

FREDERICK AUGUSTUS TODD

Professor of Latin in the University of Sydney
1922-1944

Frederick Augustus Todd was born in Sydney on 14 March, 1880. Eighteen years later he matriculated from Sydney Public High School and entered the University of Sydney where he graduated in 1901 with First class Honours in Latin and Greek, gaining also a University Medal for Classics. Awarded a Woolley Travelling Scholarship, he studied at the Universities of Leipzig (1901-2) and Jena (1902-3), being awarded by the latter the degree of PhD for his thesis de musis in carminibus poetarum Romanorum commemoratis (Jena, 1903). He returned to Sydney as Assistant Lecturer in Latin, was Assistant Professor from 1913 to 1921 and Professor from 1922 to 1944.

Todd played a full part in University life: he was Dean of the Faculty of Arts and a Fellow of the Senate from 1930 to 1937. He was for several years a member of the Board of the Sydney University Union, and, in 1913-14, its President. For ten years he acted as Secretary of the Extension Board.

Outside the University he served for many years as a member of the New South Wales Board of Examiners and of the Board of Secondary School Studies. He was in 1909 a co-founder of the New South Wales Branch of the Classical Association.

In 1940 his book Some Ancient Novels was published by Oxford University Press.

An appreciation of his life and work and a select bibliography was contributed by his distinguished colleague, Professor A.D. Trendall, to the Union Recorder of July 13, 1944, pp.99-100.

Professor Todd died suddenly in June 1944. His friends, colleagues and former pupils created by subscription a Memorial Lecture Fund which is administered by a Committee on which are representatives of the three bodies to which Todd dedicated his services - the University, the Union and the Classical Association of New South Wales. From time to time, as accumulated interest provides the necessary funds, a distinguished scholar is invited to deliver a lecture.

NINTH TODD MEMORIAL LECTURE

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO INTERPRETATION
OF VIRGIL'S AENEID?

PROFESSOR G.W. WILLIAMS
Professor of Classics in Yale University

Stephen Roberts Lecture Theatre
Sydney
Thursday 22 July 1976
at 8 p.m.

What is happening to interpretation of Virgil's Aeneid?¹

1.

The Aeneid is unique among epics that have survived from the ancient world in the nature of its historical perspective - and there is no good reason to think that the survival of any of the lost epics would have altered that judgment in the least. The poem is set in the far mythical past of the twelfth century, and yet the reader is made constantly aware that the poet is urgently reflecting on the social and political problems of the time of composition (the Twenties of the age of Augustus). However, the technique of indirection which the poet has devised to accommodate that gap between the temporality of the narrative and that of the composition has encouraged interpreters to take very different views of the political attitudes that seem to underlie the poem. That divergence has become very uncomfortable in the last forty years; in that period assessment of the Aeneid seems to have swung from regarding it virtually as a work of propaganda for Augustus to a view that sees it as Virgil's deliberate rejection of the Augustan concept of the Roman empire.

Consider the two following quotations which are typical and epitomize that divergence:

'But there is of course a broader problem that we have hardly touched upon in this book. That is the justification of Virgil's "ideological" viewpoint, the extent to which his poetry may or may not be vitiated by his Augustan "propaganda", if indeed we can use so unkind a term without question-begging. First of all, it seems quite plain that Virgil was himself a convinced Augustan. He was clearly inspired by his theme: he believed in his own "ideology". He really saw in Augustus the type of man who could bring peace out of fratricidal war, order from anarchy, self-control from selfish passion, in a sense an "age of

1982

Copyright © University of Sydney

ISBN. 0 86758 069 0

gold" from an age of iron.'²

'There are few hints in the action of Book XII of any greatness of character in Aeneas and no mention whatever of the future brilliance of Rome, save in the idealistic utterances of Jupiter at the end, predicting a future harmony to which his own sudden violence against Turnus gives an immediate lie. For whatever reason (and the reactions of a poet must never be weighed purely in the perspective of history), Virgil seems to say here [in the final scene], if we judge correctly, that Aeneas - and through him Augustus - can never fulfill in fact the ideal conditions of empire, where force and freedom must be fused into a fortunate amalgam.'³

The first quotation is from a book entitled Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry by Brooks Otis and published in 1963. The second is from a book published only three years later in 1966: The Poetry of the Aeneid by Michael C.J. Putnam. The viewpoint expressed by Brooks Otis was put forward more pungently and with more political realism by Ronald Syme in Chapter XXX of his book The Roman Revolution, published in 1939: that chapter has the significant title 'The Organisation of Opinion'. More extreme forms of both views - particularly of the second - can easily be found. To some extent both views reflect their times. Syme was writing at a time when the considerable achievements of Nazi propaganda were making a great impression. Putnam was writing at a time when opposition in the United States to the war in Vietnam was feeding on a sense (growing since the end of the Second World War) that war is an absolute wrong which no circumstances can justify. The majority of scholars nowadays seem to follow Putnam rather than Syme. That is partly due to a disquiet that Brooks Otis barely alludes to: if the Aeneid is propaganda for a regime that can be judged to be militaristic, then it cannot escape condemnation. Consequently, if the poem is to be saved (and who could deny that it must be?), its 'ideology' must be discovered to be in fact the opposite of what Syme and Brooks Otis took it to be: the poet is actually condemning Augustus and all his works, together with the

imperialist ideal of Rome. Putnam, for instance, asserts (p.viii): 'Those who hear in Aeneas and his progress a mighty paean of praise for the peace and prosperity of Augustan Rome do the force of Virgil's poetry the greatest disservice'. This preposterous thesis has steadily gained both credence and currency, so that it is now almost taken for granted and the task that remains for scholars is regarded as being to demonstrate more and more features of the 'anti-Virgile chez Virgile' (as used to be fashionable with Lucretius).

A crucial episode for this thesis is, as can be seen from the words of Putnam quoted above, the final scene of the Aeneid, in which Aeneas seems to overcome his instinct to spare Turnus' life and kills him. This lecture will be focussed on that scene. But first several general points need to be made about the narrative-technique of the epic and the way in which the poet has used the divine machinery and the concept of Fate, since the view taken of these two elements radically influences the interpretation of the poem's ending.

2.

Fate is all-pervasive in the Aeneid, right from the opening words: arma virumque cano Troiae qui primus ab oris / Italiam fato profugus Laviniaque venit / litora 'Of war I sing and of the man who first from the shores of Troy an exile by Fate came to Italy and the coast of Lavinium'. The concept of Fate is normally analysed as if it should be considered as belonging to religious or philosophical beliefs. The result of this approach can be seen, for instance, in Cyril Bailey's Religion of Virgil, where an attempt is made to define a system of religious and philosophical beliefs that can be said to be Virgil's own. But it is quite unilluminating, because the so-called beliefs have a life of their own as ideas in the poem and strongly resist transference outside it and comparison with, or classification among, traditional beliefs. The concept needs to be analysed in terms of technique as one element in the strategy of the poet's narrative. Seen from this viewpoint the concept

of Fate has three aspects that are relevant to the final scene.

The authorial usefulness of the concept can be seen clearly in Lucan who was deeply influenced by the technique of the Aeneid. Lucan dispensed with the divine machinery and so had Fate as the only superhuman force in his epic. In his narrative Fate is what is going to happen before it actually happens. The concept allows the author to use his privileged position to create suspense - not the obvious suspense of not knowing what is going to happen (a type of suspense that issues in a sense of surprise that is not very long lived), but that form of suspense that constantly makes a reader oppressively aware of a threatening future looming ahead. In the Bellum Civile this is focussed mainly on the threat of Pharsalia.⁴ In the Aeneid this aspect of Fate is employed to herald, for instance, the approaching deaths of Dido and Turnus a long way in advance.

A second aspect of the concept in the Aeneid concerns the poem's relationship to Roman history. Virgil invented the highly original technique of setting the reader in the twelfth century so that he looks forward, from the wrong direction as it were, down the centuries over the whole panorama of Roman history to its culmination in the present day, which is the time of composition of the poem. Here the poet uses the concept of Fate not only to relate the short-range events of the immediate narrative but also to connect the unfolding of that story intimately with the whole history of Rome. Here Fate expresses the historical sense that, when a long series of events is examined after they have taken place, they can be seen to be connected and explicable; they acquire, as it were, an aura of inevitability. Fate enables the poet to represent that sense of inevitability as inherent in the events before and during their happening; this is, of course, a poetic and not a philosophical or doctrinal concept.

The third aspect of Fate is derived from the idea that, though Juppiter does not create it, it is uniquely known to him and is identical with his will. Juppiter cannot will otherwise

than in accordance with the decrees of Fate. But other gods, because they do not know them or have only an imperfect knowledge of them, can and do obstruct them in the short run. So when Aeneas is frustrated through the storm roused by Juno in Book 1, Venus can suspect that Juppiter has changed his mind (237), and the great prophecy of Rome's destiny that he delivers is a revelation to her and is introduced by a metaphor from initiation (262 fatorum arcana movebo) - Fate is a secret known to Juppiter.

This paradigm provided the poet with a most useful pattern. For what happens when human beings come to have some knowledge of Fate? In that case Fate is what converts itself into duty once it becomes known to them. This allows many poetic formulations of great power. For instance, the Etruscan forces are kept idle because a prophet has revealed that they can only be led into battle by a foreigner (8.497-504) - Fate and prophecy are closely allied both conceptually and linguistically. When Aeneas arrives, they can follow him, and so the poet says (10.154-56):

tum libera fati
classem conscendit iussis gens Lydia divum
externo commissa duci.

'Then, freed from Fate, the Lydian nation boards ship on divine instruction, entrusted to a foreign commander.'

But, of course, the way the poet makes most use of this aspect of Fate is to express the driving-force that impels Aeneas through endless hardships, temptations, and setbacks to found a city in a land that is unknown and only gradually becomes clear to him. Aeneas is privileged; he has a sense not given to ordinary men. When the Latins have broken the truce and there has been great slaughter, they send a delegation to Aeneas, asking a truce to bury the dead. He replies (11.110-14):

pacem me exanimis et Martis sorte peremptis
oratis? equidem et vivis concedere vellem.
nec veni, nisi fata locum sedemque dedissent,
nec bellum cum gente gero; rex nostra reliquit
hospitia et Turni potius se creditur armis.

'You beseech me for peace for the dead and for those cut down in battle? Indeed I should gladly have granted it to the living as well. I have not come to this place had not Fate assigned me this region to settle in. And I am not at war with your nation: your king abandoned his ties with me and entrusted himself instead to the weapons of Turnus.'

The problem of a man driven by an inner vision interested the poet, and his Aeneas is a man whose strength of will comes from his knowing something of the future in a way that he can only explain in terms of revelations of the will of the gods; he has visions in which the dead or gods appear to him. People like Dido mock him, but that is the only explanation he can give (4.340-59 and 376-80). Once revealed to him, that partial knowledge of the future (that is, a vision of what the future could be) imposes the duty on him of seeing it achieved. Aeneas is not to be regarded as an instrument of Divine Will: that is to interpret the poetic text in the most literal way possible. The concept of Fate is a trope for a particular kind of ambition, the ambition, as it were, of the frontiersman. Aeneas' strength comes from the power of the vision that he has, and so, at times, he falls into doubt and despair (as when the ships are burnt in Book 5).

If Fate is regarded in this way, as a many-sided narrative-device, various useful consequences follow. For instance, it is often asserted that the dice are loaded against Turnus in the last battle and that this essential unfairness is epitomized in Juno's words to Juturna (12.149) nunc iuvenem imparibus video concurrere fatis 'Now I realise that Turnus is fighting a Fate that is too strong for him'. But Juno is only helping the author create that sense of doom and suspense. She has by now learnt enough of the future to realise that she has gone far enough in opposing Fate. But it is no empty determinism - the author is not relieving himself of the obligation to write a convincing script in which the stages of the movement towards the end will be shown and not just told. Turnus carries his own particular death within him and is responsible for it.

But what about the incident where Juppiter sends a Dira to frighten and weaken Turnus? Is that not unfair, an unwarranted advantage to Aeneas? A recent critic, who goes to greater extremes than Putnam, says of this: 'In the end Aeneas does not beat Turnus by a superhuman effort - Turnus is rendered incapable of fighting by Jove in order to bring about the fulfillment of fate'.⁵ Here it is time to look at the part played by the gods in the epic.

3.

It is often remarked that gods play a far smaller part in the Aeneid than in the Iliad or Odyssey, but it is as often remarked that it was a pity that Virgil used them at all. Why did he choose to use this traditional device? What advantage was the divine machinery to an epic poet?

One immediate advantage appears from comparison with Lucan who excluded gods. Lucan is incessantly plucking at his reader's elbow to make sure that he understands the full significance of a particular event; in this constant entry into his own text, Lucan is more like a didactic than an epic poet. But that unepic insistence on his own personality was deliberately sought by Lucan.⁶ Virgil, on the other hand, gives the appearance of a far greater epic impersonality. There are certainly various ways in which he enters his own text, but it is always done with tact and indirection. The divine machinery is one means which Virgil uses to show various aspects of the narrative that Lucan is compelled to tell by authorial intervention.⁷

For instance, there is only one Council of Gods in the Aeneid and it comes at the beginning of Book 10. It is often judged adversely. A recent writer says of it: 'Virgil's divine Council of War ... strikes the modern reader as a curiously inadequate prologue to a book which is structurally so important and in some respects the finest in the poem'.⁸ But the council enables the poet to make clear the real issues at stake which are

obscured, and have all along been obscured, in the random details of preparation for war and of fighting. In particular it allows two opposing points of view to be expressed. For Venus in her speech (17-62) sets out the Trojan point of view - the suffering, the hardships, and the dedicated obedience to divine commands. Juno in her answer (63-95) forcefully expresses the Italian point of view, and their sense of the brutality and ambition of the Trojans; she equates Fate with (68) Cassandrae furiis 'the ravings of Cassandra' - as if that were all that Aeneas had to rely on for his confidence in the future. What is more important is that she portrays Turnus and his followers as native Italians on their own land, and the Trojans as mere usurpers. Then Juppiter has his say (104-13) more briefly: he is neutral (except that he is bound to see the decrees of Fate carried out) and sets this war in context by contrasting it with the real war to come - the long and desperate struggle with Carthage - in which Trojans and Italians will be one nation against a common enemy. Here an important thesis about Italian unity (ignoring the Social War) is unobtrusively expressed.

These contrasting and yet interrelating points of view enable the poet to portray the war in Italy as a form of civil war (for there are potential Italians on both sides), both in virtue of the strange mixture of loyalties and in virtue of the long-range historical viewpoint by which all these peoples are really one (that is, Romans).

This same advantage is conspicuously exploited in the great prophecy of Juppiter (1.257-96). The speech creates an effect of greater authority and objectivity in the god's mouth than if its claims had been asserted in the poet's own voice.

A second advantage that the poet found in the divine machinery can be seen in the incident of the Dira sent by Juppiter as an omen to warn off Turnus' sister Juturna (12.853-54). His sister who is a goddess recognises the creature and leaves (869-86). Turnus, however, only sees the creature as a little owl that flaps against his face and shield. He is terrified by what he regards as an ill omen. He replies to

Aeneas very near the end (894-95) non me tua fervida terrent / dicta, ferox; di me terrent et Iuppiter hostis 'Your fierce words of anger do not terrify me; the gods terrify me and the hostility of Juppiter'. The effect is to go some way towards explaining and excusing Turnus' defeatism; but it is an ambiguous excuse. For, though the poet represents Fate as finding its way (10.113) and Juppiter as assisting that process, Turnus has, in fact, been running away from Aeneas throughout Book 12. Seen from this point of view, the divine intervention here is the emblem of Turnus' own fear. The act of Juppiter in sending the Dira is history in the making as revealed by the omniscient poet. Turnus focusses on what he sees as a symbol of his own fears that have debilitated him for a long time; it is that sense of hopelessness which brings about his weakening and death. There is a very similar complexity in the death of Dido. The goddesses conspire to make her fall in love with Aeneas, and so make use of her and thereby go some way to absolving her from responsibility; that is history in the making. Yet she does not see it in that way: she falls in love quite naturally and she takes full responsibility for her actions. The madness of Amata in Book 7 should be analysed in the same way.

On two occasions in the last three books Turnus is saved from meeting Aeneas by interventions of Juno. On one of these he pursues a phantom of Aeneas and, before he knows where he is, he arrives back home (10.636-88). On the other his goddess sister disguises herself as his charioteer and keeps him well away from the fighting (12.468-85 and 614-49). In the former incident he feels a coward and tries to commit suicide; in the latter he finally admits that he has long recognised his sister and knew all the time what she was doing. In both cases there is a wide gap between the omniscience of the poet and the perception of the mortal. The divine interventions function as a trope for human motivation that can accommodate the sense that human beings often not only cannot fully explain, let alone justify, their actions, but also act as if under an inescapable compulsion.

It is false to portray Turnus as fighting an objectively hopeless battle against the gods and Fate. The poet keeps bringing the inevitable tragedy before the reader's eyes (as with Dido) to increase that sense of suspense and doom towards the final climax. Thereby he succeeds in working up sympathy and understanding for Turnus. But the tragedy is only inevitable because the poet knows the outcome and shows Turnus himself bringing it about step by step. It simply denies the complexity of the composition to say of Book 12: '[Turnus] begins the last attempt to oppose destiny against insuperable odds'.⁹

This leads to recognition of another aspect of the technique by which the poet exploits the divine machinery. He uses the gods to enforce a gap between freewill and determinism. That gap can also be expressed in terms of a contrast between events as they are seen in the short run, especially by participants, and events as they are seen over the long range of history. In the former perspective events are fluid, unpredictable, and there is a wide range of possibilities. In the latter perspective a sequence of events acquires an increasing burden of determinism. The gods express the poet's sense of that contrast, seen through hindsight, with full tragic irony; it is also the tragic contrast between man's hopes and ambitions and what really happens. It is a well calculated surprise when, in Book 8.395-99, Vulcan explains to Venus that Troy need not have fallen as it did in Book 2; neither Juppiter nor Fate had any objection to the city's (and Priam's) survival for another ten years. It is in that gap that human freewill and responsibility reside. In Books 9-12 Turnus acts in such a way that his choices become more and more restricted. There is a tragedy in that and it merits sympathy; but the responsibility is not to be shifted from Turnus. The poet of the Aeneid reconciled the polar contrasts of freewill and determinism by means of the divine machinery, but without pretending that judgment is simple.

However, recent commentators on the last scene of the epic have not hesitated to pass simple judgments on the basis of their own interpretations. A few typical quotations will illustrate this:

'Aeneas, the cherisher of his Trojan folk against wiles human and divine, should ideally have become by the epic's conclusion not only the founder of the Roman race, but the first of a people which would ultimately re-establish the golden age after the forces of madness have at last been defeated at the battle of Actium. In reality he remains the person who imposes Troy on Italy ... The primary change - and it is one which must have forced on Virgil at least a partial reevaluation of his epic's purpose and achievement - is in the figure of Aeneas, forced by circumstances to adopt a position not unlike that of Turnus himself in Book XII or the Greeks in II, where violence, even needless violence, is created to attain an end.'¹⁰

'It is Aeneas who loses at the end of Book XII, leaving Turnus victorious in his tragedy ... Aeneas fails, initially, because he kills the suppliant craving pardon at his feet at the very instant when reconciliation would not only be possible, but would prove that the triumph of empire was not at the cost of personal rights and liberty.'¹¹

'The reaction he [Virgil] wants to prompt is plain. We must condemn the sudden rage that causes Aeneas to kill Turnus when he is on the point of sparing him - and when his death no longer² makes sense, for Turnus has acknowledged defeat (936-7) ... The killing of Turnus cannot be justified, this is beyond doubt the judgment expected of us. It is of course intolerable, from the point of view of plot construction, that Turnus should be left alive. But if he is a competent poet, aware of the implications of his own fiction, Virgil must make

Aeneas' action both psychologically plausible and forgivable: we cannot be invited to condemn the poem's hero at the very climax of the poem.¹²

The latter writer ends by having to condemn the poet's craft explicitly, but in terms that should certainly call in question the nature of the analysis he has applied. The former writer only comes close to that position; he turns back from it by regretting the end of the epic and suggesting that the inherent nature of the material compelled the poet into a presentation that could please neither poet nor reader.

But in both cases - and in many more - the analysis itself is faulty and only imposes on the poet the desires and prejudices of the critic.

5.

In response to such judgments it needs to be said immediately that the poet was in no way compelled to represent Turnus as killed by Aeneas. He deliberately chose to do so, for in the tradition Turnus was killed in the course of general fighting, and Virgil seems to have invented the death in single combat with Aeneas. It is easy to see several structural reasons, unconnected with the moral issues inherent in the ending, that would have made that course attractive to him. First, the involvement of Aeneas in a drama of confrontation with a single individual that is emblematic of the whole large-scale situation unifies the last four books of the poem just at the point where the theme of a war could easily fragment into a series of more or less disconnected incidents. In that way the figure of Turnus functions very much in the second half of the Aeneid as the poet's invention of Dido's love and suicide does in the first half. Secondly - and derived from the emblematic nature of the confrontation - the killing of Turnus by Aeneas achieves a conclusive climax and nothing more needs to be said; this is not just because his death ends a particular drama, but also because the future beyond Turnus' death has been made clear

in various parts of the poem, especially in the great prophecy of Juppiter in Book 1 and in his confrontation with Juno in Book 12 just before the climax of the final scene.

The poet has certainly taken risks, both with Dido and with Turnus, and he has not escaped hostile comment and misunderstanding in consequence. But the risks were not taken inadvertently, and, though a critic is entitled to conclude with an adverse judgment, certain features of the final scene should be noticed first because they give clear indications of the poet's intentions.

6.

The nature of the poet's representation of Turnus changes extraordinarily in Book 12. It is not just that the narrative concentrates on him; it is that the poet, as it were, stands beside him and sees the action from Turnus' point of view.

I have already suggested how the poet works up sympathy for Turnus in Book 12 by constantly making the reader oppressively aware of an inevitable outcome through the concept of Fate. There is another aspect of the narrative that works in the same direction. When Turnus has picked up a vast stone, has faltered and not been able to throw it even as far as Aeneas, the poet moves out into a simile to express Turnus' lack of power (12.908-14):

ac velut in somnis, oculos ubi languida pressit
nocte quies, nequiquam avidos extendere cursus
velle videmur et in mediis conatibus aegri
succidimus; non lingua valet, non corpore notae
sufficiunt vires nec vox aut verba sequuntur:
sic Turno quacumque viam virtute petivit,
successum dea dira negat.

'And as in dreams, when relaxed peace presses heavily on our eyes in the darkness, we feel that we are vainly striving to increase the speed of our desperate running

and in the midst of our efforts weakly collapse; our tongue has no strength, the accustomed powers are not present in our body, and neither voice nor words issue: so for Turnus, wherever he exerted his power to find a way, the dire goddess denied him success'.

This is a unique simile in the Aeneid. It is what one might expect to find in a didactic poem, in the Georgics for instance, or, most of all, in Lucretius' de rerum natura. The reason is that in didactic poetry the poet assumes the persona of a teacher and goes out of his way to draw his pupil (the reader) into the experience that he is describing and which he assumes they have both shared. Here the effect is to appeal to readers in the most intimate way possible (and normally impossible for an epic poet) to understand the predicament of Turnus by recalling a type of experience which they - no less than the poet - will often have had.

The partisan nature of this simile is clear: the poet is working to make the reader realise Turnus' awful situation. But that same partisanship should have been recognised in other similes - in the sense that the similes do not function as an objective comment by an impersonal poet on the situation, but view that situation deliberately through the eyes of one of the participants. For instance, at the very beginning of Book 12, Turnus is shown as implacable in his desire to continue the war in spite of the defeat of his forces (4-9):

Poenorum qualis in arvis
 saucius ille gravi venantum vulnere pectus
 tum demum movet arma leo, gaudetque comantis
 excutiens cervice toros fixumque latronis
 impavidus frangit telum et fremit ore cruento:
 haud secus accenso gliscit violentia Turno.

'Just as a lion in Carthaginian fields, gravely wounded in his breast by hunters, at last joins battle; he exults as he shakes the luxuriant mane along his neck and fearlessly snaps off the brigand's spear transfixing him and roars with blood-stained mouth: not otherwise did violence catch fire within the flaming Turnus'.

Recent commentators take the word latro 'brigand' as Virgil's comment on Aeneas. They support this by pointing out how Aeneas is called praedo 'bandit' a number of times (7.362; 10.774; 11.484). But all of these occur in speeches by Italian enemies of Aeneas: that is the natural rhetoric of the opposite side. In the simile, the shift from describing the cause of the lion's wound as 'hunters' in the plural to defining it as a single 'brigand' mirrors the shift of the lion's attitude to violent hatred of his enemies. That is, the simile views the situation through Turnus' eyes: in his hatred he regards Aeneas as a mere brigand.

This question of aspect becomes very important in a simile that the poet uses after the first clash in the single combat between Aeneas and Turnus. Turnus' sword has shattered and he seeks safety by running away. Aeneas, in spite of his wounded leg, presses hard on him (749-57):

inclusum veluti si quando flumine nactus
 cervum aut puniceae saeptum formidine pennae
 venator cursu canis et latratibus instat;
 ille autem insidiis et ripa territus alta
 mille fugit refugitque vias, at vividus Umber
 haeret hians, iam iamque tenet similisque tenenti
 increpuit malis morsuque elusus inani est;
 tum vero exoritur clamor ripaeque lacusque
 responsant circa et caelum tonat omne tumultu.

'Just as when a hunting-dog has caught up with a stag hemmed in by a river or by the crimson feathers of a hunting net, and presses on him barking; he [the stag], terrified by the snare and the high river-bank, races back and forth a thousand ways; but the lively Umbrian hound hangs on his heels with gaping mouth; always he just has him, or thinking he has him, he snaps his jaws shut and, baffled, bites on nothing; then a great noise arises and banks and waters resound all about and the whole sky echoes the confusion.'

The following comment on this simile seems typical of modern interpretation:

'Turnus has become only the frightened stag, Aeneas its vicious hunter - a hound who has taken to himself all the violence he has felt from others'.¹³

This treatment of the simile as authorially objective is absurd. One only has to note the fact that Aeneas is lame and is actually forced to stop every now and again (746-47); he is not objectively seen as a vividus Umber - it is only Turnus who sees him in that way. From the storyteller's point of view, the simile serves to see the desperate situation through Turnus' eyes: the hound is what Turnus sees, not the poet, and the figure is clearly not intended to condemn Aeneas.

But it does serve to arouse sympathy for Turnus, and this is important in the poet's strategy for recounting the final battle. For Turnus is shown as frightened and desperate, but at the very point where a normal audience-reaction would be to feel that this bloodthirsty killer is at last getting his deserts, the poet portrays Turnus as a human being who merits sympathy. This is done by several means: by the concept of Fate, by the apparatus of the Dira, by the telling of the story through Turnus' eyes, and by the similes that take his point of view. This partisan account culminates in the moment just before Aeneas brings Turnus down with his spear; leading on from the dream-simile that makes a special appeal to the reader, the poet describes Turnus' thoughts (914-18):

tum pectore sensus
vertuntur varii: Rutulos aspectat et urbem
cunctaturque metu letumque instare tremescit,
nec quo se eripiat, nec qua vi tendat in hostem,
nec currus usquam videt aurigamve sororem.

'Then various thoughts flit through his mind: he looks to the Rutuli and the city, and hesitates in terror and trembles at the near approach of death, and cannot see whither to escape, nor how to attack his enemy, nor his chariot, nor his sister who drove it'.

As Turnus hesitates, Aeneas throws his spear and brings him to the ground; he is then upon him for the death-blow, but the poet says nothing of this for he is back with Turnus in his terror

and the description is remarkable (930-31): ille humilis supplex oculos dextramque precantem / protendens 'He, suppliant with humbled eyes and stretching out his right hand in entreaty ...' This is complete humiliation, and the poet uses here the adjective humilis (which he always uses elsewhere of things - 'low, low-lying') of Turnus' eyes; I have translated it as 'humbled', but a sense of slavery and subjection is entailed.

Now follows Turnus' desperate appeal. Recent critics have tended to slide over it with the implication that Turnus is asking only for burial (as Hector does in Iliad 22 when he is at the mercy of Achilles). But what Turnus says is this (931-38):

'equidem merui nec deprecor' inquit;
'utere sorte tua. miseri te si qua parentis
tangere cura potest, oro (fuit et tibi talis
Anchises genitor) Dauni miserere senectae
et me, seu corpus spoliatum lumine mavis,
redde meis. vicisti et victum tendere palmas
Ausonii videre; tua est Lavinia coniunx;
ulterius ne tende odiis'.

'I have deserved it and I make no appeal. Exercise your good fortune. If any feeling for a bereaved parent can touch you, I beg you (and you too had such a father in Anchises) take pity on the old age of Daunus and send me (or, if you prefer, my corpse despoiled of life) back to my people. You have won, and the Italians have seen me beaten and stretching out my hands in appeal; Lavinia is yours to marry; go no further in your anger'.

So he says that he will not appeal, and then does; that is what is called the rhetoric of the situation. He goes on explicitly to beg for his life - a fact of which Aeneas shows, by his interpretation, that he is well aware. For now, for the first time in the account of the combat, the poet takes the point of view of Aeneas.

Aeneas hesitates for a long time and begins to be swayed by Turnus' appeal (940-41). What the poet has

accomplished has been to create sympathy for Turnus in such a way as to make Aeneas' dilemma as real for the reader as it is for Aeneas. But suddenly the hero's eye is caught by Pallas' belt on Turnus' shoulder; he erupts in sudden rage and anger, and kills Turnus in a moment of passion.

Here, it seems, the critics too erupt in rage. Some have already been quoted, but here is one more. This critic has already said: 'Virgil elicits the reader's sympathy for Turnus ... because he wishes to show that the ideology as such does not work' (he means the ideology of the Roman empire as it was conceived by Augustus).¹⁴ He then says this:

Virgil could not be more clear. Aeneas's final act and words in the poem are intended to be seen as unequivocal instances of furor ... and the effect of this is to focus the reader's attention once more upon the non-fulfilment of the imperial ideology and to elicit a final condemnation (and a condemnation prefigured many times in the poem) of the forces of empire and history which Aeneas represents. The death of Turnus may signify the victory of Aeneas, Rome and her empire, but it is Virgil's concern to emphasize that it is a victory for the forces of non-reason and the triumph not of pietas but of furor.¹⁵

So, on this view, the poet's ideal is of an extreme Stoicism, with suppression of all passions, and furor can never be justified. The poet is seen to condemn both Aeneas and Augustus. There is, however, a feature of the narrative that speaks clearly against the poet's having any such intention.

7.

There is a very marked ring-composition between the scene of Pallas' death in Book 10 and the finale of Book 12, such that all three characters who are involved in that finale have already been indissolubly linked in Book 10. The representation of all three characters by the poet needs to be

weighed carefully.

First, then, Pallas. His slaughter by Turnus causes the furor of Aeneas in the latter half of Book 10. Modern critics are incensed: Aeneas has no good cause for such destructive fury; friendship and loyalty are all very well, but Aeneas simply goes too far. There is a touching scene as Aeneas sails back by night to the Trojan forces and Pallas questions him about the stars and about his trials on land and on the sea (10.160-62). That is not allowed to be enough. But the relationship between Pallas and Aeneas is analogous to the traditional epic relationship between a squire (ὄπιδων or θερσίπων) and his lord; that relationship is the basis of Achilles' self-reproaches and fury over the death of Patroclus in the Iliad and also of Heracles' over the loss of Hylas in the Argonautica of Apollonius. Essentially there is a reciprocal relationship involved, such that the lord, in return for services, owes protection to his squire. Such is the traditional literary pattern of this relationship. But there is a further - and most important - element in the relationship between Aeneas and Pallas. It appears in the scene in Book 8 in which Evander entrusts his son to Aeneas and prays for death now, instantly, if his son is not destined to return alive (572-83). Earlier he had said to Aeneas (511-19):

tu, cuius et annis
et generi fatum indulget, quem numina poscunt,
ingredere, o Teucrum atque Italum fortissime ductor.
hunc tibi praeterea, spes et solacia nostri,
Pallanta adiungam; sub te tolerare magistro
militiam et grave Martis opus, tua cernere facta
adsuescat, primis et te miretur ab annis.
Arcades huic equites bis centum, robora pubis
lecta dabo, totidemque suo tibi nomine Pallas.

'You, to whose years and people Fate is kind and of whom the gods are making this demand, go forward, most steadfast leader of Trojans and Italians. In addition, I shall attach to you Pallas, my one hope and consolation. Under your instruction let him learn to endure military service

and the grim work of Mars; let him learn to watch what you do, and from his earliest years let him look up to you in admiration. With him I shall send two hundred cavalry, elite troops, and Pallas shall contribute to you an equal number on his own account'.

Many times in the course of the epic Virgil uses or alludes - in an unobtrusive way - to customs that are recognisably Roman and historic. It is one way of showing the Roman state being born in the twelfth century. Here Pallas, in the most solemn language, is being entrusted to Aeneas as his contubernalis: he is being put under Aeneas' protection, as sons of prominent Romans were placed in the protection of distinguished army commanders, and Aeneas is constituted his tutor in the place of his father. No more solemn duty could be enjoined on Aeneas. What happens is that, when the troops disembark, Aeneas is instantly involved in battle and gets drawn away. The troops of Pallas, who have never been in battle, are inexperienced and falter. Pallas rallies them and then gets involved in fighting till he is far away from Aeneas, meets Turnus, and is killed. The news reaches Aeneas, and he blazes up; and in his mind's eye - the poet intervenes to tell (515-17) - there is nothing but Pallas, Evander, the hospitality he received as a stranger, and the undertakings marked by joinings of right hands. That is, Aeneas is conscious of having betrayed his trust and of letting his friends, in their inexperience, get into moral danger. He pursues Turnus as the only means of compensating the situation, but Turnus escapes.

Now Turnus. He is a crude, bloodthirsty warrior, the only character whom the poet designates (and often) by the terms violens and violentia. He boasts and rejoices over Pallas, and mocks him as he dies. He sets his foot on the body and tears off a unique belt with a bloody scene embossed on it (the slaughter of their husbands by the Danaids), executed by a famous artist. Such despoiling of a corpse was nothing unusual in Homeric warfare; it is, in fact, fairly standard heroic practice in the accounts in the Iliad. But the poet's comments here, deliberately set outside the narrative as a personal

intervention, are remarkable (500-05):

quo nunc Turnus ovat spolio gaudetque potitus.
nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae
et servare modum rebus sublata secundis.
Turno tempus erit magno cum optaverit emptum
intactum Pallanta, et cum spolia ista diemque
oderit.

'Turnus is for now exultant in the loot and delighted to possess it. O minds of men, heedless of Fate and the uncertain future and of the need to observe moderation in the exaltation of success. The time will come for Turnus when he will long to purchase at great price an unharmed Pallas, and when he shall loathe that loot and this hour.'

In the Iliad Zeus expresses some of these sentiments when Hector despoils the body of Patroclus. But here the poet himself expresses an attitude that is totally unHomeric in asserting the necessity for moderation in success. He expresses a set of values quite unknown to Turnus at the same time as he connects this moment of Pallas' death immediately with the death of Turnus which will come. What he seems to reflect on in these words is the bloodthirst of Turnus exulting over an easy victim, and deliberately choosing to record it on his own person by his greed. Aeneas - the poet implies - is an unusual sort of hero and would have spared Turnus if only Turnus had not gone to this length.

Finally, Aeneas. After killing many others, Aeneas kills Lausus (who is portrayed as another Pallas), and is instantly filled with regret (821-32); he explicitly allows Lausus all his equipment and actually carries Lausus' body off the field himself. He returns and kills Lausus' father, Mezentius. The next book opens with a scene of Aeneas dedicating Mezentius' weapons and armour, with due religious ceremony, as a trophy to the god Mars. This is, of course, another of those historic Roman customs. Only two instances of stripping the dead are recounted by the poet of the Aeneid, those of Pallas and of Mezentius; no comment is made, but the contrast is as

striking between them as between the killers' attitudes in the two cases of Pallas and of Lausus. It is well to define this contrast, for it has wider bearings.

Homer's heroes have one remarkable characteristic in common: they are intensely self-centred and self-concerned. The concept of a general good that supersedes the private advantage of the individual is almost entirely unknown - a limited exception should probably be made in the case of Hector. The assertion of selfhood and self-pride is paramount in all circumstances: hence the constant sense of boastfulness, cruelty, disregard for life, and acquisitiveness. Aeneas, on the other hand, is totally unHomeric in that concern for others - for his family, for his men, for his household gods, for his destiny that is imposed on him, as he sees it, by the gods (all, in fact, that is meant by *pietas*) - takes precedence over what may be called his heroic character. There are, however, some important exceptions to this. One occurs when Troy falls, Anchises refuses to leave Troy, and Aeneas rushes out determined to die in battle (2.668-78); that is, no alternative is left to him in that situation except to revert to the instinctive heroic ethic. Another occurs when he hears of the death of Pallas; he goes berserk, really searching for Turnus, but killing without mercy when he cannot find him. That too is the heroic ethic, and his conduct therefore is not distinguishable in external appearances from that of Turnus or of any other Homeric type of hero (Camilla, for instance). The poet has carefully underlined this Homeric streak of behaviour by a curious touch that has given enormous offence to critics.

Aeneas, when he hears of Pallas' death, takes prisoner eight young men and keeps them alive 'to sacrifice to the shades and sprinkle the flames of the funeral pyre with their captive blood' (10.517-20). That is a brief treatment of a motif that belongs to Aeneas' grief and fury at Pallas' death. But the poet deliberately marks the importance of the motif by returning to it in the next book as the funeral procession sets out to take the body of Pallas home to Evander (11.81-82): 'He tied their hands behind their backs, intending to send them as

offerings to the shades and sprinkle the flames with blood from their slaughter'. Is the poet here really signalling the degradation of Aeneas and his own disapproval? The incident needs to be considered in the strategy of the narrative.

It is a Homeric motif; this is what Achilles did at the funeral of Patroclus. But Homer condemns Achilles explicitly in his own authorial comment (23.176): *κακὰ δὲ φρεσὶ μήθετο ἔργα* 'he conceived an evil deed in his heart'; in those words he measured the gap between the temporality of the narrative and that of the composition - the judgment belongs to the poet and his audience. Virgil has no word of condemnation; yet (as commentators point out) his contemporaries explicitly condemned human sacrifice as barbarous. But it is notable that, while Homer describes the funeral of Patroclus and makes Achilles commit the sacrifice with his own hand, Virgil not only avoids describing the funeral of Pallas but even keeps Aeneas away from it (instead he conducts the funeral rites of his own men at the camp).

The use of this Homeric motif functions (as often in the *Aeneid*) as a measurement of the distance between Aeneas and the Greek hero. At the same time the poet uses the reversion to a primitive custom as an indication of the depth of Aeneas' grief, fury, helplessness, and self-reproach at Pallas' death. It is part of Aeneas' reversion to the heroic ethic. Yet he is capable of regretting his own killing of Lausus. Furthermore, the sacrifice is not for his own satisfaction: it is for the honour (11.24-25) 'of those who with their blood gained this as a homeland for us'. Another important aspect to the use of this motif resides in the fact that the youths are a surrogate sacrifice; the real sacrifice should be Turnus. In this way war-aims and his duty to his ally and guest-friend coincide for Aeneas. This is solemnly underlined by Evander's words when he receives the dead body of his son. He sends an explicit message to Aeneas (11.176-82):

vadite et haec memores regi mandata referte:
quod vitam moror invisam Pallante perempto

dextera causa tua est, Turnum gnatoque patrique
 quam debere vides. meritis vacat hic tibi solus
 fortunaequae locus. non vitae gaudia quaero,
 nec fas, sed gnato manis perferre sub imos'.

'Go now and remember to give this message to your king:
 There is one reason for my prolonging a life made
 hateful by the death of Pallas - your sword-arm, which
 you realise owes Turnus to both father and son. This
 is the one action left to your merits and destiny to
 accomplish. Not to pleasure my life do I ask it (that
 would be wrong), but to bring that news to my son in
 the shades below'.

That is, the motif expresses a duty not yet completed and points
 forward to the scene that ends the epic. As Aeneas kills Turnus
 he says (12.948-49):

Pallas te hoc vulnere, Pallas
 immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit.'

'By this wound Pallas sacrifices you, Pallas exacts the
 penalty on your criminal blood'.

Here modern commentators are apt to pass judgments like this:
 'He may claim that Pallas "immolates" Turnus, but the metaphor
 cannot conceal the person of the real killer'¹⁶; or like this:
 'The Trojan hero's attempt to represent the killing of his
 Italian adversary as an act of pietas ("duty") towards his
 former alumnus, Pallas, is conspicuous for the lack of awareness
 and understanding which it reveals. In the world of realpolitik
 self-deception is all important'.¹⁷ Such comments, however,
 wilfully ignore the motivation that the poet has painstakingly
 set up. The killing of Turnus does indeed spring from the
 heroic ethic, but it is done for someone else; the satisfaction
 exacted will go to Evander, not to Aeneas. This draws attention
 to another aspect of the motif of human sacrifice. The poet of
 the Aeneid was imaginatively excited by the need to create a
 sense of an alien time, a civilization with quite different
 customs and standards, amongst which could be discerned, however,
 the nuclei of Roman civilization. That is where the need to
 understand both the similarity as well as the difference between

Aeneas and Achilles becomes important in the poet's strategy:
 Homer is used as a sounding-board to locate elements of
 behaviour and attitude that point historically forward to Rome.
 Aeneas is a man who lives on the borderline between both worlds.

The anger that flares up in Aeneas as he sees the belt
 of Pallas on Turnus goes back to the careful motivation in Book
 10. And, just as the words of Evander's message to Aeneas keep
 the sacrifice-motif alive in the narrative, so the anger-motif
 comes alive again in Book 12 when Aeneas has been frustrated by
 Juno's success in removing Turnus from his path, for Turnus'
 courage had returned when he saw Aeneas wounded and being helped
 away (324-25), and he rampaged in violent slaughter. Aeneas'
 every instinct and all his efforts are for peace and binding
 agreements, but, when these were broken for the second time,
 there was no alternative to war. Aeneas avoids all fighting and
 seeks Turnus alone, but when he is constantly provoked by others,
 he too (694) bursts out in rage and slaughter, and the poet
 connects both men in explicit comment (500-04):

quis mihi nunc tot acerba deus, quis carmine caedes
 diversas obitumque ducum quos aequore toto
 inque vicem nunc Turnus agit, nunc Troius heros,
 expediat? tantone placuit concurrere motu,
 Iuppiter, aeterna gentis in pace futuras?

'What god can now expound in poetry all the bitterness,
 all the variety of slaughter and the fall of leaders whom
 in turn, at one time Turnus, at another the Trojan hero
 drove back and forth over the whole plain? Was it
 really your will, Juppiter, that people who were
 destined to live in eternal peace should clash in such
 violence?'

Aeneas reverts here to the battle-rage of the heroic ethic and
 becomes like Turnus - except that the poet explicitly motivates
 it as originating from the one single source; that reluctant
 surrender to instinctive behaviour is far removed from the self-
 indulgence that marks Turnus' love of killing (even to cutting
 off heads and decorating his chariot with them - 511-12). The
 rage - the furor and ira - is not to be condemned in Stoic

terms, and the poet (as distinct from modern critics) does not do that. Such rage is the indispensable psychological condition that enables men to make war and to kill other human beings. That is why every expedient must be tried before resort is made to war. Such is Aeneas' attitude; but when all has been tried and failed, then war is justified. This is very different from the constant lust for battle and for killing that dominates Turnus and that Numanus boasts is an Italian characteristic (9.607-13).

When the ring-composition is complete and the three characters come together at the end, the poet, by his careful concentration on Turnus, can be seen to show him as, in some sense, a tragic figure, bringing his own doom more and more inevitably on himself, so that the reader's sympathy is compelled to widen to include him - but without causing Aeneas to forfeit sympathy. For the poet has also done everything possible to motivate that final outburst of rage as something not only entirely justified within the heroic ethic, but as being also a sublimation of the heroic ethic in virtue of its selflessness and of its being explicitly directed to the just satisfaction of others. The poet has made it clear that Aeneas was regarded as owing that act of vengeance to father and son. But that is just one element in the final combat. The major element is another Roman historical practice: the custom whereby a war could be settled by single combat between the Roman commander and the leader of the enemy. It is that which motivates Aeneas throughout Book 12, and it is that which makes him think of sparing Turnus at the end. The anger is awakened accidentally and with it the other element comes to life, as the poet foresaw in Book 10 when Turnus went too far after killing Pallas.

One of the greatneses of the Aeneid is that serious moral issues are raised but not settled. The poet recognises that the really important moral issues derive from irreconcilable clashes of viewpoint, each of which, to some degree, is justifiable on its own terms. The poet presents the two sides and traces the conflict, but turns back from any expressed

solution. He actually makes solution impossible, in fact, by showing full understanding of, and real sympathy for each side. So it is with Aeneas' abandonment of Dido, and so it is too with the killing of Turnus. Human life is tragic in its basic constitution, and the poet of the Aeneid was not an optimist.

8.

I have tried to show that the interpretation of the final scene as a condemnation of Aeneas by the poet is misconceived and simply misreads what can be seen to be the poet's clear intention. Of course he may not have been successful in achieving his aim; but that is not what modern critics are saying. Those who go on - and they now seem to be the majority - to claim the condemnation of Aeneas as an implicit condemnation of Augustus are only able to do so by assuming that Aeneas is a symbol for Augustus. The words of the second quotation at the beginning of this lecture mean exactly that: 'Aeneas - and through him Augustus - can never fulfill ...' Others are even more explicit; for instance: 'The ideal contemporary reader we postulated earlier would take it for granted that, somehow or other, Aeneas was Augustus'¹⁸; and again: 'If the Aeneas of Book 4 suggests Julius Caesar or Mark Antony, the Aeneas of Book 12 points plainly to Augustus; and the portrait is hardly a flattering one'.¹⁹

The basic assumption that Aeneas symbolises Augustus involves the further assumption that the time span of the Aeneid is symbolic of the time span of Roman history. But this is clearly wrong. There is an important series of related passages that contradict any such view; they include the great prophecy of Juppiter in Book 1, the review of Roman heroes by Anchises in the Underworld in Book 6, the description of Aeneas' shield in Book 8, and the final speech of Juppiter to Juno in Book 12. These passages are all designed in different ways to construct a continuum of Roman history that runs directly from the fall of Troy and the period of Aeneas' lifetime to the climax of the Augustan age. The importance of Juppiter's prophecy in Book 1

is that it establishes the basic chronological framework at an early stage in the poem. Consequently, in the view of the poet, the adventures of Aeneas are not myth, but history; he is not a symbol, but the real earliest origin of a world state. Two very important consequences for the poet flowed from this point of view.

The first is that one of the great sources of poetic excitement in the Aeneid lies in the challenge to the poet to imagine and represent a cultural environment that had two characteristics: on the one hand, it had to be a recognisable part of the heroic world of Homer; on the other hand, it had to contain features that implied a distance from that world and that pointed forward historically. That exciting sense of a culture in process of transition and struggling free from the ideals of an earlier society is wonderfully caught in the Aeneid.

The other consequence is related to that. It consists in the concept - suggested, not stated - that the ideals of human existence that have been implicit in the historical creation of the Roman state in the twelfth century are only now, in the age of Augustus, after desperate setbacks and shortcomings, being fully realised in fact. The nuclei of Roman ideals are shown by the Aeneid to have come into existence in the twelfth century, born from the breakdown of heroic society, and to be alive in the poet's own time. That is no mere propaganda for a regime, but an inspiring poetical vision, disappointed, of course, and betrayed by reality, yet the hallmark not only of a great age (and shared in different ways by others at the time), but also of the historical vision of Rome's greatest poet.²⁰

N O T E S

1. It is a pleasure to record that, when this lecture was delivered, there were present, among the large audience that customarily gathers on the occasions of these lectures to honour the memory of a great teacher and scholar, Miss Cynthia Todd, daughter of the late Professor Todd, and Mr and Mrs R.G. Todd, his son and daughter-in-law.
2. Brooks Otis Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press 1963), p.389.
3. Michael C.J. Putnam The Poetry of the Aeneid (Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1966), pp.xiii-xiv. It should be stressed that the attitude expressed in this and much other writing is characteristic of criticism written in English. The situation is somewhat different in German writing. For the contrast up to 1972 (there has been some change since), see A. Wlosok, 'Virgil in der neueren Forschung', Gymnasium 80 (1973), 129-51.
4. See Gordon Williams Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire (Berkeley: University of California Press 1978), pp. 173-74, 247-50.
5. Kenneth Quinn Virgil's Aeneid: A Critical Description (London 1968), p.56.
6. See Williams (op. cit. n.4), pp.233-34.

7. On the distinction between 'showing' and 'telling', see Gordon Williams Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry (New Haven: Yale University Press 1980), pp. 31, 33-34.
8. Quinn (op. cit. n.5), p. 213.
9. Putnam (op. cit. n.3), p. 151.
10. *ibid.* p. 152.
11. *ibid.* p. 193.
12. Quinn (op. cit. n.5), p. 273.
13. Putnam (op. cit. n.3), p. 189.
14. A.J. Boyle, 'The meaning of the Aeneid: A critical inquiry', Ramus 1 (1972), p. 73.
15. *ibid.* p. 85.
16. W.S. Anderson The Art of the Aeneid (Englewood Cliffs: New Jersey 1969), pp. 99-100.
17. Boyle (op. cit. n.14), p. 74.
18. Quinn (op. cit. n.5), p. 54.

19. *ibid.* p. 253.
20. Only one aspect of the complex problem of interpreting the Aeneid could be considered in this lecture, and, even so, much that is relevant had either to be passed over or else treated with extreme brevity. But that, after all, is in the nature of a lecture. However, spurred by the reception of this lecture and by the interesting and helpful discussion that followed, I have, in the meantime, set out my views on the interpretation of the Aeneid at length in a book that will appear shortly.