

di cuius iurare timent et fallere numen.

haec omnis, quam cernis, inops inhumataque turba est ..

Can anyone find more than four anywhere? I think it just came so; Virgil did not seek this effect, and there only about forty such lines in the first 300 lines of the Sixth Book. No doubt he knew very well what he was doing.

F. R. DALE

AGAIN THE SHIELD OF AENEAS (Aeneid VIII. 625-731)¹

Time has dealt with imaginative attempts to map the scenes depicted on shields in ancient epic, such as that found in Leaf's Iliad, vol. II, Appendix I (pp. 602 ff.) for the Shield of Achilles, or the rather more sophisticated application of the principles of Geometric art to the motifs of the Aspis in the Hesiodic corpus, as worked out by J. L. Myres (J.H.S. 61 [194] pp. 17 ff.). It may be only a flat-footed criticism that seeks for system or coherence in Virgil's choice of scenes for Aeneas' shield and in their arrangement, but the curiosity is understandable enough; indeed the question is still very much alive, as recent discussions indicate.² Otherwise one must be content to dismiss the 106 lines of the description as a "mere miscellany" or "a selection of scenes calculated to flatter Roman pride", and leave it at that. Obviously unsatisfactory, particularly in the case of Virgil, a pen-poet working, we are told, (and there seems no ground for doubting the tradition) off a prose sketch. His choice of what to include and what to omit in such a descriptive passage needs to be taken as part of a conscious plan, deliberately executed. This is not invalidated by the tradition that he composed sporadically and as the spirit moved him, or by the fact that not all the necessary adjustments to remove minor inconcinnities had been effected at the time of his death in 19 B.C.

Before coming to grips with particulars, some general, even elementary remarks are perhaps in place. No attentive reader can fail to be struck by the fundamental differences in conception between Aeneas' shield and that of Achilles in Iliad XVIII; hardly anywhere else in the poem is the independence of the Latin poet so evident. The most important would seem to be these:

(i) In the Iliad Achilles' shield is convincingly motivated; Aeneas' is not. After the death of Patroclus and the stripping of his body by Hector, Achilles is "deficient" (in the Quartermaster's sense of the word) of his equipment, and he remains ineffective until re-equipped. Aeneas on the other hand was certainly armed at the crisis of the Fall of Troy (Aen. II 671 f.) and nothing has happened since to part him from what he had then. The only excuse for Aeneas' new and special shield in Aeneid VIII, apart from epic precedent, is that he will need first-rate arms to face the ferocity of Turnus, that alter Achilles, and for one of his descent divinely-made weaponry is obviously indicated.

(ii) In Iliad XVIII the poet takes us into Hephaestus' smithy and shows step by step the process of manufacture: ποσειδῶν δὲ... ἐν δ' ἔποινε... ἐν δ' ἔτιθεε; recur with variations, and the Lame God does all the work himself. Vulcan descends to the Liparae islands, a suitably volcanic site for a mythological forge, but once

there shows all a Roman's sense for organized decentralization. He puts his Cyclopes on to the job, insisting on its urgent execution as an order of the highest priority:

"Tollite cuncta" inquit "coeptosque auferte labores,
Aetnaei Cyclopes, et huc advertite mentem:
arma acri facienda viro ..."
(VIII 439-441)

So it comes about that Aeneas' shield is first shown ready-made. Venus has delivered this remarkably unfeminine load herself, and placed it under a convenient oak-tree (616). The description of its workmanship is thus given as through the eyes of Aeneas.

(iii) The scenes on the Iliadic shield might illustrate features of the life of almost any civilization and are, with one or two exceptions, quite unmilitary. Ploughing and reaping seem to be in the spirit of the steatite "Harvesters' Vase" from Haghia Triada, a high-water mark of Late Minoan I (c. 1600 B.C.) artistic achievement. In other ways too, whatever may be thought of the time when the last part of Book XVIII assumed its present shape, the inspiration is very much that of an imaginary Phoenician or even Minoan-Mycenaean artefact. The most obviously military scene, that of the besieged city, recalls, at least in subject, the similar scene on the silver rhyton found in the Fourth Shaft Grave at Mycenae. None of the 20-odd scenes has any sort of special relevance to Achilles, the shield's recipient and user: the contrast with the Roman stories on Aeneas' shield could hardly be more pointed.

(iv) Neither should it be forgotten that the decorated combat-shield is unknown to Homeric epic, as indeed to other heroic literatures such as the Viking-sagas. Craftmanship, whether in Scandinavia later or in Mycenaean Greece was fully equal to the task, and decorated votive-shields, such as those found in the Idaean Cave in Crete are another matter (although the date of these is hard to fix precisely). The only Homeric shield to carry a blazon is that presented by King Cinyras of Cyprus to Agamemnon, described in Book XI, where he is being accoutred for his *ἐπιπορεύεσθαι*. The blazon is obviously of psychological value in close formation hoplite fighting, where a well-drilled row of advancing infantry sporting horrific devices such as Gorgoneia, snakes, lions rampant (or, if the addition to heraldic terminology be allowed, mangeant), and the like could demoralize inferior troops. Such decorations would also be of use as aids to recognition of friend from foe in the *mêlée* following the initial clash, a point of special importance, one conceives, where mercenary armies were involved. It may be significant, indeed, that the invention of the blazon is ascribed to the Carians (so Herodotus, I 171), a people who provided numerous contingents of mercenaries throughout Greek history. Under the Homeric conditions of single combat recognition was a very hap-hazard affair: Diomedes has to ask Glaucus who he is directly, before their colloquy ends in the quixotic exchange of armour in Book VI, though Glaucus identifies Diomedes readily enough (VI 146). In fact it seems to have been the helmet rather than the shield that was the distinctive item of equipment: Hector is *κορυθατόλος* and even in later times decorated helmets were prized by such unaesthetic owners as Roman legionaries, as witness Juvenal XI 103 f. Shields were in any case too exposed to damage in battle for elaborate plastic ornamentation to be justified: a painted blazon that could be "touched up" between engagements was obviously practical in a way which inlay or appliqué-work was not. It would therefore seem that the stock motif of the ornamented shield is an exercise of the poet's fancy, inspired by votive shields, perhaps, certainly not by combat ones.

(v) Account should also be taken of an acute observation of F. H. Sandbach, in his article in these Proceedings, no. 5 (1965-6) p. 31, where it is shown that Virgil distinguishes between scutum and clipeus. The oblong scutum is not used in epic battles, and no individual warrior carries one. The shield of Aeneas is thought of as a clipeus (clipei non enarrabile textum, 625; cf. 729), and so resembles the circular δοκίς παντός ἔσση. Yet the larger area of the scutum, σάκος, renders it far more suitable for elaborate decoration, and indeed the Shield of Achilles is described as such (XVIII. 478). Perhaps the antiquarian associations of clipeus, the legionary shield of the time before Camillus' reorganization of the Roman army, helped to determine Virgil's choice of word at 625. Tactically it was appropriate, for Aeneas is actually to use it in combat, but aesthetically (from the point of view of art-history) it is anomalous and is in fact a break with literary precedent.

*

*

*

Inspection will show that attempts so far made have, with one forgotten exception, failed to elicit a credible unity to cover the 8 scenes on Aeneas' shield, when considered in isolation. These are drawn from the legendary and historical past of Rome, the first 7 occupying the 41 lines from 630-70, while the eighth, topical in its reference, takes up more space than all the rest put together, no fewer than 54 lines (675-728) and gives a brilliant impression of the Battle of Actium and its sequel in the triumph of Augustus. For the sake of clarity in the following discussion, I list the 8 scenes in order:

- (1) The suckling of Romulus and Remus by the she-wolf (630-4)
- (2) Rape of the Sabine women and ensuing treaty (635-41)
- (3) Punishment of Mettus Fufetius (642-5)
- (4) Porsenna, Horatius Cocles, Cloelia (646-51)
- (5) Manlius, the geese and the defence of the Capitol against the Gauls (652-62)
- (6) Dance of the Salii, Lupercalia and other ceremonies (663-6)
- (7) Tartarus and Elysium, with Catiline and Cato the Younger (666-70)
- (8) Marine setting (671-4) for Battle of Actium (675-728)

The defects in the schemes previously canvassed to yield a thematic unity or a pattern of related themes on the Shield have been sympathetically but decisively pointed out by Professor Eichholz in a brief communication which is printed in an expanded form in these Proceedings, n. 6 (1967) pp. 45 ff. He is surely right in saying that a unity in terms of "narrow escapes of Rome from imminent perils"³ fails to account for (2), (3) and (6); it might be added that had this been Virgil's intention, his choice of scenes was perverse for the critical situation after Cannae or the threat from Pyrrhus' invasion earlier would have served better, and neither is mentioned elsewhere in the poem. An opposition of abstract principles,⁴ virtus, consilium, pietas against vis and furor has to be stretched to cover (1) and (6), and again the choice is far from obvious; Regulus voluntarily returning as a captive to Carthage is manifestly much more in keeping with this line of

approach, and other exempla scarcely less apposite could be found. Neither is the suggestion of an allegorical representation of the four "Augustan" virtues,⁵ virtus, clementia, iustitia and pietas any more helpful: it might be maintained with a little goodwill that these were consistent with the scenes in question, but they are certainly not demanded by them, and other virtues, such as respect for fides (to cover the exemplum of Mettus) or for the rights and duties of women would fit better. More serious, perhaps, there is nowhere in the matter-of-fact verses (607-25) which precede the description so much as a hint to foreshadow this allegorical turn to the thought.

Simpler than any of these is an attempt, not mentioned by Eichholz,⁶ to detect an internal unity in terms of the growth of Rome from very modest beginnings - in the words of its propounder,⁷ "the great ancestor of the masters of the world an exposed helpless infant" - to the Imperial grandeur of Actium and of Augustus' subsequent triumph. The objection to this is, it seems to me, the triviality of incidents such as those of Mettus and Cloelia, to say nothing of the omission of others of greater moment, such as the Punic wars, which would illustrate much better the supposed stages on the path of Rome's progress to her final greatness. If such was really Virgil's intention, he has gone out of his way to camouflage it by his choice of examples.

Eichholz' own explanation⁶ seems to come much nearer the mark, though it is not, I think, quite the whole story. Stressing the words genus omne futurae / stirpis (628-9), he suggests that Aeneas' shield is to be thought of as a truly miraculous shield, protraying seriatim the main facts of Rome's history in terms of Aeneas' remote descendants, famamque et fata nepotum (731). Within the limited space at his disposal Virgil had to be selective, and so he scaled down his panorama by mentioning only 8 episodes, adroitly chosen to give an impression of having traversed the whole sweep of Roman history and legend, with variation of tempo as events moved closer to his own day. The reader is left to imagine the omitted scenes for himself. This explanation in terms of movement rather than of content, of "dynamic" rather than "thematic" structure, is surely closer to the eloquently allusive manner so characteristic of the poem as a whole than anything so far put forward, and any future treatment that sets out to be complete must take account of it. If it makes demands on the reader's imagination, these, it could be said, are notional rather than obligatory; one may pause in flight to wonder momentarily why some obvious figure such as Hannibal gets no mention, but it is not necessary to the appreciation of the poem to fill in the gaps of the intervening scenes mentally. Indeed conscious effort to do so might distract the attention.

My own suggestion may be stated quite simply in terms of Eichholz' approach: what he postulates as gaps in the scene-sequence on his "miraculous" shield are in my view filled by the complementary references to the Roman past elsewhere in the poem. More specifically, the selection of scenes on the Shield in VIII ceases to perplex once these are viewed in relation to that other great passage describing outstanding figures in Roman history and legend, the Parade of Heroes (sometimes called the Heldenschau) at the end of Book VI (756-892). This simple idea seems to have been first adumbrated by one W. Whitehead, otherwise, so far as I can trace, unknown to fame, in an elegantly written Appendix (pp. 457-78) to volume III of the unpretentious edition of Virgil (text, verse translation and brief notes) by Christopher Pitt, published in 1753: the fuller implications have not, it seems, been worked out since. As we do so it may be well to keep in mind another description of an artefact, telling of the sculptured scenes from the

Trojan War which adorned the Temple of Juno at Carthage (Aen. I 456 f.), where the principle of selection can be explained simply and convincingly.⁸ We should not lose sight either of cross-references to the early books of Livy, who began his great work in 29 B.C., the very year when, so one form of the tradition has it,⁹ Virgil finished the Georgics and embarked on the Aeneid. Whether there was any contact, literary or personal, between these two men cannot be known; it is at least evident that a serious study of Roman antiquities was much in the air at that time, so that relevant cross-references to the first pentad of Livy may perhaps tell us something.

That the Parade of Heroes in VI and the Shield-scenes in VIII together form a selective yet satisfyingly inclusive epitome of the Roman past may well be true, but it might properly be questioned whether any ancient reader would have detected Virgil's intention, if this is what it was. Certainly he could not have expected his public to do the work of a latter-day scholar with the paraphernalia of lexica and other aids to comprehension at his elbow. What however he was entitled to count on was a public (or audience) with memories sharpened by the exercise of listening to recitation and not atrophied, as ours are, by constant scanning by eye of the printed page. A parrot memory of the one passage while reading or listening to the other would indeed be a handicap rather than a help to appreciation. It would suffice if a fair proportion of the more sensitive of his audience were alerted to the cross-link by the few repetitions which seem to signal it and carried in their heads enough of the details to sense the relationship and so to appreciate the widened perspective presented by taking the two passages in combination. To some extent the alerting of the audience would have been helped by the symmetrical placing of the antiquarian sections in VI and VIII around the centre-piece of the whole poem, which is the section VII 37-285.¹⁰ Even those who are temperamentally disposed to reject pattern-hunting criticism in its extreme forms should be prepared at the least, I think, to accept some of the more obvious symmetries such as this one.

On this view Virgil had no need to conceive of Aeneas' shield as carrying any more decorative detail than the eight scenes he chose to give us. This obviates the need to press the meanings of what are only formulaic phrases in such contexts nec procul hinc (635) and haud procul inde (642). For Eichholz these indicate considerable spatial separation and thereby are taken to imply the undescribed happenings he postulates between the selected episodes. Thus on his account hinc procul (666) emphasizes a big separation, corresponding to the long jump in time as Virgil nears the years of the late Republic with Catiline and the Younger Cato. I prefer to think of the separation implied by nec procul hinc and haud procul inde as no more than that between adjacent bands or panels of scenes on geometric or archaic art, such as, to name the first object that comes to mind, the François Vase. This is surely the natural way to take these phrases, and would seem to be so even in default of the formulaic use of nec procul hinc which also occurs (Aen. F 469) in the description of another artefact, the Temple of Juno at Carthage, where there is nothing to suggest that anything other than a continuous succession of scenes is in the poet's mind, be they thought of as murals or metopes. At VIII 666 hinc procul raises no difficulty once allowance is made for an idiomatic usage which sometimes passes unrecognized. Procul is a word of elastic connotation; the extent of the separation it implies varies with the context, in much the same way as does the length of time-interval denoted by nuper.¹¹ In appropriate contexts procul may amount to much the same as iuxta, as it clearly does e.g. at Aen. VI 10, procul secreta where Norden quotes Servius, who gives the right explanation but throws in a false etymology. Equally clear is VI 808, where

procul in the Parade of Heroes marks the transition from Augustus to Numa a transition made ineffective if these two figures are to be imagined at arms' length from each other. This use is, I think, confined to poetry: Conington has a short but sensible note on it at Aen. X. 835 but Orelli gives a fuller documentation in his note on Horace Satires II. 6, 105, citing inter alia, Terence Hec. 607, where procul hinc (our phrase) means prope.¹²

When procul is negated, as it is at both 635 and 642, it keeps its familiar sense and the resulting negative phrases denote proximity; at 666, after an interval of 24 lines it is used positively and so can perfectly well bear the rarer, idiomatic sense of iuxta. Only if procul in its idiomatic use followed close upon a phrase such as nec procul (where it must have its normal force) would the shift in its meaning be a stylistic blemish. It is in any case desirable that these transition phrases whether expressed in the negative form (nec procul) or positively should reinforce each other and amount to the same thing. So interpreted procul does not invalidate Eichholz' "dynamic" structure: the variation of tempo is still there for a percipient reader, being implicit in the content of the scenes as Virgil tells them and in the amount of space allotted to each.

For the fuller understanding of this approach, one must turn to details. These will become clear if the two passages, VI. 756 f. and VIII. 630 f. are set out in skeleton form side by side. Place names as well as those of human personalities may be relevant; references to Livy have been given where appropriate, and names which occur in both VI and VII have been underlined. Place names have been inset.

VI. 756 f.

VIII. 630 f

761 f. Silvius and Alba Longa

(Livy 1.3.6)

767 Procas (Livy 1,3.9)

768 Capys (" ibid)

Numitor(" I,3.10)

769 Silvius Aeneas (id. I,3.7)

773 Nomentum (Livy I,38.4)

Gabii (" I,53.4)

Fidenae (" I,14.4)

774 Collatia (" I,38.1)

775 Pometii (" I,53.2)

Castrum Inui(" I,5.2)

Bola (" IV,49.3)

Cora (" II,16.8)

778 Romulus (no mention of Remus)

(Encomium of Rome)

789 f. Cesar and Augustus

(Encomium of Roman Empire;
Golden Age)

808 King Numa and Cures (811)

812 f. Tullus, warrior king, in
contrast to Numa

630 Romulus and Remus; the
she-wolf

635 Sabine Women: Tatius (Livy
I,10.1): Cures

642 Mettus Fufetius and King
Tullus

815	Ancus Martius		
817	<u>Tarquins</u> and Brutus	646	<u>Tarquin</u> and Porsenna
		650	Cocles (Livy II, 10.2 f)
		651	Cloelia (Livy II 13.6-11)
824	The Decii; the Drusi. Torquatus. Camillus	652 f.	Manlius geese and defence of Capitol against Gauls (Livy V 47 f.)
826 f.	Caesar and Pompey		
836 f.	L. Mummius (and Aemilius Paul- lus) and conquest of Greece		
841	Elder Cato; Cossus		
842	The Gracchi. the Scipios		
844	Fabricius Serranus		
846	Q. Fabius Maximus Cunctator	663 f.	Salii Lupercalia ancilia procession of matrons.
		666	Tartareae sedes; Catiline and Younger Cato
847 f.	The Roman Achievement	671 f.	(marine background to arte- fact)
855-87	The Marcelli (climax in 867-886)	675-728	Octavian-Augustus and Actium: theomachy
		722 f.	Triumphal parade of subject races.

From this synoptic view the technique of variatio employed in VIII to yield a complementary picture to the earlier passage in VI emerges clearly. In VI the first 15 lines are occupied by figures from the misty prehistory of Rome, in keeping with the quasi-metaphysical sense of remoteness in time necessary for the effect of the conversation between father and son in the Underworld. The very place-names--- not a matter for pictorial treatment--- are evocative: Alba Longa had for a sensitive Roman something of the emotional overtones which Glastonbury or Avalon have for us or the Rock of Cashel or the Hill of Tara have for an Irishman. Gabii on the other hand, though of no consequence later,¹³ as well as Fidenae, had associations with Romulus, and with them Rome might seem to emerge from the penumbra of legend and take her place on the stage of history, much as English Constitutional History might not unreasonably be said to have been born on the islet of Runnymede. For his first episode on the Shield Virgil avoided sentimental effects and used the highly graphic motif of the Twins and the She-wolf, the pictorial symbol of Rome from antiquity down to the present day. In VI Virgil places Romulus next to Caesar and Augustus, the latter being regarded as the second founder of Rome: if we may imagine Anchises as conducting Aeneas round a kind of expanded Roman house-atrium where the effigies of the distinguished members of a whole nation and not merely those of a single family are on view,¹⁴ this anachronistic arrangement needs no explanation and the two encomia, on Rome (778 f.) and Augustus (789 f.), fall into place. Since on the Shield in VIII Augustus is to be portrayed in his militant aspect at Actium, in VI he is immediately followed by Numa who symbolizes the spiritual side of Rome and would have approved of the energy with which Augustus restored no fewer than 82 temples, as his own

statement on the Monumentum Ancyranum testifies (35,3). By the mention of Augustus early on, the ground is clear for the highly charged emotion of the Marcellus-passage, which forms the climax of the whole Parade. Father and nephew thus enframe the whole of the historical section.

On the Shield the scene of the Sabine Women (an incident which has appealed to artists in later ages) and the treaty which ensued suitably follow mention of Romulus and provide an event from the post-Romulean period for which there was no room in VI, where the two encomia need all the available space, if overall proportions are to be maintained. Tullus Hostilius' warlike character was as different as could be from the peaceable Numa's, and makes an effective contrast with the warrior following immediately on the priest-king. Over Ancus there seems to have been a difference of opinion in antiquity; bonus Ancus of Lucretius (III. 1025) and of Livy (I.32,2) is in Virgil qualified by the adjective iactantior (815). Whatever the explanation of the epithet, it leads on well to the stormy times of the proud Tarquins and the stern rigour of Brutus the Liberator, who ended their dynasty. In VIII the minor but frighteningly graphic episode of Mettus Fufetius' condemnation by Tullus and his gruesome punishment seems a strange choice, unless it suffices to say with Whitehead (p 464 top) that "to the manner of engaging in a treaty succeeds the punishment for breaking one". This is true, so far as it goes; a complete explanation may lie in a structural consideration, to be suggested presently.

In the list of historical names which come next in VI, it is noticeable that several are in the plural, the Decii, Drusi, Gracchi, the Scipios and lastly the Marcelli. Others in the singular such as Fabricius and Q. Fabius Maximus as well as Brutus himself are the names of eminent families whose bearers turn up time and time again in the history of the Republic; Fabricius later became a type-name for old-style patrician dignity, as twice in Juvenal (II. 154 and VI. 91). This family-motif tells in support of the concept of the house-atrium as an imagined setting for the Parade; it may be relevant to observe that the Elder Cato occurs in VI. 841 and the Younger in VIII. 670, as if further to emphasize this idea of the continuity of family tradition.

The Tarquins have their mention in VIII too, coupled with their ally the Etruscan Porsenna, which leads up to the struggle for libertas (648) sustained by the Sons of Aeneas. This may be regarded as an analogue to the part played by Brutus in the Liberation (VI. 817), but in VIII it is further developed by reference to Horatius Cocles and that stout swimmer the girl Cloelia. In consequence space is running short, so that the only episode from the whole of the early and middle period of the Republic represented on the Shield is the picturesque one of Manlius, the geese and the defence of the Capitol against the Gauls 15. In VI Torquatus and Camillus had sufficed for the Gallic danger; Manlius' defence of the Capitol not only provides opportunity for a brilliantly imaginative description (652-62), but offers an incidental link with VI, for not only was Torquatus (VI. 825) a member of a branch of the Manlii, but Virgil's Manlius was also an antagonist of Camillus (825) in some rather revolutionary measures which later historians interpreted as prefiguring those of the Gracchi.

This brings us to the puzzling passage about the Salii and other matters of Roman religious ceremonial (663-6). It is hardly enough to say that the Salii here owe their place to the earlier description in this book of their dance and hymn (285)f.), or to think, as Whitehead does. (p. 470), of their hymn and dance as signifying nothing more than the celebration of victory over the Gauls. It is a counsel of despair to see in them an analogue to the encomium of Rome and the account of the Golden Age in VI. 789 f. Virgil may have been prompted to include them by no more than a recollection of the Choral Dance in Iliad XVIII 590-606; elsewhere however he shows a remarkable independence of the Homeric Shield. Certainly without this passage there would be nothing to suggest the religious side of Roman life on Aeneas' shield, but while this is true, it still leaves the particular place it occupies in the eightfold sequence unaccounted for. It has not been noticed, so far as I am aware, in this connection that in the crisis of the episode of Mettus Fufetius as Livy (I. 27,7) tells it, Tullus, seeing his army's flank exposed as a result of Mettus' treachery, vowed to institute twelve Salii (in addition to those already created by Numa) as well as temples to Pallor and Pavor; Tullus in re trepida duodecim vovit Salios fanaque Pallori ac Pavori. By itself this link is too tenuous to carry any weight, but it acquires substance once account is taken of a feature of Virgilian composition whereby the second or third item in a longer series stands in a counterpart relation to the last-but-two or last-but-one as the case may be. We have only to think of the "chiastic" or if you will "pedimental" grouping of the Eclogues to see just this;¹⁶ there Eclogues III and VII are both amoebic songs of shepherds' competition and are both in dramatic form while II and VIII both non-dramatic and, for matter of that I and IX (both again dramatic) similarly form balanced pairs. So here in a series of 8 items Mettus, as item (3) stands in the appropriate counterpart position to the Salii who are item (6). If this is right, Livy may have given us the hint that explains not only the choice of these two apparently unrelated scenes, but also their placing in relation to each other. We who enjoy our poetry through the eye on the printed page may not be much impressed by this kind of formal symmetry, and when it is pointed out may not feel our appreciation quickened thereby. There are however too many such instances - and not only in Virgil, - in Latin for this to be dismissed out of hand and it is a purblind criticism that refuses to make reasonable allowances for such possibilities where, without entertaining them, a perplexity would otherwise remain unsolved.

From the ethereal religiosity of the Salii and the rest we come back to historical reality with Catiline and Cato. In VI Virgil had dealt with the painful matter of the Civil War with consummate tact (828 f.); such a stroke was unrepeatable, yet something was needed in VIII to bridge the long gap in historical time between the Gauls in 395 B.C. and Actium, over three and a half centuries later. Thus Catiline serves admirably as the evil genius foreshadowing the civil convulsions to come, while Cato the Younger, by his suicide a victim of those upheavals, makes an effective foil, and provides an incidental echo of the reference in VI (841) to his older and more famous forebear.

If an immediate link between the Salii and the after-world description involving Catiline and the Younger Cato is needed, Whitehead (p.471) may supply it. Stressing the protreptic implications of the word castae in 665 and quoting

Horace's Sixth Roman Ode (III. 6, 17-20) to show that "the violation of the marriage-bed is the bane of society and a disregard or negligence on that head the sure forerunner of the destruction of a state" he goes on: "as religion was necessary (to a Roman) to protect his state, so a doctrine of rewards and punishments was full (sic) as necessary to protect his religion... For which reason he is like a true legislator, with his hell for bad citizens and his Elysium for good." A homespun but entirely reputable morality from whose uncompromising terms the pseudo-moralists of a permissive age may uncomfortably flinch.

This brings us to the great climax of the Shield, the impressive picture of the carnage off Actium, showing Octavian-Augustus in action against Antony, Cleopatra and the embattled forces of the Orient, with their outlandish gods, Anubis and the rest. But it is more than a glorification of Augustus and the forces of civilization: it is the nearest that Virgil's chosen theme allowed him to come to that traditional feature of ancient epic, the Theomachy such as occurs in Iliad V and again in Iliad XXI. In Virgil against the barking Anubis and his monstrous kind are arrayed Neptune, Venus and Minerva, Olympian Pantheon against Pandemonium, and it is the bow of Apollo that finally stills Discord, Bellona and their fiendish crew (704). Thus Augustus in his triumph is seen as the instrument of destiny, and the institution of Empire is sanctified by the beneficence of the divine purpose. Against this background the review of subject-races which concludes the section (722 f.) needs no justification: short, crisp phrases with arresting and highly pictorial epithets (sagittiferi, discincti, bicornis (of the Rhine)) conjure up in parvo something of the majesty of that other great pictorial parade of the might of an earlier empire, carved high upon the cliffs of Behistun, overlooking the highway that ran between Ecbatana and Babylon.

By relating VI and VIII in this way, it becomes easier to take the point of some other cross-references at various places in the poem. The repetition of ex ordine which had occurred in the account of the sculptures of the Temple at Carthage at I. 456 and also at VIII. 629 is probably no more than the unconscious use of a phrase that had formulaic status in such contexts. In neither place need it indicate any more than that the scenes in question were both in the Temple and on the Shield, in correct (or at least reasonable) chronological order, as they are in each case. Again in Book I, Jupiter's prophecy not only links the name Iulus (Iuli progenies, VI. 789) with Ascanius (I.267) and gives an etymology (for what that is worth), but by its explicit promise of revenge on Greece in years to come for the sack of Troy (I.283 f.) it justifies the somewhat fulsome praise of the conquerors of Greece in VI. 838 f. What Virgil says there is not unsuitable for L. Aemilius Paulus, the victor of Pydna in 168 B.C., but somewhat infelicitous in so far as it also covers the inglorious despoliation of Greece by L. Mummius Achaicus in that annus mirabilis, 146 B.C.

More might be said, but perhaps at the cost of blurring the main lines of the argument put forward. One question remains enigmatic and is likely to continue so. No evidence exists to show if any of the numerous similarities between Virgil's allusions and Livy's account of the early phase of Rome is due to literary associations between these two writers or to a common source. Discretion opts in such circumstances for the unadventurous answer, and for the purpose of this enquiry the

supposition of a common source suits well enough. But it is at least cause for reflection that both in VI and VIII the detailed descriptions are all of places or persons whose stories are told in the first pentad of Livy; the latest of these in time is the episode of Manlius and the Gauls, told in Livy V.47 f. In VI, after the mention of the Tarquins and Brutus, and in VIII after the description of Manlius, the tempo quickens or alters; thus in VI the entries after line 835 are very brief or little more than rhetorical enumeration (quis te, magne Cato, tacitum aut te, Cosse relinquat?) while in VIII there is nothing directly historical between Manlius and Catiline, who is almost within living memory for Virgil. Those of a speculative or associative turn of mind will not be slow to recall that Livy's first five books were completed between 27 and 25 B.C. (for the internal evidence on which this rests, see R.M. Ogilvie, Livy I-V /1965/p.2) So long as the imaginative are content to say that nothing forbids the possibility that Virgil worked off Livy's account, I have no quarrel with them; what needs to be remembered is that there is no proof that he did.

J. G. GRIFFITH,
Jesus College, Oxford.

NOTES

1. This paper was read to the Oxford University Classical Society on 6 February 1968. It was prompted by reading the communication of Professor D.E. Eichholz on the Shield of Aeneas, as printed in an expanded form in these Proceedings, no. 6 (1967) pp. 45 f. I am very grateful to him for his kindness in replying so helpfully to a letter I wrote to him outlining the substance of what is suggested here, and for his encouragement to follow the line of thought further. I would also like to thank Mr. C.G. Hardie for his most welcome comments after reading a draft of this paper
2. Useful points are made in the rather diffuse essay of C. Becker in Wiener Studien 77 (1964) pp. III f. I find only incidental references to Aeneas' shield in W. Schadewaldt, Von Homers Welt und Werk (1959) pp. 171 n. 5 and p. 378, and in K. Rheinhardt Die Ilias und ihr Dichter (1961) pp. 401. f.
3. So W. Warde Fowler, Aeneas at the Site of Rome, 1917, pp. 103 f. developed by Miss J.R. Bacon in Cl.Rev. 53 (1939) pp. 97-104)
4. So Brooks Otis Virgil... 1963. pp. 341 f.
5. So D.L. Drew, The Allegory of the Aeneid. 1927 pp. 26 f.
6. In Proceedings of the Virgil Society 6 1967 pp. 45 f.
7. W. Whitehead, Appendix to volume III of Pitt's edition of Virgil of 1753 (see below)
8. See R.D. Williams in Cl. Qu. N.S. 10 (1960) pp. 145 f.

9. In fact it appears from Donatus that Virgil had committed no part of the Aeneid to writing before 26 B.C.
10. As pointed out by W.A. Camps in a short but important note in Cl. Qu. 48 (1954) pp. 214-5.
11. nuper when used of a short time previous may be reinforced by nunc, as it is at Plaut. Truc. 397 or Ter. Eun. 9. In Juvenal VIII. 120 it refers to an event of anything up to 20 years past, in Pliny Paneg. 8 to one of 31 years before.
12. Among other passages where this sense is required are Hor. Epp. I,7.32 or Virg. Ecl. VI. 16 (the garlands of the sleeping Silenus, capiti demissa, lie procul, close by).
13. So Hor. Epp. I,15.9; Juvenal III. 192, VII. 4 al.
14. I have been unable to trace the originator of this idea. Random ordering is a poet's prerogative where nothing turns on the sequence. Thus Norden in his commentary on Aeneid VI, p. 315 thought Virgil had probably assumed complete freedom, but called attention also to the paired arrangement: Decii-Drusi, Torquatus-Camillus, Caesar-Pompey Mummius-Paulus, Cato-Cossus. Gracchi-Scipios, Fabricius-Sarranus. He suggested that this paired grouping gave Augustus the idea of placing statues of empire-builders (die Erweiterer des Imperiums cf. proferet imperium. 795) round his forum. Possibly, but we can never know how Augustus' mind worked, and the paired grouping would suit a tour round an atrium just as well. It is a pity that so little survives of the twelfth book of Ennius' Annales, where there may have been something like a parade-section.
15. The inclusion of the thatched cottage of Romulus on the Capital (654) is a delicate and effective touch.
16. In establishing this symmetry it is of course necessary to leave aside Ecl. X explicitly announced as the extremum laborem in its opening line; it is a pendant-piece to round off the series formed by the other nine.

BOOK XII REVISITED

Epicurean Tension

Vergil is not entirely happy. His residual Epicureanism did not relish wars - or gods who intervene in human affairs. Aeneas is hardly the detached Stoic hero:

terribilis saevam nullo discrimine caedem
suscitat, irarumque omnis effundit habenas. (498-9)

Glover called him the Happy Warrior but he scarcely seems so. As for the gods, Jupiter's apparent fear that Juno may catch cold hanging about the chill damp clouds (796) is matched by Juno's odd disappearance from the heavens altogether (842). The Fury is portrayed with a weird mixture of genuine grimness and ludicrous exaggeration. Her path to earth is first a swift spiral (turbine 855). Then comes the not very happy comparison with a Parthian arrow; then the transformation into a sedentary owl. Vergil is happier with humanity than with heroism or divinity.

Rare Usages

With a poet as careful as Vergil the use of rare words or even their coining represents some constraint; the language does not come naturally to him, and he has to force it into his mould.

- 7 latro unusual of a hunter, and the only appearance of the word in Vergil.
- 120 limus The only literary appearance of the word, authorized here by Servius. Aulus Gellius (12,3,3) attests it from Tiro.
- 121 pilata See also under Ambiguities. The meaning "dense" is attested from Ennius and Varro, but rare; "armed with javelins" is not found before Martial.
- 165 crispans Also 1,313 but otherwise not found earlier; the usage is curious, and Poschl takes it to connote anxiety.
- 364 sternax not elsewhere before Silius; may be a coining of Vergil's.
- 375 bilix hapax legomenon.
- 389 latebra the sing. is not elsewhere in Vergil and is not found previously in verse.
- 451 sidus I take to mean "the sky", a usage not previously attested. The phrase is in any event unusual, even if we take it with Servius of a storm breaking or with R. D. Williams of the sun's light being cut off.
- 517 exosum twice in this book (cf. 818), also in 5,687, but not found before Vergil.
- 596 incessi the first appearance of the word.