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THE ALLEGORY OF THE GOLDEN BOUGH

I

Not too many years ago, an essay bearing the title above would have required an apology. Viktor Pöschl’s Die Dichtkunst Virgils, for example, published in English in 1962, “displays throughout an uncompromisingly hostile attitude toward allegory.”¹ Indeed, the enormous prestige of this book may be largely responsible for the fact that in the wake of its publication, most criticism omitted even to mention allegoresis as a method of interpreting the Aeneid. When David Thompson wrote in 1970 that Pöschl’s symbolic reading of the poem is itself “in many cases the veriest allegory,”² this protest had the character of a voice crying in the wilderness. That, however, was a quarter of a century ago. Since then things have changed, and to such a degree that a discussion of Virgilian allegory now requires bibliography rather than apology.³ Therefore, thanks to a critical climate that no longer dismisses out of hand the possibility of allegory in Virgil, we may proceed directly to the preliminary thesis of this paper.

II

In Aeneid 6.724–51, Virgil adopts the manner of Lucretius and presents a philosophically eclectic cosmology according to which the macrocosm is a living organism composed of body and soul. The overt Lucretianisms in this passage have been noted in detail by Norden and Austin.⁴ Elsewhere in the same book, however,

¹ David Thompson, “Allegory and Typology in the Aeneid,” Arethusa 3 (1970): 147, where Pöschl’s book is called “the greatest modern critical work on the Aeneid.”
² Ibid.
Virgil’s debt to Lucretius extends beyond words and phrases to include ideas and conceptions. In lines 273–81, for example, Aeneas encounters an assemblage of fearful abstractions encamped at the entrance to the underworld:

vestibulum ante ipsum primisque in faubus Orcli Luctus et ullices posuere cubilia Curae,

dallentesque habitant Morbi tristisque Senectus,
et Metus et malesuada Fames ac turpis Egestas,
terribiles visu formae, Letumque Labosque;
tum consanguineus Leti Sopor et mala mentis
Gaudia, mortiferumque adverso in limine Bellum,
ferrique Eumenidum thalami et Discordia demens
viperum crinem vittis innexa cruentis.

Here also, to be sure, Virgil is indebted to Lucretius for phraseology—“turpis Egestas” in line 276 is a conflation of “turpis contemptus” and “acris egestas” in Lucretius 3.65—but he has borrowed a conception as well. In Lucretius 3.65–67, “turpis contemptus” and “acris egestas” loiter before figurative gates of hell:

turpis enim ferme contemptus et acris egestas
semota ab dulci vita stabilibque videtur
et quasi iam leti portas cunctarier ante

In Aeneid 6.273, as Agnes K. Michels once noted,⁵ these figurative gates reappear as an actual anteroom leading into Hades. Here Virgil has borrowed a Lucretian image and turned it into material reality.⁶

In the pages that follow, I will argue that Virgil’s Golden Bough is another instance, albeit a more complex one, of Lucretian imagery made real. More generally, I will also undertake to show that Virgil describes the Golden Bough in terms that apply as well to the union of body and soul in a living organism. Finally I will consider some implications of this fact for the meaning of the Golden Bough

⁵ Agnes K. Michels, “Lucretius and the Sixth Book of the Aeneid,” AJP 65 (1944): 138–40. Lucretius’ “leti portae” reappear as “leti ianua” in 5.373, in a passage in which Virgil found further material for his description of the entrance to the underworld. For “vasto immanis hiatu” of the cave in Aen. 6.237, Norden (n. 4 above) 201 cites parallels in Euripides and Apollonius, but he does not mention the immediate source both of Virgil’s phrase and of its chthonic context, viz., Lucretius’ “sed patet immani et vasto respectat hiatu,” which occurs in 5.375 and refers to the “leti ianua” in 5.373. For the correspondence between Virgil’s Avernian cave and Lucretius’ figurative gate of death, see Raymond J. Clark, Catabasis: Vergil and the Wisdom-Tradition (Amsterdam, 1979), 188–89.

⁶ This aspect (“remythologization”) of Virgil’s debt to Lucretius is discussed in Philip R. Hardie, Virgil’s “Aeneid”: “Cosmos” and “Imperium” (Oxford, 1986), 178, 180–82.
in the context of *Aeneid* 6 as a whole.7

III

In *Aeneid* 4.441–46, Aeneas is compared to an oak that, like Aeneas himself in Book 6, “in Tartara tendit” (4.446). This “age-old simile between men and trees”8 is grounded in an anthropomorphic perception of trees that is apparently universal.9 In Latin, *brachia* for *rami*, and *coma* for *folia*, are both trite poetisms, and even in common parlance, *truncus* is applied to tree trunks as well as to human torsos.10 Indeed, the former is the primary meaning of the word. Amphibology is thus inherent in the noun *truncus*, and in *Aeneid* 6.207, this aspect of the word is brought to the fore by the addition of the adjective *teres*, which is itself used of the human anatomy no less than of trees and their branches.11 Thus, removed from its context, “teres ... truncos” in *Aeneid* 6.207 would be ambiguous; it could refer to trees, but it could equally well refer to human bodies.

The anthropomorphism of the Golden Bough and its oak is, if anything, even more pronounced in the passage in which they are first mentioned. In 6.141, the Sibyl refers to the Bough as the “auricomos ... fetus” of the oak. The transference of the noun *fetus* from animals to plants is too common to allow much to be made of that here. Conversely, however, the adjective *auricomus* is unattested before this occurrence, and so it is not known how (or, indeed, whether) this word was used before Virgil. The Greek adjectives *χρυσοκόμος* and -*κομός*, on which

---


9 The last word on this subject is Wilhelm Mannhardt, *Wald- und Feldkulte* (Berlin, 1904–5; reprinted Darmstadt, 1963); see esp. 1:1–4 (“Grundanschauung”) and 2:23–31 (“Wechselbeziehung zwischen Mensch und Baum”). Yet this immense work appears not to mention the important phenomenon of the ancient battle trophy, which consisted of the defeated warrior’s armor suspended from a tree trunk representing, presumably, his torso. The anthropomorphic aspect of the trophy is salient in Virgil’s description of the trophy erected by Aeneas in *Aen.* 11.5–11 (see also 11.83). For bibliography on the trophy, see W. Kendrick Pritchett, *The Greek State at War*, Part 2 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1974), 246–51. There is also testimony indicating that in Greece, tree trunks could serve as aniconic monuments: see A. A. Donohue, “*Xoana* and the Origins of Greek Sculpture” (Atlanta, 1988), 220; also the passage quoted from Clement’s *Protrepticus* ibid. 266–70.


auricomus is modeled, are used primarily of gods (Apollo in particular). If, as seems likely, Virgil adhered to the reference of his Greek models as faithfully as he reproduced their form, *auricomi fetus* would be a bold personification. The literal meaning of the adjective would suggest that in any case. The same applies to the Sibyl’s choice of words when, in 6.146, she tells Aeneas that, “si te fata vocant,” the Bough will prove easy to detach:

\[ \text{ipse volens facilisque sequetur} \]

This too is an expression that would ordinarily refer to an animate being. Out of sixteen other occurrences in Virgil, *volens*, for example, is applied to gods or to human beings in all cases but one (“volentia rura” in *Georgics 2.500*). Finally, the Bough is also personified in 6.211, where “cunctantem,” as others have noted, seems “to endow the branch with a will, consciousness, and quasi-animate life of its own.”

As it is analyzed in *De rerum natura* 3 and elsewhere, the physiology of the living organism corresponds in many respects with the union of Virgil’s Golden Bough and its oak. Indeed, in the line of the *Aeneid* just quoted, the wording of the Sibyl’s promise that the Bough “ipse volens facilisque sequetur” recalls Lucretius 3.400, where the *anima* is said to depart the body in the wake of the *animus*:

\[ \text{sed comes insequitur facile} \]

Thus, the Sibyl characterizes the detachment of the Golden Bough from its tree in language that Lucretius applies to the separation of soul from body. Such correspondences between Virgil’s Bough and its oak and the Lucretian analysis of body and soul are in general so numerous—and their implications so suggestive—that it will be worthwhile to consider them in some detail.

The light from the Bough contrasts with the darkness of the oak within the dark forest where the oak grows. The importance of this contrast is implicit in the frequency with which Virgil alludes to it:

\[ \text{latet arbore opaca} \]
\[ \text{aureus et foliis et lento vime ramus} \]
\[ (6.136-37) \]

---

12 Norden (n. 4 above) 176.
13 So John H. D’Arms, “Vergil’s ‘Cunctantem (Ramum)’: *Aeneid* 6.211,” *CJ* 59 (1964): 266, where the personification in “auricomos . . . fetus” is also noted.
The corresponding antithesis of the light of the soul locked in the darkness of the body (σῶμα σίμα) is too familiar to require documentation. In the Aeneid it is found some 700 lines after the first mention of the Golden Bough, that is, in the cosmology to which reference has already been made:

igneus est ollis vigor et caelestis origo
seminibus
(6.730–31)

... neque auras
dispiciunt clausae tenebris et carcere caeco
(6.733–34)

... purumque relinquit
aetherium sensum atque aurai simplicis ignem
(6.746–47)

A further link with the Bough is to be found in “aurai simplicis ignem” in 6.747, which parallels “auri . . . aura” in 6.204. In both of these expressions, which are striking precisely on this account, light is referred to as aura: the light/fire that is soul in 6.747, and the radiance of the Golden Bough in 6.204.

16 Usefully succinct is Plu. 2.1130b: αὐτὴν τε τὴν ψυχὴν ἐνοι τῶν φιλοσόφων φῶς εἶναι τῇ ὑπὸ την ημισωματίαν, cited in Albrecht Dieterich, Nekyia2 (Leipzig and Berlin, 1913; reprinted Darmstadt, 1969), 24, n. 1.


Vergilius 7
In *Aeneid* 6.207, the Golden Bough is compared to mistletoe encircling a tree:

\[\text{[quale solet viscum] teretis circumdare truncos}^{18}\]

As the mistletoe clings to its host, a similarly tight bond ties the soul to all parts of the body in Lucretius 3:

\[\text{nam neque [anism] tanto opere adnecti potuisse putandumst corporibus nostris extrinsecus insinuatus (3.688-89)}\]

\[\text{namque [animal] ita conexa est per venas, viscera, nervos ossaeque uti dentes quoque sensu participentur (3.691-92)}\]

\[\text{nec [animalae], tam contextae cum sint, exire videntur incolumes posse et salvas exsolvere sese omnibus e nervis atque ossibus articulisque (3.695-97)}\]

In the *Phaedo* of Plato, no verb is used more often than δεῖν, the exact equivalent of *nectere*, and its compounds to express the relationship of soul to body.\(^{19}\) The same conception is also found in *Aen.* 4.695, where the meaning of “nexos” (sc. “animae”) is clear from the first two passages quoted just above:

\[\text{quae luctantem animam nexosque resolveret artus} \]

Finally, the similarity between an animate body and a tree wrapped in mistletoe is made overt in Lucretius 3.325. Here soul and body are compared to two

True enough; and hence the parallelism between 6.204 and 6.747, unmentioned by Brooks, is the more salient on that account.

\(^{18}\) In Sen. *Ep.* 92.13, the same verb is used to express the opposite relationship of the body enclosing the soul like a garment: “hoc [sc. corpus] natura ut quandam vestem animo circumdedit,” with which cf. the many sources for this idea cited in G. Zuntz, *Persephone* (Oxford, 1971), 406, n. 4. On the other hand, there is an exact correspondence between “teretis circumdare truncos” and the Pythagorean (?) symbolism of a large veil = ψυχή removed from the body at death: for this image on Roman sarcophagi, see William Lameere, “Un symbole pythagoricien dans l’art funéraire de Rome,” *Bull. Corr. Hell.* 63 (1939): 79–85.

\(^{19}\) Cf. *Phd.* 81D-E (ἀνδεῖν), 82E (διαδεῖν, προσκολλάν, δεῖν), 83D (καταδεῖν, προσηλôν, προσπερινάν), 84A (ἐγκαταδείπν).
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plants which, like mistletoe and tree, are so tightly entwined that they seem to spring from the same roots:  

nam [anima et corpus] communibus inter se radicibus haerent

This image is sustained through lines 331–32, where soul atoms and body atoms are implicitly compared to intertwining plants:

implexis ita principiis ab origine prima
inter se, fiunt [anima et corpus] consorti praedita vita

The same botanical metaphor is latent in Plato’s choice of words in Phaedo 81C, concerning the corruption of soul by body:

ἀλλὰ διειλημμένην . . . ὑπὸ τοῦ σωματοειδοῦς, διὰ αυτὴ ἡ ὁμιλία τε καὶ συννοσία τοῦ σώματος διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ συνείναι καὶ διὰ τὴν πολλὴν μελέτην ἑνετοίησε σύμφυτον;

From the tight bond uniting soul and body, Lucretius derives some important corollaries, among them the notion, expressed in 3.695–97 above, that the soul is not easily pried loose from the body. This idea, in turn, affects Lucretius’ diction, for the separation of soul from body is sometimes expressed with verbs connoting effort or even violence.  

In 3.326, a compound of vellere serves this purpose:

nam communibus inter se radicibus haerent
nec sine pernicie divelli posse videntur

Similarly, it is difficult—nay, impossible in most cases—to separate the Golden Bough from the oak on which it grows:

20 “The atoms of soul and body so interpenetrate each other . . . that they have, as it were, a tangle of common roots” (Cyril Bailey, ed., Titi Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex, vol. 2 [Oxford, 1947], 1048).

21 This aspect of Lucretius’ thanatology is discussed in Charles P. Segal, Lucretius on Death and Anxiety (Princeton, 1990), 60.

22 In 3.327 and 3.563, evellere and avellere are used with reference to odor and oculus respectively, to both of which the soul is compared. Also cf. compounds of trahere in 3.330 and 3.844. The occurrence of convellere in 3.340 and 3.343 is not, however, apposite, for in both lines this compound refers not to the separation of soul and of its analogue, water vapor, but rather to the effect that this separation has, or fails to have, on the body and on water respectively.

23 The force required for removing the Bough from its tree is expressed not only by a- and convellere in the lines quoted below, but also by “decerpserit” in 141, by “carpe manu” in 146 (manu roughly = “forcefully”), and by “corruptit” and “refringit” in 210. See Segal (n. 14 above) 74–76, which critiques William T. Avery, “The Reluctant Golden Bough,” C J 61 (1966): 271.
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aliter non viribus ullis
vincere nec duro poteris *convellere* ferro

(6.147–48)

Note the compound of *vellere*, as in Lucretius. Combined with a different prefix, the same verb is used of the Bough in *Aeneid* 6.143:

primo *avulso*, non deficit alter

*aureus*

This idea is also found in *Phaedo* 108A-B, where it applies, however, only to the class of souls corrupted by the body:

*η μὲν ὄν ἀνάμικτα τε καὶ φρόνιμος ψυχῇ ἔπεται τε καὶ σώκοι σὰ τὰ παρόντα· ἡ δ’ ἐπιθυμητικῶς τοῦ ἀναμικτού ἔχονσα . . . , περὶ ἐκεῖνο πολὺν χρόνον ἐπιθυμεῖ καὶ περὶ τὸν ὀφαρτὸν τότον, πολλὰ ἀντιπρόσωπα καὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα, βίοτο καὶ μόνιμος ὑπὸ τοῦ προστεταγμένου δαίμονος ὀξεῖται ἀγωμένη.*

It is likely that the notion of the difficulty of separating soul from body also lies behind *Aeneid* 4.695, where Dido’s soul is said to struggle (*luctari*), presumably to free itself from the queen’s body:

*quae luctantem* animam nexosque resolveret artus

So does the same participle of *cunctari*, resembling *luctari* phonetically, express the difficulty of separating the Bough from its tree in 6.210–11:

*corripit Aeneas extemplo avidusque refringit cunctantem*

This, however, is different from what the Sibyl tells Aeneas to expect in 6.146–48:

*namque ipse volens facilisque sequetur si te fata vocant; aliter non viribus ullis vincere nec duro poteris convellere ferro*

There are some striking verbal correspondences between the preceding two passages on the Bough and the lines quoted above from *Phaedo* 108A–B²⁴:

²⁴ There is also a close resemblance, noted by commentators, between *Phd*. 66B–C and lines 730–34 later in *Aeneid* 6. Thus, a connection between the *Phaedo* and Virgil’s Bough is a priori a plausible hypothesis.

10 *Vergilius*
“cunctantem” = πολλά ἀντιτείνασα; “facilis” opp. μόνος; “sequetur” = διήπται; and “viribus” = βίο. Subject to the condition “si te fata vocant,” the Sibyl leads Aeneas to expect the Bough to detach as easily as χαμία τε καὶ φρόνμος ψυχή; in the event, it more resembles in its tenacity ψυχή ἑπιθυμητικῶς τοῦ σώματος ἔχονσα. The correspondence between Virgil’s stubborn Bough and a soul clinging to life can also be adduced from Lucretius. Cunctari, used of the Bough in Virgil, refers in Lucretius to an injured man’s reluctance to relinquish his soul:

si non omnimodis, at magna parte animai
privatus, tamen in vita cunctatur et haeret

(3.406–7)

The fact that Virgil’s Bough is hidden from view is expressed in no fewer than three separate clauses, first with latere, then with tegere, finally with claudere:

latet arbore opaca

. . . ramus (6.136–37)

hunc tegit omnis
lucus et obscuris claudunt convallibus umbrae

(6.138–39)

Similarly, in Lucretius 3.273–81, the verb latere is thrice used of the “fourth element” constituting the soul, the remoteness of which from perception by the senses (Bailey’s gloss) is expressed as follows in 3.273–74:

nam penitus prorsum latet haec natura subestque
nec magis hac infra quicquam est in corpore nostro

If “in corpore nostro” alone were deleted, these could be the words of the Sibyl speaking of the Golden Bough. Secondly, as the verb tegere is applied to the grove covering the Golden Bough, so is the same stem used of the body sheltering the soul in Lucretius 3:

quare etiam atque etiam, resuloto corporis omni
tegmine et eiectis extra vitalibus auris,
dissolvi sensum animi fateare necessest
atque animam, quoniam coniunctast causa duobus

(3.576–79)
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quid dubitas tandem quin, extra prodita corpus
imbecilla foras, in aperto, tegmine dempto,
non modo non omnem possit durare per aevum
sed minimum quodvis nequeat consistere tempus?
(3.603–6)

So with the last of the three verbs employed by Virgil, namely, *claudere*, a compound of which is used to refer to the soul trapped in an aged body in Lucretius 3.773:

an metuit **conclusa** manere in corpore putri?

Indeed, later in *Aeneid* 6, Virgil himself uses *claudere* of souls imprisoned in bodies:

... **clausae** tenebris et carcere caeco
(6.734)

Here there is a clear verbal correspondence between souls enclosed in darkness ("clausae tenebris") and the Bough that shadows enclose ("claudunt umbrae") in line 139.

If we extend our inquiry beyond Lucretius to include ancient philosophy in general, further correspondences emerge. Pythagoreans held the view (rejected by Lucretius in 3.670–97) that only the body is created at conception, the immortal soul entering the mortal body only at the moment of birth. The particular application of this idea in Ennius *Annals* 8–10 (Skutsch) is well known:

ova parire solet genus pennis condecoratum,
non animam. post inde venit divinitus pullis
ipsa anima

Thus, the living organism is an entity composed of alien elements, of which only the body is a product of conception. In describing the mistletoe and its toree in *Aeneid* 6.206, Virgil comes as close to this idea as biological facts will allow:

**quod** [i.e., *viscum*] non sua seminat arbos

The same could be said of the tree's soul, if only it had one.

The parallelism between Virgil's mistletoe and the soul of Ennius' peacock is exact: like the soul of the peacock, the mistletoe is genetically alien to the tree on which it grows. Indeed, the rare verb *seminare* (occurring only here in Virgil, and missing entirely even in Lucretius) could seem calculated to bring to mind

12 Virgilius
Lucretius' *semina* and their central role in his theory of the soul. When Virgil ostentatiously mimics Lucretius in the cosmologies of *Eclogues* 6.31–40 and *Aeneid* 6.724–51, he uses *semina* in both passages. Lucretius himself, moreover, in refuting Pythagorean doctrine, insists that the soul, like the body, is created "semine seminioque":

\[
\text{si non certa suo quia *semine seminioque* vis animi pariter crescit cum corpore quoque} \\
(3.746–47)
\]

From a purely formal point of view, the similarity between Virgil's "*non sua seminat*" and "*non . . . suo . . . semine*" in Lucretius is obvious.\(^25\) Plato uses the same image in *Phaedo* 83D, where the reincarnated soul is said to be planted and to take root in a new body:

\[
\overset{\text{ωστε ταχύ πίπτειν εἰς ἄλλο σώμα καὶ ὄστερ σπειρομένη ἐμφύεσθαι}}{\text{For α πταιεν εἰς ἄλλο σώμα καὶ ὄστερ σπειρομένη ἐμφύεσθαι}}
\]

Different origins imply different natures. Just as the carnal conception of the body and the celestial origin of the soul reflect their respective mortality and immortality, so the apparent immortality of the mistletoe sets this plant apart from the tree on which it grows:

\[
\text{quałe solet silvis brumali frigore viscum} \\
\text{fronde virere nova . . .} \\
\text{et croceo fetu teretis circumdare truncos} \\
(6.205–7)
\]

For the mistletoe alone, the spring that is life is eternal, enduring even in winter, when its host tree succumbs to a dormancy resembling death.\(^26\)

The correspondences detailed above are remarkable not only for being precise. Their sheer number is so large that useful though it might be in principle to summarize them here, to do so would destroy the coherence of the discussion. The correspondences between oak/Bough and body/soul are also thoroughly consistent. Points of contact lie without exception between oak and body, Bough and soul; there are none at all between oak and soul, or between Bough and body. In sum, the correspondences identified above are so exact, so numerous, and so con-

\(^{25}\) It would appear that in 6.209, Virgil also owes to Lucretius the noun *brattea*, which is first attested in *Lucr*. 4.727 (a comparison between gold leaf and compound *simulacra* sufficiently "tenuia" [4.726] both to combine and to penetrate through to the "*tenuem animi naturam*" [4.731]. Thus, the *brattea* of Virgil's Bough has *tenuitas* in common with the Lucretian soul).

\(^{26}\) "Winter und Tod sind für mythisches Denken eins" (Norden [n. 4 above] 166).
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sistent as to justify adopting, *argumenti causa*, the working hypothesis that the oak stands for a human body (this, as noted at the outset, is plausible a priori), while the Golden Bough symbolizes a soul.\(^{27}\) The next step is to consider whether *Aeneid* 6 as a whole supports or negates this hypothesis. Considering this question may also make it possible to identify whom the oak and its magical bough might be taken to represent.

IV

In lines that are among the most famous in the *Aeneid*, the Sibyl warns Aeneas that a journey into the underworld is fraught with danger:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{facilis descensus Averno,} \\
\text{noctes atque dies patet atri ianua Ditis;} \\
\text{sed revocare gradum superasque evadere ad auras,} \\
\text{hoc opus, hic labor est}
\end{align*}
\]

(6.126–29)

And so Aeneas’ own experience proves it to be. In yet another series of encounters with phantoms connected with his irretrievable past, Aeneas proves no less vulnerable to basic but ruinous human impulses—"ignoscenda quidem, scirent si ignoscere Manes"—than he has been throughout his voyage on earth from Troy to Cumae. But for the Sibyl, his *misericordia* for Palinurus could induce him to violate the iron law of Hades,\(^{28}\) as *amor* led Orpheus before him to do. Virgil does not indicate (he does not need to) how Aeneas’ own *amor* might have led him to react had Dido’s shade received him with warmth and affection, as Anchises’ shade does later; but untranslatable “prosequitur” at the end of the episode (6.476) leaves little doubt. Finally, the pitiful sight of his mutilated compatriot Deiphobus reawakens the same *dolor* that repeatedly immobilizes him on earth. “With Deiphobus, Aeneas would have spent his whole time in reliving the past.”\(^ {29}\) This predilection Aeneas and Deiphobus share with the Trojan shades in Elysium, who also cannot forget their Trojan past:

\(^{27}\) In order to prevent later misunderstanding, I should stress at this point that the correspondences detailed above lie between Virgil’s description of the Golden Bough and *some* of the terms in which Lucretius analyzes the interrelationship between soul and body. This is not to argue that Lucretius’ Epicurean psychology is also Virgil’s psychology. In Anchises’ eschatology (6.724–51) as well, Virgil’s debt to Lucretius’ language is patent, but the content of that speech is downright anti-Lucretian.

\(^{28}\) “Lest Aeneas’ pity violate the laws of the Underworld, the Sibyl answers for him. . . . And he [Palinurus] would bind him to the emotional ties of the past when Aeneas is entering upon a larger scheme of destiny” (Segal [n. 15 above] 4 [1965]: 651–53).

\(^{29}\) Commager (n. 17 above) 8.

14 *Vergilius*
quae gratia currum
armorumque fuit vivis, quae cura nitentis
pascere equos, eadem sequitur tellure reposos
(6.653–55)

These actions betray the same overpowering nostalgia that Deiphobus puts into words:

et nimium meminisse necesse est
(6.514)

Once again, the Sibyl must intervene:

et fors omne datum traherent per talia tempus,
sed comes admonuit breviterque adfata Sibylla est:
"nox ruit, Aenea; nos flendo ducimus horas"
(6.537–39)

The first of these lines makes the meaning of "hoc opus, hic labor est" abundantly clear, "omne datum tempus" being nothing less than eternity in the context of the underworld. Aeneas’ continuing susceptibility to memoria and to dolor threatens to sidetrack forever his return to the world of the living. In the third line, the setting in sunless Hades—"tristes sine sole domus" (6.534)—clearly marks the symbolic import of “nox ruit, Aenea; nos flendo ducimus horas.” The same thing could have been said in Carthage and, in fact, was said:

quis talia fando
Myrmidonum Dolopumve aut duri miles Ulixī
temperet a lacrimis? et iam nox umida caelo
praecipitat suadentque cadentia sidera somnos
(2.6–9)

In Carthage, this reference to night falling as tears are shed is literal truth; but in the land of perpetual night—“umbrarum hic locus est, somni noctisque soporae” (6.390)—“nox ruit, Aenea” necessarily takes on the character of metaphor. Eternal darkness is about to fall on Troy, and Troy and the debilitating memory of it are soon to vanish from Aeneas’ consciousness. This interpretation is confirmed at the end of the scene, when Deiphobus, speaking as the personification of Troy and its people, promises to withdraw and to impede Aeneas no more:
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discedam, explebo numerum reddarque tenebris
(6.545)

This is a major turning point, for it signals Aeneas’ final release from the lure of
dolor and memoria.31

After a digression in which the Sibyl describes the impious of Tartarus and
their punishment,32 she and Aeneas make their way to Proserpina’s palace. There,
in two climactically succinct lines33 marked by tricolon, parison, and placement of
identical verb forms at extremes of the line,

occupat Aeneas aditum corpusque recenti
spargit aqua ramumque adverso in limine figit
(6.635–36)

If the Bough represents someone’s soul, the context of these lines makes it clear
enough whose soul is here left behind in Hades. Aeneas himself relinquishes his
Trojan soul. This act is the culmination of Aeneas’ labores and the precondition of
his passage from the darkness of Hades into the light of Elysium. Significantly,
he enters Elysium immediately after the deposition of the Bough, and this event
anticipates other, less concrete transitions soon to follow. With the emblem of

31 “The reader has a sense of leave-taking—of a farewell to wandering, to love, to Troy”
(Wendell Clausen, “An Interpretation of the Aeneid,” in Commager [n. 17 above] 86). “But I can-
not but believe that in this book he is meant to take a last farewell of all who have shared his past
fortunes, have helped him or injured him. . . . Henceforward [i.e., after Anchises’ prophecy]
Aeneas makes no allusion to the past and the figures that peopled it” (W. Warde Fowler, The Reli-
gious Experience of the Roman People [London, 1911], 421). For further discussion of this view
both pro and con, see the citations in Agnes K. Michels, “The Insomniun of Aeneas,” CQ, n.s., 31

32 Discussed at length in Zetzel (n. 7 above) 264–72.

33 Some years ago, L. A. MacKay also noted the striking contrast between the importance
of Aeneas’ presentation of the Bough and the brevity of its narration: “this could have been a
grandiose and impressive scene, but [Aeneas] . . . does not present his passport to Proserpina; when
he comes to dispose of the Bough he does so in a less spectacular, but actually more solemn
and more meaningful way” (L. A. MacKay, “Three Levels of Meaning in Aeneid VI,” TAP 86 [1955]:
182–83).

The same number of lines marked by the same features noted in Aen. 6.635–36 also de-
scribe the similarly climactic event of Aeneas detaching the Bough in 6.210–11:

corripit Aeneas extemplo avidusque refringit
cunctantem et vatis portat sub tecta Sibyllae

Is the final abandonment of the Bough thus meant to recall its initial acquisition? In addition to the
pair of lines, the tricolon with parison, and the framing of line 210 with identical verb forms (fea-
tures already noted in 6.635–36), note the correspondence between “corripit Aeneas” (6.210) and
“occupat Aeneas” (6.635), and also between the acts of taking the Bough to the Sibyl in 6.211 and
presenting it to Proserpina in 6.636.
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Trojan Aeneas’ soul relegated for eternity to the darkness of Hades, hope may now supplant nostalgia, the honest vigor of Rome in the making may replace the super-civilized decadence of fallen Troy (“excudent alii . . .”), and allegiance to the ideal of Romanitas may evolve from devotion to a mortal father.\textsuperscript{34} Nothing less than death and rebirth could suffice to express the mystery of such profound transformations,\textsuperscript{35} which found their contemporary parallel in the comparable mystery (or so it must have seemed to Virgil) of Octavian’s transformation from a dynast motivated by filial piety into the founder of a new order of things. Aeneas experiences the inverse of a usual reincarnation, in which the same soul exchanges one body for another.\textsuperscript{36} Aeneas rather exchanges one soul for another, and he deposits the Bough on Proserpina’s threshold at precisely that point in the narrative at which the burden of his Trojan soul is finally laid down. Here the identification of the Golden Bough with the soul of Trojan Aeneas suits the context admirably well.

The act of abandoning the Golden Bough at Proserpina’s door is accompanied by a lustration. Commentators since Servius have wondered why a lustration is required at this point in the narrative, and this quandary, in turn, raises the possibility that Aeneas’ actions in 6.635–36 are not to be explained in narrative terms alone. To be specific, these lines suggest a funeral, and this connotation is due not only to the context of similar actions elsewhere in the Aeneid, but also to the reflexive use of the noun corpus in the phrase describing Aeneas’ lustration: “corpusque recenti spargit aqua.” It will be worthwhile to consider each of these in turn, beginning with reflexive corpus.

\textsuperscript{34} The ascent from Aeneas’ love for his father to love for the Romanitas seen reflect in his father is analogous to the ascent from δ᾿ ἐρώτημα: το αὐτό ἦν καλόν in Plato’s Symposium. This Platonic aspect of Aeneid 6 is too little remarked upon; but there are useful observations concerning the interconnection between the motivation and the result of Aeneas’ catabasis in Richard C. Monti, The Dido Episode and the Aeneid (Leyden, 1981), 79–80. See also Otis (n. 30 above) 286. For the transformation of Aeneas in the underworld, see Viktor Pöschl, The Art of Virgil, trans. G. Seligson (Ann Arbor, 1962), 38; Elizabeth Belfiore, “Ter Frustra Comprensia: Embraces in the Aeneid,” Phoenix 38 (1984): 25; also below, pp. 22–24.


\textsuperscript{36} This is only a more precise formulation of Brooks Otis’s view that when Aeneas finally reached his father, “he had also undergone a kind of death [emphasis mine]—the death of his old Trojan and erotic self” (Otis [n. 30 above] 307). Similarly Adam Parry: “Aeneas has not only gone into the Underworld: he has in some way [emphasis mine] himself died” (Adam Parry, “The Two Voices of Virgil’s Aeneid,” Arion 2.4 [1963]: 78, reprinted in Commager [n. 17 above] 121). Otherwise Monti (n. 34 above) 80: “the Sibyl makes it plain that in seeking union with Anchises in the underworld, Aeneas seeks a true death.” For a Homeric parallel in Odyssey 11, where Odysseus’ journey to the underworld is said to be “most explicitly a symbolic death and rebirth,” see Stephen V. Tracy, The Story of the “Odyssey” (Princeton, 1990), 68 (a reference for which I have Joseph Rife to thank).
The reflexive use of singular corpus, though common in Latin, is uncommon and, with the sole exception of Aeneid 10.834, is restricted to the phrases “corripere e stratis/somno corpus” (3.176, 4.572) and “corpus spargere lympha/aqua.” The latter phrase occurs in identical contexts (lustration) in identical lines (635) in Books 4 and 6, and in both places the use of corpus instead of se is apposite for the same reason. In Book 4, Dido dispatches her nurse to bid Anna “corpus properet fluviali spargere lympha.” The corpus in question would seem to be Anna’s own, but for Dido, and for the reader aware of her imminent suicide, “corpus” also denotes Dido’s corpse. Not only does such amphibology become pronounced as the Dido drama reaches its climax, but “corpse” is in fact the usual meaning of accusative corpus in Virgil. In 4.683–84, the corpus to be cleansed proves to be Dido’s after all: “date,” says Anna to the throng gathered round her dying sister, “vulnera lymphis abluam.” A similar double entendre may be present in Aeneid 6.635. Here too the immediate context would require that corpus stand for se; but the symbolism of the Bough also suggests the meaning “corpse.” In laying down on Proserpina’s threshold the talisman of his ψυχη Τροικη, Aeneas becomes not a disembodied soul but, conversely, a body without a soul. The funerary import of Aeneas’ lustration is reinforced by the occurrence of the same details in the funeral of Misenus:

\[
\text{pars calidos latices et aëna undantia flammis} \\
\text{expediunt, corpusque lavant frigentis et unguunt} \\
\text{(6.218–19)}
\]

\[
\text{idem ter socios pura circumtulit unda} \\
\text{spargens rore levi et ramo felicens olivae,} \\
\text{lustravitque viros dixitque novissima verba} \\
\text{(6.229–31)}
\]

As Charles Segal observed almost thirty years ago, Aeneas’ lustration “closely recalls the ritual of burial required for Misenus before he could attain the Bough. . . . The rite of fastening the Bough thus recalls the recent actuality of death in the upper world.”

On the other hand, the phrase following Aeneas’ lustration suggests a dedication of equipment no longer needed:

\[
\text{37 See TLL, vol. 4, col. 1012.41–1014.10.} \\
\text{38 See Pöschl (n. 34 above) 83–85.} \\
\text{39 Sixteen times out of thirty-three, by my count, not including Aen. 10.820.} \\
\text{40 Segal (n. 15 above) 5 (1966): 41.}
\]
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Both *adversus* and *figere* appear in a dedicatory context in *Aeneid* 3.286–87, where Aeneas deposits in the temple of Apollo at Actium a shield taken from the Greek Abas:

*aere cavo clipeum, magni gestamen Abantis, postibus adversis figo*

When one dedicates the tools of one’s trade, however, that signifies retirement, the tools in question being now expendable. Thus, Antenor’s dedication of his Trojan arms in 1.248–49 indicates that both Troy and warfare lay behind him once he had achieved the settled peace of a new city in Italy:

*hic tamen ille urbem Patavi sedesque locavit Teucrorum et genti nomen dedit armaque fixit Troia, nunc placida compostus pace quiescit* (1.247–49)

In Carthage, Aeneas too retires his Trojan arms, albeit prematurely, metaphorically, and irresponsibly:

*arma viri thalamo quae fixa reliquit impius* (4.495–96)

Here the deity is a mortal, her temple a boudoir, and the dedication itself a gesture not of piety but of its opposite, even if that is not quite the sense that Dido herself attaches to “impius.” To both Antenor and Aeneas alike, arrival in Italy brings death of a sort.41 That is implied for Antenor by the words that describe his settled peace, for “placida compostus pace quiescit” applies to burial (N.B. “compostus,” standard parlance for “buried”) as well as to retirement.42 The same is also the significance of Trojan Aeneas’ dedication of the expendable talisman of his soul. What sets Aeneas apart from Antenor is not death but rebirth.

41 When Aeneas makes landfall in Italy, he and his crew disembark “onto the Hesperian shore” (*Aen.* 6.6), i.e., with lower-case h, “onto the evening shore.” Both evening and a distant shore are commonly associated with death, e.g., in Soph. *OT* 178, where the two ideas are combined in the expression *αἰκτίαι τὸ ἀνόμος ἐκπέρου ἄδημο*, “the evening god” being, of course, Hades. Thus, from the very beginning of Book 6, Italy, as an “evening shore,” is linked with the land of the dead.

42 See the copious comments of Heyne and Wagner on *Aen.* 1.249: “quo sensu haec dicta sint dubitare licet; aut enim de morte aut de otio et tranquillitate . . . accipi potest” (C. G. Heyne and G. P. E. Wagner, eds., *Publius Virgilius Maro* 4, vol. 2 [Leipzig, 1832], 115).
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Finally, as a munus for Proserpina, Virgil’s Bough is cast in the same role as the purified soul in Orphic mysticism, released from the Wheel of Birth (κύκλος τῆς γενέσεως). In one of the poems inscribed on the so-called Orphic Gold Leaves found at Thurii, such a soul, like the Bough, is destined for Proserpina:

δεσποτίνας δ’ ὑπὸ κόλπον ἐδών χθονίας βασιλείας

In Pindar, fragment 127, the same goddess presides over the judgment and reincarnation of souls.

The Golden Bough is first mentioned in Aeneid 6.136–48. We may now turn back to that passage and consider to what extent the Sibyl’s words in those lines are consistent with the hypothesis that the Golden Bough stands for the soul of Trojan Aeneas. The text is as follows:

latet arbore opaca
aureus et foliis et lento vimine ramus,
Iunoni infernae dictus sacer; hunc tegit omnis
lucus et obscuris claudunt convallibus umbrae.
sed non ante datur telluris operta subire
auricomos quam quis decerpsit arbore fetus.
hoc sibi pulchra suum ferri Proserpina munus
instituit. primo avulso, non deficit alter
aureus, et simili frondescit virga metallo.
ergo alte vestiga oculis et rite repertum
carpe manu; namque ipse volens facilisque sequetur,
si te fata vocant; aliter non viribus ullis
vincere nec duro poteris convellere ferro.

We have already considered how the image of splendor shrouded in darkness applies to the incarnate soul, and so this theme, to which the first four lines are devoted, need not concern us here. The symbolism of the gold, however, from which the splendor of the Bough derives—and which Virgil highlights at the beginning of three lines out of eight (6.137–44)—establishes another connection

43 See the excursus below.
44 Zuntz (n. 18 above) 301, 308, 319.
45 Ibid. 86–87. Virgil may have found the Bough itself in certain mysteries of Proserpina: so Norden (n. 4 above) 171–73.
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between Bough and soul. As Norden\textsuperscript{46} recognized, gold symbolizes life and
imortality, that is, the essential attributes of the soul. Indeed, this symbolism was
observed above in the Greek adjectives \textit{χρυσόκομος} and \textit{-κόμης}, used primarily of
immortal gods. Thus, the material of the Bough symbolizes the essence of the
soul.\textsuperscript{47}

Concerning “\textit{Iunoni infernae dictus sacer}” in line 138, commentators (Norden
and Austin, for example) have tended to concentrate either on the alleged tech-
nical reason for the periphrasis (\textit{metri gratia}) or on the identity of “\textit{Iuno inferna}.”
On the other hand, the sinister connotations of the four words in question seem not
to have been fully appreciated. Taken by itself, the phrase “\textit{dictus sacer}” would
mean “damned,” “accursed,”\textsuperscript{48} and in the particular context of the \textit{Aeneid},
the hostility of Juno brings this meaning very close to the surface. In the climactic line
of her reconciliation speech to Jupiter in \textit{Aeneid} 12, Juno employs, emphatically and
significantly, the diction of death when she refers to the destruction of Troy as
\textit{a fait accompli} that she demands remain so:

\textit{occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia}

(12.828)

She does not specify exactly when Troy’s demise occurred, but arguably it was not
complete until even the memory of Troy ceased to exist in Aeneas’ psyche. Con-
trary to Aeneas’ professed expectation in 1.206—“\textit{illic fas regna resurgere
Troiae}”—Troy is in fact never to rise again. Juno demands its eternal annihilation,
and she is granted nothing less when the last of the Trojans surrenders the talisman
of his soul to her chthonic manifestation. As it pertains to the destruction of Troy,
Jupiter’s “\textit{do quod vis}” in 12.833 is a statement of accomplished fact.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid. 172. In the fragment of Clearchus quoted ibid., n. 2, the power of a \textit{ψυχουλακός
ράβδος} both to disembowel and to incarnate souls has an obvious connection with the symbolism
here proposed for Virgil’s Bough. See also Segal (n. 15 above) 4 (1965): 627–28, 631.

\textsuperscript{47} There is plausibility in Agnes K. Michels’ contension (“The Golden Bough of Plato,”
\textit{AJP} 66 (1945): 59–63) that Virgil knew the golden bough mentioned in the proem of Meleager’s
\textit{Garland}, which refers to Plato’s epigrams as the “ever-golden branch of divine Plato” (\textit{χρύσων
ἀει θείου Πλάτωνος / κλώνα}, lines 47–48). If Virgil also knew that Meleager’s “ever-golden
branch” was specifically the houseleek (so Benedict Einarson, “Plato in Meleager’s Garland,” \textit{CP}
38 (1943): 260–61), which in Greek carries, among others, the names \textit{ἀείχρωσον} ([Dsc.]) and
\textit{ἀείχρωσ} (Theophr.), Meleager’s couplet will in that case have supplied the linkage among branch,
gold, and immortality that Virgil exploited for his own purposes.

\textsuperscript{48} See R. M. Ogilvie, \textit{A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5} (Oxford, 1965), 500–1, s.v. “\textit{ius
fasque}” and “\textit{livi}.”

\textsuperscript{49} Others have argued otherwise, e.g., Agnes K. Michels (n. 31 above) 142: “one can
argue that, in the last half of the \textit{Aeneid}, Aeneas . . . has not put behind him his past and his
memories of Troy.” This conclusion, however, is not supported by the evidence, limited as that is
to a single line (12.440) in which Aeneas invokes both himself and Hector as \textit{exempla virtutis} for
Ascanius. If Aeneas’ memories of Troy in \textit{Aen.} 7–12 amount to no more than this unique, curt, and
ad hoc reference to Hector, he has clearly become a different man from the nostalgia-ridden hero of
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An object *sacer* to an underworld divinity is in any case earmarked for destruction *ipso facto*. Virgil combines *sacer* with a dative noun six times, and twice this noun is the name of an underworld deity. Like the Golden Bough "Iunoni infernae dictus *sacer*," Dido’s lock in 4.703–4 is "Diti *sacer*." It too is severed, and for Dido this action has the same significance as our hypothesis would postulate for Aeneas and the severing of the Golden Bough. Dido’s soul is set free, "omnis et una / dilapsus calor atque in ventos vita recessit" (4.704–5). In sum, not only are Dido’s lock and the Golden Bough both *sacer* to one or the other of the reigning monarchs in the underworld, but both are severed, and in both cases essentially the same outcome ensues: actual death for Dido, symbolic death for Aeneas. It is also worth noting that *auricomus* applies to Dido’s lock no less than to the Bough:

nondum illi *flavum* Proserpina vertice *crinem*
*abstulerat*

(4.698–99)

Finally, a further link between the Golden Bough and Dido’s death has already been noted above in the similarity between the *cunctatio* of the Bough in 6.211 and the *luctatio* of Dido’s soul in 4.695. In line 147, too little note has been taken of the expression *fata vocant*, which here makes its debut in extant Latin literature. Like *auricomus* in line 141, Virgil may have borrowed *fata vocant* from Roman tragedy, for according to Socrates in *Phaedo* 115A, the corresponding Greek expression belonged to τρωγική λέξις:

Books 1–6. Michels (ibid. 143, n. 6) gives five citations from Books 7–12 in which Aeneas’ mission is said to be the rebuilding of Troy; but four of these (7.322, 10.26–27, 58, 74–75) come from speeches of Juno and Venus, whose perception of fate is consistently myopic. Nowhere in Books 7–12 does Aeneas himself speak of his mission in these terms, in marked contrast to Books 1–6 (see 1.206, for example). Finally, there is nothing to indicate that Aeneas himself is responsible for naming the Dardanian camp “Troy,” which Michels also considers germane. If Aeneas is called a Trojan by himself and by others in Books 7–12, the immutable fact of his provenance allows no alternative. The nuance of the name, however, no longer suits him, as is evident when one compares Jupiter’s differing reactions to the insults of Iopas and of Numanus Remulus, for which see n. 58 below.

50 *Aen*. 4.703, 6.138, 6.484, 10.316, 11.768, 12.766; also cf. 4.485, where the branches holding the golden apples of the Hesperides are, like the Golden Bough, *sacer*, but sans dative.

51 To the correspondences enumerated above, another may be added: the claim of L. Annaeus Cornutus, reported and rejected by Macrobius (*Sat*. 5.19.2), that Dido’s lock and the Golden Bough are both instances of Virgilian *inventio*. For a modern assessment of this claim, see Norden (n. 4 above) 169.

52 See ibid. 176–77 for Virgil’s aversion to neologisms.

22 *Vergilius*
Similarly, *fata vocant* in Latin is, with one exception, exclusively poetic. Nevertheless, whatever may be the literary history of this expression, the question here is rather its meaning in *Aeneid* 6.147, where “si te fata vocant” is generally taken as equivalent to “si es vir fatalis.” In *Phaedo* 115A, however, the meaning of the corresponding Greek expression is “esse moriturus,” and that is the usual meaning of *fata vocant* in Latin as well. Thus, in *Aeneid* 6.147, the Sibyl could mean “si es vir fatalis,” but she could equally well mean “si es moriturus.” In fact, the second alternative, addressed to “Tros Anchisiades,” suits the context better; for if “si te fata vocant” is taken in the sense “si es moriturus,” the inconsistency between “ipse volens facilisque sequetur” in line 146 and “cunctantem” in line 211 ceases to be a problem. The tenacity of the Bough calls into question not Aeneas’ status as a man of destiny—that is assured in the second line of the poem—but rather the readiness of Trojan Aeneas to embark upon the death journey that the separation of the Bough from the oak symbolically inaugurates. Oriental are proverbial voluptuaries, and hence the Oriental soul is, in Socratic terms, 

53 Socrates must mean the entire expression, for η εἰμαρμένη alone occurs even in prose.

54 Four times in Virg., twice in Ov. (Her. only), once in Sen. trag., more than once in Sil., and once in Claud. The only occurrence in prose is in Justin 18.6.5. Sg. *fatum vocat* is found once in Luc. and more than once in Sil. Citations are in *TLL*, vol. 6, col. 363.12-14.

55 For example, “the golden bough . . . cannot be broken off by any but the appointed few . . . who are fated to carry it” (Otis [n. 30 above] 288-89); “only those can pluck it who are called by destiny” (Austin [n. 4 above] 83).
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ἐπιθυμητικῶς τοῦ σώματος ἐχώνα (Phaedo 108A). The _luctatio_ of Dido’s soul in the face of death resembles the _cunctatio_ of the Golden Bough, and it suggests what the clinging Bough signifies for Aeneas. The Trojan king no less than the Tyrian queen waivers on the threshold of death, just as the Socratic analysis on pages 10–11 above would lead one to expect in view of the nature of the Eastern soul. 59 Beginning with an elaborate Greek vocative—“Tros Anchisiade”—in which she uses the language of Troy to underscore Aeneas’ Trojan identity (and a patronymic to allude to the filial piety that alone has brought him to her door [6.108–17]), the Sibyl tells Trojan Aeneas that if his final hour is at hand—“si te fata vocant”—it will prove possible to detach the Bough from the oak; otherwise,

59 Among the four examples of pleasures that Socrates attributes to the somatoeidetic soul in _Phd._ 64D-E, two in particular apply to Dido and Aeneas: _tà ἀφροδίτεια_ (64D; cf. 81B) and _ἴμωτων διαφορών κτήσεως καὶ ὑπόθηματων καὶ οἱ ἀλλοι καλλωπισμοί οἱ περὶ τὸ σῶμα_. For the latter, see _Aen._ 1.648–55, 711, 4.137–39, 216–17, 261–64, 11.72–75. Decked out in a _fop’s_ finery in 4.261–64, Aeneas, far from adopting alien ways, rather reverts to type. His cargo of objets d’art and Trojan _gaia_ in 1.119 (mentioned also in 2.763–66) betoken the same mores as does “wealthy” (4.263) Dido’s freight of Tyrian treasure in 1.362–64. In 1.637–42 and 1.697–700, the interior of Dido’s palace, “regali splendida luxi,” exhibits the same character as the doorposts of Priam’s Trojan palace, “barbarico . . . auro spoliisque superbi,” in 2.504 (note “at domus interior” of both palaces in 1.637 and 2.486, but nowhere else in Virgil; also _superbus_ in 1.639, 1.697, 2.504). Luxury is endemic among Trojans and Tyrians alike (cf. 2.4 and 4.75, in which, similarly structured, “Troianae” and “Sidoniac” are interchangeable as modifiers of “opes”), and Trojan and Tyrian gold is as old as the peoples themselves (1.640–42, 2.448, 8.166–68, the last concerning Priam’s visit to Arcadia with Anchises before the war). The Trojan king succumbs to the allure of Carthage precisely because this transplant of Tyre could pass for Troy itself, to which it is Aeneas’ fondest desire to return. In Carthage he feels quite literally at home. It is significant that when Aeneas arrives in Africa in 1.157–73, Virgil recalls the Homeric passage (_Od._ 13.93–124) in which Odysseus returns to his native land. For good remarks on the “dangerous oriental luxury” common to both Trojans and Carthaginians, see Segal (n. 58 above) 340–42.

60 So has she already done in 6.52, where she addresses Aeneas as “Tros Aenea.” The prayer of Aeneas that follows in 6.54–76 is a compendium of terms for “Troy” or “Trojan,” of which there are eight occurrences within the first thirteen lines (56–68). “It may be fancy in me to see even in his prayer . . . a leaning to think of Troy” (Fowler [n. 31 above] 421). The extreme neotericism of the initial Daedalus episode also reflects Aeneas’ Asiatic provenance, as the subject of the passage (separation of father from son) alludes to the filial piety that motivates Aeneas at this point in the narrative (see Pöschl [n. 34 above] 150).

61 Herein lies a probable explanation for the fact that in no book of the _Aeneid_ is Aeneas called “son of Anchises” so often as in Book 6 (lines 126, 322, 331, 348). The three cases in Book 5 (lines 244, 407, 424) are similar: they all belong to the funeral games, which, like the underworld journey, are an act of filial piety. Finally, in most of the four isolated cases remaining, there is a clear connection between the immediate context and the appellation “son of Anchises”: 7.152, 8.521 (following a speech of Evander that concludes with the name of his ill-starred son), 10.250 (before a prayer to the “fostering mother of the gods, dwelling on Ida,” the trysting place of Anchises and Venus), 10.822 (as Aeneas views the dying Lausus, “mentem patriae subit pietatis imago”). See K. W. Gransden, ed., _Virgil: “Aeneid” Book VIII_ (Cambridge, 1976), 151, and cf. Norden in the next footnote. Aeneas’ journey to Hades as an act prompted “by love and longing” for Anchises is succinctly and eloquently stressed by Segal (n. 15 above) 4 (1965): 635. See also Belfiore (n. 34 above) 24. In this connection it may also be pertinent to recall that death and love have in common the separation of soul from body, as in Callim. _Epigr._ 41.
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impossible, no matter the force that is brought to bear. The same applies to Trojan Aeneas’ soul, separable from the body only in the hour of death:

\[
\dot{\alpha} \rho\alpha \mu \eta \ [s.e. \ \eta \gamma\omega\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha \tau \nu \ \theta\alpha\eta\alpha\tau\alpha\nu \ \epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\eta] \ \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omicron \ \tau \iota \ \eta \ \tau\eta \\
\tau\iota \psi \chi\iota\chi \ \alpha\pi\omicron \ \tau\omicron \ \sigma\omega\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\gamma\eta\eta \\
(Phaedo 64C)
\]

Nothing less than death and rebirth could suffice to express the mystery of such radical transformations as occur in \textit{Aeneid} 6. These transformations are radical not only because they involve polar opposites, but also because their realization is as swift as it is total. This becomes especially clear when the prolonged and ardent reunion of Aeneas with Anchises\textsuperscript{62} (6.679–702) is set beside the complete absence of a final leave-taking at the end of the book. In the initial encounter between father and son, nearly identical phraseology underscores the fact that when reunited at last with his father, the longed-for focus of his \textit{pietas}, Aeneas responds with the same intense emotion as when he earlier met the woman for whom his \textit{amor} still burned:

\[
\begin{align*}
da, \ \text{genitor, teque amplexu ne subtrah\ae \ nostr\o} \\
(6.698) \\
siste gradum teque aspectu ne subtrah\ae \ nostr\o \\
(6.465)
\end{align*}
\]

As he often has at other times,\textsuperscript{63} Aeneas reacts to this Trojan \textit{imago} as if it were real:


\textsuperscript{63} E.g., in 1.453–95 and 6.648–55. The Trojans depicted in the temple at Carthage and those met in Elysium are \textit{imagines} that differ only in kind, and hence \textit{inanas} applies to the chariots of both:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fertur equi currusque haeret resupinus inani} (1.476; \text{cf. 1.464}) \\
\text{arma procul currusque virum miratur inanis} (6.651)
\end{align*}
\]

Aeneas is amazed at both artifacts and shades (“miranda” in 1.494, “miratur” in 6.651), and the tears shed at the sight of Anchises’ shade replicate the tears evoked by Dido’s panels:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sic memorans, largo fletu simul ora rigabat} (6.699) \\
\text{multa gemens, largoque umectat flumine vultum} (1.465)
\end{align*}
\]

Even if \textit{due to pietas} (see n. 61 above) rather than to debilitating nostalgia, Aeneas’ reunion with his father nevertheless belongs to a lengthy series of encounters with Trojan ghosts that extends as far back as the beginning of the poem. Included among these, as David Bright has shown (“Aeneas’ Other Nekyia,” \textit{Vergilius} 27 [1981]: 40–47), is Aeneas’ visit to the New Troy of Helenus and Andromache, a Trojan \textit{imago} that Virgil assimilates to a land of shades and phantoms. Aeneas’ propensity to treat phantoms as realities is first manifested as \textit{memoria} in 1.94–101, where Troy and its people, though dead, continue to affect Aeneas as powerfully as if they were still living realities.
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Thus, when Aeneas takes leave of his father some 200 lines later, he could be expected at least to acknowledge, as he does to Dido in 6.466,

extremum fato quod te adloquor hoc est

He might also be expected to act accordingly. In fact, however, he does not even offer his hand in eternal farewell, nor does he betray any impulse to embrace his father’s shade. If words of farewell are spoken, the poet omits to say so. What he does say, after devoting twice as many lines to the gates of horn and ivory,64 is simply this:

his ibi tum natum Anchises unaque Sibyllam
prosequitur dictis portaque emittit eburna
(6.897–98)

“Prosequitur” is the same verb with which the scene with Dido concludes, but otherwise the two passages have nothing in common. The “his . . . dictis” referred to are instructions, not affectionate words of eternal farewell.65 It would be difficult to imagine a sharper contrast with the emotionally extravagant reunion of father and son in 6.679–702; and the transformation underlying this contrast is revealed in 6.889:

incenditque animum famae venientis amore

Amor patris has been transformed into amor famae venientis. Aeneas’ affections are here transferred from Trojan father to Roman ideal, from a human being to an abstraction. With this, proto-Roman Aeneas is born, and the requisite transformation is completed from Trojan son into “pater Aeneas, Romanae stirpis origo” (12.166).

Read against this background, the Sibyl’s words concerning the Golden Bough in 6.143–44 take on the character of allegory:
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The metempsychosis of the last of the Trojans into the prototypical Roman requires death and rebirth, that is, the surrender of one soul in exchange for another. The removal of one Golden Bough and its replacement by another symbolically foreshadows Aeneas' experience in the underworld. Thus, this detail too accords with the thesis that the Bough, carried into the underworld and laid at Proserpina's door, is the emblem of Trojan Aeneas' soul.

VI

In *Aeneid* 4.441–46, as was observed at the outset, a formal simile makes explicit the identification of Aeneas with an oak that "in Tartara tendit." In Book 6 the same image reappears as the oak containing the Golden Bough, but here Virgil makes the connection with Aeneas implicit, by describing oak and Bough in terms that correspond not only with the imagery pertaining to body and soul in Lucretius and Plato, but also, as has just been argued, with the experience that Aeneas undergoes in Book 6. The separation of the Golden Bough from its oak is thus a symbolic enactment of the separation of soul from body—that is, of death—without which no journey into Hades is possible.66 This interpretation is further corroborated by the fact that as soon as the Bough is pulled loose from the oak, there follows an elaborate funeral, the significance of which deserves some attention.

With the sole exception of Pallas in Book 11, no one in the *Aeneid* is prepared for burial with greater pomp and ceremony than is Misenus in Book 6. The death of Pallas is a cardinal event, and the length of the passage devoted to his funeral is consistent with the central importance of this young victim's death. The same cannot be said of Misenus, however. To his funeral rites also a long passage (6.212–35) is devoted, and yet, until Aeneas and his men come upon his body in 6.162, his role in the poem has been limited to a unique mention in a single line (239) in Book 3. In this respect he resembles Deiphobus later in the book. In spite of receiving equal time with Palinurus and Dido, familiar to both Aeneas and reader alike, Deiphobus is known only from an isolated mention in 2.310. The parallel of Deiphobus is instructive, for as Brooks Otis recognized, Deiphobus is "the symbol of all the violence and treachery that attended the destruction of Troy."67 In other words, the familiarity of Palinurus and Dido prompts a response to them as individuals. The very anonymity of Deiphobus, however, enables him

66 In Charles Segal's view ([n. 15 above] 4 [1965]: 634, 636), "the symbolic enactment of his own death" rather occurs when Aeneas enters Hades in 6.236–63.

67 Otis (n. 30 above) 296. Additional arguments in support of the same view are adduced in Falkner (n. 30 above) 19–20.
to acquire a significance that extends beyond his personal insignificance. For Deiphobus there are no givens, as there are for Palmaruus and for Dido, and as there would have been for Hector or Creüsa had either of these appeared in his place. The same is true of Misenus. The incongruity between his lavish funeral and his own obscurity ("the enormous preparations for the funeral of one man, Misenus, are astonishing") suggests the possibility that his burial may have a significance that extends beyond itself. Specifically, because Misenus' burial immediately follows the passage in which, according to our hypothesis, the death of Trojan Aeneas is symbolically enacted, it would not be unreasonable to suppose that Misenus is only a stand-in for Aeneas himself. If, for passage across the Styx, burial is required after death, the same would also apply after the sort of symbolic death that Aeneas undergoes when he tears the Golden Bough from its oak. As a matter of objective fact, Misenus is interred in Aeneid 6.212-35, but rather than Misenus, the funeral rites filling these lines are likely to honor Trojan Aeneas. There is, moreover, a linguistic argument that leads to the same conclusion. What that argument is we may now proceed to consider.

In Aeneid 4.19, Dido acknowledges to her sister that if she had not grown indifferent to marriage, "I could perhaps have yielded to this single wrong," that is, to the wrong of marrying Aeneas in spite of her vow to Syechaeus:

68 So Clark (n. 5 above) 163-65.
69 Skutsch (n. 10 above) 341.
70 The burial of Misenus coming next after the discovery of the Bough is a juxtaposition that Segal too considers "of the highest importance," and he discusses it at length ([n. 15 above] 4 [1965]: 620-24, 636-42). It is in any case not to be taken for granted. The Sibyl treats the Bough and the burial as distinct tasks (note "praeterea" preceding the burial instructions in 6.149), and so Virgil could be expected to have presented them sequentially, taking up the search for the polluting corpse only after the Bough is secured, or vice versa. This, however, would have prevented the juxtaposition of Bough and burial, which Virgil achieved by integrating the discovery of the Bough into the search for wood for Misenus' pyre. For the integration of these two episodes, noted as early as Servius, see Norden (n. 4 above) 180 and Segal (n. 15 above) 4 (1965): 620-22.

A pair of doves and their role in the discovery of a magical oak are elements that Virgil's narrative has in common with the foundation legend of the oracle at Dodona. This oracle traced its origin to the flight out of Egypt of two doves, one of which flew north to Dodona, landed on the prophetic oak, and with a human voice instructed the local to establish an oracle on the site. According to S. Tr. 172, the ancient oak at Dodona spoke "out of twin doves" (διοικόντων ἔκ πτερειαδῶν), as the priestesses at Dodona were called. At the same time, as Servius remarked and Norden (n. 4 above) 189-90 demonstrates in detail, the doves' flight to the Bough in 6.191-203 is made to resemble an augury. Thus, Roman augury and Greek prophecy are combined in a unified episode. Such a contamination of Greek with Roman sources is so thoroughly Virgilian that the pair of doves, which are out of place in their augural context ("keine augurales aves"—ibid. 190), can confidently be assigned not to the symbolism of the Golden Bough, but rather to the concrete reality of the oak at Dodona. Norden (ibid. 174) notes the parallelism between the Cumaeans and the Chaonians doves, and hence it is surprising that his commentary on 6.191-203 has nothing to say about contamination.
71 Something akin to this view is advanced in Monti (n. 34 above) 81: "in burying Misenus, Aeneas buries symbolically his own will."
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THE ALLEGORY OF THE GOLDEN BOUGH

huic uni forsan potui succumbere culpae

This verse is grammatically complete, however, with "succumbere," and until the addition of "culpae"—at the last minute, as it were—it means "under this man alone I could perhaps have lain." The last word in the line transforms the meaning, but nonetheless, the initial indiscretion is by no means erased. On the contrary, it betrays an aspect of Dido's psychology that her regal status, not to mention epic decorum, will not allow to be made explicit.

Another example of the same technique is found in the words of the Sibyl, whose penchant for significant ambiguity, "obscuris vera involvens" (6.100), has already been observed in such expressions as "si te fata vocant." In the same speech in which these words occur, the Sibyl begins as follows her instructions concerning the second task awaiting Aeneas:

praeterea iacet exanium tibi corpus amici

(6.149)

Initially the Sibyl appears to say that it is Aeneas' body that lies lifeless—"praeterea iacet exanium tibi" corpus—and this sense persists up until the last word, which, like "culpae" in 4.19, amounts to a παρὰ προσδοκίαν requiring the reinterpretation of the words that have come before it. The lifeless corpse requiring burial belongs after all not to Aeneas but to one of the hero's friends. Nevertheless, the initial meaning lingers, and with it the innuendo that the burial of Misenum is tantamount to the burial of Trojan Aeneas himself.

There is another expressive double entendre employed to the same effect in Aeneid 6.232–33, where, as the climactic action preceding the final action, Aeneas places atop Misenum's tomb the tools of this trumpeter's trade:

---

72 For the double entendre in Aen. 4.19, see Clausen (n. 8 above) 42; see also ibid. 24, where Clausen's remark on the double entendre in Aen. 4.165 applies as well to the case under discussion: "the effect is untranslatable. Ambiguity in Latin poetry is circumscribed and tends to be, as here, momentary and evanescent; but it does exist." For two other examples in Aen. 2.235 and 4.82, see respectively ibid. 37 and Clifford Weber, "Some Double Entendres in Ovid and Vergil," CP 85 (1990): 212–14; also the sources cited in James J. O'Hara, "They Might Be Giants: Inconsistency and Indeterminacy in Vergil's War in Italy," Colby Quarterly 30 (1994): 221, n. 41. As the postponement of a conjunction creates a double entendre in Aen. 4.165, so the same mannerism produces the same effect in Anna's urgent question in 4.33: " nec dulcis natos Veneris nec praemia noris?" Initially the first object appears to be "dulcis natos Veneris," i.e., Cupid and Aeneas, whose sibling relationship Venus herself invokes in 1.667.


74 This valuable insight concerning Aen. 6.149 is entirely Julia Dyson's, to whom I am grateful for bringing it to my attention.
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Here the sentence is grammatically complete with "viro," at which point it means that Aeneas' own arms crown Misenus' tomb. Although the ashes of Misenus are stored within, the tomb, it would seem, is marked as that of Trojan Aeneas. Like the final words in 4.19 and 6.149, the final two words in 6.233 alter the meaning of all that precedes them. The "arma" belong after all not to Aeneas but to Misenus. Nevertheless, the initial impression remains, that Aeneas lays his own arms on the tomb.75 Such would be the normal sense of "sua," which, despite the special pleading of commentators, would properly denote Aeneas rather than Misenus. Here too, then, double entendre serves to suggest a meaning that cannot be expressed overtly. In the end, Misenus' accoutrements do after all crown Misenus' tomb. Nevertheless, Aeneid 6.232-33 appears initially to convey the sense that Misenus' tomb is marked as the tomb of Aeneas, and this implication tallies with the conclusion advanced above, that the lavish funeral of Misenus is likelier to honor the symbolic death of Trojan Aeneas than the actual death of an insignificant trumpeter.76

VII

It remains to consider the penultimate appearance of the Golden Bough in Aeneid 6.384–416, where the Sibyl dispels Charon's misgivings over ferrying

75 Cf. Antenor's dedication of his Trojan arms upon his arrival in Italy (Aen. 1.248–49, quoted on p. 17 above).
76 In addition to the length of the Misenus passage, a feature of its diction also contributes to the incongruity noted above between the modest subject and its extravagant treatment. The adjective ingens occurs 168 times in the Aeneid, and three times within the twenty-four lines devoted to Misenus' funeral. This concentration is equaled or exceeded in only four other passages: 2.476–89 (the attack on Priam's palace), 6.400–26 (five times, thrice of Cerberus), 8.241–58 (the Cacus episode), and 12.708–24 (the duel of Aeneas and Turnus); cf. 7.167–85 (different paragraphs), 12.888–97 (epanalepsis). Applied so often to the funerary apparatus of a minor figure, ingens seems misused, as is noted by Norden (n. 4 above) 195, who finds in 6.222 (ingens of Misenus' bier) an instance of "der starken Katachrese, die dieses Wort . . . oft bei Vergil hat" (on the other hand, ingens used of Misenus' pyre and grave in 6.215 and 6.232 elicits no comment). The same adjective also links Misenus to Aeneas, who, as he boards Charon's boat, is called ingens in 6.413 (the view that Aeneas is here ingens qua vivas [so Helen H. Bacon, "The Aeneid as a Drama of Election," TAPA 116 (1986): 317] is refuted in Aen. 2.557, where, as my colleague Eugene Dwyer reminds me, the "ingens truncus" is that of Priam's corpse; neither does it follow from Aeneas' great weight in 6.413 that his must therefore be a corpus vivum, for weight is a prime attribute of dead bodies: cf. English "dead weight," and see Luc. 2.206, where "viva corpora" and "graves trunci" are antithetically juxtaposed). Misenus also has in common with Aeneas the fact that he "Hectoris . . . magni fuerat comes" (6.166: cf. Pöschl's remarks [(n. 34 above) 36–37] concerning the amicitia of Hector and Aeneas); and with Trojan Aeneas, Misenus shares characteristic Trojan garb ("purpureaque . . . vestes, velamina nota" in 6.221, derided by Numanus Remulus in 9.614 as a familiar example of Trojan decadence; see nn. 58–59 above).
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Aeneas across the Styx. Charon gives two reasons for denying Aeneas passage: first, because "corpora viva" are prohibited from crossing the river (6.391); and, secondly, because the last mortals to do so—they too, like Aeneas, descended from gods and invincible (6.394, echoing the Sibyl’s words to Aeneas in 6.129–31)—played havoc in the halls of Pluto’s palace. Stressing once again77 Aeneas’ Trojan provenance and the filial piety that motivates him (6.403–4), the Sibyl refutes Charon’s two objections in reverse order, and by different means. For dealing with the second objection, she resorts to argumentation. Aeneas, she says, is no Hercules, Theseus, or Pirithoüs, for he exemplifies pietas, not vis and insidia (6.399–404). Then, having thus dissociated pius Aeneas from his violent predecessors, the Sibyl proceeds to address as follows the first and more general of Charon’s objections, to wit, that it is forbidden ("nefas" in 6.391) for corpora viva to cross the Styx:

"si te nulla movet tanteae pietatis imago,  
at ramum hunc" (aperit ramum qui veste latebat)  
"agnoscas." tumida ex ira tum corda residunt,  
nec plura his. ille, admirans venerabile donum  
fatalis virgae longo post tempore visum,78  
caeruleam advertit puppim ripaeque propinquat
(6.405–10)

In these lines, the Sibyl employs evidence rather than argumentation, and the symbolism of the Golden Bough serves to explain not only why the Sibyl exhibits the Bough at this point in particular, but also why Charon relents as soon as he sees it. Representing Trojan Aeneas’ soul, and detached from the tree on which it once grew, the Bough constitutes material proof of the fact that the body that Charon beholds is not vivum but, symbolically at least, exanimum in the literal sense of the word. Thus, even more decisively than the Sibyl’s words concerning the nature of Aeneas’ motivation, both the presence of the Bough and its symbolic import satisfy Charon that qua exanimus, Trojan Aeneas is not included among the corpora viva79 that the boatman is forbidden to take on board.

77 See nn. 60–61 above.
78 I have nothing to add to all that has been written about "longo post tempore visum." That Charon has previously seen such a bough would follow naturally enough from 6.143–44, where the Sibyl says that a golden bough is always available for the plucking. Aeneas, it would seem, is not the first to detach the Bough, nor, presumably, will he be the last. Likewise, the Sibyl’s "pauci" in 6.129 explains well enough why Charon has not seen the Bough for some time.
79 Too little note has been taken of "viva" applied to "corpora" in 6.391; it changes the objects of Charon’s refusal from bodies in general to living bodies exclusively. If corpora exanima had means of locomotion (as Trojan Aeneas does, thanks to the ersatz nature of his death), Charon would apparently be willing to take them on board. The expression corpus vivum is noteworthy for another reason as well: elsewhere it is limited, if the TLL may be trusted (see below), to Cicero’s philosophical works (twice), Lucretius (2.703, 2.879, 3.714, 5.476, the last missing from TLL, vol. 4, col. 1009.27–32), and Lucan (twice). Noun and adjective, in that order, are always contiguous in
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Even before 1986, when Philip R. Hardie discussed in some detail particular Lucretian rationalizations of myth, this tactic per se was a familiar feature of Lucretius' art, and nowhere more so than in Lucretius' allegorical analysis of the Acherusian realm in which Aeneid 6 is set:

atque ea nimirum quaecumque Acherunte profundo
prodana sunt esse, in vita sunt omnia nobis
(3.978–79)

Virgil "remythologizes" (Hardie's term) his predecessor's allegory. In Aeneid 6, Lucretius' abstractions reacquire concrete form. Considered from a different point of view, however, Virgil's underworld is seen to preserve Lucretius' allegory intact. To be sure, it accommodates the familiar monsters and sinners of tradition, but these monsters are in fact remarkably innocuous. The Hydra and other terrors encamped at the entrance pose no threat at all:

et ni docta comes tenuis sine corpore vitas
admoneat volitare cava sub imagine formae,
inruat et frustra ferro diverberet umbras
(6.292–94)

Cerberus too is easily pacified with a timely dose of drugged dog food. On the other hand, there is genuine danger in the recrudescence of the passions within Aeneas that the shades of Palinurus, Dido, and Deiphobus evoke. These Aeneas struggled to tame on earth as well—"in vita sunt omnia nobis." Thus, even if Virgil "remythologizes" Lucretian abstractions, he more fundamentally follows Lucretius in portraying those abstractions as the truly formidable monstra that threaten to waylay Aeneas in the underworld. Far more is Aeneas endangered by Dido than by insubstantialities like Cerberus and the Hydra. Herein he resembles Hercules, his predecessor in the underworld, whose victories over the traditional monsters encountered by Aeneas were rationalized by ancient savants as the taming of human passions.81

Cicero and Lucretius (but never so in Lucan), and plural in all cases except Lucr. 2.703 and 3.714. This expression, then, can be added to the tally of Lucretian borrowings in Aen. 6.

For Aeneas' great size and weight in 6.413 and their irrelevance to his status as a corpus vivum, see n. 76 above.

80 See n. 6 above.
81 See Hardie (n. 6 above) 213–14, 217, n. 151, and the sources cited there.
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 Strictly speaking, “remythologization” does not apply to the Golden Bough, for there is no pre-existing myth of which the Lucretian analysis of the soul may be viewed as a rationalization. Nevertheless, apart from the fact that here a myth is invented rather than restored, there is no important difference between Virgil’s Bough and the traditional monsters and sinners with which he populates his underworld. Like these, the Bough is a tangible reality, and as Virgil confronts his hero with the human passions that Lucretius saw allegorized in Tartarus, so does he also adopt aspects of the Lucretian theory of the soul out of which he created his own allegory of the tree and its magical bough. Virgil’s Golden Bough has an obvious narrative function, but to the extent that this narrative is also an allegory, Virgil’s debt to Lucretius is twofold. Not only is the allegoresis of chthonic legend a thoroughly Lucretian procedure, but Lucretian imagery underlies the particular form that Virgil’s allegory has assumed.

**Excursus**

That the soul of Trojan Aeneas is to be spared further incarnations is clear from Anchises’ cosmology, which reads like a gloss on the *labores* that Aeneas has endured at sea. Thus, in the description of punishments in 6.740–42, some impure souls are described as if the sails of Aeneas’ becalmed ships, while others suffer Aeneas’ trials in the storm at sea, or the fate of his ships on the day when the Trojan women set fire to them:

\[
\text{aliae panduntur inanes}
\]

\[
\text{suspensae ad ventos, aliis sub gurgite vasto}
\]

\[
\text{infectum eluitur scelus aut exuritur igni}
\]

N.B. “panduntur,” a *vox propria* for unfurling sails (*TLL*, volume 10.1, column 194.11–25), and “gurgite vasto,” which elsewhere in the *Aeneid* is restricted to the context of Aeneas at sea (1.118, 3.197; cf. 3.421). *Exurere* is also specialized, referring to burning ships in five out of eight occurrences in the *Aeneid* (1.39, 5.635, 5.794 [both of these of the firing of Aeneas’ ships], 9.115, 10.36). In a word, πάθη κοβαρμός, and this positive rationale for the toils of Aeneas answers in retrospect the indignant question posed at the beginning of the *Aeneid*:

Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso

---

82 See n. 51 above.

83 The notion that the *Aeneid* is “an antique Pilgrim’s Progress” is advanced with some supporting detail ibid. 326 and in Francis A. Sullivan, “The Spiritual Itinerary of Virgil’s Aeneas,” *AJP* 80 (1959): 154–61.
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quidve dolens regina deum tot volvere casus
insignem pietate virum, tot adire labores
impulerit. tantaene animis caelestibus irae?
(1.8–11)

In *Aeneid* 6.305–32 there are even clearer instances of parallelism between Aeneas’ journey and the fate of disembodied souls in the underworld. In 6.305–14, “matres atque viri” (306) and “pueri innuptaeque puellae” (307) gather on the hither bank of the Styx and beg to be made the first to cross. In their “ripae ulterioris amor” (314), this “inops inhumataque turba” (325) resemble the “miserabile vulgus” composed of “matres virique” and “collecta exsilio pubes” who, in 2.796–800, crowd the shore of the Hellespont and await their crossing to the farther shore that is Italy. Like the migratory birds to which the souls of the unburied are compared, Aeneas and his Trojans, arriving in Italy in ships (compared to birds in *Apollonius* 4.238–40), “ad terram gurgite ab alto / . . . glomerantur . . . , ubi frigidus annus / trans pontum fugat et terris immittit apricus” (6.310–12). Making their escape from Carthage, the Trojans too cross the sea in winter, and the sun-filled land *par excellence* is uniquely Italy itself: “hic ver adsiduum atque alienis mensibus aedec litora circum” (6.329)—stems from his own experience of a similar fate: “multosque per annos / errabant [sc. Troes] acti fatis maris omnis circum” (1.31–32). Indeed, the longing of the unburied for burial—“prius quam sedibus ossa quierunt” (6.328)—echoes Aeneas’ similar longing for settled quietude in 1.205–6: “sedes ubi fata quietas / ostendunt.”

Clifford Weber
Kenyon College

85 This paper has benefited along the way from the comments and criticisms of various friends and colleagues. These include Michael Barich, Wendell Clausen, Eugene Dwyer, Julia Dyson, Patricia Johnson, William McCulloh, Helen North, and the editor of this journal, to all of whom I am indebted for their willingness to read a long paper carefully. I regret not being able to acknowledge by name my debt to the written reports of anonymous referees.

34 Vergilius