V.S. Lectures, No. 77.

ANTI-ANTIQUARIANISM IN THE AENEID

A lecture delivered to the Society

19th March 1966

by F. H. Sandbach, M.A.

The subject that lies concealed under my somewhat catch-penny title, is that deliberate anachronism as regards the material background which stands out in many places in the *Aeneid*. In writing a story of the heroic age, Virgil was of course less well-informed archaeologically than, say, Mary Renault is today, but he was by no means ignorant. Positively he had the evidence of Homer, then considered a more reliable authority than now; negatively there was the record of inventions, which ascribed many innovations to dates long after the Trojan War. With all this a man of his learning must have been familiar, yet he chose largely to disregard it, and to depict a world materially closer to his own. I shall put in the forefront what might be called primary anachronism, that which contradicts the evidence that was available to Virgil; but it is hard to draw a line between this and a secondary type, which imparts to the heroic age features of contemporary life for which no warrant could be adduced and perhaps no verisimilitude claimed, but which did not explicitly conflict with the historical evidence that he knew.

I begin with ships, for they are introduced in the first lines of the story, *uix e conspectu Siculae telluris in altum/uela dabant laeti et spumas salis aere ruebant* (1.34), 'sent flying with their bronze the salty spray'. There was no bronze on the prow of the Homeric ship. This is the ram of the later ship-of-war, and sure enough when Aeneas after the storm looks for his missing fleet, he hopes to see *Phrygias biremes* (1.182). Biremes occur again in the eighth book, when he chooses two to take him up the Tiber, *geminasque legit de classe biremis* (8.79). Not only the Trojans, but also the Etruscans possess at least one bireme, the ship that is described at 10.207 in the words *centenaque arbore fluctum/uerberat*; for the ship with a *hundred* oars is not the old penteconter, which had approached the maximum feasible length for a wooden boat,[1] but must be a double-banked vessel. But Aeneas could do better than this; he had among his fleet a trireme, named *Chimaera*, one of the four ships that took part in the race in Book V.

> ingentemque Gyas ingenti mole Chimaeram,
> urbis opus, triplici pubes quam Dardana uersu
> impellunt, terno consurgunt ordine remi (5.118).

One might suppose that the other three competitors, who are not so circumstantially described, were *not* triremes. We know from Servius that some in antiquity drew this conclusion. But I think that scholars who take all four to be triremes are right. Not because the contest would otherwise have been unfair; just as in boxing and the pancration there were no classes divided by weight - boys, youths, and men being the only divisions - so the ship-race might have been open to all types. Nor because the four ships are called *pares*, since *Chimaera*'s larger man-power might have been offset by her greater *bulk*; but because each crew is rewarded by a prize of three bullocks - clearly one bullock to each bank of oars (5.247).

These triremes and biremes cannot be anything but a deliberate anachronism. Thucydides is the authority for the tradition that the Corinthians were the first Greeks to build triremes, and that the Corinthian Ameinocles built four of them for the Samians about 700 B.C. Many generations after the Trojan War, he observes, the Massiliots and Carthaginians were clashing with fleets consisting mainly of penteconters, having only a few triremes (1.13.2; 1.14.1). More than this, there was preserved at Rome a ship which traditionally was the one in which Aeneas had come to Italy, and she was a penteconter.[2] There does not seem to be any literary tradition giving a firm date for the introduction of biremes, but the archaeological evidence favours the view that they were a Phoenician invention, quickly improved on by the Greeks, who found room for a third row of oars. And Servius informs us that Varro took biremes to be much more recent than the Trojan War.[3]

In the race itself the water is torn into by prows armed with three teeth: *conuulsum remis rostrisque tridentibus aequor* (5.143). Here again we meet the bronze ram of the later warship, with its three teeth arranged vertically.

Another feature of the ships of the *Aeneid* which is not Homeric is that they are adorned with figure-heads. This is most explicit in the case of the Etruscan ships (10.156 ff.). That which carries Aeneas has yoked Phrygian lions at her bow, with Mt. Ida towering above them; another, the huge *Centaur*, as she is called, has a representation of that monster rearing up and threatening to hurl a rock - *saxumque undis immane minatur/arduus*; a third is the vast *Triton*, and her figure-head is fully described: the god blows a blast on his horn, from his belly downwards he takes the form of a shark, and the water foams and gurgles round his chest. Without doubt this is a carved figure-head, and all three (together with the ship from Mantua that bears a representation of the river Mincius) are to be understood as decorated in the same way, even though Servius suggests that the ship that carries Aeneas had *painted* lions: his reason is the prosaic and pedantic one that there would have been no time to carve this appropriate emblem: some old picture must have been overpainted! The descriptions of Book X make it plausible that the ships of Book V, named *Shark*, *Chimaera*, *Centaur*, and *Scylla*, are all to be thought of as similarly adorned with figure-heads; and possible (I say no more) that the blueness of *Scylla* is that of her figure-head rather than of her hull (5.123).

Figure-heads of the above sort were not, so far as is known, used in the navies of classical Greece, although there are vase-paintings that show the ram given the form of an animal head. But the Romans so decorated their ships; there is a well-known example of a bireme on a relief from Praeneste, up the bow of which there clambers a carved crocodile: this dates from the earlier half of the 1st Cent. B.C.[4]

Lastly, it may be added that whereas Homeric ships moored themselves by large stones (εὐναί), Aeneas' have anchors, *unco ... ancora morsu* (1.169, cf. 6.3).

In an interesting article, entitled *Sails and Oars in the Aeneid* (*TAPA* 1948, 46), S.L. Mohler maintains that Virgil displays considerable technical knowledge about the handling of ships and their performance; that Aeneas' ships in their courses relative to the winds and in their speeds come up to

the standards of the naves longae of the Augustan age; he even claims that the account of how Aeneas left Carthage shows Virgil to have been familiar with the changes in wind-direction usual there in the early morning. This may be taken with a grain of salt, but it is true that there does not seem to be any place in the Aeneid where there is anything obviously primitive about either the ships or their manoeuvres, so that where the language used about the sails is imprecise and equally applicable to that of the Roman war-ships and the much simpler arrangements of the old penteconter, the reader's imagination will supply that with which he is familiar. Occasionally he must think in modern times, as when the ships leave Drepanum tacking this way and that in unison, following the lead of Palinurus, una omnes fecere pedem pariterque sinistros nunc dextros soluere sinus: una ardua torquent cornua detorquentque (5.830). This is the disciplined manoeuvring of a Roman fleet; and in Virgil's time the backbone of the Roman navy was provided by the fast 'Liburnian', which is generally thought to have been two-banked a bireme like the bulk of Aeneas' ships. [5]

Turning now to architecture, we are on the threshold of what I have termed secondary anachronism. The Homeric poems give no very clear picture of the palaces, still less of the temples, of the heroic age. Menelaus' palace is large, brilliant, and high-roofed: that of Alcinous is a fairy-tale affair, where even the dogs at the gate are made of gold and silver; something can be made of the plan of Odysseus' home, but it was that of a minor provincial prince, and need not serve as a paradigm. A later poet was, therefore, not encumbered by precedent, and if he liked to describe buildings that recalled those of his own time, he could not certainly be convicted of anachronism. Yet there were traditions about the development of architecture through the ages, and anyone who had the mind of an antiquarian would have found it plausible to introduce some primitive features into any reconstruction of an early town. This must apply to the original Carthage, whether it belongs in our imagination to its historical date or whether we allow Virgil to carry it back to the times of the Trojan War.

In fact, among the first sights to meet Aeneas' eyes as he looks down upon the new city, is one that brings it right into Virgil's times. The foundations are being laid for a great theatre, and other colonists are quarrying huge monolithic columns to adorn the wall that will stand behind the stage.

hic lata theatris
fundamenta locant alii, immanisque columnas
rupibus excidunt, scaenis decora alta futuris (1.427).

Virgil's contemporaries must have known as well as we do that the great wall behind the stage, the scaenae frons, treated as an elaborate architectural façade, was a recent invention now being developed in the Roman West. Drama itself, for which theatres were built, had its origins, according to Horace, with Thespis' rude productions staged upon a cart, and Thespis was supposed to have been young when Solon was old. The first stone theatre at Rome (Pompey's) was not built until 55 B.C., and the splendid Theatre of Marcellus was probably begun in the 30's.

No doubt early towns had paved streets, but strata uiarum will suggest to the Roman a familiar kind of thoroughfare; and the excavation of a harbour - hic portus alii effodiunt - is only necessary for a town that will be visited by the great merchant-ships of deep draught, such as plied between Egypt and Italy in Virgil's time. The excavation of a harbour at Ostia,

although perhaps planned by Julius Caesar and Augustus, had to wait for the Emperor Claudius for execution.

When Aeneas reaches the temple in the centre of the city, it faces him at the head of a flight of steps, with doorway and doors of bronze

> aerea ... gradibus surgebant limina nixaeque
> aere trabes, foribus cardo stridebut aenis (1.448).

Nixaeque, given by Servius as the reading of multi and accepted by Probus, is more attractive than nexaeque of our mss. The picture is of the long architrave resting upon capitals - Corinthian capitals I imagine - of bronze, not necessarily solid bronze. Such, Pliny tells us (N.H. 23.13), were a feature of Agrippa's Pantheon, completed in 26 B.C. and thus erected while Virgil was beginning his poem. [6]

Virgil does not specifically say where Aeneas found the pictures of the Trojan War which brought him comfort, but they seem to be in luco and sub ingenti templo. A Roman could hardly help applying his own experiences and imagining them as adorning a colonnade enclosing the sanctuary; this was pointed out already by Heyne. By a strange chance paintings (now lost) of Trojan scenes were found at Pompeii on the walls of the colonnade of Apollo's temple there. [7]

Let us enter Dido's palace. The purple stuffs, the gold and silver plate, have their Homeric counterparts, even though in view of what has preceded there is a temptation to imagine them to possess the refinement of Hellenistic workmanship. Yet the gilded coffered ceilings and the lamps that hang from them belong to the Roman nobleman's house. [8] The servants hand round not only bread in baskets, as in Homer (Od.1.147), but also unHomeric table-napkins - Cereremque canistris expediunt, tonsisque ferunt mantelia uittis (1.701): just so Statius describes a Roman banquet in less euphuistic terms - panaria candidasque mappas subuectant (Silv.1.6.31). The waiters and waitresses, too, are matched not only in numbers - 100 of each sex - but also in age, pares aetate. Presumably Vestinus, who in the time of Nero kept seruitia pari aetate, had his Augustan predecessors (Tac. Ann. 15.69).

Here we are firmly in the realm of secondary anachronism. None of these domestic arrangements positively conflicts with what was known of early times; yet they go to reinforce the primary anachronisms.

The palace of Priam in Book II has been the subject of much study and in particular of two papers by Professor Erik Wistrand. [9] He has argued that it inconsistently combines the plan of a classical Greek house divided into men's and women's quarters, with that of a Roman house where atrium, tablinum, and peristyle lie on an axis, so that when the front door is broken down, apparet domus intus et atria longa patescunt. I think that if there is any inconsistency it is due to Virgil's methods of piecemeal composition. The peruius usus tectorum (2.453), the passage-way that is held to suggest that which separated men's and women's quarters, comes in what may be called the roof-sequence, whereas the series of rooms belong to another in which the view point is at ground-level. But I doubt whether Priam's palace has much to offer that is to my purpose: it hints at the great houses of Virgil's time, but the main impression is of a great complex of rooms, such as might have been found in a palace of any date. [10] Nor is there anything very striking about the look-out tower on the roof, which the Trojans topple over upon the besiegers (2.460);

the Romans were doubtless familiar with such erections on their villas; they can be seen on paintings and the younger Pliny describes the one on his house at Ostia (Ep.2.17), but a wooden tower on a flat roof is a construction that would cause no surprise even in a comparatively primitive milieu.

The temple in which Latinus gives audience also lacks striking features; it is tall with a hundred columns, but the round number merely lends it dignity without recalling any particular modern building; that the ancestral statues are made of cedar-wood, not marble or bronze, is an archaising touch; conceivably there is another in the fact that the first weapons among the trophies at the door are battle-axes, which had become obsolete in Italy centuries before Virgil's time; the only item to which an antiquarian could object are the beaks of captured warships - ereptaque rostra carinis (7.186).

The third sphere in which we may look for anachronism is that of war. Now although Homer was, as Heinze says,[11] the authority on the warfare of the heroic age, he was no authority on the weapons and tactics of ancient Italy. If Greeks and Trojans, for all the latters' repute as 'breakers of horses', knew nothing of fighting on horseback, it cannot be called anachronism that Latins and Etruscans should engage in a cavalry battle. But Virgil had no hesitation about letting the Trojans also fight on horseback.

Must we expect modernity on the battle-field as on the sea? The answer is that there is a mixture of old and new that is not without interest. The most striking peculiarity of Homeric weapons and armour is that they are made of bronze, although Homer indicates that iron was known to his heroes, for a great lump of pig-iron serves both as discus and as prize in the funeral games. To account for this, it was later conjectured that the early smiths had possessed some secret by which bronze could be tempered to have the hardness of steel and that iron was adopted when this secret was lost (Plut.Mor.395B). For Virgil, there is a sharp distinction between weapons and defensive armour. Swords, spear-heads, and the heads of missiles, arrows, javelins, etc. are of iron, never of bronze, except for the inhabitants of Bella, whose bronze swords are as unusual and as primitive as their cork helmets (7.743). I was surprised to find how frequently the metal is specified. The use of iron for these purposes accords, as is obvious, with the practice of his own times, and must be seen as a conscious anachronism.[12]

For defensive armour bronze remained in use alongside iron up to and long after Virgil's time. He was therefore able, by giving his heroes bronze armour, to respect history without making them old-fashioned. Bronze is in fact almost universal as the metal of armour; the only exception is Pallas' shield (10.482), which has layers of bronze and iron - tot ferri terga tot aeris - as well as of leather. It would not, however, be true to say that Virgil's soldiers are armed as they might have been in a Roman legion. To discover how he did imagine them, we must look at some pieces of armour in turn.

Shields

Homer did not always understand what he was describing, but his tradition knew, besides round shields, great shields that reach from neck to ankles. We can envisage their shape from Mycenean monuments, but Virgil would have no such aid. He dropped them entirely as quite unfamiliar. The round shield, which in Latin is called clipeus, he accepted, and several times describes it as being made of bronze, once 'of hollow bronze': this is the shield of the classical Greek hoplite, and it will probably have been carried by the heroes of the Trojan war in all Greek painting, as it is in vase-painting, and as it is in the famous picture (from the House of the Dioscuri in Pompeii) of the discovery of Achilles among the maidens of Scyros.

But it was not the shield of the Roman army, in which (except for some auxiliaries) the round clipeus was replaced by the long scutum at an early date. Tradition associated the change with Camillus at the beginning of the 4th century.[13] The scutum was made of wood covered with linen or leather, and strengthened by a metal boss and a metal rim. Now although the clipeus predominates in the Aeneid, there is a considerable minority of scuta, about one case in four, almost evenly divided between Trojans and Italians. Being made of wood, light wood like willow and agnus castus, they float when the Trojans are shipwrecked; or they are imagined as borne upon the waves of the Tiber; Evander can make a bonfire of them (1.101; 8.539; 8.562). In spite of this, I expected to find that Virgil often used clipeus and scutum interchangeably for metrical convenience, as Homer does σάκος and ἀσπίς . But this is not so. No individual warrior ever carries a scutum, and with one exception they never appear in actual use in battle: that is when, as the beleaguered Trojans pour missiles upon the Rutulians who are attacking their camp, 'their scuta and hollow helmets resound' (9.666). Conversely, when the scene is not one of fighting, both sides are found to be armed with scuta, even (as an extreme instance) at a pause in the battle: when Aeneas withdraws his troops to address them on his new strategy, they do not ground their scuta (12.563). Similarly the night council of Trojan leaders hold their scuta as they lean upon their spears (9.229), and the crews of the ships that row up the Tiber hang their scuta over the side (8.93). Clipei, on the other hand, hardly occur outside battle-scenes, except as the possession of a named person: twice they appear as battle-trophies (3.286, 7.186), and Turnus' contingent is described as clipeata agmina, but the first company named is Argiua pubes, who might reasonably be expected to carry the hoplite shield, and the rear is brought up by scuta Labici (7.793-6).

What emerges from this is that, when Virgil describes the feats and fates of individual warriors in battle, he thinks in Homeric terms, and gives them the round shield - ἀσπὶς παντόσ' ἐΐση . But when he conceives of men in the mass, particularly in un-Homeric situations, he prefers to imagine them armed with the familiar shield of the first century.[14]

Cuirass

'As to the exact form of the Homeric cuirass,' says Dr. Stubbings,[15] 'the poems cannot be said to help us much.' Virgil was therefore able to describe his heroes' cuirasses more or less as he pleased. What he pleased to do was to take the types best known to the Romans. The most usual legionaries' wear in the 1st century seems to have been a jerkin on which metal chains were sewn. Another type, apparently new in the 1st century, was made of small plates of bronze or iron threaded together with wire. One or other of these is intended

wherever Virgil is specific: *aerea suta* 'bronze things that have been sewn' (10.313), *loricam consertam hamis*, 'a cuirass put together with hooks' (3.467), *duplici squama lorica fidelis* (9.707), *thoraca aenis squamis* (11.487). The last phrase suggests that *thoracas aenos* (7.634) need not be the obsolete Greek hoplite solid breastplate; even Aeneas' *loricam ex aere rigentem* (8.621) is not necessarily such (cf. 11.72).

When a metal is mentioned, apart from decorative gold or silver,[16] it is always bronze, in spite of the fact that iron seems to have been more frequently used by the Romans. Iron was of course cheaper, but one cannot assume that grandees always wore bronze cuirasses, for Lucullus is described as going into battle glittering with a *thorex* of iron (or steel) scales (Plut.*Luc*.28).

Virgil sticks to bronze because he is thus both modern and traditional. He does the same with helmets (*galeae*), which are of bronze on the few occasions when the material is mentioned (5.491, 10.836). (The *aurea galea* of 9.50 will be gilt (cf. 12.536 *aurata tempora*) like some examples in our museums). Yet iron was quite as commonly used in the first century.

Spears

Once again Homer spoke with an uncertain voice, obscuring what must have been an original distinction between the heavy thrusting spear, the ὄβριμον ἔγχος, and the throwing spear δόρυ, which went in pairs, so that it is familiar in the dual δοῦρε. Virgil regards the spear as primarily a missile weapon, and obscures any distinction between different kinds. The same weapon may be *hasta* and *iaculum* (10.585-8); the usual pattern is that the warrior throws his single spear and then resorts to the sword: thus e.g. Pallas at 10.380 and 474.

Yet before the battle in XII Turnus has a pair of spears, as does Aeneas when he goes out scouting on the coast of Carthage, and Nisus actually uses two successively in his attempt to rescue Euryalus (12.165, 1.313, 9.410-17). Mezentius, too, once drops his 'spears', in the plural, to take up a sling (9.586), although in his *aristeia* he has only one; and the Italian Messapus hurls one of a pair at Aeneas, but earlier, when he stabs with a spear from horseback, he too will be conceived of as having but one (12.488, 12.294). Except for this last incident, un-Homeric because Homer does not know cavalry, Virgil seems to base himself on tradition not experience. It is noteworthy that he makes no use of the typically Roman weapon, the *pilum*, discharged before the legionary engaged with the sword. But we may perhaps see a parallel with his treatment of bronze and iron armour. Archaeological evidence suggests that only some of the legionaries used *pila*; the points of ordinary spears are much more frequently found.[17] By sticking to the *hasta*, Virgil again gets the best of both worlds.

Siege-craft

Ancient tradition was well-aware that siege-craft, as opposed to blockade, was a late development. The invention of the battering-ram (which looks obvious enough) was ascribed by Vitruvius to the Carthaginians in Spain, by Servius (on 9.503) to one Artemon of Clazomenae of unknown date, but that town was founded 93 years after Rome. Artemon was also

supposed to have invented the *testudo*, a movable shed to protect men who tried to undermine the fortress wall. Yet certainly the battering-ram appears in the *Aeneid*, used against Priam's palace and Latinus' town (2.492, 12.706). Possibly the *testudo*, too, for the palace door is *obsessum acta testudine*; and similarly the Volsci attack the Trojan camp *acta testudine* (2.441, 9.505). But both passages may refer to the Roman tactic of approaching a fortification under cover of linked shields (*scuta*) held overhead; although *agere* is the proper word for pushing forward the armoured shed, which Vitruvius says was used when filling in ditches (10.20) and in Virgil we have *fossas implere parant*, yet the great stone that falls upon the attackers *armorum resoluit uincula*. Even more striking in their modernity are the great wooden towers[18] associated with defensive walls. The odd thing about these is that they do not seem to make much military sense. One could understand that the Trojans might have profitably built such a tower *inside* their camp, to provide an eminence from which to pour their missiles (cf. Caesar, *B.G.*5.40); but what is it doing outside, where it is easily set on fire, and why is it so insecure that, when the garrison moves to one side to avoid the flames, it falls over (9.503 ff.)? Equally puzzling is the great tower at Latinus' town, which Turnus had built and which Aeneas sets on fire, since it is on wheels (12.672). One could imagine that, if there were a clear space inside the walls, it could (as Servius suggests) be rolled to any point that was attacked, but such a device seems to be unheard of in military history. What is known is the use of such towers by an *attacking* force who could pass from them by gangways on to the walls from which their missiles drove the defenders. Such was Turnus' tower, for *pontis instrauerat altos* (12.675), i.e. he had given a protective roofing to the gangways that led from its upper storey. (Servius, not unnaturally embarrassed by *pontis*, thinks the word is used for *tabulata*, 'stories'.) A movable tower of this sort would not be excessively stable, and if the tower of the Trojans is so conceived, one can understand the fatal accident that overtook it, although not their motive in constructing it.

* * * *

No-one supposes that Virgil made any attempt to reconstruct and reproduce the modes of thought and feeling that were current in the heroic age. We have found that in the material background to his story also there is a pervading modernity, achieved in part by selection of what was both old and new, in part by deliberate anachronism. The antiquarianism so often ascribed to him is confined to a few passages in Book VII, where it is his concern to depict a primitive Italy that needs a new element if it is to develop the Roman civilisation, and in Book VIII, where he wishes to contrast the humble beginnings of Rome with her present grandeur. Elsewhere his characters inhabit a world of remarkably modern aspect.

Was this feature of the Virgilian treatment of the heroic past something peculiar to him, or one adopted by other writers of epic? The answer is easy so far as the Greeks are concerned. The procedure is foreign to Apollonius Rhodius. His *Argo* uses no anchor, but ties up to rocks. To be sure, she has an un-Homeric ὑπόζωμα to hold her timbers together (1.368), but this device might well have been used in primitive ships. Amycus enters the ring (2.63) with no horrific *caestus*, but binds his hands with the plain thongs that are used by the contestants in the *Iliad*.[19] Jason's shield is large enough for him to hide under it. I must confess that I have not read Quintus Smyrnaeus in toto, but enough to feel pretty sure that he, too, attempts to follow

Homeric precedent.[20] There is no reason, then, for supposing that Virgil took a hint from the Greeks, although it is of course possible that if more Greek epic were restored to us, we should find that he had predecessors there.

Turning to the Romans, neither Valerius Flaccus nor Statius did as much as Virgil to depict the material background of their stories, Valerius perhaps less than Statius. As a result the material is scantier, but shows that neither was concerned with antiquarian correctness. It would, of course, have been absurd for Valerius to represent the Argo, for him the first wooden ship to be built, as a bireme. Indeed he makes it light enough to be carried down to the sea by its crew at a run (1.185). But it has its anchor (2.428, cf. 4.72) - and what is more surprising it has the ram of the later warship - *spumas uomit aere tridenti* (1.688 cf. 339). Of other elements that do not belong to the heroic age there are a few, but only a few: *ferrum* is occasionally used of a sword or other weapon (e.g. 2.238), trumpets sound for battle (2.129, 3.43), there is a marble statue or pair of statues (5.187). These are all small points, and I have the impression that Valerius had little interest in the material setting of his story.[21]

Statius has more to offer that is to my purpose. His *Argo* is so large that she is a floating mountain; she has the warship's bronze prow, and a Triton as her figure-head (5.335 ff.). So far she recalls Aeneas' ships; but she is an open boat without a deck, like that which carries the Greeks to Troy on the François vase, for Jason has to tread on the rowers' backs as he passes up and down the ship (5.404). Statius thus seems to waver in his view of her. His battle scenes, unlike those of Virgil, show no sign of generalship or strategy; infantry, cavalry, and war-chariots are committed pell-mell; the fighting is neither Homeric nor anything else. When the Thebans have retreated behind their walls one of the besiegers careers about in a scythed chariot (10.544), an act more likely to cause alarm to his friends than to the enemy. Details about armour are less common than in Virgil, but *ferrum* is often used collectively of weapons. Thebes has modern defences: the walls are equipped with armoured loopholes which spit out whistling missiles, and when the defenders find javelins and arrows are of little use, they are able to fall back on *tormenta* (10.859). The attackers, too, do not lack corresponding equipment (10.527-30): they have their rams and *testudo*: *scrutanturque cauas caeca testudine turres* - this is clearly the movable shed used to cover a search for weak spots in the defences, a device as anachronistic as the Theban artillery.

But the most striking instance of modernity in the Thebaid is in the funeral games for Archemorus (6.238 ff.). They follow the construction in a mere nine days of an enormous stone temple with marble reliefs, showing the whole story; the athletic events themselves are preceded by a parade of statues of the child's ancestors: the first is explicitly of bronze and all that follow may be presumed to be of the same material, since they have lifelike expressions, which that medium was universally supposed to be capable of reflecting. The chariot-race with which the programme begins is no mere out-to-a-tree-and-back-again affair, as in the *Iliad*, but is round and round, lap after lap, as in a Roman circus, and Oeclides comes in to the finish, *ceu modo carceribus dimissus in arua solutis*, as if he had only just left the starting box. For the foot-race the sprinters limber up, a precaution unknown to Homer or to Virgil; they have starting-gates, and they are naked, although Thucydides remarks that loin-cloths were de rigeur, even in the Olympic games, until not so long before his own days.[22] The discus is of bronze, not the

shapeless lump of metal that was the best the Achaeans had at Troy, nor a round stone such as was used by the Phaeacians. Finally the boxing-match sees the use of the lead-weighted boxing-gloves of later professionalism - nigrantia plumbo tegmina cruda boum.

Such modernity is less frequent in Statius than in Virgil, but all the more striking when it occurs, standing out by contrast and by its thoroughness. There can be no doubt that it is deliberate, and it would hardly be rash to suppose that he was deliberately following Virgil's example, when he remembered it.

* * * *

In the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge there is a pair of lively pictures representing the death of Hector and the Trojan Horse, painted by Biagio di Antonio, a Florentine of the later fifteenth century. Off the shore is a round-bellied medieval ship with prow and poop towering above the low waist; the Greek knights on horseback are plated in suits of armour from crown to toe; and inside the walls of Troy there rise buildings of extraordinary likeness to the cathedral at Florence (completed 1462), to the Loggia della Signoria, and to the leaning tower of Pisa. This happens neatly to exemplify anachronism in the three spheres with which I have dealt, but the pictures are typical of the way in which painters, not only the early and naive, but also sophisticated ones like Titian and Veronese, long dealt with scenes from worlds that had disappeared, attempting no antiquarian reconstruction but depicting the costumes, furnishings, and architecture of their own day. The painters of the ancient world do not seem to have acted otherwise.[23] Some well-known wall-paintings of the first century B C. found on the Esquiline show scenes from the Odyssey. A contemporary Roman might well have copied the facade of Circe's house for his own residence - a round-headed front-door, surmounted by a pediment, set back behind a curving vestibulum, in front of which runs an arcade in the Tuscan order. In other scenes ships are represented on which the oars are so close-set that I think they must be biremes; but the pictures have now been cleaned, and it may be possible to see the details more clearly than in present reproductions. In the famous relief, the Tabula Iliaca of the first century A.D., it looks like a bireme on which Aeneas escapes. The warriors' shields there are probably all intended to be round, but Hellenistic models doubtless lie behind these representations.

I would not say that in considering Virgil's material anachronisms the anachronisms of contemporary painting should be disregarded. They must have done something to prejudice the reader to accept or even to expect such things. But the situation of the painter is not that of the poet. Before the days of excavations, museums, and archaeological reconstructions, the painter does not, perhaps cannot, paint the vanished age that he cannot see. The poet, on the other hand, works within a literary tradition, which provides him with information about the past, not only in the writings of his poetic predecessors, but also underlined in the commentaries upon them, and preserved in the records of historians. He does not lie under the same necessity to be modern as does the visual artist. Apollonius, Quintus, and to some extent Valerius Flaccus, show this to be true. To account for Virgil's practice better reasons are needed than the influence of contemporary art. Nor is it sufficient to say that he followed literary practice, for we do not know of any previous poet who provided a precedent.[24]

Any attempt to arrive at Virgil's motives must be speculative, and they

may have been multiple, reinforcing one another. One can only hope to make suggestions that are not plainly inadequate to account for his practice. Some comments that have been made clearly are inadequate. Warde Fowler, noting the anachronism of Turnus' tower in Book XII, calls it 'amusing'.[25] That, certainly, was not the effect that Virgil intended here, whatever may have been Ovid's intention over the anachronisms of the Metamorphoses. To do Warde Fowler justice, he was probably recording his own reactions rather than explaining the poet's wishes, but he would hardly have made the comment had he been aware how characteristic the passage is. Cartault explains that ships are moored by fluked anchors, not by stones, because although Virgil 'certainly gives his poem a certain heroic colour, he does not wish to disconcert his contemporaries by things that had become obsolete long ago'.[26] It is possible that he was affected by this consideration, which might be enough to explain the anchors if they were an isolated phenomenon; but it will not explain the whole complex of gratuitous modernity. Even Kroll, who added to his rightly-praised Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur an appendix on anachronisms (p.178), mainly in the Aeneid, hardly gets beyond stating a fact: 'Virgil felt justified in projecting backwards upon the old Italians such circumstances of the present-day as seemed good to him'. He then speaks of an effort to lift the heroic age into a fairy-tale atmosphere - this because of the greater frequency of gold in the Aeneid as compared with Homer, a frequency which he admits suggests later luxury - and concludes by saying that learned poets of antiquity were untouched by antiquarian pedantry.

My own belief, for what it is worth, is that the material modernity met in the Aeneid is to be seen as the counterpart of another characteristic that has often been noted. I mean the way in which Virgil ascribes to his Trojans and to his Italians customs familiar among the Romans of his own times. To take familiar examples, Anchises on seeing the harmless flame that plays around Iulus' head prays to Jupiter haec omina firma, and is rewarded by a shooting-star, whereupon he rises to his feet (2.687ff.). Here is the Roman distinction between the auspicium oblatiuum that comes without being asked, and the auspicium impetratiuum, which is a reply to a a prayer; and if Servius is to be believed, it was the Roman custom so to require a confirmatory augury, and to rise from the sitting position in which auspices were awaited so soon as they had been received. Or Turnus acts like the Roman pater patratus when he declares war on the Trojans by hurling his spear, not at them but into the air:

> iaculum adtorquens emittit in auras
> principium pugnae, et campo sese arduus infert (9.52).

Virgil's concern was to underline the continuity between the men about whom he wrote and those for whom he wrote, and he does it by showing them as sharing customs; the mos maiorum acts as a link. There is no question here of anachronism, since no-one in his time could have argued that the ancient Trojans and the ancient Latins would not have possessed these customs: on the contrary it would appear plausible that they should have done so.

The desire to achieve continuity and likeness worked also, I believe, to encourage the anachronisms which have been the subject of this paper, whether they ascribed without warrant to the heroic age things that were familiar to the poet's audience, or whether they took what seems to the modern reader the strange and exaggerated form exemplified by biremes and the turris ambulatoria. Another consideration may also have played a part.

It is undeniable that Aeneas, although he does not 'stand for' Augustus, although he is no allegorical figure, not infrequently recalls Augustus: he performs acts and finds himself in situations that anticipate and foreshadow those of his descendant. This role may be an easier and more credible one because he moves in surroundings that are not primitive, but assimilated to those of the Augustan age.

Virgil invented a new kind of epic in which the apparent mythological subject carried within itself the story of a nation right down to its living present. It suited his conception that the unity of early and late, of beginning and achievement, should extend - if it were not so fashionable a word I might say symbolically extend - to the material setting and background. The taste of his time did not forbid anachronism, and he used it with a more serious purpose than any poet who followed him.

* * * *

NOTES.

1. A. Köster, Das Antike Seewesen, 97.
2. Procopius, De Bello Gothico, 4.22.9.
3. Servius Danielis on 1.182.
4. Baumeister, Denkmäler 3.1634, C. Torr, Ancient Ships plate V and often elsewhere.
5. R.E. xiii.144.
6. See A. Boethius, Eranos, 1952, 147. The sculptured parts of the capitals of the temple of Baal at Palmyra (i A.D.) were of bronze gilt; D.S. Robertson, History of Greek and Roman Architecture,[2] 222.
7. A. Mau, Pompeii[2], 84.
8. Pliny, N.H. 33.57 says that such ceilings were first used in temples in the late second century B.C., and subsequently spread to private houses.
9. Eranos, 1939, 1. Klio 1960, 141. Cf. C. van Essen, Mnem. 3rd series 7, 1939, 225.
10. 'It is possible that Virgil had no very formal picture in mind, only a vista of linked apartments.' Austin ad loc.
11. Vergils Epische Technik, 194. Heinze's invaluable pages 194-205 depict Virgil as joining the Homeric with the old Roman. A view nearer to mine is taken by L. Wickert, 'Homerisches und römisches im Kriegswesen der Aeneis', Philologus N.F. 39, 1930, 285, where detail is systematically given.
12. Swords: 2.510, 4.580, 6.294, 9.331, 850, 10.546, 12.666, 737, 950.
    Spears and javelins: 1.313, 5.306, 9.701, 11.637, 747, 12.165, 278, 488, 578, 774.
    Arrows: 11.682.
    The material of the obsolete battle-axe is never given. I use 'iron' to include the iron-alloy steel; ferrum covers both.
13. My information about Roman armour is drawn from Couissin's standard work, Les armes romaines.
14. But Virgil does not go so far as to show knowledge of the semi-cylindrical shield that had recently been adopted by the army from the gladiators. On the parma carried by Lausus and Helenor see Heinze, 204.
15. Wace and Stubbings, A Companion to Homer, 507.
16. In our practical days we are tempted to think of Virgil's frequent mention of precious metals in connexion with armour as due to a romantic view of the heroic age. But Plutarch says of Brutus' army

at Philippi, χρυσὸς γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν ὅπλων καὶ ἄργυρος ἀφειδῶς καταχορηγηθείς.

I do not know to what Virgil's phrase *auroque trilicem* refers (3.467, 5.259, 7.639 cf. *bilicem* 12.375).

17. So Couissins. *Pila* are carried by some of Aventinus' men (7.664) in the catalogue, where many weapons are mentioned that are not used in the battles. Most of them, unlike the *pila*, are archaic, for Virgil here wished to suggest comparatively primitive peoples.

18. They were invented by Diades, who served with Alexander the Great and wrote a monograph on their construction, Vitruvius 10.13.3.

19. *Iliad* 23.684. In Theocritus xxii the boxers use up-to-date ring-craft but old-fashioned thongs. Virgil draws a vivid word-picture of heavily-loaded *caestus*, for which others less damaging, but not specifically described, are substituted in the contest itself - a clever way of suggesting the new world without committing himself.

20. E.g. his weapons are regularly of bronze. A *testudo* of shields is formed at 11.358, a passage reminiscent of *Aen*.9.505 ff.; but it is implied that this was not a standard practice, but an *ad hoc* device of the wily Odysseus.

21. The cataphract Sarmatian met in Phasis (6.231) is of a type only recently known to the Romans (Mr. H.M. Currie reminds me of the article by Sir Ronald Syme, C.Q. 1929), but he might at a pinch be supposed to have existed for a thousand years in the unexplored East.

22. Thuc.1.6.5. Contrast Quintus Smyrnaeus 4.188, who emphasises the loin-cloths of his runners. Virgil wisely says nothing one way or the other.

23. Margaret R. Scherer, *The Legends of Troy*, provides a convenient and well-reproduced collection of their representation in art through the ages.

23. We cannot affirm that Ennius, as Professor Skutsch reminded me, or even Naevius did *not* provide a model.

25. *The Death of Turnus*, 120.

26. *L'Art de Virgile dans l'Eneide*, i.148. I cite Warde Fowler and Cartault as writers who have illuminated so much in Virgil that one might hope for illumination here too.