GEORGIC 4 AND THE AENEID

A lecture to the Virgil Society, February 1978

by

A.M. Crabbe

Many critics may be found to vouch that Virgil's *Georgics* constitute the most perfect poem in the Latin language. Although I count myself of their number, I am not going to apologise for a paper which will treat the Aristaeus episode as a stepping stone to the writing of the *Aeneid*. My concern here is not with the glories, nor even the artistry and intent of the earlier poem *per se*, but with the practical mechanics of its composition and its contribution towards the epic which succeeded it. For without the skills which Virgil developed in treating the story of Aristaeus, that particular solution to the problem of writing Augustan epic which we now know as the *Aeneid* might have eluded the poet's grasp indefinitely.

Those who regard the mannered intricacies of the Hellenistic poets and polished exquisiteness of their neoteric heirs as a species of frigid and donnish verbal quadrille tend to dismiss the Aristaeus episode as an exercise in Alexandrian frivolity that is out of place at the end of Virgil's magnificent didactic poem. Certainly Callimachus could have lavished no greater care on its details, and, as I have argued elsewhere[1], the influence of the *Wedding of Peleus and Thetis* of Catullus, particularly on the Orpheus and Eurydice section is paramount. However we should not lose sight of the fact that in certain other respects the Aristaeus episode constitutes a revolt against much of what Callimachus stood for and might almost have made Catullus turn in his grave.

Virgil has compiled his story from four quite separate mythological traditions, the *bougonia*, Aristaeus and Cyrene, Proteus and the version of the Orpheus and Eurydice saga, less well-known at the time, in which the *katabasis* eventually failed. In the last case, he also incorporated details from traditions concerning Orpheus' death which originally did not include the loss of Eurydice[2]. The resultant whole was to prove so convincing that Virgil's almost immediately became the canonical version and has so remained[3]. Such interweaving of stories is of course a Hellenistic technique particularly beloved of Callimachus and one in which, if Catullus 64 is anything to go by, the neoterics excelled. Where then is the problem? It lies in the stitches used to bind the fabric and in the grandiose nature of the finished tapestry, and it may be summed up in two words: Homeric epic.

Virgil had organized the bare essentials of his story. Aristaeus was to

pursue Eurydice and unwittingly to cause her death. Thus the disastrous *katabasis* would be set in motion and Orpheus' revenge on the bees of Aristaeus ensured. But it was not out of his head that Virgil created the dramatic machinery through which the reader understands and becomes involved in these events. Rather he borrowed it wholesale, like a set of theatrical costumes, from the doings of others. Chiefly these were the characters of the two Homeric poems. Admittedly, quite apart from her influence on the loss of Eurydice, Catullus's lamenting Ariadne also played a part in the making of Aristaeus; Pindar's Cyrene is not wholly forgotten in the scene in the underwater cavern - indeed she is perhaps reborn in Virgil's charming if unladylike Arethusa[4]; the Theseus of Bacchylides (*Epinic*, 17) must be the prototype for the Aristaeus who passes through the waters to visit his mother: one could continue the list of details *ad nauseam*. But above all it is Homer's characters and their actions who create the main lines of Virgil's new personalities. The appeals of Achilles to Thetis (*Il.* 1.348ff. and 18, 33ff.) are the models for Aristaeus' own to Cyrene. Before the reception scene in the cavern is over we are reminded of Menelaus' entertainment of Telemachus[5], so that it comes as no surprise that Cyrene's solution to her son's ills is to suggest a consultation with Proteus. Abruptly the nymph ceases to be Thetis and to all intents and purposes becomes Eidothea, familiar with the wiles of the *halios gerōn* and with the ambrosia ready to hand, even if she puts it to a more elevated use than does her Homeric counterpart. The adaptation of Homer in these two instances is familiar and need concern us no further.

The same cannot be said of the rest of the poem. Little has been written to explain Virgil's creation of the last part of the Aristaeus story, and, small details apart, the Orpheus passage is rarely related to the Homeric *nekyia*. Apparently Virgil invented all this, with, perhaps, some rather dubious help from the lost *katabaseis* of Orpheus and Heracles[6] in the central section. Such an approach misses much of the richness of literary and mythological association to be found in the remainder of the episode.

One very significant departure from Homer's version of the Proteus consultation is that Cyrene remains throughout, and is there at the end to give advice, whereas Eidothea disappears before even her father's seals have appeared on the horizon. Cyrene, as mother of Aristaeus, has a personal interest in the success of the consultation; Eidothea has none. There is, however, one lady in the *Odyssey* who both assists in the obtaining of a prophecy and who has a rather different personal interest in the welfare of the recipient. Her name is Circe. She it is who sees Odysseus off to the underworld with a series of extremely explicit instructions as to how to obtain the benefit of Teiresias's advice. Although she does not accompany him on this quest she is waiting when he returns to her house to bury Elpenor: οὐδ' ἄρα Κίρκην

ἐξ' Αΐδεω ἐλθόντες ἐλήθομεν (*Od.* 12, 16-17)
Instead she sits Odysseus and his companions down to one last meal and delivers herself of a very lengthy prophecy concerning the rigours and dangers of the immediate future.

This general pattern is mirrored in Virgil's story. Cyrene delivers a speech to interpret the prophecy which she has just assisted Aristaeus in obtaining, thereby ranging herself on the side of a Circe rather than of an Eidothea. It so happens that the prophecy which Aristaeus receives as a result concerns a visit to the underworld, which is also reminiscent, albeit inversely, of the Homeric state of affairs, where the prophecy obtained was delivered in the course of a visit to the underworld. Is this mere chance juxtaposition of vaguely similar events or has Virgil, intending an adaptation of the Proteus prophecy from *Odyssey* IV and needing rather more than is offered by the Homeric Eidothea to flesh out the role of Cyrene, deliberately introduced the clearly highly appropriate Circaean elements into the shape of his narrative?

In that case the correspondence would be likely to extend to further details, and it does indeed do so. The gradual introduction of Circe into the character of Cyrene precedes the entire Proteus scene. It is not mere irrelevant accident that the Homeric reception scene upon which Virgil's is modelled and which I have already linked with that in Menelaus' palace at *Od.* 4, 49ff. is a formulaic one recurring almost verbatim in Circe's palace at *Od.* 10, 363ff. Rather Virgil chose to use it as a bridge between the two Homeric episodes he had decided to fuse, and a specific detail makes it clear that Circe's household is as much in his mind as that of Menelaus. Her serving maids are no ordinary mortals, but nymphs of the springs and groves and rivers:

> γίγνονται δ' ἄρα ταί γ' ἔκ τε κρηνέων ἀπό τ' ἀλσέων
> ἔκ θ ἱερῶν ποταμῶν, οἵ τ' εἰς ἅλαδε προρέουσι.

(*Od.* 10, 349-50)

In Virgil's reception scene, Cyrene's handmaids are likewise her sister nymphs and a cursory glance at the list of their names given earlier suffices to show that they too are named for springs, groves and rivers (*Georgic 4*, 336ff.). In addition, although the

> *Nymphasque sorores*
> *centum quae silvas, centum quae flumina servant*

to whom Cyrene prays at line 382-83 certainly owe much to the handmaids of Artemis at Callimachus, *Hymn* 3, 14-17 and 42-45, they also evoke the Homeric description of Circe's serving maids. Clearly then Circe has a part to play in the creation of the character of Cyrene before the consultation with Proteus as well as after

it, and this too reflects the manner in which the Homeric Circe episode encloses the Nekyia.

What then of Cyrene's second speech to Aristaeus? (Georg. 4, 531-47). We have seen that it corresponds in position to Circe's meeting with Odysseus at Od. 12, 16, although the same could scarcely be said for its content. The link in terms of position might even be said to be confirmed by the audible echo of οὐδ' ἄρα Κίρκην in the At non Cyrene of line 530. Clearly the general Homeric outline does away with the problem often raised by critics of the piece as to why Proteus does not give the instructions to Aristaeus himself. Quite apart from the balance achieved by bringing Cyrene and Aristaeus back into the limelight together at the end, which Virgil will have appreciated, that is how it was in Homer, and it is from Homer that Virgil has borrowed his structure wholesale.

But we must return to the question of content. Did Virgil simply invent the passages concerning the instructions for sacrifice and their fulfillment? By no means. Here also he has Homer's Nekyia and Circe in mind; indeed one might say that the Homeric associations involved in the content of this sacrifice are almost the raison d'être for the introduction of Circe in the first place. The passage concerned is not that following the Nekyia this time but that which introduces it. At Od. 10, 516-535, Circe advises Odysseus on the requisite form of sacrifice for a consultation with Teiresias. At Od. 11, 24-47, Odysseus duly performs it. Cyrene and Aristaeus follow the same pattern to rather different ends, namely the ritual propitiation of the goddesses of Eleusis and of the offended dead.

In both accounts the sacrifice is bipartite. Odysseus first digs a trench and offers honey wine and barley meal. He vows sacrifice to Teiresias and the dead on his return home and slaughters two black sheep on the spot, one male, one female. At this point the souls of the dead appear. In the second part of the sacrifice, he offers more animals, mēla, and prays to Hades and Persephone.

In Virgil, Aristaeus must first sacrifice four heifers and four steers to Demeter and Persephone on altars of his own building. Only when the corpses have been left for nine days is he to return and offer the poppies of forgetfulness to Orpheus, together with a black sheep, and, for Eurydice, a calf. The black sheep, always a death offering, reflects the Odyssey passage, as does the choice of recipients for sacrifice, although with some subtle variations. In both cases dead mortals and deities are involved, although Persephone's role varies somewhat in the two accounts. Virgil reverses the order of the sacrifices, treating the goddesses first and the human dead second, but the nature of the sacrifice for each category remains much the same as in Homer, with the minor exception that Virgil mentions the male and female animals in the context of the goddesses, whereas Homer only makes that point explicitly with regard to the souls

of the dead. But generally speaking deities receive the least, the dead the most specific sacrifice.

An understanding of the Homeric background to the sacrifice brings its strangest aspect into sharper focus. This passage, like the Proteus sequence, not only employs the events of Homeric epic; it uses one of its most characteristic structural devices, namely large-scale repetition, here of instructions and their execution. It seems a sufficiently startling technique in a poet of Virgil's background and literary training to go direct to Homeric epic as a source for story patterns at all. It is still more startling to find him taking over, apparently wholesale, a device which we would expect a post-Hellenistic poet to regard as one of Homer's most primitive, and using it not once but twice in the course of what many regard as his only essay in that generic chimera which passes under the mythical name of 'epyllion'. How does he get away with it? The answer, as we might expect with Virgil, is that for both passages he has raised the trick to new levels of sophistication. A careful comparison of the two halves of the Proteus tale (Georg. 4, 387-414, 422-52) would show that they are quite staggeringly unlike given the purpose in hand. The method by which Virgil engineered the doublet of the sacrifice without boring his readers was pointed out to me first by Professor Knauer, when he prodded the reluctant graduate student's imagination with the simple question 'And how long are the two sections?' Virgil has indeed managed a minor miracle of compression.

Both the instructions and their execution begin with an introductory line (537: 548). Thereafter in the execution the ten lines of instructions are reduced by half, the first six being reduced to three, the remaining four to two (538-43: 549-51; 544-7: 552-3), although the spellbound reader is left with the impression that he has fully covered the same ground twice. Virgil takes advantage of the fact that he began each of the trios at the start of the instructions with the word quattuor to compress their action into three. The description of the actual building of the altars occupies the first line, whereas it had started the second group in the instructions. Virgil includes the choosing of the beasts from the first group of three and the actual sacrifice only by implication in the statement that Aristaeus led them to the altars. We are scarcely aware of the omissions, since the poet succeeds in compressing their import into the second and third lines of the action by repeating the key first line:

quattuor eximios praestanti corpore tauros,

omitting the following relative clause and repeating the third line from the instructions unaltered but for the substitution of ducit for delige at the start. The last two lines of action begin by repeating the first line and a half of the second section of instructions with the substitution of induxerat for ostenderit. All details of the offerings are omitted and Virgil condenses what remains of

Cyrene's words into the rest of his second line:

inferias Orphei mittit, lucumque revisit.

ii

So far the investigation has centred on the use and manipulation of Homer within the structure of the Aristaeus Episode. I shall come to their significance for the *Aeneid* shortly, but first I must make some fairly general points about Virgil's finished structure. Customarily critics stress that it is composed of two contrasting stories, one inside the other. Aristaeus' success is laid against Orpheus' failure[7], or Aristaeus the practical man is seen triumphing in the world, where the lyrical and unworldly Orpheus must abandon hope[8]. Love, like poetry, is a weak reed in the brutish world where the bad guy always wins, or whatever variant on the theme one cares to play, depending on where one's sympathies lie. I do not wish to run down the importance of contrast to the poem's structure, but I would plead that similarity is almost as important for our understanding here and that it is particularly crucial to the architecture of the piece. For over and above the framed story is laid a more or less independent scheme which we ignore at the peril of making the opening section seem quite disproportionately long in relation to the dénouement, and, indeed, of misunderstanding Virgil's intentions completely.

Aristaeus has often been described as a cross between a bully and a cry baby who should make no claims on our sympathy. Against this second picture is sometimes set its corollary, the artistic vision of the sympathetic poet[9]. Whatever we may think of Aristaeus' treatment of Eurydice, the second charge, that of the cry baby, can only be made to stick if we are prepared to tar the Homeric Achilles with the same brush. For the loss of the bees is likewise an affront to *timē*, constituting a drastic setback to the young hero's hopes of becoming an agricultural deity and achieving immortality[10]. As we are told at the start (4.315), the whole story shows how, eventually, Aristaeus actually did become a *deus* as the *prōtos heuretēs* of the *bougonia*. That he made his discovery through the efforts of others is irrelevant; he learns to honour the gods in obedience, and the *heuresis* that follows is both his reward and his gift to mankind. In view of the catalogue of inventors in the proem to *Georgic* I, the subject is to be taken seriously with regard to Virgil's overall purpose in the didactic poem.

If we consider Aristaeus and Orpheus from a neutral standpoint, the tale falls naturally into four sections: Aristaeus' appeal to Cyrene, the consultation with Proteus, the Orpheus story and finally the sacrifice and the generation of new bees, which links in subject matter to the opening section, as well as to the

preliminary account of *bougonia* as practised in Egypt, thus constituting a frame. At least in terms of style, however, the second and fourth sections, with their characteristic epic repetition, which I have already discussed, stand out as corresponding and complementary. Sections 1 and 3 also complement each other in what they tell us of Aristaeus' and Orpheus' somewhat similar adventures. This is brought out in a formal threefold repetition of what is in effect the same story with different protagonists.

The sequences begin at 317, 457 and 499 respectively. First comes the double theme of flight in some connection with water and of grievous loss through death. Aristaeus is introduced *fugiens Peneia Tempe*, having lost his bees *morboque fameque*. Orpheus too has lost Eurydice, snatched from him by death in the guise of a snake whilst she fled Aristaeus through the river's waters. The second time she has gone again to her death, fled (500: *fugit diversa*) like smoke on the air and she floats irrevocably on the Styx. Both for Aristaeus and for Orpheus the loss is crippling, involving the death of all that was dearest to them, the centre of their hopes in life.

Lament beside water follows: Aristaeus

> *tristis ad extremi sacrum caput astitit amnis*
> *multa querens.* (*Georg.* 4, 319-20)

The whole landscape of Thrace gives vent to its grief and the river waters run in streams down to the shore where Orpheus himself stands lamenting his dead wife day and night in song, until at last he ventures with his threnody into the very jaws of Taenarus (4.460-70). When Eurydice is finally lost the same motif recurs, perhaps doubled. From line 505 we must assume that the vain lament starts beside the river Styx, barred to Orpheus by Charon, before the singer carries it up to the frozen North and the lonely waters of Strymon.

Finally comes the motif of descent. Aristaeus is bidden by his mother as of lawful right *limina divum tangere* and descends through the world's waters to the cavern where Cyrene holds court with her nymphs. Orpheus goes down to the *alta ostia Ditis* and makes his way through the underworld to the very throne of Hades, only to forget Persephone's express command on his way back and so start the sequence again from scratch. Eventually he too descends the waters of the Hebrus still lamenting in song in his death. It is perhaps not far-fetched to assume that death and water, the themes of the two earlier descents are here united[11].

These formal parallels underline the features that Aristaeus and Orpheus share in common. The losses that they suffer are interlinked and the responsibility divided. Thinking of Aristaeus' *magna commissa* (4.444),it is easy to forget that he is not punished until Orpheus himself has also failed. The error is in each case an expression of *furor*. With Aristaeus, it is a sexual *furor* and the point

is never made explicitly. Orpheus' folly is one of forgetfulness arising from his deep love for his bride, yet Virgil calls it dementia, and Eurydice herself furor (4,489:495). The destruction that ensues for both men is Virgil's final comment in the Georgics on the universal furor of lust on which he had written so eloquently in the third book, a furor that dominates nature and does not leave man unscathed (3.209-83).

Whilst Aristaeus turns to Cyrene for consolation and for advice, the singer must on both occasions seek both comfort and hope in his lyre. What each one searches for is the resurrection of what has been lost. What each eventually finds is a new kind of rebirth and immortality. The new and divine race of bees is engendered from the slaughtered oxen. Eurydice herself is not returned and Orpheus must die, yet both find immortality in the song which is taken up by the banks of the Hebrus from the dead singer's lips, and at least in poetry will never die. Thus the formal similarity used by Virgil in telling of his two heroes is borne out by the comparable nature of their characters and experiences.

iii

It is time to turn to the Aeneid. That Virgil was already contemplating an Augustan epic when he wrote Georgic IV seems clear from the proem to Book 3. What light then does an understanding of the processes of composition of the Aristaeus episode shed on those of the later poem? Several general points can be made.

First, the direct challenge to Hellenistic and neoteric principles which the paradoxical epic elements of the earlier piece constitute and which is most apparent in the passages concerning Proteus and the sacrifice clearly led Virgil some way along the road to the Aeneid. In one sense it led him almost beyond it. For he was scarcely ever again to employ the formulaic device of immediate repetition on a parallel scale. The nearest he comes to it is in Jupiter's instructions to Mercury and Mercury's subsequent conversation with Aeneas in Book 4 (Aen. 4.223-37; 265-76) and in Artemis's orders to the nymph Opis and their fulfillment in Book 11 (Aen. 11.535-94; 836-65). In each case he has sophisticated the process of variation far further than in Georgic IV, almost as if he wished here to underline the difference from this particular Homeric technique rather than draw attention to its similarity. In Book 4 the two parts are separated by a lengthy description of Mercury's journey, in Book 11 by the whole of the aristeia and death of Camilla. Rather what matters for the Aeneid as a whole is that Virgil had already taken over one characteristically epic device and refined it into something acceptable to the sophisticated Roman literary

palate. Thus it has a part in the preparations for the writing of the Aeneid.

However the movement towards Homer was no mere flirtation. It had been vital to the building of the myth of Aristaeus. The famous parallel passages between Georgic IV and the Aeneid on which Buchner based his misguided attempt to revive the 'laudes Galli' myth[12] are but the tip of the iceberg as regards the relationship between the two poems. They are important only because without exception they come from Homer, and in Georgic IV, just as much as in the Aeneid, their Homeric context is crucial. Looked at more generally, it is the overlaying in the fourth Georgic of Thetis and Achilles, Eidothea and Menelaus, Circe and Odysseus, to create Cyrene and Aristaeus which provides as it were a detailed technical sketch for the vast canvas of the Aeneid. How Virgil fused Iliad and Odyssey into the epic of Rome's foundation will be familiar. Professor Knauer has equipped us with a comprehensive Homeric-Vergilian dictionary and demonstrated the complex interweaving of Homeric characters and events in the later epic[13]. Thus Aeneas is Odysseus, Menelaus, Achilles; Turnus is Hector, Paris and suitors. Dido combines Nausicaa, Circe, Calypso and so forth. A similar task awaits completion for Apollonius. Whilst we know already of the combination of Hypsipyle and Medea with the Homeric characters in the creation of Dido, less work has been done on the contribution of Jason's voyage to the Odyssean wanderings of Aeneas in Aeneid III, although the main lines are apparent even on a cursory reading[14]. Virgil's achievement in building a new myth of Aeneas, invested both with Homeric grandeur and with Callimachean subtlety, whilst contradicting Homeric heroic ideals in its main thesis, is a revolutionary idea carried out on a vast scale. Callimachus may have taken the first few steps in this direction in the Hecale and Apollonius have progressed rather further in the Argonautica, but neither poet had conceived of an adaptation as all-inclusive or as penetrating as Virgil's. In our attempt to understand how the grandiose plan was arrived at, it is advantegeous to turn to the Aristaeus Episode, where the poet first experimented with the creation of a substantially new myth from originally independent mythological elements.

A second general principle of composition in Georgic IV was also expanded on a much larger scale in the Aeneid. I suggested earlier that one clue to the structure of the Aristaeus Episode lay in the threefold repetition of a single succession of events with different characters and circumstances, applied once to Aristaeus and the bees and twice to Orpheus and Eurydice. A similar feature makes a significant contribution to the ambivalent attitude towards Rome's glory which Virgil uses in the course of the epic. It is also used as a source of poetic unity on numerous occasions throughout the poem. In the first instance this centres on the notion of sacrifice. The Aeneid ends with the stage cleared for the building of Rome, no more. The city's tribulations, as well as its

glories, have been described in prophecies and on the shield. But at the end of the poem these lie in the future. So far all that has happened concerns the cost of that future. Aeneas has sacrificed the ideals of his heroic ancestry and his personal happiness on the altar of his descendants' destiny. As if this were not enough we have been shown that Rome, which by the compact of Juno and Jupiter will not even bear the Trojan name, is to be founded on the ruins of three earlier cities, Troy, Carthage and the Laurentine citadel.

On each occasion, a woman, witting or unwitting, is the cause of the disaster, and Helen, Dido and Lavinia, different as they are in character, cannot be disassociated. Troy suffers most directly as a result of Helen's escapade. It is the loss of Dido's leadership and ideals which proves fatal both to the queen herself and to the city which she was building. The omens that attend Lavinia are ambivalent, good for the future Rome, disastrous for the present Latin city. Lavinia's associations with Helen are reinforced by the presentation of the war in Latium as a second Trojan war in which the innocent Lavinia must recall her guilty predecessor. Helen and Dido are linked in the breaking of marriage vows, although Menelaus was still alive and Sychaeus dead. Lavinia and Dido are tied by the use of bee similes with regard to both their cities and by the bee portent at the start of Book 7[15]. For all three cities the end is fire. Dido is told the tale of Troy's firing in Book 2 and herself dies on a funeral pyre whose flames seem to Aeneas, looking back from the sea, to engulf Carthage itself. Finally in Book 12, the Trojans adopt the role of the Greeks at Troy in firing the Laurentine city. Virgil seems to argue that Troy must be destroyed three times before it rises phoenix-like and at last indestructible as one element in Rome's foundation[16].

Once again we find Virgil employing a technique that he had first used in the Aristaeus episode. I have given only one example, but it could be paralleled repeatedly, for example, in the treatment of divine interventions at intervals throughout the poem, in the decision to balance the attacks on the ships in Books 5 and 9, or, perhaps still more strikingly, in the double adaptation of the Patroclus episode of both Pallas and Camilla in Books 10-12[17]. But even from a single example that spans the whole poem, the conclusion seems inescapable that the reduplication of story patterns within a single narrative forms an integral part of Virgil's solution to the structural problems involved in the writing of Augustan epic, that he first evolved this technique in the course of composing *Georgic* IV and that he did so with an eye to his future plans for the *Aeneid*.

iv

If the general contribution of this brief composition to the *Aeneid* was

considerable, we should not ignore that more specific one made by its actual subject matter to the narrative of Books 5 and 6. I have attempted to express this in the diagram on page 29 . Just as in Aeneid 1, 3 and 4 Virgil linked Apollonian adaptation of Homer with its actual Homeric sources, and in Book 8 blended Callimachus's Hecale with its model, the Odyssean Eumaeus sequence, to create Evander's poverty-stricken realm, so here he does not shrink from overlaying the Odyssean Circe and Nekyia passages with his earlier adaptation of them in Georgic 4.

It will be convenient to begin with Aeneid 6. Curiously the most obvious parallel, the experiences of Orpheus and Aeneas in Hades, has little to offer of any structural significance beyond its mere existence and position. True, most of the details in the Georgic description of Hades recur in some form in Aeneid 6. The most significant lines, employing near verbal quotation, deal with the rivers of the underworld (Georg. 4, 479-80, Aen. 6, 438-39) and the congregating of the souls at Georg. 4, 471-78 and Aen. 6, 306-12 where closely related similes are involved. It is perhaps worth noting that the rivers of the underworld are never mentioned in the Homeric Nekyia, but only in the course of Circe's instructions to Odysseus at Book 10, 513-14. Virgil had transplanted them from there into his Georgics katabasis in the first place, long before he came to describe them in that of the Aeneid.

Such points excepted, the bulk of Aeneid 6 need concern us no longer for the time being. It is not surprising that we are not more conscious of the Orpheus katabasis during Aeneas' advanture, given the immeasurably greater proportions of the latter and its heavy structural dependence on Odyssey 11.

Far more important is the Sybil's role, which cannot be satisfactorily accounted for from the activities of Circe in Odyssey 10 and 12. Virgil has lavished great care on her portrayal and the end product is an amalgam of the Homeric Circe and the Georgic Cyrene and Proteus, with different aspects coming to the fore at different points. There are two prophecies in Aeneid 6, which together reflect those of Odyssey 11 and 12. But since the Sibyl actually escorts Aeneas to Anchises and remains throughout that prophecy, she goes beyond the brief of Circe, or, one might add, of Eidothea. In this respect, rather, she seems to reflect the Cyrene of the Georgics, who takes her son to Proteus and remains concealed but alert throughout the resultant oracle.

As far as content goes, Anchises' prophecy formally reflects that of Teiresias, and is of no further significance here. It is the Sibyl's own prophecy which is important for our purposes. At this point there is nothing of the Homeric Circe. There is only one true prophet in the whole of Homer and Virgil whose behaviour in any way resembles hers, namely the Proteus of the Georgics. In the best prophetic tradition, both are vates who give their oracles

in a cave, and both are subject to ecstatic inspiration. The Sibyl is twice described. At 6, 77-80, we hear:

At Phoebi nondum patiens immanis in antro
bacchatur vates, magnum si pectore possit
excussisse deum; tanto magis ille fatigat
os rabidum, fera corda domans, fingitque premendo.

and later:

horrendas canit ambages antroque remugit
obscuris vera involvens: ea frena furenti
concutit et stimulos sub pectore vertit Apollo.[18]

The description of Proteus is similar but briefer:

................*vi denique multa*
ardentis oculos intorsit lumine glauco
et graviter frendens sic fatis ora resolvit (*Georg.* 4. 450-2)

The symptoms of *furor* are rather different but undeniable in each. Neither initiates prophecy wholly of their own free will. The Sibyl agrees to prophesy rationally enough, but she is a medium, and must be brutally overpowered by Apollo before she can speak. Proteus is himself a god, but offers his prophecies only to a mortal tenacious enough to overpower his violent struggles. The similarity is underlined by the verbal resemblance of the *quanto...tam...magis* of *Georgic* 4, 411-12 to the *tanto magis* construction of *Aeneid* 6, 79-80.

The Proteus episode is also important for the form of Aeneas' request to the Sibyl to be his guide in Hades. At 116-123 he gives his reasons:

.... '*natique patrisque*
alma, precor, miserere (potes namque omnia nec te
nequiquam lucis Hecate prafecit Avernis),
si potuit manis accersere coniugis Orpheus
Threicia fretus cithara fidibusque canoris,
si fratrem Pollux alterna morte redemit
itque reditque viam totiens quid Thesea, magnum
quid memorem Alciden? et mi genus ab Iove summo'.

That the first heroic example chosen by Aeneas should be Orpheus might in any case suggest that Virgil has the fourth *Georgic* in mind, where he had himself dealt with the topic. When we look a little closer we find that Aeneas' request both in form and content, strikingly resembles that of Aristaeus to Proteus for a prophecy which we, with hindsight, know will contain an account of Orpheus' *katabasis*. When Proteus asks the meaning of Aristaeus' ill-mannered behaviour, he receives the reply:

'<u>scis, Proteu, scis ipse: neque est te fallere quicquam:</u>
<u>sed tu desine velle. deum praecepta secuti</u>
<u>venimus hinc lassis quaesitum oracula rebus</u>'. (<u>Georg</u>. 4.447-9)

Both speeches justify their demands on three counts. I follow here the order of events in the <u>Aeneid</u>:

1a) <u>Aeneid</u>: Aeneas's father is dead and he wishes to see him again.
 b) <u>Georgics</u>: Aristaeus' bees are dead and he wishes to get them back again, or at least account for their loss (<u>lassis</u>...<u>rebus</u>).
2a) <u>Aeneid</u>: The Sibyl has the ability to make the required journey as one of her many talents.
 b) <u>Georgics</u>: Proteus possesses the knowledge that is needed for the <u>oracula</u> required (<u>scis, Proteu, scis ipse</u>).
3a) <u>Aeneid</u>: Aeneas justifies himself as stemming from the gods (<u>at mi genus ab Iove summo</u>).
 b) <u>Georgics</u>: Aristaeus is following their advice (<u>deum praecepta secuti</u>). We know in addition from earlier in the poem that he is indeed Apollo and Cyrene's son and that he too is therefore the recipient of special privileges (358-59: <u>fas illi limina divum / tangere</u>).

The second ground in the <u>Aeneid</u>, that leading up to the mention of Orpheus is perhaps the most significant parallel. Not only does the half line:

.... '(<u>potes namque omnia nec te</u>....)

reflect the general sense of:

'<u>scis Proteu, scis ipse</u>....',

it is also in rhythm and sense very close to Cyrene's earlier description of Proteus:

.... '<u>novit namque omnia vates</u>'(<u>Georg</u>. 4.392)

This link is reinforced by the words that follow the half line in the <u>Aeneid</u>:

.... '<u>nec te</u>
<u>nequiquam lucis Hecate praefecit Avernis</u>'. (<u>Aen</u>. 6.117-8)

Clearly the Sibyl's omnipotence stems from the tutelary position she holds by Hecate's authority. Likewise Cyrene places Proteus's omniscience within the gift of Neptune, and links it closely with his supervision of Neptune's herds:

'<u>quippe ita Neptuno visum est immania cuius</u>
<u>armenta et turpis pascit sub gurgite phocas</u>' (<u>Georg</u>. 4.394-5)

The final link with Proteus is slight and does not come till the return of Aeneas to the living world. Quite suddenly the Sibyl departs from the role of both Circe and Cyrene and disappears abruptly without further comment (<u>Aen</u>. 6. 897-9). One might say that here she is acting as had the Odyssean Eidothea, but the parallel is scarcely valid; Eidothea does not even wait for the prophecy in

Odyssey 4. In any case there is no other connection with that episode in Aeneid 6. Rather we should perhaps think of Proteus's similarly abrupt return to the waves in Georgic 4:

Haec Proteus, et se iactu dedit aequor in altum,.... (Georg.4.528-9)

leaving Cyrene to sort out the mess. The Sibyl will not, of course reappear at the start of the following book as does the Homeric Circe, since Circe herself will make a brief if portentous appearance in Book 7.

I have already suggested that Georgic 4 contains two katabaseis, one into water and one into Hades. At the time I made scant attempt to justify this statement in any detail, since the best evidence comes in fact from the preparations for Aeneas's descent in Book 6. For the bulk of Aristaeus's dealings with Cyrene, which, as I have indicated, owe much to the tenth book of the Odyssey, provide Virgil with the material for this part of Book 7.

In Aeneid 6, as in Homer, the sacrifice, this time to Hecate, immediately precedes the Hades passage. However the details of the offering bear more resemblance to the propitiatory sacrifice in Georgic 4.

quattuor hic primum nigrantis terga iuvencos
constituit (Aen. 6. 243-4).

should be compared with Aristaeus's action:

quattuor eximios praestanti corpore tauros
ducit. (Georg. 4. 550-1)

with the additional note that the Aeneid's constituit picks up the verb used by Cyrene when she instructs Aristaeus to build altars for sacrifice:

'quattuor his aras alta ad delubra dearum
constitue'. (Georg. 4. 541-2).

In the Aeneid there follow the offerings to Night (matri Eumenidum) and her sister Earth, and to Proserpina, as in the Odyssey do those to Hades and Persephone. Whereas in Homer these are unspecified mēla (Od. 10. 532; 11.35), Virgil chooses particular offerings, a black lamb for Night and a cow for Proserpina, just as in Georgic 4 Orpheus had received poppies and a black sheep and Eurydice a calf, the only difference being that here young and adult animals are reversed.

The sacrifice is followed by an earthquake and the path of Hades lies open:

sub pedibus mugire solum et iuga coepta moveri
silvarum ..... (Aen. 6. 256-7)

The Sibyl's cry is important:

.... 'procul, o procul este profani'
conclamat vates. 'totoque absistite luco:
Tuque invade viam......Aenea'. (Aen. 6. 258-61)

In other words, it is fas for Aeneas, who traces his lineage ab Iove summo to enter.

Aristaeus' experience is very similar. Cyrene bids him come to her:

> 'duc, age, duc ad nos: fas illi limina divum
> tangere'. (Georg. 4.358-9).

To make this possible, she creates an unnatural arch in the river's waters, apparently the equivalent and indeed the inspiration of the earthquake that makes the jaws of Hades yawn open for Aeneas.

Finally Aeneas's first steps into the land of the dead must be compared with Aristaeus's entrance into the strange realm. In the Georgics we find:

> iamque domum mirans genetricis et umida regna
> speluncisque lacus clausos lucosque sonantis
> ibat. (Georg. 4. 363-5)

which is reflected in reverse order in the equivalent Aeneid lines:

> ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram
> perque domos Ditis vacuas et inania regna. (Aen. 6.268-9).

Lest it should seem that the Orpheus descent has been forgotten entirely, I should add that there are several lines at the start of that which also relate closely to the beginning of Aeneas's katabasis[19].

v

Having promised to include Book 5 in my analysis of the influence of Georgic 4 on the Aeneid, I come to that last, perhaps on the grounds of the apparent inherent improbability of any such connection. The first points of interest occur long before any possibility of structural ties. At 5, 588-95, in the course of the Anniversary Games for Anchises, a pair of rather remarkable similes compare the manoeuvres of the lusus Troiae first to the windings of the Cretan labyrinth and then to the playful frolics of dolphins in the Carpathian and Libyan seas. The first simile clearly looks forward to the description of the doors of Apollo's Cumaean temple in Book 6 (Aen. 6. 20ff., esp. 27-30). If any weight may be attached to the geographical references, and in the light of what follows I think it may, then the connection of dolphins and the Carpathian Sea would recall the sea-cortège of Neptune's prophet in Georgic 4, whilst the Libyan gulf points forward to the sea in which Palinurus will lose his life as the victim of Neptune at the end of Aeneid 5. Indeed early on in that episode Neptune himself appears with a still more elaborate sea-cortège after his colloquy with Venus. In line 819,

> caeruleo per summa levis volat aequora curru,

traces may be seen of the halios gerōn:

> 'caeruleus Proteus, magnum qui piscibus aequor
> et iuncto bipedum curru metitur equorum' (Georg. 4. 388-9)

The immania cete at the end of line 821 echoes immania cuius of Proteus's armenta at the end of Georgic 4, 394. Finally the terms of the pact by which Palinurus

has just been condemned:

'unum erit amissum quem gurgite quaeres (Aen. 5. 814)

contain the characteristic line end of 'gurgite plus spondee' which both opens and closes Cyrene's introductory description of Proteus at Georgic 4, 387 and 395, and which Virgil had already there taken over from its two double appearances in Catullus's sixtyfourth poem[20].

So much for Proteus and Neptune in Aeneid 5. Palinurus follows. I shall for the moment treat the two parts of this story, here and in Aeneid 6, as one. I do so partly for convenience and partly because, once Virgil had decided on Palinurus as one of his three aetiological representatives of the Homeric Elpenor (the other two being Misenus and Caieta), he must in the first instance have worked the story out as a single entity, despite the fact that the Odyssean prototype would inevitably force him to divide it. The element in the histories of both Palinurus and Misenus which is notable for its absence in the Odyssey is the point that the fall is into water. Perhaps also of relevance here is the fact that Aeneid 6 contains yet a third victim of this fate in Daedalus's son Icarus, although the point is only alluded to. It is at least plausible to link this stress on falling into water with the two descents into water of Georgic 4, namely that of the living Aristaeus into Cyrene's realms and that of the dead Orpheus' head down the stream of the Hebrus.

But it is the story of Orpheus that is most important for Palinurus. For the fates of both its principal characters contribute to Virgil's moulding of his legend[21]. Palinurus is visited at night by Somnus, who shakes the dew of Lethe from a branch over the helmsman's temples with the result that

cunctantique natantia lumina solvit (Aen. 5.856)

and his victim falls headlong into the sea

socios nequiquam saepe vocantem (Aen. 5.860):

both phrases should be connected to the final loss of Eurydice. When Orpheus makes his fatal mistake and breaks his pact with Persephone by looking round, Eurydice plays on the associations of somnus and nox in the following words:

.... 'conditque natantia lumina somnus

iamque vale: feror ingenti circumdata nocte (Georg. 4.496-7).

Whereas Eurydice's somnus is in fact his brother Mors and her nox that of Hades, Palinurus is visited by the true somnus in the course of a real night. Yet that more deadly associations are not lacking in Aeneid 5 is clear from the accompanying mention of Styx and Lethe. Palinurus's death is under compact to Neptune as is Eurydice's life to Orpheus, and the sea-god makes no human errors. By a curious reversal, Palinurus comes to grief because he cannot keep his eyes open, Eurydice because Orpheus cannot refrain from using his.

The phrase describing Palinurus's fall,

socios nequiquam saepe vocantem,

seems to reflect the plight of both characters in Georgic 4. Eurydice stretches out her hands vainly towards her husband, and Orpheus, as she disappears, tries without success to embrace her and speak with her again:

.... neque illum
prensantem nequiquam umbras et multa volentem
dicere praeterea vidit; (Georg. 4.500-2)

for Eurydice is herself carried away afloat upon the Styx (Georg. 4.506).

The actual cause of Palinurus's death is not told until Aeneid 6, 337ff. The helmsman's account there also has close associations with the deaths of both Orpheus and Eurydice. As a further source of piquancy, one should not ignore the fact that the conversation with Aeneas in which this narrative takes place is set in Hades and upon the banks of the Styx, more or less precisely where Orpheus and Eurydice exchange their last words. There is a strong irony when the unburied Palinurus begs Aeneas for a lift in Charon's boat across the Styx to the main regions of Hades:

da dextram misero et tecum me tolle per undas (Aen. 6. 370).

We are forcibly reminded of the invalidas...palmas that Eurydice stretched out to Orpheus and his own inability to cross the Styx a second time while still alive and carry her back a second time in the opposite direction. Each sufferer appeals in vain to the human being most responsible for their well-being and Palinurus's pathos is deepened by the associations with the fate of Eurydice. For him even the underworld has become desirable and yet the Sibyl forbids Aeneas to fulfill such a dira cupido (Aen. 6. 373).

In another sense also, the manner of the dying of Palinurus and Eurydice is alike. Both must face death twice and for both the second time their luck runs out. Palinurus has almost emerged, in his case on to dry land from the sea, when disaster strikes. The phrase

..................'iam tuta tenebam' (Aen. 6.385)

both in its rhythm and in its position at the unforseen crisis relates to the description of Orpheus' loss as he turns:

..............Eurydicenque suam iam luce sub ipsa
immemor, heu, victusque animi respexit. (Georg. 4. 490-1: cf. 485-6)

The word prensantem (Aen. 6.360) used of Palinurus vainly attempting to grasp the rocks on the shore occupies the same position in the line as it does at Georgic 4. 501 when Orpheus tries to grasp Eurydice's shadowy form, and his hopes prove equally illusory. At the start of the scene, Aeneas's question to his helmsman:

.............'quis te, Palinure, deorum
eripuit nobis medioque sub aequore mersit?' (Aen. 6, 341-2)

seems to echo Eurydice's appeal to her erring spouse:

> *illa 'quis et me' inquit 'miseram et te perdidit, Orpheu,*
> *quis tantus furor?* (*Georg*. 4.494-5).

However the precise nature of Palinurus's death appears to be related to that of Orpheus rather than of Eurydice. He is set upon by a *gens crudelis* (*Aen*. 6.359) as he attempts to leave the sea and presumably mutilated in a manner comparable to that in which Orpheus is torn apart by the Thracian women (*Georg*. 4.520-7), and his body left to float beside the shore, whilst his singing head floats on the river Hebrus down towards the sea. Thus in both parts of the Palinurus story Virgil has in essence conflated the deaths of Aristaeus's two victims.

I have drawn attention to several passages chiefly at the end of *Aeneid* 5 and in the earlier parts of *Aeneid* 6, which provide evidence that Virgil was drawing fairly extensively both for his general narrative and for his choice of words on the earlier Aristaeus episode. The question remains, is there any structural pattern to these borrowings, or did Virgil just have *Georgic* 4 generally in mind because he was drawing close to that part of the *Aeneid* which would contain his second treatment of *nekyia*? In fact a broad pattern would seem to emerge which would indicate that Virgil is using self imitation akin to the type of imitation in terms of story pattern with which we are already familiar from his treatment elsewhere of the two Homeric poems.

The main events of *Georgic* 4 are as follows:

1) Descent into water (Aristaeus)
2) Meeting with an assistant who enables a prophecy (Cyrene)
3) Consultation with a prophet (Proteus)
4) Hades *katabasis* within a prophecy including
    a) Meeting and conversation with a lost loved one in Hades (Eurydice)
    b) Account of a death by *sparagmos* (Orpheus)

Looking at *Aeneid* 5 and 6 we get a similar pattern:

1) Descent into water (Palinurus' fall)
2) Meeting with an assistant who will enable a visit to the underworld to consult with a prophet (the Sibyl; Anchises)
3) Consultation with a prophet (the Sibyl)
4) Hades *katabasis* including
    a) Meeting and conversation with a lost friend for whom Aeneas was responsible in Hades (Palinurus)
    b) Account of a death by violent means (Palinurus)
    c) Prophecy (Anchises)

Obviously there are flaws to this scheme. The reduplication of the descent into water theme in Misenus's death, unless one decides to match that up as an

equivalent to Aristaeus' descent into water within Book 6 itself, is one. Likewise the doubling up of prophecies in Aeneid 6 betrays the conflation of two sources, Odyssey 11 as well as Georgic 4. But certainly the fact that the Sibyl's prophecy precedes rather than follows the katabasis would be conveniently explained if we were to assume the influence of the order of events in Georgic 4. Again, the temporal distinction between the Sibyl aiding Aeneas to obtain Anchises' prophecy and delivering her own prophecy is rather blurred because she is a conflation of both Cyrene and Proteus. Categories 1 and 4, the descent into water and the Hades katabasis remain fixed points, but they too have their paradoxical elements, in that each of the Aeneid passages concerned is influenced less by its natural counterpart in the Georgic scheme than by its opposite. That is, Palinurus's story draws freely on the fates of both Orpheus and Eurydice even in its first part, whilst the preparation for the Aeneid's katabasis, partly thanks to its links with Homer, develops details from Aristaeus' early visit to his mother as well as adapting the sacrifice with which Georgic 4 ends.

It cannot be said with total certainty that Virgil deliberately adhered broadly to the order of events in the Aristaeus episode whilst reversing the detailed content of the first and last elements. However, since it is clear that that poem was at the forefront of his mind in composing Aeneid 5 and 6, we may be close to the truth if we assume that subconsciously at the very least it exercised some influence on the narrative structure of this part of the epic.

GEORGIC IV

ARISTAEUS

- Appeal to Muses — 315
- Prayer to Cyrene — 321
- Cyrene's permission — 359-360
- Descent into water — 360-362
- Path through domus et regna — 363-365

PROTEUS

- Cortège Carpathio caeruleus — 386-389
- novit namque omnia vates — 392
- Fight and chaining — (405-414 (438-443
- Aristaeus' speech — 447-489

PROPHECY (ORPHEUS)

- Souls in Hades — 473-477
- Hades rivers — 479-480
- Eumenides vipereis etc — 500-501
- Loss of Eurydice — 485-502
- Somnus — 496
- Embrace — 500-501
- Orpheus sparagmos Head in water — 520-525

CYRENE AND ARISTAEUS

- Proteus disappears — 527-530
- Sacrifice to Orpheus and Eurydice — 537-553

Creusa

AENEID V

- 594-595 — Simile: Delphinum Carpathio.
- 819-826 — Neptune's Cortège, caeruleo cursu

PALINURUS

- 854-856 — Somnus
- 857-860 — Fall into water

AENEID VI

SIBYL

- 75-80 — Prophetic frenzy
- 82-97 — Prophecy

AENEAS

- 117 — Potes namque…nec te
- 123 — et mi genus ab Iove summo
- 170-174 — Misenus in water

SIBYL

- 243-246 — Sacrifice
- 256 — Earthquake
- 258-268 — Permission for Aeneas
- 265-267 — Appeal to Hades Gods

CATABASIS

- 268ff — Enters Hades
- 280-281 — Eumenides
- 306-312 — Souls
- 438-439 — Rivers
- 318-355 — Fall into water
- 356-358 — Near success
- 359-364 — Lynching and body in water
- 700-702 — Embrace
- 893-899 — Sibyl disappears

Footnotes to Georgic IV and the Aeneid

1) Ignoscenda quidem...Catullus 64 and the Fourth Georgic, CQ 27 (1977) 342-351

2) Cf. the discussion of J. Heurgon, Orphée et Eurydice avant Virgile, Mélanges d'Archaeologie et d'Histoire, 49, 1932, 6ff.

3) Cf. Conon, Dieg. 45,2 (FGH I 26, 207). On Virgil's priority, see Heurgon, loc. cit., 28. I have argued the point further in my thesis, The Aristaeus 'Epyllion', Oxford, 1975 (unpublished) 280-1.

4) Georg. 4, 346 and 351-2; cf Pindar, Pyth. 9, 18-25.

5) Od. 4, esp. 43-58. See P. Jahn, Aus Virgils Dischterwerkstätte, Wiss. Beil. z. Jahresber. d. Kölln. Gymnas. zu Berlin; the similarity was noted independently by Prof. G.N. Knauer in a seminar in Oxford in 1969. See now p. 911, paragraph 4, of his essay, Vergil and Homer, in Aufstieg und Niedergang d. Röm. Welt, II 31.2 (1981).

6) Norden, Orpheus und Eurydice, Sitz. Berl. Akad. 1934, 627ff (=Kl. Schr. 507-8) and P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI ad Aen. 6, 309, assumes a good deal more about the lost poems than I would believe justifiable.

7) e.g. B. Otis, Virgil, A Study in Civilized Poetry (1963) 212-214, although he does make some concessions to the similarity in the predicaments of the two heroes.

8) e.g. S.P. Bovie, The Imagery of Ascent-Descent in Virgil's Georgics, AJPh 77 (1956) 337-358, esp. 354ff. Orpheus is a tragic hero achieving a divine success through his song, 'an image of reciprocal love' as a result of his human failings.

9) S.P. Bovie, above, n. 14.

10) Georg. 4, 321-332; cf Il. 1, 352-356.

11) See further CQ 27 (1977) 343; 348.

12) R.-E. s.v. P. Vergilius Maro, coll. 294-295.

13) Die Aeneis und Homer= Hypomnemata 7 (1964) esp. 363ff.

14) Many important points, however, are noted by M. Hügi, Vergils Aeneis und der hellenistische Dichtung (1952) = Noctes Romanae 4, 9-104. For further bibliography see now W. Suerbaum, Vergil-Forschung/Aeneis: E III 5, Aufstieg u. Niedergang, II 31.1, 271-272.

15) See Aen. 12, 587-592; 1.430-437; 7, 64-68.

16) For further ties between Aeneid 1 and 7, see E. Fraenkel, Some Aspects of the Structure of Aeneid 7, JRS 35 (1945) 1-14 and K. Reckford, Latent Tragedy in Aeneid VII 1-285, AJPh 82 (1961) 252-269. I would stress in addition the similarities between Dido and Aeneas at the start. Dido, like Aeneas, is a widowed exile attempting to found a new city for her people. Also, Dido, like Lavinia, is faced with rival 'suitors', Iarbas for her hand in marriage, Aeneas for her favours, not to mention the ghost of Sychaeus for her fidelity; Lavinia with both Aeneas and Turnus. Needless to say, Aeneas gets the better of his rivals on each occasion, but the consequences, from either lady's viewpoint, are not unmitigated bliss. Parallels might likewise be drawn between the reactions of the jilted suitors.

17) I hope to deal with this in more detail in a future article: Aeneid 11 and Virgil's examination of war.

18) Aen. 6, 99-101; cf 102: furor and rabida ora.

19) Georg. 4, 471-479, cf Aen. 6, 306-312; Georg. 4, 478, cf Aen. 6, 132, 295ff. 323, and esp. 438ff; Georg. 4, 482-483, cf Aen. 6, 280-281.

20) See further CQ 27 (1977) 349-351.

21) The major contribution of the Orpheus and Eurydice episode to another myth, that of Creusa's loss at the end of Aeneid 2, has been well discussed by J. Heurgon, Un exemple peu connu de la retractatio virgilienne, REL 9 (1931) 258-268. It should be noted that it is substantially the same details which are involved in both cases. Note particularly the near escape and the conversation, more or less brief, with the ghost after the disaster. The failed embrace and the vain desire for further speech are particularly striking features in this respect. It would be possible to compile a fairly large list of the instances in the Aeneid where Virgil alludes briefly to this scene, particularly with reference to stories involving a near escape. But the two before us are the most substantial elaborations of the Georgics passage.