

accords with Commager's demonstration that a considerable number of Lucretius' deviations from Thucydides' text suggest a remarkable pattern whereby the poet appears to regard physical disease in terms of psychological elements, particularly *timor* and *cupido*, held by Epicurean doctrine to be the two principal obstacles to happiness.<sup>6</sup> Grimm, moreover, has demonstrated that the motif of *timor* in particular plays a key role in Lucretius' whole poem and seems indicative of the poet's own highly individual *Weltanschauung*.<sup>7</sup>

Further clarification of Lucretius' view of the medical art is provided by a second alteration. Thucydides notes that two aspects of the Plague were equally dreadful: apathy (*ἀθυμία*) and the danger of contagion (*ἕτερος ἀφ' ἑτέρου θεραπείᾳ ἀναπιμπλάμενοι*) (2. 51. 4). Lucretius states at 6. 1226, "nec ratio remedi communis certa dabatur," and then proceeds (1227–38) to emphasize only the apathy (1233 *deficiens animo*). As Commager notes,<sup>8</sup> he relegates the spread of disease—with no small amount of grammatical confusion—to a subordinate position (1235); he makes the uncertainty of medical treatment (1226 "nec ratio remedi communis certa") serve as an analog to the lack of sure knowledge on the part of those infected by mental or psychological despair.

In a remarkable but nonetheless characteristic movement from the physical plane to the metaphysical (or the mental or spiritual) on the part of his highly symbolic imagination,<sup>9</sup> Lucretius transfers the uncertainty and the fear (*tacitus timor*), which he associates with the inefficacy of the medical art in the healing of bodily disease, to the psychic plane of the afflicted. Thereby the lack of sure knowledge and the fear can indeed be healed by the sure knowledge of Epicureanism.<sup>10</sup> And thus, while on grounds of Epicurean ideology or his own highly individual point of view he necessarily looks askance at the efficacy of the medical art, Lucretius reconciles its specific objective—healing—with a basic Epicurean assumption, namely, a sick mankind is to be cured by the healing draughts of the philosophy.

J. H. PHILLIPS  
Tufts University

6. Commager, "Lucretius' Interpretation," pp. 105–9; cf. J. Grimm, *Die literarische Darstellung der Pest in der Antike und in der Romania* (Munich, 1965), p. 50.

7. Grimm, *Die literarische Darstellung*, p. 51.

8. Commager, "Lucretius' Interpretation," pp. 112–13.

9. See here Elder's discussion, "Lucretius 1. 1–49," pp. 91–93. He thinks that this kind of movement from the physical plane to the metaphysical is sanctioned if indeed not required by Epicurean physics since the body and mind are corporeal, coterminous, and consensitive.

10. Cf. Epicurus frags. 220 and 221 (Usener 169).

#### HECTOR, SYCHAEUS, AND DEIPHOBUS: THREE MUTILATED FIGURES IN *AENEID* 1–6

When Aeneas first turns to his own role in the tragic events on the night of Troy's fall, it is with an account of Hector's appearance in a dream and his own immediate response (2. 268–317). The passage forms one of the most striking sequences in this powerful book. It begins in an atmosphere of deceptive calm

(cf. 2. 268–69) into which the weeping form of Hector, “raptatus bigis ut quondam, aterque cruento puluere perque pedes traiectus lora tumentis” (2. 272–73), suddenly intrudes to inform Aeneas that Troy is falling and that he is to take the household gods of Troy and flee across the seas to found a new city.<sup>1</sup> The subsequent scene describes Aeneas’ response to the apparition. Roused by the sound of the approaching sack, Aeneas bounds to the top of his father’s house where the poet graphically delineates his amazement and horror before describing Aeneas’ response in four lines that epitomize the nature and problems of heroic conduct throughout the epic (2. 314–17):<sup>2</sup>

arma amens capio; nec sat rationis in armis,  
sed glomerare manum bello et concurrere in arcem  
cum sociis ardent animi; furor iraque mentem  
praecipitat, pulchrumque mori succurrit in armis.

The scene with Hector is striking in many respects. Constructed with a conspicuous economy and vigor of expression, it both develops the association between these two great epic heroes that is to continue by comparison and contrast throughout the poem and is the first of the series of events in which Aeneas’ mission is gradually revealed.<sup>3</sup> Commentators and critics from antiquity on, however, have been puzzled by certain aspects of the scene, and there has been considerable debate over such questions as why Aeneas disregards Hector’s message and plunges into battle or why Aeneas in his speech to Hector (2. 281–86) apparently remembers neither the fact nor the manner of Hector’s death.<sup>4</sup> The latter has usually been explained by noting that the apparition is in a dream, and the passage has afforded critics the opportunity for advancing many excellent comments on the poet’s use of dreams in the epic as a whole and the success of this scene in particular.<sup>5</sup> More, however, than psychological verisimilitude may

1. All quotations are from R. A. B. Mynors (ed.), *P. Vergili Maronis opera* (Oxford, 1969).

2. I am deeply indebted to K. Quinn’s discussion of the “heroic impulse” in the opening chapter of his *Virgil’s “Aeneid”: A Critical Discussion* (London, 1968); see also R. Heinze’s excellent comments on the scene, *Virgils epische Technik*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig, 1915), pp. 25–29, and R. Allain, “Une nuit spirituelle d’Enée,” *REL* 24 (1946): 189–98. Aeneas’ response at this juncture is as shortsighted as his initial outburst of 1. 94–101, and it can hardly be coincidental that at both points at which we meet Aeneas his response is so limited.

3. The connection between Aeneas and Hector, first made in the former’s outburst at 1. 97–99 and echoed in such phrases as Jupiter’s description of Alba Longa’s power continuing for 300 years *gente sub Hectora* (1. 273), is one of the most important themes the poet employs to show Aeneas’ bond with the most positive aspects of the past and the traditional heroic code (cf. Venulus’ report of Diomedes’ refusal to aid the Latin cause, 11. 252–95). As A. Cartault, *L’art de Virgile dans l’“Énéide”* (Paris, 1926), p. 188, observes with respect to the scene in Book 2, Hector designates Aeneas “comme son successeur et le continuateur de son oeuvre.”

4. Aeneas’ conduct here is in sharp contrast to his response to the depiction of Hector’s fate on the Carthaginians’ temple to Juno (cf. 1. 483–87). The view that Virgil creates a temporary lapse of memory on Aeneas’ part is reflected in the three most widely used commentaries in English. T. E. Page, *The “Aeneid” of Virgil, Books I–VI* (London–New York, 1962), R. G. Austin, *P. Virgili Maronis “Aeneidos” liber secundus* (Oxford, 1964), and R. D. Williams, *The “Aeneid” of Virgil, Books 1–6* (London, 1972). The significance of the lapse is indicated by the fact that, despite the entrance of Panthus bearing the Penates and recounting Troy’s fall in the very next episode (cf. 2. 318–35), Aeneas persists with the traditional heroic response and advocates an immediate assault on the Greeks.

5. The commentaries of Austin and Williams offer many telling observations on this topic; the latter’s remarks (ad 2. 268–69) on how dreams in Virgil amalgamate past, present, and future to show the interaction of the divine and human planes in the epic parallel the general thesis of H. R. Steiner’s excellent study, *Der Traum in der “Aeneis”* (Bern, 1952); see also J. B. Stearns, *Studies of the Dream as a Technical Device in Latin Epic and Drama* (Lancaster, 1927), pp. 72–73. Austin emphasizes the

be involved. In a recent attempt to explain the apparent inconsistencies of the scene and to demonstrate the utility of interpretations of classical texts based on structural semantics and semiotics, P. Kragelund has proposed that Aeneas disregards the significance of Hector's mutilated form as a sign of Troy's fall and clings vainly to the hope that the war is over.<sup>6</sup> According to Kragelund, Aeneas would have known that Hector's mutilation portended the fall of Troy even if he had not said a word, and so the hero's queries, as well as his subsequent conduct, constitute a deliberate disregard of the omen. Although reviewers have properly drawn attention to the irregularities of Kragelund's methodology and results, I believe that his suggestions do warrant further consideration.<sup>7</sup> The scene, however, must not be considered in isolation; rather it must be recognized that the appearance of Hector is the second of a series of three parallel scenes involving mutilated figures that Virgil employs in the first half of the *Aeneid* to illustrate the hold of the past and traditional ideals upon Aeneas. The other two appearances are that of Sychaeus to Dido reported by Venus in 1. 335–70 and then Aeneas' encounter with Deiphobus in 6. 494–547; while the parallels of language among these scenes have been noted, the significance of the sequence as a whole has not been explored.<sup>8</sup>

The first of these scenes occurs in the encounter between Venus and Aeneas following his landing on Carthage's shores. The language, setting, and description of Venus disguised as a Spartan or Thracian maiden are very suggestive, and the elegant, elliptical narrative with its emphasis on Dido's chastity and Pygmalion's greed and brutality that the goddess offers to her son clearly foreshadows events that are to come.<sup>9</sup> There are unmistakable similarities between the descriptions of Sychaeus' appearance to Dido and Hector's to Aeneas: both apparitions appear as they were at the time of their deaths, both order their viewers to undertake

---

psychological dimensions of Hector's appearance in a very suggestive manner; see also A. Rapaport's judicious remarks on this aspect of the scene, "De insomniis Vergilianis," *Eos* 33 (1930–31): 163–70. Steiner's objections to this study (cf. *Der Traum*, p. 32, n. 1) are more appropriately directed to R. Humphries' Adlerian analysis, "The Dreams of Aeneas," *Internationale Zeitschrift für Individual-Psychologie* 5 (1927): 344–48, which assumed that the Aeneas of the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* are virtually interchangeable.

6. *Dream and Prediction in the "Aeneid"* (Copenhagen, 1976). Kragelund supports his conclusions with a discussion of Donatus' comments on the passage and a psychological interpretation that parallels Rapaport's study.

7. The reviews of M. C. J. Putnam, *CW* 70 (1976–77): 482, and A. Crabbe, *CR* 28 (1978): 249–51, are very acute and I share their belief that the parallels between this scene and Turnus' dream in Book 7 should be explored further.

8. For the most part, comments on the similarities among the three scenes have been restricted to verbal or situational parallels. Kragelund, *Dream and Prediction*, pp. 21–22, comments only briefly on the general parallels between the scenes in Books 1 and 2 but does not even mention the episode with Deiphobus. Austin, "*Aeneidos*" *liber secundus*, ad 2. 268–97, comments very adroitly on how Aeneas' narrative would have roused a sympathetic echo in Dido's own experience, and E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro "Aeneis" Buch VI*<sup>3</sup> (Berlin, 1926), ad 500–503, noted the essential similarity between the scenes in Books 2 and 6.

9. The most commonly cited models for this scene are the encounter of Odysseus with Nausicaa in *Od.* 6 and that hero's meetings with Athena in *Od.* 7 and 13. On Virgil's adaptation of these passages, see Cartault's general remarks, *L'art de Virgile*, pp. 112–13, G. N. Knauer's detailed analysis of the parallels, *Die "Aeneis" und Homer* (Göttingen, 1964), pp. 158–63, and F. Klingner's short but pointed remarks on the problem, *Virgil* (Zurich–Stuttgart, 1967), pp. 396–97. R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis "Aeneidos" liber primus* (Oxford, 1971), supplements Cartault's remarks on the style and mood of the scene by noting Virgil's debt to Hellenistic literature in terms of detail as well as form.

journeys across the sea to found new homelands, and both direct their recipients to take something of great value with them.<sup>10</sup> The appearance of Sychaeus to Dido and the Queen's prompt response not only set the pattern of the scene down in unequivocal terms against which Aeneas' conduct in Book 2 can be measured but also establish an important parallel and contrast between Dido and Aeneas.

In sharp contrast to the air of wonder that marks the scene in Book 1, the appearance of Deiphobus to Aeneas (6. 494–547) is brutally graphic. Their meeting in the *ultima arva* occurs after the scene between Dido and Aeneas in the *lugentes campi* in which the intensity of the hero's personal feelings are so tellingly revealed. The appearance of Deiphobus is grotesque; he is not pale and wounded as Sychaeus or swollen and filthy with his own gore as Hector but barely recognizable because of his wounds (6. 494–99):

Atque hic Priamiden laniatum corpore toto  
Deiphobum uidet et lacerum crudeliter ora,  
ora manusque ambas, populataque tempora raptis  
auribus et truncas inhoneste uulnere naris.  
vix adeo agnouit pauitantes ac dira tegement  
supplicia, et notis compellat uocibus ultro.

Deiphobus' appearance and manner offer an even more compelling witness of the Greeks' treachery than that of Hector which had hinted at the violence to come.<sup>11</sup> To Aeneas' queries and expressions of *pietas* Deiphobus replies that he beholds the monuments of his wife's treachery.<sup>12</sup> In the subsequent account of Deiphobus' death (6. 509–30), we are returned to the atmosphere and setting of Book 2. We see the events of that terrible night from yet another perspective, and the treachery of the Greeks takes on a new cast with the description of Helen hiding Deiphobus' arms and then admitting Menelaus and Odysseus to their chamber. The report and Aeneas' response remind the audience once more how Aeneas was shaped by these events in the past and now, as he is about to enter the future, how much he has changed from Book 2.<sup>13</sup>

When the three scenes are considered together, there is a clear progression that

10. See Steiner, *Der Traum*, p. 29; the "archetypal" qualities of the scene are also pointed to by the fact that Dido apparently requires only this one sign while the appearance of Hector to Aeneas is but the first of a series of episodes that prompt Aeneas' departure for the west.

11. It is clear that Virgil intended the description to echo and intensify the earlier one of Hector. This pairing may have been prompted in part by Athena's appearance in the *Iliad* as Deiphobus when she stays Hector from his flight from Achilles and so leads to his death and mutilation (*Il.* 22. 224–46). Of all the descriptions of Deiphobus' death and disfigurement, Virgil's is by far the most extreme and even the later references (Sen. *Ag.* 748–49; Quint. *Smyrn.* 13. 354–73; Tryphiodorus 622–23; and Hyg. 240) are pale by comparison. Commentators have noted the parallels of this scene to the descriptions of the mutilations of Agamemnon given in Aesch. *Cho.* 439–43 and Soph. *El.* 444–46 as well as that of Priam's body in 2. 557–58. In addition to the work of Norden, my remarks on this passage are indebted to R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis "Aeneidos" liber sextus* (Oxford, 1977).

12. Deiphobus' contempt of Helen is signalled by the fact that he never addresses her by name and refers to her with such phrases as *scelus exitiale Lacaenae* (6. 511) and *egregia . . . coniunx* (6. 523).

13. As Klingner, *Virgil*, p. 487, and M. C. J. Putnam, *The Poetry of the "Aeneid"* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965), pp. 129–30, observe, the figure of Deiphobus ends the sequence of Palinurus, Dido, and Deiphobus that goes progressively back into his past and epitomizes various phases of the hero's career. I share the opinion of Cartault, *L'art de Virgile*, pp. 458, 460–61, and B. Otis, *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry* (Oxford, 1963), pp. 296–97, that Deiphobus synthesizes the qualities of the group as a whole as he poignantly bids Aeneas to embrace his future. As L. A. McKay, "Three Levels of Meaning in *Aeneid* VI," *TAPA* 86 (1955): 180–89, observed, the figure of Deiphobus also fulfills another important role in reassuring Aeneas that he did everything that could be done in the past.

reinforces the epic's themes. Each figure appears at a significant moment in the action and helps epitomize the action and tension of the epic at that point. The appearance of Sychaeus to Dido comes in the episode that immediately follows the great statement of the epic's theme in the scene between Jupiter and Venus (1. 223–96), and the manner in which the apparition urges her to comprehend the present, leave the past, and move to the future sets the general significance of the figure in very explicit terms. The figure is then applied to the hero in a somewhat more complex but parallel fashion in the following book. The appearance of Hector is a pivotal episode set between sequences of scenes which epitomize the treachery of the Greeks and the follies of heroic conduct. Aeneas' response illustrates in very graphic form the tension between past ideals and future obligations which is so characteristic of his behavior in the first six books as well as offering a display of the kind of heroic behavior Aeneas cannot entertain if he is to realize his destiny. Finally in Book 6 Aeneas' past in the person of Deiphobus spurs a sadder but wiser hero on to his future. The scene with Deiphobus recalls many elements from Book 2, demonstrates how Aeneas has grown as an individual, and, just as the encounter with Dido in the Underworld makes patent the private costs of the hero's mission, so also the meeting with Deiphobus recalls his public loss at the fall of Troy.

The suggestions Kragelund advanced with respect to the appearance of Hector are true but in a more general sense than he proposed. Much more is involved than an incidental demonstration of Aeneas' self-delusion and reluctance to face reality. Rather the sequence of mutilated figures, Sychaeus, Hector, and finally Deiphobus, combine to offer a striking compound image of the ironies of the traditional heroic code and the need to transcend it. The presence of the mutilated figures offers a fixed point of reference for evaluating heroic conduct, and Virgil employs the increasing brutality of their disfigurement to delineate the intensity of the past's hold on Aeneas as he progresses to the future.<sup>14</sup> It is, in my opinion, not coincidental that we are reminded of these factors in a similar way in the final book where the tension between traditional heroic ideals and the prototypical Roman ones are given dramatic expression in the contrast between Turnus and Aeneas. The words of Aeneas to Ascanius (12. 435–40) not only restate the close association of Hector and Aeneas but also poignantly recast Deiphobus' closing injunction to Aeneas (6. 544–46).<sup>15</sup> An even more compelling echo of this sequence is offered by the sudden advent of Saces, *adversa sagitta / saucius ora* (12. 651–52), to inform Turnus of the disasters back at the city.<sup>16</sup> With language that echoes

14. I do not share Kragelund's belief, *Dream and Prediction*, pp. 20–23, that Virgil developed the apparition of Hector from some form of "dictionary" of dreams; rather I believe that, while Virgil drew upon a number of familiar images, the symbol of the mutilated figure is a distinctly Virgilian creation which, despite the frequency with which the figure of Hector has been compared to the appearance of Patroclus in *Il.* 23, has no real Homeric counterpart. Virgil *may*, however, have been inspired by the Homeric motif of the mutilated corpse that plays such an important role in the late books of the epic to denote the nature and extremes of heroic conduct; on the latter, see C. Segal, *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the "Iliad"* (Leyden, 1971).

15. It is important to recognize the note of personal bitterness at the time of prospective public triumph in Aeneas' words; see V. Pöschl's excellent comments, *The Art of Vergil*, trans. G. Seligson (Ann Arbor, 1962), pp. 37, 56–59.

16. The clipped, abrupt phrasing of the initial line, "Vix ea fatus erat medios uolat ecce per hostis" (12. 650), sets the tone of the passage as a whole. The use of present tenses adds a note of urgency as well as vividness to the scene. The use of *ecce* (12. 650) both parallels the effect it had had in 2. 270 to bring out the sudden advent of Hector's shade and is effectively echoed in 12. 672 at the start of the

Drances, at a critical stage in that sequence of scenes in which Virgil depicts Turnus accepting his responsibility, Saces makes clear the folly of Turnus' course and offers in his closing words a stinging rebuke of Turnus' traditional heroism, "tu currum deserto in gramine uersas" (12. 664).<sup>17</sup> Turnus' subsequent response parallels that of Aeneas in Book 2; only now, when confronted with Aeneas' painfully gained higher morality, is tragedy the inevitable result.

CHARLES FUQUA  
Williams College

---

description of the tower's collapse that illustrates Saces' point. Although it seemed a clear example of *contumelia* to Servius (ad 12. 652), the sudden arrival and direct manner of this previously unknown warrior brings out the urgency of the situation in a very effective manner.

17. Saces' *miserere tuorum* (12. 653) is a clear echo of Drances' use of the same phrase in the same position in the line (11. 365), and commentators with some frequency have noted the general parallels between the pair. Saces' appearance is the catalyst that triggers Turnus' final espousal of traditional heroic behavior, "sine me furere ante furorem" (12. 680; see Quinn, *Virgil's "Aeneid,"* pp. 330–31).

#### AMBIGUITY IN HORACE *ODES* 1. 4

Lucius Sestius, known as one who revered the memory of Marcus Brutus long after the event, had served under Brutus as proquaestor in Macedonia in 43–42 and had refused to betray him. He was proscribed.<sup>1</sup> But twenty years later Augustus chose him as *consul suffectus* when he himself withdrew from the consulship in the middle of the year 23. Dio cites this as an example of Augustus' broadmindedness. It was probably also in 23 that Horace published the first three books of the *Odes* and wrote, or at least dedicated, to Sestius the fourth ode of Book 1.<sup>2</sup> Close in age and in political convictions, the poet and the new consul had surely, in spite of their different backgrounds, been friends for years, at least since the time of their mutual service under Brutus, certainly since Philippi. With the publication in 23 of Books 1–3 of the *Odes*, Horace would also, like Sestius, have achieved the pinnacle of his career. What was more natural than for him to honor Sestius by placing his poem near the front of the first book, in the company of the poems to Maecenas, Augustus, and Virgil? Now at last it was safe to honor even a friend who kept likenesses of Brutus on display at home.

The fourth ode of Book 1 is explicitly addressed to Sestius, but, superficially, that appears to be that. "The poem is in no way about Sestius," in the words of one commentary.<sup>3</sup> The relevance to the addressee, which Horace is usually careful to articulate in the twenty-odd odes dedicated to specific individuals in the first three books, seems at first glance strangely lacking. The emphatic position given the poem to Sestius in the collection as a whole seems to make the omission the more striking. A closer look, however, particularly in the light of what is known

1. App. *BC* 4. 51, where by an apparent textual error the praenomen is mistakenly given as Publius. Dio 53. 32. 4 gives the name correctly as Lucius Sestius; cf. *MRR*, 2:349, 362–63.

2. For a recent discussion of the date of publication of the *Odes*, see R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: "Odes," Book I* (Oxford, 1970), pp. xxxvi–xxxvii.

3. Nisbet-Hubbard, *Commentary*, p. 68.