The End of the Third GEORGIC

Once again, when addressing the Virgil Society, I take my starting point from the distinguished and original work of my friend Dr. E.L. Harrison. The paper which he gave to the Society on Virgil's *Georgics* Plague in January 1977[1] has, like Topsy, grow'd, and in its Liverpool reincarnation[2] is almost as vast a thing as the geographical area over which Virgil represents the plague as raging. As one involved in lively, on-going discussion with Dr. Harrison, I have for years wrestled to disentangle my own thoughts on this highly problematic but exciting and fruitful subject.

But let the poet himself have the first words:

> non tam creber agens hiemem ruit aequore turbo
> quam multae pecudum pestes, nec singula morbi
> corpora corripiunt, sed tota aestiva repente,
> spemque gregemque simul cunctamque ab origine gentem.
> tum sciat, aerias Alpis et Norica si quis
> castella in tumulis et Iapydis arva Timavi
> nunc quoque post tanto videat, desertaque regna
> pastorum et longe saltus lateque vacantis.
>
> (470–477)

> Thicker and faster than squalls of wind that tear at the sea's face
> Come many diseases of cattle,
> Killing not one here and there, but a whole summer pasture—
> The lambs, the dams, the whole lot of them root and branch.
> You'd bear me out, if you went to look at the lofty Alps,
> The Hill forts of Noricum, the fields by Iapydian Timavus;
> It happened long ago here, but you'd see the derelict ranches
> Of sheep, old grazings empty up to the far horizon.
>
> (tr. Day Lewis,
> slightly adapted)

Let it be clear that this anthrax plague,[3] if anthrax it be—I speak as one who long ago looked out with awe over the island of Gruinard in Wester Ross—is attributed to an area of which poetic picturesqueness is surely only a very secondary characteristic. All the allusions to the Alps in Virgil, and there are seven[4] have in them an element of potential menace, notably of course in relation to the Hannibalic invasion: the word *castella* suggests not merely mountain villages but fortified positions; *tumulis* suggests not just gentle hills but burial mounds, where Romans killed on military campaigns might be buried; it might also hint at the swelling pride (*tumere*) of those tributary peoples including the Iapydes, of whom Cassius Dio tells us (49.34.2) 'even before this they had been behaving in no decent manner towards the Romans'. (οὐδὲν μέτριον ἐς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους ἔπρασσον). For, as is widely acknowledged, Octavian turned his primary attention from his great-uncle's preoccupation with Britain to the northern frontier peoples.

There can be little doubt that one of the obsessive motifs of the *Georgics* is what would ensue in the Roman world if something were to happen to Octavian. The almost over-the-top panegyric of the proem to Book I is an only slightly coded plea to Octavian, 'Don't die yet, for heaven's sake!' And, as Dio himself tells us (49.35.2), in 35 BC 'Octavian himself led the campaign against the Iapydes and overcame those on the heights with no small trouble' (τοὺς...ἐπι τῶν ἄκρων: cf. *castella in tumulis*?). But what is most significant is that these insubordinate folk laid low κατέστρωσαν, Caesar himself (...αὐτόν τε ἐκεῖνον). The verb is one mostly used of fatal wounding, in tragedy and Herodotus (see LSJ *s.v*), so here we should take quite seriously this piece of impious presumption on the part of the Iapydes, who brought Octavian down as he was trying to step from a wooden tower upon the wall of Metulum.

Nor evidently was the official view of the frontier activity a light one, for in the triple triumph of 29 BC the first of the three days celebrated Octavian's victory over the Pannonians, Dalmatians, the Iapydes and their neighbours, and a number of Germans and Gauls, the second the naval victory at Actium, and the third the subjection of Egypt (Dio 51.21.5). The Norici continued to be troublesome, in common with other Alpine tribes, until enslaved in 15 BC (Dio 54.20). It seems legitimate, therefore, to posit that the area specified within Virgil's wide-ranging geographical determinants—I am tempted to call it Hapsburg country—was meant to convey something of topical urgency to the poet's rather

special audience, and that it is foolish to underplay this, or to talk (as has been done) as if the plague took place in Northern Italy as distinct from outside the northern boundaries of Italy.

The plague is a huge tragedy, not least because innocent beasts suffer for the impiety of their masters who have, as Harrison shows[5] lost the *pax deorum*. The basic injunction of 1.338, *in primis venerare deos*, has been forgotten: the plague comes about *morbo caeli* (478) in circumstances where, in the words of Euripides, *Trojan Women* 27, 'religion is sick' (νοσεῖ τὰ τῶν θεῶν). And the consequences of this plague, as we see on looking back to 470 ff., represent at once a wiping-out like that of whole summer-camps at a stroke (*tota aestiva repente*) or the total extirpation of a doomed race (*cunctamque ab origine gentem*), like the historical Carthage, or like the sack of Troy that was to come in *Aeneid* 2, that too the immediate consequence of divine wrath, (though the role of destiny also emerges). Virgil's plague may have owed more to Lucretius 6 than to unvarnished historical fact, but the hostility to Rome of the peoples in the area where it is set certainly is historical. In this closing section then of Book 3, Virgil explores what it means to be the enemy of Rome in terms of a relationship with the Gods. We are in the presence of a sort of oblique panegyric of Octavian and of Roman values—and a warning.

For any reader who has not yet grasped that this is the background to the plague, the remarkable section on the misguided attempts of the frontiersmen to alleviate their horses' sufferings with wine shows the way:

> profuit inserto latices infundere cornu
> Lenaeos; ea visa salus morientibus una;
> mox erat hoc ipsum exitio, furiisque refecti
> ardebant ipsique suos iam morte sub aegra
> (di meliora piis erroremque hostibus illum!)
> discissos nudis laniabant dentibus artus.
>
> (509–514)

> Some use it was to insert a drenching-horn and give them
> Wine: it seemed the one thing that would restore the dying.
> But soon this remedy proved fatal; the sick revived
> Only to rave in madness till under the mortal plague

(God send better to good men, and leave to our foes that error!)
Teeth bared they savaged their own limbs and tore themselves to
shreds.
(tr. Day Lewis)

Line 510 is fascinatingly compressed: the dative *morientibus* is not to be taken, as might at first appear, as one of judging, 'this seemed to the dying the one means of salvation', but rather as dative of advantage, 'this seemed (we must understand 'in the judgment of the frontiersmen') the one means of salvation for the dying (creatures)'. Of course this assessment of the appropriateness of wine as a restorative soon turns out to have been a terrible mistake. The phrase *furiisque refecti* at 511 anticipates the figure of pale Tisiphone at 552 driving in front of her *Morbos...Metumque*. We are in the area of demonic involvement or divine retribution. I do not regard *furiis* as a faded metaphor any more than in Aeneas's demonic possession at the end of Book 12 (946 f.) *furiis incensus et ira / terribilis*. The treatment of Turnus by Juno's hellish agent Allecto in *Aeneid* 7 is an explicit instance of this. But so too, on the doors of the great temple which Virgil imagines himself dedicating to Octavian at 3.37 f.,

Invidia infelix Furias amnemque severum
Cocyti metuet.

I will show the end of rebellion, tormenting Furies,
Hell's harsh rivers...

Robert Wells excellently interprets the sense of *invidia*. For this comes in the ambit of Rome's conquered foes such as the Nile (29) and would-be conquests such as the Britons (25) and Parthians (31). There is a marvellous painting by Bronzino in the National Gallery, 'An Allegory of Time and Love', in which a figure obviously to be identified as Jealousy tears her hair on the extreme left of the composition. Bronzino could have demonstrated more practically than certain modern scholars that Virgil is here thinking in pictorial terms of *Invidia* banished to the extremes of the temple door and the proximity of the punishments meted out to such archetypal sinners as Ixion and Sisyphus. The word *infelix* is the epithet of Dido at *Aeneid* 4.450, the word

applied to an accursed tree, a childless woman or perhaps a plague-ridden land: unblessed, cursed. *Ipso facto*, therefore, ill-will to the Roman people calls forth the fear of divine retribution: ring-composition links these *furiae* at the beginning with those at the end of Book 3.

This is the moment at which to quote an admirable remark of Kenneth Quinn[6] on Virgil's poetry in general: 'The words form not a pattern but an experience in time, the order or sequence of which we are not free to meddle with. We cannot begin in the middle of a sentence and work backwards.' Precisely. Nor can we, in the time-honoured way of schoolboys and schoolgirls, begin at the end with *artus*. Whereas, if we take 511 ff. word by word, an astonishing ambiguity is experienced:

> furiisque refecti
> ardebant ipsique suos iam morte sub aegra

I translate in accordance with the head-on metaphrasing techniques which we advocate in our course 'Learning Latin':[7]

> 'and revived by the Furies they burned and themselves* ('starred' i.e. an anticipated verb) their own—('blank' i.e. an anticipated accusative plural to agree with *suos*) already close to sickly death'.

The complete sentence, which we have not yet experienced, is so appalling that the poet breaks in with his *apopompé*; very well, we get to the verb and noun at 514, but not before the possibility has flashed across our minds that we might be in the presence of something like the horror of Glaucus at 3.266 ff., whose mares, because he kept them from breeding, in *furor* prompted by Venus tore him limb from limb. The way in which the clinching word *artus* is held back to the very last keeps us guessing: with *suos* at first we might reasonably hazard such a word as *magistros*, their trainers.

Line 513 and its general tendency has long been recognised as having its didactic forerunner in Nicander's *Theriaca* 186, which treats of the poisonous bite of the asp. Snake-bites are important in more than one book of the *Georgics*, though not here, and yet the fire of the plague is analogous. But Nicander's *apopompé* in no sense interrupts the syntax of its Greek context, unlike the remarkable passage in Virgil which I have analysed. Here is Nicander, translated by Gow/Scholfield:

Thence it belches forth poison unassuageable on a body.
Be they no friends of mine whose heads these monsters assail.
For no bite appears on the flesh.

Virgil transforms this wish that the asp's bite shall not befall any friend of the poet into a highly elliptical imprecation expressed in polar fashion:

Di meliora piis erroremque hostibus illum!

The error, *errorem...illum,* is pointed to and deprecated in relation to its sequel described at 511 ff. It is a horrified authorial intervention in mid-syntax to avert this ill-omened error from the Romans on to such as are their enemies. In the contextof *furiae* and divine retribution the corollary of *pii* must be *impii,* with whom the *hostes* are to be identified. And in such a context *error* must naturally mean a disastrous error of judgment, such as ensued when Ἄτη overtakes those who are under a curse. In my last lecture to the Society[8] I suggested that Anna, as a member of the house of Belus, tragically misconstrues the divine motive in causing Aeneas to reach Carthage: significantly, she and Dido, like the frontiersmen, seek the *pax deorum* which they have lost (4.50). Equally Anna later misunderstands her sister's intentions in ordering the pyre, so that Anna unwittingly supplies Dido with the means for her suicide. Ἁμαρτία may or may not be considered at present the *mot juste* for such an error. The frontiersmen think that they are helping the suffering creatures (for the practice of the drenching-horn was known to ancient mulomedicine,[9] but in fact they are making their inevitable end all the more ghastly. Virgil averts this error of judgment, surely not the act of auto-cannibalism itself, which would be merely grotesque, as in the case of Erysichthon in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 8, on to Rome's enemies, whom we have identified. It thus seems impossible to thrust aside this interpretation of *error*, which proceeds organically from the context, in favour of Dr Harrison's forced one,[10] as if to say, 'that ritualistic blunder, cf. 531 ff.'

As for the lines 531 ff., I hope to offer an interpretation different from Harrison's, and one which proceeds more naturally from the Latin and from the content and implications of these six lines:

tempore non alio dicunt regionibus illis
quaesitas ad sacra boves Iunonis et uris
imparibus ductos alta ad donaria currus.
ergo aegre rastris terram rimantur et ipsis
unguibus infodiunt fruges montisque per altos
contenta cervice trahunt stridentia plaustra.

At no other time, or so they tell us, in those parts
Were cattle sought in vain for Juno's rites and chariots
Hauled to high votive-shrines by ill-matched urus-beasts.
Painfully men scratched at the soil with mattocks, used their
Own nails to cover the seed corn, harnessed their necks
To drag the creaking waggons over a towering hillside.
(tr. Day Lewis, slightly adapted)

This is clearly a highlighted passage: 'zweifellos der höchste Punkt den die Betrachtung erreicht', in Büchner's words.[11] Dr Harrison is creatively impatient with the traditional interpretation, namely that these lines 'merely add more detail'. 'Or how,' he asks, 'can the actual availability of buffaloes, however ill-matched, possibly explain why men have to pull carts themselves?' His solution is[12] to take 531 ff., in sequel to his interpretation of *error* examined above, as a description of the original offence against the goddess Juno. He is thus obliged to take *quaesitas* as indicating negligence in the search and (dare I say it of my friend?) with comparable negligence to understand *uris* as any old buffaloes. The Norici, he believes—I prefer the term 'frontiersmen' as embracing Iapydes and others—at this very time, just prior to the plague, had not bothered scrupulously to fulfil their ritual obligations to the goddess. *Hinc illae lacrimae*!

I do not believe that 531–3 refer to the cause of the plague. But let me do honour to R.D. Williams by quoting from his commentary his lucid and judicious account of the traditional view: 'The meaning is that never before had it been impossible to find appropriate cows for the sacrifice to Juno, so that wild cattle, *uri*, which did not match each other, had to be used as offerings.' I would risk the speculation that the fact that the creatures which they did manage to find did not match would in itself have constituted flawed ritual and thus a secondary offence to Juno: the wrong creatures, not ritually matched. But there

is more to it than this.

At 2.374 Virgil describes how *silvestres uri* and nagging wild goats make sport of vines; W. Richter in his commentary attempts to distinguish between the creatures in Book 2 and those in Book 3 on account of the adjective *silvestres*. Of that more in a moment.

Urus is (according to Macrobius 6.4) a Celtic loan-word denoting the aurochs. Richter, having already declared that Virgil's two references in the *Georgics* refer to two different creatures, further asserts that in neither place can he be referring to the aurochs, which lived only north of the Danube. Now this word *urus* occurs only once in extant Latin before our poet, in Caesar, *de Bello Gallico* 6.28, in an extraordinary catalogue of the wild beasts (including unicorns) that frequent the vast Hercynian Forest, stretching from the Helvetii in the West along the Danube as far as the Dacians in the East. E.H. Warmington[13] assures us that it was not until the exploratory campaigns of Tiberius and Drusus that the *Hercynia silva* was clearly distinguished from the Alps. Its relevance to our present enquiry is thus clear. For the adjective *silvestres* at 2.374 may be seen as an allusion to the provenance of these exotic creatures: the 'Foreign Lands Theme', as L.P. Wilkinson has shown,[14] is an important one in the *Georgics*. And if at 3.406 ff.

> numquam custodibus illis
> nocturnum stabulis furem incursusque luporum
> aut impacatos a tergo horrebis Hiberos
>
> You'll never need to fear
> Robbers by night in your cattle-pens or a raid of wolves
> Or Spanish brigands creeping up behind you, while they (dogs)are
> on guard (tr. Day Lewis),

why then should exotic *uri* not threaten your vines?

It is time now to examine the Caesar passage in detail:

> Tertium est genus eorum qui uri appellantur. hi sunt magnitudine paulo infra elephantos, specie et colore et figura tauri. magna vis eorum est et magna velocitas; neque homini neque ferae quam conspexerunt parcunt. hos studiose foveis captos interficiunt; hoc se labore durant adulescentes atque hoc genere

> venationis exercent, et qui plurimos ex his interfecerunt, relatis in publicum cornibus quae sint testimonio, magnam ferunt laudem. sed assuescere ad homines et mansuefieri ne parvuli quidem excepti possunt. amplitudo cornuum et figura et species multum a nostrorum boum cornibus differt. haec studiose conquisita ab labris argento circumcludunt atque in amplissimis epulis pro poculis utuntur.
>
> Caesar, *de Bello Gallico* 6.28

> A third species is the aurochs, an animal somewhat smaller than the elephant, with the appearance, colour, and shape of a bull. They are very strong and agile, and attack every man and beast they catch sight of. The natives take great pains to trap them in pits and then kill them. This arduous sport toughens the young men and keeps them in training; and those who kill the largest number exhibit the horns in public to show what they have done, and earn high praise. *It is impossible to domesticate or tame the auroch, even if it is caught young.* The horns are much larger than those of our oxen, and of quite different shape and appearance. The Germans prize them greatly; and they mount their rims with silver and use them as drinking-cups at their grandest banquets.
>
> (tr. S.A. Handford)

The italicized sentence is the one in which I believe that the key to Virgil's intention is contained. Was it Conington who gave this whole passage the kiss of death when he wrote (on 2.374 f.) 'The *urus* was properly a wild animal mentioned by Caesar and Pliny. Here and in 3.532 the name is applied to the buffaloes of Italy (*sic*).'

But if we sustain the logically economical possibility that the creature in question in Virgil's plague-stricken Alpine area and in Caesar's Alpine forest is one and the same, the consequences are stunning! *Tempore non alio*: Conington translates, 'This was the first time'. I would go further and say, 'This was the first and only time'. It is what we northern Scots call an 'unco': a story told, compare *dicunt* (531), of something wonderful or uncanny. Conington parallels, without going into ungentlemanly details, the unique display the mermaids gave to the Argonauts when the first ship so amazed them that they stood right

up out of the water:

> illa atque <haud> alia viderunt luce marinas
> mortales oculis nudato corpore Nymphas
> nutricum tenus exstantes e gurgite cano.
>
> (Catullus 64.16 ff.)

The unique and unprecedented happening is that, in the desperation produced by the plague, these rebellious, self-indulgent frontiersmen went far afield into the forest and succeeded in capturing and yoking the untameable. No wonder that they were *impares*: the nicety of exact pairing would hardly have been open to their captors on this unparalleled occasion. What they did they did for Juno, but it was too late, and flawed, and did them no good. I would like to call this an ἀριστεία on their part; it is a mark of Virgil's art, as Austin showed,[15] that he can afford to evoke sympathy or even admiration for what in his final judgment is discarded or condemned. These frontiersmen and their terrible plague belong in the company of such as Dido and Turnus. For these desperadoes succeeded in an *adynaton*.

> ante leves ergo pascentur in aethere cervi,
> et freta destituent nudos in litore piscis,
> ante pererratis amborum finibus exsul
> aut Ararim Parthus bibet aut Germania Tigrim,
> quam nostro illius labatur pectore vultus.
>
> (*Eclogue* 1.59–63)

> Sooner shall lightfoot stags go grazing on thin air,
> Or the sea contract, leaving its fishes high and dry;
> Sooner the Germans and the Parthians, migrating
> Across each other's frontiers, drink of each other's broad
> Rivers, than I'll forget the look that young prince gave me.
>
> (tr. Day Lewis)

So sang Tityrus, beyond reasonable doubt of Octavian. Perhaps Virgil tended to think of the Julian family in terms of *adynata*. That achieved by the frontiersmen, according to the argument advanced above, took place some while before the poet wrote: cf. *nunc quoque post tanto* (475).

Recalling the campaigning of 35 BC we see that unspecified representatives of these folk in general yoked the untameable sooner than the Iapydes and other tribes in particular were able to overwhelm Octavian, for it was in fact quite the reverse: it was he, this *divi filius*, who overcame them, he, hostility to whom and to Rome was commensurate with neglect of the old Italian goddess Juno Regina—or her Alpine equivalent—and marked these frontiersmen with *impietas*.

The information which Julius gives about the *uri* is contained in a context where he sees (i.e. reads) that the Alexandrian scholar Eratosthenes, the founder of systematic geography, and certain Greeks knew of the *Hercynia Silva* by report:

> ...Hercyniam silvam (quam Eratostheni et quibusdam Graecis fama notam esse video, quam illi Orcyniam appellant).
>
> (*de Bello Gallico* 6.24)

In other words, this is a 'learned' reference, entirely in place in Virgil's 'didactic' poem, but, most important of all, it reiterates the link between Octavian and his great-uncle. This link has already been made in the corresponding part of Book 1, where the portents announcing the murder of Julius and hideous civil war are offset by the great prayer to the *di patrii* at 500 f. to spare Octavian to save the world and be the man of the *saeclum*:

> hunc saltem everso iuvenem succurrere saeclo
> ne prohibete...

There are a few details of interpretation to clear up before I proceed finally to a possible triumphal motif.

Richter holds that *quaesitas* means 'sought with difficulty (but found)'. The use of cows for sacrifice to Juno/Hera is set against the use of bullocks for drawing the processional waggon, a Greek thing from the Hera cult. Cows, Richter says, never pull such waggons. But what held good for the Greco-Roman world need not apply to the Alpine regions. Indeed Tacitus (*Germania* 40), writing of the Germans' devotion to Nerthus says, 'The priest can feel the presence of the goddess in his holy of holies, and attends her, in deepest reverence, as her car is drawn by kine (*bubus feminis*).' (tr. H. Mattingly). Therefore, to make a disjunc-

tion between *boves* and *uris* in 532, instead of regarding the second as a substitute for the first, simply because cows were not used in the Greco-Roman world for religious processions, seems to me misleading and unnecessary.

Francis Cairns has suggested to me that Virgil may be establishing something akin to a Homeric Question in regard to the exact identity of the *urus*; Servius on 2.374 seems to draw on Caesar's information: *sunt autem exceptis elephantis maiores animalibus ceteris*; he continues in a way confirming the Homeric Question idea: *dicti uri* ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέων *id est a montibus*. The interpretation of Gary B. Miles,[16] that bears (*sic*) instead of cows had to pull the processional chariots to the temple of Minerva (*sic*), is too novel for my taste: it would need a Housman or a Jocelyn to do justice to it. There is no textual justification for *ursis* instead of *uris* known to Geymonat: he who runs does not always read accurately.

But when we survey the evidence for *uri*, when we read of their elephantine proportions, of their fierceness, and contemplate their huge horns in Count Herberstein's representation of the creature which died out in 1627 (reproduced by Otto Keller[17])

how is it possible to say with Harrison[18], 'they used inferior beasts...'? I cannot accept this or his taking *quaesitas* as if it were *non conquisitas, parum quaesitas*, a kind of imperfect participle passive, if such existed. In the sense of *requisitas*, sought in vain, all is well.

There remain the difficulties of 534. *ergo* now, in the light of the

above account of the *uri*, does not have to be taken, as Harrison deprecatingly took it, in reference to the traditional view, of men having to pull the carts themselves in consequence of the actual availability of buffaloes (*sic*). Sir Roger Mynors, in a generous preview of his much-awaited commentary, translates beautifully, 'No wonder...'. There are no domestic cattle surviving the plague; the desperadoes have made their supreme effort in yoking the *uri*, and it has failed. No wonder they have to assume the tasks of the beasts themselves. Unlike Dr Harrison[19] I do not see *contenta cervice* (536) as ironical punning: these people are now under the yoke themselves, a symbol of their eventual subjugation to Rome. It is well to remember the speech which Octavian made before Actium, according to Dio (50.28 tr. Scott-Kilvert): 'You who are serving with me here fought valiantly against the Taurisci, the Iapydes, the Dalmatians and the Pannonians, and often it was only to take a few walls and a patch of barren soil. You subdued all these tribes, although they are among the most warlike opponents in the world.' Yes, they were no pushover, but now they pull carts—in Virgil's poem at least—up their steep mountainsides.

I spoke of a possible triumphal motif. Both Suetonius (*Augustus* 43) and Dio (51.22) stress Octavian's lavish shows of exotic beasts. In the sequence of ceremonies following the triple triumph 'a rhinoceros and a hippopotamus were seen in Rome for the first time...the rhinoceros, which is less familiar, resembles the elephant in some respects.' He might almost be describing the *urus*. Hannibal had his elephants, the Alpine tribesmen their *uri*; elephants were associated as draught-animals with Dionysus, other gods and semi-divine rulers. Augustus is shown on a *denarius* of 18 BC on a *biga* of elephants.[20] All the more does what the Alpine tribesmen did for Juno seem an exemplary effort.

With her admirable lucidity Miss Jocelyn Toynbee[21] does not turn the *urus* into an Italian buffalo, nor confuse it, like Martial (*de Spectaculis* 23.3) with the *bubalus*, an African antelope. The *urus*, with the *vison*, bison, with which it was more understandably confused (as having much in common, see Keller *l.c.*), yielded to Carpophorus, the celebrated *venator* described by Martial. Virgil already appreciated the imaginative appeal of such a creature and he did something remarkable with it in the Third *Georgic*.

JONATHAN FOSTER
University of Liverpool

NOTES

1. *PVS* 16 (1976–77) 9 ff.
2. *PLLS* 2 (1979) 1 ff.
3. E. Flintoff, *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* N.S. 13.1 (1983) 85 ff.
4. The others are: *Georg.* 1.475: *insolitis tremuerunt motibus Alpes* (among the portents attending Caesar's assassination); *Aen.* 10.11 ff.: *adveniet...tempus / cum fera Karthago Romanis arcibus olim / exitium magnum atque Alpis immittet apertas* (Jupiter discloses 'classified' information at a council of the gods); *Aen.*4.442: *Alpini Boreae* (Aeneas compared to an ancient oak tree buffeted by winds); *Ecl.*10.47: *Alpinas...nives* (Lycoris without Gallus); *Aen.*6.830: *Alpinis...aggeribus* (Caesar in the Civil War), *Aen.*8.661 f.: *Alpina...gaesa* (weapons of the invading Gauls in 390 (or 387) BC.
5. 1979, 25 f.
6. 13th Jackson Knight Memorial Lecture, Exeter, 1980, 4.
7. *Learning Latin*, an Introductory Course for Adults by John G. Randall in collaboration with J.C.B. Foster and D.F. Kennedy, Liverpool, 1986.
8. *PVS* 13 (1973–74) 35 f.
9. Sir Roger Mynors kindly supplies me with a reference to wine as a stimulant for horses, Columella 6.30.1: a horn is used for administering wine to oxen, *id.* 6.2.7.
10. 1979, 27 f.
11. *RE* II.VIIIA.3.1301.
12. 1979, 37.
13. *OCD* (2nd edn) *s.v.*
14. *The Georgics of Virgil, a Critical Survey*, Cambridge, 1969, 67, 77 etc.
15. Introduction to his Commentary on *Aeneid* 4, xiv, quoting L.C. Knights, *Scrutiny* xvi (1949) 322 on *Antony and Cleopatra.*
16. *Virgil's Georgics, a New Interpretation*, Berkeley, 1980, 221.
17. *Die Antike Tierwelt*, Leipzig, 1909–13, 342, fig. 120.
18. 1976–77, 14.
19. *ibid.*
20. *CREBM* 1.75.432.
21. *Animals in Roman Life and Art* <London> 1973, 148 f.