Classical Quarterly **55.1** 153–169 (2005) *Printed in Great Britain*
doi:10.1093/cq/bmi011

EPIC AND EPIGRAM—MINOR HEROES IN VIRGIL'S *AENEID*

INTRODUCTION: FIGHTING TO BE HEARD

In epic, major heroes are given ample space to strive for glory and memory. The convention is to honour them with elaborate burials and to erect them a *monumentum*, while the minor heroes are forgotten after a few verses — replaced by the next in line. No epic will be written to ensure their remembrance: they are usually adorned with just a short obituary. These cameos read, as we shall see, much like funerary epigrams. Virgil employs them in a multifunctional manner, using them to foreshadow, to develop motifs, and to characterize their killers. He also applies to them the synecdochic poetics developed by Hellenistic epigram. Exploiting the generic and thematic versatility of epigram is a significant resource of the epic repertoire: just a few lines serve Virgil as generic transmitters that bring poignant aspects and qualities of the epigrammatic genre into the quintessential epic *aristeia*, and enable him to insinuate telling metapoetical comments.

The aim of this article is thus to raise a voice on behalf of the ostensibly unimportant, by showing in detail how Virgil's minor heroes as an epigrammatic force with an inherent epitaphic gesture shape Latin epic.

I. EPIC AND EPIGRAM – PREHISTORY OF A GENRE

Book 7 of the *Iliad* provides us with a good starting point to explore the structure behind the minor heroes who came down to Virgil as part of the epic tradition. In a self-commentatory passage Homer has Hector imagine the tomb of a (so far) unknown soldier:

> καί ποτέ τις εἴπῃσι καὶ ὀψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων
> . . .
> ἀνδρὸς μὲν τόδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος
> ὅν ποτ' ἀριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ.
> ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει· τὸ δ' ἐμὸν κλέος οὔ ποτ' ὀλεῖται. (*Il.* 7.89–91)

These lines have been interpreted as the earliest example of a funerary epigram in literature, and Thomas has pointed out similarities to early military epitaphs.[1] Inscriptions are thought of as precursors of epigram, and indeed in later times epigraphic pretensions continue to form an important feature of the literary

* I am grateful to John A. Crook, Philip Hardie, Michael Reeve, Christiane Reitz, and particularly John Henderson, as well as the audiences in Warwick, Rostock, and Cambridge, for comments on this article.

[1] Cf. Ps. Plut. *De Hom.* 2.215 (ed. Kindstrand); A. Skiados, 'ΕΙΙΙ ΤΥΜΒΩΙ', in *Inschriften der Griechen*, ed. G. Pfohl (Darmstadt, 1972), 61–6; and the discussion of Luck, Raubitschek, and Pfohl in A. Dihle, *L'Épigramme Grecque*, Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt 14 (Genève, 1968), 33; R. F. Thomas, 'Melodious tears, sepulchral epigram and generic mobility', in G. C Wakker (ed.), *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry* (Groningen, 1998), 206. One wonders if Homer might have known inscribed epigrams. It seems noteworthy in this context that the earliest known inscribed verses (?eighth century B.C.) are in hexameters: *CEG* 1.432, 454 (cf. n. 3).

Classical Quarterly 55.1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

genre.[2] Nevertheless these lines belong to the '*preistoria' del genere*,[3] for this epic is not yet aware of a self-conscious genre of epigram. In fact it qualifies as a pre-epigram in a double sense: prior to the literary genre; and prior to the deceased.

Scodel has referred to Hector's words as an anti-epitaph 'since it excludes precisely the information most essential to the genre, the name of the dead man'.[4] However, this might not be without purpose as this unrealistic 'oral epitaph'[5] thereby defines the formula for epic glory:

X will die to increase the glory of Y.

The latter is usually a well-known hero, whereas X is a variable, to be filled with an ever-changing throng of cannon fodder, the so-called minor heroes.[6] Their only reason and justification for existence is to be slaughtered and to add their *kleos* to that of their killers.[7]

The appearances of these minor heroes are typically short and packed with information. Thus they evoke in the most economical way a presence and at the same time sum up the minor hero's *kleos* at the moment of his death. The minor hero leaves the narrative, meets his deathstiny,[8] before we readers even come to know him. He is turned into a present absence while the reader becomes a passer-by in the graveyard of epic battle addressed by a multitude of fatalities.[9] If we read Homer through the epigrammatic lens,[10] conscious of the epigrammatic genre, we seem to read through sequences of pre-epigrams that construct the minor heroes as the living dead bearing motifs and characteristics which are later to become the standard repertoire of funerary epigram. A short survey of the features that both epigram and minor heroes share will serve to demonstrate this.

Conventionally the minor heroes are briefly introduced with two or three lines which contain not much more than name (sometimes with an epithet), patronym, and/or homeland.[11] So in Walsh's definition of Hellenistic Greek funerary epigram, 'Epitaphs normally tell us at least three things about a corpse. In order of importance these are name, father's name, and homeland.'[12]

[2] Laura Rossi, *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach*, Hellenistica Groningana 5 (Leuven and Sterling, VA, 2001) demonstrates this in detail: 6–9 on votive, 9–13 on funerary epigrams.

[3] Marco Fantuzzi and R. L. Hunter, *Muse e modelli: la poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto* (Roma, 2002), 392–3, discuss the eighth-century inscription of 'la coppa di Nestore' (*CEG* 1.454) under this heading, 'un caso del tutto isolato' (393).

[4] Ruth Scodel, 'Inscription, absence and memory: epic and early epitaph', *SIFC* 10 (1992), 59.

[5] Irene J. F. De Jong, 'The voice of anonymity: tis-speeches in the *Iliad*', *Eranos* 85 (1987), 77.

[6] The same idea is expressed even more explicitly by Sarpedon: *ἴομεν, ἠέ τῳ εὖχος ὀρέξομεν, ἠέ τις ἡμῖν* (*Il.* 12.328).

[7] Cf. M. M. Willcock, 'Battle scenes in the *Aeneid*', *PCPhS* 29 (1984), 92.

[8] Cf. John Henderson, 'Form remade/Statius Thebaid', in A. J. Boyle (ed.), *Roman Epic* (London, 1993), 174, for this term.

[9] For this notion or purpose of epigram, see the beginning of Werner Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* (Berlin, 1955), GG 217 (first century B.C.): *στήλη σοι λέξει τὸν ἐμὸν μόρον ἠδὲ χαρακτά/γράμματα, πῶς τ' ἔθανον καὶ οὔνομα τῶν γονέων* ('The stone with its inscribed letters will tell you my fate—how I died and the name of my parents').

[10] This reading manifests itself in the many epigrams on the Trojan war in the *AP* (cf. *AP* 9.457 *passim*).

[11] *Kennbegriffe* as Gisela Strasburger, *Die kleinen Kämpfer in der Ilias* (Fankfurt, 1954), 16, defines them.

[12] G. B. Walsh, 'Callimachean passages: the rhetoric of epitaph in epigram', *Arethusa* 24 (1991), 88.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In the cases in which these lines go beyond basic information the obituaries are confined to a length that forces both poet and reader to concentrate on single details or motifs. As in later epigram, descriptions of minor heroes work with categories in which the soon-to-be-dead are placed[13] or as Walsh defines it: 'to win a reading, epitaph strives to lend motive to the information it transmits'.[14]

Among the motifs Griffin in his search for 'pathos' in the *Iliad* detects are (I) 'far from home', (II) 'short life', (III) 'bereaved parents', (IV) 'young husband slain', and (V) 'beauty brought low'.[15] In comparison, Rossi's overview of the types of dead commemorated in epigram lists 'those dead far from their homeland' (cf. motif I). The category 'girls who die before their weddings' incorporates motifs II, III, and V. Moreover 'children who die before their parents' uses II and III, while 'married women' is a counterpart to IV. [16]

To conclude this introductory section, let us now look at one Homeric example, the end of Iphition (*Il.* 20.382–92), because Homer here has the killer himself summing up the minor hero's life in an epigrammatic utterance. Iphition fills the gap left by Aeneas, who is snatched away by Poseidon. Thus he is the first person Achilles actually kills after re-entering the fight; the first to prove that Achilles really is the best of the Acheans. Therefore the reader needs to get the impression that he is a worthy opponent. *Πρῶτον* seems to be the leitmotif of his appearance. Iphition is a leader, the first among his people, the first to fight, the first to die. His name points to his excellence and may be translated as 'honoured for his might'.[17] Furthermore he is of 'first-class' descent. His father's name Otrynteus (*ὀτρύνω*) means 'marshal'[18] and he is marked as noble king over rich Hyle and an experienced fighter. Iphition thus constitutes the first example in a sequence of noble sons Achilles encounters which finally leads to Hector himself. The mention of his geographical and generic details carefully places Iphition in a *Gegenwelt* (*ὕπο*, *ἐν* 384). When Iphition is struck on the head by Achilles, he is brought back to the din of battle: *ἰθύς–μέσσην–ἄνδιχα* (385–6) constructed as its very centre.

πρῶτον δ' ἔλεν' Ἰφιτίωνα
ἐσθλὸν Ὀτρυντεΐδην πολέων ἡγήτορα λαῶν,
ὃν νύμφη τέκε νηΐς Ὀτρυντῆϊ πτολιπόρθῳ
Τμώλῳ ὕπο νιφόεντι Ὕδης ἐν πίονι δήμῳ·
τὸν δ' ἰθὺς μεμαῶτα βάλ' ἔγχεϊ δῖος Ἀχιλλεὺς
μέσσην κὰκ κεφαλήν, ἡ δ' ἄνδιχα πᾶσα κεάσθη. (*Il.* 20.382–7)

These lines contain name, patronym, epithet, genealogy and homeland, and manner of dying—all that a good epitaph would give to the reader to make the death meaningful

[13] Cf. Rossi (n. 2), 13: '. . . one also has the clear impression that the poets were interested not in the defunct, but in categories of the dead, such as poets, . . . heroes, . . . hunters, shepherds, unmarried girls, . . . brave men, . . . children who die before their parents'.

[14] Walsh (n. 12), 78.

[15] Jasper Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford, 1980), 106–42: Iphition *Il.* 20.389–92 (far from home); Xanthus and Thoos *Il.* 5.152–60 (father). Often the motifs overlap: Harpalion *Il.* 5.643 (far from home + father) or Polydorus *Il.* 20.407–12 (short life + father); Imbrius 13.171–5 (husband); Amphimachus and Nastes *Il.* 2.872–4 (beauty).

[16] Rossi (n. 2), 12–13. Similarly R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, 1942) provides examples under the headings 'The untimely dead' (184–6), 'Children buried by parents' (187–91), 'Death before marriage' (192–94), and 'Death at sea', or 'Away from home' (199–201).

[17] Wilhelm Pape and Gustav E. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, 2 vols. (Braunschweig, 1911[3]), 581.

[18] Ibid. 1083.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to those outside the circle of family and friends. Homer employs the motifs 'far from home' and 'bereaved parents'. By displaying parts of the victim's personality and family 'they increase the killer's *kleos* by showing how their deed has ramifications far beyond the battlefield. A whole chain of social life is ended by the prowess of the victor.'[19] Homer emphasizes Iphition's epitaphic appearance as he lets follow verses 'erinnernd fast an eine Form des späteren Grabepigramms':[20]

> κεῖσαι Ὀτρυντεΐδη πάντων ἐκπαγλότατ' ἀνδρῶν·
> ἐνθάδε τοι θάνατος, γενεὴ δέ τοί ἐστ' ἐπὶ λίμνῃ
> Γυγαίῃ, ὅθι τοι τέμενος πατρώϊόν ἐστιν
> Ὑλλῳ ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντι καὶ Ἕρμῳ δινήεντι. (*Il.* 20.389–92)

Spoken by Achilles, we may see them as reading out Iphition's tombstone inscription (another oral epitaph). They demonstrate how Iphition fits into his epic context. In death Iphition, the first of his people, is humiliated (κεῖσαι), a contrast to patronym and ἐκπαγλότατε (389). The next line sets θάνατος (at the very spot) in opposition to γενεή (far away). The Gygaean Lake (391) complements Mount Tmolus (385), while τέμενος points to Iphition's kingly descent. Finally Hyllus (392), rich in fish, illustrates the wealth of Hyde (385), and helps to delimit Iphition's geographical origin further. Thus Achilles' boast accentuates and complements motifs of Iphition's introduction. By providing a summing up in death it confirms the assumption that Iphition's introduction already contains an epitaphic gesture.

II. VIRGIL, THE EPIGRAMMATIST

The embedded epi(c)grams we find in Virgil's *Aeneid* are part of a development of generic mixing, the absorption of the sepulchral epigram by subsequent forms of Roman poetry.[21] Catullus introduces the experimental use of sepulchral epigram into Latin poetry[22] and the elegists show delight in composing embedded epitaphs for themselves, their friend or beloved.[23] Some of these epitaphs as well as Meleager's self-epitaphs *AP* 7.417–19 and 421 continue the Hellenistic sub-genre of epigrams on poets, in which the Alexandrian poets commented on the literary tradition of present and past. These epigrams provide us with an echo of the disputes or systematizations of Alexandrian philological culture.[24] Already for Naevius, Plautus, and Ennius, Schwindt suggests that we should read their epitaphs as 'Keimzelle immanenter Literaturgeschichte'.[25] Thomas has already pointed to some of the epitaphs the *Aeneid* incorporates,[26] and the importance of epitaph in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* has been illuminated by a recent study.[27] In the following section I will suggest how Virgil dealt with this experimental and metapoetic epigrammatic

[19] R. L. Hunter, *The Argonautica of Apollonius, Literary Studies* (Cambridge, 1993), 43; cf. also Griffin (n. 15), 139.

[20] Karl Reinhardt, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*, ed. Uvo Hölscher (Göttingen, 1961), 430.

[21] Cf. Philip R. Hardie, *Virgil*, G&R New Surveys (Oxford, 1998), 57–63 for the prominence of 'crossing of genres' in modern scholarship on the *Aeneid.*

[22] Thomas (n. 1), 214–16.

[23] A. Foulon, 'La Mort et l'Au-Delà chez Properce', *REL* 74 (1996), 164–5.

[24] Rossi (n. 2), 86–91.

[25] Jürgen Paul Schwindt, 'Literaturgeschichtsschreibung und immanente Literaturgeschichte. Bausteine literaturhistorischen Bewußtseins in Rom', in E.A. Schmidt (ed.), *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine: huit exposés suivis de discussions*, Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique 47 (Genève, 2001), 11–14, at 12.

[26] Thomas (n. 1), 218

[27] Philip R. Hardie, *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion* (Cambridge, 2002), 96.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

heritage, and how he applied and discussed the different sub-genres of epigram—sepulchral, dedicatory, and metapoetic—in connection with his minor heroes.

1. Aeolus

Virgil read the *Iliad* conscious of the epigrammatic genre. That he noted its epigrammatic tendencies is shown by his reworking of Achilles' boast over Iphition as an epitaph for Aeolus embedded in the *Aeneid*:

> te quoque Laurentes viderunt, Aeole, campi
> oppetere et late terram consternere tergo.
> occidis, Argivae quem non potuere phalanges
> sternere nec Priami regnorum eversor Achilles;
> hic tibi mortis erant metae, domus alta sub Ida,
> Lyrnesi domus alta, solo Laurente sepulcrum. (*Aen.* 12.542–7)

Thomas comments:

> The Virgilian adaption [*sic*] reconfigures the Homeric speech of Achilles in the direction of epitaph, with the poet (not the character) apostrophizing the dead Aeolus, just as the epigrammatic voice does, and with the final couplet studiously imitating the elegiac couplet, and drawing attention with *sepulcrum* to the genre it is incorporating.[28]

Virgil seems here to point to his own 'neoteric' reading of the Homeric minor hero. By applying the marked figure of epanalepsis to Aeolus' Trojan homeland of Ida and Lyrnesus (546–7) he alludes to and simultaneously reverses the lament of Catullus for his brother (*Troia . . . /Troia . . . sepulcrum* 68.88–9).[29] Catullus bewails a Roman who died at Troy; Virgil commemorates a Trojan buried in Italy. Furthermore Aeolus' framing with *Laurens* (542, 547 *Laurentes campi* become *Laurente sepulcrum*) imitates the Trojan frame of Catullus' passage (88–90 and 99). Virgil's last line marks the transition from Troy to Italy: **Ly*rnes*us will read **Lau*rens***, the Italian earth incorporates a Trojan body, and following the 'drive' of *domus . . . domus . . . sepulcrum* becomes a new and final home. The Laurentian frame itself is framed by an epigrammatic frame constituted by the specific epitaphic apostrophe *te quoque* and the final *sepulcrum.*[30] In Aeolus' epigram Virgil employs two traditions, the epigrammatic reading of Homer and the Catullan technique of epigrammatic embedding and framing. Virgil by Romanizing a distinctively Homeric figure measures himself against the poetic tradition and defines once more his own position among the epic successors of Homer. He demonstrates that his epigram on a minor hero can contain a lot in a little and can serve to elucidate his poetics.

2. Palinurus, Misenus, Caieta

Book 6 of the *Aeneid*, the epic's centrepiece, in which the reader learns what Aeneas' mission is, is framed by two epigrams.[31] Furthermore Book 6 itself contains the

[28] Thomas (n. 1), 218. Robin R. Schlunk, *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid: A Study of the Influence of Ancient Homeric Literary Criticism on Vergil* (Ann Arbor, 1974), 22, also notes an 'epigrammatic effect'.

[29] Cf. Jeffrey Wills, *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion* (Oxford, 1996), 145.

[30] On the Greek and Latin epitaphic tradition of *te/tu quoque*, cf. Nicholas Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary*, Mnemos. bibliotheca classica Batava, Supplementum 198 (Leiden and Boston, MA, 2000), on *Aen.* 7.1 with extensive bibliography.

[31] For a book-length discussion of this frame, see S. Kyriakidis, *Narrative Structure and Poetics in the Aeneid, The Frame of Book 6* (Bari, 1998).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

epitaph for Misenus. I have chosen these three examples as they on the one hand mirror the development of the main hero Aeneas, and on the other demonstrate the progress of the undoing of the Trojans' Trojanness. Furthermore they show how Virgil frames his epigrams with a context or deliberately chooses not to do so, thus reducing epigram back to its original format. Nevertheless his careful preparation of this process ensures that the reader is still able to place the epigram.

First there is Aeneas' oral epitaph on the helmsman Palinurus:

> o nimium caelo et pelago confise sereno,
> nudus in ignota, Palinure, iacebis harena. (5.870–1)

Patronym and epithet seem to be missing if we look for the conventions of epigram; but these have both been mentioned in the narrative shortly before: *princeps ante omnis* (5.833) and *Iaside* (5.843) occur at the beginning of verses in a prominent position. Moreover the omission of his homeland might point to the fact that Palinurus dies between two homelands. This allows Virgil to imitate here the style of an epigram for those who die at sea and whose name and origin are not always known in all detail.[32] Palinurus will lie *nudus in ignota harena*, and for those who find him he will be *sine nomine corpus* (cf. Priam 2.558). This impression is conjured up without totally omitting the generic information expected of a character the reader meets here for the fifth time. Aware of the conventions of epigram Virgil inserts a nautical type of epigram and plays an *Ergänzungsspiel*[33] with the reader, who can easily conjure up a 'standard' epigram for Palinurus with the information given. Furthermore his epigram fits Palinurus' role as unconscious 'synecdochic hero'.[34] His is the one important life whose sacrifice (*unum pro multis* 5.815) guarantees the safe journey of the Trojans; his death becomes the ticket to Rome (not Dido's as one might have thought). But neither Palinurus himself nor Aeneas, as whose substitute he here functions, understands this.[35] The first line of his epigram clearly demonstrates Aeneas' unawareness of the 'masterplot' through its striking misrepresentation of Palinurus (cf. his implied carefulness in 3.513 and 5.12).[36] In the second line Virgil already inscribes Palinurus' longing for a tomb in the underworld. There his embedded epi(c)gram is transferred and embedded into Roman culture, narrated into a familiar Roman context: he provides the aetiology for Cape Palinurus near Velia, *aeternumque locus Palinuri nomen habebit* (6.381): Roman maps of Italy on which Palinurus' name is inscribed serve as his eternal tombstone. Seen from the Trojan perspective Italy will not be *ignota harena* any more, for part of it now

[32] Cf. *AP* 7.494–506, all part of Meleager's collection. A. Barchiesi, 'Palinuro e Caieta, due "Epigrammi" Virgiliani (*Aen.* V 870 sg.; VII 1–4)', *Maia* 31 (1979), 6–7; A. S. F. Gow, and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1965), 2.368 point out that epitaphs without names are usually those on sailors; cf. also the chapter on *tombe senza nome*, 382–413 in Fantuzzi and Hunter (n. 3), who point to a further sub-category 'tomb without care'.

[33] Cf. Peter Bing, '"Ergänzungsspiel" in the epigrams of Callimachus', *Antike und Abendland* 41 (1995), 116 for this terminology.

[34] Philip R. Hardie, *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (Cambridge and New York, 1993), 4.

[35] W. Nicoll, 'The sacrifice of Palinurus', *CQ* 38 (1988), 466–70, and Hardie (n. 34), 33, point to Romulus and Remus as parallels. Palinurus represents 'a side of Aeneas' character which must be discarded before he can achieve his goal' (Nicoll, 467–8).

[36] Nevertheless Aeneas will start to understand parts of his *fatum* and mission. Yet, cf. Aeneas' reaction to the depictions on the shield 8.730. Nicoll (n. 35), 463–5, and A. Schiesaro, 'Virgil in Bloomsbury', *Proceedings of the Virgil Society* 24 (2001), 41–3, point to the dualism of the concepts of *Fortuna*/*Fatum* in Palinurus/Aeneas.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

bears a Trojan name. It starts to be their land, a sign that the Trojans can indeed abandon their helmsman and begin to come 'home'.[37]

Misenus, Hector's trumpeter, is the last to die in the sea (6.174, not actually *at* sea any more) and first to be buried in Italy. We get his epigram, including name, patronym, and clearly implied homeland, in 6.164–7:[38]

> Misenum Aeoliden, quo non praestantior alter
> aere ciere viros Martemque accendere cantu.
> Hectoris hic magni fuerat comes, Hectora circum
> et lituo pugnas insignis obibat et hasta.

Misenus' Iliadic *cantus* is of the highest quality and has creative features. He does not tell about past *arma virumque* as Virgil does but has the power to bring together *viros Martemque*, to create 'live' epic warfare (cf. his role in 3.239–40).[39] His tune is the epic Ur-song that creates deeds for future songs to tell about. After his death this creative role is supplied with 'energy from hell'. Virgil in his *maius opus* (7.44) outdoes the Homeric trumpeter by employing Allecto (7.513–14).

Like Andromache in Book 3, Misenus is turned into a (living) reminiscence of Hector, to whom the entire third line of the epigram is given. As his voice and comrade, Misenus becomes a symbol of lost Trojan glory, the restoration of which will be Aeneas' foremost labour. At the arrival in Italy he thus serves as foil for Aeneas' forthcoming role as successor of Hector and refounder of Troy. Within a short span of years the third line will read Aeneas' name instead of Hector's, as already foreshadowed by 6.170 *non inferiora secutus.* Additionally Misenus will also be incorporated into the Roman future: he functions as aetiology for an Italian landmark and gives his name to the lookout post above Rome's largest naval base.[40] His funeral will serve the reader as model—and so will his story.

When we finally arrive at Caieta's epigram we can transfer the context—we know how to read it, we understand its function. Here four lines are enough; Caieta's epigram has been prepared by the others—by Palinurus, and by Misenus. It can now stand on its own:

> Tu quoque litoribus nostris, Aeneia nutrix,
> aeternam moriens famam, Caieta, dedisti;
> et nunc servat honos sedem tuus ossaque nomen
> Hesperia in magna, si qua est ea gloria, signant. (7.1–4)

Caieta marks several transitions: the reader crosses a poetic border, a book division. But he progresses not only from one book roll to the next but also from the Odyssean half of the *Aeneid* (1–6) to the Iliadic (7–12). Nevertheless the shores in 6.901 (*litore*) are the same as in 7.1 (*litoribus*) and linked by the figure of prolepsis.[41] Virgil thus bridges the most important structural division in the *Aeneid.*[42]

[37] Cf. Richard Jenkyns, *Virgil's Experience: Nature and History, Times, Names, and Places* (Oxford, 1998), 462–6 for the signposting of Palinurus, Misenus, and Caieta.

[38] One might argue that Misenus' name reappears to fulfil the epitaphic formula and not only to rouse emotion.

[39] Cf. Servius ad loc. for Virgil's extempore completion of l.165 after *viros*: live epic composition and a sign that *Martem* is the most obvious association for *viros* in the *Aeneid*.

[40] Cf. Hubert Cancik et al. (edd.), *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike* (Stuttgart, 1996), 8.262.

[41] Wills (n. 29), 199.

[42] Stephen Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998), 109–11 points to the Ovidian comment on Caieta (*Met.* 14.157 and

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Furthermore the aetiological form and epigrammatic poetics (*multum in parvo*) of the epigram manifest Virgil's Alexandrianism and set up a tension between the Callimachean programme and its apparent rejection in the invocation of Erato (7.37–44).[43] Caieta's epigram forms part of an implicit programmatic discussion in the *Aeneid*: the four lines are marked out through their position, the presence of the poet's person (*at* 7.5 distinguishes him from Aeneas), and the opening phrase *tu quoque*.[44] Finally Caieta's death demonstrates that Aeneas has truly grown up to adulthood (*nekyia* as transition), and found his mission and *Sendungsbewußtsein*. The alien coast has become *litoribus nostris*, a homeland (*Italia nutrix)*. Aeneas has 'come home'; he will need his nurse no more.

By demonstratively dissolving three distinctively Trojan minor characters who have become narratologically obsolete Virgil stresses that the Trojans' arrival in Italy actually means a coming home. The epigrams are part of the undoing of Trojanness and simultaneously give the *Aeneid* a ktistic drive as they set up the first landmarks in *New Italy*. The reader is taught to interpret epigram, to play the *Ergänzungsspiel*: the first epitaph delivers its context later, while the second establishes the rules and allows us to understand the third without context. Furthermore the epigrams of all three of these minor heroes are distributed so as to demonstrate Aeneas' *rite de passage*. They show him first as unknowing, then as *not-yet-Hector* and finally as grown-up hero who can confidently cremate his nurse.

One might even develop the chain of epigrams further and read Caieta's epigram as the prototype for the foundation of Rome. According to a Greek version of Rome's foundation myth it is named after the female leader of the captured Trojan women, who by burning the ships of their masters forced them to found a city; a version displaced by Virgil to Sicily.[45] Thus the question *si qua est ea gloria* (7.4) might raise expectations of greater things to come: *aeternam famam* bestowed by *Roma moriens*.

3. Further voices

In some instances where we observe epigrammatic voices that are extinguished or avoided while others are carefully nourished and framed we can gain insight into Virgil's literary technique. They serve the reader as examples of Virgil enacting his power as moderator of the *Aeneid*. He alone makes the authorial decisions to whom to give a voice and to whom a line to speak, thus adding or subtracting further voices.[46]

Polydorus' epigrammatic voice talks out of the ground and informs us of his fate (3.41–6):[47]

> nam Polydorus ego. hic confixum ferrea texit
> telorum seges et iaculis increvit acutis. (3.45–6)

441–5), which deconstructs Virgil's narrative bridge with a 'substantial narrative interposition' (*Met.* 14.158–440).

[43] R. Thomas, 'From recusatio to commitment: the evolution of the Virgilian program', in R. Thomas (ed.), *Reading Virgil and his Texts: Studies in Intertextuality* (Ann Arbor, 1999), 105–6, 110.

[44] Kyriakidis (n. 31), 79–83.

[45] K. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome* (Princeton, 1969), 105. But some versions also bestow this role on Caieta, thus spelling out the etymology of her name (*καίω*): cf. Horsfall (n. 30).

[46] The title, and partly also the concept, of this section have been inspired by R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid* (Oxford, 1987).

[47] Cf. note 9.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Nevertheless it has to be installed into its proper seat and honoured with an elaborate burial. Then at least it can sound from where we would expect to hear it, a grave (*ingens/aggeritur tumulo tellus* 3.63). The Trojans thus re-enact a Trojan funeral for Polydorus (cf. *Iliades crinem* ***de more*** *solutae* 3.65), and provide a piece of their Trojan tradition to bury a piece of Troy.[48] Polydorus' little voice thereby becomes part of a new and different, perhaps greater storyline and is absorbed by a more prominent voice (cf. the last words of the episode ***magna*** *supremum* ***voce*** *ciemus* 3.68). This is indeed the last explicitly Trojan funeral we shall be shown: Anchises' funeral is glossed over by Aeneas (5.47–8) and Misenus' funeral (6.214–35, cf. p. 159) is already stylized as the first 'Roman' burial on Italian ground. Polydorus marks a closure for he has arrived at his final home (*animamque sepulcro/* ***condimus*** 3.67–8), but simultaneously he serves as point of departure as he drives the Trojans out of their recently established new settlement (*moenia prima loco* 3.17) through his account of the country's pollution with greed (3.41–4). Furthermore he inflicts 'greed' (for knowledge) upon Aeneas[49] and thus sets in motion a chain of prophecies that will supplement the information given by Creusa and become a central feature of this third book.

Similarly we witness an entire discourse on which of the dead in the underworld Virgil allows to raise a voice in the *nekyia* of Book 6. Virgil thereby selects features of the past that contribute to Aeneas' image and character, and prepare the impending solemn moments with his father. Thus he recalls for his readers Deiphobus' cenotaph:

> tunc egomet tumulum Rhoeteo litore inanem
> constitui et magna Manis ter voce vocavi.
> nomen et arma locum servant; te, amice, nequivi
> conspicere. . . (6.505–8)

before we hear what his stele should have told (6.509–30).[50] Thus his name is given a place in this epic and his dead voice is put into the context where it belongs. Deiphobus acknowledges this when he contrasts Aeneas' pious commemoration (*omnia Deiphobo solvisti et funeris umbris* 6.510) with the *monumenta* his wife initiated: his wounds (*illa haec monumenta reliquit* 6.512). Finally he stirs up memories on his part (*et nimium meminisse necesse est* 6.514) and by recounting a snippet from the fall of Troy he exemplifies the prominence given to the Trojan heritage that shaped Aeneas.[51] For he is permitted to speak, whereas this privilege is denied to the Greeks: as if Virgil wants to prevent them from interfering with the very Roman *Heldenschau* he makes theirs a silent grave (*pars tollere vocem/exiguam, inceptus clamor frustratur hiantis* 6.492–3).

In the case of Dido we can look back to the example given by Polydorus, where a voice was turned into a *monumentum.* Dido on her part remains silent when she appears—apparently unmoved—reminiscent of her own marble gravestone (cf.

[48] The *Iliad* bears witness, cf. *Il.* 20.407–18 and 22.46–7.

[49] Cf. M. C. J. Putnam, 'The third book of the *Aeneid*: from Homer to Rome', *Ramus* 9 (1980), 2–4.

[50] E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* (Leipzig, 1917[2]), 506 ff., inspired by the fact that the opposition of *nomen-te* is a feature possibly taken from Hellenistic epigram, supplements these verses and composes a Greek epitaph on Deiphobus.

[51] Cf. C. Fuqua, 'Hector, Sychaeus, and Deiphobus: three mutilated figures in *Aeneid* 1–6', *CPh* 77 (1982), 238–9.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

6.471 *quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes*).[52] A reason for this may be that we have heard her epitaph already:

> dulces exuviae, dum fata deusque sinebat,
> accipite hanc animam meque his exsolvite curis.
> vixi et, quem dederat cursum Fortuna, peregi,
> et nunc magna mei sub terras ibit imago.
> urbem praeclaram statui, mea moenia vidi,
> ulta virum poenas inimico a fratre recepi,
> felix heu nimium felix, si litora tantum
> numquam Dardaniae tetigissent nostra carinae. (4.561–8)

Thomas has recognized verses 4.653–8 as '(self-)dedicatory epigram (651–2) followed by a sepulchral epigram, which … relates the subject's *res gestae*'.[53] As Fraenkel pointed out, lines 4.655–6 bear stylistic similarities to an *elogium*, a form of honorary inscription that the Romans used to commemorate their worthiest men.[54] Thus Dido does not simply die like a lovesick woman: her epitaph contrasts her with others in the *Aeneid* and points to the fact that she has achieved something in the time-frame of the poem. With *et nunc magna mei sub terras ibit imago* (4.654) she already seems to prepare us for her reappearance in the underworld. Yet there Dido is not allowed to repeat herself; her petrified appearance serves to remind us that we are now asked to recall her last words ourselves. Virgil thereby makes quite sure that her great achievement, the foundation of Carthage, will not overshadow the climax of Book 6.

By contrast, in the case of Anchises' death Virgil builds up pathos by allowing epigram a strong voice:

> heu! genitorem, omnis curae casusque levamen,
> amitto Anchisen; hic me, pater optime, fessum
> deseris, heu! tantis nequiquam erepte periclis! (3.709–11)

Here the narration takes the form of a relative lamenting his loss, a common feature of sepulchral epigram.[55] Movingly it interferes with the epic voice, here the voice of the narrator Aeneas. This *labor extremus* (3.714), both the last and the ultimate toil, even causes his voice to break (3.715), so that finally Virgil's voice has to step in (3.716–18), in order to finish off the book in the silence of graveside *quies* (*conticuit tandem factoque hic fine quievit* 3.718).

These examples of Polydorus, Deiphobus, Dido, and Anchises serve to demonstrate how Virgil exercises his power over the (epigrammatic) voices in the *Aeneid* but also plays with their notions as actual gravestone inscriptions, when he makes the reader bring τάφος and ἐπιτάφιος λόγος together.

4. *Chloreus*

Cases where Virgil imitates and employs funerary epigram are on show, and easy to detect. But there are further sub-genres of epigram which may have influenced him. In

[52] Cf. Hardie (n. 27), 185.

[53] Thomas (n. 1), 219. Its first line, *vixi et quem dederat cursum Fortuna peregi*, has also left an impact on later tomb inscriptions: cf. *CE* 385, 814, 1068, and 1105.

[54] Eduard Fraenkel, 'Urbem quam statuo vestra est', in Eduard Fraenkel (ed.), *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* (Rome, 1964), 140–1. This stylistic feature links her first and last appearances.

[55] For example, *AP* 7.361, 453, 701.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this section I argue that he also draws inspiration from dedicatory epigram and uses it to discuss and define heroic *decorum*.

The role dedication plays in this discourse becomes explicit in the case of Chloreus (*Aen.*11.768–781), a walking pile of gold and weapons, or as we may say a dedicatory epigram in the making.[56] Rossi notes that the (Hellenistic) 'epigrammatic taste indulges even too willingly in labelling the tools and gear offered … with their most appropriate names' and that entire 'lists of gifts' appear, even though these are not attested in inscriptions.[57] This dedicatory impression is reinforced by his description as *sacer Cybelo Chloreus* (11.768), a formula also used for dedicational gifts to gods.[58] Furthermore the reader realizes in the end that we see Chloreus in the same way Camilla focalizes him, eventually pondering the possibility of dedicating his armour (*hunc virgo, sive ut templis praefigeret arma/Troia … sequebatur* 11.778–81). Chloreus is modelled on the brothers Amphimachus and Nastes (*Il.* 2.872), one of whom is decorated like a girl, which might point us to an inherent sexual ambiguity. Attention has been drawn to the effeminacy of Chloreus' Phrygian dress, a motif which also occurs in the taunts of Numanus Remulus (Aen. 9.616f.), and the scorn of Iarbas (4.215–17); and to Chloreus' role as priest of Cybele, whose worship contains elements of transsexuality (cf. 9.617–19).[59] Furthermore the colour of Chloreus' mantle (***croceam*** *chlamydemque* 11.775) has been recognized as a gloss upon the origin of the bearer's name (χλωρός), which bears erotic connotations as the colour of women and effeminates.[60] Thus in this passage a virgin–warrior–huntress meets an 'effeminate' priest, who thanks to his name Chloreus (an unknown kind of bird,[61] possibly pointed to with his horse's *plumam* 771) already evokes the notion of a hunter's prey.[62] Camilla's implied uncertainty over what to do with the spoils may serve to contrast her with Aeneas (=ἀνήρ), the successful *manly* hero, who kills a priest of Apollo and Diana dedicating his weapons to Mars (10.537–42). Moreover he erects the first war-trophy in 11.5–11 in honour of Mars, thereby initiating a tradition of the Roman army. Thus in the Chloreus passage dedication and motifs taken from dedicatory epigrams together with other recurrent *topoi* like hunt and gender are employed to define Camilla's heroic status. Additionally Virgil employs the *topos* of dedication for a wider discussion of the function of spoils in the *Aeneid*. He demonstrates that there is a difference between 'good' spoils won through virtue and then given to the gods, and greedily robbed 'bad' ones usually recycled to a fatal outcome.[63] Spoils show that victory can be heroic but also seductive, fatal, hollow, barbaric, or unmanly. Thus Virgil makes the

[56] For similarities to dedicatory epigrams on weapons, cf. *AP* 6.122 and 124, both third century B.C., *AP* 6.123 from the fourth century B.C., all part of Meleager's Garland, and especially the contemporary *AP* 6.91, where a list of nine different weapons is dedicated at once, which is strongly reminiscent of the well-equipped Chloreus.

[57] Rossi (n. 2), 8.

[58] Cf. *OLD, sacer* 1oc. cit.

[59] Nicholas Horsfall, 'I pantaloni di Cloreo', *RIFC* 117 (1989), 57–60; K. W. Gransden (ed.), *Virgil, Aeneid, Book XI*, Cambridge Greek and Latin classics (Cambridge, 1991), 23.

[60] Cf. Nicholas Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary*, Mnemos. bibliotheca classica Batava, Supplementum 244 (Leiden, 2003), on 11.768, who also points to the association of the skin colour of *pallidus*, χλωρός with the sexual practice of cunnilingus.

[61] Cf. *OLD.*

[62] His name is also reminiscent of *Od.* 11.281 χλῶριν … περικαλλέα, one of the female shades Odysseus has seen. Chloreus bears the male version of a morbid name.

[63] Nicholas Horsfall, *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*, Mnemos. bibliotheca classica Batava, Supplementum 151 (Leiden and New York, 1995), 176–7, and for a more detailed discussion R. A. Hornsby, 'The armour of the slain', *PhQ* 45 (1966), 347–59.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reader reflect on the nature of victory and triumph, which are measured in terms of captured weapons, and commemorated through memorial, dedication, epic, and epigram. Dedicatory epigram thus forms part of Virgil's discourse on epic values, indeed touches the epic's essence. How spoils can question the image of military success and heroism can be seen best from the dedicatory inscription 3.288 at Actium, where we read '*victoribus* where *victis* would be expected':[64]

AENEAS HAEC DE DANAIS VICTORIBUS ARMA.

5. Creusa

Through the sub-genre of 'epigrams on poets', epigram manifests itself as a place for poetic discussion and provides the opportunity to comment on poets, their work, or one's own poetic production.[65] Furthermore it is a means of self-classification within the literary tradition. Virgil makes use of this possibility to provide metapoetical comments when he creates Creusa's epigram as an 'answer' to Andromache.

Creusa, coming back from the dead, pronounces her own epitaph, a common feature of sepulchral epigram.[66] Furthermore her name forms the last word of the preceding line and thus creates the image of a heading, common in inscriptional evidence when the proper name does not occur in the epitaph itself:

> . . . Creusae.
> non ego Myrmidonum sedes Dolopumve superbas
> adspiciam aut Grais servitum matribus ibo,
> Dardanis et divae Veneris nurus,
> Sed me magna deum genetrix his detinet oris.
> Iamque vale et nati serva communis amorem. (2.784–9)

Creusa's family status and homeland are displaced on to and encoded into *magna deum genetrix*: this is Cybele, the *Idaea mater*, goddess of Phrygia. She contrasts *servitum* with her patronym and *divae*, a proud account of her descent from Priam and marriage into a semi-divine family (Servius supplements 787 with *et tua coniunx*). Furthermore Creusa's epigram is marked by the formula *iamque vale* (*Aen.* 2.789), which constitutes Eurydice's final despair (*G.* 4.497), Anchises' farewell (*Aen.* 5.738) and Camilla's last words (*Aen.* 11.827).[67] As Creusa has to remain on Phrygian shores, likewise Dido has to be left behind (*aspectus detinet urbis* 4.348).

The first two lines of Creusa's epigram concentrate on non-events, for unlike Andromache Creusa will not become a living epitaph for her husband, the role

[64] R. D. Williams (ed.), *Aeneidos liber tertius* (Oxford, 1962), ad loc. D. West, 'In the wake of Aeneas (*Aeneid* 3.274–88; 3.500–5; 8.200–3)', *G&R* 41 (1994), 57–9 invites a comparison of Aeneas' small gesture with the vast memorial erected by the later Augustus on the same spot after the battle of Actium. H.-P. Stahl, 'Political stop-overs on a mythological travel route: from battling Harpies to the battle of Actium (*Aen.* 3.268–93)', in H.-P. Stahl (ed.) *Vergil's Aeneid: Augustan Epic and Political Context* (London, 1998), 68–70 points to this monument's oversized inscription as 'post-Actium propaganda' (70) taken up by Virgil. Moreover, Iris releases Dido with a dedicatory utterance, *hunc ego Diti/sacrum iussa fero teque isto corpore solvo* (*Aen.* 4.702–3); cf. Thomas (n. 1), 216–17. This echoes Berenice's lock which she dedicated lamenting as her husband was going to leave (Cat. 66, 19–20).

[65] Cf. n. 24.

[66] Cf. *AP* 7.167, 178–80.

[67] Cf. R. G. Austin, *Aeneidos liber secundus* (Oxford, 1964), ad loc. For the epitaphic gesture of *iam vale*, cf. *CE* 1515.7 and 737.10.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

already sketched for her in *Il.* 6.459–61, a passage whose epitaphic quality was already noted by the Scholia:[68]

> καί ποτέ τις εἴπησιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσαν·
> Ἕκτορος ἥδε γυνή, ὃς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι
> Τρώων ἱπποδάμων ὅτε Ἴλιον ἀμφεμάχοντο.

If one could replace ἥδε γυνή with τόδε σῆμα, this would form a perfect epitaph for Hector.[69] In the *Aeneid* Andromache lives for the past, as an icon of epic fatality, praising those happy ones whom fate allowed to die at Troy (*Aen.* 3.321–4; cf. Aeneas 1.94–6). Aeneas encounters her tending Hector's cenotaph, and thus playing her Homeric part. There she, the embodiment of the *Aeneid*'s subject matter (ἀνήρ + μάχη = *arma virumque*),[70] functions as micro-image of the narrator Aeneas, who in his *logos epitaphios* for Ilion pays honour to his Trojan past, himself a mirror image of the author Virgil. Creusa, however, must die to give way to the future, stressing in her self-epitaph that the *Aeneid* will not just be another *Iliad* but lead to a constructive τέλος, the foundation of Rome. Aeneas 'remarries' his fate, and Lavinia/Rome will become the new *regia coniunx*/κρέουσα.[71] Like a Roman matron Creusa leaves to her child her good name and descent.[72] Her deed was to combine the glory of two families in Ascanius, and she dies to win glory for others. In her epitaph Virgil sums her up and defines her as an anti-Andromache, consciously playing on the epitaphic gesture of the Homeric verses.

6. The answer lies in death: poetic discourse and dying heroes

In his discussion of the models, nature, and importance of Iopas' song (*Aen.* 1.740–6) Hardie points out that 'in the *Aeneid* . . . we may detect a special sympathy with the figure of the mythical or legendary poet'.[73] Building upon this notion I will argue that Virgil holds a poetic discourse on generic transition and the power of song within his minor heroes, some of them marked explicitly as poet figures.

In seven instances *carmen*/*cantare* or *cantus* is directly linked with minor heroes. The best-known of these is in Virgil's epiphonema on Nisus and Euryalus (9.446–9). Fowler demonstrates their adventure to be a *mise en abyme* of the *Aeneid* and sees in Nisus a 'surrogate author'.[74] The conditional in *si quid mea carmina possunt* (9.446) can accordingly be read as a genuine question put to the entire epic. But Virgil asks the reader more than once to ponder whether poetry 'can do it' or 'if it can't'.[75]

[68] ἐπιγραμματικὸν ἔχει τύπον ὁ στίχος and Ps. Plut. *De Hom.* 2, 215 (cf. n. 1) and extended in Eur. *Andr.* 105–112. Ovid reworks this passage featuring Hecuba (*Met.* 13.512).

[69] Scodel (n. 4), well aware that this is metrically impossible.

[70] Michael Paschalis, *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names* (Oxford, 1997), 87.

[71] Ibid. 96.

[72] Cf. Prop. 4.11 Cornelia's self-obituary. For the epigrammatic motif of a mother who leaves behind her son, cf. *AP* 7.163–5.

[73] Philip R. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986), 52–66, at 59. Cf. also Philip R. Hardie, 'Cosmological patterns in the *Aeneid*', *PLLS 5* (1986), 87, for Vulcan as figure of the demiurgic poet.

[74] Don Fowler, 'Epic in the middle of the wood: *mise en abyme* in the Nisus and Euryalus episode', in Alison Sharrock and Helen Morales (edd.), *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman Textual Relations* (Oxford, 2000), 98.

[75] Ibid. 104.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Virgil's awareness of the power of his words may be read from the second exhibit, one of the few in which he leaves his authorial cover and addresses a minor hero directly:

> nec tu carminibus nostris indictus abibis,
> Oebale, quem generasse Telon Sebethide nympha
> fertur, Teleboum Capreas cum regna teneret,
> iam senior. (7.733–6)

Virgil demonstrates that he is able to erect an everlasting poetic monument for Oebalus. He uses his epic as epi(c)taph and projects a name into the Roman social memory. Nevertheless Oebalus' deeds themselves (7.736–40) already read like a mini-epic of war and successful conquest. His story might serve as the germ of an epic as he actually seems to bear narratological potential for another *Aeneid* and in fact Oebalus is already subject of *fama* (*fertur* 735).[76] Virgil incorporates Oebalus into his epic's *fama*, soaks him up, swallows a potential major hero, and frames him with expressions of poetic tradition (*carminibus nostris, fertur*). He gives him no chance to win glory of his own by battling within the *Aeneid*, since—not without a certain irony—he is never mentioned again. Herewith Virgil on the one hand points out his own power as *poeta creator* but on the other simultaneously shows that his social fabric could also become a poetic one: every minor hero is a potential 'Lycaon' with a distinctive fate of his own, but some—as the example of Oebalus demonstrates—could even be major heroes in their own right, subject of song, their *own* epic, as Messapus is to his people:[77]

> ibant aequati numero regemque canebant. (7.698)

We are not told if Oebalus is killed or survives the *Aeneid* as he must have survived his previous conquests, but nevertheless his appearance contains an epitaphic gesture—to Oebalus' *own* poem. Virgil ensures the pre-eminence of the *Aeneid*, Aeneas' story, through rejecting an endless number of storylines.[78] Oebalus is one of the cases where he lets us glimpse what is missed out—and silenced.

After this demonstration of poetic self-consciousness the reader does not have to wait for long to detect a more sceptical voice on the use of song in the catalogue:

> Quin et Marruvia venit de gente sacerdos,
> fronde super galeam et felici comptus oliva,
> Archippi regis missu, fortissimus Umbro,
> vipereo generi et graviter spirantibus hydris
> spargere qui somnos cantuque manuque solebat
> mulcebatque iras et morsus arte levabat.
> Sed non Dardaniae medicari cuspidis ictum

[76] Cf. *ferunt fama Hippolytum* . . . 7.765, for a short version of a tragedy and an earlier *poetic career*.

[77] He is held to be an ancestor of Ennius; cf. Horsfall (n. 30), ad loc., and this may construct him as an image of the epic tradition.

[78] With great poetic art and pathos (cf. Philip R. Hardie [ed.], *Virgil, Aeneid, Book IX*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics [Cambridge, 1994], ad loc.) the voice of the fellow poet but maybe also potential rival Cretheus is silenced forever in 9.774–7. Indeed the only 'safe' poet figure in the *Aeneid*'s second half seems to be Iapyx, who demonstratively rejected poetry in favour of medicine (*mutas agitare inglorius artes* 12.391–7). But in a way he fails in his *mutas artes* as he acts without divine inspiration (*nihil auctor Apollo/subvenit* 12.405-6) and it is Venus not he who ensures that Aeneas returns *opera ad maiora* (12.429, cf. Virgil's *maius opus* 7.45).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

evaluit, neque eum iuvere in volnera cantus
somniferi et Marsis quaesitae montibus herbae.
te nemus Angitiae, vitrea te Fucinus unda,
te liquidi flevere lacus. (7.750–60)

The figure of the priest Umbro has attracted much scholarly attention.[79] On the one hand he has been interpreted as a piece of old Italy that has to die: he will not surmount the transformation of the Italians, warlike and archaic, into Roman citizens.[80] His role as priest who is finally brought down mirrors the threat to the Italian indigenous cults represented by Aeneas' arrival bringing the Trojan gods to Latium. Faunus, progenitor of Latinus, plays an important role as oracular god before the Trojans' arrival (7.96–101). But in the end the Trojans cut down his holy tree and the duel between Turnus and Aeneas becomes for a short time a contest between native gods and Venus, the Trojan tutelary goddess (12.766–87). Moreover Umbro is identified with a place that weeps for him (7.759–60). His death thus may also constitute an erasure of localism, which is replaced, subsumed by an empire.[81] Barchiesi has punningly analysed how the water of the Paeligni and Marsi runs across lake Fucinus into the *Aqua Marcia*, aqueducts already planned—as it was said—by the fourth Roman king Ancus Marcius and later restored by the *praetor urbanus* Quintus Marcius Rex in 144 B.C. and again by Agrippa.[82] 'So the nature of the Italic heartland squeezes its tears for Umbro and Roman management of nature pipelines them into the capital.'[83] On the other hand he has also been seen as a pastoral figure who does not manage to register himself in the epic genre. The lament by nature (759–60) is a bucolic motif,[84] while the triple repetition of *te* constitutes an originally Theocritean and Georgic marker employed to mourn the passing of an idealized poet.[85] Hence Umbro has been read as representative for a genre, as nostalgia for the eclogues, 'the pastoral being subverted by history'.[86] Furthermore Hardie has explained Virgil's use of *umbra* (*Ecl.* 10.75) as referring to Lucretius' poetic shadows (6.783) and simultaneously to the 'bucolic headaches' of Theocritus (*Id.* 3.52–3).[87] Applied to the *Aeneid*, this serves as a further hint that Umbro marked through the etymology of his name is the embodiment of pastoral shade, of the pastoral poetic tradition. One might see his fate as an enactment of the interference of Rome with the pastoral valley (*Ecl.* 1) and him as a human equivalent to Silvia's pet stag (7.483ff.). Umbro's cameo appearance—which with its inherent paradox of the healer who cannot heal himself actually follows the pattern of an epideictic epigram[88]—can be seen as a swan-song of *Old Italy* on the one hand and of the pastoral on the other. Yet, as we shall see, Virgil does not leave this issue of generic

[79] Horsfall (n. 30), ad loc. provides a vast bibliography.
[80] A. Parry, 'The two voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arion* 2 (1963), 110.
[81] Cf. A. Barchiesi, 'Naissance d'un peuple', Gray lecture (Cambridge, 2001, forthcoming).
[82] Cf. Pliny, *HN* 31, 41; Strab. 5.3.13; Frontin. *Aq.* 1.7; and Stat. *Silv.* 1.5.26–8 for play with *Marsas–Marcia* (*aqua*).
[83] Barchiesi (n. 81).
[84] Cf. the examples in Reinhold Glei, *Der Vater der Dinge: Interpretationen zur politischen, literarischen und kulturellen Dimension des Krieges bei Vergil*, Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 7 (Trier, 1991), 30, n. 88.
[85] Wills (n. 29), 359.
[86] Barchiesi (n. 81).
[87] Philip R. Hardie, 'Cultural and historical narratives in Virgil's *Eclogues* and Lucretius' (forthcoming).
[88] Cf. Rossi (n. 2), 15 and *AP* Book 9.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

transition undiscussed: Umbro is *fortissimus* (752) and when mentioned again in 10.544 he rallies the front. Pastoral will at least not die defenceless.

Surprisingly we later meet a pastoral survivor, the shepherd Alsus, whose occupation gains emphasis by its position at the beginning of a line. The reader presumably will quickly bury him in his imagination because he is a pastoral figure, in imminent danger. Hence he certainly does not expect Alsus to turn round and to finish off his pursuer Podalirius—both are caught by surprise:

> Podalirius Alsum
> pastorem primaque acie per tela ruentem
> ense sequens nudo superimminet: ille securi
> adversi frontem mediam mentumque reducta
> disicit et sparso late rigat arma cruore.
> olli dura quies oculos et ferreus urget
> somnus, in aeternam conduntur lumina noctem. (12.304–8)

Alsus, a bucolic figure successful in epic warfare, has turned Umbro's *somniferos cantus* into violent fight. Still, the effect remains the same: sleep (*somnus*, 308), but now distinctively epic (*dura quies et ferreus somnus*; Servius points to the Iliadic χάλκεον ὕπνον 11.241). Moreover what flows here is no longer the lovely waters of the bucolic *locus amoenus* but the blood of the victim. The shepherd definitely seems to be out of context, but he survives by sacrificing his generic attributes of song and countryside. One feels tempted to mark him as *entartet*, as Virgil's example of what happens when pastoral goes wrong.

Virgil elaborates the many facets united in Umbro in a further minor hero, whom Umbro anticipates in various respects. With Menoetes (12.517–20), an Arcadian who hates war, we find another pastoral figure cut down. His name suggests that he would have done better to stay where he was (μένω). In fact in the following simile Aeneas and Turnus are compared to fires which burn down bay (*lauro* 12.522 in end position), which represents a constitutive element of the bucolic landscape in the *Eclogues* when weeping for Gallus: *illum etiam lauri ... flevere* (*Ecl.* 10.13).[89] Pastoral becomes extinct before the epic showdown. In the second half of the *Aeneid*, then, we seem to witness the lament for a genre, the funeral of pastoral poetry, with minor heroes as its epitaph.

By employing his minor heroes for a wider discussion of genre and poetic production, and by inserting a series of genre-specific characters or explicit poet figures into the *Aeneid*, Virgil was following, as we have shown, a Hellenistic tradition of encoding literary statements into obituaries.

EPILOGUE

At the end we may step back and try to imagine the *Aeneid* through the eyes of an ancient editor. Throughout the poem half-lines are a constant reminder of the epos' incompleteness, and its sudden ending (*fugit indignata sub umbras* 12.952) marks where the poet had to leave off. The *Aeneid* can be regarded as both the highlight but simultaneously also the finale of Virgil's poetic career. Thus later editors have employed the *ille ego* lines as a form of autobiographical proem which casts the *Aeneid* as the realization of Virgil's epitaph (cf. *Mantua me genuit ... cecini*

[89] Furthermore Virgil plays with the association of δάφνη with the ultimate bucolic figure Daphnis in *Ecl.* 8.83 *ego hanc in Daphnide laurum* (sc. uro).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pascua, rura, duces, Donat. *Vita Verg.* 36).[90] Accordingly the ancient reader when he began his reading was greeted in many a copy by a portrait of Virgil and the following verses:

> Ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena
> carmen, et egressus silvis vicina coegi
> ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono,
> gratum opus agricolis: at nunc horrentia Martis. . . .

By enhancing the *Aeneid*'s implicit epitaphic gesture, these lines ask the reader to regard the *Aeneid* as the poet's legacy, his everlasting monument, and simultaneously style their own poetic tradition.[91]

St John's College, Cambridge MARTIN DINTER
mtd26@cam.ac.uk

[90] Cf. R. G. Austin, 'Ille ego qui quondam . . .', *CQ* 18 (1968), 107–15 regarding their authenticity.

[91] Cf. J. Fairweather, 'Ovid's autobiographical poem, *Tristia* 4.10', *CQ* 37 (1987), 186–7 for the epitaphic qualities of *ille ego* in Ovid *Tr.* 4.10 and verse inscriptions and John Henderson, 'On Pliny on Martial on Anon . . . (Epistles 3.21/Epigrams10.19)', *Ramus* 30 (2001), 72 on Martial's *ille ego* preface (Ep. 9 pr.).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/bmi011 Published online by Cambridge University Press