

Battle Narrative in Virgil and Ovid

Camilla Rose Christie

CHRCAM001

A dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of

Masters in Latin Language and Literature

Faculty of the Humanities

University of Cape Town

September 2014

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

COMPULSORY DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Abstract

The intent of this thesis is to examine the stylistics of Latin epic narrative as used to narrate and describe extended battle sequences, and to explore the way in which Latin authors working during the Augustan Era engaged with Homeric techniques of oral narrative while composing written epic. A total of six extended battle sequences from the *Aeneid* of Virgil and the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid are examined and analysed with regard to their use of word order, simile, catalogue, and other such stylistic features. The overall aim is to consider Ovid's literary debt to his immediate epic predecessor Virgil, together with the debt of both poets to Ancient Greek epic narrative, in such a way as to explore the various techniques of generic allusivity practised by both poets on a stylistic level.

The first chapter provides a brief overview of Homeric technique, defines the distinction between primary and secondary epic, and serves as an introduction to Virgilian and Ovidian concerns.

The second chapter contains analysis of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Battle sequences from Book 2, Book 9, and Book 10 are examined and discussed from a stylistic perspective, and the extent to which Virgil has drawn on and reformulated Homeric epic technique is established. Book 2 is examined for the manner in which it engages with and reconstructs Homeric ideals of heroism. Book 9, constituting as it does the first instance within the second half of the *Aeneid* of Homeric battle narrative, is analysed as a transitional episode, and its motifs of literary and cultural inheritance discussed. Book 10 provides an extended example of Homeric battle narrative.

The third chapter engages with Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Extracts of notably epic tone from Book 5, Book 8, Book 12 are discussed in such a way as to highlight their literary allusivity, and in particular their contrast with the Virgilian model of adapting epic technique. Book 5 is examined as an introductory example of extended Ovidian battle narrative. The analysis of Book 8 demonstrates how epic narrative may be enriched by the intrusion of alternate poetic genres. Book 12 is contrasted with Book 2 of the *Aeneid*, and the manner in which it, too, engages with Homeric ideals of heroism, is discussed.

The thesis concludes that while both poets utilised and expanded upon specific stylistic elements of Greek epic narrative, they did so in a notably different fashion. Ovid contrasts sharply with his predecessor Virgil and often incorporates elements of alternate genres in order to establish his own allusive technique.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Three Battles in the <i>Aeneid</i>	13
2.1. The Sack of Troy - <i>Aeneid</i> 2.....	13
2.2. The Opening of Hostilities - <i>Aeneid</i> 9.....	30
2.3. Aeneas and Pallas - <i>Aeneid</i> 10.....	49
3. Three Battles in the <i>Metamorphoses</i>	60
3.1. The Wedding Brawl - <i>Metamorphoses</i> 5.....	64
3.2. The Boar Hunt - <i>Metamorphoses</i> 8.....	77
3.3. The Centauromachy - <i>Metamorphoses</i> 12.....	96
4. Conclusion	129
References	131

1

Introduction

Works of literary epic as composed by both Greek and Latin poets not only drew elements of style, theme, and narrative content from older texts, but also served as the continuation of a fossilised oral tradition, the stylistics of which were geared specifically toward facilitating oral narrative. For the purposes of this dissertation it will be sufficient to provide a brief overview of Homeric epic features, before examining in particular the way in which they are reformulated and adapted to comply with the medium-specific constraints of two later Latin literary epics, namely the *Aeneid* and the *Metamorphoses*, and of literary battle narrative in particular.

The recurring motifs and structural features of Homeric and other oral narrative would have evolved in such a way as to bolster the performer's capacity for recall and to facilitate improvisation, but also to convey his material to the listening audience with the greatest possible degree of immediacy and vividness. These motifs and techniques simultaneously served as a pragmatic means to announce, organise, emphasise, and conclude. Tension and immediacy are heightened by apostrophe and simile, the latter of which would seem to function so to 'deepen[s] our emotional response to the text'¹ and as a vivid illustrative aid. Epithetic constructions not only serve as identifying devices but also fall into the class of pre-composed metrical formulae that would assist with improvisation by 'maximis[ing] the opportunities for creating...metred verse spontaneously,'² while invocatory formulae, in addition to announcing and introducing the material to a listening audience, occur within the prefaces to catalogic passages. Since the recitation may have constituted a form of virtuoso

¹ P Toohey, *Reading Epic*, Routledge, London, 1992, p. 16.

² C R Beye, *Ancient Epic Poetry*, Cornell University Press, New York, 1993, p. 4.

performance,³ this would suggest that the invocation demarcated and emphasised their placement at the beginning of these sections of the narrative song.

The unique fashion in which a listening consciousness responds to, organises, and interprets a continuous spoken narrative on a psycholinguistic level would also shape the progression of the material, and may well have resulted in the specific types of repetition so frequently encountered in the Homeric texts. Just as a chapter headings and paragraph breaks, in conforming to a standardised orthography, serve to assist in the organisation of a modern written work, so repetitive closing and opening formulae regulate the inception and conclusion of certain episodes, while the frequent verbatim repetition encountered in such instances as the relay of messages from sender to recipient (as with ὄν τις οἴστεύσας ἔβαλεν τόξων ἐὺ εἰδῶς / Τρώων ἢ Λυκίων τῷ μὲν κλέος, ἄμμι δὲ πένθος at *Il.*4.196-7 and 206 - 207, for instance) would similarly seem to reflect the prevalence of repetition in oral narrative, and there exists substantial evidence linking the prevalence of ring composition to techniques apparent in oral storytelling.⁴ Furthermore, repetition is particularly notable in battle sequences appearing in the *Iliad*.⁵ In short, the primary tropes of the epic genre are a direct functional result of its oral nature, and no less polished for that. They are, as Beye puts it, the ‘refined contrivance of a very sophisticated narrative tradition.’⁶

By the time Apollonius was composing his *Argonautica*, an epic forerunner to the *Aeneid*, the practice of oral recitation, and, potentially, of extemporaneous oral improvisation,

³ E Minchin, *Homer and the Resources of Memory*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2001, pp. 76 - 79.

⁴ E J Bakker, ‘Discourse and Performance Involvement, Visualization and “Presence” in Homeric Poetry’, *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 12, pp. 1-29, 1993, p. 8.

⁵ Toohey, p. 14.

⁶ Beye, p. 3.

would seem to have fossilised, or at least to have been supplanted, for although it was certainly altered and diminished, it is unlikely that oral performance was entirely done away with.⁷ However, the main onus of composition no longer fell on a poet trained to perform and ornament selections from a memorised canon of primary, oral epic, but rather on a poet who wrote a secondary, literary form of epic, likely producing, editing, and rejecting multiple drafts before arriving at a final product, which might be read aloud to an audience.⁸ Even so, Apollonius wrote in the epic style to such an extent that his continued employment of characteristic devices such as invocatory introductions might be considered an outright ‘recreation of the context of performance,’⁹ thereby acknowledging the *Argonautica* to be the product of a long tradition with specific medium-based constraints despite working in a different medium entirely.

Perhaps the most marked development brought about by this gradual shift from primary epic to secondary epic, as precipitated by the spread of literacy and hence of literary culture, was the emphasis that it placed on the creative capacity and literary skill of the individual, and the consolidation of the author’s responsibility for a product which was far more permanent than oral song. Certainly it is this which resulted in the marked lack of Homeric repetition in later literary authors despite their eager and almost competitive willingness to replicate and rework every other major Homeric device. It is hence of interest to consider not only the methods by which Greek devices are realised in the Latin, but the fashion in which later

⁷ R Scodel, *Listening to Homer*, University of Michigan Press, Michigan, 2002, p. 61.

⁸ R V Albis, *Poet and Audience in the Argonautica of Apollonius*, Rowman and Littlefield, Inc., Maryland, 1996, p. 9.

⁹ Albis, p. 8.

authors manipulated devices that originated to serve a distinct function dictated by the necessities of a specific medium within the context of a different medium entirely.

The portrayal in a manageable fashion of anything so chaotic and unrestrained as battle must necessarily come as a challenge to any storyteller, and particularly the pre-historic ideal of epic battle, which commences with little in the way of unified strategy or direction and unfolds on a vast scale involving multiple smaller conflicts between individuals, which take place over an extended duration of time. The sheer number of individual *promachoi*, each a named and hence significant mythical warrior in his own right rather than one in a phalanx of interchangeable soldiers, renders the strict chronological relation of events immensely difficult, if not outright impossible, given that in the situation posited, multiple events occur simultaneously and with little direct causal relation to each other. The ubiquitous press of battle does not lend itself well to a medium experienced in real-time. Where a visual medium may portray multiple simultaneous occurrences synoptically, a narrative can only single each occurrence out in turn. To impose any implication of linear progression or chronology onto these occurrences is to lessen the effect of the ubiquitous chaos of battle - such lists convey with great vividness 'the urgency of the battlefield', as Minchin says.¹⁰

The Homeric model overcomes the problem of chronology, or at least side-steps it, by expanding any given battle narrative into an episodic series of smaller skirmishes relayed in paratactic language. Each of these begins with a clash between two opposing warriors and ends in the death of one, hence the term *androktasia*. A causal progression from one episode to another may at times be discerned, as when the victor of one skirmish continues directly on to meet his next opponent, but more often there is no progression whatsoever. It is thus inadvisable, if not broadly impossible, to attempt to impose a sense of narrative progression

¹⁰ Minchin, p. 92.

on these ‘kill-lists’, for although they are narrated to us in some degree of order, that order is not necessarily chronological. An overarching linear progression may be assumed, particularly in the earlier and later stages of any such instalment, when certain events must be causally linked in order to ensure progression, and certainly longer episodes with stronger narrative force retain an overt sense of chronology; but the bulk of Homeric battle narrative is fleshed out, so to speak, by multiple, largely disconnected conflicts that are not necessarily contained within a strictly linear timeframe, and may instead be viewed as occurring simultaneously, or at least in an overlapping fashion.

Beye identifies *androktasiai* as having likely been derived from the catalogic tradition, since ‘each battle list seems to be a thing apart from the general dramatic narrative, often introduced in a way seemingly so consciously artificial as to set the passage very definitely off to itself.’¹¹ Certainly the careful inclusion of the names of each participant, often together with a heroic pedigree or an introductory heroic epithet, suggests that this technique may have been distilled into the Homeric corpus from stock lists of mythological heroes and their conflicts.¹² This process would certainly allow for the preservation of ‘large amounts of mythological data without the aid of writing’¹³. In essence, the process of constructing lists would seem to be a hallmark of the oral genre,¹⁴ and the episodic structure of Homeric battle narrative is likely derived from the structure of catalogic recital, as free of the constraints of chronological progression as other Homeric lists, such as the Catalogue of Ships.

Three primary traits of battle narrative may be identified from the Homeric model. Firstly, an episodic construction free in the main from the constraints of linear narrative

¹¹ C R Beye, ‘Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues’ in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 68, pp. 345-373, 1964, p. 345

¹² Beye, 1964, p. 345.

¹³ B Sammons, *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010, p. 6.

¹⁴ Minchin, p. 73.

progression due to its battle narrative's evolution from an oral catalogic tradition; secondly, the identification of participants via epithetic naming and, very often, the provision of heroic pedigrees and heroic armaments, the bulk of which depends heavily on stock repeated formula; thirdly and most centrally, the commemoration and reinforcement of the heroic *kleos* of each victorious participant, generated through their kill and preserved by its retelling. This last, of course, constitutes the grand overarching theme of epic and has an ancient pedigree. The notion of extending the lifespan, as it were, of the especial kind of social renown achieved through victory by recording it in song would seem to belong to the very earliest Indo-European origins of the epic genre,¹⁵ but pertains particularly to prowess in battle. All these traits are thus distilled directly from the genre's original function as an oral tradition.

In moving to consider writers of literary epic, therefore, the question arises as to how such features are reinterpreted in a written medium under the constraints of both the distinct aesthetic standards that arose from the development and dissemination of writing, and of the altered allusive function of epic. Virgil's battle narratives inform and characterise the Iliadic segments of the text, from Aeneas' first-person reminiscence of the destruction of Troy in Book 2 to the full-scale battles that constitute the bulk of Books 9 and 10, and serve in their Homeric allusivity not only as the mechanism by which a Homeric character may most appropriately achieve his aims, but also as the means by which Virgil himself may relate them. Thus the Virgilian practice of appropriating epic language and themes may be said to operate on three levels, the first being to serve as fitting instalments, often climactic, in the context of a narrative of a particular genre (and hence textual); the second to acknowledge literary debt (and hence intertextual); and the third to reframe this debt with the metatextual aim of extending to readers an invitation to draw direct comparisons between the source work and its product, thereby locating it within a broader literary tradition. Spread across entire

¹⁵ Toohey, p. 6.

chapters and functioning not only as a suitably elevated framework for the *Aeneid*'s themes of Roman nationalism and idealised masculinity, but also as an attempt to ground this framework firmly in literary tradition, Virgil's battles are broadly episodic after the catalogic fashion of Homeric battle, but far less paratactic, and are considerably more aware of the intricacies of chronology.

In Virgil, this is frequently achieved through the focus on a single combatant whose participation in battle consists of several victorious engagements, each one treated as an individual episode in which the victim is identified by name and, frequently, by information pertaining to his genealogical and topological origin. The victim is generally identified towards the beginning of the episode, and each name is frequently supplied in the accusative case, thus denoting their status as a victim, before the action of each episode can begin, and supplying the success of the single combatant as a foregone conclusion. These 'accusative kills' serve to demarcate individual episodes and to preserve the progression of the victor's rampage. This technique is exemplified in Book 11, in which a single combatant, the Amazon Camilla, is apostrophised by a question that asks her the names and numbers of her kills - *quem telo primum, quem postremum...deicis? aut quot humi morientia corpora fundis?* (11.664 - 65) Fratantuono draws comparisons between this question and the Homeric address of Patroclus at *Il.*16.692 - 93, which serves an explicitly pathetic purpose in announcing his impending death with *σε θεοὶ θάνατον δὲ κάλεσσαν*, and certainly Virgil's take on the first half of the apostrophe is as close as it can be to a direct gloss.¹⁶ In the *Iliad*, this question and others like it¹⁷ are followed by a close run in polysyndeton of accusative names, generally occupying several lines and comprising a catalogue in miniature. In Book 11 of the *Aeneid*, the subsequent series of expanded episodes, the majority of which relay the names of the

¹⁶ L Fratantuono, *A Commentary on Virgil Aeneid XI*, 2009, Éditions Latomus, Brussels, p.220.

¹⁷ Including *Il.*5.703 - 710, *Il.*8.273 - 277, *Il.*11.299 - 303, and *Il.*14.508 - 515.

victims in the accusative, would suggest that the episodic structure is an expansion on the Homeric catalogue in such a way as to create a narrative-based kill-list.

Furthermore, individual deaths are frequently set up in such a way as to provide some kind of ironic or thematically-relevant commentary on the victim, whether it be an etymological play on the victim's name, the targeting of a certain body part, or a kill that occurs in such a way as to engage with some previously established facet of the victim's character. The appearance of such irony in parodic stretches of Ovidian battle narrative might tempt modern readers to classify the technique as an example of humour, but it occurs also in more weighty Virgilian narrative, particularly during Aeneas' lengthy list of kills in Book 10, as well as in Camilla's rampage in Book 11. One of the most marked instances of epic imitation in the *Aeneid*, the line *Appenninicolae bellator filius Auni* (11.700), serves as the set up for a complex instance of death irony. In conjunction with the single-word epithet *bellator* and the periphrastic genitive phrase that caps the line, the compound epithet *Appenninicolae* is markedly overblown (and is parodied by Ovid with *Appenninigenae* at *Met.*15.432). Despite such an impressive heroic introduction, the hero himself is never named. His heroic identity (or lack thereof, both with regard to his anonymity and to his unheroic immorality) is bound up with his extensive but false genealogy - he is a member of a race famed for their practice of deceit (*haud Ligurum extremus dum fallere fata sinebant*, 11.701), and during his combat will deploy underhanded and deceptive tactics. Camilla, however, dispatches him while referring to his *fraus* as *patrias artis*, and even goes so far as to call his father *fallax* (11.716 - 17), thereby ensuring that his connection with deceit, and its significance even at the moment of his death, is preserved. Other simpler examples of death irony include instances of twin-death occurring in such a way as to render their bodies distinctive in death where they were identical in life. This may occur during inherently parodic and self-aware battle narrative, as at *Met.*5.107 (Broteas and Ammon) and *Met.*5.140 (Clytius and Clanis), but also

at the more serious *Aen.*10.391 - 96 (Larides and Thymer) and *Aen.*10.575 - 605 (Lucagus and Liger). The use of death irony during non-parodic battle may well mark it out a means of tailoring deaths to suit the individual, thereby preserving the thematic unity - and hence the compositional integrity - of each episode.

Ovid's primary innovations on Virgilian secondary epic are founded in his ability to combine relatively straightforward reworkings of epic style with unexpected structural outcomes that are frequently underscored by his manipulation of narrative tempo. His technique relies on the straightforward recreation of what would at first appear to be a heroic story told in heroic language, coupled with such twists as a seemingly ill-timed or inappropriate wordplay, or a lengthy epic crescendo cut abruptly short, thus undermining the expected progression of events and detracting from the depiction of epic glory. In the *Metamorphoses*, therefore, instances of battle narrative would seem initially to serve only as an opportunity for the generation of entertainment. Vivid as they are and replete with humorous subversions and grotesque exaggerations of both the heroic ideal and the traditional heroic register, the reader seizes upon them as high-energy brawls that are only enjoyable enough to provide a degree of levity, and that forego the inclusion of the heavier aspects of Virgilian epic. Pathos is frequently destroyed outright through the sheer enormity of the violence perpetrated, and the outcomes of this violence do not serve a higher purpose, such as the destiny of Rome.

However, to read Ovid's epic reworkings solely as parodic due to their erotic or burlesque nature, or as being wholly devoid of either pathos or literary merit, is to underestimate them severely. Such readings frequently overlook the fact that his epic segments are often set up so as to supply scope for allusion and criticism in such a way as to invite direct comparison with their many literary antecedents. We may consider as an initial example Casali's observations on the function of Ovidian commentary on Vergilian omission.

In discussing Ovid's take in Book 13 of the *Metamorphoses* on Book 3 of the *Aeneid*, Casali notes that while the Ovidian Aeneas' sacrifices to Apollo are brief and delayed, being performed in the space of only two lines (13.628 - 9) after the hero has taken a good night's rest, is frequently interpreted as a 'witty debasement of Vergil's solemn narration' - which relates exhaustively (from *Aen.* 3.84 - 117, in high-flown prayer language) Aeneas' petition to the god and the god's response - this may not, in fact, be the case.¹⁸ Ovid's description, however brief, is devoted specifically to the process of ritual sacrifice, and this, Casali argues, may in fact serve as a subtle criticism of Virgil's omission of any mention of a ritual sacrifice to Apollo during his description of Aeneas' prayers.

Viewed in this light, this particular method of retelling reminds us that Ovid was not simply rehashing Virgil's *Aeneid* and flavouring it with the occasional joke, but was in fact versed in the literary criticism that had sprung up in the wake of the *Aeneid*, and was more than capable of incorporating elements of it into his own epic and capitalising on it by inserting his own subtle commentary. Certainly this coincides with Huxley's observance that an efficient shortcut to locating Virgilian passages ripe for Ovidian imitation would, at least at first, be to seize on those passages most derided by commentators, since 'these. . . exerted a magnetic attraction on the later poet.'¹⁹ Ovid seems to have had something of a penchant for examining in close detail the real-world applications of other mythical events, to the extent that Altieri describes him 'competing with the past by seeing how much more wittily and elaborately he can render the same basic narrative.'²⁰ Rather than stoop simply to mockery of epic, and aware that any ambitious attempts at straight-faced improvement would attract only greater criticism, Ovid chooses to engage with Virgil, his closest predecessor, by working

¹⁸ S Casali, 'Correcting Aeneas's Voyage: Ovid's Commentary on *Aeneid* 3', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 137, pp. 181-210, 2007, p. 190.

¹⁹ H H Huxley, 'Ovid's Debt to Virgil', *Vergilius*, Vol. 42, pp. 83 - 102, 1996, p. 89.

²⁰ C Altieri, 'Ovid and the New Mythologists', *A Forum on Fiction*, Vol. 7, pp. 31-40, 1973, p. 35.

carefully-placed acknowledgements of contemporary criticism into the body of his own narrative.

Battle narrative in both Ovid and Virgil is markedly Homeric not only because it shares its epic themes of physical prowess and heroic κλέος, but also due to the unique nature of its episodic construction. During Books 9 and 10 of the *Aeneid*, Virgil develops the traditionally paratactic and repetitive nature of Homeric battles into lengthier arcs that, while still inherently episodic, are more characteristic of a carefully composed narrative, and are very often demarcated by the use of specific syntactic patterns, as well as by the deployment of such constructional techniques as ring composition and thematic unity. In the Wedding Brawl of Book 5 and the Centauromachy of Book 12, Ovid manipulates typical epic narrative to great effect in accordance with his tendency to subvert the expectations of an audience conversant with the structure and tropes of epic. In the Boar Hunt of Book 8, Ovid also examines the relative effectiveness of masculine heroic identity when epic is impinged upon by the introduction of the competing elegiac genre. Both authors also interrogate Homeric ideals of epic heroism through examining the correspondence between heroic identity and heroic armour, and through framing battle narratives as metadiegetic explorations of the construction of heroic achievement and reputation. Aeneas and Nestor each serve, after their own fashion, as a makeshift αἰτιόδοξ in Book 2 of the *Aeneid* and Book 12 of the *Metamorphoses*, respectively. In presenting epic themes within metadiegetic narrative, and allowing epic characters to recount epic scenes, both authors hold the construction of the epic hero up for scrutiny.

This dissertation examines the line of thought that interprets Ovid's condensations of Virgilian narratives as acts of parody, crafted in such a way as to set up the expectation of a lengthy Virgilian passage, only to undercut this expectation with either a marked anti-climax, the sudden subversion of heroic imagery, or both. The suggestion is made that Virgil and

Ovid reformulated within a written medium a structure which was characteristic of oral narrative, and and that in so doing they enabled a degree of individual authorial innovation not actualised in the traditional format of epic.

2

Three Battles in the *Aeneid*

The Sack of Troy *Aeneid 2*

The first example of list-based battle narrative in the *Aeneid* is arguably the least typical of traditional epic, both in its construction and in its overall thematic content. As such, however, it is programmatic of the particular type of literary allusion which Virgil intends to employ, constituting an early demonstration of the mechanics of translating oral stylistic devices into written epic, and establishes not only a good deal of Aeneas' character and motivation, but also the *Aeneid*'s own central concerns pertaining to the ethics of combat, and of applying a contemporary moral framework to outdated epic ideals of heroism.

In lieu of the emotional immediacy of an extemporaneous composition, the apostrophised grief of first-person narration may be relied upon to compensate for the impersonality of a written medium - building upon the epic conceit that 'the genesis of epic poetry resides, at divine initiative, in the poet's memory'²¹ by transferring it to the particular paradigm of retrospective first-person narration, the character himself is made poet. Virgil's choice to position Aeneas as the proxy narrator of flashback is by necessity heavily Homeric, ushering in the Odyssean segment of the *Aeneid*, but by this same positioning must also serve to establish a distinctly Virgilian take on epic. To this end, this section will consider the implications of allowing a particular character's narration to influence both content and construction by contrasting certain sections of Aeneas' own personal narration of battle with accepted Homeric technique, while simultaneously allowing for the conventions of secondary

²¹ N Berlin, 'War and Remembrance: *Aeneid* 12.554-60 and Aeneas' Memory of Troy', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 119, 1998, pp. 11-41, p. 11

epic, and considering the adaptations in the context of the *Aeneid*'s reconfiguration of heroic identity and heroic morality.

Both Aeneas' crucial role as narrator and his own very personal response to being presented with images of the Trojan War combine to suggest that the meta-narrative literary history of this narrator must be taken into account. Di Cesare suggests that '...the event is ahistorical to Aeneas; it is massively mythical, archetypal.'²² However, Aeneas' own response to seeing his own experiences of the Trojan War mythologised and thus effectively reduced to artifice (*artificumque manus inter se operumque laborem / miratur* 1.455 - 6), would in fact seem to be one of personal grief. The explicit use Aeneas' emotional reflection on the murals as commentary 'allow[s] the hero to add his interpretive prejudice to what he views and to influence the reader accordingly.'²³ Syed similarly calls attention to the way in which 'the gaze of Aeneas. . . filters the reader's view of the spectacle', and in which his personal 'interpretation is imposed upon the images.'²⁴ Significantly, there is included in the mural 'a striking detail, briefly described (1.479 - 82)' which shows an offering to Athene that is rejected.²⁵ This prefigures neatly the insistence throughout Book 2 that the gods have effectively abandoned the Trojans to their fate, and that no effort of mortal arms, however valorous, could have saved the city. Furthermore, in addition to acknowledging the close stylistic correspondence between epic and ecphrasis,²⁶ the 'ecphrasis is in itself a reference to

²² M A Di Cesare, *The Altar and the City: A Reading of Virgil's Aeneid*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1974, p. 38

²³ M C J Putnam, *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the Aeneid*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1998, p. 23

²⁴ Y Syed, *Virgil's Aeneid and the Roman Self*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 2005, p.66

²⁵ G Williams, *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1983, p. 93

²⁶ W B Boyd, 'Virgil's Camilla and the Traditions of Catalogue and Ecphrasis (*Aeneid* 7.803-17)', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 113, 1992, pp. 213-234, p. 226

other epic poems,²⁷ and must therefore be viewed as standing in direct dialogue with existing traditions; readers are invited not only by their own awareness of Virgil's literary tradition to consider his descriptions of battle in relation to existing epic, but also by Aeneas' own awareness of his personal history within the context of the narrative.

It is not unacceptable, therefore, to examine the effect which the use of a secondary proxy narrator will have on an epic account, particularly given the tradition of first-person epic narration, and given the significance of personal autopsy to the inherent memorialising function of epic. By standing almost as makeshift ἀοιδοί, equipped with knowledge not by the Muses but by their own eye-witness experiences, previous characters-as-narrator have been capable of establishing their own heroic κλέος. Book 2 of the *Aeneid*, however, reveals its account of the Sack of Troy to be a deeply unconventional take on the core aims of epic, and particularly of character-narrated retrospective epic.

Aeneas' chosen approach to narration either challenges or discards the use of epic as a means of establishing personal heroic identity, and as a medium through which identity can be commemorated - in describing the loss of his home city, he 'resigns himself to losing his identity, situated as it is in the particular social fabric and historical context of Troy,'²⁸ which action runs counter to the typical function of epic as establishing heroic identity. Stylistically, he would seem to be recounting his experiences from a rather stricter perspective than Odysseus: rather than uniformly adopting the panoramic and quasi-divine viewpoint of even character-dependant epic narration, he is equipped with the unfettered ability to perceive and hence to relay only the most significant of events of the sack - the disembarkation of the Greeks from the Horse, and the murder of Priam. Here Virgil has no Homeric model, but

²⁷ Syed, 2005, p.66

²⁸ W Franke, 'The Secondariness of Virgilian Epic and its Unprecedented Originality', *College Literature*, Vol 40, 2013, p. 20.

works from later sources, which were ‘both copious and diverse’, in order to create his retelling.²⁹ During the bulk of his narration of the sack, his perspective is dependant on his physical position within the city’s topography, and is fairly narrowly focused on the progression of the fighting that occurs in the streets themselves - for broader descriptions, he must rely either on the frantic reports of others, or else he must physically alter his position by climbing onto the rooftop of his house in order to engage in panoramic *teichoscopia*.

Furthermore, in stark contrast to the central function of epic, he is not over-concerned to provide proof of his participation in the battle he recounts, and indeed goes out of his way to understate his role. Although as *ᾠοιδός* he is capable, as any performing narrator should be, of furnishing his account with such epic flourishes as *apostrophe*, *catalogue*, and *extended simile*, he deviates from the traditional goal of epic - the commemoration of the glorious dead and the preservation of heroic *κλέος* - by minimising his own contribution to the battle and going out of his way to insist that he was, for the most part, a passive and obedient soldier, rather than a hero equipped with any true authority. Throughout his account, he will attempt to side-line his own presence, making much by contrast of the attacks ordered by others, and will eventually argue that since the gods themselves had turned against Troy, he was powerless to save the city. Ahl remarks that Aeneas’s ‘rhetorically magnificent’ narration is in many ways akin to an oratorical defence, during the course of which he attempts to acquit himself of responsibility.³⁰ Certainly his high-register oath at 2.432, directly preceding the climactic murder of Priam, deploys a legalistic use of *testor* - Aeneas styles himself primarily as a witness to the Sack of Troy in general, rather than as an individual combatant whose participation might elsewhere have contributed to his personal heroic renown.

²⁹ Kenney E J, ‘Iudicium Transferrendi: Virgil, *Aeneid* 2.469 - 505 and its antedecents’, *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979, p. 104.

³⁰ F Ahl, ‘Homer, Vergil, and Complex Narrative Structures in Latin Epic’, *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 14, 1989, pp. 1 - 31, p. 28

Warned by the ghost of *maestissimus* Hector (2.271) and shaken from his sleep by the sounds of battle, Aeneas climbs onto the roof of his house, from which he is afforded a view of the destruction already underway. The narrator's entrance into the destruction occurs in *medias res - iam* (2.310 - 311) is used to track the progression of fire from house to house. Viewed from above, the initial destruction takes on a *teichoscopeiac* quality, but once Aeneas descends from the rooftops, he is no longer afforded the god's-eye view of the *aoidos* - his first-person vantage point becomes fairly realistically limited, and he supplies us with events which he himself has witnessed at close-quarters. The simile at 2.304 - 8, itself using the half-line *sata laeta boumque labores* in repetition of the pastoral stylings of *Georgics* 1.325,³¹ sees Aeneas stand helpless as a shepherd observing the destruction of his crops, and foreshadows Aeneas' later role as *pastor*, into which he must grow over the course of the work. However, never throughout the rest of Book 2 does Aeneas portray himself as having assumed any particular authority during the Fall of Troy.

Certainly the likening of the roving band to which he attaches himself to a pack of wolves (2.355 - 60), admittedly a stock epic simile, is at odds with Aeneas' developing imagery, and 'suggests an abrupt change from hapless defender to predator.'³² The hero of the *Aeneid* is by his own narrative design wholly removed from the man who fought at Troy, and he emerges from Book 2 as little more than a bystander to the two central events of Book 2 - the induction of the Horse into the city, and the death of Priam.³³ Even during these accounts, he displays considerable restraint, and will be demonstrated to prefer euphemistic and perfunctory vocabulary when describing death, and to avoid the more typically epic description of wounding and death, until the climactic death of Priam merits at the last the

³¹ R O A M Lyne, *Further Voices in the Aeneid*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1987, p 7.

³² Ahl, 1989, p. 29

³³ Berlin, 1998, p. 14

provision of gorier detail. This is unlike the later battles of the *Aeneid*, during which Virgil, no longer using Aeneas as his mouthpiece, conforms more closely to the epic practice of lingering with brutal clarity over each wound, even utilising simile in his descriptions specifically of death rather than simply of attack or architectural collapse. Similarly, it is only during these later books that Virgil-as-narrator, allows the battles to function as a showground for feats of exaggerated heroic ability. During Book 2, Aeneas-as-narrator chooses carefully which deaths he will describe in detail, and, for the most part, does not provide any overly gory account of his comrades' deaths. The standard mechanisms of epic are impinged upon by the sensitivities of a character whose personal grief over the events at hand prevents him from describing them in true epic fashion.

The first-person flashback of literary epic may allow certain of its attributes to be either curtailed or exaggerated, in keeping with the character and motive of the narrator. Ovid's *Centaurumachy*, as shall be seen, adheres closely to the Homeric aims of epic narrative - but even there, Nestor is chosen as a deliberate vehicle for epic due to his well-established character traits and Homeric identity. This identity, together with Ovid's comic exaggeration of his status as a long-winded *grandaevus*, informs the quality of his narrative, allowing it to be plausibly peppered with archaisms, rambling catalogues, and a degree of hyperbole excessive even by the standards of epic. He vaunts himself and his own recollection of his heroic performance, together with those of the peers of his youth. When paraded before a band of Homeric listeners, the epic effect of this narrative is so intensive as to preclude the necessity for epic style in the following instalments - for the *Centaurumachy* precedes the 'Little Iliad' and 'Little Aeneid' segments of the *Metamorphoses*, and Nestor's traditional propensity for garrulity effects the stylistic shift into epic diction.

Virgil, however, exploits his narrator's personal specifications to quite the opposite effect. Aeneas does not even willingly join battle at 2.337, but instead is driven into it (*in*

arma) with the passive verb *feror*, which is attended by *numine divum* (2.336). The passive voice will return at 2.655, *rursus in arma feror mortemque miserrimus opto*, in which Aeneas contemplates simply fighting to his death rather than hoping for victory or escape. He does not personally choose his involvement in the battle, and would not seem to consider it worthy of recounting. It is furthermore crucial that Aeneas is portrayed as *amens* while in the process of outfitting himself for battle at 2.314 - 16, and that the word is so closely conflated with *arma*, for epic, even secondary epic, frames the act of donning armour as an act of assuming heroic identity. Now armed, Aeneas is characterised as a warrior, and is possessed of battle rage that strips him of conscious control. Similarly in the *Metamorphoses*, the Centauromachy will culminate in Latreus cobbling together a set of stolen armour and, after donning it, suddenly exhibiting a capacity for sustained and eloquently mocking speech displayed by no other centaur in Book 12 before that point. In acquiring technologically superior armour, Latreus acquires a comparatively civilised identity, at least to the extent that he is able to participate in the blustering back-and-forth that precedes many a Homeric encounter.

In the *Aeneid* the significance of armour as a marker of heroic identity, and with it the importance of the proper handling of arms that have been won in battle as *spolia*, is a recurrent theme throughout. Nisus and Euryalus' ill-starred night-raid occurs as an excessive desire for *spolia*,³⁴ and Euryalus, conspicuous for having donned an enemy's helmet, is killed in 'the clearest indication in the poem to illustrate that taking and wearing enemy armour, *spolia*, results in death for those who do so.'³⁵ Camilla is distracted by her excessive desire for the priest Chloereus' rare armour in Book 11 in what is portrayed as a feminine take on the *spolia* motif (*femineo praedae et spoliorum ardebat amore*, 11.782). Even Aeneas' pious

³⁴ R Heinze, *Vergils Epische Technik*, B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Stuttgart, 1965, p. 219.

³⁵ V Cleary, 'To the Victor go the *Spolia*: A Study in Vergilian Imagery', *Vergilius* No. 28, 1982, pp. 15-29, p. 19

tropaeum, built from the arms of Mezentius ('*contemptor divum* in life but in death subject to the proper rites'³⁶) and constructed during the sombre funeral rites of Pallas at the beginning of Book 11 forms a direct contrast with Turnus' inappropriate and inflammatory use of Pallas' sword-belt in Book 12. Armour, and the extent to which it is synonymous with a hero's capability in battle (and hence their approach to the proper uses of strength) is so integral to the *Aeneid* that King suggests that Virgil's *arma* ought to be read 'as equivalent to μῆνις, just as [*virum*] is equal to the *Odyssey*'s ἄνδρα.'³⁷ Heroic ability is discussed and demonstrated directly through the relationship between the hero and his armour, and Virgil's frequent examinations of the appropriate use of armour form an extended comment on the proper use of military skill.

Book 2 in particular establishes the way in which Aeneas' personal approach to heroic morality is inextricably bound up with his choice of armour. As noted, Aeneas is *amens* (2.314) when first seizing his armour, and certainly his capacity for judgement, deliberately downplayed though it may be through his own account, may be inferred to be lacking throughout. Lines 2.314 - 17 begin with *arma* and end with *armis*, thus rendering them 'framed by the war cry of heroic enterprise',³⁸ and the segment is rife with assonance that underscores the connection between the gaining of arms and the loss of mental control. *Arma amens* (2.314) are fused through elision, and the violence of *ardent animi* is emphasised by the immediate synonymy of *furor iraque* (2.316); the repetition of *in armis* in line-final positions three lines apart is unlikely to be anything but deliberate in a segment so heavily ornamented with wordplay. The fire that has taken hold of the city has spread with

³⁶ K W Gransden, *Virgil's Iliad: An Essay on Epic Narrative*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984, p.160.

³⁷ K C King, 'Foil and Fusion: Homer's Achilles in Vergil's *Aeneid*' in *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* No. 9, (1982), pp. 31-57, p. 36.

³⁸ Di Cesare, 1974, p. 48.

metaphorical zeal into the minds of Aeneas' *socii*, and the connection between city and individual is suggested by the parallel positioning of *mentem* and *in arcem*, both line-final accusative spondees (2.315, 316), and made deliberate by the framing of line-final *in armis*. Certainly the notion of remembered battle is sufficient to inspire Aeneas to his final ferocious attack at 12.560 - the *imago* of Troy burned still burns him, at least metaphorically (*accendit*).³⁹

Aeneas therefore approaches the battle while not in the clearest state of mind - itself not unusual for heroes, who are often made subject to *furor* or other manifestations of battle-frenzy, but in context actively detrimental to his heroic status; it is worth noting that the Trojan Horse itself had earlier been driven into the city by those 'blind with fury' (*caecique furore*, 2.244). Aeneas has been altered by the armour he steals - in resorting to disguise, he loses his identity as a man of Troy. The underhandedness of the ploy is dismissed by the orchestrator of the trick, Coroebus, who at 2.390 defends the deed with the question, *dolus an virtus - quis in hoste requirat?* Against an incursion achieved through an act of *dolus* as egregious as the Trojan Horse, only an equally outrageous *dolus* can prevail, and as a result is merited. While the use of δόλος to escape a pressing situation may be rather more permissible for a Homeric hero operating under epic Greek morality, Abbot argues that the word carries a 'conspicuously negative tone' throughout the remainder of the *Aeneid*, a poem 'very much in accord with [the] well-known Roman ideology' that encourages *virtus*.⁴⁰ In the disintegrating landscape of Troy, any moral high ground has quite literally been destroyed. Virgil's criteria for heroic achievement in battle, by which heroic identity is sustained, have fallen away.⁴¹

³⁹ Berlin, 1998, p. 30.

⁴⁰ J C Abbot, 'The *Aeneid* and the Concept of *Dolus Bonus*' in *Vergilius*, Vol 46, 2000, pp. 59-82, p.61.

⁴¹ Di Cesare, 1974, p. 40

The deceit inherent in Sinon's elaborate lies and the much-lauded Horse are successful, coming as they do from Greek heroes; Moskalew even identifies potential wordplay in the particular mention of the Myrmidons and the Dolopes (the juxtaposition of which names results, at 2.6, in *Myrmidonum Dolopumve*), that inherently links ideas of deceitful gift-giving to the Greeks⁴² via the type of etymological pun favoured by aetiological literature. For Aeneas' Trojan comrades, and for Aeneas himself, who must over the course of the *Aeneid* progress from *dolus* through to acts of *virtus* better befitting a Roman hero, the outcome of resorting to morally questionable acts is not favourable - indeed, it 'provides the first example in the poem of the folly of donning enemy armor.'⁴³ Aeneas is a 'tragic hero' who 'finds himself needing to redefine his Homeric heroic values in order to accommodate the demands of the communal goal',⁴⁴ and realign himself more precisely with the Roman values required by Augustan literature. As we have seen, a degree of self-recrimination is easy to infer from Aeneas' narrative in Book 2 - his guilt at surviving the sack, and his lingering grief for the dead, are manifest in his attempts to shift any blame from himself and minimise his own responsibility for the fall of Troy. His participation in an act that parallels the δόλος of the Greeks who perpetrated the sack, coupled with his inability to drive out the invaders, would similarly provide ample target for his own guilt, and serve moreover as an indicator of how much the atrocity of the Greek attack has undermined the standardised codes of battle.

Unlike the frequent lengthy poetic catalogues that Virgil will in faithful epic fashion provide later in the *Aeneid*, Aeneas' catalogues during the battle proper of Book 2 are brief and few in number; this distribution is very much in keeping with Aeneas' function as a

⁴² W Moskalew, 'Myrmidons, Dolopes, and Danaans: Wordplays in *Aeneid* 2' in *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol 40, 1990, p. 276.

⁴³ Cleary, 1982, p. 17

⁴⁴ V Panoussi, 'Vergil's Ajax: Allusion, Tragedy, and Heroic Identity in the *Aeneid*' in *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 21, 2002, pp. 95-134, p. 97.

narrator working from a narrow perspective, unable to perceive all the players clearly. That Aeneas is capable at 2.259 - 64 of identifying the Greek heroes in catalogue and describing their exit from the Horse under Sinon's direction is an instance of his function as an epic narrator transcending the logical limitations of character-based perspective, and indeed, occurs prior to his being awakened by Hector, and therefore prior to the narrowing of his perspective to the streets of Troy. By contrast, his brief list of comrades at 2.339 - 47 exemplifies catalogue as an example of autopsy and personal recall, albeit with a great deal of pathos - he speaks of family members and friends, singling out Coroebus in particular as *iuvenis* and *infelix*. Most significantly, however, the three catalogues together provide an instance of ring composition that structures and brackets the entirety of the sequence: for the initial catalogue of Aeneas' comrades is not only comparable in structure to the earlier catalogue of hidden Greeks, but is further paralleled by a third miniature catalogue - that of their deaths at 2.424 - 30.

Ring composition, deployed throughout the *Iliad* and signalled by verbatim repetition or the explicit signalling that a list or simile has been concluded or begun, rather than through any repetition of thematic content, is considered crucial to the organisation of oral narrative. The repetition of certain key phrases allows both for the subordination of large amounts of information into clearly demarcated lists, and for the balancing of long swathes of narrative. Unlike most other features of oral epic, the technique transfers well to a written medium, and is used frequently by Virgil to structure battles and to compartmentalise information. In addition, there are scattered throughout briefer instances of name-listing that, while hardly lengthy enough to constitute true catalogue, follow the same structural template for the identification of allies or adversaries.

With both sides depending upon stealth and engaging, as we have seen, in morally contrasting acts of deception, it comes as no surprise that in their two parallel introductory

catalogues the Greeks and the Trojans are linked by the theme of sudden exposure - one might compare *patefactus ad auras* (2.259) with *sublatus ad aethera clamor* (2.338), which phrases are coupled respectively with the reflexive constructions *se...promunt* and *addunt se*. The phrases in lines 2.262, *lapsi per funem Acamasque Thoasque*, and 2.340, *oblatis per lunam Hypanisque Dymasque*, each occur toward the end of their respective catalogues, and provide further evidence of compositional parallels between the two segments. That this repetition is marked and deliberate is evidenced once again in the repetition of the phrase *Hypanisque Dyamisque* in metrically identical line-final position barely a hundred lines later at 2.428 - they are identified in tandem first at their introduction, then at their death.

Furthermore, both the Greek and Trojan enclitic phrases are closely accompanied by patronymics - *Pelidesque Neoptolemus* at 2.263, and *Coroebus / Mygdonides* at 2.341 - 42. This immediately suggests a deliberate link between the two heroes, both of whom are young men acting primarily on the impulse of strong familial ties. Neoptolemus will later drag the helpless Priam to an altar and slaughter him in the hopes of emulating his father Achilles' heroic κλέος; Coroebus, a prospective in-law, is noted for his particular devotion to Priam's cause (*gener auxilium Priamo*, 2.344), and will attempt to defend Cassandra and preserve the sanctity of the altar from which she has been dragged. Here again, in keeping with the reversal of order and collapse of divine morality, it is the impious defilement of an altar which succeeds, and piety which fails. It may also be noted that Coroebus himself is *insano Cassandrae incensus amore*, and, when he makes to rescue her at 2.407, is *furiata mente*. Like Aeneas, he has been touched by a metaphorical flame, and acts primarily in an unheroic passion that is likened to madness, as though he were a young and lovelorn hero of elegy rather than an epic warrior.

Easily the most poignant element of ring composition here in play, however, is the similarity between Coroebus' introduction and his death. We have been introduced to him at

2.341 as *iuvenisque Coroebus*, who is the last to join Aeneas' band, and whose tale of origin, relevant to upcoming events, furnishes the catalogue with an extended coda (typical of the sort used to ease the audience out of catalogue and into the narrative mode once more). This is reflected at 2.424 by *primusque Coroebus*, where *primus* refers to the order of death - as the youngest and most exuberant of the band, introduced last and most conspicuously, he is necessarily the first to fall in their final catalogue. The particular phrasing further mimics the earlier *primusque Machaon* (2.263), supplied during the initial catalogue of the Greeks, where *primus* served as an indicator of superior ability. Thus the catalogue of companions is rendered a catalogue of the dead with minimal alteration, and the expedition of the roving band is closed via structural repetition.

These three brief catalogues are of further interest due to their use throughout of varied epithetic construction. Periphrastic epithets and single-word epithets are favoured, these being more naturally inclined to the morphology of Latin; it is only much later in the *Aeneid*, during the Iliadic segments (which, conversely, treat with the Latins themselves), that Virgil seems more willing to begin to attempt epithetic innovation of the compound variety endemic to Greek. The only compounds used in Book 2 are *vociferans* (2.689), *armipotens* (2.425), *armiger* (2.477), and, at 2.801, *Lucifer*, all of which are pre-existing and unmarked. *Armiger* and *armipotens* alone stand as true epithets capable of inducing an archaic register, and here specifically in catalogue. *armiger*, used also at *Aeneid* 5.255, 9.330, 9.564, 9.648, 11.32, is by no means a rare word; it will also be used frequently in the *Metamorphoses* (3.166, 5.149, 5.619, 15. 385).

However, it is a nominal compound and therefore heavily reminiscent of typical Greek compounds in terms of morphology; here it is marked due to its being deployed as the culmination of a series of three separate epithet, one of each possible type. Beginning with the single-word epithet *ingens*, the second half of the line supplied the periphrastic pseudo-epithet

equorum agitator. Although similar in construction to *equorum domitor* (a calque of the Homeric ἵππόδαμος used liberally throughout the second half of the *Aeneid* as the especial epithet of the Italian hero Messapus), here it functions less as an epithet and more as a substantive that refers literally to Automedon's duty as chariot-driver; he himself, in a line-initial climax to the miniature catalogue, is accorded the true compound *armiger*. There do exist in these catalogues other examples of so-called periphrastic epithets, notably *doli fabricator Epeos*, a phrase unique to this context, and, arguably, *maximus armis / Erytus* at 2.339 -40.

With regard to the use of simile, Virgil does allow Aeneas to provide us with early examples of the particular type of literary simile that he will deploy throughout the *Aeneid*. A lupine simile occurs at 2.355 - 60, albeit one in which the significant points of comparison are not the rabidity of warriors to the rabidity of wolves after the typical fashion, but rather the terrified passage of wolves *atra in nebula* to the *urbis iter* of the band, the dark and deceptive nature of which is summed up with the interlaced phrase *nox atra cava circumvolat umbra* (2.360). This self-damning take on a stock epic simile highlights the dubious regard in which Aeneas would seem to hold his own exploits: rather than compare the battle-fury experienced by himself and by his comrades to the fury of ferocious beasts, which is the expected result in Homer of lupine imagery, we are met with cowardly imagery of stealth, and with animals that are 'compelled' by hunger (*improba ventris exegit*, 2.356-57). That Virgil furthermore intends to deploy in his battles a rather more literary and hence intricately structured form of dual-correspondence simile than the Homeric standard is evidenced by an example that extends and enriches such typical Homeric short-form similes as νυκτὶ ἔοικώς into a long-form simile so specific in its points of correspondence that four winds are named following a segment listing four heroes.

The variation of the lexis used throughout this segment - *cadit* (2.425) *procumbit* (2.425) and *pereunt* (2.428) are used in quick succession - is both particularly literary, eschewing as it does the repetition more frequent in Homeric kill-lists, and also remarkably euphemistic. Even allowing for the brevity and breathless pace of the death-list, little space is accorded here to the grisly descriptions which are expected of epic, and which are in fact provided liberally elsewhere in Virgil and particularly in Ovid - the slaughter is brief, total, and couched in deliberately neutral terms. The account of the death of the disguised band is not mapped after the expected turn-taking structure of epic *androktasia*, in which not only deaths but also their perpetrators are clearly identified, but is rather a devastatingly swift slaughter. Here one may impose a reading of grief-induced personal sensitivity onto Aeneas' account: certainly the battle segments in which he is personally involved neglect to include the multiple-line descriptions of gore more typically suited to epic (and which Virgil himself will provide in bulk during the Iliadic books of the *Aeneid*).

The will of the gods in this segment supersedes the agency of the Greek invaders, and friendly fire is the fault not of its perpetrators but of the Trojans who resorted to the improper use of heroic arms. The only named Greek opponent in this brief section is Peneleus, who is grammatically conflated with divinity to such an extent that his genitive epithet, *armipotensis*, is juxtaposed with the genitive *divae* of the altar from which Cassandra was dragged, and at which, having failed to rescue her, the unsuccessful Coroebus falls. Certainly there is something to be said for the close interweaving, further emphasised by alliteration, of *armipotens*, an archaic epic compound, and the *ara* which serves as the scene of Coroebus' defeat - as the one to suggest the *dolus*, it is fitting that he falls at the altar of the gods against whom he transgressed, and at the very moment in which he is noted for the strength of arms which will be useless to him due to the gods' effective abandonment of Troy. For all their own treacherous deployment of δόλος, the Greeks, by contrast, can do no wrong. The

immutability of the gods' will is demonstrated throughout the progress of the battle: the futility of prayer, and the inversion of rectitude, is such that even Rhipheus, *iustissimus unus*. . . *et servantissimus aequi* (2.426 - 7, a direct contrast with the earlier *acerrimus Ajax* at 2.414) is dispatched with only the bitter explanation *dis aliter visum*, and, in transgression of the normal rules of combat, Hypanis and Dymas are made the victims of friendly fire (*confixi a sociis*, 2.429).

Finally, even the priest Panthus falls (his death conveyed only through the euphemistic *labentem*) in spite of his *pietas*, and despite being clearly marked out by the *infula* that denotes his office. Priest-death, often occurring simultaneously with the desecration of altars, is not uncommon in the battles of the *Metamorphoses* (examples include the deaths of Emathion at *Met.*5.100 - 6 and Aethion at *Met.*5.145 - 46) and would in all instances seem to be treated as something of an off-colour joke; the irony surrounding such murders seems framed around mocking or subverting the garrulity of pontificating old men, as shall be examined. These aggressively irreverent portrayals may well be a direct response to the dire significance of priest-death in the *Aeneid*, in which such deaths are loaded with both contemporary cultural relevance and symbolic function. First introduced in high-register triplicate at 2.318 - 19, the priest Panthus was identified at his first appearance by name, by patronym, and by office. Although his initial attempt to rescue both *sacra victosque deos* and his young grandson provides the template for Aeneas' ultimate escape, he is *amens* when first introduced and, when Aeneas presses him urgently for strategic advice, can only rave to Aeneas of the fall of the city. Aeneas' final apostrophe of Panthus before his death at 2.429, *nec te tua plurima Panthu*, is couched in the high-register alliteration of prayer-language, which not only renders it a highly emotive formal appeal, but also serves to mark it out as a bitter failure in a segment devoted to the singular uselessness of prayer and the futility of any attempt at defence. Just as the gods have set themselves against the preservation of Troy, so

even an altar affords Cassandra no sanctuary, and the disguise that Aeneas' band has donned invites friendly fire from the roof of the temple itself. It is only after this *miserrima caedes* that the Trojan's own take on *dolus* fails at last, and Greeks who had previously been taken in by the ruse and put to flight return with a vengeance.

As the city is overturned, so are the ethics of battle - Priam's unethical murder at 2.554 - 588 serves as the climax of the sack, and 'emblemizes...the fate of a city destroyed when the forces of reason were overwhelmed'⁴⁵ While not itself an example of extended battle narrative, it is worth noting that the death of Priam, as described via Aeneas, does depend heavily on the use of certain stock Homeric scenes, particularly the scene of heroic armament and the victor's dispatch of the victim to the underworld; here they are either directly inverted, or framed within images of collapse and ruin so as to disrupt their expected epic function. Furthermore, the segment displays a focus on detail and on gore that is very different to the reticence previously displayed during the description of the burning streets themselves. Here we see a return to the more omniscient narrative abilities of which he was clearly capable at the outset of his recollection: Aeneas' own vantage point is never made explicit, and his recollection approaches Di Cesare's vision of the detached and quasi-mythical 'ahistorical' collapse of Troy.

During the battle narrative of Book 2, therefore, Virgil exploits the vehicle of the first-person character-as-*ἰστορικός* so as to manipulate specific elements of catalogue-based battle, as well as to reframe certain stock epic scenes, thereby producing a nominally epic instalment that consistently undermines itself, almost to the point of rendering it anti-epic. This is significant both on a literary or thematic level, and on the level of stylistic composition. It illustrates at the outset of the *Aeneid* the effectively defunct literary tradition on which Virgil

⁴⁵ E Vance, 'Warfare and the Structure of Thought in Virgil's Aeneid' in *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, No. 15, 1973, pp. 111-162, p. 122.

intends to build, while simultaneously upsetting ideals of heroism in order to reconstitute them in his development of *pius* Aeneas.

The Opening of Hostilities

Aeneid 9

Having deconstructed to an extent the function and deployment of Homeric battle narrative in Book 2, Virgil begins to reengage with it in the Iliadic half of the *Aeneid* after a somewhat more standardised fashion, albeit with an eye to manipulating stock elements of battle narrative in order to render them a more fitting vehicle for his narrative themes, and to render them more palatable to a literary audience. This section will examine the structure of this battle with regard to syntax and episodic construction, and in particular the difference between kill-lists achieved by sympathetic Trojan heroes, and those perpetrated by Italian warriors.

Book 9, as the beginning of the war in Italy proper and the first exchange of hostilities between the Italians and the Trojans, is the first instance of pitched battle which the Trojans have experienced since their defeat at Troy, many years and seven books previously. In terms of narrative it is therefore only proper that ‘the war between the Italians and the Trojans is, to some extent, a repetition of the war between the Greeks and the Trojans.’⁴⁶ The parallel is made explicit by character commentary⁴⁷ Virgil relies on the character-acknowledged irony of the Trojans having to endure a second siege, inserting into such utterances as Numanus’ speech to his men at 9.598 - 620 and Turnus’ boasts to Pandarus at 9.741 - 42 references to the Trojans’ past failures in order to render the parallels with the *Iliad* explicit. Thus Virgil seizes once again the opportunity to emphasise how the news of their defeat has already

⁴⁶ Williams, 1983, p. 93.

⁴⁷ W S Anderson, ‘Virgil’s Second *Iliad*’ in *Oxford Readings in Virgil’s Aeneid*, 1990, p. 246

become the stuff of legend in his envisioning of the ancient Mediterranean world. Just as Dido saw fit to include murals of the Greek and Trojan heroes in her city, and as news of Aeneas' exploits preceded him to Evander, so the Italians are well aware of the Trojans' history.

A primary theme of Book 9 is the contrast between individual or personal impulse and concerted group effort. With so much of Book 9 focused upon the decision by Nisus and Euryalus to make a misjudged pre-emptive strike against the Trojan camps, and upon their less-than-decorous motives for doing so, the subsequent battle sequences engage with the subtleties of individual heroic reasoning when set against the mob mentality of larger groups of combatants, with the result that 'Vergil seems to be studying group action by casting it in different forms, now successful, now unsuccessful.'⁴⁸ This suggests the continued examination of the morality that underlies and motivates not only military action in its Roman conception, but also in criticisms of epic heroism, characterising as he does Nisus and Euryalus' desire for spoils as the cause of their downfall, and Pandarus' independent action of closing the gates at 9.722 - 26 as *demens* (9.728) and ultimately detrimental, as shall be examined. Horsfall even detects elements of historicity in this episode, opining that much of Turnus' siege is 'consciously reminiscent' of Hannibal's attack upon Rome itself in 221 B.C., and suggesting an Ennian source such as *Annales* viii.⁴⁹ The potential reference to an event so monumental in the Roman popular consciousness even in Virgil's day, speaks once to the transplantation of narrative into a specifically Italian setting, not only in terms of literary device and inherited epic technique, but also via the direct application of Homeric themes to Roman politics. This transplantation is very much in keeping with the theme of the relocation of the Trojans themselves.

⁴⁸ C Saylor, 'Group vs. Individual in Vergil *Aeneid* IX' in *Latomus* 49, 1990, p. 90.

⁴⁹ N Horsfall, 'Turnus *ad portas*' in *Latomus* 33, 1974, p. 80.

The moral and military failures of the Trojans begin now to be re-examined, as they will, eventually, come to serve as the moral framework of Rome's own military endeavours. Rabel, following Heinze, 'recognises that the book is a unit which produces its particular effect through use of a tripartite structure highlighting the deeds of Turnus - Nisus and Euryalus - Turnus',⁵⁰ and reinforces this view by drawing on Duckworth's model that locates Nisus and Euryalus' raid as the nocturnal interlude that separates Turnus' two day-time assaults. As one of the first forays into pitched military proceedings in the Iliadic section of the *Aeneid*, it also introduces with great vigour the device of *androktasia* or death-catalogue, and sees a similar transplantation of epic device.

Thus, if one acknowledges that Book 9 owes its structure almost entirely to Book 12 of the *Iliad*, due to the book's triplicate structure of two attacks on Greek lines by Hector, as whose analogue Turnus is perceived to function, then Virgil has simultaneously cast the Trojans in the Greek role - as in the *Iliad* the Greeks defend their lines from Hector's assaults, in between which Sarpedon and Glaucus sally forth on a night-raid, so here the displaced Trojans, now themselves invaders, must defend their encampments against Virgil's Hector analogue, Turnus, the 'constant features' of whose character throughout Book 9 are 'bellicose rage and madness'.⁵¹ The parallel will be developed more explicitly in Book 10 by the gods themselves - Venus will identify the developing combat as being directed *muris*. . . *nascentis Troiae* (10.26). This suggests, again from a metanarrative perspective, that an element of role reversal is in fact in play, and that, counter to the hopes of the Italians, the Trojan defeat is not to be repeated - the war in Italy 'cannot be a second Trojan war for the Trojans, as the reader is aware.'⁵²

⁵⁰ R J Rabel, 'The Iliadic Nature of *Aeneid* 9' in *Vergilius*, No. 24, 1978, p.37.

⁵¹ F Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999, p.71.

⁵² Williams, 1983, p.99 - 100.

The language here deployed is almost instantly more heavily Homeric than any used by Aeneas himself in describing the fall of Troy, and this bolsters the subtextual theme of transplantation. Along with their narrative history, the Trojans have, on a metatextual level, brought the language of their own particular epic with them into Italy. Epithetic constructions and lengthy catalogues of kills abound, and apostrophes and invocations are frequent, outlined in such a way as to exploit to the full benefits of working in a literary medium while preserving the framework of oral epic. This examination of the battle itself will focus closely on kill-lists, and of their construction, both lexical and grammatical. Of note is the extent to which Virgil chooses to utilise literary variation in order to render narrative more vivid and more chronologically appealing to a literate audience.

This is not to say that kill-lists in Latin epic eschew all formulaic construction in favour of rampant invention, nor is it to suggest that variation is not present, albeit on a less dramatic level, in Homeric *androktasia*. While there is variation in the Latin, primarily in word-order and case with an emphasis on constructing each individual kill discretely and with unique genealogical or other heroic information, patterns can be detected, particularly the tendency to head up each instalment with the victim's name in the accusative, and often at the head of the line. When this tendency is subverted, it is generally in order to illustrate some unique narrative feature about the battle in question, or about the hero by whose hand the kills are effected.

Following the unsuccessful night-raid by Nisus and Euryalus, the Rutulian troops storm the Trojans' fortifications at 9.503 - 24. Having been unsuccessful in his first attempt to attack the Trojan ships at the very beginning of Book 9, Turnus' next act of war is to recreate in miniature the siege of Troy. Seeing the Trojans clustered inside an impermeable tower which no human force can penetrate, he promptly resorts to the use of fire. Throughout this section,

‘the siege-craft is Roman rather than Homeric’,⁵³ which is in keeping with the beginnings of the transition into the Italian narrative. However, Troy remains fresh in the memory both of the poet and of the Trojans themselves, resulting in a clash not only of armies, but also of narratives. Following Turnus’ aggressive opening manoeuvres, the resultant stampede sees the panicked Trojans retreat desperately to parts of the tower as yet untouched by fire, thereby recreating the fires of Troy. When the fortifications begin to collapse, the explosion of the falling tower shakes ‘the whole of heaven’ (*caelum tonat omne fragore*, 9.541), recalling the noise of the Sack of Troy in Book 2 (*clamores simul horrendos ad sidera tollit* 2.222). The hyperbolic image of sound⁵⁴ extending to the heavens is ‘quite frequent’ in Homer,⁵⁵ and here serves not only as a take on a stock Homeric figure, but functions also as an echo of the Sack itself. The dactylic *ad sidera* will return within a hundred lines with very familiar phrasing, *Teucri clamore sequuntur / laetitiaque fremunt animosque ad sidera tollunt* (9.636 - 37), and is remembered again at 10.262, *clamorem ad sidera tollunt*, during the triumphant return of Aeneas.

Here, the collapse of the fortifications produces a particularly grotesque image in which the Trojans, *semineces*, are pierced through and killed by their own weapons (*confixique suis telis et pectora duro / transfossi ligno veniunt*). Once again we are reminded of the dynamics of the Siege of Troy, in which panic and impeded strategic thinking, not to mention an improper and immoral approach to heroism, saw the Trojans defeated through friendly fire and other betrayals of arms. Interlopers though the Trojans are in Italy, Turnus’ attack has put them once more under siege by fire, and the Italian Numanus, too, in taunting the Trojans at 9.598 - 620, seems cognizant of this irony. His mocking speech, one of only nine addresses by

⁵³ Hardie, 1994: 166

⁵⁴ The motif occurs specifically of sound at *Il.*12.338 *Il.*14.60 (using the formulaic ἀὐτῆ δ’ οὐρανὸν ἵκει), as well as at *Il.*15.686 and *Il.*17.425.

⁵⁵ P Hardie, *Virgil’s Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*, Clarendon Press. Oxford, 1986, p. 291

a commanding officer to his troops in the *Aeneid*,⁵⁶ is addressed to *bis capti Phryges*; he chides them for enduring a siege and preferring the safety of their ramparts *iterum*, and introduces the problem of Trojan effeminacy⁵⁷ that will later contribute to Camilla's death, and which is expressed by Turnus in his prayers at 12.95 - 100.⁵⁸ This is first instance of characterisation of the *Aeneid*'s protagonists from an enemy perspective, and, crucially, the first time they are viewed as unpleasantly foreign on Roman soil. It is for Virgil to ease their cultural transition, largely through an examination of various kinds of morality on the battlefield from a contemporary Roman perspective, but also through the exploration via literary device of genealogy and place of origin.

The only survivors of the collapse of the tower are Lycus and *primaevus* Helenor (9.545), whose contrasting fates are cruelly and ironically bound up in their particular identities. The juxtaposition is strengthened by the use of two very different similes, each seemingly better suited to the other's subject. Although their paradigms of comparison are stock Homeric animal similes, their deployment results in an almost chiasmic means of structuring the two deaths.⁵⁹ Each simile is better suited with regard to its extended symbolism to the description of the other's hero, with the result that the two episodes are inextricably tied together. Helenor, we learn from 9.545-48, is a bastard of dubious heritage, long excluded from the privilege of bearing heroic arms, and as such wields only a light sword and a *parma alba*, the same light unmarked shield that will serve as the equipment of the Amazons in Book 11. His appearance is inglorious (9.548), but his death is anything but

⁵⁶ G Highet, *The Speeches in Virgil's Aeneid*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1972. p. 86

⁵⁷ Horsfall, N M 'Numanus Remulus: Ethnography and Propaganda in *Aeneid* 9.598ff' in *Oxford Readings in Virgil's Aeneid*, 1990, p. 311

⁵⁸ Williams, 1983, p. 97

⁵⁹ On Virgil's technique of using structural chiasmus to strengthen narrative, see D Quint 'Virgil's Double Cross', *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 132, 2011, pp. 273-300.

ignoble. On finding himself *media inter milia* (9.549), the ubiquity of his foes emphasised by the anaphora and elision of *hinc acies atque hinc acies astare Latinas* (9.550), he rushes in where the enemy is thickest, and in doing so receives a stock but heroic comparison to a hunted beast that rushes in *contra tela* (9.551-53).

Lycus, meanwhile, whose lupine name would suggest a fate rather more bellicose, especially considering the steep rise in wolf-related images of fury⁶⁰ in this and subsequent books of the *Aeneid*, is made prey to Turnus' own feral imagery. Instead of being likened to a wolf in his own right, Lycus flees and gains the wall, where he reaches out desperately in the hope of being drawn up to safety. Instead, he is drawn back down by Turnus, *magna muri cum parte* (9.562) and subjected to the indignity of a *pathos*-laden simile likening him to prey animals being snatched up both by *Iovis armiger* and by *Martius lupus* (9.563-66), both clear analogues to Turnus. There exist for the simile of predator and prey animal 'a number of Homeric models,'⁶¹ which will be examined below during the discussion of Camilla's particular viciousness on the battlefield; here the two contrasting images of feral behaviour, together with their inverse relationships to their subjects' characterisation, illustrate very neatly the thematic precision that is very often attached to Virgil's use of dual-correspondence similes, for following two initial comparisons to a rabbit and to a markedly Ennian swan (*candenti corpore cycnum*, 9.563), which are suggested but not expanded upon, the simile culminates in the example of lambs being snatched from under their parent sheep. The image here is not an extended poetic detail, as it would be in Homer, but rather corresponds directly with Lycus' being pulled away from his comrades.

What is most significant is that Helenor, the younger man who has previously been denied any connection with heroic identity, receives the comparison to a wild beast via the

⁶⁰ E Paratore, *Eneide Libri IX - X*, Fondazione Loranzo Valla, 1981, p. 142.

⁶¹ Hardie, 1994: 179

particular well-worn Homeric simile associated almost exclusively with the battle-madness and aggression of established heroes,⁶² while the elder, equipped with heroic speed and capable of eluding his attacker (*pedibus longe melior*), is afforded the comparison to a helpless lamb, and to prey animals incapable of outrunning their predators. The almost kenning-like reference to *Iovis armiger*, at first glance yet another instance of a parallel, here to *Martius lupus*, draws attention to the chiasmic organisation of the two similes, and balances out Lycus' incongruities. The use of *armiger* might, had it been used in association with Helenor, the younger man, have allowed for certain thematic parallels in much the same way that Lycus' lupine name would have been more immediately suited to Helenor's wolf analogy. The literary appeal of such a contrast is obvious, and certainly the dual metaphors serve both as excellent vehicles for heightened pathos and as a strong example of inventive variation, but when considered as a medium for the organisation of information during battle-narrative they constitute an excellent example of what is effectively an extended antithesis.

There follows at 9.569 - 76 an example of a very dense kill-list, opening on the almost obligatory Homeric motif of the inclusion of a vast rock as a makeshift missile, and following through with two sets of accusative-initial kills that closely couple victim and victor after the fashion of a Homeric episode. The neatly unvaried structure is echoed a line later by the explanation of the two deaths, relayed by a contrastive pair of *hic* clauses - one hero has made the kill well, at close-range with a javelin, while the other relied upon a long-range arrow, thus contrasting *iaculo bonus* with *longe fallente sagitta* (9.572). This structure, with its heavy emphasis on balanced contrast, is almost immediately revealed to have been cunningly calculated in its neatness. 9.573 begins with *Ortygium Caeneus*, suggesting a continuation of

⁶² A few extended Homeric examples from the *Iliad* include comparisons to lions at *Il.*3.21 - 29, *Il.*5.136 - 43, *Il.*5.161 - 65, *Il.*10.485 - 88, *Il.*11. 548 - 57, 13. 198 - 202, 15.630 - 635, to wolves at *Il.*4.471 - 72, and to boars at *Il.*4.253, 11. 324 - 25, 13.470 - 477. The formulaic comparison of active combatants to both boars and lions, λείουσιν ἐοικότες ὠμοφάγοισιν ἢ σὺσι κάπροις, occurs at *Il.*5.780 - 783 and *Il.*7.256 -57. In Virgil already we have seen the likening of the Trojans to wolves at *Aen.*2.355 - 60.

the accusative-initial kill-list, but a sudden disruption is supplied by *victorem Caenea Turnus*. The quick transition from hunter to quarry is characteristic of the turn-and-turn-about vengeance pattern of fast-paced battle that will be favoured by Ovid for its mercurial effect on both pace and narrative, but here the sudden appearance of *victor* in the accusative violently upsets the painstakingly established pattern of the nominative killer, and the sudden placement of the inflection renders the phrase seemingly illogical at first glance. Turnus proceeds to spend close-packed lines killing no fewer than six opponents (9.574-75): four fall in quick succession, while a fifth begins a new line; only the last, Idas, manages to evade the enclitics of Turnus' slaughter, pursued as he is a brief way into the fortifications.

Following this interruption, Capys manages to snatch the last kill of the list at 9.576, thereby very abruptly restoring the expected accusative-nominative order, and implying also, at least in structural terms, the preservation of a regularised timeline. If Turnus' kills are considered to exist within the suspended chronology of catalogue, the structure of which is maintained by Capys' final restorative effort, then six deaths occur by his hand in the same narrative space it would ordinarily take a hero to kill only one man. This sudden subversion to a well-worn and indeed expected progression thus impresses upon us not only Turnus' martial prowess, but also his remarkable speed. In fact, his swiftness is so great as to permit him to supersede the expected order of catalogue, and to kill six combatants almost out of turn. Prior to this all three kills were related via balanced accusative-nominative pairs, and the list closes with only Capys' lone triumph to restore the expected turn-and-turn-about progression, all of which would suggest that Turnus' sudden intervention is a dire and frightening aberration, capable of exceeding even normative narrative limits.

This provides a strong example of both stylistic manipulation and of manipulation of his readers' epic expectations through the disruption of the anticipated progression of the list. The technique is particularly telling when utilised as the turning-point of an otherwise relatively

simplistic list of kills. Extended kill-lists afforded to a single hero do occur in Homer,⁶³ and polysyndetonic lines consisting solely of the names of the fallen are not unusual; they are generally introduced by direct questions put either to the muse or to the character themselves, and function as a quick and formulaically efficient means of listing the dead without any concern for chronological narrative. In Virgil, however, they are rarer, and would seem to be reserved for such pyrotechnic moments as these: they serve not the menial function of relaying the names of the dead, but indicate a marked or unusual quality pertaining either to the hero in question, or to the stage of battle - the elevated pace and Homeric tone, when combined with sudden literary invention, suggest that they are after a fashion climactic. Thus, rather than function as a specific type of catalogue in and of themselves, they stand as intensifying additions to lengthier descriptions of multiple kills, often telescoping the chronology of the action either by implying a literal increase in the rate of a single hero's kills or simply by serving a summative purpose.

Following Ascanius' communication with Apollo (9.638 - 44) and first forays into battle (9.645 - 671), the narrative returns to focus upon the Trojan soldiers and their defence of the wall at 9.672, when we meet the ill-fated brothers Pandarus and Bitias, who constitute 'a pendant to the episode of Nisus and Euryalus, who also die because of their heroic devotion to the Trojan cause.'⁶⁴ Nisus and Euryalus constitute an example of the warning thread that runs throughout the *Aeneid* and speaks to the dangers of the excessive personal desire for both *gloria* and *spolia*. Pandarus and Bitias, similarly eager to act, do so without thought for the orders which *optimus armis* Aeneas gave to his troops at 9.41 - 43: not to risk open warfare, and to maintain the security of the fortifications (*tutos servarent aggere muros*, 9.43). Their disobedience will result in disaster, for their sortie has the unfortunate result, however

⁶³ Examples include Agamemnon's rampage at *Il.*11.84 - 162, Patroclus' exploits at *Il.*16.399 - 439.

⁶⁴ Hardie, 1994: 213

unintentional, of penning Turnus up inside the gates with the Trojans. Furthermore, their attendant imagery further strengthens the parallels between the Siege of Troy and the first clash in Italy by associating them with very physical reminders of Trojan tradition, the ships of Cybele.

Protection afforded to the Trojans by the presiding (and maternal) deities of their homeland has already allowed their fleet, at the beginning of Book 9, to escape disaster through divine intervention. In his very first act of military aggression, Turnus attempts to fire the ships, but is duly thwarted. At 9.77, following an impassioned authorial invocation of the Muse and a brief *concilium deorum*, in which Jove and Cybele negotiate and the ships' fate is set. This segment emerges in the opinions of many modern commentators as inappropriately overwrought for the puzzlingly fanciful subject matter: for the endangered Trojan fleet is transformed into a fleet of nymphs before Turnus can set them on fire. Though modelled on the firing of the ships at *Il.* 16.112, the addition of divine transformation renders this a uniquely Virgilian episode; its insertion was viewed 'even before Servius' as inappropriate,⁶⁵ and even by such modern critics of the mid-twentieth century as Williams and Quint the tableau is still often considered to be as much a source of amazement to readers as to the astonished Rutulians who witness it,⁶⁶ or else, due to its whimsical nature, simply as 'an Alexandrian excess unworthy of the poem.'⁶⁷

This miracle of transformation, 9.80 - 122, is effected at the behest of Cybele and with the approval of Jupiter, and is connected with the use of timber from the slopes of Ida. Sacred to Cybele as the groves of Ida are, trees felled from those groves remain under her maternal

⁶⁵ E Fantham, 'Nymphas...e navibus esse: Decorum and Poetic Fiction in *Aeneid* 9. 77-122 and 10. 215-59' in *Classical Philology*, Vol. 85, 1990, pp. 102-119, p. 102.

⁶⁶ R D Williams 'The Purpose of the *Aeneid*' in *Oxford Readings in Virgil's Aeneid*, 1990, p. 33

⁶⁷ D Quint, 'The Brothers of Sarpedon: Patterns of Homeric Imitation in *Aeneid* 10. 36' in *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 47, 2001, pp. 35-66, p. 36.

protection. Thus it is ultimately in order to placate both Cybele's motherly anxiety for her trees, and her divine concern for the hero whose pious requests for timber she indulged, that Jupiter offers the transformation as a solution that will preserve the ships without intervening overmuch in Aeneas' voyage (9.94 - 103). It is specifically on behalf of their place of origin that she makes the request: *prosit nostris in montibus ortas* (9.92). Certainly Virgil follows Catullus in acknowledging the poetic resonance of the ship as 'something more than an artifact, still carrying the life of the trees it had been'.⁶⁸ In this instance, the ships of legend are important in that they have carried not only literary tradition on a metatextual level, signifying the transfer of epic narrative from Homer's Troy to Virgil's Italy, but also men who, like the trees of the ships' origin, are endemically Trojan, and are in the process of ushering in a transformation that will be military, rather than magical.

This transformation becomes relevant when one acknowledges that Pandarus and Bitias' introduction at 9.672 - 82 speaks not only to the journey which the Trojans have undergone, but also illustrates the transformative potential of epic simile. When relocated into an extended literary context, simile may expand upon a single image throughout the progression of the subsequent narrative, thereby drawing the reader's attention to certain significant thematic elements. The points of comparison are not chosen arbitrarily, but serve also to underscore certain narrative threads. In this case, the likening of men to Trojan trees and mountains underscores the themes of transfer and Italian transformation. The two brothers are characterised first through to their semi-divine parentage (*Idaeo Alcanore creti*, 9.672) that depicts their impossible, larger-than-life stature,⁶⁹ and then through a lengthy topological description of the forests of their homeland, which serves to delay the provision of the object *portam* (9.675) for three full lines and suspends the narrative in favour of genealogical

⁶⁸ Fantham, 1990, p. 106

⁶⁹ K Quinn, *Virgil's Aeneid: A Critical Description*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1968, p. 210.

exposition. Their opening description ties them inextricably to the Trojan landscape, and in particular to the wooded slopes of Ida. Likened both to the trees of their homeland and to mountains due to their heroic stature (*abietibus patriis et montibus aequos*, 9.674), the image is continued in the comparison of their crested helmets to the leafy branches of *gemmae quercus* (9.681). Most notably, they are semi-divine - their maternal grandmother was a wood-nymph, and her son Alcanor made his home in the groves of Ida. The importance of the ships' Trojan origin, and specifically of the power of a genealogical link provided by a divine maternal figure, therefore returns at 9.673 with *Iaera*. This name is applied in Homer to a sea-nymph (*Iliad*, 18.42), who is in Virgil reimagined as a woodland deity (*silvestris*).

The brothers thus embody both the Trojan heritage of Aeneas' men and Virgil's own epic heritage. The more generalised arboreal imagery associated with the brothers is inspired heavily by such Homeric conceits as are found in the passage on which this segment is based, particularly the simile at *Il.*12.132 - 140.⁷⁰ The connection specifically with rivers may well be a careful reference to Ida's great epithets, *πολύπτυχος* and *πολυπίδαξ*, famed throughout Homer as it is not only for the richness of its shady groves but also for the multiplicity and clarity of its springs; here, the relocation of the trees to the banks of Roman rivers reflects the relocation of the brothers.

The naming of the rivers themselves, coupled with the frequent other toponymic references that inform Virgil's technique of hero-naming, is 'a systematic...attempt to bring all sections of the peninsula (or at least their names) into some relation to his poem.'⁷¹ Thus Mount Ida's trees have themselves been relocated, albeit in the form of ships, following their long sea-voyage and their subsequent progression along the rivers of Italy (and one recalls the

⁷⁰ Williams, 1973, p. 313

⁷¹ L A Holland, 'Place Names and Heroes in the *Aeneid*' in *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 56, 1935, pp. 202-215, p. 212

emphasis on the arboreal beauty of the Italian landscape that greets Aeneas' men during their progression along the Tiber at 8.94 - 96). The extension of the simile is once again unremarkable in the long-form Homeric use, but here is noteworthy for its deployment in the literary medium. Pandarus and Bitias' duality is crucial to their efficacy as fighters - one takes the right-hand flank at 9.678, the other the left. Their first achievement is almost an inversion of the more standard kill-list: the enemies relayed in quick succession include both a pair of Italian names, Quercens and Aquiculus, and a pair of standard Greek names, Tmarus and Haemon, and are all in the nominative, suggesting that, as grammatical subjects, they will perform the first kills, or at least display agency in launching some form of attack. In fact, they have been put to flight by the brothers, and their only contribution is to govern *terga dedere* (9.686), thus creating a sense of anti-climax.

A second series of kills at 9.696 is rather lengthier, and sees a return to the expected format in which the names of the fallen are conveyed rapidly and in the accusative case. To initiate the list, *at primum* is used of Antiphates, whom the Rutulian hero kills unceremoniously from afar with a spear (*coniecto sternit iaculo*) following a brief description of Antiphates' bastard lineage. That Antiphates is the bastard specifically of Sarpedon further strengthens Pandarus and Bitias' arboreal imagery, and underscores their connection to the fleet's place of origin - Sarpedon's death at *Iliad* 16.482 - 84 is relayed via a wandering Homeric simile that likens his collapse to the toppling of trees felled on the mountainsides by carpenters who wish to build ships.⁷² The extraneous detail is characteristic of a long-form simile in Homer, and is itself relatively unremarkable (though it is related to death due to its association with the Homeric motif of funereal tree-felling), but in Virgil's complex tapestry it constitutes a careful thread of literary allusion, particularly as it is Sarpedon and Glaucus'

⁷² Quint, 2001, p. 40

night-raid that inspired the night-raid of Nisus and Euryalus, and the structure of *Iliad* 12 that has provided the basis for *Aeneid* 9 as a whole.⁷³

Turnus' defeat of Antiphates results in a textbook example of Homeric gore - three and a half lines are devoted to his death throes (9.698 - 701). The description is quite unlike the eroticised death of Euryalus at 9.433 - 37, which draws not only on Homeric simile but also upon neoteric imagery,⁷⁴ and as such is a more personalised examination of heroic death. This is a true epic excursion into brutality, and one of the first to occur in the *Aeneid* proper. The siege of Troy shied away from the description of genuine gore save at the most morally shocking moments, but here we are treated to what would by Homeric standards constitute the relatively unremarkable and in fact stylistically expected description of a fallen hero's death throes. Indeed, it precipitates a series of three unremarkable accusative kills (9.702), suggesting that Pandarus and Bitias, as the embodiment of Trojan heroes equipped with strong literary ties to the site of the *Iliad*, have brought with their endeavours a long-awaited return to oral epic structure, even that perpetrated by Turnus.

It is thus quite suddenly and very distressingly that Bitias joins the kill-list of enemy names at 9.703, during the third instalment of a repetitive *tum-tum-tum* structure. Once again, Virgil has manipulated the reader's expectations, which were carefully fostered by the application of a specific and unvaried structure during which narrative would typically be suspended in favour of the paratactic relation of relatively unimportant heroic names, in order to introduce a significant occurrence. It is not only the sudden manner in which the death is related, but also the disruption of the expected sequential nature of the kill-list, which frames it as such an effective subversion. *Bitias* is syntactically the object of the same *sternit* which

⁷³ R J Rabel, 'The Composition of *Aeneid* IX' in *Latomus* 40, 1981, pp. 801-806, p. 801.

⁷⁴ B Pavlock, 'Epic and Tragedy in Vergil's Nisus and Euryalus Episode' in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 115, 1985, p. 216

has governed all other instalments in the kill-list, but a three-line hyperbaton separates him from the verb *venit* which confirms at 9.705 the manner of his unexpected death, in which the reader's suspense and confusion are rendered all the more extreme by the application of such delaying mechanisms as the chiasmic pair *ardentem oculis* and *animis frementem*. With the retrospective irony typical of inverted chronology, Bitias' heavy armour and heroic shield are described in Homeric detail only after we are fully aware that they have failed to protect him.

Unlike Antiphates at the beginning of the kill-list, however, Bitias is not the prey of a simple spear flung by Turnus from far-off: to kill him requires a *phalarica* (9.705), the Roman oversized battle-spear fit for use with siege-engines.⁷⁵ Certainly it may be worth noting that this is 'the only instance of the use of a specifically Roman rather than Homeric weapon in Virgil'.⁷⁶ Occurring as it does in a segment in which 'many of Virgil's details are reminiscent of Hellenistic siege-warfare',⁷⁷ the unique instrument of Bitias' death, magnificent both in size and in its unusual association with Roman warfare, may well provide a localising function, akin to the use of Roman river names while describing Trojan heroes, and, of course, to the marked transplantation of extended Homeric simile into an Italian landscape using Latin tree-names.

Bitias' death, capped off via a lengthy epic simile at 9.710 - 16, inspires in the Italian forces a new vigour, expressed as the influence of Mars. Significantly, the epithet applied to Mars, *armipotens*, which was first encountered at 2.425 during the Sack of Troy, has since reoccurred twice only in Book 6, first while Aeneas is speaking with the ghost of Deiphobus, who is singled out as *genus alto a sanguine Teucris* (6.500), and then of Achilles during the heavily stylised catalogue at 6.839. Distraught at the death of his brother, Pandarus' act of

⁷⁵ R D Williams, *The Aeneid of Virgil Books 7 - 12*, Macmillan Education Limited, London, 1973, p. 315

⁷⁶ Hardie, 1994, p.221

⁷⁷ Horsfall, 1974, p. 80

ensuring that the gates are safely closed is one of panic, performed while he is *demens* (9.728). and results both in many of the Trojans being left stranded outside the gates, and in Turnus being shut in among the Trojans *immanem veluti pecora inter inertia tigrim* (9.730). This is ‘a bad strategy’, and one that results from unwise individual action ‘in flagrant opposition to Aeneas’ order that the Trojans avoid combat for the safety of all.’⁷⁸ The pattern of group action gives way to a one-on-one battle that is painstakingly Homeric: Turnus’ eyes flash with a *nova lux* (9.731), and his bloody armour contributes to his terrifying appearance, while Pandarus *ingens* (9.735) challenges him with a neatly-balanced set of lines (*dotalis regia Amatae / . . . patriis media Ardea*, 9.737-38), and finally with the assertion that he will never leave the camp (9.739).

Once again, Virgil uses two contrasting but inherently linked methods of death in order to balance the segment, here by contrasting the two brothers: the death of Bitias, struck down by chance from afar and without the opportunity for challenge, is balanced by the death of his fraternal counterpart, who engages in deliberate competition with Turnus, and as a result is killed at close-quarters and at least partially due to the intervention of a god (9.745). Turnus responds to his challenge with the stock conclusion to a turn and turn-about verbal challenge: the mocking dispatch of the opponent with a message to be conveyed to the dead. Here Turnus invokes once again the sack of Troy, attempting to demoralise Pandarus by comparing himself directly to Achilles at 9.742, once again invoking an incongruity between the character’s expectations and the reader’s understanding of the narrative’s outcome. Already in Book 9 there has been sufficient allusive material to establish in the mind of a Roman reader Turnus’ function as a new Hector. Turnus’ dispatch of Pandarus, however, intentionally fails on a metaliterary level - it ‘will be no news to Priam, but a repetition of what the Trojans had

⁷⁸ Saylor, 1990, p. 93

already experienced in Troy⁷⁹ - Turnus is engaging once again in an attempt of his own to establish himself among the icons of myth by approximating heroic behaviour, but attempts to establish himself as the wrong hero, aping Achilles when in fact his function will mimic that of Hector.

The subsequent description of gore that accompanies Pandarus' death outdoes any yet encountered in the second half of the *Aeneid*. A full seven lines are given to the splitting in two of Pandarus' forehead, including a heavily alliterative and highly stylised line *conlapsos artus atque arma cruenta cerebro* (9.753), which mimetically blurs the boundaries between *artus* and *arma*; the construction of the final line of the segment (*huc caput atque illuc umero ex utroque pependit*, 9.755) is itself divided with the formulaic *huc. . .illuc. . .* pair neatly split by the head itself, while the final description of body parts, similar by way of assonance and further joined by elision, depends all the same on an intermediary preposition.

The same impulsive lack of judgement that prompted Pandarus to close the gates now besets Turnus. As Pandarus was *demens*, so Turnus is himself now subject to *furor*, and, most particularly, to *caedis insana cupido*, the same personal desire and individual-oriented thought that brings disaster (Euryalus, earlier on, was prompted to his rash decision to embark upon the night-raid by *laudum amore*, 9.197). As in Book 2, however, what is explicitly proven to be morally inappropriate for a Trojan hero may prove acceptable and even beneficial for an enemy. Turnus' headlong rush against the group, a rash and unrestrained individual action, succeeds, and provides once again an opportunity for him to showcase his heroic speed, rather than illustrating why certain kinds of epic action - such as Nisus and Euryalus' night raid, and Pandarus' act of closing the gates - are in fact out of line with contemporary Roman conceptions of effective military action and heroic motivation.

⁷⁹ Williams, 1983, p. 99

Turnus' subsequent kill-list depends for its effectiveness not on any unexpected case constructions, but rather on its aggressive swiftness. Here no disruptions are made to the expected accusative-initial ordering of the names of victims, and no surprises await the reader: Turnus' final spree of violence is brutally successful, and the end of the catalogue is very clearly demarcated by *tandem*, which stands in counterpoint to *principio* and denotes the return of normalised narrative chronology. Rather, it is the participants in the catalogue themselves who are violently surprised, even to the point of indignity. Having disarmed Phaleris and Gyges (whom he strips of speed by hamstringing him, *succiso poplite*, 9.762), he promptly aims their own weapons at their fleeing comrades. At 9.767, a full line of four names is relayed in Homeric polysyndeton, and it is only Lynceus who breaks the run, being unfortunate enough to have his death described in full (9.768 - 71). Turnus takes his opponents while still engaged in the act of rallying their comrades to arms (*ignaros... Martemque cientis*, 9.765; *sociosque vocantem*, 9.768), suggesting less a series of fair one-on-one combats than an outright slaughter of unsuspecting victims who are taken by surprise. The reader, however, experiencing each kill in the accusative and as part of kill-list that approximates Homeric density, is for the first time not surprised at all.

It is the contrast of continuous action with the simultaneity of Turnus' kills that renders them so aggressively swift. His opponents are taken unawares, while engaged - that is, while participating in a chronologically-bound event that precipitates narrative events - and he has capacity to dispatch them regardless at the normal achronological pace of catalogue. These observations together suggest that his heroic speed allows him, to supersede the constraints of catalogue, rather than simply to subvert its conventions through the rearrangement of word-order. This again suggests that Virgil draws on elements of Homeric chronological styling (the unvaried relation of names in polysyndeton) and intersperses them elements of the literary composititional model. This model involves the capacity to telescope action through the application of narrative chronology so as to collapse and expand the structural norms of Homeric death-lists as required for stylistic effect.

Aeneas and Pallas

Aeneid 10

Book 9 examines thoroughly the efforts of Trojan heroes and the broader Trojan troops when left to themselves; Book 10, by contrast, focuses more sharply on the effort of the Trojan leaders and their Italian counterparts, and provides a counterpart to Book 16 of the *Iliad*, mimicking the set up of the death of a comrade and the subsequent impulse toward revenge by the hero - Turnus will kill Pallas 'exactly' as Hector killed Patroclus.⁸⁰ The battles of the first half of the book feature an unusual amount of inflectional variation, especially when contrasted with the very strict use of the accusative encountered in Book 9's kill-lists; however, it foregoes the technique of unexpected interpolations and syntactic shocks that rendered the swiftness of Turnus and the death of Bitias so vividly. Following as we do the progress of two high-profile combatants, first Aeneas himself and then the young Pallas, we experience two kill-lists that are designed to track Pallas' heroic progress: his participation in battle emulates Aeneas' own. It is only with the retreat of Turnus and the violent onslaught of Mezentius that the expected accusative kill-lists return and variation falls almost to the wayside. The similes applied to Mezentius are in the main executed with lavish, almost Homeric amounts of wandering detail, as well as with heavy use of archaising language, and depend on the stock Homeric imagery that compares heroes to wild beasts; the execution, however, of the lengthy simile at 10.707 - 18, will not be stock at all.

Aeneas enters the fray by wreaking upon the Rutulians some of the longest kill-lists so far encountered in the *Aeneid*, consisting of twenty-one lines from 10.310 - 31 and, after a brief interruption during which Achates and Aeneas confer (10.332-35), twenty-one lines more from 10.335 - 56. The list is capped off with a simile, from 10.356 - 361, which owes a

⁸⁰ Knauer G N 'Vergil's *Aeneid* and Homer' in *Oxford Readings in Virgil's Aeneid*, 1990, p. 409

great deal to the Homeric simile at *Il.* 9.4 - 8. In the *Iliad*, the fury of swift winds and the storm they induce upon the sea stands for the perturbation of Greek morale (ὦς ἐδαΐζετο θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν Ἀχαιῶν, *Il.* 9.8); in Virgil, the winds themselves engage in battle (*proelia . . . tollunt*, 10.357) and compete for territory (*non nubila non mare cedit*, 10.358), which suggests rather the physical clash of two equal lines of battle, with the result that the conflict is *anceps diu*.⁸¹ Its conclusion, moreover, utilises three instances of epic polyptoton to denote the press of battle in two lines: *acies aciesque*, *pede pes*, and *viro vir*. Many of Aeneas' initial kills in this segment will be equipped with some degree of death irony, by which their characterisation is linked with the manner of their death.

At the beginning of the sequence, the forces join with *signa canunt* (10.310) a rather brief description of the sounding of war-trumpets which is elsewhere in Virgil accorded rather more detail.⁸² The onset of the kill-list is marked with the expected *primus*, here describing Aeneas himself. The first kill is related, unusually and with an unusual poetic verb,⁸³ via an ablative phrase, *occiso Therone* (10.312), and the death is confirmed prior to the provision of specific details about either the man himself or the manner of his attack. The order of action is inverted: that Theron was in fact the first of the two to engage in combat by seeking out Aeneas is learned from the relative clause, anticipating already the reader's expectations of the mechanisms of a kill-list. The line-initial *Aenean petit*, might elsewhere be a standard means of cataloguing an attempt to add to a kill-list - compare the line-initial phrases *deicit Herminium* (11.642) and the unsuccessful attempt *Ascanium petit* (9.646) - but is here provided after the fact as a tag to Theron's death.

⁸¹ Compare *Georgics* 1.322 - 24, *immensum caelo uenit agmen aquarum*, for an image that is the reverse of this simile.

⁸² Compare, for example, the first trumpet-sounding of the war at 9.503 - 505.

⁸³ S J Harrison, *Vergil Aeneid* 10, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1991, p.155.

Unusual genealogical information subsequently provides a very interesting instance of death irony. Lichas, dedicated to Apollo after the fashion of all those born by Caesarian section,⁸⁴ survived a blade at birth, but could not avoid the blade that killed him at the end of his life (10.315 - 17). Although Lichas himself is named in the expected accusative, it is as the object in an invocation of Apollo (who is himself ‘pathetically powerless’ in his inability to defend Lichas)⁸⁵ again subverting the expected simplicity of an unvaried list of warriors killed, whose names are in the accusative case. The already moderately non-standard nature of this kill-list is relieved for a moment with rather more simplistic chiasmic variation *Cissea durum / immanemque Gyan* (10.317-18), and with what may constitute a small play on words in the correspondence of Latin *immanis* with the ‘Greek giant-names Γύγης and Γύης’;⁸⁶ but their otherwise unremarkable heroic epithets are evidently a take on Herculean imagery, as we are informed following their deaths about a genealogical link to Hercules through their father’s friendship with the hero whose cult we have already encountered as the focus of Book 8’s *Cacus parergon*.

A further instance of irony attends the death of the next Latin warrior, Pharus, at 10.322 - 23: an overly garrulous man, he is introduced, uniquely in this list, with the exclamatory *ecce*, and it is noted that his words are ineffectual, *voces inertis* (10.322), which reflects his own weakness in battle.⁸⁷ The particular use of the verb *iactat* (10.323), echoed immediately afterwards by *iaculum*, frames a correspondence between his throat and the weapon that achieves his death by piercing his throat. In addition to the simple intrusion onto the battlefield of grim comedy, made permissible even in such a comparatively serious narrative by the inherent humour of slapstick violence, a contrast may be drawn between his ineffectual

⁸⁴ E Paratore, *Eneide Libri IX - X*, Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1982, p. 254.

⁸⁵Harrison, 1991. p.156

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 157

⁸⁷ Paratore, 1982, p. 255.

act of ‘throwing out’ speech, and between Aeneas’ highly effective heroic act of stifling his words. He exists to provide the opportunity for irony, and, in all likelihood, to set up a contrast with the subsequent death, which brings a touch of pathos to the list with its description of Clytius, both *infelix* and *nova gaudia*, of whose youthful beauty much is made. The apostrophe of Cydon, *tu quoque*, and the complex syntax in which his narrow escape from death is couched (10.327-30), render the subsequent divine intervention all the more startling: it is the sudden appearance of *alma Venus* (10.332) which puts an end to the list, and which brings a momentary lull in battle. The line itself is notably more heavily spondaic than those preceding it, and *fidum Aeneas adfatur Achaten* (10.332) makes for a startling contrast due to its hyperbaton and interwoven alliteration. Following this break, Aeneas proves himself capable of incapacitating two brothers, but the third, in attempting to retaliate with one of Aeneas’ own missiles, cannot equal him, and lightly wounds Achates instead (10.335-44).

The creative use of multiple cases in the kill-list is continued in the next sequence: rather than have Maeon stand in the accusative as the target of Aeneas’ first spear-throw, it is his armour which bears the brunt of the attack, while his name occurs only in the genitive, after his shield’s destruction has already been confirmed (*clipei transverberat aera / Maeonis thoraca simul cum pectore rumpit*, 10.336-37). Alcanor, in the nominative, is introduced through the use of a connecting dative, *huic frater subit* (10.338): the transition of Aeneas’ attacks from brother to brother is of course underscored through the repetition of *frater*. . *fratrem* (10.338), and, finally, *fratris de corpore* (10.342), following Numitor’s unsuccessful attempt to grasp the same spear and return the attack. Following this, the Latins press back and we are introduced to Clausus (*primaevo corpore*, 10.345), who mimics Aeneas’ earlier feat of silencing the loquacious Pharus. Striking Dryopes in the chin, he robs him of both voice and life (*vocem animamque rapit traiecto gutture*, 10.348), and accords him a death

described with Homeric attention to gore. The pace of the battle quickens with Clausus' felling of six combatants in quick succession, although none is identified as an individual after the fashion of such catalogues (*tres quoque . . . et tris quos*, 10.350-51). Neither trio is accorded individuation save through their respective association with their homelands.

The final introductions at 10.352 - 61 do not contribute any named kills, but simply serve to swell the list of the Italian forces, and do so with considerable variation: Helaesus and his *manus*, and Messapus. First encountered during the catalogue of the Italians in Book 7, he is identified by a fragment of his formulaic sequence, *Messapus equum domitor Neptunia proles* (7.691). Although *equum domitor* is applied in isolation to other heroes (even those in the same catalogue, such as Lasus, who is afforded the dual chiasmic periphrasis of *equum domitor debellatorque ferarum* at 7.651), this particular combination of epithets is unique to Messapus. The same formula has been repeated already at 9.523, during a particularly florid segment that contains such archaisising compound adjectives as *fumiferos* (9.522) and directly precedes the stylised invocation of Calliope (9.525-28) that introduces Turnus' rampage. It will recur at 12.128, making it the most frequently recurring approximation of a fixed epithetic formula in the *Aeneid*. In Book 10, *Neptunia proles* is used, together with an interesting alternative to his previous periphrastic epithet. *Equum domitor*, itself a calque on the Homeric ἵππόδαμος, is here perhaps referenced by *insignis Messapus equis*. Broken as it is by the hero's name, it cannot serve as an approximation of an epithet, which even in the periphrastic analogues are not separated, although the construction certainly offers parallels with the quasi-formulaic *turbatis Messapus equis* at 9.124, during which Messapus is perturbed to such an extent that he loses control even of his signature horses. It is, however, a take on the more natural Latin means of singling out a combatant via the ablative; that it stands here in direct conjunction with the formulaic *Neptunia proles* does suggest a parallel between the essential function of the periphrastic ablative identifier and the compound epithet.

The opening battle scene of Book 10 therefore constitutes a variation on the more standard kill-lists observed in Book 9 (to which format Virgil will return at the end of Book 10). Furthermore, the structure of the list allows us to observe the efforts of both sides by tracking the back-and-forth progression of each fresh attack: having first been treated to Aeneas's varied kill-list with its thoroughly inventive panoply of kills, we are allowed to watch the Latins regain their impetus, and are treated to the efforts of their heroes in turn. The confused and highly varied structure of the battle, with its idiosyncratic use of multiple cases and its profusion of sharply-drawn miniature genealogical biographies, illustrates well the confusion of which the culminative simile speaks (10.356-61).

It should be noted that it is not only the turmoil induced by the presence of multiple participants in a hotly-contested battle noted for its confusion that disrupts the expected structure of catalogue. Pallas, like his analogue Patroclus directly before his death, is afforded a one-man kill-list in order to demonstrate his particular valour and ability. Throughout Book 10, Pallas has been observed as being in the process of learning directly from Aeneas' example. For his part, 'Aeneas stands *in loco parentis* to Pallas',⁸⁸ having taken him on as his protégé as a sign of faith. Furthermore, Pallas is possessed of an almost rustic naiveté which Petrini has argued 'reflects the cultural innocence of Evander and the Arcadians.'⁸⁹ In heading up the cavalry charge that breaks the deadlock at 10.361 and engaging in his own series of kills, however, he takes it upon himself to function as a heroic combatant,⁹⁰ and attempts to emulate Aeneas' previous display of prowess in battle.

Following his speech at 10.369 - 79, the incipency marker *primum* in the description of Pallas' initial charge is delayed until the third word. The placing of *obvius* more than

⁸⁸ H W Benario, 'The Tenth Book of the *Aeneid*' in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 98, 1967, pp. 23-36, p.25.

⁸⁹ M Petrini, *The Child and the Hero: Coming of Age in Catullus and Vergil*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1997, p.50.

⁹⁰ Benario 1967, 27

compensates, signifying as it does the initial clash of combat at line 380, and, crucially, the fact that Pallas' charge was met by the impetus of another. The structure of the encounter between Aeneas and Theron is mimicked in that of Pallas and Lagus, the latter of whom is Pallas' first kill, but who is relayed at first counterintuitively in the nominative (*fit Lagus*, 10.381) due to his having been in the process of launching an attack on his Trojan opponent, just as Theron did (10.313). The relative *hunc* is required at 10.381 for the description of the death to progress, just as *qui* expanded Theron's attack at 10.312. His next kill, Hisbo, is similarly relayed in the nominative, and both are surprised in the process of beginning their attacks: Lagus is interrupted by the young hero while he is in the very act of attempting to heft the staple boulder of Homeric exchanges (*vellit. . .dum*, 10.380), while Hisbo is taken in the act of avenging his companion's death (*dum furit*, 10.386).

Pallas' kills, like those of Aeneas (particularly Pharus, Clytius, and Alcanor), are not exempt from death irony, as is made most clear by the death at 10.391 - 96 of identical twin brothers, Larides and Thymer, in what constitutes a particularly pathos-ridden example of twin-death. Here the *simillima proles* (10.391), apparently so alike as to have confused even their parents in life, are provided with *discrimina...dura* in death (10.393). They are addressed at the outset with a lengthy and very marked apostrophe that confirms their parity through *vos etiam gemini* (10.390), but ultimately the appearance of each twin's corpse after their respective deaths will be very different: one loses a head, and the other a hand, allowing the bodies to be distinguished at last.

In order to appreciate the significance of Virgil's progression from the initial unified apostrophe to the separate invocations that attend their death, one may consider that, Nisus and Euryalus, the only other example of a dual apostrophe in the *Aeneid*, die singly and thirteen lines apart from one another (9.432 - 45), but are commemorated by the distinctive *fortunati ambo* (9.446). By contrast, the twins die within a line of each other, but are

apostrophised separately, and their unity is further disrupted once their very names have been separated through the figure of chiasmus. No longer juxtaposed by the enclitic - *que*, even the cases of their respective apostrophes differ, with *tibi* (10.394), describing Thymer's quick and brutal death by decapitation, and *te* describing Larides' loss of a hand (10.395), ensuring that each is afforded a grammatical construction as distinctive as their mutilated bodies. Taking into account the marked and heavy use of apostrophe, and the pathos inherent in having a battle-forged pair of comrades die separately, this section is further reminiscent of Aeneas' Clytius and Cydon (10.324 - 32, which segment begins with the apostrophe of Cydon), as well as of the complex case of Maeon and Alcanor (10.335 - 41).

Both Pallas and Aeneas' forays into the field, then, disrupt the more standard progression of naming in kill-lists already observed in Book 9, and furthermore contain sufficient similarities to suggest that Pallas' is modelled at least in part on Aeneas', which illustrates Virgil's ability to manipulate traditional devices in such a way as to reinforce literary themes broached within the broader context of the narrative proper. The parallel structure of Aeneas and Pallas' forays onto the field mimics the literary theme of Pallas' emulation of Aeneas' heroism, and illustrates and enforces their pedagogic relationship.

Following the establishment of the theme of paternal pedagogy in battle, Book 10 introduces by way of a foil to Aeneas and Pallas' relationship a very different father-son pair, Mezentius and his son Lausus. First encountered at the very beginning of the catalogue of the Italian war-leaders during Book 7, Mezentius is there introduced by the notable periphrastic epithet *contemptor divum* (7.648), patterned after the Homeric epithetic model of agent noun and genitive descriptor but without lexical analogue, he is accompanied by his son, Lausus, who is accorded the remarkable chiasmic set of epithets *equum domitor debellatorque ferarum* (7.651), appropriate given the Homeric invocation and heavy Homeric stylisation that open the catalogue. We learn already that Lausus, *dignus patriis qui laetior esset*, is ill-paired with

his father. In Book 8, he is characterised by Evander as having been so unwontedly tyrannical as to have sparked revolt, and, subsequently, conflict throughout Etruria. The easy reading suggests that Mezentius embodies civil war, and stands as a symbolic representation of the wickedness of internal conflict;⁹¹ closer study suggests that his appearance serves to heighten the tension associated with the theme of the father-son relationship, and ultimately imbues it with a note of terrible irony considering the circumstances under which the theme is resolved.

At the close of Book 10, and in the wake of Pallas' horrific murder by Turnus, he comes as a particularly brutal reminder of the true might of the Italian forces, and as a grim forewarning of the wrath to which grief over the loss of a son or younger charge can drive a combatant. In spite of his lack of piety, it is his armour of which Aeneas disposes with such careful ceremony at the beginning of Book 11, thereby setting an example of the appropriate means of handling spoils taken in war. This will in turn serve as counter-example to the avarice which Turnus will display in wearing Pallas' arms so shamelessly, and which will in Book 12 prompt Aeneas to rash action in order to avenge the death of Pallas, established as his son-by-proxy. In killing Turnus, Aeneas will engage in the same degree of wrath here displayed by Mezentius. Indeed, Aeneas' own furious spree of slaughter (10.513 - 601) following Pallas' death at 10.489 is longer by far than any yet encountered, and *proxima*, rather than the expected variation on *primus*, is used to describe his new motive of avenging Pallas. It is only this kill-list, of Aeneas' viewed thus far, which includes such close-packed passages as 10.561 - 564, which enumerates seven names, five of them in the accusative after the Homeric fashion.

Mezentius' appearance on the battlefield, therefore, plays entirely into our expectations of him: aware as we are of his brutal nature, we have anticipated his brutality since Book 7. His entrance into the battle at 10.689 is delayed somewhat by a simile that likens him to a

⁹¹ P F Burke, 'The Role of Mezentius in the *Aeneid*' in *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 69, 1974, pp. 202-209, p. 202

cliff-face unmoved by battering sea-winds(10.693-96), and that tantalisingly separates the line-initial *ille* from its object four lines later (10.693). The delay, however, is almost instantly redressed by his swift and relentless series of kills, which come thicker than any other set of kills achieved during the beginning of the pitched battle, or by Pallas himself; nine men are dispatched in eleven lines. The simile, in delaying the narrative and reducing Mezentius' momentum to a standstill in a seemingly counterproductive tactic, expertly prefigures the fashion in which the battle will progress. Although these names are relayed in the accusative, and are therefore technically on the receiving end of Mezentius' actions, the rapid-fire list of victims mimics the force of the sea and sky which rush to meet the *rupes* of the simile, to no avail. This marks a return to the expected killings *en masse*, of the sort which Turnus achieved at the end of Book 9, and certainly it is significant, given the theme of parental bereavement, that the first of Mezentius' kills, and the accusative that breaks the syntactic suspense of the simile and sets the pace for all subsequent deaths, is *prolem*. Following the introductory *Dolichaonis Hebrum* (10.696), it is only after a further five kills that biographical information is attached at 9.702, slowing the pace into discrete segments of description attributed to each opponent in turn.

While the subsequent imagery of the wild beast pursued by hunters is itself is not unusual, having being universally applied to single heroes facing a full line of opponents and observed multiple times over the course of the past two books, the construction of the simile renders it of unique interest.⁹² It is considered noteworthy not only for its twelve-line length, but also for the fact the extended comparison is introduced first, and the target supplied second, before returning at the close to what would, arguably, appear to be a description of the

⁹² J W Jones 'Mezentius the Isolated Hero' in *Vergilius*, No. 23, 1977, pp. 50-54, p.51.

boar,⁹³ suggesting that the imagery of the simile has in some way been transferred inalienably to Mezentius himself, and that his behaviour is not bestial only in terms of the simile, but only at some more visceral level. If indeed he does intend ‘to blur the distinction between man and beast’, then Virgil is here ‘dealing more severely with Mezentius than with any other hero in his epic’.⁹⁴

There follows at 10.747 - 54 a brief but very densely-packed series of kills, which occurs directly prior to the acknowledgement at 10.755 - 57 that the battle has begun to intensify (*iam gravis aequabat luctus*), when the confusion of battle is once again noted through epic polyptoton and close chiasmic structures (*caedebant pariter pariterque ruebant / victores victique*, 10.756-57). Conveyed at first in victor-victim format by the coupling of such nominative-accusative pairs as *Caedicus Alcathoum obtruncat* (10.747), *Sacrator Hydsapen* (10.747) and *Partheniumque Rapo et... Orsen* (10.748), Messapus breaks the pattern of this death-list with three kills out of turn, following which the format is wholly disrupted. The brief turn-and-turn-about dispatch in which victor becomes victim is embodied through an example of named polyptoton, *Thronium Salius Saliumque Nealces*. The weapons responsible for these last deaths are relayed after the fact and are coupled together, emphasising that both fell due to *insidiis*, but of two subtly different kinds, one by the spear and one by the bow.

⁹³ The introduction of the comparison first is of course not in itself unique; there are several comparable examples, notably a Homeric boar simile at *Il.*11.414 - 422.

⁹⁴ Jones, 1977, p. 51

3

Three Battles in the *Metamorphoses*

Despite being classed formally as epic due both to its length and its metre,⁹⁵ the *Metamorphoses* is by no means an epic after the Homeric or even Virgilian fashion, lacking as it does a central character whose actions will afford the author opportunity to expound upon the role and function of heroic identity within society; nor does it treat exclusively with a single narrative arc, utilising as it does multiple narrative voices. The safest conclusion that may thus be drawn with regard to Ovid's approach to the absorption of multiple genres into a traditionally epic format is that of Conte, that Ovid 'understood the tradition within which he was writing and attempted to contribute something to the ongoing dialogue about poetic authority and the viability of epic.'⁹⁶ Destruction is as much an element of cosmogony as creation, due in large part to the significance of 'the vacillation between order and disorder'⁹⁷ that constitutes the bulk of Ovid's cosmogonic philosophy. While Ovid's treatment of such destructive natural catastrophes as the Flood undoes the order instituted by the creation cycle of Book I, much of his scientific understanding of the cosmogonic forces in play is derived via Lucretius from the fundamentals of Hellenistic atomic theory. A significant degree of the language associated with storms is necessarily derived from epic, and even the placement of a storm at the outset of his *carmen* is essentially a Virgilian take on the Homeric practice.⁹⁸

Multiple genres come to the fore, from the tragic to the erotic, each indicated as necessary by the introduction either of iconic thematic material or the use of a genre-specific

⁹⁵ G B Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*, Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1994, p. 350.

⁹⁶ K S Myers, *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the 'Metamorphoses'*, The University of Michigan Press, Michigan, 1996, p. 25.

⁹⁷ M S Bate, 'Tempestuous Poetry: Storms in Ovid's "*Metamorphoses*", "*Heroides*" and "*Tristia*". *Mnemosyne*, Vol 57, 2004, p. 301.

⁹⁸ Bate, 2004, p. 298

lexis. Epic colouring, for instance, may be added to episodes otherwise concerned entirely with an unrelated genre through the use of various archaising or high-register features such as alliteration, epithets, and apostrophe, in order to introduce variation. The segments which treat specifically with battle narrative utilise similar amounts of epic language, but even in these contexts, Ovid will not suffer epic to stand unmanipulated.

Ovid's innovation, however, depends predominantly upon the realignment of ancient themes and language, such as epic endeavours and heroism, with contemporary Roman genres such as love elegy. In considering the application of Homeric epic devices to battle narrative within the *Metamorphoses*, it must first be acknowledged that Ovid is heavily influenced by Virgil's reinterpretations of the Homeric standard. While Ovid is considerably more likely to deploy short-form similes of the sort encountered frequently in Homer and less so in Virgil, he is certainly capable also of constructing the occasional epic simile. Ovid's avoidance of repetition would seem to correlate directly with Virgil's stylistic preference for variation, in keeping with the originality and unflagging creativity of a medium emphasising personal literary prowess and individual merit. Ovid's primary innovations, and the irreverent subversions and the humour derived from their genre commentary, are founded on his ability to combine relatively straightforward reworkings of epic style with unexpected structural outcomes that are frequently underscored by his manipulation of narrative tempo. His technique relies on the straightforward recreation of what would at first appear to be a heroic story told in heroic language, coupled with such twists as a seemingly ill-timed or inappropriate wordplay, or a lengthy epic crescendo cut abruptly short; all of which undermines the expected progression of events and detracts from the depiction of epic glory. In the *Metamorphoses*, therefore, instances of battle narrative would seem initially to serve primarily as an opportunity for the generation of entertainment. They are vivid and replete with humorous subversions and grotesque exaggerations of both the heroic ideal and the

traditional heroic register, and are also located at very specific points in the development of various heroic arcs. The reader therefore seizes upon them as high-energy brawls that are only enjoyable enough to provide a degree of levity, and that forego the inclusion of the heavier aspects of Virgilian epic. Pathos is frequently destroyed outright through the sheer enormity of the violence perpetrated, and the outcomes by no means dictate the destiny of Rome.

Furthermore, Ovidian battle narrative sees a marked return to the episodic format. The length of Ovid's battles must necessarily be confined by the more generally episodic nature of the *Metamorphoses*, which cannot dwell too long on any particular instalment, and their structural function is accordingly curtailed - although it is important to note that they can be considered brief only by comparison with Virgilian epic narrative. This is closer to the Homeric model, comprising an Ersatz catalogue of previously unspecified heroes drawn from a broad mythological pool. Ovid does not flinch from supplying the gruesomely hyperbolic death-descriptions expected of Homeric battle. There is, most notably in the *Iliad*, a host of instalments which concern themselves more closely with minutiae and which lead as a result to a degree of hyper-realism.⁹⁹ This close attention to the mechanics of death is complemented by compressed narrative and thus lends Ovidian battle narratives an exaggerated verisimilitude which verges, paradoxically, on the ludicrous.

In any case, Ovid seems to have had something of a penchant for examining in close detail the real-world applications of other mythical events, to the extent that Altieri describes him 'competing with the past by seeing how much more wittily and elaborately he can render the same basic narrative.'¹⁰⁰ In such instances Ovid's invention takes an aetiological bent, and, often, at the moments of greatest pathos. Although a great many tales of metamorphosis are aetiological, to embark on a lengthy and gleefully inventive consideration of the

⁹⁹ W H Friedrich, *Wounding and Death in the Iliad*, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London, 2003, p. 34.

¹⁰⁰ C Altieri, 'Ovid and the New Mythologists' in *A Forum on Fiction*, Vol. 7, 1973, p. 35.

geographical ramifications of Phaethon's reckless driving forcibly wrenches the focus away from what might otherwise have been a 'moral tale'¹⁰¹ with tragic overtones. This tendency to delve into inventive, humanising pragmatism is remarkable not for its originality, since it was by no means a new technique,¹⁰² but for its sheer scope and cheerful superfluity even when included as a coda to a tale that ought to be far too serious for such trivial details. Effectively, the notion that heroism and fallibility can co-exist in certain genres and at certain intervals even during the course of epic, and hence that high literature and humour can co-exist, is one that Ovid revives in order to vary the tone of his epic borrowings. Ovid's portrayal of the heroes of epic as fallible comic actors subject to human error, thereby stripping them of the superhuman prowess that marks them out as heroes in the first place, can easily be read as an extension of his well-documented tendency to bring to even the highest provinces of myth a degree of realism and familiarity that is frequently read as insouciant, but is equally well an extension of this hyper-realism. It is drawn from a strictly Homeric source and is repurposed in the context of self-aware and allusive battle in order to bring to it a degree of levity that belies the seriousness of its origins.

This section will examine elements of epic language and epic narrative structure present in the three primary battle sequences of the *Metamorphoses*, following the order in which they occur. Each battle, despite being portrayed in inherently epic language, utilising epic themes, and, most notably of all, deploying the episodic structure of Homeric battle narrative, is derailed by the intrusion of an element that destabilises the development of an epic theme. In the Wedding Brawl (*Met.* 5.1 - 241) it is Perseus' special Gorgonic equipment that introduces into the hyper-realistic battle an incongruous and amusingly anticlimactic conclusion; in the

¹⁰¹ Altieri, 1973, p. 35.

¹⁰² The application is universally folkloric in origin, and the 'integration of myth and experience, especially as it existed in archaic and classical Greece' meant that 'personal experience and the heroic world were not sharply separable.' (C Segal, 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Greek Myth in Augustan Rome' in *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 68, 1971, p. 371).

Boar Hunt (*Met.* 8 260 - 450) it is Atalanta and the unfortunately elegiac change she induces in Meleager; and in the Centauromachy (*Met.* 12.210 - 535) it is both Nestor himself, that most familiar Homeric of figures, who manages all the same to distort the narrative through the sheer extremity of its allusive nature, and the Centaurs, who function as heroic foils to the listening audience of Homeric heroes.

The Wedding Brawl

Metmorphoses 5.1 - 241

The ludicrous odds of one man facing off against an army make both for great epic and for great humour. Observed to function as a parody of the grandeur of Homeric battle narrative, and, more particularly, of the nearer Virgilian model, the Wedding Brawl that begins Book 5 of the *Metamorphoses* and serves as the climax of the 'Perseid' is easy to identify as a textbook example of mock-epic. The brutal slapstick that inspires the bulk of the deaths, compacted and conveyed at a ferocious pace, creates a sense of glory having been brought up short, and the exaggerated claim that Perseus is capable of facing a tremendous host of enemies (in excess of a thousand, if we are to take poetic hyperbole literally, at 5.155, and reduced by the end of the battle to *bis centum* 5.208) immediately pushes the narrative beyond the boundaries of epic, which is admittedly heroic yet quasi-realistic, and almost into the domain of folklore. Most significant of all will be the introduction, close to the end of the battle proper, of an unexpected object that undercuts the chronology of battle in order not only to remind the reader of the overarching metamorphosis theme, but also to provide a shocking and ultimately un-epic anti-climax.

There is an emphasis throughout on images of heroism not quite achieved, and of heroic or sacred images upset and belittled by anti-heroic behaviour and the application of dark humour. Keith argues that the closeness with which Ovid follows Virgil in this segment, as

well as the intensity of the wedding brawl proper (lasting as it does only 241 lines, brief compared with Virgilian epic sequences which may extend throughout entire books, yet conveying all the same an extraordinarily varied number of creatively violent deaths) are together indicative less of outright parody, and more of an attempt to work through as many of Virgil's battle episodes as possible, as efficiently and vividly as possible, in a highly compressed space.¹⁰³ If Keith is correct, this would constitute a clear decision by Ovid to draw attention to his debt to Virgil, rather than to cower in his shadow, and to invite comparison while simultaneously offering careful criticism and invention of his own. He shows off with great flair his conversancy with not only the required set-list, as it were, of heroic *topoi*, but his ability to improvise on them.

This reading is reinforced by remembering that the battle takes place within Cepheus' confined hall, rather than on a spacious field: this narrative is briefer and more condensed than Virgil's sprawling battle chapters not only by virtue of the fact that it constitutes only a relatively small episode in the context of the *Metamorphoses* as a whole, but also, more practically, because of the realities of its narrative positioning. Ovid's 'Perseid', a reworking of a hero's quest in miniature, which represents Perseus as 'the quintessential epic hero whose *virtus* is tested in a series of trials.'¹⁰⁴ As the heroic climax to Perseus' narrative arc, it must exhaust the traits of a Virgilian battle, and yet cannot exceed the scope of the narrative that has produced it.

Whittled down, the violence must be exaggerated or else fall wholly flat. The brutality in play maximises the vividness of battle despite its having been reproduced in miniature. What comedic elements are present are thus the result both of the exaggeration of violence,

¹⁰³ A M Keith, 'Ovid on Vergilian War Narrative' in *Vergilius*, Vol. 48, 2002a, p. 119.

¹⁰⁴ A M Keith 'Sources and Genres in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1-5', in B W Boyd (ed.), *A Companion to the Study of Ovid*, Leiden, 2002b, p. 240.

which produces a darkly slapstick air, and of the contracted sense of escalation necessitated by its brevity. Heroes are introduced, brought to bear against the hero Perseus, and overcome, all in the space of a few lines. It is this swift and brutal progression from daring confidence to swift come-uppance and often ironically humorous death that encapsulates the chronology of this particular battle, which may be divided into two segments. The first sees Perseus do battle under his own power, and the second sees him assisted by the Gorgon's head - a transition from a typically Homeric battle scene into an Ovidian showcase of metamorphosis.

The description of the youth Athis at 5.47 - 58 is in its own brief way programmatic of the battle to follow, providing as it does a strong example of the particular pattern of crescendo and sudden shortfall that characterises the narrative construction throughout, and standing as a very vivid allusion to epic precedents - for in Athis' death, we see a miniaturised parallel the Nisus and Euryalus episode of Book 9 of the *Aeneid*. Second to die after Rhoetus, whose undignified and unheroic actions of cowering behind an altar ushers the battle in on a deliberately inglorious note, the young Athis is formally introduced to us in the fashion of an epic hero about to do battle, fully equipped with a heroic genealogy that not only confirms his divine heritage, but also serves to reinforce his ethnic origin - Athis is marked out as a hero of his own region by taking his origin from the river Ganges (*quem flumine Gange / edita Limnaee vitreis peperisse sub undis / creditor*, 5.47 - 49).

His stock heroic trappings and skills, as integral an aspect of his heroic identity as his divine origins, are carefully recounted. We are told both of his rich purple chlamys and its golden trim (5.51) and of his well-trained skill with both the javelin and the bow (5.55), which last, once bent, serves as the catalyst for the beginning of the combat proper. Marked out as *egregius forma* in no small part because of his divinity, he is an idealised warrior youth, although there do intrude elements of the imagery of *mollitas* associated with eastern

nations¹⁰⁵ in the description of his ornamental torc and his coiffed hair oiled with myrrh. *Indus* Athis would initially appear to function as a deliberate eastern analogue to the stock Hellenic hero, and as such is introduced in appropriately Homeric fashion, with emphasis placed on topological origin, genealogical identity, and heroic skill.

However, he has in fact been built up purely so as to be undercut. This is established vividly over the course of nine lines, but he is despatched in three. Here Ovid's particular knack for temporal compression is manifest. Although the descriptive escalation is immediately subverted through a strange subject change, with Perseus swooping down unexpectedly from a line-final position, the killing blow, *perculit*, is not landed until the completion of a relative clause long enough to occupy a full line, and its results are proleptic in their construction: the crushing of Athis' face and the blow that causes it are relayed almost simultaneously thanks to the hyperbaton of *fractis confudit in ossibus*, thus framing the death as ingloriously abrupt. A twisted element of comedy is engineered via the technique of deliberately raising expectations for a grand battle after the glorious Homeric fashion, only to have the very first adversary, heroic trappings notwithstanding, meet a casually grisly end. It is not the exaggerated violence that is unHomeric, but rather the deliberate contrast of the young man's resplendent appearance with his immediate and inglorious destruction. That the deathblow is dealt specifically to the face suggests an added degree of cruel humour dependant on Athis' *mollitia*: his vanity serves him not at all, and Athis' *egregius forma* is wholly undone almost before the battle proper can begin.

Athis' death functions also as a segue that both frames and supplies causation for the subsequent instalment. Our own shock at the boy's death, and particularly at the cruelly ironic nature of it, is transferred to Perseus' next opponent, Lycabas, Athis' comrade, who, *non dissimulator amoris* (*Met.* 5. 61), is distraught and attempts to engage with Perseus by way of

¹⁰⁵ B Isaac, 'Proto-Racism in Graeco-Roman Antiquity' in *World Archaeology*, Vol. 38, 2006, p. 44. pp. 32-47

revenge, resulting in his own death. Here Ovid has seized upon a chance to introduce an element of pathos by appealing to the epic motif of the erotic warrior-bond and the required vengeance for a fallen comrade, and the episode concludes on a touching description of their solace in dying together. Keith notes numerous textual parallels between the enormously compressed depiction of this relationship and the Virgilian representation, spread out over the course of Book 5 to Book 9 of the *Aeneid*, of the relationship between Nisus and Euryalus.¹⁰⁶ The early inclusion of the theme of the *iuncta mors*, ‘common in later epic’,¹⁰⁷ suggests that already Ovid has attempted to include a brief but vital take on an important stock heroic conceit.

However, a vivid *ecce!* (*Met.* 5.74) diverts attention from the pathos of this scene, and the remains of what has now become a dual death cue in turn the introduction of the next wave. Plunging into the fray, the heroes Phorbas and Amphimedon, who are appropriately introduced via heroic patronymics and toponymics, charge on Perseus only to slip and fall in the same fresh gore that had previously so distressed Lycabas. This not only immediately dispels the residual tenderness of the previous episode by creating humour through the subversion of heroic prowess in battle in a very dark use of slapstick, but also connects two distinct episodes with a sense of loose continuity. The introduction moreover of the combatants in the nominative, actively running towards their deaths, is an inversion of the tendency we have previously observed in Virgil to organise death-episodes by supplying the accusative name of victim first.

¹⁰⁶ Keith, 2002a, p. 115.

¹⁰⁷ D Meban ‘The Nisus and Euryalus Episode and Roman Friendship’ in *Phoenix*, Vol. 63, 2009, p. 244.

The use of sequential episodes immediately suggests that Ovid has taken as his model the inherently catalogic, and hence episodic, structure of Homeric battle narrative.¹⁰⁸ That he characterises them using a structure wholly different to Virgil's suggests again that he intends to provide them with his own stamp. In Ovid, and nowhere in greater abundance than in this Wedding Brawl, there is a marked tendency for the manner of the deaths of certain participants in battle to reflect, upstage, undo, or in some way relate to their introductory characterisation. Each participant's introductory lines are, of course, especially significant in this context, as the technique derives from the catalogic tradition on which Homeric battle may have been modelled typically functioning as a means both of identification and of the establishment of heroic prowess, each introduction will include genealogical information, often supplied by means of an epithetic patronym or toponym, and may also provide what amounts to a highly compressed character sketch. One thinks of Aias' young victim, ἠΐθεον θαλερόν Simoeisios, whose death at *Il.*4.473 - 487 is supplemented by an interlude that not only allows the reader a touchingly pastoral glimpse of the youth's home life, but also equips him with toponymic information by explaining that his name is a reference to his birth, which occurred along the banks of the river (παρ' ὄχθησιν Σιμόεντος γείνατ' . . . τοῦνεκά μιν κάλειον Σιμοείσιον, *Il.*4.475-77). This information is significantly recalled in the poignant simile that illustrates his death. He is compared at length to a marshland poplar that on its death falls beside the river (κεῖται ποταμοῖο παρ' ὄχθας, *Il.*4.487). The effect is highly stylised, and is in keeping with the Homeric technique of ring-composition,¹⁰⁹ allowing the youth a measure of closure denied him by battle - as he was born, so did he die, at least in simile.

¹⁰⁸ C R Beye 'Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues' in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 68, 1964, pp. 345-373.

¹⁰⁹ E J Bakker 'Discourse and Performance: Involvement, Visualization and "Presence" in Homeric Poetry' in *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 12, 1993, p. 8.

In Ovid, however, these identifying passages provide nothing so much as an epic set-up which is subsequently subverted through irreverent irony, inappropriate witticism, or violence so exaggerated and so profane that it transcends even Homeric violence and comes to be read as parodic. The technique, not universal in the Brawl but certainly frequent, of having the precise manner of death provide an ironic comment of sorts on each participant's heroic identity might constitute an example of the poet's habit of reshaping traditional material, using parodic hyperbole in conjunction with the anticlimactic subversion of heroic tropes. Certainly his use of death irony will be demonstrated to be rather less heroic and more parodic than Virgil's. While Ovid's broader target is certainly the epic genre as a whole, his parodic aim is here narrowed to the Virgilian interpretation of epic, and particularly to its introspective *gravitas*. This is made apparent by his liberal use throughout the Brawl of themes, images, vocabulary, and even whole phrases appropriated from a Virgilian context, with a high concentration of these having been drawn from the latter half of the *Aeneid*.

There are at least eight individual instances of death irony in the Brawl alone.¹¹⁰ The death of Athis, discussed above, is one such, diluted though it is by the surface sincerity of 5.72 - 73. Certainly Anderson feels that the inability of Lycabas to avenge his comrade undermines his heroic ability, and concludes that while Ovid's take on the trope constitutes a 'pretty episode,'¹¹¹ it is ultimately shallow and inconsequential. Nisus deliberately chooses to die at Euryalus' side after having avenged him, thus not only supplying the scene with a powerful and tragic degree of agency that renders its conclusion all the more wrenching, but also transforming it into an *exemplum* of heroic valour that glorifies a self-sacrificial code of honour. Lycabas, by contrast, makes to avenge Athis but is defeated almost immediately, thus

¹¹⁰ Including the deaths of Athis, 5. 47 – 58; Emathion, 5.100 - 106; Lampetidas, 5.111 - 118; Dorylas 5.129 - 136; Clytis & Clanis, 5. 140 - 143; Aethion, 5. 146 - 147; Ethemon, 5.171 - 173; and Nileus, 5. 187 - 194.

¹¹¹ W S Anderson, *Ovid's Metamorphoses Books 1 – 5*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, 1997, p. 503.

emphasising his lack of heroic valour and depriving the episode of any potential paedagogical function. What sincerity may be found in the final image of Athis and Lycabas' death, and in the hollow *solacia mortis*, is short-lived, as the aggressive and irreverent hostility of the Brawl admits no pathos.¹¹²

Lines 5.100 - 94 of *Metamorphoses* 5, however, which constitute the thick of the battle proper, are crammed with deaths of this type, each relating to a stock trope. Emathion (5.100 - 6) is a wordy and overbearing *grandaevus*, very much of the Nestor type. Introduced with the periphrastic epithets *aequi cultor timidusque deorum* (5.100) which grand phrase is further elevated by its chiasmic structure, Emathion is so very fond of flinging insults that he continues to berate his attackers even after his ignoble decapitation. The moral outrage of his murder is compounded to the point of parodic hyperbole by the deliberate casting of his severed head into the fires of a nearby altar, with the result that a man whose establishing epithets expressed his piety expires not only in a grotesquely impious way that makes mockery of the stock tragic image of supplicants seeking sanctuary, but is also reduced to speaking *verba execantia* (5.105). Notable are potential similarities with the darkly humorous murder of overly talkative combatants, such as the death of Pharus at *Aen.*10.322 or Tarquitus at *Aen.*10.555 as a form of comeuppance for garrulity that impedes martial prowess. Where in the *Aeneid* an opponent may be silenced by a well-aimed blow, in Ovid their obnoxious loquacity transcends even death, as is proper for the hyperbole of parody.

The effectiveness of the ironic death is in fact well-illustrated by the degree to which it enables humour in the case of Emathion. While a straightforward depiction of such brutality in an attempt at parody would constitute only a clumsy glorification of violence, the deliberately contrived nature of Emathion's death, so horribly appropriate from a thematic perspective, removes from it any possibility of realism. The added supernatural touch of post-

¹¹² Anderson, 1997, p. 506.

mortem insults, an almost folkloric insertion that combines the well-established imagery of death-throes with the humorous image of a cantankerous old man so bent on criticising his juniors that even death cannot quiet him, tips the entire scene so far over into obscenity that it is rendered absurd. Remarkably similar, and continuing the theme of the horrific and immoral slaughter of non-combatants by the heartless Perseus, is the death at 5.111 - 18 of Lampetidus *imbelle* (5.114), a bard who contributes to the battle only with words, and whom Petalus kills while supplying the pithy one-liner *Stygiis cane cetera...manibus* (5.115 - 16). As instructed, Lampetidus strums his lyre *digitis morientibus* (5.117). As with Emathion's final words, the notion of a dying gesture may well be a take on the recurrent motif in the Brawl of describing a fallen combatants' post-mortem spasms. Certainly it would be typical of Ovid to promise verisimilitude by homing in on a specific detail, then extrapolating from it in such a way as to lead it in a supernatural or mythological direction.

What would appear to be the stock figure of the non-combatant drawn inadvertently into battle is certainly derived from a model in Homeric epithet. One thinks of the minstrel Phemios (who is equipped with his own fitting genealogical identifier, *Terpiades*, at *Od.22.330*), who is rather luckier than Lampetidus in pleading for his life. Keith further identifies Aethion *sagax* (*Met.5.146*) as having been distilled from the Odyssean *θυοσκόος* Leiodes (*Od.22.310 - 29*), and indeed, the 'situational parallels' of this segment with Book 22 of the *Odyssey* are 'particularly striking'¹¹³ due to its vindicating position as the conclusion to the journey of a wandering hero. Aethion's treatment in Ovid is marked due to its brevity. Directly preceded by the Astreus (whose unknown father is a direct inversion of typical genealogical narrative), he occurs toward the end of a final flurry of deaths dispatched at quickening pace before the recapitulating device *plus tamen exhausto superseset* (5.149) provides a transition to the second half of the battle, and his description is necessarily

¹¹³ Keith, 2002b, p. 241.

compressed. His claim to the epithet *sagax* is substantiated only by *quondam ventura videre*, without any further specification or elaboration, with the result that his primary identifier is at once subverted by the twist of his death. The second half of his descriptor has been deliberately set against the first through the use of *quondam* and *tunc*. We are told only that his powers failed him in some fashion (*ave deceptus falsa*, 5.147). The inclusion of the ironic motif even under such constrained circumstances would suggest its integral significance to the tone of the battle as a whole. Certainly there would seem to be something of Leiodes' death in the ends of all three Ovidian non-combatants, who have in common the gift of speech rather than any strength of arms: for as Lampetides' fingers continued to play in death, so Leiodes' severed head speaks its last words even as it hits the floor (φθεγγομένου δ' ἄρα τοῦ γε κάρη κονίησιν ἐμίχθη, *Od.* 22.329).

The significance of the ironic death motif is emphasised by the allusive attention which Ovid pays to his literary forebears. As in the *Aeneid*, which includes several instances of twin-death, so here Ovid juxtaposes the identity of the combatants with the manner of their deaths. At 5.107, the *gemini fratres* Broteas and Ammon have already been the subject of wordplay. The polyptoton of *invicti vinci* at 5.108, together with the ironic repetition of *caestibus* and its juxtaposition with the superior *enses*, suggests that battling brothers provide ample scope for the deployment of a device dependant on repetition. Likewise, Clytus and Clanis, another pair of brothers, die of vastly different wounds at 5.140, and their deaths are singled out as a darkly ironic fate by the juxtaposition of *una* and *diverso* at 5.141. Unlike Virgilian twin-death, exemplified by the pathos-heavy deaths of Larides and Thymer at 10.390 - 96 and the complex chiasmic moral wrangling of Liger and Lucagus at *Aen.*10.575 - 601, little space is allotted by Ovid to any examination of the brothers' emotional development. Emphasis is placed instead on the opportunity for wordplay, founded mostly in polyptoton and other contrastive techniques, that is afforded by the contrast of two identical or closely related

combatants, suggesting once again the repackaging of standard epic tropes into a briefer but more bombastic presentation.

Irony may also be supplied less by the manner of death itself and more by the comment of the victor. This suggests that the device is transparently contrived, and is encapsulated in direct speech to very much the same comedic effect as a bad pun. Dorylas is introduced at 5.129 through the periphrastic epithet *ditissimus agri* (another use of a Virgilian phrase, *Aen.* 10.563),¹¹⁴ and this segment is ripe with epic flavour, from the alliterative phrases *totidem tollebat* and *letifer ille locus*, to the use of *letifer* itself. However, despite his grand introduction, he is cruelly mocked following his death by Halcyoneus, who remarks that for all Dorylas' land in life, in death he owns only the land where he falls. Anderson takes this as a comment on the futility of the accumulation of wealth in the face of mortality.¹⁷ The precise manner of the murder is hardly ironic, but Halcyoneus' comment, a callously triumphant one-liner that with its complex clausal construction mimics the haggling of merchants, has much the same effect as Petalus' derisive eulogy of Lampetides; it lends the death an air of contrived irreality, and is vitally important for ensuring that the violence remains ludicrous, rather than simply distasteful.

Boastfulness is not in itself an unusual feature of epic narrative; typically, a perpetrator is proven wrong when his boasts of skill are rendered void and he receives his deserved comeuppance. When the device is coupled with the hero Nileus' false assertion of his divine paternity at 5.187, however, it serves quite markedly to undermine stock heroic imagery. In addition to the unimaginative etymology of his name, he is equipped with a shield whose decoration is as deliberately ostentatious as the syntax that encases its description (5.189). Both his paternity and his arms, however, will prove ineffectual against the Gorgon, with the result that his heroic introduction, already suspect despite its overtly standard format due to

¹¹⁴ Anderson, 1997, p. 511

the presence of the corollary *ementitus erat* (5.188), is summarily undercut and rendered moot by his inglorious defeat. Not only is this episode in keeping with the theme of anti-heroic epic, but the manner of Nileus' death qualifies the episode as an instance of 'ironic' technique, since he is petrified in the very act of boasting (*pars ultima vocis / in medio suppressa sono est*, 5.194 - 95). Even as he displays his heroic arms and claims that they offer him invulnerability, he is proven wrong. The vivid immediacy lent to metamorphosis by its occurring so swiftly as to interrupt its victim even in the act of speech is a uniquely Ovidian staple of human transformation.¹¹⁵ Actaeon loses the power of human speech in the very act of trying to cry out and produces only bestial groans at *Met.*3.201, while Caeneus' voice deepens midway through the very sentence with which she requests her transformation into a man at *Met.*12.203.

It is this same immediacy of transformation which upsets the standard progression of the episodic killings thus far observed in Ovid, thereby superseding normative epic pace - and which extends the use of the well-worn 'heroism interrupted' motif by relocating it within the context of a mythological *spectaculum*. Nileus is among the victims of the Gorgon, and where before this the tally of deaths has been episodic in typical Homeric fashion, after 5.182, it becomes episodic due to the intervention of Perseus' special heroic weapon. The Gorgon strikes the sceptical Thescelus down in the very act of hurling his javelin in such a way that he is forever halted there (*utque manu iaculum fatale parabat / mittere in hoc haesit signum de marmore gestu*); similar in death are Ampyx (*inque petendo / dextera deriguit*, 5.185 - 86), Eryx (*incursurus erat tenuit vestigia tellus*, 5. 198), and Astyages (5.205 - 06). Not only is this technique of interruption apparent as the mechanism that enables the vivid portrayal of metamorphosis, but it serves well to conclude the battle on a climactic note. However, it is

¹¹⁵ Barchiesi A, 'Narrative technique and narratology in the *Metamorphoses*' in *Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002, p. 185.

also antithetical to the traditional pattern that requires physical valour to triumph, and reminds us that the primary topic of the *Metamorphoses* is change rather than heroic identity.

Once again, it is the swift undercutting of heroic action that results in a humorous, if unsettling, anti-climax, here transferred from the death of an individual to the swift come-uppance granted to the entire host:

nomina longa mora est media de plebe virorum

dicere - bis centum restabant corpora pugnae

Gorgone bis centum riguerunt corpora visa

Met. 5. 207 - 09

With the prerogative of the bardic narrator Ovid decides, having recounted an initial few deaths by transformation, to skip ahead, thus participating in a recapitulative technique common in lengthy narrative and extensive listing (and which reoccurs significantly in the mouth of Nestor in the Centauromachy of Book 12). He dispatches the remainder in two markedly anaphoric lines which serve to reinforce the perfection and immediacy of the transformation. Metrically, the parallels encapsulate not only the transition of the warriors from battling flesh to wordless stone, but also the transition of the poem's thematic content. The two sets of words, emphatically located line-initially and line-finally, take us from an account of battle (*dicere. . . pugnae*) to the marvel of the Gorgon (*Gorgone. . . visa*), while the surface similarity of the verbs *restabant* and *riquerunt* renders the immediately transition a shock, and also provides a powerfully descriptive change of tense from the iterative to the perfective. The fast-paced tumult of battle is instantly frozen by a *spectaculum*, and as such is transformed into a *spectaculum* itself, thereby stripping it of the possibility of generating any heroic κλέος, and confirming the battle itself to be a showpiece and the use of epic language a necessary disguise.

Certainly the Brawl concludes with a series of lines constituting perhaps the single most ostentatious use of archaising epic language so far observed in the segment. The golden line *torva colubriferi superavit lumina monstri* (5.241) features a high-register compound epithet in addition to its complex metrical composition. It is followed by a line which features both epic apostrophe together with the alliteration expected of Latin invocatory language and an added flair of internal rhyme (*te tamen o parvae rector Polydecta Seriphi*, 5.242), and a similarly marked degree of alliteration appears not seven lines later with *silicem sine sanguine* (5.249). The overall effect is one of a last flourish to conclude the battle.

Despite utilising the artificial and highly archaising language of Latin epic as expounded by Virgil, the Wedding Brawl therefore depends heavily for the bulk of its allusions upon Virgil in such a way as to utilise generic subversion as a vehicle for the Ovid's continuing establishment of himself as competitive voice rather than a mere imitator. The use of episodic death-scenes further reveals an adherence to the catalogic battle structure established in Homer, but emphasis is placed throughout on grotesque and irreverent violence in such a way as to render it unique among its epic predecessors and to mark it as his own. Ultimately even what appears at the outset to be a classic battle is revealed to have been only a vehicle for the true conclusion of his Odyssean epic-in-miniature with an instalment of the overarching theme of the *Metamorphoses* as a whole - the spectacle of transformation.

The Boar Hunt

***Metamorphoses* 8.260 - 450**

The chronicle of Meleager, which stands at the centre of Book 8, is a composite hero-narrative drawn from multiple and ancient Hellenic sources. Its inclusion in the *Metamorphoses* is textually validated by the final segment, 8.526 - 46, which details the traditional transformation of Meleager's grieving sisters, constitutes a 'metamorphic

narrative' that Ovid 'superimposes...on a Homeric tale,'¹¹⁶ and justifies Ovid's selection of the subject material. Its primary aim, however, is less to detail metamorphosis and more to expound upon the Meleager legend, which Ovid has seized as an opportunity to treat with multiple genres and showcase his poetic versatility, while simultaneously re-interrogating the ancient subject matter from alternate artistic perspectives. The lengthy narrative is divided into three segments, each drawing on a distinct genre. While the second and third are tragic and Alexandrian respectively, the introductory segment, the Calydonian Boar Hunt, is 'of all the sections in the *Metamorphoses*...one of the most strictly formal pieces of epic writing,'¹¹⁷ and yet it has also been described as 'deliberately antiheroic.'¹¹⁸ Due to the length and scope of the Meleager chronicle as envisioned by Ovid, variation of genre, tone, and theme is in fact most welcome, and does serve well to provide a series of clear demarcations which organise and structure the narrative. Ultimately the use of multiple genres is entirely in keeping with the all-encompassing cosmogonic nature of the *Metamorphoses* as a whole. However, if an inherently epic saga can be repackaged into three specific genres, then Ovid's intent in choosing mock epic language as its opening, and his development of the mock epic theme throughout, deserves examination.

The rowdy battle-piece is pleasingly populated with the familiar figures of myth all banded together in mock-earnest enterprise and full of heroic failure and over-the-top slapstick, all conveyed in solemnly epic tones. It is juxtaposed with a sudden derailment into the ornate monologue of a tragic heroine of the Euripidean sort that Ovid would seem, in accordance with his preoccupation with Medea, to have enjoyed writing. The participation of heroes in hunting does not in itself necessarily constitute a lowering of epic register or a

¹¹⁶ C Segal 'Ovid's Meleager and the Greeks: Trials of Gender and Genre' in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 99, 1999, p. 301.

¹¹⁷ A S Hollis *Metamorphoses Book VIII*, The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1970, p. 77.

¹¹⁸ Segal, 1999, p. 301

parodic application of the genre, as Horsfall has shown. Hunting as a topic falls well within the limits of heroic activity, and indeed is so closely associated with warfare that it can deploy any number of stock similes associated with Homeric battle.¹¹⁹ Rather, it is the manner in which the heroes fail at subduing the creature, and their subsequent upstaging by a woman, that together render the application of '[epic] solemnity in comic counterpoint'¹²⁰ to the clumsy misadventures of the worlds' finest heroes humorous in context. There exists a degree of ineptitude on the part of the hunters that is comparable to the lack of refinement displayed in both the final battle of the Perseid and the Centauromachy. Weapons continually miss their mark to disastrous effect, and male heroes are upstaged and ashamed by the success of Atalanta.

The tone of overblown solemnity arises in large part from the portrayal of the Hunt as a Homeric battle, with an army whose heroic virtue is assumed from the readers' knowledge of their previous exploits facing off against a single opponent who fulfils much the same function as a Homeric *promachos*. The truly destabilising element is, however, Atalanta. Her success is deliberately used to foreground the failures of her male peers, and results in the emasculation of all those around her, down to the very language used to describe their shame. Her presence results moreover in Meleager's being reduced to a figure suspiciously reminiscent of an elegiac lover, rather than an epic hero, and it is precisely this which results in the progression of the plot. In this regard, the use of anti-heroic epic is itself a plot device, and variation and allusivity are both integral to organising the complex structure of the *Metamorphoses*. It is specifically the gendered clash of the epic genre with the elegiac, and the characters' highly critical awareness of the unacceptable intrusion of the erotic into what ought to have been a strictly epic instalment, which set up the tragic crux of Meleager's story.

¹¹⁹ N Horsfall 'Epic and Burlesque in Ovid, *Met.* viii. 260ff' in *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 74, 1979, p. 322.

¹²⁰ Horsfall, 1979, p. 319.

Ovid's use of catalogue is rarely unmarked. His dalliances in the *Metamorphoses* with catalogic form are tremendously self-aware, and most frequently they serve either a cosmogonic or deliberately parodic purpose. The catalogues of mountains at *Met.*2.216 - 26 and rivers at 2.238 - 59, and indeed much of the Phaeton section in general, serve as a superb example of catalogic creation. The oft-cited catalogue of hunting dogs at 3.206 - 25 remains a clear example of the ease with which this technique, in many ways a cumbersome relic of the Homeric tradition that is arguably ill-suited to the literary medium, is rendered humorous through the simultaneous lowering of subject matter and retention of epic register.

Also of note to the general consideration of Ovidian catalogues is Orpheus' list of trees at *Met.*10.86 - 105, which functions not only as an exaggerated parodic take on both epic catalogue and the lavish descriptions abundant in bucolic poetry (particularly Virgil's comparable catalogue of plant-life at *Eclogues* 4.18 - 30), but also serves as a vehicle through which Ovid may use various mythological and literary references to introduce commentary on matters of gender and sexuality presented in earlier texts (with *innuba lauris* [10.92] standing clearly for Daphne, *aquatica lotos* [10.96] for Dryope, and with the metamorphosis of the *hirsuta pinus* [10.103] explicitly referencing Attis).¹²¹ The language employed in this brief catalogue is typical of epic register, but is riddled with Ovidian wordplay and innovation nonetheless. Thus, in keeping with the Orpheus section as a whole, the reader is confronted with a 'contrast between epic seriousness. . . and Callimachean lightness.'¹²² Even within the introductory lines, the appellation *dis genitus vates* (*Met.* 10.89) appears in between the phrases *umbra loco deerat* (10.88) and *umbra loco venit* (10.90), of themselves humorously anaphoric and arguably also a pun that would refer to Orpheus' loss of Eurydice, herself an

¹²¹ J F Makowski 'Bisexual Orpheus: Pederasty and Parody in Ovid' in *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 92, 1996, p. 34.

¹²² P E Knox *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*, Cambridge Philological Society, Cambridge, 1986, p. 50.

umbra or ‘ghost’.¹²³ The description of Orpheus’ musical summons of the trees, ripe with literary allusions, is introduced using double negatives, and utilises such elaborate epic kennings as *Chaonis arbor* (10.90) and *nemus Heliadum* (10.91) for the oak tree and the poplar. Ovid even goes so far as to apostrophise ivy with the epic compound epithet *flexipes*, and such phrases as *amnicolae simul salices* (10.96) supply not only the marked alliteration unique to elevated Latin register but also the use of an innovative compound epithet patterned of the classic *-cola* type (such as Naevius’ *silvicola* and Ennius’ *caelicola*). Thus even in a brief and largely light-hearted catalogue that treats with ostensibly frivolous subject-matter, Ovid is clearly capable of engaging in a great deal of intertextual reference.

In introducing the full complement of heroes who participate in the Calydonian Boar Hunt, Ovid chooses to forego the formal and emphatic invocations of the Muses that precede lengthy Homeric catalogues, which preserves with great conscientiousness in such instances as 7.641 - 46. Instead, Ovid keeps his catalogue strikingly brief on this occasion. Dispatched in barely more than thirty lines (8.301 - 28), which name thirty-seven combatants in total (of whom ‘almost a third’ are allotted additional identifying information),¹²⁴ these warriors are presented in such a way as to combine parataxis, which feature is central to Homeric style,¹²⁵ with the Virgilian preference for variation over formula. This choice minimises the presentation of epic pedigree and neglects to inform us of each hero’s provenance, genealogy, and special armaments. While each of these does occur in the catalogue, it does so singly and without any degree of thoroughness. It should be noted that these three features are not, in

¹²³ W C Stephens ‘Descent to the Underworld in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*’ in *The Classical Journal*, Vol 53, 1958, p. 180.

¹²⁴ A M Keith, ‘Epic Masculinity in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*’ in P Hardie, A Barchiesi, *et al.* (eds) *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*, The Cambridge Philological Society, Cambridge, 1999, p. 224.

¹²⁵ P Toohey, *Reading Epic*, Routledge, London, 1992, p. 14.

fact, always mandatory,¹²⁶ and that in paring them down, Ovid is continuing and improving upon the artistic choices of his predecessors.¹²⁷ Ovid's only concession to detail in this introductory catalogue is the somewhat lengthier note attached to Atalanta, a decision which may very well be a nod to the inclusion as 'exquisite coda' of Virgil's Camilla,¹²⁸ and, ultimately, to Virgil's nearest potential source for this figure, Herodotus' Artemisia of Halicarnassus.¹²⁹ Most significantly of all, however, Ovid's description of her sets up Meleager's crucial response.

The first eight lines - effectively the first half - of the catalogue, are without a finite verb (contrast *init* as the second word of Vergil's catalogue at *Aen.*7.647), which gives the list a somewhat abrupt character. It contains minimal variation save where chiasmus is used to underscore the presence of twins, and is articulated primarily by co-ordinating conjunctions such as *et* and the enclitic - *que*. Variation is achieved at the midway point by the use of the double negative, *nec Telamon aberat*, 8.309. There is no attempt to apply any degree of chronology, as ordinal catalogic terms are entirely lacking, but six uses of *et* do occur in the space of six lines (8.303 - 308), thrice in identical line-initial position, and *cum* is used at 8.310 and 8.315 as a means of appending further participants to one already named. The closest approach made to order is the sorting of the heroes more or less by rank, as it were. The dactylic patronymic *Tyndaridae* (8.301) kicks it off in a grand fashion that borrows heavily from *Fasti* 5.700,¹³⁰ with the Dioscouri, equipped with chiasmus and anaphora, leading the pack in particularly portentous fashion. Jason, author of the first such *lecta manus*

¹²⁶ Hollis, 1970, p. 74.

¹²⁷ Horsfall, 1979, p. 322.

¹²⁸ Horsfall, 1979, p. 322.

¹²⁹ W B Boyd, 'Virgil's Camilla and the Traditions of Catalogue and Ecphrasis (*Aeneid* 7.803-17)' in *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 113, 1992, p. 214.

¹³⁰ F Bömer, *Metamorphosen: Kommentar Buch VIII - IX*, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg, 1977, p. 110.

(8.300) is accorded special place, and Theseus and Pirithous follow close behind at 8.303 due to their fame. The bulk of the rest of the catalogue is inhabited by known but moderately less famous heroes, until Atalanta provides the coda at 8.317 - 23.

The lack of variation, and the careful arrangement that locates a slew of names moderately recognisable to an ancient audience (punctuated every so often by tantalising references to future glory) at the very heart of the catalogue, would in fact suggest a deliberately cumulative effect, and provides a strong example of Ovid's ability to exaggerate by means of miniaturisation. In foregoing any attempt at overt ordinal organisation by compressing information into so small a space and outlining it with the insistence of multiple coordinating conjunctions, and particularly by using *cum* to stress the idea of multiple participants, he creates the illusion of having swelled his mythological ranks, thereby capitalising on his limited space to great effect.

The language of the catalogue remains careful and deliberate, and, furthermore, displays multiple devices that are philologically consistent with the typical Latin methods of adapting Greek epic language. Immediately noticeable is the phrase *ratis molitor Iason*, which has the effect of a periphrastic epithetic construction not unlike Virgil's favoured phrase *equum domitor* (a Latin paraphrase of the Homeric ἰππόδαμος, used of Castor himself at *Il.*3.237) which, as has been examined above, appears several times in catalogue in Book 7 of the *Aeneid*.¹³¹ The catalogue sets the tone in this regard for a particular fragment of phraseology which will reoccur throughout the progression of the Boar. There is notably frequent use of an agent noun with a genitive restrictor, which would seem to be the simplest natural Latin alternative to the Greek compound epithet, maximising as it does efficiency of metre while best expressing the grammatical function of an exocentric compound. Most significant is the

¹³¹ 7.189, 7.651, 7.691, making it a rare instance of verbatim Virgilian repetition, significant in so markedly oral a context.

recurring use of *auctor* as the headword of a periphrastic epithet, nearly always of Meleager (the sole exception being Jason himself at 8.349, where he is *auctor teli*), almost in the fashion of the sort of stock Homeric epithet attached with identifying force to one specific personage - he is *vulneris auctor* at 8.418, *muneris auctor* at 8.430, and *auctor necis* 8.449. This progression quite ably encapsulates the shifting definition of his role in the battle, but also establishes his heroic identity inasmuch as it exists within the very specific context of this trilogy in miniature: he is the *auctor* of all that will transpire to bring the saga to its tragic climax.

Such single-word epithets as *velox* (8.305), *ferox* (8.306), *impiger* (8.311), and *sagax* (8.316) appear in abundance, in addition to such alternate periphrastic epithets as *iaculo insignis* (8.306) and *cursu invictus* (8.311), each of which refer to specific heroic attributes, while *magni creator Achilli* (8.309) is sufficient in construction to qualify as a periphrastic epithet. The primary achievement of this small catalogue, however, is that it assembles swiftly and effortlessly all the necessary epic players: the twin warriors (here the Dioscouri themselves), the close friendship enshrined in the warrior-bond of Theseus and Pirithous' *felix Concordia* (8.303), Nestor the mandatory greybeard, and even Atalanta herself as the token warrior queen. It is significant that, rather than introduce them through more typically expansive catalogic fashion, with lavish attention paid to their armaments and strict record made of their origin and genealogy, Ovid identifies these participants by reference to their most famous exploits within the existing canon of heroic deeds despite the fact that, in many cases, they have not yet performed them. This would immediately suggest a highly allusive and metaliterary approach. This is a catalogue not in the archaic Homeric sense, of heroes whose names will most assuredly be preserved due to the deeds about to be expanded upon within the text proper, but rather of existing literary heroes whose adventures are not only

thoroughly chronicled elsewhere, but also, in many cases, not yet performed, thus rendering their heroic status wholly dependent on the reader's literary knowledge.

This deliberate exploitation of the audience's response to an allusive text is detectable throughout both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Aeneid*. Reworkings of ancient literature depend both upon the erudite audience's critical approval of a clever reference well-executed, and upon the pleasure of recognition experienced by the more casual reader when stumbling across a familiar figure. Unlike the Wedding Brawl, in which a handful of well-known personages are for the most part overwhelmed by hosts of little-known participants, here Meleager's *lecta manus iuvenum* is comprised of well-known heroes, and Ovid does not hesitate over the course of the battle to make continual and marked reference to the careers on which his illustrious band will eventually embark. Nestor's cunning, already very much a fixture of his personality and hence a heroic marker even *citra Troiana...tempora* (8.365 - 66), is showcased by his comedic innovation on the battlefield. He uses his spear not to engage in heroic activity, but to vault himself out of the path of danger and into a nearby tree, a feat which is an example of burlesque-inspired slapstick humour, evoking particularly the acrobatic tumbling of street-plays and comedy. Caeneus, significantly, is *iam non femina* (8.305), thus not only making reference to a heroic background with which the audience is expected to be familiar, but establishing the first of a series of significant intratextual links on which Nestor himself will rely in his own epic contribution in Book 12.

Even when entering the battle proper, Castor and Pollux will be marked out as *gemini nondum caelestia sidera fratres* (8.372), and the significance of their being twins, their primary heroic marker, reinforced by the insistent triple anaphora of *ambo* at 8.373 - 4. That the chronology itself is broadly inconsistent is unimportant. The immediate identification of well-known heroes trumps any need for the imposition of a strict order on Ovid's very loose mythological corpus, since it provides the reader with the special pleasure of recognition.

Even so, the conscientious effort made to identify particularly notable personages with respect to the chronology of the mythical narratives suggests that there is some significant appeal to the reader in the relocation of mythological heroes outside of their best-known endeavours. The Boar-Hunt is treated as a typical *parergon*, and as such is entitled, and indeed expected, to provide a degree of comedic entertainment, and to inject both levity and innovation into otherwise tired motifs. As we are expected to recognise these characters, and to enjoy recognising them outside of their standard terrain, so it is acceptable to transplant their typical hero behaviour into a somewhat altered heroic paradigm, and to frame their efforts in similarly transplanted and allusive language. Their exploits are humorous as a result of their belonging, just as their language does, to an alternate context.

While the Wedding Brawl made much of the feat of heroic strength that is Perseus' single-handed victory against a host, in the Boar Hunt, a large company must face off against a single enemy, and one which is described with such Homeric imagery that it effectively takes on the role of a single Homeric *promachos*, which will stand against the Company's concerted efforts. The boar's initial description bears close resemblance to other prodigious apparitions. Both the Serpent that sets upon Cadmus and his men at *Met.*3.26 - 94 and the Calydonian Boar display the flashing eyes, pestilential effect on their immediate environment, bristling crests, and vicious teeth. One may easily compare *sanguine et igne micant oculi*, 8.284, and *emicat ex oculis. . . flamma*, 8.356, to *igne micant oculi* at 3.33, while bearing in mind the perceived ability of a violent or predatory animal's eyes to strike an aggressive and almost paralytic fear into its prey or opponent, prevalent throughout antiquity and used in particular in Homeric simile 'to enhance the understanding of audiences about the heroic dimensions of characters' extraordinary actions.'¹³² Both apparitions are inherently

¹³² S H Lonsdale 'If Looks Could Kill: *παπταίνω* and the Interpenetration of Imagery and Narrative in Homer' in *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 84, 1989, p. 333.

pestilential, equipped in some way with the ability to raze their surroundings. Where the Serpent is understandably venomous, the Boar is not only flecked with poisonous foam in keeping with imagery of rabidity, but also, having been visited upon Calydon as a divine punishment, breathes fire and lightning in order to destroy crops. The imagery of *spirat quoque pectore flamma* (8.356) is similarly Homeric, at least in its reliance on metaphor - Iliadic heroes may breathe wrath in the formulaic μένεα πνείοντες (*Il.*2.536, *Il.*3.9, etc.). This in keeping with the portrayal of the boar itself, monstrous as it may be, as a single Homeric *promachos*, able to fight against a multitude of epic heroes. It enters the peaceful pastoral scene¹³³ *medios violentus in hostes* (8.338) and merits the description *ut excussis elisi nubibus ignes* (8.339) (the comparison with *ut* in a shortform simile to a natural phenomenon is highly Homeric) thus immediately characterising it as a participant in battle, where before the heroes' involvement has been strictly that of hunters setting snares - some carry nets, others lead dogs (8.331-32), and the early part of their exploit is concerned primarily with tracking (*pressa sequuntur / signa pedum*, 8.331 - 32). From the moment of the Boar's attack, however, they forego their nets and their hunting dogs and make the change to *tela* and, significantly, to the high-register *lato ferro* (8.342). The creature charges the dogs (*ruit*, 8.343), and thus dispatches them summarily so as to remove all the trappings of a hunt.

Despite the prevailing Homeric atmosphere, elements of Roman military imagery do intrude. The use of a typically Homeric long-form simile, deployed throughout Latin epic in only the most formal of contexts and always with heavy overtones of grandeur, in conjunction with the more recent Roman military imagery of siege engines at 8.357, can surely only be deliberately jarring. While the use of specifically Roman activities in simile is at least as old

¹³³ cf. ἡὔτ' ὀμίχλη, *Il.*1.359, ὥς τ' ἠλέκτωρ, *Il.* 6.513, ἡὔτε καπνός, *Il.* 23.100, etc.

as Ennius¹³⁴ (and the very efficiently expressive and often highly poignant conflation through simile of the mundane imagery of daily life with the idealised glory of the epic battlefield is wholly Homeric), here the comparison forces the reader to equate the idealised romance of mythological epic with a far more familiar and unromantically Roman setting, thereby highlighting the contrast between the two.

Other comparisons to siege warfare in Ovid do most certainly exist, mostly notably in Book 11 of the *Metamorphoses*, where the Virgilian language and Homeric imagery used to describe a storm provide an epic framework for what is, at heart, the heavily elegiac love story of Ceyx and Alcyone (*Met.*11.474 - 572). A short-form simile at 11.508 - 09 compares the sounds produced by the wave-battered ship to the ringing of a battle-worn citadel, *laceras...arces* (11.509) when it is struck by either the battering-ram (*aries*) or the catapult (*ballista*), and from there serves as the springboard for a secondary long-form simile at 11.510 - 11, which, in comparing the waves to lions, is typically and indulgently Homeric. The abundance of simile and the clamorous superfluity of metaphorical images serve well to underscore the tumult of the storm, and in fact offers a parallel to the Homeric practice of supplying alternate options at the introduction of a simile. A short while later, however, the multiple failures and re-attempts of the waves to overwhelm the ship itself are compared in an elaborate and highly original long-form simile to a soldier who succeeds at last in scaling an enemy wall (*cum saepe adsiluit. . . murum tamen occupat*, 11.526-28). The language used throughout is not that of Homeric epic but of the Roman war-narrative - the specific use of *miles* (11.525), *moenibus* (11.526), *ruit impetus* (11.530),¹³⁵ *oppugnare* (11.531), and *captae* (11.532) all constitute instalments in the language of everyday military reports. The sheer

¹³⁴ Hollis, 1970, p. 80.

¹³⁵ The imagery of *ruit impetus undae* is potentially influenced by Virgil's imagining of a strictly heavenly rainstorm as opposing armies charging each other at *Georgics* 1.322 - 24.

vividness of this simile, one among a profusion of complex images, and the thorough precision of its Roman military language, contributes primarily to the tremendous detail with which each progressive stage of the storm is described, and is certainly also in keeping with the neoteric conceit of *militia amoris*, particularly with reference to the typically erotic image of the ship.

In Book 8, however, it is precisely the clash of approaches to warfare that makes the comparison of the Boar to a catapult so well-placed, underscoring as it does the Boar's symbolic function within the epic as an enemy host and contributing to the epic structure of the section while simultaneously reminding the reader that it is not a true epic. Instead, having been repackaged for an appreciative Roman audience capable of recognising all its players by name alone, its nature is fundamentally and deliberately anachronistic. At 8.357, the language is highly militaristic for the space of but one line, with *plenas milite turres* in particular serving as a marker of typically Roman military imagery, but the immediate provision of *vulnificus sus* (8.359) for the subject of the verb *fertur* (8.360) undoes this quite deliberately, juxtaposing epic idealism with military realities. Virgil uses the compound epithet *vulnificus* at *Aen.*8.446 of the substantive *chalybs*, itself almost a kenning, in the highly poetic context of the description of Vulcan's forge. In Ovid, the adjective is followed soon after by *letiferos* (8.362), applied to the deathblow (*ictus*) levelled by the Boar against a luckless Enaesimus. That the epic phrase is applied to the deliberate killing blow of a wild animal is notable, and suggests again that the Boar is intended to function as a single warrior, against whom other warriors must compete in order to obtain *laus*. At 8.391, *bipennifer* Ancaeus attacks the Boar, but even in the act of doing so is gutted with its *geminos dentes* (8.400). The Boar matches a heroic weapon, a two-headed axe alluded to using an epic compound, with a similarly doubled but natural weapon of its own, again suggesting that it functions as a *promachos*, a

single warrior of equal or greater might equipped with its own armaments.¹³⁶ It is intrinsically the elevation of a wild animal to the status of a hero, that ultimately gives cause for humour. As the heroes must lower themselves somewhat by using their talents in the unusual application of hunting while retaining all their heroic pomp, so their target itself rises to match their grandeur by assuming the language of an epic hero.

Even the image of the Boar defeated is ultimately one of a man who, fallen in battle, has his head pressed beneath his victor's foot (*pede inposito caput. . . pressit*, 8.425), which image was adopted by the elegiac poets.¹³⁷ Save for the *caput* in question here being *exitiabile* rather than *miserum*, the image is otherwise very much what we might expect from a spurned lover in Catullus or Propertius. Certainly this image ushers in the tragic result of Meleager's elegiac lapse, and confirms the reader's growing suspicions that this narrative, epic in form and language, is becoming nonetheless something of a love-story, and one that comes at the cost of its central character's heroic virility. What initially appears to be the party's general incompetence is, in fact, integral to Atalanta's success, and also serves to structure the pace of battle by transferring the Homeric function of individual failure to the band as a whole. The concept of a heroic failure or mistake is most certainly present throughout Homer. Antiphos' attempt on Aias, for example, misses its target (τοῦ μὲν ἄμαρθ', *Il.*4.491), but strikes Leukos instead, thus prompting Odysseus' vengeance; Aias and Hector's spears do not fly askew but still fail in piercing each other's shields (*Il.*7.244 - 54). Such failures would seem to function primarily as a narrative device designed to heighten tension and delay the outcome of a battle. They may also be framed as attempts or reiterative exertions designed to impress upon the audience the sheer magnitude of the heroic task attempted, or else, when a weapon misses its

¹³⁶ Keith, 1999, p. 224.

¹³⁷ As at Propertius 1.1.4.

mark but takes an inadvertent target unawares, illustrate the uncertain and turbulent nature of battle.

In Ovid, however, such heroic misadventures would seem to constitute the construction of an extended sequence whose primary focus is on failure. They are not elements of a technique by which a build-up of suspense will serve to highlight the eventual success, but rather are themselves the action. The humour in this segment is dependent on the gravity of the personages in play and on the heroes' well-known pedigrees. The image of Nestor pole-vaulting into a tree would not be nearly so effective were it not juxtaposed ludicrously with the reader's appreciation of his Homeric characterisation as an old man incapable of such a feat and dignified moreover.¹³⁸ Even the inclusion of lesser-known heroes with so illustrious a band does deceptively supply them with an assumed degree of competence which is soon subverted. Since these failures are assiduous and extreme, the conative aspect of Homeric failure is transferred from one hero to the band as a whole, which in turn contributes to the interpretation of the scene as a take on the typical structure of a battle between two Homeric *promachoi*. However, they serve also to frustrate the party, so that, with tensions running high, when insult is offered, it has tragic consequences.

Ovid's inclusion of the precise moment (8.324 - 28) at which Meleager sees Atalanta and becomes inflamed with love for her is not only a pleasing reference that provides for the reader a special insight into the beginning of an infamous mythological love-match, but also a crucial plot-point. This sets up the quarrel between Meleager and his uncles, Plexippus and Toxeus, that will allow Ovid to contrive the death of Meleager through the actions of his mother Althaea. Althaea then embarks upon a tragic introspective monologue. Significantly, Meleager's infatuation depends on the description of Atalanta in the catalogue (8.317 - 323). The brevity of Ovid's description of feminine beauty may indeed have its precedent in

¹³⁸ O D Watkins 'Ovid, "*Metamorphoses*", 8, 365-8' in *Latomus* 42, 1983, p.137

Virgil's description of Camilla at 7.803 - 17, but in this instance, the narrator's gaze is transferred not to a crowd of stunned onlookers (*illam omnis iuventus / turbaque miratur matrum*, *Aen.*7.812 - 13) but to Meleager alone (*hanc pariter vidit pariter. . .optavit*, *Met.*8.324 - 25), thereby rendering it erotic.¹³⁹ The specific styling of Atalanta's hair as *simplex nodum collectus in unum* (*Met.*8.319) suggests a specifically neoteric ideal when contrasted with Camilla's (*fibula crinem auro internectat*, 8.815).

Furthermore, the erotic ambiguity of a dual-gendered appearance (*virgineam in puero puerilem in virgine possis*, which here displays a deliberately contrastive structure to enhance the semantics of the relative clause) has appeared before in Ovid in his description of a young Dionysus (*virginea puerum ducit per litora forma*, *Met.*3.605) and this mingling of aspects of the masculine and the feminine, at first innocuous, is in fact indicative of the gendered havoc her presence will soon wreak. Meleager's passion is itself inappropriately feminine. His immediate response is to become inflamed with passion (*flammas. . . latentes hausit*, comparable to the desire already felt in Book 8 by Scylla (*flammasque meas*, 8.53), the intrusion of whose gaze via an erotic variant on Homeric *teichoscopia* at 8.17 - 41 proves to be unstable element in a narrative that ought to have been propelled by the martial designs of heroes, and whose momentary success concludes in a tragic dilemma). Meleager eventually becomes *captus amore*, an elegiac motif closely associated with the conceit of *militia amoris*, which takes as its crux the adaption of the imagery of martial conquest, and, by association, masculine heroic prowess, to the erotic. Here, however, the reverse adaptation is about to unfold. The epic, primarily concerned with warfare, will suffer from the intrusion of erotic language.

¹³⁹ Keith, 1999, p. 225.

It is Atalanta who, following the band's many frustrated efforts, finally lands the first blow on the Boar at 8.382, prompting Meleager to make rather too much of her achievement by daring to describe it as *meritum. . . virtutis honorem* (8.387). The use of *virtus* is an instance of etymological wordplay and certainly highly incongruous with regard to heroic ideology; as such it might further be said to constitute an example of genderplay. The subsequent use of *erubere*, typically a virginal or youthful action with *vir* as its subject is thus a corresponding instance of gender inversion. With *iuvenes*, its application might have been permissible, but here in the thick of battle, the company is comprised no longer of bashful and aesthetically appealing youths, but rather of heroes shamed into womanly behaviour by a woman who has exhibited the masculine quality of *virtus*. The scornful comparison of one's enemy to a woman is a noted Homeric device. Certainly it will happen in Book 12 to Caeneus, again in a surprisingly literal context (12.470 - 74). Ancaeus is deeply unimpressed and takes it upon himself to go one better, but as in the Wedding Brawl, the meets with swift and brutal come-uppance. His interjection is itself highly bombastic, and phallic overtones are most certainly present in *tela virilia praestent*. The line that concludes his outcry (8.395) is similarly overwrought, featuring alternating alliteration of *t* and *m* as well as hyperbaton. The close of Ancaeus' challenge is denoted by the epic formula of *talia* followed by a speech-indicating term, here the polysyllabic and highly ornate *memoraverat*, and his words are characterised as overly grandiose by the use of hypallage to describe Ancaeus' speech *magniloquo. . . ore* (8.396). That his boastfulness is met with excessive force and punished by a ludicrously gory death serves well to underscore the threat of mortality in the face of pretended glory.

In landing the first blow, Atalanta has attained for herself, at least in Meleager's eyes, the honour of having drawn first blood, thereby allowing her to share in the *spolium iuris* (8.426) that he has earned through his own heroic prowess. This induces, on Segal's reading,

‘humorous incongruity between the gift and its function.’¹⁴⁰ It is the image of a monstrous and bloodied kill presented as a love-gift, together with the attempt to award it to Atalanta in recognition of her contribution to the hunt, that result in the intrusion of inappropriate generic overtones. In response to this, and quite rightly within the constraints of an epic narrative, Meleager’s relatives protest, sparking his rage and resulting in their murder. The motif of heroes quarrelling over the spoils of war is itself Homeric, and as such only to be expected in a passage that has so far adhered quite loyally to the progression of epic narrative, if not quite to its sense of grandeur. Here again, an epic motif is diminished by its association with a parasitic genre, in this case the elegiac. It is, ultimately, the intrusion of genre which yields the clash. The audience is informed, at the conclusion of the catalogue and the beginning of the Hunt, that neither *tempus* nor *pudor* will permit Meleager’s gaze to linger on Atalanta (8.327), and that his passion must be set aside. The *opus* that is the Hunt, and the epic development of a *magni certaminis* (8.328) must take precedence over his elegiac sufferings. Failure to adhere to these generic constraints invites disaster, impairs his judgement, and reveals his collaboration in the absorption of the intended scope of epic language into the elegiac.

As Segal notes, his uncles stand as ‘conservative literary critics’ who decry the mingling of genres: ‘their reproach to Atalanta is the voice of the male-centric epic tradition protesting the intrusion of Alexandrian eroticism.’¹⁴¹ However, it is not simply the presence of a love-motif that renders the narrative inappropriately varied, but rather of the very specific sort of genderplay that is inextricably associated with the elegiac genre, and that is the direct result of yielding to undue passion for a woman. This gender-play is reflected on a lexical level. As noted above, *auctor* is used throughout to form periphrastic epithets tied to Meleager’s

¹⁴⁰ Segal, 1999, p. 313.

¹⁴¹ Segal, 1999, p. 313.

personage, and is used again at 8. 435 - 36 in the phrase *captus amore auctor*, spoken in a scathing direct address by the very uncles who disapprove of Atalanta's involvement. Though not here used as an epic epithetic phrase, its establishment as integral to Meleager's heroic identity in the context of his overarching story is sufficient to bring out the contrast with the elegiac image of *captus amore*, rendering the juxtaposition perhaps the best textual representation thus far of the fusion of epic with elegiac. Not only has Meleager been defeated in what stands by analogy here for battle, thus rendering him *captus* in the military sense, he has also become that most wretched of figurative prisoners, the elegiac lover, and is as such a comprehensively beaten man.

In ceding the trophy that he has attained through the application of his heroic skill to Atalanta, Meleager behaves not like an epic hero, who struggles to gain *spolium* and *gloria* and to defend his heroic and highly masculine right to their retention. Like the suffering elegiac subject, stripped of his masculinity through the act of having surrendered his agency, and with even his hero's hunting trophy having taken on some of the language of the elegiac, Meleager elevates the feminine object of his desires to the position of conqueror, an elegiac *domina saeva* who uses the language of battle to defeat, emasculate, and enslave. Atalanta has her place in the ranks of heroes, but Meleager's uncontrolled and inappropriate elegiac response does not, and it is his self-feminisation that results in his ruin. Ovid provides us with a deliberate and highly self-aware example of the dangers that the intrusion into epic of the elegiac, and of all other such flightier genres, can herald, thus capitalising on an oft-criticised technique. He uses it only to drive his narrative, but also to have it take on the aspects of yet another genre. Atalanta's very specific ability to function equally within the masculine paradigm of a hunt by virtue of her heroic skill and within the feminine paradigm of instilling lust due to her physical beauty, together with Meleager's reinforcement of her inappropriate

dual function via his own elegiac aspirations, all result in the disruption of the expected outcome of an epic narrative.

Marked from the outside as an instalment not to be taken particularly seriously - or, rather, to be enjoyed wholeheartedly as an amusing and witty take on traditional epic imagery, characterised by the inherently humorous portrayal of a wild animal as a heroic opponent - the Boar Hunt is well-suited to function as a deconstructive consideration of heroic masculinity. The insertion of a love-narrative into epic already marked as deeply humorous and ultimately allusive by the slapstick antics of its participants does not derail its purpose - instead, not only does it allow for a humorous examination of the seminal Roman quality *virtus*, but also results in a clever fusion of genres and, significantly, the plot-relevant justification of the use of epic.

The Centauromachy

***Metamorphoses* 12.210 - 535**

The figure of the Homeric *oidos* served, so far as can be discerned, a dual purpose - not only to supply and interpret material both entertaining and educational, but also to serve as an eye-witness to the ancient past, which special status was conferred upon him by his Muse. In the production of epic, therefore, 'the Greek singer had also to arm himself with special language,'¹⁴² and it is this special language, represented by a Latin analogue, of which Ovid's version of Nestor makes liberal use throughout his own foray into epic performance, the Centauromachy (*Met.*12.210–535). Book 12 marks the beginning of Ovid's treatment of subject matter drawn from the epic tradition, which continues into Book 13 with the expansion into the so-called 'Little Aeneid'. The Centauromachy serves as the only true Homeric battle offered in Book 12, and, as is so often the case with Ovid, it is not at all the

¹⁴² J B Hainsworth, *The Idea of Epic*, The University of California Press, Oxford, 1991, p.20.

battle a reader might have reasonable grounds to anticipate. Instead of supplying a rewritten and entirely expected clash between the Greeks and the Trojans, focus is given instead to a favourite subject of Hellenic art, the Centauromachy,¹⁴³ which, due to its unique framing and content, establishes Nestor as an *aoidos* in his own right,¹⁴⁴ and thereby directly invites comparison with its Homeric model.

As is often the case with Ovid, earlier commentators of the 20th century have tended to view it as violent parody undeserving of further examination. Otis describes the battle as ‘tedious and otiose, although grudgingly admitting that it serves some structural purpose in setting the tone for the epic passages to follow,¹⁴⁵ while Coleman, characterising the Centauromachy as a famously brutal incidence of ‘senseless slaughter’, suggests that Ovid’s intent is ‘[to pour] scorn upon the whole epic tradition of the aggrandizement of war.’¹⁴⁶ However, serving as it does as a highly allusive excursus into Homeric battle narrative, the Centauromachy is in fact contextually validated both by its pedagogical function and by its dependence upon *fama*, and, as such, may be expected to comment on and define the nature of traditional heroic identity. The result is a fascinating interplay of heroic masculinity with unheroic barbarism which explores the Centaurs’ bestial nature, and which ultimately uses a hero of questionable masculinity as a foil, while simultaneously holding the entire establishment of epic up for humorous examination through the interrogation of the very construct of κλέος and its less idealised manifestations.

¹⁴³ F B Tarbell, ‘Centauromachy and Amazonomachy in Greek Art: The Reasons for Their Popularity’ in *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 24, 1920, p. 226.

¹⁴⁴ N Zumwalt, ‘Fama Subversa: Theme and Structure in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 12’ in *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*, Vol 10, 1977, p. 214.

¹⁴⁵ B Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1966, p 283.

¹⁴⁶ R Coleman, ‘Structure and Intent in the *Metamorphoses*’ in *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 21, 1971, p. 474.

Book 12 is centrally concerned with various manifestations of *fama* - not the straightforward heroic κλέος of epic, but Ovid's own gently parodic distillation thereof. The early ephrasis of the House of Rumour is to a degree programmatic of the concerns of heroic reputation and report that will inform subsequent instalments, and upon which epic, the genre to which Ovid's narrative will shortly begin to switch, is founded.¹⁴⁷ Following Achilles' encounter with Cygnus (12.64 - 145), both the Greeks and the Trojans enjoy a few days' respite, and, come a sacred day (*fasta dies*, 12.150), sacrifices are made in thanks. It is during the festivities that Nestor, anxious and, it is easy to imagine, somewhat piqued due to Achilles' youthful exploits and unheeding pride, takes it upon himself to regale the heroes with a tale that, not unreasonably for its context, takes the form of an epic poem told both as entertainment and in order to educate his young listeners. Nestor's intent in commemorating the heroic κλέος generated by the Centauromachy depends centrally upon the conveyance of *fama* to his audience after the fashion of an epic narrator.

His storytelling technique, however, will ultimately be found wanting by its audience. At 12.536 - 41, Tlepolemos criticises the omission of the deeds of his father, Heracles. Despite having admitted by way of poetic apology the possibility that his memory may be wanting, Nestor is affronted at this critique, and decries Heracles' actions as wicked and unpleasant to recall (12.542 - 44). When placed under serious contextual scrutiny, therefore, the narrative is lacking in its capacity for accurate commemoration due to a simple difference of opinion, and therefore fails to achieve the traditional aim of epic, demonstrating that Nestor's take on the Centauromachy exhibits 'traits intrinsic to *fama*'s creative and distorting power.'¹⁴⁸ Tarrant notes that in Ovid the removal of certain details from an existing

¹⁴⁷ Zumwalt, p. 212

¹⁴⁸ Ziogas I, *Ovid and Hesiod: The Metamorphosis of the Catalogue of Women*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013, p.207.

mythological canon is ‘akin to demonstrating in an especially pointed way the narrator’s control over the story’ and that when such small details are omitted by a narrator within the text, their loss characterises ‘one of many ways in which the reader of the *Metamorphoses* is made aware of narration as the production of conscious art.’¹⁴⁹ Rather than existing solely to undermine the veracity of Nestor’s remembered tale, the Tlepolemos coda serves as a final comment on the fickleness of fame as a whole, gently critiquing the establishment of heroic commemoration and allowing for the acknowledgement of contemporary ethical appraisals of Hellenistic heroism, while demonstrating that even epic cannot guarantee the creation of uncritical κλέος due to the personal reservations of individual narrators, and hence to the vagaries of *fama*.

The conceit that the personal perspective of narrator can influence a commemorative narrative, and that first-hand knowledge is therefore crucial to the creation of an accurate report, would seem to function as a counter-theme. Just as the young Tlepolemos has only heard of Heracles’ deeds (*certe mihi saepe referre*, 12.540), so the House of Rumour depends for its news upon *parvae murmura vocis* (12.49). Nestor’s narrative, however, and his long-held opinions on Heracles, are influenced by autopsy. Certainly the significance of autopsy to the account of the Centauromachy is introduced almost immediately, as it is the long-lived Nestor and no other who can serve as *aidos*. He stresses that he himself was witness to Caeneus’ miraculous invulnerability with *vidi* (12.172), which claim recurs insistently throughout (*vidi ego*, 12.327, *ante oculos stat et ille meos*, 12.429). Mader identifies these first-person interpolations, as being suggestive of an ‘aesthetic of theatricality’, and further likens the listening host of warriors to ‘spectators at the amphitheatre.’¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁹ Tarrant R, ‘Roads Not Taken: Untold Stories in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*’, *Materiali e discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici*, No. 54, 2005, p. 72.

¹⁵⁰ Mader G, ‘The Be(a)st of the Achaeans: Turning Tables / Overturning Tables in Ovid’s Centauromachy (Metamorphoses 12.210–535), *Arethusa* 46, 2013, p. 87.

However, Nestor's own presence in the battle not only equips him to recount it, but also establishes him as a personage of heroic myth, and hence as a living link between heroic generations capable of reminding his younger companions that their prowess is not unique, and that they would do well to remember the marvels of earlier times - Cygnus is an anomaly only among members of their generation (*vestro fuit unicus aevo* 12.169). Ovid's own audience has previously seen Nestor participate in the Boar Hunt. Just as that was fundamentally a forward-looking narrative that relied on its readers' knowledge of its heroes' future exploits, so this is a retrospective account, the success of which depends as much on its ancient listeners' appreciation for the heroes of their personal past as it does upon a contemporary audience's ability to appreciate the inherent intertextual allusivity of metadiegesis, together with the complex and often counter-intuitive flow of time that prevails throughout the *Metamorphoses*.

In particular, Nestor's first-person interjections - such as his dependence on *vidi* - serve as a relocation of typical features of Homeric narrative into the mouth of a Homeric hero, which, working in conjunction with the vivifying capabilities of autopsy, serves to underscore Nestor's function as a Homeric *aoidos*. In Book 2 of the *Aeneid*, the function of *vidi* was observed to establish Aeneas as a participant rather than as a witness. Working from a rather stricter perspective than either Ovid's Nestor or even the bulk of Homer's narrators, and rather than uniformly adopting the panoramic and quasi-divine viewpoint of epic narration, Aeneas was equipped with the unfettered ability to perceive and hence to relay only the most significant of events of the sack. During the bulk of his narration of the sack, his perspective was dependant on his physical position, and is fairly narrowly focused on the progression of the fighting that occurs in the streets themselves. For broader descriptions, he must rely either on the frantic reports of others, or else he must physically alter his position by climbing onto the rooftop of his house in order to engage in panoramic *teichoscopia*.

Nestor, interjections of formulaic prefatory dissimulation and appeals for forgiveness should his memory fail him notwithstanding, is capable of recounting multiple episodes of *androktasia*, and ones to which only a loose sense of chronology may be applied. The revenge-driven turn-taking structure of individual episodes implies a chain of causation that affects only the participants in each *androktasion*. The effect of so many loosely-connected spats is the illusion of their occurring contemporaneously, independent of a mandatory chronological narrative until the events of the climax. Even the obligatory *recusatio* technique is approached quite differently by each narrator. It is telling that where Nestor uses old age and forgetfulness as the grounds for his prefatory apology, Aeneas appeals instead to grief.

At first consideration, Nestor might therefore be imagined to serve almost as a comic Aeneas, providing a narration for battle so vivid that it effectively exhausts the resources of epic long before Ovid's reworking of Homeric canon can begin. His overtly pedagogic motives are certainly in keeping with the memorialising function of epic, but, when directed at a hero whose own exploits would more normally serve as pedagogic material, are immediately marked out as allusive and self-examining. Nestor's attempt to locate his own achievements on par with those of his heroic peers is almost certainly comic to some extent, but is also indicative of his function within both battle and narrative. He has no need of a muse as intercessory, since he has performed deeds of mythical status that corroborate his heroic identity, and he has participated in the events that form his subject matter, thus establishing him as a narrator equipped with the autopsy required to perform epic.

As the link between past and present, between Book 8 and Book 12, and between contrasting interpretations of epic, Nestor is inherently equipped with the special eye-witness status ordinarily granted to a Homeric narrator by his Muse. From the outset, therefore, we are given to understand that the Centauromachy must necessarily consist of a tremendously self-aware and overtly pedagogic appraisal of the nature of heroic identity, and of the varying

reliability of the channels by which heroism may be communicated to subsequent generations. Comparisons with Book 2 of the *Aeneid* may therefore be justified by a number of points of contact. The Centauromachy, framed as a flashback and deploying a character with first-hand knowledge of the event as its *oidos*, serves as an introductory and programmatic examination of epic themes soon to be expounded upon. Since the Centauromachy presages the ‘Little Iliad’ and ‘Little Aeneid’ of Books 13 and 14 respectively, Nestor’s epic retelling does in some way facilitate the transition to Homeric narrative, and signals to the reader the onset of weightier epic topics that are, conversely, recounted with distinctly un-epic brevity, and feature little in the way of epic style, at least when compared to Nestor’s lengthy and deliberately overwrought Homeric endeavour.

The fact that this retelling is addressed to Homeric heroes, overtly with pedagogic and patronising intent that relies in large part for its effectiveness on the humorous tension of intergenerational interaction, does create the opportunity for a significant degree of intertextual allusivity. As has been observed in Tlepolemos’ interjections and Achilles’ need for edification, audience engagement and audience response to epic are both critical factors in the narrative’s appraisal even on a textual level. Aware of the potential for harsh criticism from his own highly literate audience, and of the extensive continuum to which he is in the process of contributing, Ovid chooses to have his proxy speaker hold the narrative up for examination to the very characters whom epic would ordinarily concern. Both the content of the Centauromachy within the text, and its execution on a metatextual level, are therefore intimately bound up in questions of inheritance. Just as Aeneas is heir to tales concerning the bold deeds of his fathers’ generation, and to the moral lessons concerning heroism that Nestor claims they can impart, so Ovid and other later writers of epic are heir to Homeric style. Also of note, however, will be the Centaurs’ unconventional approach to weaponry. Just as Book 2 of the *Aeneid* contributed a morbid deconstruction of heroic identity by having its central

protagonists engage in morally dubious acts concerning *arma*, so here the liminal nature of the Centaurs' claim to heroism and their semi-human barbarism are expressed through their acts of impiety and their improvised, uncivilised weaponry.

The Centauromachy is further comparable to the Wedding Brawl of Book 5 in that both are concerned with the development of an epic battle that happens to unfold in a contained area during a wedding, and that both feature elements of impiety, for the Centauromachy not only exaggerates the essential epic motifs so as to present them in a vastly overblown light, but also introduces a series of far more complex themes. This is not the heroic struggle of Perseus to assert his heroic status and thus to restore the correct operation of a fixed social code, nor is it the comedic but ultimately socially acceptable portrayal of a group of heroes out hunting; this is, centrally, an undoing of heroism, and is integrally concerned with the collapse of social order. The conceit of the destruction of ethical order expressed via the destruction of man-made structures and social conventions, previously observed in Virgil's envisioning of the Sack of Troy, comes to the fore in the disruption of a banquet.

While the ludicrously exaggerated acts of violence, humorously inventive irreverence, and the supposedly trivial cause and scale of the battle, certainly do trivialise the subject matter, it is primarily the presence of the Centaurs, creatures notorious in Hellenic antiquity for their uncivilised demeanour, unrefined hypersexuality, and irrational bent toward a particular brand of unmeasured violence that actively destabilises established social order instead of working to shore it up, that works so concertedly against the production of a straightforward epic atmosphere. Thematically, the contrast of the glory-hunting hero who observes and upholds the laws of society with the bestial half-man who conspires to collapse all such laws owes much of its conception and execution to the *Odyssey*, and in particular to the conflict of Odysseus with the Cyclops in Book 9, whence Ovid derives a number of similes and images. Furthermore, the language and figures of speech employed throughout

are, as De Brohun shows, obsessively concerned with images of duality.¹⁵¹ By the time the battle reaches its long-promised climactic final instalment, in which Caeneus, himself decried for being *semimas* (12.506), faces off against Centaurs who have been amply demonstrated to be *semiferi* (12.406) we are well-prepared for the complex interplay of masculinities that inform his final stand against the Centaurs, and that result in an epic treatise on a battle between two forces whose claims to heroic virility are questionable at best. Caeneus' story is, at 12.175 - 9, cited as being of particular interest to Achilles; this interest 'authorizes us to suspect that this has something to do with the hero's youthful sojourn of Scyrus, and his embarrassing concealment in women's clothes while there.'¹⁵²

Even on its own, such thematic undertones render it a fascinating segment to consider in the examination of epic motifs in Ovid. An aberrant element, however, is the presence throughout of Nestor-as-narrator, which elevates the episode as a whole from the surrounding text and places it as it were on display. As a remembered battle drawn from Nestor's glorious youth, which was spent in the company of heroes whose names have already, in context of the retelling, become the stuff of myth, it is justifiably presented as a stylised and reinterpreted retelling. It is presented as the exaggerated eye-witness account of an aged Nestor, marked by 'parody and hyperinflation,'¹⁵³ and is offered up not only as a deliberately raucous and above all entertaining set of anecdotes, but also as a direct opportunity to make overhanded and contextual reference to the source texts. Epic language is justified by the presence of an epic narrator, since not only is it delightfully paradoxical yet perfectly fitting for a Homeric character to speak to Homeric characters in stylised Homeric language. The setting

¹⁵¹ J B De Brohun 'Centaurs in Love and War: Cyllarus and Hylonome in Ovid "*Metamorphoses*" 12.393-428' in *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 125, 2004, p. 420

¹⁵² G Rosati, 'Narrative Techniques and Narrative Structures in the *Metamorphoses*' in Brill's *Companion to Ovid*, 2002, p. 289

¹⁵³ Mader, 2013, p. 89.

furthermore allows Nestor to reinvent himself as a Homeric *aoidos* in his own right, deploying as he does the similes and archaic language expected of Homeric narrative.

As with the Boar Hunt, the chronology is deliberately muddy. Musgrove notes that Nestor's inability to recall precisely the date of Peleus and Thetis' wedding (12.193-95) may very well be wholly in keeping with the infamous inability even of Hellenic poets to impose any degree of order on myth.¹⁵⁴ Ovid even includes within the body of the retelling a minor elegiac idyll, thereby applying the technique of throwing assiduous descriptions of warfare into sharp relief by contrasting them with 'peace and domestic tenderness' - a tactic 'as old as Homer's *Iliad*'¹⁵⁵ - but one that has unlikely origins, centred as it is on the love between two centaurs, creatures not otherwise renowned for their tenderness. Relayed to the heroes who would themselves perform feats of epic heroism and inflict acts of violence in any standard Homeric battle narrative, the Centauromachy functions as a substitution for the progression of battle proper. The existence of the audience sets up Nestor's account as an allusive entry.¹⁵⁶ Once again, reader recognition and appreciation of Ovid's manipulation is crucial - the Centauromachy's positioning and its relevance to Book 12 anticipates and manipulates its readers' epic expectations.¹⁵⁷

Nestor's narration is used not only to provide the account of the battle with great vividness, but also to exaggerate the crucial function of the text's generic allusivity. There is certainly great fun to be had with this retelling. There is inherent potential for humour in portraying the overblown battle nostalgia of an old man, particularly one who, despite his long Homeric pedigree, has previously been observed to participate in comedic physical feats

¹⁵⁴ M W Musgrove 'Nestor's Centauromachy and the Deceptive Voice of Poetic Memory (Ovid *Met.* 12.182-535)' in *Classical Philology*, Vol. 93, 1998, p. 226.

¹⁵⁵ De Brohun, 2004, p. 417

¹⁵⁶ Mader, 2013, p. 92.

¹⁵⁷ Musgrove, 1998, p. 223.

in the Boar Hunt. Here again, however, Ovid is in fact engaged in a process of crafting a careful and self-conscious set of intertextual allusions that function to shore up his own poetic claims and locate his interpretations in a continuum of contemporary literary criticism.

Structurally, it is simple enough to remark at first reading that the battle is primarily episodic, with each set of episodes supplied with some structure through the application of revenge-kills - or, as is often the case, attempted revenge-kills. The technique of accusative-initial episodes structured around the introduction of the victim is in Ovid discarded in favour of descriptive episodes that focus on the action of the aggressor towards his victim. Unlike Virgil, who favours the accusative-initial relay of kills and only manipulates this format in such a way as to play upon the formulaic expectations of his readers, Ovid is more concerned during battle with painting vivid complexity. At 12.245 - 89 the aggressors and victors of the Centauromachy are introduced prior to their victims, generally in the nominative and never with their names standing line-initial, so that their circumstances are described first, with details of their kills closing each episode. At 290, the nondescript victor stands line-initial and precedes a full-line list of three accusative kills. This may be immediately contrasted with the more structured nature of Virgil's battle-narrative; Virgil's insistence on adhering to a specific syntactic structure, and his tendency to organise battles into rampages perpetrated by single combatants against multitudes in which he can manipulate existing structures in order to subvert expectations, may be considered characteristic to his organisational technique, and indicative of his somewhat more formulaic approach to battle narrative. Ovid, by contrast, tends to build up a more chaotic and vividly motile picture of multiple enemies in order to make the most of his limited epic space. When one combatant kills multiple opponents, the action is not segmented into separate episodes, but rather despatched through the same Homeric runs of polysyndeton that Virgil reserves for climactic catalogues (*Met.* 5.86 - 87; 12.290; 12.459 - 60).

The primary instigator of the battle, the Centaur Eurytus, is also its first casualty. While in attendance at Pirithous' wedding feast, he is overcome both by intoxication and by his bestial and uncivilised inability to control his own lust (*ebrietas geminata libidine regnat*, 12.221). He moves to grab at the bride, thereby offering insult to his host and prompting the other Centaurs to attack the women of their choosing. In order to avenge Eurytus' slight, Theseus strikes him a brutal blow with a huge and richly-worked *crater*, with the result that it is, quite literally, an excess of wine which proves to be Eurytus' undoing. His death supplies the heel-kicking motif observed frequently in the Wedding Brawl (*madida resupinus harena / calcitrat* 12. 239 - 40); the wound itself leaks *globos pariter cerebrumque merumque* (12.240). This cheeky jingle immediately sets the tone for bouts of graphic violence rendered blackly comedic through the application of a broad range of humorous stylistic innovations. It is certainly worth noting that the blow results in Eurytus *vulnere et ore vomens* (12.239), thereby combining the emetic results of overindulgence in conviviality with the fatal results of rudeness, while simultaneously introducing Ovid's debt to the *Odyssey*, which will be examined further below. Crucially, Theseus' speech has already introduced the prevailing conceit of duality that runs throughout the Centauromachy as a central thematic thread - '*violesque duos ignarus in uno!*' (12.229) he warns Eurytus, while emphasising the concern of the civilised man that proper respect for social bonds be observed at all times. The remaining Centaurs rush to defend their fallen kinsman (*ardescunt germani caede bimembres*, 12. 240), and the feast collapses into a brawl.

Up until Eurytus' unforgivable breach of proper behaviour, all had seemed to be perfectly in order. The initial wedding scene is so unremarkable that Nestor becomes suspicious (*paene fefellimus omen*, 12.219), and thus (admittedly with the clarity of hindsight, but equally with the clarity of Ovid's authorial awareness of genre) would seem to have been aware of the violence to come. Despite its unexpected subject matter, the Centauromachy will

serve in context as a perfectly functional analogue to staple Homeric content, albeit with the added potential for intertextual allusion. As early as 12.225, we are invited by *captaeque erat urbis imago* to equate the immediate repercussions of the rape of Hippodameia with the eventual result of the abduction of Helen, and are thereby reminded that the events of the *Iliad*, too, though preoccupied with higher thematic concerns, occurred in response to something as disgraceful as a broken social code. It is not necessarily context, then, or even scale, which removes this battle so far from straightforward epic, but rather the nature of its participants, the complex appraisals of heroic masculinity in play, and, ultimately, its metaliterary function as an allusive text. This is a tale woven of much the same stuff as the central conflict of the *Iliad*, but with markedly different players.

The particular brand of intoxicated violence and irreverence that ensues is facilitated, at least to a degree, by the nature of its participants. The significance of the characterisation of the Centaurs as inherently barbaric and lawless creatures, prone to a loss of control, cannot be underestimated, especially since it contributes a secondary layer of Homeric reference. The Centauromachy is framed from the outset as a clash of cultural codes, opening as it does with the deliberately ludicrous image of *nubigenasque feros*, appropriately located in the bucolic environment of *arboribus tecto antro* yet reclining at tables *positis ex ordine* in the orderly and civilised manner of men at a banquet. Despite its rustic nature, this vast cave is equipped with all the furnishings of a *domus* (12.226), including, significantly, the blazing altars required for a marriage ceremony; the location is liminal, partway between the pastoral and the domestic.

Ovid does display an inclination for situating violent interludes in pastoral landscapes, and this technique often serves to introduce the theme of hunting and conflate it with certain erotic episodes in the *Metamorphoses* due to compatible thematic elements. Certainly the

influence of landscape painters on Ovid's bucolic imagination cannot be underestimated.¹⁵⁸ The origins of much of the Centauromachy's stock imagery as a battle of particular violence do, as noted, arise from early Hellenic landscape painting,¹⁵⁹ but here the ambiguous nature of a rustic cave surrounded by trees transformed into a fully-equipped feasting hall is appropriate to the double nature of the Centaurs, and underscores the fact that they are, as a result of their liminality, only semi-civilised. The language used of the Centaurs throughout attests to their inherently bestial nature. They are *feros* (12.210), *bimembres* (12.240, 12.494), *fuventibus* (12.231), and *semihomines* (12.356) as well as *semiferi* (12.406), and as such their acts of gross violence and the outrageous insults done to their host are explained and supported by their quasi-barbaric nature. The application of the elaborate compound epithet *nubigenas* (12.211) may well be an instance of bathos in context, especially given a reader's anticipatory knowledge of the battle to come, but serves well to locate the Centaurs within an accepted mythological continuum through the use of one morphologically marked word. The epithet is itself wholly appropriate to the epic model due both to its archaic compound nature and to its high-register Virgilian precedent at *Aen.*8.293, where it is used in ornate and ritualistic invocatory speech to describe the deeds of Heracles, together with *bimembres*.¹⁶⁰

Many of the initial episodes centre on the use of unconventional weapons, to match the unconventional heroism on display. Such *res epulis* as *pocula*, *cadi* and *lebetes*, in lines marked with heavy alliteration (12.242 - 44), are repurposed by the combatants to serve as weapons, and the banqueting hall itself, previously transformed by human artifice into a

¹⁵⁸ H Parry 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape' in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol 95, 1964, p. 268.

¹⁵⁹ Tarbell F B 'Centauromachy and Amazonomachy in Greek Art: The Reasons for Their Popularity' in *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 24, 1920, pp. 228.

¹⁶⁰ The term is echoed by Tlepolemos at 12.541, who uses it substantively to enquire of Nestor after the deeds of his father, Heracles, suggesting either a direct Virgilian reference or a standard epithetic use after the fashion of a fixed Homeric substantive epithet.

liveable abode, is thrown into disarray. The collapse of a banquet scene into a brawl provides a handy visual analogy for the disruption of peace and the ensuing turmoil of war.¹⁶¹ We see the disruption of careful table arrangements and congenial interaction. In the Centauromachy, it is the Centaurs themselves who constitute the destabilising element. As they are only half human and therefore inherently uncivilised, they operate to destabilise the pattern of established social norms: they contravene the inherent social contract of a wedding, with the result that the festivities degenerate into violence.

A similar inventiveness with regard to weaponry allows the themes of irreverent and impious behaviour observed in the Wedding Brawl of Book 5 to surge immediately to the fore. Sacred items are profaned when weaponised, and even pious deeds are reframed as acts of tremendous violence. Here, however, the aim is not simply to shock through the description of a series of humorous deaths, but rather to underscore the flagrant disregard of the Centaurs for sacred relics and pious behaviour. The first act of the battle proper, following the death of its instigator at Theseus' hands, sees the centaur Amycus make so bold as to despoil even the innermost sanctuaries of the rustic altar of its lamp-stand in his search for a weapon. This act not only mimics the act of irreverently plundering a conquered temple through the use at 12.246 of the phrase *haut timuit spoliare* (thus serving to extend the metaphor of *captaeque erat urbis imago*), but also emphasises the sheer disregard of social custom on display. The simile which at 12.248 likens his use of the lamp-stand as a murder-weapon to the ritualistic sacrifice of white bullocks, satisfyingly Homeric in its introduction of everyday activities into the battlefield yet simultaneously recalling the imagery of an innately Roman festal day, heightens the uncivilised brutality of the slaughter.

As in the Wedding Brawl, witticisms may be spouted at especially unfortunate victims by their conquerors. Aphidas is already worse the wear for wine, and is thus unable to

¹⁶¹ Mader, 2013, p. 96

participate in the Centauromachy because he is passed out insensate. When happened upon by one of the enemy, Phorbas, he is summarily dispatched by a thrown spear despite being *frustra nulla arma moventem* (12.320), and is told to mix his wine with the waters of the Styx (12.320). This hearkens back to the explicitly humorous (*inridens*) suggestion at 5.115 - 16 that the minstrel Lampetidus continue his harping in the Underworld. Aphidas does not even feel the moment of his own death (*mors caruit sensu*), which suggests again a instance of blackly apposite humour. It is fitting that a man who had been too deeply sunk into stupor to participate in battle should die in that same stupor. Similarly, a prophet is included among the ranks of the participants, and manages to distinguish himself despite what would appear to be the stereotype of bards serving only as non-combatants (Emathion fought in the Wedding Brawl only by hurling insults (*loquendo pugnat*, 5.101 - 02). At 12.455 - 56 Nestor cautions his audience against underestimating the prophet Mopsus with *nec tu credideris tantum cecinisse futura / Ampyciden Mopsum*, 12.455 - 56). Again, as in the Wedding Brawl and many of Virgil's extended battle segments, there do arise parallels between one's character and one's manner of death, or, in this case, one's character and the manner of one's kill. Unlike the prophet, Mopsus' victim Hodites is deprived of the ability to speak at all (*frustra loqui temptavit*, 12.457) due to the gruesome nature of his wound (*ad mentum lingua mentoque ad guttura fixo*, 12.458), which recalls various deaths of Book 10 of the *Aeneid*, including that of Pharus at 10.322 - 23, and Dryopes at 10.345 - 49.

To return to Amycus, we may note that he in turn meets his own death with a similarly mundane object, the leg of a table. Gryneus goes one better, asking '*cur non. . . utimur istis?*' (12.261) and proceeds not simply to despoil the sanctuary of its riches, but to wrench up the altar itself and to hurl it as a missile into the thick of the Lapiths. Genealogical information is volunteered for Orion, one of Gryneus' victims, almost as an afterthought at 12.263 - 64; such information is requisite within the context of a Homeric battle, the abrupt

and seemingly disjunctive nature of its provision typical of catalogic structure. The specification of a mother skilled in charms, however, is here an added flourish, one supplied by our Homeric narrator in such a way as to recall his source material. Once again, the attacker is felled immediately after achieving his kill, thus establishing the ‘combat-chain’¹⁶² structure that serves as the primary source of causality in catalogic battle.

Already there emerge several potential points of contact with Homer not only due to the language in use, but also in the loan of several very specific sets of imagery. We have already seen Erytus, established as an uncivilised and irrational monster incapable of holding his drink, vomit up both blood and gore. Deployed as it is in the context of murder, that image owes much of its shock value to the Homeric image of loathsome barbarism that is the Cyclops Polyphemos drunkenly vomiting up human flesh (φάρυγος δ’ ἐξέσσυτο οἶνος / ψωμοί τ’ ἀνδρόμεοι ὁ δ’ ἐρεύγετο οἰνοβαρείων, *Od.* 9. 374 - 5). It is worth noting in that a later simile at 12.434 - 38, we have not only the image of gore leaking from Tectaphon’s shattered skull rendered by the indiscriminate polysyndeton of *perque os perque cavas nares oculosque auresque*, but also a comparison to the domestic process of straining curds through a sieve. This resembles the Homeric practice of applying everyday or mundane household tasks to the horrors of the battlefield.

Now, however, at 12.271 - 79, one of the many blazing wedding-torches on hand is snatched up from the altar and hurled at the head of Charaxus, resulting in the comparison of this unfortunate’s blazing hair through short-form simile to a field on fire (*veluti seges arida*, 12.274). Certainly there may well be some significance that it is hair of a particularly bright colour, *fulvo capillo* (12.273), that gives way to flame, and that a man possessed of such marked hair should be injured by having it burnt is precisely the same cruelly serendipitous kind of morbid humour identified in the ironic deaths of the Wedding Brawl, but the

¹⁶² Mader, 2013, p. 96

comparison there is not otherwise developed into a long-form simile. Of particular note, however, is the fact that the brief comparison then transitions into a simile lifted directly from Book 9 of the *Odyssey*. Lines 12.275 - 79 recreate the famous Homeric likening of the hissing of the burning brand used to kill the Cyclops to the sound hot iron makes when it is tempered:

...et vulnere sanguis inustus

terribilem stridore sonum dedit ut dare ferrum

igne rubens plerumque solet, quod forcipe curva

cum faber eduxit lacubus demittit at illud

stridet et in tepida submersum sibilat unda.

*Met.*12.275 - 79

ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἀνήρ χαλκεὺς πέλεκυν μέγαν ἠὲ σκέπαρνον

εἰν ὕδατι ψυχρῷ βάπτῃ μεγάλα ἰάχοντα

φαρμάσων· τὸ γὰρ αὖτε σιδήρου γε κράτος ἐστίν

ὥς τοῦ σίζ' ὀφθαλμὸς ἐλαϊνέῳ περὶ μοχλῶ.

*Od.*9.391 - 94

Charaxus, however, survives the assault, and, now incensed, makes to dismantle the *domus* itself by tearing up its *limen*, and hence all barriers between himself and his monstrous opponents, who similarly show no qualms about attacking the human structure. Much like the tremendous door-stone utilised by Polyphemus, which human men cannot move and which would be too heavy even for teams of oxen (οὐκ ἂν τόν γε δύο καὶ εἴκοσ' ἄμαξαι / ἐσθλαὶ τετράκυκλοι ἀπ' οὔδεος ὀχλίσσειαν, *Od.* 9. 241 - 42), this *limen* is *onus plaustris* (*Met.*12.282), Charaxus' attempt to use it as a weapon falls short due to his own human weakness. The stone from the *limen* strikes not its target, but, disastrously, one of his allies, thereby effectively

aligning him with his own enemies - Rhoetus, his attacker, is delighted (*gaudia nec retinet* 12.285 - 86).

In all these instances, the language borrowed from Homer serves to underscore Ovid's use of the essential theme of Book 9 of the *Odyssey*, specifically the interaction of a civilised hero who works to defend social values with uncivilised and barbaric enemies who shun and destroy accepted social codes. The theme of barbarism contrasted with the wit and cunning of civilised man is not the primary aim of this narrative but rather a vehicle by which Homeric codes of heroic κλέος may be deconstructed and held up for the consideration of Homeric heroes themselves, and the excessive brutality of such mythological relics as Centaurs, themselves bestial creatures existing outside the behavioural constraints of civilisation and prone to an unacceptable loss of control when intoxicated, is used to foreground and exaggerate central concerns of Homeric violence. It is therefore only to be expected that much of the imagery used to render the inhuman violence that they perpetrate owes a debt to the presentation of that same theme in the *Odyssey*.

Charaxus' overambitious attempt, and the epic failure in which it results, is comparable to the kind which is frequently observed in the Wedding Brawl to work against the achievement of heroism through physical skill and martial prowess. While there is Homeric precedent in Hector and Aias's attempts to outmatch each other by hurling each a successively greater stone (*Il.7.264 - 72*), Mader notes also the potential for this image to carry additional metaliterary implications that connote the idea of the unwise or inexperienced poet attempting to treat with matter too weighty for his skill to support.¹⁶³ Indeed, size and the inappropriate handling thereof, as Mader points out, features prominently throughout the Centauromachy, in marked testimony to the overbearing proportions of this battle that stand

¹⁶³ Mader, 2013, p. 100

against its compressed literary dimensions. Here the result is once again a self-defeating futility - ‘emphasis on size and savagery, ostensibly to magnify epic *kleos*, turns out instead to be self-cancelling’¹⁶⁴ - and overblown aspirations to physical might result in correspondingly catastrophic failures. The Centaurs’ thoughtlessness is the result of their incapacity to employ reason while in combat, and their temerity in selecting inappropriate and unwise weapons contributes to their own undoing.

Indeed, the bulk of the Centaurs would seem not to be equipped with forged or ranged weapons of their own at all, and as such are forced to improvise, either through disrupting and polluting images of peaceful social order, or by attempting to take their weapons wholly from nature. At 12.341, an attempt to contribute to the turn-and-turn-about pattern encouraged by the vengeance structure is interrupted midway through, and the bold introduction *ultor adest* is belied as Aphareus, struggling to break off a chunk of rock for use as a missile, has his arm broken almost in passing by a wrathful Theseus, who presses on immediately to attack his next target. The overweening attempt aborted midway through recurs at 12.356-57 with the Centaur Demoleon’s attempt to uproot a tree entire, seen already with the unwise human Charaxus, and encountered also at 12.327 - 31 when Petraeus is killed in the act of uprooting his own oak-tree (this inglorious mishap is bathetically described in Lucretian epic language with *glandiferam*, 12.328). Here, however, Demoleon’s strength fails him entirely, and, hard pressed, he resorts instead to breaking it in half. That Demoleon, as a bestial Centaur, is spurred primarily by uncontrollable physical urges, is confirmed by the contrast between the remark *ipse dolor vires animo dabat*, 13.373, and the young Nestor’s own claim that *vires animus dabat* (12.383). In the Centaur, courage or strength is the product of an external

¹⁶⁴ Mader, 2013, p. 106

physical influence - in this case, *dolor* - upon the *animus*, whereas in the man, the *animus* is capable of inspiring courage of its own accord.¹⁶⁵

The establishment of a pattern of reciprocal acts of violence is not uncommon in the structure of Homeric *androktasiai*, and is used frequently in order to establish a pattern of constant development and movement instead of allowing the battle to stagnate. This pattern constitutes the truest attempt at the imposition of a direct causal chronology on the otherwise highly paratactic and non-sequential nature of catalogic battle. In the early stages of the battle's progress, reciprocal attacks, or 'combat-chains', do serve to provide a sense of causality and to structure the chronology of battle into smaller segments, but as the pace of the battle picks up, and as the focus switches from preliminary encounters to episodes involving far more significant heroes (most particularly Peleus, Theseus, and Nestor himself, before the climax arrives with Caeneus' death), so the structure here becomes increasingly more chaotic and prone to variation, which invites the development of a chain of catastrophic failures. As in the Wedding Brawl, in which narrow misses result in death and boastful claims are violently disproved, or in the Boar Hunt, in which the initially humorous upstaging of general male incompetence by female success eventually proves plot-relevant, repeated instances of failure do serve to destabilise the basis of the heroic code.

Although heroic mishaps are certainly present in Homer, and as much a feature of the hyperbolic nature of epic battle as the detailed and exaggerated attention paid to the manner and location of wounds, in Ovid they have previously been seen to contribute to the deconstruction of the heroic ideal through the negation of heroic skill and the reduction of grand feats of strength to slapstick comedy. Here, from lines 12.327 to 392, and interrupted only by the Cyllarus and Hylonome episode, the function of the heroic failure is extended to

¹⁶⁵ A potential point of comparison arises at the very beginning of the battle at 12.242, in which *vina dabant animos* is used to explain the Centaurs' outrageous behaviour, and once again their reasoning is influenced by an external factor rather than subjected to any internal control.

emphasise the fact that the Centaurs were never heroic at all. Although they are capable of engaging with established heroic personages due to their tremendous physical strength and their drunken brutality, they seem in most cases to lack weapons that are not natural and only possess those that are some by-product of bestial aggression, which suggests that they are not technologically capable of producing the superior steel-bladed weapons of a civilised man. The number of Centaurs described as carrying bladed weapons is very small indeed - Nestor's *vetus cicatrix* (12.444), for example, is dealt by Teleboas' unique *iaculum* (12.443), although his companion Cthonius has only a *ramum bifurcum* (12.442).

Attention to the Centaurs' unique physiology is also used to great effect to exaggerate and render even more grotesque the standard motif of heel-kicking death throes by its development at 12.390 into an image so gory as to be ludicrous. Dorylas is a particularly bloodthirsty opponent, and his weapons are themselves bestial and barbaric. Rather than the *galea* and *clipeum* which we will see Peleus wield so bravely against Demoleon and with such creative battle-savvy, Dorylas wears a wolfskin bound about his brows and wields as his weapon a forked pair of ox-horns already *multo rubefacta cruore* (12.382). Heartened, as noted above, by *animus* alone, the contrast between man and beast is reinforced by Nestor's taunting at 12.383 - 84, wherein he makes an explicit point of comparing Dorylas' inferior weaponry to his own technologically superior steel spearhead (*adspice. . . quantum concedant nostro tua cornua ferro*). His blow catches Dorylas by pinning his futilely raised arm to his forehead, and again emphasises the tactical incompetence of the Centaurs. Described even during his death as *ferox* (12.390), he is struck mid-jump by Peleus and, still galloping headlong, treads his own entrails underhoof until he disembowels himself. The excruciatingly protracted nature of the death is emphasised by the irreverent polyptoton of *traxit tractaque calcavit calcataque* (12.391), a phrase which forms not only a fitting onomatopoeic rendition of hoofbeats but, on De Brohun's reading, also underscores through both anaphora and the

alteration of phonetic values the ‘doubleness of this brief picture’ and speaks to the cumbersome nature of the centaur’s double body.¹⁶⁶ Ultimately, the scene concludes with motions similar to death throes, inducing death itself through an act that is itself very much inane.

Hard on the heels of this grotesque image, however, comes the tale of Cyllarus, the only Centaur to approach human standards of aesthetics, at least in Nestor’s estimation. Discussion of the Centaurs’ physical appearance would therefore seem to focus primarily on their monstrous nature, and has contributed to their characterisation as rough, brutish, and generally unsophisticated. Phaeocomes is forced by his dual nature to wear not one but six lionskins, since it is only by knotting skins together that he is able to produce a pelt large enough to provide coverage for both his human and equine parts (*hominemque simul protectus equumque*, 12.431). It also renders the Centaurs, in some instances, unsuited to war, as demonstrated by the comedic scene at 12.345 - 46 in which Theseus leaps onto Bienor’s equine back so as to be able to disfigure him at close quarters.

Similarly, when in dire straits and pressed by great suffering, Demoleon goes so far as to rear up like a true stallion against his enemy and to attack *pedibus. . . equinis* (12.374), though this gesture does not help him at all, since it allows Peleus to strike from below. The particular juxtaposition present in *uno duo pectora perforat ictu* (12.377) is reminiscent of the contrived irony in death episodes in the Wedding Brawl and suggests a degree of stylised epic-inspired humour. Together with Latreus, however, Cyllarus and his beloved spouse Hylonome are the only Centaurs accorded any description after the fashion of a human participant, and, as De Brohun notes, theirs is far more than a simple digression provided for

¹⁶⁶ De Brohun, 2004, p. 421.

the sake of a pause in a fast-paced action-oriented narrative.¹⁶⁷ While it certainly does lessen the intensity of the violence present in the Centauromachy as a whole,¹⁶⁸ it serves to highlight the dual nature of the Centaurs that informs the Centauromachy's struggle to establish heroic identity.

Theirs is most frequently described as an interlude, providing as it does something of a rest stop midway through the battle. Although the tale does, ultimately, end in tragedy, it manages before its fatal conclusion to interject something of the pastoral idyll into an otherwise unremittingly bloodthirsty instalment. This sort of interlude is not unHomeric, and serves to reinforce the truly dualistic nature of the Centaurs. Certainly they are capable of grotesque and unwarranted violence, but the tenderness of a domestic parergon is also not unknown to them. An added layer of textual allusion thus comes to the fore through the obvious parallels to erotic poetry, most particularly Alexandrian, via the appeal to pastoral imagery, the extolling of its subjects' physical virtues, and the pattern of their relationship prior to its establishment. De Brohun argues comprehensively that the episode constitutes a brief but striking and elegantly-composed commentary on the contrast between the epic and the erotic, and which with its focus on duality and shifting identity provides an alternative to the otherwise sharply demarcated thematic contrasts present both in the Centauromachy and in its function within the broader context of Book 12. The interlude begins at 12.393 with a straightforward apostrophe that signals a shift in the narrative's content. Fresh from Dorylas' repulsive death, the result of his own irrationality and uncontrolled bestial impulses, a Centaur is introduced who is far closer both in appearance and in behaviour to civilised man than any other.

¹⁶⁷ De Brohun, 2004, p. 418.

¹⁶⁸ C Segal 'Ovid's Metamorphic Bodies: Art, Gender, and Violence in the "*Metamorphoses*"', *Arion*, Vol. 5, 1998, p. 25, pp. 9-41.

The character sketches of Cyllarus and Hylonome, ecphrastic in their detail and in their preoccupation not only with the pleasing appearance of both Centaurs but also the colour and contrast of their equine and humanoid forms, are so similarly structured as to constitute two matching halves nearly equal in length.¹⁶⁹ As noted, Cyllarus is distinguished among his kind by the exceptionally pleasing nature of his physical appearance; while Hylonome, too, is physically outstanding (*qua nulla decentior inter/ semiferos altis habitavit femina silvis*, 12.405-06), but she is unique also in her ability to secure Cyllarus' affections by defeating the many other females Centaurs competing for his attention (*multae illum petiere sua de gente*, 12.404). A degree of gender-play is present in the arguable inversion achieved through the presentation of the aesthetically prized half of the relationship as male, and the triumphant suitor as female. Cyllarus' sketch proper is introduced with the interesting anaphora *barba erat incipiens barbae color aureus aurea. . .coma* (12.395-96), the structure of which is echoed in the description of Hylonome's love for him (*haec et blanditiis et amando et amare fatendo*, 12.407), then neatly resolved in *Cyllaron una tenet* (12.408). The anaphoric structure and the heavy use of polyptoton are arguably mimetic representations of the dual nature of the centaurs themselves, for Ovid does exploit throughout the double ecphrases the potential of wordplay; De Brohun emphasises the significance of colour and its contrastive nature in this description,¹⁷⁰ and it should be noted that even among the Augustan poets' careful and self-conscious scrutiny of the function of the artificial *spectaculum*, Ovid 'arguably reflects most frequently and most directly of all on the place of art and the artist within nature and society.'¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁹ The first consisting of eleven lines from 12.393 - 403, and the second of twelve from 12.404 - 415.

¹⁷⁰ De Brohun, 2004, p. 430

¹⁷¹ R Armstrong 'Against Nature? Some Augustan Responses to Man-made Marvels' in P Hardie (ed.), *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2009, p. 81.

Providing contrast with the praise given to Cyllarus' statuesque physical perfection is the attention that is paid throughout primarily to Hylonome's careful toilette, rather than to her physical form. Where he is *gratus in ore vigor* (12.397), and his human half so finely-shaped as to resemble the sort of artwork produced by civilised human hands (*artificum laudatis proxima signis*, 12.398), she is less beautiful in and of herself, but rather *cultus*, and is herself the author of her physical charm through the application of a rustic beautifying process that makes use of such natural cosmetics as various flowers and springwater. Even her choice of clothing, *electarum ferarum. . . vellera* (12.410-12) is admirably well-chosen despite being ultimately barbaric. With their contrasting habits and appearance, they carry connotations of the complementary relationship between nature and art, a prominent theme in Ovid.¹⁷²

The harmony of their ideal relationship is illustrated through the dual nature of the descriptions of their life together, while anaphora serves once again to reinforce their remarkably well-suited union. Furthermore, 'the relationship between the lovers is so far removed from the lust-driven sexuality typical of Centaurs that they offer. . . an exemplary picture of conjugal love,'¹⁷³ suggesting that in this interpretation, 'Centaurs, instead of being uniformly brutal, savage males, prove to be diversified both in sex and conditions of life.'¹⁷⁴ Not only is their love itself *par*, and the complementary nature of their wanderings expressed through the two phrases *errant in montibus una* and *antra simul subeunt*, which through their chiasmatic structure and paired lexical variation underscore the duality of *mons* and *antrum* as

¹⁷² The grotto where Diana bathes at *Met.*3.158 - 9 is *arte laboratum nulla simulaverat artem / ingenio natura suo*, while in Book 8 Daedalus' art is so skilful that it trumps even the will of nature (*ignotas animum dimittit in artes / naturamque novat*, 8.188 - 189); the end product is so marvellously perfect in form that it tricks the mind into thinking that it is a natural product (*ut clivo crevisse putes*, 8.191) and ultimately comes to resemble nature itself (*ut veras imitetur aves*, 8.195). In the Pygmalion episode, too, artistic skill is such that it outstrips the natural form and serves itself as the cause of the deception (*ars adeo latet arte sua*, 10.252).

¹⁷³ De Brohun, 2004, p. 439

¹⁷⁴ Segal, 1998, p. 25

two complementary fixtures of the natural world, but they themselves are matched in their actions. In a neatly balanced line at 12.418 that hinges the mimetic anastrophe of *pariter pariter*, they participate together in a battle that, notably, meets the criteria to render its descriptor *fera* an etymological pun, since it is both waged by beasts and brutal in nature. That their short-lived idyll is centrally focused on wedded bliss and the desirability and orderliness of tranquillity, even in the fundamentally extra-social context of the rustic ideal, only sharpens the contrast of its placement within a Wedding Brawl instigated by the disruption of matrimonial security and by the overturning of social order, but does not, however, render it out of place. The liminal nature of the Centaurs themselves, existing as they do on the outskirts of humanity but still owning some claim to that humanity, cannot be called truly liminal without consideration of their more civilised side.

Immediately after the conclusion of this digression we are brought sharply back to the battle proper, and with a careful reminder that it is Nestor who has charge of the tempo of battle by grace of the special rights accorded him by autopsy - *ante oculos stat et ille meos*, as he insists at 12.429, and indeed, the subsequent episodes are marked by more references to his perspective than any before. An added level of showmanship, and the ultimate proof of autopsy, is supplied at 12.444 by *signa vides* - Nestor's insistence that the audience examine his *vetus cicatrix*, the powerfully evocative power of which in turn introduces a fond reminiscence of his spent strength that he develops into a speculative take on how quickly he would have triumphed even over Hector. It is important to note that, unlike the discovery of Odysseus' scar - which Ovid certainly had in mind - his self-satisfied display ensures nothing, again reusing a Homeric motif more for the sake of its impact than for the sake of plot.¹⁷⁵ However, the reference is by no means entirely empty of significance. Simply by functioning as an Odyssean throwback, it serves to reinforce the thematic allusivity of its surroundings,

¹⁷⁵ Musgrove, 1998, p. 227

and also allows Ovid to insert a nostalgic digression. We have seen that Nestor's physical involvement in the Centauromachy does not only equip him to narrate the tale with especial authority, but also sets up a degree of introspection that toes the line between the poignant and the comedic, and certainly the ensuing lament for his youth. Just as in Book 8, the narrative speculated on what might have happened had Nestor not taken steps to avoid being gored by the Boar (*fortisan et Pylius citra Troiana perisset / tempora*, 8.365 - 66), so here he himself speculates on what might have happened had he only come to Troy earlier.

Once again, the specific timeline is vague, but attempts are made to impose some degree of logic upon them. Nestor's stock reminiscences are dispelled by the admission *illo sed tempore nullus / aut puer Hector erat* (12.447-48), and the curiously logical acknowledgement that while Nestor was in his prime, Hector was only a child. Musgrove notes that the concept of 'temporal manipulation', and of a complex approach to the chronology of a single narrative, is intrinsically Homeric. Although the *Iliad* itself does not contain 'an extended flashback of this type', it certainly does rely on the compression of ten years' worth of war into a final climactic episode,¹⁷⁶ and where the *Iliad* lacks flashbacks, the *Odyssey* delivers in excess. The Centauromachy is Homeric not only in terms of its content and its language, but also in terms of its position within the context of an otherwise linear narrative, and of its first-person retrospective structure.

Of interest to considerations of the reframing of epic language is the use of a particular kind of modified apostrophe, facilitated only by the framing of the battle as an epic narrative, whereby Nestor is able to provide emphasis by addressing his audience members, and in particular the overconfident Achilles, for whose pedagogic benefit he has provided the tale in the first place. At 12.363, as an aside to a series of particularly fast-paced deaths brought

¹⁷⁶ Musgrove, 1998, p. 223

about by Theseus, Nestor makes a note that Crantor was, in fact, Peleus' armour-bearer (*armiger ille tui fuerat genitoris, Achille*). The reminiscence is introduced in grand and markedly dactylic epic language, and utilises the line-initial compound *armiger*, a term inducted by Augustan poets into the ranks of elevated poetic diction and used throughout the *Aeneid*,¹⁷⁷ before concluding the line with the vocative *Achille* and going on to detail the terms of the then-young Crantor's status as *pignus* to Peleus. Nestor here uses the term not as an epithet but as a substantive noun with a restricted semantic sense, at 12.363 - addressing Achilles, he provides clarification of the deceased Crantor's heroic identity by singling him out as armour-bearer to Achilles' father. The similarity of the line to *Aeneid* 2.476 - 7 (*unā ingens Periphas et equorum agitator Achillis / armiger Automedon*) suggests a deliberate allusion, and Nestor's apostrophe of Achilles further serves to invert the conventions of epic narrative for his purposes, drawing as it does specific attention to the generational parallels in play. This aside supplies the identifying heroic information a reader expects, but achieves its aim through an alternative poetic vehicle that results in pleasing variation; it should also be noted that the interjection serves also to remind his own audience of the potency of his link to the past and the sheer expanse of his anecdotal knowledge.

By producing apostrophes at particularly stirring junctures in the narrative, where due to the heightened drama of the piece, 'the dividing line between private imagination and public experience is at its weakest', the Homeric narrator might attain 'a maximum of presence in the epic performance' through what amounts almost to true 're-enactment.'¹⁷⁸ This is, of course, strictly in keeping with the modern understanding that the Homeric narrator's primary function was to serve as an eye-witness to the heroic past by grace of the Muses, capable of

¹⁷⁷ W S Anderson, 'Chalinus armiger in Plautus' "*Casina*" in *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 8, 1983, p. 12 pp. 11 – 21.

¹⁷⁸ Bakker, 1993, p. 23.

translating the mythical into the real through oral performance. In Ovid, however, the confines of the literary medium, together with the deliberately allusive framing of the episode, work in conjunction to produce a very different effect. In addressing Achilles directly, Nestor not only underscores his tale's intent, but also the fact that it is actually fictional, and told to a listening audience. *Il.1.260 - 70* may be considered by way of a Homeric comparison: although it is only a minor interjection and as such cannot develop the same degree of theatricality, it does establish characterisational precedent on which Ovid no doubt draws, and provides the paradigmatic precedent of anecdotally-supported advice. The function of this alternative to the apostrophe is therefore inverted. Instead of supplying the episode with a degree of hyper-realism that would, to a listening audience, vivify the tale, it reminds us, the readers, that its context is unreal.

As has been examined above, Nestor does fall short due to his old age, as well as due to Ovid's own presentational designs. The old man has acknowledged at the outset that his account may well be encumbered by *tarda vetustas*, since *multa...fugiant spectata* (12.181 - 2), but embarks upon it all the same. This device functions as the standard prefatory excuse for any potential omissions or lapse in quality that introduces any literary work, enhanced by its reliance on Nestor's age. Once again, as in Tarrant's appraisal of omission,¹⁷⁹ the reader is reminded that all poetry is constructed and therefore dependant upon the idiosyncrasies of its narrator. Similarly, at 461, he declines to list the wounds suffered by the centaurs whom Caeneus killed due to his inability to remember their precise nature - although, after the manner of a responsible cataloguer, he does note that he can still remember the names and number of the participants in the slaughter (*vulnera non memini numerum nomenque notavi*). Although this forgetfulness is framed as a symptom of Nestor's advancing age, it also serves a useful organisational purpose. Nestor has previously recounted a significant number of gory

¹⁷⁹ Tarrant R, 2005, p. 72.

deaths in excruciating detail, but only begins to omit their description now that the narrative has begun to approach its climax - specifically, the encounter of Caeneus with Latreus. This compression of detail signals that the conclusion is fast approaching. It is in addition a 'common device for a poet' to feign awareness of his audience's swift propensity to boredom by 'getting on with the story.'¹⁸⁰ This device has occurred before during the climax of the *Perseid*, both at *plus tamen exhausto superest* (5.149) and at *nomina longa mora est. . . dicere* (5.205 - 06). These excuses therefore operate both to characterise Nestor as old, and to merge this well-established character trait with pre-existing organisational and structural devices, thereby once again calling deliberate attention to the presence of the narrator.

The only member of the Centaurs' company who is explicitly described as fully outfitted with armour, and who is equipped moreover with appropriately fearsome weapons, is Latreus, *membris et corpore. . . maximus* (12.463 - 4), whose battle with Caeneus forms the climactic instalment of Nestor's anecdote. To Caeneus moreover is given the detailed facial description more usually applied to a civilised man, and which is seen elsewhere only in such special aesthetic cases as Cyllarus and Hylonome. His middle-aged appearance is noted, and careful attention paid to his greying hair (*variabant tempora cani*, 12.465). Significantly, he has obtained his armour by means of despoiling a victim. Now made *conspicuus* (12.467) by his new armaments, Latreus alone of the Centaurs appears as a *promachos* after the traditional Homeric fashion, and displays martial behaviour despite his equine form. He stands removed from the *agmen*, and behaves less like a horse than a mounted combatant directing a steed (*equitavit*, 12.468). Furthermore, he issues a challenge introduced by the grandiose phraseology expected of a hero (*verbaque tot fudit vacuas animosus in auras*, 12.468). This elaborate phraseology is a far cry from the simpler verbs *loquor*, *aio* and *dico*, used to introduce all other instances of speech in the battle thus far. Its inclusion signals both that this

¹⁸⁰ Anderson, 1997, p. 517.

opponent is set apart from the rest, and that the pace of the killing has been dilated from terse episodic progression to a slower and more focused climactic encounter.

His speech of challenge to Caeneus is similarly far longer and of a far higher register than any speech observed from a Centaur thus far. Although brief jokes or cruel one-liners have been permitted, his is the first lengthy speech since Theseus' challenge at the very outset of the battle (12.227 - 29). Latreus, then, is unique, and fittingly so, given his climactic position. It is his near-human appearance and deportment that serves as something of a turning point in the behaviour of the surviving Centaurs. His capacity for speech is developed later with great rationality and eloquence by Monychos, who, in exhorting the Centaurs to approach the problem with forethought and creative reasoning, not only calls upon the near miss of their divine heritage in much the way that a human demigod might take pride in their immortal lineage by reminding them that they are of the line of Ixion and have Iuno as their unofficial divine sponsor, but also explicitly cites the benefits of their two-formed nature in his long speech at 12.498 - 509. They are equipped with *membra inmania*, with *geminæ vires*, and most significantly, *duplex natura Animalia* (12.501-03). Furthermore, he calls to witness Ixion's bold virility, proven by the attempted rape of Juno, as proof that they should be able to prevail against one whose virility is inherently impaired. In contrast to the Centaurs who have been identified as *semiferi* (12.406) a parallel term is at last introduced for a human combatant - *semimas* (12.506) for Caeneus, especially ironic when spoken by a Centaur who is himself only half-human. Attacking an enemy for their perceived femininity or feminine weakness is 'a stock epic motif,'¹⁸¹ here recycled by Ovid into a wholly new context by applying it quite literally, and to great effect, to Caeneus. It may be worth noting that outside of the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid uses the rather rare word *semimas* elsewhere of only livestock (notably in the *Fasti* at 1.588) or of *Galloi* (*Fasti*, 4.183), the implications in such cases being

¹⁸¹ Segal, 1998, p. 25.

distinctly anti-heroic, and, in the second instance, distinctly associated with liminality and bestial or extra-social behaviour; in its application to mythological characters within the *Metamorphoses* it is used also of Hermaphroditus at 4.381, with the apparent synonym *semivir* appearing a few lines later at 4.386.

For ultimately, of course, it is weapons of a natural sort (and, additionally, of a phallic sort) that do, in fact, prevail against the luckless Caeneus. Seizing the opportunity to recreate a classic Homeric scene,¹⁸² the tree-felling interlude (*Il.*23.114 - 25), and looking backwards at Virgil's own take on the trope throughout (*Aen.*6.177 - 82), Ovid has the Centaurs display a capacity for inventive and resourceful reasoning hitherto undemonstrated, or at least unperfected, for previously it has been not their inventiveness that failed them, but rather their inability to match it with measured forethought, introduced *forte* though it may have been. The effectiveness at last of the Centaurs' propensity for ceding to their bestial impulses and resorting to the use of impromptu natural weapons symbolic rather than embracing the advancements of civilised technology afforded by a rational mortal mind is ultimately an appropriate match for such an opponent as Caeneus, who, by their dual-gendered nature, embodies quite literally the liminal and contrastive theme that underlies the Centauromachy in its totality. Not only is a spectacular death fitting for a hero who had led a spectacular life, but the fruitful marriage at last of bestial ferocity to human intellect can be allowed only in the case of a hero who has themselves transcended the limits of nature and come to represent a mingling of identities.

¹⁸² S M Goldberg *Epic in Republican Rome*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1995, p.83.

4 Conclusion

The writers of literary epic of the Augustan Era reinterpreted the characteristic narrative techniques and stylistic devices of oral epic narrative in an altered medium in such a way as to confer upon the genre additional scope for the personal creative flair of individual authors, and, by expanding upon a well-established genre, created the opportunity to include in their work a high degree of intertextual allusivity and literary commentary. Battle narrative in both Ovid and Virgil is markedly Homeric due not only to its epic themes of physical prowess and heroic κλέος, but also due to its episodic construction, which draws on the catalogue-derived construction of Homeric battle narrative, but expands it in such a way as to render it better suited to a literary medium.

Drawing heavily on the conventions of Iliadic epic, the battles of the *Aeneid* serve in their Homeric allusivity as suitable narratives in which Virgil's Homeric characters may display their own Homeric traits and generate their own share of heroic κλέος. Episodic after the catalogic fashion of Homeric battle, Virgilian battles display a more nuanced approach to the progression of epic chronology, and frequently manipulate readers' expectations of pacing developed through familiarity with Homeric narrative in order to subvert expectations. This has been demonstrated to depend upon Virgil's focus upon a single combatant whose contribution to any given battle narrative consists of multiple engagements from which they emerge as the victor, rather than of a series of encounters between various pairs of the victorious and the conquered, as in Homer. In Virgil, the victim of each encounter is most frequently named at the outset of each episode in the accusative case, thus denoting their status as a victim and suggesting that the overall success of the focal combatant should function as a foregone conclusion. This organisational technique constitutes a literary expansion upon the typical list-based construction of the type of oral battle narrative encountered in Homer.

Ovid's engagement with Virgilian epic is rooted in his tendency to contrast straightforward examples of epic narrative with subversive or otherwise deconstructive literary techniques, particularly intertextual allusion, humour, anti-climax, and parody. These techniques are often emphasised by his innovative approach to both structural pacing and register, as well as the intrusion of alternative genres into epic *topoi*. His style depends upon the reworking of

seemingly heroic subject matter, relayed in language borrowed from his epic predecessors, into quasi-farcical explorations of epic in miniature that feature such unexpected flourishes as ill-timed wordplay and dark humour, which subverts his audience's expectations and diminishes the depiction of epic grandeur.

His deployment of battle narrative in the *Metamorphoses* is rich in comedic subversions of Homeric register, and the grotesquerie of the exaggerated violence contained within these narratives removes for the most part any trace of pathos. Not solely for the sake of parody, however, are Ovid's reworkings - his engagements with battle narrative frequently supply the opportunity for both intertextual allusion and his own brand of poetic criticism in such a way as to invite the reader to draw comparisons between his own work and the extensive epic tradition that preceded it.

His generic borrowings (particularly of elegiac material, as exemplified by Atalanta's intrusion into the Boar Hunt and the interlude of Cyllarus and Hylonome in the Centauromachy) serve to enrich his work in such a way as to render it unprecedented in the literary landscape of Augustan Rome. Ovid was not engaging with Virgil's *Aeneid* after the fashion of a mere imitator, but was well aware of the many subtleties of contemporary literary criticism, and ensured that his own work would be able to compete with the *Aeneid* by capable of incorporating elements of it into the *Metamorphoses*. Ovid does not mock Virgil outright, and is cognizant of the fact that an excessively ambitious attempt at imitation might only attract harsher criticism. Instead, Ovid chooses to engage with Virgil through the vehicle of intertextual allusion.

References

- Abbot J C 'The *Aeneid* and the Concept of Dolus Bonus' in *Vergilius*, Vol. 46, 2000, pp. 59-82.
- Ahl F 'Homer, Vergil, and Complex Narrative Structures in Latin Epic', *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 14, 1989, pp. 1 - 31.
- Albis R V *Poet and Audience in the Argonautica of Apollonius*. Rowman and Littlefield, Inc. Maryland. 1996.
- Alessio M *Studies in Virgil Aeneid XI*. Ann Arbor. Michigan. 1993.
- Altieri C 'Ovid and the New Mythologists', *A Forum on Fiction*, Vol. 7, 1973, pp. 31-40.
- Anderson M J *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art*. Clarendon Press. Oxford. 1997.
- Anderson W S *Ovid's Metamorphoses Books 1 – 5*. University of Oklahoma Press. Norman. 1997.
- Anderson W S 'Chalinus armiger in Plautus' "*Casina*", *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 8, 1983, pp. 11 – 21.
- Anderson W S 'Virgil's Second *Iliad*', *Oxford Readings in Virgil's Aeneid*, 1990, pp. 239 - 252.
- Armstrong R 'Against Nature? Some Augustan Responses to Man-made Marvels', Hardie P (ed.), *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture*, pp. 75 - 94. Oxford University Press Oxford. 2009.
- Bakker E J 'Discourse and Performance: Involvement, Visualization and "Presence" in Homeric Poetry', *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 12, 1993, pp. 1 - 29.

- Barchiesi A 'Narrative technique and narratology in the *Metamorphoses*', *Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002, pp. 180 - 199.
- Bate M S 'Tempestuous Poetry: Storms in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, *Heroides* and *Tristia*', *Mnemosyne*, Vol 57, 2004, pp. 295 - 310.
- Benario H W 'The Tenth Book of the *Aeneid*', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 98, 1967, pp. 23-36.
- Beye C R 'Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 68, 1964, pp. 345-373.
- Beye C R *Ancient Epic Poetry*. Cornell University Press. New York. 1993.
- Berlin N 'War and Remembrance: "*Aeneid*" 12.554-60 and Aeneas' Memory of Troy', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 119, 1998, pp. 11-41.
- Boyd W B 'Virgil's Camilla and the Traditions of Catalogue and Ecphrasis (*Aeneid* 7.803-17)', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 113, pp. 213-234, 1992.
- Bömer F *Metamorphosen: Kommentar Buch VIII - IX*. Carl Winter Universitätsverlag. Heidelberg. 1977.
- Briggs W W 'Lines Repeated from the *Georgics* in the *Aeneid*', *The Classical Journal*, Vol 77, 1981, pp.130 - 147.
- Cairns F *Virgil's Augustan Epic*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. 1999.
- Casali S 'Correcting Aeneas's Voyage: Ovid's Commentary on *Aeneid* 3', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 137, pp. 181-210.
- Cleary V 'To the Victor go the Spolia: A Study in Vergilian Imagery', *Vergilius*, No. 28, 1982, pp. 15-29.

- Coleman R 'Structure and Intent in the *Metamorphoses*', *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 21, 1971, pp. 461-477.
- Conte G B *Latin Literature: A History*. Hopkins University Press. Baltimore. 1994.
- De Brohun J B 'Centaur in Love and War: Cyllarus and Hylonome in Ovid "Metamorphoses" 12.393-428', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 125, 2004, pp. 417-452.
- Di Cesare M A *The Altar and the City: A Reading of Virgil's Aeneid*. Columbia University Press. New York. 1974.
- Dinter M 'Epic and Epigram: Minor Heroes in Virgil', *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 55, 2005, pp. 153-169.
- Fantham E 'Nymphas...e navibus esse: Decorum and Poetic Fiction in *Aeneid* 9. 77-122 and 10. 215-59', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 85, 1990, pp. 102-119.
- Franke W 'The Secondariness of Virgilian Epic and its Unprecedented Originality', *College Literature*, Vol 40, 2013, pp. 11 - 31.
- Fratantuono L *Madness Unchained: A Reading of Virgil's Aeneid*. Lexington Books. Plymouth. 2007.
- Fratantuono L *A Commentary on Virgil Aeneid XI*. Études Latomus. Brussels. 2009.
- Friedrich W H *Wounding and Death in the Iliad*. Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd. London. 2003.
- Goldberg S M *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford University Press. New York. 1995. p.83.
- Gransden K W *Virgil's Iliad: An Essay on Epic Narrative*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. 1984.

- Hainsworth J B *The Idea of Epic*. The University of California Press. Oxford. 1991.
- Hardie P *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Clarendon Press. Oxford. 1986.
- Hardie P *Virgil, Aeneid IX*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. 1994.
- Harrison S J *Vergil Aeneid 10*. Clarendon Press. Oxford. 1991.
- Heinze R *Vergils Epische Technik*. B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft. Stuttgart. 1965.
- Hight G *The Speeches in Virgil's Aeneid*. Princeton University Press. Princeton. 1972.
- Holland L A 'Place Names and Heroes in the *Aeneid*', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 56, 1935, pp. 202-215.
- Hollis A S *Metamorphoses Book VIII*. The Clarendon Press. Oxford. 1970.
- Horsfall N 'Turnus ad portas' in *Latomus* 33, 1974 , pp. 80-86.
- Horsfall N 'Epic and Burlesque in Ovid, Met. viii. 260ff', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 74, 1979, pp. 319-332.
- Horsfall N 'Numanus Remulus: Ethnography and Propaganda in *Aeneid* 9.598ff', *Oxford Readings in Virgil's Aeneid*, ed. Harrison S J, Oxford University Press, 1990, pp. 305 - 316.
- Horsfall N *Virgil. Aeneid 11: A Commentary*. Brill. Leiden. 2003.
- Huxley H H 'Ovid's Debt to Virgil' in *Vergilius*, Vol. 42, pp. 83 - 102, 1996.
- Isaac B 'Proto-Racism in Graeco-Roman Antiquity', *World Archaeology*, Vol. 38, 2006, pp. 32-47.

Jones W 'Mezentius the Isolated Hero', *Vergilius*, No. 23, 1977, pp. 50-54.

Keith A M 'Epic Masculinity in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', Hardie P, Barchiesi A, (eds) *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*, p. 214 - 239. The Cambridge Philological Society. Cambridge. 1999.

Keith A M 'Ovid on Vergilian War Narrative' in *Vergilius*, Vol. 48, 2002, pp. 105 - 122.

Keith A M 'Sources and Genres in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 1-5' in Boyd B W (ed.), *A Companion to the Study of Ovid*, pp. 235-69. Leiden. 2002.

Kenney E J, 'Iudicium Transferrendi: Virgil, *Aeneid* 2.469 - 505 and its antedecents', West D, Woodman T, (eds) *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979, pp. 103 - 120.

King K C 'Foil and Fusion: Homer's Achilles in Vergil's *Aeneid*', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 9, 1982, pp. 31-57.

Knauer G N 'Vergil's *Aeneid* and Homer', *Oxford Readings in Virgil's Aeneid*, 1990, pp. 390 - 412

Knox B M W 'The Serpent and the Flame: The Imagery of the Second Book of the *Aeneid*', *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 71, 1950, pp. 379-400.

Knox P E *Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Traditions of Augustan Poetry*. Cambridge Philological Society. Cambridge. 1986.

Lonsdale S H 'If Looks Could Kill: παρταίνω and the Interpenetration of Imagery and Narrative in Homer' in *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 84, 1989, pp. 325-333.

Lyme R O A M *Further Voices in the Aeneid*. Clarendon Press. Oxford. 1987.

Mader G 'The Be(a)st of the Achaeans: Turning Tables/Overturning Tables in Ovid's *Centauromachy* (*Metamorphoses* 12.210-535)', *Arethusa* 46, 2013, pp. 87-116.

- Makowski J F 'Bisexual Orpheus: Pederasty and Parody in Ovid', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 92, 1996, pp. 25 - 38.
- Meban D 'The Nisus and Euryalus Episode and Roman Friendship', *Phoenix*, Vol. 63, 2009, pp. 239 - 259.
- Minchin E *Homer and the Resources of Memory*. Oxford University Press. New York. 2001.
- Moskalew W 'Myrmidons, Dolopes, and Danaans: Wordplays in *Aeneid* 2', *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol 40, 1990.
- Musgrove M W 'Nestor's Centauromachy and the Deceptive Voice of Poetic Memory (Ovid *Met.* 12.182-535)', *Classical Philology*, Vol. 93, 1998, pp. 223-231.
- Myers K S *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the Metamorphoses*. The University of Michigan Press. Michigan. 1996.
- Otis B *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. 1966.
- Panoussi V 'Vergil's Ajax: Allusion, Tragedy, and Heroic Identity in the *Aeneid*', *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 21, 2002, pp. 95-134.
- Paratore E *Eneide Libri IX - X*. Fondazione Lorenzo Valla. 1981.
- Parry H 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Violence in a Pastoral Landscape', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol 95, 1964, pp. 268-282.
- Pavlock B 'Epic and Tragedy in Vergil's Nisus and Euryalus Episode', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 115, 1985, pp. 207 - 224.
- Petrini M *The Child and the Hero: Coming of Age in Catullus and Vergil*. Ann Arbor. Michigan. 1997.

- Quinn K, *Virgil's Aeneid: A Critical Description*. Routledge & Kegan Paul. London. 1968.
- Quinn K *Text and Context: The Roman Writers and their Audience*. Routledge & Kegan Paul. London. 1979.
- Quint D 'The Brothers of Sarpedon: Patterns of Homeric Imitation in *Aeneid* 10. 36', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 47, 2001, pp. 35-66.
- Rabel R J 'The Iliadic Nature of Aeneid 9' in *Vergilius*, No. 24, 1978, pp. 37-44.
- Rabel R J 'The Composition of Aeneid IX' in *Latomus* 40, 1981, pp. 801-806.
- Rosati, G 'Narrative Techniques and Narrative Structures in the *Metamorphoses*', *Brill's Companion to Ovid*. BRILL. 2002. pp. 271 - 304.
- Sammons B *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue*. Oxford University Press. Oxford. 2010.
- Saylor C 'Group vs. Individual in Vergil *Aeneid* IX' in *Latomus* 49, 1990, pp. 88-94.
- Scodel R *Listening to Homer*. University of Michigan Press. Michigan. 2002.
- Segal C 'Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: Greek Myth in Augustan Rome', *Studies in Philology*, Vol. 68, 1971, pp. 371-394.
- Segal C 'Ovid's Metamorphic Bodies: Art, Gender, and Violence in the "*Metamorphoses*"', *Arion*, Vol. 5, 1998, pp. 9-41.
- Segal C 'Ovid's Meleager and the Greeks: Trials of Gender and Genre', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 99, 1999, pp. 301 - 340.
- Sklenář R J 'The Death of Priam: Aeneid 2. 506-558', *Hermes*, 118, 1990, pp. 67-75.

Stephens V G 'Like a Wolf on the Fold: Animal Imagery in Vergil', *Illinois Classical Studies*, Vol. 15, 1990, pp. 107-130, p. 125.

Stephens W C 'Descent to the Underworld in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 53, 1958, pp. 177 - 183.

Syed Y *Virgil's Aeneid and the Roman Self*. The University of Michigan Press. Ann Arbor. 2005.

Tarbell F B 'Centauromachy and Amazonomachy in Greek Art: The Reasons for Their Popularity' *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 24, 1920, pp. 226-231.

Tarrant R 'Roads Not Taken: Untold Stories in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 54, 2005, pp. 65 - 89.

Toohey P *Reading Epic*. Routledge. London. 1992.

Vance E 'Warfare and the Structure of Thought in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, No. 15, 1973, pp. 111-162.

Watkins O D 'Ovid, "Metamorphoses", 8, 365-8', *Latomus* 42, 1983, pp. 135 - 138

West G S 'Chloereus and Camilla', *Vergilius*, No. 31, 1985, pp. 22-29

Williams G *Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid*. Yale University Press. New Haven. 1983.

Williams R D *The Aeneid of Virgil Books 7 - 12*. Macmillan Education Limited. London. 1973.

Williams R D 'The Purpose of the *Aeneid*' in *Oxford Readings in Virgil's Aeneid*, 1990, pp. 21 - 36

Ziogas I *Ovid and Hesiod: The Metamorphosis of the Catalogue of Women*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge. 2013.

Zumwalt N 'Fama Subversa: Theme and Structure in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 12', *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 10, 1977, pp. 212 - 222.