling Catullus's *quemne*[50]; *foedere amantis* echoing *foedere amantes*[51]; Syrtis in the singular[52]; the burning marrow[53]; the cry of *perfide*[54]. The Atlas passage is perhaps the least successful section of the book, but its mannered style, as Kenneth Quinn has suggested, is strongly Catullan, and the repetition of *Atlantis* at the beginning of two consecutive lines is an echo of Catullus's similar device with *Thetis.*[55] The great oak-simile merits careful comparison with Catullus's oak-simile.[56] The simile is not infrequent. Virgil's is drawn from observation, Catullus's from his poetic stock; Catullus uses it as the image of a physical, Virgil of a mental struggle, and Austin suggests that the comparison "shows the distinction of Virgil's art". We shall not disagree. It remains true that this book owes much to Catullus. Dido's great speech contains, as we have seen, two Catullan borrowings; it leads up to the climax of *parvulus Aeneas,* recalling another Catullan passage,[57] and Catullus's use of diminutives generally. In Dido's next speech her thought that Aeneas is the product of some of the wilder and harsher forces of nature is taken straight from Ariadne,[58] and her final self-questionings echo those of Ariadne.[59] What did Virgil intend by this? Partly, no doubt, he was offering a compliment to his predecessor. Partly he knew when a thing had been well done. He saw points at which he could improve upon Catullus, but he accepted Catullus's general presentation and method. Murley, Mendell and others have done much to reveal the pattern of Catullus's poetry.[60] We may instance the Ariadne episode from *Peleus and Thetis:*

132–202 ARIADNE'S LAMENT

124–31 ARIADNE ON SHORE	202–6 ARIADNE ON SHORE
116–23 THESEUS AND ARIADNE TO DIA	207–11 THESEUS TO ATHENS
76–115 ARRIVAL AND ADVENTURES IN CRETE	211–48 DEPARTURE AND INSTRUCTIONS IN ATHENS
52–75 ARIADNE ON SHORE; THESEUS DEPARTS	249–64 ARIADNE ON SHORE; DIONYSUS COMING
50–1 COVERLET	265–6 COVERLET

Here, by way of comparison, is an analysis of the last part of the Dido book:

554–83 AENEAS

522–53 DIDO	584–629 DIDO
474–521 DIDO'S PLAN	630–92 DIDO'S PLAN FULFILLED
450–73 PROLOGUE	693–705 EPILOGUE

Of course it is easy to force the evidence, and the pattern is never mechanical, but it is clear that Virgil went to Catullus as his master in the method of telling a short dramatic story. Quinn has taken this point to a deeper level. It is not merely the narrative element, but the particular use of myth, the two-level writing, the narrative with another meaning in the background which fascinated Virgil.[61] But beyond this Virgil wanted to establish a point about Dido. He wanted, as has often been remarked, to place her firmly in the class of deserted heroines.[62] But he wanted also, I think, to indicate a future hope. He did not want this book to end in utter desolation. Ariadne finds her Bacchus, and by the allusion to Ariadne Virgil points forward to the sixth book, where Dido has found her Sychaeus.

2

No poem of Catullus has left so much trace upon Virgil's thought and language as *Peleus and Thetis*. This is readily understandable. It is a hexameter poem and an epic in miniature, and if it does not quite attain to tragedy it has a genuine pathos. But anyone who thought that Virgil was solely interested in Catullus as a writer of hexameters and narrative would be much mistaken. It is here that we see how easy it is to over-rationalize

our treatment of ancient authors. When we first read Catullus we are probably attracted by the emotional and romantic element in his writing. When we learn a little more we are startled by the fact that Quintilian does not allow him a place among the lyric poets, we note the epithet *doctus* applied to him, we place him firmly in the school of Valerius Cato and dub him *Alexandrian,* and if we are not careful, we dissociate our affection for the lyric poems from our scholarly estimate of him in his own context. We do well to remember that Quintilian has nothing to say about *Peleus and Thetis* either, that Propertius tells us how the Lesbia poems were the talk of the town, and that the "Passer" poems were probably the most imitated of all his writings. When we look at Virgil's borrowings we find that it is precisely the most tender, sentimental, romantic lyrics which have made the greatest impact on his imagination.

Take first the 101st poem:

Multas per gentes et multa per aequora vectus
advenio has miseras, frater, ad inferias,
ut te postremo donarem munere mortis
et mutam – nequiquam! – alloquerer cinerem,
quandoquidem fortuna mihi tete abstulit ipsum,
heu, miser indigne frater adempte mihi!
Nunc tamen interea haec, prisco quae more parentum
tradita sunt tristi munere ad inferias,
accipe fraterno multum manantia fletu
atque in perpetuum, frater, ave atque vale!

Already in the *Georgics* Virgil has ended a line *ventosa per aequora vectis.*[63] *Ventosum aequor* is itself a Catullan phrase,[64] and it is notable that a few lines later Virgil has a typically Catullan spondaic fifth foot.[65] Here the echo is technically but not spiritually significant. In the first book of *The Aeneid* comes *diversa per aequora vectus.*[66] The echo comes yet again in the seventh book, where the swarm of bees

liquidum trans aethera vectae

is followed shortly by Latinus demanding of the Trojans

quae causa rates....
....tot per vada caerula vexit?[67]

In *Aeneid* IV a tremendous passage in Dido's final curse perhaps recalls this poem in a gigantic inversion of its blessings.[68]

tum vos, o Tyrii, stirpem et genus omne futurum
exercete odiis, cinerique haec mittite nostro
munera.

But the supremely significant borrowing comes in the sixth book of *The Aeneid.*[69] Here Anchises is greeting Aeneas.

quas ego te terras et quanta per aequora vectum accipio!

What a happy allusion to the earlier display of *pietas,* and pointing of the fact that whereas Catullus offered his gifts *ad inferias* Aeneas has actually dared to journey *ad inferos!* But Virgil dares another independent allusion to Catullus's poem. It is Aeneas's farewell to Pallas.[70]

> salve aeternum mihi, maxime Palla,
> aeternumque vale.

A poor poet spoils his effect by repeating it. A rather better poet consciously avoids such repetition. It is a great poet who can repeat his effect in such a way as to give it an independent beauty the second time. This Virgil does.

Or take the marriage-song Catullus wrote for Vinia and Manlius. Virgil perhaps took his *suave rubens* and *grave olentia* from *suave olentis* in its second stanza[71], his *credo equidem... genus esse deorum* from its *Uraniae genus*[72], his use of *dum* with the indicative meaning "all the while till" from Catullus's usage[73], and the poetical form *iuventa* which appears first in Catullus[74], and in the line in *The Eclogues:*

> Sparge, marite, nuces: tibi deserit Hesperus Oetam

brings together passages from both epithalamia.[75] The song contains much of beauty, but one stanza stands out from the rest for its tenderness.

> Torquatus volo parvulus
> matris e gremio suae
> porrigens teneras manus
> dulce rideat ad patrem
> semihiante labello.

Virgil twice seems to allude to this in key-passages. Once is in the fourth eclogue in the famous

> incipe, parve puer, risu cognoscere matrem,

(notice the change from father to mother: when it came to the crunch Virgil was Octavian's man, not Antony's), once in Dido's plea for some *parvulus Aeneas,* where the diminutive, the only one in *The Aeneid,* makes the debt clear.[76] In each the allusion is a singularly happy one, in the second perhaps happier than he intended, for there is little doubt that Catullus in writing for Vinia and Manlius, has at the back of his mind his own fruitless love for Clodia.[77]

An illuminating insight into Virgil's methods can be seen in another example, which has been well analysed by Rand. Catullus's 11th poem in his final renunciation of Clodia. Virgil took from it *septemgeminus* as an epithet for the Nile.[78] From this same poem Virgil took the catalogue of remote places in the first *Eclogue,* culminating in the isolated Britons, and the alternative journeys in another part of *The Eclogues.*[79] Catullus, after a bitter outburst, ended with a picture of the death of his love in which obscenity

changes to pathos.

> cecidit velut prati
> ultimi flos praetereunte postquam
> tactus aratro est.

Virgil takes this as his image for the death of Euryalus[80]

> purpureus veluti cum flos succisus aratro
> languescit moriens, lassove papavera collo
> demisere caput pluvia cum forte gravantur.

Here Virgil has transferred the image from one metre to another, always a fascinating procedure. He has blended Catullus with Homer, as Rand has shown.

> *μήκων δ' ὡς ἐτέρωσε κάρη βάλεν, ἥ τ' ἐνὶ κήπῳ,*
>
> *καρπῷ βριθομένη νοτίῃσί τε εἰαρινῇσιν,*

Succisus is a piece of Virgilian magic, a precise image. Westendorp Boerma is full of praise: "Virgil combined the redness of the flower in Sappho, the dropping of the head by the heavy rain in Homer, and the cutting off by the plough in Catullus; the whole comparison, however, is finer and more delicate than all its models."[82] I do not myself agree. This time it is Virgil who is over-elaborate, and Catullus who has the more telling image.

Catullus was in this – deliberately[83] – using an image which he had himself employed before in one of his marriage-songs.[84]

> ut flos in saeptis secretus nascitur hortis,
> ignotus pecori, nullo convolsus aratro....
> quem mulcent aurae, firmat sol, educat imber,
> multi illum pueri, multae optavere puellae;
> idem cum tenui carptus defloruit ungui,
> nulli illum pueri, nullae optavere puellae...

Virgil took from this poem the collocation "Vesper Olympo".[85] There is a rhythmic echo of a line in one of *The Eclogues.*[86] A particularly interesting borrowing is the not very serious cry of the girls

> quid faciunt hostes capta crudelius urbe

given a tragic dimension in the sack of Troy

> aut quid in eversa vidi crudelius urbe.[87]

The death of Pallas gives him the opportunity for a further blend of Homer and Catullus.[88]

> qualem virgineo demessum pollice florem
> seu molles violae seu languentis hyacinthi,
> cui neque fulgor adhuc nec dum sua forma recessit,
> non iam mater alit tellus virisque ministrat.

In the same Catullan stanza the words

> multi illum pueri, multae optavere puellae

applied to the girl who is cosseted and protected like a garden-flower prompt almost ironically the description of the warrior Camilla

> multae illam frustra Tyrrhena per oppida matres
> optavere nurum. [89]

It is arguable that we have here the four most tender passages in Catullus. One is from the lyrics, two from the longer poems, and one from the elegies. Virgil has given them all prominence in his own work.

3

These are conscious adaptations. The rest of the echoes are probably mostly unconscious. The most flagrant of them sets a familiar but curious problem. That Virgil knew Catullus's version of the *Coma Berenices* is clear. In the introduction to *The Georgics* he takes *novum sidus* from there[90], and, shortly after, *rapidi solis.*[91] There is also a curious echo in *The Eclogues,* where

> quid domini faciant, audent cum talia fures

picks up

> quid facient crines, cum ferro talia cedant.[92]

At one point Catullus makes the lock cry

> invita, o regina, tuo de vertice cessi,
> invita: adiuro teque tuumque caput.

Adiuro with the accusative, a Callimachean rather than a Latin idiom, comes in book XII of *The Aeneid, te tuumque caput* in book IV. But most astonishing of all is that Virgil should put into the mouth of Aeneas, addressing Dido in Hades, the words

> invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi.[93]

The allusion, if intended, seems at first sight bathetic, and the comment of the Verona scholiast on X 557 is unkind but understandable "in his imitationibus Vergilius neque temporis neque loci habet curam." Virgil did some strange things at times, but I cannot

think that this is justified. The *Coma Berenices* did not leave a deep mark on Latin literature, and Anderson supposed that the echo was unconscious. A Freudian interpretation of such an unconscious slip might suggest that deep within himself Virgil is accusing his own hero of triviality, and implying (without consciously meaning to) that he is more worthy of satire than respect.[94] But Mrs. Thornton has shown good reason for taking the allusion seriously. She suggests that whether or not Catullus is satirical, Callimachus, writing for the very queen, must have been in earnest. The parallel is pointed and poignant. The words are spoken not by a lock of hair but by a divine constellation, and remind us of the divinity of Aeneas and his house. They are spoken to Berenice, a fact which reminds us of Dido's regal splendour. The cruelty of the dividing knife parallels the cruelty of the Fate which severs Aeneas from Dido. The former joy in attachment between the divine constellation and the queen parallels the joy Aeneas once had in Dido's company before Fate caused the severance.[95]

Other echoes are worth noting because they reveal which poems of Catullus left an impression upon Virgil. *Quodcumque hoc regni* in *Aeneid* I seems to show familiarity with *quicquid hoc libelli* in Catullus I.[96] From the same poem he derived his licence to lengthen the first syllable of *Italus*.[97] *Cytore buxifer* in the fourth poem is no doubt the origin of Virgil's *undantem buxo...Cytorum*,[98] and it may be that Catullus's Grecism *ait fruisse navium celerrimus* emboldened Virgil to his *sensit medios delapsus in hostes*.[99] Of the kissing poems, the second supplied Virgil with the phrase *furtivum amorem*.[100] And from the same poem he took into *The Georgics* the uncountability of the sands of Libya.[101] It would be odd if *Acme and Septimius* had not touched Virgil's imagination, and his description of Dido

> est mollis flamma medullas

recalls Acme

> ignis mollibus ardet in medullis.[102]

The only possible reminiscence of any of the vituperative poems that I have been able to trace is from the 60th

> num te leaena montibus Libystinis
> aut Scylla latrans infima inguinum parte
> tam mente dura procreavit ac taetra

which may have affected Dido's great speech, though it has not influenced Virgil's account of Scylla.[103]

The *Attis* has left a little more behind it. Virgil could hardly fail to have been impressed, as Tennyson was in his day, by this tumultuous outburst of imaginative sympathy. The most significant of these borrowings has again been well treated by Rand. Virgil allows

Remulus this bitter taunt:

> O vere Phrygiae, neque enim Phryges, ite per alta
> Dindyma, ubi adsuetis biforem dat tibia cantum.
> Tympana vos buxusque vocat Berecyntia matris
> Idaeae, sinite arma viris et cedite ferro.

Here the essence of the taunt is transferred from Homer's Ἀχαιδες, οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοί but Virgil has fused it with a completely appropriate allusion to Catullus's evocation of the horrors of emasculation.

> agite ite ad alta, Gallae, Cybeles nemora simul,
> simul ite, Dindymenae dominae vaga pecora...
> ubi cymbalum sonat vox, ubi tympana reboant,
> tibicen ubi canit Phryx curvo grave calamo. 104

In this capacity to blend different sources in a freshly imagined whole Virgil's writing is original even when derivative. Other echoes are slighter, and interesting mainly as demonstrating the translation of galliambic phrases into hexameters. We may note *stabula alta ferarum* from *ferarum gelida stabula*[105], *furens animis* from *vagus animis*[106], and *pelagi alta* from *truculenta pelagi.*[107]

The 65th poem, a letter accompanying the *Coma Berenices,* had also stuck in Virgil's memory, though the fact does not tell us very much. But the line in *The Georgics*

> atque illum in praeceps prono rapit alveus amni

clearly comes from Catullus's

> atque illud prono praeceps agitur decursu.[108]

Gellius tells us that *atque* in this passage is equivalent to *statim.* No allusion seems intended, and other reminiscences are trivial.[109]

The 68th poem is a long and moving letter, or rather two letters which have been welded into one. Virgil knew the poem well. There is one striking echo, from the Dido book, where *confectum aetate parentum* picks up *confecto aetate parenti.*[110] The relationship of mood between the two passages is important to understand. Mingled with the sorrow of his brother's death and the story of Laodamia, the essence of Catullus's poem is Clodia's infidelity, but the mood is one of rather weary complaisance. Dido's theme is Aeneas's infidelity, but her mood is one of damnatory defiance. This poem also provided Virgil with a structural device. It has long been shown that Catullus's letter is built on a kind of pyramidal structure:

FRATERNA MORS

TROY	TROY
LAODAMIA	LAODAMIA
LESBIA	LESBIA
ALLIUS	ALLIUS

Gilbert Norwood has shown a similar structure for the Orpheus-Eurydice epyllion[111]:

CORE OF THE STORY

INFERNAL RIVERS	INFERNAL RIVERS
BIRD SIMILE	BIRD SIMILE
PERSISTENT SINGING	PERSISTENT SINGING
GREEK GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES	GREEK GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES
REJECTED LOVE LEADS TO DEATH BY RIVER	REJECTED LOVE LEADS TO DEATH BY RIVER

We have noted something similar on the Dido book. There are several other echoes, but all are slight, and I take them to be unconscious.[112]

Among the remaining elegiac poems I have traced no verbal echoes worth speaking of.[113] But I suspect that the Catullan *odi et amo* has gone with much else in Catullus to the making of Dido

> ingeminant aurae rursusque resurgens
> saevit amor magnoque irarum fluctuat aestu [114]

The mood is very strong as she watches Aeneas's preparations for departure; anger at his perfidy mingles with fear for him in a winter journey.[115]

4

I want now to ask whether this examination can throw any light on the vexed question of the authorship of the *Appendix Vergiliana.*[116] I have nothing to say here about *Aetna;* both external and internal evidence are against Virgilian authorship, nothing about *Copa* which is too slight and *Moretum* which is too remote to be significant, and nothing about *Dirae* or *Lydia.* This leaves *Catalepton, Ciris* and *Culex.*

Catalepton is a collection of small poems, whose indebtedness to Catullus is manifest.

The tenth poem is the most obvious. Here Virgil is skilfully turning Catullus's dedicatory poem to his yacht into a parody lampooning one P. Ventidius Bassus, who made his money out of the transport services of Cremona.[117] We have already noted two assimilated references to this poem elsewhere in Virgil. There does not seem to me any reason to doubt its authenticity. But *Catalepton* is generally indebted to Catullus. The first poem is quite Catullan; two of the pentameters end in a three-syllable word. The second is in scazons; Quintilian attests it to be Virgil's[118]; the mockery of Annius Cimber's Mispronunciations recalls Catullus's similar mockery of Arrius.[119] The fourth is full of Catullan echoes; for example *dispeream*[120], or

o quis te in terris loquitur iucundior uno

picking up Catullus's *quis me uno vivit felicior.*[121] The fifth, again in scazons, has also plenty of echoes. Rostagni called these two poems a parody of Catullus's journey poems, especially the 46th, the return from Asia. The sixth actually quotes Catullus, reversing the order of two words: *gener socerque perdidistis omnia.*[122] Fruterius was foolish enough to attribute the poem to Catullus. The seventh, to Varius with the Epicurean epithet *dulcissime,* looks authentic and has the Catullan *dispeream* again. The eighth, the little poem to Siro's villa, with the characteristic Catullan diminutive, has something of Catullus's poems to Sirmio, and to his farm (Sabine or Tiburtan)[123]; this too looks authentic. The longer ninth poem is somewhat stilted: I do not know that this is against its authenticity. The prosody is quite Catullan; there are odd reminiscences: the learned Muses, the exchange of verses, the characteristic *candida,* the colloquial *hoc satis est.* The twelfth has the Catullan *putidum.*[124] Of the thirteenth Heyne said "Catullo potius quam Virgilio dignum carmen."

Obviously nothing firm can be built on this. Westendorp Boerma after pointing out some detailed parallels summed the matter up judicially: "I might point out the metrical peculiarities, the frequent use of diminutives, alliteration, anaphora, parallels in diction (words like *stupor:* 'blockhead', *putidus* etc.). But enough; if we have in these small poems authentic juvenile poetry by Virgil, it is certain that this first work was completely influenced by Catullus. What Theocritus was for the Eclogues, Catullus was for the *Catalepton.*"[125] Or, to reverse the line of thought, the relationship of *Catalepton* to Catullus is totally compatible with the Virgilian authorship of most of the poems.

Ciris is a true epyllion. Richardson goes so far as to suggest that *Ciris* almost copies *Peleus.* "The structure is simple, precise, and intelligent, the strict form that a genius like that of Catullus would naturally choose as a mold for his artistry; but the whole meaning has been changed, and the simplicity which was Catullus's guide is now a stereotyped form." He goes on to show that *Ciris* is Catullan in form-structure and sentence-structure, but Virgilian in verse and vocabulary. He draws attention to the inclusion of Britomartis in *Ciris* as a non-integral element (like Ariadne in *Peleus),* and

points out that Scylla's lament is parallel to the epithalamium of the *Parcae* in position, function and thought. When we look at details, there are at least three clear borrowings from *Peleus,* of which *niveos...virginis artus* is particularly striking.[126] Other points might be adduced: *frigidulus* for example, also from the 64th poem[127], the anaphora on *tum*[128], the marvelling nymphs[129], and the search towards golden lines such as

Attica Cretaea sternebat rura sagitta,[130]

and the laments of Scylla and Carme recalling Ariadne's plaints. From other poems we can cite *recrepo* from *Attis*[131], *deponere amorem* from one of the great renunciation poems[132], and an extended echo of one of the marriage-songs.[133] On the whole scholars have tended to follow Skutsch in attributing *Ciris* to Gallus.[134] This is not impossible. It seems to me that the relationship to Catullus makes it much less likely that Helm's view that it is post-Augustan is right.[135] But the relationship alike to Catullus and to Virgil's admittedly authentic work makes it still possible to credit it to Virgil – possible, not probable.

Finally, we turn to *Culex.* Here the Catullan influence in planning is not so striking, but Drew, who argued strongly and persuasively for Virgilian authorship, also noted a deep and detailed debt to *Peleus and Thetis*[136], and I have been able to add a few additional passages.[137] Drew also notes the indebtedness of the invocation to Apollo to Catullus's hymn to Diana; it is sustained, but we may note especially *silvasque virentes* from Catullus's *silvarumque virentium.*[138] He suggests less persuasively that the reference to Athos comes from *Coma Berenices.*[139] I have culled a couple of borrowings from the letter to Allius.[140] The indebtedness to the 64th poem and the general handling of the borrowings, together with the use of other poems with which Virgil was closely familiar, can properly be used as supporting evidence for Virgilian authorship.

5

To recapitulate. Virgil knew Catullus's poetry well. He had studied it carefully in his younger days; he retained a significant amount to use consciously or unconsciously in his own later writing. His poetry was, after all, "born under the tail of the neoterics"; he joins Catullus in praise of Cinna.[141] The poem which had the greatest influence upon him was naturally Catullus's essay in hexameters, *Peleus and Thetis.* This, apart from the pathos of Ariadne, and the attraction of its verbal phrases, profoundly affected his treatment of narrative, his patterning of episodes and weaving together of stories. He was not averse from the pursuit of the golden line, the noun-adjective sandwich, but it is not a fetish within him, as it tends to be in Catullus's hexameters,[142] and he frees himself from Catullus's end-stopped hexameters, and patterns lines as well as episodes. But he shows traces of knowledge of all branches of Catullus's work; only within these branches he has a limited number of favourite poems, which are, on the whole, those which we should also pick out as our favourites. Many of his borrowings are mere verbal reminiscences and do no more than throw light on the phrases which impinged upon his memory. Particularly

important is the lightening of his usually dignified verse by the conversational element which Catullus had made his own, in phrases like *quidcumque hoc regni* or *magis atque magis*, or diminutives. Quinn has put it well: "What Virgil has learnt from Catullus more than anything else is to write with a lightness of touch, an unostentatious economy of words enlivened by a wry irony."[143] His more elaborate borrowings are deliberately contrived, and often allude to the spirit of their original, either for direct effect, or for contrast. His borrowing is never merely plagiaristic; he generally improves on Catullus, but sometimes falls short. Some of his most fascinating effects are achieved when he accepts Catullus's inspiration, but has to change the rhythm of his words, or when he fuses Catullus with Homer or a directly experienced image of his own, or the rather different logic of his own passage. There is some tendency for Catullan reminiscences to accumulate in particular passages[144], and the figure of Dido not merely owes much to Ariadne but also serves to evoke other Catullan moods and memories.

Perhaps when Martial made Catullus present his book to Virgil he was not so far wrong.[145]

The Open University John Ferguson

NOTES

1. There is a copious literature on the subject. I have found most useful E.K. Rand "Catullus and the Augustans" *Harvard Studies* 27 (1906) pp. 15–30; P. Jahn "Die Quellen und Muster des ersten Buchs der Georgica Vergils" *Rhein Mus.* 58 (1903) 391–426; D.A. Slater "Was the Fourth Eclogue written to celebrate the marriage of Octavia to Mark Antony – a literary parallel" *CR* 26 (1912) 114–9; Marion Smith "Echoes of Catullus in the Messianic Eclogue of Vergil" *CJ* 26 (1930) 141–3, L. Hermann "Le Poème 64 de Catulle et Virgile" *REL* 8 (1930) 211 ff.; W.B. Anderson "The Aeneid and Earlier Latin Poetry" *PCA* 40 (1943) 9–12; E. Castonna "Da Levio a Virgilio" *GIF* 2 (1949) 22–8; Mendell "The Influence of the Epyllion on the Aeneid" *YCS* 12 (1951) 205–6; L. Richardson jnr. *Poetical Theory in Republican Rome;* R.E.H. Westendorp Boerma "Vergil's Debt to Catullus" *Acta Classica* 1 (1959) 51–63; Agathe Thornton "A Catullan quotation in Virgil's Aeneid Book VI" *AUMLA* 17 (1962) 22–9; D. Knecht "Virgile et ses modèles latins" *L'Antiquité Classique* 32 (1963) 491 ff.
I have not been able to see C.N. Cole *De Vergilio Catulli Imitatore;* A Danysz *De scriptorum Romanorum studiis Catullianis* or J. Süss "Catulliana" *Acta Semina Philol. Erlangensis* 1 (1878).

2. The only other echo I have noted in *The Eclogues* is Cat. 64, 354; V. *Ecl.* II 13 *sole sub ardenti.*

3. Cat. 12, 8–9.

4. Macrob. VI 1, 41; Cat. 64, 327; V. *Ecl.* IV 46.

5. Cat. 64,384 ff. and 397 ff.; V. *Ecl.* IV 13–4.

6. Cat. 64,323; V. *Ecl.* IV 17.

7. Cat. 64,39–41; V. *Ecl.* IV 40.

8. V. *Ecl.* IV 32.

9. V. *Ecl.* IV 34.

10. V. *Ecl.* IV 49.

11. *The Magical Art of Vergil* pp. 110–1

12. G.E. Duckworth *Vergil and Classical Hexameter Poetry* (Ann Arbor 1969) pp. 50–2.

13. L.P. Wilkinson *The Georgics of Vergil* (Cambridge 1969) p. 45.

14. W.F. Jackson Knight *Roman Vergil* (London ^{2}1944 p. 330).

15. L.P. Wilkinson *Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge 1963) p. 194.

16. Cat. 64,12; V. *G.* 1,97 cf. 1,40; Cat. 64, 39–41; V. *G.* 1, 156 ff.; Cat. 64,48; V. *G.* 1,57; Cat. 64,2888–91; V. *G.* 1,20; Cat. 64,384–6; V. *G.* 1,21–4.

17. Cat. 64,40; V. *G.* III 515.

18. Cat. 64,399; Lucr. III 72; V. *G.* II 510.

19. Cat. 64,177 ff.; V. *G.* IV 504 ff.

20. Cat. 64,19–21; V. *G.* IV 525–7.

21. cp. also the way in which episodes are woven into the Aeneid – Laocoon, Cacus, and Nisus and Euryalus cf. Mendell *op. cit.* 214.

22. L.P. Wilkinson *The Georgics of Virgil* (Cambridge 1969) pp. 115–8.

23. Cat. 64,156; V. *Aen.* VII 302.

24. Cat. 64, 227; V. *Aen.*IX 582.

25. Hom. *Il.* I 518 ff.; Cat. 64,202–4; V. *Aen.* IX 104–6, X 113–5.

26. Cat. 64,6–7; V. *Aen.* III 208, V 158 cf. VI 320, VII 198.

27. Cat. 64,164; V. *Aen.* II 101.

28. Cat. 64,36; V. *Aen.* II 197.

29. Cat. 64,26–7; V. *Aen.* II 406–6; L. V 950–1.

30. Cat. 64,1, V.X230; Cat. 64,6, V.V 148; Cat. 64,7, V.III 208; Cat. 64,20, V.VII 398 (lengthening of *-it* before *hymenaeos*); Cat. 64,23, V.V 80; Cat. 64,24, V.V 77 (supporting Palmer's *mero* for *meo* in Catullus); Cat. 64,46, V.I 637 (a very clear instance); Cat. 64,62, V.VIII 19; Cat. 64,106, V.III 680; Cat. 64,139 ff., V.I 670 ff.; Cat. 64, 142, V.IX 312; Cat. 64,183, V.V209; Cat. 64, 187, V.I 91; Cat. 64, 198, V.I 485, VI 55; Cat. 64, 207, V.III 203; Cat. 64,215, V.V. 724 (an exquisite echo on the "dearer than life" theme); Cat. 64,224, V.XII 611; Cat. 64,251, V.X 362; Cat. 64, 343 ff., V.V 803–11 (see D.L. Drew *Culex* Oxford 1924 p. 84); Cat. 64, 363, V.XI 849 ff.; Cat. 64,394 (first appearance of *letifer),* V.III 139.

31. Cat. 64,64–5; V.III 65.

32. Cat. 64,187; V.I 91.

33. Cat. 64, 271, 404; V. *Aen.* VI 255, 613. cf. Cat. 64,7, V. 320; Cat. 64,12, V. 335; Cat. 64,22 ff., V. 648 ff.; Cat. 64,198, V. 55; Cat. 64,262, V. 165; Cat. 64,343, V. 879 ff.; Cat. 64,166, V. 689.

34. Cat. 64, 113 ff.; V. *Aen.* VI 27 ff.

35. Cat. 64, 249 ff.; V. *Aen.* 475 ff.

36. Cat. 64, 46; V. *Aen.* I 637 cf. also VI 602–5.

37. I have found especially useful R.G. Austin's edition of *Aeneid* IV, and N.W. de Witt *The Dido Episode in the Aeneid of Vergil.*

38. Macrob. VII, 42; Cat. 64, 171; V. *Aen.* IV 657.

39. Cat. 64, 132; V. *Aen.* IV 305.

40. Cat. 64, 141; V. *Aen.* IV 316.

41. Cat. 64, 62; V. *Aen.* IV 532.

42. Cat. 64, 250; V. *Aen.* IV 1.

43. Cat. 64, 175–6; V. *Aen.* IV 10.

44. Cat. 64, 339; V. *Aen.* IV 11.

45. Cat. 64, 181; V. *Aen.* IV 21.

46. Cat. 64, 295; V. *Aen.* IV 23.

47. Cat. 64, 63; V. *Aen.* IV 216.

48. V. *Aen.* IV 521–4 cf. Cat. 64, 1–10.

49. Cat. 64, 298; V. *Aen.* IV 558.

50. Cat. 64, 180; V. *Aen.* IV 538.

51. Cat. 64, 335; V. *Aen.* IV 520.

52. Cat. 64, 156; V. *Aen.* IV 41.

53. Cat. 64, 93 cf. 100, 7; V. *Aen.* IV 66.

54. Cat. 64, 132; V. *Aen.* IV 305, 366.

55. Cat. 64, 19–21; V. *Aen.* IV 247–8.

56. Cat. 64, 105 ff.; V. *Aen.* IV 441 ff.

57. Cat. 61, 209 ff.: see below.

58. Cat. 64, 154 ff.; V. *Aen.* IV 365 ff.

59. Cat. 64, 177 ff.; V. *Aen.* IV 536 ff.

60. C. Murley "The Structure and Proportion of Catullus LXIV" *TAPA* 68 (1937) 305–17.

61. K. Quinn *Virgil's Aeneid* (Ann Arbor 1968).

62. R.S. Conway *New Studies in a Great Inheritance* (London 1921) p. 147.

63. V. *G.* I 206.

64. Cat. 64, 12.

65. V. *G.* I 221.

66. V. *G.* I 376.

67. V. *Aen.* VII 65; 197–8.

68. V. *Aen.* IV 622 ff.

69. V. *Aen.* VI 692.

70. V. *Aen.* XI 97.

71. Cat. 61, 7; V. *Ecl.* III, 63; *G.* IV 270.

72. Cat. 61, 2; V. *Aen.* IV 12.

73. Cat. 61, 154; V. *Ecl.* IX 23.

74. Cat. 61, 228; V. *Aen.* IV 32.

75. Cat. 61, 135; 62, 7; V. *Ecl.* 8, 31.

form and in fact neither evinces any great interest in it. This is demonstrably so with Eliot and it's at this point in the argument that matters peculiarly demonstrable in his case take on a decisive significance. It's also at this point, I may say, that the relevant differences between the three poets begin to appear (at first seemingly setting Keats furthest apart), but it's still Eliot who provides a convenient approach. 'I confess that personally I take so little interest in novels that I am inclined to deplore your devoting so much time to prose', he wrote to an acquaintance in the 1930's, and a few years earlier to another: 'I feel quite incompetent to judge novels and I confess a complete ignorance of human psychology.' The implications here are evident and unwelcome. 'At Naples', Donatus tells us, 'Virgil was commonly called Parthenias (Virginia). ... He spent most of his time in Campania or Sicily, where he could get away from people.' 'Eliot's poetry', says Dr. Leavis with characteristically unapologetic directness, 'hasn't a rich human experience behind it. It reveals, rather, a restriction; it comes, indeed, out of a decided poverty.'[9]

The relation between poetry and biography (or psychography) is always a delicate matter, whatever the issues, but the present case leaves little room for doubt. Eliot's 'poverty' underlies his inability to give a full realization of character; it further manifests itself in an unsatisfying *attitude* towards human relationships in general, and especially the man-woman relation; and within that particular relation it shows up most conspicuously as an unexplained – and thus artistically unwarranted – distaste for physicality. My suggestion (as the flirtatious dropping in of Donatus' Parthenias anecdote was meant to indicate) is that in these matters no less than in others Virgil presents a comparable picture, as indeed, up to a point, Eliot himself can tell us. In a talk he once gave on 'Virgil and the Christian World', he discussed some relevant points and in so doing revealed, as he was bound to, something of his own disposition. 'The term which one can justifiably regret the lack of in Virgil is *amor*. It is, above all others, the key word for Dante. I do not mean that Virgil never uses it. *Amor* recurs in the *Eclogues (amor vincit omnia)*. But the loves of the shepherds represent hardly more than a poetic convention. The use of the word *amor* in the *Eclogues* is not illuminated by meanings of the word in the *Aeneid* in the way in which, for example, we return to Paolo and Francesca with greater understanding of their passion after we have been through the circles of love in the *Paradiso*. Certainly, the love of Aeneas and Dido has great tragic force. There is tenderness and pathos enough in the *Aeneid*. But Love is never given, to my mind, the same significance as a principle of order in the human soul, in society and in the universe that *pietas* is given; and it is not Love that causes *fatum* or moves the sun and the stars. Even for intensity of physical passion, Virgil is more tepid than some other Latin poets, and far below the rank of Catullus.' It's pleasing to find Eliot speaking up for Catullus, but this shouldn't distract us from the remarkable emphasis he uses. 'Even for intensity of physical passion': the terms of this faintly condescending afterthought ('even') indicate a total separation between 'physical passion' and *amor* proper, including *amor* as 'a principle of order in the human soul'. He continues: 'Virgil was, among all authors of classical antiquity, one for whom the world made sense, for whom it had order and dignity and for whom, as for no-one before him except the Hebrew prophets, history had meaning.' But, he concludes, Virgil was still denied the ultimate Christian, and specifically Dantean, vision represented by a conception of *amor* as the universal 'principle of order'.[10]

100. Cat. 7, 8; V. *Aen.* IV 171.

101. Cat. 7, 3; V. *G.* II 105.

102. Cat. 45, 16; V. *Aen.* IV 66.

103. Cat. 60, 1–3; V. *Aen.* IV 365 ff.; III 424 ff.

104. Cat. 63, 12–3, 21–2; V. *Aen.* IX 617–20; Hom. *Il.* 2, 234.

105. Cat. 63, 53; V. *Aen.* VI 179.

106. Cat. 63, 4; V. *Aen.* VIII 228.

107. Cat. 63, 16; V. *Aen.* IX 81.

108. Cat. 65, 23; V. *G.* 1, 203; Aul. Gell. 10, 29.

109. Cat. 65, 7; V. *Aen.* VI 505 Rhoeteo litore, (perhaps however the ordinary name); Cat. 65, 14; V. *Aen.* IV 601 (Catullus seems to be responsible for this use of *absumere*).

110. Cat. 68, 119; V. *Aen.* IV 599.

111. G. Norwood "Vergil Georgics IV 453–527" *CJ* 1940–1, 354–5.

112. Cat. 68, 48 cf. 38, 3, V. *Aen.* II 299; XII 239, 406; Cat. 68, 64, V. *Aen.* VII 8; Cat. 68, 67, V. *G.* I 126; Cat. 68, 75, V. *Aen.* V 78; Cat. 68, 83, V. *Aen.* I 749 (a Dido passage); Cat. 68, 88, V. *Aen.* VI 165; Cat. 68, 151, V. *G.* I 495.

113. There is an enexpected echo of one of the Gellius poems in *The Eclogues:* Cat. 80, 5; V. *Ecl.* VIII 107.

114. Cat. 85 etc.; V. *Aen.* IV 531–2.

115. V. *Aen.* IV 430 cf. 309.

116. See A. Rostagni *Virgilio Minore.* T.R. Fairclough "The poems of the Appendix Vergiliana" *TAPA* 53 (1922) 5–34; R.S. Radford "The Priapea and the Vergilian Appendix" *TAPA* 52 (1921) 148-77; E.K. Rand "Young Virgil's Poetry" *Havard Studies* 30 (1919) 103–85; A.R. Bellinger "Catullus and the *Ciris*" *TAPA* 53 (1922) 73–82.

117. Cat. 4; V. *Catal.* 10.

118. Q. 8, 3, 28.

119. Cat. 84.

120. Cat. 92.

121. Cat. 107, 7.

122. Cat. 29, 24.

123. Cat. 31; 44.

124. Cat. 35, 17; 50; 68, 70, 68, 147.

125. *op. cit.* p. 54.

126. Cat. 64, 364, *Cir.* 399 cf. Cat. 64, 309, *Cir.* 511; Cat. 64, 369, *Cir.* 366.

127. Cat. 64, 131; *Cir.* 251, 348.

128. Cat. 64, 19–21; *Cir.* 387 ff.

130. *Cir.* 115.

131. Cat. 63, 29; *Cir.* 108.

132. Cat. 76, 13; *Cir.* 11.

133. Cat. 62, 20 ff., 32 ff.; *Cir.* 349 ff. op. also Cat. 68, 17; *Cir.* 242.

134. F. Skutsch *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* (Leipzig 1901) p. 310.

135. R. Helm "Ein Epilog zur Cirisfrage" *Hermes* 72 (1937) 78–103.

136. D.L. Drew *Culex* (Oxford 1924).

137. Cat. 34, *Cul.* 120; Cat. 43–9 (a passage used more than once elsewhere by Virgil), *Cul.* 59–68; Cat. 48, *Cul.* 86; Cat. 95, *Cul.* 26, 37 *(sancte puer);* Cat. 132–3, *Cul.* 132–3 (repetition of *perfide:* the equation of the lines is a curious coincidence if it is a coincidence); Cat. 149, *Cul.* 214, 224; Cat. 186–7, *Cul.* 348–9 (anaphora with *omnia);* Cat. 230, *Cul.* 257; Cat. 287, *Cul.* 19; Cat. 403–4, *Cul.* 124–5 (repetition of *impia).*

138. Cat. 34, 10; *Cul.* 22.

139. Cat. 66, 45–6; *Cul.* 31.

140. Cat. 68, 4, *Cul.* 224; Cat. 68, 64, *Cul.* 155–6.

141. Cat. 95, 1; V. *Ecl.* IX, 35.

142. e.g. V. *Aen.* 1, 91; 2, 168. Catullus has 21 in 408 lines.

143. K. Quinn *Virgil's Aeneid* (Ann Arbor 1968) p. 372.

144. My treatment above, by looking at the poems from a Catullan rather than a Virgilian standpoint, obscures this, but it will be found to justify some of the references which may at first seem slight.

145. *Mart.* IV 14, 13–4.

PIETAS IN VIRGIL AND STATIUS

I have chosen *pietas* as the starting point for my comparison because it is generally agreed that it plays an important role in the *Aeneid* – I believe it is important in the *Thebaid* too – and because its role seems to me to be central to the dramatic and moral tension of each poem. Each poet asks a question in his epic; my purpose is to discover and contrast the two questions and to show how the difference between the questions is indicative of the difference in outlook of the two poets, and I believe that in each poem the poet is asking his basic question in terms of *pietas.*

Pietas for a Roman consisted in the fulfilment of obligations to family, country and gods, to one's leader or those who rely upon one as a leader and to those who had done one a service. Having undertaken a very extensive study of the usages of *pius, impius* and *pietas* in the Republican and early Imperial periods I am convinced that *pietas* was quite strictly limited in its range of application, that it did not approach anything like 'humanity' or 'gentleness' as some have tried to argue.

Aeneas' *pietas* is certainly confined within traditional limits; it commends the fulfilment of his obligations to his father, living and dead (1), to his companions, whether in death like Misenus (2) or in need of responsible leadership as after the shipwreck in Book 1 (3), or simply when he is carrying out ordinary administrative duties (4). Virgil's special emphasis on Aeneas' *pietas* of responsible leadership may well be an attempt to present him as a model especially suitable for Augustus to follow. The heaviest emphasis, however, is put upon Aeneas' *pietas* towards the gods, not just his observation of religious ritual or his upholding of oaths (5), but especially upon his obedience to the divinely revealed mission which Fate has laid upon him. Aeneas knows at the fall of Troy that he has been chosen to fulfil a special task, the nature of which is revealed in stages until by the time he reaches Carthage where we see him in Book 1 he knows he is to go to a certain part of Italy and found a city. It is not, of course, until the 6th Book that the full glory of the future is shown to him and it is Aeneas' willing fulfilment of the laborious task laid upon him, his willingness to follow the directions of Fate before he knows of the glorious fulfilment, Rome, to which his mission is leading which is perhaps the most basic aspect of Aeneas' *pietas.* It is, of course, a mistake to assume that Aeneas' *pietas* can be divided up into neatly labelled compartments. One word, *pius,* characterises him in the fulfilment of all his obligations, obligations the fulfilment of which are all subsumed under what we call the mission. The mission itself involves *pietas* over the whole range of its usage; it is to be *pius* in all situations which is to be the basic quality of Rome:

> 'hinc genus Ausonio mixtum quod sanguine surget,
> supra homines, supra ire deos pietate videbis,'
>
> 12.838–9;

So not only is Aeneas *pius* in his obedience to the gods, his willing fulfilment of his mission, but his overall *pietas* is itself a model of what his mission is intended to achieve; Aeneas' own *pietas* therefore is a foretaste of the *pietas* which is to be a dominant characteristic of Rome.

Pietas in the *Aeneid,* however, is not as simple as that. When Aeneas decides to resume his mission and abandon Dido he is called *pius Aeneas* in the notorious line 4.393, *pius* for the first time in the fourth book. Of course he is *pius* since he has chosen obedience to the gods and to Fate rather than disobedience, but book four henceforth is concerned not with the righteousness of Aeneas but with the tragedy of Dido. *Pietas* involves intense suffering for Aeneas and suffering and death is the result for Dido. There is a real tension here; *pius* is not simply a mark of Virgil's approval of Aeneas' decision to put his duty before himself; its use here raises the question of whether it really was best for Aeneas to go on to Italy in view of the suffering his *pietas* occasions. So here Aeneas' *pietas* involves his sacrifice of humanity but nevertheless it is a sacrifice he makes with the deepest regret.

The tension between achievement and suffering pervades the *Aeneid* and it is crystallised in the conflict between *pietas* and humanity. This tension reaches a pathetic climax at the end of Book 10 where Aeneas is confronted with the young warrior Lausus who has intervened to save his father Mezentius. Aeneas kills him and speaks:

> 'quid tibi nunc, miserande puer, pro laudibus istis,
> quid pius Aeneas tanta dabit indole dignum?'
>
> 10.825–6.

The phrase *pius Aeneas* recalls the whole complex of ideas associated with Aeneas' *pietas* and his mission. The fulfilment of his mission means that Aeneas has to fight and kill people like Lausus. Aeneas' sympathy towards Lausus as it was towards Dido is enormous but *pietas* demands that humanity be put aside. The tension, therefore, between Rome and the sacrifice necessary for its existence is stated in terms of *pietas.* In this situation, however, Lausus is also *pius.* Let us look back to lines 812–4:

> 'fallit te incautum pietas tua'. nec minus ille
> exsultat demens, saevae iamque altius irae
> Dardanio surgunt ductori.....

Lausus' *pietas* leads him into death at the hands of Aeneas, a fact which enhances Aeneas' tragedy (and hence the tension) inasmuch as his *pietas* demands that he kill someone whose *pietas* mirrors his own (6). It has also led Lausus into a mad charge of savage violence against the enemy and there is a very fine example of this sort of behaviour earlier in Book 10. After Turnus has killed Pallas, Aeneas charges madly into battle:

> Pallas, Evander, in ipsis
> omnia sunt oculis, mensae quas advena primas
> tunc adiit, dextraeque datae.
>
> 10.515–7.

Aeneas had previously been subdued in fighting (Otis and Conway (7) noticed the change in his behaviour here) but with the thought of his obligations towards Evander uppermost in his mind he seizes two sets of four brothers to sacrifice on Pallas' tomb and kills many

warriors including three as they beg for mercy, one of whom, it is implied, he will not allow to be buried (8). At the climax of this scene of hideous violence comes the familiar formula *pius Aeneas* (9). Once again the word *pius* is used at a moment when the horror and suffering involved in *pietas* are being most strongly emphasised. However, whereas in the moments of confrontation with Dido and with Lausus Aeneas felt a deep regret, here he has no such scruples. He appears to have been corrupted, temporarily at least, by the very behaviour which it is his mission to stamp out. Thus Virgil has another reservation to make on the glory of the Roman mission; not only is there a tension inherent in the role of *pietas* as he presents it in the *Aeneid* but also in the character of Aeneas. We see this situation again in the notorious closing scene of the final book (10). Turnus begs for mercy as did the three victims of Aeneas in Book 10 but at the sight of Pallas' belt Aeneas kills him; the implication is, although *pius* does not occur in the text as we have it, that once again it is the demands of *pietas* which are decisive. Turnus is clad, as Aeneas puts it, in the *'spoliis ... meorum'* (11). Nevertheless Aeneas kills Turnus in *dolor, furiis accensus et ira terribilis* and *fervidus* (12). He feels no regret at that moment for the fate of Turnus. Not only does *pietas* necessarily entail violent behaviour but once more we are asked to consider whether Aeneas has really learnt to feel humanity consistently towards those that his *pietas* demands that he kill. One might also note the parallel situation earlier in Book 12, where *pietas* is instrumental in Aeneas' violence. After the breaking of the truce he is wandering over the battle-field in search of Turnus and restraining himself from promiscuous slaughter when he is treacherously attacked by Messapus:

> tum vero adsurgunt irae, insidiisque subactus,
> diversos ubi sensit equos currumque referri,
> multa Iovem et laesi testatus foederis aras
> iam tandem invadit medios et Marte secundo
> terribilis saevam nullo discrimine caedem
> suscitat irarumque omnis effundit habenas.
>
> 12.494–9.

Here too Virgil is very careful to connect the violence of Aeneas' charge with his *pius* motive; the tension is stated once more, although not explicitly in terms of *pietas*.

The rather sinister implications of Virgil's treatment of *pietas* should now be clear: Aeneas is a man of complete *pietas, pius* in his obedience to his mission and *pius* in fulfilling the obligations which the mission is all about, for example in his relationship towards Evander and Pallas. The exercise of that *pietas,* however, involves the abandonment of Dido and the deaths of Lausus, Turnus and others *by necessity of the role of pietas in the poem:* the Roman mission, both the inherent nature of it (illustrated by the necessary deaths of people like Turnus because of *pietas* towards Evander) and the way it has to be implemented (illustrated by the necessity of abandoning Dido and killing Latins like Lausus in the war) is incompatible with humanity, and on top of this Aeneas as a character is still liable to uncontrolled outbursts of emotion as he fulfils the demands of *pietas* rather than the regret which the necessity for violence should and frequently does occasion.

It is important, however, not to underemphasize the very positive achievement to which Aeneas' mission is leading. Certainly the means to the end involve enormous suffering and sacrifice and the exercise of *pietas* as a Roman virtue involves violence and murder but it would be wrong to suppose that Virgil felt no real pride in the achievement of Rome. Aeneas is a tragic figure placed in a difficult situation and when he does run amok it is only under enormous provocation. In restoring the balance a survey of the role of *virtus* in the *Aeneid* will, I believe, be of value.

Virgil's attitude towards *virtus* varies according to who is exercising it and according to the end towards which it is being exercised. The *virtus* of Aeneas is rarely referred to but it is always forward looking and constructive. At 8.131–3. Aeneas tells Evander that it is his own *virtus* together with the *sancta oracula divum* that has brought him to Italy, the willing follower of Fate. *Virtus*, then, is connected with Aeneas' mission, and in Book 6 it is linked closely with the glorious Roman and explicitly Augustan future, for after recounting the triumph and Empire of Augustus Anchises asks:

> 'et dubitamus adhuc virtutem extendere factis?'
>
> 6.806.

The Augustan Empire, then is the ultimate consequence of Aeneas' *virtus*, and in Latinus' reported thoughts at 7.255–8 this *virtus* is projected onto Augustus himself as a descendant of Aeneas:

> hunc illum fatis externa ab sede profectum
> portendi generum paribusque in regna vocari
> auspiciis, huic progeniem virtute futuram
> egregiam et totum quae viribus occupet orbem.

At 12.827: *'sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago,' virtus* is once more constructive and forward looking; the *virtus* of the Italians will be harnessed for Roman glory.

There is one scene in the *Aeneid* where we actually see a present action explicitly linked with the Roman future. At 9.590–644 is described the confrontation between Numanus and Ascanius and after Ascanius' killing of Remulus Apollo addresses him:

> 'macte nova virtute, puer, sic itur ad astra,
> dis genite et geniture deos. iure omnia bella
> gente sub Assaraci fato ventura resident,
> nec te Troia capit.'
>
> 9.641–4.

No sympathy is expressed for Remulus and the reference to future Rome and what appears to be the closing of the temple of Janus in BC 29 make irony unlikely here. The emphasis is all on Ascanius' *virtus* in killing Remulus as a pattern for future Roman glory; Remulus' suffering is not mentioned: here lies dead one more boasting individualistic hero who was standing in the way of Rome. I believe that there is real political significance in this

passage; the giving of the two names Remulus Numanus, the use of the word *cognomen,* the marriage alliance with Turnus and the resulting *regnum* all assist in the presentation of this man as a characteristic late-Republican aristocrat, selfish, individualistic. Men like this, Turnus, Pallas, Euryalus all have to die since they stand in the way of Rome just as did their selfish Republican successors. The lack of sympathy for Remulus coupled with the emphasis on the Roman future shows that Virgil was very much concerned with the achievement to which Aeneas' mission was leading as something glorious and worthwhile.

Virtus is by no means always directed towards the mission, the foundation of Rome. Before Aeneas becomes fully aware of his mission he fights in Book 2 a hopeless battle, scarcely for the preservation of Troy but simply to win honour by going down fighting, and with his followers participates in an orgy of meaningless slaughter leading to inevitable self-destruction (13). Moreover Dido connects Aeneas' *virtus* in the Trojan war with his *gens* (references to hereditary *virtus* occur elsewhere in the *Aeneid),* surely a recollection of the Republican aristocratic code of maintaining family honour by winning *gloria* through *virtus.* The *virtus* of Pandarus, Mezentius and Pallas too is individual and entirely destructive (14). Pallas shows absolutely no sympathy for his victims; his wars at 10.371 are *patriae....aemula laudi* and at 11.154–5 Evander reveals his son's attitude towards war:

> 'haud ignarus eram quantum nova gloria in armis
> at praedulce decus primo certamine posset.'

For Pallas war is a glorious game of heroism for its own sake, an attitude never held by Aeneas after Book 2. It is, of course, Turnus who epitomises the old heroic, individualist attitude to war. His *virtus* is combined with heroic shame at failure, *insania, furiae* and love for Lavinia (15). The position of Lavinia is interesting. Turnus regards her as a major prize of battle (16) worth winning for her own sake through *virtus* (12.20) whereas for Aeneas she does not count: her only purpose is to provide a name for his new city (17). In Book 11, Turnus' *virtus* is linked with the winning of personal *gloria* (18) and at 11.336 he achieves *gloria* through family rivalry within the state, the situation which in fact prevailed at the end of the Republic. In the *Aeneid gloria* is sought by the same sort of people to whom destructive individualistic *virtus* is attributed: Turnus, Camilla, Euryalus (19), Entellus who seeks individual *gloria* and *laus* in the boxing match (20) and Troy and Carthage (21), outdated and anti-Roman societies. But just as there are two sides to *virtus,* so there are two sides to *gloria.* Aeneas' *gloria,* according to Jupiter and Anchises (22), consists in being the founder of Rome and in Rome's future achievement. Individual *virtus* in search of individual *gloria* as illustrated by fighters like Turnus and Pallas is useless, destructive and eventually self-destructive (as illustrated, for example, by the taking of spoils by Euryalus and Turnus) but *virtus* if harnessed to the achievement of the Roman future, Aeneas' *virtus* after Book 2, is glorious, and under these conditions even the slaughter of Remulus Numanus is apparently justifiable.

In the *Aeneid* we are constantly being reminded of the Roman future, not least in some of the passages in which *virtus* occurs and the *virtus* of Aeneas is contrasted with

the self-seeking *virtus* and *gloria* of Turnus, Pallas and the like which is entirely destructive. *Pietas,* however, does reveal a very powerful tension, for Aeneas is explicitly *pius* at those very moments when the suffering necessitated by his *pietas* is being most strongly emphasised. Not the least to suffer for obedience to his mission is Aeneas himself. Not only does he regret the abandonment of Dido and the futile deaths in the war like that of Lausus, both, of course, connected with the interferences of Juno, but he suffers more directly through events like the storm and shipwreck in Book 1 and the ship-burning in Book 5. In the introduction to the poem at 1.8–11 Virgil himself asks why Juno inflicted such suffering on a man *insignem pietate* and Venus, confronting Jupiter later in the same book, recounts Aeneas' sufferings and asks: *'hic pietatis honos?'* (23). When his ships are burning Aeneas is *pius* as he prays to Jupiter, surely a recollection of this same tension, but it is in the address to his disguised mother in Book 1 that the discrepancy between Aeneas' *pietas* and his suffering is most poignantly expressed:

> 'sum pius Aeneas, raptos qui ex hoste penatis
> classe veho mecum, fama super aethera notus;
> Italiam quaero patriam, et genus ab Iove summo.
> bis denis Phrygium conscendi navibus aequor,
> matre dea monstrante viam data fata secutus;
> vix septem convulsae undis Euroque supersunt.
> ipse ignotus, egens, Libyae deserta peragro,
> Europa atque Asia pulsus.'
>
> 1.378–85.

Certainly Aeneas has to suffer, but the Junonian opposition is eventually overcome and after the revelation of the future glory of Rome in Book 6 Aeneas knows he will succeed, that his *pietas* will be rewarded; Fate, after all is on his side; it is the force of anti-Fate which is making him suffer for his *pietas* and it is by means of Aeneas' *pietas* that Fate will be fulfilled. However great the suffering we know from the start that *pietas* will achieve a magnificent goal.

The main action of the *Thebaid* is the war between Argos and Thebes. Although the dispute between the two brothers Eteocles and Polyneices is the immediate cause of the war and although the brothers fight on opposite sides and eventually meet in a fratricidal duel, it is not a civil war and all the fighting apart from the duel is between members of different states. The hereditary curse on Oedipus' family which has no connection with Argos in any case is conflated with a divine plan of Jupiter, outlined in Book 1 and explicitly put into action in Books 2, 3 and 7 (24), for the destruction of the people of Argos and Thebes by means of a war, and, Jupiter tells us, such destruction has been fated since the beginning of time:

> 'sic Fata mihi nigraeque Sororum
> iuravere colus: manet haec ab origine mundi
> fixa dies bello, populique in proelia nati.'
>
> 3.241–3.

A great deal of the horror of the *Thebaid* lies in the violence of this ordinary interstate war while the traditionally *impius* actions such as the fratricide provide climaxes of horror in a ghastly orgy of death and suffering. Statius' usage of words like *impius, nefas* and *scelus* reflects this conflation of traditional crimes against family, country, gods etc. and ordinary violence against one's enemy in war, a conflation, that is to say, of *pietas* and humanity. For example, on two occasions warriors are described as *impii* because they kill particularly pathetic victims in war (25) and *nefas* is used to describe the death of a particularly tragic young warrior (26); *scelus* too refers to the death of a warrior (27) and to the death of the infant Opheltes (28) killed by a snake sacred to Jupiter, an event also described as a *nefas* (29). Simply the defeat of one side in the war is a *nefas* (30) and even the destruction of a band of warriors sent to ambush an ambassador (31). Such usages are completely alien to Virgil who confines these words to traditional *pietas* situations. Statius, then, is concerned as much with the horror of violence as with traditional impiety and extends the usage of these words to cover ordinary suffering and death in war. The Virgilian tension, therefore, between *pietas* and the inhumanity to which it leads, a tension between the word *pietas* (or *pius*) and the context in which it is used, of necessity evaporates since in the *Thebaid* inhumanity of this sort is regularly characterised as *impius:* Statius opposes humanity to inhumanity in his usage of *pius* and *impius* and therefore cannot conceive of using the word *pius* in a situation in which inhumanity is involved. Situations just do not arise in the *Thebaid* in which the fulfilment of obligations traditionally demanded by *pietas* involves inhumanity and so there is no tension; traditional *pietas* and humanity and traditional *impietas* and inhumanity coincide.

The basic dramatic tension of the *Thebaid* is to be found rather in the role played by *pietas* in the epic. One of the most remarkable features of the *Thebaid* is the enormous emphasis placed upon the power of the supernatural, especially Olympians and Furies, and their role is decisive in the main action of the poem; the Theban-Argive war takes place within the framework of a divine plan for human destruction, ordained by Fate and organised by Jupiter and this plan and the hereditary Theban curse are conflated and work in conjunction towards the war. The fact that almost the first half of the first book (32) is devoted to the exposition of these divine plans in supernatural terms as sources of the approaching disaster is a measure of the importance which Statius attaches to the supernatural framework of his epic. Affixed to this basic plan is a plan of Pluto which takes shape in book 8, a plan involving four hideous actions within the general framework of the war explicitly directed towards the pollution of Jupiter: Tydeus' anthropophagy, Capaneus' attack on the gods, the mutual fratricide and Creon's decree forbidding the burial of the Argive dead. (33). This plan of Pluto is formulated in retaliation against Jupiter because light has been let into the underworld in an earthquake which swallowed up Amphiaraus, one of the Seven, in fulfilment of the basic plan of Fate. The so-called digressions in the *Thebaid* also describe the working out of divine plans for human destruction: Apollo's destruction of Argos in the Coroebus story in Book 1, the death of Opheltes, infant son of King Lycurgus of Nemea, in accordance with Fate in Book 5 and the destruction of the Lemnians by Venus' plan, narrated in Book 5 by

Hypsipyle (34). The *Thebaid,* then, is very much concerned with the malevolence of Fate and the gods and if one looks at those usages of *impius, nefas* and *scelus* which decry specific events it will be seen that on very nearly every occasion either an action undertaken within the framework of one of these divine plans or simply an event (35) which occurs within that framework is being decried. Statius uses the word *impius* thirty-seven times in the *Thebaid* as against Virgil's ten times in the *Aeneid,* only five of which decry specific human actions, and in only two cases is there a feeling that a divine plan is at work, the *impietas* of Dido in abandoning Sychaeus and of Latinus in breaking his agreement for peace with the Trojans (36). In these two instances the divine plan at work is that of Juno who is working against Jupiter and Fate. In the *Thebaid impius* behaviour or events are involved in the plans of Fate itself or of gods working with the sanction of Fate (37). This is a very important distinction and one to which I shall return. For the present let it suffice to note that Statius was very much concerned with *impietas* in a way in which Virgil, for whom the dramatic tension lay within the implications of *pietas* itself, was not.

In the *Thebaid,* then, violent behaviour and traditional *impietas* occur within the framework of a series of divine plans, each directed towards human destruction. What is the role of *pietas?* Let us look briefly at an example of *pietas* outside the main lines of the story. In Book 6 Statius relates in a brief allusion the disaster which befell Phaethon: his father warned him against the dangers and gave him the necessary advice:

> pius ille quidem et formidine cauta,
> sed iuvenem durae prohibebant discere Parcae.
>
> 6.324–5.

There are a number of similar examples related to the divine plans for war and impiety. For example, in Book 12 Creon has forbidden the burial of the Argives as a sign of his monarchic tyranny and as part of the plan for *impietas* formulated by Pluto in Book 8 but Argia's *pietas* (12.186) towards her husband Polyneices encourages her to challenge the *inmitesque deos regemque cruentum* (38) and she sets out to bury him against the edict; the basic opposition between human *pietas* and the joint plans of gods and kings is made explicit (39). Once Antigone and Argia have put Polyneices' body on the pyre which turns out to be that of his brother there is a supernaturally caused earthquake and the women are captured. The Furies and Fortuna (40) once again have conspired to thwart human *pietas* and manipulate it so that it leads to disaster. Examples like this could be multiplied many times, but I will confine myself to one more specific instance connected with the basic plan for the war and the curse which seems to illustrate the situation very clearly. The *pietas* of Amphiaraus, the Argive prophet, who does not want to go to war but eventually submits to Fate is frequently referred to (41); nevertheless he dies in an earthquake brought about by Fate with the sole object of killing him; his *pietas* did him no good and in two places in the *Thebaid* his *pietas* is explicitly connected with his undeserved fate, with the fact that it did indeed do him no good (42). Aeneas' *pietas* is eventually rewarded by success and it is the forces of anti-Fate which make him suffer; Amphiaraus' *pietas* is not rewarded by Fate; he dies in spite of it, not at the hands of an enemy but through Fate's direct intervention.

Significant as these individual examples are, the tension between the divine plans which necessitate *impietas* and violence and man's attempts for peace and *pietas* is most clearly felt in the dramatic structure of the plot itself. The first three books of the *Thebaid* consist of an irresistible movement towards war in accordance with Jupiter's plan outlined near the beginning of Book 1. Adrastus, the king of Argos is a pacific leader; he does what he thinks is just and best for his people. In the first three books of the epic he undertakes three major actions: he marries his daughter Argia to the exiled Polyneices in accordance with a riddling oracle of Apollo; he sends Tydeus on an embassy to Thebes to request Eteocles' abdication, a model of diplomacy; he orders Amphiaraus to consult the auspices to discover whether or not war is advisable. All these actions are well meaning attempts to do the right thing, but in fact each action only makes war more inevitable. The marriage and the embassy are both explicitly manipulated by Jupiter to bring about the conflict, and Jupiter says so, calling the marriage *belli.....semina* and the outcome of the embassy (Jupiter had suggested to Eteocles through Laius' ghost that he should refuse to abdicate) *semina pugnae* (43). The great auspices scene in which the events of the imminent war are revealed in detail to Amphiaraus indicates the success of Jupiter's scheming by showing that war is now inevitable as Amphiaraus is forced to realise:

> 'sed quid vana cano, quid fixos arceo casus?
> ibimus...'
>
> 3.646–7.

Adrastus is prevented from acting on the information by the intervention of Mars who at this point makes the Argives madly desire war, to kill and to be killed (44). Adrastus' attempts, therefore, to prevent violence (his characterising word in the *Thebaid* is *mitis*) (45) are rendered futile by the plans of the gods. In the final human attempt to stop the Fate-ordained disaster, Jocasta's intervention in Book 7, the *pietas* of the Argive warriors is explicitly opposed to the war, for example at 7.505–6: *bellum horrescit pietas,* and the whole tragedy is well summed up by Polyneices in Book 11 as the Fury encourages him to challenge his brother to a duel. Polyneices, recounting the suffering occasioned by the war, contrasts the Argive disaster with Adrastus' reign before his arrival:

> 'te pacem et pia iura regentem–'
>
> 11.165.

Adrastus' own *pietas* is emphasised at the same time as the disasters which have befallen him, and Polyneices concludes his speech with a reference to the divine plan by which this has come about:

> '...nec enim omnis culpa malorum
> me penes, et superi mecum Parcaeque nocentes...'
>
> 11.188–9.

The eleventh book, the mutual fratricide, is in many ways a microcosmic model of the whole war with a long supernatural introduction in which the Furies decide to carry out Pluto's orders of Book 8 (46). The dramatic tension is once more between the

divine plan for *impietas* and human attempts to stop it, to preserve *pietas*. First Jocasta tries to dissuade Eteocles, then Antigone Polyneices, but each is thwarted by the direct action of the Furies (47). Adrastus then intervenes but to no avail (48) and the conflict culminates in the intervention of the goddess Pietas herself (49). She was created, she says, by Natura to oppose the *animi* of gods and men. (50). Thus like Clementia she is detached from the Olympians and enters the battle on the side of man and of humanity, complaining of *saevumque Iovem Parcasque nocentes* (51). The outcome is inevitable: she is driven off by the Fury. The tension here between *pietas* and the gods' plans reaches its climax with the sublimation of *pietas* as a deified abstraction to oppose the Fury, the embodiment of the forces of *impietas* and violence – for Tisiphone is responsible for violence in general, not just traditional impiety (52) – in the world. The routing of Pietas by Tisiphone is the culmination of the successive defeats of human *pietas* by the malevolent interventions of the supernatural powers in accordance with Fate.

There is an important difference, therefore, between the role of *pietas* in the *Aeneid* and its role in the *Thebaid*. Part of Aeneas' *pietas* was his willing obedience to the commands of Fate in the fulfilment of his mission and Fate could only be fulfilled as long as Aeneas stood firm in his *pietas;* the opposition to his *pietas* which led to his own and his mother's indignation – the storm, Dido, the shipburning, the war – was raised not by Fate but by Juno, the anti-Fate symbol. This difference is crucial for an understanding of the different degrees of pessimism in the two poems.

We saw too how the use of *virtus* in the *Aeneid* could be connected with Fate. It was strongly approved of when used by Aeneas on behalf of the Roman future, but shown to be aimless and only destructive when used for the winning of individual *gloria*. In the *Thebaid virtus* is always destructive and this attitude reflects the foundation of Statius' pessimism. The war has no goal except the destruction of its participants; it has no purpose beyond itself. It is a battle involving the very survival of *pietas*, an aimless orgy of destruction in which successive human attempts at *pietas* are overwhelmed by the intervention of the gods, culminating in the defeat of the goddess Pietas by Tisiphone.

We can now summarise in terms of *pietas* the questions each poet is asking and we can assess the comparative optimism and pessimism of the two poems. The basic question in the *Aeneid* is whether *pietas* which is the foundation of the glorious Roman future can be justified by the suffering which it involves, the sacrifice of individuals. There is never any doubt that *pietas* will win through as long as Aeneas stands firm in adversity – *pietas* and *fatum* are on the same side – and after Book 6 we know that he will stand firm. The question is being asked of pietas itself, whether the sacrifices which it demands, Dido, Lausus, Turnus, are too great a price to pay – they certainly seemed so at times to Aeneas – and at the end the question is asked of Aeneas; is he really the right sort of man for the Roman future who kills so eagerly in the name of *pietas* in an outburst of emotionalism? It is a question which I shall not attempt to answer: only let it be remembered that the great Trojan-Latin war is for a purpose, a purpose normally described by Virgil as glorious, as the end of true *virtus*, and that the alternative offered to *pietas*

is the heady violence of Turnus, the individualism that had very nearly destroyed Rome in the years of Virgil's youth. *Pietas* is far from perfect but its alternative is unthinkable. Statius poses a different question and answers it for us: he asks what significant effect *pietas* can have in the world, and his answer is 'none'. *Pietas* for him is unquestionably good, absorbing as it does gentleness and humanity, the very qualities to which it is often opposed in the *Aeneid,* but the cussedness of the universe gives the *pii* no chance; Statius' pessimism is more stifling: there is no possibility of a glorious future; the war is an aimless orgy of death and suffering ordained by Fate itself: the violence of the *Aeneid* at least has a reason, it is the necessary concomitant of that *pietas* by which Rome is to be founded and the dictates of which she is to follow, but in the *Thebaid* The general violence of the war and the specific horror of the fratricide are presented in terms of the gods' machinations in accordance with Fate to bring about destruction for its own sake, a plan which involves the crushing of human attempts for peace and *pietas* finally epitomised in the defeat of the goddess Pietas by the Fury in order that the fratricide may go ahead: Fate and *pietas* are on opposing sides.

I want to conclude by looking at an adaptation by Statius of a passage in the *Aeneid* which I hope will demonstrate the poets' different attitudes towards the place of *pietas* in relation to the human environment, the universe. Where Statius has taken over a specific Virgilian model involving an act of *pietas* and altered it we should be able to see at least Statius' attitude, and the alterations he makes will also highlight the salient points of the Virgilian model. At *Aeneid* 9.176–449 Virgil tells the story of Nisus and Euryalus, a story which Statius adapts in his account of Hopleus and Dymas at *Thebaid* 10.347–448. Let us look closely at Virgil's story. Nisus tells us that he has long wanted to dare a great deed and that he is not content with *quies* (53). Personal heroic feelings are important from the start therefore, and although the basic aim of the exploit is *pius,* the message to Aeneas that the Trojans are in dire straits, there are moments when the *pietas* of the act itself seems to be subordinated to the desire for the glory achieved through it: Nisus says:

> nam mihi facti
> fama sat est.
> 9.194–5.

and Euryalus is described:

> magno laudum percussus amore.
> 9.197.

The opening dialogue of the pair (54) and the Trojan council (55) show that the message to Aeneas is the primary purpose of the exploit, although in his speech before the council Nisus mentions slaughter of the enemy and spoils as extra advantages (56). It is nowhere suggested, however, that the massacre itself should not be part of the *pius* plan, although as the pair set out it looks as if the massacre has rather gone to their heads and the *mandata* which Ascanius gives them to take to Aeneas are scattered by the breezes (57). In the massacre Euryalus takes as spoils a helmet and a belt and it is these very things

which precipitate the disaster, since the helmet shines in the moonlight and warns Volcens of their presence and the belt hinders Euryalus as he tries to escape through the wood. The moral is clear and accords with what we already know of Virgil's attitude towards *pietas:* the *pius* mission to warn Aeneas of necessity, apparently, involved violence – this is not questioned – and the description of the suffering of the Latin victims is characteristic of the enhancement of the tension between *pietas* and humanity. The *pius* mission, however, did not involve the taking of spoils; this was an example of the old, heroic, individualistic values, the desire for personal glory, and it was specifically the taking of spoils, not the massacre, which led to the disaster, just as it was Turnus' taking of that other belt, the belt of Pallas, which explicitly precipitated his own death. *Pietas,* questionable as it may have been in involving the massacre, would have succeeded; it was a lapse from *pietas,* the adherence to the values of a Turnus type, which brought disaster. In the *Thebaid* the situation is quite different. Hopleus and Dymas are in a party bent on a nocturnal massacre, an atrocity explicitly inspired, I need hardly add, by the gods, but they are not mentioned as belonging to that party until the massacre is over (58). It is only then that they conceive their *pius* exploit, the recovery and burial of the bodies of their dead chiefs which are still lying on the battlefield. So their *pius* mission, an idea represented as entirely their own, as we might expect, is separated from the horrible violence of the divinely inspired massacre – *pietas* having for him subsumed pacific behaviour. For Hopleus and Dymas the sole motives are grief and duty (59); they have no thoughts whatever of personal glory in contrast with Virgil's pair: they are completely *pii* and humane. They fail: a Theban cavalry squadron spots them as dawn approaches and they die – no need for a glittering helmet, the cussedness of the universe is enough. Their downfall results simply from their *pietas* in delaying to rescue the bodies of their chiefs and the hostility of their environment, the dawn, and Statius' comment, a fine summary of his attitude, is:

> invida fata piis et fors ingentibus ausis
> rara comes.
>
> 10.384–5.

In Virgil's Nisus and Euryalus episode Fortuna and the gods are neutral (60). Hopleus and Dymas were in the massacre party, Statius tells us, by the decree of Fate (61) and they die because of their *pietas* rather than for a lapse from *pietas* as Nisus and Euryalus do: *invida fata piis:* nowhere is it better illustrated how, in contrast to the guarded optimism of the *Aeneid,* Statius' *Thebaid* is an epic of unmitigated despair.

University of Reading J.F. Burgess

NOTES

1. *Aen.* 3.480, 5.26, 6.403.
2. *Aen.* 6.176, 6.232.
3. *Aen.* 1.220, 1.305.

4. *Aen.* 5.286, 5.418, 9.255.
5. *Aen.* 12.175, 12.311.
6. *Aen.* 10.820–4.
7. Otis, Virgil, a Study in Civilised Poetry, p.357; Conway, The Virgilian Age, pp. 135–6.
8. *Aen.* 10.510–605.
9. *Aen.* 10.591.
10. *Aen.* 12.919–52.
11. *Aen.* 12.947.
12. *Aen.* 12.945, 12.946–7, 12.951.
13. For the use of *virtus* in this context cf. *Aen.* 2.367 and 2.390.
14. *Aen.* 9.741, 10.872, 11.27.
15. *Aen.* 12.677–8.
16. *Aen.* 12.17, 12.70, 12.80, 12.937.
17. *Aen.* 12.193–4.
18. *Aen.* 11.444.
19. *Aen.* 11.336, 11.444, 11.708, 9.278.
20. *Aen.* 5.394.
21. *Aen.* 2.326, 6.65, 4.49.
22. *Aen.* 4.272, 6.757.
23. *Aen.* 1.253.
24. *Th.* 1.197–311, 2.1–133, 3.218–323, 7.1–226.
25. *Th.* 7.763–5, 9.665–7.
26. *Th.* 9.882, 9.887.
27. *Th.* 10.548.
28. *Th.* 6.144.
29. *Th.* 5.592, 6.161.
30. *Th.* 3.458, 6.945.
31. *Th.* 3.54. The ambush itself is described as a *nefas* at 3.214.
32. *Th.* 1.46–311.
33. *Th.* 8.65–77.
34. *Th.* 1.557–666, 4.746 – 5.637, 5.48.498.
35. Such as the death of a warrior described as a *belli scelus* at 10.548.
36. *Aen.* 4.496, 12.31.

37. For example Venus at *Th.* 5.274–7.
38. *Th.* 12.184–6.
39. Statius appears to regard monarchs as a reflection of gods on earth and their behaviour as a translation into earthly terms of the malevolence of the universe.
40. *Th.* 12.422–3.
41. *Th.* 5.731, 6.378, 9.659.
42. *Th.* 6.378–83, 9.653–9.
43. *Th.* 1.243, 3.235.
44. *Th.* 3.575–97; cf. 7.137–8.
45. *Th.* 1.448, 1.467, 7.537, 11.110.
46. *Th.* 11.57–135.
47. *Th.* 11.315–402.
48. *Th.* 11.424–46.
49. *Th.* 11.457–96.
50. *Th.* 11.465–6.
51. *Th.* 11.462.
52. *Th.* 11.80–4.
53. *Aen.* 9.186–7.
54. *Aen.* 9.184–223.
55. *Aen.* 9.224–313.
56. *Aen.* 9.242–3.
57. *Aen.* 9.310–3.
58. *Th.* 10.347–50.
59. *Th.* 10.351–63.
60. *Aen.* 9.210–1, 9.282–3.
61. *Th.* 10.347.

DIGNA ATQUE INDIGNA RELATU: OBSERVATIONS ON *AENEID* IX

In this paper on the *Aeneid*,[1] I shall not be speaking about Aeneas, for the very good reason that he is absent throughout the book – the only book of the poem in which he plays no direct part. This absence of the hero may have presented the poet with special problems: it will at any rate be interesting to see how he uses it. In a general way, I shall be concerning myself with Virgil's art of construction – a subject which has been much

discussed. In particular, I want to consider one episode in the book: not the famous story of Nisus and Euryalus (though I shall have something to say about that later on), but the taunting speech of Numanus Remulus which was answered by the successful bowshot of Ascanius. This episode has sometimes been regarded as a rather tiresome irrelevancy: I shall seek to show not only that it illustrates the constructional art of Virgil in a very interesting way but also that it deals with an issue of fundamental importance to the *Aeneid* which it is the particular function of Book IX to develop.

I shall not be speaking about Aeneas, nor for that matter very much about Turnus, though, Aeneas being absent, Turnus holds the stage for a considerable part of the book. The transition from VIII to IX is in fact carefully designed. VIII ends with Aeneas receiving the god-made armour from his goddess-mother: it ends with Aeneas and a goddess in a sacred grove in a valley (597f. *lucus ... religione patrum late sacer;* 609 *in ualle reducta).* IX begins with Turnus and a goddess in a grove in a valley (3f. *luco ... sacrata ualle).* In terms of modern cinema technique, this might be regarded as a piece of effective "cutting".[2] It is of course more than a formal link, since it invites us to reflect upon the different divine protections accorded to the two heroes.[3] The goddess who comes to Turnus is Iris – a mere emissary, and the emissary of Juno. How effective is Juno's support? Virgil will tell us by another device of formal symmetry. Just as the end of VIII and the beginning of IX are linked by goddesses, so the beginning and end of IX are linked by two missions of Iris. 2 *Irim de caelo misit Saturnia Iuno / audacam ad Turnum;* 802 *nec contra uiris audet Saturnia Iuno / sufficere; aeriam caelo nam Iuppiter Irim / demisit.* The passages are linked not only by Iris and her downward missions but also by the theme of *audacia.* This is "ring-composition",[4] as we find it in Greek poetry, for instance in the dramatists; and, as so often in the Greek dramatists, it is not a mere device of symmetry but a mode of emphasis, the form serving the content. Iris is nothing but a messenger, first of Juno, then of Jupiter; and Jupiter's message demonstrates the ineffectiveness of Juno's protection. Valid up to a point to sustain the *audacia* of Turnus, it ends by leaving him in the lurch: *nec ... audet Saturnia Iuno.*[5]

Turnus must be regarded as the leading figure of a book, which, while diversified with episodes, keeps returning to him as a rondo to its main subject. The analogy should not be pressed, nor should the "cult of personality" blind us to aspects of the book which relate to the collective rather than to the individual. For there is another principle at work, which is to maintain a certain balance between Italians and Trojans; and this, as we shall see, is important and explains certain features in the episodes, which are moreover related to one another in various ways. The scheme of the work is something like this, though there are obviously several ways of analysing it, all more or less valid.[6] The first section is dominated by Turnus (1–158 or 175), but broken by the episode of the ships (77–125), which is however the occasion for a display of over-confidence on his part: *at non audaci Turno fiducia cessit* (126). There follows the story of Nisus and Euryalus (176–449 or 502),[7] complete in itself, yet worked into the main structure of the book through the handling of certain motifs. The remainder of the book is to be mainly the Aristeia of Turnus (made possible, and made dangerous, by the absence of Aeneas), but

falls into three sections, of which the first is a preliminary scene (503–89). Turnus' entry into the battle is carefully prepared: from anonymous Rutulians[8] we pass to Mezentius and Messapus and then to Turnus himself (the cult of personality at full blast, it would appear); there is an invocation to the Muse (525–58), echoes of Ennius, and the fighting begins. But the Aristeia of Turnus is interrupted by an episode – the taunts of Numanus and the answer of Ascanius (590–671), which, though less extensive, can perhaps be said to balance the episode of Nisus and Euryalus. Finally (672 or 691–818), we have the main Aristeia – though my very hesitation as to where it begins betrays that there is a partial diversion of interest towards the behaviour of two individual Trojans, Pandarus and Bitias.

It is no part of my intention to speak further of Turnus, about whom so many have written so well; and I shall have comparatively little to say – at least until later – about the story of Nisus and Euryalus, which certainly has not failed to attract attention. I am concerned, first, rather with that Cinderella among episodes – shorter, less famous, less attractive – the episode of Numanus and Ascanius; and, more particularly, with the speech of Numanus (or Remulus, if you prefer), which has perhaps received less attention than it deserves.[9]

The speech consists of two elements: praise of the Italians, abuse of the Trojans. When Virgil describes the cries of Numanus as being *digna atque indigna relatu* (595), he presumably means that the praises were *digna,* the taunts *indigna.* Still, he relates them both and must be supposed to have had his reasons for doing so. The taunts evoke, it is true, a spirited reply in word and deed from Ascanius, before this problem-child[10] of Virgil's, after receiving a compliment from Apollo, is tactfully and honorifically suppressed. No doubt Virgil was pleased to find something active for Ascanius to do – something less harmful than shooting the pet deer in VII – but this may not be a fully adequate explanation of the introduction and handling of the episode. Indeed it has long been recognized to have links with wider themes important to the conception and construction of the *Aeneid.* It may be worth studying these links in some detail.

When Virgil chose a theme for his Roman epic, not least among the advantages which he saw in the story of Aeneas will have been the opportunity which it afforded of establishing relationships between Rome, on the one hand, and Carthage, Greece and Italy, on the other. The opportunity brought problems with it, for instance in connection with Greece. How Virgil handled that subject, particularly through the role of Evander, is not our present concern. That the Italian theme is of the first importance has always been recognized. Virgil was himself an Italian; Augustus, who was an Italian on his father's side, had an Italian policy which the *Aeneid* served, as the *Georgics* had served it already. Indeed, the self-praise of the Italians through their spokesman Numanus, brash though its tone and violent though its language may be, is not dissimilar to the praise which Virgil, in his own poetic person, accords to the hardy Italian stocks. Compare, for instance, *Georgics* II 167ff.: *haec genus acre uirum, Marsos pubemque Sabellam / adsuetumque malo Ligurem Volscosque uerutos / extulit* – before the great Roman heroes are mentioned.

(*Aeneid* IX 607 is only lightly adapted from *Georgics* II 472.) It is the same picture we get, broadly, from the muster-roll of *Aeneid* VII 641ff.[11] and from the last five books in general. A hardy valiant race, if perhaps a little primitive, a little in need of higher civilization. A little? Perhaps that is an under-statement: Brooks Otis[12] speaks of "unsophisticated primitives whose courage is put to a very bad use". I do not want – or need – to argue the point, since it is quite clear that, in Virgil's view, the Italians were capable of making a vital contribution to the new Rome. *sit Romana potens Itala uirtute propago,* says Juno at XII 827. And so it was to be. The final settlement is more than fair to the Italians, since Aeneas and his descendants are to rule a joint city in which Italian dress and customs will prevail. And this is historically correct, since, despite the Trojan legend, Rome was an Italian and not an Asiatic city.

It is not the praise of the Italians which is the really interesting feature in the speech of Numanus, but his taunting of the Asiatic Trojans. For this – the relationship of the new Rome to its Asiatic origins – was, I suggest, a theme requiring the most skilful and tactful handling on the part of the poet; and I suggest that we can see his skill and tact at work particularly in Book IX.[13] In an interesting article in *Greece and Rome* for 1955,[14] Dr. Gossage pointed out two features in the Trojan legend which were potentially embarrassing: that Aeneas was by no means the greatest of Trojan heroes, and that the Trojans were a defeated nation. But these features could, as he showed, be handled without too much difficulty. Far more embarrassing was the fact that the Trojans were Asiatics. In Homer, Greeks and Trojans, though at war, shared a common civilization, common gods and (as it appears) a common language. The post-Homeric tradition, however, as we see it from Herodotus onwards, regarded the Trojan War as the first round in a secular contest between east and west. The Greeks, most of them, and not always with good reason, had despised the oriental barbarians; and the Roman attitude was not dissimilar.[15] Not only this, but there had been real danger during the civil wars that power would pass to the east, the pattern of government follow the semi-oriental monarchies of Egypt and Asia, Rome itself be swamped with oriental cults. Yet Aeneas, the founder of Rome, the ancestor of Agustus, was an Asiatic. Virgil might have evaded this issue by concentrating wholly upon the Homeric aspects of Aeneas and his followers, reaping all the advantages, moral and poetic, which they entailed, but he does not do so. The Trojans – and this is classical Greek usage – are Phrygians; and Phrygian was – or could be – a term of contempt and is so used, naturally by enemies, in VII: in Amata's speech (363 *at non sic Phrygius penetrat Lacedaemona pastor*) and in the complaint of Turnus (579 *stirpem admisceri Phrygiam*). The issue is squarely put in the speech of Numanus.[16]

That he taunts the Trojans, wisely sheltering behind their rampart, with the twofold fall of Troy (598f. *non pudet obsidione iterum ualloque teneri, bis capti Phryges?*) amounts to little compared with the lines which follow his praise of the Italians (614ff.):

uobis picta croco et fulgenti murice uestis,
desidiae cordi, iuuat indulgere choreis,
et tunicae manicas et habent redimicula mitrae.
o uere Phrygiae, neque enim Phryges, ite per alta
Dindyma, ubi adsuetis biforem dat tibia cantum.
tympana uos buxusque uocat Berecyntia Matris
Idaeae, sinite arma uiris et cedite ferro.

The gibes are cheap, but they must have an answer; and an immediate answer is forthcoming, when the young Ascanius shoots his first arrow in war (590), with the suitable words: *bis capti Phryges haec Rutulis responsa remittunt* (635). But an answer is given, I would suggest, up and down the book, when the Trojans are shown, Asiatics though they be, behaving in a manner to refute the charges and the Italians in a manner to incur them. The consistency with which this is done must surely be deliberate.

The long-sleeved tunic and the ribboned headdress (616), ridiculous and effeminate by Roman standards, are features of that oriental costume which was not to prevail. We hear very little in the *Aeneid* of this characteristic Trojan dress. At III 483f. the embroidered robes and Phrygian chlamys are presents from Andromache to the young Ascanius (in a context which I shall mention later). Aeneas, in his role of a second Paris, is pictured by a rival (IV 216) as wearing the mitra.[17] Only Chloreus (XI 768ff.)[18] is described in the full detail of his oriental luxury, and for a specific purpose, that Camilla's eye may be caught by it and that she (an Italian) may, like Euryalus, bring about her own ruin by coveting pretty things.[19] Should we then disregard the taunt as a triviality? Perhaps, but the stress – with the two words of colour in 614 (*croco, murice* – is upon ostentation.[20] Numanus, that is to say, attributes to the Trojans outward display in dress. It is not perhaps accidental, then, that – with two exceptions which prove the rule[21] – there is in this book upon the Trojan side no colour or finery – or for that matter gold (associated with the Phrygian dress at III 483 and XI 774), whereas such descriptions of the Rutulians are common. The Rutulian army is *diues pictai uestis et auri* (26). At 50 we hear of the red crest upon the golden helmet of Turnus (*cristaque tegit galea aurea rubra).* The Rutulian guards are *purpurei cristis iuuenes auroque corusci* (163). At 270 Turnus is *aureus,* and we hear again of his ruddy crest (and again at 732f.). Among the things that Nisus and Euryalus leave behind, when they refrain from killing the comrades of Messapus (357ff.) are armour and bowls of solid silver, and beautiful carpets. But Euryalus did take the swordbelt of Rhamnes embossed with gold and the helmet of Messapus *cristis decoram* (365) – and it was fatal to him. Luxury everywhere, but not on the Trojan side. With two exceptions. The son of Arcens had an embroidered cloak of dark Iberian blue (582), but he was a Sicilian, not a Trojan! And there were Pandarus and Bitias (678, 707), to whom I shall return.

Numanus accuses the Trojans of *desidia* and an addiction to dancing (615). And how have these idle festive pleasure-loving people been behaving? With an admirable energy and discipline. That the Trojan camp was in confusion (13 *turbata arripe castra*)

was a false assumption conveyed to Turnus by Iris. They keep a look-out (34) and man the walls, in accordance with the parting instructions of their supremely competent leader (38ff.). To the Rutulians, because they will not fight, they seem to have *inertia corda* (55), but their inactivity is no *desidia* but rather a self-discipline which can control the emotions of *pudor* and *ira* (44–6). Their watch is well kept (174f.); and when Nisus and Euryalus leave their post, their places are duly taken by a relief. What, then, of the Rutulians? Messapus is put in charge of the sentries and the watchfires, with fourteen officers and a large force of men. The fires are lit and a watch is kept, but there is drinking and gaming (159–67). We are not surprised[22] to learn a little later that: *lumina rara micant; somno uinoque soluti / procubuere* (189f.) – a picture which is repeated and amplified in Nisus' speech at 236–40 (*Rutuli somno uinoque soluti / conticuere ... / interrupti ignes, aterque ad sidera fumus / erigitur*). The Rutulians are asleep like the whole animal world (224f.): contrast the Trojan leaders, awake and standing upright.[23] What Nisus and Euryalus find is what they expect: *passim somno uinoque per herbam / corpora fusa uident, arrectos litore currus, / inter lora rotasque uiros, simul arma iacere, / uina simul* (316–19); we hear of Serranus, who had played long, but not long enough (335ff., cf. 167); of Rhoetus, still awake, but hiding behind a mixing-bowl (345f., cf. 350); and then the crowning touch – Messapus, on whom the responsibility lay: *ibi ignem / deficere extremum* (351f.); his helmet is taken while he sleeps.

The last charge is that of effeminacy.[24] The Trojans come from Ida, and they are therefore like the eunuch devotees who worship the Great Mother with tambourines and double-pipes. Ridiculous, of course. Sufficient answer is given by the shot of Ascanius which evokes the traditional compliment from Apollo: *macte noua uirtute* (641). But here too we may look back as well as forward. Ida and *Berecyntia mater* were first introduced into the book through the episode of the ships. It may well be that the supernatural disappearance of the ships symbolizes the severance of the Trojan connection and the complete committal of Aeneas and his men to Italy.[25] But in the story the Great Mother plays a role of dignity and power.[26] Mother of the gods, she carries weight with Jupiter and wins a favour from him; and we remember she had been sent for by the Senate during the Second Punic War and made respectable with a Roman cult. But note that Ida has associations in this book other than those of an oriental worship. If Ascanius answered the taunt with a lucky shot, it had already been answered by the courage of Nisus and Euryalus. And Nisus came from Ida (176–8). And Ida is *uenatrix* (178), Nisus a huntsman as much as any Italian (605); bred to hunting on Mount Ida, it was through hunting *(uenatu adsiduo)* that he had learnt his way about in Italy (245).[27]

These are the true answers to the cheap gibes of Numanus. But then Virgil goes on, very characteristically, to show us that there are black sheep even in the Trojan camp – and they too come from Ida (672). With Nisus and Euryalus it is pathetic, if not tragic, that their youthful heroism should be destroyed by an excessive lust for slaughter and by a young boy's hankering after a splendid piece of armour. (I shall return to this.) But Pandarus and Bitias offend in every respect. As bad as Messapus, they betray the trust placed in them by their leader (675 *ducis imperio commissa).*

Relying on their arms, they invite the enemy gratuitously within the walls (676 *freti armis, ultro*) – with a *fiducia* worthy of Turnus. So we are not at all surprised to find that they make a display like the Rutulians (678 *cristis capita alta corusci*) or that the corslet of Bitias had scales of gold (707). The brothers are called *superbi* (695), elsewhere in this book used only of Rhamnes, the snoring drunkard (324). At 722ff. Pandarus shuts the gates, callously leaving his own men outside, madly shutting Turnus in; and *ultro* is repeated from 676. But Turnus will waste the opportunity through his own *furor* and insane lust for blood: *sed furor ardentem caedisque insana cupido / egit in aduersos* (760f.).

The speech of Numanus, telling of the real qualities of the Italians and the imaginary defects of the Trojans, focuses attention upon a theme that is developed in the book as a whole, in which the Trojans are shown behaving with no less courage, and with far more discipline, than the Italians – behaving, in fact, like Romans. This is indeed a main function of IX in the development of the poem, to emphasize that Troy has now come to Italy and that the Trojans are becoming Romans. As was suggested above, the disappearance of the ships may symbolize the severance of the Asiatic connection; and it may be observed that the abortive attempt of the Trojan women to fire the ships (V 603ff.) led itself to the foundation of a kind of new Troy.[28] Troy is in fact re-founded not once but three times. The settlement at Buthrotum, ruled over by Helenus and Andromache (III 294ff., 497ff.), is a Troy, a Pergama, complete with its famous rivers and its Scaean Gates, but a poor affair, a mere simulacrum of Trojan greatness;[29] Anchises is anxious to depart from it and Helenus blesses their departure. It is the ghost of Anchises that gives instructions to found a Troy in Sicily (V 722ff.), which is duly constituted by Aeneas under the rule of Acestes: *hoc Ilium et haec loca Troiam / esse iubet* (756f.). But it is a second-grade Troy for the less courageous spirits (*quos / pertaesum magni incepti* 713f.), for Trojans (one might say) unworthy to become Romans. The bravest go with Aeneas to Italy: *exigui numero, sed bello uiuida uirtus* (754). As Anchises said, *lectos iuuenes, fortissima corda, / defer in Italiam. gens dura atque aspera cultu / debellanda tibi Latio est* (729–31). It is the flower of the Trojans that fight in Italy, meeting and defeating the hardy native stock: so much more ridiculous the taunts of Numanus.

It is the flower of the Trojans that found there a new Troy. In IX Virgil has, for his purposes, tolerated a gross improbability. It is only a few days since the Trojans landed, yet the camp has elaborate fortifications; it has *muri, moenia;* it is not only *castra,* but an *urbs* (8, 48, 473, 639, 729, 784). It is in fact a new Troy, and so it is described, not in IX, but four times in X. Most significantly, it is *Troia nascens* to Venus (27) and no less to Juno (74f.), which is the point of contention between them.[30] In this point at least Juno's wishes are to prevail. Her prayer (XII 827f., 833ff.) is answered: *sit Romana potens Itala uirtute propago: / occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia,* and the name is not heard again.[31] Thus, in IX, the camp must become a "city", not merely because it is the last re-foundation of Troy, but for a more important reason, because it is the first foundation of Rome. It is an *urbs* with *ciues* (36, 783), with *populus* and *patres* (192). It is Roman, like the courage and discipline of its defenders.

I have reached the point at which a sensible man might stop. One of my purposes has been to show how, in *Aeneid* IX, in the working out of the design, Virgil has made a controlled artistic use of formal patterning and leit-motiv. This is an art which he may have learnt in part from the Greek tragedians whom he obviously knew so well. Like them, he uses this art to promote the themes to which importance is attached. But it may seem that I have been taking a singularly orthodox, not to say simplistic, view of the purposes of Virgil's Roman epic, particularly when I have been speaking about the making of Rome and the transformation of Trojans into Romans. Did Virgil think that the truth was quite like that – the truth about Rome and the Romans and (by implication) about Augustan Rome and its imperial mission? Adam Parry, in an article on the *Georgics* which appeared in *Arethusa* after his death,[32] says of Virgil's art that it has "its characteristic mode of taking back what it gives". I should like to spend a short time doing something of the same kind myself. And I shall do it by taking a quick look at the episode of Nisus and Euryalus which is such a striking feature of Book IX.

This episode is indeed the book's most memorable feature and should have a bearing on the themes we have been considering. And indeed I said a little earlier that the taunts of Numanus had been answered in advance by the courage of Nisus and Euryalus which rendered his gibes ridiculous. I believe this to be true. True, but too simple; or even too true to be good. True, not only because of what Aletes says at 247–50 *(non tamen omnino Teucros delere paratis, / cum talis animos iuuenum et tam certa tulistis / pectora),* but because of that remarkable apostrophe with which Virgil concludes – or appears to conclude – the episode. This is at 446–9:

> fortunati ambo! si quid mea carmina possunt,
> nulla dies umquam memori uos eximet aeuo,
> dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum
> accolet imperiumque pater Romanus habebit.

This passage worried Mr. F.R. Dale:[33] "Fortunate indeed they are. Virgil's unmerited tribute has worked like a spell." And it has led Mr. A.J. Boyle, in an interesting article which has recently appeared in the first number of *Ramus,*[34] to speak of "the forceful irony of Virgil's extravagant eulogy". It worried Mr. Dale, because the behaviour of the young Trojans was so foolish and undisciplined; it seems ironical to Mr. Boyle, because their behaviour was so cruel and so bloody and rooted in emotions bound to lead to cruelty and bloodshed.[35] (And of course it raises the question of what *imperium* connoted for Virgil.) To examine the episode in detail is beyond the scope of this paper, but it is surely full of characteristic Virgilian ambiguities, and not least an ambiguity of motive in the youthful Trojan heroes. Nisus longs for glory (184ff.) and awakes a similar longing in Euryalus (197f.); and he sees his opportunity in the need for a message to be taken to Aeneas. *aut pugnam* (he had said at 186f.) *aut aliquid iamdudum inuadere magnum / mens agitat mihi.* But was a quiet efficient, if risky, passage through the sleeping Rutulians enough to satisfy this ardent young soldier? No, he longs to kill, and kill he does. But he knows what his mission really is; his conscience is restless, and his words betray it. 320f.: *Euryale, audendum dextra* (and that means killing); *nunc ipsa uocat res*

(which is ambiguous). *hac iter est* (but did it require them to kill?) Again, at 355f.: *poenarum exhaustum satis est* (which means killing in vengeance), *uia facta per hostis* (which did not need the killing). Nisus spoke so, because he knew what he was doing: *sensit enim nimia caede atque cupidine ferri* (354).[36] It is the younger lad, with his perhaps more venial lust for pretty spoils, who brings on the disaster (and the needle of Virgil's sympathy oscillates as usual upon the dial).

Does it not look as though Virgil has shown us a Nisus and Euryalus who are brave as the Italians but, like the Italians, still lacking the ideal Roman discipline: too much *audacia,* too much *furor,* too much lust for blood? Too like Turnus (760f.)?[37] And yet their story is followed by 446–9: *fortunati ambo.* It had been a glorious episode worthy of the traditions of Rome, of Roman *imperium,* immortalized by Virgil in his Roman epic. But we must look on a little farther.

446ff. read like the end, like a final valid comment on the episode. But they are not the end. They are followed by a most remarkable passage (450–58), introduced by two remarkable lines[38] in which the victors weep; and the spoils they have gained turn out to be the recovery of their own dead and of the spoils Euryalus had taken. The keynote is blood: we have the sequence *exsangui, caede, caede, sanguine.* Then the dawn breaks. Surely it is over now. Two lines are repeated from IV 584f.:[39] *et iam prima nouo spargebat lumine terras / Tithoni croceum linquens Aurora cubile.* Beautiful, bland, conventional – with mythology, with reminiscence of Homer and Lucretius. Surely it is over now, the adventure of the night, romance or nightmare as one sees it. We return to normality, and to normal fighting; or so for a moment it seems. But no, the ghastly trophies of the night are carried past the walls. It was real, and its effects upon the survivors are symbolized by the lamentation of Euryalus' mother.[40]

This is all very Virgilian, surely. What do we make of it? In particular, what do we make of *fortunati ambo?* For that is the problem. Not that Virgil has followed up his account of a martial exploit, refused to let it rest, gone on to show its appalling effects upon victors and vanquished alike. The problem, as I see it, is that Virgil has shown us a Nisus and Euryalus brave but bloodthirsty, brave but undisciplined, all too comparable with the *gens dura atque aspera cultu* that the Trojans were sent to Latium to "war down" *(debellare).* Why not? These are early days. But then comes this resounding eulogy, in terms of the future of Roman *imperium.* I think it is a problem.

Mr. Dale found the eulogy unmerited. Mr. Boyle finds it ironical. He finds it an essential part of the meaning of the *Aeneid* to contrast what he calls the ideology of empire with its reality, to bring out the disparity between the achievement and the cost. To me – and I speak with all hesitation – this seems to swing too far away from the old simple notion of Virgil as the propagandist of Augustan Rome. Irony? Of course there is irony in Virgil, but hardly an over-riding ironic purpose informing the whole work; and the lines do not *sound* ironical. But, if irony is the wrong word, to find the right words would involve a task of total interpretation beyond the scope of this paper and far beyond my competence. The remarks which follow are of the most tentative description.

I take it that Rome, for Virgil, was not an empty name or the making of Rome an empty thing or the attempt of Augustus to re-make Rome after the civil wars a mere illusion or a fraud. Virgil had lived through the traumatic experience of those wars, and the trauma was never to be cured: Augustus had brought peace. It is true that Virgil, who had not mingled in the world of action, was possessed of a certain innocence. But the pure in heart not only see God, but often see their fellow-men with a penetrating clarity. I take it, therefore, that Virgil was aware of the difference between ideology and reality and knew the cost of an achievement which was still in the realm of insecure hope; that he can scarcely have believed that Augustus and his associates had found the secret of making the world safe from the turbulent emotions of humanity; that Roman *imperium* can hardly have been for him a simple and uncomplicated ideal. Yet his grand theme was the making of Rome and the role – and glory – of its *imperium* (I 286ff.). I take it that, in developing this theme, he was not constrained to follow a brief, but that, despite all misgiving, despite his knowledge that the actuality was deeply flawed, he could without insincerity set out an ideal he knew had not been realised and might never be realised. Without insincerity, without irony, but not without conflict, not without tensions. There is, one might say, a rational structure, an ideal text (an ideology, if you like), but running continuously with it in the poetry a commentary – a critical sensitive emotional commentary. The tensions are part of the greatness of Virgil. Adam Parry[41] says of the *Aeneid* that "its strange amalgam of triumph and sadness, of confidence and nostalgia, of the martial tones of Roman and Augustan achievement, and of the poignant notes of personal loss and renunciation, has hardly been fathomed by ancient or modern criticism". Though how much more criticism can do than state and accept and expound this fascinating amalgam may be doubtful.

Categorize it we cannot, for it is *sui generis*. But we can speak – and are probably right to speak – of Virgil's sense of tragedy (and no one has spoken better of the tragic spirit of the *Aeneid* than Professor Maguinness in his Presidential Address to this Society).[42] Tragedy too deals essentially with tensions and contradictions, and often with tensions and contradictions inherent in a social system, a code or an ideal. I would suggest that Virgil learnt much of his tragic thought, as well as his constructional art, from the Greek tragedians. I said that I would not speak about Aeneas, and I will keep my promise, except to say that Virgil chose to end the *Aeneid* with his hero betrayed by human weakness into an act of that savagery it was his mission to terminate. So are ideals betrayed by what Mr. D.A. Little calls "the malevolent vagaries of the human mind".[43] So in their small way – and with the excuse of youth – were Nisus and Euryalus betrayed by emotions closely bound up with the courage and energy that made them heroes. *Imperium* of its very nature is always at such risk.

FOOTNOTES

1. This is a version, slightly revised, of a lecture given to the Society on 20 May 1972. Many of the ideas contained in it were, however, first presented to an audience – a Virgil Discussion Class in the University of Manchester – as long ago as January 1934. Of all that has been written about Virgil since then I cannot claim to have

read more than a portion, but, since I have not noticed that Aeneid IX has been tackled from quite the same point of view as mine, I make no apology for reviving notions that have been suppressed for four or five times as long as Horace recommends.

2. "The poet's eye is like the edited shots of a cine-camera." So R.D. Williams, speaking of the method of presentation in the Catalogue (*CQ* n.s. 11 (1961) 147). The comparison has been developed independently by Fred Mench, "Film sense in *The Aeneid*", *Arion* 8 (1969) 380–97, who opens with quotations from Sergei Eisenstein, *The film sense* (which I have not seen). Eisenstein cited Milton as a poet who used essentially cinematic techniques "to give dynamic emphasis to scenes".

3. A. Cartault, *L'art de Virgile dans l'Enéide* 660, draws attention to the correspondence and interprets it correctly.

4. Another link between the beginning and end of the book is provided by the association of Tiber and Turnus, cf. V. Pöschl, *Die Dichtkunst Virgils* 165 n.2. F. Bömer, *RhM* 92 (1944) 333f., gives a few examples from other books. See also R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik* 451f., on the beginnings and endings of books. The Nisus and Euryalus episode is framed by 187 and its ironical echo at 445. See also n.38 below.

5. *Audacia* is also associated with Juno and her agents (or victims) in VII 300, 308, followed by 409, 475; in XII 152, 159 *(auctor ego audendi),* 786, 814. The value of *audacia* is of course relative to context, cf. VIII 110, IX 625, for commendable boldness. (Where do IX 281, 291, fall?)

6. Brooks Otis, *Virgil* 346, analyzes the book on rather different lines. See also Heinze, *op.cit.* 447, cf. 382. I doubt if Pöschl, *op.cit.* 176f., is right to see in the insertion of the Ascanius-episode a change of plan, though he could be right to see Numanus' praise of the Italians as (in part) a preparation for the *aristeia* of Turnus.

7. On the illusory impression of finality at 449, v. *infra.*

8. *audaces Rutuli* (519), but there is a limit to their *audacia,* unlike that of Turnus.

9. There is now an interesting, full and well documented examination of the speech by Horsfall, "Numanus Remulus: ethnography and propaganda in *Aeneid* IX 598f.", *Latomus* 30 (1971) 1108–16. See n.12 below.

10. "La principale ressource qu'un personnage de très jeune combattant offre à un poète, c'est le thème infiniment pathétique de sa mort" (L.–A. Constans, *L'Enéide de Virgile* 322). Euryalus, Pallas, Lausus, can die: not so Ascanius. Virgil was also able to use Ascanius in the early part of the Nisus and Euryalus episode: with what success I leave others to judge.

11. Cf. R.D. Williams, in the article cited in n.2.

12. Otis, *op.cit.* 329, stressing the element of *furor.* The reader is referred to Mr. Horsfall's article (n.9 above) for a full examination of this passage. He rightly

stresses the difference of tone between it and the *Georgics:* "the lack of warmth and charm in the picture in this speech makes it seem a most unattractive world, far from the happy and simple peasantry of *Georgics* II." He therefore denies, rightly again, that it can be regarded as "propaganda for a united Italy of free peasant cultivators", while admitting that "the old world is also in part desirable". He refers to a dissertation by H.J. Schweizer, *Vergil und Italien,* which I have not seen.

13. The way is prepared in VII by the diplomatic exchanges of 205ff. "Vergil sought to eliminate the dichotomy between the *Troianus barbarus* and the *Troianus nobilis atque diuinus* by making Aeneas' ancestor Dardanus a native of Italy, and thus rid the concept of Trojan descent of the *odium* with which it had been connected, especially since Antony's activities in the East." So G.K. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* 222 (a work in which the reader will find much that is interesting and relevant to the themes of this paper). No doubt this was Virgil's intention, but the alleged western origins of Dardanus are a highly artificial link, operating at the rhetorical rather than the poetic level. The argument of Ilioneus at 231–3 may be more significant.

14. "Two implications of the Trojan legend", *GR* 2nd ser.2 (1955) 23–29, 72–81.

15. It is interesting to observe that, at *Aeneid* I 283–90, the Caesar who will be deified is both *pulchra Troianus origine* and *spoliis Orientis onustus.*

16. Cf. Constans, *op.cit.* 320: "Il a abordé ici le problème de front, avec une grande hardiesse."

17. See also n.24 below. The Tyrian purple worn by Aeneas at IV 262 was the gift of Dido.

18. Cf. Constans, *op.cit.* 358.

19. But, in her case, *femineo praedae et spoliorum ardebat amore* (XI 782)!

20. See Horsfall, *op.cit.* 1114 and notes.

21. Since we need hardly trouble about the gilded sword and ivory sheath which Ascanius presents to Euryalus (303–5)?

22. Though Cartault, *op.cit.* 668 n.8, 673 n.4, is astonished and finds in the negligence of Messapus "une disparate".

23. 229 *stant longis adnixi hastis et scuta tenentes,* contr. 164, 190.

24. Repeated by Turnus, in a state of *furor,* at XII 99 *(semiuiri Phrygis),* with the additional reference to an effeminate hair-style. Cf. IV 215ff.: *et nunc ille Paris cum semiuiro comitatu, / Maeonia mentum mitra crinemque madentem / subnexus, rapto potitur.*

25. So that there is a germ of truth in what Turnus says at 128ff.

26. Cf. VI 784ff., where she is brought into close relation with Rome through a simile; and the prayer of Aeneas at X 252ff. Cf. Galinsky, *op.cit.* 176f., 224–6.

27. Improbably enough, but the point was worth making in defiance of probability.

28. For some close parallelisms between V and IX see Otis, *op.cit.* 273f. Note that both attacks upon the ships are introduced by a mission of Iris from Juno (IX 2 repeats V 606).

29. Cf. Otis, *op. cit.* 260f. N.B. *falsi Simoentis* (302), *simulata ... Pergama* (349), *effigiem Xanthi* (497).

30. The third reference (214) is followed by the episode of the nymphs and the prayer to Cybele. The fourth case is at 378.

31. Cf. William S. Anderson, *TAPA* 88 (1957) 30.

32. "The idea of art in Virgil's *Georgics*", *Arethusa* 5 (1972) 35–52.

33. "Character and incident in the *Aeneid*", Presidential Address to the Virgil Society, 1953, p.11.

34. "The meaning of the *Aeneid*: a critical inquiry", Part I, *Ramus* 1 (1972) 63–90, p.79.

35. Similar points have of course been made by other writers, e.g. Cartault, *op.cit.* n.5 (on the motif of imprudence in the book); Otis, *op.cit.* 349.

36. Conington – and others – are right (as against e.g. Mackail) to take *caede ... atque cupidine* as a hendiadys (cf. 760): the capture of spoils has not yet entered into the narrative. Nevertheless, *cupido* may well look forward to the fatal covetousness of Euryalus which immediately follows. When I say that spoils have not yet entered in, I am not forgetting the much discussed problem of 242 *(adfore cum spoliis ingenti caede peracta).* The transposition of 241 after 243 should be resisted. The mission to Aeneas is the primary concern of the Trojan leaders, and Nisus (whatever else is in his mind) must place it first. Nor are those leaders interested, primarily, in the return of Nisus and Euryalus but in that of Aeneas, who must therefore be the subject of *adfore.* Aeneas will not in fact return with spoils after much slaughter, nor could he rationally be expected so to return. But for Nisus is this the ideal picture of the return of a great military leader? In any case, by the language he uses, he shows what is in his own mind: the reference to slaughter and spoils falls between two references to his proper mission. Perhaps he has already betrayed his ambitions by the use of *insidiis* at 237, since this word implies a surprise *attack.*

37. *sed furor ardentem caedisque insana cupido / egit in aduersos.* The sentence is largely made up of words and notions to be found in the Nisus and Euryalus episode. The strong *perfurit* is used of Euryalus at 343. Boyle, *op.cit.* 65f., calls attention to the use of fire imagery to suggest "the ruinous and impassionate hot-headedness of the Trojan youths".

38. Remarkable in the way that 450 is contradicted by 451: *uictores* by *flentes, praeda ... spoliisque potiti* by *Volcentem ... ferebant.* Mackail is wrong to translate *potiti* by "regained" and so anticipate 457f., which not only round off the section but reveal that the spoils they gained were the spoils Euryalus had taken.

39. Where the effect of contrast is not dissimilar.

40. The pathos of this scene is not to be compared with that of 424ff., dealing with a relationship which Virgil doubtless understood from his own experience. It is something of a set-piece, a variation on a conventional theme.

41. In the article cited in n.32, p.36.

42. "The tragic spirit of the *Aeneid*", 1955.

43. "The death of Turnus and the pessimism of the 'Aeneid' ", *AUMLA* 33 (1970) 67–76. Mr. Little holds that Virgil's view is "still optimistic, but it is tempered with apprehension for the progress which rests on so unsure a foundation, and pessimism for the nature of things".

R.P. Winnington-Ingram

TWO SUPERNATURAL INCIDENTS IN THE *AENEID*

I

"nam mihi Cassandrae per somnum vatis imago
ardentis dare visa faces: 'hic quaerite Troiam,
hic domus est' inquit 'vobis.' " [5. 636 – 38]

Iris, passing herself off as a mortal, Beroe, is speaking to the Trojan women, who are now weary and in despair. The purpose of the goddess is to exploit this misery and to induce the women to set fire to the ships of Aeneas, so preventing him from leaving Sicily. The reader of the *Aeneid* will be familiar with the convention that the immortals, despite their divine power, do not always achieve a faultless performance when they assume human guise.[1] In this instance Pyrgo, formerly nurse to the Trojan princes, is able to denounce the false Beroe. She draws attention to signs of divinity in the face and bearing of Iris and clinches the matter by disclosing that she has herself just come from the sick-bed of the genuine Beroe. We should note that in addition to the two pieces of external evidence provided through the mouth of Pyrgo, Virgil offers internal evidence to discredit this impersonation by the goddess.

Iris-Beroe claims to have seen Cassandra in a vision and to have heard her affirm *"hic domus est vobis."* Now Apollo decreed that Cassandra should always declare the truth, but that mortals should never believe her. If the pretended Beroe claims that as a mortal she has heard Cassandra, and if she then proceeds to urge acceptance of what Cassandra has said, there is an evident flaw in her story. Virgil, we may suppose, has left his reader the opportunity of detecting for himself this slip on the part of Iris, who has as much difficulty in assuming the mentality of the mortal she portrays as she has in concealing the burning eyes and other physical indications of her own divinity.

II

his aliud maius Iuturna adiungit et alto
dat signum caelo, quo non praesentius ullum
turbavit mentes Italas monstroque fefellit. [12. 244–46]

Juturna's sign takes the form of an eagle, which seizes a swan, is mobbed by other water birds and is finally forced to release its prey and fly off. Tolumnius, the Rutulian seer, hails this sign. For him it symbolizes the invader yielding to the natives, and modern commentators follow Tolumnius. In her recent edition, for example, Bertha Tilly says:

> For him [*Tolumnius*] ... rightly the eagle represents Aeneas, the swan which it seizes Turnus, the flock of river birds the Latins and Rutulians... This portent sent by Juturna is meant to deceive and although Tolumnius' interpretation of the imagery is right, what it seems to foretell does not become a reality. Turnus is not saved from Aeneas and Aeneas is not driven away.[2]

The purpose of this note is to call into question the concept of a false omen.

The *Aeneid* conforms in many respects to the doctrines of the Stoics, or, more precisely, to those of Roman Stoicism, for the Romans found it possible to accommodate that philosophical system to their state religion with its marked interest in augury. We have no Stoic treatise specifically explaining omens, portents, prediction and other such paranormal phenomena, but it is possible to sketch out Stoic ideas from the information provided in Cicero's *de divinatione* and *de natura deorum*. Briefly, in the Stoic cosmology there is communication between gods and mortals because the universe is their common home and because the human spirit derives from the divine.[3] This communication may take the form of a dream, a vision or an ecstasy, or it may express itself through some material phenomenon.[4] The relationship between this last and the event it presages may be obscure, but a full understanding of the causation is not necessary.[5] The universe proceeds in a rational manner:[6] certain events are preceded by certain signs and prolonged observation has led to a practical art of interpretation.[7] If from time to time the interpretation of a given sign does not correspond to the event in reality, it is the interpreter who is at fault,[8] since the universe is not irrational and omens do indicate the destined course of events.

In the *Aeneid* itself, the present passage aside, it is noteworthy that signs and prophecies are always fulfilled, though not necessarily in the way that might be expected.[9] Perhaps the most doubtful case occurs at the start of the ninth book, when Iris tells Turnus of Aeneas' departure and the consequent vulnerability of the Trojan camp. As the goddess departs, the heavens open for her and Turnus cries

"medium video discedere caelum
palantisque polo stellas. sequor omina tanta." [9. 20–1].

In fact the attack on the Trojan camp does not in the end prove to be successful, but that does not constitute a false revelation or omen. The information given by Iris is perfectly correct and so are the tactics she urges. It is Turnus who chooses to regard the opening of the heavens as an omen of success, a phenomenon which Quintus Cicero lists among precursors of disaster.[10] The reader here is privileged to know that Turnus is wrong, just as he is at the transformation of the ships of Aeneas, when his boasting and particularly his words

"sunt et mea contra
fata mihi" [9. 136–37]

have their own irony. As for the other signs and revelations, of whatever sort they are – the sow and her litter, the eating of the tables, the oracles, the prophecies of Helenus, of the Sibyl and of others, the mystic fire about Iulus, the comet, the warnings of spirits and so on – in one way or another they all represent a coming reality.

In considering our own passage it is also helpful to take into account a familiar but important aspect of Virgil's style. By a sort of literary irony Virgil uses a similarity in language, in imagery or in some other aspect of presentation to establish for his reader a link between certain incidents or passages. Thus the words of Dido to Aeneas

"cui me moribundam deseris, hospes,
hoc solum nomen quoniam de coniuge restat?" [4. 323–24]

recall ironically those of Creusa

"cui parvus Iulus,
cui pater et coniunx quondam tua dicta relinquor?" [2. 677–78]

Similarly the pathetic but horrifying phrase

infixum stridit sub pectore volnus [4. 689]

recalls from the opening of the fourth book the *tacitum volnus* of Dido, for whom the words and ways of Aeneas

haerent infixi pectore [4. 4]

The common simile of a tree links and contrasts the Troy of Laomedon, destined to fall, and the mystical Troy of Aeneas, servant of the divine will, which is to stand.[11] So too in the funeral games, when Nisus slips and falls in spilt blood, but still attempts to help Euryalus, the episode, grotesque enough in itself, foreshadows the death agony over the pierced body of Euryalus that destiny has in keeping for Nisus.[12]

The incident that throws light on Juturna's omen occurs at the start of the *Aeneid*, when Venus interprets for Aeneas the omen of twelve swans, escaped from an eagle, which represent the Trojan fleet restored to safety.[13] If the theory of a false omen is rejected in our passage as being out of keeping with Stoic views on the nature of omens and with the practice followed by Virgil elsewhere in the *Aeneid*, the swan, a bird associated with

Venus, emerges as symbol of the Trojan cause. Whether invoked by a friendly goddess or by an enemy, the omen of the eagle and swan impartially represents the outcome decreed by destiny, the victory of Aeneas and the Trojans, the defeat of ferocity. It is true that Virgil uses the phrase *monstroque fefellit,* but it is necessary to distinguish between *fallax,* which the omen certainly was, and *falsus,* which implies a departure from the concept of destiny, gods and their revelations which Virgil accepted, at least for the purposes of his *Aeneid.*

New University of Ulster, Londonderry, N. Ireland. F.J. Lelièvre

NOTES

1. *Aen.* I, 328; 10. 656 f.
2. *Aeneidos Liber XII* (London, 1969), p.140. Cf. W.A. Camps, *Introduction to Virgil's "Aeneid"* (London, 1969) p.46; W.S. Maguinness, *Virgil:* Aeneid *Book XII* (London, 1960) p.82; C. Bailey, *Religion in Virgil* (Oxford, 1935) p.23; W. Warde Fowler, *The Death of Turnus* (Oxford, 1919) p.73.
3. *de div.* 1. 70. 82–3; *N.D.* 2. 154.
4. *N.D.* 2. 163.
5. *de div.* 1. 127.
6. *N.D.* 2. 81–2; *de fato* 5–6.
7. *de div.* 1. 109, 127.
8. *de div.* 1. 124.
9. *Aen.* 3. 247–57: so too Dido's curse in *Aen.* 4. 607–20.
10. *de div.* 1.97.
11. *Aen.* 2. 624–31; 4. 441–49.
12. *Aen.* 5. 327–36; 9. 441–45.
13. *Aen.* 1. 393–400. So M.J.C. Putnam *The Poetry of the "Aeneid"* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965) p.166.

To Professor R.G. Austin on his 70th birthday.

Aeneidea

a) Two Ghost Scenes

The most memorable scene in Plautus's *Mostellaria,* from which in fact the play takes its name, is the one in which Tranio relates to Theoropides the occasion and substance of a narration given by a (fictitious) murdered guest Diapontius in the accursed house (that

of Theoropides) where he allegedly met his end. I believe it has not been noticed how remarkably- granted the difference in *genre*- this scene prefigures the account given in *Aeneid* I to Aeneas by Venus, disguised as a Tyrian girl, of the murder of Dido's husband Sychaeus by her brother Pygmalion.

In moral terms the situations are clearly parallel: at *Aen.* I. 349 Pygmalion is described as *impius* for murdering his kinsman at the altar; Diapontius the guest, having complained at *Most.* 500f. of his host's violation of *fides,* concludes at 504 *impia est habitatio.* Pygmalion's motivation is given in the same line (*Aen.* I. 349): *auri caecus amore;* Diapontius in *Most.* 503 gives his murderer's motive: *auri causa.* Then the murders were both committed in secret: *clam ferro incautum superat* (*Aen.* I. 350); *hospes me hic necavit isque me / defodit ... clam in hisce aedibus* (*Most.* 501f.) The murders were both long kept concealed and only made known by the appearance of the ghost: *factumque diu celavit ... ipsa sed ...* (*Aen.* I. 351ff.); Tr. *scelus, inquam, factum est iam diu, antiquom et vetus.* / Th. *antiquom?* Tr. *id adeo nos nunc factum invenimus.* (*Most.* 476f.) The victim was not given proper burial: *inhumati* (*Aen.* I. 353); *insepultum* (*Most.* 502). He came in a dream: *in somnis ... venit imago / coniugis* (*Aen.* I. 353f.); *ait venisse illum in somnis ad se mortuom* (*Most.* 490). The ghost revealed the guilty secret of the house: *caecumque domus scelus omne retexit* (*Aen.* I. 355); *scelestae hae sunt aedes* (*Most.* 504). The ghost's final advice in both cases is to clear out: *tum celerare fugam patriaque excedere suadet* (*Aen.* I. 357); *nunc tu hinc emigra* (*Most.* 503).

The cumulative effect of these eight close resemblances in points of detail is to suggest that Virgil was influenced[1] by the classic *Mostellaria* episode when he came to write his own ghost scene in *Aeneid* I.

NOTE

1. For another instance of Virgil's adapting comedy procedure for epic, see Austin's note on *Aen.* I. 321, a passage which happens to be very near to the one under discussion.

b) A Lucretian Echo in *Aeneid* IV

At 31ff. Anna asks Dido most tenderly if she is going to waste the prime of her life in sad solitary widowhood and not know the joy of children and married love:

> o luce magis dilecta sorori (l)
> solane perpetua maerens carpere iuventa
> nec dulcis natos Veneris nec praemia noris?

Austin defends *dulcis natos* against Pease's accusation of 'cliché' and recalls Lucretius III. 895f. That passage of Lucretius, (894ff.), the statement of the common opinion of man about the regrettable sundering of happy domesticity which death brings, deserves full

quotation:

'iam iam non domus accipiet te laeta neque uxor
optima nec dulces occurrent oscula nati
praeripere et tacita pectus dulcedine tangent.
non poteris factis florentibus esse tuisque
praesidium. misero misere' aiunt 'omnia ademit
una dies infesta tibi tot praemia vitae.'

The phrase *Veneris praemia* in Virgil may have its origin in Homer's δῶρ' Ἀφροδίτης (2) as Page, after Conington, assumes, but its whole area of association has been transformed through Virgil's response to Lucretius's *Praemia vitae.*

At 291f. Virgil gives, in Austin's words, a 'tiny revelation of Aeneas's true feelings' (3):

sese interea, quando *optima Dido*
nesciat et tantos rumpi non speret amores,
temptaturum aditus

I suggest that this phrase *optima Dido* may possibly echo *uxor optima* in the same Lucretian context, and thus that Virgil's idea of the loving domesticity of Dido and Aeneas, both in the tender anticipation of Anna and in the mind of Aeneas facing immediate and final separation, is conceived in terms of this famous and beautiful passage of Lucretius.

NOTES

1. This comparison is particularly apt in view of the fact that Virgil sets the conversation *at sunrise* (cf. IV. 6f.).
2. *Il.* III. 54 and 64, not, *pace* Conington, of the joys of wedded love, but of Paris's personal attractiveness (cf. the Latin word *venustas* as used, for example, at Catullus 86.3) in contrast to Menelaus's heroic prowess.
3. For different views on the tone of *optima,* which he successfully repudiates, see Austin's commentary *ad loc.*

University of Liverpool Jonathan Foster

'IT'

ac uelut ingentem formicae farris aceruum
cum populant hiemis memores tectoque reponunt,
it nigrum campis agmen praedamque per herbas
conuectant calle angusto; pars grandia trudunt
obnixae frumenta umeris, pars agmina cogunt
castigantque moras, opere omnis semita feruet.

Aeneid 4:402–7.

In a short paper with an even shorter title I shall examine briefly a familiar simile and add a few comments on metre, lexicography and even entomology.

The Trojans, as in their preparations for leaving Carthage they busily scavenge for leafy boughs and unhewn branches to serve as oars, are compared by Virgil to a column of ants feverishly collecting grain-seeds quite disproportionate to their diminutive size. Correspondingly the untrimmed oars shouldered by the Trojan exiles will be twice their own height. The *grandia frumenta* of lines 405/6 will remind most Virgilians of the *grandia saxa* of *Georgics* 4, 26, where another kind of hymenopterous insect is involved. The commentators, *ut saepius fit,* are niggard of their aid. While the hungry sheep look up and are not fed, A.S. Pease, caparisoned like the White Knight in the super-abundant trappings of Germanic scholarship, suggests that *nigrum* may mean 'ill-omened'. He quotes Artemidorus Daldianus (2nd century A.D.) who associates ants with death because 'they are children of the earth and cold and black'. Ignoring the first proposition, I maintain that the second is false and the third at best only partially true. Ants are not cold, and they come in many colours, black, brown, red, grey and yellow. Even black ants usually have legs of a lighter hue. The poet surprisingly means exactly what he says; the ants are black. The aptness of the simile might have been underlined by mentioning that in warmer climates columns of driver ants may exceed two hundred yards in length. And what of these shoulders with which the ants push? A quick glance at any passing pismire will convince doubters that the head, which has to find room for a fearsome set of toothed mandibles and the necessary musculature, is often twice or three times as wide as the pronotum, to which the shoulders would correspond. Indeed the slender pronotum is frequently recessed into the head area, swallowing up, as it were, what would be the shoulders. If we required a pair of classically-proportioned shoulders, meet for pushing, our short list would inevitably exclude Humpty-Dumpty. Did Virgil's mind fuse the efforts of ants and men? Had *obnixae umeris* been drained of its literal content and reduced to the meaning 'trying very hard'? Was the Mantuan spirited away into the realms of myth and reliving the transformation of ants into Myrmidons? Leaving these speculations unanswered, I merely remark that the dutiful Pliny, recalling this passage, reproduces *obnixae umeris* and attests his borrowing by substituting for the Virgilian molossus *conuectant* the simpler but metrically inadmissible cretic *conuehunt*.

We must return, however, to the anatomy of ants. The aforementioned Pease, drawn irresistibly to whatever speculation achieved the respectability of print, draws the reader's attention to a dissertation, *De Animalibus apud Vergilium* (1895) by Le Breton, who added a fresh dimension to erudite theorising by noting how appropriate was the verb *it* for the short legs of ants. The Harvard professor is not so discourteous as openly to reject this, but with commendable scholarly caution notes that it would leave unexplained why Accius used the hemistich to refer to Indians and Ennius to elephants. On this absurdity the urbane Austin pounces with the asperity of a son of Balliol. Taking a backward glance at the *passer Catullianus* and the famous hendecasyllable

qui nunc it per iter tenebricosum

he comments waspishly 'Fortunately Catullus' sparrow has not yet had its legs measured'. This certainly earns a smile, but isn't Professor Austin forgetting (perhaps choosing to ignore?) the fact that Virgil uses the verb not in isolation, but in combination with a cognate noun *iter* to form a *schema etymologicum?* If by chance you should, like myself, have practised as an amateur entomological mortician, you will not need to be told that, relative to the size of thorax and abdomen, all ants possess nether limbs which, *mutatis mutandis,* for length and slenderness, even the most fastidious principal boy in a pantomime might well be proud to encase in tights. Now suppose that Virgil, who, as we know from the Bugonia, could not distinguish a four-winged bee from a two-winged fly, really did suppose that ants were shortchanged by the Creator when legs were being distributed, would he not have kept the syllable *it* short, if Le Breton's theory were to hold water? To illustrate what may be done in this direction even by a 'beta minus' versifier, I quote hitherto unpublished fragments of Bavius and Maevius. Of these the third is the most remarkable, which is plausibly said to refer to Hercules sneaking into a cool grot to pursue an amorous adventure –

agmen it atratum campis (Bavius, Fr. xxvii)
per campos agmen it atrum (Idem, Fr. xxxi)
Amphitryoniades it inobservatus in antrum (Maevius, Fr. viii)

Let us look briefly at verses 404–7. Many have noticed the spondaic effect. Less is said about the way in which the clash of accent and ictus is obtained. A half-line composed of a monosyllable or even an elided dissyllable followed by three unelided spondaic words is rare in Virgil and indeed in most hexameter poets, though Silius Italicus, 'Virgil's ape', has more than others I have closely examined. The corresponding 3½ feet of line 405 break down into two molossi held apart by *calle,* which is in effect a monosyllable by elision. This combination of rare plus rarer adds up to a metrical pattern one may reasonably term unique. Before bidding farewell to the simile notice the strict parallelism between *pars grandia trudunt* and *pars agmina cogunt,* which seems to anticipate what in Ovid has been called 'liturgical repetition'.

Before undertaking the arduous task of examining *it* in the major dactylic poets I looked at Ennius' *Annales,* and should like to quote the only other lines where *it* occurs –

it eques et magnum sermonibus occupat urbem. (Fr. 439)

aestatem autumnus sequitur, post acer hiemps it. (Fr. 424)

In each the verb must be in the present tense, and each is abnormal.

Lucretius produced one example of short *it* –

nidor enim penetrat qua fucus non it in artus (2,683)

I had hoped for at least one example from Ovid and was not disappointed. In fact I found four –

huc it et hinc illuc (*Met.* 4,342)

rumor it et magnum sermonibus occupat urbem. (Ibid. 6,147)

sanguis it in sucos, in magnos bracchia ramos. (Ibid. 10,143)

amnis it insana nomine Gallus aqua. (*Fasti* 4,364)

Of these four note how the second reflects the Ennian line and the third the Lucretian example. If Ovid has short *it,* there may well, I argued, be an instance in Statius. There was –

it eodem angusta phaselos
aequore. (*Silvae,* 5.1. 245/6)

If both Ovid and Statius, Claudian would be a likely imitator. This inference proved correct –

quocumque it in aequore, fulvis
adnatat umbra fretis. (*Rapt. Pros.* 3,443/4)

The investigation covered, besides the authors quoted, Horace, Tibullus, Catullus, Propertius, Persius, Martial, Juvenal, Lucan, Valerius Flaccus, Silius, Ausonius, Prudentius and several others. In all perhaps 100,000 lines were looked at; the harvest of merely seven examples from so wide a field seems to suggest that brevity is *not* the soul of *it.*

In the course of preparing for this paper I became more and more fascinated with the ramifications of the verb *ire.* I am thinking not just of the utilitarian clichés of Latin poetry, *itur, itum est,* the rarer *ibitur,* the common jingle *itque reditque,* and the asyndetic *it redit,* important though these may be, but to the verb's surprising range of meaning. On this a few brief observations. Even our title-word *it* may refer to movement over land, water or air; common subjects are *nauis, puppis, ratis, phaselos* and *carina.* The movement implied may be swift or slow. If swift, it may be arrow or javelin aimed at a single target *(hasta, abies, cornus, taxus* or *fraxinus)* or it may be a host of missiles *(tempestas telorum).* If slow, what moves may be a teardrop, sweat, smoke or blood. It may be postulated of something invisible but apprehended by another sense *(nidor).* Frequently the subject is a sound *(clamor, clangor, fragor, stridor, gemitus),* or a rumour *(fama, fabula, rumor).* The movement may be in many simultaneous directions, whether

of something visible *(it Stygius color)* or invisible *(it timor* or *it monti decus* = 'the fame of the mountain spreads'). Spatial or temporal motion may be involved; what passes could be a squadron of cavalry or a summer's day. One might ask what considerations other than the demands of metre result in the substitution of *surgit ... clamor* or *tollitur ... clamor* for the more concise *it clamor.* Again, when is *it* reinforced by a directional preposition *(ad, in, per, circum)* or by a local ablative *(it clamor caelo)* and when does it occur in isolation? There is no simple answer to the question why *it* is almost always long, whereas not merely words of similar weight (such as *et, at* and *ut*) are very frequently kept short but also monosyllabic verbs like *dat, fer, fit* and *es.* Such investigations are far from being ends in themselves, but could provide the raw material for more ambitious scholarly projects, or even, like a whetstone, help us to put a finer edge on the criticism of Latin poetry.

University of Victoria. Herbert H. Huxley
(20th June, 1972)

*A shortened version of a paper read to the Classical Association of Canada at the Annual Meeting held in McGill University, Montréal in June 1972.

OBITUARY NOTICES

DAVID MORRICE LOW, M.A., F.R.S.L.

With the death in his eighty-second year of David Low the Society has lost a former Honorary Treasurer, a member of very long standing, and a true friend. A man of peculiarly wide learning and many cultural interests, Low early chose as a special field of study Edward Gibbon's 'Decline and Fall', on which he published much distinguished work. But he also ventured into fiction and wrote some interesting novels which deserve to be better remembered. His classical scholarship was exact and discriminating, and his pupils at King's College, London, have cause to be grateful for the high standards he taught them to respect and pursue.

To his widow there goes our deepest sympathy.

H.MacL.C.

PROFESSOR MARTIN WIGHT, B.A.

A modern historian whose special area was international relations in Europe, Martin Wight had a profound regard for the classical contribution to our Western culture, and saw to it that due attention was paid to this subject in the curriculum at the University of Sussex which he so conspicuously adorned. His very many friends mourn the passing of a great and good man.

Printed in England by Typlan Limited, Typlan House, 10, Den Road, Bromley BR2 ONH.