

In this setting she miraculously appears to him and we can now see, I think, why Virgil had not paused unduly in the earlier part of the narrative. Creusa has a distinctive role to play, not only by consoling Aeneas about her own fate, but, like Hector and Venus previously, by foretelling his own destiny. The passage is full of an unhurried dignity:

quid tantum insano iuvat indulgere dolori
o dulcis coniunx? non haec sine numine divum
eveniunt; nec te hinc comitem asportare Creusam
fas aut ille sinit superi regnator Olympi.
longa tibi exsilia et vastum maris aequor arandum
et terram Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva
inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Thybris. (776-82)

And as the vision of Creusa fades and the book draws to its close there is a gently stylised passage with reminiscences of Homer, beginning with a mild archaism and ending in one of Virgil's most liquid lines:

haec ubi dicta dedit lacrimantem et multa volentem
dicere deseruit, tenuisque recessit in auras.
ter conatus ibi collo dare bracchia circum;
ter frustra comprensa manus effugit imago,
par levibus ventis volucrique simillima somno. (790-4; cf. VI 700)

All I set out to do in this paper was to try, and share with you one aspect of Virgil's art which, amongst so many others, gives me pleasure; and if I have been doing no more than indulge my own fancies, we have at least read some Virgil together.

V.S. Lectures, No.92

EPIC AND ENCOMIUM

A lecture delivered to the Virgil Society
15th March 1969

by D.W. Black, B.A., M.Litt.

It is an obvious and familiar statement that the Aeneid invites comparison with the Homeric epics. Even before the death of Virgil - to say the completion of the Aeneid begs some question - Propertius had written nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade¹. And at every level, the influence, imitation or emulation of Homer is evident at a cursory reading. We can, with Servius, divide the Aeneid into a Roman Odyssey and a Roman Iliad at a major structural level. Lesser episodes have their clear Homeric models: to take one example from many, the story of Nisus and Euryalus in Aeneid IX is in some sense founded on the Doloneia of Iliad X. At yet

another level, the line-initial phrases voce vocans and voce vocat² recall to my mind the Homeric ἄσπερ ἄσπερ³; similarly, the two forms of accusative Daren and Dareta and the variation of form in tegmina and tegimen⁴ are exploitations, within the limits of Latin, of morphological plurality such as we find so much more frequently in Homer, and which is so confusing to the beginner reading Homer.

It is however at least as clear that the Aeneid is no mere imitation, in the modern sense, of either or both of the Homeric epics. There is at the very least 'modulation' of the Greek exemplar: the cases of imitation cited above will show this; so too, in the first book of the Aeneid, Virgil introduces the singer Iopas - a sufficiently Homeric scene - but the subject-matter of his song is unthinkable in Homeric epic:

hic canit errantem lunam solisque labores,
unde hominum genus et pecudes, unde imber et ignes,
Arcturum pluviasque Hyada geminosque Triones;
quid tantum Oceano properent se tingere soles
hiberni, vel quae tardis mora noctibus obstet. (742-746)

"He sings of the course of the moon and the work of the sun; of the origin of man and beasts, or rain and fire; about Arcturus and the rainy Hyades and the two Bears; why the sun in winter so hastens to sink in the Ocean, or what delays nightfall when it is late."

Mr. Preshous has shown that there are two sources other than the Odyssey for this song - Apollonius Rhodius and Lucretius⁵. The ultimate model is Homeric, but the Virgilian final form shows considerable modification or modulation of its original.

But at this point it is convenient to turn our attention to a trick of style in which, it seems to me, Virgil so far diverges from the Homeric model as to run counter to it. At certain points in his narrative, Virgil suddenly introduces a new factor whose relevance to the course of the narration is not immediately obvious and is only revealed later. There is no expressed link, only a leap to a new point in order to begin an advance along a new axis; and later the new path will intersect with the line of the preceding narrative, giving retrospective relevance to words which seemed, at first, irrelevant.

The feature may be illustrated from a passage in Aeneid VI. Daedalus, ut fama est, fugiens Minoia regna: the mention of Daedalus is an abrupt turn in the narration. There is here nothing to indicate why the approach of Aeneas and his companions to the Triviae lucos atque aurea tecta of the preceding line should suggest or lead us to Daedalus. After some five lines, we are told that he constructed immania templa, and we are left to understand that the tecta of v. 13 and the templa of v. 19 are the same. No great demands are made on the reader's intelligence in appreciating the identification and the retrospective relevance of Daedalus: nevertheless, it is retrospective and there has been an abrupt change of direction. The device may seem a simple one, but it is not isolated: transitions similarly abrupt at first hearing occur elsewhere. The time of the action is so altered in Aeneid IV, 522 - nox erat et placidum carpebant fessa soporem / corpora; in Aeneid XI, 522 the device marks a change of place - est curvo anfractu valles;

and a rather different change of subject is made in Aeneid VII, 601 with the words mos erat Hesperio in Latio.⁶ Even in Aeneid II, 21 the words est in conspectu Tenedos are reminiscent of this device, although in this case the transition is not so clearly distinct from Homeric patterning.

A leap in order to change the immediate subject of discourse and to approach the continuation of the narrative from another angle is remote from the Homeric style; it is not that of the poet of the Iliad; it is not even a mark of the more sophisticated methods of the poet of the Odyssey (more sophisticated in that the latter was able to relate simultaneous events without imposing on them a false temporal succession). The conditions of Homeric composition and the general usage of Greek are such that an overt, if at times untrue or forced, expression of linkage is to be expected. Admittedly, the link in Homer is sometimes weak, reduced to a mere $\delta\epsilon$. Some link, however, there is and an abruptness deliberately sought, as it is in Virgil, is quite un-Homeric. If we look at the lines containing the most violent change of direction in the Homeric epics, the lines at the end of Odyssey IV and the beginning of Odyssey V where the 'Telemachy' is broken off and the story of Odysseus himself is introduced, we shall see something far different:

Μνηστῆρες δ' ἀναβάντες ἐξέπλεον ὕγρὰ κέλευθα,
Τελεμάχῳ φόνον αἰκῶν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ὀρμαίνοντες.
ἔστι δὲ τις νῆσος μέσση ἀλὶ πετρήεσσα,
μεσσηγῶς Ἰθάκης τε Σάμοιο τε καιπαλοέσσης,
Ἄστερις, οὐ μεγάλη. λιμένες δ' ἐνὶ ναύλοχοι αὐτῇ
ἀμφίδυμοι. τῇ τὸν γε μένον λοχῶντες Ἀχαιοί.
Ἦώς δ' ἐκ λεχέων παρ' ἀγαυοῦ Τιθωνοῖο
ὄρνυθ', ἴν' ἀθανάτοισι φῶς φέροι ἠδὲ βροτοῖσιν.
οἱ δὲ θεοὶ θῶκόνδε καθίζανον

(Odyssey IV, 842 - V, 3: "The suitors embarked and sailed the watery paths, planning fell death to Telemachus, and there is a rocky island in the midst of the sea between Ithaca and rugged Samos, Asteris, not very large: there are harbours to take ships there, twinned; there the Achaeans waited for him in ambush. And Dawn rose from bed beside noble Tithonus to bring light to immortals and mortals. And the gods went to council....")

The business which Athena puts before the assembly of the gods is discussion of the sufferings of Odysseus, and we are to hear no more of Telemachus until the beginning of Odyssey XV. It would not be easy to guess from these lines the magnitude of the transition they contain; one might even object that there is something improper in the attempt to smooth it. But the link between the night-ambush and the meeting of the gods, between 'Telemachy' and 'Odyssey', is there and is sought, as a necessity in compositional technique. It is a real achievement for the poet to have produced it here, where he might have abandoned the effort to link overtly. This poet would scarcely have sympathised with Virgil when he, in the passages cited supra, stresses a break in narration. The device in Virgil appears to be not only un-Homeric but counter-Homeric.

There is of course much in Virgil which is not taken from Homer. Amongst other precursors whose work he used, attention has been particularly focused upon the Hellenistic poets, especially Apollonius Rhodius, and on Latin models, especially Ennius⁷. These additional sources of influence are, in a sense, un-Homeric (although Apollonius is a most obvious example of a Homerist), but they are not necessarily counter-Homeric: they do not of necessity add anything inconsistent with Homeric epic.

But in the Aeneid we have observed a technical device which is counter-Homeric. The device alone is of little real importance. It may arouse interest, nevertheless, since it appears symptomatic of a spirit governing the conception and composition of the Aeneid which is also counter-Homeric. Distinguishing the Virgilian epic from the Homeric there is an encomiastic strain, a feature to which Heinze draws attention in speaking of the influence of Hellenistic historians upon Virgil⁸. There is an element of encomium, of the giving of praise, in the very structure of epic. And in the Homeric epics, Patroclus in the Iliad and Demodocus in the Odyssey both sing κλέα ἀνδρῶν, as does Phemius in the first book of the Odyssey, although the phrase is not found there⁹. The κλέα ἀνδρῶν and what Cato called carmina de clarorum virorum laudibus¹⁰, sung by an ἀοιδός or a vates, appear to be a common inheritance of the Greeks and Latins from their distant ancestors - a literary form which can, not improbably, be traced back into the prehistory of the Indo-European language groups as an element in the prehistory of literature¹¹. Epic itself cannot be so traced back, but that epic grew from such songs is scarcely open to question. But the encomiastic element that this implies is of so indeterminate a kind that it is proper to make distinctions between Homer and Virgil in their encomiastic intent.

It is perhaps worth reflecting that it is not an easy task to praise some-one effectively. On a number of occasions, Virgil describes Aeneas as pius, but that is not enough to convince the reader that Aeneas is praiseworthy. Yet the quality of pietas might in itself command more general approbation than some other value-judgments which are nevertheless employed to convey praise. It is necessary that there be some rapport between the laudator and his audience in order that commendation be acceptable. The laudator must achieve this, and in order to persuade or convince his audience he may need to show that his laudandus does in fact possess certain qualities, and also that these qualities are worthy of admiration. If he is a poet, the laudator must do this without ceasing to hold the attention of his audience and without distracting it too far from the laudandus. We should expect that the difficulties inherent in carrying out a task which must be common would lead to the development of established forms of procedure whereby the audience may be persuaded.

Among these forms, we would find the device generally known under its German name of "Priamel". Sappho, wishing to single out as especially valuable the object of love, wrote: οἱ μὲν ἱππῶν στρότον οἱ δὲ πέσδων

οἱ δὲ νῶν φαῖσ' ἐπὶ γᾶν μέλαιναν
ἔμμεναι κάλλιστον, ἔγω δὲ κῆν' ὄτ-
τω τις ἔραται

(fr. 16, 1-4: "Some say it is a troop of cavalry, some a company of infantry, some a squadron of ships that is the finest thing on earth: but I say it is whatever one loves.") When Sappho says this, it is not an intellectual, but an emotional reaction to find the final term of the priamel, the final contrastive term or "cap", more acceptable than would be the simple statement, unadorned by the "foil" of the first three terms¹². The priamel focuses the attention in such a way that its final term is enhanced by comparison and by contrast, briefly, by association with the others. It is not an arcane device, and was known to and employed by Virgil, although not in the Aeneid. There are several examples amongst the Eclogues. At some length, we find in the second Eclogue (8-12):

nunc etiam pecudes umbras et frigora captant;
nunc viridis etiam occultant spineta lacertos,
Thestylis et rapido fessis messoribus aestu
alia serpyllumque herbas contundit olentis.
at mecum raucis, tua dum vestigia lustris,
sole sub ardenti resonant arbusta cicadis.

Here there are three items of foil leading to the cap, strongly marked by the adversative at and the pronoun following. Although there is no element of encomium in these lines, the device is employed, as in Sappho, to concentrate attention on the closing term. Similarly, but in a briefer, more compressed form, attention is focused on the last term in two lines from Eclogue III (80-81):

triste lupus stabulis, maturis frugibus imbres,
arboribus venti, nobis Amaryllidis irae.

It is, I think, clear why the priamel is not carried over to the broader canvas of the Aeneid: not because Virgil, having essayed the form, was dissatisfied with it, but because it is essentially a compression, a reduction to bare essentials of the setting for the principal term. Within the epic, the foil and cap need not be so compressed: terms of contrast and comparison, actual and implied, may be stated in far greater leisure, at much longer extent and with less insistence on their functional relevance. The hero or heroes of the epic are commended to the reader in virtue of their associations, but these associations are the rest of the epic, their setting and foil. In this respect, the Homeric epics and the Aeneid are both encomiastic: they do recommend their heroes. But since the setting is less compressed and less formalised than the foil of the priamel, there are from time to time doubts about the personages: who is hero, and who is part of the setting. Such doubts find expression in argument about the relative merits of Achilles and Hector in the Iliad and even of Turnus and Aeneas in the Aeneid.

Argument about the identity of the hero is ill-founded in these cases, although not entirely worthless, but it is ill-founded for different reasons. It was not the poet's intention to persuade his audience to admire Achilles or Hector above the other, and therefore argument about the identity of the hero of the Iliad lacks validity. Even in the Odyssey, where there is no room for doubt that Odysseus is the principal actor, the hero who stands out from his setting, it is by no means clear that it was the purpose of the epic to make him stand out so. The relative prominence of characters of the Homeric epic is the result partly of the cultural

background and partly of the nature of the story told: the poet's intention was to produce an interesting and entertaining story. But in the Aeneid, Aeneas' superiority to Turnus is not an incidental effect of a thrilling tale told for its intrinsic interest. From the opening lines, the intention of the poet is not in doubt: he calls Aeneas insignem pietate virum, he tells us that Aeneas' wanderings came about saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram, he asks amazed tantaene animis caelestibus irae?¹³ The position of Aeneas is central, and Virgil was not indifferent to the identity of his hero: instead, the identity of the hero, to be commended to the reader, determines the epic story.

Virgil was setting out to write an epic in a literature heavily influenced by Greek tradition when he began the Aeneid, and it is therefore appropriate to consider a hypothetical problem in a Greek context: suppose a Greek poet to ask himself what sort of poem he should write in order to make his audience think well of his principal character. His answer will not be 'Homeric epic', although it will depend upon the identity of the supposed hero. What then are the appropriate forms for laudatory poems in Greek? We may begin with a slight misapplication of Pindar's τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; (O1.II, 2). In the fifth century, one might quickly think of a hymn for a god, of tragedy for a hero. For a man (in whom, as the priamelian form shows, Pindar was most interested in Olympian II), differing circumstances would suggest different answers. The Attic scholion in honour of Harmodius and Aristogeiton exemplifies one type; not very remote from this are the "encomia" of the Alexandrian classification¹⁴. But of the possible forms, I wish to consider only the occasional verses of the epinician ode since, as I shall try to show, the epinician casts some light on the Aeneid¹⁵.

There survive more than fifty epinician odes, written by Pindar and Bacchylides: none of those written by Simonides, the originator of the form, are extant, and it is difficult to make any estimate of the extent of our loss. But sufficient examples there are to give confidence that we can define with enough precision the demands and limits of the genre. Indeed, it is only necessary to consider one typical, but by no means exceptional, ode from those that survive to recall some frequent features. Such an ode is Pindar's Isthmian VI, a poem of some seventy-five verses, written on the occasion of the victory of an Aeginetan boy, Phylacidas, in the pancration at an Isthmian festival not long before 480 B.C.¹⁶. The ode falls into three fairly clearly defined sections: an introductory section enables the poet to indicate the occasion for the poem, and further to recall the victory of the boy's brother at the Nemean games; he tells us who Phylacidas' father and grandfather were, and wishes the family well for the future. The final section is concerned with subjects much the same as these: there is a further catalogue of successes in athletic contests, and there is more about the kinfolk of the young victor, with some particular compliments to Lampon, his father, who commissioned this and other odes from Pindar¹⁷. Enshrined between these two sections, there is a mythic section which demands our closer attention. This comparatively short excursus, extending from v. 19 to v. 56 of the ode, contains a wealth of allusion as it proceeds rapidly from the invocation of the Aeacids to Hercules' prophecy about Telamon's son, Ajax. To produce from these a clear, consecutive narrative would involve considerable lengthening and destroy the proportions of the ode and, more importantly, obscure its relevance and effect¹⁸. Pindar finds it his duty to mention the Aeacids since the ode was written for an Aeginetan, and the city and island of Aegina had an especial connexion in myth and religious cult with the

heroes of this family. There is no such obvious appropriateness in the introduction of Hercules, but within the myth the overt subject is Hercules, the grammatical subject and the moving personage. But the function of Hercules in the myth is analogous to the function of the myth in the epinician ode. Whilst Hercules is in the centre of the stage as a reference-point, the focus of attention is on the Aeacids - principally Telamon, but also Peleus and, to a greater degree, Ajax. The latter are the personages of real interest in the myth. So too the myth itself bulks largely in the ode, framed within passages concerning the Psalychiadae, and thus serves as a reference-point for these more important personages, the victor and his family.

Within the myth, the temporal sequence of events is of little significance beside the importance of concentrating on the most relevant points in their most effective order. From the mention of Telamon, it falls into two parts of which the earlier is, temporally, subsequent to the second. The myth thus rises to its climax with peculiar appropriateness in prayer and prophecy about Ajax, son of Telamon: Pindar's client was Lampon, father of the victor, and the gently implied analogy between the two father-son pairs is nonetheless unmistakable; similarly, the words of Hercules in v. 48 πρῶτον ἀέθλων κτεῖνὰ ποτ' ἐν Νεμέῳ recall the non-mythic words in vv. 3-4 ἐν Νεμέῳ μὲν πρῶτον ... ἄωτον δεξάμενοι στεφάνων where the success was that of Pytheas, the elder brother of Phylacidas.

This ode, although typical, does not present a universal exemplar of epinician form: not all epinician odes contain a mythical narrative, as Isthmian VI does: Olympian XIV is a particularly charming example of a short epinician without a myth. The myth does not necessarily take us back to the heroic age: Bacchylides III uses the story of Croesus instead - admittedly, as exceptional a choice as the subject of Aeschylus' Persae. It is not always so easy to detect multiple lines of connexion between the myth and the occasion of the poem: it can happen that the myth appears to be connected to the ode in general by the merest chance, at least in the state of our knowledge or ignorance of all the circumstances of its composition - the vexed Pythian XI provides one example. There is not always the same apparent proportion between the myth and the remainder of the ode in sheer length, although the myth is commonly between a third and a half of the ode. The ordinariness of Isthmian VI renders it more useful than these exceptions for illustration of the Aeneid of Virgil. In this ode, there is a manifestation of a method of encomium by association; in it, the myth functions rather as foil in the priamel, but the whole is more convoluted than the relatively simple priamel. Hercules stands in the centre, a hero to all the Greeks and an earnest of the real worth of the Aeacids. No Aeginetan could, in any case, seriously doubt this worth, since their own mythical ancestors were unquestionably great and praiseworthy. The Aeacids in turn set off the Psalychiadae, the victor and his kin, and thus the whole context of real worth includes them and redounds to their credit.

Now let us consider again Virgil and his Aeneid. In the Georgics, Virgil had indicated an intention of writing a work in praise of Augustus:

mox tamen ardentis accingar dicere pugnas
Caesaris et nomen fama tot ferre per annos
Tithoni prima quot abest ab origine Caesar.¹⁹

Virgil tells us of an intention of writing an historical work, presumably following the example of Ennius' *Annales*, although we have no evidence that he began the project in a serious way. Had he carried out his apparent intention, we would have had, I suppose, a poem from him rather more closely analogous to Lucan's *Pharsalia* than to the Homeric epics, and had Virgil selected Ennius as his principal exemplar, he would, I submit, have written within a more severely Roman tradition than he did. As it is, the *Aeneid* is very much in the Greek tradition. Its author had no need to be reminded, with others, vos exemplaria Graeca / nocturna versate manu, versate diurna²⁰. Virgil did know and read his Greek poets, and it would be dangerous to underestimate the range of his reading which was certainly not confined to those poets whose influence upon his work is marked and well-known. There is demonstrable evidence in his own work that he devoted care and attention to his reading of Homer and Apollonius Rhodius. We must assume that he had read some works whose influence has not been unequivocally detected in his own work, if only because so much of ancient literature, Greek and Latin, has not survived. If Virgil did, as he says he did, seriously contemplate a laudatory poem on Augustus, his attention must surely have been drawn to the epinician form, offering as it did an established model for work of this kind. He did not in fact produce a Latin epinician, and speculation about his reasons is not very profitable. He did produce the *Aeneid*, and we can find in this some points of contact with the epinician genre.

From the first lines, the essential unity of the companions of Aeneas, the Aeneads, and the contemporary Romans of the poet is stressed. At first, Aeneas is the founder of that city from which Rome drew its ultimate Italian origin, but by v. 33 the task of the Aeneads has become clear - Romanam condere gentem, a notable task. Already in *Georgic* I, 501-502 we find the equation of the Roman people with the Trojan: satis iam pridem sanguine nostro / Laomedontae luimus periuria Troiae. In this case, it is only a passing remark, alluding to the commonplace of tradition that the Roman people was of Trojan origin. But in the *Aeneid*, the essential unity is further emphasised by particular connexions. Iulus, whose name was changed from Ilus, was progenitor of the Julii and hence of Augustus; no reason is offered for the change of name, not even a pun, such as that of aietos and Aias in Pindar's *Isthmian* VI. In *Aeneid* V, three Roman gentes are traced back to three individual companions of Aeneas:

mox Italus Mnestheus, genus a quo nomine Memmi,
ingentemque Gyas ingenti mole Chimaeram,
urbis opus, triplici pubes quam Dardana versu
impellunt, terno consurgunt ordine remi;
Sergestusque, domus tenet a quo Sergia nomen,
Centauru invehitur magno, Scyllaque Cloanthus
caerulea, genus unde tibi, Romane Cluenti. (117-123)

In the same book, we find Atys, genus unde Atii duxere Latini (568), and the very improbability of these etymologies only reinforces their effect. The lines of connexion are drawn deliberately and of set purpose so that from time to time the reader is reminded that it is not only ancient history, but ancient history

intimately connected with the present that he reads²¹. The relationship of mythical to contemporary life is comparable to that which impelled Pindar to write in Isthmian VI:

ὕμνε τ', ὦ χρυσάρματοι Αἰακίδαι,
τέθειρόν μοι φανί σαφέστατον ἔμμεν
τάνδ' ἐπιστεῖχοντα νάσον βαινόμεν εὐλογίαις.

(19-21)

In larger set-pieces in the sixth and eight books of the Aeneid, the poet has further opportunities to present the relationship. But these long excursuses appear to be qualitatively different. To read the Dardanium prolem quae deinde sequatur / gloria of Aeneid VI, 766-886 and the res Italas Romanorumque triumphos of VIII, 626-728 is to be presented with a selected number of explicit intermediate points in the history of the Roman people between the age of the heroes and the present. These intermediate points do link the heroic period to the present, but they are conceived as history, not myth (their actual truth or falsehood is irrelevant). Thus they form, as it were, a family history. In the epinician ode too we find family histories: they are, as in the sixth Isthmian, outside the myth, and are indeed a more essential element than the myth, for they are indicated in those epinicians, most of them short, which lack narration of myth. It was a necessary part of the task of the epinician poet to celebrate not only the immediate occasion, but also other notable events in the recent history of the family of the victor or laudandus. Usually, our attention is drawn to other victories at athletic festivals, but other notable events are also recorded. In the very short Pythian VII, Pindar refers to the facing of the temple of Apollo at Delphi with marble, the expense of which was borne by the Athenian Alcmeonid family, for one member of which this ode was written. Similarly, the foundation of the city of Aetna by Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse, and the success of members of Hiero's family in the battle of Himera against the Carthaginians in 480 B.C. find a place in surviving epinicians. Such achievements may seem small things to set beside Roman history: but the fifth century was closer in time to the beginnings of writing in Greece²² and hence there was less recorded history; and epinicians were written for small groups, for families in whose life a victory in the Olympic games might loom as large as the conquest of a new province in the life of an empire. The recall of achievements outside the scope of the myth and distinct from the immediate occasion of the epinician ode shares a quality of non-mythic historicity with the parade of future Romans and the description of the shield of Aeneas in the Roman epic, and I therefore suggest that they are analogous.

Earlier, the disturbance of strict temporal order in the narration of the myth in Pindar's Isthmian VI was mentioned. The disturbance permits an ordering of events determined by the emphasis which the poet seeks in each case, and is particularly valuable to the poet in easing the transition from a given situation, the occasion of the poem and the identity of the victor, to a freely chosen mythical subject. Other effects may also be sought, and thus in the ode here used as an exemplar the prophecy of the birth of Ajax occurs fittingly at the close of the myth. We may feel at times that the poet has disturbed the temporal order solely from habit and without sufficient reason, particularly in the long Pythian IV, but there are proper uses for disturbance in some cases, not vitiated by misuse. Virgil too, although certainly not in this imitating the epinician poets, disturbs strict temporal order with the initial plunge in medias res. To start in the middle of

his story demands of a narrator a conscious choice amongst several possibilities, for there may be only one beginning, but there are several medial points in a narrative. Virgil chose to begin in such a way that two important and connected features might be presented from the outset as immediately relevant in addition to their more pervasive, less specific relevance elsewhere: these are the character of Juno and the city of Carthage. I am reminded of the transitions to be found in epinician poetry and I am tempted to ask whether Virgil was conscious of any similarity of technique.

There do, however, appear to be real similarities in technique and spirit between epinician poets and Virgil in the stressing of relationship between the heroic age and the time of writing and in the peripheral family histories outside the major myth. If these similarities are the result of mere chance, it is a strange chance that they are equally counter-Homeric features, for the connexions established between Homeric heroes and later Greek cities are the work of later commentators and interpreters, not of the poets who composed the Homeric epics. It may be objected that if Virgil were really influenced by epinician poets, we should expect to find observable verbal reminiscences of these poets in his work, and it is true that there are few verbal reminiscences of Pindar in the Aeneid. Commentators adduce few examples, and I have not been able to add to their number. Servius cites Pindar as an authority on the myth of the Centaurs²³ and Virgil's fulva...de nube is at least parallel to Pindar's ξανθα νεφέλω²⁴. The most notable case is the parallel between the description of Aetna in Aeneid III, 571-582, which is itself a reworking of Virgil's own Georgic I, 472-473, and Pindar's description in Pythian I, 18-28²⁵. There are considerable differences between the two passages, and there is further an inherent likelihood of similarity at some point of description by two men of something which both had seen. Nevertheless, there are some striking phrases which, whilst not imposing conviction, persuade me that the Virgilian passage is related to the Pindaric, a relationship of which Jackson Knight says that Virgil has here used Pindar "to detonate his own imagination"²⁶. These points of contact between Pindar and Virgil, slight as they are, suffice to demonstrate what is in any case inherently probable, that Virgil was open to the influence of epinician form.

Since this is so, it is pertinent to wonder whether the classical Greek form of encomiastic poem may have influenced the Roman poet in his approach to the epic in the light of the epinician ode. They are distinguished in scale to such a degree as to be almost incommensurate, and of course distinguished in verse form. They are distinguished too by the presence in the text of the epinician of an explanation of its occasion and the lack of so overt a contemporary motive in the epic. But if we consider only the myth of the epinician, the similarity of attitude of the epinician poets and Virgil is striking: is it too much to consider for a few moments the Aeneid as the myth of an epinician poem, and ask then who is the hero of this work? In such a comparison, the hero must be external to the myth, and for the Aeneid only one answer remains possible: Augustus. Servius stated that it was the aim of Virgil Augustum laudare a parentibus; the application of the epinician ode to the Aeneid suggests a justification for this statement within the norms of classical literature, and we may see in the Aeneid a poem really in praise of Augustus, really both epic and encomium.

1. Prop. II, xxxiv, 66.
2. Aen. VI, 247; XII, 483.
3. Il. V, 31; 455.
4. Aen. V, 455, 460; VII, 632, 666.
5. Proc. Virg. Soc. 4 (1964-1965), p. 6.
6. For further examples, see Aen. III, 73; V, 124; VII 563; VIII, 26; XII, 845.
7. Cf. M.Hügi: Vergils Aeneis und die hellenistische Dichtung; J.D.M. Preshous: "Apollonius Rhodius and Virgil", Proc. Virg. Soc. 4 (1964-5) 1-17; E.Norden: Vergilius und Ennius.
8. R. Heinze: Vergils epische Technik, pp. 474 ff.
9. Il. IX, 189; Od. VIII, 73; Od. I, 325 ff.
10. Cic. Brutus 75; T.D. IV, ii, 3.
11. Cf. R. Schmitt: Indogermanische Dichtersprache, pp. 340-343.
12. For the terminology employed, see E.L. Bundy: Studia Pindarica I, p. 5 fn.
13. Aen. I, 10; 6; 11.
14. The Pindaric examples are well edited by B.A. van Groningen: Pindare au Banquet.
15. Since scolia and encomia lack any mythic narration, they are obviously less relevant for the study of epic.
16. For the date, E. Gaspar: Essai de chronologie pindarique, p. 56; Wilamowitz: Pindaros, p. 179 suggests the summer of 480 B.C.
17. Pindar, Nemean V and Isthmian V.
18. Length alone is not an insuperable barrier: that of Pythian IV, 9-261 is comparable with the epyllion.
19. Geo. III, 46-48.
20. Hor., A.P., 268-269.
21. Cp. also Aen. VII, 707-8 (Clausus and the Claudii). Other proper names of characters in the Aeneid suggest connexions with later Rome, without further insistence by the poet, e.g. Arruns, Caeculus (cp. Caecilius), Camilla, Cethegus.
22. I exclude of course the pre-alphabetic Minoan and Mycenaean scripts.
23. ad Aen. VIII, 293.
24. Aen. XII, 792 and Pindar O1. VII, 49.
25. Cf. Heinze, op. cit., p. 250.
26. I am grateful to Mr. H.M. Currie for pointing out to me this striking phrase: Proc. Virg. Soc. 1 (1961-1962), pp. 10-11.