

Copyright Notice

Staff and students of this University are reminded that copyright subsists in this extract and the work from which it was taken. This Digital Copy has been made under the terms of a CLA Licence which allows you to:

- Access and download a copy
- Print out a copy

This Digital Copy and any digital or printed copy supplied to or made by you under the terms of this Licence are for use in connection with this module or course of study. You may retain such copies after the end of the course, but strictly for your own personal use.

All copies (including electronic copies) shall include this Copyright Notice and shall be destroyed and/or deleted if and when required by the University.

Except as provided for by copyright law, no further copying, storage or distribution (including by e-mail) is permitted without the consent of the copyright holder.

The author (which term includes artists and other visual creators) has moral rights in the work and neither staff nor students may cause, or permit, the distortion, mutilation or other modification of the work, or any other derogatory treatment of it, which would be prejudicial to the honour or reputation of the author.

Title of extract: **Other Voices in Ovid's Aeneid**

Name of Author: **Casali, S.**

Title/Author of book/edition (if applicable): **Oxford Readings in Classical Studies**

Ovid. Knox, P. (editor)

Name of Visual Creator or other acknowledgement (if applicable):

Journal details –title/Vol/Year (if applicable):

Publisher: **Oxford University Press**

Pages scanned: **144 - 165**

Course of Study (Module name and number): **Muses' Playground CLCS5001**

Name of Designated Person

authorising scanning: *E. L. Harris*

Date authorised: 05.04.17.

Moodle/Powerpoint

Other Voices in Ovid's 'Aeneid'

Sergio Casali

Dixit insipiens in corde suo 'Non est Deus'. *Psalms* 13.11. THE DEPARTURE FROM TROY: OTHER VOICES
AND OTHER SILENCESAeneas is leaving Troy (*Met.* 13.623-6):¹

Non tamen euersam Troiae cum moenibus esse
spem quoque fata sinunt: sacra et, sacra altera, patrem
fert umeris, uenerabile onus, Cythereius heros.
de tantis opibus praedam pius eligit illam
Ascaniumque suum...

And yet the fates do not permit Troy's hope to be overturned with her walls. The heroic son of Cytherea bears away upon his shoulders the sacred objects and, another sacred object, his father, a venerable burden. Of all his great possessions, the dutiful man chose that prize, and his son Ascanius...

In his introductory note to *Met.* 13.623 ff., Franz Bömer (1982: 363) prints a useful chart, summarizing the Virgilian and Ovidian versions of the journey of Aeneas from Troy to Sicily: in the left-hand column, the events of the *Aeneid*; in the right, those of the *Metamorphoses*.

¹ For a sketch of the critical debate on Ovid's 'Aeneid', see Baldo (1995) 29-37. Among the later contributions, see especially Hinds (1998) 104-22; Thomas (2001) 78-84.

The first point of comparison, then, is presented thus: 'Virgil: II 721-804: Flight from Troy; Creusa. Ovid: XIII 623-627: Flight from Troy.' Obviously, Creusa is missing in Ovid. With Bömer as guide, Ovid's reader will probably think that this absence is a matter of little account, in view of the fact that poor Creusa is destined to disappear also from the following notes, which will be devoted to the analysis of single verses. All the more so, since, on the subject of Aeneas' departure from Troy, we will be told (368) that 'an intentional contrast with Virgil cannot be securely identified.'

Now it is clear that Ovid is alluding to another tradition about Aeneas' departure from Troy, probably the one in which the victorious Greeks allowed him to choose only one thing to take away with him; and he chose his father. Impressed by this choice, the Greeks granted him a second, and he chose the Penates. In admiration the Greeks allowed him to take whatever he wanted.² Certainly, Ovid's formulation does not exclude a presupposition of the Virgilian version of events. But to be sure, it obviously also does not rule out that things could have gone differently; on the contrary, it makes it clear that Virgil is only *one of the versions*, and there are others. There is one that the reader could recall, in which Aeneas is positively guilty of treason.³ Above all, he could also recall that if Aeneas chose the Penates, his father,

² Thus Varro, *Rer. Hum.* fr. 9 Mirsch = Serv. Dan. *Aen.* 2.636, who suggests that the formulation in *Aen.* 2.635-6 (*genitor, quem tollere in altos | optabam primum montis primumque petebam*) alludes to Varro's version of the series of choices; cf. also Schol. Ver. *Aen.* 2.717, pp. 106-7 Baschera. The same account is found in Diod. 7.4; cf. [Xen.] *Cyn.* 1.15. The story that it was the Greeks who permitted Aeneas to leave Troy, with some variants, was known since Hellanicus, *FGrHist* 4 F 31 = fr. 77 Ambaglio (in D.H. 1.47.4, the Achaeans permit Aeneas to leave Troy with the riches that they had saved in their flight); cf. Lycophr. 1263-9 (the Achaeans allow Aeneas to take away the thing he most desires: he chooses the Penates, neglecting wife and son, and leaves with his father); Aelian, *Var. Hist.* 3.22; [Apollod.] *Epit.* 5.21; Quint. Smyrn. 13.334-49. Cf. Barchiesi (1962) 349-52; Galinsky (1969a) 43-6; Cassola (1991) 276-85. Ovid's allusion to this alternative tradition was first recognized by Stitz (1962) 25-6.

³ Cf., e.g., Menecrates of Xanthos, *FGrHist* 769 F 3 (= D.H. 1.48.3); Dict. Cret. 4.22; Dares Phryg. 40-2; on this, see Ussani (1947) and (1952) vii-xviii; Galinsky (1969a) 46-51, who, among other things, interprets Naev. fr. 23 Mor/Strz (*blande et docte percontat, Aeneas quo pacto | Troiam liquerit*) in light of the versions of the flight that are less honourable to Aeneas (50): 'the hero evidently had to justify himself'; Horsfall (1979) 383-8 and his summary in *Enc. Virg.* 2.223a; Gabba (1976) 91-2; Braccisi (1984); Casali (1999) 206 n. 6; Thomas (2001) 71-3, 78-9, 109-10.

and Ascanius, it was as *praeda*.⁴ Now to characterize as *praeda* what Aeneas took away from Troy amounts to taking the point of view of the Greek conqueror rather than the conquered Trojan.⁵ This is a bit risky, when we have accounts that Aeneas betrayed Priam: εἰς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐγεγόνει, 'he became one of the Achaeans' (Menecrates of Xanthos, *FGrHist* 769 F 3 = D.H. 1.48.3). The juxtaposition *praedam pius* conceals a deep tension. Dictys Cretensis, in an altogether more appropriate use of the word *praeda*, will relate that the Greeks who were involved in Aeneas' betrayal decided that 'if he agreed to keep his word, part of the booty (*praeda*) and his whole household intact . . . would be granted to Aeneas' (4.22).

Let us return to Creusa. One point shared by the non-Virgilian versions of Aeneas' departure from Troy is a total lack of interest in the fate of Creusa, to the point where Lycophron can say that Aeneas, in his great *pietas* (cf. 1270 παρὰ ἐχθροῖς εὐσεβέστατος κριθείς, 'judged the most pious by his enemies'), had departed from Troy 'abandoning his wife, his children, and every other precious thing' (παρώσας καὶ δάμαρτα καὶ τέκνα | καὶ κτήσιν ἄλλην, 1263–4). Evidently Virgil did not think it opportune for his hero to reserve his *pietas* for his father and the Penates, neglecting completely his wife. Creusa's absence was necessary for the sequence of the story, but it was necessary to *justify it*.

In Ovid's version of the departure from Troy, on the contrary, the silence about Creusa leaves open all possibilities. Perhaps Ovid wants to insinuate that things did not go just as Virgil recounted. Or perhaps he wants to insinuate that even in Virgil there are, in fact, many other possibilities, since it is not Virgil's voice that narrates the second book of the *Aeneid*. The justification for the disappearance of Creusa is entrusted to the voice of Aeneas: the narrative of Creusa's

⁴ The Penates rescued by Aeneas from Troy are also called *praeda* at *Fast.* 3.423–4: there too Ovid alludes to the story that the Greeks let Aeneas leave Troy because they were impressed by his *pietas*: *di ueteris Troiae, dignissima praeda ferenti, | qua grauis Aeneas tutus ab hoste fuit*.

⁵ Solodow (1988: 144) makes an allusion to this, but without quite hitting the nail on the head: 'the word *praeda* ("booty") strangely suggests that Aeneas was a victor of the Trojan War. Though contradicted by the text and plainly wrong, the suggestion misleads for a moment and does so on a crucial matter almost as if Ovid were indifferent to whether Aeneas was in fact victorious or vanquished.' Cf. also Stütz (1962) 26: 'Aeneas is able to choose, like a victor.'

fate on the last night of Troy belongs to him, and it is, we must admit, a somewhat confused narrative.⁶

Perhaps it is this that Ovid is inviting us to reflect upon with his version of the departure of Aeneas from Troy; that is, on the possibility that the version of the *Aeneid* is not so much the Virgilian version of the myth as it is the 'Aenean' version of the facts. And no one reassures us that Aeneas had told the truth, or all the truth. Clearly, by putting things in this perspective, Virgil's situation would become truly awkward, since he would be left with an unreliable hero and with the consequent uncertainty about what really happened on Troy's last night.

This is not the first time Ovid has suggested that the story of Creusa's disappearance in *Aen.* 2 is scarcely credible. But on the first occasion he had caused *Dido* to say it (in an absolutely explicit manner), in the elegiac voice of Dido in *Her.* 7.83–5:

Si quaeras ubi sit formosi mater Iuli—
occidit a duro sola relicta uiro.
Haec mihi narraras, at me mouere . . .⁷

If you should ask where the mother of handsome Iulus is—she fell, left behind alone by her hardhearted husband. This was the story you had told me, and it moved me . . .

In the *Metamorphoses*, his epic poem, the silence about Creusa transfers to the voice of the epic narrator the uncertainty about the veracity of Aeneas' account, which had been expressed by Dido in the *Heroides*. In the same way, and more explicitly, the openness of the version about the act of treason in *Met.* 13.626 (*praedam . . . eligit*, 'he chooses . . . his prize') constitutes an acceptance in epic objectivity of the point of view on book 2 expressed by Dido in *Virgil*, when she asserted that Aeneas' account of Troy's fatal night was false (a point of view eagerly adopted by the elegiac Dido: *Her.* 7.81 *omnia mentiris*,

⁶ For a very negative evaluation of the story of Creusa in *Aeneid* 2, abandoned by Aeneas as Dido will subsequently be abandoned, see Perkell (1981). Ancient critics of Virgil had already regarded Aeneas' account of Creusa's fate with a certain suspicion; cf. Georgii (1891) 141–4 on the discussion by Serv. *Aen.* 1.711, 743, 746. On the problems raised by *longe* in *Aen.* 2.711, see Thomas (2001) 214–18.

⁷ For the view that in *Her.* 7.83–4 Ovid anticipates the critical discussion developed by Perkell (1981) on Creusa as a foreshadowing of Dido, see Casali (2004–5). See too Desmond (1993) 61.

'everything you say is a lie'), and that he had been saved not in the manner recounted in *Aen.* 2, but thanks to *facta impia* (*Aen.* 4.596–9), the betrayal of his country (Casali 1999). This is the point of Ovid's strategy: in the *Metamorphoses* the 'other voices' in Virgil become the voice (or the silence) of the epic narrator.⁸

2. SCYLLA AND HELENUS

Aeneas' fleet docks at Zancle (*Met.* 13.730–4):

Scylla latus dextrum, laeuum inrequieta Charybdis
infestat; uorat haec raptas reuomitque carinas,

⁸ For another voice that raises doubt about the credibility of Virgil's Aeneas, cf. Ahl (1989), esp. 24–31: 'Virgil's Aeneas convinced not only Dido, for a while, that he was not a perfidious traitor, but the majority of Vergil's readers from the Renaissance onwards' (30). Ahl's reading of the *Aeneid* is outrageously tendentious, but precisely for this reason it can be interesting to compare it with the no less tendentious reading that Ovid makes of the *Aeneid*. An example: we have seen that upon his departure, the Ovidian Aeneas takes as *praeda* only the Penates, his father, and Ascanius *de tantis opibus* (13.624–7). To be sure, it cannot be denied that the other Trojans could have taken some precious objects with them; nevertheless it is difficult not to detect a certain jarring, when, soon after, in the house of Anius it is disclosed that Aeneas and his companions are, in fact, loaded with riches: *nec leuiora datis Troiani dona remittunt | dantque sacerdoti custodem turis acerram, | dant pateram claramque auro gemmisque coronam* (13.702–4). It will be objected that also in Virgil Aeneas offers precious gifts to his hosts; for example, he offers Dido *munera . . . Iliacis erepta ruinis* (1.647), i.e. Helen's cloak and veil, and the sceptre, necklace, and the *duplicem gemmis auroque coronam* of Ilioneus (1.647–56); then he offers Latinus the sceptre, crown, and garments of Priam, *reliquias Troia ex ardente receptas* (7.243–8). Agreed, but is it not possible that *already in Virgil* a tendentious reader could notice some jarring? Especially when he contrasts the riches, of which the Trojans undoubtedly disposed, with the words Aeneas uses to ask Dido to receive in Carthage 'us, the leavings of the Greeks, with all the chances of sea and land now exhausted, in need of everything' (*nos, reliquias Danaum, terraeque marisque | omnibus exhaustis iam casibus, omnium egenos . . .*, 1.598–9)? Is it possible that that tendentious reader, Ovid, read it this way? What is certain is that another tendentious reader, Ahl, did. In commenting on *Aen.* 1.599, Horsfall (1986) 14–15 remarks: 'When Virgil describes the Trojans as *omnium egenos*, he intends primarily a contrast with the wealthy Dido, but we may also suspect a deliberate rejection of those stories in which Aeneas was permitted to carry off property and treasure from Troy, incurring thereby the suspicion of treason'. And Ahl (1989: 25) clarifies: 'The speaker who describes the Trojans as destitute of everything is, however, Aeneas. The authorial voice, in contrast, says the Trojans were carrying Trojan treasure (*gaza*) with them, some of which goes down with Orontes' ship: *Troia gaza per undas* (1.113–19)'. Ovid picks up and develops this Virgilian point.

illa feris atram canibus succingitur aluum,
uirginis ora gerens, et, si non omnia uates
ficta reliquerunt, aliquo quoque tempore uirgo.

Scylla infests the right-hand coast, unrelenting Charybdis the left. The latter sucks down and vomits back the ships she has caught; the former's dark belly is girt with wild dogs though she has a maiden's face. And, if all the tales the poets have left are not false, in another time she too was a maiden.

And at this point the story of Scylla slips in, who first listens to Galatea, then is a protagonist in the story with Glaucus and Circe, which concludes with her transformation into a monster. But when the narrative returns to join the fleet of Aeneas after the conclusion of Scylla's tale, a surprise awaits us. We had left Aeneas (13.730–4) confronting a monster with the face of a maiden, girded about the waist with fierce dogs. But when the account of Ovid's 'Aeneid' resumes, we discover that in reality no monster awaits Aeneas (*Met.* 14.72–7):

mox eadem Teucras fuerat mensura carinas,
nī prius in scopulum, qui nunc quoque saxeus exstat,
transformata foret: scopulum quoque nauita uitat.
Hunc ubi Troianae remis auidamque Charybdin
euicere rates, cum iam prope litus adessent
Ausonium, Libycas uento referuntur ad oras.

She also would have drowned the Trojan ships had she not beforehand been transformed into a rock, which still now stands there: sailors avoid the rock too. When the Trojan ships had passed it and greedy Charybdis, and when they had almost reached the Ausonian shore, they were carried back by the wind to the coast of Libya.

Scylla would have sunk the Trojan ships if she had not previously been changed into a cliff, a cliff that exists even now. It is a cliff that Aeneas finds himself required to confront, not the mythological monster that the reader expected from the previous book. Why this surprise? As a perplexed Bömer asks (1986: 29), 'how should we understand the fact that Scylla is still in business at the time of Aeneas' landing, but at his departure has been turned to stone?'

Naturally we look for an answer in Virgil's *Aeneid*. This is the subject of the Ovidian 'Aeneid': Virgil tells us a story, Ovid a

text—not (only) the journey of a character, but of a reader. And so let us see how things stand in the *Aeneid*.

In the *Aeneid* Scylla makes her first appearance in the prophecy of Helenus. And she is a monster, indeed she is precisely the monster of whom Ovid speaks in *Met.* 12.730–4 (*Aen.* 3.420–32):

dextrum Scylla latus, laeuum implacata Charybdis
obsidet . . .

at Scyllam caecis cohibet spelunca latebris
ora exsertantem et nauis in saxa trahentem.
prima hominis facies et pulchro pectore uirgo
pube tenus, postrema immani corpore pistrix
delphinum caudas utero commissa luporum.
praestat Trinacrii metas lustrare Pachyni
cessantem, longos et circumflectere cursus,
quam semel informem uasto uidisse sub antro
Scyllam et caeruleis canibus resonantia saxa.

Now Scylla holds the right coast, insatiable Charybdis the left . . . But a cavern with blind retreats contains Scylla, who thrusts out her mouths and drags ships upon the rocks. Above she is a maiden with a human face and lovely breast down to her loins; underneath she is a monster with a huge body, joining dolphins' tails to her wolves' womb. It is better to go slow around the point of Trinacrian Pachynum and to bend your course around the long route than once to behold misshapen Scylla in her vast cavern and the rocks that echo with her sea-green dogs.

But matters are complicated when Aeneas then actually encounters her (*Aen.* 3.555–60):

et gemitum ingentem pelagi pulsataque saxa
audimus longe fractasque ad litora uoces,
exsultantque uada atque aestu miscentur harenae.
et pater Anchises 'nimirum hic illa Charybdis:
hos Helenus scopulos, haec saxa horrenda canebat.
eripite, o socii, pariterque insurgite remis'.

And far away we hear the mighty moan of the sea and pounded stones and voices broken at the shore; the shoals leap out and the sands mingle with the surge. And father Anchises cries, 'Surely here is Charybdis; these are

the crags, these the fearful rocks that Helenus predicted. Save yourselves, comrades, and rise as one on the oars.'

To be sure, Helenus spoke also of cliffs, of 'Scylla . . . who drags ships upon the rocks' (*Scyllam . . . nauis in saxa trahentem*, 3.425), and of 'the rocks that echo with her sea-green dogs' (*caeruleis canibus resonantia saxa*, 3.432). Anchises can see these cliffs and understands, even through the great crashing, that they are the cliffs where Scylla nests: 'these the fearful rocks that Helenus predicted.' It might be so; that is, Virgil's reader is not bound to worry about it: Aeneas draws near to Scylla, but though he doesn't see her directly, realizes it, and steers away.

However, there are readers, and then there are readers. There could be a reader who would read Anchises' words and recall that the two monsters in question, Scylla and Charybdis, were nothing more than mythological personifications of two natural phenomena, a whirlpool and cliffs dangerous to those navigating the Strait of Messina.⁹ This reader could think, then, that Aeneas' fleet is not in fact encountering either the monster Scylla or the monster Charybdis, but instead is encountering the cliffs called 'Scylla' and the whirlpool 'Charybdis': 'This whirlpool is what Helenus prophesied, calling it Charybdis; these cliffs are what Helenus prophesied, calling them Scylla'. This would be the sense of the words of Anchises, a good interpreter of Helenus' prophecy. Furthermore, an exegesis of this type is attested in Servius.¹⁰

Ovid wanted to read the Virgilian encounter of Aeneas with Scylla precisely in this way, somewhat mischievously. When Aeneas encounters Scylla in the *Metamorphoses*, she had already become a rock, the same rock that still exists today. She had already been 'transformed' into a rock. About this second metamorphosis Ovid says nothing,

⁹ Cf. e.g. Sall. fr. 4.27 Maur.; Serv. *Aen.* 3.420.

¹⁰ Serv. *Aen.* 3.559 HAEC SAXA HORRENDA CANEBAT *rettulit se ad historiam: nam pro Scylla 'saxa' dixit 'horrenda'*; similarly Pinotti (*Enc. Virg.* 4.726): 'Aeneas [in 200–1 *uos et Scyllaeam rabiem penitusque sonantis | accestis scopulos*] and his father [...] seem to become the spokespersons, so to speak, for the nationalistic explanations of the danger of Scylla'. The agreement between the ancient exegesis attested in Servius and the one suggested by Ovid fits into a pattern of analogies upon which I dwell elsewhere (2003 and 2004).

which is a somewhat sly means of alluding to the fact that in reality no metamorphosis ever took place, neither of maiden into monster nor of monster into rock. The only thing that has happened is a poetic personification.

Exactly then as in the case of a mischievous reading of the *Aeneid*, in the *Metamorphoses* an expectation is created for an encounter of Aeneas with a monster that will never appear. After the description of the monster (*Aen.* 3.424–32, *Met.* 13.730–4), there follows the encounter of Aeneas with a rock. First the ‘poetic’ description, then the reality. Accordingly, it will not be by chance that the description of the monster in *Met.* 13.730–4 contains the following clarification (733–4): *si non omnia uates | ficta reliquerunt*. The allusion to the fact that the metamorphosis of Scylla could be nothing more than a poetic fiction sounds more appropriate than ever: what Aeneas will encounter will be nothing more than a simple rock.

But that is not all. In the *Aeneid* who took on the task of providing the poetic, mythical, and finally ‘false’ description of the monster Scylla? It was not Virgil’s voice that uttered those phrases that Ovid, in his own ‘false’ description, cited practically word for word. It was the voice of Helenus, the seer Helenus. In other words, Helenus the *uates*. Immediately after completing his ‘false’ description, Helenus continued his speech (*Aen.* 3.433–4): *praeterea, si qua est Heleno prudentia uati, | si qua fides, animum si ueris implet Apollo . . .* ‘Furthermore, if there be any prudence in Helenus the seer, if there be any trust, if Apollo fills his soul with truth . . .’ For the mischievous (or attentive?) reader of the *Aeneid* there is no reason to place much trust in the truthfulness of this *uates*.

3. DIDO: OTHER VOICES

The story of Aeneas and Dido is dispatched in four verses, four verses in Carthage for four books of Virgil (*Met.* 14.78–81):

Excipit Aenean illic animoque domoque,
non bene discidium Phrygii latura mariti,

Sidonis, inque pyra sacri sub imagine facta
incubuit ferro, deceptaque decipit omnes.¹¹

There the Sidonian woman received Aeneas in her heart and in her home, doomed not to bear well the departure of her Phrygian husband. On a pyre made under pretence of a sacred rite, she fell upon his sword and, herself cheated, she cheated all.

I am not interested in discussing here the anti-Augustan Ovid or the anti-Virgilian Ovid; I am interested in Ovid the (literary) critic of Virgil. I am concerned to place Ovid in the stream of criticism that eventually arrives at the *Further Voices* of Oliver Lyne (1987). It is nevertheless a line of criticism that certainly has a political dimension, which could easily be defined as ‘anti-Augustan’. We could imagine that Virgil would have been a bit embarrassed if Lyne had had Augustus read his study of *Further Voices in Virgil’s Aeneid*. Likewise, Ovid’s version of the story of Aeneas does not aim so much at being different from Virgil’s, to show that Ovid has a different political attitude, or that Virgil’s approach was unacceptable. Ovid’s version of Aeneas’ story is an unsettling reading of the *Aeneid*, an anti-Augustan reading that aims at implicating Virgil himself in the charge of anti-Augustanism.¹²

Ovid’s ‘Aeneid’ is a critical reading of Virgil’s, but an unsettling one, unsettling for everyone, but above all for Virgil. That in the

¹¹ *Deceptaque decipit*: the polyptoton is pungent. For the suicide of Dido as deception, see, for example, *Aen.* 4.675 (Anna speaking) *me fraude petebas*? For the narrating voice of the *Metamorphoses* to describe Dido as *decepta* constitutes a startling accommodation of Dido’s point of view to the objectivity of epic; cf. *Aen.* 4.330 *non equidem omnino capta ac deserta uiderer* and *Ov. Her.* 7.69 (Knox 1995: 105). In Dido’s speech to Anna at *Aen.* 4.17, *deceptam* referring to Dido ‘cheated’ by the death of Sychaeus is tragically ironic. But perhaps in this case too Ovid wants to note that again he has been preceded in this formulation by Virgil: the polyptoton *decepta decipit* alludes to the fact that in Virgil’s account ‘deceptions’ are attributed both to Aeneas and Dido by means of the same word (*doli*): 296 *at regina dolos (quis fallere possit amantem?) | praesensit . . .* (cf. also the problematic *doli* of Venus and Juno at 4.128); and 563 (Mercury speaking) *illa dolos dirumque nefas in pectore uersat | certa mori*. But actually Mercury’s very words are a deception, for Dido is not planning to attack Aeneas and, to be precise, the only ‘deception’ will be her suicide.

¹² See Knox (1995: 23–4) on *Her.* 7: ‘The so-called “negative” reading of the *Aeneid* associated with modern criticism began almost simultaneously with the release of the poem . . . Ovid is not interested in re-creating a Dido of his own; he is interested in Virgil’s Dido.’ On Ovid as a pessimistic critic of Virgil, see now Thomas (2001) 74–83.

Aeneid there were 'other voices' than the one we call 'Augustan', Ovid will argue explicitly and directly to Augustus in his handbook on reading, *Tristia* 2 (533–6):

et tamen ille tuae felix Aeneidos auctor
contulit in Tyrios arma uirumque toros,
nec legitur pars ulla magis de corpore toto,
quam non legitimo foedere iunctus amor.

And yet that fortunate author of your *Aeneid* brought his 'arms and the man' to a Tyrian couch, and no part of the whole work is read more than the love affair joined by an illicit bond.

It is not the epic voice alone: Dido is one of the scandals of the *Aeneid*. This is an extraneous section: it is anthologized and read separately, and so it distracts from the more Augustan parts. It violates the genre: *arma uirumque*, the epic, is contaminated with erotic poetry. As Barchiesi (1993: 169 = 2001: 93) puts it, 'these lines are a tendentious, but also meticulous, reading of the *Aeneid*; *arma uirumque* at once recalls both the proem—and hence, the epic poem in general—and the scene in which the hero and his arms are physically framed in Dido's bedroom (4.495 *arma uiri, thalamo...*).'¹³ A meticulous reading: in that case let's have another look at that love *non legitimo foedere iunctus*. Even a glance at the Virgilian bibliography reveals that a hotbed of 'other voices' resides precisely in this *foedus*, which is illegitimate to be sure, but is also betrayed by the pious Aeneas. When, in fact, does Virgil mention that those hero's arms were in Dido's bedchamber? When Dido takes them to commit suicide. And, if we want to be punctilious, there will indeed come a moment in which the arms of Aeneas, and Aeneas himself, in the form of a likeness, will in effect climb in *Tyrios... toros*: *Aen.* 4.507–8 *super exuias ensemque relictum | effigiemque toro locat* 'on the couch above she sets the clothes and the sword he left and his effigy.'

By characterizing the love of Aeneas and Dido as *non legitimo foedere iunctus*, Ovid turns against Aeneas (and Augustus and Virgil) the essential point around which the 'Augustan' reading of *Aen.* 4 revolves: the marriage of Aeneas and Dido was not a true one (and

¹³ See further Barchiesi (1993) 18–19, and on the sword of Aeneas see also Lyne (1987) 22.

so Aeneas is right, and with him the Augustan readers). But *precisely for this reason* Aeneas (and Virgil) have committed a scandalous fault. Here Ovid (unlike in *Her.* 7 and *Met.* 13, as we shall soon see) focalizes the narrative through the point of view of Aeneas, but the adoption of Aeneas' point of view serves to put in a bad light this thoroughly Augustan hero.

And so let us look at the Dido episode in Ovid's 'Aeneid': let us look at it as a chapter in Ovid's assessment of the unsettling voices of the *Aeneid*: *excipit Aenean illic animoque domoque...* Everyone recognizes here the echo of *Aen.* 4.373–4:

'Nusquam tuta fides. eiectione litore, egentem,
excepi et regni demens in parte locaui'.¹⁴

Nowhere is trust certain. When he was cast out on the shore, in want, I received him and in my madness placed him in a share of my kingdom.

Actually this is not simply an echo of the *Aeneid*, it is an echo of words that in the *Aeneid* belong not to the epic voice, but to the antagonistic voice of Dido. What in the *Aeneid* amounted to conceding a creditable point of view to a character, the possibility of seeing things from a different perspective, becomes the point of view of the epic text. Ovid says something unsettling, that to yield room to other voices, antagonistic to Aeneas, is risky. Because these voices can be more attractive and convincing than the Augustan voice; they can become the dominant voices. To say that *nec legitur pars ulla magis de corpore toto, | quam non legitimo foedere iunctus amor* (*Trist.* 2.535–6) also amounts to saying that more than any other section of the poem called the 'Aeneid', the public reads a section of which a large part is taken up by shameful insults directed at Aeneas.

In *Met.* 14.79 *non bene discidium Phrygii latura mariti*, even the expression *Phrygius maritus* to indicate Aeneas is taken directly from the fourth book of the *Aeneid*. But who uses it? Who utters the phrase? It is Juno's: *liceat Phrygio seruire marito...* (*Aen.* 4.103). 'A venomous line, for *Phrygius* is often a term of contempt used by the enemies of Troy and *seruire* implies the abjectness of Dido's love' (Austin ad loc.). How can Bömer (1986: 31) so blandly assert that 'in Ovid there is no

¹⁴ Compare Dido's words at *Her.* 7.89–90, *fluctibus eiectione tuta statione recepi | uixque bene audito nomine regna dedi*.

negative undertone'?¹⁵ The voice of the principal opponent of Aeneas and his mission becomes the 'official' voice of the text.

Virgil has brought *arma uirumque*, the epic, in *Tyrios toros*: he has contaminated the epic. And to say that Dido is 'destined not to well endure the *discidium* of her Phrygian husband' is certainly not a very epic way of presenting the situation: the phrase *non bene...latura* recalls *moritura* which is repeatedly referred to Dido (*Aen.* 4.308, 415, 519, 604). On the contrary, *non bene discidium...latura* brings to mind the opening of an elegy: Tib. 1.5.1 *bene discidium me ferre loquebar*. And this could be more than a casual echo, for Tib. 1.5 is an elegy that could, for a malicious reader, present some traits similar to Dido's situation. Consider for example verses 9–18, in which Tibullus complains that by his prayers he snatched from death the sick woman who now reveals herself to be ungrateful, just as Dido reproaches Aeneas for the help she offered him. Not only an elegiac voice, then, but an unsettling voice. The *discidium* of Delia, in fact had little fatal consequence: 1.5.17–18 *omnia (sc. uota) persolui: fruitur nunc alter amore, | et precibus felix utitur ille meis* 'I paid them all, and now someone else enjoys my love and that lucky man profits from my prayers'. Delia has abandoned Tibullus for a new lover, a *diues amator*, an idea that is perhaps somehow evoked also in the elegiac voice of Dido: *Her.* 7.17 *scilicet alter amor tibi restat et altera Dido* 'evidently another love awaits you and another Dido'.¹⁶

Ovid devotes four verses to the fourth book of the *Aeneid* (14.78–81); then the summary of Aeneas' wanderings follows rapidly until he lands at Pithecusa. Here ten verses (91–100) are devoted to the account of the metamorphosis of the inhabitants of the island, the Cercopes, into monkeys, whence the name Pithecusa. Of course, the story is completely absent from Virgil's *Aeneid*, but, as Galinsky (1975: 223–4) rightly notes, Ovid does not limit himself to

¹⁵ Lamacchia (1969) 7 is better: Ovid adopts the expression 'to express the point of view of the deluded Dido'. This is right; the entire verse is focalized through Dido: on *discidium* cf. *OLD* s.v. 2b in the sense of 'divorce'. This is how Dido sees her relationship with Aeneas. Therefore, if *discidium* signifies 'divorce', the termination of a marriage, it cries out the point of view of Dido; on the other hand, if *discidium* is a 'breaking off' in the elegiac sense, it recalls a too human precedent. Either Aeneas has married Dido, or he has abandoned her in the elegiac manner for an *alter amor*.

¹⁶ The text is corrupt: with Rosati (1989) and Knox (1995), I print the reconstruction proposed by Diggle (1967) 138. See Knox's apparatus and his note ad loc.

emphasizing the theme of metamorphosis, he inserts into the story 'a moral note that is far more typical of Vergil than of the *Metamorphoses*'. In fact, in the version of the myth followed or invented by Ovid, the transformation of the Cercopes into monkeys is motivated by Jupiter's wish to punish them for perjuries and deceptions: 'he is a highly moral and awesome Jupiter at that'. Now why this metamorphosis and why this moral note, with a 'Virgilian Jupiter' who punishes those guilty of perjury and deception? If we recall that this is the first inserted narrative that follows on the summary of the book about Dido *decepta*, perhaps the answer is already grasped (*Met.* 14.91–2):

quippe deum genitor, fraudem et periuria quondam
Cercopum exosus gentisque admissa dolosae...

For the father of the gods, hating the fraud and the *perjuries* of the Cercopes and crimes of that *treacherous race*...

How can we not recall *Aen.* 4.296 *at regina dolos...* or the words of Dido (4.541–2), *necdum | Laomedontae sentis periuria gentis* 'do you not yet understand the perjuries of Laomedon's race'? And another voice is added (*Met.* 14.98–9): *nec non prius abstulit usum | uerborum et natae dira in periuria linguae* 'and first he took away from them the use of words and a tongue made for dreadful perjuries'. It is the voice of the elegiac Dido (*Her.* 7.67): *protinus occurrent falsae periuria linguae* 'the perjuries of your lying tongue will immediately come to mind'.¹⁷

4. TURNUS: OTHER VOICES

Aeneas finally reaches Latium (*Met.* 14.449–51):

... Faunigenaeque domo potitur nataque Latini,
non sine Marte tamen: bellum cum gente feroci
suscipitur, pactaque furit pro coniuge Turnus.

¹⁷ In light of the possible, implied analogy between the perjurious Aeneas and the Cercopes transformed into monkeys, I cannot refrain from thinking of the parodic representation of Aeneas, Anchises, and Ascanius as *monkeys* (or perhaps, dogs) in a famous Pompeian painting: cf. Galinsky (1969a) 32, fig. 30 and Canciani (1981), according to whom they are represented as dogs.

...and he takes possession of the house and daughter of Latinus, but not without warfare. War with a fierce race is begun and Turnus rages for his promised bride.

The phrase *bellum cum gente feroci | suscipitur* echoes a version of the war in Latium that is very 'Augustan' and equally concise: Jupiter's prophecy to Venus at *Aen.* 1.263–4 *bellum ingens geret Italia populosque ferocis | contundet* 'he shall wage war tremendous in Italy and crush fierce peoples'.¹⁸ The voice of the epic narrator could, with complete legitimacy, borrow from Jupiter's prophetic voice, as well as taking it as a model of concision. But the problem is that alongside this most authoritative borrowing are other borrowings from other voices of a much different authority.

In the first place, *potitur*. Aeneas 'takes possession of the house and daughter of Latinus'. Not only is this a somewhat abrupt manner of presenting things.¹⁹ Virgil uses the form *potitur* twice in the *Aeneid*. The first time, the epic narrator is speaking about the infamous Polymestor, who treacherously kills Polydorus and 'violently takes possession (*potitur*) of the gold' (3.55–6). The second time *potitur* occurs in reference to Aeneas, as here in Ovid, and in a reference to Aeneas taking possession of a woman, in the words of another enemy of the Trojans, Iarbas (*Aen.* 4.214–16):

et nunc ille Paris cum semiuiro comitatu,
Maeonia mentum mitra crinemque madentem
subnexus, rapto *potitur*...

And now that second Paris with his crew of half-men, binding his chin and his dripping hair with a Maeonian ribbon, takes possession of his plunder...

The action of Aeneas in Latium, his 'taking possession' of Lavinia, is described in the epic voice of the *Metamorphoses* borrowing the word that Aeneas' enemy Iarbas used in the *Aeneid* to describe Aeneas'

¹⁸ Here too *cum gente* could be an 'etymological' echo of *ingens*.

¹⁹ *Faunigenae* 'refers also to the oracle so decisive for events in Latium' (Galasso 2000: 1529), but the reference to the fatal oracle clashes stridently with the action of *potiri*: we expect Latinus, the son of Faunus, to offer his daughter to Aeneas, as in *Aen.* 7, not that Aeneas takes possession of her.

action at Carthage, his 'taking possession' of Dido in the guise of the new Paris.²⁰

And as we know, in Virgil's *Aeneid*, Aeneas will again be identified in Latium with Paris the abductor of women: just as he took possession of Dido as a new Paris, so he takes possession of Lavinia, again as a new Paris and again, naturally, from the point of view of Aeneas' enemies. We come, then, to Turnus, who, in Ovid and according to the epic voice, 'rages for his promised bride'. In the *Aeneid* it is never said explicitly that Lavinia was officially promised to Turnus. Not by Virgil's voice, I mean to say, since we know that there is another voice, Juno's, which puts things in a different light (*Aen.* 10.77–9):

'quid face Troianos atra uim ferre Latinis,
arua aliena iugo premere atque auertere praedas?
quid soceros legere et gremiis abducere pactas...'²¹

What do you say of the Trojans' attack on the Latins with their dark torches, what of their pressing others' land with the plough, of their taking plunder? What of their choosing their fathers-in-law and kidnapping betrothed women from their mothers' bosom...?

The hostile voices of the *Aeneid* become the epic voice. Iarbas' point of view and Juno's, which agree in advancing an identification of Aeneas with Paris, the abductor of women, are assumed as its own by the narrating voice of the *Metamorphoses*.

5. THE END OF THE AENEID: ARDEA

After the episode of the ships of Aeneas (*Met.* 14.526–65), Ovid's 'Aeneid' swiftly draws to an end (*Met.* 14.572–80):

tandemque Venus uictricia nati
arma uidet, Turnusque cadit: cadit Ardea, Turno
sospite dicta potens; quem postquam barbarus ensis
abstulit et tepida latuerunt tecta fauilla,

²⁰ In a wonderfully ironic piece of retaliation, in *Fast.* 3.552 it will be Iarbas himself who will formally take possession of Dido's house: *et potitur capta Maurus Iarba domo*.

²¹ Lundström (1980) 57–8. As is known, Juno's version coincides with Livy's (1.2.1): *Turnus rex Rutulorum cui pacta Lavinia ante aduentum Aeneae fuerat...*

congerie e media tum primum cognita praepes
 subuolat et cineres plausis euerberat alis.
 et sonus et macies et pallor et omnia, captam
 quae deceant urbem, nomen quoque mansit in illa
 urbis, et ipsa suis deplangitur Ardea pennis.

And finally Venus sees her son's arms victorious and Turnus falls. Ardea falls, called powerful when Turnus was safe. After the barbarian sword killed him and his home lay hidden by warm ashes, from the midst of the pile a bird flew forth, recognized then for the first time, and beat the ashes with its flapping wings. Its sound, its thinness, its pallor, all things which become a captured city, even the city's name remained in it, and Ardea is itself lamented by its wings.

And so, immediately before the apotheosis of Aeneas (14.581–608), ends the 'Aeneid' of Ovid. The pious Aeneas, forgetting his fated mission, takes Ardea, the city of Turnus, and destroys it, burns it, razes it to the ground. *Tepida latuerunt tecta fauilla* (575); of the powerful city of Ardea there remain only ashes and shapeless ruins. Since Ovid's poem does *not* end here, Ovid would have had an excellent opportunity to 'correct' the Virgilian scandal of the end of the *Aeneid* with Turnus killed by Aeneas, by supplementing the *Aeneid* with a more conciliatory conclusion. In effect, Ovid does supplement the end of the *Aeneid* in a certain sense: Virgil's *Aeneid* ends, in the text of the *Metamorphoses*, at 14.573–5 (the death of Turnus, on which see below), but Ovid continues. He continues, indeed, with the destruction of the Turnus' city, Ardea. A metamorphosis now closes the 'Aeneid', appropriately, but the end point remains an act of destruction. Ovid supplies a truly Virgilian sequel to the plot of the *Aeneid*. In *Aen.* 12.930–8, Turnus, wounded and suppliant, had begged Aeneas to spare him, invoking his old father Daunus, or at least to restore his body to his people: 'do not press on your hatred' (*ulterius ne tende odiis*, 938). Turnus suggested an Iliadic sequel to the story: *Iliad* 24 and the meeting of Priam and Achilles. The Ovidian Aeneas seems to act precisely on the basis of this prayer by Turnus, by rejecting it. Aeneas' deadly anger is not satisfied with the death of Turnus, Aeneas *ulterius tendit odiis*: he goes to Ardea, old Daunus' city, and, far from humanely returning Turnus' corpse, he destroys the city.

To annihilate a city is certainly a very debatable way of fulfilling the mandate that Virgil's Anchises had entrusted to the Augustan hero: *paci . . . imponere morem* (*Aen.* 6.852), just as killing the unarmed Turnus was a very debatable way of *parcere subiectis et debellare superbos*. In his note on *Aen.* 7.412, Servius commits a significant lapse when he remarks that in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid told of Ardea 'burned by Hannibal'.²² But again what matters is not so much the Ovidian 'Aeneid' *per se*: Ovid's Aeneas is different from Virgil's, so Ovid has a different ideological vision from Virgil's. What matters is Ovid's 'Aeneid' as a *reading* of Virgil's. Now it would seem possible to assert that Virgil says nothing about the destruction of Ardea by Aeneas. But is it really so? Many things can be said even by saying nothing; or rather, even one who says nothing can be made to say many things.

Ovid's 'Aeneid' closes with the death of Turnus and the destruction of Ardea. Virgil's *Aeneid* spoke of Ardea just before introducing Turnus for the first time in the poem (*Aen.* 7.411–13): *locus Ardea quondam | dictus auis, et nunc magnum manet Ardea nomen, | sed fortuna fuit* 'There was once a place called Ardea by our ancestors, and still today Ardea remains a great name, but its power is gone'. Ovid's 'version' amounts to a critical reading of this passage, in which a comment is made on *sed fortuna fuit*: why? Why did Ardea's power disappear? Virgil doesn't say, but Ovid does: because Aeneas, pious Aeneas, destroyed it. Ovid's reading transforms *sed fortuna fuit* from 'a romantic poetic recollection of the glorious poetic past of a city among the most powerful of archaic Latium' (*Enc. Virg.* 1.301–2) into a sinister and ominous allusion. Ovid's reading suggests (or allows us to understand) that when Allecto goes to Turnus in Ardea, Virgil is already forecasting the destruction of Ardea by Aeneas. Ovid recovers the allusion to a 'glorious past', to faded power, but explains it: *cadit Ardea Turno | sospite dicta potens . . . | . . . tepida latuerunt tecta fauilla*. Virgil's silence on the reason for *fortuna fuit* becomes a noisy, unsettling *reticence*. The grammatical parallel, diligently cited by commentators, between *fortuna fuit* and the words of Aeneas in 2.325 (*fuimus*

²² 'Rome is witness (rather it is practically always the cause) to the fall and sometimes the annihilation of numerous cities, great and small. But the cultural ideal of *humanitas* [...] ought to render ambiguous the spectacle of an enemy city in flames, injecting doubt into the ferocious joy of the conqueror' (Labate 1991: 168).

Troes, fuit Ilium) could become uncomfortably significant: the sudden destruction of Troy is destined to repeat itself through Ardea, and its agent will be the very exile whose story had moved us in the second book of the *Aeneid*.

In Ovid's 'Aeneid', from the ashes of Ardea is born a bird never seen before, which by its cry, by its leanness, and by its ashen colour is well adapted to the ruined city and preserves its name: it is the *ardea*, the heron (14.576–80). This miraculous birth is not attested elsewhere. Naturally, Virgil makes no reference to the heron, but he does allude to the etymology of Ardea from *ardua*, as already Servius explains: '*magnum manet*²³ *Ardea nomen*: a good allusion, for Ardea comes from *ardua*, i.e. great and noble'.²⁴ According to Virgil, for Ardea 'no longer powerful' (a euphemism for 'destroyed', according to Ovid's interpretation) *manet*... *nomen* of 'lofty'; according to Ovid, for the bird that rose from the ashes of the city, *nomen*... *mansit* of the city.

It's been said that Virgil makes no reference to the heron, but are we really sure of that? It would seem so: according to an orthodox reading, there is no mention of birds. But Ovid was not an orthodox reader and if we reread the passage of the *Aeneid* with eyes much less orthodox, perhaps a bird will appear (*Aen.* 7.411–12): *locus Ardea quondam | dictus AVIS*... 'There was once a place called Ardea by our ancestors', but also 'there was once a place called "Ardea the bird"'. I do not say that in Virgil's text *there is* this double sense of *avis*; I say that a 'perverse' reader, who leaves out the different quantity of the termination *-is*, could see it.

This is provable. Two examples. In his apparatus Heyne (1833: III, 59) asks: '*Locus Ardea quondam Dictus avis*; is *avis* here 'ancestors'? Or is *Ardea avis*? With the result that the city is called Ardea, a bird (cf. *Ge.* I, 364) by name'. Heyne inclines toward the first

²³ Thus MV: Servius reads *tenet* of M²R; note *Ov. Met.* 14.579 *mansit*.

²⁴ Perhaps it would be better to interpret simply 'lofty'; cf. also immediately after, 413 *tectis hic Turnus in altis* and above all *Geo.* 1.364 *altam supra uolat ardea nubem*, with Servius ad loc. In Ovid, *dicta potens* (574) alluded to the Virgilian etymology of Ardea from *ardua*. Then since for the heron the *nomen*... *mansit* of the city burned, the suspicion arises that Ovid wants to suggest a new etymological motivation: after *fauilla* (575), after *cineres* (577), *ARDEa* from *ARDEo*.

hypothesis and notes, 'In my opinion this second sense, that *Ardea avis* is connected, is somewhat silly'.²⁵

In discussing *Aen.* 7.411–13, Frederick Ahl notes that *ardea* is also the name of a bird (which among other things Virgil knew well, as can be seen from *Geo.* 1.364), and, even without taking Ovid into account or the etymological connections that were made between Ardea and the *ardea*, he concludes, without excessive scruples (1985: 265, n. 29): 'As a result we should be a little suspicious of Vergil's reasons for describing Turnus' city of ARDEa as *locus*... *quondam | dictus AVIS* in *Aeneid* 7.411 f.: since AVIS (in Latin) means either "by one's forebears" or "a bird"'.²⁶

We have tried to show that, in *Met.* 14.572–80, Ovid creates a critical discourse on *Aen.* 7.411–13, a rather unsettling one for Virgil. It is also quite probable that Ovid (like Heyne and Ahl) saw a bird in the Virgilian passage (Hardie 1992: 77, n. 16; Dyson 1997: 315, n. 3). In that case, what value, what meaning would he have given to this presence? In light of Ovid's discourse on the destruction of Ardea, the etymology of *ardea avis* that Virgil possibly suggests for the city comes to acquire a particular emphasis. At the same time as he alludes to the etymology of Ardea from *ardua*, Virgil would also be alluding to *another* etymology of the name of the city, of *Ardea* from *avis ardea*. But if the place had been called '*avis ardea*', that would mean that, according to Virgil, the bird was not born from the ashes of the ruined city, since clearly it existed already, having given its name to the place.

Servius attests for us that Hyginus (noted Virgilian critic and friend of Ovid)²⁷ gave a different explanation of the origin of the name Ardea: Ardea is so called because it is *ardua*, 'even if Hyginus, in his work on the cities of Italy (Hyg. fr. 15 Fun., fr. 11 P.) maintains that Ardea was so called following an augury provided by a heron'. Virgil could have known this etymology and alluded to it in 7.411–12; or alternatively, it might be possible that this etymology originated from

²⁵ Cf. Conington (1883) III, 43: 'some have fancied that "avis" here means a bird'.

²⁶ Cf. also O'Hara (1996a) 190; Dyson (1997) 314–15; and, more cautiously, Horsfall (2000) 282.

²⁷ For a coincidence between an exegesis of Virgil attested in Ovid and one in Hyginus, see Casali (2004) 45–8. On Hyginus, see Timpanaro (1986) 51–67, (2001) 13–23, and Kaster (1995) 205–14.

his own text. Given Hyginus' interest in Virgilian exegesis, it is in fact possible that his etymologizing of Ardea was suggested to him by an 'ornithological' exegesis of this passage on *Ardea* . . . | *avis* in *Aen.* 7.411–12.

In any case, at this point we may suggest that Ovid not only develops the ornithological etymology of Ardea suggested by Virgil's text, but makes a polemical *correction*. Ovid says that the bird is the product of the *destruction* of the city, and he is quite precise in this regard (576–7): *congerie e media* tum primum cognita *praepes* | *subuolat*. It was not the place that was named from the bird, but the bird from the place. Hyginus' explanation (certainly) and Virgil's (if interpreted 'perversely') is impossible, Ovid says, because the bird did not exist before the destruction of the city. This is a way of insinuating that Hyginus' (and Virgil's) version is nothing more than an 'accommodation', a version originated to cover up an uncomfortable and unsettling truth: the destruction of Ardea by the pious Aeneas.²⁸

6. THE END OF THE AENEID: TURNUS

'Poetry is the foreknowledge of criticism.' Paul De Man

A final word on the ends of the two Aeneids. Aeneas' murder of Turnus, now a suppliant and unarmed, has been and remains one of the most debated interpretative problems of Virgilian criticism. In the finale of the *Aeneid* many have seen the failure and defeat of what Aeneas owed to *paci* . . . *imponere morem*, | *parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* (6.852–3). The non-Augustan reader who more than any other has framed this antagonistic mode of reading the ending of the *Aeneid* is Michael Putnam. At the end, Putnam asks (1972: 67), 'does Aeneas act the part of civilizer or *barbarian* (my emphasis)?' Ovid had already asked the same question, and had also given the same

²⁸ On Ovid as an interpreter of Virgilian etymologies, see O'Hara (1996b, = ch. 5 above). This would be an example of a category not envisioned by O'Hara: not 'Virgil alludes, Ovid explains' (1996b: 263–73), but 'Virgil alludes, Ovid denies'.

identical response (*Met.* 14.574–5): . . . *quem* [sc. *Turnum*] *postquam barbarus ensis* | *abstulit* . . .²⁹ The problem is not (only) whether with this Ovid was being anti-Augustan. What Ovid says is that this reading might be a *possible*, albeit unsettling, reading of the end of the *Aeneid*.³⁰ No one will deny that he was also a good prophet.³¹

²⁹ This is also an obvious reversal of Tibullus 2.5.48, where the Sibyl prophesies to Aeneas himself the death of Turnus with this apostrophe: *iam, tibi praedico*, *barbare Turne, necem*. Perhaps the Sibyl is speaking as a Greek, but the implications don't change: '*barbare*, i.e. "cruel, savage"' (Smith 1913: ad loc.). Cf. also Murgatroyd (1994) 198: 'Also possible is the translation "fierce, savage" (...) which (...) would imply that Aeneas brought civilization to Italy'.

³⁰ On attempts at 'textual cleansing' (for the concept, see Thomas 2001: 190–221) in *Met.* 14.573, cf. Bömer ad loc., who in turn tries to neutralize *barbarus ensis* by saying that 'here in epic poetry *barbarus* is morally indifferent'. Tarrant (2004) prints the variant *quam postquam barbarus ignis*, which is also possible, and has the merit of preserving *barbarus* against, e.g., *Dardanus* (Heinsius); in favour of *quem* . . . *ensis*, see Junod (1991) 73–4; Galasso (2000) 1538–9; Thomas (2001) 83.

³¹ This article has been revised and corrected, with an updated bibliography. I am grateful to Alessandro Barchiesi, Andrea Cucchiarelli, Luigi Galasso, Mario Labate, Oliver Lyne, and Gianpiero Rosati, who provided valuable assistance for the first version. Thereafter I have received fundamental encouragement and help from Peter Knox and Richard Thomas, to whom I am deeply grateful. Unfortunately, in the meantime, Oliver Lyne has left us: this paper, which owes so much to his teaching, is respectfully dedicated to his memory.