

determinism whose thrust moves from the mind of man, back into the past and revises the past from the standpoint of the present.

He assigns the Sibyl's prophecy to the former, which he sees as characteristic of the gods in the *Aeneid*. However, its associations with the repetition that leads out of the labyrinth suggest that, from Aeneas' point of view, it might also become the latter, cf. Harry Berger, "Archaism, Vision and Revision: Studies in Virgil, Plato and Milton," *Centennial Review* 11 (1967) 24-52.

23. Pp. 204-5.

24. Cf. Jackson Knight, p. 207.

25. P. 223.

26. This repetition of the *Iliad* involves a striking reversal, with Aeneas taking over the role of the Greek Achilles and Turnus that of the Trojan Hector. In book one he had seen, on Dido's temple, a representation of the pathetic fate of Troilus who had engaged Achilles in unequal combat and whose corpse had been brutally dragged by the latter from his chariot (1.474-8). As agent, rather than observer, of his history he must adopt the brutal role of Achilles.

27. This connection is made by Robert Crutwell in his intriguing book *Virgil's Mind at Work* (Oxford 1946). In his chapter "Shield and Maze" Crutwell links the labyrinthine phraseology of these two passages with that of the description of Aeneas' shield (8.447-9) and, adopting Jackson Knight's interpretation of the Labyrinth, describes this phraseology as "defensive symbolism."

28. This closely imitates the words of Homer on the duel between Hector and Achilles (*Iliad* 22.159-60): "for they were not competing for a sacrificial beast or an ox-hide, which are the prizes of men for footraces, but they ran for the life of Hector, tamer of horses."

29. duBois (see n. 9) points out that Turnus is associated with the Minotaur by the devices on his helmet and shield, which both represent hybrids: a Chimaera and Io, the cow-woman corresponding to the bull-man (7.785-92).

30. Op. cit., p. 223.

31. Duckworth also sees a double structure of diptych and triptych in the *Aeneid*, though rather different from mine. For him there are two ways of dividing the work: either in two halves, with correspondences that indicate a progression, or as a central "Roman" panel (books 5-8) flanked by the tragedy of Dido (books 1-4) and the tragedy of Turnus (books 9-12). Our descriptions of the *Aeneid*'s double structure are, I think, complementary. Cf. George Duckworth, *Structural Patterns and Proportions in Virgil's Aeneid* (Ann Arbor 1962).

32. The end of the *Aeneid* is particularly puzzling if we wish to see Aeneas as a character who grows into Augustan *pietas* as he turns away from Homeric savagery, for he kills Turnus with the fury that has characterized the Junonian opponents of his fate. Perhaps we should think of this not as a *reversion* but as an *appropriation* of that almost brutal energy which will be so necessary to a Rome that will often appropriate the gods of its enemies. In the same way, Aeneas appropriates his past by repeating it.

History and Revelation in Vergil's Underworld*

D. C. Feeney

*Source: *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, vol. 32, 1986, pp. 1-24.

Vergil's parade of heroes, a panegyric that becomes a threnody, is an odd blend. It is framed by an elaborate quasi-philosophical eschatology, whose relation to the parade is problematical. Much of the passage puts itself forward as high panegyric, yet certain sections are at variance with that tendency. The lament for Marcellus (868-86) is most commonly remarked upon; other passages are equally, or more, anomalous.¹ Still, the massive self-assurance of the picture of the underworld has its own imposing conviction, so that although the disparateness of the contributing elements has been documented often enough,² few have felt the need to dispute the question of whether the blend coheres as a single statement. One noteworthy reader of Vergil was, however, compelled to give minute attention to the implications of the historical vision in Book 6. Incidentally throughout the *Bellum Civile*, but especially in his own sixth book, with the vision of hell called forth by the agency of the witch Erichtho, Lucan provides a provocative reading of *Aeneid* 6. His insights will be exploited in the discussion as a valuable stimulus to reflection and re-assessment; an appendix will give a more systematic account of his re-interpretation of Vergil.

In formal terms, Anchises' eulogistic speech is genealogical protreptic, using historical *exempla* and the promise of glory to steer Aeneas towards virtuous rule.³ The opportunity for the speech is provided by a substantial and complex eschatology, made up mainly from Plato (especially *Republic* 10), and from Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* (itself the last book of a *Republic*, and intimately linked with the myth of Er).⁴ The eschatology relates the toils of the soul in its progress between this life and the next (724-51). Too few readers are puzzled by this blend of mysticism and worldly motivation; the stark oddity of nationalistic, glorifying protreptic in such a setting and tradition is perhaps not sufficiently appreciated.⁵

No one systematic picture emerges from Plato's account of the soul's fate after death,⁶ but certain basic themes and patterns do emerge. The entire tendency is to encourage the reader to cultivate the life of philosophic virtue. Plato's contempt for the carnal unrealities of actual life, which are irreconcilably inimical to the interests of the soul, leads him to urge us to live in such a way that we may emancipate ourselves totally from earthly concerns, and escape one day from the tomb that is our body into the upper regions.⁷ Within the terms of reincarnation, this means that when we come to select our next lot in life, we must choose according to the priorities of the soul, not of the body. The main temptation in our path here is the life of politics, public affairs, tyranny (*Rep.* 619a, *Phaedo* 82c-d). Plato allows that there are a very few decent characters amongst the public men (*Gorg.* 526a-b, *Phaedrus* 248d), but asserts that such a life almost necessarily involves one in the inflicting and the suffering of great evil and pain, since scarcely any can resist the corruption of power (*Laws* 691c-d, *Rep.* 494b-c).⁸ Thus, in the myth of Er, the soul with the first lot chooses straightaway the life of the greatest tyrant and does not see until too late the destiny that awaits him – παίδων αὐτοῦ βρώσεις καὶ ἄλλα κακά (619c). The last named soul of Plato's catalogue is that of Odysseus, who has learnt through suffering, and abandoned φιλοτιμία. He hunts out the inconspicuous life of a private citizen who minds his own business (620c).⁹

Such a perspective does not commend itself to Roman sentiment. It is in fact remarkable how much Platonic matter Cicero retains for his adaptations in the *Tusculan Disputations* and the *Somnium Scipionis*. As regards the slighting of renown and achievement, the consul, proconsul and augur has some scruples. A brief section of the *Disputations* attempts, not altogether happily, to reconcile a philosopher's disdain for the matters of this life with the patriot and statesman's partiality for the goods of fame (1.109–11). The problem had engaged Cicero more extensively in the *Somnium Scipionis*. There he follows Plato in teaching the inferiority of the body's interests (19), the pettiness of earthly glory (esp. 20–25), and the immortal reward of the virtuous soul (14–16), while at the same time trying to assert that it is the rulers and preservers of states who have the surest title to that immortal reward.¹⁰ Again, the success of the blending is not complete, and the uncertainties of Cicero's presentation highlight the striking incongruities of the amalgam of Platonic and imperial thought. Yet the attempt alone was bold, and a strong impulse on Vergil's imagination.

Vergil's debt to Plato and Cicero is clear, and well-documented.¹¹ Anchises' description of the cycle of purification and rebirth (724–51) has Platonic matter mixed with Stoic, and owes much in expression to the *Somnium Scipionis*.¹² Especially Platonic is the presentation of corporeal existence as entrapment in a sinful prison.¹³ If the speech itself puts us in

mind of Plato's doctrines, the personal setting recalls the situation of the *Somnium Scipionis*, where a son meets a deceased father and is given a discourse on the role of the statesman.¹⁴

The reader who has his expectations primed by such reminiscences is going to be considerably puzzled at a number of points where Vergil's drift runs directly counter to his models. It is not the mere fact of inconsistency which should arrest us, for Vergil's eclecticism is by no means always synthetic.¹⁵ At issue here is a fundamental paradox, an eschatology which is expressed and presented within a recognised philosophical tradition, but which appears to champion mundane values disparaged by that tradition, turning our eyes insistently towards this corporeal world, away from the concerns of the soul. Various writers have commented on the difficulties of the link between the 'philosophical' exposition and the subsequent praise of Rome, but for the most part they accept the independence of the two sections.¹⁶ The paradox is not inert, however, but operative; it is not one which the poet glosses over, or leaves tactfully unstressed, but one to which he regularly directs our attention.

When Aeneas sees the shades gathered at the river of Lethe, he shudders at the sight, and asks what is the reason for what he sees: *causasque requirit / inscius Aeneas* (710–11). He is being cast as the ignorant disciple, who wishes to be told *causae* by his mentor. Anchises explains that the souls are ready to return to earth once they drink of the river (713–5). He continues:

has equidem memorare tibi atque ostendere coram
iampridem, hanc prolem cupio enumerare meorum,
quo magis Italia mecum lactere reperta.

(716–8)

These almost jaunty words might stand in themselves as sufficient introduction to the parade of heroes, but we are interrupted by a shocked question from the enduring hero:

o pater, anne aliquas ad caelum hinc ire putandum est
sublimis animas iterumque ad tarda reuerti
corpora? quae lucis miseris tam dira cupido?

(719–21)

That, as Servius saw, is the pertinent philosophical question at this point.¹⁷ Possibly, it may also be that Vergil puts us in mind of the characteristic Platonic mode of composition here, for this is the only occasion in the poem where Vergil uses *dialogue* in this way – Anchises, Aeneas, and again Anchises – without any intervening narrative to introduce the speaker.¹⁸

The expectations that Aeneas' questions set up are reinforced by Anchises' 'Platonic' account of reincarnation, in which life on earth is represented as something in its essence antipathetic to the soul. Yet the parade of heroes, when it comes, is a catalogue of earthly achievement, of kings and statesmen, the very category against which Plato warns so strenuously. No Odysseus here, seeking the ordinary life – rather, to go no further, two men whose public position caused them to put their children to death (Brutus, 817–23, and Torquatus, 825). The question of Aeneas is there precisely to point the contrast between this 'earthly' eschatology and the otherworldly direction of the models.

Aeneas' question formally resembles the question put by Africanus Minor to his natural father Paullus in the *Somnium Scipionis*.¹⁹ There Scipio asks Paullus why, if mortal life is so vile, he should not die voluntarily, to escape the prison of the body and reach heaven; he is told that God alone may decide the time of his death (15), and that in the meantime he must serve the state (16). It has been suggested that the Ciceronian model helps to explain the difficulties of Vergil's transition from philosophy to eulogy,²⁰ but in fact Vergil's treatment looks even more idiosyncratic if set against the *Somnium Scipionis*, despite the numerous general debts. Cicero, in blending Platonic thought with Roman ethics, had two principal devices of accommodation. The prize of immortal beatitude which Plato had held out to the philosopher was promised by Cicero to the statesman (13–6), while at the same time Cicero strove – with what success? – to preserve the integrity of his philosophical position by systematically disparaging earthly *gloria* (20–5). Vergil, on the first point, says, in effect, nothing.²¹ On the second point, it is plain that Anchises' panegyric is radically at odds with Cicero's presentation.

Scipio exhorts his grandson again and again to despise *gloria*: *haec caelestia semper spectato, illa humana contemnito. tu enim quam celebritatem sermonis hominum aut quam expetendam consequi gloriam potes?* (20). He shows him the petty globe, patchily inhabited, so many people so remote from Rome: *a quibus expectare gloriam certe nullam potestis* (20). Could the *nomen* of Scipio, or any Roman, cross Ganges and Caucasus (22)? Vergil's parade of heroes, on the other hand, begins, continues and ends with personal *gloria* and *nomen*:

nunc age, Dardaniam prolem quae deinde sequatur
gloria, qui maneant Italia de gente nepotes,
inlustris animas nostrumque in nomen ituras,
expediam dictis

(756–9)

Procas, Troianae gloria gentis
(767)

uincet amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido
(823)

quae postquam Anchises natum per singula duxit
incenditque animum famae uenientis amore.

(888–9)

Lucan took the point. His resuscitated corpse in Book 6 looks like a better philosopher than Anchises, and appears to know what the context demands. In a splendid announcement to the young Pompeius, the corpse tells him not to worry about the glory of this brief life: *nec gloria paruae / sollicitet uitae* (6.805–6). This is exactly what Cicero and Plato would have said. And then the twist: *ueniet quae misceat omnes / hora duces* (806–7). The grand perspectives and portentous backdrops of Cicero evaporate: mere death, mere failure provide the context for the philosophical aphorism.

The effects of Vergil's deliberate, even blatant, reversals remain to be assessed. First, we must examine in more detail, as well as the setting, the contents – Anchises' speech itself, the parade of heroes. At the beginning I observed that various elements of the speech were at odds with its ostensible role as high panegyric. A consideration of the conventions behind the oration will establish the perspective for the discussion.

The speech becomes something of a history of Rome, by way of providing Aeneas with a series of *exempla* which will incite him to greatness.²² The *exempla* are given a notional co-ordination in that the persons figuring in them are taken to be descendants of the speaker and the addressee (756–8). The presumed continuity of the *gens Iulia* underpins the whole, but in the second half of the speech the great republican *gentes* come into their own – Marcii, Bruti, Decii, Drusi, and so on (815–86). The emphasis on the *gens* and the continuity of the *gens* is felt throughout:²³ it is one of the features which most markedly links Anchises' speech with the *laudatio funebris* (and a *laudatio funebris* it becomes overtly, with the lament for Marcellus, 868–86).²⁴ The funereal associations have been well discussed by Skard and Burke.²⁵ We have a procession of men whose faces Anchises recognises as one would the ancestral *imagines* in the funeral parade of a noble (*omnis longo ordine posset / aduersos legere et uenientum discere uultus*, 754–5); Aeneas has the individuals pointed out and explained to him by his father, as would any son in a Roman street, watching the procession go by. We have the praise of the family line. Especially, we receive the impression that representatives of the *gens* from many, many generations are rubbing shoulders together on the same spot, as would the actors wearing the masks at an actual funeral. At various places in the speech there is a rough chronological schema in the groupings, but behind it all is the notion that the members of each *gens* stand

together. Thus, when Aeneas sees the Marcellus of the first century B.C. standing beside the Marcellus of the third, he can tell the family resemblance, but he does not know whether this is a son, or a more remote descendant (*filius, ane aliquis magna de stirpe nepotum?* 864); and Anchises sees all the Fabii before him, so that he cannot speak of all of them (*quo fessum rapitis, Fabii?* 845).

This theme of the continuity of the *gens* is most important. One of its effects is to set up what Ahl has called 'a number of riddles for the reader';²⁶ for Vergil is often studiously vague about which members of a family we are meant to see behind the name. Which Drusi does he mean in 824? Which Gracchi, which Scipiones in 842–3? Here we may be helped by the exemplary character of the speech, for by looking at the associations of such names in other exemplary contexts, it is often possible to divine what Vergil is driving at. A proficient exploiter of the exemplary tradition is Lucan; consistently he sheds light on problematic Vergilian passages. Cicero and Seneca are likewise valuable. Another effect of the focus on the continuity of the *gens* is to put us in mind of a man's descendants when an individual is named, since to a Roman a noble was, in one side of his persona at least, the temporary incarnation of the essence of his family.²⁷

It is this frame of mind which produces and explains the riddles. If Vergil mentions, for example, the first Brutus, his audience is readily suggestible to associations with the assassin of Caesar; while mention of Gracchi or Drusi is potentially provoking; as the audience is invited to reflect upon the diverse fates and worth of successive bearers of the same name. Vergil had before him, in Horace *Odes* 1.12, an example of this approach (perhaps a directly inspiring example; although, as we shall see, the *Georgics* already contain one variety of the technique). In Horace's poem, of the many *exempla* from Roman history, some are of distinctly ambiguous reference. In *superbas / Tarquini fasces* (34–5), as Nisbet and Hubbard remark, the adjective points to one Tarquin, the noun to the other (although they plump for the younger). Which Scaurus is behind the *Scauros* of 37? Of more moment is the ambiguity in *fama Marcelli* (46, where Nisbet and Hubbard see a process of association between two different Marcelli), and *Iulium sidus* (47). In particular, Horace surprises us with *Catonis / nobile letum* (35–6), in the same stanza as Romulus, Numa and Tarquin. Why is Cato in the company of the *reges*? Horace may be for the moment graciously giving credence to the dogma of Cato's sect, that the true *rex* is the Stoic *sapiens*: *rectius enim [sapiens] appellabitur rex quam Tarquinius* (Cic. *Fin.* 3.75; a doctrine normally ridiculed by Horace, cf. e.g. *Epist.* 1.1.107). More surely: the name of Cato, who resisted the tyranny of Caesar, follows the archetypal tyrant, Tarquin; the name of Brutus, too shocking for panegyric of Caesar's heir, is hinted at by Cato's presence, for resistance to tyranny, whether Tarquin's or Caesar's, is what the first and last Brutus embodied.²⁸

If tact was a principal motive for Horace's ambiguity, in the hands of Vergil these confusions become vehicles for a more sophisticated and profound conception. The riddles will emerge as being part of a process whereby the entire panegyric receives extensive qualification. Whole sections of the speech treat openly of dark and painful matters – the civil wars of Pompey and Caesar (826–35), Brutus' execution of his children (820–3), and Marcellus' funeral (868–86). These larger passages have attracted much comment. We will need to recognise that the glorifying impetus of the speech as a whole is checked and intermittently retarded by countervailing tendencies of dubiety, mourning, even disparagement. Norden discerned the elements of ψόγος within the ἐγκώμιον (p. 314). Modern critics will perhaps rather refer to the qualifications that characterise the epic as a whole, or else, if they wish to contain discussion within the terms of genre, they will acknowledge the two-sidedness that is inherent in the bestowal of high praise.²⁹ So in the *laudes Italiae* of *Georgics* 2, as Richard Thomas has shown, apparent praise is shot through with reservation.³⁰ Between the untroublesome names of the Decii and Camilli, we have the name *Marii*: *Decios Marios magnosque Camillos* (169). The plurals are 'riddles'. The Decii were father and son, famous for the same glorious act of *deuotio*: *hi duo fuerunt, qui Mures dicti sunt, pater et filius* (Serv. *Aen.* 6.824). The *Marii*, likewise, were father and son. C. Marius is an ambivalent enough figure in himself, a great general, but a sinister and disquieting character:³¹ his son had nothing to be said for him. When a pair of exemplary relatives are immediately succeeded by a suspect father and a bad son, the panegyric doubles back upon itself. Again, the Indian whom Caesar keeps away from the citadels of Italy is adorned with the startling and provocative epithet of *imbellis* (172). The miniature work of this *Georgics* passage is extended in the speech of Anchises over some 130 verses.

The first problem we encounter is at 773–6, with the listed towns of the *prisci Latini*:

hi tibi Nomentum et Gabios urbemque Fidenam,
hi Collatinas imponent montibus arces,
Pometios Castrumque Inui Bolamque Coramque;
haec tum nomina erunt, nunc sunt sine nomine terrae.

tum erunt, nunc sunt . . . ; the words invite us to ask what the towns were in Vergil's day. Look at these places:

Nomentum A byword for an out-of-the-way backwater in Seneca and Martial.³²

Gabii In Horace, a yardstick of depopulation, together with Fidenae, the next town in Vergil's list.³³ To Cicero and Juvenal it is emblematic of insignificance, while Propertius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus draw a contrast between its former and present condition.³⁴

Fidenae Strabo has the town in a list of places, τότε μὲν πολίχνια, νῦν δὲ κῶμαι, ἢ κτήσεις ἰδιωτῶν (5.3.2). Note that Vergil pointedly calls it an *urbs*. The place also figures in a similar list of vanished towns in Pliny (*Nat.* 3.68–70).

Collatia In Strabo's and Pliny's lists.

Pometia Likewise in Pliny's list.

Castrum Inui Vanished very early in the Republic, a victim to fever.³⁵

Bola Likewise in Pliny's list.

Cora Florus treats the erstwhile power of Cora almost as a joke: *Cora – quis credat? – et Alsium terrori fuerunt* (1.11.6).³⁶

haec tum nomina erunt, nunc sunt sine nomine terrae . . . The tenses are intriguingly two-sided, depending on whether one's perspective in time is that of Aeneas, or of Vergil's audience. To Aeneas, the words say that these will be famous names after his time, whereas now, in his lifetime, they are areas of land without any title (or else, places that exist but have no fame). To the contemporary audience, the words are saying that the places will be what they are in fact – *mere names*; now, for 'us', they are only *pieces of land*, without the *reputation* they once had (Lucan's adaptation, which follows shortly, plays upon these meanings; Vergil exploits the pathos of *nomen* in a rather different way at *Aen.* 7.411–13: *locus Ardea quondam / dictus avis, et nunc magnum manet Ardea nomen, / sed fortuna fuit*). The shifts in tense and reference are unsettling. What is proffered as praise becomes disparagement, or condolence, as it is uttered. The glorious future of the independent states is taken away from them before it has even happened, as the poet nudges his audience into remembering their contemporary eclipse, swallowed into obscurity by the dominance of the metropolis. The fate of these places is embodied, indeed, in the name of the first town in the list: *Nomen-tum*.³⁷ In such a context of instability, one is perhaps prompted to ask (as I was by Professor West) whether Vergil can conceive of a time when even Rome will be only a name. It has not happened yet.

Lucan takes half of what Vergil offers. His imitation condenses the conventional sarcasm concerning the vanished Latin states into a statement of the debility of Roman power:

tunc omne Latinum
fabula nomen erit; Gabios Veiosque Coramque
puluere uix tectae poterunt monstrare ruinae
Albanosque lares Laurentinosque penates,
rus uacuum, quod non habitet nisi nocte coacta
inuitus questusque Numam iussisse senator.

(*BC* 7.391–6)

Latinum / fabula nomen (391–2) is dazzling play on Vergil's use of *nomina*; *rus uacuum* (395) takes up, and strips of ambivalence, Vergil's *terrae*.³⁸

Romulus comes next. He is introduced as making himself the 'comrade or associate of his grandfather' (*quin et auo comitem sese Mauortius addet / Romulus*, 777–8). Vergil refers to the story we see in Livy (1.3.10–6.2). The grandfather of Romulus and Remus was one Numitor (his name occurs earlier at 768, preparing us for this story). He was disinherited and exiled by his younger brother Amulius. Amulius was responsible for the exposure of the twins, but, when grown, Romulus collaborated with his grandfather Numitor to kill the usurper by stealth (1.5.6). He and Remus then restored Numitor to the throne of Alba Longa.

The man who began adult life by killing his great-uncle went on to kill his brother. Vergil does not mention the deed here, nor even the brother, but there is a hint, in *huius . . . auspiciis* (781). The taking of the auspices at the foundation of Rome, Vergil obliquely reminds us, was a *competition*, which Remus lost (Ennius, *Ann.* 72–91 Skutsch). If an earlier argument of mine is correct, then 780 also refers to this competition, and to the prize of divinity which Romulus won at the expense of his brother.³⁹

The founder of the city was a genuinely ambiguous figure, never more so than in the years when Vergil was at work on the *Aeneid*. He had an important role in Caesarian and Augustan cult, and in the literature of the time.⁴⁰ Dio reports that Octavian wanted the name for himself (53.16.7). In the end, a less controversial title won the day, though one which itself had associations with the *conditor urbis* (Suet., *Aug.* 7.2) – less controversial, because much in the Romulus myth was disquieting (and not only the fratricide).⁴¹ When Anchises speaks of Romulus, his words have a strong and primary panegyric direction, which I do not mean to shut out – and yet Vergil does not allow us to block Remus from our memory. A very similar operation is to be seen in Jupiter's prophetic speech in Book 1. Jupiter describes the birth of the *twins*: *geminam partu dabit Ilia prolem* (274). The first five feet of the next line allude to the wolf who nursed the twins (*inde lupae fuluo nutricis tegmine*), and it is with considerable shock that we reach the final word and discover that it is *singular* (*laetus*).⁴² We carry on to find Romulus as the subject: *Romulus excipiet gentem* (276). *Remo scilicet interempto*, comments Servius. Just so. We continue: *Mauortia condet / moenia Romanosque suo de nomine dicet* (276–7). It was when Remus jumped over Romulus' *moenia* that he was killed,⁴³ while the naming of the people after Romulus rather than after Remus was a result of Romulus' victory in the contest of auspices: *certain urbem Romam Remoramne uocarent* (Ennius, *Ann.* 77 Skutsch). And yet Vergil does not leave us here, for at the end of the speech, in the vision of hoped-for peace after the civil wars, the brothers are shown as reconciled: *cana Fides et Vesta, Remo cum fratre Quirinus / iura dabunt* (292–3). It was possible simply to suppress mention of Remus (as does Cicero, for example, in the *Republic*, 2.4–12); what is striking in Vergil is

the way in which we are reminded of Remus even as we hear the praise of Romulus the founder.

To Lucan only one side of Romulus appeals, that to which Horace responded in the dark days of the Triumvirate (*Epod.* 7). The city was unsound from the moment of its foundation,

uolturis ut primum laeuo fundata uolatu
Romulus infami compleuit moenia luco. . .
(7.437–8)

The civil wars have their beginning in Rome's beginning:

fraterno primi maduerunt sanguine muri.
(1.95)

Once Vergil has dealt with Romulus, there follows a panegyric on Rome (781–7), which develops into the praise of Augustus (791–805). Rome's other kings follow (808–17; note that Augustus, by this arrangement, is one of the *reges*); as the establishment of the Republic approaches, equivocation returns.⁴⁴

Towards the end of the list of kings comes Ancus Marcius, *iactantior Ancus / nunc quoque iam nimium gaudens popularibus auris* (815–16). If any king had a name for being a *popularis*, it was not Ancus Marcius, but Servius Tullius (Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* 4.8.3). Vergil's licence is explained by his wish to associate the individual with the 'popular' family of the Marcii, who claimed descent from the king.⁴⁵ E. Badian, in connection with our passage, refers to one M' Marcius, the first man to distribute grain to the plebs, as well as to another early member of the family, who introduced a law to restrain usury. As he says, 'the later Marcii obviously prided themselves on early *populares* in the family'.⁴⁶ Even such a man as L. Marcius Philippus (cos. 91) could exploit the family tradition: as tribune c. 104 he acted in an ostentatiously demagogic fashion, and attempted to introduce a *lex agraria*.⁴⁷ Another member of the family, Q. Marcius Rex (cos. 68), was outside Rome with his army in 63 when he received a letter from the rebel Manlius, asking for redress of grievances. In Sallust's account, Manlius appeals to the aristocracy's tradition of giving succour to the plebs – either Manlius or Sallust judged Marcius an appropriate person to whom to address the following words: *saepe maiores uostrum miseriti plebis Romanae decretis suis inopiae eius opitulati sunt* (*Cat.* 33.2). Thus, lightly, Vergil touches upon a theme in the political life of his people, identifying a king with a family, and a family with a dubious political tradition.

The tension becomes acute as we turn to the Tarquins, linked with Brutus, who introduce a passage of notorious ambivalence, compounded of awed pride and shock:

uis et Tarquinius reges animamque superbam
ultoris Bruti, fascisque uidere receptos?
consulis imperium hic primus saeuasque securis
accipiet, natosque pater noua bella mouentis
ad poenam pulchra pro libertate uocabit,
infelix, utcumque ferent ea facta minores:
uincet amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido.
(817–23)

Here the theme of the continuity of the *gens* is at its most powerful. Also at its most evident, for the associations made by Vergil's contemporaries between the assassin of Julius Caesar and his supposed ancestor, the first consul, are well-established facts.⁴⁸ With a number of touches Vergil draws our attention to the similarities linking the two deeds, at the beginning and the end of the *res publica*. The essential truth was stated by Fletcher, in his note on *superbam* (817):

Here as applied to the spirit of Brutus it is a reminder that arrogance is not a monopoly of "tyrants" (*reges*). None of Virgil's readers could fail to think of the descendant, another *ultor Brutus*,⁴⁹ whose intellectual arrogance they had known. He had also violated natural ties in the belief that he was serving his country: the killing of Julius Caesar, like the execution of his own sons by the elder Brutus, was an act praised by some and blamed by others, and Virgil's comment in 822–3 may be applied equally to either action.⁵⁰

Certainly the tyrannicide was the object of a considerable industry of hagiography, which began soon after his death, and which is exemplified for us in Plutarch's *Life*.⁵¹ Not all approved, however: Brutus was far less popular than Cato as an *exemplum*, and controversy concentrated on the clash between two types of *pietas*, between patriotism and humanity.⁵² Valerius Maximus states the case against most forcibly:⁵³

M. Brutus suarum prius uirtutum quam patriae parentis parricida – uno enim facto et illas in profundum praecipitauit et omnem nominis sui memoriam inexpiabili detestatione perfudit.
(6.4.5)

Vergil's language enmeshes us in the same dilemma of judgment: *uincet amor patriae laudumque immensa cupido* (823). The phrasing invites the reader's decision: do we accord or withhold the *laudes* which Brutus wishes to have? A modern reader perhaps starts at the notion of attributing desire for praise to the second Brutus, but even Cicero could grumble on this score, while Appian attributes to Brutus the desire for δόξα.⁵⁴

Two lines, in which the pressure does not altogether relent, separate us from Caesar and Pompey, and the civil wars:

quin Decios Drusosque procul saeuumque securi
aspice Torquatum et referentem signa Camillum.
(824-5)

'These names', observes Horsfall, 'and not Brutus' alone, sandwiched between the great monumental blocks of the Kings and Caesar and Pompey must be of particular importance.'⁵⁵ Vergil uses the same device as we observed in *Georgics* 2, whereby, in a panegyric context, a suspect or disquieting name is inserted between two more straightforwardly praiseworthy names. In the *Georgics* passage, the unsettling name had been that of the Marii; here, there are two names, of the Drusi, and of Torquatus, 'savage with his axe'. The parallelism of effect is powerfully marked by the fact that in the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* it is the same names which act as a frame. In the *Aeneid* we have Decii and Camillus bracketing the Drusi and Torquatus in the middle, and in the *Georgics* the same thing happens: *Decios Marios magnosque Camillos* ... (169).

In the case of the Drusi, Servius saw the link with Augustus' wife Livia, who was one of the Livii Drusi. Such an association may well be felt, while Horsfall's identification of a 'Gallic' connection in the vicinity is also very appealing.⁵⁶ But our context, as in the *Georgics*, is one of names listed as *exempla*, and we must look to other similar contexts in order to establish the full tone of the allusion.

As Horsfall remarks, 'the alliteration of *Decios Drusosque* is striking. Vergil highlights the strength of the *gens*'.⁵⁷ The juxtaposition is very important, in just the same way as the juxtaposition of *Decios Marios* in *Geo.* 2.169. The Decii were father and son,⁵⁸ with the son following exactly in the footsteps of the father; in Lucan, the corpse sees them together, as here: *uidi Decios, natumque patremque, / lustrales bellis animas* (785-6). The Drusi of this exemplary tradition were also father and son. Here, however, the son did not live up to the standard of the father, but fell off disastrously, and became a byword for degeneration. The senior M. Livius Drusus (tr. pl. 122, cos. 112), was the principal enemy of C. Gracchus, and was praised in the optimate tradition.⁵⁹ His son (tr. pl. 91) was excoriated, often in direct comparison. Cicero quotes the words of C. Carbo (tr. pl. 90):

o M. Druse, patrem appello, tu dicere solebas sacram esse rem publicam, quicumque eam uiolauissent ab omnibus esse ei poenas persolutas. patris dictum sapiens temeritas filii comprobauit.

(*Orat.* 213)

The name Drusus does not occur in a laudatory context in lists of *exempla*. The reference is always to the younger Drusus, and it is always condemnatory, linking him with other notorious demagogues, such as the Gracchi, Saturninus, Sulpicius, Cinna (*Herenn.* 4.31, *Cic. Vat.* 23). The force of Vergil's reference is shown by Lucan's adaptation;⁶⁰ in the underworld, the corpse had seen *laetantis, popularia nomina, Drusos / legibus immodicos* (6.795-6). This theme of sons falling short of their father's standards is one which Vergil will pick up later in the parade, in speaking of the Gracchi (842); it is the theme with which he had first experimented in *Georgics* 2.

There were many things to say about the great Torquatus. Vergil chooses his execution of his son, so that we see Torquatus alone, in the singular, after Decii, father and son, and Drusi, father and son. The language takes us back to Brutus' like deed (*saeuumque securi*, 824; *saeuasque securis*, 819). When Camillus follows Torquatus, we may feel that Vergil's dubieties are on the ebb; but immediately Anchises shows us the shades of Caesar and Pompey (826-35). Their calamitous wars are too painful to be described directly. Anchises beseeches both of them to abstain (832-3). He prays then to Caesar to relent first:

tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo,
proice tela manu, sanguis meus!

(834-5)

This plea is sometimes seen as a reference to Caesar's famous *clementia*.⁶¹ Certainly Caesar was *clemens*, but only once he had begun the war; here Anchises is begging his descendant to lay down his arms first, before Pompey does.

If Augustus is the central peak of the first half of the speech, the glimpse of the civil wars is the peak of the second.⁶² In a manner by now familiar, Vergil then veers away from these horrors into a celebratory passage (836-46); but it is possible that even here there are traces of civil strife to be recognised.

The victories over Greece come next, with a couple of easy riddles of identity for the reader to answer (*ille* is L. Mummius at 836, L. Aemilius Paullus at 838). At 841 a riddle of more moment may be presented:

quis te, magne Cato, tacitum aut te, Cosse, relinquat?

The commentators tell us that Cato the Censor is meant here. In Vergil's time he could be called *Cato maior*, 'Cato the elder'.⁶³ When Anchises addresses someone as 'great Cato', then the positive form of the adjective, if it prompts thoughts of the comparative, is perhaps disconcerting. Was Cato Censorius then *greater* than Cato Uticensis? Which Cato was

the greater?⁶⁴ When seen from this angle, the question form becomes energised: the question of whether to leave Cato the younger unmentioned was, after all, not untropical.⁶⁵

Following Cato and Cossus comes *Gracchi genus* (842). The phrase has caused difficulty,⁶⁶ but once again the *gens* is the focus,⁶⁷ and once more, as in the case of the Drusi, the exemplary tradition directs our attention to the degeneration of demagogic sons from optimate fathers. Ti. Sempronius Gracchus (cos. 177), father of the tribunes, was a model for later generations.⁶⁸ It is noteworthy that although Cicero speaks of him with warm praise, he never includes the name of Gracchus in his frequent lists of exemplary names – except once, and then specifically, in the singular, in strict chronological sequence, so that this representative of the family alone could be understood (*Nat. deor.* 2.165). The name was simply too loaded, tied in men's minds to the sons. Thus Cicero, in the *De provinciis consularibus*, mentions Ti. Gracchus, and hastily assures his audience that he did not mean the tribune: *an Ti. Gracchus (patrem dico, cuius utinam filii ne degenerassent a gravitate patria) . . .* (18). These words illustrate the fixed attitude of the exemplary tradition.⁶⁹ Once more, Lucan's adaptation is an aid to understanding. The corpse sees Drusi and Gracchi together:

uidi ego laetantis, popularia nomina, Drusus
legibus immodicos ausosque ingentia Gracchos.
(*BC* 6.795–6)

The mother of the tribunes was the daughter of Scipio Africanus Maior, and the family of the Scipiones is the next to appear:

geminos, duo fulmina belli,
Scipiadas, cladem Libyae.
(842–3)

Who are these Scipiones? As we move through the lines, a number of different suggestions present themselves in sequence, so that the extension of the *gens* is once more brought home to us.

When a Roman listener had heard as far as *geminos, duo fulmina belli / Scipiadas*, he would have thought he knew who was meant: the two brothers Gn. Cornelius Scipio Calvus (cos. 222), and P. Cornelius Scipio (cos. 218), respectively uncle and father of Africanus Maior (*geminos* would reinforce the expectation that *brothers* are being spoken of). This is how Servius takes it, and it is plain from the language of Cicero and Silius that Servius' interpretation has some sanction.⁷⁰ Generally, when Cicero speaks *tout court* of *duo Scipiones*, he means these two, as is seen most clearly at *Tusc.* 1.110, where in an exemplary list he has *duos Scipiones, duos Africanos*.⁷¹

It was Ennius who devised the pun in *fulmina*, and he applied it to Africanus Maior as well as to the two brothers.⁷² Vergil picks up this reference to Africanus with *cladem Libyae*, a phrase that cannot apply to the two brothers, who did not campaign in Africa. All at once the reader is forced into some readjustment. It must then be Africanus – no, not just he, but *both* Africani (*duo fulmina*). The second of these, Africanus Minor, the captor of Carthage, was of course not in Ennius: the historical perspective suddenly opens up, as Vergil squeezes another two generations from the Ennian phrase, extending the reference down to 146, with Africanus Minor's sack of Carthage. In seven words we see the family of the Scipiones over four generations.

And for more than four generations, *cladem Libyae* applies to the disasters which the two Africani inflicted upon Libya. Exactly a hundred years after Scipio Aemilianus annihilated Carthage, another Scipio, Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio, suffered a disaster in Libya, as commander of the Republican forces against Caesar in the Thapsus campaign of 46. The African fate of the Scipiones was taken seriously by both sides in the Thapsus campaign,⁷³ and the varying fortune of bearers of the name became something of a topic; the two Senecas have some fine epigrams on the subject.⁷⁴ In particular, Lucan represents Scipio's death in Libya as atonement for the victims of his ancestors,⁷⁵ and in his underworld the elder Scipio is seen bewailing the fate of his descendant:

deplorat Libycis perituram Scipio terris
infaustam subolem.
(*BC* 6.788–9)

Lucan seems to be drawing out a latent suggestion of Vergil's text: the Scipiones were associated with more than one disaster in Libya.

If the mention of the Scipiones in Africa does contain ambivalence, then it is the last such citation in the speech. Fabricius, Regulus and the Cunctator round off the *exempla* in noble fashion. Before Anchises closes, he enunciates his celebrated doctrine of empire, fixing for the Romans the nature and the limits of their achievement:

excudent alii spirantia mollius aera
(credo equidem), uiuos ducent de marmore uultus,
orabunt causas melius, caelique meatus
describent radio et surgentia sidera dicent;
tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
(hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem,
parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.

(847–53)

Griffin has best clarified the way in which these words hold back as much as they offer, deny as much as they assert.⁷⁶ Many admirable forms of artistic and intellectual endeavour must be spurned in the cause of political and military preeminence. Yet, of course, the irony is not inert, as we hear Anchises proclaim that the Romans must abjure a faith in ideals of artistic attainment, when the very existence of the poem in which he is a character is witness to the power of that faith.⁷⁷

We think we have come to the end, but Anchises resumes, showing us the great Marcellus of the Hannibalic war, leading us into the lament for the young Marcellus who had recently died. There is no question of seeing this lament as a late addition to an existing parade. The melancholy coda was part of the basic conception from the very beginning.⁷⁸ Augustus' designated heir receives high praise, but waste and futility are the ruling tones. The formal cast of Anchises' speech throughout has been that of a prophecy, and here at the end that prophesying form becomes activated, as the perspective makes itself, for the poet and his readers, genuinely forward-looking. Marcellus had embodied the future,⁷⁹ a future which is painted gloriously (872–81), and then taken away from us, unrealised. As Anchises closes, scattering flowers in his descendant's honour (883–6), the contemporary of Vergil is left suspended, his attention all forward, all expectant: what, then, will follow Marcellus? Will the divine Augustus, as promised, be able to carry us through?

When, shortly afterwards, Aeneas comes to leave the underworld (893–8), his departure is described in terms which recall the philosophical myths introducing the parade. Here we are much indebted to R. J. Tarrant, who has clarified the longstanding difficulties of the gates of horn and ivory, by setting their imagery in the context of the Platonic doctrines of the soul.⁸⁰ Aeneas leaves by the gate of the *falsa insomnia* because he is still alive, still a prisoner of the body and of the illusions of the 'real' world which the body is doomed to inhabit.⁸¹ Tarrant is completely convincing when he goes on (p. 54) to draw more general conclusions on the effect of such a setting for the view of mortal achievements in the historical vision: 'Virgil seems to have found Plato's view of the physical world as a mere shadow of a purer world a useful structure of thought by which to express his own sense of the evanescence of mortal aspirations.'

We have been led by this framing device back to the unresolved questions which occupied us at the beginning, concerning the paradox presented by Vergil's use of the otherworldly myths of philosophy to introduce a show of mundane achievement, and a celebration of *gloria*.

The parade of heroes exhibits mighty national and individual accomplishments. It also covers civil war, *populares* and demagogues, fathers executing sons, the disappearance of once-great cities, the falling-off of families, the stifling of promise, the shunning of art, the hunger for personal glory: in short, the political life's intolerable demands on human nature,

together with the 'evanescence' (to use Tarrant's fine phrase) 'of mortal aspirations'. The insistent stress on *gloria* is not only remarkable in this 'philosophical' context; it is altogether striking in a poem that is so preoccupied with the great contemporary ethical shift in attitudes to *gloria*, away from the ruinous competition and egoism that was the essence of traditional *gloria*.⁸²

The 'Platonic' setting creates two principal effects (if we may be so blunt in fixing the passage's diffused force). The personal aims and sufferings of the politicians on view are put into a disconcerting perspective once we have been invited to see them as characters in a Platonic myth, once we have been reminded of the moral exhortations for which Plato's myths were a vehicle, turning us away from the vanity of this world, and especially from the vain, hollow harshness of public life. Further, the setting presents the Roman state as the *τέλος* of the way in which the world is ordered, while making it difficult or impossible for us to decide on a clear response. Rome is celebrated by the device, but the reader has been given the perspective of a Platonist, and it is bewildering to be promised an elaborate revelation which ultimately declares that there is in fact nothing more than the mixed uncertainties of actual history. From the standpoint of a moral philosopher, the achievements of the Roman state do not have a self-evident importance. When Vergil leads us to expect a Platonic vision, and deceives our expectation, a complex rearrangement of priorities ensues. He gives us instead something powerful and something of one kind of beauty; but when he denies his poem and his audience the beauty and the consolation of the myths of philosophy, immortality and redemption, this formal and aesthetic exclusion mirrors and recreates the exclusion which is the lot of the chief character in the poem, and of the poem's audience in the world.⁸³

This world is indeed what concerns Vergil here. The very elaboration of the picture of the underworld has led many to speculate on the religious sentiment or message to be found there, but as far as the elements of religion or philosophy are concerned, I take the truth to be more or less as Servius stated it: *sectis philosophorum poetae pro qualitate negotiorum semper utuntur*.⁸⁴ In the meeting of Aeneas and Anchises, the 'essential nature of the matter in hand' is not a religious revelation, but an image of the nature of Rome and of the political process, an image of the life of the Roman statesman, or of any such statesman.

Appendix: Lucan's Underworld

Lucan's hell, like Vergil's, has an image of the nature of Rome. Lucan has been a valuable aid in the discussion so far; an investigation of his underworld, interesting and rewarding in itself, will give further support to the

reading of Vergil suggested here, by showing that Lucan recognised Vergil's equivocations, and seized upon them as his point of departure.

When scholars compare Lucan's underworld scene with Vergil's, they represent Lucan as the inverse of Vergil, negating the glorious vision of Rome's history with a pessemistic one.⁸⁵ Of course, there is a certain amount of solid truth in such a picture, as is well brought out by Bramble's pithy juxtaposition:

'Where . . . in Vergil's underworld scene we have the founder of Rome, a venerable Sibyl, and a parade of future heroes, in Lucan's *vexilla* we find a coward, a witch, and the triumph of Rome's villains. The cycle is at an end: decay replaces birth, discord follows greatness.'⁸⁶

By this perspective, Lucan splits up Vergil's succession of great heroes, substituting two opposed camps: the good shades lament, and the wicked shades gloat over, the advent of the civil wars (6.779–99).

Such a reading, however, in glossing over Vergil's qualifications, misrepresents his parade of heroes, and hence inevitably misrepresents Lucan's adaptation. Within the framework of the epics, Vergil's catalogue of heroes looks forward, while Lucan's, more regularly, looks back. This chronological orientation is operative in a more profound sense as well. The direction of Vergil's passage carries our expectation forward to the future,⁸⁷ to the uncertain hope that Augustus may be able to overcome the latent flaws in Roman life and history, and restore the state. Lucan's perspective is entirely backward-looking. By taking up and exploiting Vergil's doubts and misgivings, he can represent Vergil's vision as a chimaera, a false dawn. His presentation again and again magnifies the reservations of Vergil to show that the hoped-for achievement has not come off, to show that Vergil was mistaken in believing that in the balance of flawed and sound the scale could possibly incline to the good. All that is positive in Vergil is stifled and suppressed by Lucan, while the discordant notes in his predecessor's piece become the leitmotif of his own arrangement.

The *donnée* of Lucan's epic is, as it were, Caesar's refusal to listen to the plea of Anchises (*tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo, / proice tela manu, sanguis meus!* *Aen.* 6.834–5). Within his underworld picture, Lucan ruthlessly forces Vergil's ambiguities into the open and makes them explicit. In Lucan, we have the Decii and Camillus, weeping in the company of the vanquished good (*BC* 6.785–6). The Drusi, sandwiched between them in Vergil (824), are shunted nine verses off into the company of the *populares* (*BC* 6.795). Lucan keeps Vergil's plural (*Drusos*): he may be suggesting that the father was no better than the son, despite the talk of the *boni*.⁸⁸ Lucan forces the tribunes out from behind Vergil's covering *Gracchi genus* (842), and brackets them with the Drusi:

uidi ego laetantis, popularia nomina, Drusos / legibus immodicos ausosque ingentia Gracchos (*BC* 6.796–7). In Lucan, both Drusi and Gracchi are in the company of Catiline (793). This ultimate bogey-man of ruling-class mythology is not named in *Aeneid* 6, but he does appear on the shield in Book 8, in Tartarus (668). Lucan is relocating the Drusi and Gracchi, placing them where they should 'really' have been in Vergil – with Catiline.⁸⁹

Vergil's poised ambivalence concerning the first and last Brutus is obliterated. In Lucan's underworld, the first Brutus is the only happy good shade, for he foresees his descendant's assassination of Caesar (791–2). In the poem generally, there are no doubts about the sanctity and justice of the tyrannicide's act (5.207–8; 9.17–18), although Lucan is certainly aware of the controversy: as Septimius prepares to kill Pompey, Lucan exclaims, *scelus hoc quo nomine dicent / qui Bruti dixere nefas?* (8.609–10). Lucan has, like Vergil, the great names of Scipio and Cato, but no glorious resonance attaches to them, for their function is merely to mourn the deaths their descendants will suffer in civil war:

deplorat Libycis perituram Scipio terris
infaustam subolem; maior Carthaginis hostis
non seruituri maeret Cato fata nepotis
(*BC* 6.788–90)

Note the characteristic play on *maior*: Cato 'maior' is a 'maior' *hostis* to Carthage than Scipio. And is that Scipio Maior or Minor?⁹⁰

Outside Lucan's underworld vision, this approach persists, as we have already seen. Vergil advances the names of the vanished towns of the Latin League with a poignant blend of antiquarian pride and commiseration (6.773–6, above p. 228); to Lucan, they signify *Italiae solitudo* and no more (*BC* 7.391–6). Romulus is a figure of *almost* undiluted grandeur in Vergil; in Lucan's poem his bloody kingship is emblematic of the Roman urge to fratricide (*BC* 1.95–7). Finally, the wars between Caesar and Pompey are a fragment only of Vergil's picture, which may possibly be subsumed in the whole, but to Lucan the battle of Pharsalus is the very τέλος of Roman history, not to be outgrown or atoned for:

maius ab hac acie quam quod sua saecula ferrent
volnus habent populi; plus est quam uita salusque
quod perit: in totum mundi prosternimur aeuum.
uincitur his gladiis omnis quae seruiet aetas.
(*BC* 7.638–41)

The power of Lucan's eloquence need not command our assent. He had the easier case to argue, and, in dealing merely with the end of one political

system, he had a smaller scope than Vergil, who dealt with the entirety of what Rome stood for, and with the perennial nature of life in the public arena, exposed to the historical process. Nonetheless, it is salutary to recognise the force of some of Lucan's censure of the *Aeneid*. With considerable justification, Lucan saw that the main impetus of Jupiter's prophecy in Book 1, of the parade in Book 6, and of the shield in Book 8 – indeed, a principal tendency in the entire work – was to glorify the figure of Augustus, and to justify the submerging of republican tradition in his person.⁹¹ Lucan deserves our attention when he protests that 'the Republic' cannot simply be appropriated in this way. There was no spirit of the Republic to be extracted. Lucan's poem illustrates the truth of Ennius' dictum, that the Republic was not an essence, but a product of men and institutions:

moribus antiquis stat res Romana uirisque.
(Ann. 156 Skutsch)

Notes

A version of this paper was read to a meeting of the Cambridge Philological Society on October 10, 1985. I thank those present for a valuable discussion. For their help and criticism I am also grateful to N.M. Horsfall, Professor R. G. M. Nisbet, Professor David West, Philip Hardie, R. O. A. M. Lyne, Stephen Hinds, and J. M. Masters.

1. Cf. K. Büchner, *RE* 8A 1391. Important discussions by W. V. Clausen, 'An interpretation of the *Aeneid*', *HSCPh* 68 (1964) 139–47; R. D. Williams in J. R. C. Martyn (ed.), *Cicero and Virgil* (1972) 207–17; J. Griffin, 'The Fourth Georgic, Virgil, and Rome', *G&R* n.s. 26 (1979) 61–80; R. J. Tarrant, 'Aeneas and the gates of sleep', *CPh* 77 (1982) 51–5; above all, W. R. Johnson, *Darkness visible. A study of Virgil's Aeneid* (1976) 105–11.

2. Bibliography on this disparateness in F. Solmsen, *CPh* 67 (1972) 31–3; cf. N. M. Horsfall, *Antichthon* 15 (1981) 145.

3. Bibliography in N. M. Horsfall, *Prudentia* 8 (1976) 84 n. 102; note especially M. von Albrecht, *WS* n.f. 1 (1967) 156–82.

4. Norden's discussion is still indispensable (47–8). See further n. 11 below.

5. It is recognised by Johnson, *Darkness visible* 105–11.

6. As is stressed by Julia Annas, 'Plato's myths of judgement', *Phronesis* 27 (1982) 119–43 (a reference I owe to M. M. Mackenzie, whom I thank for help on these Platonic matters). The main Platonic passages are *Gorg.* 523a–527c; *Phaedo*, 112c–114c; *Rep.* 614b–621d; *Phaedrus* 245c–250c.

7. Although hope of this escape is not actually held out in the myth of Er.

8. The philosopher-king may be free from this corruption, but Plato seems to have become increasingly pessimistic on this score; see Julia Annas, *An introduction to Plato's Republic* (1981) 106.

9. For praise of the inconspicuous life in such contexts, cf. *Phaedo* 82c–d, *Gorg.* 526c.

10. This is, as it were, a base version of the Platonic problem involved in why the Guardian should go back into the cave after attaining his own enlightenment (Annas, *Introduction* 262–70). On these links between Cicero and Plato, see P. Boyancé, *Études sur le songe de Scipion* (1936) 147–60. Many writings on Cicero's Platonic debts are discussed by P. L. Schmidt in *ANRW* I 4.309–10.

11. On the Platonic element, see the works cited by Solmsen (n. 2). On the Ciceronian, see Norden 47; F. Klingner, *Virgil* (1967) 485–92; W. A. Camps, *An introduction to Virgil's Aeneid* (1969) 89–90; R. Lamacchia, *RhM* 107 (1964) 261–78.

12. Cf. Austin 221.

13. Note 731–4 in particular, and the language of malaise and imprisonment to describe earthly life in 734 (*clausae . . . corpore caeco*), 736 (*malum*), 737 (*corporeae pestes*), 739 (*malorum*), 742 (*infectum scelus*). Very Ciceronian language here: cf. esp. *Somn.* 29.

14. Cf. (besides works in n. 11) Boyancé, *Études* 39–40; L. Alfonsi, *Aevum* 29 (1955) 375–6.

15. As we have recently been well reminded by Horsfall (n. 2).

16. Thus B. Otis, *Virgil. A study in civilized poetry* (1963) 300–1; Solmsen (n. 2); R. J. Clark, *Catabasis: Virgil and the wisdom-tradition* (1979) 182–3.

17. Note, especially, these words: *miscet philosophiae figmenta poetica et ostendit tam quod est uulgare, quam quod continet ueritas et ratio naturalis*.

18. Cf. H. C. Lipscomb, *CW* 2 (1908–9) 116.

19. Cf. Lamacchia (n. 11) 263–6; Klingner, *Virgil* 490–1.

20. By Lamacchia and Klingner.

21. A few great souls may eventually achieve a pure life in the aether (Austin 279–80), but most souls do not achieve this, and it is not the basis of the exhortation to statesmanship, as it is in Cicero.

22. On *exempla*, see H. W. Litchfield, *HSCPh* 25 (1914) 1–71; Pease on Cic. *Nat. deor.* 2.165.

23. Cf. von Albrecht (n. 3) 176–7; N. M. Horsfall, 'Virgil, Varro's *Imagines* and the Forum of Augustus', *Anc. Soc. (Macquarie)* 10 (1980) 20–3; id., 'The structure and purpose of Vergil's Parade of Heroes', *Anc. Soc. (Macquarie)* 12 (1982) 12–18.

24. Horsfall points out to me that there must be links with the *laudatio funebris* which Augustus spoke over Marcellus (fragments in H. Malcovati, *Caesaris Augusti Imperatoris Operum Fragmenta*² (1928) 53–4.)

25. O. Skard, 'Die Heldenschau in Vergils Aeneis', *SO* 40 (1965) 53–65; P. F. Burke, 'Roman rites for the dead and *Aeneid* 6', *CJ* 74 (1979) 220–8.

26. *Lucan. An Introduction* (1976) 143.

27. Cf. R. MacMullen, *Enemies of the Roman order* (1966) 7–8; J. Griffin in B. K. Gold (ed.), *Literary and artistic patronage in ancient Rome* (1982) 124.

28. On Cato and the Bruti, see G. Williams, *Figures of thought in Roman poetry* (1980) 18.

29. Note the interesting remarks of C. Martindale, *G&R* n.s. 31 (1984) 67.

30. *Lands and peoples in Roman poetry: The ethnographical tradition* (1982) 45–9.

31. On this ambivalent figure, see Thomas (n. 30) 64 n. 52; Litchfield (n. 22) 51 n. 4.

32. *Sen. Epist.* 104.1; *Mart.* 6.43, 10.44.3 f., 12.57.1 f.

33. *Epist.* 1.11.7–8.

34. *Cic. Planc.* 23; *Juv.* 6.56–7, 10.100; *Prop.* 4.1.34 *qui nunc nulli maxima turba Gabi*; *Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom.* 4.53. On this theme of contrast between cities' former and present condition, see A. J. Gossage, *G&R* n.s. 2 (1955) 72–4.

35. H. Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde* (1883) 2.579.

36. On Cora's obscurity see Nissen 2.644. The disappearance of the towns of the Campagna was a general phenomenon: cf. T. Ashby, *The Roman campagna in classical times* (1927) 18–19.
37. As pointed out to me by Simon Goldhill. Norden and Austin (on 730) are, then, only half right to draw a distinction between the pride of Vergil and the realism of Horace (*Epist.* 1.11.7–8).
38. J. R. Patterson informs us that Lucan is far less true to the facts of his contemporary reality than is Vergil; the 'facts' of literature count for more.
39. *CQ* n.s. 34 (1984) 185–91.
40. Cf. R. Syme, *The Roman revolution* (1939) 305–6; S. Weinstock, *Divus Julius* (1971) 176–85.
41. Cf. Syme (n. 40) 313–14; H. Wagenvoort, 'The crime of fratricide', in *Studies in Roman literature, culture and religion* (1956) 169–83; H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom* (1964) 85–7.
42. 'The position of *laetus* gives the adjective marked emphasis', remarks Austin, making a different point.
43. *Enn. Ann.* 92–4 Skutsch; *Ov. Fast.* 4.841–4.
44. Cf. Büchner, *RE* 8A 1391: 'Der 2. Teil, der weitere Gestalten mustert, Könige nach Romulus und Helden der Republik, zeigt neben dem Stolz auch alles bedenkliche der römischen Geschichte.'
45. Cf. Suet. *Jul.* 6.1, *ab Anco Marcio sunt Marcii Reges*. See here T. P. Wiseman, 'Legendary genealogies in late-republican Rome', *G&R* n.s. 21 (1974) 153–64 (154 on the Marcii).
46. *Fond. Hardt* 17 (1972) 34–5.
47. *RE* 2R 28. 1562.
48. Cf. MacMullen, 8–10.
49. Cf. Luc. 5.207, *ultores . . . Brutos*; 9.17 f.
50. Similarly Austin ad loc.; W. F. Jackson Knight, *Roman Vergil* (1966) 368; William (n. 1) 212–3.
51. Cf. MacMullen, *Enemies* 18.
52. Cf. Litchfield (n. 22) 41–2; E. Wistrand, *The policy of Brutus the tyrannicide* (1981) 5–6.
53. Cf. [Sen.] *Oct.* 498 f.; *Sen. Ben.* 2.20.1 f.
54. *Bell. Civ.* 2.114; cf. *Cic. Att.* 14.11.1; 12.2; 14.3.5. For evidence of the tyrannicide's *anima superba* see *Cic. Att.* 6.1.7, 14.20.5; *Plut. Brut.* 34.7 f., 45.9. But he was a complex character (Syme, *Roman Revolution* 58; MacMullen, *Enemies* 6), and could be very charming: cf. *Cic. Att.* 14.17 A 5.
55. 'Structure and purpose' (n. 23) 12.
56. 13.
57. 12.
58. A grandson is occasionally mentioned as having also sacrificed himself in *deuotio* (*Cic. Fin.* 2.61).
59. *Plut. Gracch.* 8.5. The truth will have been less straightforward: see D. Stockton, *The Gracchi* (1979) 192, 200 n. 15.
60. Norden (followed by Austin) refers us to M. Livius Salinator, victor at the Metaurus in 207. But this man was not a Drusus, and the distinction was drawn (*Suet. Tib.* 3.1. f.). The Horace passage which Norden and Austin cite refers to the other consul of the year, C. Claudius Nero, ancestor of Horace's addressee: *quid debeas, o Roma, Neronibus, / testis Metaurus flumen . . .*, *Carm.* 4.4.37–8.
61. Thus Austin ad loc.
62. Cf. Williams (n. 1) 208–9.
63. At least, such was the title Cicero gave his essay on old age (*Att.* 14.21.3; *Amic.* 4; *Off.* 1.151), and there seems to be an allusion to the usage in a punning passage of Lucan (6.789–90). How regular this nomenclature was remains uncertain; Cicero may only have used the title *Cato Maior* to avoid confusion with his *Cato* (on Uticensis). I am grateful to Jonathan Powell for help on this point.
64. Ahl first pointed out the problem (*Lucan* 140).
65. It is typical of Vergil's manner in this section that the unproblematic Cossus should be mentioned in the same breath; cf. esp. 824–5.
66. See Ahl, *Lucan* 140–1.
67. Cf. von Albrecht (n. 3) 168.
68. See Norden on 842; *RE* 2A.1409.
69. Cf. *Cic. Off.* 2.43, *Fin.* 4.65, *Har.* 41; [Sen.] *Oct.* 882–9 (this last passage links the Gracchi brothers and the younger Drusus as examples of demagogic degeneration within a family).
70. *Gn. et P. Scipiones, duo fulmina nostri imperii*, *Cic. Parad.* 12; *Balb.* 34; *Sil.* 7.106–7; *geminus . . . Scipiadas*, 13.382–4; 15.3–4, 16.87.
71. See Pease on *Cic. Nat. deor.* 3.80; cf. *Planc.* 25, *quis Gn. et P. Scipionibus, quis Africano?*
72. See O. Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* (1968) 145–50. Austin's note expounds the pun, which depends on the similarity between the Greek words for *scipio*, 'staff' (σκηπτρον) and *fulmen*, 'thunderbolt' (σκηπτός).
73. Cf. *Suet. Jul.* 59; *Plut. Caes.* 52.2; *Dio* 42.58.
74. *Suas.* 7.7; *Epist.* 24.10.
75. 6.309–11, *nec . . . Poenorumque umbras placasset sanguine fuso / Scipio*.
76. 'The Fourth Georgic' (n. 1) 65–6.
77. Cf. Johnson, *Darkness visible* 108.
78. Convincingly argued by Otis, *Virgil* 303–4, and Horsfall, 'Structure and purpose' (n. 23) 15–16.
79. Cf. von Albrecht (n. 3) 178–9; S. V. Tracey, *CJ* 70 (1975) 38.
80. n. 1.
81. Cf. *Cic. Somn.* 14. *immo uero . . . hi uiuunt, qui e corporum uinculis tamquam e carcere euolauerunt, uestra uero quae dicitur uita mors est*.
82. On this see D. Earl, *The moral and political tradition of Rome* (1967) 59–79 (a reference I owe to I. M. LeM. DuQuesnay). Note too (as Professor Reeve pointed out in discussion) how the next book opens with the *fama*, *honos*, and *nomen* of Aeneas' nurse Caieta – *si qua est ea gloria* (7.4).
83. Cf. especially Griffin (n. 1) 68; and Johnson, *Darkness visible* 105–11, for an excellent discussion of Vergil's use of perspective here.
84. *Aen.* 10.467; cf. *Aen.* 1.227, *Donatus* 1 6.1 ff. (Georgii).
85. Thus A. Guillemin, 'L'inspiration virgilienne dans la *Pharsale*', *REL* 29 (1951) 214–27; L. Paoletti, 'Lucano magico e Virgilio', *A&R* 8 (1963) 11–26; E. Narducci, *La provvidenza crudele. Lucano e la distruzione dei miti augustei* (1979) 54–62.
86. *The Cambridge history of classical literature* 2, edd. E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen (1982) 543.
87. Cf. von Albrecht (n.3) 178–80. Panegyrics naturally look to the future, to the influencing of future events: see G. Kennedy, *The art of rhetoric in the Roman world* (1972) 260.
88. So claims the tradition used by Tacitus: *Gracchi et Saturnini turbatores plebis, nec minor largitor nomine senatus Drusus*, *Ann.* 3.27.
89. I thank S.E. Hinds for pointing out the role of Catiline to me.
90. Such play appears irresistible. Note Vergil's arrangement in *Georgics* 2.169–70: *magnumque Camillos, Scipiadas duos bello et te, maxime Caesar*. That is, *magni, maior, minor, maximus*.
91. See Horsfall (n. 3) 89 on this process (of which the *Aeneid* is only one contemporary example).