

I should be more inclined to take the end of the line as the easier break, supporting this with the progression from the polite address deum gens to the more urgent Aenea to introduce the exhortation to action. As I read it, there will be an entirely different tone-pattern to Aenea according as we make the question end there or not - Aeneá? (rising) or Aeneà (falling). Can we assume that Latin inflexion was the same?

Finally, book xii has in my opinion no difficulties of this sort at all, and not even any genuine ambiguities. It occurred to me that xii also has only a single unfinished line, and might well claim to be a demonstrably well-polished book, in case one might consider that difficulties of phrasing indicate relatively incomplete work. Unfortunately the three books which I have suggested boast only a single problem apiece have six incomplete lines each. So much for an effective correlation between supposed tokens of polished work. I still find it interesting that xii, with all the problems seen by contemporary critics in the emotional colouring of the death of Turnus at the close, approaches so closely, in one respect at least, to the standard of the unquestionably completed earlier works. I am sometimes inclined to think - not always - that some at least of the passages which I regard as real stumbling-blocks to the reader are signs of imperfection which the poet might have removed if he had lived longer. The coherence of Virgil's phrasing seems to be one feature of his organization of words - of the perfection of his rhetoric, if such a phrase may safely be used before this Society - which raises him above other poets. He may not be easy to translate - sometimes he is simply impossible, if he contains as many actual ambiguities as I have suggested, quite apart from those in other categories - but he is probably about the easiest of Latin poets to read - read aloud, of course. One day I imagine myself settling down to read through a totally unpunctuated text of Silius Italicus, or Claudian, or Corippus, just to see whether their phrasing falls into place as easily as Virgil's. I should be surprised if it does; although even Corippus seems to be so soaked in Virgilian rhythms that he may have acquired something of this mastery at the same time. The trouble is that I cannot imaginè where we are to find such virgin texts of these poets as I have suggested, not to mention the time to read through them and the zeal to do so with the necessary attention to possible errors. If any of my audience have the leisure and the inclination, together with the requisite unfamiliarity with the works of these epic epigoni, I gladly bequeath the task to you; and await your findings with interest.

THE GEORGICS AND MARK ANTONY

Scholars are wont to see in the Georgics the first fine flowering of the literary partnership between Virgil and Maecenas his patron. In this spirit T.E. Page, relying on Georgic 1.2, offered long ago a typical statement of this orthodox position. "It was at the request of Maecenas that he composed the four books of the Georgics, written between 37 B.C. and 30 B.C. and dedicated to him." (1) Again in 1939 Ronald Syme advanced this traditional explanation in a modernised form. "Maecenas hoped to employ Virgil's art in the service of Caesar's heir But the poet was reluctant, the patron too wise to insist. Yet something might be done. It was folly not to

exploit the treasures of erudition that Varro had consigned to public use; if not the national antiquities, then perhaps the land and the peasant. Various books on agriculture had newly appeared But Virgil intended to compose a poem about Italy, not a technical handbook: he wrote about the country and the life of the farmer in a grave, religious and patriotic vein."⁽²⁾

Furthermore, it has been an accepted scholarly truism that these four poems were composed "with slow and elaborate care".⁽³⁾ Indeed, as Page remarks, "if we allow seven years for their composition we get an average of less than a line a day".⁽⁴⁾ Though we may choose to accept Dryden's evaluation of the *Georgics* as "the best poem of the best poet"⁽⁵⁾ it is strange that its composition should have proved so tardy. Here a comparison is not without interest. The *Aeneid* was begun immediately after the completion of the *Georgics* in 30-29 B.C., and was apparently finished in its present shape when Virgil departed from Greece in 20 B.C. Thus a total of 9896 verses was composed over ten years - at most - or roughly at a rate of 990 verses a year. But if we consign the whole period from 37 B.C. to 30 B.C. over to the composition of the *Georgics*, we find that in this case 2188 verses were written in seven years, or 313 verse per year, which is less than one third of the rate of progress with the *Aeneid*. It can of course be argued that the poet's skill increased as he became more practised in his metre and technique. On this view one might maintain that 2188 verses were composed between 37 B.C. and 30 B.C., while a further 4755 were written over the next seven years down to 23 B.C. when *Aeneid* I-VI may well have been read in its entirety on the famous occasion when Octavia swooned at the mention of her dead Marcellus.⁽⁶⁾ Finally, then, one would maintain that the last three and a half years of the poet's life saw the composition of the concluding 5141 verses of the *Aeneid*. Against this assumption of progressive acceleration stands, however, the attested fact of the poet's failing health in the last years of his life. We are thus left to conclude that there is some oddity latent in the low output recorded for the years 37 B.C. to 30 B.C.

Altogether, then, we may reasonably suspect that far more than our surviving 2188 lines were written in these seven years, but that there were delays or changes of plan in the work, and that therefore revisions, excisions, and insertions are intrinsically likely to have occurred. Bearing such possibilities in mind let us now review the whole structure of the *Georgics*.

THE PATTERN OF THE POEM

Book 1

- 1 - 23. An outline of the subject and invocation to the Gods of Tillage.
- 24 - 42. The invocation of Divus Iulius.
- 43 - 49. Soil preparation.
- 50 - 70. Soil properties and climate as factors in cultivation.
- 71 - 100. Rotation, fallowing, and burning of stubble.
- 100- 117. Irrigation and drainage of fields.
- 118- 159. Pests; and the moral purpose of Jove making men earn bread by toil.
- 160- 175. The tools and implements of a farmer.
- 176- 202. Protection of barns and threshing floors from vermin. Tendency of plant strains to decay.

- 203 - 230 The stars as markers for the farmer's calendar.
231 - 256 Value of the twelve signs of the Zodiac as indicators of seasons.
257 - 275 Winter tasks on the farm: draining, ditching, maintenance, storage.
276 - 286 Farmers must eschew unfavourable lunar phases.
287 - 297 Certain tasks are best performed by night.
298 - 310 Winter is the time for hunting and relaxation.
311 - 334 Graphic description of storm damage: cf. Lucretius, I, 271-94.
335 - 350 To avoid trouble we should watch the sky and sacrifice to Ceres.
351 - 423 Jupiter himself provides men with numerous signs of weather.
424 - 460 An explanation of the use of sun and moon in weather forecasting.
461 - 488 The numerous portents of Caesar's death.
489 - 497 The disasters of Philippi were all the fruit of Caesar's murder.
498 - 514 A prayer to all the Gods to help Octavian stop the Civil War.

Book II

- 1 - 9 An invocation to Bacchus.
10 - 21 The distinguishing marks of self-sown and hand-planted trees.
22 - 34 Methods of hand propagation: suckers, layers, budding, grafting.
35 - 46 Invocation of the favour of Maecenas.
47 - 60 Improvement of trees by cultivation and pruning. Otherwise they tend to return to sterility.
61 - 72 Labour essential to results, and sterile stocks will support fruitful grafts.
73 - 81 The techniques of grafting and budding.
82 - 108 List of species of fruit trees and vines.
109 - 135 The ecology of various tree species in varied regions.
135 - 176 The praise of Italy.
177 - 225 A consideration of soils best suited to olive and vine.
226 - 258 Tests for heavy and light soils, and for sweet and sour earth.
259 - 297 Proper procedures for planting out vines and support trees.
298 - 312 Features to avoid in vineyards: wrong aspects, hazel trees as supports. Do not graft olive trees on oleaster.
313 - 345 Transplant in spring or autumn. The excellence of springtime.
346 - 353 Transplanting procedures to protect roots.
354 - 361 Cultivation and protection of young plants.
362 - 370 Pruning young shoots.
371 - 396 Repair of fences and exclusion of goats from vineyards. The proper veneration of Bacchus with games, plays, goat-victims.
397 - 419 Annual tasks of the vineyard.
420 - 425 Advice for olive culture.
426 - 458 Proper culture of other trees.
459 - 474 Benefits of farming in wartime.
475 - 499 The poet's regret at not having become a philosopher.
500 - 512 The worries of statecraft.
513 - 542 The delights of country life.

Book III

- 1 - 11 Invocation of Pales and Virgil's dream of poetic fame.
12 - 48 The praises of Caesar Octavian.
49 - 71 Selection of brood dams and best ages for breeding cattle.

- 72 - 94 Similar precepts regarding mares and stallions.
95 - 122 The selection of an appropriate sire for the required breed.
123 - 137 A stallion should be well-fed to arouse ardent passion: mares breed better if kept poor before conception.
138 - 156 The proper care of animals in foal or in calf.
157 - 178 Rearing of calves: culling for sacrifice, breeding, or work.
179 - 208 The training of young horses for warfare or racing.
209 - 241 Segregation of sexes desirable to conserve energy.
242 - 283 Power of love among all creatures. cf. *Lucr.* I. 1-43:
Soph. Ant. 781ff.
284 - 293 Transition to sheep and goats.
294 - 338 Shelter for these beasts: avoid footrot in sheep: south aspect for goats. Best hours for pasturing both.
339 - 383 The pastoral life in hot desert and cold steppe lands.
384 - 393 Production of good wool: avoidance of lush pasture.
394 - 403 High milk yield from ewes and goats. Segregate kids and lambs.
404 - 414 Value of dogs for hunting and herding.
415 - 439 Precautions for dealing with snakes.
440 - 463 Treatment of scab in sheep.
464 - 477 General proneness of animals to illness.
478 - 560 Great cattle plague of Noricum: cf. *Lucr.* VI, 1090-1286.

Book IV

- 1 - 7 Invocation of Maecenas. Bees are significant.
8 - 50 Siting and design of the hive.
51 - 67 Attracting a swarm to settle in the new hive.
68 - 102 Battles between rival kings. Methods of resolving them.
103 - 115 Prevention of future conflict and planting flowers nearby - to entice the new swarm to work.
116 - 148 The old gardener of Tarentum: his flowers attracted the bees.
149 - 218 Co-operative practice, collective property. The Social excellence of bees in the hive.
219 - 228 Bees exemplify Stoic view of mind as pervasive rational fire.
229 - 250 Collection of honey and correct care of the hive.
251 - 314 Procedures to be adopted when plague strikes the hive.
315 - 414 Aristaeus pioneered the method. He appealed to Cyrene.
415 - 452 Aristaeus and Cyrene find and catch Proteus, who knows a cure.
453 - 529 Proteus explains that Aristaeus incurred pollution through Eurydice's death while he was pursuing her for rape. The tale of Orpheus' vain pilgrimage to Hades is told in explanation.
530 - 547 Cyrene advises her son how to placate the dead couple.
548 - 558 Aristaeus performs the required rites and then secures new bees by the method of bougonia described earlier.
559 - 566 The poet wrote the *Georgics* at Naples while Octavian was waging war by the Euphrates.

THE FOURTH GEORGIC

The above summary serves to emphasise one conclusion. Despite some digressions, the first three *Georgics* are actually devoted to their avowed topics.

But once we turn to the fourth book we enter a different artistic and intellectual climate, where theme and continuity largely elude us. Indeed, the whole structure of the fourth book seems odd and disjointed once one ceases to be drugged by the exquisite magic of its verse. Let us survey its subject matter as it stands. Broadly, 1-115 are concerned with a proper site for the hives and how the farmer must deal with disputes between the rival queens, or kings, as Virgil imagines them to be. However, in 116-48 the poet at once digresses to his wish to write about gardens and tells the story of the old gardener of Tarentum, whose splendid flowers incidentally attracted bees. Then we find 149-218 extolling the co-operative practice and concept of collective property exemplified among bees in a hive, whilst in 219-28 Virgil suggests that the bees exemplify the Stoic notion of the soul or mind or celestial fire as a substance pervading all living creatures. Thereupon we have a discussion of the proper method of collecting honey and the correct care of the hive in 229-50, while 251-315 sketch out the procedures to be followed when a plague strikes the hive, concluding with an account of the Egyptian method of breeding a new strain by spontaneous generation from the carcase of a flayed steer. Thus far we might feel that the claims advanced for a new and distinctive tone in the fourth Georgic appear entirely baseless. But Virgil follows his account of the Egyptian practice with a long and irrelevant tale of its origin. Servius informs us that this passage, extending from 315-558, was inserted to replace a panegyric on the poet's friend and literary colleague, Cornelius Gallus the Prefect of Egypt. As the disgrace and suicide of Gallus occurred in 26 B.C., this change would have represented a revision of a published poem. But granting the truth of the Servian tradition, a long hymn of praise to Gallus as poet and as administrator of Egypt would have had no more relevance to the skills of the apiarist than the present digression about Aristaeus has. This passage relates that Aristaeus appealed to his mother the nymph Cyrene when all his bees had died. She advised him to seek out Proteus, bind him, and keep him thus constrained through all his many metamorphoses. If he could achieve this, Proteus would reveal the source of his woes. This then is the content of 315-414. In 415-52 this plan is put into effect, Aristaeus being assisted by his mother. From 453-529 Proteus explains how Aristaeus had incurred pollution through his amorous pursuit of Eurydice. In this explanation the sad tale of Orpheus and Eurydice is related in some detail. Then in 530-47 Cyrene advises her son how to placate the dead couple. Next, in 548-58 Aristaeus performs the rites which have been stipulated and then secures new bees in the way advised. Finally, 559-66 inform us that the poet wrote at Naples whilst Caesar was fighting in the East.

In conclusion, then, we find that barely half of the fourth Georgic is directly concerned with the avowed subject of the poem - the keeping of bees. Indeed, an apiarist will find only the most tenuous links between his industry and the substance of 116-48, 219-28, or 315-566. This means that a total of 290 verses out of 566, or more than half the poem, has no valid connexion with the theme.

PATRONS AND POLITICS

Much scholarship and intelligence has been expended on modern Virgilian criticism. None the less there is a remarkable lack of unanimity about basic

elements. M. Perret insists that the great achievement of the Georgics is the assertion of the moral worth of labor:⁽⁸⁾ Professor Brooks Otis maintains that the coupling of the term improbis with the noun shows that labor is a pejorative label for an activity which has no value except in a context of cosmic harmony.⁽⁹⁾ The real trouble is that too much valuable and sensitive work tends to be vitiated by a basic dishonesty: our tendency to assume that Virgil means what he says whenever this assumption suits our argument and to assume that he does not whenever his statements prove inconvenient to our hypotheses. In reference to Georgic IV, Professor Otis is moved to remark: "In the poem (1-7) the dual aspect of the subject is emphasised: it is light and slender as the bees themselves, but it is also concerned with high matters of politics and social life ... And it is this very duality that determines the peculiar tone and mood of the Book."⁽¹⁰⁾ However, in the face of a promise which the poet appears to leave unfulfilled, the same critic adopts a very different tone. In discussing the digression on gardens in the same Georgic, he remarks: "Virgil has deliberately framed this 'digression' as a self-avowed praeteritio ... This is, of course a rhetorical pretence. Virgil had no intention of devoting more space to gardens."⁽¹¹⁾ A possible clue to the composition and plan of the work or to its early redactions is thus peremptorily discounted on grounds of a priori convenience to the argument of the critic. Yet Professor Otis is a sensitive and perceptive Virgilian scholar with many valuable insights. However properly Otis and other scholars as different as Jackson Knight and Le Grelle may applaud the structure, balance and numerical symmetries of the Georgics as we have them, our previous consideration of the fourth book suggests that this polished and elaborate final draft is not the original form of Virgil's poem.

Recent scholarship has tended to play down the role of Asinius Pollio as Virgil's patron. Indeed Brooks Otis follows Bardon in viewing him mainly as a fellow-poet and placing him in the "original Maecenas-group" that included Varius, Virgil and Horace.⁽¹²⁾ However, Jackson Knight assesses the matter in fuller social perspective. "Servius has a tradition that Virgil wrote in Pollio's honour through gratitude to him for pleading with Octavianus against the confiscation of Vergil's first home. At this time, however, Pollio was no longer governor of Cisalpine Gaul. Nor was he likely to have been on good enough terms with Octavian. He was closely associated with Antonius, whose brother Octavianus was besieging about this very time. Vergil's friendship with him was rather literary than practical. He addressed him in the fourth Eclogue because he was consul in that year, and all the more freely since Octavianus and Antonius were to be reconciled. However, it is quite probable that Pollio introduced Vergil first to Maecenas, who then, unless Vergil met the future emperor independently, introduced him to Octavianus."⁽¹³⁾ Elsewhere the same critic observes: "Vergil addresses Gaius Asinius Pollio in two Eclogues, the Eighth and the Fourth. In some sense he dedicated the Eclogues to him. They were written at his command, Vergil says, and he must accept them, for he is their end and their beginning."⁽¹⁴⁾

On the other hand Wilkinson sees Pollio as a political neutral after his Dalmatian triumph of October 39 B.C., and as devoting all his energy to writing tragedies and a history of the civil wars. Yet the same critic concedes that, "although Octavian was 'Divi filius', Antony was still at this

stage the dominant triumvir." (15) So when, on the same page he assures us that by 39/38 both Virgil and Varius had become part of Maecenas' circle we must avoid hindsight in interpreting the meaning of any such association. As in fact Maecenas negotiated the Treaty of Misenum, he had as good a motive as Pollio who arranged the earlier Treaty of Brundisium for urging his poet friend to celebrate the deeds of Antony. Not until 36 B.C., when Agrippa defeated Sextus Pompeius and Octavian deposed Lepidus, was there any doubt that Antony was the senior Triumvir in every respect, and indeed his clear primacy was generally accepted until his Parthian failure became evident in 34 B.C. Even if Maecenas was now Virgil's sole patron, as Wilkinson believes, he would not have judged it prudent to permit his poet to ignore Antony until the divorce of Octavia made an open breach, while he would scarcely have approved expressions hostile to Antony until Actium was safely won.

But we are still free to ask whether Maecenas had already become the sole patron of Virgil when he joined the Etruscan's literary group. Pollio remained a uir consularis et triumphalis even in his retirement, and he enjoyed the respect of Octavian as well as the friendship of Antony. Did he in fact remain Virgil's patron until 34 or 33 B.C.? This consideration raises a further question, no less important. In such circumstances, was Pollio perhaps intended to be the recipient of the dedication, not of the Eclogues alone, but also of our presumed first draft of the Georgics as well? If so, even though the original draft might have tried to keep a political balance between the two colleagues and kinsmen, it was more likely to have lavished praise on Antonius than on Octavianus his junior partner. Later, after Octavia's divorce and the Donations of Alexandria, the official rupture between Antony and Octavian in 33 B.C. could readily have enabled Maecenas to bring pressure on Virgil to adhere to the supposedly patriotic faction of Octavian. Once Actium was won, this loyalty could have been required to take the form of replacing all reference to the earlier victories of Antony with the praise of Octavian and the insertion of Maecenas' own name as the poet's patron in place of the now enigmatic Pollio. Thus would be created the Georgics as we have them. So when Jackson Knight, relying on the evidence of 1.2, III.41 and IV.2, declares of the poet of the Georgics, "it was, he says, the command of Maecenas", (16) the revision rather than the original could well have been meant by Virgil. Again, though Wilkinson advances a milder interpretation of iussa, (17) the phrase tua, Maecenas, haud mollia iussa could well be a complaint, not perhaps against the choice of subject matter, but rather about this obligatory revision which has been inferred.

Now, if this view has any substance, it ought to be possible to substitute Pollio for Maecenas in the three other contexts where the patron is addressed. But the practice of Virgil himself in Eclogue III, vv. 84, 86 and 88 must warn us that the last syllable of Pollio is long, and therefore is always elided before a following short vowel to permit the use of the name in dactylic verse. Thus, if Virgil had to write "Pollio amat" or "Pollio et ipse" to secure a dactyl in the Eclogues, we must do the same kind of thing in any attempted reconstruction of lines from an original draft of the Georgics. Moreover, any such proposed alteration should serve to clarify rather than to obscure the argument of the passages where the change is made. We cannot presume to reconstruct what Virgil perhaps wrote, nor need we claim that our

lines will have a poetic merit comparable with those they displace. They are re-written simply to demonstrate the possibility of an earlier version. Now we may turn to I.1-3: the received text reads:

quid faciat laetas segetes, quo sidere terram
uertere, Maecenas, ulmisque adiungere uites
conueniat

Names apart, we already have a problem in this text. Ploughing in spring was, of course, universally advocated by ancient authorities. But regarding the proper time for planting young vines beside their supporting trees we find considerable vacillation. Here we may quote Wilkinson with benefit. "Columella preferred autumn if the climate was dry or warm, and if the terrain was either poor and arid plain or lean and steep hillside. Theophrastus reports some arguments for autumn, though generally favouring spring. Virgil mentions autumn only to return immediately to spring, whose praises he is poised to sing." (18) From his practice in II.315-22 it is therefore clear that Virgil is in two minds about vine planting, and will be considering, not the agreed fixed season, but which of two possible seasons gives dependable results to the grower. The use of bene and melius by Martial in the sense of 'appropriately' is found in Epigram IV.xiii; 3-5:

tam bene rara suo miscentur cinnama nardo,
Massica Theseis tam bene uina fauis;
nec melius teneris iunguntur uitibus ulmi,

This suggests that quo (sidere) bene iungere uites conueniat might have answered appropriately to quo sidere terram uertere (conueniat) in the present context. Bearing in mind the rules regarding elision of the final syllable of Pollio, one might venture to suggest this reconstructed verse:

quid faciat laetas segetes, quo sidere terram
uertere, Pollio, et ulmis quo bene iungere uites
conueniat .

We do not need to assume that Virgil wrote this jerkier line full of diaereses, for which the best that can be claimed is that it reflects the effort of ploughing heavy soil or taking an awkward decision! It is enough for our purpose to show how Pollio might have been introduced.

Next, we must turn to Book II. 39-41, where Maecenas again is invoked:

Tuque ades inceptumque una decurre laborem
o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae,
Maecenas, pelagoque uolans da uela patentí.

If Virgil had already published any work dedicated to Maecenas while he was still engaged on the Georgics, then it is no longer extant and the ancient critics have observed a conspiracy of silence about it. Also Dio simply refers to Maecenas as 'a man of equestrian rank' in the one place where he finds mention before Actium. (19) So, even if he were the poet's praesidium, the minister could hardly yet be called on either count famae pars maxima nostri.

But on the score of Eclogue VIII. 6-13 this phrase would surely have been a peculiarly appropriate tribute to Pollio. Perhaps, then, Virgil wrote in the presumed first draft of the Georgics something rather like this:

tuque ades inceptumque una decurre laborem,
o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae,
Pollio, et ipse uolans pelago da uela patenti.

Here again there seems a stylistic gain from introducing ipse in v.41. Further, uolans, which suggests the winged victory, is most appropriate in addressing an imperator who had celebrated a triumph.

Finally, we have an exhortation to Maecenas at the start of IV.

protinus aërii mellis caelestia dona
exsequar. hanc etiam, Maecenas, aspice partem:
admiranda tibi leuium spectacula rerum
magnanimosque duces totiusque ordine gentis
mores et studia et populos et proelia dicam.

Here too the military qualities of bees seem more likely to interest the renowned commander Pollio than the unwarlike Maecenas. With very slight changes these lines can also be referred to Pollio:

protinus aërii mellis caelestia dona
exsequar. hanc minimam mihi, Pollio, et aspice partem:
admiranda tibi leuium spectacula rerum.
magnanimosque duces totiusque ordine gentis
mores et studia et populos et proelia dicam. (IV, 1-6)

Here too there is a more natural logical connexion between minimam and the leuium spectacula rerum of the verse following than we find between leuium and the etiam of the received text.

If Pollio really remained the poet's patron when he began the Georgics, then we might expect that his earlier draft would have tended to take the part of Pollio's friend Mark Antony in the growing civic tension of the decade. Now Jackson Knight remarks of Messala, another friend of Virgil's, "he went to serve with Antonius, whom Vergil never liked, in the East." (20) However this verdict is based on the text of Virgil as we have it. Can Virgil really have disliked Antonius strongly if he wrote Eclogue IV in honour of the anticipated birth of a son to Antony and Octavia, as both Syme and Jackson Knight himself believe? (21) It is equally possible that Virgil was simply forced to disown Antony in a revision of his poem imposed on him by Maecenas.

In rather similar vein Brooks Otis remarks on a possible view of Georgic IV. "The contrast between the two kings in 91f., one insignis et ... clarus; the other uncouth in his sloth (desidia) and trailing his broad belly, may suggest Actium, the contest of Octavian and Antony." (22) Indeed, it may: but it might also suggest Philippi, where Antony played a soldier's part while Octavian skulked in the marsh with the excuse of an ill-omened dream. (23) So the interpretation of any allegory present in these lines might equally well

have first been intended to glorify Antony and deride Octavian. If we believe the lines were written just after Agrippa had done Octavian's fighting for him at Naulochus in 36 B.C., then our second possibility becomes extremely attractive. If on the other hand we agree with the general opinion of scholarship and consider that the lines were written during 30-29 B.C., then Otis' interpretation is no doubt persuasive.

THE PRAISE OF ANTONY

This discussion compels us to question the origin of the panegyric passages in praise of Octavianus Caesar. Were they originally written in honour of Mark Antony? The passages in dispute are I, 24-43 and 466-516; II 161-4 and 170-2; III 10-48, and IV 559-66: a total of 124 lines. The extracts from Book I refer clearly to events subsequent to Actium and can therefore be excluded from the present consideration. Indeed, vv.466-514 seem coeval with Horace, Odes I, 2 - but this is not the time to pursue the interrelations of Horace, Virgil and Maecenas.

On the other hand, II 161-4 and 170-2 seem to relate to the events of 37 B.C. - the year when Virgil's gradual Caesarian 'conversion' is likely to have begun. In the latter part of 37 B.C. Agrippa was busy constructing the Lucrine harbour, so Virgil could not have composed II 161-4 before this date. But if the praise of Italy in the second Georgic dates from 37 or 36 B.C., when Octavian was locked in a life-and-death naval struggle with Sextus Pompeius, then vv. 170-2 must be a later addition, or else they have been re-written at a later date to apply to Octavian, who never went near India.

et te, maxime Caesar,
qui nunc extremis Asiae iam uictor in oris
imbellem auertis Romanis arcibus Indum.

T.E. Page is typical of editors in describing imbellem Indum as "any inhabitant of the East." (24) But there is an alternative to referring this passage to the vanquished at Actium. In 37 B.C. Antony was busy preparing to avenge Carrhae. The negotiations at Tarentum in that year delayed his actual departure till 36 B.C. His strategy envisaged a campaign directed at Parthia through Armenia and Media rather than through Mesopotamia, where Crassus had already tried and failed so disastrously. The title Dionysus Omestes in which he delighted (25) may have led Virgil to compare him with the mythical Dionysus who conquered India, and whose legendary exploits inspired the efforts of Alexander in that region. Further, as the pirates of Aden were not broken by Roman sea power till 2 B.C., it is conceivable that a secure land route for the rich trade with India was actually one of Antony's Parthian objectives. In short the subject matter of 170-2 can be made consistent with the date and political climate of the Lucrine constructions if we assume that the lines were originally composed in reference to Antonius:

Scipiadas duros bello et te, maxime Marce,
qui nunc extremis Asiae iam uictor in oris
imbellem auertis Romanis arcibus Indum.

Again, if III 10-48 referred originally to Antony's eastern wars, we could solve an interesting puzzle. As Syme points out, there was actually very little to the vaunted Augustan settlement of the East after Cleopatra's death, at least not so much as to justify Res Gestae 27 or Georgics II.171, III. 30 or IV. 560 ff. ⁽²⁶⁾ Pollio, Virgil's original patron, remained Antony's friend to the last. Though he refused him aid at Actium, he washed his hands of the Caesarian cause with firm disdain. ⁽²⁷⁾ One is left with the thought that Virgil's first draft may well have contained a list of Antony's sizeable victories over eastern foes between 40 and 37 B.C, and that this tribute to the old patron's friend may well have been hastily reworked after 31 B.C. to suit the vanity of the new patron's friend. This list perhaps confronts us in III 10-33.

A feature of the Parthian invasion of Syria and Asia Minor in 39-37 B.C. was the success of Antony's legatus Ventidius in ejecting the Parthian nominee Antigonus from the throne of Jerusalem which Antony and Octavian had awarded to Herod the Idumaeus in 40 B.C. Furthermore in 38 B.C. the arrival of Herod with his forces enabled Antonius to complete the capture of the besieged town of Samosata on the Euphrates, which was Antony's main personal success in this war. ⁽²⁸⁾ Virgil sings :

(III.12):

primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas.

Referring to Caesar Octavianus this adjective may be, in Page's words, "merely an epitheton ornans and by no means in place," ⁽²⁹⁾ but if it had originally referred to Herod's part in the victory of Antonius at Samosata it is very pertinent indeed. Again, though Page explains the Gangaridum of 27 - "people dwelling at the mouth of the Ganges", ⁽³⁰⁾ as referring to "the Oriental forces who fought under Antony at Actium", the excision of the following verses 28-29 as either a later insertion or else a modification of the original draft would leave it open for the reader to construe Gangaridum as referring to Antony's suggested Indian ambitions. The mention of the gold and ivory might bear a similar implication:

in foribus pugnam ex auro solidoque elephanto
Gangaridum faciam uictorisque arma Quirini.

It is now time to consider the implications of Quirini. Readers of Wilkinson's recent masterly study of the Georgics may well feel that his findings rule this ingenious interpretation out of court because of the meaning he assigns to the term Quirini here. ⁽³¹⁾ A few pages earlier Wilkinson discusses the title in more detail: "another idea then abroad was that Octavian was a New Romulus, there being actually talk of giving him the title of Quirinus quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis". ⁽³²⁾ However, it should be pointed out that Wilkinson's two Latin sources used the title Romulus, not Quirinus. So Florus writes "tractatum etiam in senatu, an, quia condidisset imperium, Romulus uocaretur", ⁽³³⁾ and Suetonius observes: "quibusdam consentibus Romulum appellari oportere quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis". ⁽³⁴⁾ Furthermore, Propertius in fact applies Quirinus as a title to Mark Antony in IV (V). 6.21-4:

erat
altera classis/tenero damnata Quirino,
pilaque femineae turpiter apta manu:
hinc Augusta ratis plenis Iouis omine uelis
signaque iam patriae uincere docta suae.

There is thus no obstacle to rendering victoris arma Quirini as "the arms of Antony the victor" if we so wish.

The following verses 30-31 add point to the identification of the original of this whole passage as a list of Antony's expected and already accomplished victories in the East. Niphates was a river in Armenia. Canidius had conquered that land for Antonius whilst Jerusalem was being reduced in 37 B.C. At this very time the senior Triumvir was himself conferring with his partner at Tarentum in preparation for his own venture into Media and Parthia and for Octavian's renewed assault on Sextus Pompeius. However, the Parthian had already met with one defeat at the hands of forces fighting under the standards of Antony. After slaying Pacorus the Crown Prince of Parthia in battle in June of 38 B.C., Antony's general Ventidius had retaken the whole East for Rome, and had expelled the Parthians from Roman land. Thus in the following couplet we have found another passage which may have been filched from the praises of Antony to adorn the triple triumph of Octavian:

addam urbes Asiae domitas pulsumque Niphaten
fidentemque fuga Parthum uersisque sagittis.

Furthermore, if Virgil first wrote this whole sequence at the end of 37 B.C., he would be anxious to celebrate the recent triumphs of two of Antony's legates - particularly when one of them was his own patron. Pollio had triumphed over the Parthini of the Danube on his return from Dalmatia in October of 39 B.C., while in November of 38 B.C. Rome had witnessed the triumph of Ventidius over the Parthi whom he had driven from Syria and Asia Minor. Thus we might interpret vv. 32-33:

et duo rapta manu diuerso ex hoste tropaea
bisque triumphatas utroque ab litore gentes.

Here surely "the twice triumphed over races from either shore" of v.33 seems to suggest the jingle Parthini/Parthi provided by the names of the vanquished, first from Europe and then from Asia, in those successive years far more naturally than it could imply any triumph celebrated under the auspices of Octavian. T.E.Page was inclined to assign these lines to the Actian and later Spanish triumphs of Augustus, ⁽³⁶⁾ but this interpretation is associated with his acceptance of the Servian tradition that the Aristaeus-epyllion of Book IV was inserted in place on the praise of Gallus after the latter's fall in 26 B.C. Such an opinion of course would date the completion of the Georgics after the Spanish triumph. Though Wilkinson sees the whole Georgics completed by 29 B.C., his interpretation of vv. 32-33 as referring "to the Morini on the English Channel and the Bastarnae on the Black Sea" ⁽³⁷⁾ tends to push him towards the acceptance of publication in 26 B.C., and he tries to disown any such implication in his footnote. "In this same year, 29 B.C. Carrinas defeated the Morini, and M.Crassus defeated the Bastarnae, one of his objects being to recover standards lost by C.Antonius. Though these were allowed later to celebrate triumphs, in May 28 and July 27 B.C. respectively, Dio emphasises that Octavian, as sole imperator, was given credit for both victories." To this one can only reply that being given credit for victory is not the same

as triumphing over a foe - to a Roman least of all. If Wilkinson is right to take utroque ab litore as meaning "from either coast of Europe" rather than as implying "from lands on either side of the Hellespont" as was assumed above, then his explanation is a ground for dating the publication of the Georgics to 26 B.C. However, ⁽³⁸⁾ he is as firmly in favour of dating this poem of Book III to early 29 B.C. as the present writer is in support of dating it essentially to early 36 B.C.

Nevertheless, in respect of this poem, Wilkinson is undoubtedly right in deducing that Virgil had been reading Pindar. Here he observes that this is the first evidence of the impact of Pindar on Roman literature. On the assumption of a date of 29 B.C. he remarks: "At this date Horace was just beginning to compose Odes in the manner of the older Greek lyric poetry, and no doubt the friends would read and discuss Pindar together." ⁽⁴⁰⁾ This is doubtless true, but on any showing such discussion could have happened any time after Horace joined the circle of Maecenas in 37 B.C., and the process of reading need not be delayed until Horace starts to compose in Pindaric vein. This consideration, then, is no obstacle to dating this poem to the beginning of 36 B.C. or the end of 37 B.C. But if we wish to maintain this date for the original drafting, it will follow that vv. 28-9 are not the only places where we must assume subsequent revision. The possible original text of this poem will receive fuller discussion in an Appendix, but for the present we must note that v.16 might not then be original as it stands:

in medio mihi Caesar erit, templumque tenebit.

While it is possible that diuos Iulius is here the subject, the full references to Antony's wars which we have discovered in the ensuing lines dispose one to think that this line was revised after 31 B.C. At the end of 37 B.C. Antonius was about to invade Parthia by way of Media, using the route through Armenia which Canidius had secured earlier in the year. Is this verse then perhaps an optimistic prophecy regarding the ultimately unsuccessful invasion of Media upon which Antonius actually embarked a few months later in the spring of 36 B.C.? If so, was the original form perhaps the following:

in Medos Antonius it, templumque tenebit?

With such a hypothesis, vv. 10-48 may originally have promised an epic poem about the wars of Antonius and Pollio and his other officers; hence they may reiterate in wider context the earlier pledge to Pollio implicit in Eclogue VIII, 7-8:

en erit umquam
ille dies, mihi cum liceat tua dicere facta?

If we grant this, it is possible that the concluding promise to celebrate the battles of Caesar is contemporary too, and ⁽⁴¹⁾ refers to the naval operations against the pirates and Sextus Pompeius. The revisions for which our terminus post quem was 33 B.C. would thus probably have been subsequent to Actium and included the altering of 16, the insertion of 28-9, and an insertion between 41 and 43 as we now have them which rather obscures the transition from what seems a summary of Georgic II to the summary of Georgic III.

interea Dryadum siluas saltusque sequamur
intactos, tua, Maecenas, haud mollia iussa.
te sine nil altum mens incohat; en age segnes
rumpe moras: vocat ingenti clamore Cithaeron
Taygetique canes domitrixque Epidaurus equorum
et uox adsensu nemorum ingeminata remugit.

The devotion to Maecenas seems here, to say the least, masochistic.

the final 'Caesarian' sequence is in IV, 559-62:

haec super aruorum cultu pecorumque canebam
et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum
fulminat Euphraten bello uictorque uolentes
per populos dat iura uiamque adfectat Olympo.

However, as we have noted, Octavian never waged a war on the banks of the Euphrates, while Antonius expelled the Parthians, restored Roman governors and client kings, and finally captured Samosata on the banks of that very river. But if the passage has been revised, it establishes one of two possibilities. Either the lines were moved from an early place in the draft of Book III somewhere to the end of the whole work, or else Virgil had completed the entire first draft before the repudiation of Octavia in 33 B.C. As this would need a working rate of less than 600 lines per year, it really offers no problem. On this assumption what then was the original form of the conclusion? Perhaps something like the following:

haec super aruorum cultu pecorumque canebam
arboribusque, Antonius en dum magnus ad altum
fulminat Euphraten bello uictorque uolentes
per populos dat iura uiamque adfectat Olympo.

In short, it can be argued that all these tributes to Octavian could have been reworked from earlier praises of Antony.

THE TALE OF ARISTAËUS

As we have noticed above, this huge digression puts the fourth Georgic in a class by itself. ⁽⁴²⁾ Servius reports the tale that it took the place of the laudes of Gallus after the latter committed suicide in 27 or 26 B.C. ⁽⁴³⁾ However, Brooks Otis gives compelling grounds for dating the Aristaëus episode to 30-29 B.C. ⁽⁴⁴⁾ But if we accept our date for the completion of the first draft as 34-33 B.C., then indeed this tale must replace something. Now Gallus at the time of his death was Prefect of Egypt. Was the omitted section in fact the praise, not of Gallus, but of the land and social organisation of Egypt, whose monarchic tradition, complex irrigation and division of labour might be held to reproduce the excellence of the hive. ⁽⁴⁵⁾ The regeneration of hives by bougonia could be held to occur in Egypt because there the ox as Apis-Osiris is sacred, and because that country's human social organisation follows the method of bees in their hive in respects which Rome's does not. Here surely would have been implied too obvious an approval of Antony's Egyptian

marriage for Octavian to tolerate or Maecenas to publish. The unbalanced total concentration on viticulture in Georgic II which Otis emphasises (46) may also owe something to Antony's self-chosen "dionysiac" style. (47) It is curious that the two optimistic books, as Brooks Otis sees them, both appear in this light to be especially sympathetic to Antonius. The first and third books which he finds more sombre (48) are also more individualistic. Did the original draft perhaps mirror a decade where many Romans - perhaps including Antony himself - saw the ritualistic and authoritarian collectivism of the Egyptian monarchy as preferable to the anarchy of their own republican past? The bees' state may be meant (49) as a much more controversial exemplar for Rome than Wilkinson imagines.

Forced then perhaps by Maecenas to discard an explanation too favourable to Cleopatra, Virgil finds in the Aristaeus legend a new aetiology for bougonia. The incorporation of the legend of Orpheus has been given many profound symbolic meanings - perhaps it had also a political significance. Octavian declared war on Cleopatra, not on Antony. After the defeat of Actium she fled to Egypt followed by her lover. Octavian pursued in his own good time and defeated the rival forces outside Alexandria. Cleopatra simulated death: Antony stabbed himself and bade his body be brought to her tomb. On his arrival Cleopatra revealed her deceit, but he died in her arms. Refusing Octavian's terms she poisoned herself with a snake. In Georgic IV 453-530 we find an analogous history. Aristaeus pursues Eurydice who dies of snakebite - the end of Octavian's pursuit of Cleopatra. Orpheus her husband descends to the Underworld to recover her - Antony carried to Cleopatra's tomb. Despite Pluto's concession Orpheus loses Eurydice again and perishes soon afterwards (50) - Antony finding Cleopatra alive but dying in her arms. In short, the Aristaeus episode can be viewed as an allegory of the War of Actium, but with its final ending shown in the first part of the allegory, and with the hint that Octavian might himself have felt more than a passing interest in Cleopatra's bed.

When Virgil revised this part of his original draft he probably made the other modifications we have suggested at the instance of Maecenas during the same period. Thus we postulate a first draft of the Georgics with Pollio as its patron and Antonius as its hero already completed by 35 or at latest 34 B.C. After the victory of Actium the poet then revised the work with Maecenas for patron and Octavian as its hero. However, the largest single modification, the tale of Aristaeus, is not simply subservient to the new regime. If Actium was fought and won, the Roman world, like Aristaeus' bees, was still perishing of an inner sickness. Proteus bade Aristaeus placate the shades of Eurydice and Orpheus: Virgil in effect bids Augustus similarly placate the shades of Cleopatra and Antony. Fair treatment of their supporters and genuine reconciliation offered the one formula for civic health and a restored Roman society. Such a revision involved Virgil in the wholesale attribution to Octavian of victories and achievements which had really belonged to Antonius. Donatus tells us that Agrippa was quick to stigmatise Virgil for noua cacozelia, or "a novel form of bad taste". Was it perhaps this practice which he was attacking? Thus one may possibly dare to postulate that at the prompting of Maecenas Virgil succeeded in transforming the praises of Antony into a lesson

for Augustus. Viewed in this sense the Georgics would retain a distinctive political significance apart from their poetic excellence.

R.G.Tanner.
University of Newcastle,
New South Wales.

Acknowledgment:

In revising the several earlier drafts of this paper I have been grateful for suggestions from Professor D.E.Eichholz of Bristol and from my Newcastle colleagues Rhona Beare and W.D.Ashworth. I have also benefited greatly from a frank and lively discussion of the paper with Professor C.M.Wells and his colleagues at Ottawa, and from the criticism and advice of my dearly-valued friend A.G.Lee of St. John's College, Cambridge.

NOTES

1. P.Vergilii Maronis: Bucolica et Georgica (Macmillan, 1898), p.vii.
2. R.Syme: The Roman Revolution, Clarendon Press, 1939, pp. 253-4.
3. T.E.Page, op.cit., p.xxiii: cf., L.P.Wilkinson, The Georgics of Virgil, pp.69-70.
4. T.E.Page, op.cit., p.xxiii.
5. J.Dryden, Dedication of his translation to the Earl of Chesterfield.
6. Donatus, 47.
7. or "Do not use oleasters to support vines" - see Wilkinson, op.cit., p.248.
8. Jacques Perret: The Georgics (in Virgil edited by S.Commager, pp.32-5).
9. Virgil, A Study in Civilised Poetry, p.157.
10. op.cit., p.181.
11. op.cit., p.184.
12. op.cit., p.31.
13. W.F.Jackson Knight: Roman Vergil (2. ed.) Penguin, 1966, p.75.
14. ibid., p.74.
15. Wilkinson, op.cit., p.39.

16. *ibid.*, p.63.
17. op.cit., p.49.
18. *ibid.*, p.249.
19. Dio Cassius, 49.16.
20. op.cit., p.83.
21. op.cit., p.62.
22. op.cit., p.183.
23. Vell. Pat. II, 70.1.
24. Virgil: *Bucolics & Georgics*, p.259.
25. Jackson Knight, op.cit., p.24. cf., Wilkinson, op.cit., p.162.
26. R.Syme, The Roman Revolution, p.301.
27. *ibid.* p.291.
28. Josephus, Bell. Iud., I.321-3.
29. Page, op.cit., p.291.
30. *ibid.*, p.293.
31. Wilkinson, op.cit., p.169.
32. ibid., p.163.
33. IV.12.66 (2.34).
34. Aug. 7.
35. Postgate prefers the reading Teucro.
36. op.cit., p.294.
37. op.cit., p.169.
38. *ibid.* p.170.
39. *ibid.*, p.166.
40. *ibid.*, p.167.
41. But see the Appendix, which decides in favour of treating these verses as a remodelling of three earlier ones done in 29 B.C.

42. Above, p.10.
43. ad ecl. X., i.
44. op.cit., pp. 408-13. Wilkinson (op.cit., p.117n) tends to agree.
45. Thus for different reasons I agree with Wilkinson (op.cit., pp.111-2): "Otherwise we may guess that a few lines about Gallus occurred à propos of Egypt at 287-94."
46. op.cit., p.165-6.
47. op.cit., p.189.
48. op.cit., p.189.
49. Wilkinson, op.cit., pp. 175-182.
50. It is of great significance for this allegorical interpretation that Virgil appears to offer an original version of the Orpheus story. See Wilkinson, op.cit., pp.116-117.

APPENDIX : THE PINDARIC PROEM OF GEORGIC III.

As observed above, Wilkinson has drawn attention to the influence of Pindar on this passage, ⁽¹⁾ and the evidence in favour ⁽²⁾ of dating its first draft to early in 36 B.C. has already been presented.

In our earlier examination we have athetised vv. 28-29 and v.16 as either added or reworked, and have expressed some doubts about the date and original shape of vv. 46-48. If Antonius is the theme, then the Britanni of v.25 also become suspect, even though Octavian perhaps was contemplating their conquest in 34 B.C. ⁽³⁾ Such a mention is natural in a work written in 29 B.C. in the wake of Carrinas' victory over the Morini, for, as Caesar himself had noted, they occupied the parts of Gaul closest to Britain: "in Morinos proficiscitur, quod inde erat breuissimus in Britanniam traiectus" (B.G.IV.21). This circumstance may equally have inspired Virgil's contemporary reference in I.30: "tibi seruiat ultima Thule". However, if the proem of III was originally devoted to dreams of Antony surpassing the victories of Alexander, then some Indian tribal name should replace Britanni here - particularly as some contact between Indian and Greek stagecraft is argued by the very Sanskrit word for a stage curtain, Yavanikā. No doubt the plays Virgil envisaged as being performed at his festival were the tragedies which his patron Pollio had lately retired to write.

In dealing with the obviously subsequent reference to Actium in 28-9 we must remember that any reference to a flooded river would be as fitting in regard to India as it is regarding Egypt. Moreover, if we read Curtius' Historia Alexandri, we find that the main difficulty Alexander met during his march into India was in crossing the great rivers of the Indus system in the

Punjab, and that he had to devise sectionalised boats which could be carried on waggons from river to river: "illi quia plura flumina superanda erant, sic iunxere naues; ut solutae plaustris uehi possent rursusque coniungi" (VIII.10.3). It is therefore likely that any original of Virgil's III.28-9 would mention the Indus rather than the Nile and a bridge of boats rather than naval trophies. Thus we might suggest for v.29:

Indum ac nauali luctantem ponte reuinctum.

In the case of v.25, Pliny, H.N., VI:20: "nouissima gente Gangaridum Calingarum: regia Parthalis uocatur", may suggest a solution. If Antony is to rival Alexander he must sail down the Ganges as once the Macedonian had sailed down the Indus. Therefore, if like Alexander he is to be deified in his lifetime and to receive a festival in his honour as the Ptolemies had done at Delos, then the dwellers at the mouth of the Ganges should appear depicted in his ritual. Hence one might venture to replace Britanni with Calingae.

Next verses 34-6 require discussion. These are generally deemed to refer to the Trojan forebears of Aeneas and the Julian house who also find mention in Aeneid VI, 648-50 - and in this version of 29 B.C. such is of course the case. But if the reading offered by some MSS for Propertius IV (v).6.21 is correct, and his text described Antony's fleet at Actium as "Teucro damnata Quirino", then perhaps Antony also laid claim to a Trojan pedigree at this time, for his mother was Julia, a lady of the Caesarian house. ⁽⁴⁾ This fact in itself could justify the list of Trojan worthies for his honour as much as for Octavian's, since the latter likewise owed his blood connexion with the line of Aeneas to his mother's having also been born a Julia. Caesar's adoption apart, Octavian stood no closer to the blood of Iulus than did Mark Antony.

In addition to the title Dionysus Omestes, Antonius also claimed other divine associations. According to Plutarch he resembled the statues of Hercules, and his family in fact claimed descent from Anton, son of Hercules. ⁽⁵⁾ This tradition would undoubtedly have been a spur to any ambitions to rival Alexander in India. When the latter arrived in India he is said to have been saluted as the third son of Zeus to invade the land: "igitur Alexandro fines Indiae ingresso gentium suarum reguli occurrerunt, imperata facturi; illum tertium Ioue genitum ad ipsos peruenisse memorantes; Patrem Liberum atque Herculem fama cognitos esse; ipsum coram adesse cernique". ⁽⁶⁾ If Alexander is to be surpassed, it must be done by one who is both the new Dionysus and the heir of Hercules: Antonius the praesens Hercules and heir of Anton. Whether the invidia infelix of 37 refers to Sextus Pompeius or perhaps to Agrippa and Octavian is a hard question, and, as Wilkinson observes, the term is a Pindaric commonplace anyway. ⁽⁷⁾

After these preliminaries, we shall hazard a reconstruction of the putative proem for the third Georgic of 36 B.C.

primus ego in patriam mecum, modo uita supersit,
Aonio rediens deducam uertice Musas;
primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas,
et uiridi in campo templum de marmore ponam
propter aquam, tardis ingens ubi flexibus errat
Mincius et tenera praetexit harundine ripas.

in Medos Antonius it, templumque tenebit:
illi uictor ego, et Tyrio conspectus in ostro,
centum quadriugos agitabo ad flumina currus.
cuncta mihi Alpheum linquens lucosque Molorchi
cursibus et crudo decernet Graecia caestu.
ipse caput tonsae foliis ornatus oliuae
dona feram. iam nunc sollempnis ducere pompas
ad delubra iuuat caesosque uidere iuuenos,
uel scaena ut uersis discedat frontibus utque
purpurea intexti tollant aulaea Calingae.
in foribus pugnam ex auro solidoque elephanto
Gangaridum faciam uictorisque arma Quirini,
atque hic undantem bello magnumque fluentem
Indum ac nauali luctantem ponte reuinctum.
addam urbes Asiae domitas pulsumque Niphaten
fidentemque fuga Parthum uersisque sagittis;
et duo rapta manu diuerso ex hoste tropaea
bisque triumphatas utroque ab litore gentis.
stabunt et Parii lapides, spirantia signa,
Assaraci proles demissaeque ab Ioue gentis
nomina, Trosque parens et Troiae Cynthius auctor.
Inuidia infelix furias annemque seuerum
Cocyti metuet tortosque Ixionis anguis
immanemque rotam et non exsuperabile saxum.
interea Dryadum siluas saltusque sequamur
intactos; uocat ingenti clamore Cithaeron
Taygetique canes domitrixque Epidaurus equorum,
et uox adsensu nemorum ingeminata remugit.
mox tamen accingar praesentis dicere pugnas
Herculis, et nomen fama tot ferre per annos
Antoni prima quot abest ab origine Marcus.

We may well ask why a temple for Antonius should be built in the territory of Mantua. First, it was the poet's homeland. Secondly, it was in Cisalpine Gaul, Gallia Togata across the Po. In 42 B.C. it had been agreed that all this territory should be incorporated in Italy, but the Antonian Asinius Pollio was its governor for the present. The War of Perusia followed, and Pollio played the role of peacemaker at Brundisium in October of 40 B.C., becoming consul for the remainder of the year. Thenceforward the Transpadane region was treated as part of Italy. Did Antony perhaps insist on this enfranchisement of all lands north of the Po at this time? If so, it would be a further reason to set the poetic temple in his honour in this district.

If these suggestions above deserve any attention, they raise the possibility that the political and military aims of Antonius have been minimised and misinterpreted by his conquerors.

R.G.T.