But whose is the casus that shatters him? Formally it is Dido's; yet here too there is an ambiguity that each reader must interpret for himself: for Aeneas' casus too was iniquus, and he has no-one to give him comfort. This we must always remember, as he plods on, almost mechanically, in grief (inde datum molitur iter, 477; there is a long pause after the words).

Virgil has used all his art and emotion to bring the tragedy of Aeneas and Dido flooding back. It had seemed over and done with for ever. But here in the world of ghosts the past has caught Aeneas up again: there is no escape. He knows now that the demands of pietas are more complex and ruthless than even he had realized before. This is the scene that T.S. Eliot felt to be 'not only one of the most poignant, but one of the most civilized passages in poetry'. It is the climax of the Book, in so far as it relates an experience that touches Aeneas most personally. The dim world beyond the Styx held for him something harder to bear than anything he could have imagined, the worst of all reckonings, a reckoning with self.

R.G. AUSTIN

BOOK REVIEWS

EGIL KRAGGERUD, AENEISSTUDIEN. Symbolae Osloenses Fasc. Supplet. XXII. 1968. Pp. 247. Paper.

This is a leisurely book, never obscure, often prolix, sometimes repetitive. Perhaps its most annoying feature is that almost a third of its bulk consists of footnotes, never obscure, often prolix, sometimes repetitive, and incidentally incorporating a very great deal of other people's half-sense.

K.'s basic thesis is that although "as a character in the modern sense Aeneas is indeed always the same" (pp. 104 f.), it is his changing, deepening relationship to the will of Fate which gives dynamic impulse to the narrative of the Aeneid, of which he is the supremely dominating figure - except of course when he is not: so K. devotes the second major part of his book to an examination of the Games in Sicily, where secondary characters play a primary role. Between these two major parts there is an attempt (pp. 106-117) to resolve the old problem of Aeneas' lost weekend (?) in Carthage: a summary of this may serve as a specimen of K.'s argumentation, which lacks neither imagination nor a grasp of the cultural background.

Dido welcomes Aeneas by saying that it is now the septima aestas since he has been wandering (1,755 f.); Iris, disguised as Beroe, tells the Trojan women: septima post Troiae excidium iam vertitur aestas (5, 626). Time has apparently stood still from the beginning of Aeneas' tale of the fall of Troy to the end of the Sicilian Games. Some ancient commentators believed that it did indeed; most moderns believe that Virgil would have removed this inconsistency (not, after all, an isolated phenomenon) in a final revision. K. believes that Aeneas spent a considerable time, including hiems in its seasonal sense, with Dido in Carthage; that the Games to mark the anniversary of Anchises' burial strongly recall the

festival of the Parentalia whose dates (13-21 February) may have been in Virgil's mind as the date of the Games; further, Virgil may have borne in mind that February marked the end of the old Roman calendar year. Now Virgil sometimes uses aestas = annus; the addition of the numeral convinces K. that this is the case here. So there is no inconsistency: Dido welcomes Aeneas within that same twelve month whose end, about the end of February, sees the burning of the ships. All very well if one could bring oneself to believe that instead of saying e.g. post Troiae excidium exigitur iam septimus annus, Virgil chose to say septima ... vertitur aestas at the precise point where the usual meaning of aestas would make the most nonsense: he wants to say that the year is coming to an end when in fact winter is coming to an end and so he refers to ... summer.

K.'s outlook and method are entirely conditioned by the Virgilian criticism of the last two decades. He is honestly and judiciously sceptical of its more extreme tendencies. Duckworth's rigid scheme of structural correspondences rests, at least in part, on "parallels without significance" (p.11, n. 3). Pöschl's extravagant fantasies are more than once (e.g. p. 43, n. 103) criticised or discarded. Knauer's relentless search for Homeric parallels is conducted in a manner which obscures the significant and exalts the incidental (p. 121, n.3). Putnam is rebuked en passant (pp. 126 ff.). Here, one thinks, is a man after one's own heart, who believes that even in the criticism of Virgil est modus in rebus. So one thinks -- but not for long. For he cannot resist the excess he has just denounced, particularly the excess of symbolic analogy.

When Aeneas views the pictures on the doors of the temple of Apollo at Cumae (Aen. 6, 20 ff.), he beholds a symbol of his own experiences, not only in broad outline, but also, according to K., in minute detail. Not only does he see that he and Daedalus were both desperate refugees who after a perilous journey had reached Cumae, and that a man named Androgeos had played an important role in the past lives of them both (Aen. 2, 370 ff., 6, 20), but under the figure of Pasiphae he sees Dido, and in the Minotaur the symbol of the monstrously hybrid offspring which would have resulted from the union of Trojans and Carthaginians had he yielded to Dido's wishes: "in particular he perceives that a union with Dido would have been impossible for him" (p. 69). Similarly, in the bee-simile of Aen. 1, 434 f. are prefigured the two possible kinds of reception Aeneas himself may meet from the Carthaginians: will they relieve him of his burden? or will they drive him away? K. presses his interpretations dangerously near to a reductio ad absurdum. Did Aeneas complete the equations and identify himself in the first situation with a disdainful bull and in the second with a lazy drone? Cloanthus receives as his prize a cloak on which is embroidered the rape of Ganymede (Aen. 5, 254 ff.); this, according to K., recalls the push given to Cloanthus' ship by Portunus to ensure his victory (Aen. 5, 239 ff.) (pp. 146 ff.). I hesitate to suggest that the only common factor in the two situations is a divine impulse.

But K. is also capable of sensitive and balanced criticism. Again, three examples must suffice. In the overall structure of the first third of the poem K. stresses the important consequences which follow Aeneas' acquiring of patria potestas on the death of Anchises: all of his life up to this point is presented indirectly, in the narrative to Dido; the epic opens at the point where he has just become fully answerable and responsible for his family and people, a situation which gives added point to his first despairing words. In the detail of how Aeneas slashes the mooring-rope with his sword, swiftly and decisively, to set sail from Carthage (Aen. 4, 579 f.), K. plausibly sees the outward expression of his resolve

to break with Dido (retinaculum). The way in which Virgil lists the competitors for the ship-race (Aen. 5, 114 ff.) would tell any attentive listener how to lay his bet: Cloanthus, whose entry contains the apostrophe Romane is bound to come first, as surely as the founding of Rome is the ultimate destiny of the whole undertaking (K. incidentally wishes to punctuate 5, 123 caerulea, genus unde tibi, Romane, Cluenti (genitive)); Mnestheus, Italus, must come second; Gyas, with three rows of oarsmen and three verses allotted to him, will be third; Sergestus is doomed to fail, having only one-and-a-half lines' description, and being the founder of the gens Sergia, which had recently produced Catiline.

The reader of K.'s book who is patient and discriminating will find some valuable insights into the Aeneid.

P.T. EDEN.

THE THIRD BOOK OF HORACE'S ODES, edited with translation and running commentary by Gordon Williams, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1969. 12/-.

This is an experimental edition, aimed largely at giving sixth formers and undergraduates an insight into the meaning and purpose of Odes III. Consequently Professor Williams is concerned not so much with the often self-contained difficulties which have tended to dominate earlier commentaries but with treating each poem as a whole and expounding Horace's process of thought.

The introduction is strictly functional and is divided into five sections. The first is a short but adequate survey of Horace's life and works, and this is followed by an account of the political situation between 42 and 23 B.C. Both require little previous knowledge from the reader. The third deals with the poet and the community. There Williams makes the important point, as do too few editors, that Horace modifies the traditional material to suit the mood of the moment and does not write poems for real social occasions. The poet of the Odes is a vates whose own personality does not appear, despite, of course, the odd autobiographical reference. The fourth and longest section raises the question of style, with discussions of Horace's originality, changes of tone, ornamentation and structural technique. The reader is urged to co-operate imaginatively with the poet and is provided with most of the necessary information. However, the last section, which deals with metre, is extremely brief. There is a specimen of each metre that occurs in Odes III and a few points of interest are added in the commentary, but nothing is said about the factors governing caesura, while a note on the occasions when a short syllable is found at the start of the first three lines of an Alcaic stanz is tucked away in the explanation of the reading inauspicatos in 6.10. Clearly only an outline could be expected, but more information on the principles behind the metres would be welcome.

After a list of ten books for further reading, the test is printed, with a translation and running commentary attached to each Ode. There are six important divergences from the Oxford Classical Text. Bibet is read for bibit in 3.12, limina Pulliae for limen Apuliae in 4.10, trahenti for trahentis in 5.15, inauspicatos for non auspicatos in 6.10, illa for illi in 20.8 and terrenum...publicum for Tyrrhenum...Apulicum in 24.4. The choice is justified, except in 4.10 and 24.4.

festival of the Parentalia whose dates (13-21 February) may have been in Virgil's mind as the date of the Games; further, Virgil may have borne in mind that February marked the end of the old Roman calendar year. Now Virgil sometimes uses aestas = annus; the addition of the numeral convinces K. that this is the case here. So there is no inconsistency: Dido welcomes Aeneas within that same twelve month whose end, about the end of February, sees the burning of the ships. All very well if one could bring oneself to believe that instead of saying e.g. post Troiae excidium exigitur iam septimus annus, Virgil chose to say septima ... vertitur aestas at the precise point where the usual meaning of aestas would make the most nonsense: he wants to say that the year is coming to an end when in fact winter is coming to an end and so he refers to ... summer.

K.'s outlook and method are entirely conditioned by the Virgilian criticism of the last two decades. He is honestly and judiciously sceptical of its more extreme tendencies. Duckworth's rigid scheme of structural correspondences rests, at least in part, on "parallels without significance" (p.11, n. 3). Pöschl's extravagant fantasies are more than once (e.g. p. 43, n. 103) criticised or discarded. Knauer's relentless search for Homeric parallels is conducted in a manner which obscures the significant and exalts the incidental (p. 121, n.3). Putnam is rebuked en passant (pp. 126 ff.). Here, one thinks, is a man after one's own heart, who believes that even in the criticism of Virgil est modus in rebus. So one thinks -- but not for long. For he cannot resist the excess he has just denounced, particularly the excess of symbolic analogy.

When Aeneas views the pictures on the doors of the temple of Apollo at Cumae (Aen. 6, 20 ff.), he beholds a symbol of his own experiences, not only in broad outline, but also, according to K., in minute detail. Not only does he see that he and Daedalus were both desperate refugees who after a perilous journey had reached Cumae, and that a man named Androgeos had played an important role in the past lives of them both (Aen. 2, 370 ff., 6, 20), but under the figure of Pasiphae he sees Dido, and in the Minotaur the symbol of the monstrously hybrid offspring which would have resulted from the union of Trojans and Carthaginians had he yielded to Dido's wishes: "in particular he perceives that a union with Dido would have been impossible for him" (p. 69). Similarly, in the bee-simile of Aen. 1, 434 f. are prefigured the two possible kinds of reception Aeneas himself may meet from the Carthaginians: will they relieve him of his burden? or will they drive him away? K. presses his interpretations dangerously near to a reductio ad absurdum. Did Aeneas complete the equations and identify himself in the first situation with a disdainful bull and in the second with a lazy drone? Cloanthus receives as his prize a cloak on which is embroidered the rape of Ganymede (Aen. 5, 254 ff.); this, according to K., recalls the push given to Cloanthus' ship by Portunus to ensure his victory (Aen. 5, 239 ff.) (pp. 146 ff.). I hesitate to suggest that the only common factor in the two situations is a divine impulse.

But K. is also capable of sensitive and balanced criticism. Again, three examples must suffice. In the overall structure of the first third of the poem K. stresses the important consequences which follow Aeneas' acquiring of patria potestas on the death of Anchises: all of his life up to this point is presented indirectly, in the narrative to Dido; the epic opens at the point where he has just become fully answerable and responsible for his family and people, a situation which gives added point to his first despairing words. In the detail of how Aeneas slashes the mooring-rope with his sword, swiftly and decisively, to set sail from Carthage (Aen. 4, 579 f.), K. plausibly sees the outward expression of his resolve

to break with Dido (retinaculum). The way in which Virgil lists the competitors for the ship-race (Aen. 5, 114 ff.) would tell any attentive listener how to lay his bet: Cloanthus, whose entry contains the apostrophe Romane is bound to come first, as surely as the founding of Rome is the ultimate destiny of the whole undertaking (K. incidentally wishes to punctuate 5, 123 caerulea, genus unde tibi, Romane, Cluenti (genitive)); Mnestheus, Italus, must come second; Gyas, with three rows of oarsmen and three verses allotted to him, will be third; Sergestus is doomed to fail, having only one-and-a-half lines' description, and being the founder of the gens Sergia, which had recently produced Catiline.

The reader of K.'s book who is patient and discriminating will find some valuable insights into the Aeneid.

P.T. EDEN.

THE THIRD BOOK OF HORACE'S ODES, edited with translation and running commentary by Gordon Williams, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1969. 12/-.

This is an experimental edition, aimed largely at giving sixth formers and undergraduates an insight into the meaning and purpose of Odes III. Consequently Professor Williams is concerned not so much with the often self-contained difficulties which have tended to dominate earlier commentaries but with treating each poem as a whole and expounding Horace's process of thought.

The introduction is strictly functional and is divided into five sections. The first is a short but adequate survey of Horace's life and works, and this is followed by an account of the political situation between 42 and 23 B.C. Both require little previous knowledge from the reader. The third deals with the poet and the community. There Williams makes the important point, as do too few editors, that Horace modifies the traditional material to suit the mood of the moment and does not write poems for real social occasions. The poet of the Odes is a vates whose own personality does not appear, despite, of course, the odd autobiographical reference. The fourth and longest section raises the question of style, with discussions of Horace's originality, changes of tone, ornamentation and structural technique. The reader is urged to co-operate imaginatively with the poet and is provided with most of the necessary information. However, the last section, which deals with metre, is extremely brief. There is a specimen of each metre that occurs in Odes III and a few points of interest are added in the commentary, but nothing is said about the factors governing caesura, while a note on the occasions when a short syllable is found at the start of the first three lines of an Alcaic stanz is tucked away in the explanation of the reading inauspicatos in 6.10. Clearly only an outline could be expected, but more information on the principles behind the metres would be welcome.

After a list of ten books for further reading, the test is printed, with a translation and running commentary attached to each Ode. There are six important divergences from the Oxford Classical Text. Bibet is read for bibit in 3.12, limina Pulliae for limen Apuliae in 4.10, trahenti for trahentis in 5.15, inauspicatos for non auspicatos in 6.10, illa for illi in 20.8 and terrenum...publicum for Tyrrhenum...Apulicum in 24.4. The choice is justified, except in 4.10 and 24.4.

The translation is generally literal, since the editor wishes to provide the shortest possible explanation of the original. Thus tui plenum (25.1-2) is rendered 'filled with you' and valentium...vertere (25.15-6) 'strong to uproot'. On the other hand, fidens...horrida bracchiis (4.50) becomes 'trusting in its forest of hands' and such versions as 'desirable' for the dulce of dulce et decorum est pro patria mori (2.13), 'ghostly' for luridum (4.74), 'dangerous' for gravibus (5.4) and 'pretty' for insignem (20.6) are a little misleading. 'Your tantrums and your heated recriminations' sounds strange for irarum calidaeque rixae in 27.70. But these are minor criticisms. The translation is satisfactory, within its limits.

The commentary is lucid and almost always fulfils its purpose admirably; in some cases, it is an expansion of the author's remarks in his work on Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry, published by the Clarendon Press in 1968. In examining the long and significant fourth Ode, for instance, he agrees with Fraenkel that it is closely related to Pindar's Pythian I (the relevant passages of this and other Greek poems are included, with translations, in an appendix) and explains the autobiographical details of 9 ff. as the result of this correspondence. Horace writes personal, not choral, lyric and so, while Pindar favours an objective description of the power of music, he prefers to illustrate the power of poetic inspiration from his own life. He speaks of his miraculous escapes from death and, with this more serious note, passes to the names of current trouble-spots in the empire and so to Caesar himself. It is unfortunate that Williams, like Fraenkel, accepts without comment the doubtful reading limina Pulliae in v.10 and says that 'what makes the account remarkable is the authentic note of autobiography given by the name of his nurse, Pullia'. Limen Apuliae, the reading of most manuscripts, is certainly not very satisfactory and raises points of scansion and poetic technique, while Porphyrio adds to the confusion by appearing to read Apuliae but interpreting it as a personal name. Nevertheless, the difficulty affects the general understanding of the poem and deserves no less attention than the problem of male ominatis in 14.11, which is discussed at some length. Sicula Palinurus unda (v.28) is rendered 'cape Palinurus in Sicilian waters' and is said to refer to an escape from 'drowning off Sicily (otherwise unknown)'. Williams thus follows Pseudo-Acron in claiming that there was a Palinurus in Sicily, although there is little doubt that the scholiast is making a guess to explain Sicula...unda. Yet, as T. Dyer points out in 'Horatian Chronology', Classical Museum ii (1845) 206-7, we learn from combining the accounts of Appian, Dio and Velleius Paterculus that in 36 Maecenas experienced a disastrous storm off the known Palinurus, the promontory south of the bay of Velia, in operations against Sextus Pompeius and, in all probability, Horace, his faithful companion, was with him at the time. E. Wistrand develops this view in Horace's Ninth Epode and its Historical Background (1958), pp. 16-7, and shows that there is ample justification for Sicula...unda as hostile waves coming from the island of the enemy. The interpretation of the phrase is a detail in a commentary of this kind, but it is one that should not be overlooked.

Such shortcomings are few and detract little from the value of the book as a whole. Professor Williams has made a useful contribution to Horatian literature in producing a refreshing and informative work at so reasonable a price.

Queen Mary College,
University of London.

M.W. THOMPSON.

Gordon Williams: Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry
(Oxford University Press, 1968: £4.10s.0d)

"No poet, no artist of any art," T.S. Eliot wrote in one of his best-known essays, "has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead. I mean this as a principle of aesthetic, not merely historical, criticism."[1] His words have a special relevance to any study of Roman poetry, in which tradition had a special vitality, in which we are presented with a remarkably organic literary achievement. I use the word organic deliberately, for medical metaphors of birth, atrophy, death are usually misleading in criticism. Transformation and renewal there must be; but the tradition itself remains living and coercive. Professor Gordon Williams has presented us with a volume of 810 pages in which he sets out "to demonstrate, by detailed analysis, the essential nature of Roman poetry and the ways in which individual poets, belonging to, and conscious of, an identifiable tradition....achieved an originality of their own". The two ideas of 'tradition' and 'originality' are in no sense opposed, but complementary.

The author has fixed as his terminus ad quem the death of Horace in 8 A.D. He faces the period in which Roman poetry emerges in all the stunning richness of the Augustan era: and not so long afterwards Quintilian, in his famous survey of Greek and Roman literature, could, without fantasy, measure and weigh the achievements of Rome against those of Greece. To trace and to analyse this blossoming of literature is a weighty undertaking. Professor Williams' book is not to be rapidly assimilated. Scholars will wish to have it by them to test, to evaluate, to dispute. For dispute there will be. No student of Roman poetry can expect to subscribe to all Professor Williams' views. But the discussion will be profitable and the wealth of material contained within the compass of one volume is both remarkable and encouraging. But let the reader be warned: he must be prepared to give the author his closest attention. The analyses and discussions are often minute and demanding; they require a thorough familiarity with the relevant text. This is greatly assisted by the printing of Latin and Greek texts in full, with a prose translation appended. This, together with a painstaking system of cross-referencing and adequate indices, is of much help in utilising so large a book.

In a recent and stimulating article, Professor Charles Segal has acutely stated problems and outlined recent trends in criticism of ancient texts. He sees that there is a dichotomy - one which is likely to widen - between two major schools of criticism, which (for want of better terms) we may designate the Old and the New.[2] He makes a rational critique of both systems, remarking that "no critical methodology, whether new or old, can make up for the critic's knowledge and sensitivity and his ability to fuse both into a valid insight. Criticism is after all probably an art rather than a science..." He adds: "The classical critic needs not so much a methodology... as a free, independent judgment and what Pöschl has called 'the aures religiosissimae for the essence of poetry' - combined with as much Latin and Greek as he can get."[3] All this is very true; but a methodology is useful - Professor Williams has one. He also has, as we should expect, a profound knowledge of Latin and Greek; yet, it must be said at the outset, that he is primarility an adherent and exponent of the older school of criticism. It is

the older school at its best as it appears, for example, in Fraenkel's Horace,[4] to which Professor Williams makes frequent reference.[5] In treating Catullus, there is no mention of Quinn, in treating Horace, no mention of Commager, in treating Virgil, no mention of Pöschl;[6] this is not necessarily a criticism but it enables a potential reader to understand the general critical attitude of this book, of the insights which it will offer on Roman poetic activity. Professor Williams, for instance, has no time for what he describes as "a type of investigation which has become very popular with scholars in recent years: this is the discovery of patterns of arrangement, balances and harmony, contrast and similarity between the Eclogues in the position to which Virgil has assigned them in the complete collection." (p.328). In the same way the author dismisses as "not...very profitable" the work of Skutsch and Otis on the arrangement of Propertius' Monobiblos[7] (for Williams believes, and argues at length, that Books I-III of Propertius were published as a single unit). I still find their ideas helpful. In short, Professor Williams' approach may be termed historicist; he is deeply conversant with the political background of Augustan poetry and investigates it with thoroughness. Such an approach brings its rewards: the chapter on "the poetry of institutions" is, to this reviewer, one of the most interesting in the book, with its learned demonstration of "the capacity of Roman poets - and especially the great poets of the Augustan age - to exploit poetically the emotive force of their own institutions." This sets the Roman poets apart from their Greek predecessors, and it is what one would expect from a great law-making nation, conservative and tenacious of their own ancient customs and rights. In the light of this, Professor Williams' discussion of Books IV and VI of the Aeneid, in comparison and confrontation with Propertius IV, 11, is valid and enlightening and will lose nothing by combination with other, post-Heinzean analyses of the same Books.

One of the great merits of this work lies in this process of confrontation: by examining various facets of Roman poetry in each chapter, the author has juxtaposed together poems that one has perhaps previously only considered in isolation. The light which they shed on each other - and on the "identifiable traditions" of Roman poetry - is valuable and convincing. This is true all through the book; it is especially apposite, for example, in the chapter "Imagination and Interpretation: the Demand on the Reader" - which shows that the demand made on a reader wishing to enter into the factitious and self-contained world of a poem is far greater than our simplicist ancestors would have thought. The reader must be prepared to weigh all the subtleties, all the nuances, all the variations in tone and emphasis which operate within a single poem. (I may say here that I still remain obstinately unconvinced of the unity of Catullus 68, despite Williams' cunning arguments to the contrary in this chapter.)[8] Another factor any reader of Roman poetry will have to face is the complex integration of Greek and Roman, to which Professor Williams devotes a perceptive chapter. This might have been profitably enlarged by a discussion of ancient theories of imitatio, with all their important implications.[9] The chapter begins with an examination of Catullus 51: I think that the author underestimates the savage irony and bitterness underlying the sudden transition from translation to self-address in this remarkable poem. It is easily forgotten just how shameful Catullus' life of poetic otium was to old-fashioned, respublica-centered Romans.[10] Poetry, it will be remembered, was classified by Cicero among the leviores artes,[11] and the phrase cum dignitate otium was in its day a startling paradox. The novi poetae were struggling to give poetry a place in a society which as Herman Fraenkel has written, "strangely misconceived the nature of poetry

and invariably associated it with idleness."[12] It is to the credit of Augustus and his associates (as Professor Williams shows in his chapter on "the poet and the community") that they provided poets with a new and honoured place and a dignitas of their own (of which Propertius for one, with his use of sacral language of his own creative activity,[13] was so fully aware); but old concepts die hard, as the debate between Aper and Maternus in the Dialogus shows.

Catullus above all revealed that, within a powerful tradition, the poet remains an individual. Roman poetry, in general, gives an impression of introspection different from any found in Greek. We have of course long passed the days that viewed Roman poetry - and particularly Horace and the elegists, as well as Virgil's Eclogues - as suitable material for crude biographical investigation; such an approach is as out of date as speculation on the number of Lady Macbeth's children. 'Sincerity' is a dangerous word to use in literary criticism. Professor Williams shows himself to be aware of that in his chapter on "truth and sincerity". There is nothing more corrupting in criticism of Roman poetry - or for that matter of Elizabethan poetry[14] - than naive romanticism. As Eliot remarked: "The only cure for romanticism is to analyse it."[15] Analysis has certainly killed romantic attitudes to the elegists, although books tinged by outmoded viewpoints still circulate among the young and innocent. The 'sincerity' of a Roman poem lies in its authenticity of expression and form, not in its autobiographical exactitude: it is not necessary to labour a theme discussed by A.W. Allen in a well-known essay.[16] The Romans would have sympathised with Sir Philip Sidney, when, in An Apologie for Poetrie, he describes poets as "speaking not (table talk fashion, or like men in a dreame) words as they chanceably fall from the mouth, but peyzing each sillable of each word by iust proportion according to the dignitie of the subjecte." The Romans, like the Elizabethans, had a thoroughly objective attitude to poetry. J.R. Newman has recently stated the fact in bold and uncompromising terms. "Poetry is art;" he writes, "art is artificial....in criticising ancient poetry, does it make sense to ignore the truth that all poetry is artificial....and substitutde a distinction between 'subjective' and 'objective' which has the disadvantage of suggesting that some poetry is not artificial....?"[17] Williams takes a rather different view from Newman, but time and again he undermines the notions of undisciplined realism by showing how, despite the presence of elements taken approximately from the poet's own life and situation, much else was added: "the poet constructs a world for himself which is more or less imaginary." And yet Professor Williams devotes a considerable amount of space to proving that the love-elegists "normally conceived themselves as addressing ladies of reasonably high social standing, who, because they are ex hypothesi attractive, are also married ..." (p.542) This is a true and useful corrective to old fashioned notions on the subject. But does it really help our understanding of the elegists? I think not, any more than I believe debates on the identity of Lesbia to be a proper field for literary critics (in the same way, is the historical identity of the Fair Youth and Dark Lady of Shakespeare's Sonnets really of any assistance in coming to grips with the aesthetics of the poems?) Professor Williams continues with the assertion that "for Propertius both ancient tradition and his own poetry combine to create a strong conviction that Cynthia to some degree conceals a real person. In the case of Tibullus, the reality of Delia is asserted by ancient tradition but it would have been impossible to assert it on the evidence of his poetry alone." But Corinna "had no real existence" - as Ovid himself suggests (Tristia II, 339-40). The

distinctions are to me of small importance. Septimius and Acme in Catullus 45 are credible people, even if their existence is restricted to the imaginative construct of the poem: the same is true of Lesbia, Cynthia, Delia, Corinna. 'Sincerity' must be judged as an objective term: the way in which a poet reacts to and evokes a situation will depend on his own psychological and intellectual qualities. Autobiographical reality - in a rigidly historical sense - has little or no relevance to our understanding of a poem. As Williams remarks of apparently autobiographical poetry: "Judgment...requires, above all, a sympathetic understanding of its subtle complexity and of the range of its imaginative comprehension." A.W. Allen has summed the matter up: "This does not mean that erotic poets were never in love, but it does mean that classical literary doctrine did not assume any specific and normal connexion between personal poetry and the actual experience of the poet. The doctrine insisted upon the independence of the poet, and his right freely to choose fitting material wherever he might wish, provided only that it accorded with the kind of poetry he was writing..."[18] In the light of this attitude, I am dubious about the validity of Williams' view that "the framework which Catullus finds may be the product of his eagerness to give the sharpest possible expression to emotion which he feels in himself, while Propertius may be writing to enjoy the drama of imagining himself in a novel situation." (p.577) The distinction is verging on romanticism, and is certainly capable of distortion.

A review of this length cannot hope to do justice to a book such as this. Professor Williams has done a real service to the study of Roman poetry. His erudite book will be of the greatest value to all students, amateur and professional; it is a volume which no reader of Roman poetry can afford to be without.

D.W.T.C. VESSEY

1. T.S. Eliot, 'Tradition and the Individual Talent', in Selected Essays3 (London, 1951), 15.

2. Charles Segal, 'Ancient texts and modern criticism: some trends in classical studies', Arethusa 1 (1968), 1-25.

3. ibid., 19, quoting V. Pöschl, 'Ovid und Horaz', RCOM 1 (1959), 21.

4. E. Fraenkel, Horace (Oxford, 1957).

5. Williams dedicates his book to Professor Fraenkel. It may be pointed out here that in this book the author has rigidly restricted his references to other works. He writes: "Consequently there is no bibliography as such but only a list of those works to which I have referred....I have been ruthless and have only mentioned works which helped me particularly or which express a point of view which I reject." (p.vii) This avoidance of the external impedimenta of scholarship makes for easier reading.

6. K. Quinn, The Catullan Revolution (Melbourne, 1959 and Cambridge, 1969; S. Commager, The Odes of Horace (New Haven, 1962); V. Pöschl, Die Dichtkunst Virgils (Innsbruck, 1950) = The Art of Vergil: Image and Symbol in the Aeneid (trans. G. Seligman, Michigan, 1966).

7. O. Skutsch, 'The structure of the Propertian Monobiblos', CPh 58 (1963), 238-9; B. Otis, 'Propertius' Single Book', HSCP 70 (1965), 1-44.

8. For another subtle attempt to prove unity, see H.W. Prescott, 'Unity of Catullus 68', TAPA 71 (1940), 473-500.

9. Mlle. A. Guillemin's 'L'imitation dans les littératures antiques', REL 2 (1924), 35-57, still remains basic.

10. On the Roman attitude to poetry, see the remarks of H. Fraenkel, Ovid: A Poet between Two Worlds (Berkeley, 1945), 9-10.

11. Cicero, Brutus I, 3 (with A.E. Douglas' note in his edition, Oxford, 1966, 3).

12. H. Fraenkel, o.c., 9.

13. cf. G. Luck, The Latin Love-Elegy (London, 1959), 124 ff. There are useful remarks in J.P. Elder, 'Non iniussa cano: Virgil's Sixth Eclogue', HSCP 65 (1961), 110-125.

14. Cf. the remarks of R. Tuve in his essay '"Imitation" and images' in Elizabethan Poetry: Modern Essays in Criticism (ed. P.J. Alpers, Oxford, 1967): "Extreme pleasure in poetry as a craft probably closed the Elizabethans to kinds of poetic pleasure which the Romantics placed very high; it certainly operated to make this age impatient of artless reportage." (p.42)

15. T.S. Eliot, The Sacred Wood (Oxford, 1928), 27.

16. A.W. Allen, '"Sincerity" and the Roman elegists', CPh 45 (1950), 145-160, reprinted under the title 'Sunt qui Propertium malint' in Critical Essays on Roman Literature: Elegy and Lyric (ed. J.P. Sullivan, London, 1962), 110-125.

17. J. Newman, Augustus and the New Poetry (ed. Latomus, Brussels, 1967), 366-7.

18. Allen, I.c., 146-7.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE AENEID by W.A. CAMPS
Oxford University Press, 1969. Boards edition 25/-; paperback 12/-.

This is a sensible and workmanlike approach to the subject, comparable with J.Perret's compendious and excellent "Virgil, l'homme et l'oeuvre" (Paris 1952), though more limited in scope. There are eleven chapters with five appendices and a small map of the voyages of Aeneas, the whole being contained in well under two hundred pages. The book is addressed to students of Virgil and of literature in general, including those who may be coming to the Aeneid for the first time. The reader need not know any Latin.

Mr. Camps has selected for discussion certain topics with the intention of conveying through these a balanced impression of the nature of the poem as a whole, and he has succeeded in his object. There is a reasonable apportionment of space between fact and opinion; the unavoidable personal element never becomes obtrusive.

Several passages treat sensitively the imaginative process in Virgil and the evocative properties of his poetry, while the observations on Virgil's 'religious' feeling and belief (pp. 42-50) are particularly helpful. The chapter on language and sensibility presents much useful material in a succinct and clear manner.

As critic Mr. Camps is independent, allying himself neither with symbolists nor allegorists - very wisely. Symbolism and allegory he does recognise in the poem, but he exercises reason and restraint. In chapter 10 and Appendix 5 he considers possible echoes of contemporary history. On the sacrificial slaughter by Aeneas at Pallas' funeral of captives, what Suetonius relates, Augustus 15, is cited - that Octavian had three hundred senators and knights slaughtered at a specially erected altar in honour of the dead Julius after the fall of Perusia in 41 B.C. The Homeric incident (see Il. 21.27 ff. and 23.175-6) does not account, says Mr. Camps, for what Aeneas is made to do. One wonders. Suetonius' story is only a rumour (scribunt quidam....); ancient biography tended to include the rumores also.

Mr. Camps remarks that Aeneas is conceived in general by the poet "as humane by nature as well as controlled by self-discipline". True, but the best of men are only men at best. They have their breaking-points, and Aeneas' sense of pietas has been unspeakably outraged. And this furious anger blazes out again at the very end of the poem for a connected reason when Aeneas notices the belt which Turnus took from Pallas. Pity vanishes and he stabs Turnus to death. Probably Homer and his own dramatic conceptions were enough to guide the poet's hand.

But it seems more than likely that Aeneas was intended somehow to suggest Octavian-Augustus; to what extent is the question. D.L. Drew went much too far in his essay published in 1927, "The Allegory of the Aeneid". Mr. Camps puts before us a good deal of the evidence (or 'considerations', perhaps a better expression here), but properly concludes that no consistent pattern of correspondences is to be detected in the allusions to contemporary events or persons. Symbol and allegory both play a part in the Aeneid, but we must beware of attempting to build a dogmatic theology on either.

The discussion of the "ille ego..." problem in Appendix 2 (which also deals with another passage said to have been similarly excised by the first editors, the Helen episode in Book 2) would have benefited if R.G. Austin's important paper (C.Q. n.s. 18(1968), p.109 ff.) had been available. Austin's attack is on linguistic grounds, though Camps's general arguments are persuasive. The lines are not authentic.

The lack of explicitness in much of Virgil's poetic procedure leads to diverse interpretations of character and incident at different levels which, if the judge is competent, have their own validity whatever their actual relation to the writer's intention. Mr. Camps stresses this point. His own reading of Aeneid 6 (already familiar to readers of The Proceedings from his lecture to the Society, P.V.S. 7(1967-68), p.22 ff.) makes him question

the traditional exposition of it: Aeneas' new assurance comes not *propter* his visit to the Underworld but simply *post* it; immediately after his ascent he reaches journey's end in the promised land. There has been no formative spiritual experience; the hero is cheered up by having got there at long last. What then we ask, is the point of *Aeneid* 6? Why is it there? The commentator must distinguish between what Virgil says and what he implies; the reader is allowed to concentrate on the implications. Factually Mr. Camps appears to be right, but readers will, on Mr. Camps's own showing, be forgiven for taking a more 'mystical' view and finding a deeper import in the poet's words. We are here on the verge of large metaphysical problems concerning the ontological status of a work of art. Virgil seems usually to say as little as possible so as to give us the widest possible field of inference. Mr. Camps has sounded a rationalist note of warning which we should gratefully acknowledge without necessarily abandoning the notion of the poem's larger life.

This book contains much of great value both for beginner and mature student. The tone is always humane and courteous. May it have the success which it deserves!

H. MacL. CURRIE.

QUEEN MARY COLLEGE,
University of London.