

Proceedings

of the

Virgil Society, No. 12

1972-1973

---



PROCEEDINGS OF THE VIRGIL SOCIETY

No. 12, 1972–73

(Editor: H. MacL. Currie, M.A., Queen Mary College, Mile End Road, London, E.1.)

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
Lectoribus Editor	ii
‘Baroque Virgil: Joseph Trapp’s <i>Aeneid</i> ’ by M.M. Kelsall, M.A., B. Litt.	1
‘Why did Venus wear boots? – Some reflections on <i>Aeneid</i> 1.314f’ by E.L. Harrison, M.A.	10
‘Virgil Today’ Presidential Address by Professor R.D. Williams, M.A.	25
‘Virgil, Tacitus, Tiberius and Germanicus’ by Janet Bews, M.A., Ph.D.	35
<u>Articles</u>	
Three Notes on Virgil by Professor M.L. Clarke, M.A.	48
A ‘Quotation’ from the <i>Aeneid</i> on the coinage of Carausius by N. Shiel, M.A.	51
<u>Book Reviews</u>	54
<u>Obituary Notices</u>	56

## LECTORIBUS EDITOR

A most welcome event in the past year has been the appearance of the two-volume edition of the *Aeneid* by our President, Professor R.D. Williams (Macmillan; vol. 1 containing books i-vi £2.50; vol. 2, books vii-xii, £3). Mackail's highly selective commentary of 1930 excepted, this is the first commentary on the whole of the poem since T.E. Page's celebrated work of 1894-1900. Despite his interpretation of the fourth book (which must have coloured many people's attitude to the *Aeneid* and Aeneas in the intervening years) Page was a man of learning and discernment. However, Virgil scholarship has advanced with great vigour and Page's work had to be re-done, a task which Professor Williams has admirably performed. No words are wasted; introduction ('Life and works of Virgil', 'Virgil and Augustus', 'The legend of Aeneas', 'Sources of the *Aeneid*', 'Synopsis of the *Aeneid*', 'Structure and themes', 'Virgil's hexameter', 'The MSS of the *Aeneid* and the ancient commentators', 'Differences of text between this edition and Mynors and Hirtzel', 'Bibliography') and notes show an economical lucidity which takes the reader to the heart of the matter. Frequent illuminating citations from Milton, Spenser and other English poets are a notable feature of the commentary. We congratulate Professor Williams and the publishers on this really valuable addition to our resources.

The fifth Jackson Knight memorial lecture, delivered by Professor G.B. Townend under the title 'The Augustan Poets and the Permissive Society' (Abbey Press, Abingdon-on-Thames, 1972; 26pp., 30 n.p.), is a sprightly piece of writing, offering a survey of Roman poets (including some pre- and post-Augustans) with regard to sexual *mores* and morals. Much good sense in brief compass.

We offer our congratulations also to Professor F.H. Sandbach, a recent past President of the Society, on the publication of his Oxford Classical Text of Menander and a commentary on this comic poet begun many years ago by the late Professor A.W. Gomme. It is not only students of ancient comedy who will be grateful for these two outstanding contributions to knowledge.

We gratefully acknowledge a generous grant from the Research Fund of the New University of Ulster. Prices continue to rise frighteningly, and we highly appreciate such assistance. May we ask members to remember to pay their subscriptions regularly and on time – 60 n.p., or 38 n.p. for full-time students (due on January 1st each year)?

After twelve issues of *The Proceedings* I feel that I must now sign off – with best thanks to all those who over the years have generously helped me and borne with me.

---

## OFFICE-BEARERS OF THE SOCIETY

Hon. Secretary: F. Robertson, M.A., Faculty of Letters, The University, Reading.

Hon. Treasurer: Dr. L. Watkiss, 106 Honey Lane, Waltham Abbey, Essex.

Editor, *The Proceedings* (till December, 1973): H. MacL. Currie, M.A., Queen Mary College (University of London), London E.1.

'Baroque Virgil: Joseph Trapp's *Aeneid*'

A paper read to the Virgil Society, November, 1972,

by M.M. Kelsall, M.A., B. Litt.

Joseph Trapp was Oxford's first Professor of Poetry, an office he held from 1708 to 1718. He lectured, in Latin, on the theory and genres of poetry, publishing his work under the title *Praelectiones Poeticae* (1711-19). As a true English Augustan he combined practice with theory, and versified in English and Latin, lamenting the death of the great, celebrating the European peace achieved by British arms, and he is credited with at least one moderately successful tragedy. His laudatory verses helped him to his Professorship; later, his services to the Tory party in the Sacheverell affair, with Sir Constantine Phipps in Ireland, and his connections with Bolingbroke and Peterborough, combined to help him to a comfortable niche in the established church. His anti-Catholic polemics secured him a Doctorate of Divinity from the University of Oxford. He was born in 1679 and died in 1747.<sup>1</sup>

His translation of the *Aeneid* appeared in two volumes dated 1718 and 1720, with an extensive preface and elaborate notes, and coincides, therefore, with the vacation of his chair. After the version of Dryden it was the best known evaluation of Virgil for the early eighteenth century. The list of subscribers is not only rich with the names of lords temporal and spiritual and the colleges of Oxford, but contains also Addison, Arbuthnot, Berkeley, Thomas Sheridan, Tickell, Swift, Thomas Warton, Young (but not Pope whose views on Homer Trapp censured, and misquoted). We have, therefore, in Trapp's *Aeneid* an edition of Virgil which was read by many of the important figures in the English Augustan cultural milieu, and which, unlike Dryden's, comes from a source of academic authority. To this historical claim for consideration the intrinsic merit of the work may be added. Trapp drew upon a powerful critical heritage, especially, and recently, from the French, among whom the names of Le Bossu, André Dacier, Rapin, and de Segrain are of prime importance, and he formed his judgements also upon the growing authority of English poetic achievement. The powerful rationalistic and analytic Aristotelianism of French neo-classicism combines in the age with the liberal tradition of English humanism, and Trapp, as a critic contemporary with Addison, Dennis, Dryden, Pope and Johnson, introduces the modern reader to Virgil by revealing familiar terrain from a fresh perspective, or, to use one of his favoured critical terms, he adds to the 'variety' of our response; and as Johnson recognised, the mind of man requires variety, lest it stagnate.

Trapp, within contemporary tradition, had his own contribution to make. This paper will attempt to cleanse from the cobwebs of obscurity certain dominant motifs in his thought, to explain why he was led to think as he did, and to see, if only for a moment, the *Aeneid* as it appeared to his eyes. Accounts have been given elsewhere of the neo-classical theory of the epic and of the history of Virgil's reputation in this period.<sup>2</sup> Nothing can be added here to knowledge or appreciation by going over this ground again, nor would Trapp wish his work to be merely absorbed into collective generalisation. His

appeal was to the individual taste of the cultivated reader, and since he solicited the suffrage of the democratic community of men of sensibility and reason, he should receive what he granted, and be permitted, not his eccentricity, but nonetheless his independence within the community.

Fundamentally Trapp wished the reader to respond to a passionate Virgil: “the Art, and Triumph of Poetry are in nothing more seen, and felt, than in *Moving the Passions*” he writes in the introductory remarks to the tragical actions of the fourth book, to which he prefaces “An Essay upon the Nature, and Art of *Moving the Passions* in Tragedy, and Epic Poetry”. “A Man cannot command his own Motions, while he reads This; The very *Verses are alive*; and the Reader is transported out of himself” is a typical remark from his commentary, here relating to the breaking of the truce in the twelfth book. Introducing the third book he quotes with approval Horaces’s claim that the poet’s art is like magic and enrages, terrifies, and soothes with fictions transporting us now to Thebes, now to Athens. Repeatedly he throws up his hands in rapture at the *je ne sais quoi*: “Some Beauties are the more so, for not being capable of Explanation. I feel it, tho’ I cannot account for it” is a typical comment (ii 16).

In the *Praelectiones Poeticae* Trapp had written of the power of poetry to “delight or ravish”, and there is nothing in his claim which would have disturbed his audience. His use of Aristotle to comment on the fourth book of the *Aeneid*, and Horace to defend the third, show a typical neo-classical regard for authority. Nonetheless, if one compares Trapp’s frequent emotive comments with the extremes of formal French Aristotelianism in Le Bossu, or the Delphin edition, or even the generic description of the epic in the *Praelectiones* itself, there is apparent a clear tendency in his appreciation which carries him away from neo-classic emphasis on generic structure and moral doctrine towards a more emotive and fluid sense of Virgil’s art. Nor, in the more haphazard approach of Trapp’s great English predecessor, John Dryden, are there to be found such raptures. On the contrary, political cynicism more often marks Dryden.

There is, thus, nothing in Trapp’s preface or commentary resembling the prolegomena to the *Aeneid* in the Delphin edition which defines epic from the doctrine of Aristotle as the imitation of one action, illustrious, complete, of a certain magnitude, which by narration in hexameter verse raises eminent men to the prime virtues by delight and admiration; proceeds to define the *actio*, *fabula*, *mores*, *sententia*, and *dictio* in the abstract, and then demonstrates that the definitions fit the *Aeneid*. Trapp, basically, would have agreed, as the *Praelectiones* show, but when he comes to reveal, as he admits, his own personality and taste in specific criticism of the *Aeneid* he is “lost”, “transported”, “astonish’d” at the poem, and with more than the emotions of “joy” and “wonder” which Aristotelianism emphasised: “it is the Property of... Poetical Flame to chill us with Horrour, and make us weep with Pity... to Kindle us with Indignation, Love, or Glory: It is it’s Property to cool, as well as burn” he bursts out quoting the description of Atlas, forgetful of definition, more concerned to record a specific response.

As for the morality of Virgil – the usual things are written about the importance of the *Aeneid's* subject, and of the rational courage and *pietas* of the hero. There is, however, little pointing of *sententia*, and there is no exposition in the preface of that specifically political morality of Virgil's epic which elaborated by Dryden especially, drawing heavily on the French, was to lead Pope to claim that the *Aeneid* was a party piece like *Absalom and Achitophel*.<sup>3</sup> The whole political matter is dismissed with haste (perhaps embarrassment). As for the allegorisers of classic texts, (treated with contempt in the *Praelectiones*), although the ghosts of a Cesare Ripa or a Gyraldus hover in the limbo of Trapp's mind, no voice escapes their feeble throats. Provided pagan religion does not too deeply shock his Christianity or his sense of probability, (and there are times when Virgil is as outrageous as Homer) he rejoices in the sublimity, grandeur, majesty, variety, and elegance of Virgil's delightful and ornamental machines. Trapp's basic aim, so he writes, was to comment on Virgil's genius and judgement as a poet, not on his meaning. Hence the emotive effect of something as morally ambiguous as Sinon's speech, moves him intensely. He has wept over it many a time, he writes, and celebrates this as the highest success of the poet's imaginative craft. "*Virgil*, to shew the Triumph of his Art, will soften us with the tenderest Compassion by the Mouth of One whom we know to be a perjured Villain.... Human Nature cannot be more sensibly touched, and human Art can go no further."

This is not to claim that Trapp merely palpitates with orgiastic aesthetic emotionism. A poem is wrought by "Art", and as such has its rhetorical and structural techniques capable of rational apprehension. Hence, for instance, his praise of Virgil's "brevity" and his "judgement" compared with Homer. Trapp obtains greater satisfaction from Virgil because the Latin poet packs his material in closer compass than his model, and arranges that material better, with greater decorum. Hence, because technically more skilful, he is emotionally more effective. Nor would he be satisfied with a poem without morality. Part of the pleasure of art, he argues, is to perceive the agreement of its descriptions to our own natural ideas, and Nature, for the English Augustan, represents a rational and moral order. Hence Virgil's celebration of Roman values provides him with a greater poetic subject than Homer. These things are in themselves, however, not enough. There are works in plenty perfect in form and impeccable in their morality, yet dead as art (witness Addison's *Cato*). What Trapp reiterates in his criticism, even at the risk, which he does not always avoid, of rapturous gush, is that to read the *Aeneid* is to submit to an emotional experience which transports the senses, and that emotional experience, although it involves our rational and moral being, at its height overwhelms in its fictive intensity:

Heav'n, inclement Heav'n  
 O'erturns this Realm, and levels Tow'ring *Troy*.  
 Behold...  
 Stones wrench'd from Stones, and thick redounding Smoke  
 Blended with Clouds of Dust; great *Neptune* shakes  
 The Walls, and with his massy Trident heaves  
 The City from it's deep Foundations. There  
 Relentless *Juno*, girt with Steel, has seis'd

The *Scaean* Gates; and, raging, from their Ships  
 Calls her confed'rate Forces.  
 Next, (that way bend thy Eyes!) the lofty Tow'rs  
*Tritonian Pallas* has possess'd; there sits  
 With her dire *Gorgon*, in a beamy Cloud,  
 Effulgent. *Jove* himself the *Grecian* Troops  
 With Courage, and new Strength supplies; himself  
 Excites the Gods against the *Dardan* Arms. (ii 751f)

Trapp comments "for the Perfection of Poetical Sublimity both in Diction and Sentiment, there is perhaps nothing equal to [this] in the Heathen World. What Ideas can be more amazingly Grand and Awful than that of a Mortal having his Eyes opened by a Divine Power to see the Gods in all the Ensigns of Terrour and Majesty employ'd in the Destruction of his Country!... And how are those Ideas convey'd to the Mind by the dreadful Grandeur of these Verses." It is these kinds of transcendental experience that the *Aeneid* provides.

Trapp's excited exclamations over the beauties and sublimities of verse are immediately recognisable as part of the critical spirit of the age. The influence of Longinus is at work on Trapp, and of John Dennis, his most powerful English critical disciple. To such influences one may unite Addison who, in his *Spectator* papers on Milton, had judiciously combined the structural formalism of Le Bossu with free comment on the aesthetic excellencies of Milton's verse, or Pope who, likewise, was eager to explain the poetic beauties of Homer in his commentary. To reduce Trapp, however, to the product of such critical sources, is to be unjust to the experience which he has undergone, and which, through the (albeit inadequate) medium of translation and commentary he wishes to arouse his reader to recognise. The most explosive force compelling him to respond with such passionate intensity is not critical at all, but, appropriately, poetic. It is the verse of John Milton. That is one reason why Trapp translates into blank verse. Repeatedly in the preface and his commentary he cites *Paradise Lost* as a touchstone of merit, or to illustrate effects similar to Virgil's. If the limitations of his own command of English leave one lost at times in a fog of vague critical epithets and jolted by the dromedary trot of his verse, he can, at least, show us his ideal in the epic of his native tongue:

So under fiery Cope together rush'd  
 Both Battles maine, with ruinous Assault,  
 And inextinguishable Rage: All Heav'n  
 Resounded; and had Earth been then, all Earth  
 Had to her Center shook. What wonder? when  
 Millions of fierce encountring Angels fought  
 On either side; the least of whom could wield  
 These Elements, and arm him with the force  
 Of all their Regions. How much more of pow'r,  
 Army 'gainst Army, numberless, to raise  
 Dreadful Combustion, warring, and disturb,  
 Tho' not destroy, their happy native Seat:  
 Had not th'Eternal King Omnipotent

From his Strong Hold of Heav'n high over-rul'd  
 And limited their Might; tho' number'd such  
 As each dividend Legion might have seem'd  
 A num'rous Host in Strength, each armed band  
 A Legion—

These lines are offered as a touchstone of poetic merit in the preface (xliv). Milton likewise takes his place to illuminate Trapp's commentary. Thus Aeneas is described in the following words in the translation of book twelve (900f), to which an appropriately Milton annotation is offered:

But Prince *Aeneas*, hearing *Turnus*' Name,  
 Forsakes the Walls, forsakes the lofty Tow'rs;  
 Breaks all Delay, all other Toil; with Joy  
 Exults; and thunders terrible in Arms.  
 As great as *Athos*, or as *Eryx* great,  
 Or Father *Apennine*, when crown'd with Okes  
 He waves the ruffled Forrest on his Brow,  
 And rears his snowy Summit to the Clouds.

Trapp comments that the stature of Aeneas was always great: "But as he is now in the full *Sublimity* and *Exaltation* of his Courage;... all our Ideas of him *swell*, and are *enlarged*: He seems to grow *bigger*, and *taller* than before; and would *actually appear* so to the *Eye*, could we *see* the Figure he is supposed to make....it is nothing but a *Poetical* and *Heroical Hyperbole*; which is not only to be *permitted*, but to be *admired*, as one of the greatest Beauties in Poetry. Thus *Milton*: Parad. Lost. B.IV.

—*On th'other Side Satan allarm'd,*  
*Collecting all his Might, dilated stood;*  
*Like Teneriff, or Atlas unremov'd:*  
*His Stature reach'd the Sky, and on his Crest*  
*Sat Horror plum'd.*"

The appeal to Milton as a fit standard by which to measure Virgilian achievement was not available to the French critics, and was not exploited by Dryden. If, after Dennis and Addison, it was a natural step for a critic to make, the claim that both Virgil and Milton are alike sublime, leads Trapp to readjust the ideal order of European literature by striking out appeals for Virgil's art which are not the commonplaces of the age. Thus inspired by a sense of the Miltonic grandeur of the Roman poet, in the age old comparison of Homer with Virgil he plays the part of a critical Prometheus filching thus the "fire" (Trapp's word) of Homer to bestow it on Virgil.

The conventional view that Trapp wishes to change was that whereas Virgil merited the laurel for judgement and decorum, Homer possessed greater "fire", "sublimity", "fecundity", "majesty" and "vastness" (to adopt again Trapp's terms). Homer was praised as the great original and inventor, Virgil followed in his steps with more refinement and rationality, showing everywhere that good sense and polished concision of expression characteristic of the Augustan age (so Rapin claimed). One blossomed with the wild

abundance and grandeur of nature, the other displayed that cultivated order shown in fields and gardens. Trapp accepted all that was granted to the Roman poet, and he quotes Denham's well-known couplet, applying it to Virgil: "Tho' deep, yet clear; tho' gentle, yet not dull;/Strong without Rage; without O'erflowing, full", but he proceeds to claim for Virgil Homeric qualities too: Virgil's borrowings are merely the basis for his own inventions, and he has, moreover, greater originality, witness the episode of Dido. As for fire "What do these Gentlemen call Fire? Or how much Fire would they have?" and Trapp begins to list "*Juno's* Speech, *AEolus*, the Storm, the Beginning of *Dido's* Passion: Almost the whole Second Book throughout: *Polyphemus*, and *AEtna* in the Third...." Among his instances he cites "the Arrival of *Aeneas* with his Fleet and Forces" in book x. His translation runs:

Amaz'd stood *Turnus*, and the '*Ausonian* Chiefs;  
 'Till, looking back, they saw the Navy move  
 Cov'ring the Sea, and gliding make to Shore.  
 Fierce burns his Helm; and from his tow'ring Crest  
 Flame flashes; and his Shield's round Bossy Gold  
 Vomits vast Fires: As when in gloomy Night  
 Ensanguin'd Comets shoot a dismal Glare;  
 Or the red Dog-Star, rising on the World,  
 To wretched Mortals threatens Dearth, and Plagues,  
 With Baleful Light; and saddens all the Sky. (360f)

He does not play the trite old game, however, of setting the texts of Homer and Virgil in comparison, but what springs to his mind at once is Milton describing Satan:

*Like a Comet burn'd,*  
*That fires the Length of Ophiucus huge*  
*In th'Artick Sky; and from his horrid hair*  
*Shakes Pestilence and War.*

Trapp will have nothing of the argument that Virgil leaves us merely readers. On the contrary he has not only fire, but fury; he is vivid in his imagery; and concerning the feelings of terror and pity as shown at Priam's death, in the meeting of Aeneas and Andromache, with Dido, Evander and many others, will not critical taste admit that, if we weigh Homer in the other scale "the *Greek* Poet knew little of the Passions, in comparison of the *Roman*"? (xxvi). To provide the climax of his argument rather than the pedantic detail of precise comparative analysis he falls back again on quotations from Milton to express the quintessence of the Virgilian sublime:

Let there be Light, said God; and forthwith Light  
 Ethereal, first of Things, Quintessence pure,  
 Sprang from the Deep;...

Such criticism probably appears too impressionistic to the modern mind disciplined by academic scholarship and the close analysis of the seminar room. But Trapp, when he wishes, can be correctly cold in rational exposition, and regularly low in the study of grammatical problems to which he frequently turns his attention in his commentary. He had mastered the current critical arguments concerning his topic, and can piddle with details

when piddling is required. There is little profit or pleasure in illustrating these aspects of his edition. What is more properly his own is his appreciation of the epic of his own tongue, and his wish to interpret and place a foreign classic by means of native achievement. His purpose is to secure that most difficult of ends, critical sincerity; to get his reader, following his illustrative quotations, to admit that he finds in both Virgil and Milton similar qualities; to break down mere analytic critical systematising, which substitutes for the experience of the text a structure of critical terminology, and to lead the reader to admit to the force of his imaginative and emotional experience. We recognise in Virgil the true language and ideas of the heart, wrought to the highest pitch of intensity for “the Impressions... of Poetry, are of the vehement kind, it is no Wonder so much Pleasure should attend them, especially when the Ideas we speak of are heighten’d with all the Elegance of Expression.” (*Praelectiones*, 1742 edn. p.26). It is the logical outcome of Trapp’s critical feelings that ultimately he should seek to prove his argument in verse rather than in prose, printing, at his own cost, towards the end of his life a work entitled *Paradisus Amissus* (1741-44). The poem is a translation of Milton’s epic into the language of Virgil

Trapp’s emphasis on the Miltonic sublime in Virgil should not obscure, however, his appreciation of the Latin poet’s “variety”. The majestic loftiness of the expression “Let there be Light” should be tempered by our sense that light plays over the surface of things in many ways, creating shade as well as brilliance, revealing what is lovely, and what is horrific, and this favoured term “variety”, (although far from new in neo-classical criticism), seen in its local historical perspective, is as important as Trapp’s admiration for Milton in shaping English appreciation of the classics through the experience of the native tongue. It releases Shakespeare from the penal chains of formalists like Thomas Rymer, and once Shakespeare had achieved his proper status as a classic of European culture, then the formal decorum of neo-classical criticism is blasted by lightning from above.

Here suggestion must replace illustration. Although the first quotation of Trapp’s preface is from Shakespeare, and, later he is weighed in terms of value in the same scale as Homer, Virgil and Milton, yet Trapp cannot deploy quotation from a dramatist to illustrate epic style, nor is his notion of decorum so free that he will subvert the rules of epic by appeal to the theatre. But the very elevation of Shakespeare to the Parnassian peak is indicative of a freeness of critical judgement in Trapp much bolder than his claims for Milton. Aristotelianism and rationalism are not overthrown, but as Trapp argues, to judge the epic from rules founded only upon the practice of Homer is no logical way of proceeding, and the inclination of taste and personality are as important in founding judgements as Nature and Reason. The praise of Shakespeare, who kept little decorum, is indicative that decorum, for Trapp, is losing its importance. He praises unity of design, and yet defends “Interruptions of the main Business” for “Variety is a Relief to the Mind of the Reader”. It is the very “Variety of Incidents” which delights the reader in the *Aeneid*, witness Camilla. Again: “In a Work intended for Pleasure, *Variety* justifies the Breach of almost any Rule, provided it be done but *Rarely*”. The delight of the method of the epic is to seem to have “*no Method* at all.” Is it complained that there is a lack of correspondence between the names in the catalogue of Virgil’s heroes and the subsequent action? but this “gives Heroic Poetry the greater Air of Freedom, and an elegant Negligence” producing therefore “Variety and Surprise”.

The principles here are not essentially different from those of Hogarth's *Analysis of Beauty* where it is insisted that variety, not regularity, within an overall structure, is the source of aesthetic excellence. The pineapple, not the circle, is a perfect form; sinuosity, not rectilinearity, bestows the highest pleasure. If one joins Trapp's freedom from formal pedantry with his insistence upon the emotive effectiveness of art, then it is far from fanciful to claim that his taste is Shakespearian not Corneillean, and his view of Virgil, compared with the French, is altered because of his English literary experience.

The matter may be put another way more in accordance with neo-classical precepts. Although it was said that the epic roused its proper emotions, especially delight and admiration, it was tragedy which was mainly passionate, for the epic formed the morals by more gradual processes. This commonplace may be found in the *Praelectiones*. But the honest response of Trapp to the *Aeneid* when he specifically turns from theory to the text betrays a subjective intensity which has nothing to do with gradualism or didacticism. He is moved to raptures by the sublime; he sheds tears at the pathetic; there are thrills of horror, romantic delights, pleasing melancholy, and all the "Beautiful Licentiousness of Poetry." It would be false to deny that such qualities are unrecognised by theory, but responding to the impetus of Trapp's criticism, one receives a sense that the prime poetic value of the *Aeneid* for him was the artful skill with which Virgil worked up his passionate variety. In this there is no one like Trapp in his immediate predecessors.

One illustration may suffice. It is the passage that Trapp claimed was "the very best" in the *Aeneid*. Of it he wrote that "the *Dreadful*, and the *Wonderful*, joined with the *Pathetical*, reign thro' the Whole to a degree unutterable." It arouses our sense of horror and of terror; it is both deep and dreadful, frightful yet elegant, arousing in its climax an image altogether admirable, "because it is an Image purely in Idea, not of any corporeal or sensible Phantasm. We feel it; and can no way explain it, but by saying we do so" – a remark not far from the romantic praise given to a Caliban. It is entirely in accordance with the argument of this paper that the passage Trapp is praising is from the fourth book, for it is this book pre-eminently, as his preliminary essay shows, which introduces the emotions of tragedy into the epic. The emotionalism of this episodic tragedy of Dido, Queen of Carthage, is here wrought up to the pitch of madness, and Virgil's lines speak of portents and of visions. It is, in some sense, a Virgilian *Kubla Khan*, but its passionate romantic excess is not produced under intoxication, nor is it merely an unfinished and meaningless fragment, but wrought with the highest art as part of a great whole; it is, as Trapp argues, something to which we respond because we recognise in it the essential truth of the human heart. Here is the greatest passage in Virgil as Trapp sees it:

She saw the Liquours sacred to the Gods  
Turn black; and as the holy Wine was pour'd,  
It chang'd to putrid Blood. This dire Portent  
From all, ev'n from her Sister she conceals.  
Besides, within her Court a Marble Dome  
There stood, devoted to her former Lord; ...  
Hence Groans are heard, and her dead Husband's Voice

Seeming to call aloud; when gloomy Night  
 Obscures the World: And, on her Palace-Top,  
 The lonely Owl with oft-repeated Scream  
 Complains, and spins into a dismal Length  
 His baleful Shrieks. Nor less the Warnings, giv'n  
 By ancient Augurs, fright her restless Mind  
 With terrible Predictions. In her Dreams  
 Cruel *Aeneas* persecutes her Soul  
 To Madness. Still abandon'd to her self,  
 Cheerless, without a Guide, she seems to go  
 A long, a tedious Journey, and to seek  
 Her *Tyrian* Subjects on deserted Coasts.

So raving *Pentheus* Troops of Furies sees,  
 Two Suns, and double *Thebes*: So mad with Guilt  
*Orestes*, agitated on the Stage,  
 Flies from his Mother's Ghost, with Torches arm'd,  
 And black infernal Snakes; revengeful Fiends  
 Sit in the Doors, and intercept his Flight.

(605ff)

This is “romantic”, but the trite critical argument will not be offered that here is nascent romanticism arising from declining neo-classicism. There is no celebration in Trapp of irrationality, subjective anarchy, and egotistical conceit. On the contrary. Such things for him would be mere degeneracy. On the other hand he is very far from strict rationalism, or able, or willing to deny the importance of individual sensibility. He does not try to justify on objective grounds why these lines are the best in Virgil.

It is in the endeavour to define the kind of relationship between passion and reason, fluidity and form shown in Trapp's sensibility, that the word baroque was introduced into the title of this paper – an impressionistic suggestion, but one in keeping with his own critical method. If one takes Brunelleschi's S. Spirito in Florence as a norm of Renaissance rationalism and order, a work of cool judgement and rigid mathematical construction dedicated to a high moral and religious end, it is not, by analogy, far different from Le Bossu's Virgil. But Trapp, while seeing the architecture of the *Aeneid* as essentially still within recognisable form, perceives that this form is so intricately complex that its order cannot always be rationalistically explained, but should be emotively responded to, that the structure is mobile, aiming at effects of sublimity and pathos, and frequently decorated with delightful ornament. Perfected craftsmanship with yet a sense of living spontaneity, a passion which achieves affects beyond the ordered confines of reason, these are qualities one finds in the great artists of the Baroque, Bernini or Borromini; or, as interpreted by Joseph Trapp: Milton and Virgil.

## NOTES

1. Biographical information from *DNB*.
2. H.T. Swedenberg Jnr., *The Theory of the Epic in England 1650-1800* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1944); T.W. Harrison, "English Virgil: *The Aeneid* in the XVIII Century", *Philologica Pragensia* X, 1-11, 80-91; R.D. Williams, "Changing Attitudes to Virgil, a study in the history of taste from Dryden to Tennyson" in *Virgil: Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence*, ed. D.R. Dudley (1969), 119-138. For a detailed bibliography, see H. Brown, *The Classical Tradition in English Literature: A Bibliography* (*Havard Stud. Phil.* 18, 1935).
3. I have discussed the political reading of the *Aeneid* by the English Augustans in *Arion* 8, 359-79.

### 'Why did Venus wear boots? – Some reflections on Aeneid 1.314f'

A paper read to the Virgil Society, January, 1973,

by E.L. Harrison, M.A.

In Book One of the *Aeneid*, after Aeneas has been shipwrecked off the North African coast, Venus appears to him disguised as a huntress and converses with him prior to his meeting with Dido. This scene has not escaped adverse criticism. Henselmans, in his quest for discrepancies in the *Aeneid*, believed that these lines provided him with no fewer than five. Buchheit maintained that they involve a pointless anticipation of the subsequent meeting between Dido and Aeneas, with Aeneas' words in particular lacking any noticeable function. And in his recent commentary on the *Aeneid* Quinn, while conceding that the scene contains what he calls 'some nice touches', considers it on the whole to be unsatisfactory, one which 'hardly earns its keep in a book where the general standard is so high'.<sup>1</sup> My aim in this paper will be to suggest that the lines in question do considerably more than earn their keep, and that in fact they constitute a key passage in the development of the Dido tragedy.

The opening scenes of the *Aeneid* are based on the beginning of what we might call the *Odyssey* proper, when Odysseus leaves Calypso for what he hopes will be the final stage of his voyage home (*Od.* 2.228f.) In each epic an angry deity intervenes when the destination seems near, Poseidon in the *Odyssey* because he wishes to avenge the blinding of his son, Polyphemus, by Odysseus (cf. *Od.* 1.68), Juno in the *Aeneid* because of her traditional hatred of the Trojans, and also because she has heard that one day their descendants will be responsible for the destruction of her favourite city, Carthage (*Aen.* 1.12f.) As a result of the storm thus produced Odysseus is shipwrecked on the coast of Scheria, where Alcinous rules over the Phaeacians, and Aeneas is cast up on the North African coast, where Dido rules over the Tyrian colonisers of Carthage. And the parallelism continues

both in general structure and in particular detail. While Odysseus is among the Phaeacians, for example, he is helped by his patron-deity, Athene, and gives a long account of his adventures while feasting in the court of King Alcinous; and while Aeneas is at Carthage he is helped by his mother, Venus, and describes the fall of Troy and his subsequent trials while feasting in the court of Queen Dido.

All this parallelism is of obvious importance, and I shall come back to it shortly. But meanwhile let us follow the fortunes of Aeneas and his comrades after the storm contrived by Juno with the help of Aeolus. Their ships are scattered, but as a result of Neptune's intervention all but one of the original twenty are saved, and seven, including that of Aeneas, reach the security of a secluded cove. While his comrades make a fire to dry out the grain they have salvaged, Aeneas reconnoitres to see if any other survivors are to be found, and shoots down seven stags from a herd he encounters, one for each crew. The Trojans feast on these, and as they turn to mourning their missing comrades Virgil switches from the earthly scene to Olympus. There Venus complains tearfully to Jupiter about the troubles inflicted on the Trojans, and Jupiter assures her in a long prophecy that all will be well – her son's descendants will indeed one day rule over a world at peace as she has been promised. In the meantime, however, Mercury is despatched to ensure that Dido and her people will give the Trojans a friendly reception. And this takes us back to earth again, with our Venus episode about to begin. Aeneas has had a restless night worrying about his next move. But after ensuring that his ships are safely concealed he goes off to reconnoitre the area more thoroughly, this time accompanied by Achates. And now his mother meets him (1.314f.), disguised as a huntress: she carries a quiver on her back, and she wears a dress tucked up above her knees and purple hunting boots. In a long dialogue she tells Aeneas about Carthage and (more especially) its queen: and after reassuring him that all the missing ships are safe except one she assumes her true identity and vanishes, leaving Aeneas complaining bitterly about the cruelty of her deceit.

In this paper I should like to ask four separate questions, and suggest possible answers to each of them. First: Why did Virgil decide to disguise Venus in this scene? Secondly: why did he choose the figure of a Diana-like huntress for her disguise? Thirdly: why did he make the disguise only partial, with Venus suddenly revealing her true identity at the very end of the scene? And finally – the question which provides the title to the paper – why did he choose to dress Venus in boots rather than sandals?

In his book on the *Aeneid* W.S. Anderson referred to our scene as follows: 'It is a poignant meeting, for Aeneas does not realise until it is too late that he is talking with his mother, and she refuses to present herself directly. Why this should be so has never been clearly articulated by critics, and possibly it is better to leave the question to the readers' imagination.'<sup>2</sup> Anderson is certainly correct regarding past investigation of this question: the disguise has not been adequately explained by critics. But I hope to show that there is no need to leave the problem in the air as he suggests: for although various ideas have been mooted in the past, none of which is really satisfactory, there remains one compelling dramatic consideration that has been overlooked. We will come to it in a moment; a word first about previous explanations and why I think them inadequate.

In her recent monograph on Virgil's Venus Antonie Wlosok stressed that it is normal for epic gods to assume disguises in their dealings with mortals: and she went on to suggest that Virgil, by conforming with the convention here, emphasises the gap that exists between gods on the one hand and men on the other.<sup>3</sup> But this view, which Lieberg has endorsed,<sup>4</sup> is scarcely supported by the evidence. In Homer, for example, although the adoption of disguise by deities is indeed common in both epics, there is no parallel in either of them for the employment of such subterfuge by a divine mother in her dealings with her own son: when Thetis and Aphrodite appear to their sons, they do so undisguised.<sup>5</sup> Moreover in the *Aeneid* not only is this convention respected elsewhere, with Venus appearing undisguised to Aeneas in Books Two and Eight,<sup>6</sup> but in addition there is not a single case among the other divine visions experienced by Aeneas where a disguise is employed by the deity concerned. The Penates in Book Three, Mercury twice in Book Four, and the Tiber-god in Book Eight all appear to Aeneas in their own easily recognisable shapes.<sup>7</sup> There are plenty of disguised deities elsewhere in the epic, but in no case is Aeneas the victim of the subterfuge.<sup>8</sup> The disguise of Venus, then, far from being conventional, as Wlosok suggests, is in fact doubly unique, involving as it does, on the one hand, a mother deceiving her son, and, on the other, the deception of Aeneas. All of which, surely, implies that the poet must have had a very compelling motive for introducing it. And that motive could hardly have been to stress the gap that exists between god and man, since elsewhere Aeneas is not merely granted easy recognition of deity, as we have already seen, but in Book Eight he is in fact fondly embraced by Venus when she presents him with the arms forged for him by Vulcan (8.615). Indeed, it would scarcely have been logical of Virgil to select Aeneas to illustrate the notion of man's distance from divinity, since we are emphatically told more than once in the epic that one day this hero will in fact become a god himself.<sup>9</sup>

A different explanation has been advanced by Ville de Mirmont in his book on Apollonius and Virgil.<sup>10</sup> His idea is that Virgil disguised Venus for modesty's sake; it would have been inappropriate for the lascivious goddess of Cyprus, as he calls her, to reveal herself to her son in the voluptuous nudity with which people tend to associate her. But this overlooks the fact that by Virgil's day the poet, no less than the painter and the sculptor, had available to him a variety of Venus types whose characteristics he could select and emphasise according to his own immediate requirements. She could indeed be the sensuous love-goddess who appears on the wall-paintings of Pompeii and elsewhere: but she could also be the stately goddess who figures on other Pompeian wall-paintings as the protectress of that city, or the one who, during the closing decades of the Republic, assumed such importance at Rome as the *Venus Felix* of Sulla, the *Venus Victrix* of Pompey, and above all the *Venus Genetrix* of Julius Caesar and Octavian, mother of the gens Iulia and ancestress of the Roman race.<sup>11</sup> And in fact, when Venus turns to go and reveals her true identity, Virgil blends features of these various Venus-types. Initially there is a sensual quality about the goddess's beauty and fragrance that recalls the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite:<sup>12</sup>

1.402      dixit et avertens rosea cervice refulsit  
                   ambrosiaeque comae divinum vertice odorem  
                   spiravere...<sup>13</sup>

But the voluptuousness is restrained and the goddess's sexuality minimized, the result being

quite consistent with dignified majesty. And it is precisely this last quality that the poet goes on to impart to Venus as he concludes the description of her departure. For the dress which up to now has been tucked up over her knees is suddenly loosened, and flows down to her feet to lend a matronly gravity to the goddess as she takes her leave. Indeed, it is the majestic tread of Venus that above all betrays her godhead as she goes:

1.404                      pedes vestis defluxit ad imos,  
   et vera incesso patuit dea...

lines which are best illustrated by the majestic statue of Venus Genetrix in the Louvre.<sup>14</sup> To return then to Ville de Mirmont's view: the notion that Virgil disguised Venus to spare Aeneas' blushes is surely untenable. For the goddess who reveals herself at the close of our scene could easily have appeared undisguised from the start without causing the slightest embarrassment to anyone.

A further explanation of Venus' disguise was advanced in the *Classical Journal* by W.D. Anderson,<sup>15</sup> who took the view that it is simply intended as a joke on Venus' part, a clue to this being provided by the colloquialism '*heus*' with which she opens the conversation. But there is no trace elsewhere of any such playfulness in her treatment of her son, and it could scarcely be more misplaced than in the present context, when Aeneas' morale is already so very low. As for *heus*, that surely is a simple piece of characterisation, suited to the young huntress-figure, and, as it were, part of the disguise.<sup>16</sup>

A final and at first sight more plausible explanation of Venus' disguise is suggested by the presence of Achates. For on all the other occasions when deities appear to Aeneas, doing so (as we have seen) undisguised, Aeneas is in fact alone. But if there really was some kind of taboo on Venus' revealing herself undisguised to anyone outside the family-circle, then why is the taboo broken at the end of the scene, when the disguise is dropped? Indeed, if the presence of Achates had proved some sort of hindrance that prevented Virgil from complying here with his usual practice, then the poet had a very simple solution open to him: he could have eliminated Achates from the scene without further ado. For the four lines he utters at 1.582f. (Achates' only speaking part in the whole of the Aeneid) make no significant contribution to the progress of the action.<sup>17</sup>

What then is the likeliest explanation of Venus' disguise? We can be helped in our inquiry by Homer. But it will not suffice simply to refer vaguely to one or two parallels in Homeric epic and leave it at that, as commentators so often do. For we are looking, it will be recalled, for a motive compelling enough to have led Virgil to introduce a disguise that is doubly unique: and the whimsical echoing of a Homeric motif scarcely ranks as that. However, we shall come back to Homer in a moment: the crucial point that explains Venus' disguise is the simple fact that when she intervenes in Book One she is entering hostile territory. For Carthage is the undisputed domain of Juno, the implacable enemy of the Trojan race in general and of Venus and Aeneas in particular. It was Juno, it will be remembered, who first indicated with the portent of the horse's head where the Tyrian settlers were to establish their new city;<sup>18</sup> and it is Juno's cult that Dido has established as supreme in the religious life of her people, centring it on the splendid new temple which figures so prominently in the developing action of Book One.

And what a daunting adversary this Juno is! For in the *Aeneid* she, no less than Venus, is a composite creation. She is not simply the Juno of Italian religion (though this aspect of her character is clear enough, for example, in the frequent use of the epithet *Saturnia*,<sup>19</sup> with its old Italian associations, in her role as *Iuno pronuba*, goddess of marriage,<sup>20</sup> and in various allusions to local cults<sup>21</sup>) but she embodies also characteristics of two other deities besides. On the one hand she is equally the Homeric Hera, scourge of the Trojan race, characterised in *Aeneid* One as *saeva, aspera, and atrox*:<sup>22</sup> a deity who, according to Zeus in the *Iliad*, would only really glut her hatred of the Trojans if she were able to eat them all, raw.<sup>23</sup> And on the other she clearly embodies elements of that formidable Phoenician warrior-goddess, Tanit, who in Roman Carthage had in fact been equated with Juno and was worshipped under the cult-title *Juno Caelestis*.<sup>24</sup> Hence lines 16-17 in Book One: *hic illius arma, hic currus fuit*. Dido's great temple naturally contains a cult statue depicting the warrior-goddess driving her chariot into the fray.<sup>25</sup>

It is scarcely surprising, then, that Venus takes the elementary precaution of disguising herself before venturing to trespass on such a deity's preserve, revealing her true identity to her son only when her mission is complete and it is too late for Juno to do anything about it. And in this connection we should note a small but significant detail in the text that mars the general impression of Venus' majestic bearing as she departs. For in striking contrast to the slow and stately *incessu* of line 405 we have, in the very next line, the extremely rapid *fugientem*. And who indeed can blame Venus for speeding things up in this way, once the protection of her disguise is gone?

This suggested explanation of Venus' disguise in the *Aeneid* is strongly supported by Homeric precedent. The convention whereby deities adopt disguises in order to deceive other deities as well as mortals is clearly illustrated by the behaviour of Poseidon in the *Iliad*. For there, when Zeus places a ban on divine intervention in the action at Troy, Poseidon defies it with impunity by appearing on the battlefield disguised, first as the prophet, Calchas, then as Thoas, and finally as an anonymous old man.<sup>26</sup> But, not surprisingly, it is the parallelism in the *Odyssey*, to which I have already referred, that provides the most striking confirmation: for there we have a situation remarkably close in all its basic essentials to that of *Aeneid* One, and in due course we are actually given, by the poet himself, an explanation of the divine disguise which exactly matches the one I have just suggested. The relevant passages are in Books Six and Seven of the *Odyssey*. Odysseus has been washed ashore on the island of Scheria as a result of Poseidon's storm, and here too the place proves to be the hostile deity's special preserve: for Poseidon is not only the patron of this specially privileged sea-faring community, but he is also the founder of its royal house.<sup>27</sup> Throughout his stay on the island Athene helps her protégé, Odysseus: but whenever she intervenes she does so either without putting in an appearance,<sup>28</sup> or else after adopting a suitable disguise. For example: just as Venus in our passage disguises herself as a huntress in order to give guidance to Aeneas about Carthage, so Athene disguises herself as a young Phaeacian maiden to give Odysseus guidance about Scheria. And elsewhere she appears to Nausicaa, daughter of King Alcinous, disguised as one of his subjects, and to the Phaeacians themselves disguised, first as a herald, and later as a spectator at their games. And at the end of Book Six the Homeric

poet explains, for the benefit of his audience, why the goddess adopts such subterfuge: *she does so because she is afraid of Poseidon.* <sup>29</sup>

I want to consider now my three remaining questions, bearing in mind the main theme of Books One and Four, the tragedy of Dido. For in each case I hope to show that once Virgil had introduced into his text the motif of a disguise to protect Venus from the attentions of Juno, he went on to exploit it to the full with that theme in mind; So that it is here above all, in this early episode, that the tragedy of Dido has its true beginning.

Question 2, then: why did Virgil choose to make a huntress of Venus, making her look so very like Diana, with whom in fact Aeneas is quick to identify her? <sup>30</sup> After all, in the Homeric analogue Athene appears to Odysseus disguised as a maiden carrying a pitcher of water, and that would have been just as effective a disguise here too, as far as evading Juno was concerned. <sup>31</sup> The answer involves us at once in the tragedy of Dido, and introduces us to a typical feature of the poet's technique: the employment of a motif throughout a section of his work, now at one level of meaning, now at another, in such a way as to give the section in question added poetic depth on the one hand, and overall structural unity on the other. (The second of these considerations – the imparting of unity – is especially important here, since the Dido tragedy is split into two halves, with the fifteen hundred lines of Books Two and Three intervening between them). In this case the motif in question is that of the hunt. It is a key symbol of the Dido tragedy, and it is in our passage, in the form chosen for Venus' disguise, that Virgil introduces it in this role for the first time. To appreciate more fully the significance of this development we need to review briefly the passages concerned.

We can best begin by stressing that in Books One and Four the role of the hunt as a symbol is erotic: <sup>32</sup> and that in the course of its employment it changes direction, <sup>33</sup> as symbols are wont to do, <sup>34</sup> so that in Book One Dido is the huntress, Aeneas the quarry, while in Book Four this relationship is reversed. With a touch of irony that we will meet again in Book Four Virgil begins by letting the quarry appear as a real-life hunter: for Aeneas' first act on Carthaginian soil is to shoot down seven stags to provide food for his men (1.184f.) But before long Dido and her supporting huntress figures take over, and Aeneas in due course quietly succumbs to their symbolic archery. The process begins, as I have already suggested, in our own passage, where Venus with her quiver acts as a kind of stand-in for Dido, who has still to make her appearance. And she goes to work on Aeneas without delay: for in answer to the hero's query about the territory on which the Trojans have landed she gives a lengthy reply which develops into a lavish encomium of Dido, filled with personal detail which has little direct bearing on Aeneas' query, but is calculated to produce sympathy and admiration in the potential lover's breast. All that is missing is praise of the queen's beauty: and Aeneas will soon see that for himself. However, before we move on to that scene we should note how in this one, both in his imagery and in the words of his symbolic huntress, Virgil assails us with references to yet other quiver-bearing females. For first the poet compares Venus herself to other huntresses similarly armed, such as a Spartan *virgo* or Thracian Harpalyce. Then Venus inquires about her fictitious sister, who is supposed to be likewise girt with a quiver. And finally Venus

conjures up a formidable picture of a whole regiment of quiver-carrying females:

1.336 *virginibus Tyriis mos est gestare pharetram.*

Nor is this all: for when Dido actually makes her appearance, and Virgil is about to bring his exploitation of this motif to a climax, Aeneas, it will be remembered, is surveying scenes on the frieze of Juno's temple: and the last figure his eyes dwell on before the queen arrives is that of yet another quiver-carrying female, the Amazon queen, Penthesilea.<sup>35</sup> And then the poet continues:

1.494 'haec dum Dardanio Aeneae miranda videntur,  
dum stupet obtutuque haeret defixus in uno,  
regina ad templum, forma pulcherrima Dido,  
incessit, magna iuvenum stipante caterva.'

In other words, at this precise moment Aeneas is at his most impressionable, Dido at her most impressive. And now there follows the celebrated simile, recalling both Homer and Apollonius, in which Dido is compared with Diana, and of which only two elements need concern us here. As she arrives to dispense justice among her subjects Dido, naturally, is unarmed. And yet on the shoulder of the goddess with whom she is compared we see yet again that inescapable quiver: *illa pharetram fert umero* (1.500-1). At the symbolic level, that is to say, Dido *is* a huntress after all. And what of her quarry, Aeneas, in the meantime? Virgil carefully avoids involving his hero in the extravagant imagery of the erotic wound, but instead echoes Homer to suggest, with appropriate brevity and restraint, that Aeneas has succumbed. For the joy of Latona, the watching mother in the Homeric simile, is reproduced by Virgil to suggest the joy of his own silent spectator, as he looks upon Dido for the very first time:

1.502 *Latonae tacitum pertemptant gaudia pectus.*<sup>36</sup>

The imagery of the hunt is not employed again until Book Four, by which time the symbolism has changed its direction. And the way to that shift is prepared in the rest of Book One. For as Aeneas reveals himself to Dido for the first time, emerging from his protective cloud, Venus sheds upon him a grace and beauty that leaves Dido spell-bound:

1.613 *obstipuit primo aspectu Sidonia Dido.*

And before long the goddess substitutes Cupid for Ascanius so that *he* can complete the process while Dido fondles him in her lap. And he does so, notice, by infusing his poison into her mouth with his kisses, instead of by firing the conventional arrow, as in Apollonius. The device is brilliantly effective, and of course it leaves the way open for Aeneas to emerge as the real erotic marksman in Book Four. But we should not miss the essential irony behind this development: for in the very book where erotic hunt-imagery is so widely exploited, Cupid, the archetypal exponent of erotic archery, has been deprived by Virgil of his bow.

When Book Four opens the hunt imagery is used at once to present Dido not as a huntress any longer, but as the quarry:

4.1           ‘at regina gravi iam dudum saucia cura  
                   vulnus alit venis et caeco carpitur igni.  
                   multa viri virtus animo multusque recursat  
                   gentis honos, haerent infixi pectore vultus  
                   verbaque...’

The image of the wound, which was avoided in the case of Aeneas, is now applied to Dido with grim appropriateness, anticipating as it does the literal wound at the end of the book. And when it recurs some sixty lines later the poet introduces an elaborate simile which allows him to clarify the situation within the same symbolic framework. Aeneas as the hunter is unaware of the wound he has inflicted, and Dido as the quarry is doomed to die:

4.67           ‘tacitum vivit sub pectore vulnus.  
                   uritur infelix Dido, totaque vagatur  
                   urbe furens, qualis coniecta cerva sagitta,  
                   quam procul incautam nemora inter Cresia fixit  
                   pastor agens telis, liquitque volatile ferrum  
                   nescius; illa fuga silvas saltusque peragrat  
                   Dictaeos, haeret lateri letalis harundo.’

We come finally to the great hunt-scene itself, in which the motif is exploited at both the literal and the symbolic levels at the same time. For as Aeneas emerges he is compared to Apollo mingling with his devotees, a quiver of arrows rattling on the god’s shoulder as he goes (4.141f.) Commentators usually stress the parallelism between this simile and that in Book One, where, as we saw, Dido is compared with Diana: a parallelism that is emphasized by the echoing of the superlative (*pulcherrima* of Dido, 1.496, *pulcherrimus* of Aeneas, 4.141). I would stress, not the parallelism, but rather the continuance of that switch in direction we have already noted: the simile insists once more that in Book Four Aeneas is the symbolic hunter, Dido the quarry. And although the queen now plays out the huntress role in the real-life hunt, the intervening symbolism of the mortally wounded hind stays fixed in our minds, and through it we know that Dido is doomed, and that her real-life role as huntress is a mere charade. Moreover a further symbol is introduced at this juncture to drive the point home with renewed force: the extravagant splendour of purple and gold which, in Greek Tragedy, is the mark of impending destruction.<sup>37</sup> For Dido’s horse is brilliantly caparisoned in purple and gold; she wears a purple robe and a purple cloak; and her quiver, hair-clasp, and brooch are all of gold. Here, surely, we have an echo of that banquet in Book One, where Dido’s troubles first began. For there too we find the same ominous combination of purple and gold: first at 1.639f., in the earlier references to the queen’s tapestries of ‘proud’ purple, and her heavy, gold-embossed plate, and later at 1.698f., when she reclines beneath a purple canopy, again described as ‘*superbus*’, on a couch of gold.<sup>38</sup>

Virgil, then, in choosing the actual form of Venus’ disguise, took the opportunity of introducing the symbolism of the hunt, which is so integral an element of the Dido tragedy. I come now to my third question: why did the poet make the disguise only partial, with the goddess resuming her true appearance for a fleeting moment as she departs (1.402f.)? Like the choice of the huntress disguise, this element too is original: in the corresponding Homeric scene on the island of Scheria Athene remains disguised as a water-carrying maiden throughout. Why then the change? Primarily no doubt Venus reveals

her identity at the last moment in order to reassure Aeneas that she is still watching over him, as she did at Troy.<sup>39</sup> But Virgil, in working the episode out, chose to develop it in a totally different direction. For leaving Aeneas blind to such considerations, the poet lets him concentrate instead on what he takes to be the cruelty of his mother's deceit, and the callousness of her sudden departure:

1.407    'quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis  
          ludis imaginibus? cur dextrae iungere dextram  
          non datur, ac veras audire ac reddere voces?  
          talibus incusat gressumque ad moenia tendit.'

The poet's purposes in letting Aeneas unleash this extravagant outburst is, I think, clear; these lines mark the culmination of a process that began for Aeneas on the night Troy was sacked. One by one his ties with his environment have been severed. He has lost his city, and with it most of the comrades he knew. He has lost his wife, Creusa, whose disappearance during the Sack he calls the most cruel thing that happened to him at Troy (2.746). At his very last port of call he lost his father, Anchises, up to then an unfailing source of comfort and encouragement. And now comes the last straw: on this forbidding shore, where he wanders, as he himself puts it, unknown and destitute over a Libyan desert,<sup>40</sup> he feels himself abandoned by his goddess mother as well. The hero, in other words, is now primed and ready to receive and reciprocate the sympathetic love of Dido. Nor has he long to wait for that: for soon after Dido has made her first entrancing appearance, she reveals herself, by her generous words to Ilioneus, to be a ready source of that sympathetic understanding which Aeneas needs so much. And the hero is quick to respond, addressing her at once as

1.597    *o sola infandos Troiae miserata labores.*

The contrast between these words and the earlier outburst against Venus is most striking. Nor should we miss the underlying irony of the situation: for that outburst against Venus comes in the very book where Venus is most active on her son's behalf. In the course of Book One she petitions Jupiter with Aeneas' welfare in mind; gives Aeneas guidance regarding Carthage and its queen; protects him with a concealing mist; enhances his appearance when he meets Dido; and finally despatches Cupid to ensure his safety.<sup>41</sup>

In making Venus' disguise only partial, then, Virgil once again has in view the development of the Dido tragedy. And that brings me to my final question: why does Venus in this scene wear boots rather than sandals? Before suggesting an answer, I should like to prepare the way with some detached but (I hope) relevant observations.

The first point I should like to make is that through concentrating on Book Four, which admittedly contains so many of the formal elements of Greek Tragedy, commentators tend to overlook Book One in this connection, although it is there that the tragedy of Dido really begins.<sup>42</sup> This has led them to miss what seems to me to bear all the marks of a divine prologue of the type that is so common in Greek Tragedy. This occurs (as we might by now expect) in our present passage, when the goddess Venus comes on stage, as it were, and explains the setting of the action that is about to unfold, in much the same way as, for example, Aphrodite in the *Hippolytus* of Euripides, or Poseidon in the Trojan

Women. The relevant section of her speech comes at 1.338f.

‘Punica regna vides, Tyrios et Agenoris urbem;  
sed fines Libyci, genus intractabile bello...’

and so on. I feel sure that if these lines had occurred at the start of Book Four, or indeed if they had not been preceded in Book One by several lines of small-talk between Venus and Aeneas, their prologue character would have been more readily recognised.<sup>43</sup>

The second point I want to make concerns the prevalence in Augustan poetry of a tendency towards studied cleverness with individual words as regards both their placing and their significance. One could illustrate this Alexandrian feature with abundant examples from Horace’s Odes and from the *Aeneid*: here I will confine myself to one, taken from *Aeneid* Seven. At the beginning of the book, lines 25-36, we find one of the most beautiful passages in the epic, describing the arrival of the Trojans on the banks of the Tiber. All is gaiety, brightness, and bird-song: or so it seems until we come to the very last word of the passage, which, in typical Virgilian fashion, casts a sudden shadow in all the brightness, and ominously suggests the grim events that loom ahead in the rest of the Book. For the last word is – *opaco*.<sup>44</sup>

The third point concerns Virgil’s use of symbols, a theme which has been so successfully investigated by Pöschl, although, as Eicholz has stressed, it should be approached with caution.<sup>45</sup> The huntsman’s quiver, and purple and gold, we have already considered in this connection: and here I want to cite a further specific example, this time from Book Eight. There Evander, King of Pallanteum, on the site of the future Rome, gets up on the morning after Aeneas’ arrival to the sound of bird-song, and dresses before joining Aeneas.<sup>46</sup> The dominant motif of the book is that of rustic simplicity, and King Evander is presented as its very embodiment: yet at this point he puts on, among other things which are entirely appropriate, a pair of Etruscan sandals. Since everything Etruscan, and especially Etruscan footwear,<sup>47</sup> suggests an element of luxury, commentators at this point tend either to prevaricate or else look the other way. But all we have here, I believe, is a very simple example of a poetic symbol. For these same sandals are about to take Evander to what will prove the most decisive development in the whole course of events in Italy: the entrusting to Aeneas of the great Etruscan command. On the previous day Evander avoided any reference to the subject, since Virgil had other things he wanted the king to do first. But now the time has come for Evander to approach Aeneas with this grave mission in mind: and the poet indicates the fact by this brief symbolic gesture, even though the reference involves some slight conflict, at the literal level, with the theme of simplicity. Anyone who finds symbolic footwear difficult to accept should follow the text further: for, of all the structural features that characterize Virgil’s epic style, the most persistent of all is his tendency to enclose sections of his work, be they large or small, within a frame formed by two corresponding elements. And just as this section dealing with the Etruscan command opens with symbolic Etruscan sandals, so it is brought to a close with a matching symbol as Aeneas accepts: for an Etruscan trumpet blares in the heavens as part of the prodigy which finally clinches that acceptance, after some initial hesitation on the part of Aeneas (8.526).

So far, then, we have noted a tragic prologue beginning at 1.338; significant word-placing, illustrated by *opacao* at 7.36; and symbolic footwear at 8.458. I want to end now by taking a last look at the detail of Venus' disguise. If you consult Austin on the subject in his latest contribution to the admirable series of Oxford editions, you will find he has this to say with regard to Venus' Diana-like appearance: 'Virgil's description accurately fits representations of the huntress Artemis in art, for example the Versailles figure in the Louvre.'<sup>48</sup> And earlier editors such as Knapp and Escott clearly held the same view, since this is the figure they reproduce in their editions in order to illustrate our passage.<sup>49</sup> But in fact the Versailles figure, a Roman copy of an original by Leochares, differs from Virgil's description in one important respect: it has the quiver, and the short skirt, but, like the equally famous Artemis of Gabii,<sup>49A</sup> wears sandals instead of boots. For Virgil's booted figure we have to go to another type of Diana found in a variety of places ranging from the great temple-frieze at Pergamum to an amethyst of the Augustan period.<sup>50</sup> It is a type which clearly held a special attraction for Virgil,<sup>51</sup> since in the Seventh *Eclogue* he lets the goatherd, Corydon, promise Diana:

31           'si proprium hoc fuerit, levi de marmore tota  
                  puniceo stabis suras evincta cothurno.

(That is to say, if things stay as they are he will see to it that the goddess gets a full-length marble statue, complete with purple hunting boots). Now if we take just one more look at the text of our *Aeneid* passage we find a quite remarkable but hitherto unnoticed feature that explains why commentators have tended to refer us to the wrong Diana. For when the disguised Venus arrives on the scene and the poet describes her in the narrative (1.314-320), in spite of all the detail he supplies, there is no mention at this stage of the most striking item of all, namely the purple boots: the very item which, in the Seventh *Eclogue*, is actually picked out to the exclusion of all the rest! Meanwhile sixteen lines of dialogue follow before the poet decides that the time is right to bring in this detail too. Whereupon Venus reverts to the subject of dress, and at last supplies the missing item, the boots:

1.335           'tum Venus: haud equidem tali me dignor honore.  
                  virginibus Tyriis mos est gestare pharetram  
                  purpureoque alte suras vincire cothurno.'

And then at once she embarks on her tragic prologue:

Punica regna vides...

Here, surely, if anywhere, we have a case of significant word-placing: *cothurno* held over for fifteen or more lines in order to present it as the very last word before the tragic prologue begins. And as for symbolic footwear, there is surely no need to expatiate on that point. Ovid, for example, uses *cothurnus* or *cothurnatus* fifteen times in all, and on every occasion the reference is to the tragic buskin.<sup>52</sup>

I have tried in this paper to show that the scene in which Venus appears at Carthage disguised as a huntress is by no means a sterile episode, as some critics would have us believe. I have suggested that Virgil disguised Venus in the first place as an

elementary precaution against opposition from Juno, and that he went on from there to exploit the disguise to the full with the Dido tragedy in mind. First, he saw in the form of the disguise an opportunity for introducing the vital motif of the hunt symbolism; next, he chose to make the disguise incomplete in order to bring to its climax the emotional isolation of Aeneas; and, finally, he chose a booted rather than a sandalled figure for Venus' disguise because this allowed him to introduce a tragic prologue with an ingenious combination of word-placing and dress-symbolism.

#### NOTES

1. V. Henselmans, *Die Widersprüche in Vergils Aeneis*, Würzburg 1913, 7f.; V. Buchheit, *Vergil über die Sendung Roms*, Heidelberg 1963, 50; K. Quinn, *Virgil's Aeneid: A Critical Description*, London 1968, 106.
2. W.S. Anderson, *The Art of the Aeneid*, Englewood Cliffs 1969, 76.
3. A. Wlosok, *Die Göttin Venus in Vergils Aeneis*, Heidelberg 1967, 86f. Cf. also Anderson, *op.cit.* 27.
4. G. Lieberg, *Vergils Aeneis als Dichtung der Einsamkeit*, 186, in *Vergiliana*, edited by H. Bardon and R. Verdière, Leiden 1971.
5. II. 1.357f., 5.311f., 19.1f. W. Kühn, *Götterszenen bei Vergil*, Heidelberg 1961, 29, rightly stresses this point.
6. 2.589f., 8.608f.
7. 3.147f., 4.265f., 4.356f., 8.31f.
8. E.g. 5.620f., 5.841f., 7.419f. Cupid disguised as Ascanius scarcely ranks as an exception, since his mission is centred on Dido, not Aeneas (1.685f., 717f.) In this connection there is no need to be put out by Aeneas' use of *totiens* in line 407: for such exaggeration as typical in the language of complaint cf. my comment in *Phoenix* 15 (1961) 42, note 6.
9. Cf. 1.259f., 12794f.
10. H. de la Ville de Mirmont, *Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile*, Paris 1894, 641.
11. Cf. R. Schilling, *La Religion Romaine de Vénus*, Paris 1954, *passim*. For the political aspect of Venus' role coins are especially important: cf. H.B. Mattingly, *The Denarius of Suffenas and the Ludi Victoriae*, *Numismatic Chronicle* 16 (1956) 200f.; H. Mattingly, *Roman Coins from the Earliest Times to the fall of the Western Empire*, London 1960, 64; A. Alföldi, *The Main Aspects of Political Propaganda on the Coinage of the Roman Republic*, in *Essays presented to Harold Mattingly*, Oxford 1965, 81f.
12. Cf. C.A. Sainte-Beuve, *Étude sur Virgile*, Paris 1883, 257.

13. The quality of these lines with their sound effects and rhythms, should be compared with that of 1.415-7 and 1.691-4 (describing Venus' haunts on Cyprus) and 1.588-91 (where Venus passes on some of the sensuality to her son). Of the fourteen lines in these passages only 1.404 does not begin with a dactyl. Wlosok analyses some of them, *op. cit.* 84f.
14. L.R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, Oxford 1896, Vol. II 692 contains a good reproduction. On the popularity of the type, of which there are several extant versions, cf. G.M.A. Richter, *The Sculpture and Sculptors of the Greeks*, New Haven 1950, 239. Schilling (*op. cit.* 313) prefers to link the lines with the *Genetrix* carved by Arkesilaus for the temple dedicated to the goddess in 46 BC. by Julius Caesar. For this work, of which five small copies survive, see M. Bieber, *Die Venus Genetrix des Arkesilaus*, Mitt. des deutsch. archaeol. Inst., Roem. Abteilung, 48 (1933), 263f. (with illustrations).
15. Venus and Aeneas: *The Difficulties of Filial Pietas*, CJ 50 (1955) 234.
16. Cf. E. Mensching, *Die Interjektion heus in der Aeneis*, Rh M 113 (1970) 265f.
17. Aeneas is already disposed to reveal himself without any promptings from Achates (1.597f.), and the dispersal of the protective mist provides any necessary impetus to the action. It should be noted that there is never any actual dialogue between the two heroes: here there is no reply from Aeneas, and there is none from Achates after Aeneas' words at 1.459f., which could easily have become a monologue.
18. 1.441f. Cf. J. Bayet, *L'omen du cheval à Carthage*, REA 1941, 166f.
19. Cf. R.D. Williams, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quintus*, Oxford 1959, 159.
20. 4.59; cf. 1.71f and 4.166f.
21. Cf. C. Bailey, *Religion in Virgil*, Oxford, 1935, 129f.
22. 1.4; 1.279; 1.662. Note how at 7.286f. she comes from her home in Argos.
23. Il. 4.34f.
24. Cf. E. Burck, *Das Bild der Karthager in der römischen Literatur* (in J. Vogt, *Rom und Karthago*, Leipzig 1945) 335f.; R. Bloch, REL 45 (1967) 335f.; J. Brisson, *Carthage et le fatum* (in *Hommages à M. Renard*, Brussels (1969) I 165f.
25. Cf. R.G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aneidos Liber Primus*, Oxford 1971, *ad loc.*
26. Il. 8.1f.; 13.43f., 13.206f., 14.135f.
27. Od. 7.56f., 13.128f., 7.34f.
28. Od. 6.110f., 139f., 229f.; 7.14f. and 13.121.
29. Od. 7.18f.; 6.20f., 8.7., 8.193.; 6.329f.

30. Aen 1.328f.
31. Cf. Od. 7.19f. Wlosok, *op. cit.* 77, considers the huntress disguise a natural one in the wild surroundings: but one would surely expect men rather than women to be out hunting. On that score it would have been more natural to retain the Homeric disguise.
32. F. Klingner, *Virgil*, Zurich 1967, 397, and Wlosok, *op. cit.* 101, regard the huntress element in Venus' disguise as foreshadowing the masculine heroism of the Carthaginian queen who is soon to appear. But that is to take much too narrow a view of its role (cf. Brooks Otis, *Virgil, A Study in Civilised Poetry*, Oxford 1964, 75f.). The perspective is wrong, too: Virgil is concerned, not with Dido's heroic past, but with her tragic future. Cf. V. Pöschl, *The Art of Virgil*, Ann Arbor 1962, 68.
33. This crucial point tends to be overlooked, but it is rightly stressed by R.A. Hornsby, CJ 60 (1965) 339. Note how the poet repeats the process in the case of Turnus, who changes from hunting beast (9.59f., 9.561f., 9.730) to quarry (9.791f., 12.1f.) And in each case the shift is marked by the introduction of an ominous wound (4.2, 12.5).
34. Cf. D.H. Lawrence, *Selected Literary Criticism*, ed. by A. Beal, London 1955, 157. As he puts it, symbols have 'a life of their own'. For similar shifts in Greek drama cf. Aesch. *Choeph.* 248 and 549; Eur. *H.F.* 631f. and 1421f.; and Eur. *Bacchae* 228 and 817. (On the last, see R.P. Winnington-Ingram, *Euripides and Dionysus*, Cambridge 1948, 107f.)
35. Penthesilea is depicted as both hoplite and archer in Greek Art (cf. M. Hirmer and P.E. Arias, *A History of Greek Vase Painting*, London 1962, Plates XVIII and 168). But the close correspondence between her and *pharetrata Camilla* (cf. 11.649) makes it clear that Virgil visualised her as an archer. As R.D. Williams puts it (*The Aeneid of Virgil, I-VI*, London 1972, ad 1.490f.) 'Penthesilea is a prototype of Camilla.' Both appear at the end of a series of male warriors, to become objects of wonder (1.490f., 7.803f.); both fight with one breast exposed (1.492, 11.649). In each case Virgil clearly had in mind the kind of figure that was carved in the fifth century by Polycleitus, Pheidias, and Kresilas, of which a series of Roman copies survive. Cf. Richter, *op. cit.*, 229f., 251f., and figs. 620, 627, 655.
36. Cf. Pöschl, *op. cit.* 67; Williams, *op. cit.* (see note 35), *ad loc.*
37. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 910f., where Clytemnestra involves Agamemnon in the dangerous excess of treading on purple; and Aesch. *Persae*, 159f., where Atossa's opening reference to a palace decked with gold leads on to reflections about such wealth proving disastrous.
38. R.B. Lloyd, *Superbus in the Aeneid*, AJP 93 (1972) 129, sees in these earlier passages a foreshadowing of the fate that will one day overtake the queen and her city. It is worth noting here how, although Aeneas and the Trojans are naturally brought into contact with Dido's opulence, *their* purple is described merely as *stratus* (1.700). As

for the hunt, in contrast with Dido, Aeneas is kept away from both purple and gold, apart from the single reference in the Apollo simile to the god's golden hair-clasp (4.148). The high point of his 'infection' comes later, brilliantly symbolizing the life he must renounce, in answer to Mercury's call; for the gods find him clad in a cloak of purple and gold made for him by Dido, and wearing a jewelled sword (4.261f.)

39. 2.589f. One could of course refer the incident more closely to her words, and regard it as lending them emphasis (R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*, Berlin 1915, 312) or confirming their validity (Kühn, *op. cit.* 33).
40. 1.384.
41. 1.227f., 338f., 411., 589., 657f.
42. Quinn's analysis of the tragedy of Dido, *Latin Explorations*, London 1968, 47, is from this point of view fundamentally unsound. Austin in his edition of Book Four (27) insists on the importance of Book One in this connection.
43. E.g. by Kühn, who concedes (*op. cit.* 33) that Venus' speech tells us all we need to know, yet earlier (13) sees a prologue, not here, but at 1.37f., where in fact Juno's impassioned monologue is in no sense expository, but more like the introspective utterance of a Medea or a Phaedra. Buchheit, *op. cit.* 69f. on the other hand compares Jupiter's words at 1.279f. with a Euripidean prologue. But although such a prologue may indeed contain references to the future, its primary role is to explain relevant events in the past, which Jupiter's words fail to do.
44. Cf. Pöschl, *op. cit.* 144.
45. D.E. Eicholz, GR 15 (1968) 105 f.
46. 8. 454f.
47. According to Pollux (7.22) Etruscan sandals decorated Pheidias' very costly masterpiece, the Athene Parthenos.
48. *Op. cit.* 120. So too Ville de Mirmont, *op. cit.* 544.
49. C. Knapp, *The Aeneid of Vergil*, New York 1901, 134; E.H.S. Escott, *Vergil Aeneid Book I*, London 1900, 52.
- 49A This also has been reproduced in connection with Venus' disguise: cf. A.G. McKay, *Vergil's Italy*, Bath 1971, 179.
50. Cf. W.H. Schuchardt, *Die Meister des grossen Friezes von Pergamon*, Berlin 1925, Plate 19; A Furtwangler, *Die antike Gemmen*, Amsterdam 1964, I Plate XLIX, No. 8.

51. And for the goddess too, according to Callimachus: *cf. Hymns* 3.15 f., where she asks Zeus for twenty nymphs to look after her boots and hounds when they are not in use.
52. For a full list of these and other relevant examples see K.K. Smith, *The use of the high-soled shoe or buskin in Greek Tragedy of the 5th and 4th centuries B.C.*, HSCPh 16 (1905) 152, note. In our passage the colour of the boots is also significant in a way it is not in *Ecl.* 7: it is as it were the national colour of the Tyrian settlers. But that is irrelevant to my immediate theme.

### 'Virgil Today'

Presidential Address to the Virgil Society,  
February, 1973,

by

Professor R.D. Williams, M.A.

The popularity of Virgil in the 2000 years since his death (1992 years to be precise) has been greater than that of any other Classical poet, and during the last ten years – a period, we are led to believe of decline in Classical studies – there has been a quite remarkable spate of books and articles about him. This is perhaps more remarkable still when we consider that this is a time at which other Latin poets might seem to be more in tune with the anti-Establishment spirit of our days – I think particularly of Catullus and Propertius, both very popular in recent years. But Virgil – to judge from the amount of published material – seems to be even more popular still.

Among the most important full-scale books on Virgil in English during this quite brief period of 10 years have been Brooks Otis, *Virgil: a Study in Civilised Poetry* (1963); M.C.J. Putnam, *The poetry of the Aeneid* (1965); K. Quinn, *Virgil's Aeneid: A critical Description* (1968); W.A. Camps, *An introduction to Virgil's Aeneid* (1969); W.S. Anderson, *The Art of the Aeneid* (1969); G. Karl Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome* (1969); A.G. McKay, *Vergil's Italy* (1970). On the *Eclogues* there is T.G. Rosenmeyer, *The Green Cabinet* (1969), and M.C.J. Putnam, *Virgil's Pastoral Art* (1970); on the *Georgics* L.P. Wilkinson, *The Georgics of Virgil* (1969). Two important collections of essays have been published: *Twentieth Century Views: Virgil*, ed. Steele Commager (1966) and *Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence*, ed. D.R. Dudley (1969). Virgil figures largely in L.P. Wilkinson's *Golden Latin Artistry* (1963) and in G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (1968).

That, I think you will agree, is a very large list of books, and a high proportion of them has appeared since I wrote the survey on Virgil for *Greece and Rome* in 1967, so that a supplement had to be published in 1971. And if one were to add to it the work

of foreign scholars (such as Klingner, Knauer, Perret, Pöschl) and the articles both by the authors of the books I have mentioned and by others (such as Austin, Clausen, Duckworth, Parry, Segal) it becomes abundantly evident that the literary appeal of Virgil in modern times is as great as it ever was.

Nor is it only in books of literary appreciation that Virgil is to the front in our generation; we have had a new Oxford Text by Sir Roger Mynors (1969), Clarendon Press commentaries on single books of the first half of the *Aeneid* by Austin and myself, a new Macmillan *Aeneid* to replace the sterling long-service volumes of Page (vol. i, 1971; vol. ii, 1973); there is Huxley's *Geo.* 1 and 4 (1963); a commentary on the *Eclogues* and one on *Aeneid* 8 are announced in the new Cambridge *Greek and Latin Classics* Series; and the great Harvard undertaking on Servius published its second volume (of five) in 1965. Translations have come thick and fast: Jackson Knight's prose translation in the Penguin Series (1956) is outside by ten year period; Day Lewis' *Eclogues* (1963) completed his *Virgil* (*Georgics*, 1940; *Aeneid*, 1952); Copley (1965) is one I would pick out from the dozens of verse translations of varying merit which have appeared in recent times.

By now I fancy my point is made, and what is more I expect many of you have thought of publications which I haven't included. I have left them out because I didn't want the whole of this lecture to be a recital of names – but I did want to remind you that our author is not neglected. I fancy that he is the only Classical author to have two periodicals devoted entirely to him – *Vergilius*, the journal of the American Vergilian Society, and our own *Proceedings of the Virgil Society*, now appearing in its handsome new format.

Why then should this be so? What is it about Virgil which exercises this great fascination? I'll reply to this question twice – first in a word, and then in the rest of this lecture. The one-word answer is 'many-sidedness', and this I should like to consider now under various headings.

The first one is the many-sidedness of his metre. Consider this passage from the description of Pallas' funeral:

haud segnes alii cratis et molle feretrum  
arbutis texunt virgis et vimine querno  
exstructosque toros obtentu frondis inumbrant.  
hic iuvenem agresti sublimem stramine ponunt:  
qualem virgineo demessum pollice florem  
seu mollis violae seu languentis hyacinthi,  
cui neque fulgor adhuc nec dum sua forma recessit,  
non iam mater alit tellus virisque ministrat.

(*Aen.* 11.64-71)

Virgil is building up a descriptive scene of great pathos, and for his simile he turns to Catullus, recalling the flower simile at the end of poem 11:

nec meum respectet ut ante amorem  
qui illius culpa cecidit velut prati  
ultimi flos, praetereunte postquam  
tactus aratro est.

(Compare also Catullus 62.39f.)

In order to match the mood which his diction and imagery have built up he has used a metrical movement very reminiscent of the descriptive technique of Catullus – three consecutive lines (66-68) have a word of three long syllables after the 2½ caesura (eleven of the first twenty lines of Catullus 64 have this shape, but Virgil uses it much more rarely in the *Aeneid*). The predominance of spondees is reminiscent of Catullus, and so too is the absence of mid-line stops: the line is being used as a sense-unit.

Contrast the description of Turnus hard-pressed in battle:

ergo nec clipeo iuvenis subsistere tantum  
 nec dextra valet, iniectis sic undique telis  
 obruitur. strepit adsiduo cava tempora circum  
 tinnitu galea et saxis solida aera fatiscunt  
 discussaeque iubae capiti, nec sufficit umbo  
 ictibus; ingeminant hastis et Troes et ipse  
 fulmineus Mnestheus. tum toto corpore sudor  
 liquitur et piceum (nec respirare potestas)  
 flumen agit, fessos quatit aeger anhelitus artus.

(9. 806-814).

Here the movement is dactylic, harsh, abrupt with clashing alliteration. None of the lines is self-contained and there are mid-line stops after the first foot (811) after 1½ (808, 814) after 2 (807), after 2½ (812). This is energetic movement, far away from the patterned mosaic of descriptive writing and golden lines.

Finally take part of a speech, the last long speech of Dido before she kills herself: I pick it up at line 600 and take it to line 612.

non potui abreptum divellere corpus et undis  
 spargere? non socios, non ipsum absumere ferro  
 Ascanium patriisque epulandum ponere mensis?  
 verum anceps pugnae fuerat fortuna. – fuisset:  
 quem metui moritura? faces in castra tulissem  
 implessemque foros flammis natumque patremque  
 cum genere exstinxem, memet super ipsa dedissem.  
 Sol, qui terrarum flammis opera omnia lustras,  
 tuque, harum interpretis curarum et conscia Iuno,  
 nocturnisque Hecate triviis ululata per urbes  
 et Dirae ultrices et di morientis Elissae,  
 accipite haec, meritumque malis advertite numen  
 et nostras audite preces.

(4. 600-612).

We begin at the point where Dido's anger and frustrated pride is finding wild and violent expression. The indignation of the rhetorical questions with the threefold repetition of *non* is metrically reinforced with alliteration of *p* in 600 and 602 and the rare pause after the first foot in 601. Alliteration (of *f* this time) becomes more violent in 603 and again

there is a rare metrical pause (after the third trochee) in 604, again reinforcing the rhetorical question. Then follows a remarkable series of rhyming pluperfects in four short clauses of three or four words each: *tulisse*, *implessem*, *extinxem*, *dedissem*. The metrical insistence violently reflects Dido's angry thoughts of what might have been, ought to have been.

Then suddenly the metre changes entirely as she gathers herself for her last appeal to the gods for vengeance. The monosyllable *sol* opens a line of slow spondaic movement, with alliteration of *m*, end-stopped; similarly a monosyllable opens the next line which is wholly spondaic and end-stopped; the movement gathers speed in the next line, again end-stopped, and then slows once more for the last invocation, with an astonishing assonance of *et Dirae* and *et di*. Here indeed we see metre reinforcing mood.

Let me now oppose two passages where the style, especially the sentence-construction, reflects the subject-matter. The first is a sentence from old Neptune as he concedes Venus' request and points out his past services:

cum Troia Achilles  
 exanimata sequens impingeret agmina muris,  
 milia multa daret leto, gementque repleti  
 amnes nec reperire viam atque evolvere posset  
 in mare se Xanthus, Pelidae tunc ego forti  
 congressum Aenean nec dis nec viribus aequis  
 nube cava rapui, cuperem cum vertere ab imo  
 structa meis manibus periurae moenia Troiae.

(5.804-811).

This is a long rambling sentence as Neptune reminisces over battle-scenes long ago: there are four verbs depending on the subordinating conjunction *cum* and the content of the phrases is colourful and slow-moving. The sentence needs to be picked up with *tunc* (808) and it continues in the involved order common in Latin prose – the indirect object *Pelidae* with a descriptive adjective, the direct object *Aenean* with a descriptive phrase, an instrumental ablative attached to the verb and then the verb itself. But still Neptune is not finished, as he loosely attaches a concessive clause, reinforcing the thought of his kindness to Aeneas 'even although I wanted to destroy Troy'.

Now contrast Nisus and Euryalus in a passage of action:

Egressi superant fossas noctisque per umbram  
 castra inimica petunt, multis tamen ante futuri  
 exitio. passim somno vinoque per herbam  
 corpora fusa vident, arrectos litore currus,  
 inter lora rotasque viros, simul arma iacere,  
 vina simul. prior Hyrtacides sic ore locutus:  
 'Euryale, audendum dextra: nunc ipsa vocat res.  
 hac iter est. tu, ne qua manus se attollere nobis  
 a tergo possit, custodi et consule longe;  
 haec ego vasta dabo et lato te limite ducam.'  
 sic memorat vocemque premit, simul ense superbum  
 Rhamnetem adgreditur...

(9.314-325).

We begin with a very simple clause of three words, followed by another short one in parataxis: Livy would have said *fossis superatis...petunt*. The narrative is interrupted with a reflexion on its upshot. Then a series of quick shots of what they see: *corpora fusa, arrectos currus, viros iacere, simul arma, simul vina*. Nisus speaks – three staccato sentences in 10 words. Then instruction to Euryalus; a promise of what Nisus will do: six main verbs in four lines, and the narrative resumes with three more main verbs in a line and a half. A lot of the narrative of the battle-books is like this – very different from the slow memorable lines packed with meaning and penumbræ of meaning which we so often associate with Virgil.

Let me now list a few longer examples of the varied kinds of writing which Virgil uses. The most familiar of his styles is the style of descriptive pathos, liquid, slow-moving, infinitely sad, as for example the death of Palinurus at the end of Book 5, or of Camilla in 11.816f., or of the destruction of Troy in 2.624f., or of the ghost of Dido in 6.450f. But Virgil commands too and very often uses a style which is the opposite of this – crisp, brisk, energetic (like the epic mode of Homer or Ennius) – for example the disguised Trojans in 2.370f., the hunt in 4.129f., the description of Hercules killing Cacus in 8.184f. He commands a style of high and patriotic impressiveness, like the speech of Jupiter in 1.257f. or the pageant of Roman heroes in 6.756f.; he also commands a plain matter-of-fact style as often in Book 3 or in the ship race in Book 5. He commands (and rather enjoys) the highly ornate set-piece, as in the storm of Book 1 or the description of Etna in Book 3, and he is prepared to take it on occasion to baroque extremes as in the boxing-match of Book 5 or the description of Venus prevailing on Vulcan in Book 8. He deploys all the skill of rhetoric, not only in the intensely moving speeches of Dido in Book 4 but also in the far more obvious methods of rhetoric employed by Juno and Venus (for example at the beginning of Book 10) or by Turnus and Drances (11.336f.). This last is a pure firework display, a piece of verbal dexterity which the audience can enjoy intellectually without being emotionally involved at all. Cicero would have enjoyed it.... We should not allow our emotional responses to Virgil's great passages of pathos to make us think that he always wrote like that: an epic writer is precluded by the terms of his genre from presenting an anthology of lyric masterpieces. No, Virgil had all the styles.

I have given my examples of the many-sidedness of Virgil's metre and style from the *Aeneid*: I turn now to illustrate other aspects of his many-sidedness, and I'll begin with the *Eclogues*. Here we surely find the same kind of attempt to mix what seems incompatible which to my mind is the great quality of the *Aeneid*. The elements in the *Eclogues* do not mix so well as those in the *Aeneid*, but it certainly is because of the endeavour to mix that the *Eclogues* gave a wholly new impulse to pastoral poetry. The mixture of course is of the ideal world and the real world – some of the poems (2, 3, 7, 8) are wholly or almost wholly in the ideal world of the shepherds and shepherdesses about which Theocritus had taught Virgil, but most of them, and the most famous ones, are mixed in one way or another between Arcadia and Rome. It is hard to read *Eclogue* 5 on the death of Daphnis without thoughts of Julius Caesar; there are real people in the puzzling sixth *Eclogue*, and the presence of the statesman Gallus in the fairy world makes *Eclogue* 10 a quite astonishing poem. One and nine mix Tityrus and Meliboeus with the

land-confiscations for Antony's veterans, and the fourth *Eclogue* mixes the pastoral setting with the altogether loftier theme of the prophecy of a child who will bring a new Golden Age.

The *Georgics* too is based on a mixture of the real and the idealised. Ostensibly it gives instructions to farmers, and is thus in the tradition of Hesiod and the Alexandrian didactic writers. But unlike these it has other deeper purposes than its ostensible theme, to explore the relationship of the plants and creatures of Nature with the organizing world of man, to try to work out a cosmic and pantheistic view of the processes and beauty of Nature and man's part in these processes. Thus there is a strange tension between the practicality of precepts about soil-testing or vine-planting and the highly ornate poetic presentation. The diction is suitable for the underlying symbolisms that it seeks to express, but less so for the ostensible subject with its detailed technicalities.

It is this mixing of two contrasting aspects of human experience which seems to me to be one of the main reasons for the greatness of the *Aeneid*. In Virgil's epic let us consider first the mixing of the public world and the private world. The public world of the *Aeneid*, empire, national glory, civilisation for the barbarians is the basic foundation of the poem, the reason for its existence; this is the proper stuff of epic, and this is what Virgil set out to portray in the excitement and national fervour of the Augustan régime. But every reader of the *Aeneid* knows that the private world of sorrow, suffering, loneliness is very much to the forefront of Virgil's thought, and indeed it has often been thought (especially by the Victorians) that this is Virgil's great quality, far more than his expression of the imperial theme. This isn't true, but it makes the point that the *Aeneid* is no simplified panegyric of Rome and Augustus, but a sensitive exploration in situation after situation in the narrative of the implications of right through might and of the sufferings involved.

Consider for example the case of Turnus. On one side it can be said (and it has been said by Brooks Otis) that here we have a character of archaic barbarism, motivated by selfish interests and pursuing them by means of violence. The word *violentia* is used only of Turnus in the *Aeneid*, and his behaviour when he kills Pallas is arrogant in the extreme: he wishes Pallas' father were present to view his death, he exults over him when he has mortally wounded him, and he says 'Tell Evander that I am sending him Pallas back as he deserves to have him' – *qualem meruit Pallanta remitto*. I for one cannot forgive him for that, and Virgil makes it plain that I am right to feel like this as he intervenes in his narrative three times in rapid succession. First he reflects on the folly of men who become uplifted by success and lose their sense of balance:

Nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae  
et servare modum rebus sublata secundis!

(10.501-2)

Then immediately afterwards he anticipates his narrative – one day Turnus will be sorry for what he has done, and will pay for it:

Turno tempus erit magno cum optaverit emptum  
intactum Pallanta, et cum spolia ista diemque  
oderit...

(10.503-5).

This of course anticipates the final scene of the poem, when Turnus wounded begs Aeneas for mercy, and would doubtless have been granted mercy had not Aeneas caught sight on Turnus' shoulder of the sword-belt he had stripped from Pallas when he killed him. Those who condemn Aeneas in that last scene should bear in mind that from this point in Book 10 when Turnus so cruelly kills his young opponent we have been waiting for him to pay for it.

Finally Virgil enters the narrative once more, this time to invoke the dead Pallas:

o dolor atque decus magnum rediture parenti,  
haec te prima dies bello dedit, haec eadem aufert,  
cum tamen ingentis Rutulorum linquis acervos!

(10.507-9).

Thus there are three interventions by Virgil in ten lines: nowhere else does he intervene in the narrative on this scale. He wants us to know that Turnus' behaviour is unforgiveable.

These then are some of the things that can be said on the one side: they make us feel that the victory of Aeneas is the victory of justice and civilisation over violent barbarism. But you are all thinking by now of what can be said on the other side, and there is indeed much. From his own standpoint Turnus has a very strong case indeed for resisting the invader. Until the arrival of Aeneas his way of life was progressing as he wished it to – his pre-eminence among the Rutulians had gained him the hand of Lavinia, the king's daughter, and the affection of her mother Amata: from being an important young Italian chieftain he had the prospect of high authority and eminence. All this is called in question by the arrival of an unknown Trojan exile: King Latinus recognised the fulfilment of an oracle about a foreign husband for Lavinia and all Turnus' hopes are blighted at a stroke. Impetuously, bravely, he faces the situation and prepares to fight for his rights, supported by the queen and by many of the local Italians. Why should he not? The answer of course is that he should not because to do so would be to oppose destiny: but Turnus does not accept this for a moment. He has his own destiny, he cries: (9.136f.): *sunt et mea contra fata mihi, ferro sceleratam excindere gentem coniuge praerepta*. In the violent debate against Drances (who wants to stop the war) near the beginning of Book 11 Turnus wins much more of our sympathy than Drances does, and often his simple bravery gives an attractive picture. We remember Blake's remark that in *Paradise Lost* Milton was of the Devil's party without knowing it, and Virgil too is certainly not without sympathy for Turnus: it is interesting to reflect that a number of the traits and actions of Milton's Satan are based on those of Turnus in the *Aeneid*. Sympathy is perhaps especially felt for Turnus when the final moment of reckoning comes and his impetuous self-confidence deserts him:

... incessu tacito progressus et aram  
suppliciter venerans demisso lumine Turnus,  
pubentesque genae et iuvenali in corpore pallor.

(12.219-21).

Or again near the end when the news is brought to him that Latinus' capital is under siege and that the queen has committed suicide:

obstipuit varia confusus imagine rerum  
Turnus et obtutu tacito stetit; aestuat ingens  
uno in corde pudor mixtoque insania luctu  
et furiis agitatus amor et conscia virtus.

(12.665-8).

And at the end as he meets his fate he reaches a true heroic nobility of stature as he says to Aeneas (12.931) *equidem merui nec deprecor, inquit, utere sorte tua*.

How easy it would have been for Virgil to have made Turnus less sympathetic, so that we could more fully have accepted Brooks Otis' view that his removal from the scene is justified and inevitable. How easy too to remove Aeneas' dilemma at the end, when Turnus begs for mercy and Aeneas has to weigh humanity against vengeance and decides for vengeance. This dilemma need not have arisen if Aeneas' spear-cast had not just wounded Turnus, but had killed him: but Virgil wanted us involved in the dilemma. Aeneas has generally in the poem seemed to be a man striving for peace and justice, trying to overcome passion and frenzy in himself and others; but he is not always able to do so – after Pallas' death he goes berserk on the battlefield, and again in Book 12 after being wounded he rages in martial fury absolutely similar to that of Turnus. Are we to think that the military dominion of Rome which will bring civilisation and a new Golden Age to the world is necessarily based on deeds of violence? Or are we to think that Aeneas himself has failed, because of faults within himself, to find the unshakeable humanity and control which an ideal Roman leader should have? Whatever we think, the thing to notice is that Virgil has refused to make it seem easy to solve these cosmic problems, has refused to present a specious over-simplification of the vast issues involved. He has mixed the vision of a Roman paradise on earth with the horrors caused by the imperfections of men, even of the best of them. Putnam has urged that by the killing of Turnus Aeneas has proved false to everything for which he was striving: I personally am much nearer to Brooks Otis, who sees this as the last grim necessity which besets Aeneas, an action which he must take, against his will, for the benefit of mankind and posterity. But my real point is that Virgil has involved us in a dilemma of universal application, and shown us both sides of the question with brilliant drama.

I end with one more example of many-sidedness, of the appreciation of two sides of a problem of universal application.

This is the relationship between fate and free-will. The one extreme here is predestination, the concept of fate as something preventing free-will; the other extreme is to deny the existence of fate. Virgil explores this intellectual tension in the character of Aeneas. Now no one will say that the *Aeneid* denies the existence of fate; but it has been felt by many of Virgil's readers that there is too much fate, that the hero is a puppet, an instrument of destiny, an unreal character acting always as a tool of fate. This is a common but most extraordinary viewpoint which probably results from reading the poem

back to front – because it is known that Aeneas did succeed it is thought that he must succeed. For my part, every time I read the poem I am in deep doubt whether he will succeed. Of course he is a man of destiny, chosen by the gods to carry out their purposes – but at each and every moment of the poem he is free to continue to be a man of destiny, or to give it up, or perhaps to fail through sheer weakness. Consider how often he nearly does give in – at the very beginning of the poem the storm strikes terror into him and he wishes he were dead:

o terque quaterque beati,  
quis ante ora patrum Troiae sub moenibus altis  
contigit oppetere! o Danaum fortissime gentis  
Tydide! meme Iliacis occumbere campis  
non potuisse tuaque animam hanc effundere dextra...

(1.94-98).

At the end of the storm he encourages those of his companions who have survived with him, but his heartening words were feigned:

Talia voce refert curisque ingentibus aeger  
spem vultu simulat, premit altum corde dolorem

(1.208-9).

His divine mother Venus meets him in disguise and he begs for help, lost as he is on an unknown shore (331f.); she replies and then tauntingly asks who he is. He answers in tones of angry complaint – he is *pious Aeneas*, he is following his appointed destiny and yet here he is washed up on the shores of Africa, driven out of Europe and Asia. Venus breaks in on his complaints (*querentem*, 385) and gives him instructions; as she vanishes she reveals her divinity and in his anguish and bewilderment he cries “Why do you so often deceive your son with unreal appearances? You too are cruel”.

Quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis  
ludis imaginibus?

(1.407-8).

There is here no serene confidence, no puppet-like reaction to the guiding strings, but a very human uncertainty, a resentment, a feeling that he is surrounded by hostility and by unsympathetic powers. And yet he goes on, because he has chosen to hear the voice of destiny and is not prepared to opt out. And if you think he could not opt out if he wanted to, again I repeat that you are working from the end to the beginning and arguing that because he remained a man of destiny and achieved his objects, therefore he had no option. Let me quote you a passage in which Virgil quite specifically states his option. After the ships have been set on fire, and after Aeneas has appealed for divine aid and a downpour has quenched the fire, he is not exhilarated at this indication of divine help, but in a mood of despair he ponders two alternative courses of action: should he settle in Sicily and forget the fates, or press on to his destiny in Italy ...

Siculisne resideret arvis  
*oblitus fatorum*, Italsae capesseret oras.

(5.702-3).

Nor does he easily decide; it is touch and go. Nautes urges him to press on, but he cannot decide; it needs the appearance of a vision of his father, sent by Jupiter, to persuade him.

It is therefore inadmissible to say that Virgil presents Aeneas as a man without freewill. But it may be said that at crucial moments when he is on the point of giving up he receives divine aid. Certainly he does, and there is surely nothing surprising if a man who had devoted himself to following the path which God decrees receives help in doing so. This is surely a well-enough known concept of the Christian religion to cause no surprise if we meet it in a pagan author: the man of God is helped in response to prayer, or by a sudden revelation. When Aeneas is staying with Dido, forgetful for the time of his mission (not indeed having abandoned it, but having postponed it, having pushed it to the back of his mind) he is reminded roughly and imperiously by Mercury as messenger of Jupiter that he must continue immediately along the journey which he is committed to follow. If this divine revelation had not occurred, we do not know how long – perhaps for always – Aeneas would have stayed in Carthage; but it did occur, and Aeneas immediately reacted to it and recognised his fault and rectified it (at what a cost all readers of *Aeneid* 4 know well). This is because he was the kind of man who could hear the voice of God when it spoke; had he been a different kind of man he would not have heard it; had he been less devoted to his mission he would not have obeyed it. He was absolutely free to disregard or reject the warning of Mercury. I used the phrase ‘hearing the voice of God’; if you prefer it there are other kinds of phrase which could be used here, such as ‘the voice of conscience’. The one phrase refers to the experience in terms outside the human world, the other in terms within the human character. But is anyone going to say that we lack free-will because our conscience may dictate a certain course of action? Against our purely personal wishes we follow a course of action because we are aware of certain higher compulsions: this is what Aeneas says to Dido – *Italiam non sponte sequor* (4.361); and it is what he says to her ghost when he meets her in the underworld

invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi.  
sed me iussa deum....

(6.460-1).

But *could* he have stayed with Dido? Being the kind of man he was, with the destiny he had accepted, he could not; but he only needed to shift a degree from the kind of man he was, and he would have stayed. How lucky for Rome that he did not shift a degree; and how important for the Romans in Virgil’s time that they too should not shift a degree from the acceptance of their duty. Aeneas’ father Anchises knew it was touch and go: we hear in Book 4 that his ghost kept appearing to Aeneas as he lingered in Carthage (4.351-3); in Book 5, as we have seen, it is a vision of Anchises which persuades Aeneas to continue; and in Book 6, when Aeneas finally reaches the ghost of his father in Elysium Anchises’ first words are *venisti tandem, tuaque expectata parenti vicit iter durum pietas?* (6.687-8): ‘Have you come at last, and has your devotion to duty overcome the hard journey?’ Yes indeed it was *iter durum*, and indeed it was conquered by *pietas*. And the last words of this speech of Anchises are

*quam metui ne quid Libyae tibi regna nocerent* (6.694).

“How afraid I was that the kingdoms of Libya might have brought you harm”. Yes indeed; how nearly they did. It was because Aeneas *chose* to follow his divine duty and not to stay with Dido that the city of Rome was founded. I am not here discussing whether it was the right choice; I am insisting that it was a choice, an act of Aeneas’ free-will. Virgil did *not* believe that the existence of a divine purpose for the world denied to men their free-will, and in the *Aeneid* he explores the question of how that free-will can operate in collaboration with the divine purpose.

I have tried to show that what I find so fascinating, and lasting, in Virgil is his variety of poetic mood and style and his ability to juxtapose different aspects of human behaviour in such a way as to show sympathetic appreciation of widely contrasted attitudes to life: of pity and of toughness; of the individual’s desires and of society’s needs; of the relationship between free-will and devoted service to a cause, especially a divine cause. Different aspects of Virgil’s poetry have been appreciated at different times: his patriotism and his learning in Roman times; his pre-Christian values and allegories in the Middle Ages; his solemn ethics and his artistic correctness in the time of Dryden and Pope; his pathos in Victorian times. Our own generation has admired Virgil not for one or two of these qualities but for many of them taken together; and in an age which looks many ways at the same time we have found satisfaction and truth in Virgil’s many-sidedness.

### ‘Virgil, Tacitus, Tiberius and Germanicus’

A lecture read to the Virgil Society, May, 1973,

by Janet Bews, M.A., Ph.D.

That there are problems of interpretation in Tacitus’ presentation of Tiberius and Germanicus is generally accepted among Tacitean critics. Most would agree, too, that some problems are a direct result of his complex method of writing literary history, a method whereby event and interpretation, fact and impression, content and style are so linked and interdependent that they cannot be separated without distortion of his text. Ignore *how* Tacitus makes a point, and you miss half of it. Hence the study of Tacitus’ language is particularly important and interesting. Associations of words, their colour, poetic overtones and literary echoes must be given due consideration if we are to understand his meaning, and assess accurately the validity of his historical interpretations.

Of the authors upon whom Tacitus draws for literary association, Virgil is perhaps the most significant. While I have no key to offer to the problems of Tiberius and Germanicus, the thread of Virgilian language which runs through Tacitus’ presentation of them is, I think, of some relevance.

The technique of literary reminiscence, which is not stylistic imitation only or mere verbal echoing, but rather the juxtaposition of passages so that they may interact with one another in the mind of the reader or listener, we associate more with poetry than

with prose. It is a technique which Virgil himself uses. One can think of numerous examples. In *Aeneid* Six, 77ff, the Sibyl of Cumae prophesies for Aeneas a re-enactment of the Trojan war in Italy and says *alius Latio iam partus Achilles,/natus et ipse dea*. But in *Aeneid* Eleven, 492ff, when Virgil depicts Turnus in a simile as a horse which has broken from his stable and now runs free, glorying in his strength, he echoes a Homeric simile used of Paris and Hector before they enter battle. (See *Il.* 6.506ff; 15.263ff, and also Ennius A.514ff.) Surely an association which bodes ill for the heroic Rutulian. In spite of his momentary sense of power, Turnus is no Achilles, and, like the Trojan heroes, he will ultimately be defeated. When Aeneas sees Hector in a dream, *Aen.* 2.270ff, and addresses him, *o lux Dardaniae*, v.281, he uses words similar to those of Cassandra in a tragedy of Ennius, *o lux Troiae, germane Hector*, Scen. 72-75V. Cassandra's words, appropriately enough, are part of a prophetic lament, additional details of which are included elsewhere in Aeneas' speech.<sup>1</sup> The juxtaposition of passages serves to heighten the pathos of Aeneas' dream by reinforcing its emotional effect. Aeneas speaks to Hector as a long-awaited saviour: *o lux Dardaniae, spes o fidissima Teucrum,/quae tantae tenuere morae? quibus Hector ab oris/exspectate venis?* But out of the dream world he knows that Hector is dead and that Cassandra has wept for him, her prophecy fulfilled.

Examples could be multiplied, but let those two suffice to indicate some of the functions which literary allusion can serve – comparison and contrast, reinforcement of emotional tone, indirect comment on the stature of characters depicted, dramatic foreshadowing, a means of establishing a context in which we may view the words and actions of individuals.

The list of passages which will be examined is selective rather than comprehensive but does not, I trust, distort the evidence. A brief comment should be made on the nature of the evidence, since the question of what is or is not Virgilian in Tacitus' works is a complex one. The examples used are of four types: words and phrases which are attested only in Virgil and Tacitus; Virgilian words and phrases which seem to be imitated independently by other writers as well as Tacitus; those for which verbal parallels in other writers are irrelevant to the question of a direct relationship between the epic poet and the historian; and, finally, words or phrases which may well have been derived directly from Virgil by Tacitus since they form part of a cluster of imitated language in their Virgilian context, or of imitative language in Tacitus' *Annals*.<sup>2</sup> We should keep in mind, too, that Virgil's *Aeneid* began its career as a school text soon after its publication, and that even if Tacitus' use of Virgilian language is difficult to parallel in prose, there are parallels in the poetry of the early Imperial period.<sup>3</sup>

A small group of imitative passages appears to have implications both for Tiberius and for Germanicus. The suggestion of tension in the relationship between the two figures begins in Tacitus' account of attempts by Augustus to guarantee a chain of possible successors, *Ann.* 1.3.5. In a sentence beginning *at hercule*, Tacitus describes the forced adoption of Germanicus by Tiberius with the words *adsciri per adoptionem a Tiberio iussit*. The verb *adscire* is unusual,<sup>4</sup> marks an unusual action, and is not particularly happy in its literary associations. Latinus had used the same verb when he attempted to

persuade Turnus to give up his quarrel with Aeneas, *Aen.* 12.38-39, *si Turno extincto socios sum ascire paratus, / cur non incolumi potius certamina tollo?* Without pushing the relationship too far one could say that the word *ascire* has overtones of conflict and dynastic struggle from its Virgilian context, overtones which are far from irrelevant to its Tacitean context since Tacitus points out that Tiberius already has a son. The stage is set for factional strife between Julians and Claudians.

Three interrelated passages in *Annals* 2.5 make more explicit comment on the relation between Tiberius and Germanicus by means of Virgilian associations (2.5.1, *dolo simul et casibus obiectaret*, and *Aen.* 2.750-751, *caput obiectare periculis*; 2.5.2, *aversa patrum voluntas* and *Aen.* 12.646-647, *superis aversa voluntas*; and 2.5.2, *celerandae victoriae intentior* and *Aen.* 9.378, *celerare fugam*.) Sallust, Virgil, and Tacitus himself at *Hist.* 2.33 combine the verb *obiectare* with *periculis*. Although the general similarity between *Bellum Jugurthinum* 7.1 and the present passage might suggest that Sallust is Tacitus' source,<sup>5</sup> there is, I think, more convincing evidence that his source is Virgil. It is clear from other contexts that Tacitus is very familiar with the second book of the *Aeneid* (see, e.g., his extensive use of *Aeneid* Two in his account of the sack of Cremona, *Hist.* 3) and it is also clear that he is familiar with the particular passage in question. Two other imitated phrases appear within five lines of *Aen.* 2.751: *lumina lustrō*, v.754, reappears in *Hist.* 2.70 and *silentia terrent*, v.755 at *Hist.* 3.84.

What then might be the function of the phrase and its possible associations? Briefly stated, Aeneas' courage and determination, shown in his resolve to face the dangers of returning to Troy in search of Creusa, are reflected upon Germanicus who thereby assumes some of the stature of his heroic ancestor. But there seems also to be an implied contrast between Germanicus and Aeneas as persons who face hazards, and Tiberius who causes others to face them, *dolo* being a significant addition for Tiberius' characterization. The two figures are contrasted more sharply with the phrase *aversa patrum voluntas*. This expression of Germanicus' thoughts about the attitude of his adoptive father recalls Turnus' ultimate recognition that the gods are hostile to his cause. Tiberius is associated with hostile divine power, power which in the *Aeneid* at least, is absolute (*patrum* and *superis* are parallel in function), while Germanicus through his equation with Turnus acquires the potential of a tragic hero, or heroic victim, depending upon one's interpretation of the *Aeneid*. The transitive use of *celerare* in the final phrase is simply a stylistic device with the virtue of conciseness and it contributes to the poetic colouring of its context. I have classed it as Virgilian rather than generally poetic because it appears in a cluster of imitated language in the Nisus and Euryalus episode in *Aeneid* Nine.

If one were to choose a theme which runs consistently through the *Annals*, it would be Tacitus' preoccupation with the nature of political power and the relationship between power and personality. The Virgilian phrases in *Annals* 2.5, as well as the passage in *Annals* 1.3, help to define the relative positions of Germanicus and Tiberius, and the nature of the power which they possess as individuals and political figures.

I shall now attempt to substantiate the interpretation of the passages which we have just examined by showing that Tacitus is to a high degree consistent in the Virgilian associations which he builds up around Germanicus and Tiberius.

## Germanicus

Book Two of the *Annals* is in a real sense Germanicus' book. Virgilian language appears in the description of his campaigns in Germany, his travels in the East and in Egypt, in the account of his death and in the description of subsequent mourning for him.

Tacitus' description of the storm which scatters the fleet of Germanicus, *Annals* 2.23-24, could be called a literary variation on a Virgilian theme, containing as it does variants of phrases and details from the *Georgics*, the description of the storm in *Aeneid* One, the monologue of Juno which precedes it, Ilioneus' speech to Dido about it, and a phrase depicting the violence of nature from another context in the *Aeneid*.<sup>6</sup>

One of the most striking aspects of Tacitus' passage is its compression. The opening phrase is spacious in concept but taut, even strained, in syntax: *placidum aequor mille navium remis strepere aut velis impelli*, 2.23.2. Tacitus' concentration upon visual and auditory effects is itself a poetic technique. The building up of the storm is presented swiftly and concisely: *mox atro nubium globo effusa grando, simul variis undique procellis incerti fluctus prospectum adimere, regimen impedire*, 2.23.2. Instead of drawing upon Virgil's more lengthy description, *Aen.* 1.82-91, Tacitus takes a compact clause from a simile as his model. In 2.23.3, *disiecitque naves in aperta Oceani aut insulas saxis abruptis vel per occulta vada infestas*, details from three passages are combined and there is a change in emphasis. Virgil's description, *Aen.* 1.102ff, achieves its effects through the building up of details with verbal repetition and parallelism as important structural devices. In addition, the storm is described in character, so to speak. The first words spoken are those of Aeneas, vv94-101, and words and phrases, some with emotional overtones, maintain the impression that we are viewing the storm through his eyes (e.g., 1.111, *miserabile visu*, 113, *fidum Oronten*, 114, *ipsius ante oculos*, 120, *validam Ilionei navem...fortis Achatae*, 121, *grandaevus Aletes*). Tacitus, in contrast, presents a panoramic scene of devastation with a minimum of detail, with no verbal repetition, and from a more impersonal point of view. There is also a change in emphasis in 23.4. At *Aen.* 1.118-119, Virgil describes the wreck of Ilioneus' ship and the loss of Trojan treasure, *Troia gaza*, a phrase which underlines on an emotional level the extent of Aeneas' loss. The detail *equi iumenta sarcinae etiam arma praecipitantur* in Tacitus' account represents not simply loss, but a desperate attempt to avert disaster. The phrase *manantes per latera*, a condensed version of *Aen.* 1.122-123, along with a variation on a phrase from Ilioneus' speech, *superante salo*, 1.537, ends Tacitus' description of the storm itself.

Chapter 24 depicts the fate of the ships and the effect of the storm upon Germanicus. There are again interesting alterations in emphasis as a result of rearrangement of details. *Aeneas scopulum...conscendit*, *Aen.* 1.180, to scan the sea for traces of his companions, but when he sees the stags grazing, he turns to the immediate task of providing food for the survivors. Germanicus performs a similar action (2.24.2, *quem apud scopulos*) but in an agony of remorse because he feels personally responsible for the disaster. His followers can scarcely restrain him from seeking in the sea the death which Aeneas wishes he had found before the walls of Troy (*oppetere* with *mortem* understood, 2.24.2 and *Aen.* 1.96). Hence Germanicus' reaction becomes an emotional focal point, as

it were, for the account, rather than its general perspective as in the case of Aeneas.

Why does Tacitus choose to present the storm in such detail, and why his extensive use of Virgilian language? One reason may be stylistic, creative imitation of an acknowledged master, which reveals Tacitus' own individuality of approach: evocative, impressionistic writing, but rigorous selection and compression of detail rather than epic expansiveness. More importantly, the storm is depicted with Virgilian echoes because it is a misfortune which befell Germanicus and is thereby a means of characterizing him in terms of Aeneas. The aura of the heroic which he gains, even though the hero is at a low ebb of his fortunes, is part of Tacitus' interpretation of a historical figure who is the inheritor of the traditions of the Julian family. Whether Tacitus is *simply* presenting Germanicus as a heroic figure is a point to which we shall return.

Three passages from the account of Germanicus' travels (2.54.2, *relegit Asiam* and *Aen.* 3.690-691; 2.60.1, *diversum ad mare* and *Aen.* 11.261-263; and 2.61.1, *instar montium* and *Aen.* 2.15) need not detain us long since they are primarily stylistic imitations which add Virgilian colour to the narrative. What is most interesting about them is the nature of their contexts. Germanicus is beset by another storm on his way to Athens. While his ships are being refitted he pays a visit to Actium (*Ann.* 2.53.2) as Aeneas did (*Aen.* 3.278-288). He also visits Troy, "venerable...for the origins of Rome", 2.54.2, and consults an oracle of Apollo, which gives him what is reputed to be an ominous prophecy. The significance of Apollo during the wanderings of Aeneas needs no comment. Germanicus' visit to Egypt, *Ann.* 2.60ff, partakes of the fabulous and the romantic. The travels of Germanicus could be said to perform a similar function to Aeneas' wanderings, as far as Tacitus' purpose is concerned, in that they associate him with founding legends, mythology, ancient history, and deeds of military glory.<sup>7</sup>

In *Annals* 2.71-73, Tacitus gives his account of the death and funeral of Germanicus. At 2.71.3, Germanicus' parting words to his friends in which he gives them the charge of avenging his death (*vindicabitis vos, si me potius quam fortunam meam fovebatis*) contain the same contrast between the individual and his circumstances which appears in Aeneas' words to Ascanius before his final combat with Turnus (*Aen.* 12.435-436, *disce, puer, virtutem ex me verumque laborem/fortunam ex aliis.*)<sup>8</sup> Germanicus' *fortunam meam* suggests the bright prospects and high hopes of the prince which have been frustrated. Possibly the words acquire both strength and irony from Aeneas' *fortunam ex aliis*, a phrase tinged with the bitterness of one who has been dogged by misfortune and suffering, his efforts at peaceful settlement in Italy frustrated at every turn.

When Tacitus describes the grief in the province at the death of Germanicus, he uses the phrase *ingenti luctu*, 2.72.2. Although its ascription to a particular context in Virgil is difficult since the combination appears more than once, on subjective grounds one context is particularly appropriate, if not right.<sup>9</sup> Anchises describes as *ingentem luctum... tuorum*, *Aen.* 6.868, the death of Marcellus. Marcellus was a young man marked out for greatness as a national leader, the focus of national hopes (*Aen.* 6.875-877). He too was cut off by an untimely death before his promise had been fulfilled. It is difficult to believe that with his extensive knowledge of the *Aeneid*, Tacitus was unfamiliar with the

moving passage at the end of Book Six which Virgil is said to have recited with such effect (*Vita Donati* 100). The suggestion of a link with Marcellus gains support from the comments on the triumph of Germanicus, which express the *occulta formido* of the people: *haud prosperum in Druso patre eius favorem vulgi, avunculum eiusdem Marcellum flagrantibus plebis studiis intra iuventam ereptum, breves et infaustos populi Romani amores*, 2.41.3.

The suggestion of what might have been is clear at 2.73.2. Those attending Germanicus' funeral in Antioch compare him favourably with Alexander the Great and say that he was no less a military figure *etiam si...praepeditus sit percultas tot victoriis Germanias servitio premere*. The words *servitio premet* appear at *Aen.* 1.285 in Jupiter's prophecy to Venus of the subjugation of the East by the house of Assaracus in the person of Augustus Caesar. Not only does Germanicus have the reflected glory of the conquests of Caesar, but also he has literary reparation for the fact that his funeral was without the traditional ancestral effigies, *sine imaginibus et pompa*. Jupiter's speech is a splendid and solemn outline of the history of the Roman people as seen through the history of the *gens Iulia*.

### Tiberius

What of Tiberius? There are no concentrations of Virgilian language as in the description of the storm, *Ann.* 2.23-24, but instead scattered passages from Book One to Book Six. Again, the passages to be examined are a selection rather than a complete list, but none of those which have been omitted, as far as I am aware, directly contradicts the pattern which will be suggested.

*Pace* F.R.D. Goodyear and in support of N.P. Miller (whose point I think he misunderstands)<sup>10</sup> I would class *Ann.* 1.47.1, *Immotum...fixumque Tiberio fuit*, as a conscious and purposeful imitation of *Aen.* 4.15, Dido's statement of her resolve never to marry again: *si mihi non animo fixum immotumque sederet/ne cui me vinclo vellem sociare iugali...* There are none of the tragic implications in Tacitus' passage of the vow so soon to be broken, but instead the ironic suggestion *varium et mutabile semper femina*. As deliberate policy Tiberius gives the appearance of being just on the point of leaving for the armies, even though he has no such intention. By using this Virgilian phrase to draw attention to apparent indecision, Tacitus belittles the logic of Tiberius' point that the power of an emperor to deal with an army mutiny, and his imperial dignity are secure so long as he remains a remote figure of authority. This interpretation of the intent of the phrase is supported by another Virgilian allusion in 6.32.1 as Tacitus comments on Tiberius' preference for diplomacy rather than armed conflict in international relations: *consiliis et astu res externas moliri, arma procul habere*. Virgil had used the combination *consilio et astu* of Ligus when he tried to escape from Camilla in battle by tricking her.<sup>11</sup> Not a complimentary interpretation of Tiberius' policy in the Eastern empire, but an interpretation it is.

The reason for Tacitus' strictures may perhaps be found in *Annals* 4.32, where he contrasts his subject-matter with that of Republican historians: *ingentia illi bella,*

*expugnationes urbium, fusos captosque reges...memorabant: nobis in arto et inglorius labor; immota quippe aut modice lacessita pax, maestae urbis res, et princeps proferendi imperi incuriosus erat.*<sup>12</sup> Tiberius' policy of consolidation, like his refusal to engage in personal heroics during the army mutinies, is sane and statesmanlike. The historian would seem to be influenced in his judgment by his own half-sentimental leanings towards the imperialism of the Republic, and even, perhaps, towards the type of strong military leader who could quell a mutiny with the single word "*Quirites*". (Note Germanicus' comments to the mutinous soldiers, *Ann.* 1.42.3).

Also in *Annals* 1.47, however, is another Virgilian usage whose implication is perhaps more serious: *resistentisque Germanico aut Druso posse a se mitigari vel infringi.* At 1.47.2 appears the only example in the *Annals* of the verb *infringere* used of persons. It is at least interesting that it is Tiberius' self-stated power to break people which is expressed by a Virgilian word.<sup>13</sup>

Later in *Annals* One Tacitus imputes to Tiberius ultimate responsibility for the death of his former wife Julia, daughter of Augustus: *omnis spei egenam inopia ac tabe longa peremit,* 1.53.2. The similarity between *omnis spei egenam* and *omnium egenos,* *Aen.* 1.599, is stylistic, a verbal echo which may be unconscious, but the latter part of Tacitus' statement recalls the *lugentes campi* in the Underworld inhabited by the shades of those whom *durus amor crudeli tabe peredit,* *Aen.* 6.442. The moral of the story may be that love and politics don't mix, as Julia and Dido found out. Syntactically, however, Tiberius and *amor* are equated, and *amor* belies its name. It is a pitiless destroyer.

The trial of Libo Drusus on a charge of plotting treason, *Ann.* 2.27ff, has been examined in detail by B. Walker and others.<sup>14</sup> In her view it is a major example of the divergence between fact and impression in Tacitus' works, and constitutes brilliant but slanted anti-Tiberian writing. Tacitus considers the case particularly significant *quia tum primum reperta sunt quae per tot annos rem publicam exedere,* 2.27.1. Tacitus' language echoes the comments of Venus on Juno's implacable hatred of the Trojans: *non media de gente Phrygum exedissee nefandis/urbem odiis satis est,* *Aen.* 5.785-786. A striking metaphor for a particularly vicious activity. Tacitus is referring here to the *delator* who pretends friendship with his intended victim in order to make him incriminate himself. At 2.29.2, Libo Drusus appeals to Tiberius, *manus ac supplices voces ad Tiberium tendens.* The language is very similar to that with which Virgil three times depicts the ritual gesture of prayer to the gods (*Aen.* 2.688; 3.176-177; 10.667). The phrase may, as B. Walker suggests (p.12) be an ironic reminiscence of the joyful thanks of Aeneas and Anchises, or it may with slightly different irony point a similarity to Turnus whose prayers were also in vain. In either case, Tiberius is assigned the role of a divinity. There can be little doubt about the power of informers, and also little doubt that the Emperor is the last court of appeal. Tacitus' echoes of Virgil are pointed comment, not simply rhetorical exaggeration.

Two other Virgilian phrases appear in the context of legal proceedings, particularly treason trials. There is a question in people's minds as to how far Tiberius might go in punishing Plancina for her alleged part in the death of Germanicus and the rebellious

actions of her husband Piso. Although the similarity between *Ann.* 3.15.1, *quantum Caesari in eam liceret*, and *Aen.* 6.502, *cui tantum de te licuit*, is largely syntactical, the context of Virgil's phrase deserves comment. In *Aeneid* Six, Aeneas is addressing the mutilated shade of Deiphobus, betrayed to Menelaus by Helen during the sack of Troy. It is perhaps not going too far to suggest that Tiberius, too, has the power to exact a terrible punishment, even though that power may not be exercised in this particular instance because of the intercession of Livia.

The trial of Votienus Montanus *does* lead Tiberius to exercise his power: *Caesar, obiectam sibi adversos reos inclementiam eo pervicacius amplexus*, 4.42.3. Votienus is convicted of treason *ob contumelias in Caesarem dictas*. Aquilia, convicted of adultery, receives the sentence of exile even though she was prosecuted under the Julian law which admitted of lesser penalties, and Apidius Merula, for refusing to swear obedience to the *acta* of the deified Augustus, loses his senatorial rank. The word *inclementia* appears only here in Tacitus' extant works. Virgil uses it in the *Georgics* of the absoluteness of death, *Geo.* 3.68, and, in *Aeneid* Two, Venus tells Aeneas that the real cause of the fall of Troy is not Paris and Helen but *divum inclementia divum*, v.602. It is to the latter passage that I suggest we should look for Tacitus' source. <sup>15</sup>

R.G. Austin's comments on the Venus-Aeneas scene are brilliantly evocative.

The repetition of *divum* comes with a stabbing shock. There and then Venus rends apart the cloud that clogs Aeneas' mortal sight and shows him the great gods in action against Troy....It is a fantastic apocalypse, gods in devilry, gloating over their horrid work like demons in a medieval Doom....

And, later in his discussion

It is as if [Virgil] had suddenly, blindingly, seen that human *pietas* – the linch-pin of the whole structure of the *Aeneid* – has no protection against the arbitrary ruthlessness of the gods, no necessary recognition from them: there is no appeal against *divum inclementia*. <sup>16</sup>

"Arbitrary ruthlessness" would, I suggest, be an accurate translation at *Ann.* 4.42.3.

The final four phrases to be considered have some characteristics in common in that they use military vocabulary or have some military associations. The prophecy of the astrologers that Tiberius would never return to Rome after his departure into Campania was misinterpreted to mean that he would soon die, not that he would go into voluntary retirement as he did at Capri, an indication *vera....quam obscuris tegerentur*, *Ann.* 4.58.3. Virgil had used similar words of the Sibyl of Cumae, *obscuris vera involvens*, *Aen.* 6.100. What the Sibyl had prophesied for Aeneas was *bella, horrida bella/et Thybrim multo spumantem sanguine*, *Aen.* 6.86-87. What is concealed by "the nature of things", the movements of the planets, is that Tiberius will approach the city but not enter it, *saepe moenia urbis adsidens*, 4.58.3. The language is specifically military. Latinus had expressed his distress at calling a Council of the Latins in his beleaguered city *cum muros adsidet*

*hostis*, *Aen.* 11.304. Rome, then, is a city under siege. If one is to find significance in the fact that it is Aeneas in the latter passage who is described as *hostis*, it can only be, I think, the significance of contrast. Aeneas' ultimate mission in Italy was to be a civilizing force. The same could not be said of the latter years of the reign of Tiberius, whatever his intentions might have been.

The fall of Sejanus had disastrous consequences which Tacitus foreshadows by means of a Virgilian allusion at 4.74.5. For those who successfully courted Sejanus *infaustae amicitiae gravis exitus imminebat*. It was Turnus of whom Juno had said *nunc manet insontem gravis exitus*, *Aen.* 10.630. Turnus, certainly, is caught up in a power struggle between Juno and Jupiter, just as the senators who flock to Campania will be caught between Sejanus and Tiberius. But is Turnus really *insons*? Juno could hardly be described as an impartial witness for her favourite. Turnus seeks to shape the world in his own image and fails. The same comment could be made of those who seek to gain by flattering the Emperor's favourite. The final phrase to be considered, which appears at *Ann.* 6.39.2, is a highly rhetorical extension of the death of Mezentius to a scene of general carnage in Rome: [*Tiberius*] *quasi aspiciens undantem per domos sanguinem aut manus carnificum* (*Aen.* 10.908, *undantique animam diffundit in arma cruore*).

It would appear, then, that there are two distinct patterns of Virgilian associations: for Germanicus, it is the positive world of heroic values represented especially by Aeneas; for Tiberius, apart from references which, in effect, question his judgment, various images of destructive power, be it destructive emotion, human vengeance, divine power turned against man, or death-dealing war.

Tacitean bias is a hoary chestnut. While it would be rash to attempt to define the function of a historian, one *can* say that he is not simply a chronicler recording events, but rather a seeker after intelligible patterns, an interpreter of the past to the present. Let us not criticize a historian unjustifiably for performing his proper task, even though his way may not be our way. Virgilian language is one level of the historian's interpretation of his material.

There can be little doubt that there was a Germanicus "legend", for Tacitus himself provides us with the evidence for it. Germanicus' general popularity is mentioned in 1.7.6, the grounds for it in 1.33.2: *quippe Drusi magna apud populum Romanum memoria, credebaturque, si rerum potitus foret, libertatem redditurus; unde in Germanicum favor et spes eadem. nam iuveni civile ingenium, mira comitas et diversa a Tiberii sermone vultu, adrogantibus et obscuris*. Other details fill in the picture: his *pietas*, 1.34.1 and 1.61.1; his martial spirit, *passim Annals* One and Two; the human touch of a good military leader, 1.71.3; his physical attractiveness, endurance, charm, and even temper, 2.13.1; his kindness and clemency, 2.55.3 and 2.72.2; his dignity and grandeur which inspired reverence, and his freedom from jealousy and pride, 2.72.2. The depth of affection for him in Rome is amply illustrated by Tacitus' moving description of the grief of the people at his death, 2.82. Of such stuff are folk-heroes made.

Yet Tacitus is not entirely uncritical nor is he lacking in perspective. For example, in 1.3.6 he comments on the German war which occupies so much of his first two books that it is a war undertaken *abolendae magis infamiae ob amissum cum Quintilio Varo exercitum quam cupidine proferendi imperii aut dignum ob praemium*. Germanicus' mock attempt at suicide as a means of quelling an army mutiny fails. Calusidius offers his own sword saying "Take this, it's sharper", 1.35.5. Germanicus is granted a triumph although the war is still in progress, 1.55.1, and his military tactics are not invariably successful: *et manibus aequis abscessum*, 1.63.2; *nox demum inclinantis iam legiones adversae pugnae exemit*, 1.64.3; *classis Amisiae relicta laevo amne, erratumque in eo, quod non subvexit: transposuit militem dextras in terras iturum*, 2.8.2. And, just before the setting up of the victory monument (2.22) there is the comment *equites ambigue certavere*, 2.21.2. Germanicus does recover two of the lost eagles of Varus, thereby saving Roman face (1.60.3 and 2.25.2) but Book Two ends thus with Tacitus' comments on the death of his chief opponent Arminius:

liberator haud dubie Germaniae et qui non primordia populi  
Romani, sicut alii reges ducesque, sed florentissimum imperium  
laccessierit, proeliis ambiguus, bello non victus. 2.88.2.

How can one reconcile such comments with the figure of popular imagination and Virgilian vocabulary which recalls a heroic world? I would suggest that they are complementary. The Virgilian language used of Germanicus serves a double function in that it suggests both potential and limitation, power and failure to realize it. It is the world of Aeneas, Turnus, and the great figures of the *gens Iulia* which is the appropriate context for Germanicus, since he possesses some of the qualities of that world, and it is against its standards that he is to be judged. To illustrate briefly, a particular and a general example. Aeneas wishes that he had died at Troy, an appropriately heroic end. Tacitus uses the same verb, *oppetere*, 2.24.2, but of what heroic action by Germanicus? Attempted suicide by drowning. Aeneas' journey to Italy is a time of testing and of learning, of trial and error, an exercise in the submission of an individual will to a larger purpose. In contrast, Germanicus enters a world of high romance on a scenic and historical tour, and, in Egypt, even wears Greek dress in imitation of Publius Scipio Africanus in Sicily (2.59.1)<sup>17</sup> Meanwhile his dispositions in the east go to wrack and ruin. Tacitus' Virgilian language and Virgilian associations contain within them the basis of their own criticism.

In the case of Tiberius, I would suggest that Tacitus is not indulging a penchant for subtle abuse, but rather presenting an interpretation of the nature of the Principate which has some validity. Although Augustus had disguised it with considerable skill, the Principate was a form of absolutism, a benevolent despotism which might, in the hands of the wrong man, become simply despotic. It was during the principate of Tiberius, particularly in the consequences for the senatorial class of his revival of the law of treason, that the potential of the office first became clear.

I have suggested earlier that Virgil is perhaps the most significant of the authors whom Tacitus draws upon for literary associations. The *Aeneid* is an evocative summation of all previous Roman history, its achievements and the cost of those achievements. It also heralds a new beginning, the return of the Golden Age of Saturn to be ushered in by the rule of Augustus. What better touchstone for a literary historian who wishes to establish a perspective for his account of Augustus' Julio-Claudian successors? The strain of imperial optimism in Virgil's *Aeneid* is in some sense answered by the imperial pessimism of the *Annals*. The Golden Age never, in Tacitus' view, became a reality. The dynasty which lost its heroic potential with the death of Germanicus, which soon, in the person of Tiberius, turned its supreme power against Rome, ends with Nero and a return to civil war: *sunt lacrimae rerum*.

## NOTES

1. Macrobius, *Sat.* 6.2.18 cites the passage as from Ennius' *Alexander*.

O lux Troiae, germane Hector  
 Quid ita cum tuo lacerato corpore  
 Miser es, aut qui te sic respectantibus  
 Tractavere nobis?

Except for the phrase noted there are no verbal parallels, but rather a re-working of details. See, e.g., 2.270ff and 277ff.

2. Examples of the four types of passages used are as follows: i. *consiliis et astu*, 6.32.1 and *Aen.* 11.704, noted by Fletcher (*Annotations on Tacitus*); ii. *aversa patris voluntas*, 2.5.2 and *Aen.* 12.647, *superis aversa voluntas* (Fletcher, *A.T.*), for which see also Val. Fl. 6.463, *mens mihi non eadem Iovis atque aversa voluntas*; iii. *gravis exitus imminebat*, 4.74.5, which shares the political overtones of *Aen.* 10.630, *nunc manet insontem gravis exitus* (Furneaux), connotations not found in Cic. *Div.* 2.22, Ov. *Met.* 10.8 or Stat. *Th.* 2.17, passages noted by Koestermann; iv. *celerare* used transitively, 2.5.2 and *Aen.* 9.378, the Nisus and Euryalus episode which also appears to provide the models *tendere contra*, v.377 (*Ann.* 3.10.1), *abutum*, v.380 (*Ann.* 14.37.1) found only in these two passages, *de nomine*, v.387 (*Ann.* 1.15.2), *fraude loci*, v.397 (*Ann.* 12.33.1) and *properet mortem*, v.401 (*Ann.* 2.31.3). Clusterings of imitated language appear elsewhere in the *Aeneid*. See, for example, the discussion of the storm, *Ann.* 2.23-24.
3. Those who most frequently use Virgilian language are themselves epic poets like Valerius Flaccus, Silius Italicus, or Statius. In addition to the phrase *aversa voluntas*, noted above, see also, e.g., Sil. 2.596, *haud gravior duris divum inclementia rebus/Quam leti proferre moras*, which has a marked affinity with *Aen.* 2.602; Stat. *Th.* 5.234, 10.716, *undantem...cruorem* and *Aen.* 10.908; and Val. Fl. 5.534-535, *cuperem haud tali vos tempore tectis/advenisse meis, quo me gravis adsidet hostis*, which is strikingly similar to *Aen.* 11.303-304.

4. Three other examples appear in Tacitus' works at H.4.24; 4.80; and A.19.2. Statius possibly uses the verb twice, *Silv.*1.1.23 (v.1) and 2.2.136.
5. Tiberius and Micipsa are given similar motivation and Jugurtha and Germanicus similar positive qualities. Sallust's passage ends *statuit eum obiectare periculis et eo modo fortunam temptare*.
6. The relevant passages are as follows:

Tacitus	Virgil
2.23.2 placidum aequor mille navium remis strepere aut velis impelli	<i>Aen.</i> 8.96 placido aequore; <i>Geo.</i> 1.254, remis impellere marmor
2.23.2 atro nubium globo effusa grando	<i>Aen.</i> 10.803-4 velut effusa si quando grandine nimbi/praecipitant.
2.23.3 tumidis Germaniae terris	<i>Geo.</i> 2.324 vere tument terrae
2.23.3 disiecitque naves in aperta Oceani aut insulas saxi abruptis vel per occulta vada infestas	<i>Aen.</i> 1.43 disiecitque rates; 1.108-12, tris Notus abreptas in saxa latentia torquet; tris Eurus in brevia et syrtis urget; inliditque vadis; 1.536 in vada caeca tulit
2.23.4 equi iumenta sarcinae, etiam arma praecipitantur	<i>Aen.</i> 1.118-19 naves in gurgite vasto/ arma virum tabulaeque et Troia gaza per undas.
2.23.4 alvei manantes per latera et fluctu superurgente	<i>Aen.</i> 1.122-23 laxis laterum compagibus omnes/accipiunt imbrem rimisque fatiscunt; 1.537 superante salo
2.24.2 plures apud insulas longius sitas eiectae	<i>Aen.</i> 1.511-12 ater quos turbo penitusque alias avexerat oras.
2.24.2 quem apud scopulos	<i>Aen.</i> 1.180 Aeneas scopulum interea conscendit
2.24.2 oppeteret	<i>Aen.</i> 1.96 Troiae sub moenibus altis/ contigit oppetere
2.24.3 claudae naves raro remigio	<i>Aen.</i> 1.104 franguntur remi; 5.271 amissis remis

J. Soubiran in "Thèmes et rythmes d'Épopée dans les *Annales* de Tacite", *Pallas* 12 (1964), 55-79, discussed the storm and its literary background in considerable detail. In spite of the fact that it is a stock theme, and that Soubiran finds similarities between Tacitus' account and details from Pacuvius, Ovid, Seneca, and Lucan, as well as Albinovanus Pedo, who sailed with Germanicus, the sheer number of parallels listed above and the contexts from which they come indicate that Virgil is Tacitus' primary source.

7. For a discussion of Germanicus' travels see e.g. J.J. Savage, "Germanicus and Aeneas", *C.J.* 34 (1938-39), 237-238.
8. See J.J. Savage, "Germanicus and Aeneas Again", *C.J.* 38 (1942-43), 166.
9. Livy uses the same phrase three times, twice of the Romans' reactions to defeats by Hannibal, and once of the reaction of the people of Rhodes to the destruction of their fleet (25.22.1; 27.2.3; 37.12.7). Virgil also uses the phrase three times at *Aen.* 6.868, 11.62-63 and 11.231.
10. "When e.g. Tiberius' intention is described in *Ann.* i.47 as *immotum fixumque* and we recall that the other famous use of the phrase is to describe (*Aen.* iv.15) Dido's intention never to wed again, we cannot but wonder if Tiberius' purpose will prove to be as unstable as Dido's." N.P. Miller, P.V.S. 1961-1962, 32. To this F.R.D. Goodyear replies *ad loc.*: "But T. himself uses the phrase, not Tiberius: Vergil had put it in the mouth of Dido. Again, T. clearly suggests at the end of this ch. that Tiberius pursued his policy steadfastly, for all his dissembling. And we already know that there is no reason why he should change it, since the Pannonian mutiny is over and the German mutiny near its end." On these grounds he concludes that this is not an allusion calculated to recall the original context but simply a verbal echo:
11. *isque ubi se nullo iam cursu evadere pugnae/posse neque instantem reginam avertere cernit,/consilio versare dolos ingressus et astu/incipit. Aen.* 11.702ff.
12. It should be noted that even here Tacitus thinks, to some extent, in Virgilian language. Syme comments (339, n.2) "Observe also the historian's (ostensible) depreciation of his own theme – 'nobis in arto et inglorius labor'. What he wished to suggest, but could not claim, was 'in tenui labor: at tenuis non gloria' (*Georgics* IV.6)."
13. The verb *infringere* is used once of a person by Cicero, *Att.* 7.2.2, as Goodyear notes. Koestermann cites Liv. 2.59.4, *nihil infractus...animus* which is analogous rather than strictly parallel. It is used twice of persons in the *Aeneid*. At *Aen.* 5.784, where it is applied to Juno, it is followed, vv. 785-86, by *exedissee nefandis urbem odiis*, the model for *Ann.* 2.27.1 (a parallel noted by Koestermann). It appears again at *Aen.* 12.1 in the scene between Latinus and Turnus which provided Tacitus with *praestans animi*, 12.19 (*Ann.* 6.6.2), *tanto impensius*, 12.20 (*Ann.* 3.44.4) and *adscire*, 12.38 (*Ann.* 1.3.5)
14. B. Walker, *The Annals of Tacitus: A Study in the Writing of History* (Manchester, 1960), esp. 93ff. See also D.C.A. Shotton, "The trial of M. Scribonius Libo Drusus", *Historia* 21, no.1 (1972), 88-98.
15. That other writers found Virgil's passage striking is clear from their imitations of it. In addition to *Sil.* 2.596 see also *Stat. Th.* 1.650. This same scene of revelation provides Tacitus with a striking image of total destruction in his account of the

sack of Cremona, *H.* 3.33, *cum omnia sacra profanaque in igne considerent* (cf. *Aen.* 2.6.24, *visum considerare in ignis Ilium*).

16. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Oxford, 1964) xx and xxi.
17. Note especially the reasons given for his travels, 2.54.1 and 2.59.1.

### THREE NOTES ON VIRGIL

Ite hinc, inanes, ite, rhetorum ampullae,  
inflata rhoezo non Achaico uerba;  
et uos, Selique Tarquitique Varroque,  
scholasticorum natio madens pingui,  
ite hinc, inane cymbalon iuuentutis;  
tuque, o mearum cura, Sexte, curarum,  
uale, Sabine; iam ualete, formosi.

*Catalepton* 1-7

According to Birt,<sup>1</sup> the names in line 3 are those of otherwise unknown fellow pupils of Virgil in the school of rhetoric. This view, the correct one in my opinion, has been firmly rejected by Westendorp-Boerma in his very thorough edition of the *Catalepton*; and in a recent, and good, account of Virgil's early life we find the confident statement "Varro is of course the great polymath."<sup>2</sup> It therefore seems worth while to restate Birt's arguments.

Lines 4 and 5 show clearly that the three persons belong to Virgil's school of rhetoric. *Scholasticus* is regularly used in connection with such schools; *pingui* suggests the turgid bombast of Asiatic oratory<sup>3</sup> and *inane cymbalon* its empty verbiage.<sup>4</sup> Apart from the fact that Virgil's rhetoric teacher is said in the Berne Life to have been Epidius, the context of line 3 suggests that the three were schoolboy declaimers rather than teachers, the older pupils perhaps as opposed to Sextus Sabinus and the *formosi*. Admittedly *scholasticus* can be used of teachers of rhetoric, but it can also be used of pupils, and the latter use is better attested than Westendorp-Boerma makes out.<sup>5</sup> *Inane cymbalon iuuentutis* is a difficult phrase, but Birt's "die Jugend die leeren Lärm machen" seems a more natural interpretation than Westendorp-Boerma's "quorum concentu aures discipulorum miserorum tintinnant."

If these arguments do not prove conclusive that Selius, Tarquitiu and Varro were pupils rather than teachers I would add a further point not made by Birt, that no Roman school of rhetoric had a staff of three.

### NOTES

1. *Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie Vergils*, Leipzig-Berlin 1910, pp. 72-6.

2. L.P. Wilkinson, *The Georgics of Virgil*, Cambridge 1969, p.22.
3. Cf. 'itaque Caria et Phrygia et Mysia ...asciuerunt aptum suis auribus opimum et tamquam adipatae dictionis genus.' Cicero, *Orator* 25.
4. Cf. 'an potius Asiaticorum oratorum inanis sententiis uerborum uolubilitas in nostrum sermonem transferenda?' Suetonius, *Augustus* 86.3.
5. He refers (as did Birt) to Quintilian XII.11.16; the two other examples which he gives as doubtful (Petronius 6 and Tacitus *Dialogus* 15) are perfectly clear.

-----

DAMOETAS      Phyllida mitte mihi: meus est natalis, Iolla;  
                          cum faciam uitula pro frugibus, ipse uenito.  
 MENALCAS      Phyllida amo ante alias; nam me discedere fleuit  
                          et longum 'formose, uale, uale,' inquit, 'Iolla.'

*Eclogues* III 76-9

What I believe to be the correct explanation of lines 78-9 was given long ago by Hayne: 'Menalcas ... se etiam amari ab ea dicit, quia se discedere fleuerit ac tanquam ipsi comes adhaesura Iolae amatori valedixerit, longum vale, vale, o formose Iola.' Page's "simplest explanation" (see his note on line 79) is on the same lines, but marred by some misconceptions; other editors still advance less satisfactory explanations.

Menalcas and Damoetas are to be thought of as in the country, Phyllis and Iollas as in the town. Menalcas has recently been in the town and claims that Phyllis had wept when he left and had given up his rival Iollas. There is no need to suppose with Page that Menalcas had pretended he was going and that Phyllis after bursting into tears went off with him. One can say good-bye to someone, i.e. give him up, without going away. For *uale* of dismissal compare Catullus 8.12 *uale puella* (and often in the subjunctive, *ualeat* etc.) *Longum* does not refer to a long drawn out affectionate farewell. It corresponds to the Greek πολλά or μακρά often found with χαιρεω λέγω or εἶν. When Hippolytus in Euripides's play (113) says τὴν σὴν δὲ Κύπρω πόλλ' ἐγὼ χαιρεω λέγω he means he will have nothing to do with Aphrodite. There is no difficulty about *formose*. Call it sarcastic with Page if you like; or think of it as expressing Menalcas's satisfaction at having ousted a better looking rival.

If this is right, we should punctuate not as in Mynors's text (given above) but  
et 'longum, formose, uale, uale,' inquit, 'Iolla.'

Heyne, though he did not use inverted commas, in effect has this punctuation, though it will not be found in Wagner's edition of Heyne; Wagner disagreed with Heyne's interpretation and made Phyllis's speech begin at *formose*.

-----

'Talia saecla' suis dixerunt 'currite' fusis  
concordes stabili fatorum numine Parcae.  
adgredere o magnos (aderit iam tempus) honores,  
cara deum suboles, magnum Iouis incrementum!  
aspice conuexo nutantem pondere mundum,  
terrasque tractusque maris caelumque profundum;  
aspice, uenturo laetentur ut omnia saeclo!  
o mihi tum longae maneat pars ultima uitae... *Eclogues* IV.46-53

This is the text as printed by Mynors. Some editors (Sabbadini, Fairclough, de Saint Denis, Holtorf) print 46-7 as a separate paragraph. But why should Virgil introduce the Parcae only to abandon them at once, and is there not something wrong with a paragraph of two lines? It has been supposed that the preceding paragraph (18-45) belongs to the song of the Parcae; this view is discussed and rightly rejected by Büchner.<sup>1</sup> A further suggestion is that 48-9 should be added to their song. But as Perret rightly says, lines 46-52 'forme un tout;' and this is supported by the parallelism of the seven-line sections 4-10 and 11-17 with 48-52 and 53-59.<sup>2</sup> I suggest that lines 48-52 be taken as part of the song of the Parcae, continuing their speech begun in 46. The parallel with Catullus 64, where the Parcae address Peleus as well as their spindles, seems if anything to support this suggestion. The address *cara deum suboles magnum Iouis incrementum* seems more appropriate in the mouth of divine personages than in that of the poet, as does the solemn and mysterious language of the next three lines. The words *o mihi* at the beginning of 53 appropriately mark the point where in modern printing the inverted commas would close and where the poet speaks in his own person.

M.L. CLARKE  
University College of North Wales, Bangor

#### NOTES

1. *R.E.* VIII A.I, 1201-2.
2. *Ibid.* 1196, 1202.

## A 'Quotation' from the Aeneid on the coinage of Carausius

Sir George MacDonald<sup>1</sup> observed that the earliest known 'clear example of a metrical inscription on coins' occurs thus on certain rare eleventh century Byzantine pieces: Παρθένε σοι πολύλαυε δε ἤλπικε πάντα κατορθοί. He also observed, as many others have done, that the legend EXPECTATE VENI used on certain coins issued by Carausius, usurper in Britain 286-293, is an unmistakable reminiscence of 'Quibus Hector ab oris *expectate venis?*' from the *Aeneid*.<sup>2</sup> As far as I am aware every commentator<sup>3</sup> on the coinage of this usurper sees this legend as a direct derivative from the *Aeneid* passage. Carausius' personal background, such as we can infer from hostile sources<sup>4</sup>, in no way suggests that he was himself a man versed in Roman literature. The area of his usurpation at its greatest extent was still very much on the fringe of the Empire. Whence the Vergilian influence?

Within Carausius coinage this legend occurs on a special group of silver pieces and as such must be seen in the context of other pieces in that group. ADVENTVS AUG also occurs and many scholars have seen in these two legends together a reason for dating the issue to the very beginning of the reign. Webb<sup>5</sup> rightly argues against this view, but no one seems to have considered the more likely occasion of such an issue in the middle of the reign. It is clear by inference from a contemporary source<sup>6</sup> and other evidence, that Carausius gained a significant maritime advantage over Maximian in 289 which led to the strengthening of his influence along the Gallic coast.

There is thus a historical context for these legends, ADVENTVS AUG; CONCORDIA MILITVM; FELICITAS AUG (with type of warship) ROMANO RENOVA and EXPECTATE VENI, as propaganda. How does Vergil fit into this? All the other legends had been used by various previous emperors in appropriate contexts. Where has Carausius found this new legend if not indeed in the *Aeneid*? The Vergilian context, however, hardly fits with the image Carausius was concerned to promote. Hector appears to Aeneas in a dream. He is 'maestissimus'; he weeps copiously; he bears all the marks of his suffering at the hands of Achilles. This is not the Hector of old, and when Aeneas asks him what all this means his answer bodes doom from the start, 'Heu fuge ... hostis habet muros.' Carausius' self assertive propaganda cannot have been designed to associate his ADVENTVS with that of Hector.

A consideration of various other occurrences of one or other of the forms of 'expectatus'<sup>7</sup> in classical literature shows that it is often found in association with some part of *venio* or *advenio*. I give some such passages with the relevant words underlined.

- (a) Plautus. Mostellaria 440 sq.  
Theop. Triennio post Aegypto *advenio* domum.  
Credo *expectatus* *veniam* familiaribus.  
Tran. Nimio edepol ille potuit *expectatio*  
*venire*, qui te nuntiaret mortuom.

- (b) Cicero. Ad Fam. IV. 10.  
Cura igitur, ut quam primum *venias*. *Venies*, enim, mihi, crede, *expectatus*, neque solum nobis, id est, tuis, sed prorsus omnibus.
- (c) *ibid.* X. 5.  
... ut ad me mihi *expectatissimae* literae preferrentur.
- (d) *ibid.* XVI. 7.  
... ad nos amantissimos tui *veni*. Nemo nos amat qui te non diligit. Carus omnibus, *expectatusque venies*.
- (e) *id.* ad AH. IV. 4.  
... sed ut hoc ipsum significarem, mihi tuum *adventum* suavissimum, *expectatissimumque* esse.
- (f) Hirtius. D.B.G. VIII. 51.  
Exceptus est Caesaris *adventus* ab omnibus municipiis et coloniis incredibili honore atque amore. Tum primum enim *veniebat* ab illo universae Galliae bello. Nihil relinquebatur, quod ad ornatum portarum, itinerum, locorumque omnium qua Caesar iturus erat excogitari poterat. Cum liberis omnis multitudo obviam procedebat, hostiae omnibus locis immolabantur, tricliniis stratis fora templaque occupabantur, ut vel *expectatissimi* triumphii laetitia praecipere posset.

To find ‘adventus’, ‘expectatus’ and *venire* together might, thus, seem more natural, less outstanding, and prompted by nothing more than normal Latin word association. If so why had none of Carausius’ predecessors had the same idea? Britain was far from the cultural centre of the empire but there is archaeological evidence that some of her inhabitants, at least in the fourth century, were well acquainted with the *Aeneid*. The Low Ham<sup>8</sup> mosaic illustrates a variety of scenes from the earlier books but has no inscription. A villa at Otford, in Kent has a wall painting depicting part of a scene from the *Aeneid* together with a fragmentary inscription: BINA MANV L[ATO CRISPANUS HASTILIA FERRO].<sup>9</sup> It is thought<sup>10</sup> ‘that one room at least of this villa was adorned with wall paintings illustrating the story of Aeneas, accompanied by inscribed quotations from Vergil’s text.’ There is also the mosaic in the villa at Lullingstone, in Kent, which, although it does not depict a scene from the *Aeneid*, carries an unmistakably Vergilian allusion in its inscription.<sup>11</sup> Mosaics came into fashion again quite suddenly not long after Carausius’ time: there is no reason to suppose that the *Aeneid* did likewise and indeed it seems certain that there must have been a certain British familiarity with the work long before Carausius’ usurpation.

As there seems undoubtedly to have been a third century Vergilian 'presence' in Britain, the *Aeneid* passage must have had some influence on this choice of words. On the coins it has a thoroughly unVergilian context, as Carausius' purpose was not to publicise his knowledge of Vergil but to publicise his latest success. Seen in this light it falls in with the rest of the issue.

N. SHIEL  
New University of Ulster

#### NOTES

1. G. Macdonald, 'Coin Types: Their Origin and Development BC 700-1604 AD.', P.243.
2. *Aeneid* II lines 282-283.
3. e.g. H. Mattingly *C.A.H.* Vol. XII p.333, "It is a notable fact that the only quotation from Vergil on a Roman coin occurs on the coinage of this low born Menapian rebel".
4. He is "Menapiae civis", A. Vict. Caes. XXXIX and "vilissime natus" Eutr. *Brev. Hist.* IX 21.
5. 'Roman Imperial Coinage', Mattingly and Sydenham eds., Vol. V pt. 2 pp.439-440 which also gives his ingenious but, I think, unconvincing explanation.
6. *Pan. Max. Dict.* cap. XI sq. delivered at Trèves in 289.
7. For the spelling of this word on the coins see my forthcoming article on 'The Coinage of Carausius as a Source for Vulgar Latin Forms in Britain' in *Britannia*.
8. *JRS.* XXXVI 1946 p.142 pl. 11 and J.M.C. Toynbee. "Art in Britain Under The Romans" pp.241-246: pl. LVIII.
9. *Aeneid* I 313 and XII 165.
10. cf Toynbee op. cit. p.220.
11. *ibid.* pp.263-264: pl. LXa.

## BOOK REVIEWS

P. Vergili Maronis opera, post Sabbadini et Castiglioni recensuit M. Geymonat, Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum, 1973.

This new edition by Marius Geymonat of the Sabbadini – Castiglioni text (1945–52) is a very important event in Virgilian studies. Its predecessor has for long offered the best available text, and the fullest modern apparatus criticus. Geymonat has been able to take advantage of the outstanding edition by Mynors (1969) in the *Oxford Classical Texts* series and of other contributions to the text published in periodicals during recent years; to these he gives references at the appropriate points. Consequently his apparatus criticus is very considerably enlarged compared with the previous edition. He has also added readings from some of the lesser MSS, and in controversial places has given indication of the preferences of outstanding Virgilian scholars such as Ribbeck, Sabbadini and Mynors.

Here are some important places in the *Aeneid* where it seems to me that he has rightly changed from Sabbadini's reading: 1.604 *iustitiae* for *iustitia*, 2.433 *vices Danaum* for *vices, Danaum.....*, 5.162 *cursum* for *gressum*, 6.141 *quis* for *qui*, 6.658 *lauris* for *lauri*, 6.882-3 *rumpas! tu....* for *rumpas, tu....*, 7.543 *conversa per auras* for *convexa per ardua*, 7.684 *pascis* for *pascit*, 8.108 *tacitos* for *tacitis*, 9.208 *nec fas; non ita...* for *nec fas, non: ita...* 10.366 *aquis* for *quis*, 10.714-6 transpose to follow 718, 12.541 *aeris* for *aerei*.

Here are some where I would prefer to retain Sabbadini's reading (S's reading first); 1.599 *exhaustis/exhaustos*, 2.567-88 (S. keeps the Helen episode but G. deletes it), 2.691 *augurium/auxilium*, 5.279 *mixantem/nexantem*, 5.777 and 5.778 (transposed by G.), 6.742-3 (in parenthesis in G.), 6.900 *litore/limite*, 8.223 *oculi/oculis*, 8.519 *nomine/munere*, 9.85 (deleted by G.), 10.24 *fossae/fossas*, 10.661-2 (placed after 664 in G.), 12.605 *floros/flavos*, 12.899 *illud/illum*, 12.904 *manus/manu*.

Geymonat's edition is absolutely indispensable for the serious student of Virgil. He offers a conservative text, as is appropriate for an author with so splendid a manuscript tradition as Virgil; where he differs from Sabbadini or from Mynors his reading always commands respect if not always consent; and he has given us in his ample apparatus criticus the best available conspectus of the evidence for the text of Virgil.

R.D. WILLIAMS  
University of Reading

---

'The Speeches in Vergil's *Aeneid*' by Gilbert Highet. Princeton University Press; London: Oxford University Press. 1973. 380pp. £7.25.

Characterisation in the *Aeneid* is usually presented through speeches and action, not straight description. This is an undeniable fact, but Gilbert Highet is the first scholar to

offer a comprehensive and thorough study of the speeches in the *Aeneid*. The work is, as one would expect, very competently done and shows the literary sensitivity that is a mark of all Professor Highet's writings. He classifies the speeches under three main headings – political and legalistic, factual (a category which includes prophecies, descriptions, narratives and questions), and emotional (greetings, farewells, threats and challenges, prayers, commands, persuasions, responses to persuasion, apostrophes and soliloquies). He examines the speeches put into the mouths of Aeneas, Turnus, Dido and Anchises, as well as those assigned to minor figures (the Sibyl, Sinon, Drances, Latinus, Evander, Helenus, Numanus, Ilioneus) and to the gods (Jupiter, Neptune, Juno, Venus), drawing out the implications for character which they convey. Sinon's important speech in the second book is well compared to a messenger's narrative in Greek drama; divided into four utterances which together amount to 'a single effort of deception, a lie whose head and tail are connected like those of a snake', it is of the same pattern as such narratives, interrupted as they often are by questions and comments. But the whole of this second book resembles a messenger's speech from Greek tragedy with Aeneas describing the scenes of fighting and destruction, as V. Ussani Jr. pointed out (*Maia* 3(1950), pp. 237-54), citing Aeschylus' *Persians* in particular to make his point, a consideration that could quite fitly have been placed before readers. In the final chapter Professor Highet affirms that Virgil was a poet rather than an orator: formal speeches are in fact few, and those which are emotional in tone and content are not rhetorically constructed; the traditional devices of the schools are used with discretion. Virgil's models were poets, not orators; Homer holds eloquence in high esteem, but there is no such attitude to it in Virgil. A judicious and illuminating book which excellently brings out the truly dramatic quality in the *Aeneid*.

H. MacL. CURRIE

-----

DAVID VESSEY: 'Statius and the *Thebaid*'. C.U.P., 1973; 357pp. £7.80

Students can be brought to look at Statius only with great difficulty – his crabbed text repels. And upon those who nowadays make a practice of re-vamping the classics in modern versions he seems to have made no impression, again no doubt for the same reason – which is a pity, for there is much that calls for attention in this poet whose influence upon medieval European literature was, we must recall, pervasive and deep. Dr. Vessey's aim is to demonstrate that the *Thebaid* deserves to be read, and he must be held to have achieved his object in this brilliant work.

We are, properly, warned against the effects of unregulated *Quellenforschung*, which has been a major pre-occupation of classical scholarship for more than a century, and since Dr. Vessey wrote we have had Herbert Juhnke's massive and careful 'Homerisches in römischer Epik flavischer Zeit' (Munich, 1972). Dr. Vessey urges strongly the originality of Statius, concluding *à propos* of Virgil that 'in his most striking creations Statius had no obvious or single model in Virgil'. The whole poem is seen as an elaborate and sustained

allegory of the emotions in which the extremes of human behaviour are exhibited for study. In the end virtue triumphs over sin: 'In the twelfth book a grander vision of man and his destiny is revealed. It had been foreshadowed even in the blackest moments of the story by those who had clung to *pietas* in the midst of seemingly universal depravity. ... The *Thebaid* is an epic not of sin but of redemption, a chronicle not of evil but of triumphant good.'

The relationship of Statius with Stoicism and with the Younger Seneca receives detailed attention; in fact, the structure of the *Thebaid*, Dr. Vessey well argues, can be seen as a reflection of its philosophical basis; the chain of mutually interdependent incidents is an image of the unbroken *series factorum* recounted -- an important and illuminating point.

Dante, Chaucer, Spenser and many others looked specially to Statius for inspiration, and this book will prove to have great value beyond the classical circle as well as within it. Beautifully produced (though one or two slight misprints have crept in) and with an excellent bibliography, the volume is to be warmly welcomed as a really signal contribution to learning.

H. MacL. CURRIE

#### OBITUARY NOTICES

The Virgil Society deeply regrets the loss of a number of long-standing members since the last volume of the *Proceedings* was published and will remember with particular affection and respect those who are mentioned here.

Donald R. Dudley was successively a master at Eton College, Lecturer in Classics in the University of Reading, Director of Extra-Mural Studies and Professor of Latin in the University of Birmingham. His wide literary and antiquarian interests were reflected not only in his publications on the Roman Empire, Virgil and Tacitus but also in discussions and conversations with his friends, colleagues and pupils. It was his chosen mission to bring the achievements of Rome to the notice of a wider, non-specialist audience, and he was an energetic Joint Editor of two series of publications, *Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence* and *Provinces of the Roman Empire*. He lectured to the Virgil Society in February, 1958, on 'A Plea for Aeneas', and in February, 1965, on 'Some Literary Descendants of the *Georgics*'. His friends will probably best remember him for his patience and kindness, his wisdom and wit, and cherish their impression of him as host at his home high in the Malvern Hills explaining some local antiquarian point or with merry smile recounting one of his inexhaustible fund of anecdotes.

J.J. Dwyer was a member of the Virgil Society from its earliest days. As Honorary Treasurer from 1946 until 1952 he did much to inform the Society's *ethos* and to build up its early tradition as a body with wide cultural interests that did not confine its appeal to the professional scholar or even to Latinists. His wide Catholic associations drew in many Catholics to membership in those early years, but irrespective of creed his natural courtesy in any case won the Society many friends. Most of his professional life was spent in the Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Office. He was keenly and energetically active in the interests of the Lingard Society and the Catholic Truth Society and he wrote nearly eight hundred and fifty reviews, about half of them for the *Tablet*, and numerous articles and pamphlets. At one time he also acted as Paris correspondent for the *Tablet*. After resigning from the Honorary Treasurership of the Virgil Society he remained a member of the Council until he was well over eighty. Although he was unable to attend meetings in more recent years he continued to read the *Proceedings* with great interest and to correspond with officers of the Society on the many points that interested him. As a nonagenarian with his six grandchildren and nine great-grandchildren he took pride and pleasure in being a patriarch. His passing has left us poorer, since we have lost the man and with him a generation.

T.J. Haarhoff, formerly Professor of Classics in the University of the Witwatersrand, was the Society's first Vice-President. It would be supererogatory to list his achievements as a scholar; let it suffice to say that he was one of the foremost Virgilians of his age. Besides his Classical scholarship, he was deeply interested in psychical research and made a significant contribution in that field. In his own country he was a leading figure in the academic world, always working for justice and social amelioration. Since he was rarely in Britain in the last two decades it is the Society's greatest misfortune not to have been able to welcome him to the meetings in London more than a few times. Those who were privileged to hear his address to the Society ('Vergil, Prophet of Peace') some seventeen years ago will still recall the occasion with the greatest pleasure. It is not only as a scholar that Professor Haarhoff will be remembered. Everyone who knew him must have been impressed by his humanity, generosity and personal charm, and there are many who will always remain deeply in his debt. Of him, if of anyone, it can be said that he was a Virgilian in the profoundest sense of the term.

E.V. Rieu became the Philemon Holland of this century – its 'translator general' – providing us with versions of many classical writers in a style fitting for the age. He was an early friend and patron of the Society, and his interest in our activities remained strong to the last. Those who were privileged to know him will remember a gentle, courteous man, full of wit and literature, who was sustained, as a devout Anglican, by a deep Christian faith.





