

DEVIANT FOCALISATION IN VIRGIL'S *AENEID*

My subject is point of view in the *Aeneid*. I want to make some theoretical points about that concept, and to discuss some examples. In writing this paper, however, I have come to realise that underneath there lies an attempt to come to terms with the work on Virgil of two of my elders, betters, and friends, Oliver Stone and Gian Biagio Conte, to whom this piece is offered with affection. But I shall not try to conceal the Oedipal nature of these encounters. As will be seen, there is also an element of *prolepsis*: I want to forestall a particular line of interpretation about the *Aeneid* which I sense is about to make its appearance.

In my title I use the term 'focalisation' rather than 'point of view'. The term is Genette's, later taken up especially by Mieke Bal.¹ I use it for three reasons. First, I believe the reason that led Genette to coin it was a valid one, and perhaps the single most important proposition in his narratology. Genette criticised traditional accounts of point of view for confusing two distinct questions: 'who speaks?', and 'who sees?'. In relation to any textual feature, the answers to these questions may be different. For the first phenomenon, we have the term 'voice', and it is helpful to have a separate term for the second; that is, focalisation.

My second and third reasons for using the term are more practical. First, we can easily form the agent-noun 'focaliser' to give us a partner for 'narrator' in a way that we cannot do with 'point of view'; and second, the term is clearly and precisely defined by Mieke Bal in her *Narratology*, is a standard one in that discipline, and has become familiar to classicists through Irene de Jong's excellent *Narrators and focalizers: the presentation of the story in the Iliad*.² I do not want my use of the term, however, to signal either a pretence to greater theoretical knowledge than I possess or an acceptance of all the propositions of Dutch narratology, in particular the tripartite version of the basic story/narrative division that Bal proposes, with *fabula* the basic level of plot, *story* the presentation of events from a point of view, and *text* the verbal expression. The problems involved in the distinction, basic to narratology, between 'what happened' and 'the way I tell it' are well-known, but if we are going to have any finite number of levels we might as well stick to two.³

By *deviant* focalisation, I mean instances where in normal language we should expect focaliser and narrator to coincide but they do not. There is no general rule of ordinary language which requires the coincidence of narrator and focaliser, and there are a host of familiar devices which allow a point of view to be

'embedded'.⁴ But I am concerned not with these explicit devices but with what de Jong terms 'implicit embedded focalisation', where there are no explicit signals in the text.⁵ I prefer the more tendentious 'deviant' to stress that there is a sense in which these instances 'break the rules'. My usage is anything but neutral, and raises many questions. Before turning to these, however, let me give a couple of examples so that it is clear what I am about. My first is taken from de Jong, the second from Callimachus' *Hymn to Demeter*.

I take the Homeric example from de Jong's discussion of the occurrence of evaluative and affective words outside direct speech, in which she tries to refine Jasper Griffin's analysis of the phenomenon.⁶ Discussing *Iliad* 23. 252-3, she notes with Griffin that the lines contain a unique occurrence of the word ἐνήης outside direct speech:

κλαίοντες δ' ἐτάροιο ἐνήεος ὄστέα λευκά
ἄλλεγον

The epic narrator speaks the word ἐνήεος but de Jong sees the focaliser rather as Patroclus' companions: 'the unique presence outside direct speech of ἐνήης may be explained as due to implicit embedded focalisation by Patroclus' companions'.⁷ Thus the problem of the presence of the word is solved. This role of deviant focalization in providing a *lysis* of a familiar type to literary *problemata* is something to which I want to return. But let me proceed to my second example. At *Hymn to Demeter* 94-5 we are told of how everyone wept for Erysichthon's plight:

κλαῖε μὲν ἅ μᾶτηρ, βαρὺ δ' ἔστενον αἱ δὺ' ἀδελφῆαι
χῶ μαστός τὸν ἔπωνε καὶ αἱ δέκα πολλάκι δῶλαι.

Hopkinson⁸ has an excellent note on the metonymy of μαστός; following McKay,⁹ he observes that 'Here the nurse is identified with the breast which she beats in her grief', which is clearly correct. He understandably passes over in silence McKay's second point, which stems from the latter's view of Erysichthon as conceived as a giant: 'for the wet-nurse who must satisfy a young giant's thirst μαστός must represent a very substantial part of the whole, and so warrant special mention'.¹⁰ This is wrong, but can perhaps serve to prevent us from too easily explaining away the metonymy. I suggest that the lexical choice ὁ μαστός τὸν ἔπωνε is determined by the focalisation. The narrator speaks, but Erysichthon is the focaliser at this point. This is a complex example, because the phrase represents Erysichthon's point of view at two moments. As a child he saw the Nurse as a breast, but now too we catch him looking at her in his hunger in the same way.

want to use this example to make two points. First, if this interpretation is correct, we do not solve a problem and thus make the text more simple, but rather complicate it by introducing another possibility which we have awkwardly to accommodate into our reading. Again, I will return to this. Second, my detection of deviant focalisation here may not be shared by everyone. I do not want to do this possibility, but to use it to emphasise that this will inevitably often be the case with implicit embedded focalisation. Because it is *not* explicitly signalled, whether we choose to suppose its presence in a particular instance will be a matter of interpretative choice.

I am already insinuating theory, so let me come out of the closet completely. The first point that I wish to make stems from my question-begging use of the term 'deviant'. This might imply that focalisation shifts of the kind that I am discussing are a special feature of literary language, one of the ways in which it deviates from normal language. This is not, of course, true. It is a common practice for people to use words which involve them 'seeing the world through the eyes of others as well as from their own point of view', to quote a modern linguist,¹¹ and for such shifts of focalisation to occur without explicit signals in the discourse. Consider, for example, the following pairs of sentences:

- (1) (Offensive male) Why are you reading that feminist rubbish?
 (2) (Feminist) I like this feminist rubbish.
 (1') (Feminist) Why are you reading that feminist rubbish?
 (2') (Reforming male) I like this feminist rubbish (now).

The focalisation shift in these instances can be signalled by various linguistic and extra-linguistic bracketing devices, but it need not be. If it is not, the shift still occurs: our feminist does not believe that what she is reading is rubbish, nor does the reforming male. This is, as I say, a familiar phenomenon, and indeed some linguists use the concept of empathy implied here to explain a number of features of discourse.¹² But their work can also, I hope, justify my use of deviant. We are conscious in these examples of something funny going on, not of an illicit use of language but of a *figured* one – the figure in question, of course, usually being irony. There is what the discourse analyst Susumu Kuno called 'The speech-act participant empathy hierarchy', one of whose dicta is that 'it is easiest for the speaker to empathise with himself (i.e. to express his own point of view)'.¹³ There is always a push to make people mean what they say, and instances where they do not are at least a little bit 'deviant' (not to say devious).

If the focalisation shift in my examples is not explicitly signalled at the time, how do we know that it takes place? The answer takes us into pragmatics: from the context of utterance, and ultimately from our knowledge of the beliefs of the participants in the dialogue. This raises a problem for literary texts, because it is precisely the pragmatics of those texts – what is to count as pragmatics for them –

which is theoretically controversial and in practice difficult to define. At the very least, an answer to the question 'Who sees?' for an expression in a literary text may depend on our interpretation of the whole of that text. This is certainly true of the *Aeneid* as we shall see. But this difficulty is arguably essential to the function of implicit embedded focalisation in literary texts, to generate ambiguity and uncertainty. That is certainly the function that is regularly assigned to the equivalent device at the level of voice, free indirect discourse (FID). Many of the discussions of point of view in the *Aeneid* do not distinguish clearly between deviant focalisation and free indirect discourse, and the distinction is obviously not a strong one. I would reserve the label of FID for more extended instances of assumed point of view in proximity to a reference to thought or speech, but there are obviously borderline cases and the one may pass into the other. One of the standard examples of FID in the *Aeneid*, for instance, is 9.399–401, giving Nisus' reactions to the capture of Euryalus:

quid faciat? qua vi iuuenem, quibus audeat armis
 eripere? an sese medios moriturus in enses
 inferat et pulchram properet per uulnera mortem?

Although this is clearly FID, the way in which *pulchram* represents Nisus' focalisation is exactly the same as in many examples of what I should call deviant focalisation, and it is pointless to make too rigid a distinction. The important point is that the functions are similar. Are we sure that *Virgil* is not saying Nisus' death will be *pulchra*? This is a point to which I shall again return, but I should add that I am not going to say much about FID partly because it has been treated in *Virgil* by Alessandro Perutelli,¹⁴ but more importantly because Andrew Laird is currently working on the whole topic of speech presentation in Latin.

But if the rôle of deviant focalisation, like that of FID, in creating ambiguity suggests again a specifically *literary* function, let me again make the point that this is bound up with general phenomena of language. In answering the question 'who sees?', it is easy to assume that the answer is determined by the conscious wishes of the participants. But language is notoriously not our own, and the expressions someone uses may come from others, and represent the point of view of others even when they appear to be freely chosen. The point is made by Moshe Ron of an extended passage of FID in a pulp novel, which is itself worth quoting *in extenso*:¹⁵

My final example comes from an underground classic entitled *Posh*. Beula Montezuma, a suburban California housewife, has spent the day preparing for her husband, Tony, a very special cake which, she hopes, will erect their hitherto inadequate relationship on a wholly new basis.

[1] 'Dinner is ready, all piping hot,' she sang. [2] How her husband loved chicken à la king for dinner, especially when garnished with a peppery watercress salad. [3] What a change from hamburgers and French fries. [4] And when the meal was crowned with a light, savory angel food specialty cake, for him it was a total experience, a repast to be remembered.

[5] 'You look a bit out of sorts,' he told his wife. 'Apprehensive or something' (<S. >Gatos <Posh (New York)>, 1971: 21).

Sentences [2]-[4] are in FID, and they are framed in this excerpt by two other sentences which 'quote' the two characters' words in Direct Discourse. The so-called expressive elements in [2] would here be attributed to her, based on the transition from *she* in [1] to *her husband* in [2] (focusing on his relevance to *her*; although *her husband* is the subject of the sentence, she is still the topic of discourse). But what shall be said of [3]? As reconstructed by an overanxious MR <(Mimetic Reader)> this might read: 'she exclaimed inwardly, as she thought her husband would exclaim (were he able to verbalise his feelings on the subject): "What a change from hamburgers and French fries!"' Considered as a representation of his mental state [3] naturally follows after [2]. So would [4] after [3]. But when the analysis gets to [5], where he is the focus (both the subject and the topic of the parenthetical 'he told his wife' – rather than *'her husband told her'), it can backtrack through the sequence using the same transitions to eliminate the implicated higher-instance clauses of which she was the postulated subject, substituting for them higher-instance clauses where he would be the subject. A third, distinctly less appealing, possibility would be to attribute the enthusiasm for this menu to an effaced narrator. There seems to be no formal ground for deciding between these readings.

I would, nevertheless, having had the benefit of reading this edifying work in its entirety, tend to judge the first hypothesis to be correct. [2]-[4] are her FID. My grounds for saying so are entirely empirical. 'All piping hot' (in DD), 'chicken à la [sic] king', 'garnished with', 'a peppery watercress salad', 'what a change from hamburger and French fries', 'crowned with', 'a light, savory angel food specialty cake', 'for him', 'a total experience', 'a repast to be remembered' – what are all these? Who produced these utterances? Don't they all sound sort of familiar? This patchwork of clichés from women's magazines, soap opera and advertising can only point to the enterprising young wife (the husband will have turned out in the end to be a propagator of clichés rather than a mere consumer). This pastiche *is* in fact the consciousness (if that is what you want to call it) of Beula Montezuma. But the contents of this person's mind are clearly not her own. Where are the original I's of these E's, the original SELFs of these sentiments?

One way of looking at the way that cultural hegemony is imposed through language is to think of *enforced* focalisation shifts. People are forced to use expressions which do not 'really' represent their point of view because no others are available to them. This may seem a phenomenon irrelevant to literary texts, but of course it is not. One aspect of it in literary texts is generic pressure: words come laden with generic associations which may force focalisation shifts. It is precisely from this viewpoint that Gian Biagio Conte approached the *Aeneid* in his *Saggio*;¹⁶ again, I must defer discussion for the moment, but would stress at this point the simple fact that deviant focalisation is bound up with ideology. Nothing could be more political than the question of whose point of view language embodies.

But first to some examples. I begin with a paradigmatic one, the standard one in many modern discussions. At 4.281 we are told of Aeneas' reaction to Mercury's mission to him: *ardet abire fuga, dulcisque relinquere terras. Dulcis* represents the focalisation of Aeneas, 'sweet to him', not necessarily of the narrator Virgil. The note in Servius is unfortunately corrupt, but seems to reflect on this:

Dulcesque relinquere terras deest 'quamquam', per quod intellegi uult Aeneas
† amo

Although he found them sweet, Aeneas was ablaze to leave the land; the focalisation shift captures his hesitation and yet deliberation. Narrator Virgil, focaliser Aeneas. For some more interesting examples, I want to turn to Virgil's use of the word *superbus*, recently helpfully surveyed by Alfonso Traina in the *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*.¹⁷ It is well known that *superbus* in Latin differs from English 'proud' in being overwhelmingly pejorative, especially when applied to people; the tiro in Latin prose composition soon comes to appreciate the difficulty of translating such Roman-sounding phrases as 'patriotic pride'. This is true also of Virgil's usage on the whole, but there are a number of occasions where it is not obviously true. There is a celebrated example at the beginning of Book 1 (19-22), where we are told what Juno had heard was to be the future of Rome:

progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci
audierat Tyrias olim quae uerteret arces;
hinc populum late regem belloque superbum
uenturum excidio Libyae; sic uoluerat Parcas.

Seeing the problem of *superbum*, Servius glosses the word as *eminentem, gloriosum*, and is followed in this by Traina; what Roman would not have agreed with this description, he asks. It is more plausible with Jackson Knight¹⁸ and

others to see here deviant focalisation: this represents the point of view not of the narrator but of Juno, the way *she* sees the future role of Rome. *Superbus* should represent the focalisation of the narrator even in indirect speech; as in English, I could not report someone's statement 'I'll get that arrogant charlatan Auceps' with the words 'He said that he would get that arrogant charlatan Auceps' unless I am prepared to focalise 'arrogant charlatan' myself. Or rather, I could only do so with a figured shift of focalisation, as in Virgil. That this is what is happening is confirmed by a more remarkable shift later in I.25–8:

necdum etiam causae irarum saeuique dolores
exciderant animo; manet alta mente repostum
iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae
et genus inuisum et rapti Ganymedis honores.

27–8 are a curiously unbalanced pair of lines. Three reasons are offered for Juno's hatred of the Trojans, spread over four cola: *iudicium Paridis*, *spretae iniuria formae*, *genus inuisum*, *rapti Ganymedis honores*. The first two clearly belong together, and represent the Judgement of Paris; the last clearly refers to the abduction of Ganymede. But to what does *genus inuisum* refer? To Jupiter's parentage of Dardanus, we are told;¹⁹ but the phrase is curiously oblique for this, and we are left with the first and third members of a tricolon containing proper names with the centre one not containing one but referring to a named individual. Dardanus cannot be completely absent from the reader's mind when s/he encounters *genus inuisum*, but equally it cannot be the whole story. The answer was seen by James Henry,²⁰ for whom *genus inuisum* was simply an emotional expression of hatred inserted by Juno in her anger: 'the Judgement of Paris, and I hate them, and the rape of Ganymede'. The irruption of the unspecified *et genus inuisum* 'And the hateful race' reproduces in mimetic *oratio obliqua* the way Juno herself put the matter in her mind. This is perhaps a matter of voice rather than focalisation, since her thoughts were articulated in this way, but the intrusion of Juno's point of view parallels the deviant focalisation in *belloque superbum*.

Other examples are less clear. At the opening of Book 3,²¹ Aeneas reflects bitterly on the destruction of Troy:

postquam res Asiae Priamique euertere gentem
immeritam uisum superis, ceciditque superbum
Ilium et onnis humo fumat Neptunia Troia,
diuersa exsilia et desertas quaerere terras
auguriis agimur diuum . . .

Superbum Ilium, as Traina notes, recalls the use by their enemies of the insulting phrase Τρῶες ὑπερφίαλοι in the *Iliad*²² and is the source of Dante's *superbo*

Ilium,²³ but Traina denies that it can have any pejorative associations in Aeneas' mouth and immediately after *immeritam*. It is true that the Homeric adjective is an ambivalent parallel since it was standard scholiastic doctrine that ὑπερφίαλος could itself be used both positively and negatively,²⁴ but it is difficult to keep from one's mind especially Menelaus' vaunt in *Iliad* 13 which accused the Trojans of defying Zeus and the gods.²⁵ The phrase would be at home in the topos of the fall of empires and cities, for which Troy was a paradigm:²⁶ 'where is now the pride of Ilium?' This time the focaliser could well be the narrating author, intruding into his character's narration; but we can also take this as representing the focalisation of the gods, and thus bitterly ironic in Aeneas' mouth. Troy seemed so *superbus* to them that they destroyed it. This makes sense of the link between *superis* and *superbum*, accentuated in the *humo fumat* of the following line: the gods thought Troy was getting uppity, and put it in its place. Line 2 is thus framed by two evaluative adjectives representing different focalizations of the *gens immerita*, *superbum Ilium*.

The opening lines of Book 3 recall the earlier epitaph for Priam that Aeneas had offered in 2.554–7:

haec finis Priami fatorum, hic exitus illum
sorte tulit Troiam incensam et prolapsa uidentem
Pergama, tot quondam populis terrisque superbum
regnatorem Asiae. iacet ingens litore truncus,
aaulsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus.

These lines are discussed in a forthcoming article by Angus Bowie,²⁷ and so I must be especially brief. He has developed Servius' observation that the description of the dead Priam recalls Pompey,²⁸ pointing out that the phrase *tot quondam populis terrisque superbum | regnatorem Asiae* is especially reminiscent of contemporary views of Pompey. Again, we may detect the presence of generic contamination, this time from the topos of the 'grandi trapassati',²⁹ most familiar from the end of Lucretius Book 3:

inde alii multi reges rerumque potentes
occiderunt, magnis qui gentibus imperitarunt (1027–8).

The topos can be used neutrally, as merely a reminder that all men must die,³⁰ but there is often a suggestion of fatal justice in pride brought low: it is worth observing that some Greek examples use the word σεμνός, though I have no examples with *superbus*.³¹ But who focalises *superbum regnatorem Asiae*? It is easy to forget in Aeneas' long narration that he speaks, not Vergil the narrator, and this narrative amnesia is inescapable: when Austin comments on 2.427 *dis aliter uisum*, 'The comment comes from Virgil's private world of thought, to move each

reader in his own private way', the elision of the distinction between Aeneas and Virgil is unfortunate but invited by the text. But it is not obviously the case that Virgil the narrator would call Priam *superbus*.³² Moreover, although there is a marked 'narrative dislocation' here, as Bowie notes³³ – we suddenly flash forward to Priam on the beach – the way that the story resumes at 559 encourages us to see this shift as Aeneas': *at me tum primum saevus circumstetit horror*. We are encouraged by the whole movement of the narrative to see the reflection on Priam's fate as a pathetic pause in Aeneas' narrative to Dido. This is accentuated by the fact that the lines have special point addressed to Dido at the luxurious Eastern banquet laid on for the Trojans.³⁴ The union of past, present, and future could not be more Virgilian.

There is another intertext, the description of Priam's death by Andromache in Ennius' *Andromacha* which was Cicero's favourite piece of poetry:³⁵

o pater, o patria, o Priami domus
saeptum altisono cardine templum.
uidi ego te adstante ope barbarica
tectis caelatis laqueatis,
auro ebore instructam regilice.

haec omnia uidi inflammari,
Priamo ui uitam cuitari,
louis aram sanguine turpari.

As Servius notes,³⁶ these lines had already been recalled at 1.726 to describe the banquet hall, and at 2.241–2 in the narration of the entry of the horse into Troy, and they later lie behind the description on the shield at 8.685–8 of that other Eastern potentate Antony: *ope barbarica, uariisque Antonius armis*. This last imitation raises a question of focalisation which is not unrelated to the present one in Virgil. In 8.685, it is natural to take *ope barbarica* as mildly pejorative, though that may be weakened by the allusion to Priam. What of the focalisation in Ennius? Andromache speaks, but how can she see the wealth of Troy as 'barbarian'? This problem and the Virgilian one come together in yet another imitation of the Ennian passage, the opening of the Priam episode which our epitaph for him closes:³⁷

uidi ipse furem
caede Neoptoleum geminosque in limine Atridas,
uidi Hecubam centumque nurus Priamumque per aras
sanguine foedantem quos ipse sacrauerat ignis.
quinquaginta illi thalami, spes tanta nepotum,
barbarico postes auro spoliisque superbi
procubere; tenent Danaï qua deficit ignis.

This is another narrative dislocation, in that it anticipates the description of Priam's death: the framing could not be stronger. Commentators from Servius to Austin reassure us that *barbarico* here is natural in the mouth of a Trojan, as does Jocelyn on the Ennius fragment, but I remain unconvinced by the parallels.³⁸ Again, we might note how the two words in *Aeneid* 2.504 which are difficult to focalise frame the line, this time reinforcing each other: *barbarico . . . superbi*. The line is clearly preparatory to 505 *procubere*, the pride before the fall, an implication Cicero noted in Ennius.³⁹ But I think that in both we are also tempted to see a sarcastic assumption of the Greek point of view: 'so-called' *barbarico*, *superbi* 'in their eyes'. If we see 2.504 in this way, then that must colour *superbum regnatorem* in 2.556: 'what some may see as' *superbum*.

You may not be happy with this: I confess that I am not myself, because I am conscious that it tames the text too much. What I do insist on though is that it is wrong merely to say that *superbus* is used neutrally, with Traina. It is of the essence of words like *superbus* that they cannot be used neutrally, and saying what they 'mean' always involves the critic's ideology as well as that of the author and his original audiences. It is of course true that *superbus* used of things is much less obviously pejorative than when used of people,⁴⁰ precisely because of the moral evasion that the transfer of focalisation embodies, but even in these cases we should not allow ourselves to be desensitised. The final example of the word that I want to discuss can serve to remind us again of how much may hang on these questions. It is in the description of Augustus on the Palatine in the shield *ekphrasis* at 8.720–3:

ipse sedens niueo candentis limine Phoebi
dona recognoscit populorum aptatque superbis
postibus.

D. Gillis⁴¹ had here noted the parallel to the description of Cacus' cave at 8.196–7 *foribusque adfixa superbis / ora uirum tristi pendebant pallida tabo* and had seen 'odious implications'; Traina⁴² prefers to see the connection, if it is to be admitted at all, as contrastive. He does not deny that at *Georgics* 2.461, *foribus domus alta superbis* the use is pejorative, but insists that 'it is the referent or the context alone which activates the negative connotation which is certainly original and prevalent in *superbus*'.

This is not absurd. There is certainly a difference between the *dona . . . populorum* that Augustus affixes and the *ora uirum* of Cacus.⁴³ And we can now offer a more powerful weapon to those who wish to defuse any hint of anti-Augustanism here. It is possible to see the use of *superbus* as representing the focalisation of the *uictae . . . gentes*. The scene is partly seen through their eyes: that is part of the function of *niueo candentis limine Phoebi*, though the spectator is also of course Aeneas. And so, even if we admit a pejorative sense to *superbus*,

this need not worry us here, because we can see it as deviant focalisation. No problem.

This time I hope more strongly that you are not convinced. Can we so easily remove all feelings of unease with the three-card focalisation switch? But before pursuing this question, let me offer one further, more extended example of problematic focalisation. This is the description in Book 6 of Dido's reaction to Aeneas' speech in the underworld (467-76):

talibus Aeneas ardentem et torua tuentem
lenibat dictis animum lacrimasque ciebat.
illa solo fixos oculos auersa tenebat
nec magis incepto uultum sermone mouetur
quam si dura silex aut stet Marpesia cautes.
tandem corripuit sese atque inimica refugit
in nemus umbriferum, coniunx ubi pristinus illi
respondet curis aequatque Sychaeus amorem.
nec minus Aeneas casu percussus iniquo
prosequitur lacrimis longe et miseratur euntem.

The most celebrated problem in these lines is the very Virgilian one of whose tears are referred to in 468. Aeneas 'was softening the mind of Dido with his words and summoning tears'. As often with ambiguities, the problem is not that we have insufficient contextual information to determine the problem but that there is overdetermination. Aeneas has already wept at 455 *demisit lacrimas* and we should naturally take the parallel *lenibat* and *ciebat* as both affecting Dido. But the sense of *ciebat* favours rather Aeneas, because, as Austin puts it, '*ciere* in such phrases is normally used of the emotions of the subject, not of an emotion stirred by another person', though the rule is not as clear as Austin suggests.⁴⁴ Yet if we take the tears as Aeneas', while the first imperfect is 'obviously conative' (Austin), *ciebat* cannot be, and we have an inconcinnity between the two verbs.

Austin offers an interpretation which is brilliant, though it presupposes a technique whose novelty he conceals. He wishes to see these lines as reporting what happened during Aeneas' speech, rather than after it:

Virgil is in fact restating the situation as Aeneas was speaking: this line looks back to 455, with *lenibat* here corresponding to *dulci adfatus amore* there, *demisit lacrimas* there picked up in *lacrimas ciebat* here, a chiasmic arrangement. Similarly, what follows describes Dido's reaction to the opening of Aeneas' speech (*incepto sermone* 470), then her convulsive movement (472) at the point where Aeneas cries *siste gradum* (465).

There is a familiar linearisation problem⁴⁵ with having to describe the reactions to

a speaker's words after s/he has finished. The solution adopted here of describing the reactions after the speech but signalling that they happened during it is not the usual one, and I do not think it is the obvious way that the reader takes these lines: that is, the reader naturally imagines a pause before 472 *tandem corripuit sese* rather than placing the line contemporaneous with 465-6. I do not mean that Austin is not right, but that he is not *obviously* right. At any rate the simile at 469-71 represents a pause at the level of narration, if not at the level of story. What interests me for the moment is the variety of ways in which the reader can focalise the description of Dido's reaction. The simile recalls two passages in particular. The first is 1.589-93, Venus' adornment of Aeneas as he first appears to Dido, a moment Austin, with perhaps an unfortunate choice of words, calls 'a magic moment, of pregnant import':

namque ipsa decoram
caesariem nato genetrix lumenque iuuentae
purpureum et laetos oculis adflarat honores:
quale manus addunt ebori decus, aut ubi flavo
argentum Pariusue lapis circumdatur auro.

The Odyssean model here is the repeated passage which describes Odysseus' bath and its effect on Nausicaa and non-effect on Penelope;⁴⁶ *Pariusue lapis* is Virgil's addition to Homer's mention of silver. The second passage is Dido's harsh words at 4.365-70:

nec tibi diua parens generis nec Dardanus auctor,
perfide, sed duris genuit te cautibus horrens
Caucasus Hyrcanaeque admorunt ubera tigres.
nam quid dissimulo aut quae me ad maiora reseruo?
num fletu ingemuit nostro? num lumina flexit?
num lacrimas uictus dedit aut miseratus amantem est?

Dido accuses Aeneas of being born of *il Caucaso gelato*, amongst *duris* ... *cautibus*; the models are *Iliad* 16.35 (Patroclus to Achilles) and especially Catullus 64.154 *sola sub rupe leaena*, though the Caucasus is Promethean.⁴⁷ As Pease notes,⁴⁸ the passage in Book 6 reverses that in 4, with Dido this time unmoved: 'The rigidity of which Dido here accuses Aeneas she herself, by poetic justice, illustrates in 6.471, where she is compared to *dura silex* and *Marpesia cautes*.'

But these comparisons of others to rocks or the offspring of rocks are usually, for obvious reasons, to be found in character speech, because they are born of feeling. There is certainly dramatic irony here, but this fact invites us also to see the comparison as representing the more-or-less conscious irony of one of the

characters. But which? The problem is that we can make either Aeneas or Dido the focaliser here. First, Aeneas as focaliser. He can see that she is angry – the transference in *torua tuentem . . . animum* throws emphasis on the way she looked at him. He tries to win her over, and perhaps is beginning to succeed, although he gives every appearance of avoiding his gaze: as Heuzé⁴⁹ remarks, *c'est une attitude d'hostilité; mais quis sait si Didon ne se prémunit pas elle-même à son tour contre des sentiments auxquels elle ne veut pas céder?* 'Qui sait?', indeed; there is hope there for Aeneas, and more hope too in *incepto sermone*. If he says more, perhaps she could be persuaded. But she pulls herself together and walks off as if he were his enemy, *inimica*; and as she does so his eyes tearfully follow her. Her ghost had appeared to him white and shining like the moon or Parian marble; but now she has gone and left him to the shades.

But perhaps it is Dido who is the focaliser here. It is, after all, her *animus* which *s ardens* and *torua tuens*, not her eyes. She watches Aeneas' attempt to persuade her, and the tears he summons up; but she herself avoids his gaze, and this time she can play the Theseus, like *dura silex* or the raw marble on the Parian hillside before it is fashioned into an image.⁵⁰ These thoughts possess her for a while; but at length she pulls herself away, and as with Aeneas over Priam's death, the *tandem corripuit sese* makes it clear that what has passed before are her thoughts. She chooses to be *inimica*, to leave him and go back *coniunx ubi pristinus illi / respondet curis aequatque Sychaeus amorem*. Her cares, her love; only with the next lines do we switch focalisation back to Aeneas.

My point is an obvious one. In respect of focalisation, this passage, and in particular the simile in 470–1, is a duck rabbit.⁵¹ The narrator speaks; but we can make the focaliser either Dido or Aeneas. We can choose to see it from the man's point of view or the woman's. Or, of course, we can deny that there is any deviant focalisation and make the narrator the focaliser after all, describing both of his characters from the outside but then sympathetically intervening in 471. It is this aspect of the reader's choice that I want to turn to for my final reflections on Virgilian focalisation in the light of my examples. The topic I have been discussing is of course not a new one for Virgilian studies. The *protos heurtes* is conventionally and with much justice made Richard Heinze,⁵² with his famous account of Virgilian *Subjektivität* and *Empfindung*, though Gianpiero Rosati and Caterina Lazzarini have been able to show that the notion of a switch in focalisation can be found already in Servius.⁵³ Heinze's concept of *Empfindung* was refined by Otis in the third chapter of his 1964 *Vergil: a study in civilised poetry*⁵⁴ into the familiar terms of 'sympathy' and 'empathy', the poet's intervention in the narrative and his identification with his characters. In so far as Anglo-American critics talk of point of view in classical texts, it is Otis' terms that they use, above all 'empathy'. Much more significant than the Anglo-American usage, however, has been the reception of Otis' work in Italy. In fact, the book occupies

a surprisingly central role in the ideological debates of the last 25 years within Italian Latin studies; discussed by La Penna in the first issue of the campaigning *Dialoghi di Archeologia* in 1967, it was then eleven years later central to Conte's *Saggio d'interpretazione dell'Eneide* which was the first article in the first issue of *Materiali e discussioni*, and later became the core of *Il genere e suoi confini* and *The rhetoric of imitation*.⁵⁵ Moreover, the issues raised have been discussed in a series of articles by pupils of La Penna and Conte, most notably Alessandro Perutelli,⁵⁶ culminating in Marzia Bonfante's large-scale study of 1985, *Punto di Vista e modi della narrazione nell'Eneide*.⁵⁷ This is not the work of Otis' book alone, but reflects also the intense interest in narratology, and specifically in point of view, to be seen everywhere in Italian criticism of the last 25 years.⁵⁸ But what is important, I think, is to see the way that the Italian scholars straightway saw the ideological importance of these matters. These are questions of politics as well as poetics.

In his article of 1967, polemically entitled 'Sul cosiddetto stile soggettivo, e sul cosiddetto simbolismo di Virgilio', La Penna rightly pointed to the unhelpfulness of combining the very different phenomena of 'sympathy' and 'empathy' into a single notion of 'subjective style', but more importantly he also saw the account of empathy as misguided. He was particularly concerned with the implications of Otis' work – implications Otis himself acknowledged – for the independence of Virgil's characters. We end up with all Virgil, and no characters, with a completely undramatic work in which 'rather than a dramatic action we have an effusion of Vergil's intense lyricism'.⁵⁹ He argued that variant focalisation should be seen rather as a more objective procedure: 'To situate oneself from the point of view of a character, and to look with his eyes, or rather his sentiments, upon action, objects, landscape is a procedure of *objectification*'.⁶⁰ So too Gianpiero Rosati stressed that: 'The intervention of Vergil into the interior of his characters is not authorial violence on the psychology of his poetic creation, not an overlaying or substitution of his own emotional reaction for theirs, but rather the best way to register and reproduce the character's own state of mind.'⁶¹ A similar point is made by Irene de Jong when she sums up what she sees as the main point of her book:⁶²

My thesis that the presentation of the story in the *Iliad* is not objective, neutral, or impersonal does not mean that I suggest to describe it now simply by the opposites of these qualifications, viz. as subjective, engaged and emotional. In fact, I think that it is best characterized as *multiple*. Despite the uniformity bestowed upon the Iliadic text by the unity of metre (both narrator-text and character-text are composed in dactylic hexameters), the formulas and the typical scenes, this narrative has more variety of presentation than many a modern novel.

hat is, although there are instances where we cannot help but see the narrator as focaliser making an evaluative intervention, usually we do not have to if we are prepared to admit variation in focalisation. By seeing an element as focalised by one of the characters rather than the narrator, we can absolve him or her of any ideological commitment.

De Jong's view of the *Iliad* is in fact more complicated, as is the view of Virgilian focalisation that Conte adopted. He distinguished between a general epic code basic to the mode and an epic norm which inscribed certain ideological values into the individual epic poem; not as an 'extraliterary inheritance', but as the backbone of epic language as it has become consolidated historically.⁶³ Original poets challenge this norm, though they cannot escape it; and 'for a new kind of poetry to be able to present itself as a thoroughgoing reformulation of the world, language must be torn away from routine connotations and must acquire a multiplicity of meanings', thus recapturing 'the wide-ranging "competence" of the code'.⁶⁴ For Conte, the works of Homer and Ennius embodied a single point of view; in particular, in Roman epic, 'A unified point of view is ensured by the poet's identification of himself with truth, tradition, and morality'.⁶⁵ Virgil reintroduces multiple points of view so that the text becomes polycentric, and thus shatters the pretence of the epic norm to natural authority. All those figures – the victims of history – whose viewpoints were suppressed by the epic norm are suddenly brought into the poem. But even more radically than La Penna, Conte sees these as not subjective interventions by the poet but independent points of view; more radically, because he denies that the *Aeneid* is really dramatic. In drama we expect multiple viewpoints, and arrange them into patterns of conflict; but in the *Aeneid* this dramatic conflict does not exist. 'Rather than real conflict, there is diversity. Every point of view is a center of independent perception. Overall reality appears in the *Aeneid* as if reflected in a cracked mirror. It exists as many times over as there are active points of view.'⁶⁶

This rapid survey is inevitably crude, but not I hope misleading. Conte has been accused of making Homer and Ennius too monologic, with some justice; certainly some modifications are needed in the light of the work of de Jong on Homer. But this is not a major objection: what matters is how the epic tradition was received in Rome, not how it could or should have been, and the way in which the neoterics and the elegists use opposition to Homer and Ennius in their politicisation of Callimacheanism suggests that Conte was not wrong in his view of the role that tradition played at Rome.⁶⁷ Moreover, we are familiar with the practice whereby poets retrospectively make their predecessors less complex and more monolithic to enable their own rebellion, as Denis Feeney has pointed out.⁶⁸ There is a tendency in the history of a work's reception for a 'regression to the mean' which it is one of criticism's tasks to resist: one thinks above all of the use made by Ovid and Lucan of the *Aeneid* itself. What is more significant is the ideological consciousness explicit in the way that Conte formulates the question

of point of view. The epic norm has the 'reality of appearances'; it seems natural, the only way to write. Merely to show that there are other possibilities is a radical act. Once we see that cultural norms are not natural but historically determined, we can set about changing them. This is not the whole story for Conte, who sets limits to the multiplicity of viewpoints in the *Aeneid* and sees Virgil using 'sympathy' as a way of welding the fragments once more together and thus saving the epic genre. But the mirror thus reconstituted is inevitably a very different one to the smooth and perfect mirror with which we began. The joints are there, for all to see.

The reason why I have paraphrased La Penna and Conte at such length is connected with the proleptic purpose that I mentioned at the beginning. As I suggested with the two examples with which I began, the concept of deviant focalisation can be used either to solve problems or to create them. One can stress the incorporation of a character's point of view as a neutral, objective procedure and thus defuse any challenge to the reader. Consider the following discussion of the opening simile of *Aeneid* Book 12 by Oliver Lyne.⁶⁹ He points out that *latro* in the vehicle of that simile is most naturally identified in the tenor with Aeneas, and continues:

If it is hard to think of anybody else to identify with the 'latro', then there is another and important point to be taken. A voice distinct from the partisan opinion of the characters (Amata etc) in direct speech is confirming these characters' view of Aeneas. They saw him as a 'praedo', this voice terms him a 'latro', 'praedo's' partner in crime. Whose voice is it? We might choose to talk of characters' feelings affecting the narrative style here,⁷⁰ and see, say, Turnus' views as obtruding. On the other hand, it is hard to dissociate the voice that utters 'latro' from the narrator's, hard to dissociate it in fact from Vergil's.

If we make the lion/Turnus the focaliser of *latro*, as Lyne points out, we can stop ourselves worrying about the judgement embodied in it. We have the Mandy Rice-Davies defence: Turnus would think that, wouldn't he? That is, variation in focalisation may easily be used to remove from the poem all those elements which Harvardy-Balliolly critics like Lyne detect in the poem; and I have no doubt that attempts will be made to do this. But Conte's approach suggests that even if we do this, the ideological challenge of the work cannot be evaded. Whoever it is to whom we ascribe these viewpoints, they are there, in the text, and the reader has the option of looking at the world that way. Merely to allow these viewpoints to exist is an ideological act: even an 'objectively' dialogic *Aeneid* challenges Augustan order.

One might without malice detect in both Lyne and less obviously Conte an element of Romanticism in their images of Virgil. Their critical approaches are recuperative, and the Virgils they produce have elements of their own ideological

positions implicit in them. Those who believe that critics can avoid this contamination will attack them for this: but they should try a little self-analysis first. A more cogent version of this criticism can be made from a New Historicist viewpoint. To praise the *Aeneid* for its resistance to power can be seen as a way of underestimating that power, and thus reinforcing it. The issue is a difficult one for mortals to decide, but ultimately it seems to me that the strongest imperative is to preserve the challenge of the *Aeneid*.⁷¹ At any point we can choose to see deviant focalisation: but we can also identify with that suppressed view, or choose to make the narrator the focaliser. As I said at the beginning in justifying my use of the term 'deviant', there is always a push to unite focaliser and narrator. It is obviously impossible to distinguish between the narrator representing a character's point of view and sympathising with it. We can go through the *Aeneid* using switches of focalisation to remove all moral challenge from the work, or we can go through creating problems rather than solving them, making things more complex rather than less, confusing rather than clarifying. My own preference for the latter procedure will be clear: and also, unfortunately perhaps, its psychological roots.⁷²

JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD

DON FOWLER

NOTES

1. G. Genette, *Narrative discourse* (1980), trans. from *Figures III* (1972) 161-211, *Nouveau Discours du Récit* (1983) 43-55; M. Bal, *Narratology: introduction to the theory of narrative* (1985, from the second Dutch ed. of 1980) 100-18. There is a good survey of the older literature on 'point of view' in G. B. Conte, 'Saggio di interpretazione dell'Encide. Ideologia e forma del contenuto' *MD I* (1978) = *Virgilio, Il genere e i suoi confini* (1984) 55-119 = *The rhetoric of imitation* (1986) 141-84, at *Virgilio* 68 n.10 = *Rhetoric* 154 n.10. Amongst modern surveys, P. Pugliatti, *Lo sguardo nel racconto. Teorie e prassi del punto di vista* (1985) is better than J. Lintvelt, *Essai de typologie narrative. Le 'point of view'. Théorie et analyse* (1981). Of particular interest for classicists are C. Segre, 'Punto di vista e plurivocità nell'analisi narratologica', *Atti del convegno internazionale: Letterature classiche e narratologia*, Selva di Fasano, 6-8 Ott. 1980 (Ist. di Filol. Lat. dell'Univ. di Perugia 1981) 51ff. and M. Fusillo, *Il romanzo greco* (1989) 111-78 (with much useful bibliography).

2. I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrators and focalizers: the presentation of the story in the Iliad* (1987).

3. For some controversial aspects of Bal's use of focalisation see W. Bronzwaer, 'Mieke Bal's Concept of Focalization', *Poetics Today* 2.2 (Winter 1981) 193-201, with her reply 'The Laughing Mice or: On Focalization' in the same issue (202-10). For a radical critique of the basic narratological division, see B. Herrnstein Smith, 'Narrative versions, narrative theories' in W. J. T. Mitchell (ed.) *On Narrative* (Chicago n.d., originally *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1980-1)) 209-32 with the reply by Seymour Chatman 258-65. Gian Biagio Conte points out to me one danger in the use of 'focalisation' rather than 'point of view', in explaining his own preference for the latter term:

... per me non è solo un procedimento di tecnica letteraria (più o meno alessandrina, più o meno apolloniana, più o meno di 'stile soggettivo') ma ... è una 'relazione di verità' ... Così il punto di vista diventa il centro stilistico-filosofico, ideologico-espressivo, del discorso virgiliano. Questa è la ragione per cui uso ancora il termine 'punto di vista' e non quella di 'focalizzazione', in quanto lo redefinisco in termini *contenutistici* e non formali, o meglio di 'forma dei contenuti' (cioè in termini che riguardano la *forma* che i *contenuti* assumono nel discorso virgiliano, vale a dire come essi sono strutturati). Dietro c'è più l'esperienza della critica russa (e postpraghe: Mukarowski!) che non l'influenza dello strutturalismo francese ...'

Certainly the wider connotations of 'point of view' are welcome, but its familiarity in English as a term of art paradoxically makes it easier for the unfamiliar 'focalisation' to achieve the recognition of the ideological dimension which I agree is vital.

4. Cf. M. Bal, 'Notes on narrative embedding', *Poetics Today* 2.2 (Winter 1981) 41-59.

5. De Jong (n.2) 118-22.

6. De Jong (n.2) 136-45. Cf. her earlier article, 'Homeric words and speakers: an addendum', *JHS* 108 (1988) 188-9.

7. De Jong (n.2) 121.

8. N. Hopkinson, *Callimachus, Hymn to Demeter* (1984) 157.

9. K. J. McKay, *Erysichthon: a Callimachean comedy* (1962).

10. McKay (n.9) 95.

11. W. L. Chafe, 'Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view', in C. N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic* (1976) 25-55 at 54, quoted in G. Brown and G. Yule, *Discourse Analysis* (1983) 148.

12. See especially S. Kuno, 'Subject, theme, and the speaker's empathy - a re-examination of relativization phenomena', in Li (n.11) 417-38.

13. Kuno (n.12) 433.

14. A. Perutelli, 'Registri narrativi e stile indiretto libero in Virgilio (a proposito di Aen. 4. 279 sgg.)' *MD* 3 (1979) 69-82; see also now C. J. Mackie, *The characterization of Aeneas* (1988) 7,79-81. There is a considerable body of literature on FID in Latin: see the works cited in J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (1965) 362, especially M. Regula, 'Streifzüge auf dem Gebiet der lateinischen Syntax und Stilistik; V. Besondere Darstellungsformen der Reproduktion', *Glotta* 31 (1951) 90-2.

15. M. Ron, 'Free indirect discourse, mimetic language games and the subject of fiction', *Poetics Today* 2.2 (Winter 1981) 17-39, at 35-6. I cannot resist the observation that one of those who read a draft of this piece where the boundaries of the quotation here were not clear took the second paragraph to be by me, and thought it the best part of the article: 'who speaks?' is indeed problematic. My own additions are in angle brackets: the square bracketed '[sic]' is Ron's.

16. Conte (n.1).

17. A. Traina, *Enciclopedia Virgiliana s.v. superbia*.
18. W. F. Jackson Knight, 'Animamque superbam', *CR* 46 (1933) 55-7, at 57 n. 6: 'the thought is Juno's; and here too *rex* and *superbus* are associated. To Juno, Roman rule may well have seemed a tyrannical despotism.'
19. See e.g. Austin ad loc.
20. J. Henry, *Aeneidea* I (1873) 217-18: 'Add to which, that the brief GENUS INVISUM, the *hateful race*, thrown in between the two more particularly detailed causes, expresses a *virus*, a concentration of feeling, which had only been weakened by particularization . . . [the] meaning being, not that the Trojan race was hateful to Juno, because descended from Electra or from Dardanus, but that the race was hateful to her, was an abomination to her (no matter for what reason), and that therefore in the Trojan war she took part against those who were of that race exactly as at present she takes part against and persecutes Aeneas and his companions because they are of that race, that GENUS INVISUM, that *hated brood* . . .'
21. *Aen.* 3.1-5.
22. *Iliad* 13.621; 21.414, 224.
23. *Inf.* 1.75.
24. See the scholia on *Iliad* 15.94 with Erbse ad loc. and on 5.881; P. Buttmann, *Lexilogus* (1837) 185-92; H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum* (1885) s.v.
25. *Iliad* 13.621.
26. Cf. Seneca, *Troades* 4-6 (Hecuba) *me uideat et te, Troia: non unquam tulit / documenta fors maiora, quam fragili loco / starent superbi*, with Fantham on 1-4; Ovid, *Met.* 15.420-31 (where the discussion of the authenticity of lines 426-30 has taken turns not irrelevant to the question of the focalisation here in Virgil: see Bömer ad loc.); in general, cf. Theognis 1103-4; Catullus 51 (with W. Ferrari, 'Catullus Carmen 51', in R. Heine (ed.), *Catull* (1975), 241-61 at 253-6); Servius Sulpicius Rufus ap. Cic. *Fam.* 4.5. 4; Seneca, *Ep.* 91.9-12; M. Alexiou, *The ritual lament in Greek tradition* (1974) 83-101; E. Hall, *Inventing the barbarian* (1989) 131-2 (who refers to M. F. Fittipaldi, 'The fall of the city of Troy and its significance in Greek poetry from Homer to Euripides', diss. Yale 1979, which I have not seen).
27. A. Bowie, 'The death of Priam: allegory and history in the *Aeneid*', forthcoming in *CQ* (1990).
28. Servius on *Aen.* 2.557, *Pompei tangit historiam*.
29. Cf. G. Monaco, 'Bonus Ancus' *GIF* 24 (1972) 245-50; G. B. Conte, 'Il trionfo della morte e la galleria dei grandi trapassati in Lucrezio III 1024-1053', *SIFC* 37 (1965) 114-32; Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.28.7.
30. Cf. H. Wankel, 'Alle Menschen müssen sterben: Variationen eines Topos der griechischen Literatur', *Hermes* 111 (1983) 129-54; M. P. Pattoni, 'L'exemplum mitico consolatorio: variazioni di un topos nella tragedia greca' *SCO* 38 (1988) 229-62 at 229 n.1.

31. Cf. Trag. adesp. 372 ([Plut.] *Cons. ad Apollon.* 15, 110d, with Hani ad loc); Marc. Aur. 6.47 with R. B. Rutherford, *The meditations of Marcus Aurelius* (1989) 128.
32. I stress 'obviously': it is of course possible to see signs in the *Aeneid* of a critical attitude to Troy, and to interpret these in various ways, e.g. as a sign that Troy is typologically transcended by Rome (cf. F. Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan epic* (1989) 127-8, and contrast the interpretations of Numanus Regulus' speech by N. Horsfall, 'Numanus Regulus: ethnography and propaganda in *Aen.*, ix, 598f', *Latomus* 30 (1971) 1108-16 and R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Further voices in Vergil's Aeneid* (1987) 202). But the obvious stress in the *Aeneid* is on the pathos of Troy's fall.
33. Bowie (n.27).
34. Cf. 1.697-8 *aulaeis iam se regina superbis / aurea composuit sponda mediamque locauit*. As always, more than one story can be told of the focalisation here.
35. Ennius, *Andromacha* fr. 92-9 Vahlen = 87-94 Jocelyn, who collects Cicero's references.
36. Serv. on 1.726 (quoted from Cicero), 2.241 'uersus Ennianus'.
37. 2.499-505.
38. I take examples like Plautus, *Asin.* 11 / *Trin.* 19 *uortit barbare* and Cicero, *Orat.* 160 to be examples of humorous shifts of focalisation. The usage in Greek tragedy is complex, but obviously use by Persians in Aeschylus' *Persae* is a special case and examples like Eur. *Hec.* 1200 may involve focalisation switches: on the whole question, see Hall (n.26) *passim*. It may be that with Peerkamp and Forbiger we should see the *barbarico* . . . *auro* here as the spoils taken from other barbarians (cf. Hall (n.26) 212 on Eur. *Troades* 477-8) but the reader cannot fail even so to think of the Trojans too as 'barbarian'. Mackail rightly draws attention to Milton's allusion in *P.L.* 2.1-4, where Satan is depicted on a throne 'which far / outshone the wealth of Ormus and of Ind / or where the gorgeous East with richest hand / showers on her kings barbaric pearl and gold'. The *OED* quotes this as the earliest instance of 'barbaric' in the sense 'pertaining or proper to barbarians or their art; in the characteristic style of barbarians as opposed to that of civilized countries or ages': it would be strange to take it completely 'neutrally', despite the italicisation as a proper name in the early editions (see Fowler ad loc.). Pope's imitation in *Temple of Fame* 94 tones down the force of the adjective in Milton.
39. Cic. *Tusc.* 3.45 *exaggeratis . . . regis opibus, quae uidebantur sempiternae fore*.
40. Cf. OLD 1.c. 2.b; Traina (n.17) 1072.
41. D. Gillis, *Eros and death in the Aeneid* (1980) 138.
42. Traina (n.17) 1073.
43. Compare also the difference between 8.722 *uictae longo ordine gentes* and 2.766 *pauidae longo ordine matres*.
44. Austin on *Aen.* 6.468, comparing 3.344-5 and *Georg.* 3.516-17; Mackie (n.14) 133 n.1. But cf. *TLL* III.1055.26ff.; O. Seel, 'Um einen Vergilvers (*Aeneis*, VI, 468)', in *Hommages à M. Renard* (1969) 677-88.

45. For the term, see W. J. M. Levelt, 'The speaker's linearization problem', in H. C. Longnet-Higgins, J. Lyons, and D. E. Broadbent (eds.), *The psychological mechanisms of language* (1981) 305-15.
46. *Odyssey* 6.232-5, 23.159-62. For the extensive bibliography on this repetition, see Heubeck on the latter passage; for its interpretation, note Hainsworth on the former, 'The modern reader, who is trained in such matters, will probably recall the present use, with Nausicaa's reaction, on reading the second, and see in it a symbol of Odysseus as a bridegroom: it is possible that some such thinking unconsciously affected the poet's choice of imagery. However the Homeric audience were too thoroughly accustomed to repetition for any particular instance to have been significant to them; the repetition therefore cannot have been conscious.' This modern reader would stress the way Penelope shows Odyssean self-control in *not* reacting. This is not irrelevant to the *Aeneid*.
47. For Prometheus and the Caucasus, see Roscher, *Lex. Myth.* s.v. Prometheus 3042; 'il Caucaso gelato' is the phrase of Tasso *Gerusalemme Liberata* 16.56. 3, quoted by Pease.
48. Pease on *Aen.* 4.366 *duris*.
49. P. Heuzé, *L'image du corps dans l'oeuvre de Virgile* (1985) 567.
50. Marpessa was a mountain on Paros, the main site of the quarries: cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. Despite *cautes* Norden curiously translates 'starr wie ein Marmorbild', referring to the common comparison of women to statues (on which see Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.19.6. and McKeown on Ovid *Am.* 1.7.51). This woman has not allowed herself to be fashioned: whether that is good or bad depends upon one's point of view.
51. It is instructive to note how Norden changed his mind on the sense of 6.469 between the first and second editions of his commentary. Having noted the erotic parallels for the line (*Eur. Med.* 27f., *Theoc.* 2.112, *Musaeus* 160, *A. P.* 5.252) he continues: 'Aber wenn ich aus dem formalen Anschluss V. s an solche Vorbilder in der 1. Aufl. folgerte, dass nach der Intention des Dichters Dido den Aeneas noch liebte (*odit et amat*), so trug ich durch diese Annahme, wie mir Heinze brieflich bemerkte, einen falschen Zug in das Bild hinein: sie ist mit ihm nur *inimica* (472), das Bild der Dido ist mit heroischer Grösse gezeichnet, alles Sentimentale fehlt.'
52. R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik* ed. 3/4 (1957) 370-3.
53. G. Rosati, 'Punto di Vista narrativo e antichi esegeti di Virgilio', *Ann. Scuola Norm. di Pisa, Classe di Lett. e Fil.* (1979) 539-62; C. Lazzarini, 'Elementi di una poetica serviana. Osservazioni sulla costruzione del racconto nel commentario all' *Eneide*, II', *SIFC* 82 (1990) 241-60 at 248-9.
54. B. Otis, *Virgil: a study in civilized poetry* (1964).
55. A. La Penna, 'Sul cosiddetto stile soggettivo e sul cosiddetto simbolismo di Virgilio', *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 1 (1967) 220-44; Conte (n.1.).
56. A. Perutelli, 'Similitudini e stile "soggettivo" in Virgilio', *Maia* 24 (1972) 42-60.
57. M. Bonfanti, *Punto di Vista e modi della narrazione nell'Eneide* (1985).
58. See the works of Pugliatti and Segre cited in n.1.

59. La Penna (n.55) 227.
60. La Penna (n.55) 223.
61. Rosati (n.53) 540.
62. De Jong (n.2) 227.
63. Conte (n.1) 149.
64. Conte (n.1) 150.
65. Conte (n.1) 153.
66. Conte (n.1) 161-2.
67. There are of course traces of alternative ways of reading epic elsewhere in Augustan literature, and indeed in the *Aeneid* itself: and the tragic reading of Homer begins with tragedy itself. I do not want to save ancient authors from monologic writing by making ancient audiences monologic readers.
68. D. C. Feeney rev. Conte (n.1), *JRS* 79 (1989) 206-7.
69. R. O. A. M. Lyne, *Words and the poet* (1989) 165.
70. Lyne refers to his earlier *Further voices in Vergil's Aeneid* (n.32) 227.
71. For some recent reflection on (and deconstruction of) the apparent choice between a formalist view of the literary as 'set over against power' versus a putatively historicist view of the literary as 'one of power's essential modes' as formulated in New Historicism, see C. Porter, 'History and literature: "After the New Historicism"', *New Literary History* 21 (1990) 253-72, with the reply of R. Fraden, 273-8. But I have been most helped in thinking about 'oppositional' criticism by M. Maslan's lucid attack on it in 'Foucault and Pragmatism', *Raritan* 10 (1990) 94-114.
72. I am indebted for help at various stages to Angus Bowie, David Cram, Peta Fowler, John Henderson, Patricia Johnston, Stephen Marsh, and Alessandro Schiesaro; and above all to Gian Biagio Conte and Oliver Lyne for paternal indulgence.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY

1990 (NEW SERIES, NO. 36)

1990

CLASSICS DEPARTMENT
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

- 1 ROBERT COLEMAN, *Dialectal variation in republican Latin, with special reference to Praenestine*
- 26 ROBIN CORMACK, *Byzantine Aphrodisias: changing the symbolic map of a city*
- 42 DON FOWLER, *Deviant focalisation in Virgil's Aeneid*
- 64 BYRON HARRIES, *The spinner and the poet: Arachne in Ovid's Metamorphoses*
- 83 GABRIEL HERMAN, *Treaties and alliances in the world of Thucydides*
- 103 D. W. RATHBONE, *Villages, land and population in Graeco-Roman Egypt*
- 143 ANDREW WALLACE-HADRILL, *Roman arches and Greek honours: the language of power at Rome*
- 182 C. W. WILLINK, *The goddess EYΛABEIA and pseudo-Euripides in Euripides' Phoenissae*