XIII.   A Source of Vergilian Hypallage

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

There is an old story of a man who said that because he knew the distance from London to Paris, it did not by any means follow that he knew the distance from Paris to London, inasmuch as it was seven days from Christmas to New Year's, but 358 days from New Year's to Christmas.   As a matter of fact, he was right about Paris and London too, if he chose to make the return trip without altering the direction in which he was traveling.   It makes a great difference whether we move in straight lines or in circles.   Similarly in the realm of mathematics, of logic, and, finally, of language, it does not necessarily follow because a bears a certain relation to b, that b bears the same relation to a.   However, this truism is frequently ignored by a poet like Vergil,[1] who, in order to distribute epithets between two different nouns without overloading either, or occasionally to suit the exigencies of the meter, and above all for the sake of variety, vividness, or vigor, frequently violates the prosaic precision demanded by rigorous logic.   To examine the ways in which he does so is often to gain a clearer insight into the stuff of which poetry is made.[1a]

[1] In citing Vergil, I designate passages from the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* by E and G respectively; all passages not specifically designated are from the *Aeneid*.   I quote enough to indicate the sense and the syntax, with no indication of omitted words.

[1a] The Referee and the Editor, to both of whom I owe thanks for gracious and helpful comments, have questioned, with cogency and wisdom, my assumption that Vergil's departures from the precision of expression normally found in polished prose, such as Cicero's, necessarily contribute to poetic effect.   I discuss the matter to some extent in an article, "A Linguistic Fallacy," to be included in a volume in honor of Professor Joshua Whatmough to appear in June 1957.   But I admit that neither here nor there do I conclusively prove my point.   Indeed it is so subjective that I doubt whether it is susceptible of proof, even if one had the aid of statistics based on the usage of many writers, both of poetry and of prose.   In this connection the Editor puts a question of considerable force: "Is the lack of strict logic necessarily 'poetic'?   Or would not a study of a prose writer turn up examples of the same usages, and in about the same quantity?"   Possibly I am tempted to find any of Vergil's instances of hypallage (i.e., "interchange in syntactic relationship between two terms," to quote Webster's definition) poetic simply because he *is* such a great poet.   If I met an instance of exactly the same thing in Plautus, I might not consider it poetic!   Yet I am inclined to think that Plautus' departures from logic, which of course are numerous, actually are of a less subtle type than Vergil's: that they are instances of the sort of contamination or con-

For instance, the use of the "transferred epithet" is set down as a common poetic device. Many cases of transferred epithets are due purely to the fallacy here under discussion. For example, it is self-evident that if *a* is mixed with *b*, at the same time *b* is mixed with *a*, and it is characteristic of Vergil that he frequently says that *b* is mixed with *a* — or that *a* and *b* are mixed together — when it would be decidedly more to the point to say that *a* is mixed with *b*. Vergil has a very wide range of constructions with *mixtus* and its compounds (*commixtus, immixtus, permixtus*).[2] A simple and typical example is the statement of Gallus (*E* 10.55) that he will traverse Maenalus *mixtis Nymphis* though actually the point is that he will do so *mixtus Nymphis*.

Similarly, if two objects are mutually *adversa*, either one may be said to be *adversum* with respect to the other, though usually one may be more pertinently so called than the other. Thus the rainbow is pictured as trailing its thousand various colors with the sun opposite (4.700–1, Iris croceis per caelum roscida pennis mille trahens varios adverso sole colores). Since we are concerned with Iris's own action, *adversa* of her, or *adversos* of her colors, would be far more to the point. However, *adversa* might not have been

fusion that abound in conversation, but that nothing is gained in suggestiveness or sensitivity as a result of their use. At all events I believe it is not without value to try to track down the basis underlying some of Vergil's departures from logic, even if there is no unanimity of opinion as to the literary effect which they produce.

Perhaps I may be permitted to quote here the opening paragraph of the article referred to just above. "In language, certain types of departure from strict logic may result in the achievement of variety, of suggestiveness, or of effectiveness in a way that considerably enriches the piece of literature concerned, especially if this be of a class that depends for value in part on esthetic or imaginative appeal. Such forms are to be expected and desired particularly in poetry or poetic prose. We shall not find them to a great extent in *straightforward prose* like that of Caesar, who resorts to practically no embellishments; or even in *rhetorical prose* like that of Cicero, who does assuredly resort to embellishments, but of a more mechanical or superficial type, so to speak, embellishments primarily of outer form such as anaphora or antithesis. We shall not find them in *prosaic poetry* like that of Plautus or Terence, who, as Horace realized well, are giving us merely the commonplace language of conversation in metrical form — language abounding in departures from logic but of a less subtle type. We shall find them to some extent in *poetic prose*, prose which breaks away from the prose norm: prose which is rich in overtones like that of Livy, who shows so often the influence of his contemporary Vergil; or prose which is, so to speak, rich in undertones, like that of Tacitus, who says so much more to the mind than meets the eye or the ear. But above all we shall find them in *genuine poetry*, particularly that of so supremely sensitive and suggestive a poet as Vergil, to whom and in whom variety and imaginative appeal count so much more than precise logic." See *Studies Presented to Joshua Whatmough*, edited by Ernst Pulgram (The Hague 1957) 53.

[2] They will be found grouped in categories in Excursus I.

metrically so convenient, and *adversos* directly before *sole* might have been less euphonious; furthermore, Iris already has her own epithet, *roscida*, and the colors have theirs, *varios* (as have her wings also, *croceis*).   In sooth, a poet has many points to think of beside the one detail of rigorous logic!

Comparable to the examples with *adversus*[3] is one with *contrarius*, in which Venus (1.239) speaks of consoling herself *fatis contraria fata rependens* — 'balancing contrary fates with fates.'   We would rather expect 'balancing fates with contrary fates.'   Perhaps the word order is important here.   The Latin does not care much which commodity it puts into which pan of the scale — compare the double construction with verbs like *muto*[4] — and the only essential point is that we should hear first of one set of fates, and then of the contrary fates, regardless of which set goes into the accusative, and which into the ablative.   But certainly Juno sounds more logical than Venus — for once! — when she says (7.293–94) *fatis contraria nostris fata Phrygum* — 'fates of the Phrygians contrary to our fates.'

The same interchangeability prevails when the adjective indicates harmonious relations.   If *a* and *b* are suited to each other, Vergil sometimes says that *b* is suited to *a* when, if he followed strict logic, he would have to say that *a* is suited to *b*.   Thus in *G* 1.256, tempestivam silvis evertere pinum, he tells us that we may find out when it is fitting to cut down the pine that is seasonable for cutting, though he surely means — since it is a question of the time of year, and not of the age of the pine — when the time is seasonable for cutting the pine.   In 9.303–5, ensem quem Lycaon habilem vagina aptarat eburna, the sword is said to be adjusted with respect to the scabbard, though really the scabbard is adjusted with respect to the sword; *habilis* is effectively applied to the sword rather than the scabbard in part because our interest is in the sword, and in part because the scabbard already has an epithet (*eburna*).   Probably the expression in 2.671–72, clipeo sinistram insertabam aptans, is similar,

---

[3] 10.571, in equos adversaque pectora tendit; 12.266–67, adversos telum contorsit in hostis procurrens; 12.370, cristam adverso curru quatit aura volantem; 12.651–52, adversā sagittā saucius ora.   Cf. the substantival use of *adversos* in 9.760–61, furor ardentem egit in adversos; 10.412, tendit in adversos; and 11.389, imus in adversos.

[4] Contrast Vergil's use of the thing given up as object, in *G* 1.7–8, tellus glandem mutavit arista, and *G* 2.511, exsilio domos mutant, with Horace's use of the thing obtained as object, in *Serm.* 2.7.109–10, uvam furtiva mutat strigili, and *Carm.* 2.16.18–19, terras alio calentis sole mutamus (in this passage the thing given up is not mentioned). Speakers of faulty English (doubtless confused by the alternative expression *a is replaced by b*) sometimes say *a is substituted by b* when they mean *b is substituted for a*.

since it is in keeping with Vergil's usual practice to combine the object (*sinistram*) with the nominative active participle (*aptans*) as well as with the verb (*insertabam*).[5] That the "logical" form would be not *clipeo sinistram aptans* but *clipeum sinistrae aptans* is suggested by 2.389–90, insignia nobis aptemus, and 9.364, haec (= phaleras et cingula) umeris aptat.

The same interchangeability prevails in regard to the use of *dignus* and *indignus*.   Latin, like English, can say either that a man is worthy of his prize, that is, that he deserves it, or that the prize is worthy of him, that is, that it is sufficiently good (or bad) for him.[6] We hear, of a despised and upbraided woman (*E* 8.32), that she is united with a worthy husband, though the point is rather that she deserves the husband than that he deserves her: digno coniuncta viro.   In more complicated strain the same speaker complains elsewhere (*E* 8.18) with reference to the same woman that he has been led astray by his unworthy love for his betrothed Nysa: coniugis indigno Nysae deceptus amore.   Here the idea is primarily that Nysa is not worthy of his love.   There is also present, however, the additional idea that the love itself is unworthy, that is, unworthy of the lover, unsuitable, wrong: the relationship is thus reflected back upon the giver of the love (the speaker) as well as upon its recipient.   Vergil, as is well-known, has a gift for making single words express a complex thought.[7]

In a sense a usage of this sort, consisting of the transfer of an epithet from a person to a thing, involves still another so-called figure of speech, to wit, personification.   Thus if a man is accustomed to, or acquainted with, a thing, the poet is ready, inasmuch as mutual intercourse is frequently the occasion of custom or acquaintance, to say that the thing is accustomed to, or acquainted with, the man. Thus Proteus seeks *consueta antra* (*G* 4.429); the first animals wander *per ignaros montis* (*E* 6.40).

[5] With these passages we may compare 11.861–2, manibus iam tangeret aequis, laeva aciem ferri, dextra nervoque papillam.   The (prosaic) point here is that the nymph with one hand touched her arrow and with the other her bow-string (and incidentally her breast); but Vergil's substitute, which seems to center interest on the breast, strikes me as at once more spirited and more pictorial.

[6] Sulpicia, in line 10 of her first elegy (= Tibullus 3.13 or 4.7), gives the full reciprocal form, cum digno digna fuisse ferar.

[7] Further examples are *E* 10.10, indigno Gallus amore peribat; *G* 1.168, te digna manet gloria ruris; *G* 1.506–7, non ullus aratro dignus honos; 2.144, miserere animi non digna ferentis; 6.162–63, Misenum indigna morte peremptum; 12.411, Venus indigno nati concussa dolore.

At times a word seems to vary in meaning, at least from our point of view, according to whether it is applied to the person in the place, or the place with respect to the person. A good example of this is *medius*,[8] which rivals *mixtus* in the variety of constructions to which it is susceptible in Vergil. Thus Vergil can talk quite indifferently of seeing *medium in penetralibus hostem* (2.508) or *mediis hostem in penetralibus* (2.665),[9] of rushing into battle *medius in hostis* (10.379) or *medios in hostis* (9.554), and of escaping from Troy *medium per ignis* (10.56) or *medios per ignis* (7.296). If he wants to say that a man is in the middle of a throng, he can apply the epithet *medius* to the man (5.76, medius comitante caterva) or to the throng (11.682–83, catervis vertitur in mediis); and if he wants to say that a group or a city contains a man, he can apply the epithet *medius* to the man (6.667–68, medium turba hunc habet) or to the city (9.738, nec cohibet media Ardea Turnum). He can tell of cleaving a man's brow *mediam inter tempora* (9.750), that is, he calls the brow (*frontem*), which is between the temples, *mediam*; and can also tell of plucking hairs from a bullock's forehead *media inter cornua* (6.245), that is, he calls the horns, between which the hair is plucked, *media*. From our point of view, *medius* in the first member of each of these pairs of examples means 'in the middle' and in the second 'in the middle of'; but from the Roman's point of view, it may be applied quite indifferently to either of the two elements involved in the expression of relationship.[10]

People may be said to possess common property, or to possess property in common. *Communem vocate deum* (8.275) and *communem populum regamus* (4.102) represent Vergil's regular usage with respect to *communis*, but Ovid speaks of the mission *quam mandarat communis Graecia* (*Met.* 13.199).

A severed hand still belongs to the man who has lost it; but it is infinitely more effective to say that the man still belongs to the hand. Thus Vergil writes (10.395): te decisa *suum*, Laride, dextera

---

[8] See Excursus II. The comparisons made here in the text between specific passages are recalled in the Excursus in notes 71 and 93, 72 and 97, 74 and 100, 69 and 91, 68 and 78, 76 and 103.

[9] We may observe how in each instance Vergil separates the adjective from the noun which it modifies.

[10] The double use of *summus*, in the sense of 'highest, topmost' and of 'highest part of, top of,' is not quite the same, since it does not involve any comparable reciprocal relation with a possible transfer of epithet. Thus Vergil's *dorsum mari summo* (1.110) could hardly interchange with *dorsum mari summum*.

quaerit. The other side of the coin — more natural but less pictur-esque — would be: te decisa *tua*, Laride, dextera quaerit. In the same way, we can say either that fruit or vine belongs to a tree, or that the tree belongs to the fruit or vine.[11] On this principle we may account for a good many instances of the "indirect reflexive," as in *E* 7.54, iacent sua quaeque sub arbore poma, and 6.205–6, viscum, quod non sua seminat arbos. 'Its own respective fruits lie under the tree' implies 'fruits lie under their own tree'[12] as well as 'the tree has its own fruits lying under it'; and 'the mistletoe, which a tree not its own produces' implies 'the mistletoe which, (a plant) not its own, a tree produces' as well as 'the mistletoe, which is produced by a tree not its own.'[13]

Nouns denoting relationship are subject to the same usage.[14] If two persons are bound by mutual ties, it is enough to indicate these ties with only one of the pair — and sometimes this one is not chosen with regard to the strict rules of logic.[15] Thus 9.593–94,

[11] We shall note later a similar possibility of inversion with verbs meaning 'have, possess.' See note 28.

[12] But that does not mean that we need to alter the line in order to say this specifi-cally. I agree with the editors (e.g. Conington and Page) who read the line as I have given it, taking *sua quaeque* as a neuter plural with *poma*. Attempts to explain one or the other as an ablative singular, by interpreting *sua* as *suā* (with consonantal *u*) or substituting *quāque* for *quaeque*, seem to me unnecessary and undesirable.

[13] The regular "logical" forms also occur: *E* 1.37, cui pendere suā patereris in arbore poma; and *G* 2.82, miratur novas frondes et non suā poma.

[14] Perhaps something of the sort is at the basis of a rather common mistake in Eng-lish, the use of *prototype* in the sense of *replica*. A particularly flagrant instance of this occurs in the *New York Herald Tribune* for Sept. 16, 1956, in an item with the by-line John Allen and the head "An Unknown Will Become a Movie Star in Otto Preminger's International Tryout." In this we read of Otto Preminger's search for "a modern, photogenic prototype of Bernard Shaw's twelfth century Maid"! The (fallacious) reasoning underlying such a solecism must be that if *a* is the prototype of *b*, then *a* and *b* are duplicates of each other, and therefore *b* is the prototype of *a*.

[15] On the other hand, sometimes the double relation is expressed with unnecessary but effective fullness, as in 10.338–39, huic frater subit Alcanor fratremque ruentem sustentat, and 10.600, fratrem ne desere frater. The same fullness occur in 4.83, illum absens absentem auditque videtque, and in the Sulpicia passage quoted in note 6. Greek instances are Sophocles, *Antigone* 73; Thucydides 7.44.7; Plato, *Menexenus* 247c. Ordinary examples of the *figura etymologica*, such as 3.329, me famulo famulam-que Heleno transmisit habendam, or 5.569, Atys puero puer dilectus Iulo, are possibly comparable but not strictly parallel, since they involve no mutual relationship. These abound in Vergil; see my collection of instances from him, as well as from other writers, both Greek and Roman, in *Coordination of Non-Coordinate Elements in Vergil* (New York 1930), 12 note 54. We may contrast with each other two lines in close juxtaposi-tion in Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 4.12, namely 20, paene mihi puero cognite paene puer, and 22, non mihi quam fratri frater amate minus; the first is like Vergil 5.569, the second like Vergil 10.600.

Turni germanam thalamo sociatus habebat, suggests the alterna-
tive, Turni germanam thalamo sociatam habebat.[16]   Because Cre-
theus the priest and the Muses are mutually on friendly terms, Cre-
theus is spoken of (9.774) as *amicum Musis* when surely it would be
much more to the point to say that the Muses were friendly to him
than that he was friendly to them.   Simply to paraphrase *amicum*
by *carum*, as at least one editor does, is, I think, to alter the funda-
mental meaning of the word — and to leave out part of the picture.
Truly the Muses show a sort of condescension in permitting a mere
mortal to be called their friend.   We recall tales of Tantalus feasted
at the divine table — or of Enoch and Noah who "walked with
God."   Still more striking is the famous simile (1.148–56) in which
Neptune stilling the waves is compared to a man *pietate gravem ac
meritis* (151) checking a mob; of course the only man to whom a
god might be compared is Augustus!   In this connection we may
note that Vergil several times attributes to the gods in their relation
to men that quality of *pietas* which one would say fundamentally
represents what men owe the gods.[17]   We are even told in one pas-
sage that the Romans will surpass not only men but the gods in
pietas (12.838–39, genus supra homines, supra ire deos pietate
videbis) — which seems to be out-Heroding Herod with a ven-
geance!   Similarly, the verb *sacrare*, which regularly denotes an
action of man in favor of the gods, is used of the action of a god in
favor of man in 10.419–20, (Halaesum) Parcae telis sacrarunt
Euandri.[18]   Possibly such an inversion of relationships is induced
by the Romans' view of their relations with the gods as based on
mutual obligations, summed up in the formula *do ut des*.

With the last two examples we have passed from the realm of
nouns and adjectives to that of verbs.   Many corresponding in-
stances are to be found in this sphere of hypallage.

The construction with verbs of changing and exchanging has
already been referred to (in fn. 4).   Analogous to this is a rather

[16] Note the development of the Romance Language perfect system from just such
a form.

[17] 2.536, di, si qua est caelo pietas quae talia curet; 4.382, si quid pia numina
possunt; 5.688–89, si quid pietas antiqua labores respicit humanos; possibly 5.783,
quam (= Iunonem) nec longa dies pietas nec mitigat ulla.   I discussed this in *CW*
19.34.

[18] We may perhaps compare 12.138–41, Turni sororem deam, stagnis quae praesidet
(hunc illi honorem Iuppiter erepta pro virginitate sacravit); presumably Juturna had
been a mere mortal before Jupiter conferred this honor upon her.

peculiar passage, *G* 4.149–52, naturas apibus quas Iuppiter addidit expediam, pro qua mercede caeli regem pavere. We are told that Jupiter gave a certain character to the bees '*in return for which reward* they fed the king of heaven'; but it would be much more to the point to say that 'the bees fed the king of heaven, *in return for which service* he gave them the reward,' namely their special character.

The most numerous examples of this inverted use are found in connection with verbs of separation. Instead of telling us, as is precise, that *a* leaves *b*, Vergil repeatedly tells us that *b* leaves *a*.

Sometimes this is quite correct from the psychological, almost the physical, point of view, as any one will testify who has looked back at a wharf from a moving boat, or who has watched the chariot-race in the stage-production of *Ben Hur*, the journey afoot of "de Lawd" in *Green Pastures*, or the passage of a motor car or a train in the movies. Thus Vergil has it (3.72, provehimur portu terrae- que urbesque recedunt) that, as we are carried away from the har- bor, 'the lands and the cities recede.' With this we may compare the contrary phenomenon (3.530–31, portus patescit iam propior, templumque apparet in arce) of a ship approaching the land — 'the harbor opens up now nearer to us, and the temple appears on the citadel.' And again, similarly (*E* 9.59–60, namque sepulcrum incipit apparere Bianoris), 'the tomb of Bianor begins to appear' when the point really is that we as we walk begin to see the tomb of Bianor. We may compare the statement by the pilot of the ill- fated airplane that crashed on Riker's Island, N. Y., on February 1, 1957 (as quoted in the *New York Herald Tribune* of February 5): "I didn't know anything was wrong until Dixwell [the co-pilot] informed me the ground was coming up at us."

A very peculiar expression is *transmittunt cursu campos* (4.154). Henry (*Aeneidea* 2.642), quoted apparently with approval by Nettle- ship *ad loc.*, explains the meaning as "*send the plains past them*, viz., by running, i.e. *run across the plains*," giving the justification "the apparent effect of all motion being to send the surrounding objects in the opposite direction." If he is right, we have another pictur- esque expression like the three quoted in the previous paragraph. But, all things considered, I doubt this. We are looking at the flight of the deer not subjectively, through their own eyes, but ob- jectively, through the eyes of the hunters, who see the deer speeding *across the fields*, not the fields speeding *past the deer* (incidentally,

'across' fits the meaning of *trans* better than 'past').[19]   Thus I would
combine *campos* not with *mittunt* as Henry evidently does, but with
trans; *mittunt* I believe has here lost its transitive force, as verbs of
motion often do (e.g. *avertit* in 1.104, *proripis* in 5.741).   Vergil's
use elsewhere not only of *transmittunt* but of verbs compounded with
trans in general favors the literal "logical" interpretation in this
instance.[20]

Vergil, as I have said, sometimes tells us that *a* leaves *b* when we
would expect him to say that *b* leaves *a*.   An example of this is
11.830, of the dying Camilla, if we accept the reading and interpre-
tation of Probus (*apud* Servius) according to which her arms leave
her (*arma relinquunt*); however, the commoner lection assigns the
action of leaving to Camilla (*arma relinquens*).[21]   Vergil may say
that living creatures leave life (*G* 3.547, vitam relinquunt; 5.517,
vitam reliquit), somewhat as we talk in English about a person's
departing this life; but it is more in keeping with his usual view to
say that life leaves the body (10.819–20, vita corpus reliquit), or
simply that it leaves (6.735, vita reliquit),[22] for to him the *vita* is a
tangible thing that departs or flees at death (4.705, 10.819–20,

[19] A similar observation applies to the line of Lucretius, 2.330, that Conington cites
as a possible source for our verse: transmittunt valido quatientes impete campos.
Here too we see the swiftly moving band through the eyes of those watching them; the
point here is that though the horsemen are in rapid motion, to the distant spectator
they do not seem to be moving at all.   Certainly here *campos* belongs with the preverb
trans (as well as with *quatientes*); that *mitto* can be intransitive in Lucretius is proved
by 6.993–94, nam fluere hac species, illac calor ire videtur, atque aliis aliud citius trans-
mittere eadem.   Furthermore, Conington does not quote the passage complete: the
preceding line ends *mediosque repente*.   The horsemen "scour across the middle of the
plains," as Munro translates; surely they do not send *"the middle of* the plains" speeding
past them!

[20] See Excursus III.

[21] I do not know whether this phrase implies that she literally drops her arms just
as she has let her head droop (the preceding words are *posuit caput*), or that she leaves
arms, i.e. warfare, by dying.   If the latter is the right meaning, the hypallage that *arma
relinquunt* would involve would, in my opinion, be too harsh; but if the former meaning
is the correct one, I think the shift of subject would be most effective.   We have al-
ready read of the successive stages of her death: she sinks, her eyes sink, color leaves
her face (818–19); then even as she uttered her last words, she was letting go of the
reins, and slipping (*fluens* — exquisite word!) down to the ground (827–28).   After her
last words, her last act was to let fall her neck and head; *lenta* of the first and *captum
leto* of the second mark the ebbing away of her life.   Following them *arma relinquens*
would be a mere banal repetition of *linquebat habenas* in 827, whereas the change of
agent in *arma relinquunt* marks her as utterly lifeless: *she* does not drop her arms, for
she has no longer the strength or the will to do even that; *they* leave her.

[22] Cf. Lucretius 5.63, eum quem vita reliquit.

11.831 = 12.952), like the *anima*.[23]   Even stranger is the statement
about people leaving their *animae* in 3.140, linquebant dulcis ani-
mas, a form of expression probably chosen as a parallel for the fol-
lowing words (140–41), aut aegra trahebant corpora; Vergil could
of course have used some other verb (as in *G* 3.495, dulces animas
reddunt), but *linquebant* intensifies the pathos inherent in *dulces*, to
match the misery conveyed by *aegra* and *trahebant*.   Also, Vergil
talks of death as resulting not only in loosing or freeing a person
from his body (4.703, te isto corpore solvo, and 11.829, exsolvit se
corpore), or in setting free (from each other) both the soul and the
physical members (4.695, luctantem animam nexosque resolveret
artus), but also, in reverse, in separating the physical members from
the soul (4.385, mors anima seduxerit artus).

We find many other inverted examples of separation, privation,
liberation, etc.   A person awakening shakes himself out of sleep
(2.302, excutior somno) — surely a picturesque substitute for the
real action, that of shaking sleep away from himself.   Though Ovid,
for once less daring than Vergil, talks of shaking flames out of hair
(*Met.* 12.280–81, de crinibus ignem excutit), Vergil talks of shaking
off flaming hair (2.685–86, crinem flagrantem excutere).   Odder
still, a boat is shaken away from its pilot (6.353, excussa magistro)
when really the pilot has been shaken away from it (cf. 1.115, ex-
cutitur magister); Vergil's use of the phrase *excussa magistro* is
doubtless induced by his desire to secure balance with another
phrase in the same line, *spoliata armis*, but he could of course have
used the same participle with *magistro* as with *armis* (cf. 5.224,
spoliata magistro est) had he not desired variety.   Not only are
articles worn removed from persons, but persons are removed from
articles worn.   Thus we may contrast 5.420, exue caestus, where the
accusative is used for the gloves taken off, with the almost immedi-
ately following passage, 5.421–23, reiecit amictum et magnos mem-
brorum artus, magna ossa lacertosque exuit, where the accusative
is used for the parts of the body laid bare (the garment removed is
indicated by *amictum* in the preceding clause); and we may con-
trast 9.303, umero exuit ensem, where the ablative is used for the
part of the body stripped of the sword (*ensem*), with 8.566–67, cui
abstulit animas et exuit armis, where the ablative is used for the

---

[23] So too in Homer the breath of life leaves the body (*Od.* 11.221, λίπῃ λεύκ' ὀστέα
θυμός) or the creature (*Od.* 14.426, τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχή), but in the Homeric Hymn to
Apollo the creature leaves the breath of life (361, λεῖπε δὲ θυμόν).

arms stripped off (the person stripped of the arms is indicated by *cui* in the preceding clause, from which *quem* is to be supplied with *exuit*).[24]   Certainly 5.422-23 gains in effectiveness by its departure from strict regularity, since it emphasizes the physical appearance of the old athlete as, dropping his cloak, he stands forth stripped for the fray.   As for 8.567, exuit armis, its structure may have been influenced by the analogy of *spoliavit armis* (for which compare 11.80, tela quibus spoliaverat hostem).   Correspondingly in the passive, we have 11.395, exutos Arcades armis.   Two similar passages, in which parts of the body are said to be removed from chains, are, with the middle voice, 4.518, exuta pedem vinclis, and, with the passive, 2.153, exutas vinclis palmas.   Again, though *levo* seems to mean 'lighten, relieve,' as when one man relieves another of a burden (e.g. *E* 9.65, ego hoc te fasce levabo), we read elsewhere not that a man is relieved of his manacles and chains but that the manacles and chains are relieved of him (2.146–47, viro manicas atque arta levari vincla iubet).   Not only does one set oneself or someone else free from mourning (2.26, solvit se luctu) or from care (4.652, me his exsolvite curis); one also sets fear free from one's heart (1.562, solvite corde metum), or one simply sets fear free (1.463, solve metus).

[24] We also find the double construction with *induo* (which corresponds to *exuo* as English *don* does to *doff*).   Probably *induo* is simply following the analogy of *exuo*: a shift from 'take *a* off *b*, take *a* from *b*' to 'take *b* from *a*' seems easier than a shift from 'put *a* on *b*' to 'put *b* on *a*.'   As a rule, people *put on* an article of clothing or armor, the noun designating this article being in the accusative with the active or middle voice: 11.76–77, harum (referring to *vestes*) unam iuveni induit, and (passive) *G* 3.363–64, vestes indutae; 9.180 and 11.439, induit arma; 9.365–66, galeam induit; 2.392–93, galeam induitur; 7.640, loricam induitur; 11.487, thoraca indutus; 2.275, exuvias indutus.   All these resemble 5.420, exue caestus, and 9.303, exuit ensem.   But people can also *deck themselves with* such articles, the noun designating the article being in the ablative: 5.674, qua (referring to *galeam*) indutus; 12.947, spoliis indute.   These correspond to 8.567, exuit armis.   Similarly, of putting arms on a trophy, we find 11.6, induit arma, vs. (in the passive) 10.775, indutum spoliis ipsum te tropaeum, and 11.83, indutos truncos armis.   Odd variations of the second construction occur with the ablative replaced by prepositional phrases: 7.19–20, quos induerat Circe in voltus ferarum (contrast with this 1.684, pueri indue voltus); *G* 1.187–88, se nux induet in florem; *G* 4.142–43, in flore se arbos induerat.   More peculiar still is 10.681–82, sese mucrone induat, of throwing oneself on one's sword; here *mucrone* does not correspond to the ablatives noted above, qua (5.674), *spoliis* (12.947 and 10.775), and *armis* (11.83), for the decidedly bizarre idea seems to be not that of dressing oneself (one's body) with the sword but of dressing the sword with oneself (one's body) — the body is to go around the sword as a cloak goes around a body — so that *sese mucrone induat* would seem to be a hypallage for the at first sight equally peculiar *sese* (ablative) *mucronem induat*.   But it is hard to give any exact or lucid explanation for this extremely strange and strained expression.

Analogous to this use of verbs of dissociation is that with verbs of association. Here as in the use of the adjective *mixtus*,[25] we find a number of variations possible. If two entities *a* and *b* are mixed or joined, *a* may be omitted and *b* may be used in the place that naturally belongs to *a*. Thus in 2.329, *incendia miscet* seems to stand for *incendiis omnia miscet* with *incendiis* fluctuating between the dative of association and the ablative of means. Again we hear of 'harnessing the chariots' (12.287, infrenant currus), which seems to be loosely used in the sense of harnessing horses to the chariots.[26] Much the same sense is conveyed elsewhere by the expression 'to join the chariot and four horses' (*G* 3.113–14, currus et quattuor iungere equos), which means to join the four horses to the chariot, just as Vergil sometimes talks, as has already been said, of *a* and *b* mixed when he means, strictly speaking, *a* mixed with *b*.

Comparable to this interchange of complements and adverbial phrases is the occasional combination of a subject and an object (direct or indirect) where the context would have been better suited by a reversal of their relationship. The difference involved may be trivial, as in 10.175–76, Asilas, cui sidera parent, where the point is rather that the man masters the stars than that the stars obey the man, but of course the one suggests the other.[27] The inconcinnity is greater in *G* 4.500–2, fugit diversa, neque illum praeterea vidit, where *diversa* refers to Eurydice and *illum* to Orpheus; *neque ille eam praeterea vidit* would be more in keeping with the general viewpoint of the narrative, which is that of Orpheus. More illogical are the instances where with a given verb with which we would have expected *a* as subject and *b* as object, we actually find *b* as subject and *a* as object. An example is *E* 7.40, si qua tui Corydonis habet te cura; 'if you have any concern for Corydon' would seem more natural than 'if any concern for Corydon has you.'[28] Again we find

[25] Already referred to in the second paragraph of the paper, and discussed at length in Excursus I.

[26] Another way of looking at this is to say that *currus* here actually stands for *equos*; cf. the use of *currus* in *G* 1.514, *G* 3.91, and *G* 4.389, similarly that of *quadrigae* in *G* 3.268.

[27] The notion of Servius and Wagner that *pareo* here stands for *appareo* seems to me wholly unjustified.

[28] Verbs meaning 'have, hold, keep' are more or less flexible in their use (cf. note 11). We may compare the doubt as to the exact sense and syntax of Gray's famous line in the *Elegy* "and all the air a solemn stillness holds," which rivals in ambiguity the well-known oracular response received by Pyrrhus: does the air hold the stillness, or does the stillness hold the air?

Venus's question (1.237) quae te sententia vertit? and Jupiter's
answer (1.260) neque me sententia vertit; we would rather expect
to hear of Jupiter's changing his intention than of his intention's
changing him.   Compare too the somewhat similar inversion in 12.74,
neque enim Turno mora libera mortis; the precise meaning is not so
much that postponement of death is not free for Turnus as that
Turnus is not free to postpone death.

At times the process leading to a given end is illogically described.
Aeneas lifting his father up to his shoulders is said to 'go beneath
him with his shoulders' (2.708, ipse subibo umeris,[29] and 4.599, quem
subiisse umeris parentem); so too of picking up a stone (12.899, vix
illud lecti bis sex cervice subirent).[30]   People get the same result
whether they 'hold food on spits over the fire,' as Homer has it (*Il.*
2.426, σπλάγχνα δ' ἄρ' ἀμπείραντες ὑπείρεχον 'Ηφαίστοιο) or 'put the
fire under the spits,' as Vergil has it (5.103, subiciunt veribus prunas);
but Homer is describing precisely what really takes place, and Ver-
gil, probably in a desire to dignify by elaboration a simple and
humble deed, is changing it.[31]   In the same way elsewhere (7.109–10,
adorea liba subiciunt epulis) Vergil talks of putting the wafers that
serve as platters under the food, whereas of course what actually
happens is that the person concerned put the food on the wafers.

Because the sun at night apparently drops into the ocean, night,
we are told, rushes up from the ocean (2.250, ruit oceano nox).
Because in winter the sky is, as Conington puts it, "closed up with
clouds and bound with frost," the sun, we are told, opens it up with
the light of summer (*G* 4.51–52, sol caelum aestiva luce reclusit).[32]
Phoebus, who by disappearing takes away the day, is said to bring
back the night (11.913–14, Phoebus noctem reducat).   Neptune,
when he drives away the clouds, is said not only to do this but also

[29] This is preceded (in 707) by the logical instruction, cervici imponere nostrae 'be
placed upon my back' (Conington and other editors explain *imponere* as a middle; but
I think, in view of Anchises' helplessness, that it is a true passive).   Also logical is
2.804, sublato genitore.

[30] With the dative, however, *subeo* probably means 'go beneath' in the sense of
'walk beneath, walk while holding aloft,' as in 6.222, subiere feretro.

[31] But when Vergil talks about setting fires underneath the wooden horse (2.37,
subiectisque urere flammis) or underneath the dead (11.119, supponite civibus ignem,
and 11.186, subiectisque ignibus), he is probably writing literally of applying a flame
below; cf. 6.223–24, subiectam tenuere facem.

[32] Of course the idea of a world that is closed all winter and opens up in the spring
is almost a commonplace in Latin poetry.   Cf. Lucretius 1.10; Horace, *Carm.* 1.4.1 and
1.9.3–4; Ovid, *Fasti* 4.87–89.

to bring back the sun (1.143, fugat nubes solemque reducit). Jupiter is said to ratify or confirm treaties with his thunderbolt (12.200, foedera fulmine sancit): he probably does not really do this directly, but he punishes treaty-breaking with his thunderbolt, and the two ideas are but a single one from different points of view.

An agent which ordinarily produces a certain effect, by simply failing to operate is said to produce the contrary effect. Thus we read (6.438) *fas obstat*; it is the function of *fas* to permit, hence by not permitting it is said to prevent.[33] The organs of speech, by ceasing to produce a sound, are said to produce silence, as in 11.241, facta silentia linguis.[34] Very similarly in a number of passages, the winds, by ceasing to blow and produce confusion, are said to produce calm: note especially 3.69–70, placataque venti dant maria, and 5.763, placidi straverunt aequora venti; and compare *E* 2.26, cum placidum ventis staret mare, *G* 4.484, vento rota constitit, and 1.66, et mulcere fluctus et tollere vento. The grief that chokes a voice, on passing is said to release it (11.151, via vocis laxata dolore est). The traces of sin that terrified the world, by being effaced are said to free it from terror (*E* 4.13–14, si qua manent sceleris vestigia, inrita solvent formidine terras).[35] We may perhaps compare *G* 4.147, spatiis exclusus iniquis, where *spatiis* represents a lack of space.

The confusion of negatives and opposites is seen, too, in such expressions as 4.292, rumpi non speret amores, for *non rumpi speret amores*, which has perhaps been confused with *rumpi non putet*

---

[33] Contrariwise, in 4.5, nec placidam membris dat cura quietam, the passion which prevents Dido from obtaining peace is said not to give it. Perhaps the genesis of this particular expression becomes clearer if we shift the form to the passive: nec membris datur cura quies. Here *cura* would probably be classified as an ablative of cause (equivalent to *propter curam*, which might have been more natural in this instance). But with the passive voice it is not an expression of cause, but one of agent, or possibly (where, as here, there is perhaps an element of personification) one of means, that corresponds to the nominative with the active voice.

[34] With this we may compare the famous *favete linguis* as used by Horace; the favorable words are equivalent to no words at all.

[35] We may look upon *inrita* with the subject of *solvent* (referring to *vestigia*) as constituting an example of the *ab urbe condita* construction: it is the *fact* that the traces of sin are rendered vain or void that will free the world from fear. As I pointed out long ago (*CJ* 23.272), when the general meaning of the adjective or participle in an *ab urbe condita* phrase simply repeats or reinforces that of the noun, the use of the construction affects the sense but little; but when the adjective or participle has a negative or privative force, the significance of the entire passage may be completely reversed. Thus in a sentence reporting that dispatches tell of someone's "delayed arrival," only the context can show whether the point is that the person *has* arrived or that he has *not*.

amores. (The tendency here exemplified is common: compare *nego* for *aio* + *non*; our own *I don't think so* for *I think not*; *I never hope to see him again*, sometimes used for *I hope never to see him again*, but more often used for *I do not hope ever to see him again.*) In 6.51, cessas in vota, the use of the accusative with *in* can best be accounted for on the ground that *cessas* 'are you slow' is equivalent in sense to the negative of its antonym, 'do you not hasten,' 'do you fail to hasten.'

In these last few examples, although they appear fairly germane to the subject, I seem rather to have got away from the precise fallacy with which I started. But I return to it now with some instances from the temporal sphere that correspond to the examples from the spatial sphere with which I started my treatment of verbs.[36]

It is natural, but not always logical, to assume that because *a* happened when *b* did, *b* also happened when *a* did. Such an assumption results, for one thing, in the so-called *cum inversum* construction.[37] This special departure from strict logic is particularly potent in creating the effect of vividness, and therefore seems, as we might have expected, to be a very popular mannerism with our poet. I have noted 53 instances of *cum inversum* in Vergil;[38] here I shall

[36] A recognition of this type of fallacy as often met in English is shown by the brilliant novelist Rose Macaulay in her novel *Daisy and Daphne* (New York, 1928) 187: "Christmas drew near; or rather the inhabitants of the earth drew near to Christmas." In the field of time relations "Christmas drew near" corresponds to Vergil's *portus patescit iam propior* (3.530–1) in the field of space relations. A vivid variation of this occurs in a speech made by Adlai E. Stevenson in Seattle on Oct. 9, 1956, as quoted in the *New York Herald Tribune* for Oct. 14, 1956: "I deny that with the future rushing toward us America can stand still."

[37] At an early stage of the language, the two clauses were doubtless coordinate; when parataxis gave way to hypotaxis, the clause that was logically the protasis might be subordinated by means of *cum*, but the clause that was logically the apodosis might be subordinated by the use of *cum inversum*. (In the same way, when the juxtaposition of two nouns in the same case — apposition — gave way to a phrase in which one noun was subordinated to the other as an adnominal modifier — the genitive — sometimes it was the noun not logically subordinated that went into the genitive. To this origin I believe we may trace many examples of hypallage, just as we may, in my opinion, trace the appositional genitive to a manifestation of overcorrection that subordinated one noun in instances where the two nouns were logically coordinate; on these two developments see *TAPA* 84.98–99 and 97–98 respectively.) Plenty of examples of the original paratactic construction occur in Vergil: we find examples in which the two clauses are joined by a coordinating conjunction (*atque, et, -que*) or by an adverb (*dehinc*), as well as instances of asyndeton; cf. note 38.

[38] For the sake of completeness, I append a classified list of examples with *cum adversum* in Excursus IV, followed by a list of examples in which the original parataxis (cf. note 37) is retained.

confine myself to detailed comments on but a single one, 12.377–82, a rather complicated passage which must be quoted in its entirety in order to illuminate my point:

> ille tamen clipeo obiecto conversus in hostem
> ibat et auxilium ducto mucrone petebat,
> cum rota praecipitem et procursu concitus axis
> impulit effuditque solo, Turnusque secutus
> imam inter galeam summi thoracis et oras
> abstulit ense caput truncumque reliquit harenae.

What really happened was that *when* Phegeus was making his way and was seeking aid, his chariot hurled him headlong and flung him on the ground; and *then* Turnus cut off his head and left his body on the sand.   But what Vergil, with the aid of *cum inversum*, says happened, was that Phegeus was making his way and seeking aid, *when* his chariot hurled him headlong and flung him on the ground, *and* Turnus cut off his head and left his body on the sand.   In other words *ibat et auxilium petebat cum Turnus abstulit caput truncumque reliquit harenae*!   We see that two actions, one extended and the other instantaneous, are not of necessity logically interchangeable even though they are more or less simultaneous.

The only conjunction usually cited as figuring in the *inversum* construction is *cum*.   However, I think we meet *ut inversum* in the same sense in 9.386–89, iamque evaserat hostis, ut stetit et respexit amicum.[39]

Cum inversum, like normal *cum*, is subject to extensions of meaning.   We find *cum inversum* in a quasi-causal sense in *G* 1.466–67, ille exstincto miseratus Caesare Romam, cum caput texit,[40] and in an adversative sense in 10.508–9, haec te prima dies bello dedit, haec eadem aufert, cum tamen ingentis Rutulorum linquis acervos![41]

---

[39] Contrast the regular form, 2.531–32, ut tandem evasit, concidit.   A parallel example with *cum inversum* is *G* 4.485–88, iamque casus evaserat omnis, cum subita dementia cepit amantem.

[40] The two acts took place simultaneously: the sun pitied Caesar, and he veiled his head.   But logically his pity was the cause of his veiling his head.   As the passage stands, *cum inversum* approaches *nam* 'for'; the second clause gives the cause not of the event represented by the first clause, but of the author's making the statement embodied in the first clause (for a comment on clauses of this type, see Hahn, *Language* 30.245 note 30).   Or we might say that *miseratus* here means not so much 'pitied' as 'showed his pity'; the second clause could be said to be in epexegetical relation with the first, in which case *cum* is not *"inversum."*

[41] The clause is clearly marked as adversative by the use of *tamen*.   Strictly speaking, it refers only to the second of the two clauses in the preceding line; for though the

What is odder is that in two instances of *cum adversum*, *cum* seems used in the sense of *dum*:[42] 3.645–47, tertia iam lunae se cornua lumine complent cum vitam in silvis traho; and 5.626–28, septima post Troiae excidium iam vertitur aestas, cum ferimur.[43]

It is in the light of these last two passages that we may perhaps find an explanation for a passage that has been much discussed and disputed over,[44] to wit *G* 4.559–62, haec canebam, Caesar dum ful-

fact that this is Pallas' *first* day of fighting intensifies the marvelousness of his many victories, it is only the fact that this same day is also the day of his death that makes possible the use of *linquis*. Thus logically the passage would run: cum haec prima dies (i.e. una dies) te aufert (or, rather, *te abstulerit*), tamen ingentis Rutulorum linquis acervos. But of course logic must not be allowed to interfere with the supreme poignancy and pathos of the balance in 509, haec te prima dies bello dedit, haec eadem aufert. Furthermore, this pair must jointly constitute the main clause, for this is the thought that is uppermost in the poet's mind as he apostrophizes Pallas, 'your first day of battle was your last'; it is only as an afterthought, the faint silver lining to this black cloud of mourning, that he adds, 'though to be sure in that single day you won great glory.'

[42] In two other passages also, *cum* seems to have the sense of *dum*, namely, *G* 3.422–24, iamque caput abdidit, cum medii nexus extremaeque agmine caudae solvuntur, tardosque trahit sinus ultimus orbis, and 10.663–65, tum haud ultra latebras iam quaerit imago, sed sublime volans nubi se immiscuit atrae, cum Turnum medio interea fert aequore turbo. But this is ordinary *cum*, not *cum inversum*. To be sure, in the first of the two, it is hard to see why either clause should be subordinated to the other; it might have been appropriate to preserve here the primitive parataxis (cf. note 37) with the head and tail balanced as are Fama's head and feet in 4.177, ingrediturque solo et caput inter nubila condit. In regard to the second passage it should be noted that many editors, following Brunck, rearrange the order of the lines, so that the *cum* clause follows 661–62, illum Aeneas poscit, obvia multa virum demittit corpora morti; but the force of *cum* (pointed up by *interea*) remains equivalent to that of *dum* in either case.

[43] *Cum* in these two passages is often explained as equal to *ex quo*; so for instance Knapp (on 3.646), who compares *ex quo* in 2.163. The construction there is: ex quo corripuere effigiem, ex illo fluere ac retro sublapsa referri spes Danaum, fractae vires, aversa deae mens (2.163–70), with *ex quo* (i.e. *ex quo tempore*) and *ex illo* (i.e. *ex illo tempore*) correlative. *Ex quo* emphasizes a point in the past at which something happened; to be at all comparable to a clause so introduced, the *cum* clause would have to be rephrased as *ex quo vitam trahere coepi*, but that would completely change the emphasis, which is on durative, not punctual, action. Furthermore, in the passage in Book 2, the main thought, that of the (pretended) misfortunes of the Greeks, is in the main or *ex illo* clause; the *ex quo* clause serves merely to mark the time of their beginning. But in our passage, the main thought, that of the misery of Achemenides, is in the second or *cum* (*inversum*) clause; the preceding main clause serves merely to mark the time of its duration.

[44] See, e.g., the discussion given by Conington, including a rather labored explanation of his own for the use of the present in the *dum* clause. The parallels which he offers (5.605–6, *E* 7.6–7) are examples of partial coextension; in such expressions the present is indeed in order in the *dum* clause, but the imperfect is not in order in the main clause, which needs a tense of punctual or perfective action, the historical present, the perfect, or the pluperfect. Furthermore, our passage as it stands, *dum fulminat*, if interpreted as a typical *dum* clause (not *dum inversum*), would have to be viewed as

minat victorque dat iura viamque adfectat Olympo. I think this, as the position of the *dum* clause suggests, is an instance of *dum inversum*: 'I was writing this (epistolary tense as a substitute for the present *cano* or the present perfect *cecini*) while (in the meantime) Caesar thunders'; in other words, *dum cano, Caesar fulminat*. The verbs 'thunder' etc. would remain present, either as the historical present (like *fert* in 10.665) or because Augustus' activities are still in process at the moment that Vergil is completing the *Georgics*. If it is shifted into the *dum* clause, the verb 'sing' must likewise be present, for this is partial coextension: the writing of the *Georgics* is supposed to have lasted for seven years beginning with 37 or 36, while the activities of Augustus here referred to are those following the battle of Actium in 31.

Thus we have seen instances of a lack of coextension, and there-fore of a lack of interchangeability, not only between verbs denoting respectively punctual and durative action, but even, on occasion, between verbs both denoting durative action, if one refers to a period of greater extent than the other. There is still another pos-sibility of variation. In speaking of an extended period of time, Vergil may consider its entire duration, *or* the momentary point that marks its close. If we delay the passage of one event, we at the same time delay the coming of another. By considering now one and now the other, we are but looking now at the obverse and now at the reverse of the same coin.[45] Thus paradoxically enough, 'to delay *life*' and 'to delay *death*' amount to the same thing, and we find examples in Vergil of both types of expression (11.177, vitam moror,

representing complete coextension; the thundering did not last as long as the singing, but the singing certainly did last as long as the thundering. The two clauses would therefore need identical tenses. Conington attempts to justify the tenses as they stand on the ground that Caesar's successes "in the poet's view, would still be going on when his work should be in the reader's hands," but for subsequent readers that is hardly true; indeed, for them Vergil's singing (even though not his actual writing) would "still be going on" much more than Caesar's thundering. Conington's alternative sugges-tion, that *canebam* (as an epistolary tense) may be regarded as a "conventional syn-onyme" for the present *cano*, is also unsatisfactory, for Vergil goes back to the im-perfect in 563–64, illo me tempore alebat Parthenope; *alebat* represents the same time as *canebam*, but is certainly not an "epistolary tense." But if *dum* is *dum inversum*, the shift from imperfect to present may be explained as analogous with the correspond-ing shift seen in many examples of *cum inversum*; see Excursus IV, examples of *cum inversum* listed under Part I A 1 c (2), and note 135.

[45] In the same way, the conjunction *dum* may refer to the prolonged duration of a given action or state ('while') or to the coming of a second action or state that termin-ates the first one ('until').

and 12.873–74, lucem morer; vs. 10.622, mora leti, and 12.74, mora mortis). In the same way a phrase used twice in Vergil (*G* 2.482 and 1.746), quae tardis mora noctibus obstet, is ambiguous: we cannot be certain whether it is the coming or the going of the nights that is delayed, in other words whether it is the days or the nights that are lengthened.

Excursus I.

Vergil's Use of *mixtus*

Vergil has six different patterns for the use of *mixtus* and its compounds, *commixtus*, *immixtus*, and *permixtus*.

(I). First, there is the logical construction, *alium alii*[46] *mixtum*, as in *E* 4.15–16, divis permixtos heroas; *E* 4.20, mixta colocasia acantho; *E* 5.3, corylis mixtas ulmos; *G* 3.516, mixtum spumis cruorem; 1.488, se principibus permixtum; 2.396, vadimus immixti Danais; 3.632–33, saniem et frusta commixta mero; 7.661, mixta deo mulier; 10.238–39, permixtus Etrusco Arcas eques; 10.416, ossa cerebro permixta; 12.617–18, caecis terroribus commixtum clamorem.[47]

(II). Equally logical is the type (A 1) *alium aliumque mixta*, which may appear in the form (A 2) *alium aliumque mixtum*, the use of the singular adjective to refer to the *two* nouns being quite in accord with normal Latin practice. But when we meet the latter form it is also possible to interpret it as a different and somewhat less logical variety (B) *alium aliumque mixtum*, in which the second element seems somewhat subordinated to the first (even where strict logic might demand coordination), and which perhaps represents a contamination of type A 1 *alium aliumque mixta* with *alium aliumque alii mixtum*. 11.807, laetitia mixtoque metu, probably belongs under B, but in 10.398, mixtus dolor et pudor, the position of *mixtus* with the first member, instead of with the second as usual, suggests that here we have an example of A 2. On the other hand, if the individual members are themselves plural (i.e. *alia aliaque mixta*), it is not always possible to be certain whether we should class the example as A (here obviously there is no difference between A 1 and A 2) or as B. 4.145–46, mixtique Cretesque Dryopesque pictique Agathyrsi, seems to be a clear example of A; the initial position of the adjective (as in 10.398) is particularly appropriate here, for it is in the adjective that the main thought lies: 'all mingled together (in worship of

---

[46] In the instances here cited, I assume we have a dative rather than an ablative, though the forms all happen to be ambiguous. However, cf. note 50.

[47] This expression is perfectly logical so far as grammatical construction goes, but the mixture of the physical (*clamorem*) with the metaphysical (*terroribus*) affords a kind of confusion that adds tremendously to the effectiveness of the description. We may compare 3.99–100, mixto tumultu laetitia, cited below as an example of Type III. Even more striking is the combination of abstract and concrete terms in 11.634–35, permixti caede virorum semianimes volvuntur equi, cited below as an example of Type IV; on this see note 51.

Apollo), alike Cretans and Dryopes and (even) painted Agathyrsi.'
But the word order in 5.293, Teucri mixtique Sicani, and 11.134, Teucri
mixtique impune Latini, makes it likely that these should be classed under
B : 'the Teucrians and, mixed (with them), the Sicilians (or the Latins).'
This is particularly appropriate as putting the emphasis on the Teucrians
or Trojans.   5.293 describes the mingling of the two parties at the
games; and the enumeration of the contestants in the foot-race that fol-
lows it lists in order first five of Aeneas' men (including Nisus and
Euryalus, in whom our interest is to center), and, only thereafter, only
two of Acestes' subjects.   11.134 describes the mingling of the two parties
during the funeral truce which Aeneas has granted at the petition of the
Latins; the Trojans seem to have the controlling voice, and it is thanks to
their magnanimity that the Latins are permitted to mingle with them in
safety (*impune*) while both sides seek wood for their funeral-pyres.

   (III). From the type *alium aliumque mixtum* we proceed naturally to
the type *alium alio mixto*, where the ablative absolute *alio mixto* is equiv-
alent to *alio alii mixto*.[48]   Here belongs the passage quoted in the text,
E 10.55, mixtis lustrabo Maenala Nymphis; also 2.609, mixto undantem
pulvere fumum; 3.99–100, mixto tumultu laetitia;[49] 4.120, nigrantem
commixta grandine nimbum; 4.161, commixta grandine nimbus; 10.871
= 12.667, mixto insania luctu; 12.340, mixta cruor harena.   Rather odd
is 10.742, subridens mixta Mezentius ira, where there is nothing for the
anger to be mixed with except the smile implied by *subridens*.

   (IV). More peculiar is the type *alium alio mixtum*, where the regular
dative is replaced by an ablative,[50] presumably an ablative of means, as
in 8.255, commixtis igne tenebris; 11.634–35, permixti caede virorum
semianimes equi;[51] 12.68–69, mixta lilia rosa; probably *G* 2.327, magnus
alit magno commixtus corpore fetus.[52]

---

   [48] In 2.609 and in 4.120 (despite the contrary testimony of 4.161, commixta gran-
dine nimbus) it is possible to view the ablatives as instrumental, with *undantem* and
nigrantem respectively.   But that does not fundamentally alter the picture.

   [49] Already referred to in note 47.

   [50] In these instances we indubitably have the ablative.   This may be an argument
in favor of classing here too some or all of the ambiguous forms referred to in note 46.

   [51] A prose writer would probably have used *caesis viris* to balance *semianimes equi*;
but not only does *caede* suggest the process as well as the result of slaughter, but also
the combination of abstract and concrete terms (already referred to in note 47) im-
measurably heightens the general atmosphere of hopeless confusion.   Such combina-
tions are common in Vergil; for a discussion of them, see my *Coordination of Non-Co-
ordinate Elements in Vergil* (New York 1930) 195–214 (for this particular example, see
209).   For various stylistic devices by which Vergil (in this passage and elsewhere)
adds overtones that reinforce his meaning, see the same work, 120 note 485.   We may
compare Horace, *Serm.* 1.5.72, paene macros arsit dum turdos versat in igni; here
Horace accomplishes by his word order what Vergil accomplishes by his vocabulary
and his syntax in 11.634–35.

   [52] I assume that *magno corpore*, like *coniugis gremium* in the preceding line, refers
not to the *pater omnipotens* but to his spouse the Earth.   This phrase *coniugis gremium*,
as also *vere tument* two lines earlier, surely stresses her corporeal guise, whereas he is

(V). More peculiar still is the occurrence of the same phrase *alium alio mixtum* in quite a different sense, *alio* being an ablative of source, as in 6.762, Italo commixtus sanguine (of Silvius), meaning *Italo Troianoque commixtus sanguine*, the starting-point being *sanguis Troianus Italo commixtus sanguine*.   12.838, genus Ausonio mixtum sanguine, is just like 6.762; and 8.510, mixtus matre Sabella (of Pallas), is odder still, for if this were an example of Type IV it would be Evander, Pallas's *pater Arcadius*, who was *mixtus matre Sabella*, and not Pallas himself.[53]

(VI). Finally, we find the dative *alii* or the ablative *alio* replaced by a prepositional phrase.   9.349–50, cum sanguine mixta vina, may seem natural to us, because our idiom corresponds so closely; but it probably represents a contamination of *cum sanguine vina* and *sanguini mixta vina*. We also meet the preposition *in*, with the ablative in 5.470, mixtos in sanguine dentes, and with the accusative (a "pregnant" construction) in *G* 4.499–500, fumus in auras commixtus.

In many of the above passages, we may say that Vergil was influenced by the normal construction with some word of kindred meaning — e.g. *mixtus matre Sabella* (8.510), listed as an instance of Type V, may have been affected by *natus matre Sabella*.   But this is to take away much of his poetry.   Perhaps it is not far-fetched to say that the departures from strict logic enhance the effect inherent in these passages involving mixtures.   Particularly striking instances are 11.634–35, armaque corporaque et permixti caede virorum semianimes volvuntur equi, and 12.617–18, attulit hunc illi caecis terroribus aura commixtum clamorem, already discussed above.[54]

<div align="center">Excursus II.</div>

<div align="center">Vergil's Use of *medius*</div>

Somewhat like the use of *mixtus* is that of *medius*, which, because of its two meanings (corresponding, as I have already said, to the English *middle* and *middle of* respectively), may be applied either to *a* located in *b* (*homo est medius in loco*) or to *b* in which *a* is located (*homo est medio in loco*).[55]   Examples follow.

thought of rather as the pure generative and fertilizing force: he is called *Aether*, and he descends in the form of rain.   The author of the *Pervigilium Veneris* evidently took the body as Aether's, to judge by his (or her?) imitation (62), unde fetus mixtus omnis aleret magno corpore; but an imitation is not necessarily a dependable interpretation. 6.727, mens agitat molem et magno se corpore miscet, would suggest that the body is Earth's; 12.835, commixti corpore tantum, that it is Aether's; but neither one is really parallel.

[53] Amazingly, Conington (*ad loc.*) compares for the construction 7.661, mixta deo mulier (classified here under Type I).   I believe *deo* there is surely a dative (cf. note 46), and so, apparently, does Conington himself, for in his note on this passage he compares *Il.* 16.176, γυνὴ θεῷ εὐνηθεῖσα; but even if we should deem *deo* an ablative (cf. note 50), it would be one of a quite different sort from *matre* in 8.510.

[54] See notes 47 and 51.

[55] An interesting passage is 2.408, et sese medium iniecit periturus in agmen: here

I. *Medius* = 'in the middle,'[56] sometimes 'intervening, in the intervening space.'[57]

　　A. Miscellaneous examples, with *medius* not specifically defined by a limiting word or phrase.

　　1. Attributive uses.

6.634 corripiunt spatium medium.[58]
5.113 tuba medio canit aggere.[59]
9.142 medii fiducia valli.
12.201 medios ignis testor.[60]

medium might be an example of the first type, in agreement with *sese*, or of the second type, in agreement with *agmen*. It is accordingly listed under both I D (cf. note 73) and II D (cf. note 98).

　　[56] A different — and rarer — variation is simply 'middle, central,' as in 9.28, medio dux agmine Turnus, where *medio agmine* is in contradistinction to *primas acies* and *postrema* (in 27). Contrast 8.587–88, agmine in medio, and 9.728, in medio agmine, 'in the middle of the line'; cf. note 90.

　　[57] The substantival use of the neuter *medium* is derived from this meaning. It may, like *spatium medium* in 6.634, quoted just below (cf. note 58), denote 'the intervening space,' as in 3.417, venit medio pontus, or 'the intervening time,' as in 9.395, nec longum in medio tempus. The neuter plural is similarly used in 6.131, tenent media omnia silvae (where I think *media* is employed substantivally and *omnia* adjectivally), and 10.407–8, correptis mediis extenditur per latos acies Volcania campos. We find *medio* in this sense combined with the genitive in 7.226–27, extenta plagarum quattuor in medio plaga. An interesting variation of this construction is its occurrence in 4.184, caeli medio terraeque; here *medio* is used in the sense of the preposition *inter* 'between' with two accusatives, as in 4.256, terras inter caelumque (note the identical word order, and see the sensitive comment on this type of order in Ernout and Thomas, *Syntaxe latine*, 101–2). A parallel is 9.230, castrorum et campi medio, if this means 'in the space between the camp and the field' (see Conington *ad loc.*). A commoner sense is 'the middle space, the middle.' We meet the ablative *medio* (7.566), *in medio* (*E* 3.40 and 46, *G* 2.528, *G* 3.16, 6.282, 8.675, 9.343, 12.118), *in medium* (*G* 4.25, 5.401; metaphorically, *G* 1.127, *G* 4.157, 11.335), *ad medium* (12.273), and *per medium* (10.383). In this sense too, *medium*, like English *the middle*, is sometimes combined with a genitive: 3.354, aulai medio; 7.59, tecti medio; 7.563, Italiae medio; 11.547, fugae medio. 9.230 (quoted above) belongs here also if *castrorum* and *campi* represent more or less coextensive spaces instead of separate and contrasted ones. — The masculine and feminine forms of *medius* are not usually employed substantivally in the sense of 'the one(s) in the middle' (cf. note 79), but there is one instance of this use, 12.696, discessere omnes medii (in which the combination *omnes medii* may remind us of *media omnia* in 6.131, quoted in the third sentence of this note).

　　[58] Already referred to at the opening of note 57 as a parallel for the substantive *medium*, e.g. in 3.417. We may also compare with the use of *corripiunt* here that of *correptis* in combination with the substantive *mediis* in 10.407, likewise cited in note 57.

　　[59] The mound is in the center of the gathering-place, like the *munera*, spoken of as placed *circo in medio* (109–10).

　　[60] The fires which Aeneas calls to witness are between Aeneas and Latinus; cf. *medio* in 4.184, quoted in note 57. See further note 79.

2. Predicative uses.[61]

G 4.436 considit scopulo medius.[62]
7.169 solio medius consedit.[63]
6.518 flammam media ipsa tenebat.[64]
G 2.297 media ipsa ingentem sustinet umbram.
1.682 ne medius occurrere possit.
10.402 quam medius Rhoeteus intercipit.
1.697–98 se composuit sponda mediamque locavit.[65]
5.622 mediam se matribus infert.[66]
7.536 paci medium se offert.[67]
10.239–40 medias illis opponere turmas est sententia.[67]
6.667–68 medium turba hunc habet.[68]
10.117 caelicolae medium quem ducunt.

[61] The predicate use of *medius* is illustrated likewise by all the examples cited below under the heads B, C, D, E, and F, with the possible but not positive exception of 9.750–51 (on which see note 76); in these instances it does not seem important to point out this distinction specifically. The adjective is also used predicatively when combined with verbs of dividing in the sense of '(cut) in two'; cf. again 9.750–51 (provided *mediam* there is employed in this way) and the passages cited as parallels in note 76, namely, 9.588–89, 12.307–8, *G* 1.209.

[62] With this picture of Proteus, seated on a rock in the middle of his cave, we may compare the picture in 7.169 (the passage next listed) of Latinus, seated on his throne in the middle of his palace. And we may contrast the picture of Polyphemus in the middle of *his* cave, where instead of *medius* Vergil uses *medio in antro* (3.624); this is cited below under II C (cf. note 94).

[63] In the parallel description of Dido, we find her too seated on a throne (1.506, solioque alte subnixa resedit) in the middle of a temple, but here the adjective *medius* is applied not to her but to the temple, or, rather, to its vaulted roof (505, media testudine templi, listed below under II B; cf. note 85). In a later description of Dido (1.697–98, se mediam locavit, listed just below; cf. note 65), *mediam* is used as is *medius* of Latinus (though it may be debated whether here Dido's seat is in the middle of the *triclinium* or in the middle of the hall).

[64] 'In the middle' with reference to the group designated in the preceding clause as *Phrygias*.

[65] See note 63.

[66] Here *matribus*, like *Phrygias* in 6.518 (see note 64), designates the group in the midst of which the individual concerned takes her place; but it is not connected directly with *mediam* any more than in the next two examples cited, 7.536 and 10.239–40, the dative *paci* (a dative of purpose) is with *medium*, or *illis* (a close parallel to *matribus*) is with *medias*; cf. note 70. However, *mediis se matribus infert* would of course have been possible; cf. 11.815, mediis se immiscuit armis (listed under II A; cf. note 82), where I suppose *armis* is a dative.

[67] Cf. note 66.

[68] Conington's characterization of this locution as "a poetical variety for 'hic turbae medius est'" seems very strange to me. If we want to take all the poetry out of it, I would rather suggest *hic media in turba est*. Even *media turba hunc habet* might not be impossible; cf. 9.738, cohibet media Ardea Turnum, with which this passage was already compared in the text (see note 8), and which is listed below under II A (cf. note 78).

B. Type *medius hominibus* or *medius loco* (ablative).

5.75–76 ille e concilio multis cum milibus ibat ad tumulum magna medius comitante caterva.[69]

5.289–90 quo se multis cum milibus heros consessu medium tulit.[70]

12.564 celso medius stans aggere.

C. Type *medius in hominibus* or *medius in loco.*

2.507–8 vidit medium in penetralibus hostem.[71]

D. Type *medius in homines* or *medius in locum.*

10.379 medius densos prorumpit in hostis.[72]

Perhaps 2.408 sese medium iniecit periturus in agmen.[73]

---

[69] Here the picture is the same as in 6.667–68 (cited just above), one outstanding individual in the middle of a great throng. We may note once more the position of *medius* (cf. note 57 on 4.184), which in this instance is reinforced by the juxtaposed *comitante*. It might be said that either *medius caterva* (with *caterva* an ablative of place like *solio* in 7.169, listed above under A), or *magna comitante caterva* (ablative absolute like *magna stipante caterva* in 1.497 and *multis comitantibus* in 3.346; cf. too the simple ablative *concursu magno* in 1.509) without *medius*, would have been sufficient, and that the form actually used represents a contamination of the two; of course such a fusion provides a tremendous gain in overtones. Another possibility would have been *media caterva* or *media in caterva* (like *catervis in mediis* in 11.682–83, contrasted in the text with our passage, and listed below under II C; cf. notes 8 and 91); but that is probably ruled out by the presence of *comitante*).

[70] Here the editors, from Thiel on, call *consessu* a dative, used instead of *in consessum*; but we have just had *quo* 'whither,' and we do not need another expression of goal (the dative *matribus* in 5.622, mediam se matribus infert, listed under A, is quite different, for it depends on *se infert*; cf. note 66). If we compare this passage with 5.75–76 (quoted just before it), we shall see that (except for *e concilio* in the earlier passage, which has no parallel in the later one but is roughly balanced by *misso certamine* three lines above) the two correspond point for point: *ille = heros, multis cum milibus = multis cum milibus, ibat = se tulit, ad tumulum = quo, magna medius comitante caterva = consessu medium.* It may not be quite accurate to apply the term *consessus* to the throng at the moment they all entered the circus, but that is equally true if *consessu* is a dative, whether it means the spectators or the place occupied by them. Of course in my interpretation it can have only the former meaning. (The word can refer only to the place in 8.635–36, raptas Sabinas consessu caveae; but it can have either meaning in 5.340–41, totum caveae consessum et ora prima patrum clamoribus implet, and 5.577–78, omnem consessum oculosque suorum lustravere in equis, where it is paired with *ora patrum* and with *oculos suorum* respectively. That it can, and in some passages must, refer to the poeple is proved by Cicero's usage: note in particular *Sen.* 18.64, quibus cum a cuncto consessu plausus esset multiplex datus.)

[71] I have already noted in the text (cf. note 8) the contrast between this and 2.665–67, ut mediis hostem in penetralibus cernam, listed below in the Excursus under II C (cf. note 93). About the same effect is produced by 7.59, laurus erat tecti medio in penetralibus altis, though there *medio* is a noun modified by the genitive *tecti* (cf. note 57) and has no direct connection with the phrase *in penetralibus.*

[72] Nettleship pronounces this "a refinement for 'medios prorumpit in hostes.'" It is certainly more vivid than the common form, seen in 9.554–55, iuvenis medios moriturus in hostis inruit (with which I have already contrasted it in the text; cf. note

E. Type *medius per homines* or *medius per locum.*

10.55–56 quid iuvit Argolicos medium fugisse per ignis?[74]

F. Type *medius inter homines* or *medius inter loca.*[75]

1.348 quos inter medius venit furor.
9.750–51 mediam gemina inter tempora frontem dividit.[76]

II. *Medius* = 'the middle of, mid-.'[77]

A. Miscellaneous examples.

9.738 nec cohibet media Ardea Turnum.[78]
9.799 medios invaserat hostis.[79]
10.440 curru medium secat agmen.[80]

8) and 2.377, sensit medios delapsus in hostis (both of these are listed below under II D; cf. note 97). However, each may be conditioned merely — or mainly — by the desire to avoid attaching *medius* to a substantive which already has a modifier (note *densos* vs. *moriturus* and *delapsus*). In the next example, 2.408, *periturus* does not have the same effect as *moriturus*, since *medium*, even though it may refer to the same person as *periturus* (cf. note 55), agrees not with the subject but with the object *sese.*

[73] See notes 55 and 72.

[74] I have already noted in the text (cf. note 8) the contrast between this and 7.296–97, medios per ignis invenere viam (listed below under II E; cf. note 100). Probably Vergil's use in 10.56 of *medium* (with the implied subject of *fugisse*) rather than *medios* (with *ignis*) is due to the fact that here *ignis* already has an adjective, *Argolicos.* Cf. note 72.

[75] This type appears almost pleonastic. Cf. note 69 on 5.75–76.

[76] I have already noted in the text (cf. note 8) the contrast between this and 6.245, summas carpens media inter cornua saetas, to which may be added 4.61, vaccae media inter cornua fundit, and 5.479, libravit media inter cornua caestus — all three listed below under II F (cf. note 103). However, perhaps the adjective is used predicatively here (as in the examples of type I A 2) 'cuts his forehead in two,' and not with *inter cornua.* Cf. 9.588–89, media adversi liquefacto tempora plumbo diffidit, and 12.307–8, adversi frontem mediam mentumque disicit; also, metaphorically, *G* 1.209, medium luci atque umbris dividit orbem. See also note 80, on 10.440 and 12.683.

[77] In all examples except those of the first set (A), for the sake of brevity I cite in each case only the adjective *medius* and the noun with which it agrees.

[78] Contrast 6.667–68, medium plurima turba hunc habet; on this see note 68.

[79] With a plural noun such as *hostis*, the hypallage is less marked: we might explain *medios hostis* as meaning 'the midmost foes,' i.e. some foes in the midst of the total group of foes. So too with *medios* itself used as a noun, as in 12.497, invadit medios. We may compare the phrases cited below, such as *mediis hominibus* in Type B; and perhaps even more the substantival uses of *medius* and *medios* cited in notes 87, 96, 99, and 101. But if we compare these examples with a genuine example of *medii* in the sense of 'the middle' (*not* 'the middle of'), like 12.696, discessere omnes medii (cited at the end of note 57), we see the difference. So too if we compare *medios ignis* 'the fires in the midst' in 12.201 (see note 60) with *medios per ignis* 'through the midst of the fires' in 7.296 (see note 100).

[80] I am interpreting *medium agmen* here, and *media agmina* in the next example, 12.683, as meaning 'the midst of the troops,' like *media agmina* in the following example, 10.721, which Nettleship says denotes the thick of the battle; cf. too 11.762,

12.683 cursu media agmina rumpit.[81]
10.721 hunc miscentem media agmina.
10.482–84 clipeum cuspis medium transverberat.
10.764–65 incedit medii per maxima Nerei stagna.
11.815 mediis se immiscuit armis.[82]
10.681–83 sese fluctibus an iaciat mediis.

B. Type *mediis hominibus* or *medio loco* (ablative).

11.762 medio agmine.[83]
8.467–68 and 12.92–93 mediis aedibus.[84]
1.638 mediis tectis.
1.505 media testudine templi.[85]
12.408–9 castris mediis.
5.188 media nave.
G 3.466 medio campo.
1.314 media silva.
4.620 and 5.423 media harena.
4.382–83 mediis scopulis.
G 3.237 and 3.104 medio ponto.
3.73 mari medio.
10.665 medio aequore.
3.270 medio fluctu.[86]
4.310 mediis aquilonibus.
E 10.65 frigoribus mediis.

C. Type *mediis in hominibus*[87] or *medio in loco*.[88]

5.303 quibus in mediis.[89]
1.491 and 12.125 mediis in milibus.
9.728 in medio agmine, and 8.587–88 agmine in medio.[90]
11.682–83 catervis in mediis.[91]

medio agmine (listed under II B; cf. note 83), and 9.728, in medio agmine (listed under
IIC; cf. note 90). But in the two passages here under consideration Knapp interprets
the adjective as 'intervening,' and he may be right. Or it may be used predicatively,
as in the examples cited in note 76.

[81] See note 80.
[82] See note 66.
[83] Cf. notes 80 and 88.
[84] Cf. note 88.
[85] Cf. note 63.
[86] Cf. note 88.
[87] Cf. the substantival use *in mediis*: 8.696, 11.237, perhaps 5.303 (see note 89).
[88] Type C seems to be practically equivalent to Type B. Cf. 11.762, medio ag-
mine, with 9.728, in medio agmine; 8.467–68 and 12.92–93, mediis aedibus, with 2.512,
aedibus in mediis; 3.270, medio fluctu, with 1.584, medio in fluctu.
[89] It is possible to separate *quibus* from *in mediis* here, taking it as a dative with
the verb *locutus*. This seems to be Conington's view, since he compares *in mediis* in
8.696 and 11.237 (see note 87).
[90] See notes 56, 80, and 88.
[91] Cf. note 69, on 5.75–76.

1.441 in urbe media.
2.328 mediis in moenibus.
2.512 aedibus in mediis.[92]
2.665 mediis in penetralibus.[93]
5.288 media in valle.
4.156 mediis in vallibus.
5.109–10 circo in medio.
3.624 medio in antro.[94]
1.584 medio in fluctu.[95]
1.109 mediis in fluctibus.
3.202 media in unda.
6.339 and 10.305 mediis in undis.
G 2.283 mediis in armis.
8.700 medio in certamine.
11.225 medio in tumultu.
11.838 medio in clamore.
2.67 and 12.213 conspectu in medio.

D. Type *medios in homines*[96] or *medium in locum.*

5.497 in medios Achivos.
6.753 conventus in medios.
2.377 and 9.554 medios in hostis.[97]
12.224 and 12.227 in medias acies.
Perhaps 2.408 medium in agmen.[98]
2.353 in media arma.
9.400 medios in ensis.
12.346 media in proelia.
10.451 medium in aequor.

E. Type *medios per homines*[99] or *medium per locum.*

3.283, 12.477, and 12.650 medios per hostis.
10.816 per medium iuvenem.
12.926 per medium femur.
G 4.82 per medias acies.
7.296 medias acies mediosque per ignis.[100]
11.787 medium per ignem.
7.384 per medias urbes, and 10.41 medias per urbes.
4.74 media per moenia.

[92] Cf. note 88.
[93] See note 71. on 2.508.
[94] Cf. note 62.
[95] Cf. note 88.
[96] Cf. the substantival use *in medios* (2.123, 9.438, 10.576, 870, 11.149, 741).
[97] Cf. note 72, on 10.379.
[98] See note 55.
[99] Cf. the substantival use *per medios* (1.440, 504, 4.674, 10.21).
[100] See note 74, on 10.55–56; also note 79, on 12.201.

3.664–65 per aequor medium.
12.452 mare per medium.

F. Type *medios inter homines*[101] or *media inter loca*.[102]

4.204 media inter numina.
9.549 and 10.761 media inter milia.
11.648 medias inter caedes.
11.541 and 12.337 media inter proelia.
E 10.45 and 10.237 tela inter media.
12.469 media inter lora.
4.61, 5.479, and 6.245 media inter cornua.[103]
4.663 media inter talia.
12.318 media inter talia verba.

Excursus III.

Vergil's Use of Verbs Compounded with *trans*

The problem presented by the interpretation of 4.154, transmittunt cursu campos, forces us to consider Vergil's usage with regard to verbs compounded with *trans*. In such verbs *trans* has been viewed as exercising prepositional force,[104] even though it is regularly, because of its position, classified as a preverb,[105] as we indicate graphically by combining it

---

[101] Cf. the substantival use *inter medios* (10.132) and *inter medias* (7.397; with this contrast 5.618, inter medias, discussed in note 102).

[102] This type is not merely tautological, like *medius inter homines, medius inter loca* (cf. note 75); it appears to be distinctly illogical, perhaps a contamination of *inter homines* and *mediis in hominibus, inter loca* and *mediis in locis*. However, 5.618–19, inter medias sese conicit, may be an exception, since Iris actually flings herself into the midst of the midmost; in other words, here *inter medias = in medias* (not *in mediis*), and hence is not so far removed from the logical expression.

[103] Cf. note 76, on 9.750–51.

[104] Caesar can use *trans* indifferently as a preposition or a preverb. Cf. *BG* 4.12.1, ei (= equites) qui frumentandi causa *ierant trans Mosam*, and 4.16.2, pars equitatus quam supra commemoravi praedandi frumentandique causa *Mosam transisse*. Still another variation is the seemingly tautological use of *trans* as preposition and preverb in the same sentence: note *BG* 1.35.3, ne quam multitudinem hominum amplius *trans Rhenum* in Galliam *traduceret* (in contrast with 1.31.16, ne maior multitudo Germanorum *Rhenum traducatur*, and 7.11.9, exercitum *Ligerim traducit*).

[105] Prepositions and preverbs have a common origin as adverbs, which is still revealed by Homer's freedom in separating such particles from the nouns or verbs with which in later authors they would invariably have been combined; cf. Hahn, *TAPA* 85.211 note 44, and 214. In classical Latin, at least in prose, they are clearly differentiated; the preposition normally precedes its noun, and the preverb invariably precedes its verb; furthermore, the preverb forms a single unit with the verb, as is indicated by internal sandhi changes. Vergilian orthography reveals instances of such sandhi changes, as *traduco, trano, transcribo, transilio*. Yet in Vergil (as in other poets), the differentiation of the various types of particles is not so full or so fixed as in the prose writers: note such examples of "tmesis" as 1.412, multo nebulae circum dea fudit amictu, and 2.218–19, bis collo squamea circum terga dati, both particularly effective

and the verb into a single unit.   In prose, as is well known, verbs com-
pounded with *trans* may, if the primitive verb is transitive, take two
accusatives in the active, one closely connected with the verb proper,
and the other with *trans*; and they may retain the latter accusative in the
passive.   But in Vergil instances of these constructions are extremely
rare, as we shall see.

Vergil has three classes of verbs compounded with *trans*.

(I). In the first set, the primitive verb is intransitive, and the ac-
companying accusative depends upon *trans*, or at least is rendered possible
only by its presence.   The verbs in question are *trano, transabeo, trans-
curro, transeo*, and *transilio*.[106]   Obviously, these verbs can take only one
accusative.   Also obviously, they are capable of being used in the
passive;[107] but in Vergil they never are so used.

(II). In the second set, the primitive verb is transitive, and retains
its full meaning; and the accompanying accusative depends upon it.   The
verbs in question are *traduco, transcribo, transfero, transfodio, transformo,
transverbero*, and *transverto*.[108]   Four of them occur in the passive.[109]
These are the verbs of the type which in prose may take two accusatives
in the active, and retain one in the passive;[110] but in Vergil they never
do either.[111]   To this list of verbs must be added one more, *transporto*,
in which the accompanying accusative depends upon *trans*; but here
there is no accusative with *porto*.[112]

passages (the former creates somewhat the same effect as 8.608, Venus aetherios inter
dea candida nimbos, on which cf. Hahn, *Language* 30.272 note 156).   To be sure,
"tmesis" in the Roman poets may be an instance not of native archaism but of artificial
borrowings from Homer (again cf. Hahn, *TAPA* 85.211 note 44).

[106] *Trano, G* 3.270, 4.245, 6.671, 10.265; *transabeo*, 9.432; *transcurro*, 5.528 (an
object *caelum* is implied by the preceding *caelo*); *transeo, G* 2.102, *G* 4.503, 5.274, 326,
9.413, 10.186, 785, 817, 11.719 (in 1.266, and almost certainly in 12.926, it is intransi-
tive); *transilio*, 10.658, 12.859.

[107] Cf. e.g. Caesar, *BG* 1.6.2, is (= Rhodanus) vado transitur.

[108] *Traduco, E* 8.99; *transcribo*, 5.750; *transfero*, 1.271 and 2.327; *transformo, G*
4.441 and 7.416; *transverbero*, 10.336, 484, 11.667.   *Transfodio* and *transverto* are used
only in the passive; cf. note 109.

[109] *Traduco, G* 3.157; *transcribo*, 7.422; *transfodio*, 9.544; *transverto, G* 4.26.

[110] Examples, both of the active and of the passive, have been given in note 104.

[111] In 2.326–27, omnia Iuppiter Argos transtulit, the second accusative, *Argos*, is
an accusative of place to which.   In the passive form, 9.543–44, pectora duro trans-
fossi ligno, *pectora* is almost certainly an accusative of specification.   One verb, *tran-
scribo*, adds a dative in both active and passive forms (5.750, transcribunt urbi matres;
7.422, tua Dardaniis transcribi sceptra colonis), and another, *transformo*, adds *in* with
an accusative (*G* 4.441, omnia transformat sese in miracula rerum; 7.416, in vultus sese
transformat anilis); the force of *trans* in both of these seems greatly reduced.

[112] 6.327–28, nec ripas datur horrendas et rauca fluenta transportare prius quam
sedibus ossa quierunt.   Conington says: "'Transportare' is used with two accusatives
(see Forc.), and the more ordinary one of the object is here to be supplied from the con-
text."   I agree that the context does make clear the identity of those who may not be
transported, the *inops inhumataque turba* of 325; but interpretation is not the same as
grammatical analysis.

(III). In the third set, the primitive verb is again transitive, but it forms so close a unit with *trans* that its own individual meaning is to a certain extent lost, the compound verb becoming what is practically a single simple entity; and it is accordingly on the verb viewed as a whole that the accompanying accusative depends. The verbs in question are *traicio, transadigo, transfigo*.[113] According to their derivation, they mean literally 'hurl (a weapon) through,' 'drive (a weapon) through,' 'thrust (a weapon) through,' respectively; but all alike have acquired the general sense of 'pierce, transfix.'[114] Because their usage varies, it must be studied in detail.

In the active, the accusative with *traicio* indicates the person or thing pierced: a man, as in 10.399–400, Pallas Rhoetea traicit, and 11.684–85, hunc illa (= Camilla) traicit; a part of the body, as in 9.632–34, sagitta tempora ferro traicit;[115] or some other entity, as in 6.535–36, Aurora quadrigis traiecerat axem. The precise force of the primitive verb *iacio* is lost sight of: the first two examples may imply, but they certainly do not specify, that one person *threw a weapon* through the other; they mean simply that one person *pierced* the other. This is made absolutely clear by 9.632–34, effugit sagitta perque caput Remuli venit et tempora ferro traicit, where it is not a person but the weapon itself (*sagitta*) that is said to do the piercing. Furthermore, both here and in 6.536 the implement by which the piercing is done is designated by an ablative of means (*ferro, quadrigis*). 9.632–34 cannot mean 'the arrow threw (a weapon) through his temples by means of steel'! The primitive verb *iacio* does not here retain its literal sense or its transitive force at all; the combination of the accusative *tempora*, the preverb *tra(ns)*, and the verbal part of *traicit* is parallel to the immediately preceding combination of the preposition *per*, the accusative *caput*, and the intransitive verb *venit*.

Correspondingly in the passive, the thing pierced is normally a part of the body. Note 1.355, traiecta pectora ferro (with the ablative of means *ferro* as in 9.633); 9.419, traiecto cerebro; 10.339, traiecto lacerto; 10.348, traiecto gutture — all corresponding to the active (9.633–34) *tempora traicit*. But in striking contrast to these is *traiecto in fune* in 5.488–89, traiecto in fune columbam malo suspendit ab alto. This must correspond to an active *traiecit funem*, literally 'he threw a cord through,' i.e. 'he passed a cord across'; *funem* would depend on the specifically verbal part of *traiecit*, while the accusative with the preverb is not specified (probably it is the dove, though some prefer to take it of the mast).

And finally we have a passive form that presupposes *two* accusatives

[113] Two exceptional uses, one with *traicio* (2.273), involving a retained accusative in the passive, and one with *transadigo* (12.505–8), involving two accusatives in the active, will be duly noted later on. See notes 116 and 120.

[114] This is the general sense also of two verbs in Class II, *transfodio* and *transverbero*; but these verbs come by this sense directly, in accord with their etymology, 'dig through' and 'beat through.'

[115] Ribbeck reads *transigit* here, literally 'drives through' rather than 'hurls through.' The ultimate meaning 'pierces' is the same either way.

in the active: 2.273, (Hector) per pedes traiectus lora.[116]   This must represent an active *Hectora per pedes lora traiecit*, with *lora* depending on the verb (like *funem* in the preceding example) and *Hectora* on the preverb (like *Rhoetea* in 10.399, quoted two paragraphs above).   This is the *only* passage that I have found in Vergil in which a verb compounded with *trans* retains an accusative in the passive; and he got it backward![117]   It is the part belonging specifically with the verb (here *lora*, like *funem*) that should become the subject in the passive; the part belonging specifically with the preverb (here *Hectora*, like *Rhoetea*) can become the subject only where the preverb and the verb are so completely fused in a single meaning that only a single object is possible.

   Transfigo behaves like *traicio*, though without posing any such difficult problem.   We meet it only in the passive: 1.44, transfixo pectore (which corresponds to 1.355, traiecta pectora, and 9.419, traiecto cerebro) and 11.644–45, hasta transfixa (which corresponds to 5.488, traiecto fune).

   Transadigo also behaves like *traicio* in that it can take an object referring to the man or the part of his body that gets pierced; in fact, it combines the two in the familiar Homeric *schêma kath' holon kai meros*, in 12.270–76, hasta unum transadigit costas.[118]   More interesting is a second passage which adds to the two accusatives shown here,[119] both depending primarily on the notion of the preverb, an additional one (*ensem*) that depends on the verb in its literal sense:[120] 12.505–8, Aeneas Sucronem excipit in latus et crudum transadigit costas et cratis pectoris ensem.   Such an additional accusative would of course have been impossible in 12.270–76, where (as in 9.632–34, quoted four paragraphs earlier) the subject (*hasta*) denotes not the man but the weapon that pierces the victim, so that the transitive force of the primitive verb is lost.   12.505–8 is the only example that I have found in Vergil in which a verb compounded with *trans* governs two accusatives because of its composition.   It justifies the active form that I have assumed to corre-

---

[116] This is a notoriously difficult passage.   The editors usually explain — or try to explain — *lora* as an *accusativus graecus*; that seems to me out of the question, for the affected part of Hector's body is represented not by *lora* but by the phrase *per pedes*.

[117] This interchange of two accusatives so that the wrong one becomes the nominative is just one more example of the typical Vergilian use of hypallage; in the field of pure syntax, it represents a reversal of the logical (and prosaic) form of expression comparable to the reversals in the field of meaning rather than of syntax which form the main theme of this paper.   A similar type of hypallage is seen when the early type of expression that sets non-coextensive nouns in the same case ("partitive apposition") is replaced by a phrase in which one noun in the genitive case "modifies" another — but the wrong noun goes into the genitive.   I have already referred to this sort of development in note 37.

[118] I have treated this at length elsewhere, *TAPA* 85.197–289; for this special type, see 219–33.   For Latin examples, including this particular passage, see *TAPA* 84.101–3.

[119] I think *Sucronem* belongs with *transadigit* as well as with *excipit*.

[120] Cf. 10.682, crudum per costas exigat ensem.   Here the preposition *per* with *costas* corresponds to the preverb in *transadigit*.

spond to 2.273, the only example that I have found in Vergil which can possibly be explained as involving the retention of one of those two accusatives with the passive voice.

In 12.505–8 the two parts of *transadigo* function separately, each governing an accusative. This, as we have just seen, is not true, and from the nature of the case could not have been true, of the otherwise similar passage 12.270–76; nor is it true of any of the instances of *traicio* (except for the puzzling and peculiar 2.273) or of *transfigo* that have also been discussed as examples of the third class of verbs. Of both *traicio* and *transfigo* it may be said that in the active they take only one accusative, which shows the influence of *trans*, while the primitive verb maintains neither its specific meaning nor its transitive force; the passive usually corresponds to this use of the active, but sometimes seems to presuppose an active in which it is the verb rather than the preverb that determines the meaning and governs the accusative.

I believe that *transmitto* behaves in the same way.

This verb appears in the active in two passages, and in at least one and perhaps both, the force of *mitto* is dormant just as is the force of *iacio*: it does not mean 'send,' and it does not need an object.[121] I have already indicated my belief that the passage which occasioned this investigation, (4.154) transmittunt cursu campos cervi, means 'the deer *speed* across the plains,'[122] with the notion of 'sending' wholly otiose. 6.313, stabant orantes primi transmittere cursum, is parallel if *cursum*,

---

[121] Since compounds of intransitive verbs with preverbs other than *trans* do not in general become transitive, and since compounds of transitive verbs with *trans* do not in actual practice get combined very often with *two* accusatives, there may be a sort of feeling that in a compound of the latter type one object is enough and takes care of the transitive verb too even though it really belongs with *trans*. It is probably some such unconscious reasoning that leads English-speaking people who would be shocked by a confusion of *lay* and *lie* to use *overlay* very often in situations that really demand *overlie*; the latter with a direct object would strike them as queer, and so they employ *-lay* though the object belongs not with it but with the preverb *over-*. Though the dictionary recognizes the same usage with *underlay*, I think it does not occur so often, perhaps because the latter is generally used in a more metaphorical sense; a mother *overlays* a baby (for *overlies*), but a mystery *underlies* a situation. However, I have noted one interesting passage in H. D. F. Kitto's *Greek Tragedy* (Garden City 1954) 59: "Aeschylus takes over the primitive conceptions, some of them, that *underlay* [italics mine] his myth, in particular the shadowy conception of a Necessity stronger than the gods." I fancy *underlay* here is the past of *underlie*, for Professor Kitto writes exquisite English; but it might be interpreted, especially since the main verb *takes* is present, as rather the present of *underlay*.

[122] Knapp, who favors a similar interpretation, obtains it (as Forbiger had done before him) by supplying *se* with *mittunt*; this is in accord with his regular practice whenever a normally transitive verb is used intransitively (see § 151 of his Introduction), and in this instance it provides him with the two accusatives which he evidently desiderates. But I have already shown that two accusatives are *not* normal in Vergil's use with *trans* verbs; and as a general principle I believe that in giving syntactic explanations we ought to work with the words that we have, and not "supply" or "understand" any that we have not.

like *campos*, designates the locality crossed, i.e. the stream — the "medium of passage" as Knapp calls it.   Conington, however, calls it "an acc. of the thing sent across"; in that case it of course belongs with *mittere* as well as with *trans*, and we must view *transmitto* here as used like the verbs in Class II.   But these are very literally-used verbs; even the one of them that is employed in the least concrete way, *transfero* (with *regnum* in 1.270–71 and *omnia* in 2.326–27), does not give us a parallel for such an abstract expression as *transmittere cursum*, and Conington's addendum that *cursum* is a cognate accusative does not help much.   Conington cites in justification of his view the one Vergilian instance of *transmittere* in the passive, (3.403) transmissae trans aequora classes; here there is no doubt that the verb is used in its literal etymological sense, as in *hasta transfixa* in 11.644–45.   But true to Vergil's custom (violated only in 2.273) of *not* using a "retained object" in the passive, he employs not the simple *aequora* but the redundant prepositional phrase[123] *trans aequora*.

Excursus IV.

Vergil's Use of *"cum inversum"*

An extreme form of the *cum inversum* type is the one in which the *cum* clause refers to the general period defined or described by the preceding clause or clauses as a whole rather than to any specific action or state denoted by the verb or verbs therein.   (A convenient translation for *cum* in such instances is 'the time when' rather than simply 'when.') Examples follow.

E 8.14–15 frigida vix caelo noctis decesserat umbra, cum ros in tenera pecori gratissimus herba.

G 4.425–30 iam Sirius ardebat, et medium sol orbem hauserat, arebant herbae, et flumina radii coquebant, cum Proteus petens antra ibat.

4.522–25 nox erat, et carpebant soporem corpora, silvaeque et saeva quierant aequora, cum medio volvuntur sidera lapsu, cum tacet omnis ager, pecudes pictaeque volucres.

12.113–15 postera vix summos spargebat lumine montis orta dies, cum primum alto se gurgite tollunt solis equi.[124]

The difference between this type of clause and the ordinary *cum inversum* clause may be clearly seen if we contrast 4.522–24, nox erat, cum

---

[123] Just as Caesar did (in the active voice) in *BG* 1.35.3.   See note 104.

[124] This example is almost certain, though there are two other possibilities: (1) that *cum primum* means 'as soon as'; (2) that *cum* here is a true *cum inversum*. Against the first, we may say that in this passage, after the imperfect *spargebat* in 113 and before the imperfect *parabant* in 117, we would expect the *cum primum* verb to be in secondary sequence, *sustulerunt* rather than *tollunt*.   Against the second, it should be pointed out that this clause is not emphatic or effective enough to be a *cum inversum* clause (the lighting up of the mountain-tops by the new-born day, and the rising of the sun's horses, are but the obverse and reverse of a single coin); the true apodosis, which in this instance lacks *cum* (see below, II C), is *campum viri parabant.*

volvuntur sidera, with 8.26–30, nox erat, cum Aeneas procubuit seramque dedit per membra quietem.[125]

Part I. Examples of *cum inversum*

Cum inversum clauses[126] may be classified as follows.

A. Protasis[127] expresses contemporaneous action: *a* is (or was) happening when *b* happens (or happened).

1. Miscellaneous examples.

a. Primary sequence.
7.166 pueri exercentur cum nuntius reportat.
9.395 nec longum in medio tempus,[128] cum clamor pervenit.
10.509 haec te prima dies bello dedit, haec eadem aufert, cum tamen ingentis Rutulorum linquis acervos.[129]

b. Secondary sequence.
5.657 matres spectare (= spectabant), cum dea se sustulit.
8.28 nox erat, cum Aeneas procubuit.[130]
9.108 aderat dies et tempora Parcae complerant, cum Turni iniuria Matrem admonuit.[131]

---

[125] Cited again, just below, under I A 1 b. Cf. note 130.

[126] In each case the line number refers only to the line containing the word *cum*. As usual, quotations are made in the briefest possible form, and normally only one verb is cited both for the main clause and the *cum* clause, though several coordinate verbs may occur.

[127] I use the terms *protasis* and *apodosis* for the main clause and the *cum* clause respectively; what I call the protasis is subordinate in thought but not in form to what I call the apodosis. It should be noted that the *cum inversum* clause always occupies the position which belongs to the apodosis, namely after the protasis. The terms *protasis* and *apodosis* essentially connote a matter of position; it is only after parataxis evolved into hypotaxis that one clause becomes subordinate to the other, and originally the prior position (that of the protasis) was regularly occupied by the *subordinate* clause. That this is never the case with the *cum inversum* clause is due to the reversal of relationship that this type of expression involves (cf. note 37).

[128] It might be argued that this clause denotes time prior to that of the apodosis; but it seems best as a rule to treat a nominal clause as corresponding to a verbal clause with *est* (however, see note 169). Actually, the nominal clause is timeless, but it is generally used to refer to present time; it is used to refer to past time only when the context makes this completely clear, otherwise it is replaced by a verbal clause. Thus when the perfect participle stands for a finite verb, it usually represents a perfect, as in *G* 1.466 (note 133), *G* 4.438 (note 158), 2.732 (note 149), 3.90 (note 186); but it may in certain circumstances represent a pluperfect, as in 2.172 (note 184) and 3.135–36 (note 150).

[129] Already cited above in the text as an example of adversative *cum adversum*; see especially note 41. Cited again below, under I B 1 a; see especially note 152.

[130] Cf. note 125.

[131] Because of the presence of the pluperfect here, this example will be listed again below, under B 1 b; cf. note 153. So too the examples referred to in notes 137 and 161, 138 and 161, 143 and 155, 148 and 155, 150 and 155, 151 and 156.

12.379 ibat et auxilium petebat, cum rota praecipitem impulit effudit-
que solo.[132]

   G 1.467 miseratus Romam, cum caput texit.[133]

      c. Mixed sequence.
         (1). Primary in protasis, secondary in apodosis.
  3.301 progredior portu, cum forte libabat Andromache.[134]
         (2). Secondary in protasis, primary in apodosis.[135]   (The
imperfect is probably chosen specifically to indicate progressive action,
while the historical present is used like an aorist.)
  1.36 vix e conspectu Siculae telluris in altum vela dabant, cum Iuno
haec secum.[136]
  3.10 vix inceperat aestas, et pater Anchises dare vela iubebat, litora
cum relinquo.[137]

---

[132] This is the example of *cum inversum* discussed above in the main text. This
should be classed as an instance of mixed sequence if, with most editors, we adopt the
alternative reading *effundit*; but, in view of the perfects both preceding (*impulit*) and
following (*abstulit, reliquit*), this seems to me doubtful.

[133] Already cited above in the text as an example of causal *cum inversum*; see espe-
cially note 40.   In its use of the perfect (cf. note 128), not the imperfect, in the protasis,
it differs from the other examples with which it is here listed; but since as the passage
stands the second clause is practically in explicative relation with the first, it is to be
expected that the two clauses should have identical tenses, as happens also in expres-
sions of complete coextension.

[134] The point is not so much that Aeneas set out from the harbor when Andromache
happened to be sacrificing, as that when Aeneas set out from the harbor Andromache
happened to be sacrificing; indeed, there is a variant reading *tum forte* (as in 9.3)
which Heyne prefers.   I am accordingly classing the passage as an example of *cum
inversum*; but it is certainly not a typical one, since the verb in the *cum inversum*
clause regularly expresses punctual, not durative, action, and even the one other
instance of the use of the imperfect in such a clause, 5.270–72 (on which see note 144),
is quite different.   In translating the passage here under consideration, we should
probably have to render *cum* not by simple 'when' but, as Conington suggests, by
'at the time when.'   This is of course not to be confused with 'the time when,' the
rendering offered for *cum* in the four examples quoted at the beginning of this Excursus.
With *cum* in this sense, a tense indicating habitual action is completely in order; since
these expressions are usually gnomic, the present is normal, but we meet the imperfect
in one instance, *G* 4.429–30.

[135] Here belongs the possible example of *dum inversum* listed above in the text,
G 4.559–62.   See note 44, especially (on the tenses) the close.

[136] A clause like this, in which some such verb as *ait* is implied, I class as in primary
sequence, unless, as in 12.154 (on which see note 159), the context demands different
treatment.   Cf. my comment on nominal clauses (note 128).

[137] For the combination of pluperfect and imperfect in the protasis, cf. note 131.
Many editors, from Wagner on, view as the apodosis the clause beginning with *et* (cf.
below, II A 2), but that would demand *iussit* or *iubet* instead of *iubebat*.   Doubtless a
more logical form would have been, vix inceperat aestas, cum Anchises dare vela iubet
et litora patriae relinquo; but the form actually used by Vergil is far more poignant,
since, with a relegation to the background of the cause of their start (Anchises' orders)
along with its time (the beginning of the summer), attention is concentrated on the
actual tragedy of departure from home and country.

3.345 talia fundebat, cum sese Helenus adfert.

11.783 virgo unum sequebatur, telum cum concitat Arruns.

11.904 vix e conspectu exierat campumque tenebat, cum Aeneas exsuperatque iugum silvaque evadit opaca.[138]

2. Examples with *iam*. The use of *iam* in the protasis is so common as to justify our grouping examples where it occurs by themselves. Its presence intensifies the effect of durative action conveyed by the tense of the verb (present or imperfect).

a. Primary sequence.

E 6.39 iamque terrae stupeant lucescere solem, incipiant silvae cum primum surgere.[139]

3.646 tertia iam lunae se cornua complent, cum vitam traho; and 5.627 septima iam vertitur aestas, cum ferimur.[140]

b. Secondary sequence.

5.867 iamque adeo scopulos subibat, cum pater sensit.

7.27 iamque rubescebat mare, cum venti posuere omnisque repente[141] resedit flatus.[142]

5.838 iamque fere mediam caeli nox metam contigerat, laxabant membra quiete, cum somnus aëra dimovit.[143]

5.270 iamque superbi ibant, cum sine honore ratem Sergestus agebat.[144]

c. Mixed sequence.
(1) Primary in protasis, secondary in apodosis.

10.261 iamque in conspectu Teucros habet, clipeum cum extulit.
(2) Secondary in protasis, primary in apodosis.

2.567 iamque adeo super unus eram, cum Tyndarida aspicio.

3.522 iamque rubescebat Aurora, cum videmus Italiam.

5.160 iamque propinquabant scopulo, cum Gyas compellat voce Menoeten.

5.328 iamque sub finem adventabant, cum Nisus labitur.

[138] Cf. note 131.

[139] The subjunctives are due to the indirect narrative, starting with *canebat uti* in 31.

[140] Already discussed in the text as examples in which *cum* has the force of *dum*; see especially note 43.

[141] Here *repente* gives much the same effect as *subito* in the passages quoted below (A 3 and 4). Cf. notes 155 and 160 on 1.586, and note 187 on 3.90.

[142] If we add the following clause, et luctantur tonsae, we shall have to class this passage as an example of mixed sequence. But I am omitting this clause here, since it is not really coordinate with the two preceding ones; on this see below, note 167.

[143] Cf. note 131.

[144] This differs from the other examples in secondary sequence in that the apodosis has the imperfect instead of the perfect. The point of the imperfect is the slowness and difficulty of Sergestus' return, and its force is pictorial: the others were going off proudly with their prizes, when Sergestus was seen laboriously bringing in his maimed and humiliated boat to shore. I know of no similar instance of the imperfect in a *cum adversum* clause; however, cf. 12.117, listed below under II C 1 b, and the comment thereon. *G.* 4.429–30 and 3.301–3 (both discussed in note 134) are wholly different.

9.353 iamque ad socios tendebat, cum talia Nisus ait.[145]
9.372 iamque propinquabant castris, cum hos cernunt.

     3. Examples with *cum subitus, cum subito*.   Just as *iam* intensifies
the effect of a durative tense in the protasis, so the adjective *subitus* or
the adverb *subito*[146] intensifies the effect of a punctual tense in the apodo-
sis.
        a. Primary sequence.
No examples.

        b. Secondary sequence.
1.535 hic cursus fuit,[147] cum subito adsurgens Orion tulit.

        c. Mixed sequence.
           Secondary in protasis, primary in apodosis.
1.509 iura dabat, cum subito Aeneas accedere Anthea videt.
2.680 gemitu tectum replebat, cum subitum oritur monstrum.
12.249 Iovis ales agitabat avis, subito cum cycnum rapit.

     4. Examples with both *iam* and *cum subitus, cum subito*.   Doubly
effective is the combination of both *iam* with the durative verb in the
protasis, and *subitus* or *subito* with the punctual verb in the apodosis.

        a. Primary sequence.
No examples.

        b. Secondary sequence.
G 4.488 iamque casus evaserat omnis, redditaque Eurydice superas
veniebat ad auras, cum subita dementia cepit amantem.[148]
   2.731 iamque propinquabam portis, subito cum visus adesse sonitus.[149]
   3.137 iamque subductae litore puppes, conubiis arvisque novis operata
iuventus, iura domosque dabam, subito cum venit lues.[150]

        c. Mixed sequence.
   3.590 iamque dies surgebat, umentemque Aurora dimoverat umbram,
cum subito forma viri procedit.[151]

   [145] I do not know whether *ait* with a direct quotation can ever be proved to be a
perfect; here at all events, despite the preceding perfect *sensit*, I would call it a present,
since the following main verbs are all presents (contrast note 154, on 6.46, and note 178,
on 4.591).
   [146] Cf. the similar use of *repente* in 7.27, referred to in note 141.
   [147] The use of the perfect instead of the imperfect in the protasis is unusual, but
even the perfect of a static verb like *sum* has a somewhat durative signification;
furthermore, we must note that the form occurs in an incomplete line.   The use of the
perfect in *G* 1.466–68 is altogether different; see note 133.   On the reverse phenomenon
— the use of the imperfect instead of the perfect in the apodosis — see notes 134 and
144.
   [148] Cf. note 131, also note 39.
   [149] Of course *visus* is equivalent to *visus est*.   Cf. note 128.
   [150] Cf. note 131.   The context makes it clear that here *subductae* and *operata* repre-
sent *subductae erant* and *operata erat*, though normally we would interpret them as
equivalent to *subductae sunt* and *operata est* (cf. notes 128 and 149).
   [151] Cf. note 131.

B. Protasis expresses prior action: *a* has (or had) happened when *b* happens (or happened).

    1. Miscellaneous examples.

        a. Primary sequence.
Perhaps 10.509, listed above under A 1 a.[152]

        b. Secondary sequence.
5.84 dixerat haec, cum anguis gyros traxit.
6.372 talia fatus erat, coepit cum talia vates.
9.108, already listed under A 1 b as showing the imperfect as well as the pluperfect.[153]

        c. Mixed sequence.
            Secondary in protasis, primary in apodosis.
6.45 ventum erat ad limen, cum virgo ait.[154]
8.98 sol medium caeli conscenderat orbem, cum muros vident.

    2. Examples with *iam*. We find *iam* (in the sense of 'already)' with the pluperfect, just as we find it (in the sense of 'now') with the imperfect, but not so frequently.

        a. Primary sequence.
No examples.

        b. Secondary sequence.
Three examples already listed under A (either A 2 b or A 4 b), namely *G* 4.488, 3.137, 5.838.[155]
7.105 haec responsa iam fama tulerat, cum pubes religavit classem.
12.941 et iam iamque magis cunctantem flectere sermo coeperat, cum apparuit balteus.
Compare the example of *ut* inversum cited above, (9.389) iamque evaserat hostis, ut stetit.

        c. Mixed sequence.
An example already listed under A 4 c, namely 3.590.[156]

---

[152] Cf. note 129. As the passage stands, probably the *cum* clause is to be taken with *dedit* as well as with *aufert*, though from the point of view of strict logic it belongs especially with the latter. See above, note 41.

[153] Cf. note 131.

[154] I again treat *ait* as a present; cf. note 145. In this instance the following verbs present a mixture of presents and perfects.

[155] Cf. notes 148, 150, and 143 respectively. One, 5.838, is cited under A 2 b, and the other two (together with 3.590, cited just below as an instance of mixed sequence) under A 4 b and c, being listed separately because they illustrate *subitus* or *subito* as well as *iam*. It does not seem necessary to make a special category for these locutions under B, because they occur in no other examples of this type. However, we meet *repente*, mentioned above (note 141), in 1.586 (cf. note 160). In all four instances the *iam* of course appears in the first clause; in 3.590 this is the clause with the verb in the imperfect, and in the others it is the clause with the verb in the pluperfect, but that seems to be a matter of no significance; however, cf. note 161.

[156] Cf. note 151, and, on the presence of *subito*, note 155.

3. Examples with *vix*.   In combination with verbs denoting prior action, *vix* occurs far more commonly than *iam*; indeed, it shows the same sort of affiliation with the pluperfect that *iam* does with the imperfect.[157]

a. Primary sequence.

G 4.439 vix senem passus[158] componere membra, cum clamore ruit magno, manicisque iacentem occupat.

b. Secondary sequence.

6.190 vix ea fatus erat, cum columbae venere.

Cf. 12.154 vix ea, cum lacrimas Iuturna profudit.[159]

c. Mixed sequence.

1.586 vix ea fatus erat, cum repente[160] scindit se nubes.

2.323 vix ea fatus eram, cum talia reddit.

3.655 vix ea fatus erat, cum videmus Polyphemum.

5.693 vix haec ediderat, cum tempestas furit.

Two examples already listed under A 1 c (2), namely 3.10 and 11.904.[161]

Part II. Examples of Alternatives for *cum inversum*

As already said,[162] the *cum inversum* construction, in which the *cum* clause is logically the apodosis or main clause, undoubtedly had its origin in paratactic expressions in which the protasis and the apodosis were co-ordinate.   Archaizing remains of this earlier state of affairs are used by Vergil with considerable effectiveness; a coordinating conjunction is usually, but not invariably, present.[163]

---

[157] With verbs denoting contemporaneous action, *vix* is, from the nature of the case, almost entirely non-existent.   The only exception known to me is 12.113–15, classed under II C 1 b; see the discussion there.   1.34–35, listed under I A 1 c (2), is not an exception, for there *vix* belongs with *e conspectu Siculae telluris*, not with *vela dabant*; contrast 11.903, vix e conspectu exierat, listed in the same section, where *vix* does belong with the verb.

[158] *Passus* is equivalent to *passus est*; cf. note 128.

[159] For the omission of the verb, cf. 1.36–37, Iuno haec secum, listed under A 1 c (2).   Although I classed the latter clause as in primary sequence, with an implied *ait* (see note 136), here (as in 3.135–36) the context demands secondary sequence (see note 150) with an implied *fata erat*, like *fatus erat* in the preceding example, 6.190.   Cf. my discussion of the sequence in nominal clauses (note 128).

[160] On *repente*, cf. notes 141 and 155.

[161] Cf. notes 137 and 138, respectively.   In both of these passages, *vix* is in the clause in which the verb is in the pluperfect; this is normally a matter of course (see note 157).   Contrast note 155.

[162] In notes 37 and 127.

[163] In these instances, the line number in each case refers to the line in which the conjunction occurs, or, in the absence of a conjunction, to the line in which the apodosis begins.   Cf. note 126.

A. Clauses joined by a coordinating conjunction.

    1. Conjunction *atque*.[164]

        a. Protasis expresses contemporaneous action.
           (1). Primary sequence.
10.219 Aeneas velis ministrat, atque illi chorus occurrit.[165]
           (2). Secondary sequence.
No examples.
           (3). Mixed sequence.[166]
6.162 multa vario sermone serebant, atque Misenum vident.
7.29 iamque rubescebat mare et Aurora fulgebat, cum venti posuere omnisque repente resedit flatus, et luctantur tonsae; atque Aeneas lucum prospicit.[167]

        b. Protasis expresses prior action.
          Mixed sequence.
E 7.7 mihi caper deerraverat, atque ego Daphnim aspicio.
4.663 dixerat, atque illam conlapsam aspiciunt comites.

    2. Conjunction *et*.

        a. Protasis expresses contemporaneous action.
          Primary sequence.
G 2.80 nec longum tempus,[168] et ingens exiit[169] ad caelum arbos.

[164] In some of these instances, the relationship is obscured for the eye of the modern reader by the punctuation; many editors seem to isolate the *atque* clause by placing a period before it. But punctuation is an artificial system of organization; often the unit of thought is not the sentence but the entire section or paragraph. (Thus Lucretius' grand prooemium cannot be fully understood unless we postpone a full stop until we reach line 28, or, better still, line 43.)

[165] If we join closely with these lines (217–20) those which precede (215–16, iamque dies caelo concesserat, almaque Phoebe medium pulsabat Olympum), we would have to call this an example of mixed sequence, like 7.25–30, treated just below (see especially note 166).

[166] There is a very strong tendency in passages of the sort under consideration to place the verb following *atque* in the present, no matter what the sequence of the preceding verb.

[167] This passage is complicated and highly interesting in its structure. First we have a compound *iamque* clause (rubescebat et fulgebat) of the sort that is so common in Vergil as an introductory passage indicating the time of day or the time of year. This is followed by a compound *cum inversum* clause, already duly recorded above, I A 2 b, whose two parts, cum venti posuere omnisque repente resedit flatus, are followed by a third clause, et luctantur tonsae, in which *et* has the force of a new *cum inversum*, as will be duly recorded below, II A 2 b (1). And finally, after all these preliminaries, comes with most vivid effect the all-important *atque* clause (who shall say with what specific verb or verbs the *atque* joins *prospicit?*). This sudden introduction of the one essential element after several rather routine generalities makes much the same impression on me as another supremely effective passage, 2.250–52, ruit oceano nox, involvens umbra magna terramque polumque Myrmidonumque dolos.

[168] Cf. 9.395, nec longum tempus, cum clamor pervenit (listed above, I A 1 a).

b. Protasis expresses prior action.
(1). Primary sequence.
7.28 venti posuere omnisque repente resedit flatus, et luctantur tonsae.[170]
(2). Secondary sequence.
5.858 vix quies laxaverat[171] artus, et proiecit in undas praecipitem.

3. Conjunction -*que*.
Secondary sequence.[172]
2.692 vix ea fatus erat, subitoque fragore intonuit.[173]
Cf. 11.296 vix ea legati, variusque per ora cucurrit fremor.[174]

B. Clauses joined by a temporal adverb.
Protasis expresses prior action.
Primary sequence.
8.337 vix ea dicta,[175] dehinc progressus monstrat aram.

C. Clauses combined asyndetically.

1. Protasis expresses contemporaneous action.

a. Examples with *iam*.   Such instances are not easy to distinguish from ordinary passages involving straightforward coordination.

---

[169] Ribbeck adopts the reading *exilit*, found in one manuscript, and Lachmann (on Lucretius 3.1042) argues for *exīt*; but the form generally accepted is *exiit*.   The tense is to be explained as a present perfect of instantaneous action: 'behold, a huge tree has shot up to the sky' (almost before our eyes, like Jonah's gourd or Jack's beanstalk). This may be an argument for taking *nec longum tempus*, at least in this passage, as equivalent to *nec longum fuit tempus*; cf. note 128.

[170] Already discussed in note 167.

[171] Note *vix* with the pluperfect here, and cf. note 157.

[172] These examples show *vix* (cf. note 171) and are especially reminiscent of 6.190–91, vix ea fatus erat, geminae cum columbae venere (listed above, I B 3 b).   The first one in addition shows *subito*, which in instances of *cum inversum* we found balancing *iam* but not *vix*; see I A 4.   We may compare the use of *repente* after *vix* in 3.90, listed below under C 2 b (2); cf. note 187.

[173] Contrast 8.520, vix ea fatus erat, defixique ora tenebant Aeneas et Achates, multaque dura putabant, where the imperfect verbs introduced by -*que* are coordinated with the preceding pluperfect.   The parallel to *subito fragore intonuit* (and it is a very close parallel indeed, except for the difference in tense) is *improviso fulgor cum sonitu venit* in 8.524–25; but it is separated from the *vix* clause because of the shift in that occasioned by the intervention of the unreal condition in 523 (ni signum caelo Cytherea dedisset aperto), which the *fulgor venit* clause, introduced by *namque*, follows as an explanatory statement.   For the combination of *vix* and *improviso* here, and of *vix* and *subito* in 2.692, see note 172.

[174] 11.296 corresponds to 2.692 as 12.154, vix ea, cum lacrimas oculis Iuturna profudit, does to 6.190, vix ea fatus erat, cum columbae venere, listed above, I B 3 b.

[175] Despite Vergil's tendency to use the pluperfect in protases of this sort even when the apodosis is in the present, as in 4.663 (quoted under A 1 b) and 8.520 (quoted in note 173), as well as in the examples of *cum inversum* quoted under I B 3 c, I am in the absence of evidence to the contrary treating *dicta* here as in primary sequence (i.e. equivalent to *dicta sunt*, not to *dicta erant*), on the basis of the principle set forth in note 128.

(1). Primary sequence.
3.358 iamque dies alterque dies processit, et aurae vela vocant;
vatem adgredior.[176]

(2). Secondary sequence.
2.134 iamque dies aderat, mihi sacra parari; eripui leto me.[177]
2.803 iamque surgebat Lucifer; cessi et montis petivi.

(3). Mixed sequence.
4.586 et iam spargebat lumine terras Aurora; regina, ut primum al-
bescere lucem vidit et classem procedere, ait.[178]
9.462 et iam spargebat lumine terras Aurora; Turnus viros suscitat.

b. Examples with *vix*.
12.116 postera vix summos spargebat lumine montis orta dies, cum[179]
primum se tollunt solis equi; campum viri parabant.   This is the only
instance known to me of the combination in the protasis of *vix* with the
imperfect instead of the pluperfect,[180] and also one of the only three in-
stances known to me of the occurrence in the apodosis of the imperfect
instead of the historical present or the perfect.[181]   The point is of course
the early start of the men on both sides in preparing for the single combat
between Aeneas and Turnus: the (newly) risen day was just barely begin-
ning to sprinkle the mountain-tops with light, (at the same time) the men
were (already) beginning to make the field ready for battle.   The
asyndetic coordination of the two verbs here adds to the effectiveness of
the passage.

2. Protasis expresses prior action.

a. Example with *iam*.
Primary sequence.
3.358, already listed under 1 a (1).[182]

b. Examples with *vix*.
(1). Primary sequence.

---

[176] Listed again below, under C 2 a, because of the presence of the perfect beside the present tense.   Cf. note 131.

[177] I believe that the historical infinitive here represents continued action, and is part of the protasis, being fully coordinate with *aderat*; the perfect *eripui leto me* con-stitutes the apodosis.

[178] On *ait* see above, note 145.   However, the speech introduced by this *ait* is fol-lowed by 630, haec ait, et partis animum versabat in omnis; probably *ait* there is a perfect, so perhaps the earlier one is also.

[179] Here *cum* means 'the time when', and is not correlative with *vix*; see the opening of this Excursus, especially note 124.

[180] Cf. notes 157 and 161.

[181] The other instances are 3.301–3, cum libabat Andromache, listed under I A 1 c (1), and 5.270–72, cum ratem Sergestus agebat, listed under I A 2 b.   G 4.429–30, cited at the opening of this Excursus, is utterly different.   On all these, see notes 134 and 144.

[182] Cf. note 176.

No examples.
   (2). Secondary sequence.
 E 8.16 frigida vix decesserat umbra, cum[183] ros gratissimus; Damon sic coepit.
 2.172 vix positum[184] simulacrum; arsere flammae.
 3.90 vix ea fatus eram;[185] tremere omnia visa[186] repente.[187]
   (3). Mixed sequence.
 10.659 vix proram attigerat; rumpit Saturnia funem.
 12.650 vix ea fatus erat;[188] volat ecce Saces.

 [183] This example was the first one listed at the opening of this Excursus. Here *cum* is almost certainly used as in 12.114; cf. note 179.

 [184] Here the context shows that *positum* is equivalent to *positum erat.* Cf. note 150.

 [185] Once more we have the familiar formula, which we have already found followed by *cum* in 6.190 (listed under I B 3 b) and by *-que* in 2.692 (listed under II A 3). Cf. note 172, and, just below, note 188.

 [186] On *visa* for *visa sunt*, cf. note 128, and contrast note 184.

 [187] On *repente*, see note 141. For its use with *vix*, cf. that of *subito* with *vix* in 2.692; on this see note 172.

 [188] Cf. note 185.