Classical Quarterly 62.2 705–720 (2012) Printed in Great Britain
doi: 10.1017/S0009838812000262

MOURNING EURYALUS: THREE NOTES ON *AENEID* 9[1]

9.471 *SIMUL ORA ... MOVEBANT*

Nisus and Euryalus carve a bloody swathe before they fall. At dawn, Turnus and his lieutenants stir the anger of the Rutulians (463–72):

> aeratasque acies in proelia cogunt,
> quisque suos, variisque acuunt rumoribus iras.
> quin ipsa arrectis (visu miserabile) in hastis
> praefigunt capita et multo clamore sequuntur
> Euryali et Nisi.
> Aeneadae duri murorum in parte sinistra
> opposuere aciem (nam dextera cingitur amni),
> ingentisque tenent fossas et turribus altis
> stant maesti; simul ora virum praefixa movebant
> nota nimis miseris atroquo fluentia tabo.
>
> 471 movebant MR : videbant P

The vulgate text had *videbant* in 471. Nicolaus Heinsius championed *movebant*, and later editors have followed his lead. So constituted, the line is grammatically ambiguous – *simul* might be either an adverb or a conjunction, *ora* either the subject or the object of the verb – but few doubts have disturbed the interpretative tradition. To judge from the remarks of Heinsius,[2] the standard semicolon (or colon) after *maesti*, the acquiescence of the commentators and the artful variations

[1] The following editions and commentaries, all of them useful for establishing the text of Book 9, are cited by the author's last name:
J.L. de la Cerda, *P. Virgilii Maronis Aeneidos Libri Sex Posteriores* (Leiden, 1617; repr. Cologne, 1642)
N. Heinsius: *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera* (Amsterdam, 1664); Heinsius' notes were first published by Burman (q.v.)
P. Burman, *P. Virgilii Maronis Opera*, vol. 3 (Amsterdam, 1746)
C.G. Heyne, *P. Virgilius Maro,* vol. 4 (Leipzig, 1798[3])
O. Ribbeck, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1862)
J. Henry, *Aeneidea*, vol. 3 (Dublin, 1881)
J. Conington, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, vol. 3 (London, 1884[4])
T.E. Page, *The Aeneid of Virgil*, vol. 2 (London, 1900)
R.A.B. Mynors, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford, 1969)
R.D. Williams, *The Aeneid of Virgil*, vol. 2 (London, 1973)
M. Geymonat, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Turin, 1973)
E. Paratore, tr. L. Canali, *Virgilio, Eneide, Volume 5 (Libri IX–X)* (Milan, 1982)
P. Hardie, *Virgil, Aeneid, Book IX* (Cambridge, 1994)
J. Dingel, *Kommentar zum 9. Buch der Aeneis Vergils* (Heidelberg, 1997)
G.B. Conte, *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis* (Berlin, 2005)

[2] 'Non videbant tantum Troes capita Nisi et Euryali praefixa hastis, sed videndo etiam commovebantur et maerebant.' Servius appears to have understood the verse in the same way (n. 7).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of most modern translators, the received sense is 'at the same time the heads … were moving (them).' My object here is to point out a few problems with that interpretation and then, while retaining *movebant*, to propose a different one. The ancient commentator Tiberius Donatus laid the foundation when he took *ora* as the object of *movebant* and *Rutuli* as the unspecified subject. Likewise Paratore and Canali: 'stanno mesti sulle alte torri; | mentre avanzavano le teste confitte dei giovani.'[3]

'They stood sadly on the tall towers; at the same time the heroes' impaled heads' – so Heinsius – 'were moving (them), known only too well to the wretched defenders and dripping with gore.' The first problem there is *simul*, 'at the same time.' In so far as they comment, the commentators say that the adverb 'adds an extra reason for … (the Trojans') despondency, in addition to the siege and the absence of Aeneas.'[4] But the setting discourages a compound sadness. We know from previous indications that the Trojans were in a position to observe, even to hear, what was going on in the enemy camp.[5] We would therefore expect the heads of Nisus and Euryalus – a 'piteous spectacle' (*visu miserabile*) paraded 'with ringing shouts' (*multo clamore*) in the van of the Rutulian host (*sequuntur*) – to have monopolized their attention.[6] As things now stand, though, the beleaguered men manage to miss the heads altogether at first. They are sad, as it were, on principle, and the exhibition of their mutilated comrades affects them only 'at the same time.' That seems improbable. They must be stoical soldiers indeed who, when confronted by such a sight, can contemplate their predicament in purely general terms, let alone direct their thoughts to distant captains. And there are other problems as well. However one chooses to render *movebant* here – 'touched', 'provoked', 'distressed' – the reaction seems unequal to the stimulus as well as inconsistent with the more intense emotion of the following verse, 472 *nota nimis miseris*. We might have expected to supply *iram* as the object of the verb, but are left to supply *eos*, which sits uneasily (though not ungrammatically) with the following dative.

The difficulty would be less if the words *ora virum praefixa* could be taken to refer specifically to the familiar 'faces' or 'features' of the two friends, more plainly visible as the Rutulians continue to advance.[7] In that case, perhaps, Virgil would be subdividing the emotions felt by the Trojans into sadness and pity, with *simul* underscoring the difference: '(having spied the heads) they stood sadly on the towers; at the same time the heroes' impaled expressions were touching (them).' Note, however, (i) the distinction seems too fine to justify *simul*, (ii) it

[3] Whether Donatus (to be distinguished from Aelius Donatus) also understood *simul* as an adverb ('mentre') is unclear, cf. *Interpretationes Vergilianae* 250.30 Georges 'movebant Rutuli occisorum capita, quae Troiani ex notitia agnoscerent et dolerent.'

[4] So Williams, following Conington.

[5] A 'siege-camp', says Hardie on 9.371, cf. 159–60 *vigilum excubiis obsidere portas* | *cura datur Messapo et moenia cingere flammis*, 168, 188–90 *cernis quae Rutulos habeat fiducia rerum:* | *lumina rara micant, somno vinoque soluti* | *procubuere, silent late loca.*

[6] Likewise Paratore: 'Preferirei intendere che la loro mestizia sia ispirata dalla vista delle teste mozze di Eurialo e Niso, di cui si parla subito dopo.' Compare the parallel expression *miseri stant turribus altis* | *nequiquam* at 10.121–2, where the causes of sadness are explicitly stated in the lines preceding, 118–21.

[7] Cf. Servius on 472: '*nota nimis miseris*: hoc plus commovebantur, quoniam etiam abscissi vultus necdum agnitionis amiserant notas.' Henry will have none of it: 'Servius should have known better than to interpret *ora* literally.' Conington cites 8.196–7 *foribusque adfixa superbis* | *ora virum tristi pendebant pallida tabo* (which supports Henry).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

may be doubted whether a distinction is even possible after *praefigunt capita* in 466, *capita* there informing *ora* here, and finally (iii) the dative *miseris* remains awkward. The variant *simul ora ... videbant* would appear to solve all of those problems. Now *simul* is a conjunction:[8] 'they stood sadly … as soon as they saw … the heads.' That gives the sadness its proper cue, but *videbant* is bland and has the look of a simplification. The variant may even have begun its career as a marginal conjecture, offered in the hope of rehabilitating *simul*.

So many roadblocks encourage a different route. Place a full stop after *maesti* and, once again reading *ora ... movebant*, consider whether the poet may not be treating the impaled heads as substitutes for military standards (*signa*): ' … they lined the ramparts and stood sadly on the towers. At the same time, they (i.e. the Rutulians) were advancing the heroes' impaled heads, known only too well to the wretched defenders and dripping with gore.' In that case, the change of subject, though unspecified,[9] would be suggested partly by the change of tense (from present to imperfect), partly by the opposition between stationary defenders (*stant*) and advancing attackers (*movebant*), but mainly by analogy with the phrase *signa movere*, 'to move the standards, begin a march.'[10] There is a crucial corollary in what precedes (465–7): *in hastis | praefigunt capita et multo clamore sequuntur | Euryali et Nisi.*[11] It would not be surprising if the basic image – an army marching behind embellished poles held aloft – had put contemporaries in mind of another set phrase, *signa sequi*, 'to follow the standards, march in order.'[12] Naturally, in so far as that interpretation is plausible, it paves the way for the kindred interpretation of *ora ... movebant* in 471.

The Trojans could not have seen the Rutulians 'moving out' at any great distance, but the two camps, again, were quite close to each other.[13] Virgil employs tactical phrases with *signa* more or less conventionally in the *Aeneid*, despite the anachronism,[14] and twice in a clever, extended sense in the *Georgics*. In Book 4, the timely removal of their commanders' wings prevents bee soldiers from pulling up their standards (107–8):

> non illis quisquam cunctantibus altum
> ire iter aut castris audebit vellere signa.

[8] For *simul* in the sense *simul ac*, cf. *Ecl.* 4.26, *G.* 4.232, *Aen.* 3.630 and, probably, 5.317 (where Virgil may have written something like *simul edita signa*).

[9] For the unspecified change of subject, cf. *Aen.* 2.442–3, 2.484–5 *apparent … penetralia regum | armatosque vident* [*videt* V], 5.223–4, 6.283–4, 7.209–11, 8.544–6, 11.340–1 *genus huic materna superbum | nobilitas dabat, incertum de patre ferebat* [*ferebant* P[1]R, but see *OLD* s.v. *fero* 36.b 'to take, accept (what is offered)'], 12.351–2.

[10] *OLD* s.v. *moveo* 5.b, *TLL* 8.1540.76–80. Cf. Livy 7.34.13, 25.9.1 *quarta vigilia noctis signa movit*, 28.26.11; Ov. *Am.* 2.12.28, *Fast.* 6.764; also Sen. *Phoen.* 390 *aquilaque pugnam signifer mota vocat.*

[11] Heyne speculated that the half-line *Euryali et Nisi* arose from a marginal gloss, but some mention of the heroes is unavoidable here since there is no prior reference to decapitation. Cf. 5.294 *Nisus et Euryalus primi* (another unfinished line).

[12] *OLD* s.v. *sequor* 1.b.

[13] See n. 5.

[14] *Aen.* 10.258 *signa sequantur*, 11.19 *vellere signa*, 517 *conlatis … signis*. At *Aen.* 8.52 *qui regem Evandrum comites, qui signa secuti*, Servius comments 'id est qui regis Evandri signa sunt secuti', whence Conington 'they followed him as their king and general'; these *signa*, though, may rather be 'divine signs', cf. *Aen.* 3.388. The phrase *movent signa* seems to underlie *Aen.* 7.603 *cum prima movent in proelia Martem* (cf. 606 *Parthosque reposcere signa*), but it is hard to say for sure; N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 7* (Leiden, 2000) takes *Martem* to mean *exercitum.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The phrase *signa vellere* is used with its normal implication of leaving camp, but precisely to achieve a piquant effect. In Book 3, after submitting to an austere training regimen, a defeated bull manages to stage a comeback (235–6):

> post ubi collectum robur viresque refectae,
> signa movet praecepsque oblitum fertur in hostem.

Lulled no doubt by the formulaic phrase, the commentators seem to miss the humour. It is not quite true that 'the battle has become a human one.' The bull's 'standards' are his horns, not yet lowered for the decisive charge. Supposing, though, that Virgil might be referring to standards in our passage, it remains unclear why he would have wished to. We want a motive, and preferably a topical motive. If ancient readers caught a reference that later generations missed, the reference most likely depended on circumstances peculiar to the era in which the *Aeneid* was composed, circumstances whose importance would have faded as time went by.

Virgil was sixteen years old when one of the richest men in Rome, undeterred by awful execrations, the hawkings of fig vendors and sensible advice,[15] bore his standards across the Euphrates for a fateful second time. Even the *signa* themselves were reluctant.[16] 'The defeat of Crassus at Carrhae and loss of the standards was deeply traumatic; a modern parallel might be Pearl Harbour, or Sedan.'[17] In Plutarch's detailed account of the battle, Crassus' son Publius dies after leading an ineffectual cavalry assault against the enemy. The Parthians decapitate him, fix his head on a spear (cf. *in hastis* | *praefigunt capita*), raise a terrifying cry (cf. *multo clamore*), and parade him exultantly before his father and the main body of Roman troops, who are accordingly distressed (cf. *stant maesti*).[18] La Cerda remarked these similarities to our episode long ago,[19] but others seem to have gone unnoticed. If the elder Crassus occupies the same position here as Euryalus' mother, elsewhere his situation resembles that of Euryalus' partner. Just as the threat to his beloved pricks Nisus' courage during the night expedition, so the sight of his son's head temporarily emboldens Crassus and wakes him to a sense of his responsibilities as general.[20] Three days after the battle Crassus grimly advances to what he suspects is a treacherous parley. The Parthian commander Surena confirms his suspicions and sends his head and hand to King Orodes (so that here too a younger and an older soldier, bound by the closest ties of affection, both end up losing their heads). In Plutarch, Surena goes on to stage a humiliating procession which he mockingly styles a 'triumph.' A captive who looks like Crassus is dressed in women's clothing

[15] Not *the* richest: see E. Badian, *Roman Imperialism in the Late Republic* (Oxford, 1968), 81–2. Execrations: Plut. *Crass.* 16.7–10. Fig vendors: Cic. *Div.* 2.84. Advice: Plut. *Crass.* 18.4–5, cf. 20.4, 23.3, 6.

[16] Plut. *Crass.* 19.5 *λέγεται δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀετῶν ὁ πρῶτος ἀρθεὶς ἀπὸ ταὐτομάτου μεταστραφῆναι*, 23.1, Cass. Dio 40.18.1–3, Val. Max. 1.6.11, cf. Ov. *Fast.* 5.590 (after their recovery) *agnorunt signa recepta suos.*

[17] R.G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus* (Oxford, 1977) on 6.825.

[18] Spear: Plut. *Crass.* 26.4. Cry: 26.4 *οἱ πολέμιοι προσεφέροντο κραυγῇ καὶ παιᾶνι φοβερώτεροι*. Distressed: 26.5 *τοῦτο τὸ θέαμα Ῥωμαίων ὑπὲρ ἅπαντα τὰ ἄλλα δεινὰ τὰς ψυχὰς κατέκλασε καὶ παρέλυσεν*.

[19] Hardie cites La Cerda on 9.465.

[20] Nisus' fatal charge is made braver by a moment of hesistation, cf. 399–401 *quid faciat? qua vi iuvenem, quibus audeat armis* | *eripere? an sese medios moriturus in enses* | *inferat et pulchram properet per vulnera mortem?* Cf. Plut. *Crass.* 26.6 *καίτοι τόν γε Κράσσον αὐτὸν αὑτοῦ λαμπρότατον ἐν τῷ τότε πάθει φανῆναι λέγουσιν*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and paraded on horseback. Before him on camels ride trumpeters and lictors, the fresh-cut heads of other Romans dangling from the fasces alongside the axes[21] (not *signa*, then, but another official symbol of Roman power). The final episode of this saga, in which Crassus' head reaches Orodes' palace just in time for a recitation from Euripides *Bacchae*, is notorious.[22]

It makes no difference for our purposes how much of this tradition is apocryphal. It matters only that there was a tradition.[23] Not until 20 B.C., a little over a year before Virgil's death, did Rome finally negotiate the return of its standards, including the eagles which, in normal circumstances, 'formed the very identity of the unit to which they belonged'.[24] The poet was still at work on the *Aeneid* when Augustus arranged for them to be publicly displayed in the temple of Mars Ultor, a small round structure he had hastily erected on the Capitol while plans went forward for the permanent structure in the Forum Augustum. Among the artefacts commemorating the recovery were several new coin types, a triumphal arch and the statue of Augustus from Livia's villa at Primaporta, on whose breastplate a Parthian is shown surrendering a legionary eagle (whether to Roma or Mars himself).[25] The occasion certainly merited celebration. For some thirty years, punctuated by Caesar's unrealized and Antony's failed Parthian expeditions – for a period encompassing the entire span of Virgil's poetic career – the sensational story later recorded by Plutarch and perhaps other tales of beheading and triumphalism had been resonating in the Roman consciousness.[26] All of them were bound up with the loss of Roman standards and could doubtless be viewed as ironic retorts on the aggression the standards represented. Not only Virgil himself,[27] but Horace,

[21] 'Triumph': Plut. *Crass.* 32.1 *παρεσκεύαζε πομπήν τινα γελοίαν ὕβρει προσαγορεύων θρίαμβον*. Axes: 32.2 *ἐξήρτητο δὲ τῶν ῥάβδων βαλάντια καὶ παρὰ τοὺς πελέκεις πρόσφατοι κεφαλαὶ Ῥωμαίων ἀποτετμημέναι.*

[22] Plut. *Crass.* 33.3–6. Crassus' head reaches the king's door at exactly the point in the play when Agave returns with the head of Pentheus (1168) and the recitation, with choral accompaniment, ends shortly thereafter (around 1179). For Plutarch, this performance marked the finale of the larger 'tragedy' of Crassus' campaign (33.7 *εἰς τοιοῦτόν φασιν ἐξόδιον τὴν Κράσσου στρατηγίαν ὥσπερ τραγῳδίαν τελευτῆσαι*); see A.V. Zadorojniy, 'Tragedy and epic in Plutarch's *Crassus*', *Hermes* 125 (1997), 169–82.

[23] Plutarch's account, though fuller, is in substantial agreement with that of our other main source, Cassius Dio (40.12–27). A.N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East* (London, 1984), 281 n. 27, suggests that the tradition goes back to Livy; further possibilities are given by Zadorojniy (n. 22), 171–2.

[24] G.R. Watson, *The Roman Soldier* (London, 1969), 128. It is tempting to recall that Nisus, the legendary Megarian king, was himself an eagle in aftertime, cf. Verg. *G.* 1.404–9, D.W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (Oxford, 1936), 44–6.

[25] Temple and artefacts: see P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, tr. A. Shapiro (Ann Arbor, 1988), 186–92, C.B. Rose, 'The Parthians in Augustan Rome', *AJA* 109 (2005), 21–75. C.J. Simpson, 'The date of dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor', *JRS* 67 (1977), 91–4 argues that the permanent structure dedicated in 2 B.C. was the only temple of this name. Even if he is right, however, Augustus must have displayed the standards in some setting, and at the earliest possible opportunity. Note the emperor's boast at *Mon. Anc.* 5.40–3.

[26] Crassus' head is subjected to further indignities in a version reported by Cassius Dio, 40.27.3 (after the commander's death) *αὐτοῦ χρυσὸν ἐς τὸ στόμα οἱ Πάρθοι, ὥς γέ τινες λέγουσιν, ἐνέτηξαν ἐπισκώπτοντες*, cf. Serv. on *Aen.* 7.606. Other sources specify decapitation before the golden infusion, cf. Flor. *Epit.* 1.46.10, Fest. *Brev.* 17. It is uncertain whether Crassus keeps his head at Val. Max. 1.6.11.

[27] Cf. *Aen.* 7.606 *Parthos … reposcere signa*. Austin (n. 17) finds another allusion to Crassus' standards at *Aen.* 6.825 *referentem signa Camillum*, where Camillus 'brings back' standards recovered from the enemy: 'Virgil's contemporaries would know what he meant.' M. Wissemann,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Propertius and Ovid refer unambiguously to the famous *signa*.[28] A couplet in the *Fasti* written long after their recovery, lends elegant expression to what once may have been a popular complaint (5.585–6):

> signa, decus belli, Parthus Romana tenebat,
> Romanaeque aquilae signifer hostis erat.

Given the contemporary buzz of fact and fable, which must have reached a crescendo shortly before the *Aeneid* was given to the public, a Roman reader would have every reason to pluck standards from *ora … movebant*.

The argument, then, rests on three piers: (i) there are logical and stylistic barriers to taking *ora* as the subject of *movebant*, (ii) in their context, the phrases *capita … sequuntur* (466) and *ora … movebant* (471) evoke the military phrases *signa sequuntur* and *signa movebant*, and (iii) that evocation would have been stronger in view of recent events which associated standards with decapitation. The half-line in 467 will encourage doubt in some: the inconcinnities in 471–2 might simply be due to a lack of revision. For others, the question will depend on their sense of Virgil's penchant for creative combination: how far was the poet willing to go in the attempt to make novel connections? In any case, the justice of La Cerda's larger observation – that Virgil intended these verses to evoke the expedition of Crassus – does not depend on a specific reference to standards. In so far as it is fair to see 'Pompey' sprawled on the shores of Troy and Aeneas escaping the enticements of 'Cleopatra' in Carthage,[29] it is fair to see the Trojans confronting the 'Parthians' in the heart of Italy.

9.481 *TUNE ILLE …* ?

Euryalus' unnamed mother is at her weaving when the evil tidings reach her. The shuttle clatters from her hand and the thread spins fatally forth. Wailing, tearing her hair, heedless of decorum or personal safety, she runs to the wall and cries (9.481–4):

> hunc ego te, Euryale, aspicio? tune ille senectae
> sera meae requies, potuisti linquere solam,
> crudelis? nec te sub tanta pericula missum
> adfari extremum miserae data copia matri?
>
> 481 ille MP : illa R

Die Parther in der augusteischen Dichtung (Frankfurt, 1982), 14–46 collects and analyses references to the Parthians in Virgil, without however touching on the Nisus and Euryalus episode.

[28] Horace: (following e.g. *Carm.* 1.2.51 *Medos … inultos*) *Epist.* 1.18.56 (Augustus) *qui templis Parthorum signa refigit*, *Carm.* 4.15.4–8; Propertius: 3.5.47–8, 4.6.80; Ovid: *Ars am.* 1.179–80, *Fast.* 5.579–94, *Tr.* 2.227–8. For further references to the Parthians in these poets see Wissemann (n. 27).

[29] 'Pompey': see R.G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus* (Oxford, 1964) on 2.557. 'Cleopatra': see A.S. Pease, *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus* (Cambridge, MA, 1935), 24–8.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

That is the text of most modern editors,[30] rendered by David West as follows: 'Is this you I am looking at, Euryalus? How could you leave me alone, so cruelly, you who were the last comfort of my old age?' Instead of *tune ille* in 481, La Cerda, Heinsius, Page and Dingel adopt the variant *tune illa.*[31] That is the wrong choice, I think, but the argument which underlies it is clear and sensible. According to Page, the double apposition *tu, ille, requies* is very remarkable, and it is not clear how the words are to be taken. Conington does not explain and in his translation omits *ille* altogether.[32] Kappe gives '*So hast du da, mein Trost im Alter, mich grausam verlassen können!*' as though *ille* were uttered pointing to the ghastly head with abhorrence; but this is awkward, especially as *hunc*, not *illum*, has just been used in addressing the head (cf. too *hoc*, 491, 492).

Reading *tune ille* with the majority, Hardie reasonably counters that *hunc* is 'contrasted with *ille*' and that *ille* refers to 'the presence now lost.' But his conclusion is obscure: 'The unexpected agreement of *ille* with *tu* rather than with *requies* focuses the cruel awareness of the difference between what he was and what he is now.'[33] That explanation seems to raise more questions than it answers. How, for instance, does the 'agreement' of *ille* with *tu* work in practice? And if *ille* is effectively an adjective, how have we avoided Kappe's 'du da'? It is not quite clear why we should 'expect' *ille* to agree with *requies*, if in fact it agrees with *tu* – or, conversely, if the agreement is implied, why it is not stated. At any rate, it remains for someone to translate *tune ille senectae* | *… requies potuisti linquere solam?* in such a way as to acknowledge the presence of the demonstrative.

Heinsius and Page saw all of these difficulties and – not unreasonably – flinched. What they did not see is that after the opposition between *hunc* and *te*, there must be an opposition between *tu* and *ille* and, further, since there is no opposition in the modern scheme, the modern scheme is wrong. The reading *illa* is a clear improvement on the modern text ('Could you, that glorious stay of my old age, leave me all alone?'), but it will not serve. The correct text involves just two slight changes of punctuation:

> hunc ego te, Euryale, aspicio? tune ille, senectae
> sera meae requies? potuisti linquere solam,
> crudelis?

That scheme, I believe, removes all of our difficulties. And yet at first sight it may seem merely to complicate matters: 'Is this one I see *you*, Euryalus? Are you he …?' We have our contrast, evidently, but between what and what? Since the English is hopelessly vague, we need to examine the rationale of the Latin.

As opposed to the combination *ille ego*, which marks a proud declaration,[34] combinations like *tu ille* (*hic ille*, *hoc illud*, etc.) regularly convey a sense of sudden recognition. The reference of *tu* or *hic* is found unexpectedly to merge

[30] So Ribbeck, Conington, Mynors, Williams, Geymonat, Hardie and Conte; Heyne prints *illa*, but says of *ille* 'doctius videtur.'

[31] S.J. Heyworth likewise defends *illa* in his review of Conte's edition, *BMCRev* 2010.10.03.

[32] So too in modern translations the demonstrative disappears without a trace, e.g. R. Fagles (New York, 2006), D. West (London, 1991), A. Mandelbaum (Berkeley, 1971), C. Day Lewis (London, 1952).

[33] See Hardie first on 481, then on 481–2.

[34] e.g. Ov. *Am.* 3.8.23–4 *ille ego Musarum purus Phoebique sacerdos* | *ad rigidas canto carmen inane fores.*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with the reference of *ille*, a person or thing which is already known, but not yet fully understood, as for instance a cryptic prophecy, cf. *Aen.* 7.128 *haec erat illa fames*, 'So *this* is the hunger (that Celaeno prophesied)'.[35] Turn those same statements into questions, as in our passage, and recognition becomes incredulity. The speaker teeters on the verge of acknowledgement but, whether from a sense of horror or amazement, draws back, cf. *Aen.* 4.675 (horror) *hoc illud, germana, fuit?* and 1.617–18 (amazement) *tune ille Aeneas quem Dardanio Anchisae | alma Venus … genuit?* Note that, in the second example, it is not as though Dido were *ignorant* of Aeneas. On the contrary, the hero was depicted on Juno's temple in the middle of Carthage.[36] The queen is simply surprised to find such wide fame embodied in a single man – and, doubtless, in so handsome a man. Likewise in our passage, though the mother knows her son as only a mother can, it is not just his grisly end that stuns her. Since he chose to keep the expedition a secret from her, [37] she is at a loss to understand how he could have been hurt at all. There he was wreaking havoc among the Rutulians, and all the while she imagined he was sleeping snugly in his bed. She had no idea he had grown up and gone out. If that analysis is correct, then in our phrase, *tune ille*, the demonstrative can only refer to the rose-tinted Euryalus of her prior conception, that beautiful, dutiful boy whom his mother dared to follow when other mothers remained behind,[38] the prop and comfort of her final days. And *tu* refers to his head.

That *te* and *tu* should have different antecedents may be unexpected, but given the nature of the mother's perplexity it is also understandable. There is a vast and unbridgeable distance between the gory interloper who seems to mimic Euryalus (*hunc*) and the Euryalus whom his mother fondly and, to a certain extent, falsely remembers (*ille*). The 'real' Euryalus, whoever or whatever he is (*te … tu*), lies somewhere between those extremes, delicately poised like the sliding weight on a doctor's scales, so that the slightest mental momentum will tip the balance.

There is no room in our verse for the sweeping *actio* of melodrama. The demonstrative pronouns are not deictic, nor is the mother hopping about *modo huc, modo illuc*. Stunned by the report of *nuntia Fama* (474) and now in a state of shock, she stands with her eyes fixed on a single object. Her first address is to the son she seems – or seemed – to see, Euryalus the Fair: *hunc ego te, Euryale, aspicio?* 'Is this one I see *you*, Euryalus?' Note, she might have said *hoc* instead of *hunc*, as she does later when she sees more clearly,[39] but for the moment all is confusion.[40] Next, as the identity begins to dawn on her, she does what any

[35] In combinations of this sort, the copula is regularly expressed or implied, with *ille* the subject, *tu* (*hic*) the emphatic predicate, cf. Ter. *An.* 125–6 *attat hoc illud est, | hinc illae lacrumae, haec illast misericordia*; Verg. *Aen.* 7.255–6 *hunc illum fatis … | portendi generum* ('*this* was the son-in-law who was foretold by the fates'), 7.272–3 *hunc illum poscere fata | et reor et … opto*, also perhaps *Aen.* 3.558 *nimirum hic illa Charybdis* [*haec* recc.]; V. Fl. 2.485–6, 4.467; Tac. *Ann.* 1.51.3, 14.22.2; Kühner–Stegmann, *Satzlehre*, vol. 1, p. 622; C.J. Fordyce, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII–VIII* (Oxford, 1977) on *Aen.* 7.128.

[36] 1.488 *se quoque principibus permixtum agnovit Achivis.*

[37] 9.287–9.

[38] Beautiful: 5.295, 9.179–80. Dutiful: 9.290–2. Other mothers: 9.285–6.

[39] Cf. 491–2 *hoc mihi de te, | nate, refers? hoc sum terraque marique secuta?* The neuter (*hoc*), the explicit partition (*de te*), the disgusted tone – these are evidences of a relative sanity.

[40] Because the mechanism of the eye is imperfect, our emotions can actually influence what we see. According to M. Luckiesh, *Visual Illusions, their Causes, Characteristics and Applications* (London, 1922), 1: 'Seeing is deceiving … Only a part of what is perceived comes through the senses from the object; the remainder always comes from within … Our past expe-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

desperate person would do. She denies it. In a futile, agonizing attempt to stave off the inevitable – to prolong the duality – she queries that other filial aspect, Euryalus the Head, but now in a lower, more plaintive tone: *tune ille, senectae | sera meae requies?* 'Are *you* really he, the comfort of my old age?'[41] When at last, so far as death and mutilation will allow, the two aspects are merged in one, she becomes angry: *potuisti linquere solam, | crudelis?* 'How could you bear to leave me alone, you heartless boy?' Without yet being wholly sane, the mother at last 'sees clearly.'[42] 'Shock, denial, anger' – the sequence has become a cliché of popular psychology, but it is no less convincing for that. As regards the mother's denial, observe that the question *tune ille?* is stubbornly incredulous, as the rationale of the pronominal formula would lead us to expect. Nor would it be strange if, having first asked whether A was B, she should now enquire – in a pathetic effort of evasion – whether B was A. The inversion is 'rhetorical', to be sure, forming with *hunc … te* the most scandalous chiasmus that ever was, but it is not merely rhetorical. It has – and had, long before the rise of psychology – a basic psychological plausibility.

To recapitulate: (i) both the preceding opposition *hunc ... te* and the expression itself show that *tune ille* expresses some kind of contrast, (ii) the logic of such expressions shows that *ille* looks backward to Euryalus the Fair, (iii) if *tu* is no longer Euryalus the Fair, it must be Euryalus the Head, and (iv) it is consistent with this scheme that the appositive *senectae ... requies* follows immediately upon *ille*. The unusual sense pause after the fifth trochee might seem to tell against this dispensation (*tune ille, senectae | sera meae requies*). The pause occurs, on average, once in every 412 lines of the Aeneid.[43] In fact, however, the anomaly clinches the case. Later in the poem, when Amata is pleading with Turnus not to face Aeneas in single combat, she says: *spes tu nunc una, senectae | tu requies miserae, decus imperiumque Latini | te penes*, etc. (12.57–9). The same rare pause before nearly the same phrase (*senectae | … requies*), situated in a speech addressed by another fond old woman to another dear young man – and likewise expressive of agitation[44] – cannot be coincidental. Virgil adumbrates by repetition. At one stroke, both Turnus (in that passage) and the variant *illa* (in ours) are doomed. *ille* is forcibly married to *tu*, with the denouement sketched above. Once the question *potuisti linquere solam, crudelis?* is detached from what precedes, it becomes natural to link it closely with what follows. The traditional punctuation (a full stop after *crudelis*) should be altered so as to form a longer compound question, in effect

riences, associations, desires, demands, imaginings, and other more or less obscure influences create illusions.' 'In the corpse we love', says George Eliot, 'it is the *likeness* we see – it is the likeness, which makes itself felt the more keenly because something else *was* and *is* not' (*Adam Bede*, ch. 43).

[41] Note the structural similarity to 1.617–8 *tune ille Aeneas quem … | alma Venus … genuit?*

[42] It would not be surprising if the mother's improved vision owed something to the dawning awareness of Agave in Euripides' *Bacchae*. For Agave's return to consciousness as prompted by her father Cadmus, cf. *Bacch.* 1264–70 (optical effects), 1277–85 (identifying the head). For further debts to the *Bacchae*, see pp. 717–20.

[43] E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI* (Leipzig, 1926[3]), *Anhang II*, 389 n. 6 cites 24 instances in the *Aeneid* of the break after the fifth trochee.

[44] Several of the instances cited by Norden (n. 43) suggest agitation, cf. 2.150–1 *quo molem hanc immanis equi statuere? quis auctor? | quidve petunt? quae religio?* 3.615, 4.28–9 *ille meos, primus qui me sibi iunxit, amores | abstulit* (so Dido, shortly before breaking down in tears), 4.603, 6.560 (with Austin's note), 11.160.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'How could you leave me without so much as a good-bye?'[45] The original tricolon is thus reconstituted (481–4):

> hunc ego te, Euryale, aspicio? tune ille, senectae
> sera meae requies? potuisti linquere solam,
> crudelis, nec te sub tanta pericula missum
> adfari extremum miserae data copia matri?

The suspense inherent in the question *tune ille?* is heightened by the unusual phrasing of the verse. After a frantic start (*hunc ego te, Euryale, aspicio?*), the mother pauses at the point where the forward momentum of the line is regularly at its strongest (*tune ille, senectae* | *sera* …), so that her question is somewhat longer than a syllable count would indicate – and longer still if the appositive phrase is pronounced slowly, with grim abstraction (*senectae* | *sera meae requies*). Here, in any case, were lines to challenge Virgil's fabled talent as reader.[46] For one brief moment a mother addresses her son's severed head. In all of literature there can be very few scenes at once so touching and so strange.[47]

9.486 *TE TUA FUNERA*

There is another textual problem, related to the last, in the verses that follow. Having determined that her son is actually dead and having scolded him for leaving her so abruptly, the mother bends her thoughts to a subordinate misfortune – that she cannot conduct his funeral. The exclamation *heu* marks the transition. After noting that Euryalus lies 'a prey for dogs and birds', she represents her plight despairingly in the perfect tense, looking back on her life through a haze of sorrow (485–8):

> heu, terra ignota canibus data praeda Latinis
> alitibusque iaces! nec te tua funera mater
> produxi pressiue oculos aut vulnera lavi,
> veste tegens …

All of the manuscripts read *funera* in 486, but *funera* lacks a construction after *te* and the text can be maintained only by special pleading. Most editors have accepted the neat conjecture of Pietro Bembo, *nec te tua funere mater* | *produxi*.[48] Geymonat, for his part, prints the proposal of L. Castiglioni, *nec te, mea funera, mater* | *produxi*. The first task here is to reassert the insufficiency of the paradosis, the second to set both conjectures aside. Of the solutions proposed so far,

[45] Taken as a unit, the two questions recall Euryalus' comment before commending his mother to Ascanius, 9.287–9 *hanc ego nunc ignaram … | inque salutatam linquo (nox et tua testis | dextera), quod nequeam lacrimas perferre parentis*. Once again the boy leaves without a leave-taking (288 *linquo*, 482 *linquere*; 288 *inque salutatam*, 483–4 *nec te … adfari … data copia matri*).

[46] See Donat. *Vit. Verg.* 28–9.

[47] Agave addressed the head of Pentheus in a lost portion of Euripides' *Bacchae*. We may even have the very line (p. 720).

[48] So Heinsius (as it appears), Heyne ('in promptu est loci emendatio'), Mynors, Williams, Hardie, Dingel ('Schlagend richtig ist sie aber nicht') and Conte.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

only one appears to merit serious consideration, P. Hofman Peerlkamp's *nec fletu funera mater | produxi.*[49] Other conclusions, pertinent to the immediate problem but extending beyond it, will be possible if it can be shown that our passage contains an ironic allusion to Euripides' *Bacchae.*

It says something about the fitness of the transmitted text that Servius could endorse a theory which denied *funera* was even a form of *funus.* He claimed it was a feminine adjective, equivalent to *funerea* and used substantivally in the sense 'funeral attendant': 'nor did I, your mother, lead you as your (*tua*) funeral attendant.'[50] Not surprisingly, that use lacks any ancient warrant. It seems clear that if Virgil wrote *tua funera* here, he meant it to represent an emotional break in the mother's speech. So Henry: 'It is as if she had said: "*thee*, do I say? alas! not *thee*, but thy funeral".' As Henry explains it, '*tua funera* is the mother's correction of the error she has committed in addressing her dead son as if he were alive.'[51] But that resolution, a dramatic instance of the figure *retractatio*, or *epanorthosis*, is neither strictly logical nor emotionally plausible. It is illogical because if *te* is erroneous, then so is *tua.* It is implausible because the mother has shaken off her stupor and is no longer confused about her son's condition. She knew Euryalus was dead even as she asked *potuisti linquere solam, | crudelis?* (482–3).[52] If she continues to call him 'you', as she does throughout her speech, that is only because the habit is long established and because its extension is comforting. No delusion is involved, nor is the futility of such soliloquies often lost on the soliloquist. Catullus makes the point with famous pathos at 101.2–4 *advenio has miseras, frater, ad inferias, | ut … mutam nequiquam alloquerer cinerem.*

Bembo's conjecture appears to retrieve the situation with a minimum of fuss: *nec te tua funere mater | produxi*, 'nor did I, your mother, lead you in a funeral procession.' The adjective *tua* is no less pleasantly paired with *te* in that scheme and, indeed, gains a certain point by emphasizing (in the manner of *ipsa*) the unfitness inherent in a *mother's* burying her child. But the verse, as Conington observes, is 'scarcely Virgilian … in the order of words.' Conington does not elaborate, but he was clearly on to something. There are 67 other instances in Virgil's corpus where a possessive adjective – *meă*, *tuă*, *suă* – occupies the biceps of the fourth foot and is followed, without a sense pause, by a noun or an adjective: with just two exceptions, the noun or adjective forms part of the same phrase and also ends in *-ă*. So too with the pronoun *eă*: in every one of twenty instances the following

[49] The remaining proposals are distinctly inferior: *ad tua funera* (Julius Sabinus) is rightly condemned by Heyne as 'plumbeum' and *in tua funera* (Jahn) is no better. There is a world of difference between 'I did not raise you for death' (*OLD* s.v. *produco* 4) and what we should like to understand, 'I did not raise you only to witness your death'. Other attempts include *ego tua funera* (Parrhasius, but Virgil never has *egō*), *tristia funera* (Burman) and *taeda funera* (Hoffmann, cf. *Aen.* 11.142 *funereas … faces*).

[50] This is the first attestation of *produco* in a funereal context (*TLL* 10.1635.22–31, *OLD* s.v. 6.c., cf. *duco, effero*, Gk. προπέμπω, ἐκφέρω). For the use in later authors, cf. Luc. 2.298 *longum producere funus*; Stat. *Theb.* 6.121 *manes*, *Silv.* 2.1.19–20 *nigrae sollemnia pompae | spectatumque … feretrum.* Statius extends the sense of the verb (if there is not simply a zeugma) at *Theb.* 8.114–15 *non tumulo, non igne miser lacrimisque meorum | productus.*

[51] So too Ribbeck, Conington (with reservations) and Page. This interpretation is at least as old as Nicholas Abram (b. 1589): see de Fresneuse de Roüen, 'Memoires pour L'Histoire des Sciences & des Beaux Arts' (Nov. 1702), 326.

[52] Hardie notes that *tua funera* would entail 'a clumsy repetition of the point made so effectively by *hunc … te … tune ille* in 481.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

noun or adjective ends in *-ă*. Two exceptions, then, in 87 instances. Editors who print *funere* here are breaking what amounts to a rule.[53]

Castiglioni's conjecture avoids that pitfall: *nec te, mea funera, mater | produxi*, 'nor did I lead you – my own funeral – forth.'[54] That is very clever, and the error would be explained by a scribal failure to appreciate the cleverness. Castiglioni cites three parallels from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* – one for the sentiment, 6.282–3 (Niobe mourns her sons) *per septem funera | efferor*;[55] one for the paradoxical apposition, 10.197 (Apollo mourns Hyacinth) *videoque tuum, mea crimina, vulnus*; and one for both features combined, 13.495 (Hecuba mourns Polyxena) *videoque tuum, mea vulnera, vulnus*.[56] It is not a decisive objection to this proposal that Virgil elsewhere expresses the same sentiment in far less pointed terms.[57] The problem lies rather in the formulation of the point itself. Even if we take *mea funera* as appositive, not to *te*, but to the sentence as a whole, 'I led you out – my own funeral', we are left to picture a woman conducting *her own* funeral – a nimble feat if ever there was one. Note, too, the mother does not actually say, 'I led you out'. Filled with regret, she says, 'I did *not* lead you out'. She longs, in other words, for the privilege of conducting her son's funeral and then, as Castiglioni would have it, complains that his funeral would entail her own. That is too involved, and contradictory. The self-pity injected by *mea funera* is inconsistent with the loving attentions that she envisions in this and the following verse.

It remains to commend the long-ignored conjecture of Peerlkamp, *nec fletu funera mater | produxi*. Ribbeck, who maintains the paradosis, records it in his apparatus with the comment 'ingeniose.' Whether that is praise or blame is hard to say. Such was Peerlkamp's tendency to wanton cleverness that Madvig saw fit to cite his 'pravitas et libido.'[58] But there is nothing *excessively* ingenious about *fletu*. The proposal is paleographically neat (*FLETU FUNERA* became *FLE TUA FUNERA*), and the allusion to Ennius' epigram – *nemo me lacrimis decoret nec funera fletu | faxit*, etc. – is both elegant and plausible. Perhaps the only remaining cause for concern (common to Castiglioni's *mea funera* and the paradosis) is the 'jingle' of *funera* with *vulnera* directly below it in line 487. Note, though, that if that is a fault, it is not the only one (483–9):

[53] 67 instances with *mea*, *tua*, *sua*: e.g. *Ecl.* 1.46 tua rura *manebunt*, *Aen.* 1.678 mea maxima *cura*. 20 instances with *ea*: e.g. *Aen.* 7.4 ea gloria*, signat.* (In the compilation of these figures, pronouns were not counted as nouns, e.g. *Aen.* 12.129 sua quisque *recessit*, and repeated lines and phrases were counted separately, e.g. the refrain *Ecl.* 8.21 mea tibia*, versus.*) Two exceptions: *Aen.* 6.695 *tua me, genitor,* tua tristis *imago*, 10.423 tua quercus *habebit.* (Note, though, that even in these exceptional instances the following word forms part of the same phrase.) Sense pause: *Aen.* 10. 231 *classis* tua. perfidus *ut nos*, 12.808–9 *nota mihi* tua, magne*, voluntas, | Iuppiter* [*magna* recc.]. There is, then, no warrant whatsoever for an 'unbroken' combination like *tua funere* (i.e. *-ă … -ĕ*) in this position.

[54] L. Castiglioni, 'Decisa forficibus V', *Acme* 1 (1948), 55–8.

[55] R.J. Tarrant, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoses* (Oxford, 2004) follows Heinsius in bracketing 282; in that case, *efferor* simply makes the same point more succinctly.

[56] Tarrant's text (n. 55) depends on the marginal addition of a second hand (B^2). The older manuscripts have either *tuum mea vulnera pectus* (so Castiglioni) or *meum tua vulnera pectus.*

[57] Cf. *Aen.* 4.682–3 (Anna mourns Dido) *exstinxti te meque, soror, populumque patresque | Sidonios urbemque tuam*, 10.849–50, 12.61–2.

[58] *Adversaria Critica*, vol. 2 (Copenhagen, 1871), 50 (cit. J.E. Sandys).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> nec te sub tanta periculā missum
> adfari extremum *miserae data copiā matri*?
> heu, terra ignota *canibus data praedā Latinis*
> alitibusque iaces! nec <fletu> *funerā* mater
> produxī pressīue oculos aut *vulnerā* lavī,
> veste tegens tibi quam noctēs festinā diēsque
> urgebam …

Some editors read *date* in 485 with later manuscripts, but such a mincing variation in phrases so baldly similar seems unlikely. Observe that if *funera* is retained in 486, the penultimate word in six consecutive verses (483–8) will end in *-ă*.[59] My guess – and it is only a guess – is that Virgil intended these repetitions to suggest the incantatory quality of a funeral song.[60]

There is an allusive wit in our passage, a situational wit, which tells against the verbal quibbles of Castiglioni's conjecture (*te, mea funera*) and the paradosis (*te – tua funera*) and favours the quieter approach of Peerlkamp. It is important to bear in mind that the mother utters her entire lament while gazing from the wall. At the same time, then, as she is envisioning her son's abandoned trunk (*terra ignota … iaces*), his head is dancing on a stick before her eyes. It may not be in her interest to dwell on that disposition, but there is nothing to prevent *us* from interpreting what she says in the light of what she sees. Granted that the lament for the unburied dead is a well-worn topos, Euryalus' disseveration lends a ghoulish cast to what would otherwise be conventional plaints. They are ghoulish, in fact, in proportion as they are conventional. 'I did not lead you … forth', says the mother – but even after the recovery of the requisite pieces, that would have entailed some messy patchwork. 'I did not close your eyes', she says – but imagine that favour bestowed upon a severed head. 'I did not wash your wounds', she says – but which wounds, the ones that killed or the ones that disfigured? – '… covering them with a shroud', as if that might mend the difficulty! Note that the action here proceeds more or less *ὕστερον πρότερον*: *nec <fletu> funera mater | produxi pressiue oculos aut vulnera lavi, | veste tegens*. Although the inversion seems to reflect the disorientation of the speaker and 'may even have been a particular feature of funeral descriptions',[61] a special effect follows from its use here. The problems posed by disseveration are yet more keenly felt – more ghastly – in the second line than the first.

Virgil was no Seneca, but for all his tender sentiments, he was no stranger either to the grotesque.[62] Euripides' *Bacchae*, that treasure house of the grotesque, was cited above with regard to the opening lines of the mother's speech, and the

[59] For the repetition (at least fivefold) of *-ă* in this position, cf. *Aen.* 1.256 (×7), 3.183 (×6), 357 (×5), 4.127 (×5), 5.277 (×5), 6.326 (×6), 7.20 (×5), 9.130 (×5), 10.97 (×5), 151 (×8), 526 (×7), 11.157 (×5), 643 (×5), 649 (×5), 12.74 (×5). The repetition of *-ĕ* in this position is much more common and often more extensive, e.g. *Aen.* 5.469 (×8), 9.503 (×10, 512 *siqua*), 10.697 (×9).

[60] See E. Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley, 1979), 199–200 with n. 26; also, for the 'senseless repetition' of the Roman dirge, *OCD*[3] s.v. *nenia.*

[61] H.D. Jocelyn, *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge, 1967), 280. Cf. Eur. *HF* 1360–1; Enn. *scaen.* 131–2 Vahlen.

[62] Cf. *G.* 4.523–6, *Aen.* 3.623–7 (see R.D. Williams, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Tertius* [Oxford, 1962] on 627), 5.469–70, 8.196–7, 9.332–3, 9.347–50, 750–5, 10.395–6 ('grotesque and almost comically gruesome', S.J. Harrison, *Vergil, Aeneid 10* [Oxford, 1991]).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bacchae seems to have served Virgil as a model here as well.[63] Recall that, despite many obvious differences between the two episodes, the *Bacchae* presents a head on a stick, a separate adventure (at least initially) for the torso, maternal disorientation and subsequent maternal awareness.[64] Once Agave realizes it is Pentheus' head she is carrying, she assumes the worst and asks her father Cadmus whether the body (*σῶμα*) has been properly reassembled (1300):

> *ἦ πᾶν ἐν ἄρθροις συγκεκλῃμένον καλῶς;*

The answer, now lost, must have been no. Cadmus goes on to recall his grandson's more endearing qualities, whereupon, after the first line of Agave's response (1329),

> there follows in the MS (P) a lacuna of at least fifty lines, in which stood the speech of Agaue and the opening words of Dionysos. Apsines' remarks on the scene (*Rhetores Graeci*, ed. Walz, 9.587), as well as verses of the *Christus Patiens* [a twelfth-century Euripidean cento], permit us to reconstruct the context. Agaue bewails her dead son and embraces in a painful farewell each part of his dismembered body in turn.[65]

Virgil, then, would presumably have been familiar with the following lines, which Porson was the first to identify as coming from the *Bacchae* (*Christ. Pat.* 1312–3):

> *πῶς καί νιν ἦ δύστηνος εὐλαβουμένη*
> *πρὸς στέρνα θῶμαι; τίνα <δὲ> θρηνήσω τρόπον;*

In keeping with the metrical conventions of his day, the anonymous author was able – and eager – to scan *τίνα* as a trochee.[66] Euripides knew it only as a pyrrhic, whence Porson's supplement *τίνα <δὲ>*.[67] 'How in my sorrow', says Agave, 'am I to hold him gingerly to my breast? In what way am I to mourn him?' The 'holding' to which Agave refers may have been a standard ritual gesture:

> The tradition of the lament scarcely changed between the Bronze Age and the Hellenistic period. The singer-woman usually cradled the head of the dead between her two palms

[63] See above, nn. 42 and 47. F. Mac Góráin documents striking structural and verbal similarities between the second half of the *Aeneid* and the *Bacchae* in his forthcoming article, 'Virgil's Bacchus and the Roman Republic', set to appear in J. Farrell and D. Nelis (edd.), *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*.

[64] Head on a stick: 1139–42 *κρᾶτα δ' ἄθλιον … πήξασ' ἐπ' ἄκρον θύρσον … φέρει*. Torso: 1216–21. Disorientation and awareness: 1264–1300.

[65] A. Lesky, *Greek Tragic Poetry*, tr. M. Dillon (New Haven, 1983), 374. Cf. E.R. Dodds, *Euripides, Bacchae* (Oxford, 1960[2]) on 1329; also the appendix to J. Diggle's edition of the play, *Euripidis Fabulae*, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1994), 352–6.

[66] In addition to enjoying licences that ancient poets did not (*α*, *ι* and *υ* are long or short *ad arbitrium*), the anonymous author observed a rule whereby no verse could exceed twelve syllables. When therefore he wished to adapt a Euripidean line which happened to involve one or more instances of resolution, he regularly found some means of 'trimming the fat'. See J.G. Brambs, *Christus Patiens, Tragoedia Christiana … Gregorio Nazianzeno Falso Attributa* (Leipzig, 1885), 18–19.

[67] The question would be more pointed if the correct supplement were *τίνα <τί> θρηνήσω τρόπον;* In that case the sense would be 'What am I to bewail – and how?' with reference to the assortment of body parts. For the disyllabic word in a resolved position, see M.L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982), 87 (ii).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

… as Thetis clasped Achilles' head when she foresaw his death, crying sharply, *ὀξὺ δὲ κωκύσασα κάρη λάβε παιδὸς ἑοῖο* (XVIII.71).[68]

It goes without saying that the gesture would have been far less satisfying, if the head were detached from the body.[69] In W. Arrowsmith's translation of the play, Agave's desperation is referred to a consciousness of personal defilement rather than a sense of the physical difficulty: 'How can I, accursed with such a curse, hold him | to my breast?'[70] Other lines, though, first assigned to the *Bacchae* by A. Kirchhoff, leave little doubt that the main obstacle is dismemberment. The certain modifications of the anonymous author are enclosed, after J. Diggle, in parentheses (*Christ. Pat.* 1120–3):

> *οἵδ' οὐδὲ φροντίζουσί σ' ἐνθεῖναι τάφῳ.*
> *πῶς οὖν ἐγώ σε (τοῦ ξύλου καταγάγω);*
> *ποίῳ δὲ τύμβῳ (καταθείμην) σὸν δέμας;*
> *οἵοις τε πέπλοις (κατακαλύψω) νέκυν;*

Whatever the particulars of the original text, the gist is clear enough. Agave wonders how she is to perform the offices due a corpse, when no one else has supposed them remotely applicable. Her concern for the *type* of tomb and shroud suggests that the stumbling block is her son's condition, not her own. The situation in Euripides is different from the situation in Virgil. The Theban mother has what the Trojan lacks, and shrinks from doing what the Trojan pines for. But the fundamental similarity between the scenes – an ironic concern for ritual precision in a context of dismemberment – is unmistakable. Note that whatever one supplies in 1122–3, the shrouding is mentioned *after* the burial, as in Virgil.[71]

Euripides was not the first to introduce laments of this sort in an ironic setting. From a literary perspective, the irony is almost as old as the laments themselves. Thus, in the *Odyssey*, when Laertes grieves that Odysseus perished without receiving the proper rites, he is speaking *to* Odysseus, whom he does not recognize (24.290–6). Similarly, in Sophocles' *Electra*, when the heroine addresses the same lament to a vessel she supposes to contain Orestes' ashes, the disguised Orestes is standing right next to her (1136–42).[72] So far from inventing the irony, then, Euripides merely gave it a different occasion. Because that occasion is nearly the same as Virgil's and because Agave's complaints – regarding entombment, shroud-

[68] Vermeule (n. 60), 15. In the vase painting cited by Vermeule (fig. 9), a woman bends towards the corpse and lifts its head from behind, without however hovering over it in such a way as to justify *πρὸς στέρνα*; cf., though, fig. 7.

[69] Cf. *Henry VI, Part II*, 4.4 (Queen Margaret cradling Suffolk's sconce) 'Here may his head lie on my throbbing breast; | But where's the body that I should embrace?' The position of *καί* (i.e. *πῶς καί νιν …;*) is significant. According to J.D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford, 1954[2]), 313, when following an interrogative, *καί* may denote 'that the question cuts at the foundations of the problem under consideration'.

[70] *The Complete Greek Tragedies, Euripides V* (Chicago, 1959). The thought 'accursed with such a curse' has been imported from another fragment, which presumably figured earlier in the speech, *Σ* Ar. *Plut.* 907 = Eur. *Bacch.* fr. (i) Diggle *εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἴδιον ἔλαβον εἰς χεῖρας μύσος.*

[71] There may even be traces of the repetitive phrasing which characterizes the Latin passage. In 1123, Kirchhoff suggested *ποίοις τε* for *οἵοις τε*, then Diggle *δὲ* for *τε*; hence *πῶς …; | ποίῳ δὲ τύμβῳ …; | ποίοις δὲ πέπλοις …;*

[72] Henry calls the speech in Virgil 'almost an exact copy' of this one, but he misses the shared irony.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ing, the ritual lament (cf. Peerlkamp's *fletu*) and, probably once, washing as well – are very similar to those made by Euryalus' mother, none of Virgil's readers who knew the *Bacchae* in its original form was likely to miss the connection. In lines assigned to the play by G. Burges (*Christ. Pat.* 1466–72), Agave asks for Cadmus' help (ὦ γεραιέ) in correctly attaching the head and making the whole body as neat and taut as possible (εἰς ὅσον πάρα). Then comes a direct address to the head of Pentheus, followed by a *double* shrouding – a veil for the head and a cover for the remaining pieces (1469–72):

> ὦ φίλτατον πρόσωπον, ὦ νέα γένυς,
> ἰδοὺ καλύπτρᾳ τῇδε (σὴν) κρύπτω (κάραν),
> τὰ δ' αἱμόφυρτα καὶ κατηλοκισμένα
> μέλη σὰ καὶ (μέρη) πέπλοις καινοῖς (σκέπω).

The situation in the *Aeneid* never reaches that pitch, but it does not have to. The number of speeches in classical literature in which a mother addresses her son's severed head is necessarily limited. Once that fundamental similarity linked the two scenes in the minds of Virgil's ancient readers, other conclusions were bound to follow. Euryalus' mother had only to say *veste tegens* (488), and they would have recalled the grisly offices of her Theban counterpart. She had only to say *fletu funera* (with Peerlkamp), and they would have thought what a disjointed funeral that promised to be. In referring to such a sensational model, the poet could afford to be subtle. The gravitational pull of the *Bacchae* was so powerful that it could even affect the course of 'real life.' So, as we have seen, in Plutarch's *Crassus*, when the general's severed head reaches the door of Parthian king, he and his court are enjoying (of all things!) a recitation of the speech Agave delivers upon her return from the mountain.[73] The substitution for the costume-head of Pentheus follows as a matter of course.[74]

JEFFERDS HUYCK
jrhuyck@att.net

[73] See n. 22.

[74] For their many helpful comments, I am indebted to the anonymous reader, Sarah Whittier and Harvey Yunis. Fiachra Mac Góráin kindly allowed me to read his article on Virgil and the *Bacchae* (n. 63) before its publication.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000262 Published online by Cambridge University Press