Translation and narrative voice:

Translating ambiguities and narrators in Virgil's *Aeneid*

Melanie J. Fitton-Hayward

Thesis submitted to The University of Nottingham

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

February 2020

Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed towards this project in a huge variety of ways. Countless staff and students at the University of Nottingham, as well as innumerable members of my friends and family, have supported, challenged, and inspired me during these years of research. But this project really began around fifteen years ago, when Mrs Lyle first taught me to read Latin, introduced me to Virgil, and allayed my fears at not being "good enough" to take Latin GCSE. This thesis is indebted to her inspirational teaching.

I have been a self-supported researcher, and have managed my research alongside working for Romax Technology, who have always been graciously accommodating, fostering my career development along a very different trajectory, whilst understanding when my academic commitments had to come first. Whilst I have not received research funding, I am grateful for generous conference funding and travel bursaries, which have enabled me to attend and speak at multiple conferences, from Durham to Oslo. I have been pleased to take up many of the wealth of opportunities presented by the University of Nottingham, from teaching to public speaking, from journal editing to conference organising, all of which I hope have helped me develop into a better researcher.

I feel incredibly fortunate to have known and worked with two wonderful supervisors: Professor Helen Lovatt and Professor Nicola Royan. They have been endlessly supportive, intellectually stimulating, and unfailingly kind in all our interactions. My family, Nicola, Keith and Lucy, who have always held unerring belief in me, have all (voluntarily) read portions of this thesis and offered insightful feedback, as have Charlotte, Kathryn, Ben, Tom and Mike. None are specialists in my field, but all feigned applaudable enthusiasm, and all, in their own ways, supported me far beyond the remit of "proof reading". Any errors or omissions which remain are entirely my own.

Finally, thanks go to Tom, who has supported me unflinchingly every day, who stayed up with me 'til 2 and got up with me at 6, who has encouraged, consoled, and fortified me, and without whom the task would have felt so much harder.

Contents

Acknowledgements 2

Notes and Abbreviations 7

Introduction: The *Aeneid*, Translation, and Narrative 9

TRANSLATION AS RECEPTION 15

Centuries of English Virgils 15

"Why another *Aeneid*?" 18

Significant publishers: Loeb, Penguin, OUP 26

OXFORD WORLD'S CLASSICS *AENEIDS* 32

Day Lewis: Classics in culture, an 'English literary life', World War Two 32

Ahl: Classics in education, Vietnam, the "pessimistic" Virgil 45

The translator and his audience: editing and explaining the text 58

Considerations, expectations, judgements 62

TRANSLATING NARRATIVE, NARRATING TRANSLATION 71

Aims and methodology 75

Thesis structure 80

1 Voice: Discourse, Focalisation, and Narrative 85

1.1 FOCALISATION 89

1.2 FREE INDIRECT DISCOURSE 106

1.3 SHIFTING PERSPECTIVE 118

1.4 VOICE: NARRATOR INTRUSION 132

1.5 CONCLUSIONS 135

2 Deixis: Narrative Presence, Temporality, and Interjection 139

2.1 DISCOURSE MODES, BASE, DEICTIC CENTRE 146

2.2 SHIFTING BASE: CHARACTER PRESENT TO NARRATOR PRESENT 155

2.3 DISPLACED IMMEDIACY AND OMNISCIENCE 163

2.4 DEIXIS AS VEHICLE FOR SUBJECTIVITY, FOCALISATION, AND CONSTRUCTION OF AN EPIC VOICE 168

2.5 DEIXIS AS INTERJECTION AND AUDIENCE INTERACTION 177

2.6 CONCLUSIONS 189

3 Apostrophe: Narrative Construction and Engagement 192

3.1 APOSTROPHE IN THE *AENEID* 196

3.2 STORY COMMENT (CHARACTER APOSTROPHE) 211
3.2.1 Dido 211
3.2.2 Larides and Thymber 220
3.2.3 Cydon 223
3.2.4 Oebalus 227
3.3 NARRATIVE COMMENT (MUSE APOSTROPHE) 231
3.3.1 The narrator's Muse 231
3.3.2 Epic openings: 1.8-11 237
3.3.3 Greater beginnings: 7.37-45 244
3.3.4 Reassurance: 7.641-646 253
3.4 CONCLUSIONS 257
4 Similes: Characterisation and Narrator Sympathy 260
4.1 EPIC SIMILE AND THE HOMERIC PRECEDENT 261
4.2 FEATURES OF VIRGILIAN SIMILE 268
4.3 SIMILES IN THE *AENEID* 283
4.4 DISTURBING THE EPIC VOICE: AENEAS AND TURNUS AS ELEMENTS OF NATURE 292
4.4.1 Aeneas: oak 292
4.4.2 Turnus: boiling water 304
4.5 THE HUNTER AND THE HUNTED: AENEAS AND TURNUS AS ANIMALS 310
4.5.1 Aeneas and Turnus: hunter and lion 310
4.5.2 Aeneas and Turnus: hound and stag 321
4.6 CONCLUSIONS 327
5 Case Study: Cumulative Narrative Engagement in Book Nine 330
5.1 NARRATIVE SUBJECTIVITY: CHARACTERISATION AND DIVINITY 339
5.2 TEXTUAL AUTHORITY: EPIC NARRATOR AND CHARACTER VOICE 352
5.3 CONCLUSIONS 362
Conclusion 365
DAY LEWIS AND AHL: INTERPRETATION AND DOMESTICATION 367
TRANSLATING AMBIGUITY, EPICNESS, AND AUTHORITY 375
TRANSLATING THE PAST, IN THE FUTURE 383
Bibliography 387
PRIMARY RESOURCES 387

COMMENTARIES, DICTIONARIES, AND TRANSLATOR NOTES 388
SECONDARY LITERATURE 389

Notes and Abbreviations

The Latin of the *Aeneid* is that of Mynors' *Oxford Classical Text*, generally considered to be the orthodox edition.

References from the *Iliad* are to Lattimore's 1951 translation, canonical in contemporary English.

Abbreviations

OLD	Oxford Latin Dictionary
L&S	Lewis & Short
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
OUP	Oxford University Press
OWC	Oxford World's Classic

Unspecified references:

Where unspecified, references to Ahl are to his 2007 *Aeneid* translation and accompanying notes, Day Lewis to the 1986 OWC reprint of his 1952 translation, and Griffin to his 1986 notes which accompanied that translation.

Where I refer to their prefaces, full date references are given, to avoid confusion between Day Lewis' two prefaces (the first in the 1952 edition published by Hogarth Press, the second in OUP's 1966 edition, reprinted in the 1986 OWC).

Narrator pronouns:

I use 'his' to refer to the narrator of the *Aeneid*, in Virgil as well as in Ahl and Day Lewis' translations. I work under the assumption that the vast majority of readers assume the gender of the narrator is equivalent to that

of the author or translator, and that all three of these men clearly identify as male.

Introduction: The *Aeneid*, Translation, and Narrative

644 latos huic hasta per armos
645 acta tremit duplicatque virum transfixa dolore.
funditur ater ubique cruor; dant funera ferro
647 certantes pulchramque petunt per vulnera mortem.

Aeneid 11.644-647

644 Driven through his broad shoulders,
645 The spear struck, quivering, and doubled him up with agony.
Everywhere streams the dark blood. They struggle; they deal out doom
647 With the sword, and offer themselves to a glorious death in the combat.

Aeneid 11.644-647 (Day Lewis)

644 Driven through him,
645 Right between his broad arms, there's a quivering spear.
And the raw pain
Doubles him up. Dark blood gushes everywhere, death clad in iron,
647 Beautiful death men yearn to attain through wounds in a battle!

Aeneid 11.644-647 (Ahl)

In his note to line 647, Ahl states that his phrase "beautiful death", a fairly literal rendition of *pulchram mortem*, is an "ironic" allusion to Horace: *dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* ("it is sweet and comely to die for one's country").[1] What Ahl interprets as sarcasm here, and amplifies with the exclamation mark and the urgency of phrasing, Day Lewis presents more

[1] Ahl (2007). The translation in brackets is his own.

positively, implying the necessity of sacrifice with "offer themselves to a glorious death in the combat". If Day Lewis is reminded of Horace here, or, perhaps more likely for him, of the echo in Wilfred Owen's sardonic condemnation of war, he does not give any sign of thinking it ironic. Rather, Day Lewis' translation might contradict not only current expectations of a poet writing soon after wartime, but also the sentiments of his contemporaries who warned that there was nothing glorious or heroic about death in battle.[2] However, the war which Owen had endured, seen as an outright waste of life and typically portrayed with scathing cynicism, was far from Day Lewis' experience of conflict, imagined as a successful and righteous crusade against the Nazis. This ostensibly glorified presentation of war continues throughout Day Lewis' translation of the *Aeneid*, broadcast via radio in 1951 and subsequently published as an Oxford World's Classic.[3] Commissioned by the same publisher more than fifty years later, Ahl's sardonic response to Virgil's imperialistic passages is equally consistent throughout his translation, as in the end of Anchises' speech in book 6:

---

[2] Spender (1937), printed in Carter (1984) 44, writes of the propagandist war lies which Wilfred Owen vehemently attacked. Although, according to Spender, Owen did not tell "the final truth" about the war, he condemned turning the dead into heroes in order to imagine a pleasantness in death: "If there is a heroism in war, it is not beautiful".

[3] It was initially published by Hogarth Press in 1952 and subsequently OUP in 1966 and, as an OWC, in 1986. Where I reference the date of his translation, I use 1952, its first appearance in print.

851 “tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento
(hae tibi erunt artes), pacique imponere morem,
853 parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.”

Aeneid 6.851-853

851 “But, Romans, never forget that government is your medium!
Be this your art:- to practise men in the habit of peace,
853 Generosity to the conquered, and firmness against aggressors.”

Aeneid 6.851-853 (Day Lewis)

851 “You, who are Roman, recall how to govern mankind with your power.
These will be your special “Arts”: the enforcement of peace as a habit,
853 Mercy for those cast down and relentless war upon proud men.”

Aeneid 6.851-853 (Ahl)

Ahl’s note to this passage again offers fruitful insight. He states that Anchises is expressing a plea to the unnamed Caesar, that he be the first to show clemency.[4] Ahl shows a willingness to see an ironic voice here, as he cynically remarks that compassion only dealt Caesar assassination, while Octavian, whose self-professed clemency was more prevalent in his rhetoric than his actions, lived to die of old age. Ahl’s inverted commas around “Arts” betray his irony here, as does his emphatic and almost oxymoronic phrase that peace is something to be “enforced”, together with the aggressive call for proactive and offensive action: “relentless war upon

[4] Ahl (2007).

proud men". These phrases contrast with Day Lewis' softer "practise men in the habit of peace", and, more so, with the rather reactive call for justified defensive action, suggested by "firmness against aggressors". Jasper Griffin, whose notes accompanied the Oxford World's Classics printing of Day Lewis' translation, 35 years after its original broadcast, attests to the unorthodoxy of the translation here, suggesting an "alternative" of "impose peace and then civilisation" for Day Lewis' "practise men in the habit of peace".[5]

Day Lewis' choice of "practise" is certainly an unusual choice for *imponere*, though not one which need be attributed to linguistic misunderstanding; his academic background in Classics, first as student at Oxford and second as Latin schoolmaster, as well as the assistance he received from Jackson Knight, attest otherwise. His translation is rather influenced by his objectives in translating, by the expectations of his readers, and by his own interpretative reading of Virgil, informed by the generation in which he lived. In the same way, Ahl's translation is a product of a different relationship to classical texts and languages, the demands of his largely academic audience, and the modern scholarly landscape of which he is very much a part. The differences are evidence that each translation is constructed via, as Emily Wilson articulated, a constant web of choices,

[5] Griffin (1986), explaining how Day Lewis has arrived at his translation of the Latin.

demanding a decision to be made, whether conscious or unconscious, and of varying levels of significance, for every single word.[6] These choices are unified, Balmer suggests, by the single guiding force of poetry itself, and combine together to create that which no translation can ever avoid becoming: an act of interpretation.[7] If readers are the authors of a text's meaning, then the translator's unusual position of being simultaneously a reader and a (re)writer means that the text has effectively undergone two stages of interpretation.[8] This interpretation, the result of many influencing factors, subsequently imbues the translation with a significance which is no longer purely literary or aesthetic, but rather social, political, and even moral.[9]

Analysing these passages has shed light on how these translators present Virgil's narrative, unfolding with battles at its heart and imperialism at its

---

[6] Video interview posted on *Channel Four News' Twitter* (13 May 2018, 6.37 am).

[7] On poetry as a single unifying force, see Balmer (1996) 21. See D. Donoghue (2000) on each translation being an interpretation (12), the quality which, Braund and Torlone (2018) suggest, makes studying them so critical (2).

[8] The writings of reader response theorists are instructive to my argument, e.g. Barthes (1977, 1995 ed.) 125-30: "the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author" (130), and Iser (1976, trans. 1978) who argues for the significance of the interaction between text and reader in literary interpretation (20). Even though New Criticism was the dominant method of interpreting narrative in the 1940s and 50s (McQuillan [2000] 311), Day Lewis (1951) acknowledged that once a poem is written, the writer feels completely detached from it (11). My approach here is similar to that of Butler (2018), who argues, in discussion of the power balance between reader and author, for honest acknowledgement that scholarly approaches are formed by individual experience. My argument about the importance of honesty and awareness regarding translation as subjective interpretation rests on similar foundations.

[9] Braund and Torlone (2018) 4.

helm, and their willingness to see his ambiguity, a reading which stemmed from a post-war response to the *Aeneid*, and with which Hardie has claimed the twentieth century is "obsessed".[10] However, these translators have a deep, complex relationship with Virgil, one which reaches far beyond their interpretation of this one elusive aspect of meaning, one which pervades their connection to him as author, their understanding of and interaction with his characters, and their construction of a new Anglophone narrative voice, influenced by historical context alongside critical and popular reception of Virgil. Both published for an intellectual general interest readership by Oxford World's Classics, Ahl and Day Lewis' translations are widely available and broadly indicative of, or at least not opposing, cultural response to Virgil's epic text at their particular time of publication. A long-established series, with an associated reputation to protect, Oxford World's Classics pride themselves on reflecting prevailing contemporary critical readings, perhaps more so than many other publishers.[11] Now, when contemporary translation is of such critical importance to sustaining appreciation of Classics and of Virgil, understanding the interactions between translation and context (public, critical and historical) is crucial. This thesis helps us towards that understanding, combining work on translation theory, narratology and Virgilian reception, to explore how

[10] Hardie (1995) 270 n13.

[11] Penguin and Loeb are also significant, though with different audiences and considerations. See below p26.

translators' appropriation of Virgil's narrative voice can shed new light on shifting relationships to this ancient author.

TRANSLATION AS RECEPTION

Centuries of English Virgils

The *Aeneid* has a rich history of absorption into English, via hundreds, I tentatively estimate, of partial and complete translations.[12] The earliest recorded rendering of Virgil in English occurs in Chaucer's *House of Fame* in 1380, but the first complete, single-authored translation into modern English was not until that of poet laureate John Dryden in 1697.[13] Whilst not necessarily useful for the student struggling to translate Virgil's Latin, that was never its intended purpose, and its readability and poetry continue to appeal to readers, critics, and translators.[14] Although none would challenge, let alone surpass, Dryden for a very long time,

---

[12] Braund and Torlone (2018), considering all languages, estimate thousands of translations of Virgil's combined oeuvre (2).

[13] Burrow (1997) 21-2. Preceding Dryden were several partial translations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, notably one begun by Thomas Phaer (1558) and completed by Thomas Twyne (1584). Gavin Douglas' earlier translation (1513) was into Older Scots. Caxton's "first complete English version of the *Aeneid*" was not from the original Latin, but rather a prose paraphrase of an existing French translation (Keith [2018] 63). See Braund and Torlone (2018) on early translations of Virgil into other languages, many of which predate or coincide with the first English translations (1).

[14] On praise of Dryden, see, among many: newspaper columnist A.N. Wilson (2008) who says that Ahl, Fagles and Ruden are all outsoared by Dryden; academic and translator Fagles (2006) who refers to Dryden as one of the "unapproachables" (402); and eminent scholar Hardie (2014) who declares that Dryden's is "probably the best" translation (12).

translations kept pace with Virgil's sustained favour and continued into the eighteenth century, but reduced with its decline in the nineteenth.[15] Critics and scholars of both English and Classics have found much of interest in Virgil's early translators. Frost (1955), Proudfoot (1960), Corse (1991), Hammond (1999), Thomas (2001), Caldwell (2008), Gillespie (2011), and Brammall (2015) have variously discussed the efforts of early translators, most frequently Dryden, to use Virgil as a way in which to interact with contemporary politics and literary culture. Gillespie in particular, in *English Translation and Classical Reception* (2011), has called for translation's impact on original creative output to be better recognised, arguing that English literary authors, traditions and canonical works could be better understood by a fuller appreciation of individual authors' relationships to, and translations of, classical works, as well as the impact that translations can have when they become canonical themselves. Since Dryden, many poets have been drawn to create their own literary version, most recently Seamus Heaney.[16] Literary appropriation may be out of celebration, inspiration, or, equally, desperation, where cultures lacking in confidence about their own literary output use translation of significant

[15] Virgil's reputational decline was partly literary (Hardie [2005] 99, [2014] 14), partly political (Caldwell [2008] 11, 21, 190; Ahl [1976] 58-60), and partly a result of changing translation trends (Burrow [1997] 31). See also Keith (2018) and R.D. Williams (1969).

[16] Heaney was working on his version until his death in 2013. It was broadcast in 2016 on BBC Radio Four (read by Ian Mckellen), and appeared in print a few months later. Sales figures have verged, Hardie (2014) says, on public success (18).

foreign texts to add perceived cultural prestige and legitimise a language otherwise considered bereft of literary significance, and even to stimulate the creation of its own canon.[17]

As well as sparking literary inspiration, Dryden's translation has stimulated others to pursue different appropriations of Virgil's politics, finding in the *Aeneid* ways to symbolise or encourage particular interpretations of historical events or situations. Zwicker explores the relationship between Rome and England through Dryden's translation, which he calls a "set of reflections on English politics".[18] Venuti discusses Dryden alongside other interregnum translators, including Denham, arguing that his royalist sympathies were conveyed both by his selection of Virgil's nationalistic text and by his methods of translation.[19] On the other hand, Kallendorf has explored how readings of the "other" Virgil were used to propagate social and political protest in early modern culture, by those involved in "marginalization, colonization, and revolution".[20] Braund

---

[17] Bassnett (1980, 1991 ed.) xii. Greatrex (2018) discusses the use of the *Aeneid* to construct a new literary canon in the recently-devised artificial language Esperanto. Marinčič (2018) makes a similar point about Slovenian reception of Virgil.

[18] Zwicker (1984) 177.

[19] Venuti (1993) 197, 198, 204, 208. Denham's name is omitted on the title page, an act of self-effacement which Venuti suggests could be an intentional concealment of identity or simply an amateur's reluctance to assert individual authorship.

[20] Kallendorf (2007), especially 14-15. See also Thomas (2001) on Augustan appropriations of Virgil throughout the ages.

and Torlone discuss the use of the *Aeneid* to articulate imperialist agendas further afield, broadly referring to the relationship between Virgilian translation and emerging concepts of nationalism, with chapters focusing on specific examples of Spain and Russia.[21] Burrow suggests that Virgil's translators are often united by an experience of adversity, and that it is often those in support of losing political causes who are drawn to seek consolation or imperial reassurance in his authority.[22] However, over the millennia since the conception of the *Aeneid*, not all readers and translators have seen Virgil as an authoritative voice, and certainly not all have interpreted his imperial vision as reassuring. Indeed I argue that translators, particularly in recent generations, are drawn to Virgil just as readers are: as much to resist empire as to endorse it.[23]

"Why another *Aeneid*?"

Through the latter half of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first, Virgilian translation is burgeoning. In part, this owes something to its educational context. Although no longer a secure element of general education, its position in the Classics syllabus, where texts are increasingly

[21] Braund and Torlone (2018) 2. On specific examples, see: Papaioannou (2018) on use of classical translations to appropriate national and cultural self-definition in Russia; Rupp (2018) on moral aspects of Virgilian translation in sixteenth century Spain.

[22] Burrow (1997) 21, 28.

[23] Of course, increasingly frequently, it is the Virgil of translators to whom they are drawn, whether out of desire to read a particular translation or any, indiscernibly, for reasons of accessibility.

taught in translation, endures.[24] Even beyond the realm of education, and amongst those reading classical texts for pleasure, the declining number of Latin language readers means that reception of Virgil relies, now more than ever before, on translation. Subsequently, English translations of the *Aeneid* are on the rise, with a significant number published since the 1950s, on both sides of the Atlantic and by translators of both literary and scholarly backgrounds. I count seventeen translations (eight since 2005), providing a vast array of choice for both educators and pleasure readers.[25] Whilst it may be commonplace to expect each generation to have a new translation, there are clearly other contributing factors.[26]

The question 'Why do we need another translation of the *Aeneid?*', whether posed to politely veil criticism or to stimulate earnest discussion of an exponentially growing market, is perhaps more pertinent now than to any other era.[27] Fagles stated his relief at not being asked it while working on

---

[24] Gillespie (2011) asserts the need for translations in education is due to declining Latin literacy (2-3, 155). Harrison (1990): the vast number of editions printed between the invention of printing and 1840 attests to education's continuing appetite for it (2). See Hardie (2014) on the *Aeneid* in education since Virgil's death (7).

[25] Keith (2018) notes that contexts of reading and teaching Latin epic vary widely, and the broad variety of translations allows appropriate selection (77). The seventeen I count are: Humphries (1951), Day Lewis (1952), Jackson Knight (1956), Oakley (1957), Copley (1965), Mandelbaum (1971), Fitzgerald (1981), Sisson (1986), West (1990), Lombardo (2005), Fagles (2006), Ahl (2007), Ruden (2008), Johnston (2012), Powell (2015), Heaney (2016a), Ferry (2017). Bartsch's forthcoming translation will make eighteen.

[26] Stallings (2006).

[27] Feeney (2017) declares the question inevitable.

his own translation.[28] His academic counterparts, he said, knew better; they understood that Virgil was a performer, and, just as performances have a new stage, actors and audience, no two translations of one work will ever be the same. Feeney's justification for the continuing retranslation of the *Aeneid* was to propose cultural relevance, appropriating a poem whose significance is both timely and timeless:

> One immediate justification is that each translation is the contemporary way of bringing the poem back to the public's attention – new audiences will find the poem newly topical, since the poem is about refugees trying to make a home in a place they had never heard of before their exile; it's about immigrants and nation-building.[29]

He is right that the poem's cultural significance changes over time; indeed, the poem's original message, to promote the founding of a city and the genealogical heritage of an Emperor, seems of little immediate application to modern audiences. However, in the case of translating *Antigone*, Heaney believed that locating contemporary relevance lent him additional authority as a translator; he suggests that the political and cultural resonances which this text held in Ireland constituted his right to translate it, his "title deeds".[30] Even in the absence of contextual parallels, the

---

[28] Fagles (2006) 403.

[29] Feeney (2017).

[30] Heaney (2009) 139. Translation can also carry unintentional but inescapable political comment: see Skoie (2018) on how translators' choice between two versions of Norwegian results in an inevitable political statement.

characterisation of the hero, in pursuit of his destiny, bravely weathering physical adventure and emotional conflicts, with unshakable commitment to his family and his men, will have never-ending appeal, and ensure that the epic remains "A poem for our time".[31]

Alongside cultural appropriation, another phenomenon causing, and caused by, the rise in translations is the widening of the conversation around translation as a creative act and increased interest in its impact on reception. Emily Wilson has spoken a great deal about her translation of the *Odyssey*, and her words have reached a very public platform. Her translation was reviewed by the *Guardian*, clips from her interview with Channel 4 were shared widely on social media in 2018, and, soon after her translation, she was granted the MacArthur "Genius Grant" Fellowship.[32] As public presence has increased, so has critical engagement, with the field of translation studies expanding beyond itself and permeating other areas of scholarship, including the field of Classics. General discussion chapters in wide-ranging classical volumes have paved the way for the more recent critical engagements which position translation as a driving force of classical reception and as a subject of scholarship in its own right.[33]

---

[31] West (1990, 2003 ed.) vii. I use the problematic and ambiguous term 'hero' cautiously. Whether Aeneas is a hero by ancient Greek or Roman parameters, the label, with its constantly moving definition, has been applied to him through the centuries (see chapter 4, pp289-292).

[32] Above, n6. *Guardian* review authored by Higgins (2017).

[33] E.g. Burrow (1997).

Subsequent key contributors have included Josephine Balmer, a practising translator herself, and Lorna Hardwick, whose *Translating Words, Translating Cultures* showed how translation is not only textual transfer, but also cultural, implicated by, and implicating, how the target culture perceives and interacts with the source, alongside examining literary and generic challenges and opportunities.[34] The volume *Translation and the Classic* explores the quality of texts as classical, not intrinsic but rather achieved through perceived value which long outlives its original target audience and through continued interaction with new cultures: "its classical identity is not a direct manifestation of timelessness, but one that continues to be mediated and configured by changing historical circumstances, which present the construction of the classic as a historical relationship between past and present".[35] The volume examines the role of translation in the definition and construction of 'classic' texts, considering the tension between translation as construction of a single instance of the text, which aims to transcend the temporal or historical gulf between the text's creation and its status as 'classic' in a new culture, and as perpetuation of its timelessness: "the understanding of the classic from the viewpoint of translation challenges the opposition between an everlasting

[34] Balmer (2013). Hardwick (2000).

[35] Lianeri and Zajko (2008) 4.

and a multiple identity".[36] Harrison's volume *Living Classics* looks at wider literary engagement between classical texts and post 1960 English poetry, via translation, identification and allusion.[37] Translation plays a vital role in acting against marginalisation of classical languages and working to sustain the living status of classical texts; indeed, contemporary writers interact with classical texts without having knowledge of the original languages.[38] Dedicated to Virgilian translation specifically, Braund and Torlone's 2018 volume opened the conversation around the complex ways in which Virgil's translations interact with literature and culture in an international context; a discussion which this thesis aims to take further.[39]

With each translation comes a new interpretation, laminating layers of intertext around the Latin epic nucleus, and perpetuating a dialogue between reception and translation. Virgil's twenty-first century readers are never an isolated interpreting force, but rather receive the text through multiple, refracted fragments.[40] In English, Virgil is no longer just Virgil, but Dryden's Virgil, read through Dante, Milton and Shakespeare. Thus, a

---

[36] Lianeri and Zajko (2008) 9.

[37] Harrison (2009).

[38] Clare Pollard, translator of Ovid's *Heroides*, works with an 'interpreter', who provides her with a literal translation which she then works into poetry. Harrison furthers his investigation of the democratisation of Classics through its reuse in the modern world in his 2013 volume co-edited with Hardwick.

[39] Braund and Torlone (2018). For my full appreciation of the volume, I refer to Fitton-Hayward (2019).

[40] Burrow (1997) 21.

particular sort of intertextual canon is created, and translators often discuss use of and reference to their predecessors.[41] Under this influence, they may strive to follow, or consciously deviate from, previous translators, and thus they drive, or are driven by, the oscillations of reception. Elements of interpretation may thus be subconscious, the inescapable effect of cultural baggage, or may have itself provoked the desire to translate.

Whilst the first woman to publish a complete translation of the *Odyssey* into English, Emily Wilson, openly discussed gender and translation issues when working on Homer's text,[42] her Virgilian counterpart, Sarah Ruden, whose *Aeneid* has received much critical interaction, rejects the idea that she has gendered the text in any way.[43] Even if it did not consciously drive her textual reading, Ruden does remark on the impact her gender had on the process of translating: believing that the relationship between her and Virgil, which initially felt akin to "an arranged marriage", became a sort of "devotion", and that women are able to adopt a closer connection with

---

[41] Fo (2018), who translated the *Aeneid* into Italian in 2012, openly discusses his reference to previous translations (419).

[42] In her Twitter biography, Wilson rejects the label which has been frequently, and incorrectly, applied to her: "Writer, professor, translator. NOT the first woman to publish a translation of the *Odyssey*." https://twitter.com/EmilyRCWilson?lang=en.

[43] Braund (2018) 120. Braund notes the depth of engagement that Ruden has attracted, numbering two interviews and eleven reviews, across academic and public contexts in the UK and US (118-119). Braund suggests this great interest is partly due to the "novelty" of her gender and Quaker faith.

Virgil without imposing too much of themselves on him, developing a level of self-effacement which Donoghue praises in her translation over others.[44]

Whilst translators might drive these changing interpretations, they are also controlled and mediated by the needs of their audience. Whereas few modern translators of classical works are likely to write primarily for an audience with great knowledge of the original language, those readers were a more significant proportion of Dryden's primary target audience.[45] His shaping of the text engages readers who, whether familiar with the Latin or simply with the story, would recognise and appreciate his domesticating interpretative flair.[46] Nowadays, it is publishers who, to a great degree, control segmentation of audience and thus the individual translation's purpose and priorities.

---

[44] This discussion is from Braund (2018) 121, with comments from Ruden (2006) 36, Howard (2008), and S. Donoghue (2009).

[45] Undeniably, these readers will always be consumers on some level, whether critical or pedagogical.

[46] D. Donoghue (2000) 12: "when a poet like Seamus Heaney turns his attention to translating *Beowulf*, readers pay special attention to the signs of his interpretative touches." Balmer (1996) 22, applying a comment from Bassnett (1980, 1991 ed.) 90: "when Dryden, Jonson or Pope translated classical works, their small, aristocratic and highly literate audiences were familiar with their originals, allowing the translator more freedom to play with the source text – a play their readers could recognise and enjoy".

Significant publishers: Loeb, Penguin, OUP

The function of different publishers is partly to produce translations which appeal to different audiences. One of the most academically significant classical publishers is the Loeb Classical Library, who aim primarily at readers learning the language. Founded in 1911, their *Aeneid* appeared just five years later, in 1916 (and was subsequently revised in 1999). With its Latin text and facing translation, the Loeb's founding aim was to increase accessibility to ancient texts, including to readers without Latin or Greek, and to provide the very best of accompanying Anglo-American scholarship.[47] Although founder James Loeb also stated the series aimed for their translations to stand as works of literature in their own rights, which may be read for pure pleasure, whether or not they have achieved this aim has been disputed.[48] Stray concurs that the traditional Loeb reader has a smattering of classical knowledge, or, at least, wants to be seen as such.[49]

Aiming at a broader audience, without knowledge of the original language, is the popular and successful Penguin Classics series. The only one of the three discussed here not to be published within an academic publishing

---

[47] *Loeb Classics Profile*: https://www.loebclassics.com/page/history.

[48] *Loeb Classics Profile:* https://www.loebclassics.com/page/history. Hardwick (2000) does not think they intend to stand as independently literary works, or even, necessarily, to provide a "good read" (12-13).

[49] Stray (1998) notes the type of reader who reads from the translation but quotes from the opposite page (285).

house, Penguin published prose translations of the *Aeneid* by Jackson Knight (1956) and West (1990), and a verse translation by Fagles (2006).[50] Their series includes "the most significant works written", representing "the greatest repository of our shared cultural imagination and a treasure trove for readers".[51] The series launched in 1946 with Rieu's million copy-selling translation of the *Odyssey*, and aimed at "an eager audience for accessible translations of classic works".[52] This accessibility is noted by a reviewer for academic journal *Greece & Rome*, who called Rieu's translation not for "us", but rather for a new public, "most of whom know no Greek, and for whom the past is not only dead but done with".[53] Their broad target audience is reflected in the types of translation they publish; Virgil's epic poem is rendered in a novelistic style, using accessible language written in a prose format, its books turned into titled chapters. These micro-choices subtly apply generic nuance, producing familiarising translations which take on the authority more typically associated with ancient historiography rather than poetry.[54] These choices befit, or are led by,

---

[50] Penguin's impact on classical reception has been the subject of a recent PhD (Crowe [2012]), which unfortunately I have been unable to consult, but hope to access in the future. For details on the project, see *Bristol Penguin Archive Project* : http://www.bristol.ac.uk/penguinarchiveproject/research/classics/.

[51] *Penguin Classics Profile*: https://www.penguin.co.uk/company/publishers/penguin-press/penguin-classics.html.

[52] *Penguin Classics Profile:* https://www.penguin.co.uk/company/publishers/penguin-press/penguin-classics.html.

[53] Newman (1946) 124.

[54] Penguin appear to be moving away from their signature prose towards the more distancing, historicising effect of Fagles' verse, reflecting a general trend in this direction.

contemporary trends for reading (and writing), designed to appeal to their wide-reaching public audience – that is that novels are commonplace and epic poetry is not. Whilst they publish in prose to be accessible, it also allows them, paradoxically, to harness more of its poetic qualities.[55] Indeed, despite being rendered in prose, some praised Jackson Knight's translation for its replication of the Virgilian poetic beat.[56] Their efforts to popularise and domesticise foreign texts, opposing the archaising and historicising approach adopted by Loeb, reflect a literary trend which tended toward the accessible. The success of the strategy is undeniable; West's translation, which Braund describes (along with the Loeb) as "utilitarian but certainly popular",[57] enjoys enduring popularity, and is still the designated school syllabus text.

Whilst Penguin opt for populist prose, the intellectually popular and well-established Oxford World's Classics series, equally popular amongst students and an intellectual strand of general readership, choose verse, a reflection of their aim to uphold an historical, elite but accessible image. Broadly, their aims sound similar to those of Penguin: OWC seek to make available, accessible and affordable, "the broadest spectrum of literature

---

[55] Wilson Knight (1975): "such truth to the poetry could only be attained in prose", since poetic translations attempt to emulate too much of the translator's own poetry, rather than recreating that of the original (7, 245, 381).

[56] Wilson Knight (1975) 387-92.

[57] Braund (2018) 113 n26.

around the globe".[58] Where OWC diverge is their focus on "reflect[ing] Oxford's commitment to [the latest] scholarship". They aim to provide the most accurate text along with a wealth of supporting materials, including "expert introductions by leading authorities", maps, bibliographies, "voluminous notes", illustrations and much more. By adding more explanatory materials, OWC simultaneously distance the text from the target culture, revering it as a museum piece by foregrounding its historical context, whilst trying to make understanding of that distance accessible, using scholarship as a dynamic tradition which aims to make the texts part of our living culture.

OWC's first *Aeneid* was Day Lewis' translation, which was originally released in the medium of radio broadcast and first published in print by Hogarth Press in 1952, accompanied by a brief translator foreword. Day Lewis had also translated the *Georgics* and *Eclogues*, and, in 1966, OUP published his complete Virgilian set (the *Aeneid* lightly revised), featuring a new translator foreword. In 1986, it was published again by OUP, this time as an Oxford World's Classic, accompanied by Day Lewis' 1966 foreword, as well as a new introduction and notes by Jasper Griffin, to befit the series' aims.[59] Thirty years later, OUP commissioned a new translation

---

[58] This and the rest of this paragraph from *OWC Profile US*: https://global.oup.com/academic/content/series/o/oxford-worlds-classics-owc/?cc=us&lang=en.

[59] Day Lewis' translation has also been published in the US, by Doubleday (1953).

by Frederick Ahl. While A.N. Wilson hailed OUP for "dropping the really bad translation by Cecil Day Lewis,"[60] the publisher clearly sees both translations coexisting: the former translation was reissued in 1998 and again in 2008.[61] Its audio popularity also endures: it was serialised again on the radio in 1999 with a cast including Ralph Fiennes and Derek Jacobi,[62] and a recording was released in 2003.[63] Whilst there are a few instances where it would appear that Ahl referred to Day Lewis' translation, both in areas where Ahl's translation is similar but also where he appears to consciously deviate from his predecessor, their different objectives, motivations and contexts are generally evident.[64]

Although both claim a significant place in Virgilian reception, Ahl and Day Lewis have been so far neglected in studies of Virgilian reception and translation.[65] They are bound together by one of the most influential

---

[60] A.N. Wilson (2008) does not elaborate on what he dislikes in Day Lewis' translation.

[61] This is perhaps surprising, considering Day Lewis, as a poet, has not experienced the longevity of popularity that, say, Auden and Larkin have.

[62] *BBC Genome*: https://genome.ch.bbc.co.uk/e5e25ff058c54857a7b78dc68d35fa98.

[63] Published by Naxos Audiobooks (2003) and reviewed by Hardyment (2003).

[64] A free verse translation by Powell (2015) was also published by OUP, though not as part of their OWC series. Powell's translation, with its plain language and explanatory though simplistic introductory materials, appears to be aimed at school-level education, though its suitability for that audience seems tainted by the fact that it is not line-for-line. Powell's translation does not appear to have made a significant impact among readership, as Juster (2018) observes, it has been widely (he adds "rightly") ignored.

[65] Cheney (1983): since its early reviewers, and excepting some comments by Parsons (1977), little has been said about Day Lewis' translation (435). Ahl's has

publishers for general reception of classical texts, but separated by a degree of difference which makes them comparable: poet versus scholar, British versus American, radio high culture versus student market. During the fifty years which separate them, the status of translation as a creative and critical activity has flourished significantly, the cultural and academic relationship between Classics and Anglophone culture has shifted drastically, and Virgilian scholarly debates, which OUP aim to uphold and reflect, have been taken in a new direction. These translators neatly demonstrate changes to audience and reception with regard to Virgilian translation across the late twentieth century, presenting two snapshots fixed in time, relative to Virgilian scholarship, translation theory, and the cultural and educational relationship between the Anglophone world and classical epic.

---

been equally neglected and received next to no academic reviews, something which Thomas (2018) calls "curious" (240). See Braund (2010) for an insightful discussion of the foreignizing effects of Ahl's translation.

Day Lewis: Classics in culture, an 'English literary life', World War Two

Day Lewis' autobiography presents a rather different image to the biography written by his son Sean, inked with underlying bitterness.[66] His ambiguous characterisation reflects how he lived, in many ways, from his birth in 1904 to his death in 1972, a divided life. From his name,[67] to his Anglo-Irish nationality,[68] his marriages and affairs,[69] his relationship with his father,[70] with religion,[71] and with his past,[72] his reluctant desire for

---

[66] Focusing on his childhood, Day Lewis (in his 1960 autobiography) conveys his strong moral sense, his anxious modesty, and his endearingly strong sense of failure (67, 80, 46). Whilst declaring itself aiming at objectivity, the critical tone of Day-Lewis' 1982 biography comes through as early as the Preface. Sean warns that his father's autobiography should be read as "the truth, nothing but the truth, but not the whole truth" (44).

[67] I follow Cecil's (and OUP's) spelling of his name (without the hyphen). Cecil declared "As a writer I do not use the hyphen in my surname – a piece of inverted snobbery" (1960) 17. Despite the inconsistency, I write his son (and biographer) Sean's name with a hyphen, which he deems the "correct" spelling of both his father's name and his own (1982: x-xi).

[68] See Day Lewis (1960) 16, 18. He refers to himself as "rather rootless", and says he struggled to feel attached to abstract concepts such as nations.

[69] He was married twice and had two (concurrent) significant relationships. See Day Lewis (1960) 97, 230, 233-4; and Day-Lewis (1982) 117, 139, 183-4.

[70] Day Lewis (1960): he was four when his mother died. He sensed he inherited from her a "passionate sense of injustice" (20). Although it is clear he loved his father (44), and idolised him as a hero from an early age (91, 105-7), their relationship was strained, comprised of "abnormal tension" and the "full force of a love that had nowhere else to turn" (21).

[71] His father was a rector, so religion formed a natural part of his life. See Day Lewis (1960) 49, 51, 143, 191, but best summed up: "I had not lost my faith, for I had nothing so positive as a faith to lose – only a tradition and a habit of Christianity" (117)

[72] Day Lewis (1960) 26-7. He seems to have harboured regret here, and realised only when it was too late to reconnect.

friendships and home,[73] his class status in "no man's land" between the village community and the aristocracy,[74] his generation caught between the domestic Victorian enclave and the excitement of the twentieth century,[75] and between feeling the effect of, but not quite understanding, the returned First World War soldiers, who were just graduating from university as he arrived.[76] Sean describes him as a "complicated and much loved man, of many contradictions", while Cecil himself refers to his divided mind as his "most chronic malady".[77] He recognises throughout his work a search for personal identity, felt himself a mass of incoherent contradictions, and voices his internal divisions in his poetry, for example "In me two worlds at war".[78]

Day Lewis acknowledged that he had a privileged education, both at school, recalling positively the feeling of elitism which his Latin teacher instilled into him, and when he attended Wadham College, Oxford, to read Classics.[79]

---

[73] Day Lewis (1960) 92, 134.

[74] Day Lewis (1960) 131.

[75] Day Lewis (1960) 135-6.

[76] Day Lewis (1960) 158-9.

[77] Day-Lewis (1982) ix. Day Lewis (1960) 212.

[78] Day Lewis (1960) 20, 24, 80, 81, 145, 156, 242. Day Lewis (1951) *In Me Two Worlds* (123). Hynes (1976), printed in Carter (1984) 175, identifies conflicting sides of Day Lewis' poetry; Day Lewis (1934: 48) described the post-war poet as "between two fires".

[79] Day Lewis (1960) 159, 102, 116, 110. Little is officially recorded of his time at Wadham, though I am grateful to their archivist for sharing records in the Wadham Gazette concerning his exam performance (Class II in Mods, Class III in Finals), his achieving athletics colours in college, his singing, as a member of a

He initially worked as a Classics schoolmaster, however, he had started writing poetry from an early age, and other professions never shook him from considering himself first and foremost a poet.[80] He was a prolific writer, penning, with consistent volume but fluctuating quality, over 400 original poems.[81] Also a novelist, under the pseudonym Nicholas Blake,[82] he later became senior editor of the publisher Chatto and Windus, and Professor of Poetry at the University of Oxford. By 1950, he was awarded a CBE, and by 1968, he was poet laureate, a post he held until his death in 1972.[83]

His Oxford connections were important to him in later life: Maurice Bowra, then warden at Wadham, was instrumental in his obtaining later teaching posts;[84] and his fellow student and friend W.H. Auden would become a key literary and political influence.[85] In terms of his poetry, Auden's influence at times became a shadow to him; praise for Day Lewis often seems to be

---

voice quartet and in the chorus of a performance of *The Clouds*, and reading a paper to the Literary Society in 1926 in praise of Emily Dickinson.

[80] Parsons (1977) vii.

[81] Parsons (1977): Day Lewis acknowledged his quantitative approach to poetry in a letter to Philip Larkin: "You write too little – I've written far too much" (ix, vii).

[82] Another element of doubleness. Day-Lewis (1982) 172.

[83] Parsons (1977) says that he took the post so seriously that it did no service to his poetry (xv-xvi).

[84] Day Lewis (1960) 164. Day-Lewis (1982) 41, 58.

[85] Both in Day Lewis' own words: (1937), printed in Carter (1984) 55-56; (1960) 176-8, 156-7; and others': Parsons (1977) xi, Bergonzi (1978), printed in Carter (1984) 190, Day-Lewis (1982) 43.

somewhat reluctant, especially when in the context of Auden and Hopkins.[86] Through Auden, he met MacNeice and Spender, with whom he shared a political concern;[87] under their influence he became a member of the communist party in 1935. His recognition that peers saw his "romanticised" version of communism as driven more by harmless eccentricity rather than violent ambitions, is reiterated by Spender, who described Cecil's view of communism as more the 'village pub' than Stalin.[88] Nevertheless, his extreme left-wing position was at odds with the responsibilities of a schoolmaster, and it was his desire to openly embrace his politics that enabled, or necessitated, him to pursue poetry as a full time career.[89] His poetry, while not 'communist poetry', had been heavily influenced by communism in thirties' England,[90] sympathetically expressing the aspirations of many young left-wing writers,[91] and expressing the role of communism to offer hope.[92] Whilst he does not speak

---

[86] Parsons (1977) xii. Fraser (1959), printed in Carter (1984) 129: "Day Lewis, for instance, in the 1930s was often writing, to my mind rather unsuccessfully, either in a manner diluted from Hopkins or in a manner taken over from Mr Auden's coarser scoutmaster vein". Day Lewis' later poetry was generally more highly praised, when he moved away from Auden's influence and returned to lyric themes (Carter [1984] 17).

[87] Auden (1963). Though often considered a group, the four did not actually meet until 1947. On their relationship, see also Scarfe (1942) 1.

[88] Day Lewis (1960) 211, 212. Day-Lewis (1982) calls Cecil's involvement in communism "exaggerated" (61, 62, 116).

[89] Day Lewis (1960) 204, 206. Day-Lewis (1982) partly attributes his initial proclamation of being politically left to a desire to be provocative at the vicarage (29).

[90] Maxwell (1969), printed in Carter (1984) 151.

[91] Parsons (1977) x.

[92] Day Lewis (1960) 218. Day-Lewis (1982) 101.

of these allegiances with regret, he renounced them in 1960, in *The Buried Day*.[93]

While World War 1 and the war in Spain provided peripheral influence,[94] Day Lewis described the Second World War as a "seismic experience".[95] In the 1940s, he had quickly scaled the military ladder and became company commander of the local home guard. Though he describes the beginning of this role as "playing at soldiers", any fantastical element disappeared as the threat of invasion grew.[96] He favoured his chances in London's blitz over frontline action, and fought rather hard, a fight which would later bring him pangs of guilt, to join the privileged classes against which he had previously campaigned, using his connections to secure himself a position as publications editor at the Ministry of Information, an institution often seen as a soft excuse to evade call-up.[97] Whilst many of his generation were suffering with the mental scars of war, Day Lewis' near nervous breakdown in 1944 seems to have been caused rather by anguish over the internal

---

[93] Day Lewis (1960) 208.

[94] Day Lewis (1960) 83-85: Ypres felt as far away as Troy, "legendary and timeless". Scarfe (1942): the Spanish war taught even the pacifist that "human values have to be struggled for" (194-7).

[95] Day Lewis (1951) 7.

[96] Day Lewis (1960) 97-9.

[97] Day-Lewis (1982) 127, 131, 136-7, 146.

conflict occurring within his divided heart, by stress incurred by the double life which he was openly living.[98]

He was halfway through his *Aeneid* when he moved in with Jill, who would become his second wife.[99] However, his first encounter with Virgilian translation was via the *Georgics*, which he translated in the summer of 1940.[100] His sighting, first hand, of men walking to battle, and his anecdote of interrupting his work to check a consignment of weapons, clearly juxtaposes his reading of Virgil alongside his wartime experience.[101] To him, the war exposed the patriotism which he imagined Virgil felt, and he envisaged the Virgil of the *Georgics* speaking to him through the English countryside, granting him a new appreciation both of his own past and of that which he shared with many through Virgil's European tradition, adding to his enhanced awareness of England. Though he described war as humanity's self-destruction, he admired the pacifist and frontline soldier equally, and believed it the poet's responsibility to be involved in every stream of human experience. He described feeling a heightening of the senses during the summer of 1940, a feeling brought about by knowing it

---

[98] Day Lewis (1960) 227, 233-4. Day-Lewis (1982) 127, 156.

[99] Day-Lewis (1982) 199.

[100] Burrow (1997) suggests that Day Lewis was attracted to Virgil as an exile, "although the Worlds Classics edition will not confess as much", and that he turned to Virgil after leaving the communists in 1940, finding, as many before "an imaginary version of the community which eluded him in reality" (35).

[101] Information in this sentence and the rest of the paragraph from Day Lewis (1960) 81-101.

might be his last; war was, for him, neither a cause nor a nuisance, but a delirium which brought lucidity, illumination and a positive feeling of participation in the human condition. However, he also recognised war's ambiguousness and the incongruity between its message and its reality, as illustrated in his lines "Lost in Flanders by medalled commanders | The lads of the village are vanished away".[102]

It was in March 1949 that Day Lewis was in first discussions with the BBC about a translation of the *Aeneid* for radio, a powerful medium, he believed, for poetry.[103] At this time, the poet was flushed with, albeit distanced, wartime experience, at the height of his career (his CBE was awarded the following year), and on the verge of celebrity status in London.[104] His translation owes its existence to Jackson Knight, partly for his scholarly assistance, but, more intrinsically, since he had first suggested the idea to the BBC's Harman Grisewood.[105] Jackson Knight provided Day Lewis with a scholar's insight into Virgil; they discussed poetic, historical and etymological layers of meaning to each word, sometimes taking a whole weekend to discuss 40 lines, providing Day Lewis more than he could ever hope to convey.[106] Although the translation was initially planned to be

---

[102] Day Lewis (1951) *Two Songs* (125).

[103] Whitehead (1989) 159. Day-Lewis (1982) 177.

[104] Day-Lewis (1982) 144.

[105] Wilson Knight (1975) 355, 357. The BBC proposed Day Lewis as translator.

[106] Wilson Knight (1975) 11, 12: it was a "useful collaboration", with Day Lewis proud to have been a "disciple" of Jackson Knight's "genius"; when it appeared in

partial (Day Lewis would only commit to producing 20 lines per day), the BBC subsequently tasked him with the entirety.[107] The commission coincided with the Festival of Britain, an initiative intended to improve the overseas' impression of Britain's post-war capacity, whilst boosting domestic morale.[108] Rather than appropriating such an establishment text as the *Aeneid* to celebrate war, or victory in war, it was rather part of a drive for national celebration, using great, epic, works of literature to celebrate poetry whilst reuniting a culture with accessible intellectualism.

For Day Lewis personally, translation was an act which he turned to in his less productive poetry-writing periods.[109] He speaks of the act of creative translation as "an exercise, a way of developing his own style […] the translating of poetry is […] a process not greatly different from that of writing original verse".[110] He acknowledged Virgil's influence on his own poetry, and thematic parallels can be drawn: Day Lewis recurringly writes of love and death, "the two deepest, most inexhaustible themes of poetry", supposedly often the real focus of his so-called political poems, as well as

---

print, Day Lewis dedicated his translation to Jackson Knight. In 1951, Jackson Knight was beginning to think about his own translation, which would be published by Penguin in 1956 (377-386).

[107] Day-Lewis (1982) 172.

[108] Day-Lewis (1982) 188.

[109] Parsons (1977) vii. Day Lewis (1960) 243.

[110] Day Lewis (1970) 6, 19-20. Heaney (2000, 2002 ed.) remarks similarly of his translation of *Beowulf*, stating that the essentials of composition are "as true for translators as [they are] for poets attempting original work" (xxxv-xxxvi).

hero-worship, apprehension, the impact of war, and the search for personal identity.[111] Day Lewis considered Virgil's compassion and pathos to some extent weakened the *Aeneid*, thus criticising it for the same emotional and personal aspects for which his own work had been criticised.[112] Indeed, Day Lewis' understanding of Virgil as "sick of civil war and hop[ing] for a long period of peace under Augustus", might reflect post-war readings of the relationship between poet and emperor.[113] The "growing concern for humanity" which Parsons sees in Day Lewis, a tension between his inherited past and the future he longed for (expressing similar pressures as Aeneas), gave expression to deeper and more pessimistic politics as World War Two loomed, and resonates in his reading of the *Aeneid*, which Day Lewis himself believed showed a "conflict between the excitement of war and the pity of it".[114]

---

[111] Day Lewis (1965) on the themes of love and death (138), and (1951) on them being the subject of his political poetry (10-11) and on his poetic influences, including Virgil (8).

[112] By both himself: Day Lewis (1951) 10: "I could show [the reader] where emotion, applied too raw, has eaten holes in the fabric of a poem, and where it has been more successfully depersonalised"; and others, e.g. Parsons (1977) xvi-xvii, who says that even though Day Lewis himself declared "However intimate the experience out of which we write, in the act of making a poem from it, that experience must be distanced", his poems were "occasionally altogether too 'personal' in a limiting sense". Day Lewis (1966) vii wrote that Virgil's compassion and pathos on occasion "weakened the poem".

[113] Day Lewis (1966) vii.

[114] Day Lewis (1966) vii. Parsons (1977) x.

The 1950s were the golden age of radio, before the true rise of television.[115] The *Aeneid* was to be broadcast by the newly devised (introduced in 1946) *Third Programme*, "alternately the glory, jest and riddle of the BBC world".[116] The *Third Programme* was part of the BBC's tripartite post-war radio structure, which offered pyramidic strata that aimed to segment its audience by cultural "brow".[117] Whilst this structure was devised, in some ways, to encourage the aspirational to climb a cultural ladder,[118] the unashamedly highbrow *Third Programme* was actually aiming itself at an already highly-educated audience, or "persons of taste, of intelligence and of education… The Programme need not cultivate any other audience".[119] This paradox of positioning radio, a mass medium form, as a highly cultural, almost elitist, programme, was one reason behind the programme's downfall.[120] On the one hand, materials were broadcast in translation, to

---

[115] Snagge and Barsley (1972) choose 1935-1953 as the vintage years of radio (vii), whilst Crisell (1997, 2002 ed.) specifies 1945-1960 as the greatest BBC radio era (74). Wrigley (2015): in 1957, the *Radio Times* would move its television listings ahead of the radio listings (227).

[116] Snagge and Barsley (1972) 157. See Wrigley (2015) on media criticism of the *Third Programme*'s content (227), e.g. Hallam (1947): "too many of the items smell of the dust of a don's study, and give the impression that they are broadcast because they are highbrow and/or unusual, not because they are good".

[117] Wrigley (2015) 79-81.

[118] Wrigley (2015) 51. Briggs (1979) 76-7. Crisell (1986, 1994 ed.) 24-5, with reference to A. Smith (1974) 83.

[119] Wrigley (2015) 7, and (the latter quote) 50, from an internal BBC memo.

[120] Wrigley (2015) 79-81. The *Third Programme*, despite its grand intentions, peaked at 750,000 listeners (2 per cent of the available radio audience) (Paulu [1961] 153, 156), and fell to 90,000 (Wrigley [2015] 81). Despite strong support from senior management (and contributors including Day Lewis [Day-Lewis (1982) 234-5]), the financially-struggling BBC were unable to justify the

aid accessibility and appeal to a new type of listener, with broadcasts accompanied by a series of scholarly lectures indicating a culturally educational purpose.[121] On the other hand, the BBC sternly rejected requests from listeners for additional study materials, labelling them "hearing aids" for "aspirants" which would dilute their programme content.[122] They might have done better to encourage this audience, since the majority of the *Third Programme*'s listeners were outside of their target demographic, proving that the programmes which the BBC had designed especially for elite audiences actually had more appeal as affordable and accessible ways for anyone with a wireless to experience what might otherwise be socially exclusive art and culture.[123] The BBC's posthumous description of the programme's reception is framed rather more positively: "the station was unlike anything else on the airwaves. Broadcasting only the very best of high culture, the *Third Programme* captured a new ideal - that elite culture was good for the whole nation. Surprisingly, it was a vision shared by both left and right".[124]

---

programme, and its airtime was cut by 40% in 1957, before being replaced by Radio 3 in 1967 (Wrigley [2015] 227, 238; Carpenter [1996] 177, 185).

[121] Wilson Knight (1975) 355: the talks included one by Rieu and two by Jackson Knight (on the making of the *Aeneid* and, in collaboration with linguist Tom Lockett, Virgil's pronunciation).

[122] Wrigley (2015) 79-81, 277. Whitehead (1989) 48-50.

[123] Wrigley (2015) 81. Carpenter (1996): it only reached a fifth of its expected audience, as well as a "a surprising number of poorly educated people" (109).

[124] *BBC, The Third Programme: High Culture for All*: https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/0055151D?bcast=30114604&sub=aeneid.

Day Lewis' *Aeneid* was serialised in 12 episodes, and read by a collection of actors. Although he had assumed he would be consulted on production and casting, producer Basil Taylor was unimpressed by his interventions, and he was subsequently banned from attending rehearsals.[125] Naturally, there was a speaking part for the narrator, which gives the text an identified performing "I"; the act of reading the play aloud embodies the narrative voice in a way which assimilates itself to the ancient epic performance. The actors cast also imbue their roles with particular characteristics: the boyish Turnus, matronly Juno, masculine Aeneas, wise narrator (voiced by the Shakespearian actor Paul Scofield). The production used musical interludes to break up the narrative where desired, and to impart a particular and relevant emotional effect. Listening to the audio recording, the impact of the speaker's intonation and pace is clear; if the translator is a reader and an interpreter, so is the actor, adding another mediating layer before the text reaches its audience.[126] Wrigley suggests that radio is "able to elicit a strong sense of 'ownership' of cultural broadcasts, through a combination of the lack of boundaries conditioning the reception of programmes broadcast into the personal, domestic sphere, and the psychologically intimate nature of the radio broadcast".[127] Radio

---

[125] Day-Lewis (1982).

[126] Published by Naxos Audiobooks (2003). Since my focus is on the enduring reception of the written text, rather than on the delivery of a particular performance, I do not focus on qualities of one specific performance in later analysis.

[127] Wrigley (2015) 276.

commands attention, especially prior to 'on-demand' listening, which gives a certain authority and urgency to the voice telling the story: there is a singular, ephemeral speaking moment. The narrator is in control, not of the listener, who can walk out of the room or pull the plug at any moment, but certainly of the narrative. The audience interaction thus differs from a book, where the reader can pick up and turn the page whenever they wish.

Whilst Cobley supposes that radio does not afford a great degree of narrative authority, since its domestic context means that listeners were often engaged in other activities, the *Third Programme* certainly did not see itself in this way.[128] It opened with a tongue-in-cheek feature on 'How to Listen', a clarion call for people to listen 'properly' and to pay attention, which defined the "perfect listener" and asserted that it was not "background listening".[129] Its format helped to consolidate this position: as Nicholas Kenyon explains, it was fundamentally different in only broadcasting in the evenings, meaning listeners were "expected to attend to the *Third Programme* with the sort of concentrated fervour that they would give to going to the theatre or the cinema or a concert. It wasn't

---

[128] Cobley (2001) 190, 197-8.

[129] *BBC, The Third Programme: High Culture for All*: https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/0055151D?bcast=30114604&sub=aeneid (3'18'').

something that you just casually had on in the background."[130] Day Lewis thus brings an authoritative, established voice to this translation, and the radio context consolidates Classics' position within culture. This is not something which has entirely disappeared from our era,[131] and thus whilst it does not mark a generational distinction, it is at least a personal consideration differentiating Day Lewis from Ahl, who would translate the *Aeneid* some 50 years later.

Ahl: Classics in education, Vietnam, the "pessimistic" Virgil

Like Day Lewis, Frederick Ahl has a degree of dual nationality: he was born in the UK (in 1941), attended Cambridge, then undertook his PhD in Texas, before joining Cornell University in 1971, where he is currently Professor of Classics and Comparative Literature. His interests include Greek and Roman epic and drama (Sophocles, Lucan and Statius), translations of Latin epic and tragedy, politics in Roman poetry. ancient Greek music, Homeric narrative, rhetoric in antiquity, Roman imperial poetry, sound and wordplay in literature, and translation theory.[132] He has been highly celebrated as a teacher and an academic, with students and peers praising

---

[130] *BBC, The Third Programme: High Culture for All*: https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/0055151D?bcast=30114604&sub=aeneid (3'56'').

[131] As evidenced by the broadcast of Heaney's translation on BBC Radio Four in 2016: https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b072j0mn.

[132] *Cornell Ahl profile:* https://classics.cornell.edu/frederick-m-ahl.

his opinionated creativity.[133] The editor of the *Masters of Latin Literature* series of translations, he himself has translated *Phaedra, Trojan Women* and *Medea* (all 1986). Like Day Lewis then, Ahl has followed a less common route to Virgil, not via Homer as many translators (including Fitzgerald and Fagles). Outside academia he is active in theatre, and has written theatrical versions of both Seneca and Sophocles' *Oedipus*, which have been performed.[134]

By the time that he had penned his translation, Ahl had written extensive scholarship on the *Aeneid*, if not directly, then through his works on Statius, Ovid and, especially, Lucan.[135] Ahl notes that Virgil, at least superficially, endorses the Caesars, and that he characterised the gods based on imperial and political propaganda rather than religious norms. "For all the magnificence of the *Aeneid*," he states, "one senses an enormous moral vacuum"; the fact that men's actions are driven by their orders rather than their commitment to the cause makes it difficult to distinguish praise for Augustus and Aeneas with criticism. The *Pharsalia* was, for Ahl, a sort of anti-*Aeneid*, harshly criticising the cost that came with peace, rather than

---

[133] Student reviews from *Rate My Professor*: https://www.ratemyprofessors.com/ShowRatings.jsp?tid=454422. Colleague praise at *Cornell Ahl Announcement*: http://news.cornell.edu/stories/1996/06/three-cornell-faculty-named-1996-weiss-presidential-fellows-distinguished-teaching.

[134] Aloi (2008).

[135] This paragraph summarises views that Ahl expresses in his introduction to Lucan (1976), especially 58, 64-7, 75, 142, 240-1, 285.

suggesting the labyrinthine possibilities of the *Aeneid*. Ahl reads Virgil's characters as, whether by design or by necessity, not distinguishably good or evil, except when it comes to the gods. He compares Lucan's portrayals of Cato and Caesar with Virgil's Juno and Venus, who oppose each other politically but are morally, wickedly, equal. He also speaks of Aeneas' ambiguity; his desire to die at Troy, born out of passion, would be considered the proper Roman action. To justify his epic, Virgil makes Aeneas' actions stem from inclement divine intervention, as shown to him by Venus. Ahl's reading of the *Aeneid* is thus infused with ambiguity; his gods are morally corrupt, and yet it is on their intervention that Aeneas' heroism depends.

In the first half of the twentieth century, few questioned the *Aeneid*'s unequivocal position as "a classic vindication of the European world-order, happily consonant with Roman imperialism and the achievements and political settlement of Augustus."[136] Whilst important scholarship did arise out of the early twentieth century, it was to significantly increase after 1945.[137] Inspired by the work of Pöschl (1950), landmark scholarly and historic developments were advocating appreciation of Virgil's darker

---

[136] The quote is Harrison's (1990) 3-4. This paragraph owes much to his introduction, which gives a clear and insightful summary of developments in twentieth-century scholarly reception of the *Aeneid* throughout Germany, the US and the UK.

[137] Harrison (1990) 11.

side.[138] The 'Harvard School' scholars, Clausen (1964), Parry (1963), and Putnam (1965), buoyed by the momentum created by the anti-Vietnam war movement and reacting against others' continued staunch imperialist readings, believed that the *Aeneid* offered, below its triumphant surface, critical undertones of the cost of that glory.[139] Whilst imperial readings find a straightforward, moralistic narrative voice, a movement towards reading ambiguity in Virgil was rising out of the historical situation. Applying reception theory to Virgilian ambiguity, Martindale makes a case that it is possible to see ambiguity "less as a property of the text and more as part of critical and readerly *practice*".[140] He also notes a particularly convenient truth about ambiguity, distant from its duplicitous connotations in other contexts, that it provides a way for readers to praise the *Aeneid* without praising imperialism, allowing it to be appropriated for anti-, rather than pro-, imperial agendas.[141]

---

[138] Harrison (1990) 4 explains that the movement which Pöschl partly inspired is actually at odds with his own views. Pöschl's work was originally published in 1950; the edition which I cite is the English translation of 1962 (1970 ed.).

[139] Braund (2018) 108-9. Harrison (1990) 5. Kallendorf (2006) 76 notes the distinction between these schools is not 'absolute'. Hardie (2005) 86: this reading suited audiences in the second half of the 20th century, "increasingly alienated from the idea of empire".

[140] Martindale (1993, 1999 ed.) 14, 22.

[141] Martindale (1993, 1999 ed.) 30. Another interesting reconceptualization of Virgil's ambiguity is as intertextuality: its other voices are the diverse texts of Latin or Greek "that it speaks or is spoken by" (23). Also see Harrison (1990) 19 on Lyne's application of this.

The influence of the Vietnam war (alongside other institutional questioning, and the free speech and civil rights movements),[142] and of the scholarship it inspired, was to be felt in the surge of American translations which followed. Ahl was one of four American verse translations published in consecutive years (2005-2008), a fact which Braund termed "remarkable".[143] His position within this context of multiple translations interacting with historical context, sets him apart from Day Lewis.[144] Braund argues that "inevitably the major American verse translations in the last 50 years have been framed by Virgil's attitude to empire, which resonated with each translator's stance in relation to the war in Vietnam".[145] Most overtly so is Lombardo's translation, with regular topical relevance through contemporary military references, and its striking cover image: a close-up of the Vietnam Veterans' Memorial Wall in Washington, DC.[146] Braund argues that both Mandelbaum and Fitzgerald were partly inspired to translate because of the Vietnam war and its impact on Virgilian scholarship, though in different ways.[147] Whilst she frequently reads in Mandelbaum an anti-war stance, for her Fitzgerald focuses on celebrating

---

[142] Braund (2018) 108; Harrison (1990) 5.

[143] Braund (2018) 113.

[144] I believe the last literary translation by a major poet was Wordsworth's (failed) attempt, and the last translation which has stood the test of time the, differently aimed, Loeb translation of Rushton Fairclough (1916). This is consistent with Keith's (2018) list of translators (78-9).

[145] Braund and Torlone (2018) 9.

[146] Braund (2018) 113, 114, citing Pelliccia (2007).

[147] Braund (2018) 107-8.

Aeneas' achievement, possibly reflecting influence from his service in World War 2.[148] Echoing these points, Thomas names Mandelbaum a particularly instructive use of "post-Vietnam" Virgil, and comments that the *Aeneid* activates the question of death's legitimacy, when read in the context of "meaningless" wars such as Vietnam and World War 1.[149] Thomas' omission of World War 2, and Braund's argument that its experience contributed to Fitzgerald's positive reading of the *Aeneid*, aligns with my understanding of the incongruence between Ahl and Day Lewis' wartime contexts.

Of the academic contributions to Virgilian ambiguity arising from this historical context, it is those which deal most explicitly with Virgil's narrative voice which will be most pertinent to this study. Parry is the eminent precursor here, with his landmark recognition of Virgil's two voices: "a public voice of triumph, and a private voice of regret".[150] The work of Empson, a critical foundation to categorising ambiguity, is important and often cited, though it is very broad; for Empson, ambiguity is "any verbal nuance, however slight, which gives room for alternative reactions", and extends to puns, wordplay, and even different ways of

---

[148] Braund (2018) 112. Fitzgerald confessed, in his postscript (1981) 414 to first reading the *Aeneid*, when stationed at Pearl Harbour, for reasons other than its literariness.

[149] In an interview for Howard (2008). Thomas (2001) has called the Vietnam war "illegal and unjust" (xi).

[150] Parry (1963) 79.

interpreting poetic beauty.[151] Parry's work (as that of many scholars) has an initial basis in the seminal work of Heinze, and later Otis, who, respectively, explore Virgil's narrative from the point of view of subjectivity, and the division of that subjectivity into sympathy and empathy.[152] If Heinze first identified Virgil's subjective voice and Otis two sides of that subjective voice, Parry reconsidered the dual vocality as opposing forces of 'triumph' and 'regret'. Quantitatively expanding Parry's theory, Lyne subsequently identified 'further voices', describing Virgil's text as a polyphonous web of subtextual voices which often contradict or subvert the surtext's Augustan propaganda.[153] Locating himself amongst American pessimists, Lyne argues that scholars who still see Virgil as "unequivocably patriotic and imperial", have "hearkened too much to the epic voice".[154] That there is an epic voice, even within this world of fractured perspective, is significant; Lyne notes that it is not irreparably damaged by the existence of further voices, and provides an anchor to readers not wishing to be "irritatingly diverted".[155] Brammall asserts the importance of this epic voice, since he considers the *Aeneid* constantly in

---

[151] Empson (1930, 1963 ed.) 1. Empson is open about the overlapping nature of his categories; in the preface to his second edition, he notes his claim to use the term 'ambiguity' to "mean anything I liked" and his repeated warnings to the reader that the distinctions between his categories "would not be worth the attention of a profounder thinker" (vii). See also Martindale (1993, 1999 ed.) 15-17.

[152] Heinze (1903, trans. 1993); Otis (1964, 1995 ed.).

[153] Lyne (1987) 217, n1.

[154] Lyne (1987) 217, n1.

[155] Lyne (1987) 227, 236-7.

danger of losing its epic status, on the brink of becoming tragedy, only supported and sustained by the "overarching perspective and sympathy of the omniscient narrator; he suffers along with the characters, but always supports a comprehensive view of the epic's direction".[156] Conte, on the other hand, sees the force of fate as the epic objective anchor, perceiving Virgil's polyvocality as a way to complicate the poem's morality, leading to voices which do not oppose truth and falsity, but rather opposing truths.[157]

The debate on optimistic and pessimistic voices of Virgil remains unresolved, and continues to perplex translators.[158] In his own translation preface, Fagles discusses relevant scholarship, specifically the two voices argument, hesitantly expressing optimism that the two voices might be moving towards a state of harmony.[159] The need to retain the original ambiguity, which Balmer claimed was her strongest guiding force in translation,[160] is an acute concern for Ahl, as he discusses in his preface and which subsequently resounds throughout his *Aeneid*.

---

[156] Brammall (2015) 71-2.

[157] Conte (2007) 31-35.

[158] Braund (2018) 113; Harrison (1990) 19. Quinn (1968), W.S. Anderson (1969), Johnson (1976), Putnam (1995; 2001) continue to take the pessimistic reading, while Hardie (1986), Cairns (1989) and Galinsky (1994) insist on its imperial message.

[159] Fagles (2006) 398-9.

[160] Balmer (1996) 21.

The academic pressures acting on Ahl come not only from scholarship, but also, and quite divergently, from his predominantly student audience. He writes in his preface, "I wanted it to be a version that the literary-minded could appreciate, but […] I tried to stay close enough to the original for a struggling Latin student to be able to use it as a crib".[161] That his translation is primarily aimed at a student market reflects Classics' changing position in culture and in education; whilst his audience differs significantly from Day Lewis', both seek to attract the most significant audience available to their time. Whilst Day Lewis' audience would be reading, or originally listening, to his poetry, a large proportion of Ahl's are likely to be learning for exams. Although the percentage of potential readers, or people literate in Latin, might not have changed drastically since Day Lewis' generation, the number of people willing to engage in high culture, and Classics' subsequent position in it, has indeed changed. Equally, within education, the movement away from language study to texts in translation is perhaps behind the recent volume of translations published. This decline in language learning was starting to occur contemporaneously with Day Lewis. Whilst Latin itself was overtaking Greek as the more common classical language, it was short-lived glory: it was to lose its compulsory entrance requirement for university education in 1958, which

[161] Ahl (2007) xlvi.

subsequently had an impact upon the study of Classics at school levels.[162] As attested by the publication of a handbook containing a section on 'Why we teach the Classics', the validity of Classics within the classroom was starting to come under threat.[163] Stray also notes a shift in the 1950s from Classics as culture to Classics as a mental discipline,[164] a movement which the (ultimately failed) efforts of the *Third Programme* seem to have been attempting to reverse. For Day Lewis, therefore, Classics is still (just) clinging on to its place in mass medium aspirational highbrow culture, experienced in the domestic living room, whereas, for Ahl, whilst the fight is waged to maintain its place beyond the realm of academia, via popular public intellectuals such as Mary Beard, and significant interaction on television and online, it is primarily an educational matter.

Although people have been writing about translation since they have been translating writing, and Day Lewis himself gave a lecture on the subject, by the time of Ahl's translation, and reflected in the awareness he shows in his preface, it had become an independent critical and theoretical discipline.[165]

---

[162] Stray (1998) 282. Harrison (2009) also notes the literary impact on the waning control of the 'establishment' over Classics, since, in the 1960s, more writers on the periphery of traditional English scholarly engagement were showing interest in accessing classical texts and making them more widely available (3-4).

[163] Stray (1998) 295.

[164] Stray (1998) 276.

[165] See Venuti (2000, 2012 ed.) 4, 11. Day Lewis (1970). Venuti (2000, 2012 ed.: 1, 138) charts the 1970s as the beginning of the true academic realm of translation studies, coinciding with Holmes, who proposed the need for a new, independent discipline in a paper presented in 1972 (printed 1988, 1994 ed.).

One of its most central paradigms is that of equivalence, or literalness.[166] Horace wrote, in his *Ars Poetica*, that poets should avoid word-for-word translations, in order to author their own distinct text, worthy of the status of being a poem in its new context.[167] Proposing an alternative view in 1813, Friedrich Schleiermacher favoured a literal approach, which used language to reinforce the cultural gulf between the translation and the source text.[168] The effect of the latter has become termed *foreignization*, opposing *domestication*.[169] Indeed, whilst such polarities work within the realm of translation theory (others include instrumental [prioritising communication] versus hermeneutic [prioritising interpretation]), in practice, translators rarely approach these binaries in the extreme; more often, they aim for a balance of equivalence, making a translation readable whilst not deviating too far from their understanding of the original text. Whilst many translators claim to balance these deviating and conflicting approaches, making a translation readable in its new (target) language whilst not deviating too far from the original (source) text, they will not all balance this scale. They will move left or right along its axis, depending on their priorities, as well as their understanding of what constitutes

---

[166] Venuti (2000, 2012 ed.) 5. He defines *equivalence* as "a variable notion of how the translation is connected to the source text", elsewhere labelled 'accuracy', 'adequacy', 'correctness', 'correspondence', 'fidelity', or 'identity'.

[167] Venuti (2000, 2012 ed.) 4.

[168] Schleiermacher (1813, 2012 ed.) 43-63. Venuti (2000, 2012 ed.) 5. Venuti (1995, 2008 ed.) 84-98.

[169] See Venuti (1995, 2008 ed.) 4-5.

literalness, and how far a translator is entitled to go to achieve 'fluency'. Venuti declares that a fluent translation reads as if it were originally written in the target language and thus creates the illusion of a transparent translator, making readers of the translation feel that the fluency they are reading is Virgil's own.[170] The desire and fashion for fluency in translation has led to what Venuti termed a bizarre quest to silence the translator's voice and deny his presence, rendering him 'invisible'.[171]

Attaining this balance of equivalence has been a concern to most translators of Virgil, who, along with their critics, discuss the difficulty of achieving both in equilibrium. Dryden declared that translators should aim for an intermediate state of paraphrasing, avoiding both overly loose and adaptive imitations but also word-for-word versions which lack readability.[172] Fagles stated that he tried to find a middle ground between Virgil's features and a modern audience's expectations, trying to create a "modern English Virgil", creating a cross between the too literal (too Latin) and too literary (too English).[173] Day Lewis, in mostly domesticating language, states the need for a translation to be "based upon the language

---

[170] Venuti (1993) 211, 216.

[171] Venuti (1995, 1998) has assertively called out and fought against the perceived secondary status of translation.

[172] Venuti (2000, 2012 ed.) 18.

[173] Fagles (2006) 390.

of its own time".[174] Ahl, taking a more overtly foreignizing approach than Day Lewis, opens his preface by stating the need to 'defamiliarize' a text in order to translate it accurately.[175]

In their function to promulgate the *Aeneid*'s continued exposure to the education system, to the scholarly classical world, and to broader Anglophone literary culture, translators are expected to be at once entertaining authors, learned scholars, and authoritative educators. Day Lewis' translation, especially in its radio broadcast, carries authoritative weight. He was chosen to give voice to Virgil for a whole nation of listeners, reflecting a literary expectation and generational obligation which Ahl does not share. Ahl's translation, on the other hand, is subject to a different set of pressures: academic.[176] Translators thus adopt, consciously or unconsciously, different roles in cultural reception, and readers approach their translations with different expectations, perhaps expecting scholars to translate in an "accurate" way whilst affording poets more flexibility.[177] The way in which they are allowed to interact with the author and their audience thus shifts, and translators may mirror these considerations in

---

[174] Day Lewis (1952) vii.

[175] Ahl (2007) xlvi. Braund (2010) discusses Ahl's translation in the context of foreignized *Aeneid*s, and ends her discussion by calling for more foreignizing translations.

[176] He is all too aware of students' demands, calling them "the hardest to satisfy without compromising Virgil, the translator, and other readers" (2007: xlvi).

[177] D. Donoghue (2000) 12. I place "accurate" in speech marks to convey its impossibility.

the way they frame their work, whether in the text or paratext, either as an original, creative piece of writing or as a reverential linguistic transfer of a text over which they have no ownership, seeing the original as a living work which belongs to the translator and the new culture or as an historic artefact, raising or flattening the status of its original author.[178] In short, the translator, who is both a reader and a writer, can choose to prefer one of these activities over the other.

The translator and his audience: editing and explaining the text

This aspect of literary authority manifests itself in the translator's approach to editing the text. Although Virgil's text was relatively well-established by the twentieth century,[179] some discrepancies remain, and give power to editors and translators to deviate from accepted editorial markers (including punctuation or capitalisation) in order to interpret the text and speculatively suggest alternative readings of Virgil's complex and ambiguous narrative.[180] Whilst Day Lewis often omits spurious lines (with no accompanying note), Ahl will typically include them within square brackets, noting their spuriousness, to provide readers with the same

[178] De Vasconcellos (2018) examines a translation entitled *A Brazilian Virgil*, and questions how the word 'Brazilian' alters readings of the text and understanding of its authorship, inseparably uniting the original text with its translation (354).

[179] Harrison (1990) 14.

[180] Of course, translators' editing will likely be influenced by the most respected commentaries available to them, which contribute to subjective interpretative readings.

information he has, empowering them to make textual decisions and to become textual editors themselves.[181] Ahl takes a more open, unauthoritative view of textual editing, reflecting his individual background, changed translator norms, and a theoretical leaning towards modern, transparent, and informal publication. The changing audience is also significant, since a concentrated percentage of the (now smaller) audience are likely to be interested in editorial issues and to permit, or demand, less textual authority, whereas for Day Lewis, the published, formal text is considered high status. This is closely related to culture's relationship with Classics, as well as the purpose of translation: textual editing is likely to be of interest to students, but less so to those listening to Day Lewis' poetic translation. Whilst radio broadcast might play a part in this consideration, since listeners cannot refer to notes, it still affects *readers* of Day Lewis's translation, who are met with a pre-edited and interpreted, authoritative text. Modern readers are encouraged to question textual discrepancies, and the responsibility offered to editors is seen more as an opportunity rather than as a source of confusion or an insurmountable difficulty. Classical texts are permitted to be insecure, fallible, non-static, incomplete, influenced by an increased interest in

[181] The Latin which Day Lewis was working from may already have been strictly edited. For instances of Ahl's treatment of spurious lines, see 9.29, 9.121, 9.529. Ahl includes these lines but notes they should be ignored. Thus he expresses editorial judgement, but does not inflict it on the reader. This discrepancy between his scholarly opinion (reported in his notes) and his perceived obligations as translator shows the differing roles which he is expected to perform in each capacity.

fragmentary texts, where these issues are commonplace. Digitisation of texts has also had a huge impact on making these considerations more accessible to non-scholars and elevating the power of individual readings.[182] In our post-modern world, and with classical texts being read by a wider audience than before, Classics is becoming democratised.

This textual editing can be exposed, as Ahl does, or concealed, as Day Lewis. Balmer, taking on Godard's advice to use the paratext to replace the "modest, self-effacing translator" with one who "flaunts the signs of her manipulation of the text", used footnotes to comment on her act of translating, to give all readers, whether monolingual or bilingual, scholars or pleasure readers, an insight into the strategic processes of translating.[183] Ahl's notes function similarly, and verge, in places, on the detail expected from a textual commentary.[184] They have been praised by many,[185] and

---

[182] For example, the *Homer Multitext project*: http://www.homermultitext.org/about/. Harrison 1990 (14). Digitised methods and renewed interest in ancient commentaries have also helped to give scholars unfiltered access to materials and information.

[183] Balmer (1966) 22. Godard (1990) 89-96, especially 94.

[184] Ahl was reportedly preparing an *Aeneid* commentary in 2008 (Cormier [2008] 189).

[185] Ormsby (2008): Ahl's paratext "bring us as close as possible to the ultimate toughness of Virgil." Cormier (2008) also celebrates the depth of notes and maps (189). Where poets have not included a formal introduction about the poem's context or a glossary of names, it has been met with equal criticism. Feeney (2017) comments on Fagles' lack of contextualising introduction, glossary and list of names, which "would make reading the epic much easier for modern readers". Keith says that Ruden's scarcity of notes is likely to attract people with a degree of familiarity with the original, assuming a certain amount of prior knowledge (2018) 75-6.

reflect a different style of textual engagement. His translation is also accompanied by a detailed introduction by Elaine Fantham, which OWC pitch as being "informative and unintimidating", perhaps in attempts to appeal to non-scholarly audiences.[186] Day Lewis' initial translation did not have any notes (it is unlikely to have been a consideration in his initial construction of a translation for radio), but notes by Griffin were added when his translation was published as an OWC in 1986, which positions him in a position of academic tension in between Day Lewis and Ahl, and the different styles of classical interaction which they represent.

Textual notes can also be given in-text, where prose gives a far greater degree of freedom to explain names, allusions, or even to achieve poetic effects, as well as a wider lexical choice due to removal of syllabic restriction.[187] Keith discusses this, and contrasts Ruden's concision with Fagles' expansion, which allows him to add extra information, though often at the expense of the poetry.[188] The degree and function of textual notes is thus related to the choice of form itself.

---

[186] *OWC Profile UK*: https://global.oup.com/academic/content/series/o/oxford-worlds-classics-owc/?cc=gb&lang=en.

[187] Wilson Knight (1975) 381. This sometimes works in the opposite way. At 9.681, Ahl finds space for a "botanical gloss […] intruded to maintain Virgil's word play": "Twin oak trees [*genus: quercus*] raise untrimmable tresses | Sky high."

[188] Braund (2018): Fagles' long line and explanation of the text results in unnecessary expansion and a slower pace (116). Braund agrees with Stallings (2006): "in expanding for clarity, compression is lost". See Keith (2018) 76 on the in-text gloss of names being typical practice in twentieth-century translation.

Considerations, expectations, judgements

Poetic form may be an initial requirement of the translator, or may be fixed rather to accommodate other aspects of their translation which they consider more important.[189] Either way, as soon as it is fixed, it becomes a restriction. Day Lewis saw form as the constraint of a poet, the symbolic bridle of writing, which checks and balances the memories and ideas that the poet catches.[190] Though unsurprising, Day Lewis chose to write in verse to convey the poetic heights of the epic genre, which would be ignored by rendering it in narrative prose, and because he believed "the translator of Virgil will be a little more 'like his author' if he writes in verse".[191] Ahl explained: "I could not render the *Aeneid* as prose, because I don't know how to refashion poetry into prose without losing the essence of what makes the original poetic".[192] Farrell notes that Day Lewis and Ahl are unusual in opting for line-for-line translation, and that this requires them to use a slightly longer line length: the density of Latin means translators inevitably have to increase one.[193] A shorter line might be elegant and concise, but may also result in more ambiguity, since there is less room to explicate, or to use an in-text gloss. Subsequently, initial decisions on form

---

[189] Venuti (1993) 215 notes the influence of translation, specifically Denham's, on naturalising the heroic couplet, thus developing a form that would dominate English poetry and poetic translation for more than a century.

[190] Day Lewis (1965) 149. The tight restraints of form, he says, can stimulate creativity.

[191] Day Lewis (1952) vii-viii.

[192] Ahl (2007) xlvii.

[193] Farrell (2010).

might influence, or be influenced by, desire to be concise or expansive: cause can become effect.

Day Lewis asked in his preface "A translation which is not somehow based upon the language of its own time will never begin to come near the poetic quality of its original… How would Virgil have told the story, if he had been born in England, and in this present age? A good translation must be a satisfactory answer to that question."[194] Day Lewis thus aimed to create a work that was his own poem, but which connected him to the author, exuding the spirit of the original. He recognised the need to use current language and rhythms, to avoid artificiality, whilst being deferential to the original, and ultimately creating a model which works, albeit ephemerally, for one particular generation.[195] Day Lewis' desire to domesticate the text was, he recognised, at odds with some of its historicising qualities; making sure his translation did not become dull when reeling off the historical details, which are now only of interest to scholars, was one of his most significant challenges.[196] Reiterating some of Day Lewis' concerns, Ahl wanted his translation to achieve a "more or less contemporary" idiom, and

[194] Day Lewis (1952) vii-ix.
[195] Day Lewis (1952) viii.
[196] Day Lewis (1966) vii.

accepted that this means "the best translations suffice only for a generation or so".[197]

Day Lewis and Ahl both attempt to recreate something akin to the Virgilian hexameter. Day Lewis uses a line with six stresses, flexibly accommodating from 12-17 syllables.[198] Parsons criticises this, reiterating Day Lewis' own fears that it could not encompass Virgil's hexameter's "melodic variety" and "complexity of rhythm", whilst accepting that compromise is inevitable in order to achieve a translation which is linguistically accurate, and modern whilst reflecting the spirit, mood and tone of the original.[199] While Day Lewis' efforts found some criticism, Ahl's have found praise,[200] even if using a dactylic or "heroic" hexameter in English initially aroused some concern.[201] O'Brien calls Ahl's version of Virgil's hexameter, which OWC identify as a differentiator, "a practical and justifiable solution".[202] His only

---

[197] Ahl (2007) xlvi.

[198] Parsons (1977) xiv-xv.

[199] Parsons (1977) xiv-xv. Day Lewis (1952) vii.

[200] Aloi (2008). Cormier (2008)**:** Ahl enviably attempts to echo and imitate the poetics of an ancient and highly sophisticated Latin hexameter (188-9). O'Donnell (2009) says Ahl's form has "many virtues" and his metre is "the most unusual of its excellences".

[201] He remarked, in an interview (Aloi [2008]), "I've been assured… that one can't write hexameters in English. Perhaps this is simply a rude way of saying that they do not like the hexameters I have written, since I've written thousands of hexameters in the course of translating the *Aeneid*."

[202] O'Brien (2007). *OWC Ahl Aeneid Profile*: https://global.oup.com/academic/product/aeneid-9780199231959?cc=gb&lang=en&: "the only [translation of the *Aeneid*] to use the same poetic metre as Virgil and to explore the subtleties of Virgil's wordplay". See also Aloi (2008).

criticism of Ahl's form is his overuse of sentences where a single word runs on to the next line, although he admits it is perhaps in the interest of fidelity. Conversely, Ahl's reproduction of the effect of Virgil's enjambment was praised by Thomas, alongside his hexameter (Johnston's, he says, is "tedious").[203] O'Brien has, however, more major complaints about Ahl's diction, which he says is full of "too much inert contemporary usage", resulting in "an intermittent failure of tone and dignity".[204] These comments are mediated by his praise of Ahl's battle narratives, which "sustain a ferocious pace, while managing the blizzard of names and genealogies" and boldly affirm "the unrivalled power of poetry to make present the imagined world".[205]

The OWC write little of Day Lewis' translation on their website, but they are proud of the accuracy of Ahl's, claiming it is "both more accurate and more readable than other existing translations".[206] However, several journalistic reviewers thought otherwise.[207] A.N. Wilson, reviewing for the *Telegraph*, was critical of Ahl, preferring both Ruden and Fagles.[208] In a

---

[203] Thomas (2018) 240.

[204] O'Brien (2007) wonders if this might be more noticeable (and more annoying) to a British reader rather than an American.

[205] O'Brien (2007).

[206] *OWC Ahl Aeneid Profile*: https://global.oup.com/academic/product/aeneid-9780199231959?cc=gb&lang=en&.

[207] It is intriguing that most of Ahl's criticism seems to be directed this way; Braund (2010) had expected his metre and wordplay to bear the brunt (462).

[208] A.N. Wilson (2008).

later review of Ferry's translation, Juster references Wilson's "quite proper skewer[ing]" of Ahl's "testosterone-drenched" translation, requoting a line singled out for its inaccuracy and inelegance.[209] D.E. Hill comments that Ahl often uses words and phrases where there is nothing in the Latin to justify such a choice, adding "Many readers will be happy to accept this sort of thing, arguing that close accuracy is less important than getting the spirit right".[210] Not all reviews have been quite so cutting. Ormsby praised Ahl's portrayal of "the savagery in Virgil's stateliness", in a version which captures Virgil's "fierce hurtling momentum".[211] He ends, "The subtlety as well as the stateliness of the original shines through in every line […] Mr. Ahl has produced the finest translation of the *Aeneid* in recent memory." Ahl's sometimes jarring choice of diction reflects his generation's position in deconsecrating translations which had, for many years, been obligated to foreignize the text in a very different way to Ahl: presenting it as a historical text, emphasising its otherness, and preserving it as sacrosanct.

The *Third Programme* had been keen to commission poetry specifically designed to be heard and not read. One of the qualities Day Lewis identified as necessary for broadcast poetry was contemporary speech: "radio poetry must give back to the listener, enhanced but still recognisable, his own

---

[209] Juster (2018).
[210] Hill (2008).
[211] Ormsby (2008).

voice".[212] He also notes in the preface to his 1966 edition that he revised his translation, to "weed out […] some of the modernisms and colloquialisms which, though they may have served a purpose for broadcasting, now seem to me unacceptable in print".[213] Day Lewis often uses casual vocabulary (particularly in direct speech), occasionally mixed in with some formal vocabulary and high style passages, suggesting conflict between desire to use modern diction for accessibility and to domesticate his text, whilst also aiming for a learned and aspirational tone, qualities which would have drawn listeners to the *Third Programme* in the first place. Keith says that Day Lewis favoured contemporary idiom, partly achieved through a "par[ing] away" of the Latinate expressions used substantially by Dryden and Fitzgerald.[214] Parsons suggests that Day Lewis' occasional use of jarring colloquialism lapses into "anachronistic comicalities" in trying too hard to keep his radio audience's attention.[215] As a contemporary reviewer appropriately comments, "The Professor of Poetry at Oxford may well have shocked many by his attempt to render the *Aeneid* in the language of his own time."[216] Balmer attributes the issue that

---

[212] Whitehead (1989) 159, quoting Day Lewis (1950). Whitehead goes on to explain that, despite the BBC's vision to commission poetry especially for radio, in reality much was still "read straight off the printed page" (162-3).

[213] Day Lewis (1966) vi. These had been noted, for example by a *Times Literary Supplement* reviewer cited in Cheney (1983) 465-6: "such enormities probably achieved their object on the air, but they might have been removed for the printed edition".

[214] Keith (2018) 75.

[215] Parsons (1977) xiv-xv.

[216] Reviewer for *Times Literary Supplement* cited by Cheney (1983) 436-9.

reviewers took with Day Lewis' "jarring" colloquialisms to the contemporary trend to treat Virgil's epic texts with awe and reverence, more so than Homer.[217] In 2003 however, Hardyment praises Day Lewis' language as "gracefully modern, sometimes startlingly succinct ("that mad bitch Scylla"), sometimes hauntingly poetic ("a wisp of the wind or the wings of a dream")".[218] The most insightful review of Day Lewis' colloquialisms is Cheney, who suggests their purpose is to "unite his audience in a common language and to maintain continuity in the literary tradition":[219]

> Day Lewis' use of colloquial language suggests that he wishes his modern audience to see that the story of Aeneas' struggle to found the New Troy corresponds to the struggle the allies of the western world underwent between 1939 and 1945, to the struggle of the fictional heroes of literature, and to the archetypal struggle upon which our western culture is based: man's perpetual struggle to enter the 'promised land'.[220]

Specifically, Cheney categorises Day Lewis' diction as a way to create parallels between Aeneas' quest and that of heroes of literature (evoking

---

[217] Balmer (2018) 422 & n 4.

[218] Hardyment (2003).

[219] Cheney (1983) 436-9. He cites recent reviewers aggrieved by Day Lewis' language: Semple at the *Manchester Guardian* (1952), "One feels that this conversational style does not soar with the original […] [the modernisms] are a misrepresentation and disfigurement of Virgil […] a very fine poem, but not Virgil".

[220] Cheney (1983) 444.

Macbeth, Faustus and Shakespeare's Antony), wartime (using familiarising language like "evacuation" [2.25], "allies" [2.99], "beached their navy" [2.30])[221] and Christianity (using Biblical language such as "apple of my own eye" [1.677-8]).[222] Day Lewis thus adds his own intertextual links in a way which domesticates the text in unusual ways, aligning Aeneas with a typical Christian hero, making his 'foreign' text seem familiar to his audience, and using translation to bring classical texts closer to an English literary canon.[223]

A translator such as Ahl, who has spent decades working on and teaching the *Aeneid*, will be unable to convey all of the elements which have fascinated them. For Ahl personally, a key priority is sound play,[224] which comes through repeatedly in his focus on poetics and restoration of poetic wordplay.[225] Thomas discusses Ahl's efforts to achieve the source text's

---

[221] Day Lewis (1947) comments on his use of contemporary military language, to appeal to his audience's common experience of war (110).

[222] Whilst this may sound at odds with Day Lewis' complex and strained relationship to religion (see above, p32), Cheney (1983): "his use of Biblical language is not religious, or at least not in the orthodox sense; it is mythical and social: ideological" (445 n14).

[223] Day Lewis (1951) 8-9. Cheney (1983) 443-4: "Day Lewis' translation of the *Aeneid* becomes an attempt to find a way of carrying the past into the future, to establish a link between the classical past and the modern present". As Day Lewis (1970) comments, a translation has "value in preserving our links with the past, the near past and the more distant of other literatures which are germane to our own" (23).

[224] See Ahl (1985) on aesthetic and hermeneutic effects of sound and wordplay. Being knowingly transgressive, Ahl applies his work to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, expecting existing readings of the *Aeneid* to be too staunchly entrenched (10).

[225] Aloi (2008). Cormier (2008)**:** Ahl has masterfully unravelled here especially the puns (188-9). As an example, Ahl's note (2007) at 9.467 reads an anagram in

linguistic aesthetics, whether wholly or by replication of aural and visual effects, including puns and anagrams (e.g. 8.321-322 *latium/maluit/ latuisset* becomes 'unmutilated'/'Latium'/'ultimate').[226] Although Thomas praises his motive, "to inject some of the ludic aspects back into a poem whose supposed classicism has stripped it of those aspects", on reflection he is still convinced by the aesthetics of domestication. Ahl is very aware of the importance of musicality in his translation,[227] and wanted it to be equally effective when read aloud, as OUP say, "like the original".[228] He had even planned to record a reading of it for compact disc.[229] Day Lewis', of course, was indeed broadcast in this way, and he too had great interest in spoken poetry.[230] Other translators also recognise the pervasiveness of orality in epic, even within a written text.[231] Ahl recognised that, to be read aloud, his translation needed energy, for which Cormier praises it: an "excellent new interpretation" which shows readers "the thrilling energy

---

Euryali et Nisi, a carefully encrypted aural allusion to Marius and Telesinus, Rome's Oscan opponents. Ormsby (2008) recognises that no pun or anagram escapes Ahl's attention.

[226] Thomas (2018) 239. Also at 7.702, 1.399.

[227] Aloi (2008).

[228] Ahl (2007): "An epic poem must sing" (xlvii). *OWC Ahl Aeneid Profile*. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/aeneid-9780199231959?cc=gb&lang=en&. Cormier (2008) also remarks that it is a version best read aloud (189).

[229] Aloi (2008). Whilst orality might have been a consideration for Ahl when translating, the context of a radio broadcast is different to a compact disc recording.

[230] His book *The Lyric Impulse* (1965) attests to his interest in lyric as a style and genre.

[231] See Fagles (2006), and Raeburn's *Metamorphoses* (2004). Raeburn included a guide to pronunciation and stated his translation was designed to be read aloud, even if not delivered orally, then with "the mind's ear".

and enthralling excitement of the original", emphasising Virgil's complexity while synchronising the ancient with the contemporary.[232]

Whilst it was important for my study to compare translators operating with consistent form, it is how they voice their narrative, both as the separate construct of the narrator and as an all pervading textual force, on which I focus. That both Ahl and Day Lewis translate in verse lends itself better to discussion of formal narrative structures, as well as considerations of style and register, and the extra decisions that these poetic dimensions often force translators to make. Their interpretation and presentation of Virgil's ambiguous and subjective narrator help us to understand how scholars' and poets' differing approaches to the function of translation are integral to our reception of the *Aeneid*. Since my research questions centre around the narratives that these translators construct, I will now introduce some essential narrative theories and concepts.

TRANSLATING NARRATIVE, NARRATING TRANSLATION

May, in her analysis of Russian narratives, has discussed the complex powerplay between translator, author and internal narrator, finding "overwhelming evidence" that translators flatten out narration, removing interjections or judgements, "out of fear of being lost among the various

[232] Cormier (2008) 195, 189.

voices of the text".[233] At greater length, Bosseaux has used corpus-based analysis of French translations of Virginia Woolf to raise the importance of opening a dedicated space within narratology to deal with translations, and to search for the "new voice" of translation.[234] As the translator inevitably constructs their own narrator through which to tell the story, Virgil's mode of ambiguity and polyvocality presents translators with a particular set of challenges.

Labelling Virgil's (or any) narrative as third person has been quite rightly called misleading by Bal, since there is always an "I" narrating the text, and to call a text third person rather than first is to deny the existence of the narrator.[235] The *Aeneid* is made up of an external narrating voice (which can take the form of multiple contradictory or conflicting voices) and many internal narrating voices. An obvious example of an internal narrator is Aeneas narrating his story in books 2-3, whilst less overt examples occur when the narrator allows a character to speak (often with no signposting), perhaps just for an utterance, or just to colour the narrative's subjectivity, through the narrative itself. This presents a vast array of opportunities for both subjectivity and ambiguity of narrative, and is the focus of the first chapter, where I address foundational narrative aspects that will resonate

---

[233] May (1994).

[234] Bosseaux (2007) 225.

[235] The primary (external) narrator can also speak through a first person pronoun - see Bal (1985, 2009 ed.) 21 and de Jong (2014) 19.

throughout this discussion. As well as his characters, Virgil also gestures towards additional beings who have contributed to the construction of his narrative. Generally, these increase his status as storyteller, and add to the significance of his tale. There are the Muses, who act as his collaborators in narrative construction, as part of a relationship which I discuss in more depth in chapter three. Additionally, Virgil refers to other contributors, using impersonal verbs like *fertur* to show that he has obtained knowledge of events through a natural inheritance of social and cultural memory. These sources add further *gravitas* to his story, which is not a work of fiction purely devised by his imagination, but rather informed by various historical and literary sources.[236] It is the responsibility of the epic narrator to unite all of the voices.[237]

Virgil's primary narrator can be described as extradiegetic and heterodiegetic. Extradiegetic (as opposed to intradiegetic) indicates that the narrator is outside the action (as opposed to inside it).[238]

---

[236] In this sense, Virgil's extensive use of intertexual references is also critical, as he presents his epic not as an isolated, independent work, but rather as an important text which is very much part of an historical body of literature.

[237] Lyne (1987: 236): "The modes of communication operated by further voices are an extension, not a replacement, of those operated by the epic voice." Goward (1999) discusses drama's use of multiple focalisation, in opposition to epic: "Ancient narrative epic partly acquires its overall definiteness of authority because focalisation is fixed at the outset on the poet, who is at the same time invoking the divine Muse" (10).

[238] This is Genette's (1980) 228-231 terminology. De Jong (2014) 19-20 uses instead primary and secondary (the primary narrator may often hand over to a secondary narrator).

Heterodiegetic (as opposed to homodiegetic) indicates that the narrator is not a character involved in the story.[239] A narrator which is both extradiegetic and heterodiegetic can subsequently appear omniscient.[240] Narrators can choose to make their presence more or less felt, becoming either overt or covert, and choosing whether or not to be self-conscious of their role as narrator.[241] As the narrative is translated, the voices telling the story are effectively increased. Chatman drew on Booth for his narrative model, which lists the narrative participants as: real and implied author, narrator and narratee, implied and real readers.[242] I am interested in ascertaining whether the act of translation modifies Virgil's epic voice, or rather adds an additional voice, perhaps a translators' narrator, and how (and why) translators' narrators differ from the original narrators. Onega and Landa suggest interrogating narrative by asking the question: "how does the narrative differ to the events it describes?".[243] It is the same questions which I intend to ask of translations: how does the translated narrator/narrative differ to its original? Hühn remarks that narrators are

---

[239] Rimmon-Kenan (1983, 2002 ed.) 94-5. Genette (1980) explains that the narrator's relationship to the story can be heterodiegetic (not present in the story they are relating) or homodiegetic (244-5); de Jong (2014) uses instead 'external' and 'internal' (19). Prince (1987) is also useful for these definitions.

[240] Rimmon Kenan (1983, 2002 ed.) 94-5.

[241] De Jong (2014) 26-7.

[242] Chatman (1978) 147-151; Booth (1961) 70-1.

[243] Onega and Landa (1996) 5-6.

the mediators of narrative, shaping it as they produce and represent it.[244] I argue that, in as much the same way, translators are textual mediators.

Aims and methodology

Whilst translation analysis provokes an infinite number of interesting variables, and this research is suggestive for other languages, translations and types of text, this thesis focuses on the OWC's Day Lewis and Ahl. By fixing the text, publisher, and form, I have defined focused boundaries for my analysis, to make this thesis manageable both to write and to read. Whilst I focus on two translators, I have referred to a few select others when particularly useful or insightful, usually when my two translations are similar and I wish to illustrate a potential point of difference: these translators are the two Penguin prose editions: David West (1990) and Jackson Knight (1956), and the first woman to translate the *Aeneid*, Sarah Ruden (2008), all of whom were briefly introduced above. The Penguin translations show how the different expectations applied to prose compared to verse affect the translation, specifically with regard to novelising the narrative voice. Jackson Knight is contemporaneous to Day Lewis, and West is relatively close to Ahl. Ruden is useful for comparison with Day Lewis in terms of primarily poetic considerations, and, for the impact that her concise line has on her presentation of Virgil's subjectivity

[244] Hühn (2009) 1.

and ambiguity. When reviewing Anglophone translations of Virgil, the lack of diversity is soon apparent: the vast majority are white men. Whilst gender has not been a central axis of analysis for this project, material provided by Ruden and Johnston, soon to be added by Bartsch, offers important future work.

The passages which I focus on, and the motifs which subsequently structure this thesis, were established by my own reading of the *Aeneid* in Latin, and identification of points of narrative interest, including changes in voice, subjectivity, point of view, moments of ambiguity, and character-focalisation.[245] Since I wanted broad coverage of Virgil's key narrative motifs, I have not focused on a particular book, theme or character. However, some patterns have emerged. I use fewer examples from books 1, 3, 5, 6, 8 and 11, perhaps because they, particularly books 5, 6, and 8, are highly epic and often subsequently relatively objective or, at least, unambiguous in their subjectivities. It is unsurprising that the books which I have focused on are those with the highest emotional intensity, and the most subjective or ambiguous narrative: typically, from Dido driving the emotional narrative in book 4 to the empathy-ridden battle narratives of the last third, the books most highly related to the tragic mode. The choice,

[245] As well as reading the Latin, I have also compared the entire texts of the two focusing translations, to locate any passages not particularly noteworthy in the Latin, but which uncovered either new points of interest or further supportive evidence.

conscious or otherwise, of books on which to focus, has steered the recurrence of some overarching themes: the imperial question, heroism and the characterisation of Turnus and Aeneas, the narrator and his identity, divine intervention, blame and victimisation. To balance completeness with the desirable, but impossible, task of comparing the entire epic, I employ statistical surveys to note similar areas.

One aspect to which I have been unable to do justice is the great wealth of intertextual links which Virgil uses to show his relation to his culture's literary canon, from Homer, Apollonius and many other writers, which I broadly omit from my discussion. Although a fascinating topic, I decided that these were less relevant in translation and less central to the topic of narrative; audiences reading in translation are less likely to acknowledge them, and what point would the translator be making, in either heightening or weakening the reference compared to its original? Do they somehow amplify the reference to the Greek? Or to a specific translation? If so, which one? Ahl does note awareness of this in his comment at line 6.893, where he strains to maintain an intertextual reference to the *Odyssey* in his translation, in the same way as he believes Virgil does. Exploring this phenomenon using translators who have tackled both Virgil and Homer presents a future avenue of research.[246] However, since neither of my

[246] Fagles (2006) does mention his attempts to suggest Homeric echoes, drawing on his own translations of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (395-6).

translators have also attempted Virgil's Homeric models, this area was not an immediate priority for the current thesis.

However, I have looked at intratextual links, i.e. lines or phrases which are repeated within the *Aeneid*.[247] These indicate Virgil's and translators' (in)consistent treatment of repeated words, the extent to which characters take on or challenge the epic voice, relationships to Homeric patterns of repetition and to the element of oral poetry, and to the translator's understanding of the poem as a whole. Translators discuss these more often. Ahl's list of specific words which he felt obligated to translate consistently shows he is alert to this phenomenon, whereas Day Lewis, whether in search of an effect similar to Virgilian *variatio*, or for another reason, is generally less consistent.[248] Ahl's pressure to be consistent may come from changing expectations of translation, and from his majority student audience, who might be using his text as a substitute for the original. Perhaps Day Lewis felt less of a constriction or expectation to be consistent with his treatment of specific words, or simply places more value on *variatio,* to entertain his radio listeners. I have looked to consistency of words either significant in meaning or context, for example

[247] Again, these are common in Virgil, for example 4.161/4.120, 3.87/1.30.

[248] Ahl (2007) l: *felix, infelix, pius, pietas*. Powell (2015) takes an interesting strategy, choosing to give himself flexibility in translation, but always accompanying it by the inflected Latin word, thus lines 10-11 are rendered: "did the queen of the gods | drive on a man famous for his sense of duty [*pietate*]".

pius, and always prompted by their existence in included extracts, and subsequently by reference to a Virgilian frequency list.[249] I preferred this approach rather than discussing keywords and repeated phrases in one dedicated section, since translation consistency is not the purpose of my thesis, but is rather used to provide evidential support.

Unavoidably, the way that I have selected (and interpreted) extracts, translators and narrative motifs is a subjective process in itself, requiring an inevitable degree of interpretation. This, however, is consistent with my aims, to prove that reading narrative is an interpretative act, and to focus on interpretation rather than intention.[250] Since the *Aeneid* is being read more and more in translation, it is critical to establish how translations can affect interpretation, when they are already interpretations themselves. Uncovering Virgil's original intent would be fruitless when subjective interpretations will always be argued. Readers will always interpret, regardless of translator intentions, and translators will never completely foresee all the ways in which their works will be interpreted: reception is uncontrollable.

---

[249] *Dickinson College Commentaries: Vergil 'Aeneid' Vocabulary:* http://dcc.dickinson.edu/aeneid-vocabulary-list. Wetmore (1911, 1979 ed.). On similes in particular, E.G. Wilkins (1921).

[250] It is for this reason that I have not conducted translator interviews, which would be contrary to my aims of prioritising interpretation over intent, and which would favour Ahl over Day Lewis.

Thesis structure

The first two chapters discuss overarching stylistic and narrative aspects, and are both introduced by relevant critical theory. In chapter 1, I explore representations of speech and point of view, examining how Virgil speaks through his characters to create a polyvocal narrative. In particular, I focus on the concepts of focalisation and free indirect discourse, when the narrator presents an episode from a particular point of view (other than his own). I will explore how their narrators and characters interact in order to present a different interpretation. I will examine the flexibility of these two translators, and whether they allow characters to mediate the narrative, or impose strong narrative presence to control the epic unity of the story, asking: how do translators' methods of blending or distinguishing discourse types reflect attitudes towards textual authority and authorship, versus reverence for the original source text? Linked to focalisation is the concept which I explore in chapter 2, deixis: personal aspects of narrative which construct a space in which the narrator locates himself geographically (using adverbs and demonstrative pronouns), temporally (using adverbs and tense) and personally (using first or second person verbs and pronouns). These aspects will show how the narrator creates his presence and persona, and thus his identity and subjectivity, through his interactions with characters, his narrative and the process of narrating the story. How does the translator position his narrator with regard to the narrative? Has their relationship to the narrative shifted in the process of translation? How does this relate to or subsequently affect

the perceived contemporary relationship to, or distance from, the source text and culture?

In the second two chapters I focus on specific narrative motifs. The third chapter focuses on apostrophe, where the narrator addresses a character and thus deictically creates a fixed temporality of writing. Apostrophe exposes the narrator's identity, his relationship to characters and to his Muses, to the creation of the narrative and its space in cultural memory. How do translators' character apostrophes express different opinions on, and relationships to, those characters? How does apostrophe expose differing expectations of narrative control, as the translator constructs a narrative which he expects will inhabit a very different cultural and commemorative space? How will the translators' narrators relate to the Muses, a concept less familiar to modern contexts, and to what extent will they profess reliance upon these external sources in the construction of their translation? In chapter four, I focus on similes. Traditionally considered a key component of objective epic narrative, I make a case for their (often ambiguous) subjectivity. Focusing primarily on Turnus and Aeneas, I examine how translators can shift a simile's subjectivity in order to alter the portrayal of a particular character. This chapter draws on previous themes, since similes can be character-focalised, and can include deictic elements. How do translators use Virgil's complex voices and subjective and deictic narrative to affirm or obscure characterisation of the epic's protagonist and antagonist, and to present different images of the hero figure within their new version of a notoriously masculine, epic text?

Finally, in chapter five, I explore the impact of these narrative elements when they co-exist in a longer, narrative-rich passage, to ask what effect they contribute cumulatively and to consolidate theories and assertions made so far. Whilst previous chapters use concise passages to focus on a particular narrative motif, this chapter zooms out of isolated close reading, to examine a longer passage, and ask how translators use these narrative techniques and motifs to construct an overall reading of this poem, in terms of interpretation and voice.

The chapters develop, rather than overlap, presented in such an order that each one provides key insights for the next, spiralling from a fundamental epicentre. Whilst the chapters are delineated by narrative motif, there are certain aspects which underlie them all. The first aspect is the exploration of Virgil's use of subjectivity and ambiguity. Translators convey different representations of or responses to the text's ambiguity to assert a different relationship to the text itself, and to reflect changing expectations of translation, and cultural relationships to Virgil. Secondly, narrator authority resonates throughout my thesis, where I consider the authorship exerted by translators through their control of the epic voice, their relationship to the Muses, and their position in time and place relative to the narrative. Do translators construct a narrative which retains the polyvocal nature of Virgil's original, or unify their narrative by a controlling narrative presence? How are differing contemporary expectations of

ancient epic, a genre towards which writers and readers might feel a degree of subservience, affected by this perception of authority?

The increasing interest in translation in recent times is due partly to more transparent discussions on its process and to critical recognition of its position in textual reception, but also owes something to our culture's heightened reliance on it. Whilst the field gains prominence, analysis of more recent English translations of Virgil is still relatively infrequent, despite the fact that we are living in one of the richest periods of Virgilian translation. Achieving an understanding of the considerations and pressures of modern translators of Virgil will help us to measure the cultural impact of the two thousand years which separate us from him, and thus better understand our cultural appreciation of and relationship to the *Aeneid.*

With declining literacy in the Latin language, the status of Classics has changed, and, in correlation, the purpose of Latin translation has altered with it. Whilst Virgil's *Aeneid* has become a canonical text in English as much as it is in Latin, entering our culture through its English translations, its future security relies on continuing retranslation. Because of its growing significance, understanding how translators (re)construct Virgil's narrative and voice, using narrative features to explore or exploit narrative subjectivities and ambiguities, is essential to understanding shifting cultural relationship to the text. The decisions a translator makes when narrating their text will affect our (and future) generations' understanding

of the way in which the text is voiced, and therefore the way in which it should be interpreted. I will analyse areas in which the narrator constructs his identity or passes subjective (or ambiguous) comments on his characters, to help understand the impact of translation on our modern understanding of the text. This study will show how translators relate to the narrative (through deixis and focalisation), to its characters and heroes (through similes and apostrophe), to their audience and Virgil, and how they exert authorship and authority over its telling. Whilst they may not be traditionally considered as textual criticism, translations are critically engaged in their own way, and provide a fruitful means of not just rereading the original text, but of understanding how the demands and expectations of translation intersect historical context as well as critical and public Virgilian reception.

1 Voice: Discourse, Focalisation, and Narrative

The narrative of the *Aeneid* is a complex fabric, made up of multiple voices woven together into several layers. I have already introduced the multi-faceted persona of Virgil's narrator, who presents the narrative subjectively but also, on occasion, with a multiplicity which verges on discord; it is certainly a subjective narrative, but its subjectivity is not consistent.[1] The narrator sometimes sympathises with Aeneas, sometimes with Turnus, sometimes presenting war as a glorious way to begin the Roman state, sometimes as a futile but necessary evil. As well as through the perspective of his own elusive yet sympathetic voice, the narrator also tells his story through his characters, adopting a position of empathy.[2] There are several methods by which he can do this. In its simplest forms, character speech or thought can be portrayed through *direct discourse* (where the exact words of the character are reported by the narrator, typically rendered inside quotation marks in standard English notation), or through *indirect discourse* (where the words of the character are paraphrased by the narrator), also termed *oratio obliqua*. As with direct discourse, indirect discourse can refer either to reported speech or to the reporting of unspoken thought.[3]

---

[1] See above p45-52.

[2] See Otis (1964, 1995 ed.) on Virgil's sympathetic and empathetic narrative (the former when he reacts to his characters and their behaviours, and the latter when he accesses and presents their own emotions).

[3] That is to say it would include both the sentences: 'she said that she was hungry' and 'she thought that she was hungry'.

Direct discourse gives the reader the impression of a precise imitation of the original statement, in one of the few instances when narrative time progresses at the same rate as that of the story.[4] Although direct discourse is an integral part of Virgil's narrative, it does not feature heavily in this chapter, since it is the form of speech representation which is least mediated by the narrator.[5] In fact, Lyne discusses how Virgil uses direct speech to lend his narrative independence, allowing the characters to drive the plot without reliance on the narrator.[6] Thus, character speech which is unambiguously presented in direct discourse will be, broadly, less relevant to a study of the narrator of the *Aeneid*, his identity and relationship to his characters and the narrative. Although direct discourse in translation may hold the answer to key research questions, their study would contribute more advantageously to a discussion of character or interpretation rather than narrative. On the other hand, indirect discourse representations stimulate narrative discussion since the reader, although they have the impression they are being informed of a character's words, are actually

[4] Laird (1999) 88-100.

[5] There is much excellent work on direct discourse in the *Aeneid*, for example, Highet (1974), Laird (1999) and Lyne (1987). In terms of its prevalence, Lyne (1987) notes that, with the inclusion of books 2-3 as Aeneas' speech, direct discourse constitutes over 50% of the *Aeneid* (223).

[6] Lyne (1987) 223.

reading them through the lens of a narrator.[7] The words of the speaker have been modified, and the reader cannot automatically imagine the exact content or style of the original utterance.[8] The narrator may have chosen to explicitly interpret the character's thoughts or to prioritise particular aspects.[9] It is this mediation which Laird and de Jong suggest makes indirect discourse a far more revealing way of presenting characters' thoughts and emotions than the soliloquy in direct discourse, and it is the narrator's influence in indirect discourse which renders it a narrative phenomenon which will contribute significantly to this study.[10]

As well as presenting the narrative through direct discourse or indirect discourse, the narrator can convey the words or thoughts of a character directly in the narrative, without any clear indication that they belong to a separate entity. This can take two forms. Firstly, *free indirect discourse*,

---

[7] As Ahl notes at 4.283-4, "the exact phrasing of Aeneas' thoughts is beyond reach in indirect speech, since the reporter can superimpose or substitute his own attitudes".

[8] Laird (1999) 88-100.

[9] Laird (1999) 101.

[10] It could of course be argued that all direct discourse in the *Aeneid* is mediated by the narrator, since it is not factual reporting of real-life speeches. The same is true of ancient historiographers, ostensibly recording (but actually openly fictionalising) speeches by historical figures. However, what I mean here is the distinction between *telling* and *showing*, as set out by Plato *Rep. 3.392d-393d*; that is the sense that the narrator chooses whether to tell the story to his audience (through *diegesis*), or to show his audience how it happened through (the pretence of) re-enactment (*mimesis*). Even though the narrator (or author figure) is responsible for the construction of both, his presence is more explicit in the former.

where it seems as if the words or thoughts of a character take over the narrative, e.g. *heu quid agat?* (4.283).[11] Whilst free indirect discourse, as with direct and indirect discourse, covers both internalised thoughts and vocalised speech, it does not rely on a speaking or thinking verb. Therefore, whether or not the sentiments are vocalised can be unclear. For the purposes of my analysis, this distinction is not crucial, hence I use the term free indirect discourse where *discourse*, as in the terms direct discourse and indirect discourse, can indicate either thought or speech. Secondly, and similar to free indirect discourse but with a slightly different effect, is *focalisation*, where no speech or thought process is presented, but the narrative conveys the perspective or judgements of a particular entity, rather than those of the narrator, e.g. *ardet abire fuga dulcisque relinquere terras* (4.281).[12]

In this chapter, I will show how Virgil uses (free) indirect discourse and focalisation to present his narrative, and how translators may alter this presentation to affect the opinions or reactions of the character thinking or speaking, resulting in a different interpretation and reconstruction of the

---

[11] The concept developed first in French criticism: Bally (1912) on *style indirect libre* (cited by Prince [1987: 34-5], among many others), and Harmer (1954: 301) on *style direct libre* ('direct' indicates use of the first person, and 'indirect' the third person [see Chatman (1978) 201]). I will introduce this concept more thoroughly in the following pages.

[12] A term coined by Genette (1980). This is a slightly simplified definition, which I shall explain in more detail in the following section. I defer to the linguists, specifically Genette, for the more detailed picture.

narrative. Where relevant, as in other chapters, I will employ statistical or comparative analysis of keywords. Arguably, such analysis is especially important to this chapter since it will show whether translation of particular words depends on how they are voiced in a particular context: will a translator interpret the precise meaning of a particular word in a particular context, and alter their translation based on the character perceiving it? I will first look at focalisation, and then free indirect discourse, introducing fundamental criticism and theory and subsequently analysing some illustrative examples. Then, I will explore a longer passage which shows shifts in the narrative from focalisation to free indirect discourse, and I will end the chapter with an example of the narrator's voice intruding within presentation of a character's discourse.

1.1 FOCALISATION

Heinze said in 1903 that Virgil's narrative is propelled by subjectivity, expressing pathos and simultaneously embodying the perspective of its characters.[13] Otis built on Heinze's foundations and clearly defined two complementary sides of Virgil's subjective voice, terming them *sympathy*

[13] Trans. (1993) Harvey, Harvey, and Robertson (290, 296). See Hardie (1995) for a concise summary of Heinze's effect on Otis, among many other cornerstone scholars (272, 275). Fowler (2000) gives a useful discussion on Heinze's historic involvement in the development of ideas of focalisation and point of view, and also notes that scholars Rosati (1979) and Lazzarini (1990) have shown that the notion of focalisation shift can be seen as early as Servius (58).

and *empathy*. For Otis, the former describes moments when the narrator gives his perspective on the action or characters, and the latter when the narrator speaks through his characters to express their own opinions or reactions.[14] Both Heinze and Otis thus hinted at the concept of focalisation, a term which Genette would coin in 1972.[15] Genette defined the *focaliser* as *the one seeing*, compared to *the one speaking* (which he defined as the text's *voice*).[16] In this way, the focaliser can be compared to the lens of a film camera, showing the perspective from which a scene is experienced. In his original definition, Genette categorised types of focalisation, one of which describes passages narrated by an omniscient external being, which Genette labelled 'zero focalisation' or 'nonfocalised narrative'.[17] This term was correctly disputed by Rimmon-Kenan (1983) and later by Bal (1985), who both stated that a text always has a focaliser, even if it is the omniscient narrator.[18] De Jong agreed with this, and, in her detailed work on

---

[14] Otis (1964, 1995 ed.) 49-51.

[15] My reading of Genette is through *Narrative Discourse* (1980), a partial translation of *Figures III* (1972). Genette's terminology avoids the unnecessarily visual connotations of the alternatives 'vision', 'field', 'point of view' (189).

[16] Genette (1980) 186.

[17] Genette (1980) 189-194. Genette's second type is internal focalisation (either 'fixed' if it only shows one character, 'variable' if it shifts between characters, or 'multiple' if the same event is seen from different character-focalisers). The third type is external focalisation, where the story is told by an external narrator who knows less than the characters, e.g. "the darkness seemed to make him scared", and often driven by a significant amount of dialogue.

[18] This theoretical development is neatly summarised by Grünbaum (2013) 112-115. Whilst I agree the text always has a focaliser, perhaps focalisation is more fruitfully seen as a spectrum. In places where the text appears to be more objective in tone, the narrator is still primary focaliser, but its effect is less noticeable, and the focalisation is thus weaker. On the other hand, instances which clearly convey the narrator's subjectivity are examples of strong focalisation from

focalisation in classical texts, labelled the primary narrator of a text its primary narrator-focaliser.[19] In her complex narrative model, there can exist secondary levels of embedded focalisation, and the narrator can also intrude upon a character's focalisation.[20]

Particularly in the case of Virgil, focalisation is used to colour the narrative and increase the number and variety of voices through which the story is told. Focalisation might be expected to indicate empathy, but it is not necessarily an automatic indication of sympathy. The narrator can still maintain sympathy for a character without focalising through them or allowing them to speak in free indirect discourse. The reverse is equally true; focalisation can be used in a way which is unsympathetically empathetic, where we see the character's point of view but are not encouraged to feel sympathy for that point of view. Therefore, the concepts are not commutative; they are related but not dependent on each other. The same is true of Smith's division of empathy into *alignment* and

---

the primary narrator-focaliser. In creative writing contexts, and particularly children's fiction, this concept of focalisation as a spectrum is common: see Lovatt (2016) 416 and Nodelman (2008) 18-32.

[19] De Jong (2014) 48. Whilst I agree with Rimmon-Kenan, Bal and de Jong, my analysis generally occurs at the secondary level. In other words, I assume the narrator as primary focaliser, and use the term *focalisation* where De Jong would specify *secondary (character) focalisation* (33). I refer to instances of interesting narrator-focalisation as narrator subjectivity.

[20] De Jong (2014) 48. Further work on remodelling and retheorising focalisation, not specific to the field of Classics, can be seen in Hühn, Schmid and Schönert's 2009 volume.

allegiance, where alignment gives the audience access to the character's actions, thoughts and emotions, and allegiance encourages the audience to feel sympathy for or against particular characters.[21] Focalisation will usually necessitate alignment, but allegiance may or may not follow, depending on the reader's interpretation. In particular, allegiance might be denied in resistant readings which are contrary to the standard or canonical interpretation.[22] Regardless of its impact on reader interpretation, focalisation certainly shows a flexible and open narrator who is willing to allow his characters to operate the lens of his camera. It more directly involves the audience in the narrative, encouraging them to share in a character's emotions and turning the narrative from a description into an experience, seeing it through internal eyes.

Fowler has written extensively about focalisation in Virgil, and coined the term *deviant focalisation*, to describe instances of *implicit embedded focalisation* (his use of de Jong's terminology) where focaliser and narrator are unexpectedly out of alignment.[23] He argues that, although it is

---

[21] M. Smith (1996) 141, writing in the context of film theory.

[22] For example, resistant feminist readings, which prioritise female voices and give female characters voices of their own against the implied intentions of the author/narrator. See Spentzou (2003) on Ovid's *Heroides*.

[23] De Jong (1987) 118-22: *implicit embedded focalisation* refers to instances which are not explicitly marked. My reference to Fowler is to his 2000 book, although the content of this chapter originally appeared as an article (1990). Fowler explains his use of the term *deviant*, which he refers to as "tendentious" and which he hopes conveys a "breaking of the rules" (42). Perhaps, in this chapter, we might observe a similar effect achieved through *deviant translation*.

impossible to distinguish between the narrator representing a character's perspective and actively sympathising with it, readers can interpret the text in a way which points towards a relatively objective, or at least consistently subjective, moral, Augustan narrator, by choosing to ascribe problematic areas to deviant focalisation from a particular character. Alternatively, readers can choose, and this is Fowler's personal preference, to attribute the focalisation and the opinions, at points, to the narrator, to read ambiguity and, in doing so, to "preserve the challenge of the *Aeneid*".[24]

Translators may choose to narrate passages through character-focalisation, shift to subjective narrator-focalisation, or detachedly report the opinion and the character to whom it belongs. The latter option can still be sympathetic, though may sacrifice a degree of empathy. Naturally, there is a degree of my own subjectivity in categorising narrative and discourse in this way.[25] However, what I aim to prove is that, since all readers read subjectively, and subconsciously interpret as they do so, even analysis which cannot be objectively proven is critical to our understanding of how Virgil is read – in the original Latin, but also, with increasing prevalence, in translation. As soon as the translator chooses a particular word or phrase, the reader receives that particular interpretation and its own peculiar

[24] Fowler (2000) 63.

[25] Fowler (2000) expresses similar concerns (43). For more on my approach in this regard, see above, p13 n8.

target language associations, which are likely to be different to those of the Latin. It might be just as ambiguous, though perhaps in a different way, or might be more or less so. As such, the translator is presented with a problem, or an opportunity, to flatten or expose their inevitable interpretation of Virgil's ambiguities.

I will now turn to some examples of focalisation, where the text implies a subjective judgement that may or may not align with expectations of the narrator's standpoint, and which thus allows the passage to be read as character-focalisation. The first is a brief example of focalisation from Turnus, angry at the boldness of the Trojans who, riding the crest of temporary war-time fortune, have rashly opened their gates and rushed out of their camp to attack.

691 ductori Turno diversa in parte furenti
turbantique viros perfertur nuntius, hostem
fervere caede nova et portas praebere patentis.
deserit inceptum atque immani concitus ira
695 Dardaniam ruit ad portam fratresque superbos.

Aeneid 9.691-5

In this extract, *fratres superbos*, emphatically positioned at the end of the line to suggest emotional significance, presents a negative impression of the Trojans. According to Fowler, it is "well known" that *superbus* is more

pejorative than its typical English translation, "proud".[26] This favours a reading of Turnus as focaliser: we are encouraged to experience this scene as he sees it. However, this interpretation is not the only one available. Hardie points out that *superbos* here carries with it a hint of "'lofty,' 'towering' (super-), as well as 'proud'", and thus could be interpreted as being a relatively neutral physical description (towering), a fairly positive term (lofty), or the more negative hint at arrogance.[27] Depending on how it is interpreted and translated, *superbus* can be read, and subsequently translated, as narrator-focalisation, whether an objective physical narrative description or a positive description, or as focalisation through Turnus.[28] Even if Turnus is focalising, it is possible that the tone is one of respectful intimidation rather than aspersion. Thus there is potential ambiguity, and room for translators to alter the focalisation and the reading of this passage.

As well as ambiguous focalisation, this passage includes a section of embedded indirect speech (lines 692-3), with the news that a messenger

---

[26] Fowler (2000) 48, 53. Fowler specifies that this is generally true of its usage in Virgil, and that the very essence of the word precludes positive use, though concedes there are a number of occasions when it is not absolutely true, including 1.19-22, where he reads deviant focalisation through Juno.

[27] Hardie (1994).

[28] OLD *superbus* 1) Full of lofty self-esteem, proud, haughty, disdainful, 1c) of things lofty or loftily situated, 1d) exultant or glorying in (+abl), 2) indicative or expressive of pride or disdain. L&S *superbus* 1) in a bad sense, that thinks himself above others. 2) in a good sense, proud, superior, excellent, distinguished, etc. (poetic and in post-Augustan prose).

has brought a report to Turnus stating that the enemy are advancing and have opened their gates to tempt in the foe. Ahl translates this section as a simple act of indirect discourse:

> Turnus, the leader, who's off elsewhere in his full battle fury,
> Wreaking his havoc, receives a report that the enemy's boiling
> Forth in a new deadly wave, flinging open its gate as a challenge.
> Monstrously angered, abandoning plans now in progress, he rushes
> Straight to the gate of the Dardan camp and the towering brothers,
>
> *Aeneid* 9.691-695 (Ahl)

The despatch which Turnus receives, that the Trojans are "boiling | Forth in a new deadly wave", is menacing, befitting Turnus' perspective of their advance, whilst also appropriate for the way in which the Trojans presumably want to be perceived: as a hostile, deadly force. Ahl's choice of the word "challenge" even more clearly depicts the opening of the gates from Turnus' perspective, as if he feels he has received a personal invitation to join in the battle. This indicates Turnus is focalising this section, as we experience his reaction to the words that the messenger is speaking. However, whilst line 693 is firmly from Turnus' point of view, Ahl's treatment of *superbos* in line 695 is more neutral. He has recognised and responded to the ambiguity at which Hardie hinted, and chosen to

translate the adjective as "towering".[29] Noting other translators' willingness to translate differently to suit different contexts, Ahl states in his introduction that 'proud' is a usefully consistent translation to use for *superbus*, since "pride can be virtue or vice in English".[30] Whilst he does most frequently give 'proud', he has deviated here. This conveys the physicality of the word *superbos*, whilst also conveying a sense of respect in what could even border on being a positive description. Day Lewis on the other hand, is more straightforwardly negative of the Trojans in his translation of *superbos*:

> Now Turnus, who was fighting ferociously and creating
> Havoc elsewhere on the field, received a despatch – the Trojans,
> Flushed with the losses they'd just inflicted, had thrown a gate open.
> He left the work in hand, and moved by prodigious anger,
> Charged at the Trojan gate and those insolent brothers who fought there.
>
> *Aeneid* 9.691-695 (Day Lewis)

Day Lewis translates *superbos* as "insolent", a more negative word which aligns with what we expect Turnus' opinion of the Trojans to be, and thus implies focalisation through him.[31] *Insolent* could suggest specifically

[29] Of course Ahl, unlike Day Lewis, may have been influenced by Hardie's 1994 commentary (or may have come across this viewpoint via another scholarly avenue).

[30] Ahl (2007) xlix. See also Braund (2010) 462.

[31] Indeed, while Day Lewis hints at negativity, more negative options are available, for example, West translates "arrogant brothers". At the other end of the spectrum

Turnus' view that Aeneas and his men have no right to rule.[32] It is also commonly associated with non-serious misbehaviour or disrespect, suggesting that Day Lewis' narrator intrudes on Turnus' focalisation, mediating, diluting, and even trivialising his viewpoint. This secondary level of mediation is made possible since the narrator is still *speaking*. Thus, even when a different entity is focalising (or *seeing*), the narrator remains in control and can choose to mediate. Statistically, Day Lewis often uses the word "insolent" to translate *superbus*. The adjective is used 39 times in the *Aeneid*, often in direct discourse, to refer to a wide range of characters.[33] Whilst Ahl is fairly consistent in his translation, using 'proud' 28 times, 'arrogant' three times, and then a few words a single time each (including 'towering' from this example),[34] Day Lewis employs greater lexical variety, including 'haughty' four times, 'arrogant' five times, and 'proud' and 'insolent' eight times each.[35] However, Day Lewis' inconsistency does not

---

is Jackson Knight's unashamedly positive "defiant", which casts a positive spin on rebellion.

[32] Whilst the first entry in the OED is "proud, disdainful, haughty, arrogant", this is noted as being obsolete or blended with the second meaning: "contemptuous of rightful authority, presumptuously or offensively contemptuous", implications which well suit this passage.

[33] 22 of its 39 occurrences are in direct discourse. It is only applied directly to Aeneas during direct speech by Dido at 4.424 (whereas it is applied to Turnus three times, including twice by the narrator).

[34] Others which Ahl uses just once are "boastful" (10.445), "command" (2.556), "spirited" (1.523), and then the more positive and more visual descriptions: "resplendent" (12.126), "triumph" (5.473), "sumptuous" (2.697), "decorated" (2.504).

[35] Again, there are several words which Day Lewis only uses once. Like Ahl, he chooses positive words "magnificent" (1.697), "proudly adorned" (2.504) and "in

seem to be driven by the pursuit of ambiguity; his most frequent choices are largely synonymous, and therefore the variation is more likely to be for metrical reasons or emulation of Virgilian *variatio*, driven by the desire to be entertaining rather than to achieve semantic precision.

Day Lewis's presentation of the indirect discourse in line 693 is more positive about the Trojans than Ahl's rendering, and is less empathetic to Turnus. Instead of translating *hostem* in the usual way as "the enemy", as Ahl does, he refers specifically to "the Trojans". By not labelling them as the hostile force in this situation, we see the scene less from Turnus' point of view. He also gives a curiously positive translation of *fervere caede nova* as "flushed with the losses they'd just inflicted". Out of the seven instances of *fervere* in the *Aeneid*, this is by far the most positive translation that Day Lewis gives. In its first few instances, Virgil uses it to refer first to working bees (at 1.436) and then, during a simile and apostrophe at 4.407-409, to the Trojans and the ants to which they are compared.[36] Ahl uses the efficient though animalistic word "seethes" three times (1.436, 4.407, 8.677), and elsewhere often conveys themes of heat. for example "set aboil" (4.409), "boiling forth" (9.693)), "red hot" (11.195). Day Lewis also explores these connotations, using "goes on like wild fire", "ablaze",

highest spirits" (5.473). He also does so with "princely" (1.639), "glory" (8.202), and "splendid" (8.721).

[36] See below, p211-220.

"scorched into battle". Yet here, during what is ostensibly a passage focalised by Turnus and presenting his receipt of indirect speech from his messenger, he uses a singularly positive phrase. This points towards a shift in focalisation in Day Lewis' translation, beginning with narrator-focalisation (sympathetic to the Trojans, "flushed with the losses they'd just inflicted"), and ending with focalisation through Turnus, which is mediated by the narrator ("those insolent brothers who fought there").

This ambiguous passage showed how translators can interpret, and translate, focalisation differently. Both maintain a degree of ambiguity, but achieve a different effect. Ahl's ambiguity allows him to focalise the first section through Turnus, then switch to neutral narrator-focalisation. Day Lewis, on the other hand, focalises the first section through the Trojans, and then allows Turnus to focalise the end, though his primary-narrator-focaliser intrudes on the narrative to mediate the focalisation. Whilst this example was ambiguous, my second example, focalised by Aeneas, is less so: it is a commonly cited example of focalisation in the *Aeneid*.[37]

281 ardet abire fuga dulcisque relinquere terras,
282 attonitus tanto monitu imperioque deorum.

Aeneid 4.281-282

[37] Fowler (2000) refers to it as "the standard one in many modern discussions" (47).

In what appears to be something of a contradiction, Virgil's sympathetic narrator presents the confused and angst-ridden Aeneas longing to be away from what he loves. The epithet *dulcis* gives a glimpse into Aeneas' feelings and encourages the audience to share his emotions.[38] After all, the lands are not sweet to the narrator, but they are sweet to Aeneas, and thus the character-focalisation shows the world through his eyes. Even though Dido's country is *dulcis* to him, he has received his divine orders and decides, with overwhelming immediacy and unnatural urgency indicated by three verbs in line 281, in favour of his prescribed destiny.[39] Whilst the conflict clearly occurring within Aeneas' mind is often reduced to that of love versus duty, here it is the lands themselves which are described as *dulcis* to Aeneas, not the woman, or his love.[40] A plausible interpretation is thus to see Aeneas wanting to stay as less an indication of romantic attachment, and more relief at the opportunity to escape exhaustion, to attain short term security, at the expense of ambition and destiny.[41] After he has made his decision, he decides how best to tell Dido, with whom he has been erotically, and perhaps romantically (certainly from her point of view), involved, that he must leave her.

---

[38] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.).

[39] R.D. Williams (1966).

[40] Jackson Knight alters the grammatical relationship between *dulcis* and *terras* to change the meaning from "loved lands", to "the land of his love", implying Dido: "Already he was ardently wishing to flee from the land of his love and be gone".

[41] This reading is foregrounded by Day Lewis at 4.75, where Dido is showing Aeneas: "The vast resources of Carthage, the home there ready and waiting". Cf. Ahl: "Showing him Sidon's resources, explaining her plans for the city".

While the adjective *dulcis* is certainly focalised through Aeneas, the verb *ardet* is unexpected, and *abire fuga* is complex, with *fuga* adding emphasis to *abire*, which already conveys the sense of 'fleeing'.[42] Indeed, the ideas of escape and flight hint at an acknowledgement of shame. If this is focalised through the narrator, then it condemns Aeneas' actions, insinuating that the protagonist is seeking a cowardly way out of his predicament. Equally, if Aeneas is focalising here, then he is accepting fault and self-blame. By line 282, the narrative does seem to be focalised through Aeneas, who is described as *attonitus*, "shocked", by such great warnings of the gods. That the warnings are "so great" reflects neither the reaction of the readers nor the narrator, and subsequently *tanto* suggests focalisation through Aeneas; the warnings were felt to be so great *by him* as he experienced them, not by us or the narrator. Even though there is clearly a degree of focalisation in this passage, its translation is far from straightforward.

> 281 Still, though, he burns to get out, to escape from the lands that delight him,
> 282 Stunned by the mighty force of the gods' commandment and warning,
>
> *Aeneid* 4.281-2 (Ahl)

[42] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.).

Ahl's relatively literal translation "he burns to get out, to escape" conveys Aeneas' unwillingness. The present tense, combined with the spatially relative "get out", with 'of there' implied, heightens Aeneas' plight. He continues the phrase by describing Aeneas as wanting to "escape from the lands that delight him", a challenging, almost oxymoronic statement which provokes thought and surprise. There is no implication that Aeneas is choosing this action, but rather an insinuation of subjugation. Ahl thus heightens the sympathy for Aeneas here, and makes his predicament appear severe. However, his clarification that the lands are *dulcis* to Aeneas specifically, provided by the object pronoun "him", exposes the focalisation and shifts it into narrative description. Subsequently, Ahl has sacrificed an empathetic effect and denied Aeneas direct control of the narrative. Day Lewis treats the focalisation in the same way, though his depiction of Aeneas contrasts significantly with Ahl's reticent hero:

> 281 Awed by this admonition from the great throne above,
> 282 He desired to fly the country, dear though it was to him.
> *Aeneid* 4.281-2 (Day Lewis)

For Day Lewis, Aeneas is still trying to escape, shown through the transitive verb "to fly". However, his decision to leave sounds more favourable; it is something he "desired". Even though Aeneas holds the land "dear", he is willing to make this personal sacrifice for his unquestionably worthy ultimate goal. Striking a note that would have chimed strongly with his 1950s' audience, the epithet "dear" has a soft, nostalgic, stiff-upper-lip tone, which evokes less pity for him and allows the audience to focus on the

strength of his resolve. The preceding line is also positive, as Aeneas is not terrified into action by the gods, but rather "awed" by an ultimate power, casting Aeneas in the mould of a good Christian, with the assimilating and strongly Christianising line, enhanced by hymnic metonymy: "The great throne above".

As in Ahl, the focalisation here is one step removed from the narrative, since Day Lewis adds "to him", again denying Aeneas direct focalisation, and rather having the narrator simply describe Aeneas' feelings. However, once again, despite not using true focalisation, Day Lewis still achieves an effect that is sympathetic. Despite both expressing sympathy, Day Lewis and Ahl present Aeneas, his motivations and reaction to his destiny somewhat differently: Day Lewis' protagonist is more convinced by the sacrifices which he must make. It is as much these particular translators' approaches to *ardet abire* which govern this, rather than purely relying on *dulcis*, the word more typically discussed in relation to empathy for Aeneas within this passage.[43]

If Virgil had focalised this passage through the narrator, if it were clear that *dulcis* was Aeneas' view, without absorbing it into the narrative, e.g. 'the land he loved', or 'the land loved by Aeneas', rather than just 'the loved

[43] See e.g. Fowler (2000) 47.

land', the effect can still be as sympathetic to Aeneas. However, the effect of focalisation is to give Aeneas more of a direct presence in the narrative, allowing him to shift the focus and alter the subjectivity of the narrative itself. This narrative authority changes the effect from sympathy to empathy, and encourages the audience to experience Aeneas' emotions rather than simply being told of them. Day Lewis and Ahl have both expanded on the word *dulcis* here, rather than simply using an epithet together with the word *terras*. This was not something that the translators felt the need to add in the previous example, perhaps since reading a description of warriors proud in war does not challenge a reader to question the source of that opinion; it is easily understood and accepted. In this example however, perhaps translators deemed that more interpretation was necessary, since it is clearly not the narrator who feels attached to Carthage. Both Ahl and Day Lewis shift the epithet into narrative description, both sympathetic, but with different interpretations of its meaning. In a similar example, at 9.112, Day Lewis again chooses to remove the character-focalisation, relating *vox horrenda* through the narrator ("A voice that awed them"), whilst Ahl replicates the Virgilian character-focalisation, through the Latins and Rutulians ("a frightening | Voice").

Whilst these examples have shown how focalisation shifts *he who sees*, next I shall show how free indirect discourse shifts *he who speaks*, at the level of

voice,[44] to explore how Virgil uses this method of representing character speech and thought to construct his polyvocal narrative. I will begin with the lines following on from the *dulcis terras* extract. But first, a brief introduction to free indirect discourse.

1.2 FREE INDIRECT DISCOURSE

It is the example above which Laird uses to distinguish focalisation from free indirect discourse.[45] The phrase *dulcis terras* cannot be free indirect discourse, since the passage does not in any way suggest that it is reported speech (Laird even suggests it might have been embarrassing for Aeneas to have uttered *abire fuga* to describe such a crucial stage of his glorious journey to found Rome) or unvoiced thought. However, the phrase does tell us something about Aeneas' attitudes, and thus, whilst it is certainly focalisation (seeing), it is clearly not free indirect discourse (speaking/thinking). In Latin (and particularly in epic), free indirect discourse often takes the form of deliberative questions in the present subjunctive (as in the earlier example *heu quid agat*), often with no verb of thinking or speaking.[46] The character's utterance is expressed through the

---

[44] Genette (1980) 186.

[45] Laird (1999) 88-100. He does note the difficulties associated with distinguishing focalisation and free indirect discourse, and that examples are not always so easily categorised.

[46] Laird (1999) 88-100.

external narrator, operating almost as internalised mimesis.[47] The use of the third person as a substitute "I" figure, directly speaking in the narrative, draws attention to the distance between subject and narrator. This distance is balanced by the sense of reality which it induces, and combines to at once expose the illusion of the epic narrative and draw the audience further into it.[48] The resulting blending of voices is sometimes used to reflect a sentiment experienced commonly by both the narrator and the character.[49] For example, when free indirect discourse indicates a character's concerns about what action to take next, or about how to express himself, it is often followed by the narrator conveying similar concerns of self-expression, within a narrative apostrophe.[50] This complex and ambiguous blurring of voices can thus contribute to a text's polyvocality,[51] foregrounded by Virgil's regular and unsignposted switching of narrative speakers. Indeed, Virgil is liberal with starting and ending free indirect discourse in much the same way as Highet notes that he is with direct discourse.[52]

---

[47] Onega and Landa (1996) 22.

[48] Laird (1999) 167-170.

[49] Laird (1999) 88-100.

[50] Laird (1999) 174-83. For example, after Aeneas' free indirect discourse at 4.291-4, the narrator apostrophises at 4.296. Further examples are at 12.486-7 (12.500-4), 9.399-401 (9.446-449). Laird suggests this pattern could be due to ancient associations of the narrator's voice with a hypothetical recitator, who might use third person deliberative questions (i.e. free indirect discourse) as a rhetorical technique.

[51] Rimmon-Kenan (1983, 2002 ed.) 113 (citing McHale [1978]).

[52] Highet (1974).

In some ways, free indirect discourse is more similar in effect to direct discourse than indirect discourse, since it conveys utterances without a distancing speech verb (although it resembles indirect discourse in person and tense).[53] However, in other ways free indirect discourse has a different effect to direct discourse, since it conveys an utterance without formalising its construction within the narrative. It allows the narrator to access a character's internal thoughts, and allows that character to speak through the narrative in a vivid and empathetic way. It is thus often used to express the sentiments of, for example, the personification of *Fama*, who never speaks in direct discourse, or of a group of people.[54] By contrast, the thoughts of arguably the epic's most powerful characters – the gods – are never presented in free indirect discourse, and thus, Laird argues, discourse presentation can alter the reader's impression of a character, of their status and self-control.[55] For example, the questions which Aeneas expresses in free indirect discourse (at 4.283 and 12.486-7 [*heu quid agat*]), Dido and Turnus both express in direct discourse (at 4.534-6 and 12.637 [*nam quid ago*]). Presenting Aeneas' thoughts through free indirect

---

[53] Rimmon-Kenan (1983, 2002 ed.) 110-113 (citing McHale [1978] 252).

[54] Laird (1999) 101. When Virgil combines the voice of a group into one person, the effect is similar to that of the chorus in tragedy.

[55] Laird (1999) 174-183. Laird's argument is not without problems. Exacerbated by Latin's lack of punctuation, it can be difficult to set such clear distinctions between different discourse types. Since the gods certainly focalise and speak in monologues, it is difficult to prove that they never speak in free indirect discourse.

discourse gives him more dignity and self-control, since, whilst he does suffer, he does not vocalise his hardship.[56] It is also possible that the protagonist's relationship with the external narrator is such that he has unhindered access to the narrative. Since the narrator (at least ostensibly) often speaks in a tone which is either sympathetic or empathetic to Aeneas, perhaps it is more likely that the narrator will be willing to portray his perspective and allow him to express free indirect discourse, with an opinion that correlates to his own. Highet claims that Aeneas' speeches evoke the broadest range of emotions, and subsequently proves that Aeneas' voice is most clearly linked with that of the narrator, since the majority of passages where Virgil moves, without indication, from narrative into direct speech are spoken by Aeneas.[57]

Whilst Homer typically begins and ends speeches to coincide with line breaks, and uses a select group of words to introduce and close discourse, Virgil is much freer, starting and ending at various points on the line, and using a broad range of words and phrases to move from narrative into speech.[58] Highet explores several reasons for this, one of which is that Homer's oral composition context necessitates formal ways of constructing

---

[56] Laird (1999) 172-3. The implication might be that he has more self-control than Dido or Turnus.

[57] Highet (1974): 2.655-658, 6.560-561, 6.719-721, 10.825-830, 9.390-391 (spoken by Nisus) (215).

[58] Highet (1974) 189, 191.

speech in narrative, and allows the performer to clearly distinguish (and the audience to more clearly follow) who is speaking at any one time.[59] This convention is followed, perhaps for the same oral performance reasons, by Day Lewis, whose translation was initially composed for radio. His discourse usually starts and ends lines, and he does not allow himself the flexibility which Virgil employs to great extent, disrupting speech by interweaving it with the narrative, or breaking out of it to add verbs of speaking or descriptions of the speakers, for example at 12.156-7:[60]

156 "non lacrimis hoc tempus" ait Saturnia Iuno:
157 "accelera […]"

Aeneid 12.156-7

156 "This is not," said Saturnian Juno, "the moment for weeping.
157 "Hurry, […]"

Aeneid 12.156-7 (Ahl)

156 Saturnian Juno cried:-
This is no time for weeping.
157 Hurry, […]

Aeneid 12.156-7 (Day Lewis)

In the example above, Ahl follows Virgil in interrupting the speech with the speaking verb. If Day Lewis were to present his speech with Virgilian

[59] Highet (1974) 192.

[60] Highet (1974) 212 for these descriptions of Virgil's flexible approach to speech and narrative, which he refers to as "narrative words within speeches".

flexibility, it would lead to repetition of speaking verbs, and switching unnecessarily and distractingly between the character and narrator actors, when the (physical) change in voice is already sufficient narrative distinction. Perhaps due to his clearly linguistically demarcated speech patterns, Day Lewis chooses not to follow conventional discourse notation by omitting use of speech marks.[61] Alternatively, and for readers of his translation, this may have the effect of defamiliarizing his narrative, since using minimal punctuation mimics the original Latin. In some ways this allows the voices of the narrative to blend together more fluidly and seamlessly, though perhaps at the cost of reducing the authority and certainty afforded to readers, who are accustomed to relying on punctuation.

Even for translations with a straightforward print publication origin, Virgil's fluidity of speech and thought representation leads to space for interpretation.[62] With multiple ways to translate his complex vocality, the layering of voices can provide translators with the opportunity to cause

---

[61] Despite not using speech marks, Day Lewis does usually offer some punctuational markers to indicate a movement into direct speech, often ':-' or else a line break (see 9.265 for both of these, one to begin and one to end). See Turnus' speech at 12.95-101 for an example with no closing editorial markers at all.

[62] Ruden renders 2.17 as direct speech (where there is no indication of such in the Latin): "They built a mountainous horse, with woven ribs | Of fire – Athena's genius aided them. | 'An offering for a safe voyage home!' The news spread." Farrell (2010) praises Ruden's introduction of an undefined voice as a way to emphasise Virgil's multivocality.

further ambiguity or to clarify which characters are experiencing particular emotions or expressing particular thoughts. I will now examine an example of free indirect discourse, to see how its effect differs to that of focalisation. This first example, taken from book 9, contains ambiguous speech representation, described by the verb *habebant* (the object is *consilium*) and then subjunctives listing the topics of their discussion. The subjunctives could be taken as deliberative questions in their own right, or rather as a construction of indirect speech dependent on *habebant consilium*.

226 ductores Teucrum primi, delecta iuventus,
consilium summis regni de rebus habebant,
228 quid facerent quisve Aeneae iam nuntius esset.
Aeneid 9.226-228

226 Top-ranking Teucrian officers, though, the select of the army,
Gathered in conference now on affairs of the utmost importance:
228 What should they do? Who should go out and pass on the news to Aeneas?
Aeneid 9.226-228 (Ahl)

226 But the high command of the Trojans, the flower of the people, were holding
A conference on the critical state of affairs, discussing
228 What they should do and whom they should send to report to Aeneas.
Aeneid 9.226-228 (Day Lewis)

Virgil's ambiguity has split the translators here. Whilst Day Lewis has translated indirect speech, "discussing what they should do", Ahl inserts a

colon after line 227, and then poses questions in free indirect discourse. The impression Ahl gives is slightly different; he places his readers more immediately in the moment, and asks them to share the experience of the scene with its actors. His narrator directly asks these questions, involving the audience in their predicament, whereas Day Lewis simply describes the topics of the characters' discussion in a rather detached, diegetic narrative. The differing ways of representing reported speech in this example alter the reading experience of the passage, and the relationship between the narrator, audience and narrative, but not its meaning or interpretation. The next example contains an element of ambiguous speech representation, which, when rendered in different formats, may affect its meaning. The translations are thus more acutely disparate, in ways which affect reader interpretation of the scene and its characters. It immediately follows a simile which I analyse in chapter 3, and describes Turnus, riled up by Allecto, madly looking to engage in battle with the invading Trojans.

467 ergo iter ad regem polluta pace Latinum
indicit primis iuvenum et iubet arma parari,
tutari Italiam, detrudere finibus hostem;
470 se satis ambobus Teucrisque venire Latinisque.
haec ubi dicta dedit divosque in vota vocavit,
472 certatim sese Rutuli exhortantur in arma.

Aeneid 7.467-472

The narrative shifts from the external narrator, who focalises the simile, to a period of indirect speech dependent on *iubet* (468-9), as Virgil reports Turnus' closely compressed orders. These lines are followed by *haec ubi*

dicta, a phrase which Virgil often uses to close direct speech.[63] Whilst these lines are unlikely to be direct speech as such, since they are dependent on the third person verb *iubet*, Virgil's use of this phrase here shows the ambiguities inherent in reading Virgilian discourse. This is made evident by the Loeb translation, which does indeed render these lines as direct speech, converting the infinitives *tutari* and *detrudere* into imperatives:

> Therefore, profaning peace, he orders his chief warriors to march upon Latinus, and bids arms be made ready. "Defend Italy" he cries, "drive the foe from her borders; I come, a match for both Teucrians and Latins." When thus he spoke, and called the gods to hear his vows, the Rutuli vie in exhorting one another to arms.
>
> *Aeneid* 7.467-472 (Rushton Fairclough)[64]

This passage shows the power and responsibility of the translator, in their role as textual editor, when it comes to ambiguous speech representation. Since this passage contains a key ambiguous line, the method of speech presentation used can impact the meaning, not just the readers' experience of the narrative. The ambiguous line is immediately before the indirect discourse: *polluta pace,* "with the peace having been broken". Its ambiguity lies both in meaning (no subject is given to identify who has broken the

---

[63] Highet (1972) 342.

[64] The Latin text given on the left hand side of the page in the Loeb edition is exactly the same as the edition which I have quoted above, i.e. with no speech marks added. This shows that translators can have as much of an editorial role in the construction of their own text as textual editors of the Latin.

peace) as well as narrative (whether it belongs to Turnus' indirect speech, or the third person narrator's report). If it is taken as part of Turnus' indirect speech, constructed as part of the purpose phrase, *iter ad regem […] Latinum indicit*, then it is Latinus who has broken the peace.[65] Its placement between *regem* and *Latinum* reinforces this reading. However, if taken as the end of the simile and before the indirect discourse, then the implication is that it is Turnus' raging state that has broken the peace, as in the Loeb translation.[66] This would signify that Turnus' orders break the peace, rather than describing him marching to King Latinus as a reactive response to the king's action.

The more common reading of lines 468-470 is as indirect discourse, where the narrator is mediating the text. However, it certainly seems a faithful representation of Turnus' speech, as we learn that his mission is to defend Italy against the 'enemy' (subjectively, from Turnus' point of view, signifying the Trojans). With *hostem* ending the line and *tutari* starting the line, Turnus' top priority is given further significance. Using the passive infinitive *parari* detaches his men from the task, and focuses on the action rather than the men who will perform it. The eager Rutulians encourage

[65] Horsfall (1999) reads this as entirely from Turnus' viewpoint, and referring to the peace between him and Latinus, personally.

[66] Fordyce (1977) and Conington (1884, 2007 ed.) share this view.

each other in pursuit of this war, and, in carrying out Turnus' orders, Virgil reminds us of their camaraderie and patriotic spirit.

> 467 Therefore he ordered his warrior captains to march on Latinus:
> He was the king who had ruined the peace. They must ready their weapons
> And, to keep Italy safe, expel their foe from its borders.
> 470 Turnus could come in and handle, he said, both Latins and Teucrians.
> When he had made this announcement, and called on the gods to bear witness,
> 472 All the Rutulians vied in their exhortations to battle.
>
> *Aeneid* 7.467-472 (Ahl)

In the section of indirect speech, even though he does not use speech marks, Ahl makes the speech slightly more direct. Although there is a speaking verb, it is delayed until line 470 (after a full stop). The section following the colon after line 467 contains clear blurring of discourse modes, with Ahl turning the indirect discourse into free direct discourse. Ahl's translation reinforces the fact that Turnus is only acting to keep Italy safe, implying that he is only acting as would be expected by a moral, patriotic Roman. Consistent with his alignment with Turnus here, Ahl interprets the ambiguity and subjectively clarifies *polluta pace*; for him, the man to blame for breaking the peace is Latinus. He translates this sentence as the first part of Turnus' speech, which strengthens the fact that it conveys Turnus' viewpoint, and Ahl thus increases the feeling of empathy towards Turnus during this passage. Day Lewis makes a similarly unambiguous rendition, but to the opposite effect.

467 Breaking the peace, then, Turnus ordered his army commanders
To get on a war footing and march against king Latinus:
Italy must be protected, the foe thrown back from its frontiers;
470 He would be more than a match for Trojans and Latins together.
So Turnus proclaimed, and called the gods to witness his vow.
472 The Rutuli spur one another on to war with enthusiasm,

Aeneid 7.467-472 (Day Lewis)

Day Lewis interprets Virgil's ambiguity differently, claiming distinctly that it is Turnus who breaks the peace. Again, it is his differing representation of the discourse that enables him to interpret Virgil's text so differently. He moves *polluta pace* to line 467, out of the reported speech and into the narrative. The second half of line 467 and line 468 are then presented in clearly separated indirect discourse, introduced by "ordered his commanders to". Line 469 can then be read as direct discourse, following the colon. Day Lewis thus empathises less with Turnus, and aligns himself more with the opposing side (who, in this instance, happens to still be Aeneas' enemy, King Latinus). Even though he does report the indirect discourse, he does so in such a way that distances him from Turnus' point of view. Virgil has been ambiguous here, and translators have interpreted his discourse in different ways, exerting their power to change narrative: Day Lewis (and the Loeb translation) blaming Turnus, Ahl blaming Latinus.

1.3 SHIFTING PERSPECTIVE

I will now look at an example from book 4 which contains regular, occasionally ambiguous, shifts between narrator/character-focaliser and different types of discourse presentation. Such regular shifts are typical within Virgilian narrative, and this extract gives a particularly clear indication of the issues and opportunities available to translators. It is a long passage, so I will break it down into the following sections, based on where the discourse shifts, for analysis:

1. 283-284 – free indirect discourse (Aeneas)
2. 285-287 – focalisation (narrator)
3. 288-291 – indirect discourse (Aeneas)
4. 291-295 – indirect discourse (Aeneas)
5. 296-299 – focalisation (narrator) and indirect discourse (*Fama*)

(1) 283-284 – free indirect discourse (Aeneas)

283 heu quid agat? quo nunc reginam ambire furentem
284 audeat adfatu? quae prima exordia sumat?

Aeneid 4.283-284

283 Wondering what he should do, how he'd dare to get round the besotted
284 Ruler with some explanation, or find ways of broaching the subject.

Aeneid 4.283-284 (Ahl)

283 But oh, what was he to do? What words could he find to get round
284 The temperamental queen? How broach the matter to her?

Aeneid 4.283-284 (Day Lewis)

In this passage, Aeneas asks questions in the form of indirect deliberatives. The free indirect discourse involves the reader in Aeneas' dilemma, and is the first time that we see a "psychological portrait of Aeneas", something which we were prepared for after the focalisation of *dulcis terras*.[67] This is certainly free indirect discourse, indeed the first time it is used by the principal narrator.[68] Laird says it cannot be direct discourse since Aeneas is unable to speak and a direct expression of these sentiments would be uncharacteristically melodramatic.[69] He continues to say that, whilst it is not directly spoken by Aeneas, it clearly and vividly conveys his trials here as he is torn apart by contradictory emotions, and the immediate, urgent effect of the present tenses is highlighted by comparison with the past tenses used in the narrative since 276.

In a reversal from what was observed in the first extract of this section, Day Lewis keeps the free indirect discourse, and leaves the open questions in his translation. Ahl however changes the free indirect discourse to indirect discourse, adding the verb "wondering", and presents it as statement rather than a question. Both Ahl and Day Lewis translate *ambire*, a word often associated with political canvassing, as "get round", which well implies both circumnavigation and persuasion. However, their renditions

---

[67] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.) on 279-285. See also R.D. Williams (1966).

[68] Laird (1999) 167-170. Aeneas had previously spoken similarly during books 2-3, e.g. 3.39.

[69] Laird (1999) 174-183.

of *furentem reginam* are rather different. Ahl makes a provocative choice in "besotted ruler", which seems to belittle Dido (Jackson Knight translates in a similar vein with "infatuated").

Ahl shows in his note to this line his recognition of the mediation that a narrator can enforce in indirect speech, stating that the exact phrasing of Aeneas' thoughts is beyond reach: in this instance, he speculates that Aeneas could have been thinking anything from: "How can I broach this matter with my darling Dido?" to "How can I broach the matter with this besotted ruler?"[70] Ahl thus shows his awareness of ambiguity, by showing the two extremes which translators could take, and his willingness to openly engage in his role as interpreter, by using one of those extremes in his translation. Since *furens* more typically means 'mad' or 'raging',[71] Ahl's explanation that her madness is the type brought about by love (she is "besotted"), has the effect of overqualification, almost overtranslation. It is especially striking compared to his translation of *furenti* in the first extract shown in this chapter, where Turnus was "in his full battle fury". Belittling Dido here must reflect either Aeneas' opinion of her (as explicitly expressed through his free indirect discourse), or that of the narrator, imposing his opinion on top of Aeneas' speech.

---

[70] Ahl (2007).

[71] OLD: *furo*.

(2) 285-7 – focalisation (narrator)

285 atque animum nunc huc celerem nunc dividit illuc
in partisque rapit varias perque omnia versat.
287 haec alternanti potior sententia visa est:

Aeneid 4.285-287

285 This way and that, he channelled his swift mind, testing his options,
Every alternative he could conceive. He approached from all angles.
287 This, as his thoughts vacillated, appeared the most forceful decision:

Aeneid 4.285-287 (Ahl)

285 His mind was in feverish conflict, tossed from one side to the other,
Twisting and turning all ways to find a way past his dilemma.
287 So vacillating, at last he felt this the better decision:-

Aeneid 4.285-287 (Day Lewis)

In this section, the narrator focalises a description of Aeneas wondering what action to take.[72] Virgil tells us that Aeneas chooses the preferable, *potior*, decision, which Ahl translates as "most forceful". Although there is possible evidence for this reading, as *potior* can imply a seizing or other sense of power, Ahl has certainly strongly interpreted this particular reading. His translation here is unexpected, jarring and provocative, with

[72] 4.285-6 is repeated at 8.20-1. While Day Lewis translates both consistently, Ahl opts for considerable variation: "Scurrying thoughts into this or that channel of choice and decision, | Surging in random directions, examining every perspective."

the effect of increasing sympathy for Dido. We could also read a secondary layer of ambiguity here, that Ahl reminds us that Aeneas has been forced into this decision, and that he is a victim of the gods. Day Lewis, on the other hand, suggests that Aeneas actively chose this option, in a different portrayal to Ahl's unwilling and reactive hero. He gives the more typical "better" for *potior*: "he felt this the better decision," showing Aeneas in control of deciding his own actions, and putting less emphasis on the confrontational and devastating impact that it will have on Dido.[73] The vocabulary chosen here thus alters the subjectivity within narrator-focalised narrative.

(3) 288-291 – indirect discourse (Aeneas)

> 288 Mnesthea Sergestumque vocat fortemque Serestum,
> classem aptent taciti sociosque ad litora cogant,
> 290 arma parent et quae rebus sit causa novandis
> 291 dissimulent;
>
> *Aeneid* 4.288-291

> 288 So he called Mnestheus, Sergestus as well, and the valiant Serestus;
> Then, he instructs them to refit the ships, muster crews on the seashore,
> 290 Ready their weapons. *No word must get out*. The entire re-equipment
> 291 *Must be disguised*.
>
> *Aeneid* 4.288-291 (Ahl)

[73] Ahl's mirroring of the unusual word *vacillating* here perhaps indicates reference to (or use of) Day Lewis' translation.

288 Sending for Mnestheus, Sergestus and brave Serestus, he bade them
Secretly get the ships ready, muster their friends on the beach,
290 Be prepared to fight: the cause of so drastic a change of plan
291 They must keep dark:

Aeneid 4.288-291 (Day Lewis)

This extract begins with a simple report of the occurrence of a speech act: Aeneas 'calls' (*vocat*) Sergestus and Serestus.[74] After that, Virgil tell us the orders that he has given, reported by third person subjunctives: *aptent, parent, cogant, dissimulent*. These are difficult to categorise, as the varying interpretations by both critics and commentaries suggest. The absence of a speaking verb means that they could be taken as simple jussive subjunctives indicating free indirect discourse.[75] However I, with Laird, categorise them as indirect discourse, reliant on *vocat* and with an omitted *ut*: 'he called them [and he said that] they were to…'.[76] Ahl keeps this passage as indirect discourse, reinforced by an additional speaking verb: "he instructs them". On lines 290 and 291, the italicisation that Ahl uses for *No word must get out* and *Must be disguised* is an ambiguous editorial marker. He does not state in his apparatus what his use of italics signifies, and thus his typography here renders Virgil's blurred voices more

[74] Laird (1999) 174-183.

[75] R.D. Williams (1966): *aptent* and *parent* are *iussive* subjunctives, reporting Aeneas' orders. Conington (1884, 2007 ed.) classifies them as subjunctives in a sort of *oratio obliqua*, dependent on the sense rather than on the expression of the previous line.

[76] Laird (1999) 174-183.

ambiguous and allows readers to make their own interpretations. The italics might indicate emphasis, or changing voices, hushed tones, or an aside (which befits the context and content). I propose that they could be read as a shift to direct discourse, switching to a direct representation of Aeneas' orders, in a way which shows translators' power in editing to alter Virgil's speech representation.

Day Lewis also includes two speaking verbs, and thus reinforces the fact that line 289 is indirect speech, by adding "he bade them".[77] As an interesting point of comparison, Jackson Knight chooses not to add a speaking verb in line 289, though he does use a colon before the statements, which still gives the effect of free indirect discourse (since although a verb is omitted, it could be implied through the colon): "He called to him Mnestheus, Sergestus, and the gallant Serestus: they were to fit out the fleet, make ready all their tackle, and muster their comrades on the shore, without giving any explanations, and concealing the reason for the change of plan."

(4) 291-5 – indirect discourse (Aeneas)

291 sese interea, quando optima Dido
nesciat et tantos rumpi non speret amores,
temptaturum aditus et quae mollissima fandi

[77] There is the possibility, as always, that this might be added for metrical reasons. Regardless, it is still a narrative choice, and one which may affect the reading of the passage.

tempora, quis rebus dexter modus. ocius omnes
295 imperio laeti parent et iussa facessunt.

Aeneid 4.291-295

291 In the meantime, since excellent Dido knew nothing,
And wouldn't dream that their great love affair was in fact being shattered,
He would himself test out some approaches, and find the most tactful
Times for a talk, and how best he could frame it. Reaction was instant.
295 Each obeyed orders and followed instructions. They all were delighted.

Aeneid 4.291-295 (Ahl)

291 In the meanwhile, assuming that generous Dido
Knew nothing and could not imagine the end of so great a love,
Aeneas would try for a way to approach her, the kindest moment
For speaking, the best way to deal with this delicate matter. His comrades
295 Obeyed the command and did as he told them with cheerful alacrity.

Aeneid 4.291-295 (Day Lewis)

Although I have tentatively labelled this section as a continuation of Aeneas' indirect discourse, it is ambiguous. The subject has moved from the orders he put to his men to what he himself will do, highlighted by the emphatic *sese* (291). Aeneas ponders how to inform Dido of his departure, and his deliberation contrasts with the emotions of his men, who are eager

and quick to action.[78] This could be read as a continuation of his vocalised speech, or as a switch to internalised thought. The argument for it being internalised thought is that his choice to communicate his means of approaching a love-sick Dido would be rather an odd thing to vocalise to his men. The stronger argument for reading it as vocalised speech is in the reaction of Aeneas' men at lines 294-5, where it reads as if his speech has immediately ended. Further evidence to reading this as a continuation of his speech act is found in the word *optima*, a value-laden word which Virgil often uses in discourse, direct or otherwise. Of its 14 occurrences, ten are in direct discourse. Seven are in books 10-12, and the character to whom it is most commonly applied is King Latinus (every instance in direct discourse). It is only used four times by the narrator, two of which are in character apostrophes (to Lausus and Teuthas). It is a word with many implications;[79] it could be taken as a relatively objective epithet to apply to Dido, or could be a personal moment, representing Aeneas' thoughts in the most heart-breaking way, giving readers one of the small revelations we get of his true feelings (also seen in *dulcis terras* at 4.281).[80] Laird suggests

---

[78] R.D. Williams (1966). Austin (1955, 1966 ed.) notes *facessere* particularly portrays this.

[79] Day Lewis uses "good" twice, but all of his other renditions are different. Ahl uses "excellent" three times, "wonderful" twice, "best" twice and "noble" twice.

[80] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.), listing (and arguing against) those who see it as in some way disparaging (e.g. Pease [1935, 1967 ed.]). R.D. Williams (1966) notes the same (*oratio obliqua*, reporting Aeneas' words) – that *optima* shows the respect Aeneas feels towards Dido, while *tantos amores* shows his feelings on a more personal level, reiterating that Aeneas, despite having decided to sacrifice his love for his duty, does in fact love Dido (he refers back to lines 221, 332 and 395).

that this section more resembles free indirect discourse than indirect discourse, due to the lack of a declarative verb, and affirmed by the singular form of *temptaturum* and by the subject which Aeneas expresses, that of doubts over how to vocalise his thoughts to Dido.[81] Laird notes that direct discourse, a direct expression conveying the conflict of Aeneas' wants, would not be viable here. Williams and Conington both refer to this as *oratio obliqua,* further suggesting that *optima* shows this passage is indirect discourse. On the following line, there is also a sentence of secondary embedded indirect discourse from Dido, introduced by *non speret*, where Aeneas speculates how Dido will react to his departure.

For several reasons, Ahl's translation here feels like a continuation of Aeneas' indirect discourse. Most striking is his translation of lines 294-5, where Aeneas' men appear to be reacting to the end of his speech (which we therefore assume has immediately finished). The continuation of the hypothetical tenses "would" and "could" throughout this section also point towards an extension of indirect discourse. If Aeneas is indeed speaking, Ahl has interpreted *tantos rumpi amores* as referring to reciprocal love, when he translates it as "their great love affair was in fact being shattered". His implication of reciprocation here makes this section contribute to the sense of this passage being spoken by Aeneas in indirect discourse. Ahl's

[81] Laird (1999) 170.

physical verb 'being shattered' also implies that it is being broken by somebody, and, since Aeneas is speaking, it is perhaps the gods that he is blaming (or himself, in a moment of self-awareness). Of course, there is embedded secondary discourse here from Dido, and thus the complex layering of voices could be ambiguous. It could reflect the way that Dido sees it (but not Aeneas), or Aeneas could be in agreement with this presentation since he is focalising Dido's speech and has the power to mediate. Ahl's expression here rather fits with his general characterisation of Aeneas; his hero is painfully aware of his faults.

Although Day Lewis also continues his use of these hypothetical tenses, and thus the section is again a continuation of indirect discourse, this passage seems to be rather internalised thought than spoken narrative. Day Lewis gives 'generous' for *optima*, which is a freer translation than Ahl's "excellent". Day Lewis removes the ambiguity inherent in the word, and his translation clarifies what it means in this instance, to Aeneas. Day Lewis's translation of *quando* follows Conington's prompt: he gives "assuming that", which is a strong indication that it introduces Aeneas' thoughts rather than speech.[82] It is also clearly not focalised through the narrator, who does not rely on assumptions. Crucially, Aeneas' men react in a less

[82] Day Lewis follows Conington (1884, 2007 ed.) in taking *quando* as equivalent to *quoniam*. Conington argues it seems to express Aeneas' thoughts rather than the actual fact, "assuming that".

immediate way in Day Lewis' narrative, and we have the impression that Aeneas' thoughts in the previous line are almost running concurrently, in contrast to Ahl's sequential speech and action. Day Lewis also names Aeneas in line 293, which again makes this feel less like spoken narrative. Finally, Day Lewis is clearer with *tantos amores* as "so great a love", where Aeneas experiences less conflict, with no reciprocation implied, and no blame for the inevitable and unavoidable end of the affair. In this passage, the translators' differing interpretations of indirect discourse, as either spoken or thought, prove its ambiguity.

(5) 296-9 – focalisation (narrator) and indirect discourse (*Fama*)

296 at regina dolos (quis fallere possit amantem?)
praesensit, motusque excepit prima futuros
omnia tuta timens. eadem impia Fama furenti
299 detulit armari classem cursumque parari.

Aeneid 4.296-299

296 Still though, the queen detected his ruse. Who *could* fool a lover?
Scared because things seemed safe, she discovered his plans for departure
First. Rumour, ever unrighteous, informed on him, telling the furious
299 Ruler the navy was being refitted and readied for sailing.

Aeneid 4.296-299 (Ahl)

296 But who can ever hoodwink a woman in love? The queen,
Apprehensive even when things went well, now sensed his deception,
Got wind of what was going to happen. That mischievous Rumour,
299 Whispering the fleet was preparing to sail, put her in a frenzy.

Aeneid 4.296-299 (Day Lewis)

At the start of this section, an abrupt change in narrative empathy is indicated by *at regina*.[83] The negative word *dolos,* followed by *motus* and *impia*, could indicate focalisation through Dido.[84] However, I read this passage as narrator-focalised, with sympathy (rather than empathy) towards Dido. The narrator tells us that Dido is *tuta* (which does not reflect her view of the situation), and there is a clear narrative aside in the brackets of line 296. The adjective *impia* refers to *Fama*, highlighting how she contrasts with Aeneas' piety, and has no regard for human relationships or emotions.[85]

In his translation of *dolos* as "ruse", Ahl implies what Day Lewis makes more explicit in "his deception", taken even further by Jackson Knight in "intended deceit". Day Lewis specifies "woman in love" for the gender neutral *amantem* (Ahl gives the appropriately genderless "lover"), thus clarifying that the lover who cannot be deceived (or rather, "hoodwinked") is female. However, whilst Day Lewis keeps the indirect discourse with "whispering", *Fama* becomes simply "mischievous", which is rather light-

---

[83] R.D. Williams (1966) notes this is a decisive repetition of the important words from the start of book four. Austin (1955, 1966 ed.): "the words mark a heightening of the drama, and a new chapter as it were in the relations between Dido and Aeneas".

[84] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.) believes it is from her point of view.

[85] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.), Conington (1884, 2007 ed.).

hearted for *impia*. Ahl maintains the indirect discourse for "unrighteous Rumour" in 298, with "informed on him" implying an organisational, again perhaps criminal and unjust telling. Whilst Day Lewis empathises strongly with Aeneas, his Aeneas once again is presented with a slightly different outlook on the world and its events than Ahl's.

In this passage, we've seen how fluidly Virgil moves between representations of speech, thought and perspective of different characters, and how translators replicate this fluidity of narrative. Speech acts are not always easily categorised; they can be read as being spoken directly by the narrator but being sympathetic to (or critical of) a character, or as being empathetic to a degree (for example through focalisation), or as a representation of a speech act (which can be mediated by the narrator to different extents, depending on how directly it is portrayed). If they see fit, translators can add in or remove speaking verbs in order to clarify which sections are reported speech. They might use punctuation such as speech marks or italics in order to clearly delineate between discourse modes. They might choose to present indirect discourse freely, where the reader is invited to share in the experience or quandary the character faces. They can also use epithets or carefully chosen vocabulary in order to convey a passage as being more, or less, sympathetic to a particular character. The resulting effect of these changes to speech representation can have an impact on the relationship between the narrator and the narrative, or on the narrator's presentation of its characters. In the final example, I will look at how the narrator can intrude upon a character's focalisation or free

indirect discourse, and how this secondary embedding of voices can affect the presentation of events and characters.

1.4 VOICE: NARRATOR INTRUSION

In this extract, Virgil describes heart-broken Dido preparing for her suicide. Having spoken with her sister, she duly proceeds towards death through observing various rites. In her piety, that quality so esteemed in Aeneas, attention is drawn to her status as his victim. Dido is described, her hands specifically, with the adjective *pius*. Whilst this adjective is most commonly used of Aeneas, it has not been regularly associated with him during book 4, when he has momentarily lost his respect for duty and obligation. Its usage in relation to Dido here is thus particularly striking.

517 ipsa mola manibusque piis altaria iuxta
unum exuta pedem vinclis, in veste recincta,
testatur moritura deos et conscia fati
520 sidera; tum, si quod non aequo foedere amantis
521 curae numen habet iustumque memorque, precatur.

Aeneid 4.517-521

Virgil portrays, with moving simplicity, Dido praying to any god mindful of unrequited lovers.[86] The verb *precatur* could imply that lines 520-1 are

[86] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.) compares Dido here to a puzzled child saying their prayers.

indirect discourse. Alternatively, *si quod* could be read as a brief aside, where the narrator subjectively comments on the injustice of Dido's situation, and speculates over the (lack of) divine assistance which she should expect to receive. Even though it seems oddly worded, Austin notes that the *si quod numen* clause is a standard precautionary 'catch-all' clause, designed to catch any power she has inadvertently omitted.[87] Dido appears to be threatening the gods here, not doubting their existence but doubting whether they care.[88] Thus, this could be read as a crucial part of Dido's spoken prayer, or a cynical narrator aside.

517 Dido, the sacramental grain in her purified hands,
One foot unsandalled, her dress uncinctured, stood by the altars
Calling upon the gods and the stars that know fate's secrets,
520 Death at her heart, and prayed to whatever power it is
521 Holds unrequited lovers in its fair, faithful keeping.
Aeneid 4.517-521 (Day Lewis)

517 She, hands righteously cleansed, offers sacred grain at the altars,
Wearing her clothes, and one of her sandals, loose and unknotted
Death-doomed, she calls upon gods and the fate-telling stars to bear witness,

[87] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.).

[88] Dyson (1996). In her exploration of Dido's complex relationship with Epicureanism, Dyson refers to Dido's sarcastic mention of the gods' indifference "a few seconds before she invokes their aid" (204). She goes on to say: "Dido's Epicurean argument to Aeneas, with its sarcastic implication that the gods scorn to intervene, can do nothing to counter the (within the epic) very real intervention of the very human gods" (217).

520 Prays to a power that is just (if there is one), a power that remembers,
521 Whose jurisdiction embraces all lovers with one-sided contracts.

Aeneid 4.517-521 (Ahl)

Ahl is arguably closer to the Latin than Day Lewis here. He uses the present tense, as he often does,[89] and faithfully renders the *si quod* phrase, with *non aequo foedere amantis* becoming the appropriately detached "lovers with one-sided contracts". We are led to wonder who it is that creates these formal contracts. By separating off the aside, he makes it more likely to be spoken by the narrator. Ahl's use of brackets is consistent with his use of other editorial markers (e.g. italics), which I interpret as signifying a change of voice. Dido, after all, is uttering the whole prayer, whilst Ahl has chosen to use syntax to separate the aside and create a division, showing the shift to the narrator's voice. Ahl thus challenges his readers, reminding them of the complexities of this narrative.[90] Ahl's presentation of this section makes it less likely to be free indirect discourse from Dido since expression of doubt over the existence of a just god is inconsistent with the thoughts of the pious, praying Dido. Ahl defamiliarizes here, and rather under-translates this section. He has played around with the word order, in a rather Virgilian way, with "just" and "remembers" in emphatic

[89] See below, p165 n40.

[90] Sceptical prayers are not altogether unusual: Iarbas also combines scepticism and prayer at 4.217-8, 4.208-10.

positions, and the embracing lovers literally embraced by the line. Day Lewis on the other hand does not doubt in the existence of the correct deity here. By saying that she prays to whichever power it is, he simply makes this sound like a request from a desperate Dido. Day Lewis' translation of *piis* as "purified" is also particularly interpretative, especially since he has defined *pietas* as "a habit of respect for gods, ancestors, parents, country, institutions, and a sense of involvement with them – a virtue one acquires slowly nowadays if at all".[91] He thus chooses to focus on Dido's sanctity, her physical observance of proper religious practice, rather than depicting her as upholding this enviable, Roman trait. His narrator thus does not interrupt in the same intrusive way as Ahl's does, however, his presence in mediating the narrative and controlling the presentation of characters is very much felt.

1.5 CONCLUSIONS

Virgil's narrative involves many storytellers. Some passages are described purely by the narrator, some are told through the lens of character-focalisers, and others are presented through various types of reported discourse. At times, the complex fabric of the *Aeneid*'s narrative obscures distinction between these voices, as Virgil's polyvocal way of storytelling encourages a blurring together of the entities experiencing and reacting to

[91] Day Lewis (1960) 26.

the narrative's events. The perspective through which the story is narrated foregrounds the speaker's reaction to or opinions on the narrative's events or characters, and the narrator can encourage or discourage allegiance with that perspective. During the process of translation, these perspectives and voices are further blended, interwoven, or mediated by the narrator. By altering the voices through which the narrative is told, translators can alter their readers' interpretation of the epic. They may do this in order to maintain or diminish ambiguity within the narrative, or to portray a different subjectivity. They may present a narrative of similar complexity and flexibility to Virgil, allowing different voices to portray the tale, for example through free indirect discourse, or they might impose a mediating narrator to hold overall control over the narrative.

I have looked specifically at examples of focalisation and discourse presented in direct, indirect or free indirect ways. The focalisation examples showed evidence of translators increasing the strength of character-focalisation, retaining character-focalisation but changing its effect, or exposing the perspective and thus minimising the focalisation (by stating that the feelings belong to a particular character, rather than purely relating the opinion through the narrative). In the free indirect discourse examples, translators sometimes choose to switch between free indirect and indirect discourse modes, achieved either simply by linguistic choices, sometimes by the addition (or removal) of, for example, speaking verbs, and sometimes by use of editorial markers such as addition or removal of speech marks, use of italics, dashes, or brackets. These punctuation

elements can clarify the reading of the narrative or can further obscure it. Due to the nature of Latin's punctuation (or lack of it), translators can (and must) function as editors of their version of the (translated, English) text, and, as such, have significant authority in terms of shifting discourse into more or less direct modes. The final example showed how sympathy and empathy interact, and how the narrator subjectively conveys his own reaction to the narrative through intrusive asides, alongside presenting character points of view.

The examples which I have analysed here have shown how translators can respond to, appropriate, or alter narrative voice and perspective by shifting between focalisation and free indirect discourse, or by switching between sympathy and empathy. Indeed, translators can still choose to be sympathetic to a character whilst staying in the narrator's own voice, and, at the other extreme, can lessen the effect of sympathy by retaining character-focalisation but minimising or belittling the character's reaction. Looking at these passages through translation sheds new light on the complexity of these narrative structures. By altering the way in which the narrator reacts to characters' thoughts and the degree of flexibility they exercise in allowing characters' voices to mediate the narrative, translators can change a reader's interpretation of the narrator, characters and narrative.

From the examples examined so far, I have shown that Day Lewis often alters his text in ways which reduce ambiguity. Ahl, on the other hand,

willingly gives his reader ambiguities to interpret. They both present a narrative comprised of multiple voices and points of view, but Day Lewis' narrator is still at the helm of his narrative, steering it in a particular direction. It is not quite as simple as stating that Day Lewis includes more or less character-focalisation than Ahl, but rather, that he uses focalisation in order to present more of a unified view within his narrative. This means either: focalising through his narrator, who possesses a clearer single subjectivity; presenting character-focalisation, but re-imposing the narrator's viewpoint as a secondary filter which mediates the character's opinions or emotions and reacts to them; or focalising through a character, but with an altered representation of that character's emotions. I have focused in this chapter on character voice, through focalisation and free indirect discourse, and how the narrator presents and mediates character speech and thought. In the following chapters I will focus on the voice of the narrator himself. The next chapter explores the influence of a concept closely linked to focalisation and to the narrator and characters' spatial and temporal proximity to the narrative: deixis. Having analysed how the narrator presents character speech and thought, I shall move to exploring how narrators, in Virgil and in translation, relate themselves to the narrative and audience.

2 Deixis: Narrative Presence, Temporality, and Interjection

.

tu quoque litoribus nostris, Aeneia nutrix,
aeternam moriens famam, Caieta, dedisti;
et nunc servat honos sedem tuus, ossaque nomen
Hesperia in magna, si qua est ea gloria, signat.

Aeneid 7.1-4

In the opening lines of book 7, Aeneas and his men are sailing up the coast of Italy from Cumae to the river Tiber. As they pass the area of coast named after Aeneas' nurse Caieta, Virgil's narrator addresses her in an apostrophe.[1] The address is signalled by the vocative case, the second person pronouns *tu* and *tuus*, and the second person verb *dedisti*. Although the narrator does not enter the narrative with a singular first person pronoun or verb form, he does use a first person plural possessive pronoun in *litoribus nostris*. He speaks from the point of view of Virgil and his contemporary Romans, creating empathy through 'our shores', and aligning himself with his audience. This identity is also exposed through the change of verb tense, from the perfect *dedisti*, indicating that the fame that Caieta gave the shores is in the past relative to the narrator, to the present tense verbs *servat* and *signat*, indicating a state of affairs that continue to happen at the narrator's time ('the name [still/even now]

[1] Whilst I use an apostrophe here to illustrate deixis (since deictic elements often accompany apostrophe), I dedicate the next chapter to dealing specifically with apostrophe. See C. Segal (1966) 57 for an insightful discussion of the Caieta apostrophe.

marks the place', or 'it continues to mark the place'). The temporal adverb *nunc* reinforces the positioning of the narrative within the narrator present.

The narrative positioning, both temporal and spatial, gives this passage a rather personal tone.[2] Bal categorises personal narrative as that which (more commonly) uses first and second person verbs and pronouns, whereas impersonal language would more likely use the third person.[3] Personal language elements also include emotive words (e.g. 'Oh!'), conative words (e.g. address, command, question), and modal verbs or adverbs (which indicate uncertainty in the speaker). Bal continues to list: indicative pronouns like 'this' and 'these' (where impersonal language uses 'that' and 'those'), spatial adverbs like 'here' and 'there' (where impersonal languages uses 'in that place'), and temporal adverbs like 'today' and 'tomorrow' (where impersonal languages uses 'that day' or 'the day after'). Whilst personal language thus indicates the spatio-temporal relationship

---

[2] Conington (1884, 2007 ed.) however says that whilst the "poet speaks in his own person", the tone here is "more national than personal".

[3] Bal (1985, 2009 ed.) 52. Bakker ([2005] 71-91) refers to Benveniste's (1966, 1971 ed.) distinction between *discourse* (*discours*), which uses subjective grammatical forms like 'I', 'you' and certain spatio-temporal deictic markers, and *narrative* (*histoire*), an objective mode which excludes every kind of autobiographical, or deictic, marker. Narratives (in the wider sense), Benveniste says, will switch between both modes (206-7, 208-9). Although e.g. Palmer (1976, 1981 ed.) 60-62 confirms the correlation between deixis and subjectivity, for clarity I avoid using the term 'subjective' to indicate inclusion of deictic elements, since I reserve it to indicate narrator-focalised opinion or emotion. I instead follow Bal's personal/impersonal terminology to distinguish between language that uses grammatically personal (deictic) elements, and that which does not.

between the narrator and the narrative, impersonal language could be narrated by anyone, at any time and place, with no relation to the narrative signified. In the extract above, it is the apostrophe, the personal pronouns, the person and tense of the verbs, and the temporal adverbs which can be described as personal.

Some of these words have an additional quality, which is that they are deictic. *Deixis* is the use of words which only have meaning in their particular context, and which cannot be understood outside of that context. Prince defines *deictic* as "any term or expression which, in an utterance, refers to the context of production (addresser, addressee, time, place) of that utterance."[4] Adverbs, he says, are also used to "locate what is reported relative to the addresser". Deixis subsequently locates and identifies people, objects and events being referred to in the narrative and being sustained by the participation in the act of the utterance by a speaker and an addressee.[5] For example, in the sentence 'I am here now', the elements 'I', 'here', and 'now' (as well as the time referred to by the present tense 'am') are all meaningless unless the addressee understands the context in which they are uttered, in which case the referenced person, place and time will have an associated meaning.[6] It is these three categories which form

---

[4] Prince (1987) 18.

[5] My definition here is drawn from Lyons (1977) 637.

[6] See Bühler (1934, 1982 ed.); E.M. Segal (1995) 10; Bal (1985, 2009 ed.) 30.

Palmer's classification of deictics, and their use to "identify objects, persons and events in terms of their relation to the speaker in space and time": firstly, those which identify the participants in the discourse; secondly, those which identify the spatial position of the speaker in relation to the discourse; thirdly, those which identify the temporal relationship between the speaker and the discourse, whether general terms such as 'now' or 'then' or the more specific 'tomorrow' or 'yesterday'.[7] Palmer also explains that verbs can contribute to the third category, through their tense, and to the second category, where their meanings suggest direction of movement e.g. 'to come' as opposed to 'to go', 'to bring' or 'to take'. Finally, he adds that the definite article can be deictic in meaning, since it refers to a specific single identifiable instance of something, understood in a particular context and apparent to both speaker and addressee, for example 'the government', or 'the kitchen'.[8] In the example above (7.1-4), the first person plural (indicated by the possessive pronoun) and the time (referred to by the present tense and the adverb) cannot be understood out of context. These elements are thus deictic, and are used to indicate the narrator's closeness to, or distance from, the narrative.

[7] Palmer (1976, 1981 ed.) 60-62. Toolan (1996, 2013 ed.) 33.

[8] Palmer (1976, 1981 ed.) 129.

Whilst pronouns are often deictic, they do not necessitate this quality.[9] They do not always depend on context, and are otherwise used anaphorically to avoid undesirable repetition by replacing a name or object. Anaphoric pronouns differ from deictic since they clearly refer to a previously established referent. When a pronoun is used in a deictic sense, it is unlikely to rely on the referent being (immediately) previously identified by the speaker – instead, its referent is understood on the basis of context. In the example above, the second person pronouns (and verb) are anaphoric references to Caieta, and thus, whilst they may be personal, they are not deictic. However, the pronoun *nostris* is deictic, since it is only understood based on the context. By referring to 'our shores', the narrator expresses his belonging to a group, and relies on his audience understanding their identity.

Perkins explains that the pronoun 'I' is usually deictic and rarely anaphoric, understood on the basis of its context rather than relying on a preceding noun phrase to define the identity of the speaking 'I'.[10] However, by choosing to translate the four controversial pre-proem lines at the beginning of the *Aeneid,* Ahl shifts the 'I' pronoun from a deictic to an anaphoric instance.[11] Since these lines identify the 'I', and thus provide a

---

[9] Perkins (1992) 102-3.

[10] Perkins (1992) 103.

[11] Ahl's footnote states that "the italicised lines were removed by Virgil's editors" (with no acknowledgement of the possibility that they were added in at a later

referent for the first person at line 1.1. The narrator thus identifies himself in ways which influence an audience's understanding of the *Aeneid*'s opening and of his narrator.

1a ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena
carmen, et egressus silvis vicina coegi
ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono,
1d gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Martis.

1 arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris

Aeneid 1a-d and 1.1

1a *I'm the same man who once coaxed music from slenderest reed pipes,*
Then, upon leaving the forests, I worked in the neighbouring ploughlands,
Making them yield their resources to even the greediest settler:
1d *Farmers all loved this work. Now I turn to the horrors of battle.*
1 Arms and the man I sing of Troy, who first from its seashores,

Aeneid 1a-d and 1.1 (Ahl)

Day Lewis, on the other hand, does not include these lines, and does not even mention them in his notes. He starts his epic at the more generally

---

date). Such closed editorial starkness is unusual for Ahl. During his translation, Jackson Knight believed he had interactions with Virgil through Professor Haarhoff; one of the messages that Haarhoff claimed to receive from the Roman poet was that the epic begins with *ille ego* (Wilson Knight [1975] 467).

accepted opening:[12] *arma virumque cano*, and adds an element of subjectivity when he translates *virum* as the "hero" rather than simply the "man", indicating to his audience what sort of man Aeneas is.[13] The deictic, rather than anaphoric, pronoun here establishes his speaker as the narrator of the text, without the additional biographical information which Ahl supplied.

1 I tell about war and the hero who first from Troy's frontier,
Aeneid 1.1 (Day Lewis)

I have so far discussed some fundamental elements of deixis as well as the dichotomy between personal and impersonal language. Next, I shall introduce a few more technical or theoretical concepts that will assist with my subsequent analyses of deixis: the concepts of discourse mode, tense, base, and deictic centre.

---

[12] R.D. Williams (1966) gives a good summary of the opinions of ancient commentators Donatus and Servius, who claim these lines were removed from the beginning of the *Aeneid* by its posthumous editors, Varius and Tucca. However, they are not found in any major manuscript, and he concludes "it is certain that they should be omitted". Conington (1884, 2007 ed.) also disagrees with these lines, and provides plentiful references to ancient sources which cite *arma virum/arma virumque/arma virumque cano* as the epic's opening. For a thorough recounting of the history of reading these lines, see Austin (1968), who concludes "The authenticity of the *ille ego* lines fails on every count" (113).

[13] Day Lewis' choice may convey Aeneas' *pietas*, or the heroic qualities inherent to a *vir* in war. For more on Day Lewis' subjectivity here, see Fitton-Hayward (2018). I discuss Aeneas' heroism, and Ahl and Day Lewis' engagement with it, in more depth in chapter 4.

2.1 DISCOURSE MODES, BASE, DEICTIC CENTRE

Just as it is more common in personal than impersonal language, deixis is also more common in particular discourse modes. Adema, using narrative categories defined by Smith (2003), locates four significant narrative modes in the *Aeneid*, two of which I wish to borrow for purposes of this chapter: *registering* and *reporting*.[14] These modes both describe moments when the narrator steps outside of his narrative to make a metaleptic comment or interjection. In *reporting* mode, narrative time does not advance, and the mode expresses, rather than the temporal relationship between the string of events within the narrative action, the temporal relationship between the events being reported and the time of speech. That is, the narrator refers, from his point in time, to a state of affairs within the narrative. Whereas narrative can be used for simple description, when the narrator, at 9.179-181, says that there was no one more beautiful than Euryalus, he makes a comparative judgement from his own point in time (using reporting mode). Reporting mode is often signalled by proximal deictic adverbs such as *nunc*, when they refer to the time or place of the narrator, first person verb forms, vocatives, imperatives, interrogatives, comparatives and superlatives. The apostrophe to Caieta is another

[14] My definition of discourse modes in this paragraph owes much to Adema (2007), who analyses deixis within the *Aeneid* in terms of *discourse modes* (from C.S. Smith [2003]) and *bases* (from Cutrer [1994]). As well as the two I discuss here, Adema uses C.S. Smith's *narrative* and *description* modes (43-49). Smith's (2003) original additional two (in her list of five; Adema's registering mode is her own) are *narrative* and *description* (8).

example of reporting mode, since the narrator is relating himself (spatially and temporally) to the state of affairs (people, places, events) within the narrative.

While *reporting* mode shows the narrator commenting on the content of the narrative, in Adema's *registering* mode, he comments on the process of narrating itself, typically in the present tense, e.g. *horresco referens* (2.204). Unlike the present tense of reporting mode, which usually implies a longer time span (again, as in the Caieta example), the present tense of registering mode refers to the very moment of utterance. Whilst this does occur in Virgil, it is not common.[15]

Whilst these terms work well in the context of Adema's research, I will adapt the terminology to more clearly describe and distinguish the functions of these two specific modes in isolation. I shall use: *story comment* (in place of *reporting*), to describe the narrator commenting on the events of the story; and *narrative comment* (in place of *registering*), to describe the narrator reflecting on the process of narrative construction.[16]

---

[15] Besides the example given, Adema (2007) 47 lists further examples at 1.1, 2.91, 2.432, 2.134, 2.506, 3.39, 6.528, 6.601, 7.44f, 9.525. The majority of occurrences (six) of this discourse mode are spoken by Aeneas narrating in books 2 and 3. Virgil's narrator only uses it five times across the remaining ten books.

[16] I use *story* and *narrative* to distinguish between the action, events and characters (story) and the way of telling the story (narrative). Among theorists, the terminology used to describe narrative structure varies considerably: Bal

As already mentioned, tense is a key element of deixis. Whilst the past tense, in its various forms, is the tense readers most expect in fictional narrative, Virgil's narrator often uses the present tense to express action.[17] In a review of Fagles' translation of the *Aeneid*, Stallings makes some pertinent remarks about the present tense, in which, when used historically, "nothing happens; rather, it is always in the process of happening".[18] She suggests that in English, the present almost has the "immediacy of stage directions", not typically used to describe action outside of sports commentary, but rather jokes, anecdotes, or when we are reliving a memory, to re-experience joy or, as in the *Aeneid*, "a particularly vivid nightmare, a play of violence and horror from which the gods are able to avert their gaze, but we are not."

Indeed, the present tense is not only challenging within the context of English translation, but already a complex phenomenon in Latin. Beyond the simple vivid present used in narrative description,[19] it has a multitude

---

(1985, 2009 ed.: 5) uses *fabula, story, text*; Cobley (2001) has story, plot, narrative (5-6); the Russian formalists used *fabula* and *syuzhet* (see Todorov [1973] 12-19).

[17] Pinkster (1999) 705 summarises the uses of the present tense in Virgil, disagreeing with Quinn (1968) 78 who dismisses it as "little more than a stylistic mannerism" and non-exceptional due to its prevalence at the time. Pinkster (1998) argues that the Latin present tense "has its own semantic value in the overall tense system", which represents positive semantic contemporaneity with the act of speech, rather than passively signifying atemporality (63, 80).

[18] Stallings (2006).

[19] See Adema (2007) and Pinkster (1999).

of more specific meanings:[20] a single present action (e.g. 'I am walking up the stairs now'); a continuous present state (e.g. 'it is raining'); a habitual or characterising state (e.g. 'Priam is the sort of person who');[21] or, as in the apostrophe to Caieta, a gnomic present, indicating something which was true in the past and which is still valid in the present (e.g. 'the sky is blue'), while conveying something of the impossible enormity of the epic poet's story. In the first two uses described (a single present action or a continuous present state), the time which the present tense refers to is implied by other aspects of the narrative. In the *Aeneid*, it may signify the present time of the narrator or of (various) characters. Even within the narrative, the *character present* might not be a single period of time. For instance, in Sinon's speech (2.69-194), the layers of speaker and addressee are numerous: Sinon is addressing the Trojans, as reported by Aeneas during a speech to Dido, being narrated by Virgil's narrator and written by Virgil in the form of an epic poem published in Augustan Rome. The activity of translation adds to these multiple temporal layers; the poem, having survived two thousand years of transcription, is now being translated into modern English for a particular audience. This leads to multiple 'present' times, and can incur complications or ambiguities when the present tense is used. For the purposes of this thesis, the most important distinctions are

[20] Perkins (1992) 103-4.

[21] Pinkster (1999) 711-712, 714: in Aeneas' tale in book 2, the first person verb forms are relatively more frequent in the historic present than in the narrative perfect.

not those between various character presents, but rather between a single unified character present and the narrator present.

Since the time to which the present tense refers is unspecified, Cutrer's theory of temporal *base* is a useful means of distinguishing the time which the speaker indicates with the present tense.[22] In her analysis of the *Aeneid*'s discourse, Adema combined Smith's narrative *modes* with Cutrer's theory of temporal *bases*.[23] Adema applies each of her four discourse modes to two bases: the time of the narrator and *reference time* (the time of the story). I shall term these *narrator present* and *character present*. Since I am interested in areas of metalepsis, when the narrator intrudes on the narrative, most of my examples are expressed from (or could be read as being so) the narrator present, as the narrator either reflects upon his process of narrating in his present time or draws attention to his own time by commenting on the state of affairs within his narrative, relative to him.

The base from which the narrative is presented combines with deictic elements to locate the centre of a spatio-temporal co-ordinate system, the narrative's *deictic centre*. [24] It is the role of the narrator to align the multiple deictic centres existing within the narrative, as it shifts between narrator

---

[22] Cutrer (1994), cited by Adema (2007) 53.
[23] Cited in Adema (2007) 42.
[24] Perkins (1992) 100-101.

and various characters. Bakker uses the example 'She still had a lot to do. Tomorrow was Christmas,' to explain the style as *style indirect libre*, like FID or embedded focalisation, where the deictic perspective of the narrator blends with that of the characters in the story.[25] The narrator refers to 'tomorrow', but 'tomorrow' here does not signify, in the narrator's world, the day after today. The use of the past tense signifies that this 'tomorrow' is in relation to the character (or the character's deictic centre). If the narrator intended to mean 'tomorrow' relative to his deictic centre, he would use the future tense. This combination of past tense plus future temporal adverb is typical, Bakker says, of deixis in modern narratives, where FID or embedded focalisation (and subsequent blurring of the narrator's deictic centre with that of the characters) occurs naturally. The narrator can adjust the tense and person to their own perspective (whilst referring to another person than himself and to another time than his own narrating moment); but temporal adverbs, indeed adverbs in general, typically convey the perspective of the character.[26] This collocation of past tenses with immediate temporal adverbs dislocates the *representing* and

---

[25] Bakker (2009) 119-120.

[26] Cited by Prince (1987) 18: "Hamburger (1957) commented that expressions which usually refer to the present, e.g. 'now', are often used in combination with past tenses in narrative fiction e.g. 'Mary learned John was in town. She now faced a crucial decision'. [Hamburger] interpreted this as evidence that, rather than signifying real time, rather than labelling the situations and events narrated as pertaining to a former time, past tenses in narrative fiction designate these situations and events as fictive and as 'occurring' in the characters' fictive and 'time-less' present." See also Bakker (2009) 119-120 and Chafe (1994) 249-258.

represented narrative selves, an effect which Chafe has termed *displaced immediacy*, and to which I return later in this chapter.[27]

Having considered the potential for personal and deictic language elements to exist within particular discourse modes (story comment and narrative comment), operating within either the narrator or character present, and how they combine to create the spatio-temporal deictic centre of either the narrator or character, I will return to the example from this chapter's opening, to analyse how translators approach deixis.

> Caieta too, who was nurse to Aeneas, when she died
> Gave Italy's coast undying fame: for even now
> The place where she rests is preserved by her legend, she has an epitaph
> In a place-name of great Hesperia – no small glory.
>
> *Aeneid* 7.1-4 (Day Lewis)

> You too gave to our coasts, Caieta, nurse of Aeneas,
> Undying fame when you died, thanks to rumour. For here in the mighty
> Twilight Land, your name still marks your bones, you ennoble
> This site even today – if that's in itself any glory.
>
> *Aeneid* 7.1-4 (Ahl)

Ahl uses much personal language: "you" (3 times), "your" (twice), vocative address to "Caieta"; as well as deixis with "this", "our", and, his own

[27] Chafe (1994) 226-228.

additions, “here”, “today”. His final phrase, “if that’s in itself any glory”, is rather conversational, as he continues his address to Caieta. He translates *nunc* as “still”, which suits the gnomic present, indicating a continuous state of truth, universal to the narrator and his audience, rather than an immediate but temporary action. His choice to instil this passage with such a great degree of deictic quality reinforces the personal tone of his narrative.

Day Lewis’s extract, on the other hand, while being descriptive, is less deictic and his narrator relates himself less personally to the narrative. There is no apostrophe, no second person address to Caieta, and no identification with the Trojans through a first person plural possessive pronoun. He does, however, retain the deictic “now” for *nunc*, and the universal, gnomic present in lines 3-4. Combining “now” with the present tense positions him at the same time as Virgil’s narrator, but he refers, again in a more descriptive way, to “the place where”, rather than Ahl’s deictic “this site”. Day Lewis uses less personal language overall and does not inhabit the narrator’s spatial reference point, even his minor addition of “who was” in line 1 adds a feeling of detachment and purely descriptive reporting. Ahl’s narrator here perhaps better preserves the “Romanness” of Virgil’s narrator, for whom Caieta is ancestral; an element which Day Lewis distances.

In the previous chapter, I analysed focalisation and discourse presentations to explore how Day Lewis and Ahl reflect, and refract, Virgil’s

polyvocal narrative, concluding that Ahl allowed his narrative to be spoken through a greater variety of voices, whereas Day Lewis emphasised the unifying force of the epic narrator. In this chapter, I explore how the narrator uses deixis to interact with the narrative and its characters, hence typically I will explore moments where it is clearly the narrator speaking, often in an aside, either to comment on the narrative content or on the narrating process itself. I am interested in analysing how the context-bound nature of deictic elements, which typically indicate a fixed person (through pronouns and verb person), a fixed time (through temporal adverbs and tenses), and a fixed place (through spatial adverbs), shifts in translation. I will ask whether translators create a new spatial and temporal relationship to the text and subsequently whether they alter the identity of the narrator and his relationship to the narrative, characters and audience.

I first look primarily at the present tense and how it is used in combination with specific temporal adverbs to show distance and closeness between character and narrator presents. Then I look at instances where temporal adverbs are used in combination with contrasting tenses, to dislocate the speaker and focaliser, and how this can affect the translators' impression of omniscience. Next, I explore how deixis can be used to increase or weaken character-focalisation, and how personal interruptions which expose the narrator's subjectivity may be translated in ways which alter, as they reconstruct, Virgil's epic narrator. Finally, I look at the use and translation of the word *ecce*, an interjection with deictic properties, to

explore how translators use it to increase or undermine the narrator's interaction with the text and its audience. Overall, I aim to show that deixis exposes the translated narrator's position relative to the original text, in ways which reflect back on translation as appropriation of classical voices.

2.2 SHIFTING BASE: CHARACTER PRESENT TO NARRATOR PRESENT

I will explore some uses of the present tense and accompanying temporal adverbs, which show how Virgil and his translators use (and abuse) tense to indicate shifts between narrator and character presents. Before I start to look at examples in Day Lewis and Ahl's translations, I begin with an introductory example to show how Virgil's narrator uses tense to distinguish between his time of narrating and the time of the story. The narrator's willingness to show the relationship between these temporal centres is unsurprising considering the *Aeneid*'s purpose, to show Rome's foundation history and relationship to the myth of Aeneas in order to unite past and present. Here, the narrator depicts a former tradition, and shows how his contemporary Rome has inherited that tradition:

600 Albani docuere suos; hinc maxima porro
accepit Roma et patrium **servavit** honorem;
602 Troiaque **nunc** pueri, Troianum **dicitur** agmen.
Aeneid 5.600-602[28]

[28] I use emboldening here to draw attention to particular words of interest.

In this example, Virgil's narrator refers subjectively to *maxima Roma*, ('greatest Rome'), to the ancient tradition of the Trojan youth games, and finally the performance inherited from that tradition, familiar to him and his contemporary audience. There is a shift from the past tense (when the Albans taught their children) to the present tense describing Augustan Rome (when the inherited formations are referred to as 'Trojan'), matched by a shift from the character present to the narrator present, indicated by the adverb *nunc*. The discrepancy between the narrator's and characters' deictic centre is again exposed at 12.133-7, where the narrator makes an aside to his audience, specifically invoking their Romanness.

134 at Iuno ex summo (qui **nunc** Albanus **habetur**;
tum neque nomen **erat** neque honos aut gloria monti)
prospiciens tumulo campum **aspectabat** et ambas
137 Laurentum Troumque acies urbemque Latini.
Aeneid 12.134-7

In this passage, the temporal adverb *nunc* combines with the present tense to portray the narrator's present ('what is now the Alban mount'). Subsequently the tense and adverb shift to the past; *tum* together with the past tense indicates the character's present, anterior to the narrator ('in those days it had neither name nor honour nor glory'). The adverbs corroborate the time indicated by the accompanying verb's tense: *tum* refers to character time and *nunc* to narrator time. Juno's watching, *aspectabat*, is also in the imperfect (the present participle *prospiciens* indicating action simultaneous to the imperfect), showing that the

character action occurs during the time when the Alban Mount did not yet enjoy fame.[29] The character and narrator deictic centres thus coexist, and the narrating voice both unites and distances them as narrative time shifts forwards as well as back. The fact that, when reading, a reader willingly and naturally follows these deictic shifts has been well documented.[30] Typically there are clear signals to allow the reader to follow such shifts, whether tense or adverbs, to balance the challenging use of the present tense by offering enough signals for the reader to interpret the communication as a past narrative.[31] However, in the final scene of the *Aeneid*, this is not the case. Turnus' death has been variously interpreted as either rash and merciless or bold and glorious, and remains a key passage for ambiguous reading.[32] Hardie reads the scene as a necessary, even if disturbing, way of

---

[29] The gaze here is Juno's, which has different implications; the divine gaze differs to the mortal. Feeney (1991), strongly disagreeing with those who conceive the gods as dispensable to the epic (e.g. G. Williams [1983] 213), notes that the gods' vision "extends down to the establishment of Roman rule over the world" (172). What they perceive, even visualise, has a fourth dimension – as well as viewing left and right across the empire, their gaze penetrates the dimension of time. See Lovatt (2013) 125-127 on the divine prophetic gaze.

[30] E.M. Segal (1995), particularly 14-15.

[31] Pinkster (1999) 709.

[32] Hardie (1997) considers multiple readings of the ending, and that the difficulty faced by the reader in making the leap from the gloomy violence of Turnus' death to triumphal scenes of Augustan celebration can be facilitated by electing to read the glorious ending of book 8 as the chronological *fin*. Hardie also notes the inversion of the standard formula whereby rituals end (or at least follow) epic killings (as in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*), but clarifies that this is the intended ending, as attested by the echoes in the closing line of silence, darkness, descent, departure, themes which arise at the close of books 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10 (141-151). That Ruden notes uncertainty over the "unfinished" nature of the *Aeneid*, prefacing her translation with the statement that Virgil had only written half of his intended epic (2008: vii), is deemed by Farrell (2010) a "bizarre piece of misinformation", unlikely to raise confidence in her readers.

making sense of the poem as a whole, and that the abrupt feel to the final few lines is exaggerated by the series of delays which have continually kept the duellers apart until this moment.[33] This scene reinforces Feeney's overall reading of the poem, that it constantly reminds readers that "incomprehensive currents" of institutionalized violence underpin the Roman order, and this scene is a fitting end.[34] Farron, on the other hand, interprets the ending, whose brutality is without literary precedent, as an attack on Rome and Augustus.[35] The ending is unresolved not only, as Hardie notes, in terms of the epic's value systems, but also in terms of form and genre.[36] In terms of narrative, there is also no closure. Virgil uses the perfect tense until line 947, then after the direct speech shifts to a vivid present tense for the final three lines. The epic then ends abruptly in the character present, leaving the audience in the character deictic centre. The lack of signalling from the narrator here leads to Pinkster terming lines 950-2 a "spectacularly exceptional" use of the present tense.[37]

938 **stetit** acer in armis
Aeneas **volvens** oculos dextramque **repressit**;
940 et **iam iamque** magis cunctantem flectere sermo
coeperat, infelix umero cum **apparuit** alto
balteus et notis **fulserunt** cingula bullis

---

[33] Hardie (1997) 145, 148.

[34] Feeney (1991) 150 on the relationship between Jupiter and Juno as the heart of this uncomfortable truth.

[35] Farron (1982).

[36] Hardie (1997) 143.

[37] Pinkster (1999) 709.

Pallantis pueri, victum quem vulnere Turnus
straverat atque umeris inimicum insigne **gerebat**.
ille, oculis postquam saevi monimenta doloris
exuviasque **hausit**, furiis accensus et ira
terribilis: 'tune hinc spoliis indute meorum
eripiare mihi? Pallas te hoc vulnere, Pallas
immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine **sumit**.'
hoc **dicens** ferrum adverso sub pectore **condit**
fervidus; ast illi **solvuntur** frigore membra
vitaque cum gemitu **fugit** indignata sub umbras.

Aeneid 12.938-952

Aeneas, relentless in combat,
Stops; and though **rolling** his eyes, he **holds** back his hand
from the death-stroke.
Slowly but surely, the words **take effect**. **He's begun
hesitating**,
But when a harness **catches** his gaze, high on Turnus'
shoulder,
Gleaming with amulet studs, those pleas **have** no chance of
fulfilment:
Pallas' oh so familiar belt, which Turnus had shouldered
After defeating and killing the boy. **It's** the mark of a hated
Personal foe. As his eyes **drink** in these mementoes of
savage
Pain, these so bitter spoils, Aeneas **grows** fearsome in
anger,
Burning with fire of the Furies. 'You, dressed in the spoils of
my dearest,
Think that you could escape *me*? Pallas **gives** you this
death-stroke, yes Pallas
Makes you the sacrifice, **spills** your criminal blood in
atonement!'
And, as he speaks, he **buries** the steel in the heart that
confronts him,
Boiling with rage. Cold shivers **send** Turnus' limbs into
spasm.
Life **flutters** off on a groan, under protest, down among
shadows.

Aeneid 12.938-952 (Ahl)

Ahl extends the use of the present tense and character present here. He keeps the whole passage in the present tense, shifting the perfect tense verbs to present, and the pluperfect tense verbs, e.g. *coeperat*, to perfect. This results in some jarring English phrasing, for example "he's begun hesitating" and "those pleas have no change", which adds to the generally uncomfortable experience of reading this scene. He keeps the present tense until the end, as Virgil does, leaving the reader suspended in an open-ended character present, with no resolution and without being returned to the time of narration. Ahl follows Virgil's deviation from narrative norms here, tearing the deictic centres apart and presenting his readers with an unconventional ending. Ahl also adds a degree of subjectivity to this ambiguous passage. Ahl's focalisation through Turnus is evident in "mementoes", strikingly juxtaposed against "savage pain", describing the spoils in the way that Turnus sees them. This both assimilates Turnus to a modern character, collecting souvenirs of memorable life moments, and alienating him through the belittling approach he takes to Pallas, violence and death. His choice here evokes the Roman *memento mori*, insinuating that Turnus is mindful of not only his natural mortality, but also his inevitable death at the hands of Aeneas. His translation of *balteus* as "harness" is jarring and unusual for a word which more typically is translated as 'girdle', 'belt', or 'swordbelt'.[38] Ahl alters the subjectivity here

[38] According to L&S, it can mean 'belly band of a horse'. However, they cite this extract as an example for the meaning of 'a girdle, belt, especially a sword belt or the band passing over the shoulder'. OLD *balteus*: 1) "a shoulder band or baldric"

in order to revisit a theme to which he repeatedly refers: the depiction of men as animals. His statement that Aeneas is "Burning with fire of the Furies" (947) exaggerates a second theme which echoes in his text: the gods' influence on the character's actions and emotions.

938 Aeneas **stood** over him, poised
On the edge of the stroke; but his eyes **were** restless, he **did** not strike.
940 And now what Turnus had said **was** taking effect, **was** making him
More and more indecisive, when on his enemy's shoulder
He **noticed** the fatal baldric, the belt with its glittering studs –
How well he knew it! – which Turnus had stripped from young Pallas after
He'd **killed** him, and put on himself – a symbol of triumph and doom.
945 Aeneas **fastened** his eyes on this relic, this sad reminder
Of all the pain Pallas' death had caused. Rage **shook** him. He **looked**
Frightening. He **said**: -
Do you hope to get off now, wearing the spoils
You took from my Pallas? It's he, it's Pallas who strikes this blow –
The victim shedding his murderer's blood in retribution!
950 So saying, Aeneas angrily **plunged** his sword full into
Turnus' breast. The body **went** limp and cold. With a deep sigh
952 The unconsenting spirit **fled** to the shades below.

Aeneid 12.938-952 (Day Lewis)

(cites this passage). 3a) "an ornamental band round the neck and breast of a horse".

Taking the opposite approach to Ahl, Day Lewis keeps the whole narrative passage in the perfect tense, even the last three lines. Naturally, he switches to the present tense for Aeneas' speech, which emphasises the distance between Aeneas' character present and the narrating present. Outside the direct discourse, the narrator speaks very much from his own deictic centre, reporting this historic story in the past. He removes any sense of temporal discomfort from the final lines, which readers of Virgil's Latin (and Ahl's translation) face. The narrative returns to the narrator present, reporting the action in the relative past, and readers do not have to extract themselves from the action. By moving to perfect tense, Day Lewis resolves some of the narrative difficulties and provides his readers with a greater sense of closure, significant given how problematic the abrupt ending has been felt to be. His narrator feels more distanced as he reports the events, rather than involving himself in the scene and conveying the action with deictic immediacy. Although on line 943, his additional interjection, 'How well he knew it!', adds a personal and deictic story comment, the fact that it is reported again in the past tense means that, whilst Day Lewis emotionally connects with his characters, and sympathetically suggests psychological closeness between narrator and character, he simultaneously reinforces the temporal distance between them.

Day Lewis' approach to the narrative's temporality differs considerably from Ahl's, as does his interpretation of the narratorial subjectivity. Whilst Ahl is more negative about Aeneas and employed subtle focalisation through Turnus, Day Lewis interprets this scene as less negative of Aeneas.

His Aeneas applies the final blow "angrily", which is less fierce than Ahl's "burning with rage". He focalises through Aeneas with the (perhaps slightly reductive) "sad reminder" on Turnus' shoulder, and through the narrator when the swordbelt is prophetically described as a symbol of "triumph and doom". Day Lewis focuses on the negative effects of war – the "sad reminder of all the pain Pallas' death caused" – and, in doing so, goes towards justifying Aeneas' actions. Aeneas, on the other hand, is depicted with fierce determination, as shown when he "fastens" his eyes, in a physical way, on this relic. The translators thus combine techniques of voice, deixis and subjectivity to construct an overall reading of this ambiguous passage: Ahl interprets it as an uncomfortable, jarring and challenging ending, whilst Day Lewis presents one which more clearly consolidates an Augustan reading, narrated clearly and confidently, conveying a justified heroic action. Having explored how shifts in deixis and tense construct distance or closeness between the narrator and his narrative, I shall now look at extracts which use present temporal adverbs along with past tenses, to create effects of displaced immediacy and omniscience.

2.3 DISPLACED IMMEDIACY AND OMNISCIENCE

I mentioned in the introduction Chafe's (1994) theory of displaced immediacy, the combination of past tenses with temporal adverbs denoting present time. This occurs when the deictic immediacy of adverbs like 'now' / 'today' are combined with the knowledge of displacement

indicated by past tense forms. In this section, I show how it is used in narrative to create, or undermine, narrator omniscience. This first passage I will analyse is taken from the opening of book 12. There is marked contrast between the description of Turnus here, as fiery, passionate and proud, compared to the humble coldness he will experience at the end of the book.[39] Turnus realises that now is the time when he must honour his fight with Aeneas. Immediately after this passage, he is compared to a lion hemmed in by hunters (see below, p310-321).

Turnus ut **infractos** adverso Marte Latinos
defecisse **videt**, sua nunc promissa reposci,
se signari oculis, ultro implacabilis **ardet**
attollitque animos.

Aeneid 12.1-4

Turnus, **observing** that setbacks in battle **have broken** the Latins,
Sees their morale's given out. Eyes **show** they expect him to honour
Now what he promised before. And he **burns** with unquenchable ardour.
Raising his courage high,…

Aeneid 12.1-4 (Ahl)

When Turnus **saw** that the Latins **were crushed** by defeat and in lowest

[39] Hardie (1997) 150 contrasts Turnus with Aeneas, who lacks chronological character development. When he first enters the scene in Troy (2.314), he is driven to fight by similar emotions as he is during the final moments of book 12. Of course, the way in which the story is presented, beginning with Aeneas helpless in a violent storm, circumvents this problem and gives the audience the impression of significant character development.

Spirits – **saw**, too, that all eyes **were** upon him as if demanding
That **now** he should make good his promise, he **burned** with a mood all the more
Uncompromising; his temper **sharpened**.

Aeneid 12.1-4 (Day Lewis)

Virgil's narrator here reports from the character present. Ahl maintains this, and actually expands the use of the present tense, more readily allowing him to focalise through the character in question, here Turnus. Beginning the sentence "Eyes show they expect him to honour what he promised before," portrays the scene visually from Turnus' perspective. Again, where Ahl, often following Virgil's prompts but sometimes of his own volition, writes in the present tense,[40] Day Lewis shifts to past tense. He does however retain Virgil's immediate temporal adverb *nunc*, "now". Thus his narrator reports from a future time, firmly from his narrator present, but creates an effect of displaced immediacy. In the next example, displaced immediacy is combined with a future tense verb, indicating a period of time in the character's future, but still in the past relative to the narrator. The narrator thus expresses his omniscience, using the future tense to distinguish between the characters' current position and the future events of which they are unaware.

[40] Ahl (2007) xlvii.

500 quo **nunc** Turnus **ovat** spolio **gaudetque** potitus.
nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae
et servare modum rebus sublata secundis!
Turno **tempus erit** magno cum optaverit emptum
intactum Pallanta, et cum spolia ista diemque
505 **oderit**.

Aeneid 10. 500-505

500 This belt **was now taken** by Turnus for spoils, and
delighted his heart.
Ah, mind of man, so ignorant of fate, of what shall befall
him,
So weak to preserve moderation when riding the crest of
good fortune!
For Turnus **a time is coming when he'd** give anything
To have left Pallas unharmed, and **will loathe** this day and
the spoils
505 It brought him.

Aeneid 10.500-505 (Day Lewis)

500 **It's now** Turnus's spoils. He's **happy** to have it, triumphant.

Witness the human mind, knowing nothing of fate or the
future,
Nothing about moderation when puffed with success and
good fortune!
Turnus **will find there's a time when he'll wish** he could
purchase an unscathed
504 Pallas, a time when **he'll** hate these spoils and the day that
he won them.

Aeneid 10.500-504 (Ahl)

In this example, the narrator uses the story comment mode in the future tense.[41] This choice of tense has the effect of portraying an omniscient, foretelling narrator. In line 500, Day Lewis begins with displaced immediacy ("now" plus past tense), "the belt was now taken", whereas Ahl uses the present tense: "it's now Turnus' spoils", where the temporal signification of the adverb aligns with that of the verb tense. To begin the story comment interjection at line 501, Day Lewis's narrator adds in the expressive, though detached and reporting interjection "Ah", whereas Ahl's imperative to the audience, "Witness the human mind," deictically asks his reader to examine his narrative. Subsequently, at the section of displaced immediacy, Day Lewis uses a mixture of modal verbs and simple future tenses, whereas Ahl uses purely future tense verbs. Ahl's translation speaks from the character present, looking forward to the future with Turnus. For Day Lewis, the future perfect: "The time is coming when he'd give anything", has the effect of positioning the moment that Turnus will regret plundering Pallas as being both anterior to us, the reader (it is in our past), but being posterior to him (it is in his future). Day Lewis emphasises his positioning within the narrator deictic centre here, portraying his narrator as an omniscient force detached from its characters. Ahl's choice of "purchase" (he will later refer to this relic as Turnus' "memento") has a

[41] Adema (2007) calls it the only example in the *Aeneid* of story comment in the character present (or *transposed reporting*, to use her terminology), with the future tense (57).

simultaneously assimilating and alienating effect, with commercial insinuation which would be regarded as deeply repugnant to a Roman audience. In the next section, I will show how deixis interacts with character-focalisation and narrator subjectivity, in construction of narrative voice.

2.4 DEIXIS AS VEHICLE FOR SUBJECTIVITY, FOCALISATION, AND CONSTRUCTION OF AN EPIC VOICE

This example is quite different to others looked at so far, since it is comparatively lacking in personal or deictic elements. However, it is a narrator-focalised personal interruption, in story comment mode, and thus reflects narrator subjectivity (integral to his self-identity). The narrator bemoans the futility of war, and that both sides suffer needlessly at the hands of the gods. The deictic pronouns *hinc* and *hinc contra* combine with a rather unexpected shift from the perfect to the present tense, which uncomfortably transfers the reader from narrator to character present.

755 **iam** gravis **aequabat** luctus et mutua Mavors
funera; caedebant pariter pariterque ruebant
victores victique, neque his fuga nota neque illis.
di Iovis in tectis iram **miserantur** inanem
amborum et tantos mortalibus esse labores;
760 **hinc** Venus, **hinc** contra **spectat** Saturnia Iuno.
761 pallida Tisiphone media inter milia **saevit**.

Aeneid 10.755-761

755 Mars, even-handed and deadly, **was dealing out** grief and destruction
On both sides, both equally slaughtering, equally slaughtered,

Victors and victims – no running from battle by one or the other.
Gods within Jupiter's halls **pitied** each for this furious, wasted
Anger, regretted that creatures who die have to suffer such hardships.
760 Venus **is watching from here**; **watching there is**
Saturnian Juno;
761 Pallid Tisiphone's rage **rules** thousands caught in the middle.

Aeneid 10.755-761 (Ahl)

Ahl follows Virgil's shift from past tense, describing the action on the battlefield, to present tense verbs to describe the gods watching the scene. He does make a minor change and chooses to shift from past to present tense a little later than Virgil does, which feels abrupt and draws attention to the shifting deictic centres by heightening the sense of the present and the visual. Whilst Virgil's shift in tense could be explained as giving the gods a different temporality, portraying them as eternally present in contrast to the specifically occurring time of the narrative action, Ahl's shift cuts across the two scenes, recreating the challenging effect of the Virgilian tense shift for his readers.

Ahl's present tense highlights the deictic effect of the references "here" and "there". He also subjectively shows his sympathy towards the victims in this scenario, with "grief" and "destruction" strong words which focus on the long lasting emotional devastation of war and its influences on affected peoples (compared to Day Lewis' "death" and "agony", which refer rather to the immediate physical impact of war on its soldiers). Ahl uses repetition

and assonance in "victors" / "victims" (echoing Virgil's *victores victi*) and "equally slaughtering" / "equally slaughtered" (reflecting and strengthening the patterning in Virgil's *caedebant pariter pariterque ruebant*). He also, as elsewhere, makes pointed distinction between the mortality of mankind and the immortality of gods. The gods themselves focalise this description, with the animalistic and removed "creatures who die". The divine focalisation here cynically depicts the gods' regret that these humans have to suffer, despite the fact that they are the ones inflicting the suffering. This theme of the status discrepancy between mortals and the gods regularly occurs within Ahl's translation.[42]

Day Lewis, however, alters the subjectivity by changing the verb to imply that men actively inflict such pain on their fellows (even though these actions have been directly constructed or indirectly influenced by the gods). Certainly when compared with Ahl, Day Lewis often seeks to lessen Virgil's portrayal of the negative impact of the gods, and puts less emphasis on men being controlled by gods, fate or destiny, elevating men's responsibility and accountability.[43]

---

[42] See 9.355, "Dawn's approaching and she will betray us" (cf. Day Lewis', "It will be light soon, and light is no friend to us") and 9.816, "the river-god caught him" (cf. Day Lewis', "Its yellow tide received him").

[43] See 9.41, "if such an emergency should arise | In his absence" (cf. Ahl "if Fortune took any such turn in his absence"), and 9.178 "He was Hyrtacus' son, and had come from the hunting grounds of Ida" (cf. Ahl "Ida, that heaven for hunters, sent him as Aeneas's comrade").

Now the hard hand of the War-god **was dealing out** impartially
Death and agony: either side had its ups and downs,
Its killings and fallen, alike; but neither dreamed of retreating.
In the halls of Jove the gods **felt pity** for all that pointless
Fury, to think that men should inflict such pains on their fellows.
Saturnian Juno and Venus **sat**, well apart, looking down
Where pale Tisiphone **raged** among the embattled armies.

Aeneid 10.755-761 (Day Lewis)

Day Lewis keeps all tenses in the past, which feels more natural in English, and does not retain the awkward shift that Virgil writes and Ahl amplifies. The scene is clearly in the past, relative to the narrator's present; we are not in the character present at any point. Day Lewis also removes the deictic demonstratives *hinc*, and generally the passage is less deictic and personal, with "Halls of Jove" more impressive-sounding and archaising than Ahl's "Jupiter's halls". Day Lewis does however translate the deictic *iam* (which Ahl removes), which, when combined with the past 'was dealing', again has the effect of creating displaced immediacy, conveying what happened next ('now') for the characters, but reminding us of our distance from the events by use of past tense verbs.

Day Lewis' translation is a little more light-hearted than Ahl's, and perhaps suggests focalisation from the War-god himself, with 'ups and downs', Ahl's 'equally slaughtered', 'equally slaughtering' conveys the fact that the mortal suffering is here a spectator sport to the gods. Ahl thus presents another ambiguous double perspective: offering his readers a participatory

role in divine observation, or the option to react to the absurdity and inhumanity on display here.[44] Day Lewis' narrator has an epic god-like view, encouraging us to pity the human characters, and the wrongs they do each other. Ahl, on the other hand, suggests an active feeling of "regret", and draws attention to the question of justification of divine intervention.

Next, I will show how simple modifications to the tense can affect the deictic centre, shifting from character present to narrator present. Subsequently, alterations to the deixis or the base time may have an impact on character-focalisation, and sometimes also narrator subjectivity. In the next example, Virgil uses an imperfect tense (*aderat*) to describe a day arriving in the past (relative to his narrator, but the present to his characters). Since the extract combines deixis with focalisation (it is the "waited for" day), the temporal shifts affect the overall deictic centre, rather than just the base. Indeed, the elements are closely interrelated; as we shall see, Ahl uses deictic elements to heighten the effect of focalisation.

103 exspectata dies aderat

Aeneid 5.103

103 The day was come they had so looked forward to -

Aeneid 5.103 (Day Lewis)

[44] Lovatt (2013) examines the divine gaze, used as a mediating frame between narrator and audience, adopted by the epic narrator, through narrative devices such as simile, and by characters, such as Aeneas gazing down from Troy's rooftops (29-77, 88-94).

Day Lewis follows Virgil and writes from the narrative present, using the past tense to refer to action occurring in the character present. He also shifts the focalisation from character-focalisation, as in the Latin, to narrator-focalisation, by explaining to us that the day was longed for by the Trojans ("they had so looked forward to"). Thus his translation here is, whilst descriptive, rather impersonal. Day Lewis removes the explicit character-focalisation and purely renders this as descriptive narrative; shifting into the past tense positions it within his own deictic centre, whilst the third person plural pronoun makes this impersonal description rather than focalised narrative language.

103 Now it's the long expected day

Aeneid 5.103 (Ahl)

Ahl here maintains the focalisation (which fits with the shift of deictic centre), with the word *exspectata* becoming "long expected" (i.e. from the point of view of the Trojans, whose perspective occupies the narrative). He also shifts the narrative deictic centre to that of his character. By shifting this into the present tense, Ahl gives it a more immediate sense – describing something that is the case now, and only for a short timespan. This is an immediate present, which has more specific deictic reference than the universal, gnomic, present seen earlier in the example from 7.1-4. He also adds "now" (there is no *nunc* in the Latin), to further highlight the aligning of the deictic centres. Ahl's translation is personal, and focalised through

the character, whereas Day Lewis' is impersonal, lacking character-focalisation, and narrated as a description of past events. Virgil is somewhere in between his two translators here, using a past tense but focalising through the character. The point here is that Ahl's additional deixis, incorporating "now" with the present tense, has the effect of heightening the focalisation.

We have seen examples of shifting between the character's deictic centre and that of the narrator, by changing the tenses and adverbs. The next point I wish to make in this chapter is to propose that translators have the option to add in a third level of base (*translator present*), and deictic centre (the *translator's deictic centre*). This extract is from book 2. Although Aeneas is speaking, as narrator, he seems to address the audience, bemoaning the difficulty of telling the tale of the sack of Troy. Although this is spoken by Aeneas, it reiterates an idea raised by the narrator,[45] and also earlier by Aeneas at 2.205.[46] Aeneas feels the same difficulty in narrating as Virgil does.

361 quis cladem illius noctis, quis funera fando
explicet aut possit lacrimis aequare labores?
363 urbs antiqua ruit multos dominata per annos;

Aeneid 2.361-3

[45] See 12.500.

[46] Ahl: "I shudder, recalling"; Day Lewis: "telling it makes me shudder". Note here the difference between Ahl's passive act of recall versus Day Lewis' active telling.

361 Who could translate into words that night's disaster and killings?
Who could shed tears that express those oceans of pain that engulfed us?
363 That day an old city died after so many years of dominion.
Aeneid 2.361-3 (Ahl)

361 That night! – what words can render its deaths and its disaster?
What tears can rise to the level of all that was suffered then?
363 An ancient city is falling, after long years of power:
Aeneid 2.361-3 (Day Lewis)

Ahl brings attention to his role as translator here, using the word "translate", as if he empathises with Aeneas' desperation in telling this story. Ahl's speaking "I" thus more naturally aligns with the translator, not the narrator (Aeneas here). He also identifies with the Trojans, using personal language with the pronoun "us", and the deictic "that day", where Day Lewis instead uses the detached passive verb "that was suffered".

Day Lewis bemoans the situation, asking which words could render the subject matter, and which tears could do it justice. He thus changes from enquiring as to the agent, to the subject matter; his Aeneas is confidently telling this story, and does not seek additional narrating guidance. Day Lewis is perhaps just as metapoetic here, but in a way which enables him to raise questions about original poetry, rather than the act of translating an existing text. Just like his narrator, Day Lewis' Aeneas is authoritative in his telling of the story.

In the third line of this extract, Day Lewis uses the present tense whereas Ahl uses the perfect (*ruit*). His choice to translate this into the present when it is part of a report that Aeneas is giving of past events, is unusual. It is perhaps simply used here as a vivid present tense, a rhetorical speech device used either as part of Aeneas' performance, or his own radio performance. Alternatively, it goes to highlight the different deictic centres which the translators occupy here. Day Lewis' present tense situates him in the character present. This is unusual for him, though he does it in a way which is stable and clear. Ahl shifts it, keeping it in his translator's present (i.e. with the events anterior), emphasising the fact that he has changed the voice here and the translator is commenting on the action. Ahl, more so generally than Day Lewis, draw attentions to his construction of a translation. Whether it is by consciously exposing ambiguity of subject matter, or by metapoetically commenting on the act of translation, Ahl is often keen to make his readership aware of his role in the construction of the text that they are reading. Day Lewis, on the other hand, generally presents a clearer view of his text, with fewer narrative layers, and choosing not to emphasise the difficulties which he faced.

So far, I have discussed deictic elements including personal pronouns, tense, and temporal and spatial adverbs. Listing deictic elements, Wilkins added interjections, which share linguistic and communicative properties with traditional deictic elements such as personal and demonstrative

pronouns.[47] Interjections typically exist within either story comment or narrative comment discourse modes. I look at these in the final section of this chapter.

2.5 DEIXIS AS INTERJECTION AND AUDIENCE INTERACTION

Due to their engaging nature, deictic elements often occur during performative narrative, where the narrator is linguistically (and, depending on the context, could be physically) *pointing* at a referent. Perkins uses the phrase 'linguistic pointing' to refer to deixis as a means of gesturing to relevant parts of the context of an utterance.[48] Interjections in Latin, such as *ecce* and *heu*, show the narrator reacting to the text, expose their identity, their reflections on the narrated events, and sometimes (as in the case of *ecce*) can imply physical deictic positioning. The full force of *ecce* is more than simple imperative, it is a request for presence. I have already mentioned that deictic elements can only be understood in the context of their utterance, and the same is true of interjections, but these also suggest a performative element, where they may be accompanied by physical extra-linguistic gestures. Bakker proposes an idea of *projected indexicality,* where indexical elements (deictic elements like I/you/now/there, which are meaningful only in the context of the

[47] D.P. Wilkins (1995) 359-386.
[48] Perkins (1992) 100.

utterance) are projected when a text is performed.[49] The phrase's indexicality, its innate hereness and nowness is thus projected by the performer. The deictic elements do not signify a 'now' in the text, but the 'now' of the text, an inbuilt projected now of the performance event that is actualised in each new performance. Every time the Homeric line 'Sing now to me, Muses' is uttered, that which is signified by 'me' and 'now' is different, depending on the performer and the time/place of performance.

I have chosen to focus on one frequent interjection: *ecce*, which occurs 37 times in the *Aeneid*. Nearly a third (11) of these occurrences are in Aeneas' narrative during books 2 and 3. A further five are in book 10 (the second highest occurring book, after book 2), meaning that nearly half of all the occurrences occur during the books in which Aeneas plays a significant role (2, 3, 10), and those in which there is a high level of battle narrative (2, 10), where the prevalence of the word *ecce* suggests something about their pace and immediacy. The visual meaning of *ecce* along with its sense of deictic immediacy and request for presence make it a difficult word to translate.[50] In the example below, during the description of Aeneas raging over the battlefield, and immediately following the graphic simile comparing him to

---

[49] Bakker (2009) 123-4.

[50] *Ecce* can be visually or non-visually demonstrative. OLD *ecce*:1) "(calling attention to something visible or perceptible) See! Behold! Look!" 2) "(calling attention to something non-visual) Observe! Mark this!"

Aegaeon, the narrator interjects with *ecce*, instructing us to look at Aeneas as he attacks his foe.

> 570 quin **ecce** Niphaei
> 571 quadriiugis in equos adversaque pectora tendit.
>
> *Aeneid* 10.570-1

In this example, it is not just the *ecce* which is likely to cause translators a challenge, but its appearance here in conjunction with *quin*, a notoriously difficult word to translate.[51] Instances of *ecce* will typically indicate story comment, since the narrator is drawing attention to the content which he is presenting. However, it may be translated in ways which carefully alter that. For example, in West's translation below, his choice to give "imagine" relates it to the process of constructing the narrative itself. He is exposing the construction and asking his reader to construct it along with him.

> **Imagine** him next bearing down on the chariot of Niphaeus, with the four horses showing their chests as they stood to meet him.
>
> *Aeneid* 10.570-1 (West)

West's translation here also raises important questions of genre; "Imagine" far better fits the context of a modern, solitary reader pouring over a

[51] Harrison (1991) calls *quin ecce* here "lively particles", and at 10.23 calls its use "asseverative", which Virgil uses to give an "archaic/colloquial flavour".

translation of the *Aeneid*, written in prose, divided into chapters, as close to the format of a modern-day novel as it could be. *Imagining*, not *looking*, is what we are expected to do when we read. It is a less physical, less visual word, and perhaps indicates a discarding of the performative elements of Virgil's Latin. Whilst West's choice here seems to be in pursuit of a novelising approach to translating the *Aeneid*, Day Lewis does also use the word "imagine" to translate *ecce*, in a different instance, and in a performative version of the text.

679 Talia vociferans gemitu tectum omne replebat,
680 cum subitum dictuque oritur mirabile monstrum.
namque manus inter maestorumque ora parentum
ecce levis summo de vertice visus Iuli
fundere lumen apex, tactuque innoxia mollis
684 lambere flamma comas et circum tempora pasci.

Aeneid 2.679-684

679 Loudly she cried these words, and filled the house with her crying.
680 Just then a miracle happened, a wonderful miracle.
Imagine it! – our hands and our sad eyes were upon
Ascanius, when we beheld a feathery tongue of flame
Luminously alight on his head, licking the soft curls
684 With fire that harmed them not, and playing about his temples.

Aeneid, 2.679-684 (Day Lewis)

Two lines before the *ecce* in this passage, the narrator makes another story comment, momentarily stopping narrative time to interject *mirabile monstrum*. Day Lewis makes the choice to double the word "miracle", which has a strongly Christianising effect. When we get to *ecce*, whilst Day Lewis

does interject and uses the same word as West, his separation of this clause, and attribution of a new, indeterminate object: "Imagine it!-" means that he has changed its construction to be more of a simple exclamation. This is indeed one way of reading *ecce*, and translating it as an exclamation is certainly not incorrect. However, it does give it a rather different effect to West. West's "imagine him next bearing down" was an imperative to the reader, asking them to construct a mental image of the action he is describing. Day Lewis, on the other hand, still gives a direct and engaging interjection, but as more of a rhetorical statement, perhaps better suiting his radio context, or his more detached and assured epic narrator. "Imagine it" is more authoritative, handing the experience over to his audience (or to Aeneas' audience, i.e. Dido), whereas Ahl in his version invites his reader into the formation of the text: he retains the direct "look", translating both the visual meaning of *ecce* as well as its directness and interjection by addressing the reader.

679 Such were her cries. She was filling the house with her
echoing sorrows
680 When there arose a most sudden, remarkably wonderful
portent.
During the conflict of looks, words, arms between desperate
parents,
Look, a slim halo of light seems to shine from the crown of
Iulus'
Head. And it's shedding a glow that can touch without
burning: a gentle
684 Flame licking over his tresses and grazing the down on his
temples.

Aeneid, 2.679-684 (Ahl)

In the next example below, Ahl takes the same approach, but this time emphasised, perhaps taking a cue from *etiam*: "Look at her now!" He adds an object to *ecce*, in the same way as Day Lewis did above.

793 per scelus **ecce** etiam Troianis matribus actis
exussit foede puppis et classe subegit
795 amissa socios ignotae linquere terrae.

Aeneid 5.793-795

793 **Look at her now**! She's made Trojan mothers her criminal weapons,
Vilely burned up their ships, and because their navy's been ruined,
795 Forces them now to abandon their crews in a country that's unknown!

Aeneid 5.793-795 (Ahl)

793 Then, **just think**, she wickedly worked on the Trojan women
To burn the ships, a foul deed! And thus she has forced Aeneas,
795 Fleet gone, to leave his friends behind in a foreign country.

Aeneid 5.793-795 (Day Lewis)

Day Lewis, on the other hand, gives a translation similar to the previous example, with "just think". He again addresses the reader, provides an interjecting and engaging direct imperative, but removes any visual element. It more seems here to be an assertion of Juno's incomprehensible actions, rather than a request for presence, immediacy or deixis, and its effect is to act more as an intensifier, emphatic rather than sensory.

In both of the examples looked at so far, Ahl gives "look". In fact, in 26 of the 37 occurrences of *ecce*, Ahl uses renderings that mean 'look' or similar. Four times he omits the word completely, and then the remaining seven times he uses what I have termed a 'soft' translation, something like 'there is'. This is still deictic, but loses some of the imperative, visual force of the Latin word. Day Lewis, on the other hand, is less consistent in his treatment of this word, and explores a greater degree of lexical variation.

Whilst Ahl most commonly uses 'look' to translate *ecce*, Day Lewis only uses this word, or a synonym, in 12 of the 37 occurrences (less than half the number of times that Ahl uses it). Perhaps more surprisingly, Day Lewis omits it completely in 11 occurrences. In seven occurrences, he uses a 'soft' translation, where he expresses something of its meaning whilst avoiding its deictic immediacy or positioning, like 'he saw' (where the deixis is removed but the sense still conveyed), 'a marvel' (where the sense of looking still again exists) or 'was there'. Finally, for the remaining seven occurrences, he changes the meaning from visual to aural, like 'listen', or uses a more conative translation such as 'think', 'imagine', 'picture the scene'. I shall report on key interesting examples of each of these variations in translation below. First is his translation 'we saw', where he conveys the visual sense of the word but without its immediacy or pointing effect.

> 203 **ecce** autem gemini a Tenedo tranquilla per alta
> (horresco referens) immensis orbibus angues
> 205 incumbunt pelago pariterque ad litora tendunt;
>
> *Aeneid* 2.203-5

203 **Look**! Across tranquil depths, out of Tenedos, writhing and coiling,
Big orbs swishing a course, twin serpents – I shudder, recalling –
205 Slither the sea's face, stretch for the shore in their parallel lunges.

Aeneid 2.203-5 (Ahl)

203 When over the tranquil deep, from Tenedos, **we saw** –
Telling it makes me shudder – twin snakes with immense coils
205 Thrusting the sea and together streaking towards the shore:

Aeneid 2.203-5 (Day Lewis)

It is of course noteworthy here, in the context of narrative deixis, that Day Lewis uses the first person plural 'we saw', thus retaining an element of deixis. However, since this section is spoken by Aeneas and not by the narrator, it is not his narrator who is empathetically aligning himself with a group of men here, but rather Aeneas who is allowed to do so.

In the next example, this time from book 12 and thus recorded by the narrator, Day Lewis gives 'he saw', conveying the visual sense, but in a purely reported narrative mode, without any sense of immediacy or deixis, translating it purely as an indicative active third person verb, and in the past tense, not even retaining any immediacy which the present tense would provide. Ahl once again gives 'look'.

672 **Ecce** autem flammis inter tabulata volutus
673 ad caelum undabat vertex turrimque tenebat,

Aeneid 12.672-3

672 **Look**, though: a rolling billow of flames is spiralling skywards,
673 Up and up, storey by storey, consuming a tower, the tower

Aeneid 12.672-3 (trans. Ahl)

672 **He saw** a whirling spire of flame which was leaping upwards,
673 Wave after wave, through the floors of a turret, had got a firm grip on it:

Aeneid 12.672-3 (Day Lewis)

Next I look at Day Lewis' use of a translation which still shows a sense of looking, but as pure description. Day Lewis still does not use the direct 'look' translation, but instead remarks that the sight was 'a marvel'. Although this word could be deictic or exclamatory, the way in which Day Lewis uses it here is really purely descriptive. Another example of this type of translation is his use of 'was there'.

219 atque illi medio in spatio chorus, **ecce**, suarum
220 occurrit comitum

Aeneid 10.219-220

219 **Look**, as he's halfway back, he's met by a group of his comrades
220 Dancing about on the waves:

Aeneid 10.219-220 (Ahl)

219 When, in mid-passage, **a marvel** – an argosy of his own ones
220 Came to meet him;

Aeneid 10.219-220 (Day Lewis)

Finally, for the remaining seven occurrences, Day Lewis uses more abstract conative translations such as 'think', 'imagine', 'picture the scene', and twice changes the meaning from visual to aural, something like 'listen'. Perhaps it is these instances which are most indicative of his radio performance context, as in the example below:

57 **ecce**, manus iuvenem interea post terga revinctum
58 pastores magno ad regem clamore trahebant
59 Dardanidae,

Aeneid 2.57-9

57 Meanwhile, **observe**, some Dardanian shepherds are dragging a young man,
58 Hands tied behind him, straight to the king, with a great deal of shouting.

Aeneid 2.57-8 (Ahl)

57 **But listen**, just at this moment some Trojan shepherds were noisily
58 Dragging a young man, handcuffed, into our king's presence.

Aeneid 2.57-9 (Day Lewis)

The instance above is in book 2, and thus Aeneas' request to his audience to listen might be directed at Dido. It is also early on in his speech, where a request for attention might be required, and Virgil thus creates Aeneas' vivid narrative through foregrounded use of sound. However, the second instance is at 6.255, when the narrator is speaking, and Day Lewis employs the same translation. In the above example, Day Lewis seems to be taking a cue from other indications of sound in the passage (*magno clamore*), reflecting the multi-sensory, not solely visual, implications of *ecce*.

Whilst the translation 'listen' can be understood as appropriate to Day Lewis' radio context, such a direct word only occurs twice in Day Lewis' translation, of all the 37 times that *ecce* appears. In other instances he chooses to convey the meaning, but in a far more purely descriptive way. Day Lewis' variation in translating keywords like *ecce* is perhaps due to fewer expectations to be literally faithful to the text, or more desire to provide variety as he entertains his listening audience. The way in which the translators use these interjections shows more desire on Ahl's part to interact with his audience directly, with more imperatives, more deictic positioning and a heightened request for presence. Day Lewis, on the other hand, interacts less directly with his audience and often removes interjections or uses them in order to comment on the narrative content rather than its construction. These translators have shown the narrative ambiguity inherent in an interjection such as *ecce*, which has been variously translated as an imperative (visual or aural), statement of surprise or amazement, simply a standard verb of visualising, or a more conative word better fitting a modern reading context. The crucial difference is the one already outlined above, that it shows a spectrum of different ways in which narrators can relate to the narrative, to the characters, and to the audience. There is an ambiguity as to whether translators use it to interact with the character, content and story (Day Lewis), or the audience and the process of narrating (Ahl).

I have said comparatively little about Ahl in this section, as a result of his consistency. He serves here rather to point out Day Lewis' difference and interesting choice to provide variation in his translation of this one word, difficult to translate. Ahl more consistently uses a translation which conveys a visual sense whilst demanding presence and engaging directly with his audience in an engaging way. He even occasionally adds in interjections, where they do not exist in the Latin, as in 5.316:

315 haec ubi dicta, locum capiunt signoque repente
316 corripiunt spatia audito limenque relinquunt,

Aeneid 5.315-6

315 This said, they go to their marks; like a storm cloud, the moment the signal -
316 **Oh, how they eat up the distance!** – is heard, they are off from the start-line,

Aeneid 5.315-6 (Ahl)

315 After this speech, they took up position. The starting signal
316 Was given. In a flash they are off and sprinting along the track

Aeneid 5.315-6 (Day Lewis)

Ahl notes of his unusual word order here that he follows Virgil – one sees the race start before they hear the signal. However, his decision to add the metaleptic intrusion, for which there is no basis in the Latin, shows his willingness to depart from Virgil in order to create a more intensely emotional effect than Virgil, and (more than) Day Lewis: that of a narrator who closely relates to the narrative and willingly intrudes to offer his

opinions on the characters and on the process of narrative construction itself.

2.6 CONCLUSIONS

Virgil's narrative is told through a complex array of viewpoints, in which the narrative shifts through temporal base and deictic centre. Virgil's narrator also speaks deictically, imbuing the narrative with personal language where he intrudes to comment on the narrative content or on its construction. Careful manipulation of tense shows the distance and closeness between character and narrator, while deixis can be used to increase or decrease character-focalisation. When Virgil comments on his narrative, he is often implicitly commenting on its construction, which allows translators to choose to more closely link together the story with the act of narration.

As translators reconstruct Virgil's narrative voice, their recreation of personal interruptions exposes their narrator subjectivity, and the relationship they want to have with the text. Whilst Day Lewis creates a less personal relationship to the narrator and the narrative, he still portrays events and characters sympathetically. He does interact with the narrative and with his characters, but less so with the audience and the process of narrating. Ahl, however, amplifies the effect of deixis, better preserving the Romanness of Virgil's narrator whilst also exaggerating the effect and process of his role as translator, thus foregrounding the double-

authoredness of translation. Deixis therefore exposes the translated narrator's position relative to the original text, in ways which reflect back on translation as appropriation of classical voices: Day Lewis in a way which reveres the authority and epicness of the text, and Ahl in a way which challenges the text and presents it in an open, deconstructed way. The ambiguity inherent in deixis, and the dislocation between represented and representing voices, is something which Ahl chooses to tease apart, using more present tenses and deixis, more readily inhabiting the character present, emulating closeness in order to emphasise distance, whilst Day Lewis more often denies vocal or spatio-temporal ambiguity. Ahl is more likely to speak from either the narrator or character's deictic centre, and even, as he deconstructs the fabric of narrative, to create and explore his own, new, translator's deictic centre.[52] Ahl is thus more willing to engage with deixis as a means to connect forwards with the audience, and backwards with the characters, showing the gap between him, the source material, and the target audience.

Since Day Lewis' narrator gains more personal authority via radio broadcast, where the author and narrator align more into one voice, the 'now of the text' is positioned in the deictic centre of his narrator. He uses fewer present tenses in order to more clearly define his own performance

[52] In her thesis conclusion, Adema (2008) suggested that additional bases might exist, for example the time of reading.

time posterior to the story, unifying his narrative into a single narrator deictic centre, and to imbue it with the authority of recounting past action.[53] When Day Lewis does use the character present, it is normally in a way which highlights the distance between his own time and that of the character, rather than in a way which brings them together. Both translators thus collapse the distance between translator and audience, but in different ways: Day Lewis creates his text and gives it to his reader, distancing the translator to such a degree that his presence is invisible; Ahl emphasises the role that he, and his audience, must play in the construction of this multivocal narrative.

The concepts outlined in this chapter will inform subsequent chapters, both directly, where examples of simile or apostrophe contain deictic elements, and indirectly, through the similarity between deictic interjection and apostrophe, and between the exposure of visual deictics through formation of similes. Using deixis, as well as the previous chapter's theories on focalisation and voice, in combination with the epic motifs which I analyse in the next two chapters, will show how the narrator and his characters position themselves with regard to the narrative, and how that impacts on character depiction.

---

[53] Goward (1999) 10.

3 Apostrophe: Narrative Construction and Engagement

500 quis mihi nunc tot acerba deus, quis carmine caedes
diversas obitumque ducum, quos aequore toto
inque vicem nunc Turnus agit, nunc Troius heros,
expediat? tanton placuit concurrere motu,
504 Iuppiter, aeterna gentis in pace futuras?

Aeneid 12.500-504

At the beginning of his epic, Virgil's narrator invokes the Muse, asking how divine anger can drive a man of Aeneas' piety through such hardships.[1] Twelve books later, his apostrophe to the gods reiterates the request for justification of their part in the actions which he has narrated. Posing this question draws together the narrator, the gods, ultimate authors of the characters' plight and action, and the audience, who might be questioning the narrative's justice as much as its own narrator appears to be. To heighten its immediacy and to draw attention to the narrator's presence, this passage has elements of deixis, temporally with *nunc*, used three times, and personally with *mihi*. This is not unusual; apostrophes are often accompanied by deixis and personal language, since they are performative, emotive, and specify a speaker, addressee, and time of speaking. As Laird has shown, it is also common for apostrophes to follow a period of free indirect discourse, a juxtaposition which draws attention to the sudden presence of the narrator's voice.[2] This apostrophe follows free indirect

[1] See below, pp237-243.

[2] Laird (1999) 174-83. See above, p107 n50.

speech from Aeneas, and the swift shift between Aeneas' voice and that of the narrator closely aligns the two. Stylistically, it is an effective passage: the narrator repeats question words *quis, quis, tanton*, alliterates *carmine caedes*, and juxtaposes *acerba deus*, to emphasise the brutality of this narrative and the gods' injustice.

When the narrator apostrophises Jupiter, the god's name starts the line, and the description of inevitable future peace which ends this sentence conveys the inexplicable futility of the situation.[3] The subjunctive mood of the verb *expediat* expresses modality and uncertainty; he is asking whether a god *would* be able to tell of the event, rather than asking which god has done, is doing, or will do so. As Griffin's note explains, "the poet leaves his epic objectivity to remonstrate with the gods of his own story".[4] This is not the first time we have seen such a cynical narrator, who described the unjust demands of Neptune to take Palinurus as a sacrifice, and who showed Dido fatally conned by divine intervention into believing in a fake marriage.[5] Compounding the effect of the narrator questioning the justification of this war and its instigators, is the position of this passage

---

[3] As Feeney (1991) has shown, it is discomforting that not even Jupiter provides an unbiased, independent moral viewpoint on the *Aeneid* (154, 155, 158).

[4] Griffin (1986).

[5] My view here is at odds with elements of D'Alessandro Behr's (2007, with reference to Barchiesi [1984] 86), that although Virgil portrays the war between the Trojans and Latins as similar to Rome's civil wars, his ultimate message is that it is a just war approved by the gods, that the narrator approves of Jupiter's plans in book 12 and does not openly question them as Juturna does (25).

immediately after Aeneas' rampage, reminding us that Aeneas himself, at least in part, inflicts the suffering for which Virgil seeks justification. Just as the reference to the harmonious future that these peoples will enjoy is a complimentary nod towards Augustus' golden era,[6] perhaps his invocation to Jupiter is an insubstantial veil for a question that he is actually posing of Augustus himself, overtly questioning the new regime and its cost. The difficulty indeed is not that the narrator does not know the events that he wishes to describe, or even that he does not understand them, but rather that he does not understand how they were approved.

500 Have I the inspiration now to do justice to so many
Horrors, to such a gamut of carnage – the deaths of captains
Driven all over the field by Turnus now, and now by
The Trojan prince? Juppiter, was it your will that nations,
504 Destined to live at peace for ever, should clash so bitterly?

Aeneid 12.500-504 (Day Lewis)

500 Could any god now craft me in verse this suffering's full toll,
Detail the carnage, the deaths among princes whom one moment Turnus,
Then, at the next, Troy's hero pursues all over the landscape?
Jupiter, was it your will that these peoples who'd one day be living
504 Bonded for ever in peace should collide in such terrible conflict?

Aeneid 12.500-504 (Ahl)

[6] As noted by Conington (1884, 2007 ed.).

Through the filter of deixis, I showed in the last chapter that Ahl constructs a new narrative mode, to draw attention to the act of translating, as well as a new base and deictic centre, to position himself as speaking from within translating time. He achieves the same effect in this passage, commenting on his role by linking the modal verb to *carmine*, "Could any god now craft me in verse", justly asking whether a god would be able to take on this overwhelming authorial task. If not, how could he, a mere mortal, be expected to do so? He thus alters the context of epic, from singing to crafting in verse, and hence brings the translator's narrator to the fore.

Day Lewis takes a different stance, asking if he has the inspiration to do justice to this song, thus implying that he knows the story, but needs assistance to properly explain it. He questions the justification of Jupiter's will, needlessly contrary to the future Romans' destiny. Day Lewis is a more authoritative storyteller here, expressing judgement on the gods and their justification for this inflicted suffering. That his opening sentence does not include an invocation to the gods, simply a question about his personal authoritative power, asserts his narrator as storyteller. He does not seek divine assistance in the telling of his tale, but he does personally and emotionally engage with the text to express the hope that his poetry is of a particular quality. Ahl, on the other hand, expands again upon his condemnation of the gods' involvement in the epic. With his invocation of a divine being, he implies that the gods, for all their knowledge and power, would struggle to bring themselves to write the suffering they have inflicted.

In chapters so far, I have explored how the narrator (in Virgil's original and in translation) relates to its characters and narrative, through discourse representation, focalisation and deixis. In this chapter and the next, I consider how Virgil's translators approach his narrative complexities within two traditionally epic narrative motifs. In chapter four, I look at similes, to explore how the narrator subjectively describes and engages with his characters. First, in this chapter, I look at how the narrator uses apostrophe to the Muses, to his characters, and to his audience to connect with his narrative and expose its construction.

3.1 APOSTROPHE IN THE *AENEID*

De Jong defines apostrophe as: "when the poet addresses a character (using the second person verb form) instead of talking about him (using the third person verb form)".[7] This is an excellent and concise definition; however, I wish to expand both the speaker and addressee: firstly, to include apostrophes spoken by characters, not just 'poets' (or 'narrators'?); secondly, to include a wider range of addressees, not just defined 'characters' but also minor deities, abstract concepts, and even the audience themselves. Expanding the definition in these directions necessitates tighter constraints in others, and I include an additional

[7] De Jong (1987, 2004 ed.) 13.

quality which de Jong refers to separately; whether spoken by narrator or character, apostrophe involves a "turning away".[8] Typically the address includes a question, directed inwardly as much as externally, and to which no response is expected. In narrator-spoken apostrophe, speaker and addressee are distanced by the narrative itself, by the separate worlds of story time and narrative time, often in ways which foreground the narrator's omniscience. For character apostrophe, this responseless addressee is likely to be absent from the scene, or at least perceived to be so;[9] the important aspect being that the speaker does not expect a response. The absence of the one invoked could also be indicative of their existence on a different plane, for example when a character apostrophises a god or abstract concept. Whilst absence is often considered a prerequisite to apostrophe, without stage directions it is not always clear whether or not the addressee is present, and besides, it is not 'absence' so much as 'separation'.

Virgil's narrator personally apostrophises a broad spectrum of characters. In fact, narrative apostrophes to major characters in the *Aeneid* are rare in

---

[8] De Jong (2009): "When a narrator turns away from his normal addressee, the narratee, to address one of his characters, thereby entering the narrated world" (93).

[9] One recalls Juliet's apostrophe "Oh Romeo, Romeo! Wherefore art thou, Romeo?" Even though he is secretly in earshot, in Juliet's mind, Romeo is absent.

comparison with those to minor characters.[10] His use of apostrophe shows his equalising treatment of characters, painting war, like his narrative, as a great leveller, in which the farmer suffers as much as the general. When the narrator speaks an apostrophe, he enters the narrated world, but he also consolidates his position outside the narrative looking in, just like the audience. By addressing a character who is present in the current action, he shows that he is close enough to that character to address him, but not close enough to have a reciprocated conversation. Therefore, at the same time as placing the reader close to the character, apostrophe also distances them from us; we are onlookers alongside the narrator. A traditionally epic motif, apostrophe aims to directly engage the voice of the speaker, whether narrator or character, with the voice of the recipient. Thus, it brings the audience's attention to the apostrophe's speaker and receiver, and to the relationship between them. By asking the audience to engage with the invoked as the speaker does, such an address often encourages the audience to align with the speaker (whether narrator or character).[11]

Typically occurring at points of high emotion, Virgilian apostrophe acts as an appeal or exclamation of disbelief, passion, or grief. As such, apostrophe

---

[10] Categorising apostrophes in the *Aeneid* is fraught with imprecision, since it is not always clear whether the addressee is absent or present, and a decision must be made as to whether or not to include rhetorical questions, asked in the second person to an undefined addressee, perhaps the audience (e.g. 8.650, 8.676, 9.247).

[11] D'Alessandro Behr (2005) 204.

is inherently a form of subjectivity. An emotional address would never be required in objective speech, as its purpose is to suggest the identity of, and relationship between, the narrator, his characters, and his audience. However, D'Alessandro Behr's assertion that apostrophe may be seen as an indication of a movement from objectivity to subjectivity is misleading, as the mimetic or diegetic narrative preceding it may already be subjective.[12] More accurate is her application of Otis' terminology to distinguish apostrophe as, more typically, an indication of sympathy compared to empathy.[13] Both sympathy and empathy are types of subjective form; the difference lies in their portrayal of the relationship between the narrator, the audience and characters. As D'Alessandro Behr goes on to show, whilst Virgil's narrative apostrophe is generally sympathetic, there are instances which take on an empathetic voice. I would argue the example below shows a degree of empathy:

30 tu quoque magnam
partem opera in tanto, sineret dolor, Icare, haberes.
bis conatus erat casus effingere in auro,
33 bis patriae cecidere manus.

Aeneid 6.30-33

[12] D'Alessandro Behr (2007) 2. In several instances where I cite D'Alessandro Behr (2007), there is repetition from her 2005 article (in this case, 198). In these cases, I cite the later source, assuming it has replaced its predecessor.

[13] D'Alessandro Behr (2007) 18. Otis (1964, 1995 ed.).

Similar to Evander's apostrophe of the dead and absent Pallas (11.152), this apostrophe makes an absent character present;[14] Virgil makes Icarus tangible in ways Daedalus could not. The absence and voicelessness of the addressee increases the emotional effect here: apostrophe is the only way to directly engage him within the scene. But just as the apostrophe brings the character to life, it also makes him appear less real, since the narrator is in a uniquely privileged position of being able to access him. Apostrophe thus simultaneously offers Icarus more independence, whilst also portraying him as a purely figurative construct which does not exist separately from the narrator's imagination. Barchiesi observes that "The 'absence' of Icarus among the images on the temple 'represents' his death," and that, by representing the suffering of an artist who is unable to do the same himself, he illustrates some of his own challenges as epic narrator.[15] Indeed, Virgil's narrator has expressed similar concerns over his own ability to produce art.[16] Thus, in this apostrophe, he subsumes Daedalus' voice with his own, empathising with the artist unable to recreate his son in gold.[17] By actualising Icarus, whom grief forbade his father to sculpt, Virgil's narrator expresses self-reflective narratorial (or authorial) doubt.

---

[14] Laird (2002) 128.

[15] Barchiesi (1999) 329-330. See D'Alessandro Behr (2007) 21, 25-7, 30 on the relationship between Daedalus and Virgil, the difficulty of depicting sorrow in art, and how this apostrophe shows the narrator's disappointment at the gods' will and at his own "inability to lament dutifully those who die".

[16] Putnam (2001) 180.

[17] Putnam (1998) sees this as a full expression of narrator empathy: "He seems to adopt the voice of Daedalus. […] In replacing the sculptor-father, the poet's

Overall, there are far fewer narrative apostrophes in the first half of the epic (with only five instances in the first six books), but it becomes a more regular occurrence in the second half (with approximately 28 instances).[18] This increase is consistent across both apostrophes to gods and Muses (indicating that the narrator requires more assistance to tell of the Iliadic events than for the Odyssean) and to characters, the majority of which during the 'war' books form panegyrics for the many minor characters caught up in a battle which the narrator often finds unworthy of its losses.[19] D'Alessandro Behr notes that Virgil's apostrophes often address characters who have died, or who are about to die.[20] As such, Virgil's apostrophes to warriors tend to mourn the death rather than celebrate with the victors, either in glorious commemoration or in regretful disbelief at the loss that Jupiter's vision is costing. This is consistent with D'Alessandro Behr's argument that apostrophe contains two impulses, that which laments the victims of war and a second which seeks to perform a public service by turning lamentation into funeral oration.[21] Apostrophes, while subjective,

---

narrator becomes a Daedalian figure bringing Icarus and his father's frustrating grief before us in the permanence of words" (5, 81).

[18] 'Approximately' since apostrophes can be difficult to define.

[19] G. Williams (1983): "What emerges from the poet's voice lamenting deaths of Italians and Trojans impartially is an explicit condemnation, given the fullest authority, of the tragedy of war" (196); "The use of apostrophe greatly accelerates in the battle scenes of Books 10 and 12, and there the poet's hatred of war distinctly comes across in the tone of pity" (191).

[20] D'Alessandro Behr (2007) 23-24. Also see Seider (2012) 242, 247.

[21] D'Alessandro Behr (2005) 207, 208.

are not necessarily unilaterally so, and may distinguish between conflicting narrative voices,[22] contributing to his complex, subjective narrative. Lovatt argues that readerly interaction and interpretation is critical to the formation of such metaleptic events; the reader must decide what constitutes a break in (or out) of the narrative level, and what effect it has.[23] Whilst an event may be reported in a subjective narrative style, an apostrophe presents the audience with a call to action; by using engaging addresses such as apostrophe to indicate a conflict between different voices or points of view, the narrator demands the audience respond to this moral ambiguity.

As well as portraying conflicting voices within the narrative, ambiguity can be created using character spoken apostrophes, whether via (in)direct speech or conveying their opinion through focalisation. These apostrophes sometimes express dislocation of subjectivities between the narrator, the audience, and various characters. Both Virgil's major and minor characters express extremes of emotion through apostrophes, and often to exaggerated effect. Within a single soliloquy (4.590-625), Dido emphasises her inability to understand Aeneas' departure, with triplicate rhetorical effect: first she addresses Jupiter at 4.590; then the sun, Juno, Hecate, the

[22] D'Alessandro Behr (2007) 6 argues this about Lucan, whose use of apostrophe becomes an attempt to communicate many sides of a complex reality.

[23] Lovatt (forthcoming).

furies, and the gods at 4.608; then at 4.625 she looks to the future and addresses her as-yet-unknown avenger. In speeches of a similar emotive power, Euryalus' mother also makes three apostrophes after learning of her son's death (9.483-497), whilst Aeneas apostrophises approximately six deities or deity groups in his speech at 12.175-195. The last two apostrophes of book 12 are from Turnus, as the final duel approaches; it is pertinent that he invokes the gods to his aid, but Aeneas does not (need to): both know the fate they are about to meet.

When the narrator speaks an apostrophe, the voice may blend empathetically with that of a character, or may, as Block argues, contribute to his independent viewpoint, functioning to distinguish his voice from that of his characters or the audience.[24] Seider agrees, to an extent, with Block, but considers the distinction only between narrator and character.[25] He illustrates his argument with examples in which both a character and the narrator apostrophise the same character, but to different effect and with different emphases (for example, the narrator celebrates Nisus and Euryalus' death and calls them fortunate to be remembered, whereas

---

[24] Block (1982) 7, 10. She also explains (8 n4) the line of rhetoric theory which, presuming that "only one speaker addresses the audience, although he may adopt any number of personae", collapses the distinction between narrator- and character-spoken apostrophe. She refers to Highet, whose 1972 book lists only character-spoken apostrophe, not narrator. However, I do not see this as Highet "obscuring the development of the narrator as a separate persona", since his, titular, focus is on *The Speeches in Vergil's 'Aeneid'*.

[25] Seider (2012) 243, 251-3.

Euryalus' mother can only express grief). These examples provide contrast through polyphony, counteracting the emotions of a grieving character with an imperial voice, reminding us of the ultimate purpose at stake. Narrator- and character-spoken apostrophe thus fulfil different purposes: the narrator may assert a controlled Roman temporal and cultural lens, and the character reacts in a more immediate and emotional way. Whilst the narrator conveys the honour of being remembered for a glorious death, the character shows the true cost of that privilege. By expressing the same narrative techniques, but using them to clearly express a different point of view, apostrophe supports the definition of the narrator as a character in his own right.

Whilst a broad range of characters address and are addressed by apostrophe, it is striking that there is no narrative apostrophe to Aeneas. The fact that apostrophes focus more on lamentation than celebration, and emphasise a character's emotional turmoil, gives one explanation for Virgil's lack of apostrophe to his protagonist. Alternatively, since Aeneas occupies a privileged position within the narrative, perhaps his voice is too intricately intertwined with that of the narrator, rendering apostrophe inappropriate and almost self-reflective. As Segal has argued, Aeneas' privileged narrative position means he is able to partake in both *participatory* and *authorial* voices, in which case the narrative is more oriented to his point of view – certainly that he is heavily involved in the

telling.[26] In the same way that the narrator's voice imposes on Aeneas' narrative in *Aeneid* 2 and 3, the reverse is also true.[27] Perhaps the narrator does not apostrophise Aeneas in order to avoid presenting him as an emotional being, and because there is not adequate separation between their voices.

As well as using apostrophe to connect with his characters, Virgil also uses it to connect with his narrative. Apostrophe, specifically to the Muses, is an important way for Virgil to show that what he is telling is not just his own story; it gives the sense of the narrator fitting into a bigger picture, and not claiming sole responsibility. Narrative apostrophe, especially to the Muses (as in the opening example in this chapter), is metapoetic,[28] deconstructing the narrative and exposing its seams. Its construction, formulated by Muse invocations, is inextricably linked to the tradition of oral performance.[29] Since the tradition of reading poetry aloud means that it is always spoken by, and addressed to, somebody, having an open address to a character or to the audience was a typical part of oral classical poetry, particularly

---

[26] C. Segal (1981) 69.

[27] See Lovatt (forthcoming) on the narrator imposing on Aeneas' narrative books.

[28] Laird (2002): "Invocations of Muses are always metapoetical: whenever a poet seeks divine assistance for his poem, the discourse of that poem itself becomes the theme" (128).

[29] Havelock (1986): "The poet is commemorating, however indirectly, a system of social communication in a culture of primary orality in which such communication is shaped and performed to preserve the cultural tradition" (81).

epic.[30] Since they already play a key role in the construction of the oral narrative, the audience are prepared to engage in the rhetorical experience of apostrophe. However, the slow development of written textual dissemination, which had begun long before Virgil, gradually started to change the interaction between the Muses, the poet and the audience.[31] Block writes that the birth of writing as a medium of literary dissemination in the ancient world resulted in a loss of engagement (and the creation of a new distance) between the audience and the narrator, but that Virgil uses this to his full advantage: his audience are not necessarily enduring the same experience as him, rather the permanent written word of the *Aeneid* seeks to demand that its audience continually reassess, question and judge the poem, so that they become a separate entity in their own right.[32] Wheeler uses a similar argument when he applies reader-response theory to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, arguing that Ovid presents his text as a fictive "viva voce" performance, reliant on the reading audience's instrumental role in its creation as a performative text.[33]

---

[30] Culler (1977) 60. Shuster (1940) 11-12.

[31] Havelock (1986) 21; D'Alessandro Behr (2005) 194. This shift affected different writers and genres in different ways; Martial, for instance, is considered more textual, whereas the genre of epic retained certain oral qualities.

[32] Block (1982) 8, 9, 10, 22.

[33] Wheeler (1999) 1-7.

As an oral and metaleptic feature, apostrophe is not the representation of an event, but rather "a fictive, discursive event" itself,[34] making its point not based on words alone, but rather "on the circuit or situation of communication".[35] Whilst apostrophe does not necessitate a pausing of narrative time,[36] it does indicate the narrator breaking out of his narrative level to comment either on the content of his story or on its construction, using one of the two narrative modes which I defined in chapter 2: story comment and narrative comment. By commenting on the plot or the narrative construction, the narrator situates himself in time and space, and therefore apostrophe creates a fixed temporality in writing, a time of discourse rather than a timeless description.[37] Using apostrophe as deixis to focus the attention on the addressee, who may exist beyond the narrative time and space, the narrator displays his eternal omniscient presence.[38] In this way, he both creates a fixed time and escapes it.

As part of its epic and oral qualities, apostrophe functions to shape and create memory.[39] Ancient epic occupied a unique space in social and

---

[34] Culler (1977) 68.

[35] D'Alessandro Behr (2007) 2.

[36] Just like in book 6, when Aeneas' speech to the speechless Dido conveys her movement away from him, narrative apostrophe can (just) manage to sustain the narrative action.

[37] Culler (1977) 68.

[38] Hutchinson (2010) 97-8.

[39] Hardie (2009): "That fame and narratives are inseparable in ancient epic and historiography goes without saying: narratives of the deeds of heroes or great

cultural memory, and, whether it is in terms of the memories which the Muse is imparting to him, or the memories which he is passing on to his audience, preserving a character or legend, Virgil uses apostrophe to explore his role. In the apostrophe to Icarus, Virgil's narrator memorialised Daedalus' son. Beyond memorialising individual characters, Virgil also has an important obligation in contributing to wider social memory, constructing cultural identity by commemorating and glorifying the past: literally true of Virgil's *Aeneid*, itself a piece of commemoration related to Augustus' efforts to foster a particular view of recent history.[40] As well as being historically memorialising, epic is also literary in its commemoration, as its vast array of intertextual references reflect and draw on multiple sources.

In translation, the text cannot occupy an equivalent space in social memory, as it no longer has the same societal function or relevance. However, for the new author, translation itself is a way of connecting with, remembering, or even commemorating the past; the way in which the translator engages with the past through Virgil reflects the way that Virgil relates to his past through Homer and his Muses. The concept of the Muses themselves may even be associated with the ancient text itself; in the same way as the

men of the past are the vehicles of, and indeed constitutive of, the fame of their subjects" (555).

[40] Seider (2012) 261, 262, 263.

translator is the intermediary messenger for Virgil, the narrator plays the same role for the Muses. At a more fundamental level, invocations and apostrophe, when spoken by the narrator, may be more discomforting to modern audiences, who may even consider the motif wholly artificial.[41] Muse invocations, with an essentially performative quality, may appear to foreignize the text for a modern reading audience. Therefore, modern, domesticating Anglophone translators of Virgil may interfere in such narrative instances. Since they are inherently personal to the narrator, and since the identity of the translator's narrator must be different to that of the original author, the translator may use apostrophe to alter the perception of their own narrative identity, or to suit a new genre and readership. Their unstable place in English translation, particularly written, may be affected by the medium in which the audience receive the text (apostrophe might have a more natural place within performative contexts), as well as changing contemporary styles.[42] In a similar way to the impact of deictic elements in translation, translators may wish to alter the fixed temporality created by the apostrophic moment, in order to occupy a different time and space in relation to the narrative.

---

[41] Culler (1977) 60.

[42] Translation of oral poetry into modern written languages can result in what Havelock (1986) sees as a static and atomistic representation of what is meant to be a dynamic medium (95-6).

In the examples which follow, I will analyse instances of apostrophe in Virgil and compare how translators approach them. My objective will be to ascertain how translators use apostrophe to change the relationship between the narrator and the narrative or the characters, and therefore alter the narrator's identity. The apostrophes which I will analyse are split into two sections: firstly, apostrophes which affect the narrator's subjective relationship to the character, either to emphasise or undermine, to ameliorate or critique, their portrayal; secondly, apostrophes which show narrative control, and the extent to which the narrator exists as an independent storyteller or as reliant on external sources. The latter are usually apostrophes to the Muses or to gods, and invite the translator to either acquire ownership of the narrative, and become accountable for its contents, or to identify themselves as interpreters controlled by superior beings who dictate the subject matter. How do translators, narrators and Muses all work together to create the narrative? What is the dynamic of this collaborative partnership? This structure divides apostrophe by addressee (to characters and to Muses), and also, referring back to the previous chapter, by narrative mode (story comment and narrative comment).

3.2 STORY COMMENT (CHARACTER APOSTROPHE)

In this section, I analyse apostrophes in which the narrator creates a sympathetic connection to his characters, using the story comment discourse mode. I will use four apostrophes, addressed to Dido, Larides and Thymber, Cydon, and Oebalus.

3.2.1 Dido

Block writes that Virgil's use of apostrophe in book 10 foregrounds the conflict between the events of the poem and its ultimate purpose.[43] This is true also of book 4, where the apostrophe to Dido amplifies the narrator's ambiguous response to the emotional conflict which Virgil's heroine endures. During book 4, the narrator undoubtedly feels a close empathetic connection with Dido, as much of the book is focalised through her, allowing her to express her emotions. Virgil's tragic subplot is, in some ways, as much his own departure from obligation and expectation as it is Aeneas'; "art proved greater than the artist," and Virgil was rather distracted from his true course, swept away by his empathy, immortalising Dido through her death.[44] Notoriously interpretable, Dido can be understood as a means by which to confirm Aeneas' willingness to make sacrifices in favour of duty, or to reinforce the needless but necessary

[43] Block (1982) 20.

[44] Mackail (1922) 106-7.

suffering inflicted on those who oppose him.[45] Partly due to the extent to which Dido focalises the narrative in book 4, this apostrophe is the only time that the narrator directly addresses his anti-heroine. Apostrophising Dido presents her as an object of extreme emotion, contrasting to Aeneas' moderation.

migrantis cernas totaque ex urbe ruentis:
ac velut ingentem formicae farris acervum
cum populant hiemis memores tectoque reponunt,
it nigrum campis agmen praedamque per herbas
convectant calle angusto; pars grandia trudunt
obnixae frumenta umeris, pars agmina cogunt
castigantque moras, opere omnis semita fervet.
quis tibi tum, Dido, cernenti talia sensus,
quosve dabas gemitus, cum litora fervere late
prospiceres arce ex summa, totumque videres
misceri ante oculos tantis clamoribus aequor!
improbe Amor, quid non mortalia pectora cogis!
ire iterum in lacrimas, iterum temptare precando
cogitur et supplex animos summittere amori,
ne quid inexpertum frustra moritura relinquat.

Aeneid 4.401-415

[45] For differing views: see Mackail (1922): "defence of Aeneas is impossible", but the guilt he shows proves his sacrifice to duty (102-3, 106); Parry (1963): on Aeneas' denial of basic human rights (72, 77, 80); Pöschl (1962, 1970 ed.): the love affair causes all of the "basic forces" which conflict within Aeneas, "respect for duty, firmness of resolution, and human feeling," to coincide (39-40, 43); Wlosok (1976, 1999 ed.): on Dido's story as a "tragic episode within the epic" (159); Perkell (1981): on how Aeneas loses his claim to *pietas* during the Dido episode, but regains it once he leaves (370); R.D. Williams (1984: 34) on how Aeneas' sacrifices, such as abandoning Dido, prove his *pietas* rather than question it, but still leave an uncomfortable question over agency of her death. See also Monti (1981), whose study goes beyond Dido's sentimental and emotional characterisation to explore her political function in the poem.

There are actually two apostrophes in this extract (408, 412), and, before those, a second verb *cernas* (401), 'you could have seen'. This is an ambiguous address, to an undefined addressee, and could be the beginning of the apostrophe to Dido, or could be directed to the audience.[46] I prefer the former argument, in which case the narrator situates himself (and therefore his readers) with Dido, following her gaze out from the top of her tower.[47] The object of the verb, of the gaze, is the Trojans preparing to leave the city, who are compared to an army of ants working together to gather food for the winter.[48] The distance between the simile and narrative worlds is closed, as Virgil uses the same verb *fervet*, just two lines apart, to describe both the swarming group of ants and the swarming Trojan soldiers. The effect is doubled by *agmina cogunt*, typically a military phrase, here used of the ants.[49] This combines to more clearly link the simile subject and

---

[46] G. Williams (1983) 188-189 agrees that the second person of the verb is the audience. He notes that the address to Dido links her to the audience, as the latter are addressed by *cernas*, and she is described as *cernenti*. The audience, however, never achieve the same connection to her as the poet. Block (1982) 20 n32: this apostrophe to the audience turns out to be equally to Dido.

[47] My reading is similar to that of W.D. Anderson (1957) 85-6 who interprets the second person verb not as the standard second impersonal singular, but rather, as is made clear when the simile ends, a means of presenting the scene through Dido's eyes.

[48] Depicting Trojans as ants paints them as soulless, unfeeling, mechanical and inhuman. They are focused on the task ahead and act only to serve their king. Their omnipresence within the scene is emphasised by the placement of the verbs *ruentis* and *migrantis* at either end of the line. This contrasts with the Carthaginians, depicted as bees in a simile focalised by Aeneas (1.430-436), animals which Farrell (1991) notes often signify the poet (247). Poetry itself is commonly depicted as honey (Pucci [1977] 19-21, 28).

[49] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.).

object for the audience.[50] I will reserve discussion of similes for chapter 4, but will look at this ambiguous second person address in translation:

> 401 Into and out of the city you'd see them, everywhere, streaming.
>
> *Aeneid* 4.401 (Ahl)

> 401 You could see them on the move, hurrying out of the city.
>
> *Aeneid* 4.401 (Day Lewis)

> 401 They could all be seen on the move hurrying from every quarter of the city,
>
> *Aeneid* 4.401 (Jackson Knight)

Ahl begins this section with the ambiguous "you'd see them". In English, the second person can assume an impersonal 'you' form (the less formal version of 'one could see them'), where it need not be directed to anybody, and can simply indicate vague possibility. Day Lewis takes a similar approach, but Jackson Knight instead translates using the passive "they could all be seen", removing the agent of the verb and the ambiguous direct address.

A few lines later (408) is the first apostrophe. The address is to Dido, as shown by the second person pronoun, questions (not only is this an address to Dido, but it is a direct question to her), and (three) second

[50] See below, pp267-8.

person verbs. Due to our relationship with Dido in this book, this apostrophe feels real and natural, rather than a purely rhetorical device.[51] Virgil could have chosen to report Dido's direct speech here, lamenting the Trojans leaving her, but instead the apostrophe has the effect of aligning narrative focalisation (and therefore the audience) with Dido, encouraging us to empathise with her whilst also foregrounding the extremity of her emotion and holding her up as an object of wonder and pity. The narrator encourages the audience to see Aeneas from Dido's point of view, negatively, his subjective voice intruding to indicate to the audience where they should feel sympathy. The Dido episode is an ambiguous and interpretable aspect of the *Aeneid*, but Virgil's narrator clearly shows us his opinion of her here.

At line 412, there is another apostrophe, to 'cruel love' (*improbe Amor*), and this time the speaking voice is ambiguous. This apostrophe could be spoken by the narrator, lamenting Dido's misfortune, or could be focalised through Dido, or even reported as free indirect speech. Either way, a second apostrophe within the narrative is unusual so soon after the previous one, although as a "sudden piece of subjectivity" is not out of place, due to the empathy for Dido which book 4 promotes throughout.[52] D'Alessandro Behr suggests that the gaze of the spectator merges with that

---

[51] R.D. Williams (1966).

[52] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.).

of the queen through repetition of *cerno*, but also claims that it is the poet who blames *Amor* for the inevitable imminent tragedy.[53] Wlosok interprets this double apostrophe as a sign of Virgil's sensitivity, as he chooses to lay aside his objective narrator, conveying sympathy for his characters.[54] However, I can envisage a performance that would present the apostrophes in quite a different tone, as we can see in Ahl's translation below.

> Dido, what did you feel when you noted and watched this commotion?
> Oh, what groans you expressed, looking out from the citadel's summit:
> Seeing the shore set aboil, and the whole expanse of the water
> Stretching before your eyes churn choppy and noisy in uproar!
> Ruthless Love! Hearts break, humans die. How far must you force us?
> Dido is forced once again into tears, once again attempts pleading,
> Bending her pride to its knees before love. For she wants to leave nothing
> Unexplored to ensure that her long-doomed death isn't pointless.
>
> *Aeneid* 4.408-415 (Ahl)

[53] D'Alessandro Behr (2005) 213-5. See Block (1982) on the alignment of point of view between audience and character (14-15).

[54] Wlosok (1976, 1999 ed.) 169.

Ahl addresses Dido by name, and asks "What did you feel", followed by "Oh, what groans you expressed", which insinuates that he was there, in a past time, to experience her reaction, thus implying his closeness with Dido. Virgil uses three verbs of looking in this passage: *cernenti*, *prospiceres*, *videres*. Ahl adds an additional one, to double the effect in line 408, though the verbs he chooses are rather clinical and unempathetic: "when you noted and watched". After the colon, Ahl's narrative becomes more empathetic to Dido; even though these lines are still spoken by the narrator, they certainly convey Dido's point of view. The hissing sound in line 410, "Seeing the shores set aboil," reflects her anger, almost as if she is spitting the words out with hatred. The immediacy of her emotion is also reflected in the striking sound and colloquial language of "churn choppy". A sense of aural focalisation compounds the visual, as the scene is described as the "noisy uproar". Ahl's apostrophe thus becomes less about offering sympathy to Dido, and more about empathetically expressing her anger through the narrative. Even though the narrator is speaking, he replicates her voice; narrator and heroine cannot be disentangled. This doubled voice continues in the following lines, where Ahl asks "Ruthless Love! Hearts break, humans die. How far must you force us?" The plural pronoun here aligns the empathetic narrator with Dido. "Ruthless" is quite an interpretative translation of *improbus*, implying its characteristics rather than quantitative excess, whilst removing its implication of immorality, and further corroborates the reading of narrative sympathy or focalisation through Dido. She is presented as a victim of an implacable force rather than a collaborator in wickedness. After this line, the narrator

uses a third person to speak about Dido, returning to the historic present tense to report his narrative.

> Ah, Dido, what did you feel when you saw these things going forward?
> What moans you gave when, looking forth from your high roof-top,
> You beheld the whole length of the beach aswarm with men, and the sea's face
> Alive with the sound and fury of preparations for sailing!
> Excess of love, to what lengths you drive our human hearts!
> Once again she was driven to try what tears and entreaties
> Could do, and let love beggar her pride – she would leave no appeal
> Untried, lest, for want of it, she should all needlessly die.
>
> *Aeneid* 408-415 (Day Lewis)

Some of Day Lewis' translation seems similar to Ahl's: the comment "What moans you gave", and the apostrophe with empathetic third person pronoun, "Excess of love, to what lengths you drive our human hearts!". However, translating *Improbe Amor* as "Excess of love" is, though more in-keeping with the Latin, more judgemental in tone than Ahl's translation, carrying subtle implication of liability on account of immoderation.[55] Day Lewis has almost transferred the sense of *improbus* to Dido herself. This follows the reading suggested by Williams, who, in suggesting that

[55] Perhaps there is an element of authorial empathy here: Day Lewis married twice, and his complex love life was compounded by several affairs.

improbus implies that Dido is "a slave to an all-powerful tyrant",[56] at once suggests love's immoderation while portraying Dido as a victim of it.

Both Day Lewis and Ahl have retained all three apostrophes, and we can look to West to see the effect of removing the apostrophe to Love: "Love is a cruel master. There are no lengths to which it does not force the human heart". West's factual statement, in place of the apostrophe, gives the feeling of a knowledgeable narrator sympathetically expressing Dido's pain, rather than one who empathises with her, and provides less ambiguity over who is speaking: it is clearly the omniscient narrator. Jackson Knight also changes the voice of the apostrophe, but to quite different effect:

> What must have been Dido's thoughts when she saw all this movement, and how bitterly must she have sighed as she looked from her commanding citadel, and discerned the lively bustle along the shore and all the turmoil of loud confusion on the sea? Ah, merciless Love, is there any length to which you cannot force the human heart to go?
>
> *Aeneid* 409-415 (Jackson Knight)

Jackson Knight here omits the apostrophe to Dido, simply explaining her turmoil. By avoiding an apostrophe to Dido, he shows that he is no closer to her than us, and all he can do is despair at the situation. He asks "how

---

[56] R.D. Williams (1966).

bitterly she must have sighed," implying speculation rather than experience or knowledge. However, he keeps the apostrophe to Love, and renders it in such a way that it could be read as free indirect discourse from Dido here, suggested by the change of tense from past to present. Jackson Knight has avoided metaleptic intrusion with his own narrator in either simile, but this creates more space for Dido to partake in a speaking role. I refer to West and Jackson Knight here, firstly since Ahl and Day Lewis are unusually similar in their translation, and secondly to suggest a point about the effect of genre on translating apostrophe, where novelising choices might result in a more detached narratorial engagement. West and Jackson Knight make key alterations to the second apostrophe here: West to translate it as narrative statement, Jackson Knight to portray it as spoken by Dido.

This extract has shown the range of options available to translators in moments of apostrophe, to translate as omniscient narrator comment, character free indirect discourse, or a blend of voices. Even within narrator voice, Day Lewis' vocabulary choice showed how translators can alter the degree of sympathy and empathy. Next I look at some characters from the second half of the epic, firstly Pallas' opponents Larides and Thymber.

3.2.2 Larides and Thymber

This beautifully touching passage describes identical twins who are fatally physically distinguished by Pallas in battle. These artificial differences rid them of their indistinguishable nature, which Virgil tells us was a source of

confusion and delight to their parents. In this scene, moments before the death of Pallas, the narrator details some of his victims, evoking emotion and equalising the sides of the battle. At this point, Pallas is rejoicing victoriously, and our sympathy is for his victims. But Virgil's narrator is only playing with our response to pathos, and we know that soon the tables will be turned to show the futility of the fatalities; regardless of the outcome of this battle, the rejoicing Pallas will die in this war.

390 vos etiam, gemini, Rutulis cecidistis in arvis,
Daucia, Laride Thymberque, simillima proles,
indiscreta suis gratusque parentibus error;
at nunc dura dedit vobis discrimina Pallas.
nam tibi, Thymbre, caput Evandrius abstulit ensis;
395 te decisa suum, Laride, dextera quaerit
396 semianimesque micant digiti ferrumque retractant.

Aeneid 10.390-396

Virgil's narrator addresses the twins together at 390-391, with vocatives, second person pronouns and verbs, and then individually at 394-5. When describing Pallas' violent actions, his sword is *Euandrius*, 'of his father Evander', conveying the paternal theme which Virgil frequently uses to draw attention to familial grief. Juxtaposed with the grief of Pallas' victims, this reminds us of the grief which we know Evander will feel when it is Pallas' turn to die, as death and familial grief repeat in the endless cycle of short-lived and futile glory. Virgil ends this apostrophe by referring to the Arcadians, fired up by Pallas' actions, armed as they return to battle by *mixtus dolor et pudor*, indicating again the harsh reality of war, not the glorious, celebratory stance which we might expect of a proud imperial

epic. Unlike in the Dido episode, but not unusual for his translation generally, Day Lewis removes all three apostrophes here.

Larides and Thymber fell too on Italian soil:
They were twin brothers, exactly alike, the sons of Daucus-
Their parents could not tell them apart, and with happy affection
Mistook them. But Pallas now created a dreadful difference
Between them, for his sword swept off the head of Thymber,
While Larides – his severed right hand groped to find
Its owner, the half-alive fingers twitching, clutching at the sword-hilt.

Aeneid 10.390-396 (Day Lewis)

Daucus' sons, identical twins, Larides and Thymber –
Even their parents – and this confusion delighted them – could not
Tell them apart – you too died then in Rutulia's ploughlands.
Pallas supplies a grim way of distinguishing one from the other:
Thymber, he cuts off your head with Evander's sword, and Larides,
Your right hand, lopped off, now misses its master; its fingers
Still have a shadow of life: they twitch and they claw at the sword-hilt.

Aeneid 10.390-396 (Ahl)

Day Lewis does not address the Rutulian twins directly, and creates little emotional connection. He uses a detached past tense, with no hint of apostrophe. Whilst Day Lewis omits the apostrophe, Ahl translates all three apostrophes and moves vividly from a past tense when speaking about the event in the apostrophe, to present tense when describing their deaths in

the narrative. His disjointed syntax and haphazard dashes show confusion and reflect mutilation; his line is as disfigured as the victims he describes.[57]

By retaining the apostrophe here, Ahl creates a significant connection with the characters, and describes their fate more engagingly. Day Lewis, on the other hand, omits the apostrophe, and thus sounds comparatively distanced from the characters and the narrative. Next I shall analyse the apostrophe to Cydon, which shows how translators can affect the tone of the apostrophe (and thus alter the relationship to the character being addressed).

3.2.3 Cydon

Following a recent apostrophe to Tarchon, battle has been engaged, and the narrator recounts gruesome details on both sides. This depiction of the two equalising forces continues after the apostrophe to Cydon, as the Trojans and Latins are described as opposing winds, natural elements controlled by the gods, who are unstoppable and inevitable. Virgil describes the young men whom Cydon followed passionately, and says that he would have been killed by Aeneas, left to forget about his loves, had he not been saved by seven (the number evocative of Rome) brothers. The story is unusual in being one of escape, rather than a touching death scene,

[57] See Most (1992) on dismemberment and Latin style (407).

and can be read in contrasting ways. This interpretable apostrophe allows translators to suggest positive or negative interpretations, and therefore to evoke either positive or negative character empathy. If the engaging and compassionate nature of apostrophe can increase the effect of positive emotional attachment, its direct and accusatory qualities can equally amplify derogatory comment.

tu quoque, flaventem prima lanugine malas
dum sequeris Clytium infelix, nova gaudia, Cydon,
Dardania stratus dextra, securus amorum
qui iuvenum tibi semper erant, miserande iaceres,
ni fratrum stipata cohors foret obvia, Phorci
progenies, septem numero, septenaque tela
coniciunt;

Aeneid 10.324-330

Cydon too, the golden down of youth on his cheek still,
Poor Cydon, who'd come here to be with Clytius, his latest love,
Would have fallen pitiably to the Trojan's sword and lain there
Oblivious of all his youthful loves, his ruling passion,
Had not his brothers, the offspring of Phorcus, interposed
Themselves in a solid body; seven they were, and seven
Spears they threw,

Aeneid 10.324-330 (Day Lewis)

Cydon, you too could have died while chasing Clytius, your latest
Passion unfulfilled, cheeks showing the first trace of blond fuzz.
You'd have been hacked by Aeneas's sword, and released from your constant
Preoccupation with youthful amours. You'd be just a pathetic
Corpse if your brothers had not intervened, a platoon of them, Phorcus'

Sons – there were seven in all – discharging a volley of seven
330 Javelins.

Aeneid 10.324-330 (Ahl)

Day Lewis again omits the apostrophe to Cydon. He also interprets the address fairly negatively, adding "Oblivious of all his youthful loves, **his ruling passion**," where the additional phrase (apparently inspired by *semper*) indicates his weakness for sexual desire. He focuses here on Cydon's distraction, implying that more time spent focusing on military prowess might have changed his fate. Griffin's note to this line refers to it as "another homosexual touch… alien to Homeric epic".[58] The key aspect here is the portrayal of *virtus*. Whilst Day Lewis implies that more *virtus* would increase his prowess in battle, Ahl creates a closer connection with the Roman cultural context. Ahl creates an empathetic connection with Cydon through apostrophe, but uses it to negative effect, emphasising Aeneas' ruthlessness and Cydon's piteousness. His choice of "released" presents him as an elegiac lover, one suffering from *servitium amoris*,[59] with love depicted as a form of torture. Ahl perhaps takes a cue from *gaudia*, which Harrison notes is common of the beloved in love elegy, using

[58] C.A. Williams (2010) 126, 129 says that Virgil's depiction of Cydon's flings heightens the contrast between his familiar joyful experience and current pathetic situation. Williams uses this line as support for his argument that "pederastic relationships enjoy a comfortable presence in the world of the *Aeneid*".

[59] E.g. Ovid *Amores* 1.9.

it to explore generic allusion.[60] The (quite exaggerated) translation of *miserande iaceres* into "You'd be just a pathetic corpse" is strong, and allows Ahl to convey the complete hideousness of war. He is negative of love here in order to be negative of war, to show its victimisation of his characters. Ahl is not unsympathetic towards Cydon; in fact, readers may find his translation the most sympathetic, but only through portraying the gruesomeness of war in ways which condemn Cydon's situation. His adjective "pathetic" evokes pathos, though may also be taken by readers in a more modern sense, in which case the whole apostrophe reads a little differently. For brief comparison, Ruden's translation engages with Cydon and encourages empathy, showing how even a concise translation can achieve a great degree of sympathy. She gives "love", which conveys more sincere emotion than "passion". The sympathy for Cydon is at Aeneas' expense, described as "a Trojan hand | That turned all passion for young men to nothing."

> And you, poor Cydon, following Clytius,
> Your latest love, with blond down on his cheeks,
> Would have been brought down by a Trojan hand
> That turned all passion for young men to nothing,
> Had Phorcus' seven sons, your troop of brothers,
> Not hedged you closely, throwing seven spears.
>
> *Aeneid* 10.324-330 (Ruden)

[60] Harrison (1991).

Whilst all of these translators evoke pathos, they achieve this to different effects, using the narrator to control the extent to which the audience feels sympathy for Cydon, Aeneas' target. Day Lewis believes in man's individual power, whereas Ahl depicts the utterly devastating effects of war and its unreasonable demands for warriors to conduct themselves with false but unerring bravery. In the next extract, I analyse how sympathy is changed for a character through apostrophe, and how it can be used to negative end.

3.2.4 Oebalus

Virgil breaks away from his catalogue of warriors to address Oebalus, on the 'wrong side' as far as his protagonist is concerned, and reassures him that he will be immortalised in death. Virgil puts his narrator (and therefore the audience) close to Oebalus, develops his lament around the impact of war, and reinforces his equalising treatment of both sides of the conflict.

733 nec tu carminibus nostris indictus abibis,
734 Oebale,

Aeneid 7.733-4

Before this passage, the narrator briefly describes Oebalus' patronage, to build his identity; he is not mere narrative cannon-fodder, but has a history and a family. His direct address comprises a second person pronoun and vocative case. In *carminibus nostris* ('our songs'), Virgil's narrator deictically alludes to a plural voice which claims joint narrative ownership between him and the Muses, who had been asked at 7.641-646 to help him

describe this catalogue. Alternatively, the plural could be a stylistic poetic plural for singular, or could be a metapoetic reference to the narrator and his audience; the narrative song, after all, does not exist without a listener.

733 Oebalus, you won't escape a citation in our writs of epic
734 Either.

Aeneid 7.733-4 (Ahl)

733 Then Oebalus must not go unhonoured and unsung –

Aeneid 7.733-4 (Day Lewis)

Day Lewis once again does not provide an apostrophe. However, even without this engagement, the effect of his phrase is a positive reading of Virgil. He changes, and interprets, the meaning of *carminibus nostris*, rendering it as "unhonoured", implying that the song of remembrance, ascribing it as an honourable quality. Although the gift he promises is a positive one, he removes personal involvement from the narrative, using the impersonal "unsung". Despite not having the direct connection of the apostrophe, what he writes is respectful and sympathetic.

However, conveying a different narrator-character relationship, Ahl does include an apostrophe, and uses it to negative effect. The words "writ" and "citation" have intriguing connotations: 'writ' can imply a formal, legal written record, while 'citation' has academic connotations and alludes to the official honours lists, but also to a court summons. Additionally, the use of "escape" and the accusatory "either" on the next line add to this ambiguous tone. Unlike Day Lewis, Ahl implies that the catalogue is not

heroic or celebratory, a list spoken in awe, but rather a list shaming guilty convicts, receiving the punishment they deserve by recording their names in history. The apostrophe here allows him to make a direct accusation, acting as a court judge; indeed, he explains his translation of 'writ' as legal in his footnote, taking a cue from *carmina*, which often has legal connotations. Ahl has made his translation ambiguous here, and comes across as being ambivalent towards epic itself, exploring irony and metapoetry: he asserts that his translation may offer the same commemorative status, which complicates, and potentially devalues, epic memory as currency. Ahl has interpreted Virgil here as being radically ambivalent, suggesting that, while memory compensates for death on some level, it can never fully compensate. As such, his translation to Oebalus, which appears harsh, scathing and sarcastic, actually accuses epic for its complicity in death and war.

Both of these authors agree to commemorate Oebalus. Ahl addresses him directly, to create engagement, but Day Lewis does not. However, for Ahl, the idea of immortalisation for one's part in battle is a negative, almost defamatory, activity, whereas for Day Lewis it is honourable and celebratory. Ahl's retention of the apostrophe, in this instance, functions to strengthen the effect of the accusation: on one level, negative of Oebalus, on another level, sympathetic with him and negative towards war. This difference in attitude to war can be perceived as a reflection on the different effects of World War Two and the Vietnam War on not only critical readings of Virgil but also cultural consciousness. Even though the

figure of a World War Two hero was complicated already, the idea of heroism in the context of the Vietnam war is inevitably tainted, in a Lucanian manner, by implication of war crime. The narrator can choose to paint the character in a more positive or negative way, and, indeed, both translators have interpreted Virgil here: there is little to indicate honour (Day Lewis) or disgrace (Ahl). Again, as in the Cydon address, this shows that apostrophe and sympathy do not necessarily correlate. The effect of apostrophe however is metaleptic, having the narrator switch his addressee and deconstruct the walls of narrative.

*****

Whether apostrophes are included or omitted does not necessarily correlate with narrator sympathy, which can be achieved in equal amounts with a favourable subjective description. The effect of apostrophe is rather to emotionally and personally connect the narrator to a character, either for honour and glorification, for mutual grief, or to chastise. These examples have shown how translators can achieve different narrative effects through their translation of apostrophe: alteration of speaker and addressee, amendment of emotional connection, removal of apostrophe, evocation of sympathy or empathy, personal comment on the narrative. Translators' treatment of these motifs can be used to present different views on the epic's characters, and expose different narrative subjectivities in translation. These apostrophes have all focused on story comment mode, addressing characters to reflect on the narrative events or situation. In the

next section, I will look at apostrophes which expose the construction of the narrative, those which are in narrative comment mode.

3.3 NARRATIVE COMMENT (MUSE APOSTROPHE)

3.3.1 The narrator's Muse

Virgil's narrator addresses a Muse to ask for inspiration, for help in recalling the story, or for support when recounting a particularly emotional episode. These apostrophes often signal to the audience a particularly significant event,[61] and indicate the narrator's prestige by suggesting his reliability is guaranteed by the Muse's co-operation and authority.[62] Muse apostrophe deconstructs the narrative, proving that it is not granted to the narrator impersonally, nor is it self-productive, whilst mirroring and reflecting "the doubts and desires of the person producing it".[63] Whilst, to some extent, apostrophe to a Muse should be understood as ritual adherence to Homeric precedent and epic convention, they also offer critical exposure of the type of narrator telling the story, and their relationship to the narrative.[64] In Virgil's case, his narrator does not exist purely to organise material received from the Muse, as in Apollonius, but rather to conduct a process of selection ("he need not tell all he knows")

---

[61] Block (1982) 11.
[62] D'Alessandro Behr (2005) 193.
[63] D'Alessandro Behr (2005) 198.
[64] D'Alessandro Behr (2005) 196.

and explanation.[65] Generally, Virgil's subjective and challenging voice does not lead us to believe that he is relaying information from the Muse in an obediently objective epic voice.[66]

Hesiod introduces the Muses with the line: "We know to tell many lies that sound like truth, | But we know to sing reality, when we will".[67] Since Hesiod, the nine canonical Muses continue to be invoked across many literary genres, but the concept of an inspirational source is also more widely applied. At the beginning of the *Pharsalia*, it is the citizens which Lucan addresses,[68] and other invoked figures include other major or lesser divinities, emperors, mistresses, patrons, and the community.[69] Rosati has explored parallels between the poet's relationship with the Muse and with the emperor, who takes on an inspirational function and becomes an "imperial quasi-Muse", ensuring that the work promotes an appropriate message.[70] More abstractly, Nuttall suggests that Homer plays a similar

---

[65] The quote is Feeney's (1991) 184, who also points to Conte (1986) 171-2 and Putnam (1987, reprinted 1995, 73-99).

[66] Lyne (1987) 230-5. Cf. Cavarero (2002) 56: "the Muses' omnipresence and perfect memory confer an objective status of reality and truth on the story".

[67] *Theogony* 27-8. Pucci (1977) on how only the Muses know if what they tell is truth or falsity (1, 8-16) and on the paradox of Hesiod's confidence in his own Muse-inspired narrative, while telling of their blind duplicity (1). Also Spentzou (2002) 1, 9. Virgilian ambiguity is compounded by an additional unreliable level of mediation: the original tale provided by the Muses may be true or false.

[68] Gowing (2005) 84.

[69] Spentzou (2002) 22.

[70] Rosati (2002) 238, talking specifically on Statius.

role, by providing literary inspiration.[71] When Aeneas begins his narrative in book 2, his words *infandum, regina, iubes renovare dolorem* (2.3) cast Dido in the role of Muse, playing the part of both his audience and his inspiration.[72]

The fact that Muses are so much a part of epic convention, and thus critically important for Virgil, distances them from twentieth or twenty-first century translators who are trying to make Virgil's text familiar and readable to their audiences: "Modern readers often view apostrophe as an obstacle to realism".[73] Inclusion of such a culturally specific motif may defamiliarise the narrative, both from its own narrator and from its audience, and make it resemble more of an historical artefact, far removed from its target culture and their conventions. Translators therefore face a choice: either to translate these invocations, or to remove them. However, the decision is far from binary. If the translator retains the invocations, they must choose how to interact with the Muses. As the text is rewritten and recreated during the translation process, the translator must coordinate their position relative to the Muses and to the storytelling role, and thus position themselves as either in creative control of their text, or as reliant on divine assistance. A greater degree of reliance on the Muses depicts

---

[71] Nuttall (1992) 14.
[72] Laird (2002) 126. Lovatt (forthcoming).
[73] Laird (2002) 128.

narrative anxiety and uncertainty, whilst foregrounding the collaborative and multi-vocal qualities of the narrative. By contrast, depreciating the role of the Muse in the narrative's construction gives the impression of confident and independent authorial ownership, not restricted to the confines of a pre-existing story. The narrator can thus either reveal or obfuscate the text's status as collaborative endeavour, drawing attention to its polyphony or cloaking it as a single-authored text (foregrounding either Virgil or the translator as that single author). Less reliance on the Muse may domesticate the text and prioritise translation fluency (at least, to those unfamiliar with the source text), while more reliance may historicise the text and result in greater translation visibility. Changing the role of the Muse in the creation of the narrative has consequences of power which reflect back to the audience, as Laird suggests, since there is a power balance between speaker and addressee, and thus between text and reader, which relates to the audience's perception of the poet's relationship to the Muse.[74] Therefore, there is a two way construction of narrative authority: a translator's alteration of Muse apostrophes exerts a different degree of power over the narrative, whilst other elements of the narrative voice affect the audience's expectation of the Muse's authority and relationship to the narrator.

---

[74] Laird (2002) 136, 140, referring to Bourdieu (1991) on power balance communicated via language, in terms of class, gender and politics, and his own earlier work (Laird [1999] 1-43) for a more detailed discussion of the implications of power in literary texts.

As well as their exposure of narrative construction, Muse invocations also pose difficulties for translators since they are so intrinsically related to the context of epic orality,[75] signifying a 'live performance' of narrative fertilisation, which Bakker claims is not a now 'in' the text, but the now 'of' the text.[76] Traditional oral reception had a bearing on contemporary poets' processes, and so whilst the oral poet "will as a matter of empirical fact experience his own performance as flowing from sources above or beneath ego-control," the modern translator cannot empathise with this, as he is likely to work by continuous editing and reflecting upon the process of composition, becoming "privy to the genesis of his own art".[77] While character apostrophes are generally metaleptic, pausing narrative time to address a character and comment on their emotions or situation, Muse apostrophes exaggerate this function, as the narrator 'turns away' from the story to comment, metapoetically, on his narrating process itself.

Crucially for translators, their relationship to the Muse also unearths questions of meaning. Sharrock questions where the power to create text and meaning lies in the *Metamorphoses*, suggesting that: "The epic pose gives authority to the Muse, and therefore denies room for the reader or

---

[75] Laird (2002) 137: "Simply by virtue of being subject to invocation, Muses are both evocative and emblematic of poetry as performance."

[76] Bakker (2009) 124.

[77] Nuttall (1992) 4.

even the poet to contribute to the production of meaning".[78] In Virgil, the creation of meaning is a contest held in tense suspension between the Muse, the narrator, and other narrative voices and focalisers, organised by Virgil but overseen by his readers and translators, whose knowledge of the ancient world and its literature will shape their individual interpretation. Specifically, the authorial relationship between translator and author (a relationship which is constructed by the translator, but guided by contemporary norms), reflects, to some degree, the relationship between Muse and author. As such, the Muse which Virgil's narrator invokes for information, almost becomes Virgil himself in translation, or, in reverse, Virgil translates from the Muses (for those who do not have direct access to speak to them) in the same way as the translator translates from Virgil (for those who do not have direct access to reading the original Latin).[79] Indeed, Jackson Knight believed that he could connect with Virgil via a spirit medium, to ask questions about his translation, which more overtly replicates the ancient concept of using special privilege to access information and inspiration from a divine being (the Muses).[80] In the same way as the Muse provides the creative catalyst for the original author, that author provides equal inspiration to the translator. The ways in which

[78] Sharrock (2002) 208-9.

[79] Laird (2002) 131 notes similarity between the God -> Divine Messenger -> Mortal Addressee relationship and that between the Muses -> Epic Poet -> Audience/Reader.

[80] Wilson Knight (1975) 15, 340, 382.

translators speak about their processes also mirrors ancient thought on the concept of the Muses; Venuti notes the oft-cited analogy of the translated text as the "body animated by the foreign writer's soul," which recalls, aside from the etymological parallel ('inspire' – *inspiro*, 'I breathe in'), Pucci's metaphor of the Muse's presence as an "animating spiritual breath".[81]

In this section, I will look at three apostrophes to examine ways in which translators relate to the Muses, exposing their narrator's identity and construction of the narrative.

3.3.2 Epic openings: 1.8-11

In book 1, the first apostrophe establishes the narrator's relationship with the Muse, and introduces the poem's genre, subject and central themes.[82] During the proem, Virgil's narrator accomplishes many things. He tells us his thematic topics for the poem, he begins to build Aeneas' character through describing his journey from one homeland to found another, he introduces Juno's bitterness towards the Trojans, and he constructs the identity of his narrator, calling upon a Muse to assist him with understanding the background to his epic. The characterisation of Juno, together with the complicating factors of 'fate' and the general 'gods' that Aeneas carries with him from Troy, contributes towards establishing the

---

[81] Venuti (1993) 214. Pucci (1977) 19-21, 28.

[82] Perkell (1999) 29-33, 49.

poem's divine artistry.[83] Feeney argues against Williams' view which layers the unreal gods as decoration overlaid upon the realistic world of human action, but agrees with Johnson, that the gods are constructed and driven by the same energy which motivates the epic's human characters, and which contributes to the poem's authenticity rather than contradicting it.[84]

Starting with a Muse invocation is very much a part of epic convention, but Virgil has a few words to say before he does so. In the first person verb, *cano*, a deviation from the traditional imperative prayer instruction, the narrator asserts "his own literate sovereignty".[85] By opening this way, Virgil both complies with epic convention, and asserts his individuality in an act of grammatical rebellion, calling upon the Muse "not as a primal source of power but as an ancillary aide-memoire or expert witness".[86] Combined with the provocative and demanding questions which he asks in the opening lines, Virgil's opening here sets out the complex relationship which he will have with the Muses throughout, as they jointly construct the narrative. At the end of this apostrophe, Virgil's question reinforces the disbelief of his narrator, and the need to seek answers to seemingly

---

[83] Feeney (1991) 130.

[84] Feeney (1991) 134-5, 172, 173, 175, referring to Johnson (1976) 146 and G. Williams (1983). Feeney refers to the latter's view as "a fundamental unwillingness to come to terms with the genre", which "elides entire dimensions of meaning and effect".

[85] Nuttall (1992) 220. Feeney (1991) 186 calls the narrator's voice here "unsubordinated".

[86] Nuttall (1992) 3. See also Perkell (1999) 29-33.

incomprehensible questions from a divine source. This invocation for justification rather than appeal for inspiration, and the tension between being omniscient and ignorant,[87] is unusual in itself, and further complicated by the challenging tone in which Virgil asks the question. His search for justification "cuts to the heart of the meaning of the world order" in ways which more closely mimic the chorus of tragedy rather than the Homeric narrator.[88]

This first Muse apostrophe is the only one in the epic's first half (there are 5 in the second half), as Juno, source of remembering wrath and responsible for inciting war and fury in Latium, the Muse and the creating "I" merge into one voice, with the concerning implication that the poem has roots in Juno's feelings.[89] Virgil's narrator has clearly set out to be both demanding and subjective from the start of the epic, establishing his identity, his ownership over the narrative and his power over its telling.[90] Spentzou argues that the question indicates the narrator's fear or anger over what the Muse will relate to him.[91] This differentiates Virgil from Homer; whilst the *Odyssey* outlines a just world which rewards the good

[87] D'Alessandro Behr (2007) reads this apostrophe, and that at 12.500-4, in this way (27-28).

[88] C. Segal (1981) 70.

[89] Putnam (2001) 176-8.

[90] D'Alessandro Behr (2007) 17-18.

[91] Spentzou (2002) 16.

and punishes the bad, the *Aeneid* is not motivated by the same philosophy, and the plot is instead driven by irrational evil from gods, mortals and from nature itself.[92] The gods function to constantly remind the reader of the "incomprehensible currents of violence for order which are at the heart of the poem and its empire", and Juno's role in particular is a reflection of that.[93] Indeed, no answer is given to the question in Virgil's proem, and instead he finds himself asking a similar question to the gods at the end of his epic (12.500-505), showing that nothing has been resolved.[94]

8 Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso
Quidve dolens regina deum tot volvere casus
10 Insignem pietate virum, tot adire labores
11 Impulerit. Tantaene animis caelestibus irae?

Aeneid 1.8-11

The narrator directly addresses the Muse with the alliterative combination of vocative noun (*Musa*), imperative verb (*memora*), and personal pronoun (*mihi*), as he asks that the reasons for Juno's anger be told to him personally (*mihi*). Virgil's narrator is not asking the Muse to tell us the events, but rather to tell him, so that he can describe them to us. He is setting his

[92] Perkell (1999) 29-33.

[93] Feeney (1991) 150-1, 131 on Juno standing for Carthage, Rome's biggest and most feared enemy, showing that any historical statement the poem makes will be indistinguishable from its underlying divine presence: "The twin motivation of Juno's hate fixes the time of the poem's action in its own limbo between myth and history."

[94] Perkell (1999) 29-33.

position as the interpreter of the story, a role which he refers to at several points later on in the narrative, a character who will be given divine secrets which he has the duty of telling to us. Such apostrophes to the Muse bridge the gap between the Muses' divine connection with past events and the author's connection with his contemporary audience; the narrator is the bridge between the Muse's history and their posterity; between himself and the story he tells.[95]

The exclamatory nature of this apostrophe shows the narrator's surprise, and heightens our impression of Aeneas' character. The fact that the narrator cannot understand Juno's possible objection to Aeneas expresses judgement that he, a character of the utmost quality (the laden word *pietas* indicates 'the performance of all duties to gods, parents, kinsman, friends and country'), is undeserving of Juno's bitterness.[96] As well as characterising him in a favourable light, the narrator focuses on a description of the trials which he has undergone (emphasised by the repetition of *tot* and the juxtaposition of his piety with Juno's shallow anger).

Translation of this apostrophe alters the extent to which the narrator is reliant on their Muse, and therefore the relationship and power balance

---

[95] Seider (2012) 260.

[96] Conington (1884, 2007 ed.).

between the original author and the translator. But Virgil's apostrophe here subjectively shows the relationship between the narrator, the gods and Aeneas, which is also open to translator interpretation.

8 Muse, let the memories spill through me. What divine will was wounded,
What deep hurt made the queen of the gods thrust a famously righteous
10 Man into so many spirals of chance to face so many labours?
11 Anger so great: can it really reside in the spirits of heaven?

Aeneid 1.8-11 (Ahl)

8 Where lay the cause of it all? How was her godhead injured?
What grievance made the queen of heaven so harry a man
10 Renowned for piety, through such toils, such a cycle of calamity?
11 Can a divine being so persevere in anger?

Aeneid 1.8-11 (Day Lewis)

Ahl clearly shows his stance as interpreter to the Muses, demonstrating his reliance on them, with "let the memories spill through me", whereas Day Lewis' "Where lay the cause of it all" has no defined addressee, let alone any reference to a divine appeal. He omits the invocation, but still asks direct questions (to an unidentified addressee). He does little to create a relationship here with the historic narrative and author, but instead seems to be rhetorically engaging his audience.

Day Lewis and Ahl both show a degree of sympathy towards Juno here ("grievance" and "deep hurt"), and Ahl can be seen to inherit Day Lewis' "toils… cycle of calamity" in his own "spirals of chance…labours". For

comparison, West's narrator shows quite different subjectivity here. Contrasting with Ahl and Day Lewis, he gives the disastrous and unenviable "such endless hardship and such suffering". Early in the passage, he deviates uncharacteristically far from *numen* and *quid dolens*, perhaps for domesticating clarity, giving the strong verb "violate", and a separate sentence to ask "What was his offence?", where the definite existence of *an offence*, together with the possessive pronoun, implies that a crime was actively committed by Aeneas. This could be read as more empathetic towards Juno, making steps to justify her hatred. Alternatively, he could be exaggerating her punitive harshness in order to present her as an object of ridicule, her accusations an absurd contrast with Aeneas' piety.

> Tell me, Muse, the causes of her anger. How did he violate the will of the Queen of the Gods? What was his offence? Why did she drive a man famous for his piety to such endless hardship and such suffering? Can there be so much anger in the hearts of the heavenly gods?
>
> *Aeneid* 1.8-11 (West)

Painting Aeneas' journey primarily as an exciting epic adventure heightens his role as active protagonist, in an imperialistic manner, whilst West's more negative description emphasises the role of the gods in creating his suffering, but also subsequently his enduring strength of character.

3.3.3 Greater beginnings: 7.37-45

Near the start of book 7, a Muse invocation parallels that of the proem in book 1, indicating a new beginning and a fresh creative force.[97] Its position 40 lines into the book, rather than at its opening, is unusual.[98] Aeneas and his men are sailing away from Cumae, when he catches sight of the Tiber, and the site of future Rome. Virgil apostrophises Erato as he prepares to start the second half of his epic, asking the Muse for advice and assistance in the telling of savage wars and kings driven to death.

37 nunc age, qui reges, Erato, quae tempora, rerum[99]
quis Latio antiquo fuerit status, advena classem
cum primum Ausoniis exercitus appulit oris,
40 expediam, et primae revocabo exordia pugnae.
tu vatem, tu, diva, mone. dicam horrida bella,
dicam acies, actosque animis in funera reges,
Tyrrhenamque manum totamque sub arma coactam
Hesperiam. maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo,
45 maius opus moveo.

Aeneid 7.37-45

When he addresses Erato, Virgil uses a mixture of first person verbs spoken by the narrator and imperatives directed to the Muse in order to signal his narrator's position, and the assistance he needs to tell the story. He repeats

---

[97] Mack (1999) 128, 131.

[98] Basson (1975) 97-111.

[99] Both Day Lewis and Ahl seem to deviate from Mynors' (1969) punctuation here, reading *tempora rerum* rather than *tempora, rerum*.

the structure of one imperative followed by two first person verbs: *age, expediam, revocabo… mone, dicam, dicam*. Both first person verbs and imperatives emphasise that he is in control, but he requires the presence of the Muse for support, advice, and information. By delaying the main verb *expediam* in the first phrase until after the list of objects, he emphasises his dependency on the Muse to answer these questions first and tell him the information before he can then tell the audience. The line positioning is also emphatic, with *dicam* and *revocabo* in a similar position in the line, and the second *dicam* at the start of the next line, in the same position as *expediam*. There are thus four first person verbs, in emphatic positions, in the space of three lines, emphasising that he is speaking, and he is in control, whilst the Muse is a supporting and advisory presence. The partnership between narrator and Muse is emphasised in line 41, where *tu* is repeated, with *vatem* and *diva* mixed in between the pronouns, showing how the two authorial forces cannot be extricated.

The same creative interaction, collaboration, or perhaps tension, between narrator and Muse can be seen at the end of the passage, with a final first person verb *moveo* conflicting with the impersonal verb *nascitur*, which implies that this greater order of events has existed conceptually for a long time, in prophecies, portents and visions.[100] The narrator is presented as

[100] Basson (1975) 115.

the mediator, setting in motion something which first has to be born to him. He is not the originator of the story; while he has control over the telling, he is not directing the action. He is the voice, but the Muse provides the words; he is the poet, she the poem.[101] In narrative terminology, the Muse represents the link between the *story* and the *narrative*; she is responsible for the story, but the narrator creates the narrative by which to constrain and bind it.[102] Just as at the start of this passage, when each first person verb relied on an imperative, the grammar here thus reflects the dependence of the narrator on his Muse. That Virgil's narrator is grammatically neither independent nor the originator of this extract points to a collaborative effort, but also provokes a certain amount of tension: neither the Muse nor the narrator can claim ownership over this poem, but they rather exist in a constant struggle for inspiration and independence.[103]

37 Come now, Erato! Who were the kings? What happened at which time?
What kind of state was the Latium of old when that immigrant army
First drove its vessels to land on the shores of Ausonia? All this
40 I will explain, I'll recall what led to the start of the fighting.
You, goddess, prompt your seer. I'll speak about hideous warfare,

---

[101] Sharrock (2002) 224.

[102] Cavarero (2002) 58.

[103] Sharrock (2002) 207, 219.

I'll speak of battles, of kings who were driven to death by their courage,
What part Etruscans played, how Hesperia's whole land was bullied
Into the fight. As the worldview birthing within me is greater.
45 *My* labour's greater too.

Aeneid 7.37-45 (Ahl)

37 Come, Muse of Love, let me rehearse the kings, the phase of History, and the conditions that reigned in antique Latium
When first that expedition arrived upon the beaches
40 Of Italy: I'll recall what first led to the war there.
Speak through me, then, Spirit of Song! Grim wars I'll tell of,
And battlefronts, and princes courageous unto death,
The levies of the Etruscans, aye, all Hesperia mustered
In arms. A grander train of events is now before me,
45 A grander theme I open.

Aeneid 7.37-45 (Day Lewis)

Erato is an unusual choice for invocation here, as she usually appears in love poetry, though this fact may go unnoticed by a non-specialist modern audience. Not those of Day Lewis' translation however, since he brings her connotations to the fore, translating "Muse of Love". Griffin's accompanying notes suggest that Erato is chosen because of the love story between Turnus, Lavinia and Aeneas.[104] This is odd, since, although the erotic

[104] Griffin (1986). R.D. Williams (1966) agrees. Mack (1999) 129, 132 justifies Virgil's choice by saying that Erato is invoked for inspiration in a book that is "infused from beginning to end with Vergil's love for his native land" (129). Basson (1975) suggests, summarising thought on both sides, it is either: a general Muse apostrophe (with Erato's personal identity of no significance), or it is a reference to Apollonius Rhodius' Arg. 3.1.ff (99-100). Whilst Virgil may well have had Apollonius in mind, this does not preclude other reader interpretations, and love and war are tightly linked at other places in the *Aeneid.* See Nelis (2001) on

subplot underpins the main plot, the primary subject matter which Virgil asks Erato to help him with is the war which will rage for the next 6 books of his epic. Day Lewis has therefore clarified the identity of the Muse invoked here, and Griffin's explanation supports his choice. His omission of *advena* is semantically significant: compare his translation of the "expedition" with Ahl's "immigrant army", where Ahl emphasises the invasion being led by Aeneas, a point which Day Lewis chooses to gloss over. Day Lewis also positively portrays the "princes courageous unto death"; compare Ahl's "kings who were driven to death by their courage", and Jackson Knight, who gives the harsher "princes whose proud spirit drove them to their deaths". He also, imperialistically and triumphantly suggests that he is about to begin a "grander" sequence of events; Jackson Knight gives "graver", a subjective translation of *maior*, which implies that the narrator himself considers this episode to be more sombre.

Day Lewis' translation of *expediam* as "let me rehearse" connotes a scripted play, where the outcome is known and the plot practised. But it also suggests that he is interpreting what he is telling us in a freer mode of adaptation, like an actor would interpret a script. The subjunctive for him indicates a request for permission, and indeed, "let me" emphasises the

---

how it will soon become clear that erotic motivations drive the wars which Virgil describes.

literal meaning of a request much more than the colloquial "let's", which, for modern readers, has come to lose the implication of requiring permission. In line 40, he involves himself in the imperative, demanding the Muse "Speak through me". This is an ambiguous phrase in terms of narrative control: for the Muse to literally speak through him may mean that all of the sentiments belong to the Muse, and the narrator simply allows them to be formed into words, but metaphorically it could indicate that the knowledge is passed to the narrator who then chooses to present it in the way that they see fit, perhaps undergoing significant alteration. This could be analogous to his role as translator, where he acts as an interpreter without too much control over the narrative content, enabling Virgil to speak through him. Perhaps the ambiguity implies that different levels of control may be exerted at different points of the narrative, as the translator deems appropriate. Day Lewis sees himself as an interpreter needing permission. The Muse (or Virgil) speaks through him, and he interprets where he sees fit. This raises important questions about translation generally. If the reader does not know the original text, they will never appreciate differences in translation, or how much control the translator exerts over the epic.

Ahl chooses to emphasise the support his narrator requires from the Muse, playing down his own status as narrator by increasing reliance on external assistance. He recognises Virgil's echo in *dicam horrida bella* to the Sibyl's words at 6.86, *bella, horrida bella*, an "explicit warning that the past will still haunt the future" (Ahl consistently translates "hideous warfare", Day

Lewis does not).[105] Ahl begins by desperately listing questions separated into different sentences, with the main first person verb delayed until line 40 – mirroring the Latin syntax, and emphasising the fact that he needs her to tell him the information before he can tell it to us. He demands the information from the Muse, which he does not naturally know, before he can commit to telling it to us. He omits an active first person verb for *moveo*, in favour of "My labour's greater too", which implies that the telling of the story is something of a burden inflicted upon him. His possession over this task is highlighted by the italicisation of *My,* emphasising the challenge of this part of the poem for him as a storyteller, but also for his characters and his audience. He is playing a subservient role to the Muse, performing the burdensome labour, without exercising any creative control or responsibility.

The word "labour" connotes pregnancy and childbirth, made more obvious here by Ahl's use of the verb "birthing" in line 44. Gender roles are reversed as the female Muse impregnates the (generally assumed to be male) narrator, and now the narrator must give birth to the narrative. This metaphor, in fact, proves quite illustrative for both narrative and translation. The translator cannot conceive alone, the seed has to be planted within him by the Muse, and the act of telling the story in a new

[105] C. Segal (1966) 57.

language is similar to the act of labour. The event is a natural one, but also physically painful, and the narrator is both at its mercy, and also controlling his own sense of destiny whilst bringing a new life into the world. Ahl's translation is sensational, provocative, and expects engagement from his readers.

Gender underlines the epic voice, the male speaker of epic (a male genre) is subordinate to the power of the female Muses, "the goddess-Muse of epic contributes to making epic a 'male' genre with a feminized, depowered speaker… the depowerment of the speaker as active agent of meaning is brought about by his subjection to the voice of the powerful female speaker, the Muse."[106] Providing not only the ultimate source of knowledge, but a specifically feminine voice, Putnam argues that the Muses have a part in the "overarching codification of female artistry in the poem".[107] Lada-Richards specifically mentions that Hesiod's succession myth contains an analogy between the belly or womb and the mouth (of the narrator).[108]

As translators, both Ruden and Day Lewis recognise the importance of adopting feminine subordination.[109] Day Lewis believed male poets had an

---

[106] Sharrock (2002) 225-7.
[107] Putnam (2001) 178.
[108] Lada-Richards (2002) 77.
[109] See above pp24-25.

obligation to find their "feminine streak", to possess a "submissive quality, the gift of passively accepting and conceiving […] to absorb whatever they may need […] indiscriminately and unawares", which the poet must then actively "choose, reject, piece together, shape, comprehend".[110] Despite his statement, his translation here asserts more the "unsubordinated" stance which Feeney reads in this apostrophe as well as the first (1.8-11), proved through the combination of invocation and first person verbs spoken in his own voice.[111]

In this episode, Ahl is reliant on the Muse, and therefore perhaps he sees his role of translator as being reliant on his original author. Ahl's "labour" refers to the unstoppable occurrence of a natural event, which will cause pain but ultimately create a new life, where the text (or Virgil) impregnates him and he births it in a new language. Ahl provocatively demands that we pay attention to the construction of his authority, whereas Day Lewis hides its construction. For Day Lewis, Virgil is calm and in control, whereas for Ahl he is overwhelmed by his subject matter, feminised by his lack of power and control.

---

[110] Day Lewis (1960) 56-7.

[111] Feeney (1991) 186.

3.3.4 Reassurance: 7.641-646

Next I shall look at a similar example from the end of book 7, in which the narrator asks for the Muses' memory to assist in the telling of the catalogue of battle-ready warriors. This invocation has a slightly different tone, since the narrator's request is not emotional justification, but rather information, calling upon the goddess' special gifts for memory of statistical detail.[112]

641 pandite nunc Helicona, deae, cantusque movete,
…
645 et meministis enim, divae, et memorare potestis;
646 ad nos vix tenuis famae perlabitur aura.

Aeneid 7.641, 645-6

Virgil's narrator directly addresses the Muses using imperatives which bookend the line: *pandite* and *movete*. The object of *movete* is *cantus*, literally meaning "set in motion the song". A few lines later, the narrator addresses the Muses using two second person plural verbs, *meministis* and *potestis*. He knows they remember the story, and the power lies with them to tell it. As the Muses are telling him the information which he must retell to us, he is not responsible for what he is about to tell, and has not determined the content – he is purely a messenger, or, to use terminology applied by both Pucci and Sharrock, he is a "mouthpiece", or a receptacle

[112] Conington (1884, 2007 ed.).

for the Muse's song.[113] His power as storyteller is diminished, though he still boasts the ability to access information from divine beings which would otherwise be unattainable for us, as is his accountability for the narrative content, in a move which might purposefully absolve him of blame. The apostrophe ends with the narrator stating that only a whisper of the rumour has reached 'us' (*nos*), an ambiguous plural, showing the difference between the Muses who know everything and the few people who learn a select amount of it. The plural, also observed in the Oebalus apostrophe in *carminibus nostris*, heightens the collaborative creativity at work here. The apostrophe differs significantly from the last extract: there are no first person verbs here, and the narrator has completely detached himself from the narrative. He has less ownership over the text, and all of the telling is done by the Muses. He is simply on the end of a rumour, like his audience. This apostrophe therefore shows that he is distancing himself further from the narrative than he at the beginning of book 7. Perhaps, after the tension built during this book and the announcement of the approaching catalogue of ships, he wishes to relinquish creative responsibility over this narrative.

641 Goddesses, open up Helicon now, set your music in motion,
…
645 Goddesses, you can remember it all and recite it from memory.

---

[113] Pucci (1977) 29. Sharrock (2002) 211.

646 We, though, feel hardly the slenderest breath of a rumour
from those days.

Aeneid 7.641, 645-6 (Ahl)

641 Muses, throw Helicon wide now! Inspire me to tell the tale.
…
645 For you are divine, you remember it all, you can recount it –
646 All that for me has become the faint whisper of antique
story.

Aeneid 7.641, 645-6 (Day Lewis)

Ahl maintains the imperatives, directly addressing the Muses. However, he ascribes a second person possessive pronoun to *cantus*, giving "your music". This has the effect of distancing him from the narrative (even more than Virgil's narrator does), as he transfers ownership of the poem (which is not signified by any pronoun in the Latin) to the Muses. This contrasts with his translation of *nos* as "we" (646), where retaining the plural must here signify Ahl and posterity in general. He does not know the details of the story, just like his audience, and together we are reliant on the Muses for information. In this way, he foreignizes the text and reminds his audience of the distance between them and Virgil's tale. He therefore seeks a similar effect to Virgil, and the apostrophe performs for him a similar function. Ahl's translation of *Fama* as "rumour" perhaps reflects his exposure to critical discourse, especially the work of Hardie, when compared with Day Lewis' less concrete "faint whisper".[114]

[114] Hardie (2011).

Day Lewis' translation uses direct address to the Muses with imperatives, but instead asks them "Inspire me to tell", to indicate that it is his song that needs setting in motion (not the Muse's, as Ahl suggested).[115] He opts for "me" on the last line, where the use of the first person singular pronoun, not the plural indicated by the Latin, positions his narrator as an independent creative function. Day Lewis shows that he is closer to the centre of the narrated world, and brings the story closer to his audience, in contrast to Ahl, who was more reliant on his Muse to give him access to this unattainable story. Day Lewis' request "inspire me to tell" contrasts sharply with Ahl's "set your music in motion", and consolidates Day Lewis' position as original storyteller, presenting a new, domesticated work to a new audience.

In this apostrophe, Ahl relies heavily on the Muse's input, whereas Day Lewis exists independently as a narrative storyteller. Ahl is defamiliarising and anti-authoritarian and allows much room for questioning, while Day Lewis seeks to conceal the narrative seams and domesticate the text (and its genre), allowing the narrative process more authority. Ahl's approach, a product of its critical discourse, intensifies the tensions lurking within

[115] See also 10.163, where both translators give a similar translation, consolidating their pronoun choices ("my" for Day Lewis, "you" for Ahl).

Virgilian poetics, while Day Lewis smooths and flattens narrative irregularities.

3.4 CONCLUSIONS

Through apostrophe, Virgil connects to the past and to Homeric epic tradition, whilst ensuring that his narrative is formed of, and subsequently occupies, a secure place within contemporary social memory. Apostrophe is a traditional epic motif, displaying its oral quality and its foundations in memories of the past, whether historical or mythical, and constructs a tight relationship between the narrator, the divine forces which oversee the events which he recounts, and the characters, from whom he is physically distanced but emotionally connected.

Invocations, and in particular the concept of the Muse, are far removed from modern audiences. Their presence may appear to foreignize the text, and, as such, a domesticating translator may be driven, by generic motivations or to better fit contemporary styles of writing, to modify instances of apostrophe. Translation has the power to make the strange familiar, or to maintain its strangeness in order to assert its difference. Changing apostrophes in this way may have a subsequent influence on the relationship between the narrator, the text and its characters, shifting the power balance of authority and changing narrative sympathy. Beyond this text, this can reflect on the context's relationship to epic genre, and to classical texts.

The fact that apostrophes are essentially performative might have led us to expect Day Lewis to more assertively maintain them. However, his translation has shown that he prioritises domesticating methods over performative, since he retains few of Virgil's original apostrophes. Often still speaking with an equivalent degree of sympathy, his reluctance to connect narrator to text and character is, I suggest, because his narrator is more urgently connected to his audience. In the radio broadcast, the acting part of the narrator conveys the story to the audience, and it is from this dialogue that he does not wish to 'turn away' too often.

Differing levels of Muse involvement in the narrative, and how they figure in translation, reflect different levels of textual authority. Day Lewis depicts narrative confidence, Ahl narrative anxiety, using apostrophe to foreground the collaborative and multi-vocality of the original text, compounded by the addition of him as translator, something which Day Lewis cloaks in the presentation of his univocal narrative. This is a reflection of increased interest in the process of translation. Ahl asserts an anti-authoritarian stance, whereas Day Lewis strengthens the reading of Virgil's unified epic vocal authority, bolstered by the authority lent to a narrator who tells the story in a one-off performance fixed in time.

Apostrophe is inherently subjective and often deictic, spoken from the narrator's deictic centre, in either narrative or narrative comment. The translators here have shown the discrepancy between their narrator's

deictic centres, in ways which relate to authority and authorship. Day Lewis flattens the importance of the Muse in the narrative construction, which in turn elevates him as original authorly source. Ahl, on the other hand, elevates the role of the Muse and thus more openly questions authority and collaboration, involving his modern audience. Paradoxically, Day Lewis creates this distance in order to domesticate the text, and Ahl the opposite, to foreignize. Day Lewis' epic narrator keeps a tight hold on the narrative, whereas Ahl, on the other hand, uses apostrophe to demand audience attention and to be provocative in his translation, raising the presence of his narrator and subsequently of himself as translator. In the first example shown in this chapter (12.500-5), I showed how Ahl uses apostrophe to explore the construction of his own translator deictic centre, reflecting on the role which he himself plays in the construction of this multivocal narrative. This is a theme which he constantly plays upon throughout his translation of apostrophe, using it to comment on, or condemn, the role of epic (as in the apostrophe to Oebalus), and to openly expose his act of (re)narration through translation.

The last three chapters have explored how the narrator relates to the narrative as well as the characters through focalisation, deixis and apostrophe. In the next chapter, I will explore how the narrator describes his characters and how the subjective descriptions conveyed via similes may be interpreted differently in translations.

4 Similes: Characterisation and Narrator Sympathy

My first three chapters all explored aspects of narrative construction in translation: chapter 1, the ways in which multiple voices contribute to the narrative through focalisation and free indirect discourse; chapter 2, the narrator's spatio-temporal relationship to the narrative through deixis; and chapter 3, the constructional contest between divine and mortal narrative authority through apostrophe. In this chapter, I focus on narrative subjectivity, by identifying and defining the voice with which the narrator describes his characters using similes.

Even though Virgilian similes belong in the epic world, bound by their historical and literary allusions and operating within a different deictic centre to the narrative, I argue that they are rarely unambiguously objective.[1] Moreover, that they show us qualities which are intrinsic to Virgil's epic voice, and which distinguish him from his predecessors. By their very nature, similes describe a character or an experience, using an object of comparison which has been selected by the speaker, and thus they cast a subjective opinion or suggest a particular interpretation, often relying on particular connotations. Similes contain densely packed layers of meaning, which can be interpreted in multiple ways, either through explicit ambiguity, where details are omitted to make the exact meaning

[1] Some exceptions are 5.527, 5.242, 5.317-9, 6.270, 10.248, 8.88; the higher number of objective similes in book 5 reflects its highly epic subject matter.

unclear, or implicit, where the overall meaning could be interpreted in various ways. This ambiguity is partially achieved through vocal incongruity: similes can be presented within a character's direct speech, but even narrative similes are not exempt from being read as character-focalised.[2] The simile's characteristic of operating beyond the norm, of offering an opposing moral perspective, in a multi-layered and complex way, means that their meaning relies on readerly interpretation, an intrinsic quality exposed by the frame of translation.

4.1 EPIC SIMILE AND THE HOMERIC PRECEDENT

Similes are not part of the *story* itself, but rather interpretations of events reported in figurative language that operate at the narrative level.[3] As figurative constructs, they are inherently artistic. However, their poetic quality does not detract from their narrative significance. Whilst they have been incorrectly labelled as mere narrative decoration, similes are rather a crucial element of the narrative itself; they are not additive, but rather clarification, to express what could not otherwise be described.[4] They

---

[2] Hardie (1995) 272. Heinze's comments about similes include his precursive comments on 'focalisation' (1903, 1993 trans. 215 n25).

[3] De Jong (1987, 2004 ed.) 125, though the terms she uses to distinguish narrative layers are: *fabula, story, text* (31-2).

[4] W.D. Anderson (1957) 81-2 vehemently disagrees with scholars who have labelled them pure ornamentation. Mader (2015) refers to a scholastic text which states "it is only a simile and not part of the story", which he says wrongly implies a disconnect between the two and reduces the simile to rhetorical ornament

provide the poet with not only a highly poetic, but also the clearest, or perhaps the only, way to express a character or scene.[5] Heinze concurred, stating that similes, far from being purely additional decoration added in during the editing phase, were instead an integral, functional part of the narrative, operating to convey its subject's emotions, "which cannot be conveyed by ordinary means".[6] Heinze considered Virgil's similes psychologically richer than Homer's, and both Anderson and Lyne have subsequently found Virgil's similes to deviate from Homer's objectivity. Anderson finds his evidence in Virgil's frequent local or personal details, compared to Homer's "universality and objectivity".[7] Lyne looks instead to the epic voice, noting that Homer's similes, as well as ekphrasis, obituary, and explanation, are typically "objective", or, as he prefers, "neutral", since the whole of his narrative gives the impression of deriving from the Muse, without personal comment or subjective reaction.[8] Homer's narrative is quite consistently spoken by an epic voice, which effaces the author and allows the narrative to achieve independence and thus credibility. Virgil strives to adhere to this technique, one of the "classic, 'Homeric' principles

---

(595). Jackson Knight (1944, 1966 ed.) only concedes that they are "sometimes" far from ornamental, but always "intrinsically authentic art" (214).

[5] Hampe (1952), cited from W.D. Anderson (1957) 81-2.

[6] Heinze (1903, trans. 1993) 215-6 n25. He focuses on their emotional rather than descriptive impact.

[7] W.D. Anderson (1957) 85-6 calls such close localisation, "an artistic weakness in any writer", which never occurs in Homer. De Jong (1987, 2004 ed.) 93-4 also discusses the generalised permanence (or, using Lyons' [1977: 680] definition, 'omnitemporality') of Homeric similes.

[8] This point and the rest of this paragraph from Lyne (1987) 218-238.

of epic narrative", and often uses character direct speech to represent opinions and descriptions which he, for fear of losing impersonality, cannot tell us himself. However, the Virgilian epic voice is juxtaposed with other voices, a *personal* authorial voice alongside multiple character voices, which constantly challenge it, and from which it cannot always be easily separated. Lyne interprets several similes, often concluding, with a desire to read ambiguity, that they contain several layers of meaning; whilst they may often reflect a subjective impression, and perhaps even suggest the intrusion of Virgil's personal voice, it is difficult to exclude the possibility of the epic voice corroborating that subjectivity. Lyne's analysis contrasts the expectation that Virgil will adopt an epic voice when narrating similes, with the reality that, just as in other areas of his narrative, the multivocality and ambiguity shines through his lines. The reading of further voices in Virgil's similes thus combines with his occasional inclusion of personal details to make his similes seem personal, subjective and often ambiguous.

Homeric similes mark a key moment in the action, highlight a crisis, or draw attention to a complex aspect of narration or developing situation, whilst providing relief through shifting perspective.[9] Putting this shift in perspective in clear narrative terms, Lovatt argues that similes have a minor metaleptic effect, "by evoking worlds and ideas outside the narrative

[9] W.D. Anderson (1957) 81-2, referencing Bowra (1930).

time and space".[10] There are two key points here which, whilst certainly related, I wish to separate: the shift in worlds and ideas, and the shift in time and space.

Firstly, the narrative shift of worlds and ideas occurs since the content of the simile is often drawn from a different world to that in which the characters exist, though naturally it is assumed to be understood by primary narrator, primary focaliser,[11] and intended audience. For Virgil, this shift typically means a movement from the epic world, grand, remote and unfamiliar even to his original audience, to scenes that are rural, domestic and everyday.[12] This shift can function, as Hardwick notes, to differentiate but also to connect the worlds of speaker and audience, "demystifying the alien and alienating the apparently familiar", encouraging the audience to process the poem through the filter of their own experience, thus creating a distinction, and simultaneously closing it, between the audience's role as receiver of the poem and constructor of its meaning.[13] Jackson Knight finds effective in Virgil's similes the combination of alternation and reconciliation, offering a new world of comparison to alternate with the realm of action, enabling readers to reconcile the action

---

[10] Lovatt (forthcoming).

[11] De Jong (1987, 2004 ed.) 93-4.

[12] Ashley (1932) describes this as a "peculiar characteristic" of Homer and Virgil (25).

[13] Hardwick (1997) 327.

through comparison with the familiar.[14] Specifically on Virgil's use of rural, everyday imagery, he remarks "Virgil understood a battle best if he saw it as some kind of storm, or forest fire." Using such comparisons has a morally neutralising effect, and portraying the idea of natural devastation without the effect of shell-shock and the acts of killing may be perceived as an objective means of description. However, Virgil uses these themes as complex and multi-layered, subjective, and often critical, comment. Wofford comments that the use of the pastoral in epic similes often functions to bring an alternative system of values into the poem.[15] However, on closer inspection, she observes they "aestheticize and […] naturalize the story of war, thereby rendering it poetically and culturally acceptable". Subsequently, by creating (or 'separating' out) a space which can both reflect on and criticise the poem's ideological claims, Wofford argues, similes often actually condemn the poem's subject and undermine the values of the system in which they are constructed.

Since simile subjects are often drawn from a separate universe, not necessarily relating to the time of the characters, and more likely to relate to the time of the narrator (and intended audience) or to operate in an eternal present, they often exist within a different spatio-temporal axis to the narrative itself. The shift from explicit to figurative is thus reinforced

---

[14] Jackson Knight (1944, 1966 ed.) 214.

[15] Wofford (1992) 2, referring generally to epic simile.

by a shift in deictic centre, moving beyond the realm of narrative time. Despite existing on a separate narrative level, Schork notices that only 5 of his listed 104 *Aeneid* similes are grammatically 'independent' self-contained units.[16] However, whilst there may not be clear syntactical boundaries, Virgil's movement into the simile world is typically clearly signified with *velut*/*veluti* or *qualis*, and his return to the narrative with a word like *sic,* or else a deictic intensifier such as *nunc*.[17] The shift from narrative to simile is also typically signposted by the use of present tense (though, of course, this may not distinguish it from the preceding narrative), to reflect the universal truths which similes reference.

Similes have two component parts, and can subsequently be constructed in two ways: subject + 'like' + simile; or simile + 'just as' + subject.[18] O'Neal writes that Homer used the latter format in more than 93% of similes in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. He attributes this pattern to Homer's oral tradition; since the hearer cannot glance back up the page to remind themselves of the simile subject, it is preferable for Homer to describe the simile first, then clearly and emphatically return to the subject. In Virgil, however, 60%

---

[16] Schork (1986) 262, though, as he adds, varying editorial punctuation means that this is not a concrete number. I contest his total of 104 on pp284-285.

[17] Fraser (1923) found that the most common words to introduce similes are: *quails* (*ubi)* (27 times), *velut/veluti* (23), *ceu* (10), *ut/uti* (eight), *quam* +adj/adv (five), non *secus* (three) *quantus* (twice), *qui*, *talis*, *non tam*, *sicut*, *haud secus*, *cum primum* (once each).

[18] O'Neal (1976) 76-79: e.g. 5.446-49 (subject then simile), 2.379-82 (simile then subject).

of similes are presented as subject then simile.[19] O'Neal recognises the transition to a primarily written medium as contributing to this, but also states that Virgil uses this format to allow his reader to explore other ways of interpreting the simile, and to offer more ambiguity. The simile at 12.103 uses ambiguous construction to push the boundaries of its meaning even more, since Virgil combines these structures to take the form: subject *a* (Turnus) + *veluti* + simile + *nec minus* + subject *b* (Aeneas). This applies the single point of comparison, the bull, to both the preceding and succeeding narrative subjects: Aeneas and Turnus. Thus, Virgil achieves ambiguity through yet another channel: his methods of linguistic construction.

As well as via his sentence structures, Virgil blurs simile and reality at the level of content. In fact, similes can inform and describe narrative events in much the same way as their own meaning is illustrated by the narrative context in which they occur. That is to say, whilst intended to compare a subject to an object, similes can transfer meaning in two ways.[20] Whilst Homer's similes are usually thought to have one point of contact, then deviate along the line of simile, away from the subject, Virgilian similes make contact with the narrative at several points.[21] This feature has been

---

[19] This trend continues into Lucan's *Civil War* (70%), and Statius' *Thebaid* (73%): (O'Neal [1976] 79).

[20] Hardie (1986) 220-1.

[21] Jackson Knight (1944, 1966 ed.) 214. W.D. Anderson (1957) 81-2 discusses Hampe's (1952) identification of the same phenomenon, saying there is no reason

termed "multiple correspondence" by West.[22] The multiple relations between simile and narrative can be emphasised or understated by choices in translation: see Day Lewis at 11.297, when a conversation is compared to "chattering water", and Ahl at 11.490, where the spirits of Turnus, who is about to be compared to a horse, are described as 'prancing'. I shall now turn to a longer example to illustrate these, and to introduce new, aspects of Virgilian similes.

4.2 FEATURES OF VIRGILIAN SIMILE

ardet apex capiti cristisque a vertice flamma
funditur et vastos umbo vomit aureus ignis:
non secus ac liquida si quando nocte cometae
sanguinei lugubre rubent, aut Sirius ardor
ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus aegris
nascitur et laevo contristat lumine caelum.
haud tamen audaci Turno fiducia cessit
litora praecipuere et venientis pellere terra.

Aeneid 10.270-277

To begin, this extract illustrates points which I briefly mentioned above. Firstly, this simile uses high register to assert its status as narrative art, to lend an element of grandeur, to provoke an emotional response, and to

to assume that only one part of the simile is relevant, and put the rest down to mere beauty.

[22] West (1969) 40-9. Similar is the effect which Lyne (1989) terms 'trespass', when language which we might expect in the simile appears in the narrative, and vice versa (92-99).

demonstrate the author's artistic ability and epic craftsmanship.[23] Secondly, the simile is clearly separated from the narrative, the start indicated by *non secus* and the end by *haud tamen*. The preceding narrative is in the present tense (*ardet, funditur, vomit*), which continues through the simile (*rubent, nascitur, contristat*). The Latin then returns to the perfect tense (*cessit*) to indicate the shift back to the characters and action, signifying the shift from the timeless description to the specific action occurring in the relative past. Thirdly, the abundance of sinister language points to a non-objective voice.[24] This indicates either subjectivity or, more likely, focalisation from the Rutulians. Although there are some positive phrases (for example, *aureus ignis*), which could be read as descriptions of Aeneas' power and necessarily violent military effectiveness, spoken by an Augustan voice, they are outweighed by the abundance of critical vocabulary. Aeneas is depicted as a warrior capable of bringing destruction to his enemy, but not in a brave, bold light, rather as an unstoppable, inhuman force, bringing about plagues to civilians. Aeneas, with the gods clearly on his side (the beings who perpetrate plagues of disease and drought), does not partake in a fair fight. The weak mortals against whom he fights stand little chance in this battle. Thus, there is a strong argument for reading this description of Aeneas as a sign of imminent destruction,

---

[23] Harrison (1991) notes the poetic nature of *lugubre,* the grammatically poetic adjective *Sirius* for genitive, and the notably formulaic *mortalibus aegris*, only ever used by Virgil (and, in its Homeric equivalent) at line-end.

[24] Cf. 8.589, when Pallas is compared to a star.

focalised through the Latins. The description is not that of a brave warrior, but rather the destruction that follows war, the emotional effect is not the relief of his return, but rather terrified dread. Furthermore, this simile illustrates another frequent Virgilian motif: historical and literary allusion. Although he makes his similes feel personal, Virgil's explicit use of anachronism is rare and not often jarring. His references tend to be subtle, such as the simile comparing Neptune calming the seas to a statesman mollifying a mob. Virgil's similes are more often taken from the natural world or from the traditional epic simile repertoire, where there is no obligation to relate to historical reality. However, even without the anchor of specific historical reference, the layers of interpretation are increased by changing cultural connotations. Thus, by comparing something from his narrative time to something in his narrating time, each simile is comprised of layered elements, some of which are timeless but others tightly contextualised, as the author provides a bridge from the fictional world to that of the audience.[25]

In this simile, the reference to the comet indicates a specific historical allusion. Comets, like similes, are interpretable. References to comets were often seen in Roman literature and history as a negative omen, although there were exceptions, such as the sighting of the comet at the death of

[25] G. Williams (1983) 166.

Julius Caesar.[26] Although this scene seems to be focalised primarily by the Latins, this ambiguous interpretation of the meaning of a comet could indicate the difference in how the Trojans and Latins react to this scene. If Aeneas' return is like a comet, for the Trojans this signifies the good omen of their forthcoming glory, whereas for the Latins it indicates fatal destruction.

The comet is referenced in an earlier passage in the *Aeneid* (8.678-681), during the description of Aeneas' divine shield in book 8, when Augustus is described during the Battle of Actium. There is repetition between these two extracts, both of the words: *vertice, flamma, vomunt* (as well as the phrase *stans celsa in puppi*, at line 10.261); and of the concepts: the flame on the top of his helmet, and the comet (there the *sidus patrium*). This constitutes an intratextual reference, a form of literary allusion, bound with the historic, relating Aeneas to Augustus, and reinforcing what Mader sees as the important ideological point made by anachronism: that by encouraging the reader to reflect on the relationship between the two worlds, they "stress the continuity between heroic past and Augustan present".[27]

---

[26] Conington (1884, 2007 ed.), referring to Servius, "they were mostly considered ill-omened", though, as Gransden (1976) points out, the comet became symbolic of Julius Caesar's divinity.

[27] Mader (2015) 595.

678 hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar
cum patribus populoque, penatibus et magnis dis,
680 stans celsa in puppi, geminas cui tempora flammas
681 laeta vomunt patriumque aperitur vertice sidus.

Aeneid 8.678-681

As well as reference to passages within the *Aeneid*, this simile contains intertextual references, another highly common feature of epic simile.[28] Intertextual allusions foreground the *Aeneid* in its literary context, and compare and contrast other similes, as well as the characters and experiences they define. This catalogue of similes and the vast range of intertextual links available creates a particular form of epic tradition, appealing to shared cultural consciousness. Likening a character to something, and in doing so, likening them to a previous simile and a previously created character at a particular point in a particular work, adds to the layers of subjective interpretation emanating from his similes. Virgil's audience would have been interested not only in the additional axis of comparison, but also in the modifications which Virgil makes to his sources. In this way, Virgil does not simply copy, but rather he re-invents, adding in particular details which may be specific to his Roman context, thus combining anachronism and intertext.

[28] Similes are a key site for intertextual negotiations, as Heinze (1903, 1993 trans.) 203 notes. See pp77-78 for a general discussion of translators' approaches to this.

Alongside a few minor references,[29] this passage contains a major intertextual reference to Achilles in *Iliad* 22.25-36, who is also compared to Sirius. Whilst stars generally "combine power and terror with outstanding beauty", depicting the image of a hero not yet in full glory but approaching it, Sirius' specific connotations are "baleful and threatening", malevolence.[30]

> The aged Priam was the first of all whose eyes saw him
> as he swept across the flat land in full shining, like that star
> which comes on in the autumn and whose conspicuous brightness
> far outshines the stars that are numbered in the night's darkening,
> the star they give the name of Orion's God, which is brightest
> among the stars, and yet is wrought as a sign of evil
> and brings on the great fever for unfortunate mortals.
> Such was the flare of the bronze that girt his chest in his running.
>
> *Iliad* 22.25-32

Both similes show the effect of these men (Aeneas and Achilles) returning to the scene of battle, as focalised through their enemies who see the warriors returning as a sign of their own inevitable and inescapable future

[29] See R.D. Williams (1966): *Iliad* 5.4 (Diomedes), *Argonautica* 3.856 (Jason).

[30] Lovatt (2013) 262, 265, 268. Lovatt notes how star images, used to imagine the hero as an icon of aesthetic beauty, contrast with animal similes, which depict immediate action.

suffering.[31] The similes both thus achieve a double purpose – firstly to paint for the audience the terrifying appearance of the warriors, but also to express, through focalisation, the feelings of those whom they are coming to kill.[32] The fact that Homer's simile is focalised through Achilles' enemies strengthens the argument that Virgil's is focalised through the Rutulians. However, there are also differences: Aeneas is returning from a trip to recruit aid, whilst Achilles had been refusing to fight. The discrepancy between the regularity and predictability of rising stars with the irregular, less predictable comet reflects that war is both inevitable but also exceptional. Thus, although both similes use the dog-star as an object of comparison, Virgil's addition of the comet creates interaction and intersection between literary intertextual allusion and historical anachronistic application through particular Roman significance.[33]

Literary and historical allusion, which have been created with the original intended audience in mind, provide a specific challenge for modern translators, whose audiences may not recognise references which original readers would have been expected to acknowledge. Since contextual connotations or references to historical events may not be automatically

---

[31] R.D. Williams (1966).

[32] See de Jong (1987, 2004 ed.) 125.

[33] Conington (1884, 2007 ed.): "the description of the comets, of which Homer knows nothing, would probably recall to Roman readers the times of the civil wars, in which the Romans were twice terrified by the appearance of a remarkable comet".

recognised, domesticating translators might simply not prioritise these references, whilst a foreignizing approach could include fuller explanation of such links, using paratext or perhaps even changing the surface meaning to bring these allusions to the fore. Sometimes, translators might add in extra information to bring awareness to details buried within the original, to emphasise specific aspects of a simile. As an example, at 1.393, *ales Jovis*, translated by Ahl literally as "Jupiter's birds", becomes an "eagle" in Day Lewis. To take another example, at 12.856, Ahl makes more effort to convey historical issues implied by Virgil's narrator: Day Lewis gives "some Parthian or Cretan archer", and refers in his note to these as "typical archers", Ahl gives "fired by a Parthian - / Parthian, or, if you will, a Cydonian - ", and adds in his note that "Virgil pointedly offers a less menacing Cydonian (Cretan) alternative to the Parthian archers (who had wrought havoc with the Roman army at Carrhae in 53BC)". Ahl's conversational narrative interjection "if you will" comments on the content of his simile. He attempts to convey the subtle nuances which Virgil's audience would have understood, suiting the fact that he is writing for an audience perhaps reading for educational purposes, rather than for entertainment. Thus, where there is incongruity between the simile and ancient worlds, the translator can attempt to convey at least some of the many layers of meaning within the simile, bridging the gap between Virgil and the new modern audience.

I shall now examine how translators approach Virgil's helmet simile, to explore which elements they prioritise, and what readings they encourage.

270 There is Aeneas, helmet ablaze, crest vomiting fire,
Golden shield-boss erupting with searing flames of destruction.
So comets boding disaster will flare blood-red in the clear night
Skies, on occasion, so Sirius' new-born star, as he rises
Blazes his heat, his diseases, and drought upon sickly and death-doomed
275 Humans. His evil brightness of eye gleams grimly in heaven.
Turnus, as daring as ever, is sure he can still take the seashore
277 First, and can stop them himself – even drive them away as they're landing.

Aeneid 10.270-277 (Ahl)

270 The peak of Aeneas' helmet was blazing, flame poured from its lofty
Crest, and the golden boss of his shield spurted huge flashes:
It was as when on some cloudless night you see a comet
Glowing, blood-red and ominous, or the fiery Dog-star rising
Which glooms the sky with sinister light and carries with it
275 Drought and pestilence to suffering humanity.
Yet the gallant Turnus' confidence was unimpaired – he reckoned
277 To occupy the beaches before them and beat off the landing-forces.

Aeneid 10.270-277 (Day Lewis)

Previous chapters have shown Day Lewis' reluctance to use the present tense for narrative description. Consistent with that finding, in this simile Day Lewis only uses the present tense for the simile itself (272-275). He uses past tenses for the narrative before and after the simile, and the gap between his tenses is emphasised by the shift which occurs during the sentence: "It **was** as when you **see**". Ahl, on the other hand, whose use of

tense is generally more fluid, uses the present tense all the way through this passage: not just for the simile itself, but also for the narrative before and after. He even uses a gnomic future tense in "So comets boding disaster will flare", indicating that the event his simile refers to is a continuingly relevant truth. As Virgil does, Ahl uses tense as a means by which to entwine his simile and narrative, whereas in Day Lewis, it functions as a clearer mark of separation, distinguishing the move from narrative to simile and back.

Day Lewis' description of Aeneas is more positive than Ahl's, and exaggerates his semi-divine status. The comet is 'glowing',[34] and other words contributing to his positive tone include: "blazing", "flashing" (which appear next to each other), "golden", and "lofty" (a poetic word which also implies Aeneas' stature and status). Despite the positive portrayal of Aeneas, the depiction of the simile's subjects themselves (comet and dog-star) remain highly sinister. As well as separating out the simile more clearly using narrative signposts, Day Lewis thus also creates more distinction between the simile and subject descriptions, creating a greater separation between the connotations of Aeneas' light and the dog-star's power. Day Lewis also subverts the incongruity between simile subject and object by associating the disasters which Aeneas will effect with

[34] Cf. Ruden (2008): "bleeding".

traditionally divine implications. 'Pestilence' particularly has Biblical connotations. Day Lewis thus appeals to implicit wartime partisanship: whilst universally agreed to be evil for both sides, each side wants war to be worse for the other. Everyone wants someone to win.

In contrast, Ahl amplifies the negative sense inherent in Virgil's text, imbuing it with a different vision of conflict. The comets are "boding disaster",[35] and he qualifies *flamma* to give "flames of destruction". He may here be influenced by a textual variation of reading *cristis* as *tristis*, supported by Harrison.[36] He describes the mortals even more extremely than Virgil, with "sickly and death-doomed | Humans". This line is repeated at 11.182-3, which amplifies its negative effect through linking the feelings of the Latins watching Aeneas arriving with the warriors preparing to bury their dead. There, Ahl is more overtly negative than Day Lewis in "sickly and death-doomed | Humans" (cf. "Suffering humanity") and "their labour and troubles" (cf. "the daily round"). On line 275 of the helmet simile, Ahl gives "his evil brightness of eye gleams grimly in heaven", where "heaven" implies a hidden or disguised power, one that is beneath the surface and thus even more sinister, emphasised by the striking alliteration in "gleams grimly". Foregrounding the ancient concept of the "magically destructive"

---

[35] Cf. West (1990): "gloomy".

[36] Harrison (1991) says that *cristis* has no real role in the sentence, an issue which reading *tristis* solves whilst also providing stylistic benefits by giving *flamma* an "appropriately sinister epithet".

gaze, which harms its object and connotes a nexus of heroic visual power and feminised, askance viewing,[37] the theme of the evil eye recurs in Ahl's translation, for example at 1.28, "Hate for Troy evilled her eye" (*genus invisum*).

Ahl's near-oxymoronic assonance between certainty ('sure') and constant fluctuation ('shore') draws attention to the futility of Turnus' expectations, and the inevitably temporary and fleeting nature of any successes which he does enjoy. Ahl portrays Turnus as deluded and helpless, more so than Day Lewis, who has him in a more considered way, "reckoning". However, Day Lewis does refer to him as "gallant", which, although it seems a positive descriptor, has military connotations of style over substance. For Day Lewis, one of the insinuations may be the phrase 'Gallant Little Belgium', which he recalls in his autobiography, depicting Turnus here as heroic in his own way, though ultimately completely ineffective.[38] Finding other contextual relations, Day Lewis attempts to create his own contemporary historical allusion, pulling his listeners into their recent past in an ambiguous way, indicated initially by the anachronistic "landing forces" and with his packed final line: "occupy the beaches" recalls Churchill's 1940 speech, combining resonances of the successful D-Day landings, which can be related to Aeneas' endeavours, with Dunkirk's resistance of German

[37] Lovatt (2013) 328-334.

[38] Day Lewis (1960) 86.

invasion.[39] Day Lewis, and his audience, empathise with beaches as sites of military peril.

Both translators also make changes in terms of the narrative construction of the simile. To heighten its emotional impact, Ahl uses a visual deictic present – "there is Aeneas", and draws more attention to him than Virgil does (there is no such interjection in the Latin). By including this deictic exclamation, Ahl heightens the focalisation from the Latins and Rutulians and increases its immediacy, encouraging the reader to experience Aeneas' arrival from their point of view. As observed in earlier chapters, Ahl constantly comments on the text and on his act of narrating (and translating) it.

Day Lewis, on the other hand, rather changes the readers' experience of this simile by presenting it more as simple description, by a distanced narrator. He does not say that Aeneas himself is like the comet, or like the dog-star. He says instead that looking at Aeneas coming is like *seeing* a comet. He is comparing the experience of the Latins and Rutulians watching Aeneas with 'you', his readers, observing an ominous or sinister comet or star. This reflects a theory, espoused by William Mitchell, of

[39] Churchill (1940).

ekphrastic fear,[40] and more clearly seen in Day Lewis' rendering of the description of Turnus' helmet (7.783-788); which, whilst not technically a simile, is similar in language and content to Aeneas' helmet simile, and could be categorised as an ekphrasis, meaning it operates through similar figurative and linguistic considerations. Day Lewis gives "The bloodier waxed the battle, the more did that creature **appear to** | Roar and rage", whereas Ahl "The more fiercely she's roaring, | Bestially wild with her menacing flames, the more rawly the battle's | Gushing of blood spouts brutally high." Day Lewis does not put his faith in Virgil's ekphrasis, and does not allow the chimaera to come to life, but rather clarifies the figurative nature of his description by adding "appear to". Day Lewis has foregrounded the fact that this is a piece of ekphrasis, not pure description. He exposes similar constructions at other points whilst, typically, Ahl takes the opposite approach, to further conceal them, sometimes even presenting similes as metaphors.[41] This shows either more confidence in the figurative constructions themselves, or less concern over them being immediately easy to interpret; leaving the reader with something to think

---

[40] Mitchell (1994) defines *ekphrastic hope*: "when the impossibility of ekphrasis is overcome in imagination or metaphor" (152); and *ekphrastic fear*: "when we sense that the difference between the verbal and visual representation might collapse and the figurative, imaginary desire of ekphrasis might be realised literally and actually" (154).

[41] Day Lewis exposes constructions at 12.103, 'seems to shoot sparks', 1.496, beautiful 'to see', 12.701, 'he looked as huge as', 8.622, 'plumes like', 12.291 and 2.223, 'you hear'. Ahl conceals at 9.706, 'it's a pike', at 9.339, 'Nisus, a lion unfed amid fullness', and 11.809, 'he is the wolf'. However, where Virgil exposes the simile at 10.454, Ahl over-emphasises its exposure.

about is less of a concern to Ahl than Day Lewis, whose original listeners could not go back a page to reread. This is not universally the case, and both translators often use heightened deixis to foreground the beginning of a figurative construction, for example at 12.473, Day Lewis adds "you can hear her", and Ahl, "think of a black shape", and at 2.304, Day Lewis adds "You know how it is when", and Ahl, "Think of… think of… add a". Such deictic scaffolding supports the construction of the simile and allows the reader to immerse themselves more fully in its experience.[42]

This example has illustrated typical Virgilian simile techniques: tense shifts, ambiguous subjectivity, focalisation, historical allusion, and literary intertext. Translators utilise different effects to change the reading experience and understanding of the narrative's characters: Day Lewis, perhaps out of trepidation over its structural integrity, clearly separates off the simile with regard to grammar, narrative and content, adds contemporary allusions, and portrays a positive view of Aeneas; Ahl flexibly integrates the simile with the main narrative, uses deixis to heighten the focalisation (here through the Rutulians), presented a more clearly negative image of Aeneas, and gives additional information to help the reader understand the different levels on which the simile operates. Day Lewis' simile is clearly narrated and he explores ways to relate it to his

[42] See also 12.66, 12.701 (Day Lewis); 11.624, 7.703, 12.683, 5.590, 5.213, 11.660 (Ahl).

audience, whilst Ahl's explores the various complex ways in which it relates to Virgil. I will use these themes to analyse other similes in the *Aeneid*, asking how they appropriate vocal subjectivity and ambiguity, whether through the epic, or another, voice, and how translators alter their emotional effect. Since the *Aeneid* contains a wealth of similes from which I could have chosen material for this chapter, I focus on Turnus and Aeneas, to explore the translator's presentation of Virgil's complex imperial question and ambiguous characters. I will examine the extent to which translators use these similes to channel or subvert, endorse or question, the epic voice. Before I go into my examples in greater depth, some brief observations on categorisation and distribution of similes in Virgil's *Aeneid*.

4.3 SIMILES IN THE *AENEID*

Virgil uses a vast number of similes:[43] 62 in books 1-6 and 101 in books 7-12, totalling 163.[44] They vary considerably in length: some of the true 'epic similes' can last close to 10 lines, whilst others, also included in the numbers that I have referenced here (but omitted by many cataloguers),

[43] My cataloguing was aided by Wilkins (1921), whose total number is, as O'Neal (1976: 76-9) notes, significantly higher than other cataloguers. Schork (1986) 261, for example, counts 104 "developed similes" (containing a finite verb – others he refers to as 'brief similes'). Although Wilkins seems to have included passages which are generally figurative, I use her generous definition for completeness.

[44] 37 of these similes include more than one comparable object. If counted singly, rather than as two (or, sometimes, three), there are 126 similes in total, 49 in books 1-6 and 77 in books 7-12.

might be just a few words (e.g. 12.733 or 2.794). Book 3 has the lowest number by far, with only two similes (both double similes describing the Cyclopes). Whilst the fact that Aeneas narrates book 3 might be given as justification here, this cannot be the only explanation, since book 2 contains 10 similes. Although it could be suggested that book 3 has so few similes since it is considered one of the most unfinished books, which would corroborate the argument of similes being narrative 'decoration', it is more likely due to the less substantial, emotional content of its subject matter. The other end of the spectrum is more easily explained: Book 12 has the highest number of similes (20), followed by book 10 (16), 9 (14), and 5 (13). The prevalence of figurative construction is not surprising in the intense battle books, nor in book 5, with its highly descriptive, epic content.

In terms of simile subjects, Aeneas is the most frequent, with 27 similes,[45] and Turnus second, with 17. Combined together, this gives them a total of 44 similes, over a quarter of the 163 total. Since Turnus only features in six books, he has a higher average similes-per-book count than Aeneas. Only seven of Aeneas' similes occur in books 1-6, with 19 in the second half. Perhaps this is to more equally balance his with Turnus', or perhaps it is because the epic battle narratives demand more figurative expression. Aeneas' narration of books 2-3 might also explain the comparative rarity of

[45] Although counting his is an inexact task, since he plays a secondary role in many.

similes describing him in the first half. Indeed, there are no similes about Aeneas in book 3, and the two (both double similes) in book 2 focus on his experiences rather than character description.[46] In terms of other characters, the Gods collectively have ten similes, Dido seven, and Mezentius five.[47] As with apostrophes, Virgil is just as likely to form similes to describe minor characters and their plight, with 55 similes focusing on characters that do not play a major role.

Virgil calls upon a wide range of objects, some along with literary allusion or cultural significance, from natural phenomena (rivers, animals, mountains, winds, etc.), to human experiences (the elusive and sometimes frustrating nature of figures in dreams just beyond our reach, or walking in woods by sporadic moonlight). There are also similes comparing mortals to Gods, though this is reserved for Aeneas, Dido, Turnus, Rome and Caesar. The reverse also occurs, and the first three similes compare gods to mortals, with a humanising effect that prepares us for Virgil's strongly anthropomorphised divine characters. Some of the imagery is more abstract, for example the simile describing Juturna wrestling away the reins, which can be read as a metapoetic image of her seizing control of the narrative.[48]

---

[46] At 2.304 and 2.794.

[47] Mezentius' are all within the space of an emotional 70 lines.

[48] Lovatt (2005) 296-299.

Whilst only two out of Aeneas' 27 similes compare him to animals (both in similes with Turnus), a significant 11 of Turnus' 17 do. Instead, Aeneas is most often compared to elements of nature, including light on a pool of water, an oak tree, a sunlit cloud, mountains, a torrent, fires, floods, a cloud, a whirlwind and a hailstorm (20 in total), then to mythology (2), gods (2), and a statue. Aeneas's two animal similes are to a bull and a dog, domestic animals which are certainly strong, rather than vulnerable, but not savagely so. Turnus', on the other hand, cover a broad range: a bull, a horse, a tiger, an eagle, and, twice each, a wolf and a lion. Aside from animals, Turnus is compared to the god Mars, and to the natural elements boiling water, clouds, rock, and the winds. Turnus' frequent bestial descriptions convey a mixture of vulnerability and aggression, but usually in a rash, savage, animalistic way. On the other hand, the natural elements to which Aeneas is more commonly related are controlled, unfeeling and unthinking, unstoppable and inevitable objects of divine action and destruction, indicating how little he is in control of his destiny and how much he is under divine subjugation. The controlled and divinely inspired nature tends toward more epic, ostensibly objective, similes, in comparison to Turnus', more often laced with passion or extreme emotion. Turnus is subject to his emotions and acts in the name of survival, against the immortal, considered Aeneas who fights, and invades, under divine duress.

The first time we meet Turnus, he is compared to a cauldron of boiling water, a natural, domestic element artificially modified to become violent

and dangerous. His next simile is as a wolf (9.59), then an eagle and wolf again (9.563-5), a tiger gleefully shut in with a helpless flock (9.730), and subsequently a lion giving ground and then fleeing (9.792). He has another moment of glory, as a lion attacking a bull which it has seen from a high vantage-point (10.454), before his descriptions take a turn which appears to reflect self-knowledge of his impending doom. His animal comparisons gradually weaken in relation to their opposition, as he becomes a horse fleeing to pasture (11.492), a wounded lion, forced into battle by goading hunters (12.4), then a bull, to Aeneas' bull, in what briefly looks like a fair fight (12.715), before he becomes a stag, hunted by Aeneas' hound (12.749). The final simile describing Turnus compares his valiant yet futile attempts to fight the helplessness we face in dreams. Virgil's narrator here empathises with Turnus, encouraging us to appreciate his pain and his realisation that possessing all of the strength and bravery in the world would not secure his victory.

Readings of Turnus are generally relative to readings of Aeneas. Many have agreed that Turnus is equally deserving of sympathy as Aeneas, and even, due perhaps to his lack of divine help and more concrete motivations of defence, more so.[49] While similes contribute to Turnus' carefully crafted

[49] Morris (1969) 123: Our sympathies are with Turnus, as Virgil intends them to be, who receives little divine help. Again, I refer to M. Smith's concepts here: while readers might on occasion *align* with Turnus, there is usually a clear option to retain *allegiance* to Aeneas, appreciating the worth of his cause ([1996] 141).

character development, Aeneas' comparisons do not support a developing character arc in the same way as Turnus' do. Lovatt provides a useful summary of the debate on Aeneas' (lack of) character development throughout the *Aeneid*.[50] A primary strand of the secondary discussion is whether Virgil subscribes to Homeric views of heroism or asserts a new model, driven primarily by *pietas*.[51] This debate over interpretations of Aeneas' heroism has presented one of the most challenging facets of his reception.[52] Despite divinity's intrinsic part in the definition of heroism, Aeneas' validity as protagonist has been most questioned by those who have read his character as being insufficiently driven by personal motivation and excessively by influence from the gods, fate or Augustus' regime. The proponents of Virgil's pessimistic readings, Parry and Clausen have respectively seen Aeneas as: unwilling and unassertive, a victim of greater forces, whom he must not resist;[53] and a hero whose opening

---

[50] Lovatt (2019a) 394-399.

[51] Quinn (1968) does not see a model of heroism in the *Aeneid*, whether by Homeric standards or of a new Roman model; Ahl (1976: 151-6) believes the *Aeneid* reflects a different view of heroism to Homer; Otis (1969: 36) believes that, when he leaves Troy, Aeneas replaces the old heroic code with a new one that prioritises *pietas*; Pöschl (1962, 1970 ed.: 39-40, 43) and Corse (1991: 61) both see Aeneas as completing a heroic transformation of sorts during book 4. See Agri (2010) 156 on the combined power of *pietas* and *furor* in Aeneas.

[52] See Pound (1934) 44, known for being critical of Virgil, for an often quoted anecdote from Yeats, where a student replies to a teacher's question about heroism in the *Aeneid* with "what hero?".

[53] Parry (1963) 72.

speech proves he is hampered by memory more than any other ancient counterpart, "profoundly melancholic, burdened by fate, impersonal".[54]

It is impossible to write about Turnus and Aeneas without using the word 'hero', a term which frequently accompanies discussion of their characterisation, though it is also difficult to do so without being divisive. The two central relations of this issue to me are that, when they read (or listen to) an epic poem, audiences expect that they will encounter a central, dominant heroic character,[55] and that the concept of the heroic figure is a dynamic cultural construct.[56] In the ancient world, the term had a loose definition: heroes were typically divine on some level, and displayed strength in (often wartime) adversity,[57] or, as Hardie puts it, could claim to be, at something, 'the best'.[58] Often a military death is an important heroic ideal, and the character will demonstrate superhuman strength, ferocity, physicality and, frequently, brutality.[59] As Lovatt explains, the model of the Homeric hero is not a single mould: Hector, Achilles and Odysseus all bring

---

[54] Clausen (1964, 1999 ed.) 66, 68.

[55] Armstrong (2006) 132: "Epic frequently looks for a single dominant hero"; Hardie (1993) 3-10.

[56] For an excellent comparison of some modern concepts of heroism with ancient ideals, see Langerwerf and Ryan (2010).

[57] Langerwerf and Ryan (2010) 5.

[58] Hardie (1993) 3: the epic hero is one who claims for himself the title 'best', normally best in battle. See Nagy (1979, 1999 ed.) on *The Best of the Achaeans*, a title given to Achilles at *Iliad* 1.244, 1.412, 16.271, 16.274, but also to Agamemnon, Diomedes and Ajax (26-41).

[59] Langerwerf and Ryan (2010) 8, 10-11.

different moral, masculine, and leadership ideals.[60] In light of the lack of a single ancient model, it is overly simplistic to apply it as a single label to Aeneas, or any other character.[61]

To twenty-first century readers, where heroic influences come from sources as diverse as Robin Hood and Superman, accumulating new conditions such as modesty, self-sufficiency and virtue, the idea that the hero is a universally understood concept is problematic, since that conceptual understanding shifts, sometimes far away from its ancient connotations.[62] Ultimately, Virgil's characters are elusive, ambiguous, and interpretable, relying on readers' moral values and expectations of heroism, hence why translations diverge so much.[63] The roles these characters play have, naturally, evolved over time, with the changing cultural construct of heroism brought about not just due to evolving ideals and expectations of masculinity, but also with the advent of new media: the filmic hero, for instance. Sixteenth century translations, Brammall notes, reflect positive contemporary views of Aeneas' heroism, omitting ambiguities where necessary for his morally clear heroic character.[64]

---

[60] Lovatt (2019a) 394-399.

[61] Langerwerf and Ryan (2010) 6 ask a set of pertinent questions on the application of the term in modern contexts.

[62] Langerwerf and Ryan (2010) 1, 4, 5.

[63] Lovatt (2019a) 394-399.

[64] Brammall (2015) 30-31 and 49.

Reception of Aeneas' heroic status has subsequently shifted with changing times, and we will expect these two translators to have different conceptions of what it means to be a hero. Ahl considers Aeneas to be too much a tragic hero for epic: he shines in a more intimate atmosphere, and his personal, psychological difficulties are too small for the scale of epic.[65] Day Lewis, in a post World War Two context, is likely to be more aware of the need for heroes to self-sacrifice for greater benefit, even if that great benefit appears at times elusive. His use of the term is commonplace in his autobiography and critical writings, and his appropriation of Aeneas as hero is likely to be influenced by heroic models of war, Christianity, and literature.[66] Heroising soldiers became a means to make sense of the atrocities of World War Two, when violence for a worthy cause could be seen as justified. However, in twenty-first century America, Vietnam's sceptics had replaced the concept of wartime heroism with insinuations of wartime criminality.

In this chapter I shall first examine similes which depict Aeneas and Turnus individually as elements of nature, ostensibly those which do so in an epic way. Aeneas is compared to an oak tree, unmoved by the pleas of Dido's

---

[65] Ahl (1976) 151-6.

[66] See above, p69. Note however that Balmer (2018) 422 & n4 questioned whether Jackson Knight's translation did not have the same impact as Rieu's Homer because the portrayal of a charismatic leader rebuilding a defeated nation was likely to sit less comfortably with contemporary audiences than that of a hero returning home after war.

desperation, and Turnus to water boiling within a cauldron. Secondly, I will explore similes which oppose both characters in hunting scenes, from the beginning and ending of book 12.

4.4 DISTURBING THE EPIC VOICE: AENEAS AND TURNUS AS ELEMENTS OF NATURE

4.4.1 Aeneas: oak

Following the speeches in book 4 between Aeneas and Dido, Aeneas is likened to an oak tree, which does not sway in the breeze.[67] Just so, he is not moved by Dido's pleas.

talibus orabat, talisque miserrima fletus
fertque refertque soror. sed nullis ille movetur
fletibus aut voces ullas tractabilis audit;
fata obstant placidasque viri deus obstruit auris.
ac velut annoso validam cum robore quercum
Alpini Boreae nunc hinc nunc flatibus illinc
eruere inter se certant; it stridor, et altae
consternunt terram concusso stipite frondes;
ipsa haeret scopulis et quantum vertice ad auras
aetherias, tantum radice in Tartara tendit:
haud secus adsiduis hinc atque hinc vocibus heros
tunditur, et magno persentit pectore curas;
mens immota manet, lacrimae volvuntur inanes.

Aeneid 4.437-449

[67] Whilst this simile has ancestral models (*Iliad* 12.131, 16.765), they typically describe a physical challenge. Virgil here applies the same imagery to a mental struggle (R.D. Williams [1966], Austin [1955, 1966 ed.]), thus emphasising the intense difficulty that Aeneas faces. *Tractabilis*, which Williams notes means 'sympathetically', Austin reads as unusual and suggestive of physical handling, as if taming an animal.

There are several possible interpretations of the ambiguous winds. They could be read as the gods, to whom they are frequently related (they are, at once, minor gods themselves, and also controlled by major gods), tearing Aeneas in different directions. Alternatively, the conflicting forces could even be Aeneas' own emotions, his divided mind. The clearest interpretation here is that they represent Dido's words. They are the ephemeral, empty, barren winds, whilst he is the oak: long-lasting, nurturing, strong, alive. Likening her pleas to winds recalls the ancient association of words that blow away, as well as a common trope of love poetry whereby promises are made to the unreliable winds in vain, heard by nobody and swift to disappear. The assonance in *nunc hinc, nunc illinc* (with *hinc atque hinc* a few lines later), and the harsh sound of the 'c' alliteration in *certant*, *consternunt*, *concusso*, reflects the contest between these competing, natural forces. In the simile itself, Aeneas first has an active verb, "he heard", and then the mood turns passive, "he could not be moved", showing that he actively listens, but is under duress to be unresponsive, as we balance his agency against his subordination to the gods. Indeed, the gods are active in their obstruction – with *deus* and *fata* nominative subjects, the latter emphasised by alliteration (it is the third consecutive line to begin with 'f'). The juxtaposition of *viri deus* also draws

attention to the role of the gods, expressing that as a man, he would have listened, but as an instrument of destiny, he cannot.[68]

The word *heros*, first in a list of three prominent line endings (*heros*, *curas*, *inanes*), is its only instance in book four.[69] It serves to remind us to support Aeneas' actions here, repositioning him as a hero, after the questionable events of book four. Virgil both emphasises Aeneas' strength and connection with the divine, whilst implicating allegiance. Although he does not act on his feelings, he does feel; *magno pectore* wraps around the intensified verb *persentit* (where the intensifying prefix is alliterative) and shows the extent of his grief. Aeneas' tree clings on to a rock, having to battle against the forces shaking it, sturdy with a length stretching from the underworld right up to the upper airs.[70] This could purely indicate the incredible height of the tree, or that Aeneas' character stretches from the heights of heaven to the depths of hell, the length of the journey that he will have to face, and the strength he will need to take him from the underworld (where he will next see Dido) to the end of his journey. It expresses sublimity, extreme height and depth, epic grandeur, and the power of Aeneas' strength. Page thinks it an unnatural exaggeration,[71] whereas

---

[68] R.D. Williams (1966). Austin (1955, 1966 ed.).

[69] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.).

[70] Hardie (1986) calls this simile a striking example of vertical extremities and notes its reference to the previous description of Atlas (280-1).

[71] Page (1955, 1966 ed.).

Austin claims it shows the contrast between 'the firm roots of Aeneas' purpose and the precarious, exposed position of his emotions'.[72] Height can be an advantage in such situations, or a fault: on one hand, it is more likely to blow over (and could represent hubristic ambition), but on the other, its deep roots can manage its height and make it more stable. The direct reference to Tartarus, reminding us that the gods represent both dark and light, is emphatic hyperbole, emphasised by the alliteration of 't'. The extremity of height also embellishes *annoso*, providing both a vertical (tall) and temporal (aged) axis for the new world order.[73]

Like the ambiguous winds, there are multiple readings of the focaliser here. Neither Dido's situation in the narrative nor the description of a victimised, yet gloried, Aeneas make her a likely candidate for focaliser. Could it be Aeneas? The epic sublimity presents his burden, the opposing forces his own uncertainty. His sense of being stretched and overwhelmed supports this reading, and intratextual links provide further evidence; the simile recalls Aeneas' comparison of Troy's siege to a tree being felled by farmers' axes at 2.654. If this is the case, Aeneas sees his position here as more secure: he is sturdy enough to withstand such blows, which come from winds (Dido's pleading) rather than from axes (wielded by men). However, its epic subject matter and objective status do not suggest it is a description

---

[72] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.).

[73] Hardie (1986) 281 n125.

which Aeneas would draw himself, and rather point towards the epic narrator being the focaliser here.

The impression that the narrator is speaking is further strengthened by the addition of the specific localisation in Northern Italy, *Alpini Boreae*, which suggests a scene from Virgil's own personal observation and creates a strong connection with his envisaged Italian audience.[74] Williams comments that the objective nature of this simile is crucial in cementing in our minds Aeneas' love for Dido.[75] Just as the lack of apostrophe to Aeneas helps to avoid him becoming an object of extreme emotion, so does the content of this simile. It is strongly epic, there is little feeling, though it ultimately gives a positive impression since Aeneas fulfils his epic cause: Aeneas is not a deer being ripped apart by Dido's lion, he is a tree that does not move in the breeze, playing a similar role to Turnus at 10.693, and Latinus at 7.586.

Indeed, whilst in book four's simile, Aeneas is referred to as a solid oak tree, which stays upright despite strong winds, in book 12 he becomes the storm cloud itself, causing the devastation and anguish which, as the oak tree, he

---

[74] Austin (1955, 1966 ed.), R.D. Williams (1966). W.D. Anderson (1957): Virgil does this when comparing the fall of a huge warrior slain by Turnus to a pile of masonry crashing into the sea at Baiae, with two further place-names.

[75] G. Williams (1983) 182.

withstands.[76] This is less evidence of character development, and more an indication of the similes' shifting focalisation. Whereas the oak tree is told fairly objectively by the narrator, with the hero presented in a gloriously Roman way, the cloud is focalised by the Rutulians and Latins, like the helmet simile at 10.270. Thus the natural, unaccountable cloud is not presented as brave, heroic and honourable, righteously defeating the enemy, but rather as seen through the eyes of the farmers tending to crops, the Rutulians, as a source of disaster.

But where the Rutulians are allowed to focalise the simile of Aeneas, Dido is not. If she had focalised a similar image of Aeneas in book 4, he would be portrayed as a destructive force, causing disruption and chaos by uprooting Dido. Instead, Virgil chose to paint him as a sturdy, reliable, focussed man, intent on his destiny, with Dido the destructive and obstructive force, testing his commitment to the cause. Perhaps her impression of his character here would be irrevocably damaging, whereas for the Rutulians, there is always an enemy in war, and their suffering, which is less personal and thus more victimless, comes with the benefit of imperial glory. The difference in subject also allows the simile to perform a

[76] Ahl highlights the link between these two similes, and Aeneas' transformation from steady tree to their destructive force, by repeating the words "uproot trees". This is perhaps an example of the function which Wofford (1992: 2) sees in pastoral similes: to contrast to, and perhaps criticise, the battle narrative. The simile in book 12 is reminiscent of that at 2.304, when Aeneas compares himself to a shepherd protecting his grain, subjected to a roar of devastating fire (the Greeks).

different purpose, and the emotional paralysis of the oak serves to remind the audience of Aeneas' own victimisation.

Virgil ends the oak simile with ambiguity.[77] The final line has alliteration of a mournful 'm' sound – *mens immota manet lacrimae* – and, in the description of the tears rolling down in vain, Virgil has, once again, left us in the dark.[78] Are Dido's tears rolling down in vain because they had no effect? Or is Aeneas shedding tears, in vain because he knows he cannot act on these emotions? Critics and translators are conflicted over this matter.[79] David West, despite believing that the tears must have been Aeneas', chose to translate this line ambiguously: "Just so the hero Aeneas was buffeted by all this pleading on this side and on that, and felt the pain deep in his mighty heart but his mind remained unmoved and the tears rolled in vain."[80] West recognises the difference between his roles as scholar, who can convey an

---

[77] The next simile which I analyse, comparing Turnus to boiling water, is followed by an ambiguous line of free indirect discourse (see pp113-117).

[78] Line 448 echoes language used of Hercules at 10.464-65 (Petrini [1997: 64]), which perhaps emphasises the justness and stateliness of his actions, whilst reminding us of his divine lineage and his destiny.

[79] On the tears as belonging to Aeneas, see W.S. Anderson (1969) 48, Servius, Highet (1974), who claims it is scarcely grammatically possible for two noun subjects in the same line to belong to different people: therefore, as the *mens immota* is Aeneas', so are the *lacrimae inanes* (226-7), and Hardie (1986) 280-1, who reads the tears as corresponding to the falling leaves of Aeneas' tree. On the tears as belonging to Dido, see Conington (1884, 2007 ed.). On the line as ambiguous, see Austin (1955, 1966 ed.), Jackson Knight (1944, 1966 ed.) 216, and R.D. Williams (1966), who states that the ambiguity here is intended to widen the area of sorrow.

[80] West (1969) 45.

interpretative opinion, and translator, who should not impose a particular interpretation on his readers.[81] I shall now look to how Ahl and Day Lewis translate this passage.

> Such were her prayers, and such the tearful entreaties her agonized
> Sister conveyed to Aeneas again and again. But unmoved by
> Tearful entreaties he was, adamant against all pleadings:
> Fate blocked them, heaven stopped his ears lest he turn complaisant.
> As when some stalwart oak-tree, some veteran of the Alps,
> Is assailed by a wintry wind whose veering gusts tear at it,
> Trying to root it up; wildly whistle the branches,
> The leaves come flocking down from aloft as the bole is battered;
> But the tree stands firm on its crag, for high as its head is carried
> Into the sky, so deep do its roots go down towards Hades:
> Even thus was the hero belaboured for long with every kind of
> Pleading, and his great heart thrilled through and through with the pain of it;
> Resolute, though, was his mind; unavailingly rolled her tears.
>
> *Aeneid* 4.437-449 (Day Lewis)

Day Lewis' simile is marked by a clear movement into the present tense, differentiated from its narrative context. The adjectives "adamant" and "resolute" (at the start and end of this passage) show that his own will stands strong against Dido's pleas. The reading of the gods trying to uproot

[81] See also Griffin's note at 1.450-1, which is inconsistent to Day Lewis' translation.

the tree is downplayed, with more liability being placed on Dido. Virgil's plural winds (*flatibus*) become singular, which suggests the destructive force is Dido herself, not a collection of deities, or even her own words. She is "trying to root it up", actively obstructing him, whilst he willingly seeks to obey the gods' commands. There is no hint of competitive forces at work here, since it is not the gods competing, or internal conflict which Day Lewis is describing, just Dido. "Belaboured" conveys the additional connotations of *tunditur*, since it can be specifically associated with words.[82] With "heaven stopped his ears lest he turn complaisant", Day Lewis adds a domesticating, Christianising context, and implies to his readers a more positive connotation than 'god'. The charge of complaisance insinuates that Aeneas might have been tempted to act in any way which would please Dido. Day Lewis thus condones the actions of the gods, stating that if Aeneas acted against these orders, he would be acting against his duty to Rome, and submitting to the folly of love. Aeneas stands firm on a crag, a positive, strong, willingly secure translation of *haeret scopulis*, which could easily express desperation, rather than the strength which Day Lewis reads. The tree is described as a "veteran", which has the domesticating implication of a military hero, further connecting it with Aeneas, and with concepts of heroism contemporary to Day Lewis.[83]

---

[82] OED (*belabour*, 2b): "to assail with words". Austin (1955, 1966 ed.) notes that *tunditur* is a vivid word.

[83] Day Lewis also uses the word "veteran" in the simile at 6.226.

Whilst the final couplet is sympathetic towards Dido, its sympathy is offset by Aeneas' resolute focus. Day Lewis' translation of the tears on line 448 rather summarises his overall interpretation of this passage: they are clearly Dido's. In suppressing Aeneas' suffering here, Day Lewis amplifies his willing heroism. The fact that he actively chooses to fulfil his moral duty, even at the cost of Dido's suffering, only strengthens, in Day Lewis' eyes, his heroic status. In a rather Augustan manner, Day Lewis thus condones Aeneas' leaving, and thus his narrator suggests narrative allegiance: as readers, even if we feel sympathy for Dido (as Day Lewis certainly does), we should morally support Aeneas' actions. He has reduced Virgil's ambiguous voice and reinforced a new epic voice of his own construction, in which Aeneas is resolute, committed, restrained.

437 Such her insistent plea; and such lamentations her sister,
Saddest of all, has to act, re-enact. To laments, he proves passive,
Motionless; and to their voices, the words that he hears, unresponsive.
440 Fate blocks, god obstructs what he, as a man, would hear calmly.
So, in the Alps, wild gales from the north gust this way and that way,
Vying among themselves to uproot some vigorous oak tree,
Massive with centuries' growth: there's a roar, and the uppermost foliage
Flies off and carpets the ground as the trunk shudders. Yet the old oak tree
445 Sticks to the crags, and as high as its crest reaches up towards heaven's

Brightness, its roots stretch down just as low into Tartarus' darkness.
Such was the pounding of voices, this way and that way, the hero
Underwent ceaselessly; he, in his great heart, felt all the anguish.
But, in his mind, he remained unmoved; tears flood, but are wasted.

Aeneid 4.437-449 (Ahl)

In his writing on Lucan, Ahl remarks that Aeneas' affair with Dido casts an unfavourable light on him, and that the audience are repeatedly reminded that Carthage will be the future enemy of Rome (even though these associations are not something Aeneas is aware of – it is, in fact, Dido who prophesies the doomed nature of their relationship).[84] It requires what Ahl calls a 'humiliating denunciation' from Mercury to force the hero back into line, though Aeneas emerges stronger for this humiliation, with a strengthened resolve shown through comparison with the oak tree.[85] Ahl also, however, writes that our potentially negative reading of book 4 is related to the fact that Aeneas struggles to reconcile his instincts with the destiny which he knows he must face; this results in a state of paralysis.[86]

[84] Ahl (1976) 183-6.
[85] Ahl (1976) 226, 183-6.
[86] Ahl (1976) 151-6.

Ahl translates the destructive forces as plural "wild gales", which validates several interpretations: Aeneas' conflicting emotions, the gods, or Dido's pleas. He also refers to the pounding of (again pluralised) voices, which are, first and foremost, Dido's words, although the generic 'voices' could refer to an inner conflict or his divine messages. The tree responds with the humanised reaction of "shuddering", which makes him more vulnerable than Day Lewis' "stalwart…veteran".

Lines 437-9 are syntactically awkward, with the sentence feeling fragmentary. Additionally, two words are given for *nullis movetur* – Aeneas is "motionless" and "unresponsive", each placed at opposing ends of the line, which emphasises the number of words and pleas that Aeneas receives, and heightens the fact that he does not respond. Ahl chooses an active verb (though uses it to neatly convey the mood of the original), "he proves passive". However, this also heightens the collaborative work of the fates and gods in acting against him, as they are making him act contrary to the normal actions of a man, where Ahl conveys the juxtaposition of *deus viri*. In other words, founding Rome requires inhuman behaviour. The sublime extremities are emphasised through Ahl's poetic balancing of phrases: "Its crest reaches up towards heaven's brightness, its roots stretch down just as low into Tartarus' darkness", with 'brightness' and 'darkness' bookending the line. The alliteration of 'm' in "in his mind he remained unmoved", conveys a mournful tone. Again, Ahl chooses to maintain the ambiguity in the final lines and ascribe the tears neither to Dido nor Aeneas, conveying general sadness within the narrative.

Even in a simile which appears to be epic and objective, translators can find room for ambiguity and interpretation within Virgil's voice, and subsequently present differing versions of Aeneas as hero. Day Lewis' hero is firmly, resolutely committed to act against Dido, who is the destructive force attempting to obstruct him from his duty. Ahl's hero suffers in his role, and proves more complex. Ahl's Aeneas is less willing than Day Lewis', and is presented as more of a victim of the gods in the emotional trauma to which he is subjected. For Ahl, Aeneas is human, flawed, and struggling to overcome his own emotional difficulties, which heightens his heroism. Day Lewis closes down the ambiguity, to result in a more clearly defined heroic character. Through their differing translations of this simile, Day Lewis and Ahl have taken a passage which is ostensibly epic and shifted its subjectivity, in order to portray different versions of Virgil's hero. The next simile describes the first appearance of Turnus, far from Aeneas' moderate, and considered tree, Turnus, as boiling water, is aggressive and passionate.

4.4.2 Turnus: boiling water

In book 7, Allecto is sent to provoke Turnus into action. Incensed to the point of madness, he is likened to water brought to the boil in a cauldron.[87]

[87] Bartsch (1998) argues that ekphrases in the *Aeneid* often oppose, for example, control/violence, truth/deception, empire/chaos, and politically suggests that one alternative is favourable (332, 334). Similes, as she shows, also often engage with the same themes and exert a similar function.

Turnus' primary traits are clearly defined: the forces of individual strength and personal power which drive him contrast with Aeneas' sense of social responsibility, and, in this first glimpse of him as tragic hero, we become privy to his thoughts and feelings as he goes into war.[88] The narrator emphasises the fact that his emotions are not his own; this extremity of emotion has divine origin. Turnus is described as being out of control, unable to contain himself, just as the water cannot be contained by the cauldron, symbolic of the ideal model of Roman masculinity: calm, moderate, restrained, controlled.[89] In this scene, and only under divine influence, Turnus breaks free from that mould, loses control of himself and reaches emotional boiling point. These emotions are pre-empted immediately before the simile, where line 462 starts *ira super*, commanding attention with the subsequent pause (signified as a colon in this edition). Turnus is likened to water made to bubble and boil by kindling crackling underneath, contrasting with the simile at the beginning of book 8, which compares Aeneas' anxiety to light flickering on a pool of still water.[90]

---

[88] R.D. Williams (1966).

[89] On self-control in Roman ideologies of masculinity, see Gleason (1995) 61-2, and C.A. Williams (2010) 151-156.

[90] R.D. Williams (1966) also makes this connection. This passage refers to *Argonautica* 3.756, where it describes Medea's anxious concern for Jason. See Beye (1999) 275-6 for an excellent discussion on this.

sic effata facem iuveni coniecit et atro
lumine fumantis fixit sub pectore taedas.
olli somnum ingens rumpit pavor, ossaque et artus
perfundit toto proruptus corpore sudor.
arma amens fremit, arma toro tectisque requirit;
saevit amor ferri et scelerata insania belli,
ira super: magno veluti cum flamma sonore
virgea suggeritur costis undantis aëni
exsultantque aestu latices, furit intus aquai
fumidus atque alte spumis exuberat amnis,
nec iam se capit unda, volat vapor ater ad auras.

Aeneid 7.456–466

This passage is generally in high poetic style: the vocabulary is high register, including: *ater* (which has sinister overtones in Virgil), *olli* (an archaic word used only a handful of times by Virgil), *amnis*, *unda*, *lattices*, and the archaic *aquai*.[91] The sound of the fire is indicated by the positioning of *magno sonore* at either end of the phrase, and mimicked by the assonance of the *-is* ending and the short words in line 466, whilst the assonance of 'f' in lines 456-7 mimics Allecto spitting her words out as she throws the torch. The subject *sudor* and verb *perfundit* are at opposite ends of the line, with Turnus' body, *toto corpore,* syntactically and semantically broken up by the participle *proruptus*. His subsequent desperation to search everywhere in order to find his weapons is emphasised by the repetition of *arma*, and the alliteration of *toro tectisque* and *arma amens*.

[91] Fordyce (1977), R.D. Williams (1966).

This said, she pointed a flaming brand at the youth and implanted
Smoke-darkened light in his heart, the torches of death and of marriage.
Frightful and massive shock bursts in on his sleep, and erupting
Sweat from his whole body drenches him through to his bones and his tendons.
Mindlessly screaming for arms, he hunts arms in his chamber and palace.
Love of the sword linked with criminal madness for war brutalizes:
Top it with anger and it's like the roaring of firewood kindled
Under the ribs of a bubbling cauldron of copper. The surface
Dances with joy as it heats. Underneath it, the upsurge of water
Seethes and it steams and it spurts spray high with exuberant splashing.
Water's not water, but vapour that flits and that blurs into breezes.

Aeneid 7.456–466 (Ahl)

So saying, she hurled an incendiary brand at Turnus, which buried
Itself deep in his heart, blazing and pitchily smoking.
Extreme terror awoke him from sleep; a sweat broke out
All over the young man's body, soaked him from head to foot.
Madly yelling for arms, by his bed, through his house he hunts for them;
Crazy with bloodlust he is, with the criminal mania for fighting,
Still more, with resentment. So, when a fire of wood, loud crackling,
Is stoked up high beneath the belly of a boiling cauldron,
The water dances in the heat; within the cauldron the water
Seethes and fumes, bubbling, spitting up foam, till it cannot
Contain itself any more and a cloud of dense steam rises.

Aeneid 7.456-466 (Day Lewis)

As previously, Day Lewis uses the shift into the present tense to clearly separate the simile from the narrative action, whereas Ahl follows Virgil in shifting at line 458. Ahl uses poetic techniques to imitate the sound of the boiling water, recreating Virgil's effect with the onomatopoeic "bubbling" and crackling fire (alliteration of 's' and rhythmic polysyndeton): "Seethes and it steams and it spurts spray high with exuberant splashing". Turnus' enthusiasm to start fighting is reflected when the water "dances with joy", and is "exuberant", a playful, humane and innocent word. For Day Lewis, the water also revels in boiling, as it "dances".

At several points in this simile, Ahl amplifies Turnus' physical suffering. He describes the sweat in a visceral manner, "erupting | Sweat from his whole body drenches through to his bones and his tendons", following Virgil's description of Turnus' symptoms with near-medical precision.[92] Day Lewis' description of Turnus being soaked head to foot is much less physical, and focuses less on his trauma. When describing Turnus searching for weapons, Ahl repeats "arms", as Virgil does, to highlight Turnus' desperation. Turnus is described as "Mindlessly screaming", showing that he is very much taken over. Day Lewis' Turnus, on the other hand, is "madly yelling for arms", and "crazy with bloodlust", with the

[92] Hardie (1986) 230-1: the detail was as important to Virgil as it was to Lucretius (one of his sources here).

subject and verb "he is" delayed to allow the start of line emphasis to fall on "crazy" rather than "he". Ahl here gives "Love of the sword linked with criminal madness for war brutalizes", linking love and war just as he does in line 456, "torches of death and of marriage". Ahl foregrounds dual opposing connotations of torches, in Roman society and in the *Aeneid.* Ahl reflects Virgil's recurring theme of love and death, referring not just to his own death, but also that of his many comrades and opponents, his love is not only for Lavinia, but also for his country.[93] Day Lewis plays down Turnus' emotional response in his translation of *ira* as 'resentment', presenting a more natural emotion.

As well as evoking more sympathy for Turnus, Ahl also goes to greater lengths to emphasise the change that his character has undergone, and the fact that he has been driven to unnatural action.[94] The main verb Ahl chooses, 'brutalizes', is delayed to the end of the line, and implies some sort of change, a chemical reaction, occurring within Turnus' body. Ahl's focus on Turnus' unnatural change of state is shown by using 'darkened light', rather than 'black light', with the participle showing that the process of change makes him act contrary to his inherent nature. To further reiterate how this behaviour is unnatural for Turnus, and the transformation he has

---

[93] See Dyson (1996) 209 on the opposition of *arma* and *amor* with regard to Lavinia.

[94] See Feeney (1991) 168-171 on the (difficult to explain) extreme of Turnus' change during this episode.

been subjected to, Ahl writes 'water's not water'. In the simile, we understand this indicates the water has been turned to vapour (under the influence of heat). Just like the water is turned to vapour when heated, Turnus has been changed into a frenzied, raging man yearning for battle, by forces beyond his control. He is presented as a victim here, unnaturally changed by the gods.

Ahl focuses on eliciting more sympathy for Turnus through presenting him as a victim of the gods, a role which Aeneas also plays. Turnus, however, is more subject to his own emotions in Day Lewis' translation, making him a mortal enemy for Aeneas to face, and focusing on the responsibility, and accountability, of men for their actions. Day Lewis attributes his emotions more to his own doing, rather than the crazed and divinely inflicted anger which Ahl goes to greater lengths to bring across. Whilst Ahl presents him as a victim of the gods, for Day Lewis he is more of a threatening figure already, primed to be made more dangerous, a theme which continues into the next simile.

4.5 THE HUNTER AND THE HUNTED: AENEAS AND TURNUS AS ANIMALS

4.5.1 Aeneas and Turnus: hunter and lion

In book 9, Turnus is described as a wolf hunting Trojans (9.59), and later (9.272), with roles reversed, as a lion hemmed in by hunters. At the opening of book 12, Virgil again compares him to a lion, typically a positive image, passionate and courageous. Whilst still threatening and

carnivorous, he has become the hunted rather than the hunter. This is the only time a book opens with a simile, which makes it especially prominent.[95] The scene is portrayed from his perspective: his name bookends this simile and the opening has a sense of internal monologue, transferring fluidly to his first speech at line 10.[96] The effect is a concentration of feelings on Turnus' character, making him feel isolated even when in the company of others.[97] He comes across as a victim of the gods, rather than an enemy overcome by Aeneas' prowess.

Turnus ut infractos adverso Marte Latinos
defecisse videt, sua nunc promissa reposci,
se signari oculis, ultro implacabilis ardet
attollitque animos. Poenorum qualis in arvis
saucius ille gravi venantum vulnere pectus
tum demum movet arma leo, gaudetque comantis
excutiens cervice toros fixumque latronis
impavidus frangit telum et fremit ore cruento:
haud secus accenso gliscit violentia Turno.
tum sic adfatur regem atque ita turbidus infit:

Aeneid 12.1-10

Virgil describes Turnus seeing the lines of his men broken 'by Mars', a metonymic symbol for 'war', which foregrounds the influence that the gods will have throughout this book, and, crucially, on its conclusion. The phrase

[95] Putnam (1999) 210; Tarrant (2012) 4-9.
[96] Putnam (1999) 210.
[97] Tarrant (2012).

infractos Latinos is separated by *adverso Marte*, so that the Latins have literally been broken up, syntactically and semantically, by the conflict, and by the god. The fact that Turnus knows the end is coming, that it is he and no other who must meet Aeneas in battle, is emphasised by asyndeton and repetition of *sua, se*.[98] He focalises the narrative as he feels the eyes of his men on him, knowing he must finally deliver on the expectation that he will face Aeneas, with the verb *resposci* implying rightful claim, as if his promise were a loan due repayment.[99]

He burns with an implacable rage; *implacabilis* is only used elsewhere in the *Aeneid* of underworld deities, suggesting that Turnus' ardour for battle has a superhuman, or even inhuman, intensity.[100] The lion is described as *fremit ore cruento*, a phrase previously used of a lion (9.341), and of *furor* (1.296), associating Turnus here with that personification of *furor*, and the violent forces which must be conquered before Rome's era of ultimate peace can be achieved.[101] Turnus is thus here associated with both underworld deities and the violent abstract force of *furor*.

---

[98] Tarrant (2012); R.D. Williams (1966); Maguinness (1953, 1964 ed.).

[99] Tarrant (2012); Conington (1884, 2007 ed.). These promises became expected at 11.116 and 11.434-4 (Maguinness [1953, 1964 ed.]).

[100] Tarrant (2012).

[101] Lyne (1989) 163-5 n49. R.D. Williams (1966). Hardie (1994) notes in the episode at 9.691 that *furor* is "the source both of Turnus' success and of his failure".

In the simile itself, the phrase *movet arma*, frequently used to describe men going into battle, personifies the lion, and closes the gap between simile and narrative.[102] Although Turnus is moving into battle, Virgil also explains his reluctance: he only moves into battle when provoked, emphasised by the alliteration of the languid 'm' sounds.[103] This lion is defensive, not aggressive. This fits with the use of *ultro* in the narrative description, a word which Maguinness explains typically describes "something that the subject would not have been expected to do on his own initiative".[104]

Turnus' name begins book 12; the only other character whose name begins a book is Dido (4).[105] There are other echoes: Dido was also compared to an animal being hunted by Aeneas. Whilst her hind differs from Turnus' lion (though of course he will later become a stag hunted by Aeneas' hound), they both symbolise necessary, sacrificial victims (both in the simile and narrative levels) and are both wounded, equally deserving of our sympathy.[106] Dido's wound was emotional; Turnus' is harder to discern, but could also be read as love,[107] the burden of awareness that he

[102] Tarrant (2012); R.D. Williams (1966).

[103] The theme of wild beasts only becoming aggressive when driven by hunger is picked up in other similes as well (e.g. of Mezentius at 10.723).

[104] Maguinness (1953, 1964 ed.).

[105] Tarrant (2012).

[106] Lyne (1989) 163-5.

[107] Lyne (1989) 163-5, Otis (1964, 1995 ed.) 372-3, Lyne (1987) 120.

has lost (or will lose) his love Lavinia[108] or his deeply loved homeland. There is also an echo with *Poenorum*, though, in a typically Virgilian treatment of complex and confused national identity, the translations will show that it is ambiguous in its application, reinforced by repetition of words used at the start of book 4 (*saucius gravi vulnere / gravi iamdudum saucia cura*).[109]

In similes describing an animal and human character, we would typically expect narrative alignment to be with the human, in this case Aeneas. Turnus' status as an animal, on the other hand, denies him political expression, and an ability to miss his homeland. However, it is Turnus who is the natural inhabitant; the hunters are the invasive, attacking force, with Turnus only reacting because he has been provoked. The hunter is not killing out of need for survival (like, say, the wolf hunting the lambs), but rather for a prize.

Our alignment with Turnus is strengthened by the fact that he focalises this simile. The primary evidence for this is in the reference to the hunter as *latro*, meaning 'bandit' or 'robber', often applied to someone without legitimate rights, and even of disreputable men who captured animals for

---

[108] Dyson (1996) 210 says that Dido burns with a Lucretian love wound, Turnus sickens with his, and both are doomed.

[109] G. Williams (1983) 172. Putnam (1999) 210. Tarrant (2012).

the wild beast trade (perhaps a metaphor for the character Turnus being pressurised by his poet-hunter, who wants to put him on display).[110] *Latro* is an unusual word here: firstly unusual in epic due to its prosaic register, and in terms of meaning, since 'robber' does not make sense here.[111] Whilst some critics and scholars have sought to simply avoid its questionable lexicality by effectively declaring this a "special usage" of the word, I agree with Lyne that Virgil is giving us the unexpected, to be provocative.[112] Reading the scene as focalised through Turnus allows it to be taken with its more typical meaning, conveying a derogatory opinion.[113] The idea of focalisation through Turnus is further evidenced by the fact that a similar word, *praedo*, is used to describe Aeneas three times in direct speech (by Amata, the Latin matrons and Mezentius).[114] Fowler uses this passage to discuss his concept of *deviant focalisation*, a means of reading which the critic uses in order to escape the consideration that the narrator (or author

---

[110] Lyne (1989) 163-5. L&S *latro, onis*: 1) a hired servant, hireling, mercenary, satellite, body-guard etc, of mercenary soldiers; 2) a freebooter, highwayman, robber, bandit, irregular soldier, brigand (this passage cited). OLD *latro, onis*: 1) a hired soldier, mercenary; 2) a brigand, robber, bandit, 2b) as a term of reproach, a plunderer of +gen; 2c) of predatory animals and of huntsmen (this passage cited). Toynbee (1973, 1996 ed.) 61: Africa, as well as Arabia, Syria and Mesapotamia, was a key source for obtaining lions in bulk for entertainment purposes by Roman emperors and magistrates.

[111] Lyne (1989) 164.

[112] Lyne (1989) 164. R.D. Williams (1966) asserts that it merely means 'huntsman', in an unusual use for this word. Reading this passage as a particular, unusual meaning of the word is also seen in OLD, L&S (see above, n110) and in Cassell's, where it is the only literary example cited for meaning (2) "a hunter".

[113] This view is also upheld by Tarrant (2012), Thomas (1998) 289, and G. Williams (1983) 171.

[114] Lyne (1989) 163-5. G. Williams (1983) 171.

himself) may have dissenting views. He incorporates comments from Lyne, that attributing passages such as this to character-focalisation can help the reader maintain a particular view of the epic's narrator, and Conte, who believes that focalisation does not negate the challenge: the author has still written the words, and the reader can still choose to interpret them as being endorsed by the narrator, or author, if they wish.[115]

Towards the end of the passage, the narrative returns to a critical and authorial perspective, as shown by the 'loaded' words *gliscit, violentia, accenso*.[116] *Violentia* is especially rare, and only ever used of winds and waves, and, in terms of characters, of Turnus (12.45 and 11.376).[117] While the lion is naturally angry, *violentia* describes his impetuousness and lack of control,[118] and is so unusual that Williams sees it as prohibiting the simile's sympathy for Turnus.[119]

1 When Turnus saw that the Latins were crushed by defeat and in lowest
Spirits – saw, too, that all eyes were upon him as if demanding
That now he should make good his promise, he burned with a mood all the more

[115] Fowler (2000) 60-63. Lyne (1989: 165; 1987: 227). Conte (1986: 153, 161-2). Cf. Bartsch (1994) 150-154 on public and private 'transcript'.

[116] Tarrant (2012).

[117] R.D. Williams (1966). Maguinness (1953, 1964 ed.) adds that it is also used for winds and waves.

[118] Tarrant (2012).

[119] G. Williams (1983) 171.

Uncompromising; his temper sharpened. Just as an African
Lion, when he's received a bad wound in the breast from the hunters
Then at last becomes really dangerous, gleefully tosses
The shaggy mane from his neck, and uncowed snaps at the assailant's
Arrow stuck in him, breaks it, roars with his mouth all bloody:
So Turnus looks; his violent intransigeance[120] kindles and mounts up.
Now, with an outburst of passion, he speaks to Latinus, saying:

Aeneid 12.1-10 (Day Lewis)

Day Lewis paints a severe description of the Latins, 'crushed by defeat', and a negative description of Turnus. His mood is 'uncompromising', and the effect of the hunter on the lion is just to sharpen the temper (in other words, it is already existing and it is just heightened). In a similar vein, he says that after his wound the lion becomes 'really' dangerous – again insinuating that he was already dangerous before (as, arguably, we would expect from a lion). This has a pejorative effect, rather than insinuating earlier innocence. Later the same effect is achieved when we hear that his 'violent intransigeance' is kindled, implying that it pre-existed, and just needed fostering. Turnus also seems to revel in his anger, when he 'gleefully tosses his mane'. *Latro* is translated in a neutral way, as 'assailant'. Day Lewis removes the reference to Carthage, obviously not

[120] Sic.

considering it important, referring generally to an 'African | Lion'. Removing the Carthage reference omits the reminder of Aeneas' previous victims, and thus again paints Aeneas in a more positive light here. Turnus speaks to Latinus in an 'outburst of passion', a typically rash, anti-Roman way to behave. Day Lewis is thus fairly negative of Turnus here, and neutral in his portrayal of Aeneas.

Turnus, observing that setbacks in battle have broken the Latins,
Sees their morale's given out. Eyes show they expect him to honour
Now what he promised before. And he burns with unquenchable ardour.
Raising his courage high, like a lion who, though he has serious
Chest wounds dealt him by hunters in Punic ploughlands of Carthage,
Finally puts life back in his limbs, exults as he ruffles
Layers of mane on his neck, and fearlessly snaps off the bandit's
Deep-fixed shaft. Blood pours from his mouth, but he's roaring.
Such is the violence now welling up within Turnus. He's blazing.
That's when he speaks to the king in an outburst of seething emotions:

Aeneid 12.1-10 (Ahl)

Ahl's translation of *Adverso Marte* as 'setbacks in battle' perhaps reflects vain hope that the situation is not quite as bad as the reader knows it to be. This could be a heightening of Turnus' focalisation, as he pretends (to himself and possibly his troops) that the situation is less dire than it appears. Ahl doubles the reference to Carthage, 'Punic' and 'Carthage',

emphasising the fact that this relates back to Dido.[121] The relation to Dido functions to compound Aeneas' tragic victims. As well as its parallel to Dido, depicting a foreign setting reinforces Aeneas' right to rule and his links to Italy.[122] While Ahl achieves the foreign setting, he distances it from either Turnus or Aeneas, choosing not to attach the genitive to either the lion or the hunters, but rather the lands. Turnus becomes the 'other', Aeneas the natural inhabitant. This consolidates focalisation through Turnus; he is brave, and goes into battle in self-defence against Aeneas, the unlawful claimant of Italy and Lavinia, against whom Turnus has been forced to protect what he loves.[123]

Ahl uses present tense verbs, and the italicised 'Now', at the start of the line, contrasting temporally with the deictic 'before', heightens the immediacy and focalisation. Turnus is 'expected' to honour now his previous promises, increasing the pressure and demanding intensity of their gaze: "eyes show they expect him to honour", gives us an impression of Turnus' experience here, with all eyes fixed on him. In this way, the focalisation through Turnus is strong. All he sees is the eyes, the expectation, not even the people behind the eyes. It's not about them, it's about the expectant gaze. Ahl translates

---

[121] Ahl (1976) refers to Turnus' association with Rome's arch enemy as "crucial" (105), citing Galinsky (1968) 175.

[122] Cairns (1989) 109-13.

[123] Tarrant (2012).

latro as 'bandit', befitting the focalisation from Turnus here, and portraying Aeneas in a negative light.

However, for *animus,* he gives 'courage' where Day Lewis gave 'temper', and in line 6, Turnus 'finally puts life back into his limbs', with a less harsh tone than Day Lewis 'then at last becomes really dangerous'. Ahl continues this perspective through the simile; rather than making the point that Turnus has gone into battle because he's been provoked, Ahl makes the point that Turnus revitalises himself ready for battle again despite having wounds. This is equally positive about Turnus – emphasising his bravery and persistence, not his needing to be provoked in order to fight. When Turnus is roaring, Ahl reiterates this: he is still roaring despite the blood pouring from his mouth, emphasising that he should be struggling, but is acting more bravely and strongly than expected.

Including this simile, Turnus and Aeneas have nine similes each in book 12.[124] Turnus' second simile (12.103) compares him to a solitary bull, bellowing before a combat, at 12.331, he is Mars, giving rein to his steed, and at 12.365, clouds scudding through the sky, cleaving a way through the enemy. Aeneas also proves a similar force driving itself through the battle

[124] The simile comparing the devastation they cause to that which fires and torrents inflict upon a wood (12.521-3) would make eleven each. I omit it since its subject is their actions (the battle) rather than the characters.

at 12.451, compared to a storm moving landwards. Following on with the theme of nature, Turnus is a rock crashing down from a mountain at 12.684, and Aeneas is likened to three mountains: Athos, Erys and Apennine. They meet as two bulls charging each other (12.715), and Turnus is briefly compared to the swiftness of the wind at 12.733. When book 12 comes to a close, and Aeneas and Turnus' inevitable duel nears, the pair are once again described in a joint simile depicting an animal hunting scene, comparing them to a dog and stag (12.749).

4.5.2 Aeneas and Turnus: hound and stag

By the end of book 12, the implications have clearly changed, as Turnus is likened to a stag, being chased by Aeneas' hunting dog. Aeneas is still a hunter, as he was in book four's Dido simile, but Turnus has been relegated from lion to stag. The inequality of these animals befits their subjects; Turnus' sword has just been broken on Aeneas' divine armour, and now he flees, unarmed, to find another weapon. Turnus seeks a fair fight with Aeneas, which, so far, he has been denied. Aeneas pursues this unmatched fight, a dog seeking a deer. Stags, whilst naturally dangerous, and certainly a more formidable opponent than a doe, are dangerous by subtle implication rather than explicit carnivorism. However, as well as being hunted for sport and food, they were also maintained for pleasure, as pets,

and celebrated for their beauty.[125] The stag is able to defend itself, but is also a noble and impressive animal, as seen by the stag in *Aeneid* 7, with significant associated pathos.

746 nec minus Aeneas, quamquam tardata sagitta
interdum genua impediunt cursumque recusant,
insequitur trepidique pedem pede fervidus urget:
inclusum veluti si quando flumine nactus
750 cervum aut puniceae saeptum formidine pennae
venator cursu canis et latratibus instat;
ille autem insidiis et ripa territus alta
mille fugit refugitque vias, at vividus Umber
haeret hians, iam iamque tenet similisque tenenti
755 increpuit malis morsuque elusus inani est;

Aeneid 12.746-755

As well as the subject of the deer, there is reference to Dido in the vocabulary of this passage, in *Puniceae* (750), which can mean either 'red' or 'Punic'. The foreign Turnus is once again assimilated to the enemy of Rome, contrasting with Aeneas' local Umbrian hound.[126] That it is Aeneas who is wounded here reminds us of his mortality, the amount he has suffered, and that he is not completely immune from pain. However, it also

[125] Toynbee (1973, 1996 ed.) 143-4. He references the Silvia episode.

[126] Toynbee (1973, 1996 ed.) on the Umbrian hunting dog (with reference to this passage of the *Aeneid*), one of only a few Italian breeds while there were many from further afield (104). See Cairns (1989) 109-113 on book 12's similes linking Turnus with foreign and Aeneas with Italian locations.

reminds of his invincibility – unlike Dido or Turnus, his wounds will not kill him.

The inequality of the fight is reinforced at the end of the passage, as we learn that they are not fighting to the death, they are fighting until Turnus dies. Aeneas plays the role of hunting dog, again a *venator* (used of him in the previous simile), meaning that he does not hunt to survive (contrary to Turnus, who, as a lion and a wolf, is a natural hunter). This comparison consolidates Aeneas' characterisation as always controlled and in control; it is harder to imagine the animalistic and barbaric Turnus as the human hunter of a wild animal.

Aeneas pursued the while, though hampered and slowed down
At times by the arrow-wound he had received in his leg:
Still, he pressed hard and hotly upon his panting foe.
It was like the scene when a hound has got a stag cut off by
A river, or headed off by the nets with their crimson feathers
Which scare it: the hound, baying, follows up close on its heels;
The quarry, frightened both by the snares and the river-bank's steepness,
Turns on its tracks again and again; but the spirited staghound
Sticks to it, jaws agape – has he got it? – you'd think he had got it,
The way his teeth snap like a trap, but he's bitten the air and is baffled.

Aeneid 12.746-755 (Day Lewis)

Hot in pursuit comes Aeneas who matches the terrified Turnus
Footstep for footstep, though every so often his knees, which the arrow's
Wound slows down, fail to work with his feet and refuse to keep running.
He's like a hunting dog with a stag he's got trapped at a river
Or fenced in by the huntsman's scarecrows feathered in Punic
Crimson. He races in yelping pursuit. And his panicky quarry,
Hedged in by fear of the treacherous nets and the river-bank's steepness,
Bounds and rebounds on a thousand escape routes. The panting and lively
Umbrian hound isn't shaken. He's got him, he's got him, he's snapping
Jaws just as if he had got him. He's fooled. For his fangs come up empty.

Aeneid 12.746-755 (Ahl)

Day Lewis paints Turnus as less of a victim than Ahl does. In Day Lewis' translation, he is described in 748 in relation to Aeneas, who subtly focalises here, as his "panting foe", whereas Ahl has him as "the terrified Turnus" (746). Ahl sympathetically compounds the image of Turnus' fear later: "scarecrows", "panicky", "hedged in by fear of the treacherous nets". Indeed Ahl's "treacherous" suggests subtle focalisation through Turnus' deer. Day Lewis' narrator, on the other hand, describes the deer's peril in a distanced way, 'the feathers which scare it', reporting the experience rather than showing it empathetically. For comparison, Ruden translates as "a terrifying pen of bright red feathers", showing how this passage can be highly focalised through Turnus. Day Lewis' narrator is again reporting the feelings of his characters with sympathy, but not empathy.

As observed elsewhere, Day Lewis foregrounds the fact that this is an example of figurative language, exposing the simile by beginning – "it was like the scene when". Whilst he clearly separates the two narrative modes, he closely follows Virgil's blurring between simile and narrative content, as when he refers to Turnus as Aeneas' "panting foe".[127] As in the lion simile, Day Lewis removes the reference to Carthage, and subsequently Dido. This means readers are less vividly reminded of Aeneas' amassing victims, and Turnus' own status as victim is weakened. Ahl, who doubled the reference to Carthage in the lion simile, gets across Virgil's double meaning in *Puniceae* with "Punic Crimson", thus reminding us of Aeneas' previous victims.

Day Lewis compares Aeneas to a "spirited staghound" (where the specification of 'staghound' insinuates Aeneas was bred to hunt Turnus), who is "baying", which connotes a crowd vociferously clamouring for a justice or punishment.[128] This expresses some certainty, some closure, but also a sense of intimidating power, strength, and personal or community desperation in a thirst to fight (or kill). Ahl, however, gives a less

---

[127] Virgil relates simile to narrative here through: *cursum* (751, 763), *increpuit/increpat* (of the dog at 755 and of Aeneas at 758), and subtle repetition with *elusus* (755) and *ludicra* (764).

[128] OED *baying*: to bark. to call for a person's blood, and even "of a person or group of people: to demand or clamour for something (especially a form of justice or punishment) vehemently or vociferously", to require something desperately.

triumphant image than Day Lewis' baying hound; he is "yelping". 'Yelping' in the *OED* is described as: "to boast, speak vaingloriously: said of dogs and related animals, and certain birds, to lift up one's voice; to cry aloud; to sing loud or on a high note, to complain, whine, to utter with a loud cry; to express by yelping or in a yelping tone". It is certainly less celebratory than Day Lewis' "baying", and suggests pain on behalf of Aeneas. Indeed, at the beginning of this extract, Ahl's Aeneas "matches the terrified Turnus", perhaps in emotion as well as footfall, since there is nothing to indicate him being angry until he is described as 'Lively'.

Both Ahl and Day Lewis end this vivid scene in a conversational, colloquial voice. Day Lewis engages his audience, with the interjectional question, followed by second person address "- has he got it? – you'd think he had got it". Ahl, on the other hand, seems rather to engage with his characters, where "He's got him, he's got him" closely relates to Aeneas' own thoughts as he snaps at Turnus' deer, subsequently denied by the narrator: "He's fooled". The move to interjection in Day Lewis is also exaggerated due to a higher register immediately beforehand, with "spirited staghound" and "jaws agape".

Day Lewis focuses on portraying a clear conflict with a clear outcome, which he encourages the audience to agree upon, whilst Ahl once again pulls us in different directions, provoking sympathy for both characters in the lead-up to the final duel.

4.6 CONCLUSIONS

Epic similes are far removed from conventional modern texts. Constructed separately to the main narrative, but closely related to it, and occupying a different deictic centre that typically exists on an eternally present plain, ancient epic similes contain a complex web of anachronistic allusions, historical and literary, to a body of work unfamiliar to a modern audience. Translators can alter the scaffolding around the simile's construction, if they wish their audience to transition more smoothly (as Day Lewis often chooses), or to blend the simile more ambiguously with the narrative and conceal it (as Ahl often does). Since simile elements are so interpretative, there is much scope for ambiguity in translation and in voice, which can be used to more clearly separate, or interlink, narrative and simile.

Although often considered to be a key component of his epic voice, Virgil's similes are often spoken in a subjective manner, or focalised through a character. Whether the original is read in a subjective or objective way, translators have frequent opportunities to interpret these constructions, according to their own reading of Virgil's epic voice and narrative. For Day Lewis, this often means using similes to present a clear narrator, breaking from the narrative in a clear and consistent way, and usually speaking with a single point of view that presents an imperial Augustan hero. Thus, Day Lewis does not seek to challenge the reader but rather to close down any ambiguities which threaten to cloud his interpretation of the narrative. For Ahl, on the other hand, similes allow him to present more ambiguity over the roles that his protagonist and antagonist play, and over how they

interact and contribute to the epic's themes. In particular, Ahl uses these similes to elevate Turnus' victimisation, an element which Day Lewis is less willing to explore. In this chapter and the previous, therefore Ahl focuses more on the role of gods within the epic, whether as part of its construction, or as authors in its events, whereas Day Lewis focuses on man's individual action.

This portrayal of the epic's human and divine characters positions the narrator and identifies his epic voice. Day Lewis makes steps towards creating, or re-creating, an epic voice, reflecting a Virgilian narrative. Even though he moves between tenses, and is certainly not always objective, his subjectivities are presented in a fairly consistent, considered and controlled way. Ahl, on the other hand, does not seek to unify his text in the same way, or to find a common voice and perspective through which to voice his similes and character descriptions. His *Aeneid* is told through a variety of complex, sometimes competing voices, that often allow characters to focalise in ways which may unsettle the audience. This perhaps reflects differing contemporary relationships to Virgil: Day Lewis' reverential view of the text and of his own status as author, of Virgil, of Classics and of Latin. This contrasts with Ahl's presentation of a living text, that belongs as much to his audience as to him, which pulls in different directions and which is challenged, as much as it is challenging.

In *The Lyric Impulse*, Day Lewis spoke about exaggerating attractive qualities in poetic subjects, and how, speaking as a poet rather than a

translator, sincerity only prohibits the lyric impulse; he initially gives the example of celebrating a beautiful woman, but states that this process is the same for extolling the bravery of heroic men, or at least their given actions.[129] His Aeneas is equally an exaggeration of the facts. He has convinced himself of the strength of Aeneas' character, and presents his world in a black and white fashion. For Ahl, whose generation was affected by a war which was not understood, and who has worked for decades in an environment where peers are continually questioning the Virgilian text, there is less desire to construct a unifying voice of reason. Ahl wants his hero to be flawed. Whilst Day Lewis might have been aware of the disfavour towards Aeneas which earlier generations had upheld, and chosen to work to solve that problem when broadcasting the epic as a piece of literature to the nation, it is not a primary concern for Ahl: making Aeneas likeable is less important. His readers are rather more attracted to the opportunity of challenging its imperfect characters.

[129] Day Lewis (1965) 21-25.

5 Case Study: Cumulative Narrative Engagement in Book Nine

In each of the first four chapters, I used short extracts to discuss a particular narrative phenomenon: focalisation, deixis, apostrophe, and simile. Translators use these motifs to engage with their narrative's characters and events, with the process of narrating and the act of authorship, and, through their new target audience, with classical reception. In this chapter, I will apply the same close textual analysis to a longer passage, to combine narratological frames and examine their cumulative effect.

I have picked a passage from book 9, which lends itself well to narratological analysis, and which prioritises my chosen themes. A narratorially rich book, of intense and unequivocal emotion, book 9 sees Aeneas absent, and Turnus foregrounded, able to take centre stage.[1] Whilst the passage I have chosen is densely saturated with narrative features, it is not unusual in this regard. It is, in fact, stylistically typical of the *Aeneid*, and thus, a representative extract for analysis. With typical Virgilian juxtaposition, it combines realistic narrative with illusion-shattering narratorial intrusion, when the narrator breaks the fourth wall to comment on his act of narrating or to address his audience. It is also, following

[1] Hardie (1994) 19 says that Aeneas' absence in this book means Turnus can, temporarily, become "the best".

Virgilian convention, full of Homeric reference and features echoes of tragedy, lyric and elegy.[2]

Following the triumphant ending of book 8, with the description of the shield at once an epic trope and a relatably Roman set-piece, book 9 begins by hurling the reader into a scene of imminent war, the first of many which the shield foretold would chequer Rome's existence.[3] The *Aeneid* is frequently structurally divided either into halves (Iliadic and Odyssean), or thirds; in both of these structures, book 9 is a significant turning point.[4] The latter method of division places book 9 as the start of the final act, but, even with the former structure, Hardie argues that it marks the first of the truly Iliadic books (since book 7 sets up the action, and book 8 describes Aeneas' absence from it).[5] Duckworth even read the final third of the *Aeneid*, and specifically book 9 and 12, as Turnus' own tragedy, foreshadowed by the Nisus and Euryalus episode.[6] Others have considered book 9 as largely "episodic and incidental", isolated since its primary subject is the Nisus and Euryalus subplot, and unintegrated since it does not progress or develop the primary plot; even its many casualties will, unlike Pallas' death in book

---

[2] Hardie (1994) 1-34, especially 29-31.

[3] Hardie (1994) 1-2.

[4] See Duckworth (1967) on the structure into thirds, Otis (1964, 1995 ed.) into halves.

[5] Hardie (1994) 1-2. R.D. Williams (1966) 276.

[6] Duckworth (1967) 142.

10, have no later significance.[7] However, as Hardie rightly says, "[book 9] is tightly woven into symbolic and thematic patterns of central importance for the epic as a whole", reflecting the sacking of Troy in book 2, whilst also symbolising the future vision of Rome and her ability to withstand aggressors.[8]

The absent Aeneas is partaking in the parallel action of book 8, in a structural narrative move which innovatively breaks Homeric tradition. Aeneas' absence provides a natural foil for the development of Turnus' character, and the two characters are sharply contrasted: Aeneas has left his people to seek allies and intelligence about the establishment of Rome, while Turnus rages, rampant, attempting to violently overthrow the Trojan camp.[9] Indeed, book 9 focuses on the development of Turnus' character, and portrays him in a typically ambiguous way, attested by his various interpretations, as either at the peak of his tragic heroism, or as a veritable "enemy of the state".[10] Turnus, both in the epic broadly, and in a concentrated fashion in book 9, undergoes a heroic downfall, a character de-escalation which allows Aeneas' to be elevated, and which is brought about in part due to his inability to adhere to the Roman heroic code, and

---

[7] Hardie (1994) 1-2. Hardie also reports that it has even been read as a completely separated epyllion (24).

[8] Hardie (1994) 5-6.

[9] Otis (1964, 1995 ed.) 345. Hardie (1994) 5.

[10] Hardie (1994) 18. See Wlosok (1976, 1999 ed.) on tragic themes in the *Aeneid*, applied to Dido and Turnus.

in part by Virgil's "imperfect perception of the human and divine world".[11] Book 9's other central characters, Nisus and Euryalus, are also extremely interpretable, open to being read as a tragic couple undeserving of their brutal death, as a pair rightly punished for their excess and unheroic action, or as noble lovers who achieve eternal glory.[12] Other Virgilian themes are also developed and complicated in book 9: pursuit of personal ambition versus public good; divine intervention and authority; love and loss; narrative foreshadowing and dramatic irony; self-control versus reckless passion.[13] Finally, this book pointedly shows the two extremes of feeling with which Virgil, who wrote about war despite strongly condemning it, approaches battle; not as a social inevitability, like Homer, but as an activity deserving of interrogation.[14] This personal hatred of war, which Williams reads throughout the *Aeneid*, is arguably expressed in the tension between his portrayal of the bloodshed which epic demands, and his personal and regretful reflection on it; in book 9, these extremes are represented by horrific and brutal battle scenes juxtaposed with the lamentations at Euryalus' death, most poignantly by his mother.[15]

---

[11] Hardie (1994) 19.
[12] Hardie (1994) 26, 28-29.
[13] Hardie (1994) 13, 20-23, 26-7.
[14] R.D. Williams (1966) 276.
[15] R.D. Williams (1966) 276.

This chapter focuses on lines 54-79, with occasional reference to other sections from book 9. If book 9 is an intimate build-up to Turnus' tragic downfall, these lines prepare us for what is to come. With extended use of his point of view, this passage offers emotional insight into Turnus' character, as he is able to be developed without Aeneas' presence, and as he faces up to the impending battle. From a practical point of view, this passage packs in the four narrative features which I have identified as significant in translation, and will thus allow me to show how our two translators produce wider interpretations of the poem.

As the extract commences, Turnus has just been informed by Iris that now is the time to fight. He vows to follow her call, and his army is subsequently described as moving into battle, compared first to the Ganges, then to the Nile, both comparisons which Ahl notes would have seemed particularly exotic.[16] These references increase the impression of narratorial omnipotence, omniscience, and exteriority; he is universal. Whilst the first two similes are relatively objective, a third simile compares the Latins to a distant cloud of black dust, a gathering darkness. The arriving enemy are observed by, and thus focalised through, the Trojans. This simile will be reversed at 12.450-458, when Aeneas is compared to an ominous cloud of black dust on the horizon, this time seen by terrified shepherds

[16] Ahl (2007).

(symbolising the Latins). On seeing the approaching Latins, Caicus raises the alarm for the Trojans, who, despite shame and anger, lock themselves in the tower (a passage of free indirect discourse informs the reader that this is the action Aeneas had ordered them to take, in case of emergency). Turnus arrives and goads them, urging them to join battle with him, compared to a wolf seeking a way into a sheep-pen. At this point, Virgil describes the scene:

clamorem excipiunt socii fremituque sequuntur
horrisono; Teucrum mirantur inertia corda,
non aequo dare se campo, non obvia ferre
arma viros, sed castra fovere. huc turbidus atque huc
lustrat equo muros aditumque per avia quaerit.
ac veluti pleno lupus insidiatus ovili
cum fremit ad caulas ventos perpessus et imbris
nocte super media; tuti sub matribus agni
balatum exercent, ille asper et improbus ira
saevit in absentis; collecta fatigat edendi
ex longo rabies et siccae sanguine fauces:
haud aliter Rutulo muros et castra tuenti
ignescunt irae, duris dolor ossibus ardet.
qua temptet ratione aditus, et quae via clausos
excutiat Teucros vallo atque effundat in aequum?
classem, quae lateri castrorum adiuncta latebat,
aggeribus saeptam circum et fluvialibus undis,
invadit sociosque incendia poscit ovantis
atque manum pinu flagranti fervidus implet.
tum vero incumbunt (urget praesentia Turni),
atque omnis facibus pubes accingitur atris.
diripuere focos: piceum fert fumida lumen
taeda et commixtam Volcanus ad astra favillam.
Quis deus, o Musae, tam saeva incendia Teucris
avertit? tantos ratibus quis depulit ignis?
dicite: prisca fides facto, sed fama perennis.

Aeneid 9.54-79

This passage includes focalisation and free indirect discourse from Turnus (54-7, 65-72), a simile comparing Turnus to a wolf (59-64), a narrator aside (73), and an apostrophe from the narrator to his Muse (77-79). Rather than analysing this passage by narrative motif, as in previous chapters, I will structure my analysis by separating the content of the narrative from the act of narrating: (1) narrator subjectivity: characterisation and divinity; (2) textual authority: character subjectivity and voice. Previous chapters have shown that Day Lewis often imposes a stronger epic narrator presence, being less flexible in allowing other characters to speak, presenting Aeneas as unambiguously heroic, clearly opposed by Turnus, and choosing to speak more commonly from a detached and less personally related position, from which he owns and controls the narrative. Ahl, on the other hand, presents a more emotional, raw, immediate narrative which connects him and his audience to the text in personal ways, inviting and challenging readers to solve its complexities of ambiguity, claiming little authorial or editorial ownership, and further complicating Virgil's voice by allowing it to be fractured into multiple unified perspectives. This chapter shows the cumulative narrative effect of these motifs, and how these translators achieve meaning not simply through what they say, but also by how they say it.

His companions acclaimed it with cheers and followed him with bloodcurdling
War-cries: they were amazed at the Trojans' inactivity,
Amazed that such warriors did not come out on the open plain
And there oppose them, but huddled in the camp. Impatiently Turnus
Rode this way and that round the walls, seeking a way in where none was.
Just as a wolf that lurks near to some crowded sheepfold,
Howling around the pens, with rainstorms driving upon him,
And late at night – meanwhile the lambs safe under their mothers
Bleat and bleat – the wolf in a fury of exasperation
Snarls at the prey he cannot reach, for long-sharpening, grinding
Hunger has driven him wild and his throat is parched for blood:–
Just so did Turnus gaze at the camp's fortifications
With mounting rage: his chagrin burned him right to the bone
As he cast about for some way to get at the Trojans, dislodge them
From their besieged emplacements and tumble them out in the open.
Their fleet, which lay concealed close to one flank of the camp,
Protected all round by earth-works and the river itself, he now
Moved against; told his exulting men to bring incendiaries;
Snatched up a blazing pine-torch himself in his hot excitement.
How they went to it then! The presence of Turnus inspired them.
Soon the hearths had been stripped, and every soldier was armed with
A smoking firebrand: the resinous torches were spouting up
To the sky a mirky glare which gave off volleys of sparks.
What deity was it, O Muses, averted that merciless blaze
From the Trojans? Who drove away so fierce a fire from their ships?
Tell me! The proofs are deep-buried in the past, but the tale is undying.

Aeneid 9.54-79 (Day Lewis)

Up goes a bloodcurdling roar as his squad joins in on the war-cry,
Adding its own yells. The Teucrians' lack of response is a puzzle:
Why don't they come out and fight, on the level, take arms against foemen's
Arms and be men, and not hide in a camp? In a mad gallop this way
Round the walls, that way, he hunts a way in, where no way's in existence,
Just like the midnight wolf in his personal siege of a dense-packed
Sheep-pen, snarling at gaps in the fencing, wind-whipped and rain-lashed.
Ruthless and rough in his rage, long starving and tortured by pent-up
Cravings of hunger, by parched jaws thirsty for blood, he is madly
Howling at lambs lying just beyond reach. They are tucked beneath mothers,
Safe and secure, their incessant bleating's their only reaction.
So, as he checks out the walls and the fort, the Rutulian's anger
Flares. Frustration's pain burns fire deep into his tough bones.
What should his strategy be to get in, or to shake out the Teucrians
Huddled inside the stockade, and to pour them all over the sea-flat
Surface? The fleet! It lay sidled away out of view at the stronghold's
Side with a circling defence of both river-fed moats and embankments.
This he breaks through. Then he calls on his cheering companions for fire,
Fervidly seizing a handful of blazing torches of pitch-pine.
Turnus' example inspires the rest, who now work with a passion.
All the young men are equipping themselves with such ominous firebrands,
Stripping the wood out of hearths. Smoky torches emit a pitch-darkened
Brilliance and Vulcan erupts to the stars fire mingled with ashes.
Muses, which god kept this brute act of arson from harming the Teucrians?
Who stopped the great blaze destroying the ships? For belief in the story
Died long ago, though it lives on in rumour, as folklore. You tell it!

Aeneid 9.54-79 (Ahl)

5.1 NARRATIVE SUBJECTIVITY: CHARACTERISATION AND DIVINITY

In this section, Virgil paints a detailed picture of Turnus, his men, and their foes. Turnus experiences pain and anger, severe emotions which affect him to his core, and which challenge the reader to vilify or victimise him. The most striking element of character description is in the simile (59-64), comparing Turnus, aiming to lead an attack against the Trojans, to a wolf, driven mad by hunger.[17] The Trojans remain inside their camp, as instructed by Aeneas, and Turnus' wolf makes thwarted attempts to attack them. Although Turnus is compared to many animals across the epic, often in complex and ambiguous ways, this simile in particular is highly interpretable. The degree of internalisation, and the focus on Turnus' suffering, with such extremity of emotion, opens up the possibility of broader readings: the wolf, for example, could be read as standing for Turnus' anger, attacking his sanity, represented by the lamb. Turnus' hunger to kill, his mad desperation to get to his enemy, echoes the simile describing Turnus being roused to anger by Allecto in book 7.[18] Further interesting comparisons can be drawn, for example with the simile at the start of book 9, contrasting the image of Turnus as a lone wolf fighting an isolated battle and the description of his troops, moving with resolve and

---

[17] R.D. Williams (1966) calls it one of the most terrifying similes in the *Aeneid* and realistic (more so than Homeric models). Whilst nowadays perhaps considered as lurking, devious characters (as in the Big Bad Wolf of fairy tales), wolves have a more positively Roman identity, but were also considered the enemy of shepherds (Toynbee [1973, 1996 ed.] 101).

[18] G. Williams (1983) 64.

fluid synchronicity.[19] Other echoes can be seen in the wolf similes at 9.339-341 (Nisus and Euryalus), 9.565-6 (Turnus, successfully snatching a lamb), 11.809 (Arruns), and 2.355 (where the Trojans themselves are compared to hungry wolves). Within book 9, Turnus is also compared to an eagle (9.563) and a tiger (9.730), and, finally, the roles will be reversed, when Turnus, inside the camp, becomes a lion hemmed in by hunters (9.792).

Williams comments that the simile feels hastily added, poorly integrated with its context and in need of editing.[20] Indeed, its emotional impact becomes more ambiguous as its layers of interpretation are unravelled. Initially, by likening Turnus to a preying wolf, our sympathy is, by default, with the lambs (the Trojans); they are harmless, vulnerable, and unable to defend themselves against this savage, wild creature. The 'battle' presented here is hardly an even one. However, whilst the lambs in the simile are innocent, is the same true of the Trojans? They are staying in under order, not because they are trapped and in danger. The wolf, on the other hand, is a frustrated hunter driven by hunger. Whilst the need for survival is the same impulse driving Turnus, his desire to defend his homeland suggests social involvement, whereas for the wolf the reward is purely his own. In this reading, the pitiable lambs are seen as the ones deceiving the wolf. They take on the attributes which modern readers expect to apply to the

[19] Hardie (1994) for echoes.
[20] G. Williams (1983) 174.

carnivore: insidious, cunning, conniving. The simile thus feels unusual, uncomfortable and unexpected. On the other hand, Williams reads, more straightforwardly, a description of a blood-lusting psychopath too long deprived of his chance to kill, a characterisation of Turnus which Virgil has not yet shown us, but which will become obsessively important in the portrait of this character.[21] Challenging Williams' reading, but supporting the interpretation of Turnus acting in a natural way, are its symbolic links to Rome. The fact that the wolf itself is a classical Roman creature, allusions to which are strengthened by the inclusion of *arma viros* a few lines earlier (57), is also reflected by Turnus' peculiarly Roman behaviour here.[22]

55 Teucrum mirantur inertia corda,
non aequo dare se campo, non obvia ferre
57 arma viros, sed castra fovere.

Aeneid 9.55-57

55 They were amazed at the Trojans' inactivity,
Amazed that such warriors did not come out on the open plain
57 And there oppose them, but huddled in the camp.

Aeneid 9.55-57 (Day Lewis)

55 The Teucrians' lack of response is a puzzle:
Why don't they come out and fight, on the level, take arms against foemen's
57 Arms and be men, and not hide in a camp?

Aeneid 9.55-57 (Ahl)

---

[21] G. Williams (1983) 64.

[22] See Highet (1972) 215 on how Turnus is acting in accordance with typical Roman pre-battle tradition.

The phrase *arma viros*, at the start of the line, is one of 11 occurrences of these words together, and four within this book (462, 620, 777).[23] As well as symbolising the epic, and Romanness itself, Hardie notes that the words convey the central theme of heroic definition. The idea of linking masculinity with status and abilities as a warrior is characteristic of epic in general, but also has particular importance in the *Aeneid*. Here *arma viros* is used to describe how, in Turnus' eyes, the Trojans are not fighting as heroic men should.[24] In Ahl's translation, Turnus wonders why the Trojans do not 'take arms against foemen's arms and be men'. Here, aside from the fact that he uses the words 'arms' and 'men' (and thus echoes Virgil's repetition from the first line of the epic), which Day Lewis does not, he also conveys what Turnus believes defines masculinity, its inextricable link with heroism or military prowess. Ahl's English is slightly awkward here, but allows him to leverage the 'arms' and 'men' connotation from the Latin, something which Day Lewis does not prioritise in his rendition, in order to avoid showing Turnus' perception of the Trojans as unheroic.

The Trojans, rather than coming out to fight, and to 'be men', are hiding, *castra fovere*, which Day Lewis translates as 'huddled in the camp',

---

[23] Hardie (1994).

[24] Hardie (1994): this charge is later developed in the speech of Numanus Remulus at 598-620, which concludes *sinite arma viris*.

contrasting cynically with his description of the subjects as 'warriors' in the previous line. *Fovere*, since it is not behaviour which is expected of brave, bold warriors, can be read as a disdainful criticism of the Trojans, for self-victimisation and cowardly concealment. The verb 'huddle' conveys the domestic tone which Williams and Hardie note is implied by the word *fovere*.[25] Ahl uses the word 'tucked', and, to closely link simile with subject, 'huddled' of the Trojans at line 68. In line 57, however, what he prioritises in his translation is conveying the connotations of *arma viros*, as well as Turnus' perception of the Latins' lack of masculinity. Ahl emphasises that Turnus sees the Trojans as cowardly men who are electing to hide, rather than as vulnerable, cowering creatures.

61 nocte super media; tuti sub matribus agni
balatum exercent, ille asper et improbus ira
saevit in absentis; collecta fatigat edendi
64 ex longo rabies et siccae sanguine fauces:

Aeneid 9.61-64

61 And late at night – meanwhile the lambs safe under their mothers
Bleat and bleat – the wolf in a fury of exasperation
Snarls at the prey he cannot reach, for long-sharpening, grinding
64 Hunger has driven him wild and his throat is parched for blood –

Aeneid 9.61-64 (Day Lewis)

[25] Hardie (1994) likens the effect to 'chicks in a nest'. OLD corroborates: 2b) "to protect from the cold (often of incubating birds)". R.D. Williams (1966) suggests it is used 'contemptuously' and refers to Aeneas at 4.193.

Ruthless and rough in his rage, long starving and tortured by pent-up
Cravings of hunger, by parched jaws thirsty for blood, he is madly
Howling at lambs lying just beyond reach. They are tucked beneath mothers,
Safe and secure, their incessant bleating's their only reaction.

Aeneid 9.61-64 (Ahl)

The wolf's intended prey are the lambs hiding within the pen and underneath their mothers.[26] Ahl's translation here makes uncharacteristic deviation from the Latin syntax, delaying the reaction of the lambs until he has described Turnus, at the end of line 64. Ahl describes the lambs' bleating as 'incessant', connoting annoyance, and frustration, which could thus be read as Turnus' reaction to their actions. Day Lewis on the other hand, allows the bleating lambs to literally interrupt the description and actions of the wolf, following Virgil's order and structure more closely. Ahl's translation here is empathetic to Turnus, whereas Day Lewis is sympathetic to the lambs, whose helpless entrance into the narrative is a means by which to heighten sympathy for the Trojans.

[26] G. Williams (1983) 64 finds great contrast in this simile between the wolf's 'naked savagery' and the lambs' 'soft gentleness'. Wiltshire (1999) 176: the bleating of the lambs is the only aspect of this simile unprecedented in the Homeric model.

ac veluti pleno lupus insidiatus ovili
cum fremit ad caulas ventos perpessus et imbris
nocte super media; tuti sub matribus agni
balatum exercent, ille asper et improbus ira
saevit in absentis; collecta fatigat edendi

Aeneid 9.59-63

Just as a wolf that lurks near to some crowded sheepfold,
Howling around the pens, with rainstorms driving upon him,
And late at night – meanwhile the lambs safe under their mothers
Bleat and bleat – the wolf in a fury of exasperation
Snarls at the prey he cannot reach, for long-sharpening, grinding

Aeneid 9.59-63 (Day Lewis)

Just like the midnight wolf in his personal siege of a dense-packed
Sheep-pen, snarling at gaps in the fencing, wind-whipped and rain-lashed.
Ruthless and rough in his rage, long starving and tortured by pent-up
Cravings of hunger, by parched jaws thirsty for blood, he is madly
Howling at lambs lying just beyond reach.

Aeneid 9.59-63 (Ahl)

In the opening of Ahl's simile, Turnus is described as 'the midnight wolf in his personal siege', which brings across the intensity of his isolation in this passage, whilst also insinuating a selfish act of revenge, but one which is rather natural for a predator (who 'hunts' for a way in [line 58]). Day Lewis gives 'lurks', which presents a more humanistic but also deceptive, thieving depiction of Turnus. The contrast between their portrayals of the Trojans is consistent with Ahl's animalistic 'dense-packed' versus Day Lewis' more

personified 'crowded'. Illustrating the ambiguity of readings available here, Day Lewis and Ahl depict Turnus differently in this simile; Ahl as a victimised animal, Day Lewis as a conniving human.

As well as portraying him as more of a natural acting animal in this simile, Ahl emphasises Turnus' victimisation by alliteratively reinforcing the idea that he is being tortured (as he was by Allecto), "wind-whipped… rain-lashed… long starving and tortured". Ahl's description, however, actually pulls the audience in both directions. On the one hand, the wolf is "wind-whipped" but he is also more ferocious: he is "Ruthless and rough in his rage", and thus is depicted as terrifying, perhaps even to himself. This is all stronger than Day Lewis', "rainstorms driving upon him… in a fury of exasperation". Even from the opening, Ahl's "In a mad gallop" (he repeats "madly" at line 62), emphasises that Turnus is out of his mind, potentially under divine influence, in comparison with Day Lewis' "Impatiently" (57), which sounds more like he is driven by his own desire to act. Ahl's increased focus on empathy for Turnus and sympathy for his status as victim here is consistent with his translation of the simile in book 7, where Allecto first instils the rage within him (discussed above pp304-310).

65 haud aliter Rutulo muros et castra tuenti
66 ignescunt irae, duris dolor ossibus ardet.

Aeneid 9.65-66

65 Just so did Turnus gaze at the camp's fortifications
66 With mounting rage: his chagrin burned him right to the bone

Aeneid 9.65-66 (Day Lewis)

65 So, as he checks out the walls and the fort, the Rutulian's anger
66 Flares. Frustration's pain burns fire deep into his tough bones.

Aeneid 9.65-66 (Ahl)

On line 66, both translators over-explain the capacious word *dolor*, by relating its meaning to the wolf in this context. Day Lewis gives 'chagrin', an unusual word which insinuates anxiety or a concern of the mind (or, in an obsolete sense, 'acute vexation').[27] Whilst Day Lewis has presented Turnus' emotions purely as 'concerning', for Ahl they have become physically manifested: Ahl gives "frustration's pain burns fire", which pulls in an opposite direction to his "ruthless and rough in his rage" and increases the readings available (where, again, Day Lewis played it down with "in a fury of exasperation", trivialising Turnus' anger). Day Lewis continues this suggestion of emotional caring with 'gaze' for *tuenti*, which gets across its fascination and intimidation, suggesting looking for a length of time, connotations which Ahl misses by simply translating 'checks out'.

74 atque omnis facibus pubes accingitur atris.
75 diripuere focos: piceum fert fumida lumen
taeda et commixtam Volcanus ad astra favillam.
Quis deus, o Musae, tam saeva incendia Teucris
avertit? tantos ratibus quis depulit ignis?
79 dicite: prisca fides facto, sed fama perennis.

Aeneid 9.74-79

[27] OED.

Soon the hearths had been stripped, and every soldier was armed with
A smoking firebrand: the resinous torches were spouting up
To the sky a mirky glare which gave off volleys of sparks.
What deity was it, O Muses, averted that merciless blaze
From the Trojans? Who drove away so fierce a fire from their ships?
Tell me! The proofs are deep-buried in the past, but the tale is undying.

Aeneid 9.74-79 (Day Lewis)

All the young men are equipping themselves with such ominous firebrands,
Stripping the wood out of hearths. Smoky torches emit a pitch-darkened
Brilliance and Vulcan erupts to the stars fire mingled with ashes.
Muses, which god kept this brute act of arson from harming the Teucrians?
Who stopped the great blaze destroying the ships? For belief in the story
Died long ago, though it lives on in rumour, as folklore. You tell it!

Aeneid 9.74-79 (Ahl)

In line 77, when the narrator asks how Turnus' act of setting the ships alight was stopped, Ahl translates *saeva* as 'brute', which seems striking compared to the more expected adjective 'brutal'.[28] Again, teasing the interpretation in a different direction, Ahl implies Turnus' direct

[28] There is more overt epithet transferal at the simile at 9.792, where Ahl applies the 'murderous' epithet to the hunters' javelins, attacking Turnus, whereas Day Lewis applies it to Turnus himself.

involvement here, with "act of arson" insinuating instigation of this action. Here, Ahl is harsher towards Turnus than Day Lewis, who gives 'merciless blaze'.

To further emphasise Turnus' victimisation, Ahl highlights the role of gods and fate, whereas Day Lewis is more rationalising and engages more with realism, to focus more on man's individual action. The gods remain highly involved in this book; Nisus asks if each man becomes his own god; Numanus Remulus asks if the gods are forcing the Trojan attack, the veracity of which is shown when the invoked Jupiter favours Ascanius' shot; Apollo gives a striking speech; Cybele turns the ships into nymphs, an unusually supernatural element for Virgil. The gods are also heavily involved at the end of the book, from 719 to its close, when Mars goads both sides and Juno has significant influence on Turnus. In line 76 of this passage, Virgil employs metonymy, using the name of the god *Volcanus* to signify fire, reinforcing his theme of the constant influence of the gods on the action of the epic. Day Lewis omits the reference to the divine, simply giving 'volleys of sparks', while Ahl consolidates it, giving 'Vulcan erupts to the stars'. Whilst he may omit the god's name, the aural cohesion of 'volleys' perhaps goes some way to convey, indirectly, the presence of 'Vulcan' in Day Lewis' translation.

Ahl continues to follow Virgil's lead in emphasising the presence and influence of gods throughout the epic, whereas Day Lewis focuses on men as willing, conscious and liable instigators of their actions. Ahl begins line

76 with the positive word 'brilliance', to describe the torches shining with fire, contrasting with 'mingled with ashes' at the end of his line, reminding us of the inevitably fatal end to their proud war efforts. Day Lewis instead gives 'mirky glare', which, combined with 'volleys of sparks', does not have the connotation of death which Ahl explores, and which perhaps reminds us of his proximity to military action. In Ahl, the men whom Turnus calls upon for aid are 'young men', whereas for Day Lewis, they are the military-primed 'soldiers'. Day Lewis and his audience are perhaps more familiar with the necessities of war, which turns every man into a soldier.

Their difference in treatment of divine intervention is also seen when Tiberinus appears in lines 123-125 (as he had done at 8.32-65),[29] afraid, like Messapus and the Rutulians, but contrasting with Turnus, who is described as having *fiducia* and *audacia*:

123 obstipuere animis Rutuli, conterritus ipse
turbatis Messapus equis, cunctatur et amnis
125 rauca sonans revocatque pedem Tiberinus ab alto.
126 at non audaci Turno fiducia cessit;

Aeneid 9.123-126

123 Shock froze Rutulian hearts, and Messapus, whose horses were rearing,
Joined in their terror himself. Tiberinus, who's normally raucous,

[29] Hardie (1994).

125 Slowed to a trickle and pulled back his muddying foot from the salt sea.
126 Turnus, however, felt no lessened trust in his confident boldness.

Aeneid 9.123-126 (Ahl)

123 The Rutuli were dumbfounded: Messapus himself was terrified;
His horses reared in panic; the river, harshly growling,
125 Checked its flow – yes, Tiber recoiled from the deep sea then.
126 But the fiery Turnus did not lose confidence –

Aeneid 9.123-126 (Day Lewis)

Whilst Ahl clearly refers to the river-god by name, Day Lewis simply translates 'Tiber', which could just signify the personified river, rather than necessarily the divine being. Additionally, Ahl implies a relationship to, or at least an awareness of, the river-god on the part of the narrator, by translating 'Tiberinus, who's normally raucous', and thus implying knowledge of his habitual behaviour. Ahl is clearly talking about the river-god, not just the river, and his translation 'muddying foot' emphasises the fact that he is talking about a person, of human form, also amplified by the personal pronoun 'his', and 'who'. This is consistent with Ahl's emphasis on the presence of gods throughout the epic as a whole and book 9 in particular.[30] The end of the 54-79 passage contains a Muse apostrophe, an

[30] See also 9.41, 9.172, 9.178. 9.204, 9.206, 9.211, 9.214, 9.240, 9.327, 9.373, 9.403, 9.504, 9.601. 9.718, 9.817.

invocation to the divine presence who controls narrative authority; a relationship which I shall discuss in the next section.

5.2 TEXTUAL AUTHORITY: EPIC NARRATOR AND CHARACTER VOICE

77 quis deus, o Musae, tam saeva incendia Teucris
avertit? tantos ratibus quis depulit ignis?
79 dicite: prisca fides facto, sed fama perennis.

Aeneid 9.77-79

77 What deity was it, O Muses, averted that merciless blaze
From the Trojans? Who drove away so fierce a fire from their ships?
79 Tell me! The proofs are deep-buried in the past, but the tale is undying.

Aeneid 9.77-79 (Day Lewis)

77 Muses, which god kept this brute act of arson from harming the Teucrians?
Who stopped the great blaze destroying the ships? For belief in the story
79 Died long ago, though it lives on in rumour, as folklore. You tell it!

Aeneid 9.77-79 (Ahl)

At line 77, the narrator asks the Muses which god rescued the Trojans, explaining that he needs to know since the story only now survives symbolically, or as a rumour. The narrator thus shows us something about the perceived power of his storytelling, to continue the eternal *Fama* of this tale. The narrator is concerned with the significance and believability of his story, as shown by *prisca fides*, which Williams notes marks a move from the mortal to the supernatural; he is accepting that the story cannot be

believed literally, but asserts that its symbolic significance remains.[31] Hardie suggests that Virgil's 'chiastic alliteration' (PFFP), and the conjunction *sed*, represents opposition between history and future memory, the event itself with its reporting, *prisca/perennis, facto/Fama*.[32] Contentious and ambiguous, then, *prisca fides* appears to be "metaliterary", functioning here as an Alexandrian footnote.[33] In translation, Ahl is more concerned, as Virgil is, about whether his readers will believe the story. Day Lewis provides no such overt reference to concerns over whether the tale will be believed, and simply seems to be requesting information which the Muses hold, implying that the facts are inaccessible, but not, as Ahl does, that they are unbelievable.

Whilst Ahl includes the apostrophe, it is more notable that Day Lewis also does so, since he frequently omits such invocations; while Ahl more often chooses subservience, Day Lewis emanates omniscience. However, their relationship with the Muses, and subsequently with their narrative, is predictably idiosyncratic here. Ahl asks the Muses, rather desperately, to tell the story: 'You tell it!' Day Lewis, on the other hand, assertively instructs 'Tell me!' As in chapter 3, Day Lewis retains more control over the

---

[31] R.D. Williams (1966).

[32] Hardie (1994).

[33] The phenomenon of allusion to general tradition and report, signalled by e.g. *dicitur* or *ferunt*, framed as scholarly activity. See Hinds (1998: 1-5). The term was originally coined by Ross (1975: 78). On *prisca fides* as metaliterary, see Lovatt (2019b: 105 n11).

narrative: the Muses will tell him, and then he will reformulate the information into the narrative which he imparts to his audience. Ahl, on the other hand, is simply acting as the mouthpiece through which the Muses can directly impart their proprietary knowledge. For Ahl, this abrupt return to the narrator's voice is anxiety-ridden, unauthoritative, and unwilling.

69 classem, quae lateri castrorum adiuncta latebat,
70 aggeribus saeptam circum et fluvialibus undis,
invadit sociosque incendia poscit ovantis
atque manum pinu flagranti fervidus implet.
73 tum vero incumbunt (urget praesentia Turni),

Aeneid 9.69-73

69 Their fleet, which lay concealed close to one flank of the camp,
70 Protected all round by earth-works and the river itself, he now
Moved against; told his exulting men to bring incendiaries;
Snatched up a blazing pine-torch himself in his hot excitement.
73 How they went to it then! The presence of Turnus inspired them.

Aeneid 9.69-73 (Day Lewis)

69 The fleet! It lay sidled away out of view at the stronghold's
70 Side with a circling defence of both river-fed moats and embankments.
This he breaks through. Then he calls on his cheering companions for fire,
Fervidly seizing a handful of blazing torches of pitch-pine.
73 Turnus' example inspires the rest, who now work with a passion.

Aeneid 9.69-73 (Ahl)

Day Lewis, on the other hand, has already regained narrative control, through his insertion of an exclamatory narrator aside for *tum vero* in line 73, 'How they went to it then!', with what seems like contemporary colloquial expression. In most of my extracts, we have seen that Day Lewis prefers his narrator to retain a detached, reporting stance. Here, he is actively commenting on the action in the narrative in a rather visual manner. On the rare occasions where Day Lewis does do this, it is normally through the voice of the narrator (not whilst a character is focalising), as here, and normally from the narrating time, so that it still shows a sense of distance or detachment between the narrator and his narrative. Whilst it is a narrative intrusion, it is lacking in deixis, and thus still has a clearly different effect to Ahl, who translates simply as 'now'. Ahl simply reports instead of intruding, but the use of present tenses, rather than Day Lewis' past, shifts into story time. Ahl's addition of the deictic temporal adverb 'now' adds a sense of immediacy which contrasts to Day Lewis' displaced immediacy at line 70-1, 'he now moved against'. Day Lewis is keen to reassert narrator power. Thus, whilst he generally interrupts the narrative less than Ahl, he is willing to do so here, to assert that the narrator is clearly speaking.

Day Lewis' reason for strongly re-establishing narrative voice is likely to be linked to the complexities and ambiguities of voice in the preceding narrative. Much of the passage is written in the present tense (all except for *latebat*, *diripuere, avertit, depulit*). In translation, Day Lewis uses almost all past tenses. For Day Lewis, movement into the present tense is reserved

for marking a significant narrative shift: either to the narrator present (79), where he addresses the Muse and comments on his act of narration, or to the parallel world of the simile, which operates in a timeless way, occupying an eternal, common temporality between the original and new audiences. Whilst the actions of his historic narrative are reported in the past tense, the present tense is reserved for instances where its use is non-negotiable. Ahl, on the other hand, uses the perfect tense in 69 and 77-8, as Virgil does, but otherwise narrates the whole passage in the present tense (even for *diripuere*, which Day Lewis transposes into pluperfect, thus showing an additional element of anteriority between the actions). This has the effect of more tightly integrating the simile with the narrative, and presents the whole extract in an immediate, deictic way. Whilst Day Lewis' 'soon' could be read as deictic, its context explains it as relative to the past tenses which he uses to report the events and situation, 'soon the hearths had been stripped'. He thus achieves the effect of displaced immediacy which he also had at 70-71, 'he now moved against'. By putting the deictic phrase 'this way' and 'that way' around 'the walls' (58), Ahl makes Turnus' search more urgent, more desperate, more chaotic. Day Lewis maintains the deictic elements, though in the more standardly formed expression, 'this way and that', but he shifts the present tenses to past.

55 Teucrum mirantur inertia corda,
non aequo dare se campo, non obvia ferre
57 arma viros, sed castra fovere.

Aeneid 9.55-57

55 They were amazed at the Trojans' inactivity,
Amazed that such warriors did not come out on the open plain
57 And there oppose them, but huddled in the camp.
Aeneid 9.55-57 (Day Lewis)

55 The Teucrians' lack of response is a puzzle:
Why don't they come out and fight, on the level, take arms against foemen's
57 Arms and be men, and not hide in a camp?
Aeneid 9.55-57 (Ahl)

As well as depicting the scene from the character's temporal perspective, using the present tense to lend immediacy, Virgil's narrator uses character-focalisation to effect empathy, though often with characteristic ambiguity. The words *fremitu horrisono* could be interpreted as a fearful sound, heard and focalised through the Trojans, or alternatively a triumphant sound as perceived by the Rutulians. However, from line 55, it is clearly the Rutulians who drive the narrative, beginning with free indirect discourse at lines 55-57, describing their current thoughts, asking questions to which they, unlike us, do not know the answer. They wonder, *mirantur*, why the Trojans will not give themselves to the fight, on an equal plain, why they have such faint hearts, *inertia corda*, and why they will not take up arms to oppose men. Of course, the audience, with the suspenseful effect of dramatic irony, are privy to the answer: the Trojans are staying inside the camp because Aeneas has ordered them to do so. That both the audience and the narrator know the answers to the questions being posed, strengthens the reading of Rutulian focalisation here.

Alongside his present tenses, Ahl follows Virgil in employing character-focalisation, with the slightly deictic prepositional verb phrase 'Up goes a bloodcurdling roar', telling the scene from the Latin point of view more than Day Lewis' 'His companions acclaimed it with cheers'. Ahl's choice of modern idiom 'squad' also heightens the immediacy and engagement of the scene. Day Lewis uses the third person verb 'amazed' on line 56, whereas Ahl simply states 'The Teucrians' lack of response is a puzzle', rendering the verb indirectly and impersonally. In line 57, Ahl combines this heightened focalisation with exaggerated free indirect discourse ("Why don't they come out and fight, on the level, take arms against foemen's | Arms and be men, and not hide in a camp?"), posed as questions. Day Lewis, on the other hand, reports their feelings from a detached and distanced standpoint: 'they were amazed at the Trojans' inactivity.' Ahl's narrative thus embodies the wondering thoughts of the Latins; while Day Lewis simply reports this information, Ahl focalises the narrative and presents the events through the lens by which the Latins visualise the situation.

Next, the focalisation of the simile is ambiguous. Its purpose is to stimulate sympathy for the Trojans, and thus it appears to be focalised through them: they see themselves as Turnus' innocent victims, with him as the merciless, bloodthirsty wild animal. Critics have disagreed with this however, including Williams who claims that it is focalised through Turnus, who sees

the lambs as the prey whom he wishes to kill.[34] Indeed, it seems that the Trojans would see Turnus as a wolf, and so perhaps it is them focalising. However, whilst they might consider themselves vulnerable, they are unlikely to see themselves as lambs, as defenceless, harmless animals. Equally, Turnus is unlikely to see his prey as defenceless, vulnerable animals, but rather as people who present a threat to him and subsequently must be defeated.

67 qua temptet ratione aditus, et quae via clausos
excutiat Teucros vallo atque effundat in aequum?
69 classem, quae lateri castrorum adiuncta latebat,
Aeneid 9.67-69

67 […] he cast about for some way to get at the Trojans, dislodge them
From their besieged emplacements and tumble them out in the open.
69 Their fleet, which lay concealed close to one flank of the camp,
Aeneid 9.67-69 (Day Lewis)

67 What should his strategy be to get in, or to shake out the Teucrians
Huddled inside the stockade, and to pour them all over the sea-flat
69 Surface? The fleet! It lay sidled away out of view […]
Aeneid 9.67-69 (Ahl)

[34] G. Williams (1983) 174.

After the simile, Turnus' thoughts are reported (67) in free indirect discourse, with *qua* introducing deliberative questions which represent his thoughts.[35] Ahl emphasises the free indirect speech and focalisation from Turnus here, firstly at line 67, where he again changes the narrative into a question 'What should his strategy be…?'. Day Lewis once again maintains a more reporting stance, 'As he cast about for some way to…'.

Turnus answers his question about how he'll get to the Trojans with an abrupt answer: *classem* on line 69. Williams notes that *classem* is heavily emphasised due to its line positioning, In this extract, Day Lewis again transposes the present tense (which Ahl maintains) into the past, anterior to his narrating time. Ahl places *classem* emphatically at the start of the line, 'The fleet!', where it acts as an abrupt exclamation from Turnus as he suddenly thinks about this opportunity, and answers the question which he indirectly, and internally, posed on the previous line. Ahl also preserves the marine references which are in Virgil's text (*effundat*, 'pours' / *aequum*, 'sea-flat surface'), which foreshadows the solution on which Turnus will hone in.

Day Lewis uses the third person pronoun 'Their fleet' (69), which is more detached, descriptive, and certainly indicates reported narrative, rather

[35] R.D. Williams (1966).

than free indirect thought from Turnus. Simply adding the pronoun has a significant difference: Ahl's 'The fleet' is almost deictic, and feels like the narrator (here Turnus) is looking in the direction of the fleet, perhaps even gesturing towards it. 'Their fleet' sounds less like something that Turnus would say at this moment, and more something that the narrator would report when retelling the tale. This presents a different level of narrative distance: 'their' is descriptive and self-contained, whereas 'the' leaves a little more room for interpretation, relying on his audience to understand which fleet is being referred to.

A bit later on in book 9, at line 110, both achieve a similar effect: Day Lewis' addition of the possessive pronoun 'their' distances the narrative and reduces the focalisation: 'first did a strange light blaze upon their eyes', compared to Ahl's epic and archaising 'came when a strange new light dazzled eyes', where the absence of the pronoun is quite striking. Day Lewis' additional pronoun makes it clearer and more descriptive for the audience, providing information which is redundant in the mind of Ahl's characters.

After the description of the fleet, Ahl continues in the present tense 'This he breaks through', where the separate short sentence at the start of the line is highly immediate and deictic (through the pronoun 'this') and present (through its tense). This heightens Ahl's portrayal of Turnus' desperation, out of his mind with divinely inspired rage as a victim of his circumstances.

5.3 CONCLUSIONS

Since character-focalisation relates inversely to the control exerted by the narrator's voice, Ahl's instruction to the Muse, "You tell it!", as much applies to the many characters whom he willingly allows to narrate his story. Day Lewis' translation is more unified and consolidated under the presence of a reassuring epic voice, which is keen to retain control. This can be seen even at a glance by the fact that Turnus' name appears three times, versus once in Ahl, since the latter allows the antagonist to embody the narrative (he is more involved in telling the story), whereas Day Lewis is narrating about him. Whilst the detached and descriptive narration requires repetition of the proper name, Ahl often replaces it with the anaphoric 'he', its referent obvious by the immediacy of his description.

Ahl again shows his willingness to sympathise (through his subjectivity) and empathise (through increased focalisation) with both sides of this epic. He gives sympathy and empathy more equally, giving his readers the power to decide which one is which, and allowing multiple voices to tell us the narrative, whereas Day Lewis' epic narrator is the primary voice, in control of his creation. Whilst Ahl also has a visible epic narrator, when he does speak (as in the Muse apostrophe), he is anxious over his own narrative power, and adopts a role which is subservient to the Muses, to Virgil, and to Classics generally. Day Lewis' apostrophe, on the other hand, shows him remaining in control, in a privileged position by which he can seek information from the Muse. Whilst both narrators speak asides, Day Lewis uses them, when they are clearly narrator spoken and focalised, to

talk about the content of the narrative rather than his narrating process, because the seams of his narrative, or his translation, are not on display. He also uses interjection to assert control over the narrative, whereas Ahl uses it (not here, but elsewhere) to challenge the reader's perception of the narrating voice, allowing his characters to focalise and speak free indirect discourse, and allowing his narrator to address his audience and comment on the narrating process.

Overall, Day Lewis' portrayal of Turnus here is more brutal, intimidating and villainous. Ahl, in contrast, depicts a suffering and victimised character. However, Ahl also emphasises alternative readings of the poem, keen for his readers to see anti-imperial possibility, though not excluding other interpretations. Ahl is not always pessimistic, but he takes the opportunity to be ambiguous as much as possible, amplified by the heightened effects of fate and the gods on his characters. Day Lewis diminishes the divine influence in favour of a focus on man's individual action, and subsequently presents a clearer, more imperial view of the poem.

Interpretation and narration are two aspects of the same phenomenon. Day Lewis and Ahl both use narrative techniques in order to construct their meaning and interpretation of the narrative. For Day Lewis, the gods have less authority within the story, just as they have less authority within the construction of the narrative, presided over by Day Lewis' constructed narrator which exists externally to the narrative. He reports in the past, distancing the events and the text, positioning epic as something which

commands respect, the pinnacle of culture and top of the cultural ladder of the *Third Programme*. In terms of his mortal characters, Day Lewis' detached, epic narrator helps him build an imperial view of Aeneas, controlling the degree of focalisation, free indirect discourse and deixis, reporting mostly in past tenses, to domesticate the telling of the text whilst presenting it as an historic event.

However, whilst Day Lewis retains a tight hold on the narrative reins, asserting authorial control, Ahl's narrative invites characters to focalise, and speak free indirect discourse, blending together a complex polyphony in a more open, ambiguous and provocative way. Ahl's present tenses and fluid narrative, as well as his relationship to the Muse, contribute to his ambiguous reading. Day Lewis often narrates from a clear narrator present base, where his reporting narrator presents his narrative from a distance, whereas Ahl's narrator is fully involved in the action and relates himself to it, often personally through deixis. Whilst Ahl might embed character thought or speech, from both sides, into the narrative, Day Lewis creates distance with reporting verbs such as 'he wondered'. It is difficult to extract Ahl's narrator from his text, and in this respect, his narrator becomes the text itself; narrative becomes meaning. Whilst, for both, interpretation and narration are inextricably linked (Day Lewis' interpretation could not be conveyed by Ahl's narration), it is an additional feature of Ahl's translation that it is his narrative, and, to an extent, his translation, which constructs the meaning itself.

Conclusion

It is only in recent years that translation studies has been offered the dedicated intellectual space which it deserves. The power of the translator in determining interpretation, and subsequently whole waves of reception of the original culture, makes them as demanding of study as the original works themselves. With regard to Classics in particular, texts are increasingly being taught in translation, and the power which translators hold over the field's current and future position within Anglophone culture cannot be overestimated. Indeed, its acceptance as a necessary activity is partly due to the fact that the majority of readers now encounter classical texts via translation. Whilst Virgilian reception has a long tradition of translation, the recent stream of new versions exposes a different market to the one-off literary events which Dryden, Pope, and, more recently, Heaney, achieved, and attests to a growing demand.

Whilst conveying any Latin text into English demands decisions based on its linguistic density and lack of articles, Virgil's flexibility of voices further complicates the ambiguities which the translator must navigate. His narrative is inherently ambiguous, combining multiple voices which convey conflicting, even contradictory, subjectivities. As such, the *Aeneid* is not just *open* to interpretation, but *demands* it. When a translator rewrites Virgil's text, they absorb this task of interpretative reading, whilst simultaneously creating the need for another, as their own text will be equally, though perhaps in different ways, interpretable. Translators will, consciously or unconsciously, construct their own narrator who can

subsequently focalise, exist within his own temporal deictic centre, possess and contribute to social memory, and comment on the process of narrative construction itself. As such, different readings of Virgil's highly narratorially complex poem both confine and fragment its meaning. Translations are thus dynamic subjective interpretations of a fixed text, and awareness of this, particularly where reception may be limited by a particular translation, is critical to appropriate appreciation and reading of translations themselves. The degree to which the translator recognises this process, and the way in which they approach it, vitally contributes to our understanding of changing cultural relationships to classical texts, whilst shedding light on Virgil's original.

The presence of the translator, and the extent to which they impose a second narrator into the text, affects the fundamental theoretical model of narrative. Whilst, typically, a translation does not structurally deviate from the original, its narratorial and vocal aspects must change. The act of translation thus creates a new story, a new fashioning of the original author's *fabula*. Through analysing both overarching stylistic aspects (focalisation and deixis) as well as specific narrative motifs (apostrophe and simile), I have uncovered visible differences between translators' narrators. These changes manifest themselves through the ways in which the narrator relates to the text and its characters: the extent to which they allow characters to speak or focalise, the strength of their epic narrator voice, whether they claim authorial ownership over the text or expose it as a collaborative creative process with the Muses and the original author,

how they position their narrator in terms of time and space, and whether they foreground or conceal the narrator's presence. Such narrative decisions reflect different perceptions and expectations of classical epic, and have here been demonstrated by two influential translators, writing for Oxford World's Classics. Both are highly significant in terms of Virgilian reception, both to their original audiences and, through regular reprints, to subsequent generations. The different ways in which they narrate the text exhibits not only a different degree of textual ownership, but also reveals their particular interpretations of Virgil's ambiguous and subjective epic, as well as different ways of bringing a text into a new culture.

DAY LEWIS AND AHL: INTERPRETATION AND DOMESTICATION

I suggested in the introduction that Day Lewis presented a glorified view of war, whereas Ahl was more cynical. In fact, Ahl's presentation of war and imperialism reflects ambiguity which many readers see in Virgil, whereas Day Lewis more confidently reads a glorified perspective, presenting a clearer moral message. As part of the World War Two generation, Day Lewis was not blindly imperial: he understood the difference between propaganda and reality, seeing through the tales of great victories to the omitted details of thousands dead, maimed or driven insane.[1] Marking a turning away from the communist views which he supported earlier in life,

[1] Day Lewis (1960) 84.

his depiction of war is glorious not because he believes that it is, but rather because he perceives Virgil as having a primarily propagandistic purpose. Whilst Day Lewis doubted whether or not war's cause was ever righteous enough to justify its pain, in his *Aeneid*, he paints one which is.[2] For Day Lewis, a positive view of war was found in the common experience it provided for humanity: he describes it not as a social plague but as a delirium which brought lucidity, illumination and a positive feeling of participation in the human condition.[3] His sense of pride comes across when he narrates to his radio audience, the generation who had endured this common experience, in a triumphant manner which coincides with Virgil's 'public voice of triumph' but obscures his 'private voice of regret'.[4]

Ahl, on the other hand, seeks to be more cynical in this area, living in a time when the Western world has less faith in the heroism that accompanies conflict. His reading of Virgil is, informed by his previous acts of translation, rather Lucanian, conveying a raw depiction of war and a focus on the gruesome physicality of death.[5] He is harshly critical of its injustice, and pointedly juxtaposes the celebrations of conquerors immediately before they are conquered themselves. His characterisation reflects the changing

---

[2] Day Lewis (1960) 186-7.

[3] Day Lewis (1960) 101, 86-7.

[4] Parry (1963) 79.

[5] Ahl's arrival at Virgil after Lucan gives him a specific view of epic and of what it means to be a Virgilian narrator.

concept of the heroic figure; Ahl's Aeneas is more aware of, and often deeply troubled by, his impositions and sacrifices. For Day Lewis, on the other hand, Aeneas' heroism stems from his willing actions, and his active adoption of the triumphant, glorious soldier role, marching with a "stiff upper lip" attitude towards what he recognises is his duty. Whilst Day Lewis does evoke sympathy for Aeneas' opponents, and Dido more so than Turnus, his narrative allegiance remains with Aeneas, who is always 'morally' right. This domesticated form of heroism, crucially, prioritises the needs of the many over the individual.[6] For Ahl, awareness of the cost of his actions, and mental trepidation over their implications, amplifies Aeneas' heroic qualities. Thus, translators perceive and present characters in ways which paint them as heroes of their own time, changing with dynamic ideals and expectations of masculinity and heroism. Day Lewis maintains distance and moderation in his presentation of Virgil: classical, carefully proportioned, tasteful, whereas Ahl sensationalises. He pushes Virgil as far as he can, sometimes beyond the implication of the Latin, in a Lucanian manner. The latter's translation results in a more varied, intense, faster-paced *Aeneid* which engages young twenty-first century readers, who face greater demands on their attention and whose tolerance for emotional extremity is heightened.

---

[6] Ryan and Langerwerf (2010: 16-17) state that this is a key concept of modern heroism.

Day Lewis presents more clear-cut characterisations, particularly concerning Aeneas and Turnus, who adopt the role of hero and anti-hero, respectively. For Ahl, the two protagonists are victims of each other, of war, of the gods, and of being immortalised by epic poetry, which is itself complicit in the horrors of war. Day Lewis is also less ambiguous in his presentation of blame and victimisation, giving individual characters a greater sense of responsibility for their own actions and lessening the control of the gods. Day Lewis' domesticating portrayal of the epic's divine characters makes them less realistic, almost a generic spiritual force, and, arguably, discardable from the plot itself.[7] By contrast, Ahl clearly recognises the link between the epic's action and its immortal figures, and increases their presence throughout the *Aeneid*, in order to proliferate the sense of victimisation on both sides, dealing out both sympathy and criticism equally, to allow his readers to make final judgements. For Ahl, the role of the gods is meant to heighten the *Aeneid*'s ambiguity: "For all the magnificence of the *Aeneid*," he states, "one senses an enormous moral vacuum;" the fact that men's actions are driven by orders rather than their commitment to the cause makes it difficult to tell whether Vergil is praising or criticising Aeneas and Augustus.[8]

---

[7] This reflects G. Williams' (1983) reading of the *Aeneid*'s gods, fervently argued against by Feeney (1991: 172). The reading of Day Lewis' divine characters as less fully formed than Ahl's is a conclusion which I am only currently able to hint at given the material I have presented; to make this point more confidently, I would also examine other sections, including their direct speech.

[8] Ahl (1976) 64-67.

My interpretations of these two translators have come to fruition through analysing their translations using the frame of narrative. Subsequently, I have shown how closely Virgil's way of narrating is linked to the meaning which he creates. That is to say, narrative itself *creates* meaning. Day Lewis often omits personal narrative elements such as deixis and apostrophe, and denies his characters focalisation or free indirect discourse, exerting his own control over the narrative compared to its other voices. Naturally he still uses engaging, sympathetic language and rhetorical questions, but the voice which speaks them is independent of the characters and of the narrative. He engages less with the Muses, and where he does, he does not do so out of subservience. Ahl, on the other hand, combines a significant amount of character empathy with often provoking or controversial narrative subjectivity, utilising interjection, addresses to the characters and the Muses (to whom he is usually obsequious), and tells his story from an often-unidentifiable moment in time, using present tenses, deixis and temporal adverbs to create immediacy. Whilst Ahl's method of narration reflects the chaotic nature of his story, Day Lewis' assertive narrator confidently controls a clearer, unambiguous narrative.

I mentioned in the introduction that on the whole, and as proposed by Braund, Ahl's translation is a foreignizing version, whilst we might expect

Day Lewis', by contrast, to be a fairly domesticating rendition.[9] In many ways, my analysis of narrative techniques has reinforced this view. Whilst Day Lewis' approach has traditionally been the more popular,[10] applying British literary conventions to Virgil's poetry in ways which aestheticize, moralise and idealise the *Aeneid*, Ahl's notes, poetic priorities and thought-provoking vocabulary expose the text's particular Romanness, occasionally rendering a translation which is purposefully obscure or difficult, to remind his readers that this is a text produced 2000 years ago.[11]

However, these approaches are not a clear-cut spectrum. Both translators employ both techniques, occasionally using domesticating vocabulary but also sometimes pulling us towards the original text in historicising moves, though Ahl is more likely to express the tension by juxtaposing these strategies, to purposefully pull his audience in different directions and to emphasise the gulf between source text and target audience. His translation also engages with the post-modern aesthetic of paradox, which correlates well with concurrent rehabilitations of post-Augustan epic. Thus, even though Ahl is foreignizing, he does so to bring his audience closer to Virgil, whereas Day Lewis domesticates in order to obscure the original author, to present a new, changed Virgil relevant to his audience.

---

[9] As Cheney had alluded to (see above, pp68-69).

[10] Braund (2010) 460, citing Venuti (1995) 43-98.

[11] My description of the effects of foreignizing and domesticating translations here owes something to Braund and Torlone (2018) 5.

To return to Venuti's points on translator invisibility, I would argue that neither of these translators are aiming to disguise themselves, to deny their presence, or to achieve invisibility, but that they are counteracting this for different reasons. For Day Lewis, there is a heightened focus on his independent creative self as poet and artist; he translates Virgil as much for himself, as an exercise in poetry, as for his audience. Ahl, on the other hand, is often self-reflective about his role as translator, occasionally making himself prominent in the narrative and exposing his processes, to remind us that he stands between his reader and Virgil, that the text is not his, and to raise questions about translation generally. Subsequently, and paradoxically, Ahl draws attention to himself *in order to* rather draw attention to the original Roman poet.

Both translators are, in their own way, 'leaving Virgil alone'. However, this means different things. For Day Lewis, it means presenting a poetic version of a closed text, something which he has interpreted and prepared for his reader. It reflects a fairly static view of the text, and a reverential treatment of it as a historical piece, reflecting typical views of the ancient epic genre. Ahl, on the other hand, also considers that he is not interfering with Virgil, by presenting him in all his ambiguous rawness. However, this also disturbs him in a particular way, forcing questions and acts of interpretation. Ahl's approach reflects a similar degree of reverence, but towards a living text, which sometimes enhances and exaggerates potential ambiguities. This shows different generational responses to what we are entitled to do with the text, and what audiences expect from both texts and

translations. The democratisation of knowledge via the internet and specific platforms such as Twitter has led to a general sense of entitlement to participate in cultural production and evaluation.

Also reflective of the different types of translation seen here, are the ways in which their new narrators interact with the text, and, by extension, the degree to which *translators* wish to expose their process of narrating. Whilst Day Lewis occasionally includes story comment, reflecting personally on the characters and action, he includes less narrative comment, and thus effects less self-conscious metaliterary interaction. Ahl, on the other hand, often deconstructs his narrative, in order to expose his construction of translation, equating the poet's act of conveying ideas, images and events via narrative to the translator's act of conveying words from one language in another. Influenced by the evolution of translation studies as a discipline in its own right, corresponding with its greater significance in the longevity of modern classical reception, Ahl exposes, temporally, spatially, and personally, his act of translating, as when Aeneas expounds on the challenge, perhaps even the impossibility, of the translator's task:

> Who could translate into words that night's disaster and killings?
> *Aeneid* 2.361 (Ahl)

Reframing the question of invisibility, Godard asked: "Do translations seek to hide the work of translation and appear as naturalised in the English

language, or do they function as text, as writing, and foreground their work upon meaning?"[12] Put simply, Day Lewis does the former, Ahl the latter. However, that Ahl foreignizes had already been discussed, and that Day Lewis domesticates is no surprise. However, I argue that this shows us something deeper about the relationship between classical epic and the Anglophone world, and that Virgil's ambiguous voices expose shifting responsibilities for translators. Whilst the paradigm of domestication and foreignization broadly applies to what these translators are attempting to achieve, I prefer to focus on the epicness of the voice which they create; the voice of a narrator whom, for Ahl certainly, cannot be separated from his narrative, and for whom the process of narration, and, by extension, translation, creates meaning itself.

TRANSLATING AMBIGUITY, EPICNESS, AND AUTHORITY

Whilst Ahl's narrator is harder to separate from the narrative, his narrator and characters intertwined to collaborate on the story and to further add to and complicate its voices, Day Lewis creates his own epic narrator, who clearly tells a detached story, as an omniscient third person. Day Lewis' sense of authority positions the *Aeneid* as a museum piece, giving his radio audience their own private viewing of an ancient masterpiece, confident in the position of Classics in culture. When listening to the recording of Day

[12] Godard (1990) 87.

Lewis' translation, his authoritative voice of the narrator instils within the poem a living sense of authority, imbuing the words with power over the tone, controlling its pace and interpreting its emotional effect. Day Lewis, himself caught between two worlds in many senses, locates in Virgil a single, unifying voice of truth, the reassurance of authority. For readers of his translation, the same epic persona resonates through the narrative, steering listeners onto a less ambiguous interpretative track.

Ahl's Virgil, living, problematic, unresolved, reflects modern cultural anxieties over the sustainability and longevity of Classics as a discipline seen as a detached, static cultural artefact. Even though it may appear paradoxical, Ahl foreignizes his translation in order to give it a more secure place in our culture, to encourage his audience to see it as a living text which should be questioned. Ahl presents a complex narrative which pulls its reader in different directions and which a single point of control does not attempt to guide or unify. Ahl thus imbues his translation with scholarship on Virgilian ambiguity, not encouraging readers towards either a pessimistic or optimistic reading, but rather giving them an insight into the questions which academic criticism has raised. His willingness to write the text through multiple voices and to make the shifting narrative modes more ambiguous is perhaps as a result of the wealth of scholarship on Virgilian voice to which he, and not Day Lewis, had access. The multivocality is also perhaps more possible in a written rather than a spoken text (since readers can themselves decide who is speaking, or focalising, where voices are ambiguous). His task is not to present his

reading of Virgil, but rather to encourage his readers to create their own reading. As such, his translation is at times, challenging – he expects his readers to be similarly involved in the narrative, with a great degree of engaging present tenses and free indirect discourse. His text is malleable, and is created at once by his characters and his readers, obscuring the presence of a consistent narrator.

His translation is thus arguably influenced by the development of reader-response theory, perpetuating the idea that Virgil can be read in many ways, and, crucially, shifting the power to the reader to decide meaning. Ahl thus reflects a movement towards public ownership of knowledge, no longer held and enforced by such bastions of culture as the BBC's *Third Programme*. The other side of the coin is seen in Day Lewis' often formal language, and epic control, matching the expectations which listeners would have brought to its broadcast, wanting an enlightening and educational experience, not one which had been 'dumbed down'. Thus, even though the listening audience are a critical part of Day Lewis' construction of text, it is in Ahl's pages that they have more of a role as active participants in the creation of meaning, whether that is by editing the text themselves, and deciding whether to read spurious lines, or by interpreting his ambiguous narrative, where his own interpretation is often confined to the notes. His approach here suits not only the shifting power balance between author and reader, but also the lesser demands on textual authority and increased transparency about changes that have been made to the text. This change in translator's attitude is consistent with

changes in generational attitudes to the stability or authority of a particular textual edition, propelled partly by digitisation and democratisation of the Classics.

Day Lewis' translation, on the other hand, purposefully positions him as editor and translator, presenting a text of unquestionable authority. His narrating voice consolidates this impression, with a clearly defined epic narrator, who speaks from a clearly defined narrating time, distanced from and less personally involved in the narrative action, who controls the narrative voice rather than allowing characters to speak or focalise. On the rare occasions when he does relate himself to or impose on the narrative, he does so in a clear, unified and defined way, rarely as a means to provoke ambiguity or to pull the audience in two directions. The epic voice is thus, for him, a means of conveying an epic interpretation of the text. His narrator, elegant and distanced, tells the story through a more authoritative voice, granted to him partly because of his established position as an authoritative voice in poetry and the contemporary English literature scene, as well as within the context of radio (he had done several radio broadcasts before, and by the time of his *Aeneid* was considered something of a 'celebrity').[13] In fact, the embodiment of Virgil's narrator with the voice of the reading broadcast actor, gives the narrator his own

[13] See p38, n104.

specified persona and grants a particular sort of performative authority. The oral performance aspect, harkening back to ancient epic tradition, makes it a tale with a clear narrating time. In the 'glory' days of radio, and certainly before performances could be listened to, at the user's discretion, 'on demand', the voice demands power and authority. The narrator is in control – there is a set performance time, a set intonation of voice and emphasis, a clear definition between what is spoken by the narrator and what is spoken by the characters (played by other actors). Day Lewis' assertion of authority via radio is paradoxical; the medium was on the cusp of general decline, as was narrative authority generally, as new technologies exposed and enabled freer approaches to reading.[14]

In Ahl's translational context, readers can pick up and read at their own behest; it is the reader who controls when and how the story is told. There is also a difference in how a scholar would approach the text, assuming less authority over it than a creative poet. Expecting his translation to be read by students, wanting to get as close to Virgil as possible, either through close replication of his poetic effects or through a translation of 'crib-like' accuracy, Ahl is different to Day Lewis, whose audience might be encountering his translation with their own expectations of the reputation

[14] Cobley (2001) 200, 207. This decline in narrative authority occurred during the latter half of the twentieth century, and is therefore likely to have had an effect on Ahl.

of his poetic prowess. Paradoxically, even though linguistic knowledge of Latin might be declining, Day Lewis' audience is more reliant on him as translator, as a means of cultural access, whereas Ahl's student audience might be more likely to be using his translation as a way in to Virgil, reading it alongside other people's interpretations and thus questioning his readings. The difference in approach to textual authority is also down to the generation in which these translators are working, with the position of Classics in culture changing significantly in the fifty-five years which separate them. Implications of decisions made in the fifties such as the removal of compulsory Classics from university admissions requirements, which were on the horizon when Day Lewis translated, produced a different context for Ahl's translation. Day Lewis' translation strengthens the authority of the Virgilian narrative, whereas Ahl, possibly to align with his perception of Virgil's narrator, embraces a rather anti-authoritarian position, in a translation which is immediate, raw, and emotive. By contrast, Day Lewis' narrator is rather prosaic, rationalising and novelistic, pursuing realism as much as possible. Whilst his narrator gives the impression of detached omniscience, Ahl's narrator seems less authoritative, often knowing little more than his characters, positioned in their present and telling the story as it happens, through them.

Overall, Ahl is more likely to engage with ambiguity, and Day Lewis with (his own created) subjectivity. Overall, Ahl, for instance, teaches us a more complex version of Virgil's questions, retaining (and sometimes adding to) Virgil's ambiguity. He does this by both under- and over-translating Virgil.

Day Lewis, on the other hand, treats ambiguity in a more straightforward sense. He often seeks to clarify the Latin narrative by closing down ambiguities and portraying his particular interpretation of what the Latin means. Sometimes Ahl manages to retain ambiguity within a particular passage, but where he does choose to interpret a passage and make the subjectivity more extreme, he does so with an even hand. In this way, even when he does not manage (or choose to) translate a particular passage in an ambiguous way, he manages to maintain overall ambiguity by invoking sympathy for both sides, just as Virgil does. Ahl's reading of ambiguity is inspired by the readings of Virgil's multiple voices and pessimistic interpretations of the *Aeneid*, an aspect of scholarship which was not articulated at the time of Day Lewis' translation. Ahl fights against the idea of absorbing ambiguity, raising it rather than flattening it in his translation. Whilst Ahl's translation more closely reflects Conte's views of the *Aeneid*'s complex subjectivities, Day Lewis' is ultimately bound together by the epic voice which Lyne, even through many complicating 'further voices', still identifies.[15] Whilst Ahl does engage an epic voice, it is argumentative,

[15] Lyne (1987: 217-238), Conte (2007: 31-35). The conversation between translation and critical reception is two-way, and, after aligning this comment with n7 p370, I tentatively speculate how much power Day Lewis' translation might have had on the subsequent generation of academic thought. Both scholars would naturally have been very familiar with Virgil's Latin, but infringing influences from translation are still possible. As such, Lyne's idea of the unifying epic voice, and G. Williams' (1983) reading of the insignificance of Virgil's gods (see n84 p238), could be a sign (though of course with many exceptions and oppositions), of the impact of Day Lewis' interpretation and translation on the next generation of scholarship. The two-way interaction between scholarship and translation is an area which deserves future exploration.

provocative, confrontational, and challenging, without offering a clear, detached stance on the events and characters. Ahl's somewhat experimental and modernist narrative style breaks conventions of Virgilian translation, placing him at one extreme of a spectrum in which Day Lewis, contentedly, occupies the median.

As well as being influenced by scholarship on the ambiguous voice, Ahl has also been influenced literarily by modernist forms of storytelling, which allow unreliable and fractured points of view (contrasting with nineteenth century norms of realist narratives with which Day Lewis may have been more familiar) and academically by movements including metapoetics, reader response theory and translation studies. His translation thus reflects not only being informed by scholarly debates, but a desire (both personally and on behalf of his publisher, OUP) to reflect those scholarly debates within his translation. His translation, certainly, is by no means at risk of committing what he considered "the most unforgiveable" way to translate:[16]

> The most unforgivable thing about a translation is to be boring, and anyone who makes a great work boring is doing it a disservice.

[16] Aloi (2018).

TRANSLATING THE PAST, IN THE FUTURE

Whilst the textual and translational interpretations presented here have been applied to two specific texts, the great level of depth in my approach has proved the usefulness of this methodology and its potential application to other translations and authors, to broaden our understanding of contemporary relationships to classical texts. As well as other avenues open to explore within Virgilian narrative analysis (aspects such as ekphrasis and collective focalisation, character direct speech, Aeneas' role as narrator), there are questions to ask of other translators of Virgil, and indeed, of authors further afield: how do they add to the conversation, or is narrative voice less significant in translation of non-epic genres?

I have, I hope, raised questions around our reading and reception of existing Virgilian translation. However, as we embark on the next two thousand years of reading and translating the *Aeneid*, we should approach newly devised texts with the same questions. In our declining age of Latin literacy, appreciating texts as translations is growing in importance. Particularly, issues raised here are important to stress within a pedagogical realm, so that we educate future generations of Latin readers about the implications of the interpretative act of translation. As a minimum, we must understand that, when we read translations, we are not only reading Virgil: we are instead reading Virgil as interpreted by a particular author, in a process which is influenced by the translator's personal, historical, literary and academic contexts, and which in turn will influence cultural relationships with the ancient text. Translations are crucial in developing

and consolidating people's readings of the *Aeneid*, and will only proliferate in the future, as readership is divided between the huge choice of translations, especially for Virgil. As translation democratises texts and thus creates new audiences, the future of Anglophone relationship with the *Aeneid* relies on translations. Therefore understanding how translators (re)construct Virgil's narrative and voice, using narrative features to explore or exploit narrative subjectivities and ambiguities, is essential to understanding a generation's relationship to the text.

There is still no critical consensus about the poem's meaning or fundamental ideology.[17] However, whilst in some areas of scholarly endeavour, this is regarded as undesirable, the volume and variety of discussion which this central issue, and great poem, continues to attract, is testament to its significance as a central point of appeal. As Perkell notes, "The ambiguities that readers have always recognised are not problems to be solved, but rather may be perceived as the poem's deepest meaning." [18] This continued deviation in reading is what speaks to Ahl, and what he seems to want his translation to convey to his audience. It could almost be argued that he feels he has, unlike Day Lewis, an obligation to preserve the ambiguity of Virgil's Latin within his translation. Ultimately, the methodological importance of translation studies as an aspect of reception,

[17] This sentence and the next are Harrison's sentiments (1990) 19.
[18] Perkell (1989) 17.

reminds us of the complexity of Virgilian narrative and the richness of Virgilian tradition, validating the idea of Virgil's ambiguous voice.

Whilst, in the case of Esperanto, the first translation into a language has a great responsibility to forge a new relationship between the target audience and Virgil, English translations are part of a continual dialogue, between themselves and back to the original text. Indeed, lessons learnt through translation are not of isolated value; translation is an important gateway back to interpreting the original. By showing the breadth of variation, translation proves the scope of Virgilian ambiguity. Whilst they may not be considered traditionally critical parts of textual criticism, translations are critically engaging in their own way, and provide a fruitful means of not just rereading the original text, but also showing how the demands and expectations of translation intersect with historical context as well as critical and public Virgilian reception.

My overarching conclusions are thus threefold. Firstly, and in a broad sense, that translators have a fundamental impact on narration; one which cannot be explained by traditional opposition of domestication and foreignization, and which imbues the text with cultural purpose. Secondly, and specifically to Virgil, that translators can amplify ambiguity or suppress it through their construction of a modified narrator, an epic voice which operates differently to that of the original, influenced by and influencing expectations of textual authority and Anglophone relationships to Classics. Thirdly, that there is still a great deal to do to understand how

translation drives textual interpretation, to perspectivise our present relationship to the Classics, and to plan for its future, not just with relation to Virgil, but across other authors, texts, and languages. Whilst I advocate a view to the future, and to expanding the field, this understanding also refines our inward gaze; even when readers of Virgil's Latin believe they have momentarily displaced the layers of translation and interpretation which have obfuscated and enriched the reading of Virgil for millennia, the original is irrevocably altered.

Bibliography

PRIMARY RESOURCES

Ahl, F. (2007). *Virgil. The 'Aeneid'*. (Oxford).

Bartsch, S. (forthcoming, 2020). *The 'Aeneid*'. (New York).

Copley, F.O. (1965). *Vergil: 'The Aeneid*'. (Indianapolis).

Day Lewis, C. *Virgil, The 'Aeneid*' *(Abridged)*. (2003). [AUDIO CD]. Naxos Audiobooks.

Day Lewis, C. (1952, 1966, 1986 ed.). *Virgil. The 'Aeneid'*. (Oxford).

Day Lewis, C. (1952). *The 'Aeneid' of Virgil*. (London).

Dryden, J. (1697). 'Virgil. The *Aeneid*', in: *The Works of John Dryden, vol. IV & V*, ed. Frost, W. (1987). (London).

Fagles, R. (2006). *Virgil: The 'Aeneid*'. (London).

Ferry, D. (2017). *The 'Aeneid'. Virgil*. (Chicago).

Fitzgerald, R. (1981, 1992 ed.). *Virgil: The 'Aeneid*'. (London).

Heaney, S. (2016a). '*Aeneid' Book VI*. (London).

Heaney, S. *'Aeneid' Book VI*. Read by McKellen, I (2016b). [AUDIO CD]. Faber.

Heaney, S. (2000, 2002 ed.). '*Beowulf': A Verse Translation*. (New York and London).

Humphries, R. (1951). *The 'Aeneid' of Virgil*. (New York).

Hunter, R. (1993). *Apollonius of Rhodes: Jason and the Golden Fleece ('The Argonautica')*. (Oxford).

Jackson Knight, W.F. (1956, 1958 ed.). *Virgil: The 'Aeneid*'. (London).

Johnston, P. (2012). *The 'Aeneid' of Virgil*. (Norman).

Lattimore, R. (1951, 2011 ed.). *The 'Iliad' of Homer*. (Chicago).

Lee, D. (1955, 2007 ed.). *Plato: 'The Republic'*. (London).

Lombardo, S. (2005). *Virgil, 'Aeneid*'. (Indianapolis).

Mandelbaum, A. (1971). *The 'Aeneid' of Virgil*. (Berkeley).

Oakley, M. (1957). *Virgil's 'Aeneid'*. (London).

Ovid. '*Amores' I*, ed. J. Barsby (1973, 2000 ed.). (London).

Powell, B.P. (2015). *The 'Aeneid*'. (Oxford).

Raeburn, D. (2004). '*Metamorphoses': A New Verse Translation (Ovid)*. (London)

Ruden, S. (trans.). (2008). *The 'Aeneid'. Virgil*. (New Haven).

Rushton Fairclough, H. (trans). (1918, 2000 ed. Revised by G.P. Goold). *Virgil, 'Aeneid' VII-XII. Appendix Virgiliana*. (Mass.)

Rushton Fairclough, H. (1916, 1999 ed. Revised by G.P. Goold). *Virgil: 'Eclogues', 'Georgics', 'Aeneid' 1-VI*. (Mass.)

Sisson, C.H. (1986). *Virgil: The 'Aeneid'*. (Manchester)

Virgil. *Vergili Maronis Opera*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors. (1969). (Oxford).

West, D. (1990, 2003 ed.). *Virgil. The 'Aeneid'*. (London).

West, M.L. (1988). *Hesiod. 'Theogony' and 'Works and Days'*. (Oxford).

Wetmore, M.N. (1911, 1979 ed.). *Index Verborum Vergilianus*. (New York).

COMMENTARIES, DICTIONARIES, AND TRANSLATOR NOTES

Austin, R.G. (1977). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus*. (Oxford).

Austin, R.G. (1971). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus*. (Oxford).

Austin, R.G. (1964). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus*. (Oxford).

Austin, R.G. (1955, 1966 ed.). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. (Oxford).

Conington, J., Nettleship, H. (1884, 2007 ed.). *Virgil*. '*Aeneid*' *Books I-II; Virgil*. '*Aeneid*' *Books III-VI*; *Virgil*. '*Aeneid*' *Books VII-IX; Virgil*. '*Aeneid*' *Books X-XII*. Ed. P. Hardie, A. Rogerson. (Exeter).

Dickinson College Commentaries: Vergil 'Aeneid' Vocabulary: http://dcc.dickinson.edu/aeneid-vocabulary-list. Accessed 12/02/20.

Fordyce, C.J. (1977). *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos, Libri VII-VIII*. (Oxford).

Glare, P.G.W. (ed.). (1982, 2012 ed.). *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. (Oxford).

Gransden, K.W. (1976). *Virgil 'Aeneid' Book VIII*. (Cambridge).

Griffin, J. (1986). Notes to: Day Lewis, C. (trans.). (1952, 1986 ed.). *Virgil. The 'Aeneid'*. (Oxford).

Hardie, P. (1994). *Virgil,* '*Aeneid*' *Book IX*. (Cambridge).

Harrison, S. (1991). *Vergil 'Aeneid' 10*. (Oxford).

Horsfall, N. (2008). *Virgil, 'Aeneid' 2: A Commentary*. (Brill).

Horsfall, N. (1999). *Virgil, 'Aeneid' 7: A Commentary*. (Brill).

Lewis, C.T., Short, C. (1879, 1975 ed.). *A Latin Dictionary*. (Oxford).

Maguinness, W.S. (1953, 1964 ed.). *Virgil: Aeneid Book XII*. (Letchworth).

Oxford English Dictionary. *OED Online*. Oxford University Press, January 2020.

Page, T.E. (1894). *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books I-VI*. (London).

Pease, A.S. (1935, 1967 ed.). *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. (Darmstadt).

Servius. *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, ed. G. Thilo, H. Hagen (1881). (Leipzig).

Simpson, D.P. (1959, 1987 ed.). *Cassell's Latin Dictionary*. (London).

Tarrant, R. (2012). *Virgil, Aeneid Book XII*. (Cambridge).

Williams, R.D. (1966). *Virgil*. *Aeneid Books I-VI. Virgil*. *Aeneid Books VII-XII.* (London).

SECONDARY LITERATURE

Ahl, F. (1985). *Metaformations: Soundplay and Wordplay in Ovid and other Classical Poets*. (Ithaca and London).

Ahl, F. (1976). *Lucan: An Introduction*. (Ithaca and London).

Adema, S. M. (2008). *Discourse Modes and Bases: A Study of the Use of Tenses in Vergil's 'Aeneid'*. PhD thesis (Amsterdam).

Adema, S.M. (2007). 'Discourse Modes and Bases in Vergil's *Aeneid',* in: *The Language of Literature – Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts*, ed. R.J. Allan and M. Buijs. (Leiden). pp42-64.

Agri, D. (2010). 'Madness, *Pietas* and Suicide in Statius' *Thebaid* and Silius' *Punica*', in: *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, ed. L. Langerwerf, C. Ryan. (Newcastle). pp141-160.

Aloi, D. (2008). 'New translation of *Aeneid* restores Virgil's wordplay and original meter'. *Cornell Chronicle*. May 22.

Anderson, W.D. (1957).'Notes on the Simile in Homer and His Successors: 1. Homer, Apollonius Rhodius, and Vergil'. *The Classical Journal*, vol. 53, no. 2 (November). pp81-87.

Anderson, W.S. (1969). *The Art of the 'Aeneid'*. (New Jersey).

Armstrong, R. (2006). 'The *Aeneid*: Inheritance and Empire', in: *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition. Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils*, ed. M. J. Clarke, B.G.F Currie, R.O.A.M Lyne. (Oxford). pp131-157.

Ashley, A.M. (1932). 'Poetic Imagery in Homer and Virgil'. *Greece & Rome*, vol. 2 (4). pp21-28.

Auden, W.H. (1963). 'Louis MacNeice'. *Encounter*, ed. S. Spender, M.J. Lasky, vol. XXI, no. 5 (November). pp48-49.

Austin, R.G. (1968). 'Ille ego qui quondam'. *Classical Quarterly*, vol. 18, issue 1, (May). (Cambridge). pp107-115.

BBC Genome. https://genome.ch.bbc.co.uk/e5e25ff058c54857a7b78dc68d35fa98. Accessed 26/01/20.

BBC, The Third Programme: High Culture for All (15 August 2008). https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/0055151D?bcast=30114604&sub=aeneid. Accessed 12/02/20.

BBC Radio Four, *Book of the Week: Seamus Heaney's 'Aeneid' Book VI* (five episodes). March 8 2016 – March 12 2016. https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b072j0mn. Accessed 30/07/20.

Bakker, E.J. (2009). 'Homer, Odysseus, and the Narratology of Performance', in: *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, ed. J. Grethlein, A. Rengakos. (Berlin). pp117-136.

Bakker, E.J. (2005). *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics.* (Washington DC).

Bal, M. (1985, 2009 ed.). *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. (Toronto).

Bally, C. (1912). *Le style indirect libre en Français moderne, I*. (Kiel).

Balmer, J. (2018). 'Afterword: Let Go Fear: Future Virgils', in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. (Oxford). pp422-430.

Balmer, J. (2013). *Piecing Together the Fragments: Translating Classical Verse, Creating Contemporary Poetry*. (Oxford).

Balmer, J. (1996). *Classical Women Poets*. (Newcastle upon Tyne).

Barchiesi, A. (1999). 'Representations of Suffering and Interpretation in the *Aeneid*', in: *Virgil - Critical Assessments of Classical Authors*, vol. 1, ed. P. Hardie. (London). pp324-344.

Barchiesi, A. (1984). *La traccia del modello: effetti omerici nella narrazione Virgiliana*. (Pisa).

Barthes, R. (1977). 'The Death of the Author', trans. S. Heath (1977), in: *Authorship and Authority: From Plato to the Postmodern*, ed. S. Burke (1995). (Edinburgh). pp125-130.

Bartsch, S. (1998). '*Ars* and the Man: The Politics of Art in Virgil's *Aeneid*'. *Classical Philology,* vol. 93, no. 4 (October). pp. 322-342.

Bartsch, S. (1994). *Actors in the Audience. Theatricality and Doublespeak from Nero to Hadrian*. (Cambridge, MA).

Bassnett, S. (1980, 1991 ed.). *Translation Studies*. (London and New York).

Basson, W.P. (1975). *Pivotal Catalogues in the 'Aeneid'*. (Amsterdam).

Benveniste, E. (1966, 1971 ed.). *Problems in General Linguistics*, trans. M.E. Meek. (Florida).

Beye, C.R. (1999). 'Vergil and Apollonius', in: *Reading Vergil's 'Aeneid': An Interpretative Guide*, ed. C. Perkell. (Norman). pp271-284.

Block, E. (1982). 'The Narrator Speaks: Apostrophe in Homer and Vergil'. *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, vol. 112. pp7-22.

Booth, W. (1961). *Rhetoric of Fiction*. (London).

Bosseaux, C. (2007). *Point of View in Translation. The Case of Virginia Woolf into French*. (Amsterdam, New York).

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*, trans. G. Raymond, M. Adamson. Polity Press (Cambridge).

Bowra, C.M. (1930). *Tradition and Design in the Iliad.* (London).

Brammall, S. (2015). *The English 'Aeneid': Translations of Virgil, 1555-1646*. (Edinburgh).

Braund, S. (2018). 'Virgil after Vietnam', in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. Oxford University Press (Oxford). pp107-123.

Braund, S. (2010). 'Mind the Gap: On Foreignizing Translations of the *Aeneid',* in: *Vergil's 'Aeneid' and its Tradition*, ed. J. Farrell, M.C.J. Putnam. (Oxford). pp449-464.

Braund, S., Torlone, Z.M. (2018). 'Introduction: The Translation History of Virgil: The Elevator Version' in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. (Oxford). pp1-19.

Briggs, A. (1979). *The History of Broadcasting in the United Kingdom: Volume IV: Sound and Vision*. (Oxford).

Bristol Penguin Archive Project: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/penguinarchive project/research/classics/. Accessed 12/02/14.

Bühler, K. (1934, 1982 ed.). 'The Deictic Field of Language and Deictic Words' in: *Speech, Place, and Action. Studies in Deixis and Related Topics*, ed. R.J. Jarvella, W. Klein. (New York). pp9-30.

Burrow, C. (1997). 'Virgil in English Translation', in: *Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. C. Martindale. (Cambridge). pp21-37.

Butler, C. (2018). *Literary Studies Deconstructed: A Polemic*. (London).

Cairns, F. (1989). *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. (Cambridge).

Caldwell, T.M. (2008). *Virgil Made English. The Decline of Classical Authority*. (New York).

Carpenter, H. (1996). *The Envy of the World. Fifty Years of the BBC Third Programme and Radio 3. 1946-1996*. (London).

Carter, R., ed. (1984). *Thirties Poets: 'The Auden Group'. A Casebook.* (London).

Cavarero, A. (2002). 'The Envied Muse: Plato versus Homer', in: *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, ed. E. Spentzou, D. Fowler. (Oxford). pp47-67.

Chafe, W. (1994). *Discourse, Consciousness and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*. (London).

Channel Four News' Twitter: https://twitter.com/Channel4News?lang=en. Accessed 12/02/20.

Chatman, S. (1978). *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. (London).

Cheney, P. (1983). 'C Day Lewis' Translation of Virgil's *Aeneid*: A "Living Contemporary Language"'. *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 20, no. 4 (Winter). pp435-445.

Churchill, W. *We Shall Fight on the Beaches* (June 4 1940). International Churchill Society. https://winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1940-the-finest-hour/we-shall-fight-on-the-beaches/. Accessed 30/07/20.

Clausen, W. (1964, 1999 ed.). 'An Interpretation of the *Aeneid*' in: *Virgil - Critical Assessments of Classical Authors*, vol. 1, ed. P. Hardie. (London). pp65-73.

Cobley, P. (2001). *Narrative*. (London).

Conte, G.B. (2007). *The Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Virgilian Epic*, ed. S. Harrison. (Oxford).

Conte, G.B. (1986). *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Vrigil and Other Latin Poets*. (Ithaca and London).

Cormier, R.J. (2008). 'Review: Frederick Ahl, trans. Virgil, *Aeneid*'. *Vergilius*, vol 54. pp188-196.

Cornell Ahl profile: https://classics.cornell.edu/frederick-m-ahl. Accessed 12/02/20.

Cornell Ahl Announcement: http://news.cornell.edu/stories/1996/06/three-cornell-faculty-named-1996-weiss-presidential-fellows-distinguished-teaching. Accessed 12/02/20.

Corse, T. (1991). *Dryden's 'Aeneid': The English Virgil*. (Newark).

Crisell, A. (1997, 2002 ed.). *An Introductory History of British Broadcasting*. (London).

Crisell, A. (1986, 1994 ed.). *Understanding Radio*. (London).

Crowe, R. (2012). *Democratising the Classics: Penguin Books' Reception of Classical Literature*. PhD Thesis (University of Bristol).

Culler, J. (1977). 'Apostrophe'. *Diacritics,* vol. 7. no. 4, (Winter). (Maryland). pp59-69.

Cutrer, M. (1994). *Time and Tense in Narrative and in Everyday Language.* PhD Thesis (San Diego).

D'Alessandro Behr, F. (2007). *Feeling History: Lucan, Stoicism, and the Poetics of Passion*. (Columbus).

D'Alessandro Behr, F. (2005). 'The Narrator's Voice: A Narratological Reappraisal of Apostrophe in Virgil's *Aeneid*'. *Arethusa*, vol. 38, no. 2. (Maryland). pp189-221

Day Lewis, C. (1970). *On Translating Poetry*. (Abingdon-on-Thames).

Day Lewis, C. (1965). *The Lyric Impulse*. (London).

Day Lewis, C. (1960). *The Buried Day*. (London).

Day Lewis, C. (1951). *Selected Poems*. (Harmondsworth and Middlesex).

Day Lewis, C. (1950). 'Broadcasting and Poetry'. *BBC Quarterly*, (Spring). pp1-7.

Day Lewis, C. (1947). *The Poetic Image*. (London).

Day Lewis, C. (1934). *A Hope for Poetry*. (Oxford).

Day-Lewis, S. (1982). *C. Day-Lewis: An English Literary Life*. (London).

De Jong, I. (2014). *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide*. (Oxford).

De Jong, I. (2009). 'Metalepsis in Ancient Greek Literature', in: *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, ed. J. Grethlein, A. Rengakos. (Berlin). pp87-116.

De Jong, I. (1987, 2004 ed.). *Narrators and Focalisers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. (London).

De Vasconcellos, P.S. (2018). '*Virgilio Brasilerio*: A Brazilian Virgil in the Nineteenth Century', in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. (Oxford). pp345-354.

Donoghue, D. (2000). 'The Philologer Poet: Seamus Heaney and the Translation of "Beowulf"'. *Harvard Review*, no. 19 (Fall). pp12-21.

Donoghue, S. (2009). 'Ten Questions for Sarah Ruden', *Open Letters Monthly*, 1 May.

Duckworth, G.E. (1967). 'The Significance of Nisus and Euryalus for *Aeneid* IX-XII'. *The American Journal of Philology*, vol 88, no. 2 (April). pp129-150

Dyson, J. (1996). 'Dido the Epicurean'. *Classical Antiquity*, vol. 15, no. 2 (October) pp203-221.

Empson, W. (1930, 1963 ed.). *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. (London).

Farrell, J. (2010). 'Review: The *Aeneid*: A New Translation. By Sarah Ruden'. *Translation and Literature*, vol. 19, issue 2 (August). (Edinburgh). pp203-213.

Farrell, J. (1991). *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic. The Art of Allusion in Literary History*. (Oxford).

Farron, S. (1982). 'The Abruptness of the End of the *Aeneid*'. *Acta Classica*, vol. 25, pp136-140.

Feeney, D. (2017). 'David Ferry Won the National Book Award in His 80s. In His 90s, He Has Translated Virgil'. *New York Times*. December 5.

Feeney, D. (1991). *The Gods in Epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. (Oxford).

Fitton-Hayward, M. (2019). 'Review: Virgil and His Translators. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone'*. Journal of Languages, Texts, and Society,* vol. 3 (Spring). pp228-232.

Fitton-Hayward, M. (2018). 'Subjectivity and Ambiguity in Two Verse Translations of the *Aeneid*'. *New Voices in Classical Reception Studies,* issue 12. pp1-19.

Fo, A. (2018). 'Limiting Our Losses: A Translator's Journey through the *Aeneid*', in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. (Oxford). pp412-421.

Forster, E.M. (1957). 'Introduction' in: *Virgil's Aeneid*, trans. M. Oakley. J.M. Dent and Sons (London).

Fowler, D. (2000). *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. (Oxford).

Fraser, A.D. (1923). 'The Simile in Virgil'. *The Classical Journal*, vol. 19, no. 1 (October) pp48-49.

Frost, W. (1955). *Dryden and the Art of Translation*. (New Haven).

Galinsky, K. (1994). 'How to be Philosophical about the End of the *Aeneid*'. *Illinois Classical Studies*, vol. 19. pp191-201.

Galinsky, K. (1968). '*Aeneid* V and the *Aeneid*'. *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. 89, no. 2 (April). pp157-185.

Genette, G. (1980). *Narrative Discourse*, trans. J.E. Lewin (from *Discours du recit* [1972])*.* (Oxford).

Gillespie, S. (2011). *English Translation and Classical Reception: Towards a New Literary History*. (Oxford).

Gleason, M. (1995). *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. (New Jersey, Princeton).

Godard, B. (1990). 'Theorizing Feminist Discourse/Translation', in: *Translation, History & Culture*, ed. S. Bassnett, A. Lefevere. Cassell (London). pp87-96.

Goward, B. (1999). *Telling Tragedy: Narrative Technique in Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides*. (London).

Gowing, A.M. (2005). *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*. (Cambridge).

Greatrex, G. (2018). 'Translations of Virgil into Esperanto' in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. (Oxford). pp124-135.

Grünbaum. T. (2013). 'Sensory Imagination and Narrative Perspective: Explaining Perceptual Focalization'. *Semiotica* 194. pp111-136.

Hallam, N. (1947). 'Advice to a One-Year Old…'. *Daily Express*. 25 September.

Hamburger, K. (1973). *The Logic of Literature*, trans. M.J. Rose (from *Die Logik der Dichtung* [1957]). (Bloomington).

Hammond, P. (1999). *Dryden and the Traces of Classical Rome*. (Oxford).

Hampe, R. (1952). *Die Gleichnisse Homers Und Die Bildkunst Seiner Zeit*. (Berlin).

Hardie, P. (2014). *The Last Trojan Hero: A Cultural History of Virgil's Aeneid*. (London).

Hardie, P. (2011). *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*. (Cambridge).

Hardie, P. (2009). 'Fame's Narratives: Epic and Historiography', in: *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, ed. J. Grethlein, A. Rengakos. (Berlin). pp555-572.

Hardie, P. (2005). 'Narrative Epic', in: *A Companion to Latin Literature*, ed. S. Harrison. (Oxford). pp83-100.

Hardie, P. (1997). 'Closure in Latin Epic', in: *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Ed. D.H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn, D. Fowler. (New Jersey). pp139-162.

Hardie, P. (1995). 'Virgil's Epic Techniques: Heinze Ninety Years On'. *Classical Philology*, vol. 90, no. 3 (July). pp267-276.

Hardie, P. (1993). *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. (Cambridge).

Hardie, P. (1986). *Cosmos and Imperium*. (Oxford).

Hardwick, L. (2000). *Translating Words, Translating Cultures*. (London).

Hardwick, L. (1997). 'Reception as Simile: The Poetics of Reversal in Homer and Derek Walcott'. *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, vol. 3 (3). pp326-338.

Hardyment, C. (2003). 'A Word in Your Ear: The *Aeneid*; Rory and Ita'. *Independent*. 15 February.

Harmer, L.C. (1954). *The French Language Today: Its Characteristics and Tendencies*. (London).

Harrison, S. (2009). 'Introduction: The Return of Classics', in: *Living Classics. Greece & Rome in Contemporary Poetry in English*, ed. S. Harrison. (Oxford). pp1-16.

Harrison, S. (1990). 'Some Views of the *Aeneid* in the Twentieth Century', in: *Oxford Readings in Vergil's 'Aeneid'*, ed. S. Harrison. (Oxford). pp1-20.

Harrison, S., Hardwick, L., ed. (2013). *Classics in the Modern World: A Democratic Turn?* (Oxford). ppxix-xxxvii.

Havelock, E.A. (1986). *The Muse Learns to Write: Reflections on Orality and Literacy from Antiquity to the Present*. (London).

Heaney, S. (2009). 'Title Deeds - Translating a Classic' in: *Living Classics. Greece & Rome in Contemporary Poetry in English*, ed. S. Harrison. (Oxford). pp122-139.

Heinze, R. (1903). *Virgil's Epic Technique*, trans. H. Harvey, D. Harvey, F. Robertson (1993). (London).

Higgins, C. (2017). 'Review: The *Odyssey* translated by Emily Wilson – a new cultural landmark'. *The Guardian*. 8 December.

Highet, G. (1974). 'Speech and Narrative in the *Aeneid*'. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. 78. (Massachusetts). pp189-229.

Highet, G. (1972). *The Speeches in Virgil's 'Aeneid'*. (Princeton).

Hill, D.E. (2008). 'Review: Latin Literature'. *Greece and Rome*, vol. 55, no. 1. pp124-5.

Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. (Cambridge).

Holmes, J. (1988, 1994 ed.). *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies*. (Amsterdam and Atalanta).

Homer Multitext Project: http://www.homermultitext.org/about/. Accessed 12/02/20.

Howard, J. (2008). 'Measuring the *Aeneid* on a Human Scale', *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 16 May, vol 54, issue 36.

Hühn, P. (2009). 'Introduction', in: *Point of View, Perspective and Focalisation: Modelling Mediation in Narrative*, ed. P. Hühn, W. Schmid, J. Schönert. (Berlin).

Hutchinson, G. (2010). 'Deflected Addresses: Apostrophe and Space (Sophocles, Aeschines, Plautus, Cicero, Virgil and others)'. *Classical Quarterly*, vol. 60 (1), pp96-109.

Iser, W. (1976, trans. 1978). *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. (London and Henley).

Jackson Knight, W.F. (1944, 1966 ed.). *Roman Vergil*. (Middlesex).

Johnson, W.R. (1976). *Darkness Visible: A Study of Virgil's 'Aeneid'*. (Berkeley).

Juster, A.M. (2018). 'Power and Rhythm. A New Translation of Virgil's *Aeneid*'. *Claremont*, vol. XVIII, no. 3 (Summer).

Kallendorf, C. (2007) *The Other Virgil*: *Pessimistic Readings of the 'Aeneid' in Early Modern Culture*. (Oxford).

Kallendorf, C. (2006) 'Allusion as Reception: Virgil, Milton, and the Modern Reader', in: *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, ed. C. Martindale and R. F. Thomas. (Mass.). pp67–79.

Keith, A. (2018). 'Love and War: Translations of *Aeneid* 7 into English (from Caxton until Today)', in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. (Oxford). pp63-79.

Lada-Richards, I. (2002). 'Reinscribing the Muse: Greek Drama and the Discourse of Inspired Creativity' in: *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, ed. E. Spentzou, D. Fowler. (Oxford). pp69-91.

Laird, A. (2002). 'Authority and Ontology of the Muses in Epic Reception', in: *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, ed. E. Spentzou, D. Fowler. (Oxford). pp117-140.

Laird, A. (1999). *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation in Latin Literature*. (Oxford).

Langerwerf, L., Ryan, C. (2010). 'Introduction', in: *Zero to Hero, Hero to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, ed. L. Langerwerf, C. Ryan. (Newcastle). pp1-27.

Lazzarini, C. (1990). 'Elementi di una poetica serviana: Osservazioni sulla costruzione del racconto nel commentario all'*Eneide*, 11.' *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, 82. pp241-60.

Lianeri, A., Zajko, V. (2008). 'Introduction: Still being Read after so Many Years: Rethinking the Classic through Translation', in: *Translation and the Classic*, ed. A. Lianeri, V. Zajko. (Oxford). pp1-23.

Loeb Classics Profile: https://www.loebclassics.com/page/history. Accessed 12/02/20.

Lovatt, H. (forthcoming). 'Metalepsis, Grief and Narrative in *Aeneid* 2', in: *Breaking and Entering: Metalepsis in Classical Literature*, ed. S. Matzner, G. Trimble. (Oxford).

Lovatt, H. (2019a). 'Character in Virgil', in: *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. C. Martindale, F. Mac Góráin. (Cambridge). pp387-399.

Lovatt, H. (2019b). 'Faith in Fate: Plot, Gods, and Metapoetic Morality in Valerius Flaccus', in: *Fides in Flavian Literature*, ed. A. Augoustakis, E. Buckley, C. Stocks. (Toronto). pp85-108.

Lovatt, H. (2016). 'East, West, and Finding Yourself in Caroline Lawrence's "Roman Mysteries"', in: *Our Mythical Childhood… The Classics and Literature for Children and Young Adults*, ed. K. Marcinak. (Leiden & Boston). pp411-427.

Lovatt, H. (2013). *Epic Gaze: Vision, Gender and Narrative in Ancient Epic*. (Cambridge).

Lovatt, H. (2005). *Statius and Epic Games: Sport, Politics and Poetics in the Thebaid*. (Cambridge).

Lyne. R.O.A.M. (1989). *Words and the Poet: Characteristic Techniques of Style in Vergil's 'Aeneid*'. (Oxford).

Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1987). *Further Voices in Vergil's 'Aeneid*'. (Oxford).

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics, Vol. 2*. (Cambridge).

Mack, S. (1999). 'The Birth of War: A Reading of *Aeneid* 7', in: *Reading Vergil's 'Aeneid': An Interpretative Guide*, ed. C. Perkell. (Norman). pp128-147.

Mackail, J.W. (1922). *Virgil and his Meaning to the World of To-Day*. (London).

Mader, G. (2015). 'The Final Simile in the *Aeneid*. Mechanics of Warfare and Textual Mechanisms'. *Mnemosyne* 68, pp588-604.

Marinčič. M. (2018). Farming for the Few: Jožef Šubic's Georgics and the Early Slovenian Reception of Virgil' in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. (Oxford). pp166-182.

Martindale, C. (1993). *Descent into Hell. Reading Ambiguity, or Virgil and the Critics*, in: *Virgil - Critical Assessments of Classical Authors*, vol. 3, ed. P. Hardie (1999). (London). pp14-49.

May, R. (1994). 'Where Did the Narrator Go? Towards a Grammar of Translation'. *The Slavic and East European Journal*, vol. 38, no. 1 (Spring), pp. 33-46.

McHale, B. (1978). 'Free Indirect Discourse: A Survey of Recent Accounts'. *Poetics and Theory of Literature*, 3. pp249-87.

McQuillan, M., ed. (2000). *The Narrative Reader*. (New York).

Mitchell, W.J.T. (1994). *Picture Theory*. (Chicago).

Monti, R.C. (1981). *The Dido Episode and the 'Aeneid': Roman Social and Political Values in the Epic*. (Brill).

Morris, B. (1969). 'Virgil and the Heroic Ideal'. In: *Meminisse Iuvabit. Selections from the Proceedings of the Virgil Society*, ed. Robertson, F. (1988). (Bristol). pp111-127.

Most, G.W. (1992). '*Disiecti membra poetae*: The Rhetoric of Dismemberment in Neronian Poetry', in: *Innovations of Antiquity*, ed. R. Hexter, D. Selden. (Abingdon). pp391-419.

Nagy, G. (1979, 1999 ed.). *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. (London).

Nelis, D. (2001). *Vergil's 'Aeneid' and the 'Argonautica' of Apollonius Rhodius*. (Leeds).

Newman, B. (1946). 'The *Penguin Odyssey*'. *Greece & Rome*, vol. 15, issue 45, (October). pp119-124.

Nodelman, P. (2008). *The Hidden Adult: Defining Children's Literature*. (Baltimore, MA).

Nuttall, A.D. (1992). *Openings - Narrative Beginnings from the Epic to the Novel*. (Oxford).

O'Brien, S. (2007). 'The Hoofbeats of Horses'. *The Guardian*. 17 November.

O'Donnell, J.J. (2009). 'Frederick Ahl: Virgil, The *Aeneid*'. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*. 21 October.

O'Neal, W.J. (1976). 'The Form of the Simile in Vergil's "Aeneid"'. *The Classical Bulletin (St. Louis)*, vol. 53. 1 November. pp76-79.

Onega, S., Landa, J.A.G. (1996). 'Introduction' in: *Narratology*, ed. S. Onega, J.A.G. Landa. (Essex). pp1-41.

Ormsby, E. (2008). 'The Music of Fatality'. *The New York Sun*. 9 January.

Otis, B. (1969). 'The Originality of the *Aeneid*', in: *Virgil*, ed. D.R. Dudley. (London). pp27-66.

Otis, B. (1964, 1995 ed.). *Virgil: A Study in Civilised Poetry*. (Norman and London).

OWC Ahl Aeneid Profile. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/aeneid-9780199231959?cc=gb&lang=en&. Accessed 21/10/19.

OWC Profile UK. https://global.oup.com/academic/content/series/o/oxford-worlds-classics-owc/?cc=gb&lang=en. Accessed 21/10/19.

OWC Profile US. https://global.oup.com/academic/content/series/o/oxford-worlds-classics-owc/?cc=us&lang=en. Accessed 21/10/19.

Palmer, F.R. (1976, 1981 ed.). *Semantics*. (Cambridge).

Papaioannou, S. (2018). 'Sing It Like Homer: Eugenios Voulgaris's Translation of the *Aeneid*', in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. (Oxford). pp151-165.

Parry, A. (1963). 'The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*'. *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics*, vol. 2 (4). 1 December. pp66-80.

Parsons, I. (1977). *Poems of C Day Lewis.* (London).

Paulu, B. (1961). *British Broadcasting in Transition*. (London).

Pelliccia, H. (2007). 'Let Virgil be Virgil', *New York Review of Books*, 12 April.

Penguin Classics Profile: https://www.penguin.co.uk/company/publishers/penguin-press/penguin-classics.html. Accessed 03/01/19.

Perkell, C. (1999). '*Aeneid* 1: An Epic Program', in: *Reading Vergil's 'Aeneid': An Interpretative Guide*, ed. C. Perkell. (Norman). pp29-49.

Perkell, C. (1989). *The Poet's Truth: A Study of the Poet in Virgil's 'Georgics'*. (Berkeley).

Perkell, C. (1981). 'On Creusa, Dido, and the quality of victory in Virgil's *Aeneid*', in: *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*, ed. H.P. Foley. (New York). pp355-377.

Perkins, R.D. (1992). *Deixis, Grammar, Culture*. (Philadelphia).

Petrini. M. (1997). *The Child and the Hero: Coming of Age in Catullus and Vergil*. (Michigan).

Pinkster, H. (1999). 'The Present Tense in Virgil's *Aeneid*'. *Mnemosyne*, vol. LII, Fasc, 6. (Leiden). pp705-717.

Pinkster, H. (1998). 'Is the Latin present tense the unmarked, neutral tense in the system?', in: *Latin in Use: Amsterdam Studies in the Pragmatics of Latin*, ed. R. Risselada. (Amsterdam). pp63-83.

Pound, E. (1934). *ABC of Reading*. (New York).

Pöschl, V. (1962, 1970 ed.). *The Art of Vergil: Image and Symbol in the 'Aeneid'*, trans. G. Seligson. (Michigan).

Prince, G. (1987). *A Dictionary of Narratology*. (Aldershot).

Proudfoot, L. (1960). *Dryden's 'Aeneid' and its Seventeenth Century Predecessors.* (Manchester).

Pucci, P. (1977). *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry*. (Baltimore and London).

Putnam, M.C.J. (2011). *The Humanness of Heroes: Studies in the Conclusion of Virgil's 'Aeneid'*. (Amsterdam).

Putnam, M.C.J. (2001). 'The Ambiguity of Art in Virgil's *Aeneid*'. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 145, no. 2 (June). pp162-183.

Putnam, M.C.J. (1999). '*Aeneid* 12: Unity in Closure', in: *Reading Vergil's 'Aeneid': An Interpretative Guide*, ed. C. Perkell. (Norman). pp210-230.

Putnam, M.C.J. (1998). *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the 'Aeneid'*. (New Haven).

Putnam, M.C.J. (1995). *Virgil's 'Aeneid': Interpretation and Influence*. (Chapel Hill).

Putnam, M.C.J. (1965, 1988 ed.). *The Poetry of the 'Aeneid'*. (London).

Quinn, K. (1968). *Virgil's 'Aeneid': A Critical Description*. (London).

Rate My Professor: https://www.ratemyprofessors.com/ShowRatings.jsp?tid=454422. Accessed 12/02/20.

Reed, J.D. (2007). *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the 'Aeneid'*. (Princeton).

Rimmon-Kenan, S. (1983, 2002 ed.). *Narrative Fiction and Contemporary Poetics*. (London).

Rosati, G. (2002). 'Muse and Power in the Poetry of Statius', in: *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, ed. E. Spentzou, D. Fowler. (Oxford). pp229-251.

Rosati, G. (1979). 'Punto di vista narrativo e antichi esegeti di Virgilio'. *Annali della Scuola Normale di Pisa, Classe di Lettere e Filologia*. pp539-62.

Ross, D.O. (1975). *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. (Cambridge).

Ruden, S. (2006). 'That Most Awful Poem, the *Aeneid*: A Translator's Tragic Alliance'. *The New Criterion* 24. pp36–9.

Rupp, S. (2018). 'Epic and the Lexicon of Violence: Gregorio Hernández de Velasco's Translation of *Aeneid* 2 and Cervantes's Numancia', in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. (Oxford). pp51-62.

Scarfe, F. (1942). *Auden and After – The Liberation of Poetry*, *1930-1941*. (London).

Schleiermacher, F. (1813). 'On the Different Methods of Translating', in: *Translation Studies Reader*, ed. L. Venuti (2012). (London). pp43-63.

Schork, R.J. (1986). 'The Final Simile in the *Aeneid*: Roman and Rutulian Ramparts'. *The American Journal of Philology*, vol. 107, no. 2 (Summer). pp260-270.

Segal, C. (1981). 'Art and the Hero: Participation, Detachment and Narrative Point of View in *Aeneid* 1'. *Arethusa*, vol. 14, issue 1 (Spring). (New York). pp67-83.

Segal, C. (1966). '"Aeternum per Saecula Nomen", the Golden Bough and the Tragedy of History: Part II.' *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics,* vol. 5, no. 1 (Spring). pp34-72.

Segal, E.M. (1995). 'Narrative Comprehension and the Role of Deictic Shift Theory', in: *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*, ed. J.F. Duchan, G.A. Bruder, L.E. Hewitt. (New York and London). pp3-18.

Seider, A.M. (2012). 'Competing Commemorations: Apostrophes of the Dead in the *Aeneid*'. *American Journal of Philology*, vol. 133, no. 2 (Summer). pp241-269.

Semple, W.H. (1952). 'Unvirgilian'. *The Manchester Guardian*. October 7.

Sharrock, A. (2002). 'An A-musing Tale: Gender, Genre, and Ovid's Battles with Inspiration in the *Metamorphoses*', in: *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, ed. E. Spentzou, D. Fowler. (Oxford). pp207-227.

Shuster, G.N. (1940). *The English Ode from Milton to Keats*. (Massachusetts).

Skoie, M. (2018). 'Finding a Pastoral Idiom: Norwegian Translations of Virgil's *Eclogues* and the Politics of Language', in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. (Oxford). pp195-208.

Smith, A. (1974). *British Broadcasting*. (Newton Abbot).

Smith, C.S. (2003). *Modes of Discourse: The Local Structure of Texts*. (Cambridge, New York).

Smith, M. (1996). 'The Logic and Legacy of Brechtianism', in: *Post Theory – Reconstructing Film Studies*, ed. D. Bordwell, N. Carroll. (Wisconsin). pp130-149.

Snagge, J., Barsley, M. (1972). *Those Vintage Years of Radio*. (London).

Spentzou, E. (2003). *Readers and Writers in Ovid's Heroides: Transgressions of Genre and Gender.* (Oxford).

Spentzou, E. (2002). 'Introduction: Secularizing the Muse', in: *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*, ed. E. Spentzou, D. Fowler. (Oxford). pp1-28.

Stallings, A. (2006). 'The Historical Present'. *American Scholar*. December 1. https://theamericanscholar.org/the-historical-present/#.Xx1oIZ5KhPa. Accessed 30/07/20.

Stray, C. (1998). *Classics Transformed – Schools, Universities, and Society in England (1830-1960)*. (Oxford).

Thomas, R.F. (2018). 'Domesticating Aesthetic Effects: Virgilian Case Studies', in: *Virgil and His Translators,* ed. S. Braund, Z.M. Torlone. (Oxford). pp239-259.

Thomas, R.F. (2001). *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. (Cambridge).

Thomas, R.F. (1998). 'The Isolation of Turnus: *Aeneid* Book 12', in: *Vergil's 'Aeneid': Augustan Epic and Political Context*, ed. H.P. Stahl. (London). pp271-302.

Todorov, T. (1973). 'Some Approaches to Russian Formalism', in: *Russian Formalism*, ed. S. Bann, J.E. Bowlt. (New York). pp6-19.

Toolan, M.J (1996, 2013 ed.). *Language in Literature: An Introduction to Stylistics*. (London).

Toynbee, J.M.C. (1973, 1996 ed.). *Animals in Roman Life and Art*. (Baltimore).

Venuti, L., ed. (2000, 2012 ed.).*The Translation Studies Reader*. (Abingdon).

Venuti, L. (1998). *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. (London).

Venuti, L. (1995, 2008 ed.). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. (Abingdon).

Venuti, L. (1993). 'The Destruction of Troy – Translation and Royalist Cultural Politics in the Interregnum.' *The Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies (JMRS)*, vol. 23, no. 2. (Spring). pp197-219.

West, D. (1969). 'Multiple Correspondence Similes'. *The Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. 59, no. 1/2. pp40-49.

Wheeler, S. (1999). *Discourse of Wonders*. (Pennsylvania).

Whitehead, K. (1989). *The Third Programme. A Literary History*. (Oxford).

Wilkins, D.P. (1995). 'Expanding the Traditional Category of Deictic Elements – Interjections as Deictics', in: *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*, ed. J.F. Duchan, G.A. Bruder, L.E. Hewitt. (New York and London). pp359-386.

Wilkins, E. G. (1921). 'A Classification of the Similes in Vergil's *Aeneid* and *Georgics'. The Classical Weekly*, vol 14, no. 22. 18 April. pp170-174.

Williams, C.A. (2010). *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. (Oxford).

Williams, G. (1983). *Technique and Ideas in the 'Aeneid'*. (New Haven).

Williams, R.D. (1984). 'The Poetic Intention of Virgil's Aeneid', in: *Virgil and his Influence: Bimillennial Studies*, ed. C. Martindale. (Bristol). pp25-35.

Williams, R.D. (1969). 'Changing Attitudes to Virgil: A Study in the History of Taste from Dryden to Tennyson', in: *Virgil*, ed. D.R. Dudley. (London).

Wilson, A.N. (2008). 'Virgil through Modern Eyes'. *The Telegraph*. 7 July.

Wilson, E. *Twitter*. https://twitter.com/EmilyRCWilson?lang=en. Accessed: 25/01/20.

Wilson Knight, G. (1975). *Jackson Knight. A Biography*. (Oxford).

Wiltshire, S.F. (1999). 'The Man who was not There – Aeneas and Absence in *Aeneid* 9', in: *Reading Vergil's 'Aeneid': An Interpretative Guide*, ed. C. Perkell. (Norman). pp162-178.

Wlosok, A. (1976, 1999 ed.). 'The Dido Tragedy in Virgil: A Contribution to the Question of the Tragic in the *Aeneid*', in: *Virgil - Critical Assessments of Classical Authors*, vol. 1, ed. P. Hardie. (London). pp158-181.

Wofford, S.L. (1992). *The Choice of Achilles: The Ideology of Figure in the Epic*. (Stanford).

Wrigley, A. (2015). *Greece on Air. Engagements with Ancient Greece on BBC Radio 1920s-1960s*. (Oxford).

Zwicker, S.N. (1984). *Politics and Language in Dryden's Poetry: The Art of Disguise*. (Guildford).