

XIII. Body and Soul in Vergil

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

1. Probably one of the outstanding differences between prose and poetry—that is, between prose that is genuinely prosaic and poetry that is genuinely poetic—is the greater use by the latter of words and phrases having the power to suggest more than actually meets the eye, or, to borrow from the terminology of a different sense, possessing overtones to reinforce and enrich the effect directly conveyed.¹ A poet such as Catullus or, in modern times, Burns, who writes conversationally even though lyrically, relies comparatively little upon this quality of evocativeness; he gets his poetic effects in other ways. But a poet with a more elaborate and artificial style, such as Vergil² or—though, I believe, to a lesser extent—his great imitators Milton and Tennyson, may use language in a complicated way that can say one thing and suggest another. *Faute de mieux*, I have used the terms “fusion” and “confusion” to suggest one aspect of this type of writing, though fully aware that the choice is far from happy, since these words, especially the second, themselves have overtones with a note of censure which it is far from my intention to bestow upon what I consider, at least in works by a true poet like Vergil, as an essentially poetic device, a virtue and not a fault.³

2. One fruitful cause of such linguistic “confusion” is, I believe, the unconscious, or rather non-conscious, misuse of the axiom “Things that are equal to the same or equal things are equal to each other.” The proper noun *Iulius* can represent either a

¹ I have discussed this distinction at greater length in *TAPA* 87 (1956) 147, note 1a.

² In all citations from Vergil, the initials *E* and *G* are used to designate passages from the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* respectively; passages without special designation are from the *Aeneid*. Quotations are given at sufficient length to show sense and syntax, with omissions freely made and left unmarked. Because of the large number of these quotations, it has seemed convenient to append an *index locorum*; to facilitate its use, and also the use of the numerous cross-references, I have numbered the paragraphs in the text.

³ Cf. *TAPA* 88 (1957) 66, note 40.

person or his name; hence in some cases the two uses are fused in a single passage.⁴ The proper noun *Italia* may stand either for the country or—in poetry at least⁵—for the people occupying the country; hence it may be made coordinate in one and the same passage with a geographical term such as *Bactra* and an ethnographical term such as *Indi*,⁶ and may be used interchangeably with either type.⁷ The name of a god may at times be employed to denote the function that he exercises,⁸ or the locality—natural⁹ or artificial¹⁰—where he dwells, or the image¹¹ by which he is represented; hence the deity is spoken of in terms that really apply only to the function, or the locality, or the image.¹²

3. A particularly interesting type of this sort of confusion is that of the *ego* with either the body or the soul, leading eventually to the confusion of the body and the soul not only with the *ego* but with each other. *Myself* may at times seem to be synonymous with my own body, and at others with my own soul. An aged crone who excites our sympathy may be quite indifferently dubbed “a poor old body” or “a poor old soul.” We may say after a great disaster that “nobody¹³ survived” or that “not a single soul

⁴ As in e.g. 1.286–88 *nascetur Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo*, where *nascetur* applies to the man, *demissum* to the name, and *magno* possibly to either. I discuss this form of confusion, with special reference to Vergil, in a monograph on “naming constructions” now in process of completion.

⁵ As in 10.8 *abnueram bello Italiam concurrere Teucris*.

⁶ In *G* 2.136–38 *neque Medorum silvae nec Ganges laudibus Italiae certent, non Bactra neque Indi*.

⁷ I discuss this sort of confusion in “A Linguistic Fallacy,” in *Studies Presented to Joshua Whatmough on His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. by Ernst Pulgram (The Hague 1957) 53–64.

⁸ As in e.g. 2.335 *caeco Marte resistunt*.

⁹ Thus in 4.246–51 *Atlas* is in part the giant and in part the mountain, and in 8.31–67 *Tiberinus* is in part the genius and in part the river.

¹⁰ I.e. the temple, as in 3.275 *nautis aperitur Apollo*.

¹¹ As in *E* 7.31–32 and 35–36, where the herdsmen tell *Diana* and *Priapus* that *they* (not their statues) are or will be made of marble or of gold; and in 2.167–68, where the impious Greeks are said to have stolen the sacred image (*sacram effigiem*) of *Pallas*, and in the course of the sacrilege to have touched the maiden fillets not of the statue but of the goddess (*virgineas divae vittas*). We may attribute the confusion to the naïveté of the persons involved in the first passage, but not in the second.

¹² I discuss this type of confusion in two articles on “Vergil’s Linguistic Treatment of Divine Beings,” *TAPA* 88 (1957) 56–67, and 89 (1958) 237–53.

¹³ That *nobody* was originally *no body* has of course been quite lost sight of as the result of our pronouncing and writing the expression as a single word. *No one*, presumably because of the collocation of the two *o*’s, is written—though not pronounced—as two words, but actually *nobody* and *no one* (*one* referring to the whole man,

survived," though the former statement may be at variance with the facts, and the latter with our religious belief. Examples of confusion of this sort occur, of course, particularly often in the poets,¹⁴ who, as I have indicated, are likely to express themselves with more picturesqueness, and less precision, than their more sober-minded brethren the prose-writers. And they are especially common in Vergil, whose keen feeling for the poignance of frail mortality, and profound interest in life after death, combine to make his use of terms for body and soul particularly rich in the imagery which they evoke.¹⁵

4. The dual nature of man—his composition of *corpus* and *anima*—is clearly recognized by Vergil,¹⁶ and the whole may be spoken of in terms now of one of the two parts, now of the other.

the *ego*) are synonymous, as are the other compounds of *body* and *one*. Cf. the amusing song by Don Alhambra in Act 2 of Gilbert and Sullivan's *Gondoliers*:

When every one is somebodee,
Then no one's anybody!

¹⁴ Instances abound in English, from Shakespeare's

. . . God forbid so many simple souls
Should perish by the sword,

to Burns'

Gin a body meet a body
Coming through the rye;
Gin a body kiss a body—
Need a body cry?

Obviously, it is not the soul but the body that perishes by the sword; and, though the meeting and the kissing are distinctly corporeal acts, it is assuredly the more spiritual parts that would motivate the unnecessary act of crying.

¹⁵ It is true that certain examples here listed, such as those that involve the placing of the soul in the tomb where the body should be, or the placing of something that at least looks like the body in Hades where the soul should be, may be due to a confusion of religious or philosophical belief (cf. fn. 11 on *E* 7). But in most of the instances here discussed I believe the source of inconsistency is primarily one of language. Cf. my brief discussion of a similar problem as applied to the confusion of a divinity with his dwelling, *TAPA* 88 (1957) 66–67, where I asked (67): "Does the Roman mix the god and the river because they are both named Tiber, or because he believes that the god and the river are really one and the same?"

¹⁶ The case is not affected by the fact that many ancients—with Lucretius as an extreme example—regard the *anima* as itself corporeal. Vergil generally stresses its lack of substance (as in the passages quoted in § 16 and note 40) and of blood (see note 81); but at least at the moment of death, it is described not only as mixed with blood, 10.908 undanti animam diffundit in arma cruore, but as actually endowed with the color of blood, 9.349 purpuream vomit ille animam—unless we accept the reading *purpureum* proposed by Servius, but opposed by Conington (*P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 3 vols., revised by Henry Nettleship, 4th ed. of vols. 1 and 2, 3rd ed. of vol. 3, London 1881–84).

5. The identification of a man with his *corpus* is at the bottom of a number of Vergilian periphrases. Thus the word *corpora* in periphrasis may be placed in apposition with a word denoting persons (or other living creatures), or may be made coordinate with such a word, or may in some way refer to it and balance it. Examples of the first class include 10.430 et vos, o Grais imperdita corpora, Teucris, 6.582–83 Aloidas geminos, immania corpora, and 11.690–91 Orsilochum et Buten, duo maxima corpora. Examples of the second class¹⁷ include *G* 4.475–76 = 6.306–7 matres atque viri defunctaque corpora vita magnanimum heroum, 7.535 corpora multa virum circa seniorque Galaesus, and 9.272–73 bis sex lectissima matrum corpora captivosque dabit; so too *G* 3.368–70 intereunt pecudes, stant circumfusa pruinis corpora magna boum, confertoque agmine cervi torpent, and 11.197–99 multa boum mactantur corpora, saetigerosque sues raptasque iugulant pecudes, where *corpora*, while not connected grammatically with the other words, stands as a parallel in thought to them (respectively *pecudes* and *cervi*, *sues* and *pecudes*). Examples of the third class¹⁸ include 3.623–25 vidi duo de numero cum corpora nostro presa manu magna frangeret ad saxum, 5.318–19 ante omnia corpora Nisus emicat, 7.649–50 Lausus, quo pulchrior alter non fuit excepto corpore Turni, and 12.899–900 vix illud lecti bis sex cervice subirent, qualia nunc hominum producit corpora tellus. We also find *corpus* standing virtually for *se* (or for some other form of the reflexive),¹⁹ as in 2.565–66 corpora saltu ad

¹⁷ In each instance the word coordinated with *corpora* is a better parallel logically for the genitive modifying *corpora* than for *corpora* itself. Coordinations of this sort are a common feature of Vergil's style. See my *Coordination of Non-Coordinate Elements in Vergil* (New York 1930) 195–214; these three particular examples are there listed on page 200.

¹⁸ We may compare also 6.149–52 iacet exanimus corpus amici; hunc refer suis et conde sepulcro, where *hunc* balances *corpus amici* (i.e. *amicum*) as in 7.649–50 alter balances *corpore Turni* (i.e. *Turno*). But 6.149–52 is not included in the present paragraph, for in it (as also in 1.486, quoted in note 46) *corpus amici* is not a mere periphrasis, since *corpus* has its full force of "corpse" (for this reason the two passages are listed in note 45). The lack of strict logic here is not in the use of *corpus amici* as a possible substitute for *amicus*; it is in the use just below of *hunc* with reference to *amici* instead of *hoc* with reference to *corpus* (for which reason the passage is listed in § 17). But it is much more touching to talk about burying *him* (the friend) than about burying *it* (the body); and the Sibyl shows unusual compassion in her choice of words here.

¹⁹ Cf. with this use of *corpus* the use of *membra* in 4.391–92 conlapsa membra referunt; also in Horace, *Carm.* 1.1.21–22 membra stratus, and *Serm.* 2.2.80–81 curata sopori membra dedit. (These passages are all referred to again below, respectively in note 28, in notes 25 and 27, and in note 27.)

terram misere,²⁰ 12.287–88 corpora saltu subiciunt in equos, 3.176 corripio e stratis corpus, 4.572 corripit e somno corpus,²¹ 7.108 corpora deponunt, 3.511 corpora curamus,²² G 4.187 corpora curant,²³ 8.607 equos et corpora curant.²⁴ In much the same way, 9.722 fuso germanum corpore cernit may stand for *fusum germanum cernit*, 9.317 corpora fusa vident may stand for *homines fusos vident*, and 11.596 circumdata turbine corpus²⁵ may stand simply for *circumdata turbine*. It goes without saying that in all these examples the employment of the word *corpora* adds something, a very definite something, to the picture: some physical trait, such as beauty (7.649–50, 9.272–73²⁶), size (6.582–83, 11.690–91,

²⁰ Contrast 4.253–54 toto praeceps se corpore ad undas misit.

²¹ Cf. G 3.471–72 nec singula morbi corpora corripunt, where *singula corpora* stands for *singulas oves*.

²² But *corpus* is probably used with full force, not periphrastically, in 10.834 vulnera siccabat lymphis corpusque levabat; so too in 6.635–36 corpus spargit aqua, and G 2.531 corpora nudant palaestra. Cf. also *corpora* as subject in 4.522–23 placidum carpebant fessa soporem corpora per terras.

²³ Cf. the same phrase in Lucretius 2.31.

²⁴ Either *equos et se curant*, or *equorum et sua corpora curant*, would be more precise, though neither sounds natural.

²⁵ For the construction here, cf. Horace, *Carm.* 1.1.21–22 membra stratus (already cited in note 19).

²⁶ Probably the emphasis here is not only on the beauty of the picked women but also on their loss of personality, the fact that they are mere chattels, like the *septena corpora natorum* (6.21–22) required each year of the Athenians by the Cretans. Perhaps *corpus* is meant to suggest the slave, as *caput* (e.g. in Horace, *Carm.* 3.5.42) suggests the free man. On the other hand, in 2.18 delecta virum corpora (of the men in the wooden horse), which looks like *lectissima matrum corpora*, the stress is on the physical prowess of the heroes chosen (surely not merely on the notion of occupying space, as Conington thinks). In 12.270–71 novem pulcherrima fratrum corpora, as in 9.272–73, the combination of the idea of beauty with that of misfortune (in this case death) enhances the pathos of the situation. However, it should be noted that elsewhere we have not a periphrasis at all, *corpora* being used in its full sense of “corpses” (cf. note 18 on 1.486, also note 22); so surely in G 4.543 corpora ipsa boum desere, of the bulls slain by Aristaeus, and in 1.192–93 septem ingentia corpora fundat humi (where there is no genitive at all). Other examples of the use of *corpora* with a genitive *not* in periphrasis are 2.213–15 parva duorum corpora natorum serpens amplexus uterque implicat (where *corpora natorum* may be contrasted with the periphrasis *septena corpora natorum* in 6.21–22, quoted at the beginning of this note), G 3.250–51 tremor pertemptet equorum corpora, and probably G 3.51 corpora matrum legat and G 3.69 quarum mutari corpora malis. A good test of whether or not we have a periphrasis consists in changing *corpora* plus the genitive of a given word to simply the given word in the appropriate case, and then inquiring whether the sense remains practically unchanged (though the loss of *corpora* may be serious from the standpoint of literary value); thus we may compare *bis sex lectissimas matres* as a substitute for *bis sex lectissima matrum corpora* in 9.272–73, or *delectos viros* as a substitute for *delecta virum corpora* in 2.18, with *bis septem Rutuli delecti* in 9.161–62. We may also replace *corpora* with a modifying adjective by an ablative of quality: cf. 11.690–91 Orsilochem et Buten, duo maxima corpora

G 3.368–70), strength or lack of it (12.899–900), agility (12.287–88 and possibly 2.565–66), or speed (5.318–19); sudden action, as when one wakes with a start (3.176 and 4.572); physical comfort and relaxation²⁷ (G 4.187, 3.511, 8.607, 7.108, and 9.317); or death,²⁸ its imminence or actual occurrence (G 3.368–70,²⁹ G 4.475–76 = 6.306–7,³⁰ 2.565–66,³¹ 3.623–25,³² 7.535,³³ 9.722, 10.430, 11.197–99).

6. Parallels for these examples with *corpus* exist in the form of comparable examples with *anima*. Thus with 10.430 we may compare 11.372–73 *nos animae viles, inhumata infletaque turba, sternamur campis*, where *animae* is in apposition with *nos* just as *corpora* is with *vos*.³⁴ In 6.817–18 *et Tarquinius reges animamque*

with 5.372 *Buten immani corpore* and 8.330 *immani corpore Thybris*; 9.272–73 *bis sex lectissima matrum corpora* with 1.71 *bis septem praestanti corpore Nymphae*; 12.270–71 *pulcherrima fratrum corpora* with 7.783 *praestanti corpore Turnus*; G 3.369 *corpora magna boum* and the probably non-periphrastic G 4.543 *corpora ipsa boum*, with G 4.538–40 *quattuor eximios praestanti corpore tauros delige* (echoed in G 4.550) and 8.207 *quattuor praestanti corpore tauros*; note too 9.563 *candenti corpore cycnum*. Still another syntactic variation as compared with e.g. 5.372 *Buten immani corpore* is seen in 11.640–41 *Iollan, ingentemque animis, ingentem corpore et armis*, where *ingenti corpore* would have been stylistically possible, but hardly *ingentibus animis* or *ingentibus armis*.

²⁷ So too *corpora* in Lucretius 2.31 (cited in note 23), where the idea is one of moderate physical indulgence, and *membra* in Horace, *Carm.* 1.1.21–22 and *Serm.* 2.2.80–81 (both cited in note 19), where the idea is one of complete relaxation.

²⁸ Similarly, in 4.391–92 (quoted in note 19), the physical term seems particularly appropriate as applied to the swooning Dido, whose conscious intelligence has for the moment departed and left her a mere body.

²⁹ The reference to the size of the poor beasts, already noted just above, merely intensifies the pathos of their helpless situation.

³⁰ Referred to again below, §§ 10 and 16.

³¹ Here too, as in 9.273 and G 3.369 (referred to in notes 26 and 29 respectively), the word may have a double connotation.

³² Ulysses' doughty companions are perfectly helpless in the hands of the Cyclops; thus they become mere bodies like the enslaved matrons of 9.272–73 (see note 26) or the unconscious Dido of 4.391–92 (see note 28).

³³ Referred to again below, § 7.

³⁴ We may further compare Horace's famous tribute to his three dear friends, *Serm.* 1.5.40–42 *Plotius et Varius Vergiliusque occurrunt, animae qualis neque candiores terra tulit neque quis me sit devinctior alter*, where *animae* is in apposition with the three proper names as *corpora* is with the two proper names in 11.690–91. (On the other hand, Horace's *qualis* clause somewhat recalls the structure of Vergil's *qualia* clause in 12.900 *qualia nunc hominum producit corpora tellus*, although Vergil incorporates *corpora* into his dependent clause while Horace keeps *animae* outside his.) Once more, of course, we must not fail to note that the loss in logic which is involved in the passage quoted is more than counterbalanced by the effective gain in force. Unfortunately, we know comparatively little of Plotius and Varius, but Vergil was surely a man who might well be described as "all soul." (Turning from the sublime

superbam ultoris Bruti, *animam Bruti* is a periphrasis of the same nature as *corpora heroum* in 6.306–7 (though a more suitable one for a denizen of the lower world); and *animam* here like *corpora* there is in strict logic less precise a parallel than the genitive modifying it for the noun with which it is grammatically coordinated (*Tarquinius reges* here, *matres atque viri* there). Just as in 3.623–25, 5.318–19, and 7.649–50 respectively, *duo corpora*, *ante omnia corpora*, and *excepto corpore Turni* as substitutes for *duos (viros)*, *ante omnes (viros)*, and *excepto Turno* balance *nostro* (equivalent to a genitive such as *virorum*), *Nisus*, and *Lausus*, so in 12.229–30 *pro cunctis talibus unam obiectare animam*, *unam animam* as a substitute for *unum*, i.e. *unum virum*, balances *cunctis talibus*, which assuredly stands for *cunctis talibus viris*, not *cunctis talibus animis*. And finally, just as *corpora* virtually stands for *se* in 2.565–66 and 12.287–88, so does *hanc*³⁵ *animam* stand for *me* in 10.525 *hanc animam* serves natoque patrique and 10.598 *sine hanc animam et miserere precantis*,³⁶ and so, too, *animas* stands for *se* in 9.663 *animasque in aperta pericula mittunt*. In all these periphrases, exactly as the use of *corpus* regularly enhances the pictorial quality of the passage, so the use of *anima* enhances its emotional quality. In 6.817–18, *animam* surely refers not so much to the fact that Brutus is a *shade* (which is equally true of course of the Tarquin kings and all the other figures seen here), as to the fact that he is characterized by a dauntless *spirit*; in other words, *anima Bruti* stands for *animosus Brutus*, just as *violentia Turni* stands for *violentus Turnus*.³⁷ As for the other examples, the use of *anima* in them

to the ridiculous, we may recall the man in Catullus 13.14 who Catullus predicted would pray to be made “all nose.”) The conception of the *anima* is also used effectively elsewhere by Horace, who calls Vergil *animae dimidium meae* (*Carm.* 1.3.8) and *Maecenas meae partem animae* (*Carm.* 2.17.5).

³⁵ For this use of *hanc* cf. *hunc* in the familiar *hunc hominem* (i.e. *me*) of Horace, *Serm.* 1.9.47.

³⁶ However, *animam* seems to be used quite literally of the soul alone in 1.97–98 *mene non potuisse tua animam hanc effundere dextra!*, 3.654 *vos animam hanc quocumque absumite leto*, 4.652 *accipite hanc animam meque his exsolvite curis*, and 11.440–42 *vobis animam hanc devovi*. Cf. the literal use of *corpus* referred to in notes 18, 22, and 26.

³⁷ Incidentally, it is perhaps worth while to observe that not only would *animosum Brutum* here have been less effective rhetorically than the phrase that Vergil actually uses; it would have led to a highly clumsy succession of accusatives, *Brutum animosum, superbum, ultorem*. It is needless to point out that such a piling up of epithets would hardly be possible in Latin. We may also note in passing how effective is the transfer, with a shift in tone, of the usual reproachful epithet for the younger Tarquin, *superbus*, to the soul of his conqueror, the avenging Brutus.

points up the poignancy of the situation, which in all of them involves the imminent danger of death. In 11.372–73 the use of *animae* is particularly effective in combination with *inhumata turba*, suggestive as the latter is of *corpora*; according to the speaker (Drances), Turnus owns—and despises—his followers, body and soul. In 12.229–30, by an ingenious touch of poetic justice, we no longer find the soldiers, poor souls, in danger of dying for Turnus; we find Turnus, poor soul, in danger of dying for them. In 9.663 the soldiers return to battle at the risk of their lives. In 10.525³⁸ and 598, a defeated warrior is desperately—and vainly—pleading for his life.

7. While the *anima* and the *corpus* are united—in other words, during life—there is not much difficulty involved in their confusion, since the *ego* represents a fusion of the two. But serious complications begin with death, consisting as it does of the separation of the two constituent parts of man. Cf. 4.385 *mors anima seduxerit artus*,³⁹ and 4.695 *quae [= Iris] luctantem animam nexosque resolveret artus*. Life departs—yet continues to exist in the form of the shade or *anima*,⁴⁰ with which the *vita*⁴¹ or vital principle

³⁸ The speaker also just below, in 10.528–29 *non hic victoria Teucrum vertitur aut anima una dabit discrimina tanta*, pathetically uses *anima una* for *vir unus*, just as in 12.229–30 (quoted earlier in this paragraph) *unam animam* is used for *unum virum*.

³⁹ *Mors animam seduxerit artibus* would be more logical. Here we find exemplified a type of confusion different from that which is under investigation in the present paper. To explain this one, too, in mathematical terms, we may say that, given the ratio *a*:*b*, that of *b*:*a*, its reciprocal, will bear to it a very definite relationship; and this time it is far more often in the realm of logic than in that of mathematics, that this relationship will be one of equality. That is, in non-mathematical terms, given two bodies which bear a certain mutual relationship, it is sometimes safe, in simple, straightforward matters, to assume that the first is related to the second in the same way as the second is to the first. But very often it is not; and yet under these circumstances Vergil frequently acts as if it were. I have treated this type of inexactitude on Vergil's part in an article entitled "A Source of Vergilian Hypallage," *TAPA* 87 (1956) 147–89; for this particular example, see 156.

⁴⁰ It hardly needs to be remarked that this *anima* in appearance is identical with the *corpus* that it once inhabited (even to the very mutilations inflicted upon that *corpus*, as in the case of the phantom of Hector in 2.270–79 and 285–86, or the shade of Deiphobus in 6.494–501), or, odder still, with the *corpus* that it is some day to inhabit (as in the case of the muster-roll of Aeneas' descendants, notably the young Marcellus in 6.860–66). Indeed, the *anima* itself is described as having a *corpus* in 6.494 *laniatum corpore toto* (of Deiphobus)! But, though it may look and speak and weep like a living man (cf. note 41), the spirit once arrived in the world of shades or returned to that of men is unsubstantial to the touch: cf. 2.792–94 of the vision of Creusa = 6.700–2 of the shade of Anchises, *ter conatus ibi collo dare brachia circum; ter funesta compressa manus effugit imago, par levibus ventis volucrique simillima somno* (this of course is reminiscent of Homer, *Od.* 11.204–8). The insubstantiality of the *animae* is

seems under certain circumstances to be interchangeable:⁴² cf. with *G* 4.526 *anima fugiente* 11.831 = 12.952 *vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras*, 4.705 *in ventos vita recessit*, 6.735

also emphasized in contrast with the heavy weight of the living Aeneas in 6.411–14 (quoted below, § 16); they are described as bloodless in 6.401, and as weak of voice in 6.492–93 (on their bloodlessness see further below, note 81).

⁴¹ This *vita*, like the *anima* (cf. notes 16 and 40), is itself represented in a more or less personal guise. Not only does it partake of the emotions of human life, being called *maesta* in 10.820 (quoted just below), but it makes actual physical sounds: note *gemitu* in 11.831 = 12.952 (also quoted just below). There are, to be sure, plenty of instances of the use of *vita* in precisely the abstract sense of the English *life*, as e.g. in *E* 4.53, 2.92, 2.637 and 641, 3.315, 3.646, 4.340, 4.550, 6.428, 6.433, 6.663, 8.577, 9.212, 10.468, 11.180. But elsewhere, even when we translate *vita* by “life,” it may have a more concrete meaning, as in 5.724–25 *nate, mihi vita quondam, dum vita manebat, care magis*, where *dum vita manebat* (which occurs also in 6.608 and 6.661) may (as may also *modo vita supersit* in *G* 3.10, but hardly *Turno rata vita maneret* in 10.629) suggest the abiding of the *vita* or *anima* in the body, while *vita care magis* may suggest Horace’s *animae dimidium meae* (cited in note 34); so too *vita* in 5.230 *vitam volunt pro laude pacisci* and 9.206 *vita bene credat emi honorem*. In general the *vita* seems identical with the *anima* so far as it is conceived of as that part of the man that is separated from the body at death (for some close parallels see note 42). Also there seems to be an all-pervasive world-life as there is an all-pervasive world-soul: cf. *G* 4.219–24 with 6.724–29, and note especially in the earlier passage *G* 4.221–24 *deum ire per omnis terrasque tractusque maris caelumque profundum; hinc pecudes, armenta, viros, genus omne ferarum, quemque sibi tenuis nascentem arcessere vitas*, and in the later passage 6.724–28 *caelum ac terram camposque liquentis spiritus intus alit; inde hominum pecudumque genus vitaeque volantum*. However, the *anima* or spirit that abides in the lower world is not spoken of as the *vita*; the word *vitae* in 6.292 is used synonymously with *umbras* in 294, but both these words apply to the monsters at the entrance to the world of the dead, not to the dead themselves.

⁴² The person who dies is said to pour out his *anima* or his *vita*, as in 9.349 *vomit animam* and 10.908 *animam diffundit cruore*, 2.532 *vitam cum sanguine fudit*; or to breathe it out, as in 11.883 *expirant animas*, 2.562 *vitam exhalantem* (cf. 11.617 *vitam dispergit in auras*). The first type of expression connects the *anima* or *vita* with the blood (as already remarked in note 16); the second connects it with the breath. This latter conception is in keeping with the identification of the *anima*, and apparently of the *vita*, with the breath during life: the seat of the *vita* seems to be the windpipe in 7.533–34 *haesit enim sub gutture vulnus et udae vocis iter tenuemque inclusit sanguine vitam*, and that of the *anima* seems to be the chest in 9.579–80 *abditaque intus spiramenta animae letali vulnere rupit* (of the lungs) and 11.408–9 *numquam animam amittes; habitat tecum et sit pectore in isto*. In the last-quoted example, there is mention of *losing* the *anima*, but much oftener dying is spoken of as *giving* the *anima* or *vita* (cf. English *give up the ghost*), as in *G* 4.204 *animam sub fasce dedere*, 10.854 *omnis per mortis animam sontem ipse dedissem*, and 11.162 *animam ipse dedissem*, of the *anima*, and 9.704 *neque enim iaculo vitam ille dedisset*, of the *vita*; cf. too *G* 3.495 *dulcis animas reddunt*, and 4.652 *accipite hanc animam*. (However, 2.145 *lacrimis vitam damus*, 11.118 *vixet cui vitam deus aut sua dextra dedisset*, and 12.879 *quo vitam dedit aeternam*?, in all of which there is a question of granting life to some one else, are completely different; note in connection with the last that only the abstract *vita* can be spoken of here, for any *vita* in the sense of “spirit” is immortal.) The conception is rather different, that of laying down, not giving up, life, in 9.687 *posuere in limine vitam*. The killer takes away the *anima* (3.654 *animam hanc quocumque absumite*

supremo cum lumine vita reliquit,⁴³ 10.819–20 tum vita per auras concessit maesta ad manis corpusque reliquit.⁴⁴ On the other hand, that which remains after the departure of the soul—the mere physical, mortal side—is with particular appropriateness referred to as the body, the *corpus* (cf. our English *corpse*).⁴⁵ Thus in 9.454–55 ad ipsa corpora seminecisque viros, and 11.634–35 corporaque et permixti caede virorum semianimes equi, the lifeless forms are contrasted with those in which some vestige of life still lingers. However, perhaps 2.364–65 sternuntur corpora, 7.535 corpora multa virum (sternuntur), and 12.97 da sternere corpus, and certainly 12.328 multa virum dat fortia corpora leto, are not

leto, 8.566–67 cui omnis abstulit animas, 9.443 animam abstulit hosti) or seizes it (10.348 vocem animamque rapit traiecit gutture, where perhaps the breath is meant as well as the spirit) or despoils the owner of it (6.168 illum vita victor spoliavit Achilles). The plural *animas* in 8.567 (just quoted) is especially interesting: Erulus had to be killed three times because he had three *animae* (8.564–66 nascenti cui tris animas mater dederat, terna arma movenda, ter leto sternendus erat). We might rather have expected, as Conington says *ad loc.*, a three-bodied monster like Geryon; but Erulus' three *animae* seem to correspond to three *vitae* (as we say in English that a cat has nine lives).

⁴³ Cf. further on this passage, § 11 below.

⁴⁴ An odd inversion of this expression is found in *G* 3.546–47 illae [= aves] praecipites alta vitam sub nube relinquunt and 5.517 (columba) vitam reliquit in astris. (These two passages deal with birds, not people, but I think this is irrelevant; Vergil regularly humanizes his animals.) Here we have the sort of reversal discussed above in note 39; once more see *TAPA* 87.147–89 (155–56 for the particular instances discussed in the present note). Instead of saying that life leaves the body, as he does in 10.819–20 (quoted again in § 19), or that life leaves the individual, as he probably does in 6.735 (discussed in § 11), with which we may compare Lucretius 5.63 eum quem vita reliquit, Vergil says that the individual leaves life—which seems natural enough in our own tongue, as in the common phrase *depart this life*, but rather odd in a language which conceives of the *vita* as a definite, concrete entity (cf. note 41). Of course it may be argued that *vita* is really used in an abstract sense here, not of one's own life but of life in general. But what of 3.140–41 linquebant dulcis animas aut aegra trahebant corpora? This is assuredly stranger yet. What leaves (or leave) the *animae*? Is it the *corpora*? But, quite apart from the fact that, as has just been said, the *animae* rather leave the *corpora*, which without them are impotent and inert, mere "corpses" indeed (cf. e.g. *G* 3.542 naufraga corpora, 9.454–55 ad ipsa corpora, 11.634 armaque corporaque), it cannot be the *corpora* that leave the *animae*, because the objects which perform this action also perform the action indicated by the following words *trahebant corpora*—and we are hence brought to an utter absurdity! No, the common subject of these two verbs is rather that mysterious union of body and soul, the *ego* (cf. 12.935–36, quoted just below, in § 9); but then strict logic demands rather *animas diffundebant* (cf. 10.908, quoted in notes 16 and 42) to balance *corpora trahebant*. Only one must not expect strict logic of a poet—especially when he is talking of matters of life and death!

⁴⁵ Examples are too numerous to quote. A few instances are given in § 17 as illustrations of the burial rites; others may be listed here: *E* 5.22, *G* 4.255, 1.484, 1.486, 2.644, 3.578, 4.600, 4.635, 6.149, 6.219, 11.30, 11.59, 11.185, 11.591, 11.848.

quite so logical, as one really slays not merely the body but the whole man, whose body and soul are thereby separated, as we have just noted.⁴⁶

8. After this separation, is the *ego* to be identified with the surviving *anima* or *vita*, or with the mortal remains that are consigned to the pyre or the tomb? The answer is, sometimes one, sometimes the other, sometimes neither.⁴⁷

9. Thus when Aeneas invokes the dead Anchises in the following terms, 5.80–81 *salve, sancte parens, iterum salvete, recepti nequiquam cineres animaeque umbraeque paternae*, the *parens* seems to consist for him of a combination of mortal and immortal remains (*cineres*, and *animaeque umbraeque*, respectively).⁴⁸ Again,

⁴⁶ Of course one must not be over-nice in analyzing these periphrases. That, after all, the phrase *virum corpora*, for instance, forms but a single idea is proved by the transference of *fortia* to *corpora* from *virum* in 12.328, and also by the making parallel with *corpora* in e.g. 7.535 *corpora multa virum seniorque Galaesus* (cited above in § 5) of a noun that is parallel in thought with *virum* (cf. note 17). We may contrast 1.101 *scuta virum galeasque et fortia corpora volvit*; here there is the same transference of *fortia* from *virum* to *corpora*, but *scuta* and *galeas* are really parallel in thought with *corpora*, while the genitive *virum* applies to all three nouns. In 1.486–87 *ut spolia, ut currus, utque ipsum corpus amici conspexit*, *spolia* and *currus* are similarly parallel to *corpus*, but I am not sure whether the genitive here (*amici*) applies to all three nouns or not. At all events, both these passages as compared with 12.328 show clearly the difference (already discussed in note 26) between *corpus* used with full force and *corpus* used in periphrasis.

⁴⁷ We may compare Catullus 101, where *te* in line 3 and *cinerem* in line 4 seem to refer to much the same thing, the ashes of the dead, but both alike to be differentiated from *tete ipsum*—the real *yourself*, which is utterly lost—in line 5. To Catullus, who surely did not believe in the immortality of the soul (cf. 5.5–6), there is no possibility of the existence of any other *te*; hence his closing line, 101.10 in perpetuum ave atque vale. The more logical denier of survival, Lucretius, makes very clear the distinction between the living *ego* and the lifeless corpse in a most effective passage, 3.870–93; note especially 881–83 *ipse sui miseret; neque enim se dividit illum nec removel satis a proiecto corpore et illum se fingit sensuque suo contaminat adstans*. On the other hand, to the believer, Socrates (as reported by Plato, *Phaedo* 115c-d), the true self is not only the living man, it is also, and equally, the surviving soul; but for him as for Lucretius, it is assuredly *not* the body, as the simple-minded Crito fancies. Compare (in c) Crito's question, *Θάπτομεν δέ σε τίνα τρόπον*; and Socrates' laughing answer, *Ὅπως ἂν βούλησθε, εἴη περ γε λάβητέ με καὶ μὴ ἐκφύγω ὑμᾶς*. Also note his continuance on the subject in more serious vein: *Οὐ πείθω, ὦ ἄνδρες, Κρίτων, ὥς ἐγὼ εἶμι οὗτος Σωκράτης, ὁ νυνὶ διαλεγόμενος καὶ διατάττων ἕκαστον τῶν λεγομένων, ἀλλ' οἰεῖται με ἐκεῖνον εἶναι, ὃν ὄψεται ὀλίγον ὕστερον νεκρόν, καὶ ἐρωτᾷ δὴ, πῶς με θάπτη. And again (in d): οὐκέτι ὑμῖν παραμενῶ, ἀλλ' οἰχέσσομαι ἀπὼν εἰς μακάρων δὴ τινος εὐδαιμονίας*.

⁴⁸ Conington, on 5.81, quotes the Verona scholia's observation, "that Virg. has enumerated the three parts of man, the dust that returns to earth, the spirit that goes into heaven, and the shade that dwells below." But of course the introduction of the

Turnus recognizes that the true *himself* consists of a combination of body and soul, which combination he differentiates from his body alone in 12.935–36 *me, seu corpus spoliatum lumine mavis, redde meis*.⁴⁹ But Nisus speaks of his corpse as *me*,⁵⁰ 9.213–14 *sit qui me raptum pugna pretiove redemptum mandet humo*; and Aeneas similarly apostrophizes that of Lausus as *te*, 10.827–28 *teque parentum manibus et cineri remitto*.⁵¹ The effect is particularly odd when the body is treated as the true *ego* in conversations in which the soul is represented as taking part. Thus in the lower world, where we see the shades of Deiphobus and Palinurus, Aeneas calls the former's body *te*, 6.507–8 *te, amice, nequivi conspiciere et patria decedens ponere terra*; and the latter calls his own body *me*, 6.362 *nunc me fluctus habet*, and *mihi*, 6.365–66 *aut tu mihi terram inice*.⁵² On the other hand, in 4.703 *teque isto corpore solvo*⁵³ and 11.829 *exsolvit se corpore*, *te* and *se* refer just as definitely to the soul as distinct from the body. Again in 12.648–49 *sancta ad vos anima atque istius nescia*⁵⁴ *culpae descendam magnorum haud umquam indignus avorum*, Turnus identifies himself with his soul as it descends to the world of the dead, calling himself *sancta anima atque nescia*, though in the next breath he thinks of himself even after death as the whole man, and shifts from feminine adjectives agreeing with *anima* to a masculine one, *indignus*.

idea of heaven is a complete anachronism, nor it is possible to make a valid distinction between *animae* and *umbrae*.

⁴⁹ Already referred to in note 44.

⁵⁰ Cf. too the use of *hunc* in 6.152 *hunc refer suis et conde sepulcro*, already discussed in note 18 and again cited in § 17.

⁵¹ Nisus and Aeneas here are like the confused thinkers refuted by Socrates and Lucretius in the passages cited above (note 47). For the reverse process, in which the term *corpus* is used of the entire *ego*, cf. the examples enumerated in §§ 5 and 7.

⁵² Actually in his long narrative speech to Aeneas, he uses *me* to apply to all three facets of his personality: (1) the complete *ego* in 6.348 *nec me deus aequore mersit*, 352 *pro me*, and 355–56 *Notus vexit me violentus aqua*; (2) the body, in almost the next breath, in 362, as already indicated above; and finally (3) the soul, in 365 *eripe me his malis*, and 370 *tecum me tolle per undas*. Only the last *me*, said by the shade of the shade, is completely accurate; but the *me* used of the living man seems more appropriate on the lips of the shade than the *me* used of the corpse. So too there seems to be reasonable even if not complete precision on the part of the visions of Anchises and Creusa that appear on earth to Aeneas in using *me* (in 5.733 and 2.788) of the corresponding entity that abides in the Elysian Fields in the case of Anchises and with the Magna Mater in the case of Creusa.

⁵³ Contrast 4.695 just above, also 4.385 (both quoted in § 7).

⁵⁴ I accept this emendation of the usual reading *inscia* as a very simple solution of the metrical difficulties otherwise presented by the line.

10. Sometimes the two views, of the self now as the body and now as the soul, are fused inconsistently in a single passage. This occurs in *G* 4.475–77 = 6.306–8 *matres atque viri defunctaque corpora vita magnanimum heroum, pueri innuptaeque puellae, impositique rogis iuvenes ante ora parentum*. In the first and second lines, except for *defuncta corpora vita*, which will be taken up later (§ 16), the persons are certainly identified with their souls; but in the third line, the words *impositi rogis ante ora parentum*, said of the *iuvenes*, apply only to the bodies of those whose souls are elsewhere.⁵⁵ *Iuvenes* (i.e. *umbrae iuuenum*; cf. *G* 4.472 *umbrae ibant tenues*) *quorum corpora imposita rogis erant* would be the logical form, although, of course, infinitely less poetic and pathetic.

11. The same confusion is perhaps less strikingly, but none the less unquestionably, exemplified in 6.730–42;

- 730 *igneus est ollis vigor et caelestis origo*
semenibus, quantum non corpora noxia tardant
terrenique hebetant artus moribundaque membra.
hinc metuunt cupiuntque, dolent gaudentque, neque auras
dispiciunt clausae tenebris et carcere caeco.
735 *quin et supremo cum lumine vita reliquit,*
non tamen omne malum miseris nec funditus omnes
corporeae excedunt pestes, penitusque necesse est
multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris.
ergo exercentur poenis veterumque malorum
740 *supplicia expendunt: aliae panduntur inanes*
suspensae ad ventos, aliis sub gurgite vasto
infectum eluitur scelus aut exuritur igni.

Here *ollis* in 730 and the verbs of 733–34 refer generally to living creatures—primarily human beings, apparently. But in 735 these beings are identified with the mere lifeless *corpora* if we are to supply *eos* with *reliquit*,⁵⁶ which certainly seems the only, or at least the obvious, thing to do; while *miseris* in 736 and the verbs in 739–42 relate to the same beings as identical with their souls.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Cf. 6.325–26 *haec omnis inops inhumataque turba est; hi, quos vehit unda, sepulti*.

⁵⁶ Note the parallel from Lucretius, 5.63, cited above, note 44.

⁵⁷ This explanation is not quite the same as that given by Conington on 6.737, who says that Vergil, in using the present *inolescere* instead of *inoluisse*, expresses himself “as if he were speaking of the soul when still in life, not of the soul after death.” But as a matter of fact the present in 738 certainly applies to the souls *after death*; if it did not, it would be a mere repetition of 731–32 *corpora noxia tardant*, etc. Not only do

12. The case is further complicated by the fact that the incorporeal part of man—his shade or soul—is not by any means a simple, single conception. Sometimes that with which the *ego* is identified abides in the tomb⁵⁸ (4.29 ille habeat secum servetque sepulcro); sometimes it dwells in the lower world (4.387 audiam et haec manis veniet mihi fama sub imos, and Book 6 in general); sometimes it may return to the upper world as a sort of fury or avenging spirit (4.386 omnibus umbra locis adero), or as the phantom of a dream (2.270–71 Hector visus adesse mihi; *et al.*). Note that the second phase seems the dominant one, with which all the others are more or less fused. Thus Dido has said that her love is buried with Sychaeus in his tomb (4.29), but it is in the lower world that she regains her husband (6.473–74 coniunx ubi pristinus illi respondet curis aequatque Sychaeus amorem).⁵⁹ It is in one and the same breath that she speaks of herself as being everywhere at once (4.386) and as being in the underworld (4.387). And Aeneas in Hades tells Anchises of the visits paid him by Anchises' *imago* (6.695–96 tua me, genitor, tua tristis imago saepius occurrens haec limina tendere adegit). We may think that we have a clue to the confusion in Aeneas' words *tua imago*—the dream phantom is the *imago*,⁶⁰ while the Anchises down

the ills which characterized the united soul and body fail to depart when their union is terminated, but, as a result of their long adherence (*diu concreta* in 738, properly put in the past, *does* refer to the life on earth), they become ingrained anew in the disembodied soul even as they had been in the soul when bound up with, and hampered by, its body.

⁵⁸ Cf. Conington's note on 3.67, quoted below (§ 17).

⁵⁹ There is an inconsistency of a different kind in placing Sychaeus in the *lugentes campi*, among those who died of love. But we are too thankful that Dido can have the comfort of his companionship and his devotion (6.473–74) to cavil at a discrepancy of this sort.

⁶⁰ It is so called also in 4.351–53 me patris Anchisae admonet in somnis et turbida terret imago; so too the dream phantoms of Sychaeus (1.353–54 ipsa sed in somnis inhumati venit imago coniugis ora modis attollens pallida miris) and Cassandra (5.636–37 mihi Cassandrae per somnum vatis imago dare visa faces). The vision of Creusa at the end of Book 2 is not a dream, I think; but whatever it is, it too is called an *imago* (2.773 nota maior imago, and 2.793 manus effugit imago). However, it is called by two other names in 2.772 simulacrum atque ipsius umbra Creusae. The word *imago* is also used of the false phantom of Aeneas prepared by Juno, 10.643 exsultat imago, 10.656 Aeneae imago, 10.663 quaerit imago; and of the false phantoms which Aeneas accuses Venus of producing, 1.407–8 falsis ludis imaginibus. Thus in general the word seems to be employed of a mere appearance as a dream or vision, whether true or false. This is perhaps also true of *simulacrum*, which, as we have just noted, is used of the vision of Creusa (2.772), and which seems to be employed of ghostly visitations in general, such as appeared on earth after Caesar's death (G 1.477 simulacra

in the lower world is the *umbra*; ⁶¹ but, since only six lines after Aeneas calls the dream-phantom an *imago*, Vergil uses the same term of the shade Anchises (6.701 *manus effugit imago*), and since the word *umbra* is applied in 6.894 (*datur exitus umbris*) to the dreams that leave Hades, we must conclude that this distinction will not hold. And the haunting specter of Dido (4.386 ⁶²) is an *umbra* too.

13. As for the ghost that supposedly haunts the tomb ⁶³ and thus is associated with the ashes buried there, though it seems to be described in 5.81 *cineres animaeque umbraeque paternae* by the phrase *animaeque umbraeque*, it is usually called the *manes*: ⁶⁴ 3.303–4 *libabat cineri Andromache manisque vocabat Hectoreum ad tumulum*, 4.34 *id cinerem aut manis credis curare sepultos?*, 4.427 *nec patris Anchisae cineres manisve revelli*, 10.827–28 *te parentum manibus et cineri, si qua est ea cura, remitto*. Doubtless it is this ghost too for whom altars were erected at the funeral of Polydorus, 3.63 *stant manibus arae*, and whom Aeneas called at the funeral of Deiphobus, 6.506 *magna manis ter voce vocavi*,

modis pallentia miris) and haunted the mystical grove of Albunea (7.89 *multa modis simulacra volitantia miris*). But neither *imago* nor *simulacrum* is restricted to this meaning. Besides being applied to the shade of Anchises in 6.701 *manus effugit imago* (which might be a mere echo of the same words as applied to Creusa in 2.793), *imago* is also used of the shade of Adrastus in the lower world (6.480 *Adrasti pallentis imago*), who is one of the group termed *animae* just below (6.486 *circumstant animae*). And *simulacrum* is similarly used of the shades who listened to Orpheus, *G* 4.472 *umbrae tenues simulacraque luce carentum*. Here as in 2.772 of Creusa, we find *simulacrum* combined with *umbra*; but whereas there *umbra* is applied to a vision that we might rather expect to call a *simulacrum*, here *simulacra* is used of a group of shades that we would naturally term *umbrae*.

⁶¹ Cf. 6.390 *umbrarum hic locus est*, 6.401 *exsanguis terreat umbras*.

⁶² Quoted at the beginning of this paragraph.

⁶³ It must be noted that the idea that the ghost is *actually* in the tomb with the ashes, though it may have prompted the type of ritual described, is not carried out consistently in the passages here cited. The tombs of Hector and Deiphobus are in reality empty (*inanem* in both 3.304 and 6.505). Andromache may be calling Hector's shade from his old tomb in Troy to his new one in Epirus, but Deiphobus' shade is clearly in Hades (6.494–534). The ashes of Anchises are doubtless in the tomb in Sicily to which Aeneas and his followers here betake themselves (5.75–76), but his shade is not; it, like that of Deiphobus, is in the nether world, and it has to be summoned up from there (note *manis Acheronte remissos* in 5.99).

⁶⁴ Is it the influence of this invariable plural that has led to the occasional use of the plural for other words of kindred meaning? We may note not only 5.81 *animaeque umbraeque* cited just above, but also *G* 4.501 *prensantem umbras*, 6.510 *omnia solvisti funeris umbris*, 10.519 *inferias quos immolet umbris* and 11.81–82 *quos mitteret umbris inferias*, and 4.571 *subitis exterritus umbris*, where the references are respectively to the shades of Eurydice, Deiphobus, and Pallas, and the vision of Mercury.

and at the anniversary ceremonies for Anchises, 5.98–99 *animam vocabat Anchisae manisque Acheronte remissos*.⁶⁵ But elsewhere the *manes* are localized in the lower world⁶⁶ with the *animae* or *umbrae*, from whom they at times seem to be distinct, with power to treat them well or ill; cf. the notoriously difficult passage 6.743 *quisque suos patimur manis*,⁶⁷ and also 12.646–49 *vos o mihi, manes, este boni, quoniam superis aversa voluntas*.⁶⁸ *sancta ad vos anima descendam*. When Orpheus seeks to win back Eurydice, the shades are moved by his music (*G* 4.471–72 *cantu com-motae umbrae ibant tenues*), but his grim task is to propitiate the *manes* and Pluto (*G* 4.469–70 *manis adiit regemque tremendum nesciaque humanis precibus mansuescere corda*); and when he has won a concession, his madness in looking back is not to be pardoned by these implacable beings (*G* 4.489 *ignoscenda quidem scirent si ignoscere manes*, and 505 *quo fletu manis, qua numina voce moveret?*). Yet in the later reference to the Orpheus story, the *manes* are not distinct from the *animae* or *umbrae*; in 6.119 *potuit manis accersere coniugis Orpheus*, Orpheus' quest for the *manes* of his wife is likened to that of Aeneas for the *anima* of his father. We may note too 10.524 *per patrios manis*, 10.534 *patris Anchisae manes*, and 11.688–89 *nomen patrum manibus referes*; also 4.387 *manis sub imos* (quoted in § 12). And finally in 10.819–20 *vita per auras concessit ad manis*, the *vita* is said to go

⁶⁵ Already referred to in note 63. In this passage, note the parallelism, *animam manisque*, like that in *animaeque umbraeque* (in 5.81, cited above).

⁶⁶ Indeed, at times they are mentioned simply to symbolize the lowest depths of the earth. So *G* 1.242–43 *illum sub pedibus Styx atra videt manesque profundi* (of the pole in the nether world); 3.565 *subducta ad manis imos desedimus unda* (of a ship in the trough of the waves); 8.243–46 *ac si terra dehiscens infernas reseret sedes superque immane barathrum cernatur, trepidentque immisso lumine manes* (of an earthquake); 12.883–84 *o quae satis ima dehiscat terra mihi, manisque deam demittat ad imos* (Juturna's despairing prayer). Note too, though here there may be more thought of the *manes* as individuals, 4.387 *haec manis veniet mihi fama sub imos* (Dido's curse); 11.180–81 *non vitae gaudia quaero, sed gnato manis perferre sub imos* (Evan-der's lament). Of Juno's summoning of Allecto from the infernal regions (7.325 *infernisque ciet tenebris*), Venus says, 10.39–40 *manis movet*, where *manis* seems to refer to Hades in general, for it certainly does not appear that the fury Allecto belongs to the *manes*.

⁶⁷ For a discussion of just what is, or at least may be, meant by *manes* here, see Nettleship *ad loc.* I myself have attempted to deal with this problematic passage, *CW* 20 (1927) 215–19.

⁶⁸ Note that here the *manes* are referred to almost as though they were divinities of the lower world, corresponding to the gods above. So too 10.33–34 *tot responsa secuti quae superi manesque dabant*. We are reminded of the familiar term *di manes*, which, however, Vergil does not use.

to the *manes* just as elsewhere (11.831 = 12.952 *vita fugit sub umbras*) it is said to go to the *umbrae*.⁶⁹

14. As for the *umbra*, it too is met in a number of different meanings, some of which have already been referred to in connection with other terms. It is used as follows: like *anima* in the invocation introducing the account of the nether world,⁷⁰ as a general designation of the inhabitants of this world, in 6.264 *di quibus imperium est animarum, umbraeque silentes* (cf. also 6.390 *umbrarum hic locus est*); like *simulacrum* of the shades

⁶⁹ Both of these passages have already been cited above (§ 7).

⁷⁰ The *umbrae* are used as a general cover-term suggesting the lower world in general, just as are the *manes*; see note 66. Cf. with the first passages quoted there, typifying the lowest depths, 4.24–26 *sed mihi vel tellus optem prius ima dehiscat vel pater omnipotens abigat me fulmine ad umbras, pallentis umbras Erebo noctemque profundam* (Dido's prayer) and 6.404 *imas Erebi descendit ad umbras* (said by the Sibyl, of Aeneas' journey); also 7.770–71 *pater omnipotens aliqueum indignatus ab umbris mortalem infernis ad lumina surgere vitae* (of the return journey, from darkness to light). Particularly common are the phrases *sub umbras* and *per umbras*: we meet the former in 4.660 *sic, sic iuvat ire sub umbras*, and 6.577–79 *Tartarus patet in praeceps tantum tenditque sub umbras quantus ad aetherium caeli suspectus Olympum*; and the latter in 6.461–62 *iussa deum, quae nunc has ire per umbras, per loca senta situ cogunt noctemque profundam*, 6.490 *videre virum fulgentiaque arma per umbras*, 6.618–19 *Phlegyas miserrimus omnis admonet et magna testatur voce per umbras*, and 12.880–81 *possem misero fratri comes ire per umbras*. In passages such as these, it is not always possible to be sure whether the meaning of *umbras* is "shades" in the sense of spirits or in that of shadows. I think the meaning must be "spirits" in 6.404 and 4.660, where *imas ad umbras* and *sub umbras* respectively remind us of *manis sub imos* in 4.387; and likewise in 6.618–19, where probably the same group is referred to by *umbras* as by *omnis*. But the meaning "shadows" seems more likely in 6.490 and 6.577–79, where the *umbrae* are contrasted respectively with the gleaming arms and with the aerial view to the top of Olympus; and in 6.461–62, where the second *per* phrase certainly has a purely local meaning, and accordingly the first one may well have such a meaning too. Similarly in regard to the invocation, 6.264 *di quibus imperium est animarum, umbraeque silentes*, it might be suggested that the following line, 265 *et Chaos et Phlegethon, loca nocte tacentia late*, also favors the interpretation of *umbrae* as local rather than personal in force, in keeping with *Phlegethon* and *loca*. However, *Chaos* may be either a god of the underworld (as seems to be the case in 4.510) or the vast, dark underworld itself; and I think in this double sense the name perhaps forms a connecting link between the two personal terms, namely the gods of the shades and the silent shades themselves, and the two local terms, namely the river Phlegethon and the dark, silent regions themselves (the emphasis on silence may be meant to emphasize the secrecy of the mysteries that the poet is about to reveal). We have the same double idea, of beings and regions, in 5.733–35 *non me impia namque Tartara habent, tristes umbrae, sed amoena piorum concilia Elysiumque colo*, only here the order is chiasmic, a b b a, with *tristes umbrae* and *piorum concilia* of the shades, and *Tartara* and *Elysium* of the places; whereas in 6.264–65 it is straightforward, a a b b, with a connecting link that can count as either a or b between a a and b b. Another ambiguous passage involving the *umbrae* is 1.547 *crudelibus occubat umbris*, where both syntax and sense are obscure; see Conington *ad loc.*

listening to Orpheus, in *G* 4.472 *umbrae tenues simulacraque luce carentum* (see § 13); like *imago* of the shade of Eurydice which Orpheus tries vainly to grasp, in *G* 4.501 *prensantem nequiquam umbras* (see note 64), as *imago* is used of the shade of Anchises which Aeneas tries vainly to embrace, in 6.701 *manus effugit imago* (see § 12); like *vita* of the *variarum monstra ferarum* at the entrance to Hades, in 6.294 *frustra ferro diverberet umbras* (cf. 6.292 *tenuis sine corpore vitas*, on which see note 41); like *simulacrum* and *imago* of the vision of Creusa, in 2.772–73 *simulacrum atque ipsius umbra Creusae et nota maior imago* (see note 60); of the dream-likeness of Mercury, in 4.571 *subitis umbris* (see note 64); like *imago* of the phantom Aeneas made by Juno, in 10.636 *tenuem sine viribus umbram* (cf. *imago* in 10.643, 656, and 663, and see note 60). Sacrifices are offered to the *umbra* as they are to the *manes*, in 10.519 *inferias quos immolet umbris* and 11.81–82 *quos mitteret umbris inferias* (cf. on the offerings to the *manes* 5.77–79 and 96–98 for the *manes* of Anchises, and 3.66–67 for the *manes* of Polydorus).

15. Not only are the *anima*, the *vita*, the *umbra*, the *imago*, the *simulacrum*, and the *manes* all used more or less interchangeably, but they are frequently confused with the *corpus*, which certainly ought to be kept distinct from them. This is probably in large part due, as has been said (§ 3), to the identification, already illustrated (§§ 5–11), of the *ego* with both the *anima* and the *corpus*.

16. Thus we sometimes find the *corpus* in the world of the dead.⁷¹ The shades crossing the river in Charon's skiff are called *corpora* in 6.303 *subvectat corpora cumba*, though not long afterward they are correctly called *animae* when dislodged from the boat to make room for Aeneas (6.411–12 *alias animas deturbat*, quoted once more near the close of the paragraph). And again the word is used of the throng of shades on the river-bank, *G* 4.475 and the identical 6.306 *defuncta corpora vita*, though they are correctly termed *umbrae* just before the first occurrence of the line (*G* 4.472 *umbrae ibant tenues*) and *animae* shortly after the second (6.319 *quid petunt animae?*). As a matter of fact, the *umbra* or *anima* should be identified not with the *corpus* but with the very *vita* of

⁷¹ Thoroughly literal and logical expressions are met in 6.713–14 *animae quibus altera fato corpora debentur*, 6.719–21 *putandum est animas ad tarda reverti corpora?*, 6.751 *incipiant in corpora velle reverti*.

which the *corpus* is said to be deprived⁷² (cf. note 41). The same type of expression (*corpora defuncta vita* or *corpora mortua*) is implied by the use of *corpora viva*⁷³ for living passengers across the Styx in 6.391 *corpora viva nefas Stygia vectare carina*; *corpora* alone ought to have been enough: compare Aeneas' corporality as emphasized by his effect upon the boat (6.413–14 *gemuit sub pondere cumba subtilis et multam accepit rimosa paludem*) in contrast with the *animae* that were routed out by Charon to make room for him (6.411–12 *inde alias*⁷⁴ *animas, quae per iuga longa sedebant, deturbat laxatque foros*), and further his contrast with the *umbrae* of 6.294 (*frustra ferro diverberet umbras*) that he strove to stab, and with the *imago* of his father (6.700–2⁷⁵) that he strove to embrace.

17. Elsewhere it is not the *corpus* that is assigned to the dwelling of the *anima*, but the *anima* that is assigned to the dwelling of the *corpus*. Perhaps the most striking example of this sort is 3.67–68 *animamque sepulcro condimus*.⁷⁶ This may be explained as having reference to the laying of the spirit, and in this connection Conington's note *ad loc.* is of interest: "Gossrau remarks that there was a distinction between the Greek and the original Roman belief, the former placing the spirit of the buried body in the infernal regions, the latter in the tomb along with the body. Virg., in that case, must be supposed to have held himself free to adopt either view: here he is a Roman, in Book 6 a Greek."⁷⁷ The im-

⁷² In this connection we may note that only a few lines above the phrase *defuncta corpora vita*, we find its precise reverse, *sine corpore vitas* (6.292), applied, with far more precise logic, to the monsters at the entrance (they too are *umbrae*; note 6.294, quoted at the close of this paragraph).

⁷³ Contrast the exact use of the terms in 8.485 *mortua iungebat corpora vivis*.

⁷⁴ *Alias* here, of course, does not mean "other" in our sense.

⁷⁵ Quoted in note 40.

⁷⁶ The following words, 3.68 *et magna supremum voce ciemus*, further complicate the situation by presenting a scarcely consistent conception: as Conington says, "'condimus' and 'ciemus' rather jar with each other, 'ciere' being specially used of calling up a shade to upper air"; for this he compares 4.490 *nocturnos ciet manis*. (Here instead of *ciet* the variant reading *movet* also exists. However, there does not seem to be any significant difference between *ciet* and *movet*; note 7.325 *infernis ciet tenebris* and 10.39–40 *manis movet*—both already quoted in note 66—with apparently identical meanings, the two passages alike referring to Juno's summoning of Allecto from Hades.)

⁷⁷ On the difference in religious views of the two peoples, Conington might well have compared *E* 8.98 *saepe animas imis excire sepulcris*, an expression of native Italian superstition without parallel in the Greek prototype (*Theocritus* 2). It is noteworthy that in the similar description of witchcraft in the *Aeneid*, 4.490 *nocturnosque ciet manis* (on which see note 76), there is no indication as to the whereabouts of

propriety of making a Roman out of Aeneas (or a Greek either for that matter) is doubtless no more serious than other similar discrepancies to be found in the *Aeneid*. However, I cannot help feeling that Vergil wrote *animam sepulcro condimus* not because he was being a Roman rather than a Greek for the moment, but simply because he could not write of the long-dead Polydorus *corpus sepulcro condimus*,⁷⁸ and so he does the nearest and next-best thing—somewhat as we are told that Cassandra raised her eyes to heaven, for she could not raise her fettered hands,⁷⁹ or that Orpheus' mere tongue went on calling Eurydice, even as his soul departed.⁸⁰ In other words *animam sepulcro condimus* is perhaps a special variant, to suit a special case, of the regular expression, such as we meet in 5.47–48 *reliquias divinique ossa parentis condidimus terra*, 11.204–5 *corpora multa virum terrae infodiunt*, 11.22–23 *corpora terrae mandemus*, 10.904 *corpus humo patiari tegi*, 6.161 *corpus humandum*, 11.593–94 *corpus feram tumulo*, 11.102–3 *corpora redderet ac tumulo sineret succedere terrae*, 2.542–43 *corpus exsanguie sepulcro reddidit*. An inexactitude of a different type is the consigning to the tomb not of just the *anima* but of the whole *ego*; examples of this sort have already been noted, namely, 9.213–14 *sit qui me mandet humo* (§ 9), and 6.149–52 *iacet exanimus tibi corpus amici totamque incestat funere classem; sedibus hunc refer suis et conde sepulcro* (note 18).

18. In the preceding paragraph, 11.22–23 was cited as an expression of normalcy; but right after it there occurs another anomaly, 11.24–26 *animas, quae sanguine nobis hanc patriam peperere suo, decorate supremis muneribus*. Here the funeral decorations are ordered to be bestowed upon *animae*; yet as a matter of fact it is not *animae* that can be so adorned, but *corpora*, whose *animae* are already departed (cf. 10.908 *animam diffundit*). To be sure, it might be urged that the tribute bestowed upon the *manes*, while in the same book, 4.242 *animas ille evocat Orco*, it is very definitely from the netherworld that Mercury summons the souls of the dead. Horace's witches, like the one in the *Aeneid* and unlike the wizard in the *Eclogue*, are of indeterminate nationality in this respect; they summon up the dead (*Serm.* 1.8.28–29, *Epode* 17.79), but we are not told whence.

⁷⁸ Of course no actual inhumation of the body was possible here. Polydorus had been buried long since (cf. 3.41 *sepulto*), though without the rites now duly solemnized by the Trojans (3.62 *instauramus Polydoro funus*).

⁷⁹ 2.405–6 *ad caelum tendens ardentia lumina frustra, lumina, nam teneras arcebant vincula palmas*.

⁸⁰ *G* 4.525–26 *Eurydicen vox ipsa et frigida lingua anima fugiente vocabat*.

body is enjoyed and felt as an honor by the departed spirit; but the form of expression is inaccurate just the same.⁸¹ Similarly, in 6.884–85 *purpureos spargam flores animamque nepotis his saltem accumulem donis*, a floral offering, probably at the grave, is said to be made to the *anima*.⁸²

19. Again in 10.827–28 Lausus' dead body (confused with Lausus himself⁸³) is to be placed not with his fathers' ashes alone but with their ashes and their *manes*; and in 4.427⁸⁴ Dido declares that she has abstained from disturbing not Anchises' ashes alone, but his ashes and his *manes*.⁸⁵ This surely seems like a mixture of the concrete and the abstract, the material and the spiritual. To be sure, Nettleship, according to his note on 4.34, appears to believe that *manes* here "seems to stand for the material part of what survives after death," and cites several examples of the same usage from other writers; yet the word *manes* certainly seems to

⁸¹ An additional element of confusion is introduced by the descriptive clause *quae sanguine nobis hanc patriam peperere suo* (11.24–25), which is applicable neither to the *corpora* nor to the *animae*, but to the living persons who once united the two, and who truly accomplished great deeds at the cost of their blood. There is a similar not quite logical association of blood and soul in 2.116–18 *sanguine placastis ventos et virgine caesa*; *sanguine quaerendi reditus animaque litandum*, where we are told that the Greeks earlier appeased the gods by means of blood and a *maiden* slain, but that now they must make atonement by means of blood and a *soul*. Perhaps we might explain the second clause as embodying a combination of the material and the immaterial that jointly constitute the complete man, *sanguis* being used here as *corpus* is elsewhere; so too 12.765 *Turni de vita et sanguine certant*. The *anima*, or *vita*, has no blood, though it may be associated with blood at the moment of death, as in the passage quoted in note 16; the *vita* that is destroyed by lack of blood, in 7.534 (quoted in note 42), is quite different, being the breath. For the bloodlessness of the *anima*, which is evidently the cause of its insubstantiality (on which see note 40), cf., in addition to *Odyssey* 11 *passim*, Vergil's reference to *exsanguis umbras* (6.401) and Horace's query, *num vanae redeat sanguis imagini?* (Carm. 1.24.15). In the same way as the members of a particular group of *animae* in Hades are identified with living beings who saved their fatherland at the cost of their blood, so too are the members of another group of *animae* identified with living beings who, by committing suicide, cast out those very same *animae*, in 6.434–36 *tenent maesti loca, qui sibi letum insontes peperere manu lucemque perosi proicere animas*. Cf. too the general confusion in *G* 4.475–77 = 6.306–8, discussed above in § 10.

⁸² Of course *animam* is used here not of Marcellus' present state as Anchises now sees him (cf. 6.680 *inclusas animas*), but of his future state when, having lived and died, he shall once more have joined the shades. How Anchises, who is never going to leave the Elysian Fields (cf. 6.744 *pauci laeta arva tenemus*), is going to be able to make this offering, we should not spoil a moving and beautiful scene by inquiring.

⁸³ Cf. above, § 9, and note 51.

⁸⁴ Quoted in § 13.

⁸⁵ On the association of these see § 13.

have an immaterial force,⁸⁶ being used for instance only a few lines ahead of the first cited of these “ashes and *manes*” passages in this sense in contradistinction to the *corpus* (10.819–20 *tum vita per auras concessit maesta ad manis corpusque reliquit*⁸⁷). Moreover, it is possible in interpreting the passage on which Nettleship has written this note—4.34⁸⁸—to say, not that the *manes* are here material like the *cinis*, but that the *cinis* is here immaterial like the *manes*—that is, the line may very well mean not “Do the empty ashes in the tomb care about such things?”, but “Does the *anima*—in the underworld⁸⁹—mind such things?”⁹⁰ Certainly a decided personality is here attributed to the *cinis* as well as to the *manes*⁹¹ (if only the personality of indifference to worldly happenings); cf. also 4.28–29 above, *ille meos amores abstulit; ille habeat secum servetque sepulcro*. The same statement applies to the *cinis* mentioned alone in 4.623–24 (*cinerique haec mittite nostro munera*) without the *manes* at all: the gift here to be bestowed upon the ashes is not like the empty decorations of 11.24–26,⁹² or flowers of 6.884,⁹³ but a distinct tribute of emotion which Dido implies her ashes will know about and rejoice in, just as elsewhere (4.387⁹⁴) a message is to reach her among the *manes*. Again in 6.379 the Sibyl says “*ossa piabunt*,” where it is not really Palinurus’ bones, but his *anima*—or his *manes* according to Conington—that must be appeased.

20. Perhaps the oddest confusion of the mortal and immortal, the material and spiritual, is found in 6.510 *omnia Deiphobo solvisti*

⁸⁶ See the discussion of the term in § 13.

⁸⁷ Cf. sup., §§ 7 and 13.

⁸⁸ Quoted in § 13.

⁸⁹ This is not wholly incompatible with the use of the term *sepultos*, of which Conington says that it is “a significant epithet: ‘they are underground: how should they care for what goes on above?’”

⁹⁰ I am inclined to think that Vergil is representing Dido’s unwise counsellor Anna as the prototype of the Epicurean, just as he surely represents his noble hero as the prototype of the Stoic; see my article “*Pietas* versus *Violentia* in the *Aeneid*”, *CW* 25 (1931) 9–13 and 17–21, especially 10 and 19. If we are to be completely consistent about this, we should assume that to Anna the ashes are wholly material and the *manes* non-existent. But she does mention the *manes*; and we need not seek to be more consistent than Vergil himself.

⁹¹ Than *manis sepultos* resembles *animam sepulcro condimus* in 3.67–68, discussed above, § 17.

⁹² Quoted in § 18.

⁹³ Quoted in § 18.

⁹⁴ Quoted in §§ 12 and 13.

et funeris umbris, where the shade is actually said to belong to the body—and the dead body at that!⁹⁵ The explanation is probably that *funeris* stands for *eius*—i.e. *Deiphobi*—by a confusion exactly the converse of that occurring just above in 6.507, where *te* as used by Aeneas stands for *tuum corpus* or *funus*.⁹⁶ Of course the logical (but intolerably clumsy) form would be *Deiphobo et (Deiphobi) funeri et (Deiphobi) umbris*⁹⁷ (i.e. to Deiphobus, both body and soul⁹⁸); and then the present confused form was reached because both *funus* and *umbrae* were conceived of as in a certain sense equivalent to *Deiphobus*. In other words, once more, though in a particularly peculiar form, we find the formula that we started out with, that both *corpus* (here *funus*) and *anima* (here *umbrae*) are conceived of as being in a certain sense equivalent to *ego*.⁹⁹

⁹⁵ There can be no doubt that *funeris* means “dead body” here; cf. 9.490–91 quae nunc artus avulsaque membra et funus lacerum tellus habet?

⁹⁶ Quoted and discussed in § 9.

⁹⁷ Cf. 5.80–81, quoted above, § 9.

⁹⁸ Funeral honors are conceived of as being bestowed upon the body in 5.47–48 and 11.22–23, both quoted in § 17; upon the ashes in 6.213 cineri ingrato suprema ferebant; upon the soul in 3.67–68, quoted in § 17, and in 6.884–85 and 11.24–26, both quoted in § 18; and upon the entire man in 6.152, quoted in § 17.

⁹⁹ Possibly not dissimilar to this body-soul confusion is the confusion which has given rise to the highly anomalous passage *E* 3.102 hi certe—neque amor causa est—vix ossibus haerent. The sheep may be thought of as represented—by a very common metonymy—either by their exterior structure (skin) or by their interior structure (bones); and so here, instead of saying that their skin scarcely clings to their bones, Menalcas tells us that they themselves (the sheep) scarcely do so. (Some editors do away with this difficulty by adopting the lection *his* for *hi*; but this necessitates explaining *neque* as equivalent to *non* or to *ne* . . . *quidem*, which on the whole appears to me to involve even more serious difficulties than the reading *hi*.)

INDEX LOCORUM

All italicized figures refer to paragraphs; all others refer to footnotes.

If an example is discussed in a given portion of the text and also in a note corresponding specifically to that portion of the text, as a rule only the paragraph in the text is listed, not the note.

Passages cited	<i>Paragraph</i> or footnote	Passages cited	<i>Paragraph</i> or footnote	Passages cited	<i>Paragraph</i> or footnote
Catullus		Vergil		<i>Georgics</i> 4 (cont'd)	
5.5-6	47	<i>Eclogues</i>		475	16
13.14	34	3.102	99	475-76	5 bis
101.3, 4, 5,		4.53	41	475-77	10 81
10	47	5.22	45	489	13
		7.31-32	11	501	14 64
		7.35-36	11	505	13
Homer		8.98	77	525-26	80
<i>Odyssey</i>		<i>Georgics</i> 1		526	7
11.204-8	40	242-43	66	538-40	26
		477	60	543	26 bis
				550	26
Horace					
<i>Carmina</i>		<i>Georgics</i> 2		<i>Aeneid</i> 1	
1.1.21-22	19 25	136-38	6	71	26
	27	531	22	97-98	36
1.3.8	34 41			101	46
1.24.15	81	<i>Georgics</i> 3		192-93	26
2.17.5	34	10	41	286-88	4
3.5.42	26	51	26	353-54	60
		69	26	407-8	60
<i>Epodes</i>		250-51	26	484	45
17.79	77	368-70	5 ter	486	18 26
		369	26 31		45
<i>Sermones</i>		471-72	21	486-87	46
1.5.40-42	34	495	42	547	70
1.8.28-29	77	542	44		
1.9.47	35	546-47	44	<i>Aeneid</i> 2	
2.2.80-81	19 27			18	26 bis
		<i>Georgics</i> 4		92	41
Lucretius		187	5 bis	116-18	81
2.31	23 27	204	42	145	42
3.870-93	47	219-24	41	167-68	11
3.881-83	47	221-24	41	213-15	26
5.63	44 56	255	45	270-71	12
		469-70	13	270-79	40
		471-72	13	285-86	40
Plato		472	10 14	335	8
<i>Phaedo</i>					
115C-D	47		16 60		

Passages cited	Paragraph or footnote	Passages cited	Paragraph or footnote	Passages cited	Paragraph or footnote
<i>Aeneid</i> 2 (cont'd)		<i>Aeneid</i> 4 (cont'd)		<i>Aeneid</i> 5 (cont'd)	
364-65	7	34	13 19 bis	636-37	60
405-6	79	242	77	724-25	41
532	42	246-51	9	733	52
542-43	17	253-54	20	733-35	70
562	42	340	41		
565-66	5 ter	351-53	60	<i>Aeneid</i> 6	
	6	385	7 53	21-22	26 bis
637	41	386	12 ter	119	13
641	41	387	12 bis	149	45
644	45		13 19	149-52	17 18
772	60 ter		66 70	152	50 98
772-73	14	391-92	19 28	161	17
773	60		32	168	42
788	52	427	13 19	213	98
792-94	40	490	76 77	219	45
793	60 bis	510	70	264	14 70
		522-23	22	264-65	70
<i>Aeneid</i> 3		550	41	265	70
41	78	571	14 64	292	14 41
62	78	572	5 bis		72
63	13	600	45	294	14 16
66-67	14	623-24	19		41 72
67	58	635	45	303	16
67-68	17 91	652	36 42	306	16
	98	660	70 bis	306-7	5 bis
68	76	695	7 53		6
140-41	44	703	9	306-8	10 81
176	5 bis	705	7	319	16
275	10			325-26	55
303-4	13	<i>Aeneid</i> 5		348	52
304	63	47-48	17 98	352	52
315	41	75-76	63	355-56	52
511	5 bis	77-79	14	362	9 52
565	66	80-81	9 97	365	52
578	45	81	13 48	365-66	9
623-25	5 bis		64 65	370	52
	6	96-98	14	379	19
646	41	98-99	13	390	14 61
654	36 42	99	63	391	16
		230	41	401	40 61
<i>Aeneid</i> 4		318-19	5 bis		81
24-26	70		6	404	70 bis
28-29	19	372	26 bis	411-12	16 bis
29	12 bis	517	44	411-14	40

Passages cited	<i>Paragraph</i> or footnote	Passages cited	<i>Paragraph</i> or footnote	Passages cited	<i>Paragraph</i> or footnote
<i>Aeneid</i> 6 (cont'd)		<i>Aeneid</i> 6 (cont'd)		<i>Aeneid</i> 9 (cont'd)	
413-14	16	884	19	579-80	42
428	41	884-85	18 98	663	6 bis
433	41	894	12	687	42
434-36	81			704	42
461-62	70 bis	<i>Aeneid</i> 7		722	5 bis
473-74	12 59	89	60		
480	60	108	5 bis	<i>Aeneid</i> 10	
486	60	325	66 76	8	5
490	70 bis	533-34	42	33-34	68
492-93	40	534	81	39-40	66 76
494	40	535	5 bis	348	42
494-501	40		7 46	430	5 bis
494-534	63	649-50	5 bis		6
505	63		6 18	468	41
506	13	770-71	70	519	14 64
507	20	783	26	524	13
507-8	9			525	6 bis
510	20 64	<i>Aeneid</i> 8		528-29	38
577-79	70 bis	31-67	9	534	13
582-83	5 bis	207	26	598	6 bis
608	41	243-46	66	629	41
618-19	70 bis	330	26	636	14
635-36	22	485	73	643	14 60
661	41	564-66	42	656	14 60
663	41	566-67	42	663	14 60
680	82	567	42	819-20	7 13
695-96	12	577	41		19 44
700-2	16 40	607	5 bis	820	41
701	12 14			827-28	9 13
	60	<i>Aeneid</i> 9			19
713-14	71	161-62	26	834	22
719-21	71	206	41	854	42
724-28	41	212	41	904	17
724-29	41	213-14	9 17	908	18 16
730-42	11	272-73	5 bis		42 44
731-32	57		26 ter		
735	7 44		32	<i>Aeneid</i> 11	
737	57	273	31	22-23	17 18
738	57 bis	317	5 bis		98
743	13	349	16 42	24-25	81
744	82	443	42	24-26	18 19
751	71	454-55	7 44		98
817-18	6 bis	490-91	95	30	45
860-66	40	563	26	59	45

Passages cited	<i>Paragraph</i> or footnote	Passages cited	<i>Paragraph</i> or footnote	Passages cited	<i>Paragraph</i> or footnote
<i>Aeneid</i> 11 (cont'd)		<i>Aeneid</i> 11 (cont'd)		<i>Aeneid</i> 12 (cont'd)	
81-82	14 64	634	44	270-71	26 <i>bis</i>
102-3	17	634-35	7	287-88	5 <i>bis</i>
118	42	640-41	26		6
162	42	688-89	13	328	7 46 <i>bis</i>
180	41	690-91	5 <i>bis</i>	646-49	13
180-81	66		26 34	648-49	9
185	45	829	9	765	81
197-99	5 <i>bis</i>	831	7 13	879	42
204-5	17		41	880-81	70
372-73	6 <i>bis</i>	848	45	883-84	66
408-9	42	883	42	899-900	5 <i>bis</i>
440-42	36			900	34
591	45	<i>Aeneid</i> 12		935-36	9 44
593-94	17	97	7	952	7 13
596	5	229-30	6 <i>bis</i>		41
617	42		38		