

ISSN: 0968-2112



The
PROCEEDINGS
of the
VIRGIL SOCIETY

VOLUME XXII
1996

ISSN: 0968-2112

The
PROCEEDINGS
of the
VIRGIL SOCIETY

VOLUME XXII
1996

Copyright © 1996 The Virgil Society

Published by the Virgil Society,
c/o Professor M.M. Willcock,
Department of Latin,
University College London,
Gower Street,
London WC1E 6BT
England

Typeset by Ernest Buckley, Clunton, Shropshire

Printed in Great Britain by
Anthony Rowe Ltd, Chippenham, Wiltshire

Contents

	Page
H.H. Huxley	1
‘Wielder of the stateliest measure’ (Jubilee Presidential Address)	
A.S. Hollis	19
Virgil’s Friend Varius Rufus	
D.P. Fowler	35
God the Father (himself) in Virgil	
Niall Rudd	53
Virgil’s Contribution to Pastoral	
Sandra Clark	79
Virgil, Shakespeare, and Romance	
Jonathan Foster	101
Some Interactive Instances of the Hero’s Name in the <i>Aeneid</i>	
Reviews	107
<i>Vergil: a census of printed editions 1469–1500</i>	
<i>Across Bin Brook</i>	
Books Received	110
<i>Pentekontaetia</i> : Addenda and Corrigenda	111

Volume 22 of *The Proceedings of the Virgil Society* was edited by Jonathan Foster, MA, B.PHIL, Senior lecturer in Classics, University of Liverpool, assisted by Joe Meltzer, BA, MA, formerly Head of English, Valentine’s High School, Ilford, and Sixth Form Latin teacher at the Latymer School, Edmonton.

Contributions on Virgilian topics are welcomed, and may be submitted to the Editor for consideration.

‘Wielder of the stateliest measure’

*The Jubilee Presidential Address was given to the
Virgil Society on 8 May 1993*

Stultum facit Fortuna quem vult perdere.

So Publilius Syrus; or, should you prefer a version better known, though of dubious Latinity:

quem Deus vult perdere, dementat prius.

Fortune, in the shape of the Virgil Society, offered me its presidency. When from the *fortunata nemora* the voice of an old friend who worthily held that office from 1949–50 whispered the admonitory initial spondee *demens*, ears had I and heard not. Consequently your fate is to listen to a Lord High Substitute:

A public hackney of the schooling trade,
Who feeds a pupil’s intellect with store
Of syntax truly, but with little more.

Eventually I settled upon the title of my discourse, oblivious of the fact that it had been selected before, and that too by someone whom I knew and admired when I was active in the Association for the Reform of Latin Teaching. It was Dennis Blandford, *egregie cordatus homo*, who not only mentioned the address given by F.R. Dale on 8th March 1952 but also generously presented me with a copy. Mr Dale’s subtitle was ‘Form and Colour in Virgil’. The meaning of ‘form’ is beyond dispute, but to elucidate the word ‘colour’ I must quote F.R.D.: ‘As a phrase in music is coloured differently as the same notes are played by a flute or violin,

H.H. HUXLEY

so the hexameter is coloured differently, according to the vowels or consonants used, singly or grouped, in contrast and change, in echo and repetition.' Of colour I shall say nothing, but no enthusiast for Virgil can keep silent about form.

Tennyson's poem, published in *Nineteenth Century*, September 1882, was the answer to a request from the Vergilian Academy of Mantua sent on 23rd June of the same year. It consists of twenty extremely long trochaic lines which rhyme in couplets monosyllabically: fire/pyre, Days/phrase, herd/word, bowers/flowers, be/sea, Mind/kind, shore/more, dome/Rome, place/race and began/man. Each complete line has seventeen syllables, and there is always a diaeresis after the first four trochees.

Possibly the number seventeen has some significance, for in a dactylic hexameter consisting of five dactyls followed by a spondee there are seventeen syllables. However, as (to modify Jeremy Taylor) every school-boy used to know, spondees may be substituted in feet 1, 2, 3 and 4 (Catullus 116.3—*qui te lenirem nobis, neu conarere* has six spondees), the syllabic count may be as low as thirteen. If we take elision and other metrical ploys into account, there may be more than twenty syllables in a single line. Clearly then the variation in respect of syllables between one Virgilian line and another may exceed 30%. This factor alone makes Professor Bush's remark, 'the rolling trochaic lines suggest something of the sound of the Virgilian hexameter', rather less than convincing.

If we consider separately the first half of the Tennysonian line, 'Roman Virgil, thou that singest', we have the metre of the Finnish *Kalevala*, employed by Longfellow in *Hiawatha* thirty-one years before *To Virgil*. Dodgson's glorious parody begs to be quoted:

From his shoulder Hiawatha
Took his camera of rosewood,
Made of sliding, folding rosewood;
Neatly put it all together.

Now in the *Kalevala* great attention is paid to alliteration. This we observe again and again in Tennyson: 'Landscape-lover, lord of language', 'Thou that singest wheat and woodland', 'All the charm of all the Muses' and 'Poet of the poet-satyr'.

The first two words, 'Roman Virgil', derive, as every classicist knows, from Petronius's insistence that *sententiae* should shine with a brilliancy

woven into the material (*Satyricon* 118). 'To this Homer bears witness, and the lyric poets, and Roman Virgil, and the studied felicity of Horace' (*Homerus testis et lyrici Romanusque Vergilius et Horatii curiosa felicitas*).

One much admired line, 'Landscape-lover, lord of language', has an unfortunate link with another Tennysonian poem, *The Lord of Burleigh*, the odd lines of which (and the poem, one hundred lines long, has more than its fair share of odd lines) are in the metre of *Hiawatha*. It begins like this:

In her ear he whispers gaily,
 'If my heart by signs can tell,
Maiden, I have watched thee daily,
 And I think thou lov'st me well.'
She replies, in accents fainter,
 'There is none I love like thee.'
He is but a landscape-painter,
 And a village maiden she.

Here is the sad ending (notice how the uneven lines rhyme):

Then her people, softly treading,
 Bore to earth her body drest
In the dress that she was wed in
 That her spirit might have rest.

It is hardly surprising that this gem is quoted *in toto* in that excellent collection of bad verse, *The Stuffed Owl*, by D.B. Wyndham Lewis and Charles Lee.

After 'Landscape-lover, lord of language' comes a strange line:

more than he that sang the Works and Days.

In this verse I have no idea what part of speech the word 'more' is. How would Benjamin Hall Kennedy have put it into Latin? In 1887 a translation of *To Virgil* was made by W.G. Williams. The metre he chose for his version was the greater Sapphic of Horace, *Odes* 1.8, in which a line of seven syllables is followed by one of fifteen—a rough approximation to Tennyson's scheme. Unfortunately, on my last visit to the University

H.H. HUXLEY

Library I was unable to wait for this rare item to be located and brought to me. It would have been instructive to see what a scholar so close to the Laureate's own time understood by the teasing word 'more'.

The first line of the final couplet rings with many echoes:

I salute thee, Mantovano,
I that loved thee since my day began.

The title 'Mantovano' forms a deliberate link between Virgil, Dante (especially *Purgatorio* VI), and Tennyson. As for the second half of the line, Peter Levi (*Tennyson*, 1993, p. 48) remarks that William Whewell, his Tutor at Trinity (later, of course, Master), 'winked benignly' at Tennyson when the latter read Virgil during his lectures on mathematics. The reference to Mantua draws one straight to Virgil in the *Eclogues*:

Mantua vae miserae nimium vicina Cremonae. (9.28)

the *Georgics*:

primus Idumeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas. (3.12)

and the *Aeneid*:

*Mantua, dives avis, sed non genus omnibus unum:
gens illi triplex, populi sub gente quaterni.* (10.201–2)

and that sublime five-word line with its third repetition of the emotionally-charged word 'Italy':

Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant. (3.524)

Perhaps when I, no professional English scholar, presume to argue that Tennyson could have done better things for Virgil, I am to some extent donning the garb of *advocatus diaboli*. Hear Peter Levi, whom we are fortunate to have as our new President of the Virgil Society. 'His poem...is a dazzling achievement' (op. cit. p. 304), 'The Mantuans asked for a scribble and got a masterpiece' (ibid.), 'It is remarkably glorious,

and if there is a touch of Swinburne that is all to the good.' (ibid. p. 305).

Tennyson seems to me to have been more at ease in eulogising Catullus. We respond with immediate warmth to such lines as:

Row us out from Desenzano, to your Sirmione row!
So they rowed, and there we landed—*O venusta Sirmio!*

a fitting tribute to that 'tenderest of Roman poets nineteen hundred years ago', whose hendecasyllabics he deftly imitated in such verses as:

Look, I come to the test, a tiny poem
All composed in a metre of Catullus,
All in quantity, careful of my motion,
Like the skater on ice that hardly bears him

Hard, hard, hard is it, only not to tumble,
So fantastical is the dainty metre.

Horace, of course, together with Milton, was celebrated in that astonishing Alcaic ode which so brilliantly mirrors the Roman verse-form:

O mighty-mouthed inventor of harmonies,
O skilled to sing of Time or Eternity,
God-gifted organ-voice of England,
Milton, a name to resound for ages.

So much for Tennyson's tributes to Virgil, Catullus and Horace; but some of the noblest lines he ever penned are reserved for that great precursor of Virgil, the *vates*, *qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*:

The Gods! and if I go *my* work is left
Unfinished—*if* I go. The Gods who haunt
The lucid interspace of world and world;
Where never creeps a cloud, or moves a wind,
Nor ever falls the least white star of snow,
Nor ever lowest roll of thunder moans,
Nor sound of human sorrow mounts to mar
Their sacred everlasting calm!

H.H. HUXLEY

Perhaps some day an English poem truly worthy of Virgil will be composed in his honour, something in the stark idiom of these troubled times, before this hope-destroying century has run its unhappy course.

In front of me is a typed list of the eighteen Presidents who held office before me, and their qualifications intensify my feeling that in this race I am a non-starter. Lord Dacre of Glanton prefaced his address with the confident assertion 'I know why I am here, or at least why I was invited here'. Setting aside a radio programme in which the great and the good are invited *inter alia* to choose a book they would most like to possess if marooned on a desert island, let us stress the fact that Lord D. was singing his palinode for having long ago, as an officer in the Secret Intelligence Service, described Virgil as 'a cissy poet'. I do not think—nor, I feel sure, do you—that he was alluding obliquely to the *cognomen* 'Parthenias' mentioned in the *Vita Servii*.

The choice of your present speaker is no mystery to those of you who are well stricken in age and addicted to the Savoy Operas. If your knee-jerk reaction to 'Lady Jane' is 'Lovejoy', and you know only the surname of our irreplaceable Membership Secretary, please ignore the quotation that follows:

Do not dally too long, Malcolm, for my charms are ripe,
Malcolm, and already they are decaying.
Better secure me ere I have gone too far!

Of course I am conscious of the minuscule contribution I may make to the Society. I bear some resemblance to a zany character in *David Copperfield*, Betsy Trotwood's Mr Dick. While he was afflicted by the mistake that was made of putting some of the trouble out of King Charles's head into his own, my cranium was in early youth penetrated by a barrage of minute pieces of shrapnel in the fantastic shapes of dactyls, anapaests, tribrachs, choriambes and, it was feared, the occasional paraceusmatic. Consequently, like a superannuated employee of British Gas, I have derived my principal pleasure in life from examining metres. This study has been interrupted frequently by attempts to assemble these metrical fragments into different verse-forms. Nor do I complain about a pathological condition which first showed itself when I was about thirteen. If one cannot be a fox, I would settle for being a hedgehog.

Πόλλ' οἶδ' ἀλώπηξ ἀλλ' ἔχινος ἔν μέγα. (Archilochus, *OBGV* 113)

Thanks to the wisdom of our Mancunian ushers we were obliged now and then to turn Greek verse into Latin, though we were never trusted to Latinise Homer. Alas, how frustrating we found the exercise of turning Greek epigrams into Ovidian couplets! Two problems demanded solution: (1) our apprentice dactyls must embrace as much as possible of the Hellenic original; (2) we must identify the essential elements of the poem and avoid falsification of its message. Statyllius Flaccus' brilliant two-line epigram about the would-be suicide who finding gold throws away his noose (*OBGV* 597) illustrates this point perfectly. The core words are two, 'gold' and 'noose'.

Shelley spun this out to eight lines, completely misunderstanding the genius of the author and gratuitously clothing the naked Greek in an unwanted philosophical overcoat:

Fortune is God—all you endure and do
Depends on circumstance as much as you.

A recent issue of *C.A. News* published a prize-winning version of the epigram by a Balliol scholar who has delighted Latinists with a splendid version of Betjeman's 'Joan Hunter Dunn'. But where's the noose? It has been transmogrified into a sword! Now *ense* is a godsend to a composer who wants to put a third-singular verb before it, but it is nonsensical in the dramatic context. If one wanted to retain possession of a fortune dubiously acquired, the means of defence is the last thing a man would jettison. Besides, classical literature abounds with hanging as the obvious method of ending one's life. Epicaste (= Jocasta), Antigone and Arachne spring to the mind. And who has expressed the sheer horror of the disfigurement better than Virgil, whose *Amata nodum informis leti trabe nectit ab alta* (*Aen.* 12.603)?

We all recognise that we are living in a world where Latin is struggling desperately to stay alive, and as for Greek the scholar who 'settled *Hoti*'s business' and 'properly based *Oun*' is *rara avis in terris nigroque simillima cycno* (*Juv.* 6.165).

In 1993 we must evangelize and welcome to our Virgil Society as valued and equal members not just the chosen few who lapped up Latin almost with their mother's milk, but those who have been guided to

H.H. HUXLEY

Mantua by Dryden, Day Lewis, Mandelbaum or David West. No less must we take steps to ensure that those lucky enough to read Homer and Virgil in the original tongues continue to aim at linguistic perfection.

I return to the *multum in parvo* aspect of Greek verse, and remind you of the much-loved translation of Callimachus (*Epigram 2*) by the author of the *Eton Boating Song*, the Etonian and Kingsman William Johnson Cory (1823–92), the centenary of whose death was last year.

They told me, Heraclitus, they told me you were dead;
They brought me bitter news to hear and bitter tears to shed.
I wept as I remember'd how often you and I
Had tired the sun with talking and sent him down the sky.

Cory's first two lines represent seven dactylic feet, ten words in all, of which four are monosyllabic. The next two lines correspond to eight feet. The whole translation covers exactly two and two-thirds lines of the Greek. In the first two verses only one word—'Heraclitus'—is common to Greek and English. Forty-four English words are needed to represent eighteen in Callimachus.

My obsession with metre and prosody goes back over sixty years, and was triggered by the study of *Aeneid 9* and Euripides' *Andromache* for matriculation. In the latter work I was both puzzled and fascinated by the fourteen elegiac lines delivered before the chorus enters. How many metres, I wondered, must a tragic poet have at his command? Our sixth-form master, who was at school and college with H.D.F. Kitto, had two literary loves, Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb* and Veitch's *Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective*. In the early nineteen-thirties it seemed to us no chore but a pleasure to commit to memory long passages of whatever we happened to be studying, Chaucer and Milton, Goethe and Grillparzer, Burke and Cicero, Ovid and Virgil. Across the Atlantic the scales fell from my eyes, as they did from Saul's, and before a middle-aged English swine were cast pearls of the new wisdom: 'only kids learn things by heart' and 'we finished grammar before we graduated from high school'. 'It is only in childhood', said my teacher T.R. Glover, 'that one has the opportunity, or perhaps the faculty, of learning much poetry by heart, and I would give a good deal now to have had my own mind charged from boyhood with Virgil and Wordsworth.'

My fondness for prosody, encouraged by the critics of my verse

compositions, T.R. Glover, E.E. Sikes and M.P. Charlesworth, received fresh impetus from an unexpected source, a course of lectures (useless for the tripos!) on 'The Latin Hexameter'. The lecturer, Algernon Paul Sinker, was later knighted, for services, I think, to coal rather than to classics. As Sinker's time-scale included the middle ages, we marvelled at the transformations of Virgil, Horace, Ovid and Juvenal in later ages.

In 1936 St John's was enriched by the arrival from K.E.S. Birmingham (a school productive of classicists such as Donald Dudley, Enoch Powell and Michael Reeve) of Robert Deryck Williams, an endearing and often Tiggerish personality, who believed no punt was adequately furnished which lacked a copy of Page's red Macmillan Virgil. We kept in close touch throughout his sadly-foreshortened life, on which I should like to say a little more.

*atque animum nunc huc celerem, nunc dividit illuc
in partisque rapit varias perque omnia versat.*

(*Aen.* 4.285–6)

These lines describe admirably the tumult in the mind of Roland Austin as he pondered the grave step of entrusting a volume of the Oxford Virgil to a scholar from 'the other place'. What could be spared? One cannot help think of the dilemma posed by the Syrophenician woman in Mark 7.26 ff. R.G.A. conceded *Aeneid* 5 (published in 1960) and *Aeneid* 3 followed two years later.

In one of Deryck's many rousing addresses he paid tribute to his classical mentors, and with touching humility recalled a time when his grasp of hexameter technique was less sure. The form, studying *Aeneid* 4 came to:

*litora litoribus contraria, fluctibus undas
imprecor, arma armis* (628–9)

To the sensible question 'Why could not Virgil have written *fluctibus fluctus*?' an answer must have been given explaining the strict laws of quantity and syllabification. In conjunction with *litora litoribus* and *arma armis*, *fluctibus undas* is strikingly out of kilter. The literary trope of polyptoton is favoured by many poets—*arboris arbor*, *carmine carmen*, *dextera dextrae*, *ensibus enses*, *funere funus*, *ignibus ignes* etc.—

H.H. HUXLEY

particularly in the last two feet. Had Virgil been writing in the language of Homer κύματι κῶμα or κύματα κύμασι would have sprung to mind. But he was not, and the *patrii sermonis egestas* of which Lucretius thrice complains set Virgil many similar problems.

Austin's comment 'Lucretius could have written *fluctibus fluctus*' seems cogent until one examines Lucretian practice in polyptoton at the line-ending and discovers that he favours endings (e.g. *aetheraque aether*) just like those of Virgil. Moreover he never suppresses the final 's' when the fifth foot begins with a double consonant. For example, though he does end a verse with *structas*, as the word before it is *pendentibu'* the fifth foot begins with a single consonant 'd'. Stephen Instone, himself no mean composer, has suggested to me *et aestibus aestus*; to this there are two objections, (1) Virgil only once has *aestibus* (*Geo.* 3.331), where it means 'heat', (2) a stronger argument—it destroys the asyndeton. My own attempts to keep the threefold asyndeton hinged on the sequence *fluctus | fluctibus, arma armis* and were cogitated just before I fell asleep. The cruel morning light revealed the forgotten rock *imprecor* which wrecked my hopes. One of the many benefits accruing from the practice of verse-composition is that one can begin to discern the subtlety of Virgil's solutions to metrical problems.

One Virgilian problem which defies solution is the identification of *tibicines* or 'props' in the *Aeneid*. How many are there? Where are they? Which show the hand of Virgil and which do not? Even Presidents of our Society may differ on the key question 'Is the *Aeneid* a finished poem?' 'It does contain stop-gaps,' says one, R.D. Williams, *The Aeneid* (1987) p. 3 (paraphrased) 'which fall short of Virgil's usual standard of excellence; it does also have minor inconsistencies in chronology and attribution of prophecies. But in no sense is it an unfinished poem.' 'In fact,' says another, W.F. Jackson Knight, *Roman Vergil* (1966) pp. 294–5, 'there have survived in the poem a number of lines whose flabby phrasing seems to mark them as metrical props or makeshifts, as well as a number of lines that are metrically incomplete. We are reminded here that the *Aeneid* in the state in which Virgil left it at his death had still three whole years of work to be done upon it.'

To cloud the issue further, it is not easy to define exactly what constitutes a Latin hexameter. To the six-spondee line of Catullus we have already referred. Fordyce (*Catullus*, p. 404) says that this is the only hexameter of this type found outside Ennius. He might have added

that *Odyssey* 15.344 exhibits a similar freak for which a late grammarian coined the epithet 'holospondeius'. Here it is:

σίτου καὶ κρειῶν ἤδ' οἴνου βεβρίθασιν.

As it means 'The well-polished tables are groaning with their weight of bread and meat and wine', the solemn procession of spondees may underline the sense. However, it is conceivable that Homer never meant to eschew dactyls and that he lightened two of the nouns by resolution. As Catullus could not possibly have done this, would a court of the Nine Muses have recognised the legitimacy of this offspring?

A leap forward of some two thousand years from Homer would bring us to the monk Bernard of Cluny penning the delights of Heaven:

*Hora novissima, tempora pessima sunt, vigilemus.
Ecce minaciter imminet arbiter ille supremus.*

No short measure here of dactyls! But are these hexameters? 'Where', asks the purist, 'is the third or fourth foot caesura? You can't admit lines exactly divisible by three.' If they are not dactylic hexameters, what are they? The tiresome word *caesura* (or *tome*) defies precise definition. Ennius sometimes dispensed with it. I doubt if Virgil lost much sleep over it; but then Virgil contrived somehow to complete *Bucolics*, *Georgics* and *Aeneid* without realising that he was handling potentially explosive materials like 'homodynes' and 'heterodynes', the former 'giving the line freedom and denoting freedom, physical or psychological', while the latter give the line constriction or reluctance, and denote obstruction or effort, physical or psychological. Had the Mantuan been conscious of these metrical subtleties, he might have experienced the *aporia* of Ray Lancaster's centipede which:

was happy quite
Until a toad in fun
Said "Pray, which leg comes after which?"
This raised her doubts to such a pitch
She fell exhausted in the ditch
Not knowing how to run.

H.H. HUXLEY

'The ancient theory of caesura', wisely wrote S.E. Bassett, quoted with approval by Bedell Stanford, *The Odyssey of Homer* Books I–XII (1961) p. lxxxv, 'confuses two different matters—the conflict between the metrical pattern and the length and position of the words, and a different contrast between the rhythmical pattern and the units of thought.' Yet even so competent a Latinist as R.G. Austin can insist on the identity of caesura and pause. Look at *Aeneid* 4.627:

nunc, olim, quocumque dabunt se tempore vires.

Though it doesn't bother Page or Williams, Austin finds the rhythm 'remarkable'; 'technically a strong caesura is present after *dabunt*; but the reflexive *se* is attached so closely to *dabunt* that *there is no real pause*' (my italics). Surely the sense demands only a light pause after *nunc* and a heavier one after *olim*.

Much can be learnt about Virgil's 'stateliest measure' by a comparison of how the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid* begin, though I am covering ground familiar to many of you.

Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεὰ, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
οὐλομένην

Here the first emphatic sense-pause comes after seven and a half feet. Now the *Odyssey*:

Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ
πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε.

Two epic lines are completed before a strong pause is reached, though the bucolic diaeresis lays stress upon the essential character of the hero; he is a man of many moves, a versatile warrior who will adapt to the situations he confronts. Virgil takes thirteen feet to set before his readers a far different hero, one who, forced to leave Troy, makes his way first to Italy (a word of great emotional depth in the *Aeneid*; see especially lines 68 and 380), then more specifically to the settlement of Lavinium. Warfare as the subject is reinforced by the *bello* of line 5. Notice that Virgil does not write *qui Troiae primus ab oris*, which, since in the fourth foot verse-beat and stress accent coincide, as they do in

altae moenia Romae (12), *pro caris gesserat Argis* (24) and *manet alta mente repostum* (26), Jackson Knight would call ‘homodyne’.

Such hexameters, especially where a block spondee constitutes the fourth foot, I would rather consider to be a subtle tribute to the metrical practice of Lucretius, perfectly illustrated in *De Rerum Natura* 1.7–8:

*tibi suavis daedala tellus
summittit flores, tibi rident aequora ponti.*

Virgil deliberately dislocates the relative clause by placing *Troiae* not only outside it, but as close as metre permits to *virum* (‘hero’). *Italiam* is normally construed with *venit*, yet the verbal force of *profugus* could not be entirely absent from the poet’s mind, so that *Italiam fato profugus* cannot exclude the interpretation ‘fleeing by fate’s decree to Italy’ followed by the more precise direction ‘came to the shores of Lavinium’. Students of the epic genre will have noticed that, whereas Achilles and his patronymic appear in the opening line of the *Iliad*, ‘godlike Odysseus’ has patiently to wait until line 21 for his name to be mentioned in the poem which bears his name, while Aeneas must bide his time until line 92, when a glorious five-word line:

extemplo Aeneae solvuntur frigore membra

reveals a far from glorious predicament. The verbal element in *profugus* hinted at above is conspicuous in the very first chapter of Livy’s history, where we read:

Aeneam ab simili clade domo profugum.

This kind of construction is common in Tacitus; cf. *profugus ab rebellis* (*Ann.* 1.57), *profugi e proelio* (*Hist.* 2.46) and *urbe profugi* (*Hist.* 4.49). A much-lamented member of the Virgil Society, Norma Miller, equally at home with Virgil and Tacitus, would have made my point with greater expertise and conviction. Of course, if we were willing to accept the reading of M², which omits *que*, we should be free of the ugly scansion of *Laviniaque* (Page, who prefers *Lavinaque*, may well be right in arguing that ‘it is improbable that Virgil would have used such a licence in these opening lines’). The line-ending then and the word-order (adjective,

H.H. HUXLEY

verb, noun) would be suggestively close to that of *Aen.* 4.236, *Lavinaque respicit arva.*

A subject rarely tackled in Virgilian lectures is the sheer size of the problem Virgil faced in recreating in Latin the metre employed so effectively by Hesiod, Theocritus, Homer and Apollonius, to name four poets he knew well. Had Virgil—the very suggestion seems outrageous!—written the *Aeneid* in Homeric Greek (an exercise surely within his competence), not only would it have been completed more quickly, but also there would have been ample time for a thorough revision. To the author of *De Rerum Natura* Empedocles, his model, seems *vix humana stirpe creatus* (1.733), but not even his greatest admirers would place his poetry in the same rank as that of Virgil.

Virgil finds no difficulty in comparing his pastoral songs with the *Idylls* of his literary ancestor Theocritus, as is witnessed by

Sicelides Musae, paulo maiora canamus! (Ecl. 4.1)

and

*Prima Syracosio dignata est ludere versu
nostra, nec erubuit silvas habitare Thalea. (Ecl. 6.1–2)*

Nor has he less confidence that he can assume with honour the mantle of Hesiod:

*Ascraeumque cano Romana per oppida carmen.
(Geo. 2.176)*

This fact is, of course, recognised by Propertius, who writes in his second book

tu canis Ascraei veteris praecepta poetae. (2.34.77)

It will surprise no-one who knows me that, as I check this reference, I have in front of me his edition of Propertius II presented to me by its highly esteemed editor, our sixteenth President, Tony Camps.

In *Catalepton* 14a we do find a comparison of Virgil with Homer:

*Vate Syracosio qui dulcior Hesiodoque
Maior Homereo non minor ore fuit. (1–2)*

The author, however, is not Virgil, and the poem is an editorial epilogue to the fifteen epigrams, and possibly the work of Varius. Virgil did not presume to measure himself by the yardstick of Homer. The great Harrovian advised letting ‘the clever ones learn Latin as an honour and Greek as a treat’. Now the proportion of clever to stupid boys and girls may not have changed significantly since 1930 when Churchill penned these words, but one has an uncomfortable feeling that the number of Churchillian treats has suffered diminution. Indeed my own rough calculations, based on a report in *The Times* on March 20, 1993, indicate that one in every forty thousand of the school population takes Greek at GCSE level. Nor, alas, do all who study Greek get as far as Homer, though, if one has Autenrieth’s *Homeric Dictionary* and, don’t blush, Malcolm, your splendid Student Edition of the *Iliad*, Homer is far easier to construe than Sophocles or Thucydides. Not that I go as far as John Sheffield:

Read Homer once, and you can read no more,
For all books else appear so mean, so poor.

Of those in peril on the Hellenic sea many who safely negotiate the Scylla of Attic pronouns accented and unaccented, fail to survive the Charybdis of verbs in ‘mi’. Moreover the superabundant linguistic variety available to the Homeric rhapsode and his imitators is to the modest vocabulary of Latin as are the unnumbered treasure of a hypermarket to the meagre display of vendibles in a corner shop facing closure. W.B. Stanford, after apologising for ‘the tedious laws of quantity and metre’, regards the complexity of the grammarian’s explanations as ‘the inevitable result of the subtlety of the poet’s art’. ‘If they (the explanations) were simpler, Homer would have been duller.’ How attitudes have changed since he wrote that in 1947! To show the gulf between the Greek hexameter and the Latin, let me quote a line ending (last two feet) from Apollonius Rhodius (*Argonautica*. 2.844), where, after a full stop at a bucolic diaeresis, we have a procession of five monosyllables—*εἰ δὲ μὲ καὶ τὸ*. To illustrate the Protean character of the Greek verb, consider the paraceleusmatic word *ἔγενετο*. Useless metrically in that form it can

H.H. HUXLEY

become a convenient amphibrach ἔγεντο or a still more adaptable trochee γέντο.

I return to Virgil's line by way of the *Metamorphoses*. With the caveat that Ovid never aspired to be a Roman Homer, we may profit from Dryden's criticism—'Ovid, with all his sweetness, has as little variety of numbers and sound as Claudian: he is always, as it were, upon the hand-gallop, and his verse runs upon carpet-ground'. Ovid's limitations as an epic poet are especially clear in *Metamorphoses* 13, 14 and 15, from which I cite two line endings, both describing the son of Anchises. The first, *Cythereius heros*, (13.625 and 14.584) is smooth and soft, whereas the second, *penatigero Aeneae* (15.450), rough and hard, would not disgrace the *Aeneid*. Ovid plundered Homer for Greek noun and adjective formations which were conveniently dactylic and would enable him to avoid Latin endings in *-am*, *-em*, *-im* and *-um*, so tiresome to a poet parsimonious with elision. As the angel did with Jacob, Virgil wrestled with Homer and marked him for his own.

Observations, perhaps bizarre and untenable (if so, they may spark off wiser reflections) must end this metrical *farrago*. Incidentally, if our Society had a coat of arms, the motto might be 'let everyone have his own Virgil' — SIT MARO CVIQUE SVVS.

impius haec tam culta novalia miles habebit
barbarus has segetes. (Ecl. 1.70–1)

Apart from the full stop no punctuation. It is just possible to place a comma after the bucolic diaeresis at *novalia*. If this is done, the sense is somewhat altered, as the pause after the first foot must go. *Impius* in conjunction with *culta* rings two bells in a Virgilian's mind: (1) *in primis venerare deos* (*Geo.* 1.138), (2) the unforgettable phrase *divini gloria ruris* (*Geo.* 1.168) There is no vestige of a sense pause in the first line, except possibly after the first and fourth completed feet. As *segetes* is the only word where stress-accent and verse-beat do not march together, 'homodynes' are on the rampage, and how appropriate for the well-drilled but conceivably foul-mouthed soldier!

We turn finally to the Massylian priestess who fed the dragon which guarded the apples of the Hesperides:

spargens umida mella soporiferumque papaver. (*Aen.* 4.486)

Once more we find coincidence of stress-accent and verse-beat. What few people realise is that the construction of the line as far as the weak caesura is in every respect Homeric, though the same general arrangement is found in the *Works and Days*, *Theogony*, Theocritus and Apollonius. I refer to verses where the first and second feet consist of single words (two dactyls or spondee and dactyl) followed by a trochaic word, after which there is frequently a light or even heavy sense-pause. Here are two examples: (1) πάσας δέξατο Γαῖα (*Theogony* 184), (2) σείων καρτερὸν ἔγχοσ (*Theocritus Idyll* 22.184). The second example (one of many similar) corresponds precisely to the grammatical pattern and word-order of *spargens umida mella*.

My contention, supported by careful observation and tabulation, is that Virgil was sensitive to the coincidence of words and metrical feet found so often in Greek hexameters. That it does not occur more often in Virgil is because the poet, realising that the Latin hexameter, to become more Roman, must move inevitably in the direction taken eventually by Ovid, no friend of elision, limits severely the range of tunes that may be played on this sensitive instrument. Virgil was to learn that his genius lay in the elaborate construction of architectural monuments like:

sed neque Medorum silvae, ditissima terra
 ... (Geo.2.136–176)

and

ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram
 ... (Aen. 6.268–94).

The second half of our verse, *soporiferumque papaver*, makes the pattern unique and exclusively Virgilian. Look carefully at the verses which end *oliviferaeque Mutuscae* (Aen. 8.711) and *sagittiferosque Gelonos* (Aen. 8.725). Ovid takes a leaf out of Virgil's book when he writes:

Antimachumque Elymumque securiferumque Pyracmon.
 (Met. 12.17).

In conclusion, if Virgil's magical metre fascinates you, form your own judgements. Virgil nearly said *nimum ne crede libellis* (Ecl. 2.17). If an

H.H. HUXLEY

editor asks you to consider in the same breath as the last two examples

ambrosiae sucos et odoriferam panaceam (*Aen.* 12.419),

be wary of other gifts he may offer. As *et* is a proclitic and therefore attached very closely to *odoriferam*, the verse has a strong caesura and therefore lies outside the scope of this discussion. 'Reading', as Sir Arthur Helps said, 'is sometimes an ingenious device for avoiding thought.'

H.H. HUXLEY

This address was first published in *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 18.9 (November 1993) pp. 132–41.

Virgil's Friend Varius Rufus

A paper given to the Virgil Society on 20 March 1993

Horace clearly felt that there were two great contemporary poets who deserved to be mentioned together. Both had close links with the emperor Augustus, and received from him rich material rewards which they justified by the high quality of their verse:

*at neque dedecorant tua de se iudicia atque
munera, quae multa dantis cum laude tulerunt
dilecti tibi Vergilius Variusque poetae.*

(*Epist.* 2.1.245–7)

The Roman People should, but perhaps not always did, recognize their status as modern classics, and thus should allow them the licence for poetic innovation which they willingly granted to the masters of previous generations such as the comic poets Caecilius and Plautus:

*quid autem
Caecilio Plautoque dabit Romanus ademptum
Vergilio Varioque?*

(*Ars Poetica* 53–5)

One of Horace's pair was of course Virgil, and the fact that this Society is celebrating its fiftieth anniversary more than two thousand years after Virgil's death amply bears out Horace's judgment. But there is no Varian Society, and Varius Rufus has retreated into the shadows. We remember him for one thing, his editorship of the *Aeneid* after Virgil's death, and, in this, self-effacement was essential. As George Goold has written, 'No carping critic ever rose to accuse [Varius] of a less

A.S. HOLLIS

than satisfactory performance; and if no devotee of Virgil has ever said “well done”, why, that in itself is the consummation of praise.¹ In some cases the loss of a poet’s work may be a just reflection of its quality; not one word survives from the *Annales* of Volusius, mocked by Catullus, nor from the poetry of Bavius and Maevius, whom Virgil derides in the *Eclogues*. Often, however, we are painfully aware of the caprice of fortune: through a slender connexion we possess the poems of Catullus, but we have hardly anything of his close friend Calvus, whom later poets often mention in the same breath without suggesting that Catullus was a superior talent. And, unless one believes that Virgil and Horace let personal friendship cloud their professional judgment, it seems that time has been unjustly harsh to Varius Rufus.

We do not know Varius’ date of birth, but Virgil regards him as senior in the service of the Muses:

*nam neque adhuc Vario videor, nec dicere Cinna
digna, sed argutos inter strepere anser olores
(Ecl. 9.35–6)*

and perhaps also in age, so that Varius might have been born a little before 70 BC. While in his 20s, he was, like Virgil, drawn to an Epicurean community in South Italy, presided over by two Greek Epicurean philosophers, Siro and Philodemus (*vixit [sc. Vergilius] pluribus annis... liberali in otio secutus Epicuri sectam, insigni concordia et familiaritate usus Quintili, Tuccae et Vari*).² It is most satisfactory that we can now point to an Epicurean papyrus fragment (almost certainly by Philodemus) from Herculaneum which beyond question is addressed to all these four friends together.³ We can probably find another reference to Varius as an Epicurean in an anecdote preserved by Quintilian.⁴ I shall return to Varius’ Epicureanism, which seems to have inspired the only poem by him of which we have appreciable knowledge.

Varius apparently left some kind of written memoir about Virgil (Quint. 10.3.8 *Vergilium quoque paucissimos die composuisse versus auctor est Varius*), which must have been of special interest, since he was better placed than almost anyone else to speak of that shy and elusive personality.⁵ We may owe to this same source the famous image of a she-bear licking her cubs into shape, which Virgil himself applied to his own process of composition: *amici...familiaresque P. Vergilii in his,*

quae de ingenio moribusque eius memoriae tradiderunt, dicere eum solitum ferunt parere se versus more atque ritu ursino (Aulus Gellius, *N.A.* 17.10.2). Before leaving Italy for the stay in Greece during which he contracted his fatal illness, Virgil tried to persuade Varius to burn the *Aeneid* should anything happen to him; but Varius resolutely refused, and, after Virgil's death, was charged by Augustus with editing the great poem, a task he fulfilled with exemplary discretion.⁶

Varius Rufus may have been the first poet to become associated with Maecenas—remember that Virgil's original patron was not Maecenas but Asinius Pollio. After the formation of the Second Triumvirate in November 43 BC Varius perhaps felt the need of a powerful protector, since he had recently attacked Antony in terms all too reminiscent of Cicero's *Philippics* (more of this later). The poets themselves may have been keen to widen their circle. Horace tells us that Virgil first, and next Varius, brought him to the attention of Maecenas, probably in 38 BC.⁷ I have sometimes wondered whether Virgil had been struck by the use which Horace's Sixteenth Epode made of his own Fourth Eclogue (the dating seems to fit). No doubt Virgil and Varius introduced Horace to Maecenas as an outstandingly promising young poet—but that is not what Horace says. We would gather from *Sat.* 1.6.55 *dixere quid essem* that they were primarily interested in his moral character rather than his talent, and when Horace speaks of his fellow poets in *Sat.* 1, it is usually their friendship rather than their poetry that he stresses.⁸ So the spirit of the Epicurean community of friends lived on in the circle of Maecenas.

The development of Varius' poetic career is an interesting subject, since, like Virgil's, it seems to have gone through three distinct phases. In the Ninth Eclogue (?41 BC) Virgil speaks of him with awe and admiration (35–6, quoted above) as an established figure comparable to Catullus' friend Helvius Cinna (who must have been the leading Roman poet for almost ten years until he was lynched by the mob at Caesar's funeral in 44 BC). What work of Varius had so impressed Virgil? The answer will come from the Eighth Eclogue: it was a hexameter poem entitled *De Morte*, almost certainly Epicurean in inspiration, which can be dated with some confidence to 44–43 BC and which remained in Virgil's mind throughout the latter's career. Thereafter, it seems, Varius changed tack, and, until at least the mid 30s, he concentrated on traditional epic poetry, probably martial—whether on mythical or contemporary wars

A.S. HOLLIS

we simply do not know.⁹ This is strongly implied by Horace, *Sat.* 1.10.43–4 (c. 35 BC):

forte epos acer
ut nemo Varius ducit,

where the epithets *forte* and *acer* point to heroic epic (suiting less well what we know about *De Morte*), and backed up by *Odes* 1.6.1 ff., where Horace suggests that Varius, ‘bird of Homeric song’, would be the right person to celebrate Agrippa’s victories. In *Satires* 1.10 Horace says that he chose to write Satire because the other branches of poetry had already been claimed by outstanding practitioners; only in Satire could he rise to the top, since he did not think much of the *Satires* of Varro Atacinus (1.10.46). No doubt Horace speaks with tongue in cheek, but there may be a grain of truth in this way of looking at things. About 39 BC Roman Tragedy had an acknowledged master in Asinius Pollio (Virgil, *Ecl.* 8.10 *sola Sophocleo tua carmina digna cothurno*), and that is still the case in 35 BC (Horace, *Sat.* 1.10.42–3 *Pollio regum | facta canit peder percusso*). But in that year Sallust died, and his assistant Ateius Philologus passed to Asinius Pollio; Nisbet and Hubbard¹⁰ suggest that this would have been an appropriate moment for Pollio to begin his career as a historian, celebrated in Horace, *Odes* 2.1, which left at least a temporary gap for another Roman tragedian (9–10 *paulum severae Musa tragoediae | desit theatris*). Just about that time Varius Rufus switches from epic to tragedy. Perhaps one motive for Varius’ change of direction was a tactful realization that, whatever success he himself had achieved, his younger friend Virgil possessed even greater talent for serious hexameter poetry. Horace, *Odes* 1.6 (? soon after 29 BC), perhaps more gratifying to Varius than to Agrippa, seems to bring together almost all the different phases of Varius’ poetic career. Martial epic is represented by the opening address to Agrippa (1–4 *Scriberis Vario fortis et hostium | victor Maeonii carminis alite, | quam rem cumque ferox navibus aut equis | miles te duce gesserit*), tragedy (and particularly the *Thyestes*, first produced in 29 BC) by line 8 *saevam Pelopis domum*. And if one believes in the existence of a Varian *Panegyricus Augusti*, one might see a reference to it (as a future project?) in line 11 *laudes egregii Caesaris*.

We do not know how long Varius lived after his editing of the *Aeneid* was complete (?16 or 15 BC), nor whether he continued to write poetry

until the end of his life. Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.16.31 is puzzling:

cum Varius Gracchusque darent fera dicta tyrannis.

At first sight there is no problem; Ovid refers to Varius' *Thyestes* (and perhaps to other tragedies of his). But Ovid is writing about AD 17, and almost all the other poets mentioned in this catalogue belong to the later years of Augustus. So, if the Varius here is our poet—and I continue to consider that more probable than not¹¹—perhaps he lived on and continued his career as a tragedian for some years after 15 BC. The only play by Varius which was still widely read and admired a century later was the *Thyestes*; among several testimonia the most fulsome is in Quintilian 10.1.98, *Vari Thyestes cuilibet Graecarum comparari potest*. Varius' hexameter verse seems to have sunk almost without trace; Quintilian fails to mention it, and the only clear imitation which I have found in Silver poetry is of fr. 4 (text below) by Silius Italicus.¹²

Let us now turn to the fragments of Varius' own poetry. Four of these, totalling just 12 hexameters, are preserved for us by the scholar Macrobius, because they are imitated by Virgil. They come from a poem entitled *De Morte*, which must predate the Eighth Eclogue. Several older scholars thought that the poem dealt with the death of Julius Caesar, some even (without any warrant) expanding the title to *De Morte Caesaris*. But there is a much more plausible way of looking at the poem. We have seen (above) that Varius had strong links with Epicurean philosophy, and one of the chief Epicurean ambitions was to free mankind from the fear of death, by arguing that 'death has nothing to do with us' (Lucretius 3.830 *nil igitur mors est ad nos*). And Philodemus, one of the mentors of Varius' group, wrote a Greek prose treatise *On Death* (περὶ θανάτου) in 44 or 43 BC. It seems highly probable that this, together with Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*, inspired Varius to write *De Morte*. Interestingly, Virgil in both *Eclogue* 8 and *Georgics* 2 interweaves echoes of Lucretius with echoes of Varius, suggesting that his two sources were in harmony with each other.

Fr. 1¹³ indicates that Varius' poem also made allusions to contemporary events, which, as things turned out, might have been highly dangerous to their author:

*vendidit hic Latium populis, agrosque Quiritum
eripuit; fixit leges pretio atque refixit.*

A.S. HOLLIS

Servius, commenting on *Aen.* 6.622 *fixit leges pretio atque refixit* writes *possumus Antonium accipere*, without mentioning that Virgil borrowed the phrase verbatim from Varius Rufus. That Varius had intended a recognizable allusion to Mark Antony is put beyond doubt by the rest of fr. 1, which is redolent of the attacks on Antony in Cicero's *Philippics*—we know the consequences to Cicero of these. *Fixit leges pretio atque refixit* refers to the laws passed by Antony as consul in 44 BC, allegedly representing the wishes of the murdered Julius Caesar (e.g. *Phil.* 3.30 *falsas leges C. Caesaris nomine et falsa decreta...figenda curaverit*). In line 1 'he sold Latium to the nations', 'Latium' no doubt refers to *ius Latii*, 'Latin rights', a lower status than, but sometimes a stepping-stone to, full Roman citizenship. 'Robbing citizens of their estates' (1–2 *agrosque Quiritum | eripuit*) is especially interesting. We know, particularly from the First and Ninth Eclogues, of the sufferings caused by land confiscations after the battle of Philippi (42 BC); much less is heard of the similar legislation, a consular Lex Antonia Cornelia Agraria, which Mark Antony sponsored in June 44 BC. Antony's brother Lucius played a leading part on the Board of Seven (*septemviri*), and Cicero writes of the latter 'He divided up estates, whichever ones he wished; there was no right of appeal for the private citizen, no chance to plead for exemption on grounds of equity. The owner was allowed to keep no more of his property than what Antonius had left behind.'¹⁴ This law was annulled some six months later, in January 43 BC. Varius Rufus contrasts Antony's corrupt generosity towards foreigners (*vendidit hic Latium populis*) with his harsh treatment of Roman citizens (*agrosque Quiritum | eripuit*). No wonder that, after Philippi, Antony entrusted the settlement of veteran soldiers (with its resulting unpopularity) to his junior partner Octavian.

Varius fr. 2 probably also belongs to this attack on Antony:

incubet ut Tyriis atque ex solido bibat auro.

If we allow the poet a somewhat free use of sequence,¹⁵ the two fragments could even be consecutive; the run of the passage would then be closely similar to *Georgics* 2.505–6 *hic petit excidiis urbem magnosque penatis, | ut gemma bibat et Sarrano* ['Phoenician'] *dormiat ostro*. In Virgil, *hic* is part of a long sequence 'one man...another'; perhaps likewise in Varius Antony served as just one illustration among many of human failings. Virgil's imitation is typically subtle: while in Varius

incubet clearly means 'reclines', on a couch at a banquet, Virgil picks it up with *dormiat*, 'sleeps'; then he has both *incubat* and *auro* in the very next line—but in a different sense, of brooding over buried treasure (*condit opes alius defossoque incubat auro*). If you wonder what place such a passage might have in an Epicurean poem on Death, we must look at Lucretius 3.59–86, where the poet explains that a frenzied search for power and wealth is prompted 'to no small extent' (64) by fear of death. Frs. 3 and 4 are both similes. We can only guess, but in both cases a philosophical application is easy enough to imagine. Fr. 3¹⁶ describes the training of a spirited horse:

*quem non ille sinit lentae moderator habenae
qua velit ire, sed angusto prius orbe coercens
insultare docet campis, fingitque morando,*

perhaps analogous to the training of the mind or subduing of the passions, as in a passage from Horace which may even reflect Varius' lines (*Epist.* 1.2.64–5 *fingit equum tenera docilem cervice magister | ire viam qua monstrat eques*).

The six-line simile which describes a hunting-dog (fr. 4) is worth lingering over:

*ceu canis umbrosam lustrans Gortynia vallem,
si veteris potuit cervae comprehendere lustra,
saevit in absentem et, circa vestigia latrans,
aethera per nitidum tenues sectatur odores;
5 non amnes illam medii, non ardua tardant
†perdita†,¹⁷ nec serae meminit decedere nocti.*

Just as if, when traversing a shady valley, a Cretan hound has been able to discover the lair of a long-lived deer; she expresses her fury against it in its absence and, barking around the tracks, follows the fine scent through the clear air; rivers in the way do not slow her down, nor...¹⁷ heights, nor does she care to give way to the onset of night.

It seems to me that the quality of these lines is superb, and the style most interesting. We might expect a hexameter poem written in 44 or

A.S. HOLLIS

43 BC. to show the influence of Catullus and his school. But the trademarks of Catullus' hexameters (e.g. the spondaic fifth foot, the pronounced end-stopping or the monotonous pattern with a word of three long syllables after the masculine caesura) are entirely absent from here. Nor does the style recall Lucretius, with his polysyllabic or monosyllabic line-endings and sometimes inelegant rhythms. Instead, we seem to have here a new style, much more like the young Virgil—perhaps intermediate between the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. This raises the possibility (in accord with the admiration for Varius expressed in the Ninth Eclogue) that Varius Rufus was a really important influence in the formation of Virgil's style. Coming on to the text of the last line, I have marked *perdita* as corrupt. Many see nothing wrong with it, and hence put the comma after *tardant* (5). In that case Virgil would have borrowed the line whole¹⁸ to conclude his own simile describing a heifer which has lost her calf:

*qualis cum fessa iuvenum
per nemora atque altos quaerendo bucula lucos
propter aquae rivum viridi procumbit in ulva
perdita, nec serae meminit decedere nocti.*
(*Ecl.* 8.85–8)

I suspect, however, that *perdita* has intruded from the text of the Eclogue into the Varian fragment,¹⁹ and that Virgil borrowed only *nec serae meminit decedere nocti*. 'Desperate' (*perdita*) very well suits the heifer in Virgil, but seems much less appropriate to Varius' hunting-dog. There is another, typically artful, imitation of Varius' lines in Virgil, which may help us:

*non scopuli rupesve cavae atque obiecta retardant
flumina.*
(*Geo.* 3.253–4)

Virgil's *retardant* corresponds to Varius' *tardant*, and *obiecta... | flumina* to *amnes...medii*. Note also that Virgil's words form a tricolon, ending after the first foot of the second line (*flumina*);²⁰ perhaps we should seek to restore a (larger) tricolon structure in the last two lines of Varius fr. 4, by marking *perdita* as corrupt and placing a comma after it. The most obvious replacement for *perdita* would be a noun; accordingly J.A. Willis²¹

suggested *culmina*, 'peaks', without being entirely happy with it.²² Alternatively we could take *ardua* as a noun, and look for an agreeing adjective.²³ Virgil's *scopuli rupesve cavae* (words likely to correspond to the corrupt phrase in Varius) create a particularly 'rocky' impression. We could match this in the Varius fragment by replacing †*perdita*† with *scrupea*. The adjective *scrupeus* ('composed of sharp rocks or projections of rock', *OLD*) comes from archaic high-flown poetry—it is attested in the tragic fragments of Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius. Virgil writes *spelunca... | scrupea* in *Aen.* 6.237–8, and Servius' comment ad loc. shows that *scrupea* would go excellently with *tardant* in Varius, since the literal reference of *scrupus* is to a sharp stone which impedes progress (*scrupus proprie est lapillus brevis qui incedentibus impedimento est*).²⁴ We then would have a two-line tricolon, with each successive limb growing in length:

*non amnes illam medii, non ardua tardant
scrupea, nec serae meminit decedere nocti.*

This splendid simile stayed in Virgil's mind throughout his career.²⁵ One possible application of the simile in an Epicurean didactic poem might be a determination to seek and find the truth—Lucretius uses a hunting-dog for this very purpose in *DRN* 1.404–6 *namque canes ut montivagae persaepe ferai | naribus inveniunt intectas fronde quietes | cum semel institerunt vestigia certa viai*.²⁶

When one works on a poet preserved only in fragments, part of the fun lies in the hope of discovering hitherto unrecognized quotations or allusions; of course a high degree of scepticism and detachment is necessary. As far as I am aware, nobody before has suggested that the following snippet in the Christian writer Lactantius (*De Opificio Dei* 18.2)²⁷ might contain a reference to Varius Rufus, *De Morte*:

*idcirco animum et animam indifferenter appellant duo
Epicurei poetae.*

One of the pair is undoubtedly Lucretius; indeed we can identify the particular lines to which Lactantius (or his source) refers as *DRN* 3.421–3 *tu fac utrumque uno sub iungas nomine eorum, | atque animam verbi causa cum dicere pergam, | mortalem esse docens, animum quoque*

A.S. HOLLIS

dicere credas. But who is the second Epicurean poet? Lactantius himself might have been unable to tell us; perhaps he has taken over this nugget of information without fully comprehending it. But Varius Rufus would be a most suitable candidate. As we have seen, his Epicurean connexions are firmly attested. Virgil seems to associate Lucretius, *DRN* with Varius, *De Morte* since he combines imitations of the two poems both in the Eighth Eclogue (85–8) and the Second Georgic (505–12). And, of course, a poem *De Morte* would give plenty of scope for discussing *animus* and *anima*.

Having praised Varius for his high-class poetic technique in the longest fragment of *De Morte*, I come now to the alleged verbatim quotation in Horace, *Epistles* 1.16 from a *Panegyricus Augusti* by Varius:

*tene magis saluum populus velit an populum tu
servet in ambiguo qui consulit et tibi et urbi
Iuppiter* (Epist. 1.16.27–9)

According to Pseudacro ad loc., *haec...Var< i>us de Augusto scripserat*, but I must say that I do not believe this. The sentiments may seem jejune to us, but are credible in a panegyric; not so the style. Would a poet capable of the hunting-dog simile produce for Augustus such sloppy and sub-standard writing as the line-endings *an populum tu* and *et tibi et urbi*? These are appropriate in the hexameters of the *Epistles*, which are first cousins to the *Satires*, but do not suit a high-flown *Panegyric*. Perhaps Varius did indeed write a *Panegyric* of Augustus;²⁸ conceivably it included sentiments such as these. But this surely is not a verbatim quotation.

Of Varius' acknowledged masterpiece, the tragedy *Thyestes*, we have just one certain fragment, spoken by Atreus and preserved for us by Quintilian (3.8.45):

*iam fero infandissima,
iam facere cogor.*

There is also the following entry in a Paris manuscript:²⁹

*INCIPIT THUESTES VARII. Lucius Varius cognomento Rufus
Thyesten tragoediam magna cura absolutam post Actiacam*

*victoriam Augusti ludis eius in scaena edidit, pro qua fabula
sestertium deciens accepit.*

On this Housman wrote,³⁰ 'One day towards the end of the eighth century the scribe of Cod. Paris. Lat. 7530 ...began to copy out for us..the *Thyestes* of Varius. He transcribed the title and the prefatory note... Then he changed his mind; he proceeded with a list of the *notae* employed by Probus and Aristarchus, and the masterpiece of Roman tragedy has rejoined its author in the shades.' Be that as it may,³¹ we learn that the tragedy was first produced in connexion with celebrations for the victory of Actium, whether in 29 BC (the year of Octavian's Triple Triumph) or 28 BC (the dedication of Palatine Apollo), and that Varius received one million sesterces—though this sum must be viewed with caution—two and a half times the property qualification of a Roman knight. One can imagine that Varius' *Thyestes* made a great impact.³² The previous master of Roman Tragedy was Asinius Pollio, whose plays, like his speeches, were stiff and archaic, in the manner of the old Roman tragedians Pacuvius and Accius (Tacitus, *Dialogus* 21.7 *Pacuvium certe et Accium non solum tragoediis sed etiam orationibus suis expressit; adeo durus et siccus est*). The *Thyestes* of Varius (to be followed by the *Medea* of Ovid) may have been the first Latin tragedy to be written in a modern style which reflected the advances in technique made by other branches of Roman poetry.³³

The fragment of *Thyestes* quoted above exemplifies the *fera dicta* of tyrants (Ovid, *Epistulae ex Ponto* 4.16.31) which would be at home in Roman Tragedy of any period. But another tragic fragment of Varius, written in anapaests, makes a totally different impression (text slightly varied from Klotz, *Scaen. Rom. Frag.* I p. 309):

*primum huic
nervis septem est intenta fides
variique apti vocum moduli,
ad quos mundi resonat canor in
5 sua se vestigia volventis.*

Apparently from an encomium of Mercury, with particular reference to his invention of the lyre, these lines describe how the god tuned his seven-stringed instrument in harmony with the music of the spheres:

A.S. HOLLIS

‘he was the first to stretch the lyre with seven strings, and to fit on it the different intervals of sound, in harmony with which the tuneful Universe re-echoes as it revolves backwards over its own path’. Does this passage belong to the *Thyestes*? That possibility can by no means be ruled out, but it is far from obvious how such sentiments could fit the myth of the abominable brothers.³⁴ We have no reason to think that Varius’ fame as a tragedian rested on only one play;³⁵ it is rather more probable, in my opinion, that the lines come from a quite different tragedy. Their style is exceptionally elegant; their subject-matter inhabits the world of Platonic philosophy (the harmony of the spheres), of learned Hellenistic³⁶ and Latin neoteric³⁷ poetry. Together with the simile of the hunting-dog (fr. 4), this fragment gives the most favourable impression of Varius’ poetic talent. Although the ancient Virgilian commentators do not draw the parallel,³⁸ Virgil shows his admiration for the last two lines when he writes of the recurring toil of the farmer:

*redit agricolis labor actus in orbem
atque in se sua per vestigia volvitur annus.*
(*Georgics* 2.401–2)

Keble College, Oxford

A.S. HOLLIS

NOTES

1. In S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford 1990) 87.
2. *Vita Probiana* 10–12 (p. 27 ed. Hardie). Quintilius Varus is lamented by Horace in *Odes* 1.24; according to some sources, Plotius Tucca shared the editing of the *Aeneid* with Varius Rufus.
3. M. Gigante and M. Capasso, *SIFC* 82 (1989) 4 lines 21–3 ὁ Πλώτιε καὶ Οὐάριε καὶ Οὐεργίλιε καὶ Κοιντίλιε. Varius Rufus appears twice elsewhere in the same papyrus collection.
4. Quint. 6.3.78 *L. Var<i>o Epicurio, Caesaris amico*. The interpretation of this passage was challenged by C. Murgia in *CQ* N.S. 41 (1991) 189–93, a discussion described by E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford 1993) 271 as ‘misguided’.
5. The later scholiastic tradition drew Varius into some of the tall stories which grew up around Virgil—stories which involved sexual favours, plagiarism and even murder (J. Hubaux, ‘La “maitresse” de Virgile’, *REL* 12 (1934) 343–59). Part of the trouble may have been caused by confusion of Varius Rufus with Alfenus Varus and/or Quintilius Varus.

VIRGIL'S FRIEND VARIUS RUFUS

6. *Vita Donati* 153–61 (p. 15 ed. Hardie) *egerat* [sc. *Vergilius*] *cum Vario priusquam Italia decederet, ut siquid sibi accidisset, Aeneida combureret; at is facturum se pernegarat...edidit autem auctore Augusto Varius, sed summatim emendata, ut qui versus etiam imperfectos sicut erant reliquerit.*

7. *Sat.* 1.6.55 *Vergilius, post hunc Varius, dixere quid essem.*

8. Particularly *Sat.* 1.5.40–2 *Plotius et Varius Sinuessae Vergiliusque | occurrunt, animae quales neque candidiores | terra tulit, neque quis me sit devinctior alter*, also e.g. 1.9.22–3 *non Viscum pluris amicum | non Varium facies.*

9. E. Courtney is perhaps over-sceptical in doubting whether Varius brought any such work to publication (*The Fragmentary Latin Poets* 271).

10. *A Commentary on Horace, Odes Book II* (Oxford 1978) 9–10.

11. M. Helzle, *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum ex Ponto liber IV* (Zurich/New York 1989) 190–1 prints †*Varus*† as a lemma, and, surprisingly, becomes entangled in the kind of scholiastic fiction mentioned in n. 5 above.

12. *Punica* 10.77–82 *ut canis occultos agitat cum Belgicus apros | erroresque ferae sollers per devia mersa | nare legit, tacitoque premens vestigia rostro | lustrat inaccessos venantum indagine saltus, | nec sistit nisi, conceptum sectatus odorem, | deprendit spissis arcana cubilia dumis.* The parallel was noted by Baehrens. One might wonder whether Silius knew just the lines quoted as Varius fr. 4 from either a commentary on the Eighth Eclogue or a collection of Virgil's borrowings from other poets. But (to take a case involving another poet) we owe Helvius Cinna fr. 1 Morel, Courtney to a grotesque misunderstanding by the grammarian Charisius; Silius not only imitates those lines in detail (*Punica* 13.86–9), but also, I believe, gives a clue to their original context in Cinna. So I am quite prepared to accept that Silius still read Latin hexameter poetry which had fallen out of fashion.

13. The numeration in Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, is the same as in Morel.

14. *Phil.* 5.20.

15. With *incubet* standing for the metrically intractable *incubaret* (Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* 272 thinks this hardly possible).

16. Quoted by Macrobius as a parallel to Virgil, *Georgics* 3.116–17 *equitem docuere sub armis | insultare solo et gressus glomerare superbos.*

17. The textual problem will be discussed below.

18. In itself that is quite credible; Virgil almost certainly (some scholars are sceptical) borrowed two lines whole from Varro Atacinus for the *Georgics* (1.377 and 2.404).

19. In such a case a suggested emendation need not be so close to the letters of the intruding word.

20. Thereafter the line of Virgil goes its own way with *correptosque unda torquentia montis.*

21. *Rh. M.* 100 (1957) 162.

22. 'Too high up', as Professor Nisbet commented to me.

23. As in *Georgics* 3.291 *deserta per ardua*, Valerius Flaccus 2.516 *Rhiphaea per ardua.*

24. Whence the metaphorical sense which we see reflected in 'scruple', 'scrupulous'.

25. *Eclogues* 8.85–8 and *Georgics* 3.253–4 (both quoted above) and *Aen.* 9.63 *saevit in absentes.* Note also the imitation by Silius Italicus quoted in n. 12.

A.S. HOLLIS

26. These lines might even be Varius' model.

27. R.M. Ogilvie, *JThS* N.S. 26 (1975) 411–12 suggests that the second Epicurean poet may be Varro Atacinus. But there is no evidence that Atacinus was an Epicurean, and the texts that Ogilvie relies on to show that a Varro wrote in verse *de rerum natura* more probably point to Varro of Reate.

28. Which may be alluded to also in *Odes* 1.6.11 and *Epist.* 2.1.245–7.

29. Cod. Par. Lat. 7530 fol. 28^r. 1–5 (cf. H. Jocelyn, *CQ* N.S. 30 (1980) 387).

30. *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman* (eds J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear (1972)) III.941.

31. Jocelyn (*CQ* N.S. 30 (1980) 399) sees things rather differently: 'Copies of Varius' tragedy, like other rarities, could have survived a long time in the odd library, little consulted and gradually rotting away. I suggest that the surviving parchment of one such copy was at some stage washed along with bits of unused or unusable ancient books in order to provide material for copying a collection of works on grammar, and the title and its explanatory note, because of their position either at the bottom or at the top of a relatively unused page, escaped the wash.'

32. Again, it is reasonable to ask whether any fragment of (or reference to) Varius' *Thyestes* has survived anonymously. Two candidates offer themselves (neither suggestion is new). (a) Two and a half iambic lines quoted by Seneca (*Epist. Mor.* 80.7) *en impero Argis: regna mihi liquit Pelops | qua ponto ab Helles atque ab Ionio mari | urgetur Isthmos*. Clearly spoken by Atreus—if not the opening words of a play, at least the first words of Atreus on stage. One might wonder whether Seneca composed these lines himself, or whether (as Cicero sometimes does) he is translating a lost Greek play, but for the fact that Quintilian (9.4.140) also quotes the first line anonymously (with *sceptra* for *regna*). Perhaps, therefore, in the time of both Seneca and Quintilian these lines were so well known that it was unnecessary to specify their author. The style does not seem that of archaic tragedy, and the *Thyestes* of Varius is quite a plausible ascription. Quintilian is responsible for our only certain fragment of Varius' *Thyestes* and it is faintly possible that he has the same play in mind at 11.3.73 *ut sit Aerope in tragoedia tristis*.

(b) A snippet from a declamation, in Seneca Rhetor, *Contr.* 1. 1.21, *cur fugis fratrem? scit ipse*. The metre appears to be trochaic (one might consider reversing the order of *fugis* and *fratrem* to produce the end of an iambic line and the start of its successor). The speaker is said to be Thyestes. If so, he seemingly answers someone who tries to reconcile him with his brother Atreus (cf. Seneca, *Thyestes* 421–90, where young Tantalus makes such an attempt), by quoting the would-be reconciler's words: '“Why do you flee from your brother?” *He* knows.' Alternatively, we might divide the quotation between two speakers: the reconciler asks *cur fugis fratrem?* and Thyestes replies *scit ipse*. According to the Elder Seneca, this tragic verse won thunderous applause when inserted into his declamation by Porcius Latro (who taught rhetoric to the young Ovid). Perhaps the quotation comes from a tragedy which was currently all the rage.

33. Note the phrase *magna cura absolutam* in the Paris manuscript mentioned above.

34. According to Apollodorus (*Epitome* 2.12) Hermes is sent by Zeus as a messenger to Atreus. An undergraduate pupil suggested to me that there might have been lyre-playing at Varius' Thyestean banquet.

VIRGIL'S FRIEND VARIUS RUFUS

35. For what this is worth (not much), Porf. on Horace, *Odes* 1.6.1–2 describes Varius as *tragoediarum...auctor*.

36. Eratosthenes, *Hermes* frs. 13 and 15–16 Powell (with *Supplementum Hellenisticum* 397A) and Alexander of Ephesus, *Suppl. Hell.* 21.

37. Varro Atacinus fr. 14 Morel = 15 Courtney.

38. Richard Thomas in his Commentary admires the image of *Georgics* 2.401–2, but seems unaware of the Varius fragment; R.A.B. Mynors quotes the last two lines of Varius in a corrupt form. Of course it is conceivable that Varius, rather than Virgil, is the imitator.

God the Father (himself) in Virgil

A paper given to the Virgil Society on 30 October 1993

*non conferre deo velut aequiperabile quidquam
ausim, nec domino famulum componere signum:
ex minimis sed grande suum voluit pater ipse
coniectare homines, quibus ardua visere non est.*

I should not dare to compare anything with god as though it were on a par with him, nor compare with the lord a sign that is his slave: but the father himself willed that men infer his greatness from what is small, since they cannot see the things on high. (Prudentius *Hamartigenia* 79–82)

A good father brings security into the family because of his natural leadership abilities. (Ptyches (1993) 137)

Gott im Himmel—der König auf Erden—der Pfarrer auf der Kanzel—der Ehemann zu Hause.

(Quoted Schneider-Böklen and Vorländer (1991) 125)

If God is male then the male is God. (Daly (1973) 19)

The *telos* is the product of the Father, his speech moves to an end, radiates light, and reaches its goal. Pucci (1992) 29

quem das finem, rex magne, laborum? (Virgil *Aeneid* 1.241¹)

There's a stake in your fat black heart
And the villagers never liked you.

D.P. FOWLER

They are dancing and stamping on you.
They always *knew* it was you.
Daddy, daddy, you bastard, I'm through.
(Sylvia Plath *Daddy*)

Nothing could be more familiar than the notion of god as our *father*, enshrined in the Christian tradition in the opening words of the Lord's Prayer, the *Pater noster*. But the fatherhood of god is not of course a notion confined to Christianity; rather, calling god 'father' is, as the long and wide-ranging article on the subject in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* remarks, one of the 'Urphänomenen' of the history of religion. The famous article on god in Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* begins with the Australian Aboriginal notion of the 'All-Father', taking aboriginal religion to be the most 'primitive' form of piety and plotting the genealogy of other notions from that most original stem. The cultural preconceptions that that reading of Australian religion implies do not need exposing to a modern sensibility; but there is no getting round the centrality of fatherhood to religious thought in many widely different traditions.

This familiarity of course makes it particularly difficult to see anything of interest in the notion of God the Father; we are trained to think worthy of investigation what is unusual or remarkable, not what is always *presupposed*. That in itself, from another point of view, makes it important to make the attempt, since it is precisely in the universal and the familiar—in the common ground of what Bourdieu called our *habitus*—that the power of ideology is most manifest. This is even more true for an atheist, who might be deluded into thinking that God the Father disappears with God *himself*, than it is for a believer. But there are three more specific reasons, I think, for taking a second look at the fatherhood of god, especially in relation to ancient Rome.

The first of these is the explosion of interest there has been in recent years in Roman family relations. Categories like 'father' and 'son' have often been taken to be cultural universals, constants against the background of which historical change takes place, archetypes *underlying* temporal and cultural differences. Times may change, but not mother-love. We have learned, however, to be suspicious of all such apparently ahistorical phenomena in the light of history and anthropology. Specifically, works like Laurence Stone's studies of the English family and

Philippe Ariés's book on childhood have encouraged us not to take for granted that the relationships within the family, indeed the very notion of 'family' itself, are unchanging. The great theorist of this historicism was of course Foucault, and the relations between husband and wife are one of the central themes of his *History of Sexuality*. But there has been a mass of detailed work, especially by scholars from Australia and New Zealand, on every aspect of the family.²

What has not emerged from these studies, however, is much of a consensus, particularly about the relationship between parents, especially the father, and their children. The Romans themselves saw the father's power—*patria potestas*—as a distinctive feature of their society; as Gaius remarks, *nulli...alii sunt homines, qui talem in liberos habeant potestatem* (*Dig.* 1.9.2). This also struck Greek observers of Roman culture like Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who praises this feature of Roman life as a preservation of ancient virtue long since gone from Greece.³ In accordance with this, some scholars (most notably the great Paul Veyne⁴) have used terms like 'coldness' and 'distance' to characterise the relationship in general between father and child in antiquity. Rather than the happy childhoods (supposedly) enjoyed by modern children, schoolboys in antiquity, according to one scholar, 'were routinely subjected to a litany of horrors that included both corporal punishment and sodomy.'⁵ Other scholars, however, have pointed out that there is much evidence on the other side for warmth and intimacy between father and children. Here for instance is one of those synoptic summaries of ancient views on children much beloved by social historians; it is from the Dutch scholar Emiel Eyben, and each sentence is tagged in the original with the appropriate references:

A father displays his feelings on special occasions when a child—not only a son—is born or dies (even at an early age) but also in more daily occurrences, for example, when a child is ill or has an accident. He cherishes a beautiful child, but an ugly duckling just as well, a sick and unhealthy child no less than a child in good mental and bodily health. He is interested in his son's studies, proud of his (often only alleged) achievements, concerned about his future bride, his name and his fame. A 'real' father enjoys his children, loves them more than his own honour and wealth, even more than his

D.P. FOWLER

own life, does everything he can to win and retain their affection, cherishes high ambition for them, hopes they will be more successful in life than he himself was, is concerned about their material, physical, intellectual, and moral well-being.⁶

Even the much-vaunted *patria potestas* has been argued by Richard Saller in particular to be much less important in practice than in theory, in part because of the chances that one's father would be dead in the ancient world before his theoretical powers could become irksome to an adult male.⁷

The response of historians to this mass of conflicting evidence and argument has for the most part been, as one would expect, to *emplot* it: to see a development from an older, sterner image of fatherhood towards what Suzanne Dixon has termed the 'sentimental ideal of the Roman family'.⁸ Naturally also there is no great agreement on exactly *when* these developments took place or on to what other plots one should attempt to map them, but the later Republic/early empire is usually chosen as the locus of change, since it provides so many possibilities for this mapping, above all the 'Roman Cultural Revolution' as some term the beginning of autocratic rule at Rome. We are told, therefore, that 'there is...among those who have studied the issue closely, general agreement that the emotional contact of the two central relationships in Roman society, husband and wife, and parent and child, witnessed a profound change that began in the Republic and climaxed during the first decades of the Principate.'⁹

The choice of this locus of change is obviously of interest for the *Aeneid*, which appears in the middle of this nodal point. But my concern is not with the adequacy or otherwise of this emplotment—which has the merit, or handicap, depending on one's point of view, of being endorsed by many first century BC Romans themselves, as Cicero makes clear in the *Pro Caelio*. Rather I want to stress that however or whenever changes took place, if they did, any picture we construct of the first century BC attitude towards the father will have to contain a great deal of *ambivalence*. The word *pater* is not a simple signifier; especially, again, because it is so central to Roman culture.

One of the arguments used by Richard Saller against those who characterise the relation of father and child only as cold and distant, is

that this characterisation makes the political use of *pater* look very strange:

If the father had been the severe and repressive figure in Roman culture that Veyne suggests, it would have been odd that emperors were so concerned to represent themselves as *pater* in contrast to *dominus*.¹⁰

It is this political use of the sign of the father which is my second reason for suggesting that we take another look at God the Father. The notion of the *pater patriae* has of course been much studied by historians, most notably Alföldi,¹¹ and has recently been discussed in the contexts of modern thought on imperial ideology by T.R. Stevenson.¹² The 'Principate' faced the task of achieving one of those moments of ideological 'energising contradiction', as Charles Martindale terms it,¹³ fusing together autocracy and solidarity, and the image of the father, in all its ambivalence, is a productive tool in this welding of the chain. As Stevenson remarks, the model of the father-ruler:

...invokes an ideal scenario with connotations which the emperor and his subjects would find mutually congenial (selfless care, absolute loyalty, the absence of exploitation or ingratitude). It signals acceptable terms for the accommodation of overruling individual power. It is sufficiently ambivalent in its connotations to soothe sensibilities on the one hand and yet to recognise the reality of a superior-inferior relationship on the other.

The key term here is again *ambivalence*, a concept widely used in modern discussions of imperial ideology. The ruler as father may be kind and indulgent, or he may punish severely—for the good of the subject, naturally. The point is made forcibly by Seneca in the *De clementia*: the *officium* of the ruler is that *bonorum parentium, qui obiurgare liberos non numquam blande, non numquam minaciter solent, aliquando admonere etiam verberibus* (1.14.1). The utility of the father-image to rulers lies in the combination of attitudes that it encapsulates.

I shall return to the politics of fatherhood, and to what Derrida calls the 'easy passage uniting the three figures of the king, the god, the

D.P. FOWLER

father'.¹⁴ But the mention of that trilogy, and who makes the reference, already suggests the third and most important reason why I think god the father at Rome deserves re-examination: the centrality of the (name, Law, figure of) the father to twentieth-century thought, and above all its critique of it/him as a repository of all our negative feelings about authority and power. The father-figure here is obviously Freud, for whom already fatherhood was an enormously complex concept;¹⁵ and it has been in particular through psychoanalytic thought, especially Lacan, that *father* has come to stand for so much more than a male begetter, just as the phallus has become (or has it?) so much more than the male sexual organ. In standing for so much, the father and the phallus have also come, in a sense, to stand for almost nothing—transcendental signifieds almost beyond language into which we pour all our feelings about power and authority. Feminist thought in particular has found in *patriarchy* a convenient master-term for the whole process of male dominance at all levels of human activity.¹⁶ This has naturally had a great effect on the ways in which the fatherhood of god is regarded in theology. In the wake, especially, of Mary Daly's *Beyond God the Father*¹⁷ feminist theologians have offered a searching critique of divine fatherhood.¹⁸ Some Christians have in the past emplotted their own notion of fatherhood as, again, a more gentle 'development' from the supposedly stern Old Testament patriarch of the Jews;¹⁹ it is pleasant to see that plot overturned as feminists have seen in that very notion of the 'good' father an enfeebling mask of power. But the implications of feminist attacks on god the father go much further than this. Older Christian apologists liked to see in the Zeus of Homer or the Jupiter of the *Aeneid* an approximation to the Christian Father-God, a step towards the 'higher' ideal of monotheism. We may reasonably doubt, however, whether paternal autocracy represents a higher stage of civilisation.

The philosopher, however, who has raised the father to the highest level of generality is Derrida, and I want to spend a little more time on him before finally making a move towards some ancient texts. In his essay 'Plato's Pharmacy',²⁰ beginning from Plato's *Phaedrus* and its account of the invention of writing he developed his famous picture of writing as the *pharmakon*, the cure and the poison. Plato had said that writing always needs the help of the father: it is thus the 'miserable son' (145), 'weakened' speech, something not completely dead; a living dead, a reprieved corpse, a deferred life, a semblance of breath' (143). Speech,

in the terms of this opposition, represents 'presence', real communication: and as Derrida remarks, 'being-there is always a property of paternal speech. And the site of a fatherland' (146). But if writing on this view is secondary, a redundant extra, it is also a threat: (77) 'From the position of the holder of the scepter, the desire for writing is indicated, designated, and denounced as a desire for orphanhood and patricidal subversion.' Derrida, famously, reversed the terms of this genealogy: writing precedes speech, in that this desire for *presence*, for *authority*, for some guarantor of meaning in the face of the shifting signs of writing, is always illusory. In this sense, the father is never there. But in another sense, the father is always present, inescapably, as one pole of an opposition engenders another and has authority over it. The sign of the West is thus the sign of the father, in that in all the oppositions which embody the Western tradition from truth v. error to men v. women, one term has had fatherly care of the other. We can deconstruct these oppositions, we can flip them to subvert patriarchal authority, but we shall never be able fully to escape them. In this respect the 'Father of Logos' will always win, will indeed always already have won. Again, his power lies in its arbitrary nature: we cannot get behind the father's authority to question it, we must simply accept that it is so.

Let me try to single out some aspects of the concept which are suggested by the sketch I have just offered. First, the sign of the father has been traced from human paternity through king and god to the most general level of human thought. These aspects of the father cannot be kept separate; they interconnect, there is this 'easy passage' between them. This is most obvious with the more concrete concepts of the Roman father, ruler, and god, nicely united in the ambiguity of Virgil's words on Nisus and Euryalus in *Aeneid* 9.446–9:

*Fortunati ambo! si quid mea carmina possunt,
nulla dies umquam memori vos eximet aevo,
dum domus Aeneae Capitoli immobile saxum
accolet imperiumque pater Romanus habebit.*

imperiumque pater Romanus habebit. As Conington and Nettleship point out, it is difficult to decide here between Augustus, Jupiter, and the generic 'Roman father' of *patria potestas*. All three are plausible in the context.²¹ But the broad Derridan notion of the father is also implicated

D.P. FOWLER

in this, because of the second important aspect of fatherhood, its *authority*. Power is always with the father, and in particular the speech of the father, the words of the Lord—*fatum*, what the father *says*. The words of the father, moreover, bring order and peace through this authority; meaning is settled, disputes are resolved, the forces of disorder and anarchy are kept in check. Paternity, as the author of a recent critique of this ‘paternal romance’ puts it, is ‘configured and projected in Western texts as an origin of culture and world-order, and as a guarantor of cultural law and justice.’²²

But always, and this is my third point, this paternal authority is ambivalent. Ambivalence is not, of course, incoherence, but may be figured as a productive way of dealing with the pull of conflicting images. It is in this sense that the ambivalence of the *princeps* as father is seen by many historians. Yet Stevenson himself, in taking this line, notes that it is not easy to control this ambivalence:

The father/tyrant antithesis attempts to give the two sides of the continuum separate images, but there is a certain uncomfortable fluidity between them. Zeus’ forcefulness, like the *potestas* of Seneca’s *paterfamilias*...is not necessarily at odds with the image of a gentle father who clearly matches the ideal benefactor, even if it is something of an embarrassment?²³

We must beware—as always—of a compliant functionalism which makes all the images of the father work together. One of the great strengths of feminist scholarship is to remind us constantly that neither the Roman Republic nor the Empire (what some call the Principate) *worked* at all, if one is prepared to consider the views of that half of the society who could never aspire to paternity. The word of the father which controls disorder is, as I have remarked, almost by definition arbitrary, a mask for violence; if it had reason on its side, why does it need to speak with *authority*? Fathers are meant to be obeyed without question; but why should an adult person ever simply do *as she is told*?

Some of the implications of these very general remarks for the reading of the *Aeneid* may already be obvious, but let me make them explicit. It is clear that the ambivalent power of the father-god can be read in more than one way. In a sense, seeing Jupiter as a father solves the

problems of the *Aeneid*. As father, Jupiter has a care for men; as Antonie Wlosok points out, when we first meet him in the poem it is *talis iactantem pectore curas* (1.227), like *pater Aeneas* full of 'väterliche Fürsorge'. But a father must punish as well, must use not only the thunderbolt but even the *Dirae*, the instruments of his wrath 'zur Wohnung der göltigen Weltordnung', to keep the peace and enforce law and order.²⁴ Like the good father Augustus, Jupiter is not a tyrant, but what he says, his *fatum*, goes.

Alternatively, however, as in traditional 'two-voices' criticism, we can try to read the sign of the father *ourselves*, in a different way, and press for a stronger ambivalence. It is notoriously unclear in the *Aeneid* whether *fatum* is just what Jupiter says or something external. One reason we find it hard to adjudicate here is that unlike Ovid's Jupiter at the end of the *Metamorphoses*,²⁵ Jupiter never offers to show the big book of fate to anyone. The master-narrative really is here in the mind of god, and Jupiter's utterances escape from the hazards of textuality to attain real presence; what happens is what Jupiter says, and what he says is what he means. One way of 'reading' this is as a mystification of power. R. Con Davis²⁶ remarks that 'the paternal romance in early Western culture puts the father in the position of seeming to be the origin of "everything", even the narrative practice that produced him' but in another sense the Father is always trying to pretend that there is something behind him, some law or higher authority of which he is only the transmitter. To see through this is in a sense NOT to see *through* the Father. On this view, beyond the book of fate would then be no more than the *ipse dixit* of the tyrant. Within the *Aeneid*, other readers, most notably Juno, try and fail to read the book of fate differently; but we do not have to cooperate with that failure. In our own cross-reading, we need not take the father's word for it.

But one thing that we have learned from Foucault and Greenblat is that 'simple' rebellion against the father, the 'simple' rebel-without-a-cause heroics of *Paradise Lost* Book One, only reinforce Big Daddy's power. It is more important to try to deconstruct the oppositions which *really* embody that power. The gendered opposition in the *Aeneid* of Jupiter and Juno is framed in terms, again, of all those Western binaries, 'culture/nature, truth/error, inside/outside, health/disease, man/woman, procreation/birthing'.²⁷ The task is not to champion one against the other, but to try to get behind the presuppositions which underlie

D.P. FOWLER

these genealogies, to try to get back to the point *before* the father has already won. And this is a task both necessary and impossible—or, as I should prefer to say, impossible and *necessary*.

But I am not going to do this here: after this mountainous prologue, the mouse. I do—despite appearances—want to say something specific about the *Aeneid*. Indeed, I want to say something about the father himself, *pater ipse*, what Jesus called πατήρ αὐτός not just *that* father, *Iuppiter ille*, what Jesus called (?) πατήρ ἐκεῖνος.²⁸ But the presence of this father may well prove illusory; perhaps I will only be talking about a pronoun. I want simply to challenge David West's translation of *Aeneid* 2.617–18, in the apocalyptic revelation that Venus offers Aeneas during the fall of Troy:

*ipse pater Danais animos virisque secundos
sufficit, ipse deos in Dardana suscitāt arma.*

West translates this, 'the Father of the Gods himself puts heart into the Greeks and gives them strength.' I think that *pater* means 'father', not 'Father of the Gods'; *the* father, himself, αὐτός.

Now of course Jupiter is the father of the gods, (just listed before in the passage of *Aeneid* 2 in question), and the father of Venus, *pater ipse deorum* as Germanicus terms him.²⁹ So Cicero translates the formulaic πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε by *pater ipse Iuppiter*.³⁰ In many contexts, this idea may be to the fore, as for instance in the divine assembly in the first book of Statius' *Thebaid* (1.201–5), where the gods await their father's gesture before sitting down:

*mediis sese arduus infert
ipse deis placido quatiens tamen omnia vultu
stellantique locat solio; nec protinus ausi
caelicolae, veniam donec pater ipse sedendi
tranquilla iubet esse manu.*

Even there, of course, as with all the divine assemblies of Imperial Literature, there is another Father in the background; and in general it is difficult to say what *pater* means, not in the sense of some controlled ambiguity but rather through a leakage of sense, a feeling that the word which carries all the semantic weight in these contexts is not *pater* but

ipse. The first two occurrences of the collocation *pater ipse* of god³¹ in Latin poetry are both in Cicero, though it would not be surprising if the phrase had occurred in Ennius: both show the problem. One is from the *Marius*, fr. 7 Traglia (9–12):

*Hanc ubi propetibus pinnis lapsuque volentem
conspexit Marius, divini numinis augur,
faustaue signa suae laudis reditusque notavit,
partibus intonuit caeli pater ipse sinistris.*

The other is from the *De consulatu*, fr. 11 Traglia (36–8):

*Nam pater altitonans stellanti nixus Olympo
ipse suos quondam tumulos ac templa petivit
et Capitolinis iniecit sedibus ignis.*

Neither of these passages is difficult to translate. In the first, Marius is rewarded with a sign not just from any god but from Jupiter *himself*, the very father of the sky. Similarly in the second, the importance of the prodigy is shown by the fact that Jupiter *himself* takes a hand in the revelation, rather than leaving it to mediation. As Cicero remarks earlier in the same fragment, 31–2:

*Haec fore perpetuis signis clarisque frequentans
ipse deum genitor caelo terrisque canebat.*

The sign³² of the father *himself* is the sign of a *presence*, of an unmediated truth: so Aeneas prays the Sibyl in *Aeneid* 6.76 not to entrust her prophecies to writing, but *ipsa canas oro*. As Statius remarks (*Theb.* 1.213) *vocem fata sequuntur*, ‘fate follows the voice’. But does *pater* in the Cicero examples mean anything? To put it another way, how paternal is he in these revelations of fate? It is interesting to see what happens to Cicero’s *ipse deum genitor* tag in the *Aeneid*. It turns up in Juno’s speech in *Aeneid* 7, where she is indignant that even the father of the gods allowed Calydon to be destroyed (304–7):

*Mars perdere gentem
immanem Lapithum valuit, concessit in iras*

D.P. FOWLER

*ipse deum antiquam genitor Calydona Dianae,
quod scelus aut Lapithas tantum aut Calydona merentem?*

If Jupiter is here firmly the father of *the gods*, there is still something *unfatherly* in his act, which makes us think that he is also—is he not?—the father of men.

Let me return to that passage of *Aeneid* 2, where the father himself was helping the Greeks. Three passages of the *Georgics* are recalled. The closest of these is from the description of Jupiter's anger against men, when he reveals the power of his thunderbolt (1.328–31):

*ipse pater media nimborum in nocte corusca
fulmina molitur dextra, quo maxima motu
terra tremit, fugere ferae et mortalia corda
per gentis humilis stravit pavor.*

As has often been observed, however, the passage is balanced by a later one in which the beneficence of the father's signs are stressed (1.351–5):

*Atque haec ut certis possemus discere signis,
aestusque pluviasque et agentis frigora ventos,
ipse pater statuit quid menstrua luna moneret,
quo signo caderent Austri, quid saepe videntes
agricolae propius stabulis armenta tenerent.*

And finally the mediation between these aspects of the father may be provided by the description of Jupiter's plan for the improvement of mankind at the beginning of the book (1.121–4):

*pater ipse colendi
haud facilem esse viam voluit, primusque per artem
movit agros, curis acuens mortalia corda
nec torpere gravi passus sua regna veterno.*

How one reads this trio of course depends on how one reads the *Georgics*, as well as vice versa; one may stress paternal care or arbitrary violence, one may take to the image of the father doing all this for our own good, or one may find it terrifying. Rather than rehearsing these familiar

arguments, I will merely draw attention to a point that has been made by Alessandro Schiesaro³³ about the *epistemology* of the *Georgics*, especially in relation to the second passage 1.351–5. One of the differences between the *Georgics* and its Lucretian model, according to Schiesaro, is that in the *De rerum natura* the didactic addressee is encouraged to find solutions for himself, whereas the *Georgics* is both more sceptical and more authoritarian about knowledge. It is hard to find certainty for oneself; one can do no more than listen to the experts. And obviously he wishes to connect this shift with the shift in cultural values of which the beginnings of the empire are part. Lucretius too had followed a father, Epicurus *ipse pater veri* (Petron. *Sat.* 132.7), but there was also a stress on independence generated by the possibility of knowledge. In the more post-modern world of the *Georgics*, knowledge is in the depths, and authority therefore all the more important. On this line of argument, it is not difficult to guess who is the real father here, the *pater* not of truth but of the Fatherland.

The implication of those passages of the *Georgics* in the revelation of *Aeneid* 2 makes it impossible to restrict *pater ipse* there to the Father of the Gods. It is the father himself who lends authority here to the Greeks' destruction of Troy, our father in heaven whose fatherly care is here perverted—doubtless for the good of mankind, for the *fata* which decree the fall of Troy and the rise of Rome. This is borne out too by the Homeric intertexts, the removal of the mist from Diomedes' eyes in *Iliad* 5.127–8 and from Ajax's in *Iliad* 17.626–50, passages with a long philosophical progeny in the rhetoric of blindness and sight.³⁴ Although Venus is more like Athene in *Iliad* 5, it is the second passage which is more important for *Aeneid* 2:

Nor was it unseen by great-hearted Aias how Zeus shifted
the strength of the fighting toward the Trojans, nor by Menelaos.

First

of the two to speak was huge Telamonian Aias:

‘Shame on it! By now even one with a child's innocence
could see how *father Zeus himself is helping the Trojans*.

The weapons of each of these take hold, no matter who throws them,
good fighter or bad, since Zeus is straightening all of them
equally,

while ours fall to the ground and are utterly useless. Therefore

D.P. FOWLER

let us deliberate with ourselves upon the best counsel,
how at the same time to rescue the dead body, and also
win back ourselves, and bring joy to our beloved companions
who look our way and sorrow for us, and believe no longer
that the fury of manslaughtering Hektor, his hand irresistible,
can be held, but must be driven on to the black ships.

But there should be some companion who could carry the
message

quickly to Peleus' son, since I think he has not heard
the ghastly news, how his beloved companion has fallen.

Yet I cannot make out such a man amongst the Achaians, since
they are

held by the mist alike, the men and their horses.

*Father Zeus, draw free from the mist the sons of the Achaians,
make bright the air, and give sight back to our eyes; in shining
daylight destroy us, if to destroy us be now your pleasure.'*

He spoke thus, and as he wept the father took pity upon him,
and forthwith scattered the mist and pushed the darkness back
from them... *(Iliad 17.626–49, trans. Lattimore)*

Ajax's prayer to Zeus (645) is based on his apprehension that anyone—even a fool—can see that 'Father Zeus himself is helping the Trojans', Τρώεσσι πατήρ Ζεὺς αὐτὸς ἀρήγει (630). In answer, 'the father had pity on him as he wept τὸν δὲ πατήρ ὀλοφύρατο δάκρυ χέοντα (648). Ajax can see that the father is helping the Trojans, but is rewarded with a paternal act of pity from Zeus; Aeneas is given to see that the father himself is helping the Greeks, as a special act of providence from his mother. The proof for Ajax that the father is helping the Trojans is that the Greek spear-throws get nowhere, but Zeus 'guides aright' (632) all the casts of the Trojans. The father's presence and authority guarantee success, the right target, the right meaning—but, as in the *Aeneid*, for the wrong side.

It is noticeable that the Latin passages are associated especially with augury, and it is possible that the phrase *pater ipse* occurred in augural usage, or that a prominent passage in e.g. Ennius' *Annales* used it of confirmation by or of a portent. Normally the gods work indirectly in their dealings with men, through dark oracles or surrogates, and the meaning of their warnings and threats is unclear and ambiguous. Sometimes, however, they speak and act *themselves*, with full presence

in their utterance, and this is above all the prerogative of the father, Jupiter himself. The opposition between directness and indirectness is again gendered; women are forced always into subterfuge and periphrasis, men can come right out and say what they mean (and mean what they say). This fact was not lost on Juno, when she took matters into her own hands in *Aeneid* 7 (620–2):

*tum regina deum caelo delapsa morantis
impulit ipsa manu portas, et cardine uerso
Belli ferratos rumpit Saturnia postis.*

Virgil innovates in having Juno open the gates of war, or, to be more exact, Juno innovates in deciding to act the man and do it herself: the queen of heaven aspires to the directness of the father (who focalises *regina deum*?³⁵), and like him shatters the temples of men with a bolt from the blue. The representative of narrative *mora*³⁶ acts to remove another obstacle to the plot—just like a woman trying to be just like a man.

In *Aeneid* 2, not the father of the gods but the father himself is helping the Greeks. A productive paradox, or a sign that the sign of the father is hopelessly split? Holding these fathers together is notoriously difficult for religions: Manicheanism will give up the attempt and unashamedly offer us two divine fathers, the grim creator and the loving saviour, and even Christianity may divide the responsibility between the Father and the Son (not to mention the Holy Ghost). The Romans were more monotheistic, more attracted to the unity of the *pater Romanus* and traditional family values. A modern atheist may feel that she has given this father up, that with the disappearance of god himself, and with the unchaining of that semi-deictic *ipse* from any reference, the father has also disappeared. But god the father is less easy to be rid of, if we understand him as the locus of authority, the (male) being who by his words determines meaning, who fashions *fatum* with his *ipse dixit*, who decides whose spear-casts succeed and whose fail. To try even to give up that father in heaven is much more difficult, the implications much more radical. It may not, indeed, be possible; but, again, I am sure that it is worthwhile.

D.P. FOWLER

NOTES

1. Cf. Feeney (1991) 137–8.
2. For surveys of recent work, see Bradley (1993) and Saller (1994), esp. 102–153: in addition to the latter, major studies include Evans (1991), Eyben (1993), Gardner and Wiedemann (1991), Kertzer and Saller (1991), and Rawson (1991a).
3. *Ant. Rom.* 2.26.1 ff., esp. §4.
4. Veyne (1978), (1987).
5. Evans (1991) 169.
6. Eyben (1991) 118–9
7. Saller (1991), and now esp. (1994).
8. Dixon (1991).
9. Evans (1991) 179.
10. Saller (1991) 165 n. 33: cf. Saller (1994), esp. 151–3.
11. Alföldi (1952).
12. Stevenson (1992).
13. Martindale (1994) 51.
14. Derrida (1981) 76.
15. Cf. Assoun (1989), Pucci (1992) 2–3.
16. See especially the essays by S. Rowbotham and S. Alexander and B. Taylor in Samuel (1981); Pateman (1988).
17. Daly (1973).
18. See for example the essays in Mek and Schillebeeckx (1981) and Kimel (1992), especially J. Martin Soskice's 'Can a Feminist call God Father?'
19. On attempts to ground this in Jesus' use of *abba*, see the suggestively titled 'Abba isn't Daddy', Barr (1988). For some of the anti-semitic undertones of pseudo-feminist anti-judaism, see Brumlik (1986).
20. Derrida (1981).
21. The reference to the Capitol in 448 points to Jupiter, but the *domus Aeneae* pushes us towards Augustus and his successors, and the general nature of the prophecy suggests reading *pater Romanus* as a general 'Roman father'. As Hardie (1994) remarks ad loc., 'it may be preferable not to confine the resonance of these phrases.'
22. Davis (1993) 3.
23. Stevenson (1992) 432–3.
24. Wlosok (1983) 200.
25. *Met.* 15.807–15, where Venus is offered the opportunity to go look at the book of fate in the archives of the Three Sisters; but she has no need to, as Jupiter himself has read it and can tell her, *ne sis etiamnum* (i.e. after the *Aeneid*) *ignara futuri* (815). I discuss the implications of this passage elsewhere.
26. Davis (1993) 15.
27. Davis (1993) 141.
28. John 5.37, 12.49, ὁ πέμψας με πατὴρ ἐκεῖνος/αὐτός (where the text should presumably be regularised to one or the other); for the Latin phrase *pater ille deum*, see Austin on *Aen.* 2.779, Harrison on *Aen.* 10.875.
29. *Phaen.* 542. Cf. Martial 9.3.6 *pater ipse deum*.
30. *De Fato* fr. 3 = *Poet.* fr. 67 Traglia.
31. Cf. Catull. 64.21 (linked to 62.60–1); cf. Stat. *Theb.* 9.71–2, and *Aen.* 5.241 (Portunus), Sen. *Phaed.* 717, Val. Fl. 2.605, 4.571 (Neptune), Stat. *Theb.* 2.217–8

(Inachus), *Sil. It.* 9.187 (Eridanus).

32. Cf. *Aen.* 6.780 *pater ipse suo superum iam signat honore* with Austin ad loc., Putnam (1985).

33. In a paper forthcoming in the proceedings of the conference *The Roman Cultural Revolution* edited by him and T. Habinek.

34. See Mayor, Courtney on Juvenal 10.3–4 *remota / erroris nebula*, especially the discussion in Plato *Alc.* 2.150d.

35. Cf. *Aen.* 1.9 (with the brilliant comment of [Sen.] *Oct.* 200–210)

36. Cf. 7.315, Feeney (1991) 146–7.

I am grateful to Debra Hershkowitz, Effie Spentzou, Liz Stuart, and audiences at Haverford College and the Virgil Society for many helpful suggestions and corrections. This paper was partly written while I held a Senior Research Fellowship of the British Academy, to whom I am, as ever, most grateful for support.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alföldi, A.

1952 'Die Geburt der kaiserliche Bildsymbolik 3. Pater Patriae' *MH* 9, 204–43; 10 (1953) 103–24; 11 (1954) 133–69.

Assoun, P.–L.

1989 'Fonctions freudiennes de père' in *Le père* ed. A. Muxel and J. M. Rennes (Paris) 25–51.

Barr, J.

1988 'Abba isn't Daddy' *JThS* 39, 28–47.

Bettini, M.

1991 *Anthropology and Roman Culture* (Baltimore and London).

Bradley, K.

1993 'Writing the History of the Roman Family' *CPh* 88, 237–50.

Brumlik, M.

1986 'Die Angst vor dem Vater. Judenfeindliche Tendenzen im Umkreis neuer sozialen Bewegungen' in A. Silbermann and J.H. Schoeps eds *Antisemitismus nach dem Holocaust* (Cologne) 133–62.

Daly, M.

1973 *Beyond God the Father* (London, revised edn 1986).

Davis, R. Con

1993 *The Paternal Romance: Reading God the Father in Early Western Culture* (Urbana and Chicago).

Derrida, J.

1981 'Plato's Pharmacy' in *Dissemination* trans. B. Johnson (London, orig. Paris 1972, article published 1968) 63–171.

Dixon, S.

1991 'The Sentimental Ideal of the Roman Family' in Rawson (1991a) 99–113.

Evans, J. K.

1991 *War, Women, and Children in Ancient Rome* (London and New York).

Eyben, E.

1991 'Fathers and Sons' in Rawson (1991a) 114–43.

1993 *Restless Youth in Ancient Rome* (London).

D.P. FOWLER

Feeney, D.

1991 *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford).

Gardner, J.F. and Wiedemann, T.

1991 *The Roman Household: a Sourcebook* (London and New York).

Hardie, P.

1994 Ed. *Virgil, Aeneid Book IX* (Cambridge).

Kertzer, D.I. and Saller, R.P.

1991 *The Family in Italy from Antiquity to the Present* (New Haven and London).

Kimel, A.F. Jr.

1992 *Speaking the Christian God* (Leominster).

Krause, J-V.

1992 *Die Familie und weitere anthropologische Grundlagen* (Stuttgart).

Martindale, C.

1994 *Redeeming the Text* (Cambridge).

Mek, J.B., and Schillebeeckx, E. eds

1981 *God as Father?* (Edinburgh).

Pateman, C.

1988 *The Sexual Contract* (Cambridge).

Ptyches, M.

1993 *A Father's Place, Fatherhood as God Intended* (London).

Pucci, P.

1992 *Oedipus and the Fabrication of the Father* (Baltimore and London).

Putnam, M.C.J.

1985 'Romulus *Tropaeophorus* (*Aeneid* 6. 779–80)' *CQ* NS 35, 237–40.

Rawson, B.

1991a *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome* (Oxford).

1991b 'Adult–Child Relationships in Roman Society' in Rawson (1991a) 7–30.

Saller, R.

1991 'Corporal Punishment, Authority, and Obedience in the Roman Household' in Rawson (1991a) 144–65.

1994 *Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family* (Cambridge).

Samuel, R. ed.

1981 *People's History and Socialist Theory* (London).

Schneider–Böcklen, E., and Vorländer, D.

1991 *Feminismus und Glaube* (Mainz).

Stevenson, T.R.

1992 'The Ideal benefactor and the Father Analogy in Greek and Roman Thought' *CQ* 42, 421–36.

Tellenbach, H.

1978 *Das Vaterbild im Abendland* (Stuttgart).

Veyne, P.

1978 'La famille et l'amour sous le haut empire romain' *Annales, ESC* 33, 35–63.

1987 ed. *A History of Private Life* (Cambridge Mass.).

Wlosok, A.

1978 'Vater und Vaternvorstellungen in der römischen Kultur' in Tellenbach 18–54.

1983 'Vergil als Theolog: Iuppiter – *pater omnipotens*' *Gymnasium* 90, 187–202.

Virgil's Contribution to Pastoral¹

A paper given to the Virgil Society on 22 January 1994

As pastoral poetry is about *pastores*, we expect it to present an age-old peaceful existence, quite different from that of warriors, hunters, or even farmers. In Theocritus' bucolic idylls this expectation is largely fulfilled. The occasional references to hunting (e.g., *Id.* 5.106–7 and 8.58) are entirely incidental; in *Id.* 10, which is about harvesters, one character has ceased to be an effective workman since he has fallen in love; *Id.* 21, about fishing, is not by Theocritus. It seems that strenuous work is only accepted when it has been stylized and frozen into a work of art. Thus, in *Id.* 1.39–44, a carved bowl shows 'an old fisherman and a rough rock on which the old fellow energetically gathers up a big net for a cast, with every sign of intense effort. You would say he was fishing with every ounce of his strength from the way the sinews stand out all around his neck, in spite of his grey hair.'² The pastoral life itself is idealized. Wolves and drought rarely obtrude; we hear nothing of endless walking over rough terrain, the discomforts of a shepherd's hut, the strain of tending sick animals in bad weather. The main factor disturbing the shepherd's tranquillity, whether for pleasure or pain, is love.

Hard work belonged to another tradition, that of Hesiod's *Works and Days* and Virgil's *Georgics*. The distinction is observed in the story of Cain and Abel (Genesis 4). Cain offered agricultural produce as a gift to the Lord; Abel offered the first-born of his flock. And the Lord rejected the first gift but accepted the second. Why? It is not made clear how Cain is supposed to have been at fault. One wonders whether the story reflects the notion that agriculture was imposed on man by the primal curse: 'Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life...in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground' (Genesis 3.17 and 19); whereas the

shepherd's life was closer to our prelapsarian state. Certainly Hesiod's description of the golden age points in that direction: 'They lived like gods, without sorrow of heart, remote and free from toil and grief...the fruitful earth unforced bare them fruit abundantly and without stint. They dwelt in ease and peace upon their lands with many good things, rich in flocks and loved by the blessed gods' (*WD* 112–20, Loeb edn). There the spontaneously growing crops are pure fantasy; the flocks are not.

When compared with those early conditions, the squalor of the present suggests that we have abused nature, broken God's laws, and fallen into sin, as in Hesiod's story of Prometheus and Pandora (*WD* 47–82), the serpent and the tree in Genesis 3, and the evil Lycaon in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1.211–43. Hence the restoration of the golden age or paradise would appear as a kind of redemption. This allowed pastoral motifs to flow readily into Christian channels. One thinks of the shepherds abiding in the fields, the good shepherd, the lamb of God, and so on; similarly the sentimental love of the Greek herdsmen was transmuted into the spiritual love of Christ. Such developments are, of course, illustrated in art as well as in literature.³

So far we have spoken of the pastoral life as earlier and easier, more healthy and spontaneous, more 'natural' than life in the city. But 'natural' is a notoriously ambiguous word. As well as meaning 'unspoilt' it can also mean 'raw' and even 'savage'. Except for a few passing hints, such defects are not ascribed to the herdsmen of pastoral poetry. In spite of their simple life, they are not normally portrayed as uncouth, though an ironic awareness that they *are* so sometimes lurks behind the genre. This was what William Empson had in mind when he said 'whereas most fairy stories and ballads are written by and for [the people], but not about them, pastoral is (ostensibly) about the people, but not written by them or for them.'⁴ Hence the convention that herdsmen speak an educated literary language and have sensitive feelings about love. This polite convention is already operating in Theocritus, whose Greek is a mixture from different periods and places.⁵

In Theocritus' bucolic idylls we encounter a pattern in which a disconsolate herdsman sings by himself (*Id.* 3 and 11), or two herdsmen hold a conversation (*Id.* 4)—a conversation which may lead to a song (*Id.* 1), an exchange of songs (*Id.* 7, 9, 10), or an actual contest (*Id.* 5, 6, 8). In the last type we can abstract a scene in which, on a sunny day in late spring or summer, when sheep are grazing on the hillside, two herdsmen

meet and exchange banter. This leads to an invitation, or challenge, to a singing match. Stakes are agreed, and an umpire is found. The trio then withdraws into a *locus amoenus* like a cave or the shade of a tree, and the contest begins. After singing in turn about topics of love, music, and country life, the contestants finish and a decision is announced. This brings us to the first of the five bases on which Virgil constructs his innovations:

I. Theocritean and bucolic

Even in his earliest pieces Virgil departs significantly from his 'model'. But this category is still valid, in that his changes are mainly stylistic changes from within the genre. This could be illustrated from the competition piece *Ecl.* 3 (or from *Ecl.* 7, which is somewhat later); but here I will use the formally simpler *Ecl.* 2, which draws on *Idylls* 3, 6, 10, and 11.⁶ It is a solo, sung from the shelter of the woods during the heat of the day by the lovelorn Corydon. He begins:

O cruel Alexis, do you care nothing for my songs? Do you not pity me at all? Are you forcing me in the end to die?

This is an adaptation of *Id.* 3.6–9:

O graceful Amaryllis, why do you peep no more from this cave of yours and call me in—me, your sweetheart? Do you hate me, then?... You will make me hang myself.

Whereas Theocritus' shepherd delivers a serenade to the cave-dwelling Amaryllis, Corydon is by himself; everything that follows presents what is going on in his mind. The Greek shepherd speaks only as a lover; but Corydon is aware of himself as a poet. Again, hatred is stronger than indifference, and hanging more graphically precise than death. Finally, in the first line, Virgil puns on Alexis' name, connecting it ironically with ἀλέγω, 'I care' (cf. v. 56). So on this very small piece of evidence Corydon is gentler, more introspective, more clever, and less specific than his prototype. In view of συμός ('snub nosed' in 8) he may also be less grotesque; but this comes out much more clearly when he is compared with the Cyclops in *Id.* 6. There and in *Id.* 11 Polyphemus is no longer the monster of the *Odyssey*; he is young, tame, and sentimental; but he

NIALL RUDD

is still monocular. In *Id.* 6, then, a shepherd adopting the role of Polyphemus sings:

I am not as ugly as they say. Not long ago on a calm day I stared into the sea, and my beard looked very handsome, and so did my one eye, to my way of thinking; and the reflection of my teeth was whiter than Parian marble. But to avoid the evil eye I spat three times on my chest as the hag Cotyttaris taught me. (34–9)

Virgil's Corydon says:

And I am not so ugly. The other day I saw myself on the shore when the wind was still and the sea calm. If a reflection never lies, I would not be afraid to let you judge between me and Daphnis. (25–7)

Here Theocritus' grotesqueness and his touch of superstition have gone; but so has his vividness. The presence of Daphnis in *Ecl.* 2 is explained by the fact that in *Id.* 6 the singer *is* in competition with Daphnis—but in music, not in beauty. 'A reflection never lies' sounds like a proverb; but, as Clausen points out, Virgil will also have learned from his Epicurean studies that deception arises, not from the reflection as such, but from false inference.

At the end of *Id.* 11 Polyphemus, who has been hoping to entice Galatea out of the water, gives up:

Ah Cyclops, Cyclops, where have your wits wandered? You'd have more sense if you went and wove cheese-baskets and gathered greenery for your young lambs. Milk the ewe that's by; why chase the one who flees? Perhaps you'll find another prettier Galatea. (72–6)

Corydon says:

Ah Corydon, Corydon, what madness has seized you? The vine on your leafy elm is only half pruned. Why not go and weave something useful from twigs and soft rushes? You'll

find another Alexis if this one rejects you. (69–73)

The rustic maxim 'milk the ewe that's by' is not in Virgil, and the cheese-baskets have become just 'something useful'. So too, in an earlier verse of the eclogue (43), Thestylis takes the place of 'the dark-skinned woman servant of Mermnon' (*Id.* 3.35). Such changes involve a loss of earthiness and colour. As for the conclusion of the two passages, the effect is much the same, for in neither case is the relief permanent—see *Id.* 11.12 (πολλάκι) and *Ecl.* 2.4 (*assidue*).

In yet another idyll a singer says:

Goat goes after clover; wolf after goat; crane after plough; and
I am crazy for you. (10.30–1)

Corydon says:

The fierce lioness follows the wolf; the wolf in his turn the
goat; the wanton goat follows the flowering clover; and Corydon
you, o Alexis. Each is drawn by his delight. (63–5)

In each case a series leads up to the singer's desire for his beloved. Theocritus' series is uneven. It goes A–B, C–A, D–E. Virgil's goes A–B, B–C, C–D; and he rounds it off with a *sententia* of Epicurean colouring: *trahit sua quemque uoluptas*. So Virgil is tidier and more logical; but his conventional adjectives do little work; his fanciful lioness does not belong to the realistic series;⁷ and he has toned down the frenzy of Theocritus' singer (ἔγω δ' ἐπὶ τὴν μεμάνημα). Toning down of another kind takes place in *Ecl.* 3.8, where the bawdiness is conveyed by an ellipse; contrast *Id.* 5.41–3 and 116–17.

Reverting to *Id.* 11, we notice the idyll is addressed to Nicias, Theocritus' friend, who is a doctor. It reminds him that there is no cure for love, except music. Virgil omits the epistolary framework and the humorous preamble, producing a miniature internal drama. Not being a Cyclops, Corydon is a less broadly comic figure. When Polyphemus boasts he has cattle, milk, and cheese, he adds 'And I can pipe as no other Cyclops here' (38). Corydon also refers grandly to his cattle, milk, and lambs. But as he must then add something different, he says 'And I sing as Dircaean Amphion used to sing on Attic Aracynthus'—*Amphion*

NIALL RUDD

Dircaeus in Actaeo Aracyntho (24). Greek mythological and geographical names, alliteration and assonance, weak caesura in the third foot and hiatus in the fifth, polysyllabic ending—all combine to produce a learned and self-consciously beautiful effect. The line may even come from a Callimachean poet (Clausen suggests Parthenius). Now while Corydon's claims about his livestock can be overlooked as a lover's hyperbole, this sophisticated verse is quite beyond him. The slyly amusing device whereby poet speaks to reader above the head of his character is not unknown in Theocritus. The herdsman in *Id.* 3 is surprisingly adept at citing mythological parallels (40–51), and the simple Cyclops in *Id.* 11 unwittingly conforms to the requirements of a formal serenade. But here Virgil plays the trick more often. We are told that the eclogue's polished verses are *incondita* (4), we have already noted the pun on Alexis (6 and 56) and the Epicurean associations of *imago* and *uoluptas* (27 and 65). Another example is *rusticus es, Corydon* (56), where *rusticus* can have both a neutral and a pejorative meaning.

Other, more serious, touches also point beyond the bucolic convention. Whereas in *Id.* 6 Damoetas gives Daphnis a Pan-pipe and receives a straight pipe in exchange (43), in Virgil we hear that Damoetas was on his death-bed when he bequeathed the syrinx to Corydon, and that the gift symbolized the handing on of an art as a kind of sacred trust (37–8).⁸ The contrast between the cooling of the day as the sun goes down and the persistence of Corydon's passion may have been prompted by Meleager's epigram addressed to another Alexis (*A.P.* 12.127). Finally, already the woods are beginning to assume a greater importance than they had possessed in Theocritus (see 3–5, 31, 60, 62). In the course of the book the woods come to have a special connection with pastoral verse. The key passages are 'If I sing of woods, let them be woods worthy of a consul' (4.2), 'My Thalia did not blush to live in the woods' (6.2); and 'You are playing woodland music on a slender pipe' (1.2). This explains why Milton ended *Lycidas* with the much-misquoted line 'Tomorrow to fresh woods and pastures new'.

II. Theocritean but not bucolic

Apart from his pastoral idylls, Theocritus composed in several other forms. Gow prints 24 epigrams, of which 4 are of the type 'I have dedicated (or X has dedicated) this object to that deity' (nos. 2, 10, 12, 13). *Epig.* 2 reads:

Daphnis of the white skin, who plays pastoral melodies on his lovely pipe, has dedicated these gifts to Pan: his pierced reeds, his throwing stick, a sharp javelin, a fawn-skin, and the wallet in which he carried his apples.

Though the content is pastoral, the poem itself is a dedicatory epigram, not a bucolic idyll. Taking a hint, perhaps, from *Id.* 5. 53–4 and 58–9, where two herdsmen *promise* gifts to nymphs and Pan, Virgil has composed two such epigrams, the second answering the first, in *Ecl.* 7. The first reads:

To thee, Delia, little Micon⁹ offers this head of a bristling boar
and the branching antlers of a long-lived stag. If this luck
remains, then thou shalt stand full length in polished marble,
thy ankles bound high with crimson buskins. (29–32)

So here, and in 33–6, Virgil has presented an independent dedicatory epigram, using it as a quatrain in a shepherds' singing-match. Another, shorter, example is in *Ecl.* 5.42–4, where Virgil has expanded Daphnis' dying words (*Id.* 1.120–1) into an instruction for a tomb and a sepulchral epigram.

Theocritus also wrote an imaginary wedding-song for Helen of Troy, sung by a choir of Spartan girls (*Id.* 18). It celebrates the good fortune of the worthy Menelaus and the beauty and skills of Helen; then, after asking a blessing for the happy pair, it ends 'Hymen o Hymenaeus, rejoice in this wedding'. Other epithalamia were available to Virgil from Greek poetry both early (Alcman and Sappho) and recent (Parthenius), and from the Latin neoterics (Catullus, Calvus, and Tivida).¹⁰ Certain features of the Roman ritual were mentioned by Catullus, notably torches (61.15), the arrival of the bride (61.77), and the throwing of nuts (61.121). Catullus also, drawing on the Greek poetic tradition, referred to the evening star shining from Mt. Oeta (62.7). In *Ecl.* 8 we find a very different situation. In a song, sung by Damon, a jilted shepherd reveals that his former sweetheart, Nysa, is marrying another man. With bitter sarcasm he says:

Mopsus, cut fresh torches; your wife is being escorted to you.
Scatter nuts, bridegroom; for you the evening star is leaving
Oeta. (29–30)

The jilted shepherd hates Mopsus, who apparently deserves the treacherous wife he is getting: *o digno coniuncta uiro* (32). So Virgil has put these normally happy epithalamic features into a poem of angry complaint and incorporated the whole piece in a pastoral song.

Another epithalamic motif occurs in *Ecl.* 4, where the Fates sing *talia saecla currite* to their spindles (46–7). This recalls the refrain of the Fates at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis in Catullus 64.227. Moreover, the famous line in *Ecl.* 4: *incipi, parue puer, risu cognoscere matrem* (60) was surely prompted by the baby in Catullus 61 who is supposed to smile at his father: *dulce rideat ad patrem* (212). The anticipation of a child's birth, naturally appropriate to a wedding-poem, is implied in Theocritus *Id.* 18: 'Surely she will bear a wonderful child if it be like its mother' (21). As in the case of the epigrams, I am not arguing that Virgil drew on Theocritus' words. My point is simply that whereas Theocritus' epithalamium is quite separate from his bucolic idylls and has no pastoral features, Virgil embodied elements of an epithalamium in two of his eclogues.¹¹

The most striking instance in this category, however, is the song of Alpheisiboeus in the second part of *Ecl.* 8. To appreciate what Virgil has done here, we have to remind ourselves of Theocritus *Id.* 2. There Simaetha, an unmarried woman, is living alone, except for her servant. In desperation she resorts to magic in order to win back her lover, Delphis. The first part of this powerful poem consists of a 16-line introduction explaining Simaetha's fears, and setting out her intentions. Then comes a series of nine incantatory stanzas interspersed with a refrain: 'O magic wheel, draw that man to my home.' In the second part Simaetha recalls how Delphis became her lover. This narrative section is punctuated with another refrain: 'Tell me, o lady moon, whence came my love.' Then, in a final section, Simaetha reveals that she suspects Delphis of being unfaithful and that she is resolved to win him back or else consign him to Hades. How, then, did Virgil adapt this wholly unpastoral poem to his purpose? Except for a few details, he ignored the introduction and the narrative; but he took over the incantations and turned them into a song which is sung by the shepherd Alpheisiboeus. This was a crucial decision; for it broke the identity of singer and sufferer. Like Damon in the first part, Alpheisiboeus is *not* miserable; nor is he performing magic. He is enjoying himself in the countryside on a fine clear morning. His song also implies a change of setting. Whereas

Simaetha lives in a town, Virgil's woman has her house in the country—*ducite ab urbe domum* is the refrain. And what is the lover called? Not Delphis, but the familiar pastoral name, Daphnis. As for the song itself, Virgil has reduced Theocritus' pathetic intensity. He has nothing corresponding to *Id.* 2.38–41: 'Look, the sea is still, and still are the breezes. But I am all on fire for him who has made me not, alas, a wife, but a miserable girl, no longer a virgin.' The point is clearer still when we compare *Ecl.* 8.91–3:

The man who betrayed me once left these articles behind as pledges of his love. Now in the very doorway I entrust them to you, o Earth. These pledges guarantee Daphnis to me.

with *Id.* 2.53–6:

Delphis lost this fringe belonging to his cloak, which I now shred and cast into the cruel flames. Ah torturing Love, why have you clung to me like some leech of the fen, sucking all the dark blood from my body?

The weird supernatural element has also been played down. Simaetha's magic wheel has given way to *carmina*—a clever choice, since the word can mean both songs and spells. In vv. 95–9 of the eclogue we hear of werewolves, necromancy, and the charming of crops—all highly melodramatic examples of witchcraft. But they are not supposed to be taking place within the poem. 'I have seen such things happen,' says the speaker; but they are not going on now. Likewise, in v. 19 spells are said to be *capable* of drawing down the moon. But in Theocritus' mime that in a sense is what happens. Simaetha invokes Hecate (the infernal aspect of the moon goddess); and the dogs of the town begin to howl on her approach (35–6). Virgil's woman, however, does not invoke Hecate. Her dog is called Yapper (Hylax), and when he barks, it may be a sign that Daphnis has returned (107). So the eclogue has the possibility of a happy ending, whereas the idyll retains a wistful sadness as Simaetha bids farewell to the moon:

Farewell, o Queen, and turn your steeds towards the ocean. I will bear my longing as I have endured it until now. O moon

NIALL RUDD

on your gleaming throne, farewell; and farewell, you other
stars that follow the chariot of quiet Night.

III. Roman public events in Theocritean dress

Ecl. 5 is generally thought to be early because of the reference to *Eclogues* 2 and 3 in 85–8. If that is true, one would expect it to exhibit prominent Theocritean features; and in fact it does. The shepherds Menalcas and Mopsus meet and exchange pleasantries. At Menalcas' request Mopsus then sings a lament for Daphnis. This is based on *Id.* 1; but there are some important differences. First, Virgil has added a few touches reminiscent of post-Theocritean pastoral; e.g., the animals' refusal to graze (25–6) recalls the *Lament for Bion*, 43–4. A non-bucolic feature already noted is the sepulchral epigram (43–4). More significant, Virgil has shifted one's attention from the dying Daphnis and his bitter recriminations to the blighting effects of his death on the countryside. With this shift, the role of Aphrodite disappears. In Theocritus Daphnis had in some way fallen foul of the goddess, and she was directly or indirectly responsible for his death. Virgil says only that his death was cruel (20) and was brought about by the Fates (34).

After a polite interchange, Menalcas then celebrates the resurrection and apotheosis of Daphnis. The text implies that this song was actually composed some time before the first (compare *iam pridem* in 55 with *nuper* in 13). But when the two were put together they formed a natural sequence, which Klingner compared to Good Friday followed by Easter Monday. Another notable feature of the songs is their identical length—25 lines. Formal symmetry was becoming more important for Virgil than it had been for Theocritus.

But, in addition to all this, *Ecl.* 5 adumbrates another development. In 49 BC, as Caesar was preparing to face Pompey, a kite is said to have dropped a branch of laurel on the forum.¹² In 45, after Munda, it was decreed that Caesar should always wear a laurel wreath; that his lictors should have laurel in their *fasces*; and that his messenger should carry laurel on his spear.¹³ In 42 BC, everyone was obliged to wear or carry laurel at the birthday ceremonies.¹⁴ Numerous divine honours were voted to Caesar before March 44.¹⁵ Then in July of that year a comet which appeared for seven days was seen as a sign that Caesar's soul had been received in heaven. In January 42 BC, at the instance of the triumvirs, those honours were officially confirmed and others were added.

Caesar's birthday (13 July) was to be observed on the 12th to avoid conflict with the most important day of Apollo's games. But as the month had already been named after Julius, and as Caesar's games lasted from July 20 to 30 whereas Apollo's lasted only from the 6th to the 13th, 'the month now belonged more to Caesar than to Apollo'.¹⁶ In addition, various attractive things, not normally attributed to a successful general, were attached to Caesar's cult, e.g. *pax*, *concordia*, *clementia*, *pietas* (the affection felt for the great man by his people), and *salus* (the security and prosperity they enjoyed thanks to his achievements). These blessings must surely have been stressed by Antony in what Cicero calls *tua illa pulchra laudatio, tua miseratio, tua cohortatio* (*Phil.* 2.91). This assumption is supported by the great set piece in *Dio* 44. 36–94, especially 45–9, which adverts again and again to Caesar's kindness and humanity. The same is true of Appian's account in *Bell. Civ.* 2.144–6. At the end of 145, Antony says 'Let us conduct this sacred man to the blessed ones, chanting for him the customary hymn and lamentation.' Dio's Antony incorporates elements of a dirge in his peroration: 'Of what avail, Caesar, was your humanity? Of what avail your inviolability? Of what avail your laws?... Woe for your grey hairs spattered with blood! Alas for your torn robe...!' (49). Suetonius speaks of the lamentations uttered by crowds of foreigners (*Caes.* 74).

In view of all this, it was surely inevitable that in the late 40s a poem lamenting the cruel death of a superhuman benefactor, rehearsing his services, describing the grief of his people, and affirming his divinity, should have been associated with the death and apotheosis of Caesar, the more so since Daphnis received his name from the laurel,¹⁷ and his cult was juxtaposed in Virgil's text with that of Apollo (*Ecl.* 5.65 ff.). A negative point may be added. As we saw, Virgil removed all reference to the circumstances of Daphnis' death. Had he taken over the erotic background outlined by Theocritus, that would have impeded the association with Caesar; for Venus would never have caused the death of her own descendant.

None of this means that Daphnis = Caesar in the *Eclogues*. Such an equivalence is not apposite in 3, 7, or 8, and is ruled out for 9 by v. 47, where Daphnis is separate from Caesar's star. Nor can we even say that Daphnis = Caesar throughout *Ecl.* 5. There he is in the first instance the legendary Sicilian shepherd; he is also, in spite of his youth (54), a master and teacher of music (48–9); and he is also a vegetation-spirit

NIALL RUDD

like Bacchus and Ceres (79). Such a fluid situation is not uncommon in the *Eclogues*. Thus 'Menalcas' in *Ecl.* 5.86 reveals that he composed *Eclogues* 2 and 3; but it does not follow that Menalcas = Virgil in 3 or in 10, or even that Menalcas is consistently Virgil in 9. The terminology of identity, equivalence, or even continuous allegory is too crude and rigid for the *Eclogues*. To appreciate those poems, the empiric has to relax his usual criteria, and try to catch the hints and echos, the glimpses and half-lights, that Virgil has provided.

'The Messianic Eclogue', or 'The Pollio', as it was sometimes called, represents a further stage in Virgil's transformation of pastoral. This can be seen in three areas. First, the pattern is more complex than in *Ecl.* 5, the material being arranged in groups of seven lines, divided as follows:

3		2+2
	4+3	7
	3+4	2+5
	28	

Secondly, the poem is an unusual example of pastoral. True, the Sicilian Muses are invoked; the golden age is described in pastoral terms (the goats will come of their own accord, the herds will be safe, and flowers will burst from the little boy's cradle), and Virgil imagines himself singing the young man's achievements in the guise of an Arcadian shepherd. Yet the opening line proclaims that this is an extension of the genre: *paulo maiora canamus*; these woods must be worthy of a consul. So the poem is, in part, a tribute to the consul Asinius Pollio. Now Theocritus had written two elaborate encomia, one to Hiero of Syracuse (*Id.* 16), the other to Ptolemy Philadelphus of Alexandria (*Id.* 17). Both were over 100 lines long, and each contained an adroit but unmistakable appeal for patronage. In spite of a hint in *Id.* 7.93, such praises were not characteristic of the bucolic idylls. But here again Virgil takes a more expansive view of the genre. In *Ecl.* 3.84–9 Pollio is both a practising poet and a powerful statesman; he also (according to most scholars) appears in *Ecl.* 8.6–13.¹⁸ But in neither case can we be sure that the praises formed part of the original poem. In *Ecl.* 4, however, the tribute is clearly integral. The same may be said of the the compliment to Varus in *Ecl.* 6.6–12.

Yet Pollio's function in the poem is limited to the fact that he is

consul at the time of the marvellous child's conception. The child himself is altogether more important. And here we reach our third point, viz. that in *Ecl.* 4 the bucolic convention is being used in an unprecedented way as the vehicle of a political prophecy. As the fifth spoke of a divine man, the fourth heralds the birth of a divine child, who will bring a new era of peace. Speculation about the child's identity is inevitable. Recent discussions conclude, without qualification, that Virgil was referring to the hypothetical son of Antony and Octavia, who married in the autumn of 40 BC.¹⁹ It is argued that after Philippi Antony was the strongest of the triumvirs; that in a poem addressed to Pollio, an adherent of Antony's, Virgil would naturally be referring to the latter; that the marriage of Octavian to Scribonia, contracted a few months earlier, would now be irrelevant. If we ask why Virgil has been so vague, we are told that precision was needless, since everyone who mattered knew the truth; or that to have specified Antony would have diminished the glory of Pollio; or that Virgil was writing in an oracular style which made explicit information inappropriate.

Most of this is convincing enough; but it needs, I think, to be blurred a bit at the edges. First, in the winter of 41 BC Antony was considerably embarrassed by the actions of his wife and brother which led to the débâcle at Perusia. As his relations with Octavian deteriorated, it was he who went to see Octavian, not *vice versa*. And as a result of the Peace of Brundisium Octavian's gains reduced the gap between the two warlords. Again, the position of Octavian vis-à-vis the poem cannot be so easily disposed of. After the spring of 40, Virgil would have had dealings with him either directly or indirectly through his officers (*Eclogues* 1 and 9 are relevant to this period), whereas he had no dealings with Antony. So Virgil may well have thought it impolitic to celebrate the latter in unambiguous terms. 'Everyone who mattered knew'—well, perhaps; but did they tell the rest? In antiquity there was a claim by Asinius Gallus, Pollio's son;²⁰ other claims were made on behalf of Augustus, Marcellus, and Jesus Christ. But neither of the two modern candidates was ever mentioned. What would have happened, one wonders, had Octavian and Scribonia hit it off, and she had borne a son instead of a daughter? Virgil might have preserved a sphinx-like inscrutability. As for the oracular style, that was probably an effect rather than a cause. In other words, when he came to praise Pollio and to celebrate the Peace of Brundisium, Virgil reflected first on the

NIALL RUDD

complexities of the situation. A son of Antony's might indeed supply a focus of loyalty; but Octavian was a potent presence, and might not welcome the secondary role of maternal uncle. Moreover, there might in the end be no son, or even no child. So better not be too precise.²¹ An utterance modelled on that of the Cumaean Sibyl would be more prudent; it would be more appropriate to the proclamation of a new epoch in history, with all the portentous religious associations attending such a change; and it would make a more impressive and intriguing poem.

In Theocritus *Id.* 7 three friends walk out from town to a harvest festival. They fall in with a goatherd (Lycidas) who is a well-known poet. The narrator and he agree to perform turn about, and each sings a love-song. Then Lycidas branches off, and the others continue to the scene of the festival which is described in joyful and sumptuous language. In *Ecl.* 9 Virgil omits the narrative, and presents a dialogue between two countrymen. One is called Lycidas; but unlike Theocritus' character he is a young poet who has not yet become famous. Also, he and Moeris are walking *into* town. But these minor inversions do not prepare us for the extraordinary conversation which follows and totally inverts the *mood* of Theocritus' idyll. In answer to Lycidas' cheerful greeting, Moeris reveals that he has been evicted from his farm and now has to work for the new owner. His broken phrases mirror his distress:

O Lycida, uiui peruenimus, aduena nostri
(quod numquam ueriti sumus) ut possessor agelli
diceret: 'haec mea sunt; ueteres migrate coloni.'

Here, then, is a theme of violence and misery, drawn from the all-too-real experience of Virgil's contemporaries. We may safely assume that such material had never before been included in a pastoral dialogue, and that now for the first time the genre was being used as a vehicle for complaint.

At v. 30 the second theme takes over—that of poetry or song. In principle it is quite unconnected with the tragedy of eviction, but the two themes are woven together by the figure of Menalcas. Thus we hear that Menalcas tried to avert the *evictions* by his *songs*, and was lucky (like Moeris) to escape with his life. What a loss he and his poetry would have been! Three of Menalcas' lines, based on *Id.* 3.3–5 but also recalling *Ecl.* 3.96–7, are sung by Lycidas (23–5). Three more of them are sung by

Moeris (27–9); they conclude the theme of eviction. After that, the attention shifts to Moeris. He sings five lines from one of his own songs about Polyphemus and Galatea (recalling *Ecl.* 2). He is followed by Lycidas, who sings five more lines by Moeris about the benign effects of Caesar's star (cf. the phenomena described in *Ecl.* 5.58–64). So the singers, in chiasitic order, have equal numbers of lines. At v. 51 Moeris declines to sing any more; Menalcas will supply all that Lycidas desires. In 64–6 Lycidas tries to persuade Moeris to continue; but again he says no—let us wait until Menalcas comes. So the structure and movement of the poem are dominated by the figure of the absent Menalcas. Furthermore, while Lycidas (as he acknowledges) has not yet made the front rank, and Moeris is too old to remember the songs he used to sing, Menalcas is at the peak of his career. So in the characterisation too, Menalcas is the central figure.

Whereas less than half of *Ecl.* 9 deals with the evictions, *Ecl.* 1 deals with nothing else. Here the dispossessed farmer has not been re-employed; he has become a homeless and hopeless wanderer. His protests are correspondingly more strident: 'A godless soldier will possess these well-cultivated acres of fallow-land; an uncouth outsider will possess these crops' (70–1). Conversely, the other speaker is not someone returning on a visit, as Lycidas seems to be, but a local resident who has appealed against eviction and won his case. His feelings are those of heartfelt relief and gratitude. As a result, *Ecl.* 1 is both a more happy and a more melancholy poem than *Ecl.* 9—an amalgam of weal and woe which foreshadows the ambivalence of the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*. More specifically, it projects an interestingly balanced attitude to the young Caesar; for, as the benefactor who saved Tityrus from ruin is surely Octavian, so the *impius miles* who expelled Meliboeus should probably be thought of as one of Octavian's soldiers, whose commander was ultimately responsible for the tragedy.

Both characters have Greek names. Tityrus formerly had a partner called Galataea and now lives with Amaryllis. Meliboeus describes two beautiful visions of the pastoral world which he is leaving (51–8, 75–8).²² So outwardly they are still Theocritean shepherds. But the dress is wearing thin. Meliboeus is saying farewell to his *patria* (3–4); he will join the other exiles who are wandering to Africa, Scythia, the Oxus, and Britain—all on the frontiers of the *imperium Romanum*. The hills of Sicily and Cos have been left behind. Tityrus has been to *Roma*, where

NIALL RUDD

Libertas has smiled upon him. In his previous *seruitium* he took no thought for his *peculium*; but now, thanks to a *iuuenis*, he has been allowed to retain his land.²³ When he speaks of the Parthian drinking from the Saône, and the German from the Tigris, he too is referring to the Roman empire, but only in a rhetorical figure. If in space the poem extends to the edges of empire, in time it reaches forward to the renaissance and after; for the note of complaint and indignation sounded by Virgil is heard again in *Lycidas* and *The Shepherdes Calender*.

IV. Greek but not Theocritean

The presence of such material has already been noted in *Ecl.* 2 (Meleager's epigram on Alexis) and in *Ecl.* 5.25–6 (*The Lament for Bion*). *Ecl.* 7.45–60 may owe something to the discussion of the seasons in Bion, frag. 2 (Gow); *Ecl.* 9.51–2 certainly recalls Callimachus' famous epigram on Heraclitus (*A.P.* 7.80). Other passages are cited by the editors. But by far the most striking instance in this category is *Ecl.* 6. Virgil has given the poem a pastoral framework which makes it (just) suitable for inclusion in his collection. In vv. 1–12 we are told that the poet's early verse was Syracusan, i.e., Theocritean. When he attempted something grander to honour the military feats of Varus, he was checked by Apollo, who said, 'A shepherd should make his sheep fat, but sing a fine-spun song.' In 13–22 Silenus is caught napping by two shepherds and a nymph, and is induced to tell stories. The longest (that of Pasiphae) takes place in what might be called, in a general sense, a pastoral setting. In 67–73 Linus, 'shepherd of divine song', welcomes the Roman poet Gallus, and urges him to accept the pipes of Hesiod (who really *was* a shepherd) from the Muses. At the end evening comes, and the flocks have to be rounded up.

Yet the framework is somewhat factitious. Apollo, in spite of his cult-title *Nomios*, had no special interest in pastoral poetry. His injunction to Virgil is adapted from the *Aetia* of Callimachus, where he says 'Poet, make your victim as fat as possible, but keep your Muse slender' (1.22–4, Loeb edn). Similarly the songs which he is supposed to have sung by the Eurotas (82–3) were not pastoral idylls. Old Silenus was said to be knowledgeable (he was, after all, tutor to the young Dionysus); he took an interest in music and dancing; and his reputation as a story-teller is illustrated by the marvellous anthropological tales which he told to King Midas.²⁴ But, as far as we know, he was not associated with pastoral poetry; and certainly the tale of Pasiphae could not be mistaken for a

bucolic idyll. As for Linus, the son of Apollo, the story of how he was brought up among lambs was told by Callimachus (*Aetia* 1.26–8), not by Theocritus. Even in Virgil he points Gallus towards aetiological poetry (72–3).

In the songs of Silenus, which make up the body of the poem, we meet first an account of the creation of the world, followed by the creation of human beings (Pyrrha) and the Golden Age (*Saturnia regna*). In spite of the very compressed treatment (what happened to the flood?) we are bound to think of the beginning of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. This impression is confirmed as Silenus goes on to sing of Pasiphae, the Proetides, Atalanta, Phaethon's sisters, and Tereus and Philomela, all of whom are mentioned by Ovid. Now for all its elaborate sophistication the *Metamorphoses* recalls its earliest ancestor, viz. the *Catalogues* and *Eoiai* of Hesiod. Even a glance at the fragments of those poems reveals the names of Deucalion and Pyrrha, Atalanta, the Proetides, Europa, Peleus, Ariadne, and the Calydonian boar. Long before Ovid, Hesiod was admired by the Alexandrians, because of his traditional learning, and because he offered a respectable alternative to Homer. One thinks, e.g., of Callimachus' dream (*Aetia* 1.2, 4.112) which was prompted by Hesiod's own account of his consecration as a poet, of Aratus' debt to Hesiod as expressed in Callimachus' epigram (29), and of the scholar-poet Euphorion's *Hesiod*, mentioned in the *Suda*. The tradition of mythological poetry was carried on by Parthenius of Nicaea, who was linked with Callimachus and Euphorion by Lucian and Pollianus.²⁵ One of Parthenius' works was entitled *Metamorphoses*, and it included the story of Scylla, daughter of Nisus (frag. 20), a tale already referred to by Callimachus (*Hecale*, 288) and later retold by Ovid (*Met.* 8.1 ff.). This story, conflated with that of Homer's monster, appears among the songs of Silenus (*Ecl.* 6.74 ff.). Now at some stage, probably in the mid 60s,²⁶ Parthenius was brought by Cinna to Rome, where he became a major influence on the neoterics and reputedly taught Virgil Greek (Macrobius, *Sat.* 5.17.18). His poetry has gone, but we do have his prose summaries of tragic love-stories, which he drew from various sources, including Philitas, Nicander, Hermesianax, Apollonius, and Euphorion. These he presented to Cornelius Gallus for use in his hexameter poems and his elegies (Preface). Among the stories we find those of Apollo and Daphne (15) and Byblis and Caunus (11), familiar to us from Ovid, *Met.* 1.452 ff. and 9.453 ff., and also three tales from Euphorion (nos 13, 26, and 28).

NIALL RUDD

This brings us to Gallus. Since Silenus' story of his consecration comes in a list of mythological poems, one assumes that (whatever else he may have written) Gallus is being consecrated as a mythological poet. This is supported by the gift which he receives from the Muses, viz. the pipes of Hesiod (69 ff.). With these pipes he is to tell of the origin of the Grynaean Grove. Now Grynium, on the coast of Asia Minor south of Lesbos, was a cult-centre of Apollo. According to Servius on *Ecl.* 6.72, the grove was the scene of a contest in prophecy between Mopsus and Chalcas; Mopsus won, and Chalcas died of shame. Significant for our purpose are the following points: (i) some such competition already figured in the works of Hesiod,²⁷ (ii) Parthenius in his *Delos* (a poem about another cult-centre of Apollo) used the words Γρόνειος Ἀπόλλων (frag. 6), (iii) Servius says that the contest in the Grynaean Grove was in 'the poem of Euphorion which Gallus rendered into Latin'.²⁸

From this network of connections one infers that the songs of Silenus represent the mythological poetry of Hesiod, as revived and elaborated by the Alexandrians, Parthenius, and Gallus—not the bucolic idylls of Theocritus.

V. Roman poetry in Theocritean dress

In no. 7, the freest of Theocritus' bucolic idylls, the narrator disclaims the title of best poet; he is as yet no match for Sicelidas or Philitas (39–41). His travelling companion apparently shares his admiration; certainly he has similar views about the proper scope and style of modern poetry: those who try to vie with Homer are wasting their time. In *Ecl.* 9.35–6 Lycidas says he has not yet reached the eminence of Varius and Cinna.²⁹ He does not, however, enlarge on the poetic creed of the moderns—a creed which was to be made explicit in the opening of *Ecl.* 6. Later in *Ecl.* 6, as we have just seen, Virgil describes how Gallus was consecrated by Linus as a mythological poet. (It was a scene which Gallus may well have described already.) Now, in *Ecl.* 10, an entire poem is devoted to that same friend. Arethusa, invoked in the first line, is the nymph of the spring which emerged at Syracuse. As she had already figured in Theocritus' lament for Daphnis (*Id.* 1.117) and in the *Lament for Bion* (10 and 77) it was appropriate for Virgil to address her in his lament for Gallus.

Although this is the latest eclogue, the music is still perceptibly Greek and Theocritean:

VIRGIL'S CONTRIBUTION TO PASTORAL

πᾶ ποκ' ἄρ' ἦσθ', ὄκα Δάφνις ἐτάκετο, πᾶ ποκα, Νύμφαι;
ἦ κατὰ Πηνειῷ καλὰ τέμπεα, ἦ κατὰ Πίνδῳ;
οὐ γὰρ δὴ ποταμοῖο μέγαν ῥόον εἶχετ' Ἀνάπῳ,
οὐδ' Αἶτνας σκοπιάν, οὐδ' Ἄκιδος ἱερὸν ὕδωρ. (*Id.* 1.66–9)

Where were ye, Nymphs, where were ye, when Daphnis was
wasting away? In the lovely valleys of Peneus or of Pindus?
For surely ye did not haunt the mighty stream of Anapus, or
the peak of Etna, or the sacred waters of Acis.

Equally mellifluous are the lines of Virgil:

*quae nemora aut qui uos saltus habuere, puellae
Naides, indigno cum Gallus amore peribat?
nam neque Parnasi uobis iuga, nam neque Pindi
ulla moram fecere, neque Aonie Aganippe.* (9–12)

What groves or glades kept ye, ye Naiad maids, when Gallus
was wasting away with a humiliating love? For the heights of
Parnassus caused no delay, no, nor those of Pindus, nor
Aonian Aganippe.

There we recognize a motif of the pastoral lament, one which recurs in
Lycidas:

Where were ye, Nymphs, when the remorseless deep
Closed o'er the head of your loved Lycidas?

and again, astonishingly, in O'Casey's *Juno and the Paycock*, where
Juno cries (*Act III ad fin.*):

Blessed Virgin, where were you, when me darlin' son was
riddled with bullets?

Before we attempt to summarize the content of *Ecl.* 10, it may be well
to examine the status of Arcadia in pastoral (and some cognate poetry)
before this piece was written. In Theocritus Arcadia is called εὐμηλος
(‘rich in sheep’) in *Id.* 22.157.³⁰ It is also ‘mother of flocks’ in the *Homeric*

Hymn to Pan, 30. That country was the birth-place of Pan (*Hom. Hymn* 19.35–7). He is associated with Mt. Maenalus and Mt. Lycaeus in *Id.* 1.123–4, and with Arcadia in general in *Id.* 7.106–7. As the god of Arcadia he is offered a steer by Glaucon and Corydon in Erucius' epigram (*A.P.* 6.96); and he, along with the nymphs, receives a gift from a shepherd in an epigram of Anyte (*A.P.* 16.291). He is promised a sacrifice by a herdsman in *Id.* 5.58. Pan is also associated, naturally, with pipes and pipe-music, as in *Id.* 1.3, *Epig.* 2, and Bion, frag. 10.7. An epigram of Anyte describes a statue of Pan playing a pipe (*A.P.* 16.231). In the Homeric Hymn, Pan delights in music and dancing (19.1–37). A connection with Theocritus is indicated in *Id.* 1.126, where the dying Daphnis urges Pan to leave Arcadia and come to Sicily.

Similar references occur in the *Eclogues*. Pan protects flocks and herdsmen (2.33); he is the inventor of Pan-pipes (2.32–3; 8.24); a music contest between him and Virgil is imagined, with Arcadia as judge (4.58–9; cf. *Lament for Bion*, 55–6). *Ecl.* 8 has the refrain *incipe Maenalius... uersus*; in 7 Thyrsis and Corydon are two Arcadians, ready to sing antiphonal song (4–5); at v. 25 Thyrsis calls on the shepherds of Arcadia to recognize his rising talent.

So pastoral poetry does have clear links with that old and mysterious country. But two negative points need to be made.³¹ First, Arcadia is not presented as a place with a glorious climate, where shepherds enjoy a life of gaiety and ease, dallying with their loves in shady nooks. On the contrary, according to Polybius, Arcadia's musical tradition developed as a way of relieving the harshness of life in a rough, forbidding, land (4.20–1). Second, in none of the poetry examined so far is Arcadia used as a setting for a bucolic idyll.

In *Ecl.* 10 Gallus appears not only as a friend of Virgil but also as a poet, a lover, and an army commander. It is the combination of these various roles that makes the poem so complicated. The following scheme, along the lines of that provided by Gordon Williams,³² suggests what is happening.

1–8 (8 lines). Address to Arethusa.³³ Gallus has requested a poem from Virgil. It will be a poem about Gallus' troubled love; the woods will echo in sympathy.

9–30. Arcadia mourns for Gallus, who is pining away in unrequited love. [Since, as we have seen, neither Theocritus nor Virgil employed Arcadia as a setting, it is a reasonable inference that Gallus had done so in his *Amores*.] Figures human and divine come and reason with him.

'Why this madness?' says Apollo. 'Your beloved Lycoris has gone away with another man to the snowy north.' Pan tells him his tears are futile; Amor is indifferent to his sufferings.

31–69. Gallus' monologue.

31–4. I shall die happy if you Arcadians (Arcadia being the land of song) tell of my love in bucolic verse [which is what Virgil is doing in response to Gallus' request].

35–43. I wish I had been one of your number—a shepherd or a vineyard-worker. Then I would be lying with my love among the willows, beneath the vine. Here are cool springs, soft meadows, and woods, Lycoris. Here I would live out my life with you. [This glimpse of a sentimentalised Arcadia came, one suspects, from one of Gallus' love-poems.]

44–9. But as it is, I am a soldier on active service, while Lycoris is far away among the snows of the Rhine. May that cruel climate do her no harm! [This again sounds like a situation which Gallus the soldier had described in his verse.]

50–61. I shall take up pastoral poetry and live in the woods and mountains, hunting wild animals. [An escapist fantasy of a very different kind.] But this arduous life will not provide a cure for my passion. The god of love has no sympathy for human woes.

62–9. So farewell to the woods. Yes, and farewell to song. The god of love is deaf to poetry, whatever pains we submit to. Amor conquers all; let us accept his dominion.

70–7 (8 lines). Address to the Muses. May this poem please Gallus. Now evening is coming; it is time for the herdsman to drive his goats home.³⁴

Certain points remain obscure. How far, for instance, were Gallus' love-elegies or *Amores* related to his real experience? Or again, when Gallus says 'I will go and play on the Sicilian shepherd's pipe the poems which I composed in Chalcidic verse' (50–1), what does he mean?³⁵ And do vv. 62–3 indicate that Gallus deliberately abandoned poetry? But such problems lie outside our present scope. The above scheme is intended only to suggest how Virgil's tribute to Gallus and his poetry is conveyed within the form of a Theocritean pastoral.

It remains to discuss, briefly, how far we have been talking about a progressive development in Virgil's *Eclogues*. 'Development' implies an assumption about chronology, and here three questions have to be distinguished: (i) to what time does a poem refer? (ii) when was it written?

NIALL RUDD

(iii) when was it published in its final form as part of the collection? The only question relevant to this inquiry is (ii). What we know about the composition of the *Eclogues* is that 2 and 3 (at least) came before 5; that 4 belongs to the autumn of 40 BC, and that 10 is the last. The changes described in this paper are all compatible with that sequence. Many scholars would go further and argue that while 2, 3, and 5 belong to the first half of the book, 1, 6, and 10 belong to the second. That scheme, which is slightly more precise, can also accommodate the procedure followed here.³⁶

In the end, however, this paper is concerned not so much with stages of development as with various modes of innovation. It is not important to determine whether, say, *Ecl.* 9 is a more radical departure from the Theocritean model (and therefore *theoretically* later) than *Ecl.* 4. After all, *Ecl.* 10, which proclaims itself the latest, is in some respects more Theocritean than *Ecl.* 6. If we want to think of the *Eclogues* as a whole, it is best to think of them, not as 'one of the few perfect books'³⁷ (there are too many difficulties for that), but rather as a series of experiments which could have taken place in several different sequences within the limits mentioned in the last paragraph. These daring and memorable experiments are the work of a still youthful poet (between the ages of, say, 28 and 31) already aware of his powers. His procedure was to abstract and take over a kind of formal framework from Theocritus, and to transform it by incorporating more and more new and unexpected material until the framework ceased to be of further use. He then took over from Hesiod a different form—that of the agricultural didactic poem—and changed that until he needed it no more. Finally, he took over the largest and grandest form of all from Homer himself, and by filling it with Italian and Hellenistic content transformed it into the *Aeneid*. Such are the lines on which Rome's greatest poet may be seen to have developed.

University of Bristol

NIALL RUDD

NOTES

1. This paper was first written in 1967. It has been revised at various stages to take account of the work of Gordon Williams, Ian Du Quesnay, and others; and it has now been brought up to date on the basis of Wendell Clausen's edition (Oxford 1994). It is

VIRGIL'S CONTRIBUTION TO PASTORAL

offered here as a possible framework for *teaching* the *Eclogues*—poems which, unlike the shorter pieces of Catullus, are not immediately appreciated by students. Depending on the time available, qualifications can be supplied and illustrations added.

2. Cf. the mosaic from Lepcis Magna reproduced in G. Hanfmann, *Roman Art* (Greenwich, Connecticut n.d.) plate xxxvii; there, however, the old man (so reminiscent of Hemingway) is baiting a hook.

3. See, e.g., Anton Legner, *Der Gute Hirt* (Düsseldorf 1959).

4. W. Empson, *Some Versions of Pastoral* (London 1968) 6.

5. See K. Dover, *Theocritus* (repr. Bristol 1985) xxxviii–xlv.

6. For a fuller analysis see R.W. Garson, *CQ* 21 (1971) 188–92 and I. Du Quesnay in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, eds D. West and T. Woodman (Cambridge 1979) 35–69.

7. Lions and lionesses do occur in Theocritus, but not in a passage like this, which is supposed to reflect the everyday experience of a countryman.

8. Johann Strauss II is said to have handed on his black, silver-topped, baton to Léhar, who in turn bequeathed it to Stolz.

9. Virgil supplies an explanatory pun on Micon's name (*paruus* = μικρός). Corydon is not identical with Micon; he is simply quoting Micon's epigram.

10. For Alcman see D.A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric* II.339 (Loeb edn); for Sappho see *Greek Lyric* I.xiii. A fragment of Parthenius reads Ἰλαος, ὃ Ὑμέναιε (Loeb edn no. 32); cf. Theocritus *Id.* 18. 58. For Calvus and Ticiada see E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford 1993) 203–4 and 229.

11. In incorporating elements from other genres Virgil may well have taken a hint from *Id.* 7, where one speaker recites what is, initially, a propemptikon (52–70).

12. See S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971) 22 and his references.

13. See Weinstock, 107.

14. See Weinstock, 207.

15. See Weinstock, 281 ff.

16. Weinstock, 156.

17. Diodorus 4.84.2–4.

18. Do the lines refer to the forthcoming triumph of Pollio, following his suppression of the Parthini in 39 BC? In that case there is no problem about his tragedies (see Horace, *Sat.* 1.10.42–3, *Carm.* 2.1.9–12, and Tacitus, *Dial.* 21.7). But why, after campaigning in the hinterland of Dyrrachium, is Pollio supposed to be returning home round the top of the Adriatic? Syme (*CQ* 31, 1937, 47–8) suggested that Virgil was poetically assimilating Pollio's route to that of Antenor (*Aen.* 1.242 ff.)—an ingenious, but far from obvious, idea. Bowersock (*HSCP* 82, 1978, 201–2) argued that Virgil's lines were addressed to Octavian, who in 35 BC *did* campaign in the N. Adriatic. Then, however, the Sophoclean *carmina* have to be seen as the *Ajax* which Octavian eventually abandoned (Suet, *Aug.* 85.2). Yet even the eager anticipation of that work (whose date is unknown) would not have justified Virgil's language, and to say in 35 BC that Octavian's as yet unfinished play would alone be worthy of Sophocles would have been a slight on the tragedies of Pollio. The sentence *a te principium, tibi desinam*, as an extravagant compliment, would have suited either man. But those words also imply that a single patron had interested himself in the *Eclogues* from their inception down to the present time. Now we know from Horace, *Sat.* 1.6.54–5 that in 38 BC Virgil was

already a member of Maecenas' circle. So in 35 we would have expected any mention of a patron to refer to him. Therefore I am in the uncomfortable position of inclining to the traditional view without being able to meet Bowersock's very reasonable objection. For a lead into the discussion see J. Farrell's article in *CP* 86 (1991) 204–11.

19. e.g. I. Du Quesnay, *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* (1976) 31–5, R. Nisbet, *BICS* (1978) 64, W. Clausen, 121–3 of his edition.

20. I have not included the much discussed Salonus mentioned in Servius on *Ecl.* 4.1 and 11.

21. No precise reference to Hercules is seen by Conington, Page, Coleman, or Nisbet (64–5) in vv. 15–16. There is a reference to Hercules in the final line; cf. Theocritus, *Id.* 17.20–33, and Homer, *Od.* 11.602–4. But this is usually taken in a general sense: 'Any child who does not smile at his parent(s) will not grow up to be a hero like Hercules.' Granted, since Antony claimed descent from Hercules (Plut. *Ant.* 4.2), some readers may have been disposed to add 'from whom your father, Antony, claims descent.' My argument is that although Virgil allowed such an interpretation he did not require it. For the association of Romulus, Scipio Africanus, Pompey, Caesar, Antony, and (a few years later) Augustus with Hercules see A.R. Anderson's paper in *HSCP* 39 (1928) 422–36.

22. The stones, rushes, and mud of 47–8, however, are Italian rather than Theocritean.

23. The legal status of Tityrus has long been a problem. In 1981 Du Quesnay proposed what seemed to me an attractive solution, viz. that Tityrus was informally manumitted—*de facto* free, but *de iure* a slave (*Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 3.115–23). This suggestion, however, is passed over without discussion by Clausen, who thinks 'Virgil deliberately confuses the private with the public sense of *libertas*' (31)—*libertas* in the public sense being 'the slogan of Octavian and his party' (43).

24. Aelian, *Var. Hist.* 3.18; Servius on *Ecl.* 6.13.

25. Lucian, *How to Write History*, 57 (Loeb edn 6 p. 68); Pollianus, *A.P.* 11.130.

26. See T.P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet* (Leicester 1974) 47–8.

27. Hesiod, *Melampodia* 1 (Loeb edn 266).

28. Servius on *Ecl.* 6.72.

29. For Varius and Cinna see E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*, 271–5 and 212–24.

30. Gow cites Pindar, *Ol.* 6.100 and *Homeric Hymn* 4.2 and 18.2 as parallels.

31. See P. Levi, *Proc. Virg. Soc.* 7 (1968) 1–11 and R. Jenkyns, *JRS* 79 (1989) 26–39.

32. See G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford 1968) 234–9.

33. Although Virgil does not say that Arethusa has travelled, not just from Elis, but all the way from Arcadia, still, that is probably a safe inference on the basis of Ovid, *Amores* 3.6.30 (*uirgo Arcadia*) and *Met.* 5.607–8; in which case Virgil may well be indicating that this is going to be in some sense an Arcadian poem.

34. Half of the *Eclogues* end towards evening (1, 2, 6, 9, 10), another Virgilian touch.

35. Does he mean (i) 'Instead of writing epyllia in the manner of Euphorion, I will write pastoral poetry as a shepherd lover'? (ii) 'Instead of writing elegies in the manner of Euphorion, I will write pastoral poetry in hexameters?' Or (iii) 'Instead of writing elegies—a form invented by Theocles of Chalcis (*Suda* under ἐλεγεῖναι)—I will write pastoral poetry in hexameters?' Against (iii) is the fact that Gallus knew certain themes at least of Euphorion (Parthenius, *Tragedies of love*, nos 13, 26, and

28) and adapted at least one of his poems (on the Grynaean Grove). If 'Chalcidic verse' refers to Theocles, we don't know of anyone who got the point, whereas we do know that Quintilian missed it (10.1.56). Against (ii) is the fact that Euphorion is not known to have written any elegies; see B.A. van Groningen, *Euphorion* (Amsterdam 1977) 251–3. Reading (i) is the least unlikely; but what about Gallus' *Amores*, which were probably alluded to in *Ecl.* 6.64 and seem to lurk behind *Ecl.* 10? Even if there were a satisfactory answer to 'Chalcidic verse', why does Gallus resolve to write pastoral—a decision that is cancelled twelve lines later?

36. To bring 5 into relation with 4, I have treated it after 8. That may well be chronologically wrong. Still, I am inclined to put 8 (except for vv. 6–13) and 7 in the first five pieces. Nilsson, cited by Clausen 238, found the metre of Alpheisiboeus' song similar to that of 2 and 3. Whether Damon's song was added somewhat later must remain a matter for speculation.

37. The phrase comes in Clausen's admirable paper 'Callimachus and Latin Poetry', reprinted in *Approaches to Catullus*, ed. K. Quinn (Cambridge and New York 1972) 193. I do not know whether he endorses it still, or whether it should be seen as prompted by the generous impulse of a devotee.

Virgil, Shakespeare, and Romance

A paper given to the Virgil Society on 26 February 1994

It is not often enough recognised that Jonson's well-known words from the First Folio elegy on Shakespeare—'Though thou had'st small Latin and less Greek'—commonly taken as a slyly malicious comment on a man who was a friend but also a rival, actually lead into a compliment: Jonson says that it is not hard to find classical comparisons for either Shakespeare's tragedies or his comedies among the best of 'insolent Greece or haughty Rome'. Nonetheless, no one would dispute that by the standards of Jonson, educated at Westminster School, able to footnote the classical references in his own works from all the latest editions and commentaries, Shakespeare's knowledge of classical literature in the original was not outstanding. The hard line still seems to be that of J.K. Thomson, who concedes that Shakespeare knew Erasmus's *Colloquies*, Seneca's plays, and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in the original, but not much else.¹ As far as Virgil is concerned, there was until comparatively recently little interest in relations between his texts and Shakespeare's, although this situation has now changed considerably. T.H. Baldwin in *William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Less Greeke* believed that he had a 'firm and lasting knowledge' of at least *Aeneid* 1, 2, 4, and 6, since this was 'the minimum of Virgil for polite society'.² But the major studies of Shakespeare's sources, by Muir and Bullough,³ do not reflect this 'firm and lasting knowledge', whether in translation or not. In Bullough, it is the other Virgil, Polydore, Henry VIIIth's historian, who emerges as a more important source for Shakespeare than the author of the *Aeneid*. John Pitcher, in an article that makes a strong case for a Virgilian presence in *The Tempest*, considers that Bullough's neglect of the *Aeneid* in the short term will probably ensure that it remains 'peripheral' to any reading of the play.⁴

On the other hand, concepts of literary influence and of what

SANDRA CLARK

constitutes source-texts have recently undergone much revision; critics such as Reuben Brower, Gary Schmidgall, Barbara Bono and Donna B. Hamilton⁵ have written at length of relations between Shakespeare's texts and those of classical authors, particularly Virgil, without finding it necessary to spend much time conjecturing the extent of Shakespeare's familiarity with them in the original languages. Brower, for example, writes of Virgil's description of the death of Priam in *Aeneid* 2 as 'the most famous of his war scenes, one that made a vivid impression on Shakespeare', and asserts that 'many Elizabethan writers knew something of Seneca...but many more like Shakespeare must have known Virgil even better, an example of the heroic style they could not have missed.'⁶ Schmidgall, in a study that acknowledges the influence of Brower, finds that 'the *Aeneid* figures more powerfully in the background of *The Tempest* than we have hitherto imagined.' For him it is the temperamental and ideological parallels he traces between Virgil and Shakespeare, both of whom 'respected the resident power structure and were convinced of the efficacy of their ruling monarchs',⁷ which constitute this presence, and they do not require the reinforcement of close textual connections such as Shakespeare could have acquired only from knowledge of Virgil in Latin and at first hand. Bono, aware of the need for 'a more precise lexicon of literary imitation and influence, one that can mediate between narrowly defined source studies and sweeping claims about the patterns and directions of culture', found it in the notion of transvaluation; this she defines as 'an artistic act of historical self-consciousness that at once acknowledges the perceived values of the antecedent text and transforms them to serve the uses of the present.'⁸ In this sense, while recognising the primacy of Plutarch's *Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans* (in North's translation) as the source of *Antony and Cleopatra*, she would regard *Antony and Cleopatra* as a transvaluation of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Her learned and stimulating book contains no explicit discussion of the nature of Shakespeare's knowledge of Virgil's text, although it is everywhere assumed in some form; Shakespeare is said more than once to be 'preoccupied' with the *Aeneid*. Hamilton is content to assert that for Shakespeare, Virgil was 'the poet he had confronted and rewritten almost obsessively throughout his career', and that his 'investment in Virgil's text is so great as to constitute a formal and rigorous rhetorical imitation of the major narrative kernels of *Aeneid* 1–6'⁹ without raising at all the question of his knowledge of Latin.

There is undeniably a tremendous excitement in the exploration of transcultural relations of whatever nature between the major texts of great writers; but this is notably enhanced when it is possible to argue for precise and specific connections. Although I do not accept Hamilton's account of the play as a 'formal imitation of the first six books of the *Aeneid*, both in its larger patterns of theme and structure and its smaller details of vocabulary and syntax',¹⁰ I hope to show that there are close relations between Virgil's *Aeneid* and Shakespeare's *The Tempest* of several different kinds; and that whereas one can discern something of a network of Virgilian motifs linking plays from different points of Shakespeare's career, Virgilian influence culminates in *The Tempest*, where the presence of the prior text is felt in a completely different way from anything in the other plays. I have no wish to suggest that the *Aeneid* constituted Shakespeare's sole or necessarily prime classical source for the play, and I am much persuaded by Jonathan Bate's reading of it,¹¹ which would assign this role to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, undeniably a more important classical source for Shakespeare overall; my emphasis is rather on the place of the *Aeneid* in *The Tempest* in relation to the series of other connections I wish to trace. Shakespeare probably knew the sixteenth-century translations of the *Aeneid* by Surrey, Stanihurst, Phaer and Twyne,¹² but he also knew at least parts of the poem in Latin, and knew them well; and there were certain Virgilian motifs which captured his imagination at an early stage and recurred in his work till the very last. From the viewpoint of a study of the romances, particularly *Pericles*, and *The Tempest*, the most important of these is death by drowning.

It is in *Richard III*, not otherwise a conspicuously classical play,¹³ that this motif first occurs, in a section stylistically rather separate from the rest of the play, the scene in which the imprisoned Clarence recounts to his keeper his guilt-stricken dream of being accidentally pushed overboard by his brother Gloucester:

O Lord! methought what pain it was to drown,
 What dreadful noise of waters in my ears,
 What sights of ugly death within my eyes.
 Methought I saw a thousand fearful wrecks,
 Ten thousand men that fishes gnawed upon,
 Wedges of gold, great owches, heaps of pearl,
 Inestimable stones, unvalued jewels,

SANDRA CLARK

All scattered in the bottom of the sea.
Some lay in dead men's skulls; and in those holes
Where eyes did once inhabit, there were crept—
As 'twere in scorn of eyes—reflecting gems,
Which wooed the slimy bottom of the deep,
And mocked the dead bones which lay scattered by.
(I.iv.20–33)¹⁴

At the keeper's prompting, Clarence continues his account with a description of his long drawn out dying struggle for breath, followed by a visit to the underworld:

I passed, methought, the melancholy flood,
With that sour ferryman the poets write of,
Unto the kingdom of perpetual night.
The first that there did greet my stranger soul
Was my great father-in-law, renowned Warwick,
Who cried aloud, 'What scourge for perjury
Can this dark monarchy afford false Clarence?'
And so he vanished. Then came wand'ring by
A shadow like an angel, with bright hair,
Dabbled in blood, and he shrieked out aloud
'Clarence is come: false, fleeting, perjur'd Clarence,
Seize on him, furies! Take him into torment.'
(I.iv.45–57)

Although there is much in these lines that is not Virgilian, such as the howling fiends, and the strange vision of skulls with gem-studded eye-sockets, the passage has clear affinities with Virgil's account of Palinurus the helmsman falling into the sea (*Aeneid* 5.834–61), and Aeneas's subsequent meeting with his unburied ghost in the underworld in Book 6. Palinurus is standing on the 'high poop deck'¹⁵ (*puppique...in alta*) when the God of sleep sits down by him in disguise and flings him, struggling, overboard (*cumque gubernaculo liquidas proiecit in undas | praecipitem, Aeneid* 5.841, 859–60). The location, the god's insidious approach, the reluctance of the doomed man to let go, all these details find a place in Clarence's narrative, together with Palinurus's account of his three days and nights tossed on the waves before he finds the relief of death. So too

do a number of others from *Aeneid* 6. Virgil's description of the rivers of Hades, and of Aeneas's meeting with Charon (in Virgil *portitor horrendus* or *navita tristis*, in Shakespeare 'that sour ferryman') on the banks of Cocytus seem to have gripped Shakespeare's imagination; perhaps the whirlpool that empties itself into Cocytus does not find a direct parallel, but the evocative sound-qualities of the language (*turbidus hic caeno vastaque voragine gurges | aestuat atque omnem Cocyto eructat harenam*, 'Thick with mud, | A whirlpool out of a vast abyss | boils up and belches all the silt it carries | Into Cocytus', *Aeneid* 6.296–7) seem echoed in Clarence's lines on his dream of dying:

...often did I strive
 To yield the ghost, but still the envious flood
 Stopp'd in my soul, and would not let it forth
 To find the empty, vast, and wand'ring air,
 But smothered it within my panting bulk,
 Who almost burst to belch it in the sea.

(I.iv.37–41)

The same lines seem to have lingered in Shakespeare's memory when he came to write *The Tempest*. Clarence's dream also recalls more directly the crowd of shades (*inops inhumataque turba*) streaming to the river banks, and, though the mood is different, the vengeful ghosts of Warwick and of Prince Edward are reworked in the uncomfortable encounter between Aeneas and the plaintive Palinurus begging for burial.

I have dwelt at some length on this episode from the *Aeneid*, to suggest something of the imaginative appeal it seems to have held for Shakespeare. Emrys Jones¹⁶ considers that Shakespeare's borrowing in *Richard III* may well have been unconscious, but in view of the way in which the material is to recur in *The Tempest* this seems to me to be unlikely, though this is not of course to make any assumptions about his intentions, or to imply that an Elizabethan audience would have been expected to recognise the allusion. It is not impossible that Clarence's dream may have come from Virgil via *The Mirror for Magistrates*, which includes in its Induction a vision of hell directly translated from *Aeneid* 6.245–50,¹⁷ though the verbal connections are such as to suggest that Shakespeare was clearly acquainted with Virgil's Latin. The richly poetic texture of Clarence's dream relates to the resonance with which

SANDRA CLARK

Shakespeare regularly invests stories of shipwreck and storms at sea throughout his dramatic career, from *The Comedy of Errors*, with its Plautine story of Mediterranean sea-wandering and shipwreck, to *The Tempest*. As with *The Comedy of Errors* (and with *Twelfth Night* and *Pericles*) the marine narratives derive more directly from other sources; but I want to suggest that the shadow of what was to the Elizabethans the most famous sea-wanderer of all, Aeneas, is behind them all, and that it assumes more shape and definition in Shakespeare's great romance, *The Tempest*, which has also been seen as a kind of reduced epic.¹⁸ Here it links up with two other Virgilian themes which also pervade Shakespeare's plays, the fall of Troy, and the love of Dido and Aeneas. But before arriving at *The Tempest* I too wish to make a journey, via two other plays concerned with wandering, sea-voyages, and the finding of brides in distant lands, *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*.

The place of *Pericles* within an account of Shakespeare's relations to Virgil is, admittedly, uncertain; but it gains some credibility if seen in the light of a general network of connections. Its source, the Greek romance *Apollonius of Tyre*, is enough to explain its Mediterranean geography and its use of Dido's birthplace for its hero. In such a story, sufferings at sea and recountings of misfortunes are almost inevitable. Yet there are lines in the play that may seem to have more specific resonance. When Pericles, having sailed from Tyre to avoid an angry king who wishes to murder him, arrives in famine-stricken Tarsus, he greets the governor with words that distantly recall the accents of Aeneas's tale of misfortune:

We have heard your miseries as far as Tyre,
And seen the desolation of your streets.
(I.iv.88–9)

Hounded from Tarsus, he is shipwrecked off the coast of North Africa:

Alas the seas hath cast me on the rocks,
Wash'd me from shore to shore
(II.i.5–6)

Attempting to return to Tyre, he is caught in a storm at sea, and his ship blown off course; he begs Neptune, then Aeolus, to calm the tempest:

The god of this great vast, rebuke these surges,
Which wash both heaven and hell; and thou that hast
Upon the winds command, bind them in brass,
Having call'd them from the deep.

(III.i.1–4)

During the storm his wife dies in childbirth, and her body, 'scarcely coffin'd', is abandoned at sea. Finally, after long years of suffering, Pericles is reunited with his wife, miraculously recovered from death, at the temple in Ephesus; he cannot believe his good fortune:

...No more. You gods, your present kindness
Makes my past miseries sports.

(V.iii.40–1)

None of these passages constitutes anything approaching a direct borrowing or parallel, yet the misfortunes of the storm-buffed Pericles are strangely adumbrated in the closing lines of Aeneas's tale to Dido, at the end of *Aeneid* 3:

...*hic pelagi tot tempestatibus actus*
...
hic labor extremus, longarum haec meta viarum,
hinc me digressum vestris deus appulit oris.

(708, 714–5)

For after seas had buffeted me so often | ...here was my final
sorrow, here the goal | Of all my seafaring. When after this | I
put to sea, god drove me to your shores.

Pericles, fragmented and unsatisfactory though its textual condition is, bears closely upon *The Tempest*. An intervening stage between the two plays, however, is supplied in the second of Shakespeare's late plays, *Cymbeline*; its relation to the *Aeneid* is more oblique, but it does develop a Virgilian theme less significant in *Pericles* but important for *The Tempest*, the founding of a dynasty. *Cymbeline* was in fact the Romano-British king Cunobellus, who had been brought up in the household of Augustus Caesar and ruled Southern England at the time of the

SANDRA CLARK

birth of Christ. The main action of the play concerns the king's loss and regaining of his heirs. Some aspects of it may have held a topical significance for the Jacobeans, particularly if the play can be dated around 1610, since in this year King James's son, the popular Prince Henry, was invested as Prince of Wales.¹⁹ The Welsh location in which the King's two sons are secreted, the repeated references to Milford Haven (a symbolic location for the Tudor dynasty, since it was here that Henry Richmond landed when he came to dethrone Richard III), and the very structure of the king's family (two sons and a daughter, like James's own) may have operated in combination to create this topicality. At the same time, there are indications of connections with the dynasty whose founding Virgil celebrates in his poem. A minor one may be the name Posthumus, husband to Imogen, Cymbeline's daughter, which, according to Holinshed,²⁰ one of Shakespeare's sources for the play, was the name of the son of Aeneas and Lavinia, and the grandfather of Brute (or Brutus), legendary founder of Britain. Another may be the likeness between Cymbeline's sons, brought up motherless in the wilds of Wales, and Romulus and Remus, especially perhaps in the light of their connection in *Cymbeline* with the prophecy by a soothsayer of peace for Britain:

The lofty cedar, royal Cymbeline,
Personates thee, and thy lopp'd branches point
Thy two sons forth, who . . .
For many years thought dead, are now reviv'd
To the majestic cedar join'd, whose issue
Promises Britain peace and plenty.

(V.iii.455–60)

The play ends with a pact between Rome and Britain; the soothsayer announces an omen foretelling a divinely ordained reign of peace and plenty, in short, though the words are not used, of a golden age. One is put in mind of Jupiter's prophecy to Venus in *Aeneid* 1.257–97, telling of Aeneas's successors in Italy, and the founding of Rome by Romulus and Remus:

*his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono:
imperium sine fine dedi.*

For these I set no limits, world or time,
But make the gift of empire without end. (1.278–9)

At the time *Cymbeline* was written Golden Age imagery was regularly used to glorify the reign of James I, particularly by Jonson, who more than once draws parallels between his ruler's own age and that of Augustus, even honouring the monarch in a masque of 1615 entitled *The Golden Age Restored*. In the City triumph of 1604 a figure in one of the arches erected for the occasion carries the motto *redeunt Saturnia regna* (*Ecl.* 4.6), and Jonson explained the allusion thus: 'Out of *Virgil*, to shew that now those golden times were returned againe, wherein *Peace* was with us so advanced, *Rest* received, *Libertie* restored, *Safetie* assured, and all *Blessednesse* appearing in every of these vertues her particular triumph over her opposite evill.'²¹ The Augustan references in *Cymbeline* are thus very much part of current royalist iconography, but this need not detract from their significance in relation to the sequence of allusion in Shakespeare's late plays.²²

In *The Tempest*, written soon after *Cymbeline*, various strands of Virgilian allusion come together in a text that exemplifies Shakespeare's most creative response to the *Aeneid*. The play was performed at court in November 1611, and again in 1612/3 as part of the festivities preceding the marriage of Princess Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine. These facts have encouraged speculations as to whether it was actually written, or alternatively, by the addition of the marriage masque, adapted, to suit royal purposes,²³ but the issue has never been resolved. Even if the play was in no way designed to compliment the royal house, it has strong dynastic themes which link it with the *Aeneid*, and of course it is very much a providential tale of suffering and destiny. Other such narratives of adventure are nearer to the surface of the play, and, for a contemporary audience, were no doubt more compelling. It is very clearly based on a group of pamphlets describing a large colonising expedition to Virginia in 1609 which tell of a storm at sea, a shipwreck, and the lucky survival of all from the wrecked vessel on the 'dangerous and dreaded Iland... Bermuda',²⁴ which turned out providentially replete with fresh water and livestock. But not only does the *Aeneid*, particularly Book 1, have a closer general correspondence with the way the story and themes of the play are shaped than the Bermuda pamphlets, there are also specific references to, and even borrowings from, Virgil's text such as to justify the phrase 'pervasive influence'.²⁵

SANDRA CLARK

I want to suggest that the relation between Virgil's text and Shakespeare's may be observed in four areas, constituting a unique instance of this particular intertextual pairing: in the general pattern of events, in emotional tone, in specific references, and in an interconnected series of references to, and parallels between, the play and the first book of Virgil's poem. The pattern is partly one of geography but also one of the shaping of events. As John Pitcher has said, 'Among critics, the feeling seems to be that, on a Mediterranean sea route between Africa and Italy, it would be difficult not to bump into the story of how the Trojans came home to build their new city, and stopped off at nearly every island on the way.'²⁶ This may be so, but Shakespeare ensures that the connection is integral and not fortuitous. Prospero's journey, from Milan, to the island, and back again to Milan, is intersected by that of the courtiers, who have sailed to Tunis for a wedding, and been shipwrecked on the island on their return to Italy. In II.i, the scene which introduces the courtiers, attention is specifically drawn to the significance of Tunis as the scene for a wedding. The courtiers banter amongst themselves, the earnest efforts of old Gonzalo to make the best of their situation undermined by the cynicism of Sebastian and Antonio:

Gonzalo: Methinks our garments are now as fresh as when
we put them on first in Afric, at the marriage of the King's
fair daughter Claribel to the King of Tunis.

Sebastian: 'Twas a sweet marriage, and we prosper well in
our return.

Adrian: Tunis was never grac'd before with such a paragon to
their queen.

Gonzalo: Not since widow Dido's time.

Antonio: Widow? a pox o'that. How came that widow in?
Widow Dido!

Sebastian: What if he had said widower Aeneas too? Good
Lord, how you take it.

Adrian: Widow Dido, said you? You make me study of that.
She was of Carthage, not of Tunis.

Gonzalo: This Tunis, sir, was Carthage.

Adrian: Carthage?

Gonzalo: I assure you, Carthage. (II.i.73–90)

To emphasize the point, the substance of the conversation is briefly reprised, a moment later, for Alonso's benefit. Critics have often puzzled over this snippet, at once so apparently pointed and yet so irrelevant, for Claribel and her spouse are never to appear;²⁷ but Antonio's cynical response to the legend suggests the ambiguity of the relation between past and present, and in relation to other references yet to be mentioned reflects how the one revises and refigures the other. The parallels in the emotional patterning of the two stories are perhaps closer. Shakespeare's shipwrecked travellers, first Prospero, and then Alonso, look back on a past of loss; Prospero contemplates his betrayal at the hands of his closest kin—'I pray thee mark me, that a brother should be | So perfidious' (I.ii.67–8)—and Alonso mourns that he has lost his son and heir and that he will never see his daughter again. But the lives of both men are shaped in unexpected ways by the action of destiny; 'By accident most strange, bountiful Fortune, | (Now my dear lady)' (I.ii.178–9) has delivered Prospero's enemies to the shore of his island, and has intervened in Alonso's life to teach him and his allies a lesson, as Ariel points out:

You are three men of sin, whom Destiny,—
That hath to instrument this lower world
And what is in't,—the never surfeited sea
Hath caus'd to belch up you; and on this island
Where man doth not inhabit.

(III.iii.53–7)

This intervention is necessary, not only in the interests of moral reform but also, more importantly, of dynastic alliance; Ferdinand, Alonso's son and heir to the kingdom of Naples, would never have met Miranda, Prospero's daughter and rightful heir to the throne of Milan, without the shipwreck. Gonzalo is on hand at the play's conclusion to make this point:

Was Milan thrust from Milan, that his issue
Should become kings of Naples? O rejoice
Beyond a common joy, and set it down
With gold on lasting pillars: in one voyage
Did Claribel her husband find at Tunis
And Ferdinand her brother found a wife

SANDRA CLARK

Where he himself was lost.
(V.i.207–13)

Like Aeneas, Ferdinand must travel and know sorrow before he can find his destined bride; but Claribel, a comic Dido, gets a husband in Tunis and lives happily ever after.

The emotional tone of the *Aeneid* enriches *The Tempest*. Books 1, 2 and 6 of the poem especially are narratives of suffering and grief; *dolor* is the keynote, sounded first in Aeneas's words of consolation to his travel-weary companions when they land on the shore of North Africa:

*O socii (neque enim ignari sumus ante malorum)
o passi graviora, dabit deus his quoque finem.*

...

*...revocate animos maestumque timorem
mittite; forsán et haec olim meminisse iuvabit.*

Friends and companions, | Have we not known hard hours
before this? | my men, who have endured still greater
dangers, | god will grant us an end to these as well... now
call back | Your courage, and have done with fear and sor-
row. Some day, perhaps, remembering even this | will be a
pleasure. (1.198–9, 202–3)

This tone is echoed in the *lacrimae rerum* speech by Aeneas to Achates in the temple of Juno at Carthage:

*'quis iam locus', inquit, 'Achate,
quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?'*

'What spot on earth,' | he said, 'what region of the earth,
Achates, | Is not full of the story of our sorrow?' (1.459–60)

Aeneas learns to leave behind the past with its familiar attachments; according to Otis, he can only do this after meeting his father Anchises in the underworld, hearing his prophecy and seeing his vision of Romans of the future.²⁹ Prospero too has much to leave behind, in particular the magic he has cultivated through study and self-discipline, for which he

lost his dukedom. Because he was ‘transported | And rapt in secret studies’ (I.ii.76–7) he lost his hold on temporal power; on the island he has acquired supernatural abilities, to command the elements and even open up graves (V.i). But at the end of the play he must give up this power, and consign it to the past: ‘This rough magic | I here abjure’ (V.i.50–1). Now he must look towards an uncertain future, retirement in Milan, where ‘every third thought shall be my grave’ (V.i.311). His vision of the world, like Aeneas’s, is shot through with sadness; ‘our revels now are ended’ rivals *sunt lacrimae rerum* in its familiarity.

The relations between the *Aeneid* and *The Tempest* so far suggested may perhaps be described as impressionistic, more perceptible to intuitive sense than to rational apprehension. But there are relations of a different kind, pointed out as much by critics who wish to minimise the Virgilian connection as by those who wish to maximise it. The first is the harpy reference in III.iii. At this point, Alonso and his party, having wandered the island to no avail, are tired and disconsolate; to their amazement they are suddenly presented by spirits with a magical banquet, but, as they prepare to eat, there is the sound of thunder and lightning, Ariel appears, as one of the play’s unusually full stage directions³⁰ has it, ‘like a Harpy’ and ‘claps his wings upon the table’, which vanishes. He addresses himself to Alonso, Antonio, and Sebastian:

You are three men of sin, whom Destiny,—
That hath to instrument this lower world
And what is in’t,—the never surfeited sea
Hath caus’d to belch up you.

(III.iii.53–6)

The scene derives from *Aeneid* 3.225 ff., where Aeneas and his men shelter from a storm at sea on the Ionian Strophades, islands inhabited by the harpies and their leader Celaeno. After they have landed they find, not exactly a magical banquet, but apparently a godsend in the shape of herds of cattle and goats pastured, unattended, in the fields. As they prepare, delighted, for a feast, harpies descend, *horrifico lapsu* (‘grotesquely whirring down’), and foul the meat as they clap their wings with deafening beat (*magnis quatiunt clangoribus alas*), which perhaps Shakespeare echoed in the stage direction for Ariel to ‘clap his wings’.

Aeneas and his company attack the birds but cannot harm them: *Sed*

SANDRA CLARK

neque vim plumis ulla nec vulnera tergo | accipiunt ('But they received no impact on their feathers, | Took on their backs no wounding cut') (3.242–3). Alonso and his fellows are equally unsuccessful, as Ariel's words make clear:

You fools! I and my fellows
Are ministers of Fate; the elements
Of whom your swords are temper'd, may as well
Wound the loud winds, or with bemock'd at stabs
Kill the still-closing waters, as diminish
One dowle that's in my plume: my fellow-ministers
Are like invulnerable. (III.iii.60–6)

Celaeno prophesies cryptically that the Trojans will never build their destined city until famine has reduced them to gnawing their own tables in desperation; this turns out to be a kind of riddling joke, in that when the Trojans make their first meal on Italian soil it is on platters made of wheat-cake, which they devour at the end of the meal: *Heus, etiam mensas consumimus?* inquit Iulus...*adludens* ('"Look, how we're devouring our tables even!" Iulus playfully said') (7.116–17).³¹ So too Ariel, when he informs Alonso that he has lost his son in the tempest, is not literally telling the truth, for Ferdinand will be 'found' in the play's final scene. Both episodes in play and poem have a mysterious, potentially ominous quality, and the travellers are smitten with horror. Aeneas and his company feel their blood run cold (*at sociis subita gelidus formidine sanguis | deriguit*, 3.259–60), and Anchises begs the gods to avert the threatened disaster; Alonso is struck with remorse for his crimes against Prospero, and plans to share his son's watery death: 'Therefore my son i'th'ooze is bedded; and | I'll seek him deeper than e'er plummet sounded, | And with him there lie mudded' (III.iii.99–101).

This brings us to the second of the more specific connections between the two works, that is, the motif of death by drowning, already discussed in relation to Clarence's dream in *Richard III*. The mystery and horror in the idea of the unburied corpse at the bottom of the sea attach in *The Tempest* to the figure of Ferdinand, the young prince and heir to the kingdom of Naples, whose father believes him dead. Alonso's speech in the harpies scene is echoed in the last scene; so keen is his remorse at what he believes to be the loss of both his heirs that he wishes 'myself

were mudded in that oozy bed | Where my son lies' (V.i.151–2). The choice of 'mudded' for the more usual 'buried' at this point (and at V.i.151) is striking. Shakespeare seems imaginatively fascinated with the ideas of mud, ooze and slime; and I have already suggested that Virgil's lines about the mud of Acheron from *Aeneid* 6.295 (*turbidus hic caeno...*) influenced his evocation of watery death in *Richard III*. Ferdinand for his part also thinks his father to be dead, but his vision of the body, on the sea-bed, expressed through Ariel's song, reverts to the jewel-studded corpse of *Richard III* and its Ovidian transformation—'Those are pearls that were his eyes' (I.ii.400). The idea of death at sea haunts the whole play. Gonzalo voices a general fear in his wish above all things to 'die a dry death' (I.i.67). Ariel, however, tells the three men of sin in III.iii. that Destiny has caused 'the never-surfeited sea...to belch up you', rather than swallowing them, as would be more natural. 'Belch' may recall Virgil's *eructat* (6.296), but the sea which gives life rather than death is not a Virgilian conception; the source here is more probably the Virginia pamphlets,³² where divine providence is credited with ensuring that none of the mariners perished. A further specific Virgilian reference, albeit a very minor one, comes in the lines spoken by Ceres in the masque scene to describe Iris: 'Who, with thy saffron wings, upon my flowers | Diffusest honey-drops' (IV.i.78–9), which recall Virgil: *ergo Iris croceis per caelum roscida pinnis...devolat* (4.701 ff.) ('So humid Iris through bright heaven flew | On saffron-coloured wings'). Shakespeare may have drawn on Phaer's translation here: 'Dame rainbow... with safron wings of dropping shours'. But more interesting, perhaps, than the precise nature of the debt is the context of Virgil's lines, which describe how Iris descends to the body of the newly dead Dido to release her spirit by cutting a lock of her hair.³³

The acknowledgment of the existence of a range of miscellaneous and fragmented connections between *The Tempest* and the *Aeneid* may perhaps set the scene for a more extended comparison between the first book of the poem and the dramatic shape of the whole play. There is no intention to attempt to demonstrate that such a comparison was consciously made by Shakespeare, although this is not impossible; and such coincidences of structure and theme as exist may be seen to throw light on differences as well as similarities between the two works. Bono, who has observed an echo of Aeneas's tale to Dido in Prospero's retrospective narrative to Miranda in I.ii., though not the more extended parallels I

SANDRA CLARK

wish to delineate, suggests one way of interpreting these differences: 'Shakespeare makes human the skeptical quest of the *Aeneid*.'³⁴

The parallels may be traced through four phases of action. The first takes in the openings of the two works. The *Aeneid* begins, after introductory lines in which Aeneas is described as an exile, *fato profugus*, with Juno causing Aeolus to raise a storm; it disperses Aeneas's fleet before Neptune manages to calm it. Aeneas lands on an island; he comforts his people, though at heart despairing. Venus, upset by the suffering of her son, appeals to her father Jupiter, who consoles her:

*Olli subridens hominum sator atque deorum
vultu, quo caelum tempestatesque serenat,
oscula libavit natae, dehinc talia fatur:
'parce metu, Cytherea.'*

He smiled at her, the father of gods and men,
With that serenity that calms the weather,
And lightly kissed his daughter; then he said:
'No need to be afraid, Cytherea.' (1.254–7)

In the early scenes of *The Tempest* all these events occur, but redistributed amongst different characters, and in a slightly different order. The play opens with a storm, apparently a natural one, which seems to destroy the ship in which Alonso and his company are travelling on their return from North Africa to Italy. In the second scene it turns out that the storm has been raised by Prospero. His daughter, Miranda, is concerned for the loss of life, but he assures her that none has occurred:

Be collected:
No more amazement: tell your piteous heart
There's no harm done. (I.ii.13–15)

All has been provided for by his magic powers:

... Wipe thou thine eyes; have comfort.
The direful spectacle of the wrack...
I have with such provision in mine Art
So safely ordered... (I.ii.24–5, 28–9)

The next scene shows the shipwrecked travellers newly landed on the island. Gonzalo attempts consolation:

Beseech you, sir, be merry; you have cause,
So have we all, of joy; for our escape
Is much beyond our loss. (II.i.1–3)

The second phase of action is more concise. Next day, in the *Aeneid*, Aeneas and Achates go hunting. They encounter a young huntswoman, Venus in disguise. Aeneas instinctively recognises her divinity, though not her identity:

*o quam te memorem, virgo? namque haud tibi vultus
mortalis, nec vox hominem sonat; o, dea certe*

how | Shall I address you, girl? Your look's not mortal, | Nei-
ther has your accent a mortal ring. | O goddess, beyond doubt!
(1.327–8)

Venus replies modestly:

haud equidem tali me dignor honore

be sure I am not fit for any such devotion (1.335)

In *The Tempest* this encounter is reworked when Ferdinand, led to Prospero's cave by Ariel's magical song, first sees Miranda:

Most sure, the goddess
On whom these airs attend! ...
... my prime request
Which I do last pronounce, is, O you wonder!
If you be maid or no?

Miranda, like Venus, is self-deprecating in her reply:

No wonder, sir;
But certainly a maid.
(I.ii.424–5, 428–31)

SANDRA CLARK

The disguised Venus goes on to tell her son the story of Dido's marriage and her founding of Carthage, questions him about his journey, and comforts him with news of the preservation of his ships:

*namque tibi reduces socios classemque relatam
nuntio et in tutum versis aquilonibus actam
. . . puppesque tuae pubesque tuorum
aut portum tenet aut pleno subit ostia velo.*
(1.390–1, 399–400)

Your friends are back. This is my news for you: | Your ships
were saved and brought to shore again | By winds shifting
north... | your ships and your ships' companies | Are either
in port or entering under sail.

This account of the supernatural preservation of the mariners and their fleet is reworked in *The Tempest*, partly in Prospero's account to Miranda in I.ii., and partly in the imaginative elaboration of the experience of returning from death given by the Boatswain near the end of the play (V.i.222–4, 229–39).

The third phase continues the reworking of the role of Venus in *The Tempest*. In the *Aeneid* she has many roles, as Jupiter's tearful daughter, as Aeneas's mother, teasing him with her disguise but also protecting him, and comforting him with the news that his ships have been preserved. At the end of Book 1 she intervenes crucially in his fortunes, disguising Cupid as Ascanius, and using him to win Dido's love for Aeneas (Dido, *infelix, pesti devota futurae*—luckless, already given over to ruin 1.712). In *The Tempest* classical goddesses appear on stage in the betrothal masque Prospero arranges for Ferdinand and Miranda; but, as in I.ii., Venus is an absent presence. Perhaps as a joke,³⁵ the familiar stride, which betrayed her to Aeneas (*vera incessu patuit dea*, 1.405) is now transferred to Juno:

Highest queen of state
Great Juno comes; I know her by her gait.
(IV.i.101–2)

The absence of Venus is specifically remarked upon; Ceres checks that

she and Cupid will not be in attendance, and is assured by Iris that they are on their way to Paphos:

here thought they to have done
Some wanton charm upon this man and maid,
Whose vows are, that no bed-right shall be paid
Till Hymen's torch be lighted; but in vain.
(IV.i.94-7)

Majestic Juno, in the *Aeneid* Venus's opponent goddess and enemy to Aeneas, is here the one to bless the lovers' union. It seems to be almost explicit that Venus's intervention is not required in Shakespeare's scheme of things. Ferdinand, the play's Aeneas, has no Dido to distract him from his destiny. If anything, his sister, the unseen Claribel, is a Dido figure, her destiny comically inverted. This Aeneas meets his Lavinia, only daughter to Prospero as Lavinia is to Latinus, early on, by divine guidance; she is, as he tells her, not the first lady he has wooed, but he has no doubt of the place she is to take in his life:

O, if a virgin
And your affection not gone forth, I'll make you
The Queen of Naples. (I.ii.450-2)

The form of his declaration may be significant; he does not so much promise to make her his wife as his dynastic partner, and although he does not at this stage know it, she will, as heir to the dukedom of Milan, bring him a dynasty to unite with his.³⁶

Aeneid 1 ends with feasting, and preparation for story-telling as Dido urges Aeneas to recount his adventures. *The Tempest* parallels this with Prospero's invitation to Alonso and the rest to his 'poor cell' where they will pass the night

With such discourse as, I not doubt, shall make it
Go quick away; the story of my life,
And the particular accidents gone by
Since I came to this isle. (V.i.303-6)

But whereas for Aeneas the past has still to be recounted and reworked

SANDRA CLARK

before life can be renewed and the destined future come about, Prospero is released from his past and ready to sail for home. In this sense, Shakespeare's use of the *Aeneid* can be seen to reflect optimistically on the world of the play, as sustaining an order that operates more comprehensively and benevolently than that of Virgil's poem; though the play's epilogue, spoken by Prospero, with its appeal for applause—

...release me from my bands
With the help of your good hands;
Gentle breath of yours my sails
Must fill, or else my project fails,
Which was to please—

implies that this order may be only a fiction, sustained by the complicity of audience and actors.

Birkbeck College, London

SANDRA CLARK

NOTES

1. J.A.K. Thomson, *Shakespeare and the Classics* (London, George Allen and Unwin, 1952) 154.
2. T.W. Baldwin, *William Shakspeare's Small Latine and Lesse Greeke*, 2 vols (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1944) 2, 496.
3. Kenneth Muir, *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays* (London, Methuen, 1977) and Geoffrey Bullough, *The Narrative and Dramatic sources of Shakespeare*, 8 vols (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966–75).
4. John Pitcher, 'A theatre of the future: The *Aeneid* and the *Tempest*', *Essays in Criticism* 34 (1984) 193–215.
5. Reuben Brower, *Hero and Saint. Shakespeare and the Graeco-Roman Heroic Tradition* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1971), Gary Schmidgall, *Shakespeare and the Courtly Aesthetic* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1981), Barbara J. Bono, *Literary Transvaluation. From Vergilian Epic to Shakespearean Tragicomedy* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1984), and Donna B. Hamilton, *Vergil and 'The Tempest'* (Columbia, Ohio State University Press, 1990). I came across Hamilton's book only after the majority of work for this article had been done. Naturally I find that Hamilton and I make some of the same points; but since I cannot accept her premise that Shakespeare throughout his play was consciously imitating Virgil's poem to the extent that not only Prospero, but also Ferdinand, and 'nearly all the male characters in the play' (p. 26) are modelled on Aeneas, I find her conclusions about the nature of the relationship between the two texts unconvincing.
6. Brower, 89, 95–6.

7. Schmidgall, xviii, 74.
8. Bono, 1.
9. Hamilton, 134, x.
10. *Ibid.*, 4.
11. In his excellent *Shakespeare and Ovid* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993).
12. See Brower's useful discussion of Renaissance versions of Virgil, 103–13.
13. The sources for *Richard III* are mainly English chronicle histories, though Shakespeare may have used Seneca's *Hercules Furens*. See Bullough, 3, 221–40, and *Richard III*, ed. Antony Hammond, Arden Shakespeare, (London, Methuen, 1981) pp. 73–97. Emrys Jones, *The Origins of Shakespeare* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1977) 208, briefly draws attention to the Palinurus connection.
14. All Shakespeare plays are cited from the Arden editions.
15. The edition of Virgil cited is by R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1969). The English translation of the *Aeneid* I have used is by Robert Fitzgerald (Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1983).
16. Jones, 208.
17. The lines are as follows:

We passed on so far furth tyl we sawe
Rude Acheron, a lothsome lake to tell
That boyles and bubs up swelth as blacke as hell,
Where grisly Charon at theyr fixed tide
Stil ferries ghostes unto the farder side.
- See Bullough, 3, 233.
18. Schmidgall, xvii. Bate, *op. cit.*, 244, calls *The Tempest* a 'romance-style reworking of epic material', although he is generally rather sceptical about Virgilian readings of the play.
19. The editor of the Arden *Cymbeline*, J.M. Nosworthy, (London, Methuen, 1955), hedges his bets about the precise dating of the play, but inclines to 1608–9.
20. As cited in Bullough, 8, 38.
21. Ben Jonson, *The Works*, 11 vols, ed. C.H. Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1935–52) vii, 100. For a discussion of Golden age imagery in Jacobean literature, see Schmidgall, 76–8.
22. Robert S. Miola, *Shakespeare's Rome* (Cambridge, CUP, 1983) also discusses Augustan references in this play, esp. in Ch. 7.
23. For discussions of this issue see editions of *The Tempest* by Frank Kermode, Arden Shakespeare (London, Methuen, 1954, 1962) xxii–iv, lxxi–lxxiv, and Stephen Orgel, Oxford Shakespeare (Oxford, OUP, 1987) 44.
24. Bullough, 8, 274–99, gives extracts from these pamphlets. For quoted phrase see 280.
25. The phrase belongs to J.M. Nosworthy, whose article, 'The Narrative Sources of *The Tempest*', *RES* 24 (1948) 281–94, gives the first listing of Shakespeare's borrowings from the *Aeneid* for the play. Orgel mentions it in his useful brief discussion of the *Aeneid* in his edition of *The Tempest*, 88–92. See also Robert Wiltenburg, 'The 'Aeneid' in "The Tempest"', *Shakespeare Survey* 39 (1987) 159–68, who sees the *Aeneid* as 'the work to which Shakespeare is primarily responding, the story he is retelling' (159).

SANDRA CLARK

26. Pitcher, 196.

27. For discussions of this passage, see esp. Pitcher, 201–2, Kermode, 46–7, Orgel, 40, and Wiltenburg, 162–3. Jan Kott, ‘The *Aeneid* and *The Tempest*’, *Arion* N.S. 3 (1975) 424. Kott in this article and also in ‘The *Tempest*, or Repetition’, *Mosaic* X (1976–7) 9–36, sets up an extremely elaborate set of parallels between the two texts, many of which seem to me fanciful and unconvincing.

28. Brower’s comment, *Hero and Saint*, 93, that the *Aeneid* is ‘a drama of fathers and sons’ suggests another connection with *The Tempest*.

29. Brooks Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilised Poetry* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1963) 307.

30. On the stage directions, see Kermode, xi–xiii. The wording of these may not in fact be Shakespeare’s, but that of Ralph Crane, scrivener for the Kings’ Men.

31. See also Pitcher, 196, and Bate, 244, who mentions an alternative source for this scene in Sabinus’ commentary on Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* 13.

32. See Bullough, 8, 280, 298, 296.

33. Baldwin, 2, 480, discusses the lines and their origins.

34. Bono, 224.

35. Kermode, in his footnote to the passage, says the idea was commonplace in the period, and cites Erasmus, *Adagia* (II.481).

36. A further possible Virgilian allusion occurs in the masque scene, though to *Georgic* 2, rather than to the *Aeneid*. Ceres’ promise of the earth’s bounty in her blessing to Ferdinand and Miranda:

Earth’s increase, foison plenty,
Barns and garners never empty;
Vines with clust’ring bunches growing,
Plants with goodly burthen bowing

(IV.i.110–13)

recalls lines at the end of *Georgic* 2, especially ll. 516–18:

*nec requies, quin aut pomis exuberet annus
aut fetu pecorum aut Cerealis mergite culmi
proventuque oneret sulcos atque horrea vincat.*

No respite! still the year o’erflows with fruit, | Or young of kine, or
Ceres’ wheaten sheaf, | With crops the furrow loads, and bursts the
barns.

I am indebted for this reference to Jonathan Foster of the Virgil Society.

Some Interactive Instances of the Hero's Name in the *Aeneid*

It is not the custom of *PVS* for the editor to perpetrate an editorial. The present incumbent has nevertheless, with his colleague's good-natured acquiescence, taken it upon himself to offer a *Beitrag* as illustration of the fact that conferences can be as lively and fruitful happenings as Calvus's and Catullus's poetic workshop described in Catullus 50. For one of the most stimulating contributions to a recent British Academy Three-Day Symposium on the Language of Latin Poetry¹ was that of Dr S.J. Harrison, entitled 'Interactive "Speaking" Names in Virgil's *Aeneid*'. As is the way on such occasions, there was only very limited time for discussion, and so, with Dr Harrison's kind permission, I here amplify an idea which came to me in response to that paper.

Interactive Speaking Names, we were told, are those 'whose latent connotative or semantic elements are brought out through interaction with linguistic elements other than proper names in the surrounding context.' Of the various categories we were shown there were permutations of explicit and implicit, Greek and/or Latin. Obviously it is the *implicit* categories—where there is no outward linguistic similarity—which attract greater debate and pose the greater challenge to the Virgilian expositor. A good proportion of these go back to Servius, serious word-plays one might call them, remembering Stoic and other philosophic concepts of language. Dr Harrison presented over a dozen new examples of Greek explained by Latin, to which the reader will look forward.²

The fact that none of Dr Harrison's examples falls in books 2 and 4, and their very nature, was marked by the phrase 'varying possible dull passages'. I took up this challenge, and what I want to investigate here is a number of places where in fact it is Aeneas himself whose name creates the interaction. So far as I know, only the first of these has

JONATHAN FOSTER

hitherto been so expounded (see below). But all refer to passages in the poem of absolutely cardinal importance.

The nearest, pre-existing exposition of such a kind known to me is Norden's of Charon's words at 6.392–3:

*nec vero Alciden nec sum laetatus euntem
accepisse lacu*

an 'antithetische Wortspiel' on *χαίρω*, *Charon*. What is significant for my present purpose is that the name Charon is here to be understood; it is not contiguously stated. But everyone knows who it is: he has been named at 299 and 326. It is the same with three out of the four Aeneas instances which concern me here.

The name Aeneas is ostensibly Trojan; it appears in Greek as *Αινείας* or *Αινέας*. Without prejudice I asked myself what Greek words might be used in interaction with this. There are essentially two, both Homeric (see *LSJ s.vv.*):

1) *αἰνός-ή-όν* = *δεινός*, dread, 'terrible';

2) *αἶνος*, 'a tale', 'story', also in the sense of Attic *ἔπαινος*, 'praise'.

In fact this corresponds with the transmitted ancient views. The first extant interactive play on Aeneas's name is in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, 194–5:

*τῷ δὲ καὶ Αἰνείας ὄνομ' ἔσσεται, οὐνεκα μ' αἰνὸν
ἔσχεν ἄχος ἔνεκα βροτοῦ ἀνερος ἔμπεσον εὐνή.*

And his name will be Aeneas because terrible distress possessed me for the reason that I laid myself in the bed of a mortal man.

This 'etymology' is repeated in the *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum*; the *Etymologicum Magnum Auctum* adds the other word, glossed 'praise' (*ἔπαινος*). In reality the most serious etymologies³ are a city *Αἶνος* at the mouth of the Hebros (*Il.* 4.520) and another, *Αἶνεα*, opposite the mouth of the Axios (*Hdt.* 7.123). But Virgil is a poet, and he did something magnificent with the word *αἰνός* 'terrible'.⁴

At the very climax of the last book of the *Aeneid*, that inscrutable and awe-inspiring moment when Aeneas avenges his debt to his kinsman

SOME INTERACTIVE INSTANCES OF THE HERO'S NAME IN THE AENEID

and guestfriend Evander for the gloating killing of his only son Pallas by Turnus, at that cardinal point right at the end of the poem, which sweeps to a close all of a sudden like a late Beethoven quartet, Aeneas is

furiis accensus et ira
terribilis. (12.946–7)

The five-word phrase is exactly balanced in its place at the end of the description by

stetit acer in armis
Aeneas (938–9)

at the beginning. Where is his *pietas* now? Some would say ‘Right here’: so *terribilis αἰνός* is Aeneas’s very nature, as shown by his name. There are further possibilities at the other end of the poem.

In Aeneas’s extraordinary encounter with his disguised mother⁵ Austin acknowledges the Homeric model (*Od.* 9.19–20) of 1.378–9, ‘but Aeneas’s words have a Virgilian emotional content and significance.’ In order better to understand this assertion let us set the passages side by side:

Homer: ἔμ’ Ὀδυσσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν
ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει.

Virgil: *sum pius Aeneas, raptos qui ex hoste penates*
classe veho mecum, fama super aethera notus.

I would look at *fama super aethera notus*. First of all it exemplifies *surenchérir*, outbidding, of the Homeric context, as for instance does Catullus 51.2

ille, si fas est, superare divos

of Sappho’s original. But, equally importantly, with the name Aeneas resonate the words *fama...notus*, if we understand *fama* in the sense of αἰνός, ‘tale’, ‘story’ > ‘praise’ (see above).

Also in this amazing first book, when Aeneas reassures Dido of his undying gratitude with a series of implied *adynata* (607–10), he uses

JONATHAN FOSTER

Menalcas's closing words in honour of Daphnis (*Ecl.* 5.76–8):

*semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt (= Ecl. 5.78)
quae me cumque vocant terrae (1.609–10)*

The addition of 610 seems to make the point: Aeneas, who is shortly to be heard as the poet of the Sack of Troy and of his own wanderings, which will be a significant factor in causing Dido's fatal passion for him,⁶ is here shown as the person in whom is intrinsic the power to praise Dido wherever he may go: *Aeneas* > αἴνος = ἔπαινος.

Lastly, and perhaps most dangerously, do we not talk habitually of the 'ambiguity' of the *Aeneid* and of its eponym? The Sibyl herself is the embodiment of the enigmatic:

*horrendas canit ambages antroque remugit,
obscuris vera involvens (6.99–100)*

and she is coupled with Aeneas in the descent to the Underworld, such that

ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram. (6.268)

Here Servius speaks of the *enallage* of these attributes, and Norden asserts that the 'normal' *soli sub obscura nocte* would be less effective. Let us in turn assert that it would be so because it would not make this implication about Aeneas: he is as enigmatic a figure as his companion with her riddles. Now we may make the link *Aeneas* > αἴμος > αἰνιγμός. Should we really be surprised when the enigmatic pair emerge from the Underworld by the gate of false dreams?⁸

I rest my case: interactive play on Greek words implicit in the name *Aeneas* adds much illumination and Virgilian enhancement⁹ to the poem at key junctures, at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end.

University of Liverpool

JONATHAN FOSTER

NOTES

1. Held at the British Academy from 20–22 April 1995.
2. I understand that they are likely to be published as addenda to an important new book, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, by James J. O' Hara, forthcoming in 1996 from the University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
3. See Pape/Benseler, *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen*, ed. 3 (1863–70) 37.
4. This view was suggested by I.M.leM. Du Quesnay, in the course of a Virgil Colloquium held at the University of Liverpool in May 1977 and published in *LCM* 2 (1977) 139–40, with a discussion in which the present writer took part.
5. On which in general see my lecture to the Society, *PVS* 13 (1973–74) 28–41, developed in *Venuše a Dido* (a lecture given at Charles University, Prague, April 1993, hitherto unpublished).
6. See my lecture on Catullus 35 given in Prague, May 1995, and forthcoming in an English version in *LCM*.
7. M.L. West on Hesiod, *Op.* 202 helpfully glosses this special sense of αἶνος 'a fable or other story with an implied message in it for the hearer', cf. Hom. *Od.* 14.508, Archil. 174.1, etc. According to West αἰνιττομαί is 'say allegorically', 'hint at a truth by indirect means', whence αἰνιγμός, αἰνιγμα, for which 'riddle' is too restrictive a translation.
8. See Roland Mayer most recently on the subject of the Gate, *PVS* 21 (1993) 53–63.
9. Niall Rudd *supra*, 55, 58, notes Virgil's puns on *Alexis*, ἀλέγω > *curo* at *Ecl.* 2.6, 56.

Reviews

Virgil: a census of printed editions 1469–1500, edited by Martin Davies and John Goldfinch, with an introduction by R.C. Alston and a foreword by Lotte Hellinga. Occasional papers of The Bibliographical Society, number 7. A centenary publication. London, The Bibliographical Society, 1992. 128 pp. Five plates.

Virgil's stature, high in his lifetime, increased greatly from the day he died. Literary critics, benign or hostile, grammarians and commentators, school teachers as far afield as Egypt—all devoted much labour to the Virgilian corpus. The renown of the poet was reflected also in the writing of the imperial period, and the survival of no less than three almost complete and four fragmentary manuscripts from late antiquity bears eloquent testimony to a vogue enjoyed by no other pagan Latin poet. Medieval manuscripts come in battalions, and it is hardly an exaggeration to say that no self-respecting medieval monastery could be without at least one Virgil. Citations of classical Latin authors in the works of medieval scholars provide further evidence of the pre-eminence of Virgil: the famous twelfth-century grammarian Peter Helias, for example, in his treatise on Priscian's grammar cites Virgil 147 times as against (the next highest figures) Terence 38, Lucan 26, and Juvenal 24.

Virgil was not the first classical Latin author to be printed—that distinction was reserved for Cicero, whose *De officiis* was brought out at Mainz in 1465 from the house of Fust and Schoeffer (there is a convenient table of *editiones principes* of Latin authors in J.E. Sandys, *A history of classical scholarship*, II.103). The first printing is generally, and perhaps correctly, assigned to Sweynheym and Pannartz, to Rome, and to a date c. 1469, but it is not impossible that priority should go to the undated edition produced in Strassburg by Johann Mentelin. After 1469 there was a regular spate of production, and it is the totality of 179 incunable editions of Virgil which is surveyed in the present volume.

But for Walter Arthur Copinger (1847–1910) The Bibliographical Society in its present form would never have come into existence and the present volume never have been printed. For what we have here is the commemoration of a double centenary: that of the society, and that of the publication of Copinger's *Incunabula Virgiliana* in volume 2 of the society's proceedings, in 1892.

W.A. Copinger emerges from Alston's introduction as a man of wide-ranging interests and enormous intellectual energy. He never finished his studies at University College Durham, but left to join a firm of solicitors in London. Subsequently called to the Bar, he published what are still standard textbooks on copyright and conveyancing. Appointed lecturer in law at Owens College Manchester, he eventually became professor and Dean of the Faculty there. A lifelong bibliophile, he amassed a library of some 30,000 volumes which included hundreds of editions of Thomas à Kempis and of the Bible; most of the facsimiles in his *Incunabula Biblica* (1892), indeed, were made from books in his own collection. His bibliographical labours,

REVIEWS

however, accounted for only a portion of his mature output, for he also wrote copiously on the antiquities of Suffolk and Co. Cork, and on matters theological.

The present volume is the result of downloading the Virgilian records from the Incunable Short-Title Catalogue (ISTC) which is (and I quote from Davies' introduction to it on p. 17) 'a database of fifteenth-century printing now being compiled at the British Library and held in MARC format on the Library's BLAISE-LINE computer service'. 'ISTC was in origin a conversion of F.R. Goff's *Incunabula in American libraries: a third census* (1964–1972) to machine-readable form. The way the file is disposed still conforms essentially to Goff's alphabetical sequence...' (ibid.) The need to turn bibliography into an exact science was already apparent to Copinger, who was ever concerned to base bibliographical entries on autopsy, as far as possible, and, failing that, on the reports of witnesses whom he trusted; it is enough to say that for the Bibliothèque Nationale he was able to turn to the eminent Léopold Delisle. That Copinger would have applauded the formation of a bibliographical database goes without question; but whether he would have approved of this particular downloading may be questioned.

For the editions which he or his helpers had seen (they number 85 out of 180 in the *Incunabula Virgiliana*, and are marked by a star) Copinger gave title and publication details, collation, description (foliation, incipits, etc.), information about surviving copies, and references to secondary literature. The present check-list deliberately omits information about collation, foliation and incipits. Why so, one may ask. Presumably such information is held in the database, and could easily have been drawn off.

Worse than such omissions, though, is the presence of positive misinformation. For the purposes of this review I naturally turned to the holdings of the British Library, and had the joy of handling the Vindelinius de Spira edition of 1470 (no. 2 in the present list), the Strassburg edition by Mentelin of c. 1470 (no. 3), and the Jenson edition of 1475/1476 (no. 17). The last of these makes my point, for the list of additional items included in the edition (pieces from the *Appendix Vergiliana*, verse summaries of the *Aeneid*, and so forth) does not correspond at all to the order in which these items appear in the book. The Donatan life, for instance, opens the volume but appears more than half-way through the ISTC list, the *Moretum*, *Priapea* and other *App.Verg.* pieces come immediately after Maffeo Vegio's 'Liber XIII Aeneidos', not after *De signis caelestibus* as in the ISTC list, and so on. The ISTC list in short bears no relation to the arrangement of material in the edition, and one may reasonably ask why so. Incidentally, I can see no reason in the case of no. 2 for enclosing the place of publication, Venice, within square brackets, but not the name of Vindelinius, when the eight-line epigram which concludes the edition begins: *Progenitus spira formis monumenta maronis | Hęc uindelinius scripsit apud uenetos*.

Let me end with a sobering reflection. Many of the items listed in this volume survive only in a few copies, but of 37 editions only one copy is still extant. The single copy of no. 90 and the single copy of no. 147, the former located in Leipzig, the latter in Berlin, were lost during the last war. With memories of the Arno flooding and the conflagration which devastated Norwich City Library coming back to mind, all those of us who love old books must hope and pray that those 37 unique editions survive all hazards by fire and water.

Across Bin Brook: Latin Poems in Various Metres by F.J. Lelièvre and H.H. Huxley. Printed by Antony Rowe Ltd., Chippenham, Wiltshire. ISBN 0 9519726 0 X. First published in 1992. No price stated.

In the nineteenth century and well into this one polished erudition was manifested by the cultivation in British universities and schools of prose and verse composition in both classical languages. Taste and felicity, skill and wit were regularly a mark of this endeavour. Wilamowitz acknowledged in his *Erinnerungen* that appreciation of his verses was more lively here than amongst his countrymen—though I do recall having my attention drawn by C.J. Fordyce to a false quantity in a Latin hexameter by the great Prussian polymath (a short ‘u’ as the first syllable of *humanum* at the end of the line). There will not be many, if in fact there will be any, such works as this *libellus* published hereafter. It worthily witnesses to a cultural activity of which there are now very few connoisseurs and capable practitioners left. Thomas Arnold of Rugby considered classical verse composition a ‘contemptible prettiness’, but it survived his strictures. As late as 1949 there was the publication of ‘Some Oxford Compositions’, followed in 1964 by that of ‘More Oxford Compositions’. Maurice Bowra, J.D. Denniston, T.F. Higham, and Maurice Platnauer were amongst the glorious company of collaborators. Doubtless not everything they wrote could have been read without suspicion by a native speaker (the ultimate ideal), but their *Sprachgefühl* and general versatility were of a remarkably high order. Lelièvre and Huxley belong to this tradition and as a dinosaur myself I greet their *opusculum* with pleasure and gratitude.

Elegiacs prevail in the collection, but otherwise the range of metres is wide, being divided between quantitative and accentual kinds. Technical dexterity and humour abound. Nearly every page exemplifies the authors’ capacity for producing *tours de force*. Huxley (p. 75) remarks on his liking for accentual rhyming poems, pointing out that they can be easily understood and appreciated by those with ‘small Latin’. Maybe he could now favour us with a florilegium of such pieces *discipulorum in usum*? Titbits of this sort could enliven lessons and help to maintain interest and numbers where the ancient tongue is still taught. Here is a grace from the pen of Anon. with Huxley’s rendering of it (p. 48):

Heavenly Father, bless us,
And keep us all alive;
There’s ten of us for dinner
And not enough for five.

*Pater noster, benedic
Peccatores decem,
Quibus fert pauperies
Propiorem necem.
Sis adiutor, Domine,
Servos ne relinque;
Namque cena nostra vix
Pascet ora quinque.*

REVIEWS

But a serious note is struck in not a few pieces. L.'s 'Joyce' (p. 20) is a tender quatrain in elegiacs in memory of his wife, while his version of 'The Banks o' Doon' by Robert Burns, also in elegiacs, well conveys the tone of the original. H., as a former President of the Virgil Society, might have been expected by the reader to stress the heroic mode in his work, but it is the Ovidian spirit of parody and pastiche, very cleverly and neatly realised, which pervades it. However, Virgil is not absent: see, for example, 'Life with Lavinia' in elegiacs (p. 58), *Lacrimae Vergilianae* in hexameters (p. 59) on Aeneas' victory and its cost in terms of the death and suffering of worthy people (the last line echoing Lucan, *Victrix causa Iovi placuit, sed victa Maroni*), and the pessimistic version of the Fourth Eclogue's apocalypticism (p. 63), deploring the physical and moral pollution which today threatens the world.

Professors Lelièvre and Huxley are to be congratulated on their *libellus*. Caviare to the general, but delectable to those who understand.

University of Teesside

H. MacL. CURRIE

Books Received

Mention in this column does not preclude a fuller review in a subsequent issue of the *Proceedings*.

Maria ALESSIO, *Studies in Vergil Aeneid Eleven, an Allegorical Approach* (Montfort & Villeroy 1993) 257 pp. Paperback. No price given.

Michael Antonius CARO, *Carmina Latina et Latinae Interpretationes*, ed. Alfredo BECERRA (Los Angeles 1993) x + 141 + 135 pp. Paperback. No price given.

VIRGIL, *Eclogues*, edited with an Introduction and Commentary by Wendell CLAUSEN (Oxford, Clarendon Press 1994) xxx + 328 pp. Casebound. £40.00.

STATIUS, *Thebaid*, a new translation by A.D. MELVILLE, with an Introduction and Notes by D.W.T. VESSEY (Oxford, World's Classics 1995) lvii + 373 pp. Paperback. £7.99.

Pentekontaetia: Addenda and Corrigenda

When a future archivist comes to write 'Son of Pentekontaetia' (or some such sequel) the following addenda and corrigenda may be useful.

- p. v For *9 Jan 42* read *9 Jan 43*.
- p. 15 Delete the (meaningless) words *and slightly to shift his historical allusion*.
- p. 17 For *Underword* read *Underworld*.
- p. 17 For *Stalingrad* (now Volgograd) read *Leningrad* (now St. Petersburg).
- p. 33 The President was George Malcolm Young (1882–1959).
- p. 34 The President was Cyril Bailey (1871–1957).
- p. 39 The PA by E.V. Rieu was published in *PVS* 21 (1993), 35–51.
- p. 45 *PVS* volume 1 was edited (in so far as any editing was necessary) by A.J. Gossage (AJG to DWB 18 Sep 93). This should be added to the *res gestae* of AJG on p. 48, and corrected in references to *PVS* 1 on pp. 99, 107, 108.
- p. 46 For (*Minutes 16 Feb 65*) read (*Minutes 16 Feb 63*).
- p. 48 *PVS* 21 (1993) now holds the record at 171 pages.
- p. 57 A set of VS publications has been deposited in the Joint Library (8 May 93).
- p. 57 A group visit to Cumae was held (24–31 Oct 93) and a report circulated to members. This should be added to p. 68.
- p. 68 For (*G&R 1959, 85–86*) read (*G&R 1959, 86–89 plus 2 plates*).
- p. 68 For £25 read £5.25.
- p. 69 s.v. Finances. The list of headings has been scrambled, and should follow the order on pages 69–73.
- p. 69 For *increase was applied for* read *increase was implemented*.
- p. 88 The mis-spelling of *Maguinness* is due to the original.

Publications

- p. 103 The most comprehensive repository of VS literature (far outstripping the British Library) is the Joint Library. This now contains (w.e.f. 8 May 93) complete sets (either originals or photocopies) of:
 - List A Pamphlets (*Pente* pp. 104–105)
 - List B Summaries (*Pente* pp. 105–106)
 - List C Proceedings (*Pente* pp. 106–113)

Pamphlets 1–24 (1944–1961) and Summaries 1–53 (1944–1961) are available on request in Room 502. Bound volumes of *PVS* (1–5, 6–10, 11–16, 17–20) are in Stack 15. The current volume is on the Periodicals shelves.

The Joint Library holds additional copies of 3 PAs (*Pente* p. 116) viz. T.S. Eliot (shelf 203A), Lord Wavell (Tract Box 48 in Stack 29) and Sir John Lockwood 1961 (*ibid.*).

Vergilian Society publications (*Pente* pp. 66–67) are incomplete but shelved in Stack 18.

PENTEKONTAETIA: ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

Other related publications include:

Memnisse Iuvabit (*Pente* pp. 113–114) on shelf 95.19Y

ORVA (vide infra) on shelf 95.19Q

GWK Biography (*Pente* p. 93) on shelf 204B

- p. 104 I have copies of Pamphlet 3 (T.S. Gregory) and Pamphlet 5 (R. Speaight) but no dates of delivery—if ever delivered.
- p. 105. Conversely, Summary 2 (E.H. Warmington) remains a mystery: this was delivered, but I wonder if it was ever published.
- p. 114. *Memnisse Iuvabit* is now a Duckworth title (£11.95). Another publication with some resemblance to *Memnisse Iuvabit* is *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (*ORVA*), ed. S.J. Harrison, OUP 1990. This contains 26 essays on the *Aeneid* including 4 reprints from *PVS* (3 of them also reprinted in *Memnisse*) plus the VS lecture of 15 Jan 72, which was not published by the VS.

Meetings

- p. 116 For *R.D. William* read *R.D. Williams*
- p. 119 s.v. 15 Mar 47 delete *Revd*
- p. 120 s.v. 15 May 48 delete *Revd*
- p. 121 s.v. 10 Mar 51 add *PVS* 21, 35–51
- p. 129 s.v. 19 Mar 66 add *ORVA* 25, 449–465
- p. 131 s.v. 14 Nov 70 cf. *ORVA* 9, 191–207
- p. 132 s.v. 15 Jan 72 add *ORVA* 7, 145–166
- p. 133 s.v. 10 Nov 73 add *ORVA* 6, 127–144
- p. 134 s.v. 22 Nov 75 add *ORVA* 15, 295–304
- p. 135 s.v. 13 Jan 79 cf. *G&R* Apr 79, 61–80
- p. 135 s.v. 10 Feb 79 cf. *G&R* Oct 82, 143–168
- p. 136 s.v. 19 Jan 80 add *ORVA* 20, 378–389
- p. 138 s.v. 15 May 84 cf. *ORVA* 9, 191–201
- p. 141 s.v. 2 Mar 91 add *PVS* 21, 65–79
- p. 142 s.v. 23 Nov 91 add *PVS* 21, 53–63
- p. 142 s.v. 14 Mar 92 add *PVS* 21, 17–34
- p. 142 s.v. 9 May 92 add *PVS* 21, 1–16
- p. 142 s.v. 5 Dec 92 add *PVS* 21, 111–150 ('Descent into Hell')
- p. 142 s.v. 23 Jan 93 add *PVS* 21, 89–110 ('Hopelessly Devoted')
- p. 143 Add to Index: Austin, R.G. 24 Feb 51
- p. 145 s.v. Williams. For 14 Nov 71 read 14 Nov 70, and for 24 Feb 79 read 24 Nov 79.

D.W. BLANDFORD

The illustration on the front cover is of a piece of Italian majolica of the fifteenth century which shows Dido's feast; her eyes are on the gifts brought by Achates, and she is hugging Ascanius/Cupid; ...*interdum gremio fovet inscia Dido | insidat quantus miseræ deus* (*Aen.* 1.718–9).

Photograph: British Museum, Department of Mediaeval and Later Antiquities, reproduced with their kind permission.