

51. And for the goddess too, according to Callimachus: *cf. Hymns* 3.15 f., where she asks Zeus for twenty nymphs to look after her boots and hounds when they are not in use.
52. For a full list of these and other relevant examples see K.K. Smith, *The use of the high-soled shoe or buskin in Greek Tragedy of the 5th and 4th centuries B.C.*, HSCPh 16 (1905) 152, note. In our passage the colour of the boots is also significant in a way it is not in *Ecl.* 7: it is as it were the national colour of the Tyrian settlers. But that is irrelevant to my immediate theme.

### 'Virgil Today'

Presidential Address to the Virgil Society,  
February, 1973,

by

Professor R.D. Williams, M.A.

The popularity of Virgil in the 2000 years since his death (1992 years to be precise) has been greater than that of any other Classical poet, and during the last ten years – a period, we are led to believe of decline in Classical studies – there has been a quite remarkable spate of books and articles about him. This is perhaps more remarkable still when we consider that this is a time at which other Latin poets might seem to be more in tune with the anti-Establishment spirit of our days – I think particularly of Catullus and Propertius, both very popular in recent years. But Virgil – to judge from the amount of published material – seems to be even more popular still.

Among the most important full-scale books on Virgil in English during this quite brief period of 10 years have been Brooks Otis, *Virgil: a Study in Civilised Poetry* (1963); M.C.J. Putnam, *The poetry of the Aeneid* (1965); K. Quinn, *Virgil's Aeneid: A critical Description* (1968); W.A. Camps, *An introduction to Virgil's Aeneid* (1969); W.S. Anderson, *The Art of the Aeneid* (1969); G. Karl Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome* (1969); A.G. McKay, *Vergil's Italy* (1970). On the *Eclogues* there is T.G. Rosenmeyer, *The Green Cabinet* (1969), and M.C.J. Putnam, *Virgil's Pastoral Art* (1970); on the *Georgics* L.P. Wilkinson, *The Georgics of Virgil* (1969). Two important collections of essays have been published: *Twentieth Century Views: Virgil*, ed. Steele Commager (1966) and *Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence*, ed. D.R. Dudley (1969). Virgil figures largely in L.P. Wilkinson's *Golden Latin Artistry* (1963) and in G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (1968).

That, I think you will agree, is a very large list of books, and a high proportion of them has appeared since I wrote the survey on Virgil for *Greece and Rome* in 1967, so that a supplement had to be published in 1971. And if one were to add to it the work

of foreign scholars (such as Klingner, Knauer, Perret, Pöschl) and the articles both by the authors of the books I have mentioned and by others (such as Austin, Clausen, Duckworth, Parry, Segal) it becomes abundantly evident that the literary appeal of Virgil in modern times is as great as it ever was.

Nor is it only in books of literary appreciation that Virgil is to the front in our generation; we have had a new Oxford Text by Sir Roger Mynors (1969), Clarendon Press commentaries on single books of the first half of the *Aeneid* by Austin and myself, a new Macmillan *Aeneid* to replace the sterling long-service volumes of Page (vol. i, 1971; vol. ii, 1973); there is Huxley's *Geo.* 1 and 4 (1963); a commentary on the *Eclogues* and one on *Aeneid* 8 are announced in the new Cambridge *Greek and Latin Classics* Series; and the great Harvard undertaking on Servius published its second volume (of five) in 1965. Translations have come thick and fast: Jackson Knight's prose translation in the Penguin Series (1956) is outside by ten year period; Day Lewis' *Eclogues* (1963) completed his *Virgil* (*Georgics*, 1940; *Aeneid*, 1952); Copley (1965) is one I would pick out from the dozens of verse translations of varying merit which have appeared in recent times.

By now I fancy my point is made, and what is more I expect many of you have thought of publications which I haven't included. I have left them out because I didn't want the whole of this lecture to be a recital of names – but I did want to remind you that our author is not neglected. I fancy that he is the only Classical author to have two periodicals devoted entirely to him – *Vergilius*, the journal of the American Vergilian Society, and our own *Proceedings of the Virgil Society*, now appearing in its handsome new format.

Why then should this be so? What is it about Virgil which exercises this great fascination? I'll reply to this question twice – first in a word, and then in the rest of this lecture. The one-word answer is 'many-sidedness', and this I should like to consider now under various headings.

The first one is the many-sidedness of his metre. Consider this passage from the description of Pallas' funeral:

haud segnes alii cratis et molle feretrum  
arbutis texunt virgis et vimine querno  
exstructosque toros obtentu frondis inumbrant.  
hic iuvenem agresti sublimem stramine ponunt:  
qualem virgineo demessum pollice florem  
seu mollis violae seu languentis hyacinthi,  
cui neque fulgor adhuc nec dum sua forma recessit,  
non iam mater alit tellus virisque ministrat.

(*Aen.* 11.64-71)

Virgil is building up a descriptive scene of great pathos, and for his simile he turns to Catullus, recalling the flower simile at the end of poem 11:

nec meum respectet ut ante amorem  
qui illius culpa cecidit velut prati  
ultimi flos, praetereunte postquam  
tactus aratro est.

(Compare also Catullus 62.39f.)

In order to match the mood which his diction and imagery have built up he has used a metrical movement very reminiscent of the descriptive technique of Catullus – three consecutive lines (66-68) have a word of three long syllables after the 2½ caesura (eleven of the first twenty lines of Catullus 64 have this shape, but Virgil uses it much more rarely in the *Aeneid*). The predominance of spondees is reminiscent of Catullus, and so too is the absence of mid-line stops: the line is being used as a sense-unit.

Contrast the description of Turnus hard-pressed in battle:

ergo nec clipeo iuvenis subsistere tantum  
 nec dextra valet, iniectis sic undique telis  
 obruitur. strepit adsiduo cava tempora circum  
 tinnitu galea et saxis solida aera fatiscunt  
 discussaeque iubae capiti, nec sufficit umbo  
 ictibus; ingeminant hastis et Troes et ipse  
 fulmineus Mnestheus. tum toto corpore sudor  
 liquitur et piceum (nec respirare potestas)  
 flumen agit, fessos quatit aeger anhelitus artus.

(9. 806-814).

Here the movement is dactylic, harsh, abrupt with clashing alliteration. None of the lines is self-contained and there are mid-line stops after the first foot (811) after 1½ (808, 814) after 2 (807), after 2½ (812). This is energetic movement, far away from the patterned mosaic of descriptive writing and golden lines.

Finally take part of a speech, the last long speech of Dido before she kills herself: I pick it up at line 600 and take it to line 612.

non potui abreptum divellere corpus et undis  
 spargere? non socios, non ipsum absumere ferro  
 Ascanium patriisque epulandum ponere mensis?  
 verum anceps pugnae fuerat fortuna. – fuisset:  
 quem metui moritura? faces in castra tulissem  
 implessemque foros flammis natumque patremque  
 cum genere exstinxem, memet super ipsa dedissem.  
 Sol, qui terrarum flammis opera omnia lustras,  
 tuque, harum interpretis curarum et conscia Iuno,  
 nocturnisque Hecate triviis ululata per urbes  
 et Dirae ultrices et di morientis Elissae,  
 accipite haec, meritumque malis advertite numen  
 et nostras audite preces.

(4. 600-612).

We begin at the point where Dido's anger and frustrated pride is finding wild and violent expression. The indignation of the rhetorical questions with the threefold repetition of *non* is metrically reinforced with alliteration of *p* in 600 and 602 and the rare pause after the first foot in 601. Alliteration (of *f* this time) becomes more violent in 603 and again

there is a rare metrical pause (after the third trochee) in 604, again reinforcing the rhetorical question. Then follows a remarkable series of rhyming pluperfects in four short clauses of three or four words each: *tulisse*, *implessem*, *extinxem*, *dedissem*. The metrical insistence violently reflects Dido's angry thoughts of what might have been, ought to have been.

Then suddenly the metre changes entirely as she gathers herself for her last appeal to the gods for vengeance. The monosyllable *sol* opens a line of slow spondaic movement, with alliteration of *m*, end-stopped; similarly a monosyllable opens the next line which is wholly spondaic and end-stopped; the movement gathers speed in the next line, again end-stopped, and then slows once more for the last invocation, with an astonishing assonance of *et Dirae* and *et di*. Here indeed we see metre reinforcing mood.

Let me now oppose two passages where the style, especially the sentence-construction, reflects the subject-matter. The first is a sentence from old Neptune as he concedes Venus' request and points out his past services:

cum Troia Achilles  
 exanimata sequens impingeret agmina muris,  
 milia multa daret leto, gementque repleti  
 amnes nec reperire viam atque evolvere posset  
 in mare se Xanthus, Pelidae tunc ego forti  
 congressum Aenean nec dis nec viribus aequis  
 nube cava rapui, cuperem cum vertere ab imo  
 structa meis manibus periurae moenia Troiae.

(5.804-811).

This is a long rambling sentence as Neptune reminisces over battle-scenes long ago: there are four verbs depending on the subordinating conjunction *cum* and the content of the phrases is colourful and slow-moving. The sentence needs to be picked up with *tunc* (808) and it continues in the involved order common in Latin prose – the indirect object *Pelidae* with a descriptive adjective, the direct object *Aenean* with a descriptive phrase, an instrumental ablative attached to the verb and then the verb itself. But still Neptune is not finished, as he loosely attaches a concessive clause, reinforcing the thought of his kindness to Aeneas 'even although I wanted to destroy Troy'.

Now contrast Nisus and Euryalus in a passage of action:

Egressi superant fossas noctisque per umbram  
 castra inimica petunt, multis tamen ante futuri  
 exitio. passim somno vinoque per herbam  
 corpora fusa vident, arrectos litore currus,  
 inter lora rotasque viros, simul arma iacere,  
 vina simul. prior Hyrtacides sic ore locutus:  
 'Euryale, audendum dextra: nunc ipsa vocat res.  
 hac iter est. tu, ne qua manus se attollere nobis  
 a tergo possit, custodi et consule longe;  
 haec ego vasta dabo et lato te limite ducam.'  
 sic memorat vocemque premit, simul ense superbum  
 Rhamnetem adgreditur...

(9.314-325).

We begin with a very simple clause of three words, followed by another short one in parataxis: Livy would have said *fossis superatis...petunt*. The narrative is interrupted with a reflexion on its upshot. Then a series of quick shots of what they see: *corpora fusa, arrectos currus, viros iacere, simul arma, simul vina*. Nisus speaks – three staccato sentences in 10 words. Then instruction to Euryalus; a promise of what Nisus will do: six main verbs in four lines, and the narrative resumes with three more main verbs in a line and a half. A lot of the narrative of the battle-books is like this – very different from the slow memorable lines packed with meaning and penumbræ of meaning which we so often associate with Virgil.

Let me now list a few longer examples of the varied kinds of writing which Virgil uses. The most familiar of his styles is the style of descriptive pathos, liquid, slow-moving, infinitely sad, as for example the death of Palinurus at the end of Book 5, or of Camilla in 11.816f., or of the destruction of Troy in 2.624f., or of the ghost of Dido in 6.450f. But Virgil commands too and very often uses a style which is the opposite of this – crisp, brisk, energetic (like the epic mode of Homer or Ennius) – for example the disguised Trojans in 2.370f., the hunt in 4.129f., the description of Hercules killing Cacus in 8.184f. He commands a style of high and patriotic impressiveness, like the speech of Jupiter in 1.257f. or the pageant of Roman heroes in 6.756f.; he also commands a plain matter-of-fact style as often in Book 3 or in the ship race in Book 5. He commands (and rather enjoys) the highly ornate set-piece, as in the storm of Book 1 or the description of Etna in Book 3, and he is prepared to take it on occasion to baroque extremes as in the boxing-match of Book 5 or the description of Venus prevailing on Vulcan in Book 8. He deploys all the skill of rhetoric, not only in the intensely moving speeches of Dido in Book 4 but also in the far more obvious methods of rhetoric employed by Juno and Venus (for example at the beginning of Book 10) or by Turnus and Drances (11.336f.). This last is a pure firework display, a piece of verbal dexterity which the audience can enjoy intellectually without being emotionally involved at all. Cicero would have enjoyed it.... We should not allow our emotional responses to Virgil's great passages of pathos to make us think that he always wrote like that: an epic writer is precluded by the terms of his genre from presenting an anthology of lyric masterpieces. No, Virgil had all the styles.

I have given my examples of the many-sidedness of Virgil's metre and style from the *Aeneid*: I turn now to illustrate other aspects of his many-sidedness, and I'll begin with the *Eclogues*. Here we surely find the same kind of attempt to mix what seems incompatible which to my mind is the great quality of the *Aeneid*. The elements in the *Eclogues* do not mix so well as those in the *Aeneid*, but it certainly is because of the endeavour to mix that the *Eclogues* gave a wholly new impulse to pastoral poetry. The mixture of course is of the ideal world and the real world – some of the poems (2, 3, 7, 8) are wholly or almost wholly in the ideal world of the shepherds and shepherdesses about which Theocritus had taught Virgil, but most of them, and the most famous ones, are mixed in one way or another between Arcadia and Rome. It is hard to read *Eclogue* 5 on the death of Daphnis without thoughts of Julius Caesar; there are real people in the puzzling sixth *Eclogue*, and the presence of the statesman Gallus in the fairy world makes *Eclogue* 10 a quite astonishing poem. One and nine mix Tityrus and Meliboeus with the

land-confiscations for Antony's veterans, and the fourth *Eclogue* mixes the pastoral setting with the altogether loftier theme of the prophecy of a child who will bring a new Golden Age.

The *Georgics* too is based on a mixture of the real and the idealised. Ostensibly it gives instructions to farmers, and is thus in the tradition of Hesiod and the Alexandrian didactic writers. But unlike these it has other deeper purposes than its ostensible theme, to explore the relationship of the plants and creatures of Nature with the organizing world of man, to try to work out a cosmic and pantheistic view of the processes and beauty of Nature and man's part in these processes. Thus there is a strange tension between the practicality of precepts about soil-testing or vine-planting and the highly ornate poetic presentation. The diction is suitable for the underlying symbolisms that it seeks to express, but less so for the ostensible subject with its detailed technicalities.

It is this mixing of two contrasting aspects of human experience which seems to me to be one of the main reasons for the greatness of the *Aeneid*. In Virgil's epic let us consider first the mixing of the public world and the private world. The public world of the *Aeneid*, empire, national glory, civilisation for the barbarians is the basic foundation of the poem, the reason for its existence; this is the proper stuff of epic, and this is what Virgil set out to portray in the excitement and national fervour of the Augustan régime. But every reader of the *Aeneid* knows that the private world of sorrow, suffering, loneliness is very much to the forefront of Virgil's thought, and indeed it has often been thought (especially by the Victorians) that this is Virgil's great quality, far more than his expression of the imperial theme. This isn't true, but it makes the point that the *Aeneid* is no simplified panegyric of Rome and Augustus, but a sensitive exploration in situation after situation in the narrative of the implications of right through might and of the sufferings involved.

Consider for example the case of Turnus. On one side it can be said (and it has been said by Brooks Otis) that here we have a character of archaic barbarism, motivated by selfish interests and pursuing them by means of violence. The word *violentia* is used only of Turnus in the *Aeneid*, and his behaviour when he kills Pallas is arrogant in the extreme: he wishes Pallas' father were present to view his death, he exults over him when he has mortally wounded him, and he says 'Tell Evander that I am sending him Pallas back as he deserves to have him' – *qualem meruit Pallanta remitto*. I for one cannot forgive him for that, and Virgil makes it plain that I am right to feel like this as he intervenes in his narrative three times in rapid succession. First he reflects on the folly of men who become uplifted by success and lose their sense of balance:

Nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae  
et servare modum rebus sublata secundis!

(10.501-2)

Then immediately afterwards he anticipates his narrative – one day Turnus will be sorry for what he has done, and will pay for it:

Turno tempus erit magno cum optaverit emptum  
intactum Pallanta, et cum spolia ista diemque  
oderit...

(10.503-5).

This of course anticipates the final scene of the poem, when Turnus wounded begs Aeneas for mercy, and would doubtless have been granted mercy had not Aeneas caught sight on Turnus' shoulder of the sword-belt he had stripped from Pallas when he killed him. Those who condemn Aeneas in that last scene should bear in mind that from this point in Book 10 when Turnus so cruelly kills his young opponent we have been waiting for him to pay for it.

Finally Virgil enters the narrative once more, this time to invoke the dead Pallas:

o dolor atque decus magnum rediture parenti,  
haec te prima dies bello dedit, haec eadem aufert,  
cum tamen ingentis Rutulorum linquis acervos!

(10.507-9).

Thus there are three interventions by Virgil in ten lines: nowhere else does he intervene in the narrative on this scale. He wants us to know that Turnus' behaviour is unforgiveable.

These then are some of the things that can be said on the one side: they make us feel that the victory of Aeneas is the victory of justice and civilisation over violent barbarism. But you are all thinking by now of what can be said on the other side, and there is indeed much. From his own standpoint Turnus has a very strong case indeed for resisting the invader. Until the arrival of Aeneas his way of life was progressing as he wished it to – his pre-eminence among the Rutulians had gained him the hand of Lavinia, the king's daughter, and the affection of her mother Amata: from being an important young Italian chieftain he had the prospect of high authority and eminence. All this is called in question by the arrival of an unknown Trojan exile: King Latinus recognised the fulfilment of an oracle about a foreign husband for Lavinia and all Turnus' hopes are blighted at a stroke. Impetuously, bravely, he faces the situation and prepares to fight for his rights, supported by the queen and by many of the local Italians. Why should he not? The answer of course is that he should not because to do so would be to oppose destiny: but Turnus does not accept this for a moment. He has his own destiny, he cries: (9.136f.): *sunt et mea contra fata mihi, ferro sceleratam excindere gentem coniuge praerepta*. In the violent debate against Drances (who wants to stop the war) near the beginning of Book 11 Turnus wins much more of our sympathy than Drances does, and often his simple bravery gives an attractive picture. We remember Blake's remark that in *Paradise Lost* Milton was of the Devil's party without knowing it, and Virgil too is certainly not without sympathy for Turnus: it is interesting to reflect that a number of the traits and actions of Milton's Satan are based on those of Turnus in the *Aeneid*. Sympathy is perhaps especially felt for Turnus when the final moment of reckoning comes and his impetuous self-confidence deserts him:

... incessu tacito progressus et aram  
suppliciter venerans demisso lumine Turnus,  
pubentesque genae et iuvenali in corpore pallor.

(12.219-21).

Or again near the end when the news is brought to him that Latinus' capital is under siege and that the queen has committed suicide:

obstipuit varia confusus imagine rerum  
Turnus et obtutu tacito stetit; aestuat ingens  
uno in corde pudor mixtoque insania luctu  
et furiis agitatus amor et conscia virtus.

(12.665-8).

And at the end as he meets his fate he reaches a true heroic nobility of stature as he says to Aeneas (12.931) *equidem merui nec deprecor, inquit, utere sorte tua.*

How easy it would have been for Virgil to have made Turnus less sympathetic, so that we could more fully have accepted Brooks Otis' view that his removal from the scene is justified and inevitable. How easy too to remove Aeneas' dilemma at the end, when Turnus begs for mercy and Aeneas has to weigh humanity against vengeance and decides for vengeance. This dilemma need not have arisen if Aeneas' spear-cast had not just wounded Turnus, but had killed him: but Virgil wanted us involved in the dilemma. Aeneas has generally in the poem seemed to be a man striving for peace and justice, trying to overcome passion and frenzy in himself and others; but he is not always able to do so – after Pallas' death he goes berserk on the battlefield, and again in Book 12 after being wounded he rages in martial fury absolutely similar to that of Turnus. Are we to think that the military dominion of Rome which will bring civilisation and a new Golden Age to the world is necessarily based on deeds of violence? Or are we to think that Aeneas himself has failed, because of faults within himself, to find the unshakeable humanity and control which an ideal Roman leader should have? Whatever we think, the thing to notice is that Virgil has refused to make it seem easy to solve these cosmic problems, has refused to present a specious over-simplification of the vast issues involved. He has mixed the vision of a Roman paradise on earth with the horrors caused by the imperfections of men, even of the best of them. Putnam has urged that by the killing of Turnus Aeneas has proved false to everything for which he was striving: I personally am much nearer to Brooks Otis, who sees this as the last grim necessity which besets Aeneas, an action which he must take, against his will, for the benefit of mankind and posterity. But my real point is that Virgil has involved us in a dilemma of universal application, and shown us both sides of the question with brilliant drama.

I end with one more example of many-sidedness, of the appreciation of two sides of a problem of universal application.

This is the relationship between fate and free-will. The one extreme here is predestination, the concept of fate as something preventing free-will; the other extreme is to deny the existence of fate. Virgil explores this intellectual tension in the character of Aeneas. Now no one will say that the *Aeneid* denies the existence of fate; but it has been felt by many of Virgil's readers that there is too much fate, that the hero is a puppet, an instrument of destiny, an unreal character acting always as a tool of fate. This is a common but most extraordinary viewpoint which probably results from reading the poem



back to front – because it is known that Aeneas did succeed it is thought that he must succeed. For my part, every time I read the poem I am in deep doubt whether he will succeed. Of course he is a man of destiny, chosen by the gods to carry out their purposes – but at each and every moment of the poem he is free to continue to be a man of destiny, or to give it up, or perhaps to fail through sheer weakness. Consider how often he nearly does give in – at the very beginning of the poem the storm strikes terror into him and he wishes he were dead:

o terque quaterque beati,  
quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis  
contigit oppetere! o Danaum fortissime gentis  
Tydide! meme Iliacis occumbere campis  
non potuisse tuaque animam hanc effundere dextra...

(1.94-98).

At the end of the storm he encourages those of his companions who have survived with him, but his heartening words were feigned:

Talia voce refert curisque ingentibus aeger  
spem vultu simulat, premit altum corde dolorem

(1.208-9).

His divine mother Venus meets him in disguise and he begs for help, lost as he is on an unknown shore (331f.); she replies and then tauntingly asks who he is. He answers in tones of angry complaint – he is *pious Aeneas*, he is following his appointed destiny and yet here he is washed up on the shores of Africa, driven out of Europe and Asia. Venus breaks in on his complaints (*querentem*, 385) and gives him instructions; as she vanishes she reveals her divinity and in his anguish and bewilderment he cries “Why do you so often deceive your son with unreal appearances? You too are cruel”.

Quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis  
ludis imaginibus?

(1.407-8).

There is here no serene confidence, no puppet-like reaction to the guiding strings, but a very human uncertainty, a resentment, a feeling that he is surrounded by hostility and by unsympathetic powers. And yet he goes on, because he has chosen to hear the voice of destiny and is not prepared to opt out. And if you think he could not opt out if he wanted to, again I repeat that you are working from the end to the beginning and arguing that because he remained a man of destiny and achieved his objects, therefore he had no option. Let me quote you a passage in which Virgil quite specifically states his option. After the ships have been set on fire, and after Aeneas has appealed for divine aid and a downpour has quenched the fire, he is not exhilarated at this indication of divine help, but in a mood of despair he ponders two alternative courses of action: should he settle in Sicily and forget the fates, or press on to his destiny in Italy ...

Siculisne resideret arvis  
*oblitus fatorum*, Italsae capesseret oras.

(5.702-3).

Nor does he easily decide; it is touch and go. Nautes urges him to press on, but he cannot decide; it needs the appearance of a vision of his father, sent by Jupiter, to persuade him.

It is therefore inadmissible to say that Virgil presents Aeneas as a man without freewill. But it may be said that at crucial moments when he is on the point of giving up he receives divine aid. Certainly he does, and there is surely nothing surprising if a man who had devoted himself to following the path which God decrees receives help in doing so. This is surely a well-enough known concept of the Christian religion to cause no surprise if we meet it in a pagan author: the man of God is helped in response to prayer, or by a sudden revelation. When Aeneas is staying with Dido, forgetful for the time of his mission (not indeed having abandoned it, but having postponed it, having pushed it to the back of his mind) he is reminded roughly and imperiously by Mercury as messenger of Jupiter that he must continue immediately along the journey which he is committed to follow. If this divine revelation had not occurred, we do not know how long – perhaps for always – Aeneas would have stayed in Carthage; but it did occur, and Aeneas immediately reacted to it and recognised his fault and rectified it (at what a cost all readers of *Aeneid* 4 know well). This is because he was the kind of man who could hear the voice of God when it spoke; had he been a different kind of man he would not have heard it; had he been less devoted to his mission he would not have obeyed it. He was absolutely free to disregard or reject the warning of Mercury. I used the phrase ‘hearing the voice of God’; if you prefer it there are other kinds of phrase which could be used here, such as ‘the voice of conscience’. The one phrase refers to the experience in terms outside the human world, the other in terms within the human character. But is anyone going to say that we lack free-will because our conscience may dictate a certain course of action? Against our purely personal wishes we follow a course of action because we are aware of certain higher compulsions: this is what Aeneas says to Dido – *Italiam non sponte sequor* (4.361); and it is what he says to her ghost when he meets her in the underworld

invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi.  
sed me iussa deum....

(6.460-1).

But *could* he have stayed with Dido? Being the kind of man he was, with the destiny he had accepted, he could not; but he only needed to shift a degree from the kind of man he was, and he would have stayed. How lucky for Rome that he did not shift a degree; and how important for the Romans in Virgil’s time that they too should not shift a degree from the acceptance of their duty. Aeneas’ father Anchises knew it was touch and go: we hear in Book 4 that his ghost kept appearing to Aeneas as he lingered in Carthage (4.351-3); in Book 5, as we have seen, it is a vision of Anchises which persuades Aeneas to continue; and in Book 6, when Aeneas finally reaches the ghost of his father in Elysium Anchises’ first words are *venisti tandem, tuaque expectata parenti vicit iter durum pietas?* (6.687-8): ‘Have you come at last, and has your devotion to duty overcome the hard journey?’ Yes indeed it was *iter durum*, and indeed it was conquered by *pietas*. And the last words of this speech of Anchises are

*quam metui ne quid Libyae tibi regna nocerent* (6.694).