Virgil's Epic Technique

Review Author[s]:
Alessandro Barchiesi

The Journal of Roman Studies, Vol. 86. (1996), pp. 229-231.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0075-4358%281996%2986%3C229%3AVET%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Q

The Journal of Roman Studies is currently published by Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Mittelfranken and about 1.7 km south of the Raetian *limes*. The site was briefly examined in 1895, but remained largely unexplored before the excavations here reported. A building inscription found in the excavation reveals its name as *Sablonetum*. The fort was small throughout its history, no more than 0.7 ha in area (1.7 acres). Its position to the south of the *limes*, though not unparalleled, is not easily explained. There is no evident reason for the choice of this site. The particular value of the excavation lies in the fact that most of the fort-interior was excavated, making this one of the most comprehensively examined forts on the Upper German-Raetian frontier. That said, it is disappointing that the history of Ellingen appears to have been uneventful, at least so far as the archaeological record can reveal it. The opening date of the fort, a work in timber, is not well defined within the first three decades of the second century. On admittedly slender evidence there is a bias towards the late reign of Trajan or the early years of Hadrian. The plan of the internal buildings of this phase could not be recovered in full, though two short barrack-blocks were identified along with structures of less obvious purpose. No command buildings were in evidence in the normal positions at the centre of the fort. The first, and only, secure date for any phase at Ellingen is provided by a building inscription recording rebuilding of the defences in stone in 182, significantly later than the other dated stone circuits on the Antonine frontier. The fort-interior was radically replanned at this same date. A double barrack with twenty-four *contubernia* provided accommodation for up to 190 men, while two further single blocks could have housed another 80 troops, making a total complement of 270. As in Period I there was no *principia*, its position being occupied by a small shrine. Evidently the unit in occupation from 182 was not an independent command. What was it? The inscription of 182 may assist, offering a unit of *pedites singulares* under a legionary centurion as the fort-builders. Zanier inclines to the view that they also occupied the fort, but that is not a necessary conclusion. This phase continued into the third century but its end is undefined. Ellingen could have been abandoned at any date between 210 and 260, according to the author of this report. On the evidence presented, a date earlier in that half-century rather than later seems likelier, perhaps between 220 and 240. No evidence bearing on the reasons for abandonment was recovered; there was no sign of destruction. The possibility of a gradual running down in occupation, with sporadic use in connection with campaigns against the Alamanni seems worth considering, though this is not raised by the author.

The report as a whole is, predictably, well presented, the rather undramatic record of finds being presented in full. The reader is left most strongly with the sense of questions unanswered. Did the foundation of Ellingen antedate the building of the *limes* and is that the reason for its position? What was the context for the reconstruction of the defences in 182? Had the site been overrun in the wars of the previous fifteen years? What were the successive garrisons and how were they deployed? When and in what circumstances was the fort given up and how did this event relate, if at all, to the end of the *limes* in Raetia? It is an ironic fact that near-complete excavation has solved none of the fundamental problems posed by Ellingen, though it must be added that the excavators and the author could not have done more than they have. Above all things, the excavation of Ellingen reveals how humdrum and uneventful was life on many sectors of the northern frontier of the Empire.

University of Exeter MALCOLM TODD

R. HEINZE, *VIRGIL'S EPIC TECHNIQUE*. Trans. H. and D. Harvey and F. Robertson, preface by A. Wlosok. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1993. Pp. xiv + 396. ISBN 1–8539–9281–x. £35.00.

Like the *Aeneid, Virgils epische Technik* was immediately recognized as a masterpiece, and now thanks to oral tradition — the Varronian scholar H. Dahlmann who informed Antonie Wlosok (p. xiv) — we also know that, like the *Aeneid*, it was threatened by incineration: Heinze, we are told, considered destroying the manuscript until Georg Kaibel (hence the dedication) convinced him to go public.

Be that as it may, it was a good idea of Bristol CP/Duckworth to produce an English Heinze: the 1928 final edition has been translated, all Greek and Roman quotes as well (even 'condicio sine qua non', even 'Mythos'); marginal numbers refer to the original Teubner pagination; the quality of the English text is sound, but there are a few misprints (e.g. *peripateia*, p. 170; Book 3 quoted as 33, p. 75, and 333, p. 77; p. 296 the Homeric reference 2,46 in fact means Π 46). There were slips in the original as well, after all (e.g. Delphi for Delos at p. 199 = 244). The reviewer sees this translation as a very important step in the survival of H.'s work: it is unrealistic, and even snobbish, to pretend that it makes no difference to serious students of Latin Literature whether the book is available in English or in H.'s dense and nervous German prose. Generations of young scholars, I suppose, have struggled with this masterpiece and only too late discovered their own inchoate ideas to be anticipated in a few words, tucked away in some aside or footnote. Yet the statistics of 'déjà-vus in Heinze' are not over, I am afraid, because the new book, which translates *lusus Troiae*, *ethos*, and

fidus Achates, passively reproduces H.'s Index, and this has always been a sorely inadequate tool for such a book; given the economic effort faced by the Press, I would certainly have extended the revision to H.'s final pages.

Another shortcoming is that the preface has been given to a fine Vergilian scholar, with a perfect background for the understanding of H.'s opus; yet for some reason Antonie Wlosok has contributed a piece which is only factually informative and laudatory. The *Technik* was hailed as a masterpiece from the very beginning, by people like Leo and Norden; it is useful to rehearse this success story now that 'the art of sound, scholarly literary criticism is all too frequently forgotten' (xi).

One is tempted to reverse and vary the point of view and try to read the book as the work of a young German, the son of a professor of philosophy, intensely concerned with 'ideas' (Vergil's aims and methods, narratology, time and the narrative . . .), deeply dissatisfied with *Quellenforschung* yet interested in the poet's negotiations with the tradition; then perhaps to ask why the present generation has problems in writing general books on great authors (is it just the decline of 'sound, scholarly literary criticism'?); and finally to experience a reading of H. as a freshly published, end-of-millennium book. We would certainly think that as a synthesis on certain aspects it is unchallenged (e.g. narrative art, plot, and structure) while other things we think important (e.g. the conflictual nature of Augustan ideology and the role of Alexandrian poetry in Vergil's epic programme) are constantly under-represented. If H. is a masterpiece, and it is, it is also a work to be criticized by contemporary standards.

Conversely, there is much to learn from an historicizing approach to H. as a difficult and in a sense untimely book. I would probably focus less on Leo and on H.'s pupils, and ask questions such as, e.g., what are the effects of Norden/H.'s division of work, that is, of the philosophically trained H. leaving aside entirely Book VI for fear of overlapping with Norden's commentary (cf. the 1908 preface, p. viii of this edition)? How does this split between two strong and different focalizations influence our average reception of the epic? What was the impact of H. on a much more traditional but influential scholar, Wilhelm Kroll? It is slightly ironic that the reunited Teubner Verlag advertises the 1994 eighth edition of the *Technik* with Norden's epigraph, 'Wir werden sozusagen *in die Werkstatt* des Dichters geführt, um ihn bei seinem Schaffen zu beobachten', because one has the impression that the use of *Werkstatt* was meant to be a polemical one. H.'s book had a destructive impact on the tradition of source-criticism whose ideology was, precisely, 'the laboratory of Vergil', and whose methodology consisted in producing lists of parallels and tests of inappropriate borrowing and inconsistencies caused by inappropriate and passive borrowing . . . All of H.'s work is a protest against this method, and the result must have deeply affected the career of Kroll (cf. p. 273 n. 16 for his resistence to H.) and others. Professor Wlosok barely mentions as a curiosity Paul Jahn's negative review of 1906 (p. xiii n. 9). One might try to view Knauer's work as a curious Kreuzung between H.'s apologetic stance and the listing habits of H.'s enemies. Seen in retrospect, the *Technik* stands on the threshold between a defensive period when originality was the issue, and a 'neo-humanistic' period, partially influenced by H. himself, when the project was the triumphant aestheticization of Roman literature and its 'values'. The trail of Wilamowitz was a different one (cf. L. Lehnus, *Eikasmos* 5 (1994), 414–15).

H.'s achievement is remarkably different from the typical 'myth of origins' that locates sound and empiric historicism in the past and cloudy theorizing in the present. His more historical essays — the contributions to the 'Wertbegriffe' industry — are unbearable today, while some of his 'bold theories' are still a fruitful platform for modern discussions: are Horace's *Odes* regularly conceived as addressing a present i.e. absent interlocutor? See M. Citroni, 'Richard Heinze e la forma dell'ode oraziana. Monologo, dialogo e communicazione letteraria,' *AION* 12 (1990), 269–84. Shall we contrast Ovid's epic and elegiac magna opera as samples of the opposition epic vs. elegy? See S. Hinds, *The Metamorphosis of Persephone* (1987).

First-time readers of the book will probably discover that it is difficult to sift strength and weakness in H.'s approach. H. is unrivalled in his capacity to treat every little moment in the poem as a significant result of Vergil's creative intention, and to connect it with other, however distant, epiphanies of the same project. Disharmonies are mostly treated as a product of the compositional 'diacronia': this, as the whole interest in the relative chronology of the books, is today one of the most unfashionable aspects of the whole essay. Nowadays, most readers of the *Aeneid* are ready to treat inconsistencies and disharmonies as part of the semiotics of poetry and narrative. In other cases, they will put an emphasis on contradiction right where H. sees mutually supporting inflections: regarding Turnus' betrothal with Lavinia, he has it that only Amata, with 'a woman's carelessness for objective truth' (144) supports the idea of a formal agreement, but this reading inevitably devalues the surprising briskness of Faunus' 'thalamis ne crede paratis' (VII.97).

After so many years, it is still difficult to imagine a new general book on the *Aeneid* that can do better than H., and equally difficult to project one that simply fills its gaps, leaving the main structure untouched. There must be, however, some area where our vantage point is better than his.

One such area is certainly Hellenistic poetry. The last preface of the book is signed October 1928, the year after the *Aitia* prologue. H. used some Callimachean criticism of the epic tradition as a basis to understand Vergil's innovation (see e.g. 210, but note p. 3, 'a poet who felt no compulsion to explore untrodden paths'), but his idea of the importance of Hellenistic poetics was reductive (yet ours could be overstated); it is not just a problem of information available, appraisal and evaluation matter too: as for Apollonius, he saw some points of contact with perfect clarity, but he did not like Apollonius, and this is the decisive factor — contrast what he was able to do when he studied Vergil's operations on Greek tragedy. The rise of Alexandrian poetry in the following two-thirds of our century creates a different vista on the *Aeneid*, especially because 'Callimachean' has become a positive standard, a warrant for the aestheticization of the poetic text, and almost synonymous not only with 'self-reflexive' or 'programmatic', but also with (how dangerously) 'true art'.

All this is certainly overstated and precarious, but one could still say, with Turnus, 'sine me hunc furere ante furorem', and work towards a systematic 'Alexandrian' reading of the *Aeneid* that is still lacking, and use it to supplement H.'s views.

Alan Cameron ends his 500-page revision of Callimachean poetics (*Callimachus and his Critics* (1995)) with a protreptic to new studies on Callimachus and the *Aeneid*. In fact we (i.e. most Latinists) are becoming increasingly aware that Callimachus is so important because his poetry provides, simultaneously, a model for praise poetry (I recommend K. K. Shanmugam, *Praise of Rulers in Hellenistic and Roman Poetry*, M. Litt. thesis, University of Oxford (1995) and its breaking point (see e.g. S. J. Heyworth, *MD* 33 (1994), 51–79; R. F. Thomas in M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit and G. C. Wakker, *Callimachus* (1993), 211; A. Barchiesi, *Il poeta e il principe* (1994), 169–74); a source of ironies *and* a way of fashioning political poetry. More than *recusatio* is involved here. The appropriation of aetiology in epic needs reconsideration (see P. Bleisch, *The Aetiological Tradition in Vergil's Aeneid 1–6*, thesis, UCLA (1994)). It is interesting to compare this approach with the growing fortunes of a book like *Aeneid* III, a text that H. rightly portrayed as 'difficult'. This narrative of delays and belatedness has recently been described as a miniature *Aeneid* (D. Hershkowitz, *Vergilius* 37 (1991), 69–76). The initial episode in Delos is influenced by the praise poetry of the Callimachean hymns (S. J. Heyworth, *CQ* 43 (1993), 255–7; A. Barchiesi, *CQ* 44 (1994), 438–43). Apollo starts the quest for a new fatherland and a new epic hero by quoting (and manipulating) two prophetic lines from the *Iliad*, and at the same time the situation recalls the programmatic Apollo of Callimachus, *Hymn* II, a remarkably bifocal approach to the start of a narrative that takes leave from the trail of the Epic Cycle. The authorization to Aeneas' travels comes from a Homeric quotation but also from the god who advocated a break within the heroic tradition in Greek poetry. Tradition and its discontents are becoming inseparable. At the other end of the book, the anticlimactic catalogue of the Sicilian coastal sites has been recently linked to the Sicilian aitiologies of *Aitia* II (by M. Geymonat, *HCSP* 95 (1993), 323–31). Here, again, we find a juxtaposition of Homeric and Callimachean voices. The Sicilian landscape becomes 'legible' to Aeneas through the learned interpretation of a Greek traveller who is an ex-companion of Ulysses. Achaemenides, so to speak, 'rereads' his past route ('relegens errata retrorsus . . .' III.690; cf. III.717, 'renarrabat'), and so the Homeric world is brought up to date. In a few lines we travel from an appropriation of the Odyssean Cyclops adventure and its aftermath towards a catalogue in the modern style of antiquarian poetry. And Callimachus, of course, may have considered the periplus of Sicilian legends as his own private 'Odyssey'. His work faced the competition both of traditional epic and of more recent 'catalogue' poetry. As for Vergil, there is a programmatic force in the idea that Aeneas' epic travels appropriate Callimachus just where Callimachus appropriated Homer to elegy: a Carthaginian banquet, an Egyptian banquet (in *Aitia* II), a Phaeacian banquet . . . And the whole plot of the *errores* needs a redefinition in terms of narrative reflexivity (as in the forthcoming essay, based on a Bristol dissertation, by E. M. Theodorakopoulos, *Images of Closure*). A new general book on the *Aeneid* would probably focus more on the Alexandrian deferrals of books like III, VIII, and XI — and we will still need H. to redress the balance.

The resurfacing of Alexandrian poetry and poetic values will complicate further our reading of the *Aeneid* in the coming years; precisely for this reason, it is good to have a totalizing, and for many aspects satisfactory, view of Vergil easily available to our students, and it is also good to feel the pressure to encourage new viewpoints.

Università di Verona ALESSANDRO BARCHIESI

M. W. GLEASON, *MAKING MEN: SOPHISTS AND SELF-PRESENTATION IN ANCIENT ROME*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995. Pp. xxxii + 193. ISBN 0-691-04800-2. £25.00/US$29.95.

In the period of the High Roman Empire the rhetorical schools and the teachers of rhetoric, the sophists, assumed an unparalleled influence. The reasons behind this are — or should be — matters