XX. Vergil's Linguistic Treatment of Divine Beings: Part II

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

For some time I have been studying the ways in which departures from strict logic may enhance the poetic effect and imaginative appeal in a writer whose style is characterized by such variety, subtlety, and richness of overtones as that of Vergil.[1] In a paper presented before the American Philological Association in 1957 and published in the *Transactions* for that year,[2] I discussed the confusion[3] in Vergil of the god and his particular province or function.[4] I now propose to discuss the not dissimilar confusion

[1] In citations from Vergil, passages from the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* are designated by *E* and *G* respectively; passages not specially designated are from the *Aeneid*. Quotations are not always in complete form; when they are not, there is usually no indication of omitted words. The editions of Vergil cited are as follows: complete works, Cerda = Ioannes Ludovicus de la Cerda Toletanus (3 vols., Cologne 1608–28), Conington = John Conington (3 vols., revised by Henry Nettleship, 4th edition of vols. 1 and 2, 3rd edition of vol. 3, London 1881–4; in vol. 3 the notes on Books 10 and 12 are mainly by Nettleship), Heyne = Chr. Gottl. Heyne (4 vols., 3rd edition, London 1793), Hirtzel = Fredericus Arturus Hirtzel (Oxford, preface dated 1900), Ianell = Gualtherus Ianell (Leipzig 1930), Nettleship = Henry Nettleship (see Conington), Ribbeck = Otto Ribbeck (Leipzig 1898); *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, Page = T. E. Page (London 1937), Papillon and Haigh = T. L. Papillon and A. E. Haigh (Oxford 1891); *Aeneid*, Mackail = J. W. Mackail (Oxford 1930); *Aeneid* 1–6 and selections from 7–12, Knapp = Charles Knapp (revised edition, Chicago 1928); *Aeneid* 1–6, Fairclough and Brown = H. R. Fairclough and Seldon L. Brown (Boston 1908), Page = T. E. Page (London 1894); *Aeneid* 1, Conway = Robert Seymour Conway (Cambridge 1935); *Aeneid* 4, Austin = R. G. Austin (Oxford 1955), Pease = Arthur Stanley Pease (Cambridge 1935).

[2] *TAPA* 88 (1957) 56–67. The present paper is a sequel to that one.

[3] I wish to repeat here what I said in my earlier paper, *TAPA* 88 (1957) 66, note 40, that the implications of the term *confusion* as I use it with respect to Vergil's style are not derogatory; on the contrary, they are laudatory.

[4] The confusion arises at least in part from the fact that, e.g., both the god and the river are called *Thybris*, or both the god and the wine—at least in poetry—are called *Bacchus*; and so words appropriate to only the one are used of the other, on the fallacious assumption that if $a = b$ and $b = c$, then $a = c$. A similar confusion, between the names of peoples and those of countries, I dealt with in an article entitled "A Linguistic Fallacy," published in *Studies Presented to Joshua Whatmough on His Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by Ernst Pulgram (The Hague 1957), 53–64. A different type of fallacy, the assumption that $a:b = b:a$, I treated in "A Source of Vergilian Hypallage," published in *TAPA* 87 (1956) 147–89.

of the god and the special dwelling or symbol or representation that man has provided in his name. In both cases, the identification is at least partially, though perhaps not wholly, a matter of language; to this I shall revert later.[5]

Just as there is confusion of the god and the particular domain in which he dwells or over which he presides, such as the air or the sea or the river,[6] so, too, there may be confusion of the god and the special home on earth which men have provided for him, to wit, the temple.[7] Thus in 3.275, nautis aperitur Apollo, *Apollo* means the temple of Apollo, or, as Knapp still further elaborates, "the height whereon Apollo's temple stands." Very similar is 3.552, attollit se diva Lacinia contra.[8] In 8.720, niveo candentis limine Phoebi, the word *candentis*, as Conington says, while it doubtless refers to "the dazzling brightness of the young sun-god," is also applicable to the gleaming marble temple itself with its snow-white threshold.[9]

[5] See below, pages 247, 253.

[6] Cf. the comment of W. Warde Fowler, *Aeneas at the Site of Rome* (Oxford 1918) 40, that the Tiber's *domus* (8.65) is "the water-system which is at the same time the god and the god's habitation, as the sky was at the same time Jupiter and Jupiter's dwelling."

[7] That the temple of a god was thought of as his dwelling is indicated by the employment, noted by Nettleship on 12.199, of *domus* in the sense of 'temple.' Nettleship gives no examples; but we may note 6.53, attonitae magna ora domus, and 6.81, ostia domus (cf. 6.41, alta in templa, of the same structure). The converse of this is seen in 12.199, duri sacraria Ditis (the passage on which Nettleship makes the comment just quoted), where *sacraria Ditis* probably means not the *shrine* but the *abode* of Dis (cf. 5.731–2, Ditis infernas domos, and 6.269, domos Ditis vacuas). Also, the hall on Olympus in which the gods meet (10.1, domus omnipotentis Olympi) seems to be modeled on the largest type of temple, the *hypaethros*, which has doors at both ends (note 10.5, considunt tectis bipatentibus); according to Nettleship, "it is quite natural that Virg. should conceive the palace of his gods according to the model of a great temple," since "the idea of a temple was originally that of a house for the deity."

[8] With these examples we may compare the confusion of a man and his house manifest in 2.311–2, proximus ardet Ucalegon. Not unlike this is the confusion of a man and his ship which we are perhaps to recognize in 1.181–3, prospectum late pelago petit, Anthea si quem videat Phrygiasque biremis aut Capyn aut celsis in puppibus arma Caici, in which *Anthea* and *Capyn* probably stand for their respective vessels; Aeneas on the shore can surely not expect to see his individual friends, but is merely straining his eyes to catch a glimpse of their ships, which he can identify by their arms. See the discussion of this passage in my *Coordination of Non-Coordinate Elements in Vergil* (Geneva, New York, 1930) 191–2.

[9] We may note that in the description of the apotheosis of Daphnis as he wonderingly beholds the threshold of Olympus, the epithet *candidus* is applied to him (*E* 5.56–7, candidus insuetum miratur limen Olympi Daphnis). Cf. too the reference to Apollo's *candentis umeros* in Horace, *Carm.* 1.2.31.

There may likewise be confusion of the god and his special symbol the altar in 7.211, numerum divorum altaribus auget (or addit),[10] whatever may be the correct reading and interpretation of this vexed passage; for Vergil certainly appears to say either that heaven increases '*the number of the gods* by (*Dardanus*') *altars*'[11] or (less probably) that it adds '(*Dardanus*') *number* to *the altars of the gods*.'

By far the commonest confusion is that of the god and his representation the statue. This is thoroughly natural. If, as we have seen, the temple was conceived of as the dwelling-place of the god, then it was in the form of his statue that the god dwelt therein.

If Conway is right in his statement (on 1.15–6) that *colo* when used of a god implies both "regular presence and affectionate regard,"[12] then we may cite as examples of a god dwelling in a given locality (presumably in the shape of a statue) *E* 2.61–2, Pallas arces colat; 1.13–6, Karthago, quam Iuno fertur coluisse; and possibly *E* 3.61 (of Jupiter), ille colit terras. In regard to *coluisse* in the second, Conington specifically declares that Juno did this "as dweller in the temple." Here of the two ideas the one of cherishing seems to me much the stronger, in the light of the context; note the entire passage: quam Iuno fertur terris magis omnibus unam posthabita coluisse Samo. However, if the notion of dwelling is present also, doubtless then we may think of a statue of Juno, probably armed, in view of 16–7, hic illius arma, hic currus fuit (we may note Cerda's comment that, according to Festus and Plutarch, Juno was sometimes represented with a spear). Again in 1.446–7, templum Iunoni Dido condebat, donis opulentum et numine divae, Conington believes that the presence of a statue is probably implied by *numine*.

If a temple containing the statue of a goddess might be said to be 'rich in divinity,' the converse was also true; when a god wished to desert a temple, he might take away his statue. The

[10] The MS. testimony certainly seems to favor *auget*, and most of the editors (e.g. Ribbeck, Hirtzel, Ianell) accept it. Conington adopts the reading *addit*, which is severely criticized by Page and Mackail.

[11] Page's interpretation, that the passage means literally 'increases their number to the altars of the gods,' i.e. 'increases the number of the altars of the gods,' does not sound Vergilian to me.

[12] He makes a similar statement concerning *numen*; on this see below, note 16.

Scholiast on Aeschylus, *Sept.* 310 tells us that, on the night of the fall of Troy, the gods departed in a body, carrying their images with them; Conington thinks Vergil is referring to this tradition in 2.326–7, ferus omnia Iuppiter Argos transtulit, and 2.351–2, excessere omnes adytis arisque relictis di.

Of course if the statue of a deity was forcibly removed from the temple by human hands, only evil could result. The story of the Palladium well illustrates this;[13] the good will of Pallas which has been so important a factor in the success of the Greeks (2.162–3) was lost as soon as *impius Tydides* and *scelerum inventor Ulixes* dared to profane and purloin her statue (163–70).[14] We may note in particular 167–8,

> corripuere sacram effigiem manibusque cruentis
> virgineas ausi divae contingere vittas;

they stole the statue (*effigiem*), but it was the fillets of the goddess (*divae*)[15] that they dared to touch with blood-stained hands.

In the temple, what is done before or among the statues of the gods is said actually to be done before or among the gods, as in 4.62,

> aut ante ora deum pinguis spatiatur ad aras,

and 4.204–5,

> dicitur ante aras media inter numina divum
> multa Iovem manibus supplex orasse supinis.

With the latter we may compare 12.201,

> tango aras, medios ignis et numina testor.

[13] At least this is the story as Sinon tells it. What he says happened may never have happened, but the point is that it could have! The tale is plausible, and the Trojans accept it without question.

[14] Much the same notion doubtless underlies the account of the failure of the Trojans' stratagem in disguising themselves with arms and armor snatched from the Greeks whom they have overcome. Note particularly 2.396, haud numine nostro, and 402, heu nihil invitis fas quemquam fidere divis! Servius thinks that the Greek arms carried with them the favor of the Greek gods; and this becomes particularly relevant to the present discussion if we are to believe the suggestion of some editors (e.g. Fairclough and Brown) that the Greek armor actually had figures of Greek gods engraved upon it.

[15] The statue of Pallas is also called *diva* in 1.482.

The divinities referred to are present in the form of their images, but of course it is much more impressive to speak of the gods themselves as actually in attendance at the solemn ceremonies enumerated in these three passages. On 4.204, Pease raises the question "whether the *numina divom* are images (*simulacra*) . . . or refer merely to the divine presence found in and near temples"; I should say to both; but of course in either case the word *numina* is rich in overtones which are wholly lacking in *simulacra*.[16]

In 7.603, prima movent in proelia Martem, there is a possibility, according to Conington, that the reference is not merely to prayer (as in 7.582, Martemque fatigant), but to an actual laying of hands on the statue of Mars.[17] At all events just below, in 7.610, nec custos absistit limine Ianus, we are surely to think of the statue of Janus as on guard. In 2.225–7,

> at gemini lapsu delubra ad summa dracones
> effugiunt saevaeque petunt Tritonidis arcem,
> sub pedibusque deae clipeique sub orbe teguntur,

the snakes are said to seek a hiding-place under the feet of the goddess; this of course refers to the feet of her statue, and may, as Heyne says, have been suggested by the representations of serpents coiled up at the feet of statues of Pallas.

[16] The exact force of *numen* in any given passage is not easy to establish, especially since it, even more than *colo* (on which see note 12), sometimes seems to be used by Vergil in a blending of different senses. Cf. Austin and Pease on 4.204, Conway on 1.8. Conway even suggests that Vergil's "characteristically subtle" use of certain words such as *numen* in "more than one meaning" may be due to the fact that "they spring from more than one source." Scholars (e.g. Walde-Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, and Ernout-Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*) regularly view *numen* as a derivative of *nuo* and a cognate of Greek *neuma* 'nod'; but Conway proposes that in addition to this *numen*, which he defines as 'nod, decision, declaration of will,' there may have been another *numen* cognate with Greek *pneuma*, which he defines as 'spirit, supernatural being,' this second *numen* meaning 'divine authority, deity with authority.' I have not seen this suggestion anywhere else, but it seems to me not impossible. Initial *pn* is so rare in Greek (being confined to the doubtless onomatopoetic group of words represented by *pneô* 'breathe' and *pnigô* 'choke') that we cannot cite the corresponding sound in Latin, but presumably it would have been *n-*; medially, a labial stop before a nasal becomes a nasal in Latin (e.g. in *somnus*: Greek *hypnos*), but initially it would probably have disappeared, as did a labial stop before a sibilant (e.g. in *sabulum* 'sand, gravel': Greek *psamathos* 'sand' and *psêphos* 'pebble') and a guttural stop before a nasal (e.g. in *nosco* and *natus*).

[17] Servius on 8.3 notes that the Roman general in charge of a war entered the temple of Mars and shook first the ancilia and then the spear of the god's statue, saying, "Mars, vigila."

The deity is actually described in terms of the statue, marble or gold,[18] in the parallel passages *E* 7.31–2,

> si proprium hoc fuerit, levi de marmore tota
> puniceo stabis[19] suras evincta coturno,

and 35–6,

> nunc te marmoreum pro tempore fecimus; at tu,
> si fetura gregem suppleverit, aureus esto,

addressed to Delia (i.e. Diana) and to Priapus respectively.[20]

The safekeeping of the Penates was a matter of tremendous importance; and these rather mysterious powers—whatever they were—certainly partook of the nature both of divinities and of images from their very earliest introduction in the Aeneid,[21] 2.293, sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia Penates. The images speak to Aeneas (3.154–71) like gods, with whom, indeed, they are coupled in 3.12 and 8.679 (Penatibus et magnis dis),[22]

[18] In the same way, raging Mars is described in terms of his representation, embossed in iron, on Aeneas' shield: 8.700–1, saevit medio in certamine Mavors caelatus ferro.

[19] The word *sto* is frequently used in connection with statues, as is especially appropriate in view of the etymological relationship of *sto* and *statua*; and also in connection with other representations. Cf. *G* 3.34, 8.653, and, of a trophy, 11.173, referred to in notes 34, 37, and 40, respectively.

[20] It is the naïveté of passages such as these (a naïveté which, of course, is to be attributed to the simple shepherd and goatherd here speaking, and not to the poet) that Horace burlesques in the opening of *Serm.* 1.8 (1–3):

> olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum,
> cum faber, incertus scamnum faceretne Priapum,
> maluit esse deum.

[21] Earliest chronologically, I mean; they have already been mentioned several times in Book 1.

[22] Conington (on 2.293) questions "whether the association implies distinction or dentification." Page (on 3.12) suggests that the ambiguous phrase "derives a certain awe from its obscurity." I myself feel, though I confess I cannot give completely cogent reasons for the feeling, that the *magni di* are distinct from the Penates. Note that the lines in full in which we meet their collocation run respectively: cum sociis natoque, Penatibus et magnis dis (3.12), and cum patribus populoque, Penatibus et magnis dis (8.679); in each case the first part of the verse consists of two separate members, and it is natural to assume that the second part does also. Then too it seems clear that Aeneas took with him other objects beside the images of the Penates. Hector said to him in his vision, 2.293, sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia Penates; *sacra* might be thought here to refer to holy ceremonies, but that they were concrete objects to be conveyed with one is made clear by 2.319–21, Panthus sacra manu victosque deos parvumque nepotem ipse trahit, and by 2.717, tu, genitor, cape sacra manu patriosque Penatis. Are the *sacra* the same as the *magni di*? Then too

and they share his defeat like sentient beings (1.68 and 8.11); but they are still spoken of as carried like images, even when they are presented as standing beside Aeneas' couch and addressing him, in 3.148–53:

> effigies sacrae divum Phrygiique Penates,
> quos mecum ab Troia mediisque ex ignibus urbis
> extuleram, visi ante oculos astare iacentis . . .;
> tum sic adfari et curas his demere dictis,

or when they are referred to as suffering defeat,[23] as in 1.68, Ilium portans victosque Penatis, and 8.11–2, victosque Penatis inferre. With Aeneas carrying his defeated Penates, we may compare Panthus taking with him his defeated gods in 2.320–1, victosque deos trahit, and Latinus carrying his rejected deities in 12.286, pulsatos referens divos.

12.286 is grouped with 2.178, numen reducant, by both Conington (on 2.178) and Nettleship (on 12.286). Conington takes both passages figuratively: he believes the gods stand for the auspices. Nettleship takes 12.286, and therefore presumably 2.178, more literally, or at least more concretely: he believes the gods stand for the images. I think that Nettleship is right in regard to 12.286, and I am inclined to believe so also in regard to 2.178. The whole passage, 176–82, runs as follows:

> extemplo temptanda fuga canit aequora Calchas,
> nec posse Argolicis exscindi Pergama telis
> omina ni repetant Argis numenque reducant
> quod pelago et curvis secum avexere carinis.
> et nunc quod patrias vento petiere Mycenas,
> arma deosque parant comites pelagoque remenso
> improvisi aderunt. ita digerit omina Calchas.

A number of editors (e.g. Fairclough and Brown, and Page)

apparently a filleted image of Vesta accompanied Aeneas also; at any rate Hector in the vision scene exhibited it, together with at least a spark of the eternal fire (2.296–7, manibus vittas Vestamque aeternumque adytis effert penetralibus ignem), and presumably Aeneas left it at home during the battle-scenes and then took it with him when he and his family ultimately departed. Was this image one of the *sacra* that Anchises was to carry, since Aeneas, defiled by bloodshed, must not touch them (2.717–20)? And if so, was she also one of the *magni di*? She is hardly one of the Penates; she is coupled with the Lar and (as in 2.296–7) with fire in 5.743–5, cinerem et sopitos suscitat ignis, Pergameumque Larem et canae penetralia Vestae veneratur; with the Penates and the Lar in 9.258–9, per magnos Penatis Assaracique Larem et canae penetralia Vestae.

[23] They are so called by taunting enemies, Juno and the Italians respectively.

believe that *numen* in 178[24] refers to the Palladium. Conington takes *numen* as "an indication of the divine will,"[25] and *arma deosque* in 181 as "fresh forces and fresh auspices";[26] he says the reference cannot be to the Palladium, "which it is evident from the context they had not carried to Greece." I see nothing in the context to make this evident. Certainly the Greeks had the Palladium; they are supposed to be giving the Wooden Horse as a substitute for it (183, pro Palladio). Why not assume that if they have sailed for Greece they have taken it with them? But what Conington apparently forgets for the moment is that actually nothing has been carried to Greece, because nobody has gone to Greece; these are Sinon's words, which perhaps he purposely makes ominously vague, his whole speech being a marvelous tissue of lies mingled with half-truths which are actually more dangerous than lies.[27] However, even if Sinon is just now taking the trouble, in the interest of plausibility, to speak logically and consistently, we cannot hope to understand him completely without being certain of the precise point of *avexere* in 179. Conington takes it of the original journey from Greece to Troy, in which case it would, as he says, refer to the "indication of the divine will." But if this is right, the mood is troublesome, as Conington himself realizes, for the clause should be a part of the declaration attributed to Calchas; and I think it would be much better to view the clause as an interpolation of Sinon's own, referring to the (pretended) journey from Troy to Greece, in which case *numen* must mean the Palladium.

A different—and more striking—phase of the confusion of deity and statue is that which attributes to the latter actions appropriate rather to the former.[28] Such miracles are described in 1.482,

diva solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat,

[24] Cf. note 16.

[25] If the meaning really is abstract, I would prefer Knapp's interpretation, "the favor of heaven."

[26] Here it seems to me the meaning must be concrete. Cf. with *deos parant comites* in this passage Hector's injunction, 2.293–4, sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia Penatis; hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quaere, referring specifically, at least in part, to the images of the Penates.

[27] Like his swearing (155–6) by the altars and swords that he never needed to flee from, and by the fillets of the gods that he never wore. False oaths are safe enough when so worded.

[28] There are parallels even today in the stories we occasionally hear of sacred images that are said to nod, weep, bleed, or sweat.

and 2.171–5,

> nec dubiis ea signa dedit Tritonia monstris.
> vix positum castris simulacrum: arsere coruscae
> luminibus flammae arrectis, salsusque per artus
> sudor iit, terque ipsa solo (mirabile dictu)
> emicuit parmamque ferens hastamque trementem.

In the first passage the statue of Pallas is again called *diva*;[29] and it is represented in the temple-sculpture at Carthage not in the guise that it usually had in Troy, but in the attitude that it miraculously assumed when the Trojan matrons approached it with their futile prayers. In the second passage it is not quite clear whether the name *Tritonia* (171) is applied to the goddess or the statue; but at all events it is the *simulacrum* (172) that reacts, presumably at the instigation of the goddess, in a manner that would have been possible only for the *diva*. Because the statue looks like Pallas, and is called Pallas, it *is* Pallas; its eyes flash, its sweat flows, it leaps up and brandishes its shield and its spear as might Pallas herself.

It now remains to inquire, as I did in my earlier article,[30] how far all the instances of confusion that have been discussed here are merely external matters, details of style; and how far they go deeper and involve fundamental religious outlook. I asked before whether the Roman mixes 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.[31] I now ask whether he mixes the goddess and the statue because they are both called Pallas, or because he believes that the artistic representation of the divine being really participates in the characteristics and capabilities of the divine being.[32]

It must be admitted that the confusion of an individual and his artistic representation is not necessarily a matter of religion,

[29] As in 2.168. Cf. note 15.

[30] *TAPA* 88 (1957) 66–7.

[31] Cf. W. Warde Fowler (above, note 6) 39: "We must not separate too sharply the deity from the river; he *was* the river."

[32] Cf. Knapp's comment in his Introduction to the *Aeneid* (123–4): "The ancients found it extremely difficult, in fact impossible, to separate the statue of a deity from the deity himself. Where the statue of the god was, there was the god. Language is used, therefore, naturally enough, of the statue which, strictly speaking, is appropriate only to the god.... The loss or the destruction of the statue meant the loss of the favor of the deity that it represented."

because it involves human beings as well as divine ones. In regard to *G* 3.16,

> in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit,

it might be argued that here Caesar is deified and therefore on a plane with deities; but in the same passage a little later we find human beings similarly identified with their statues, *G* 3.34–6,[33]

> stabunt[34] et Parii lapides, spirantia signa,
> Assaraci proles demissaeque ab Iove gentis
> nomina, Trosque parens et Troiae Cynthius auctor.

The same kind of language as is met in *G* 3.16 is used elsewhere too of mortals, e.g. in the description of the engraved cups in *E* 3.40,[35]

> in medio duo signa, Conon et—quis fuit alter?

and 44–6,

> et nobis idem Alcimedon duo pocula fecit,
> et molli circum est ansas amplexus acantho,
> Orpheaque in medio posuit silvasque sequentis.

Examples of this sort abound in the shield passage at the end of Book 8, as e.g. 652–3,[36]

> in summo custos Tarpeiae Manlius arcis
> stabat[37] pro templo et Capitolia celsa tenebat.

There is even a suggestion of the metals used here[38] to produce color effects, 655–6,

> atque hic auratis volitans argenteus anser
> porticibus Gallos in limine adesse canebat;

[33] The structure here is rather complicated. The first pair of substantives in apposition to each other, *lapides* and *signa*, constitute an instance of "hendiadys," the meaning being 'stone statues'; and then we have another series of appositives, *proles*, *nomina*, *Tros parens*, and *Cynthius auctor*, with *nomina* introducing a confusion of a different type, that of a man and his name (a highly complex matter which I hope to treat in detail elsewhere).

[34] On the use of *stabunt* cf. note 19.

[35] Here again we find *signa* followed by an appositive denoting a person. Cf. note 33.

[36] At first sight this passage may seem similar to 7.610, nec custos absistit limine Ianus (discussed above, page 241); but really the two are quite different. In 8.652–3 the confusion is between the man Manlius acting as a guard, and the representation on the shield depicting him in this action; in 7.610 the confusion is between the god Janus acting as a guard, and his statue performing the same action. The engraving of Manlius is simply a work of art; the statue of Janus has properties magically transferred from the deity whom it depicts.

[37] On *stabat* cf. note 19.

[38] Cf. 8.700–1 saevit medio in certamine Mavors caelatus ferro, already treated above, note 18.

659–61,

> aurea caesaries ollis atque aurea vestis,
> virgatis lucent sagulis, tum lactea colla
> auro innectuntur;

and 671–7,

> haec inter tumidi late maris ibat imago
> aurea, sed fluctu spumabant caerula cano,
> et circum argento clari delphines in orbem
> aequora verrebant caudis aestumque secabant.
> in medio classis aeratas, Actia bella,
> cernere erat, totumque instructo Marte videres
> fervere Leucaten auroque effulgere fluctus.

In this last example we may note the more precise form of expression, *maris imago aurea* (671–2), made parallel with the less precise forms, e.g. *argento clari delphines* (673), a substitute for the cumbersome *argento clarorum delphinum imagines*.

In all the examples cited in the preceding paragraph, every instance of confusion is one of language alone and not of fundamental ideas. But in other passages involving representations of human beings, there really is present an element of religion or at least of superstition. This is particularly true of the use of the figure of Daphnis in *Eclogue* 8, which in accordance with the usual practice of sympathetic magic is definitely identified with Daphnis the man. The proper name refers to the man in the refrain (72, 76, etc.), ducite Daphnim, and in its final variant (109), venit Daphnis; also in 81, sic nostro Daphnis amore. This is true also of *Daphnis* in 83, Daphnis me malus urit, ego hanc in Daphnide laurum, but *in Daphnide* is ambiguous: the parallel from Theocritus (2.23–4 ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ Δέλφιδι δάφναν αἴθω) cited by the commentators (e.g. Conington, Page, Papillon and Haigh) is thought by them all to favor 'in the case of Daphnis' (the man), but 'on Daphnis' (the image) is not impossible, and it would be quite in the Vergilian manner to suggest both.[39] There can be no doubt that the image is meant by *tibi* (though directly below it is referred to in the third person as *effigiem*) in 73–5,

> terna tibi haec primum triplici diversa colore
> licia circumdo, terque haec altaria circum
> effigiem duco.

[39] Cf. above, notes 12 and 16.

A person may likewise be confused with a trophy representing him, as in 11.15–6:

> haec sunt spolia et de rege superbo
> primitiae manibusque meis Mezentius hic est,

and in 11.172–3,

> magna tropaea ferunt quos dat tua dextera leto;
> tu quoque nunc stares[40] immanis truncus in armis.

Or he may be identified with the lot that decides his fate, as in 5.490–9,

> convenere viri deiectamque aerea sortem
> accepit galea; et primus clamore secundo
> Hyrtacidae ante omnis exit locus Hippocoontis;
> quem modo navali Mnestheus certamine victor
> consequitur, viridi Mnestheus evinctus oliva.
> tertius Eurytion, tuus, o clarissime, frater,
> Pandare. . . .
> extremus galeaque ima subsedit Acestes,
> ausus et ipse manu iuvenum temptare laborem.

Here *sors Hippocoontis* is replaced by *locus Hippocoontis*; but *sors Mnesthei*, *Eurytionis*, and *Acestae* are replaced simply by the men's names, *Mnestheus*, *Eurytion*, and *Acestes*, and these are accompanied by expressions (the modifying participles *evinctus* and *ausus*, and the appositive noun *frater*) which apply to the men and not to the lots. With this passage we may compare 2.201, Laocoon, ductus Neptuno sorte sacerdos; we similarly talk in English of a man as "drawn by lot," but strictly speaking it is the lot that is "led" or "drawn" and not the man.[41] In all these passages too, there are religious implications: Aeneas' erection of the trophy representing Mezentius is the fulfilment of an obligation to the gods (11.4, vota deum victor solvebat), and the trophy itself is explicitly dedicated to Mars (7–8, tibi, magne, tropaeum, Bellipotens); while the casting of lots was thought of, as Knapp says on 1.508, as "an appeal to heaven itself."

[40] On *stares* cf. note 19.

[41] Still more anomalous is 1.507–8, operumque laborem partibus aequabat iustis aut sorte trahebat; here there is no mention of the men, but the task assigned to each man is said to be 'drawn by lot.'

We may finally note a particular type of representation in which the subject represented, regularly either a rather monstrous divinity or a somewhat superhuman monster, is confused with his or its image that serves as the figure-head of a ship. This is a special case because it frequently involves a second, and somewhat different, type of confusion, that of the ship itself with the figure-head. The second type, which it seems convenient to treat briefly at this point, doubtless arose because the ship bore the name of the creature shown by the figure-head or *parasêmon*[42]; or, to put it differently, because the *parasêmon* represented the creature whose name the ship bore.

[42] The editors of Vergil regularly take it for granted that the ships had a figure-head, which I would assume to be a carved image of some sort. See, e.g., Fairclough and Brown on 5.116, Knapp on 5.122–3, Nettleship on 10.166; and note especially figure 60 (p. 409) in Fairclough and Brown, "Figure-head of a Roman Ship" (provenience unfortunately not indicated). The figure-heads are given their Latin name *insignia* by Conington (on 5.116) and their Greek name *parasêma* by Nettleship (on 10.116). Strangely, this particular meaning is not recognized by the dictionaries; the only renderings at all applicable to ships are 'sign,' 'emblem,' 'ensign' for *parasêmon* in *LSJ*, and 'sign,' 'standard' for *insigne* in *Harpers*. The inaccuracy or inadequacy of these definitions is made clear if one reads the detailed and convincing study by Joannes Enschedé, "Disputatio de Tutelis et Insignibus Navium," published in Davidus Ruhnkenius, *Opuscula* (two volumes, second edition, Leyden 1823) 1.412–56. Enschedé (413) defines the *insigne* or *parasêmon* as a *simulacrum* or *imago*; he also (455) uses the phrase *insignium pictura* (similarly, Servius uses the words *pictus*, *depicta*, and *pictura* of the figure-heads in 10.209, 5.116, and 10.166 respectively; and Nettleship in his comment on 10.157, quoted near the end of the present note, describes the representation of Ida as a "figure" or "painting"), but, as I have already said, it seems to me that the *insigne* would probably have been carved rather than painted. Enschedé states repeatedly that the *parasêmon* was on the bow of the ship, and gave it its name (for references, see below, note 55); and in his long list of *parasêma* or of names derived therefrom he includes all the instances from Vergil's fifth and tenth books that I cite just below (Pristis, 436; Chimaera, 434; Centaurus, 434; Scylla, 431; Tigris, 436; Mincius, 431; Triton, 427). He also (454) classes as a *parasêmon* the *leones* mentioned in the rather difficult passage 10.156–7, Aeneia puppis prima tenet, rostro Phrygios subiuncta leones; here on the basis of the following words in 158, imminet Ida super, Nettleship thinks the figure-head consisted of "the whole group" including "the figure or the painting of Ida." Nettleship's view of a single composite figure-head seems to me a little more likely than Enschedé's of a figure-head consisting simply of the two lions (I assume there were just two of them, representing the Magna Mater's team); for if the *leones* alone constituted the entire figure-head, it would presumably have been a double one, a type apparently characteristic of Alexandrian rather than of Italian ships (see note 55), whereas Vergil doubtless had the latter in mind in describing Trojan vessels. Neither Enschedé nor Nettleship comments on the use in this passage of *puppis*, which of course must mean here not the stern but the whole ship.

The ships are clearly meant in 5.116–23,[43]

116 velocem Mnestheus agit acri remige Pristim,
118 ingentemque Gyas ingenti mole Chimaeram,
121 Sergestusque . . .
Centauro invehitur magna, Scyllaque Cloanthus caerulea.

It is true that, as Conington says, *caerulea* in 123 may refer specifically to the monster, Scylla, since the same adjective is applied to Scylla's dogs in 3.432 (*caeruleis canibus*); but none the less it probably applies to the whole ship in 5.123.[44]

The passages about ships in Book 10 are more complicated. They run as follows:

166 Massicus aerata princeps secat aequora Tigri;
195 ingentem remis Centaurum promovet; ille
instat aquae saxumque undis immane minatur
arduus, et longa sulcat maria alta carina;
205 quos patre Benaco velatus harundine glauca
Mincius infesta ducebat in aequora pinu;
209 hunc vehit immanis Triton et caerula concha
exterrens freta, cui laterum tenus hispida nanti
frons hominem praefert, in pristim desinit alvus,
spumea semifero sub pectore murmurat unda.

The first is ambiguous, since Massicus cutting the deep might be said to do so either with the ship as a whole, or with the figurehead that seems to precede it.[45] In the second *Centaurum* must refer to the ship, which is being rowed forward; *ille*[46] as the subject

[43] It is interesting to note that an adjective in combination with the name of the ship is feminine whether the normal gender of the noun denoting the creature is feminine (as in 122–3, Scylla caerulea) or masculine (as in 122, Centauro magna). I do not think it is correct to say, as Conington does, that the adjective agrees with *navi* "understood"; I would rather say that the name of the ship has lost its force as a common noun and thus can become feminine (presumably because *navis* is feminine—but that is not the same as saying that *navis* is understood with the name of the ship) without regard to normal gender, somewhat as in Horace, *Serm.* 2.6.20 (seu Iane libentius audis) and *Epis.* 1.7.37–8 (rexque paterque audisti) the nouns, though used as objects of the verbs, are quoted in the vocative without regard to normal case (I discussed this phenomenon in *CW* 22 [1929] 131–2).

[44] As Knapp notes on 122–3, Vergil, with his usual love of variety, selects one point to emphasize in regard to *each* ship: the *Pristis* is swift, the *Chimaera* bulky, the *Centaur* big, and the *Scylla* blue.

[45] In 5.218–9, sic Mnestheus, sic ipsa fuga secat ultima Pristis aequora, sic illam fert impetus ipse volantem, the words *illam fert impetus* suggest that *Pristis* means the ship.

[46] Note that the pronoun is masculine, unlike the adjective referring to *Centauro* in 5.122 (see note 43).

of *instat* and *minatur* must refer to the figure, which is evidently represented as in the act of hurling a stone, and yet the third verb, *sulcat*, clearly refers to the action of the ship.[47] In the third Mincius *leading* Ocnus' men to the sea (*ducebat*, 206) must be the figure-head.[48] Equally in the fourth Triton *carrying* Auletes (*vehit*, 209) must be the ship; yet the remainder of the passage refers to the figure-head, described as blowing on Triton's own special instrument the *concha*,[49] and as being in shape a combination of human being and sea-monster.

As I have said, the confusion of the *parasêmon* with the ship whose name it shared is of quite a different type from the confusion of the *parasêmon* with the god or other fabulous creature that it represented; but the two types of confusion have a certain interrelation. The ship was named after the creature, the creature was depicted by the figure-head, and thus the figure-head actually served the ship as the creature itself might have done. Such divinities as the river-god Mincius and the sea-god Triton[50]

[47] Cf. 5.158, longa sulcant vada salsa carina, said of the *Pristis* and the *Centaur*.

[48] Unless he is the river, conveying the Mantuans as Tiberinus in Book 8 did the Trojans; note especially 8.57, ipse ego te ripis et recto flumine ducam (however, *ducebat* in 10.206 probably has a different connotation; cf. note 51). I discussed this possibility in *TAPA* 88 (1957) 61, but pointed out (61, note 24) the serious objection to it provided by lines 209–12; since these lines clearly indicate that Aulestes had a ship called the Triton (after the sea-god), with an appropriate figure-head, it is natural to interpret 204–6 as a parallel passage meaning that Ocnus had a ship called the Mincius (after the river-god), also with an appropriate figure-head.

[49] Cf. the indignation of Triton the sea-god when the audacious Misenus challenges him to a contest on this instrument (6.171–4).

[50] So too the Dioscuri—the *fratres Helenae, lucida sidera* of Horace, the "Great Twin Brethren" of Macaulay—who apparently gave their name to the ship mentioned in *Acts* 28.11 *ἀνήχθημεν ἐν πλοίῳ . . . Ἀλεξανδρίνῳ, παρασήμῳ Διοσκούροις*. This passage, incidentally, is an interesting one syntactically. The structure is very loose. The Vulgate, the King James version, and the translation in *LSJ*, all seem to interpret it in the same way, running respectively: "navigavimus in navi Alexandrina . . ., cui erat insigne Castorum"; "we departed in a ship of Alexandria . . ., whose sign was Castor and Pollux"; "with the Dioscuri as the *sign* or *emblem*." I am in doubt as to what syntactical interpretation these renderings imply. Is *parasêmôi* to be viewed as in partitive apposition with *ploiôi*, or as a sort of comitative dative, *Dioskourois* in either case being in apposition with *parasêmôi*? Or could the phrase *parasêmôi Dioskourois* possibly constitute a kind of dative absolute (on this dubious construction, see Schwyzer-Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik* 2.401)? Personally, I would take *parasêmôi* as a dative of specification, and *Dioskourois* as in apposition not with *parasêmôi* but with *ploiôi*, the meaning being 'a ship, the *Dioscuri* in sign.' Then this passage too shows confusion of the ship and its *parasêmon*; in combination with *ploiôi*, *Dioskourois* refers to the name of the ship, but with the addition of the dative *parasêmôi* it comes to denote also the subject of the figure-head or other emblem.

would of course be particularly appropriate as guards and guides[51] for a vessel. From such a monstrous figure as Triton to sea-monsters such as Pristis and Scylla,[52] and then to other monsters such as Centaur and Chimaera, or to wild beasts such as the Tiger,[53] would be an easy transition. Doubtless all of them were meant to guard the ship against the dangers of the deep; note that Triton in 10.210 is expressly represented as *exterrens freta*, while similarly the Centaur in 10.196 *instat aquae saxumque undis immane minatur*.[54]

Additional protection was afforded by the figure of a patron deity, the *tutela*, on the stern of the ship.[55] Thus in the catalog of the Etruscan forces in Book 10, directly after the reference (already quoted) to Massicus' ship with the Tiger as its *parasêmon*, 10.166, there follows a reference to Abas' ship with Apollo as its

[51] In their position at the prow, they would seem to be leading the vessel on its way. This is probably the force of *ducebat*, used of Mincius in 10.206.

[52] Cf. with the description of Triton, 10.209–12, quoted in the preceding paragraph, that of Scylla, 3.426–7, prima hominis facies et pulchro pectore virgo pube tenus, postrema immani corpore pistrix. Note too that each is in part a *pristis* or *pistrix* (the two forms seem interchangeable in sense).

[53] Or the lions of 10.157, on which see the close of note 42.

[54] Cf. Propertius 4.6.49, vehunt prorae Centaurica saxa minantes. The form in which Enschedé (above, note 42) quotes the line (434), with *Centauros* instead of *Centaurica*, is even closer to Vergil; but I find no sanction for it among modern editors.

[55] The difference between the *parasêmon* and the *tutela* is repeatedly stressed, and I think abundantly proved, by Enschedé (above, note 42): the *insigne* or *parasêmon* was "in prora," and gave the ship its name; the *tutela* was "in puppi," and served as protecting deity (see especially 412, 439, 441, 452, 454). Nettleship follows Enschedé in his note on 10.166, where he carefully distinguishes the *tutela*, "a figure of the god that protected the ship, and was generally placed in the stern," from the *parasêmon*, the "figure-head at the prow from which the ship received its name." Servius in his comment on the same passage, in which he locates the *tutela* on the rostrum and says it gave the ship its name, is obviously confusing the *parasêmon* and the *tutela*, as both Enschedé (440) and Nettleship (*ad loc.*) point out. We may note, for the position of the *parasêmon* on the prow, Propertius 4.6.49, quoted in note 54 (cited by Enschedé 454); for that of the *tutela* on the stern, Ovid, *Her.* 16 (or 15).114, accipit et pictos puppis adunca deos, Persius 6.30, ingentes de puppe dei, and Valerius Flaccus 8.202–3, puppe procul summa, vigilis post terga magistri haeserat auratae genibus Medea Minervae (all cited by Enschedé 455), also Statius, *Theb.* 8.269–70, solus stat puppe magister pervigil inscriptaque deus qui navigat alno. Nettleship (on 10.166) suggests on the basis of *Acts* 28.11 (quoted above in note 50) that in Greek ships the *parasêmon* or "sign" may not have been distinct from the *tutela*; however, Enschedé (453) views the *Dioskouroi* as definitely the *parasêmon*, though different from the Roman type in being double, with one figure on the right side of the prow and the other on the left (he quotes evidence, 453–4, to show that a double *parasêmon* was characteristic of Alexandrian ships, and perhaps of Phoenician ones also).

tutela,[56] 10.171, aurato[57] fulgebat Apolline puppis.[58] The *tutela*, as its name suggests, was regarded as the tutelary deity of the vessel; and the passengers, particularly in time of danger, directed to it their prayers and supplications for help as if it were really the deity in person.[59]

Hence in most of these identifications of a god, a monster, or even a man, and his representative—altar, statue, figure-head, trophy, lot, etc.—there is present a religious element going back to the primitive practice of animism, fetichism, or magic. But this confusion is at the same time reflected in, and perhaps to some extent reinforced or even conditioned by, a type of confusion that is purely linguistic; and obviously the confusion of language serves as an important clew to the underlying confusion of belief.

[56] Cited by Enschedé (above, note 42) 437–8 as an example of a *tutela*. However, see note 58.

[57] According to Enschedé (above, note 42) 412, the *tutela* could be "picta fictave." Hence I do not know whether we are to think of this gilded Apollo as a statue, like the image of Priapus promised in *E* 7.36, aureus esto (above, page 242); or as some sort of embossed or engraved metal representation, like the golden gates in 8.655–6, auratis porticibus, and the yellow hair and garments of the Gauls in 8.659, aurea caesaries ollis atque aurea vestis (above, page 247), and the iron figure of Mars in 8.700–1, Mavors caelatus ferro (above, notes 18 and 38), all in the shield passage; or as a gilded painting. But in Valerius Flaccus 8.202–3 (quoted in note 55), the gilded Minerva (*auratae Minervae*) to whose knees Medea clung must be a statue. Images of some sort must also be meant in Persius 6.30 (quoted above in note 55, referred to at greater length below in note 59) and in Petronius 108.13, protendit ramum oleae a tutela navigii raptum. On the other hand, in Statius, *Theb.* 8.270 (quoted in note 55), *inscripta alno* suggests a drawing or carving on the surface of the vessel; and in Ovid, *Her.* 16.114 (also quoted in note 55), *pictos deos* suggests a painting.

[58] Here *puppis* probably, as Nettleship says *ad loc.*, has its literal meaning 'stern,' unlike *puppis* in 10.156 (on which see the end of note 42). However, Enschedé (above, note 42), though, as already reported above in note 56, he classes the representation of Apollo as a *tutela* (437–8), also (*ibid.*) envisages the possibility that *puppis* means the whole ship, and that in that case Apollo may be the *insigne* rather than the *tutela*.

[59] Note that in Valerius Flaccus 8.203, haeserat auratae genibus Medea Minervae, Medea clings to the knees of the image of Minerva in the typical posture of the suppliant. And in Persius 6.29–30, iacet ipse in litore et una ingentes de puppe dei, there is a note of irony and pathos in the description of the shipwrecked mariner whose prayers have proved unavailing (28, surda vota), and who now lies cast up on the shore while along with him lie the gods from the prow who, for all their size (30, ingentes), have not fulfilled their function as tutelary deities.