2012

Genus Esse Deorum; Infelix Dido

Jacqueline McLean
Bard College

Genus Esse Deorum; Infelix Dido
The Aeneid in Translation

Senior Project submitted to
The Division of Literature
of Bard College

by
Jackie Lee McLean

Annandale-on-Hudson, New York
May 2012

CONTENTS

Introduction

I intend in this brief exploration to examine Virgil's *Aeneid*. Why this work of all the others that I have come to love through my studies and personal forays? As a Literature major and only part-time student of the Classics, I did not plan upon first contemplation to focus on such a cornerstone of ancient and contemporary influence as the *Aeneid*. I read David West's rendering of Virgil's original in the summer of 2011. Aside from excerpts, this was the first time that I had come into deep contact with the work. I was overwhelmed by the intensity of the story; the pathos that stirred in me when I encountered Dido's tale, the power of conviction behind the battles, the desperate attempts of each character to understand the cosmological and ethical structure of his/her world. For the first time, I really understood the propensity of Virgil's *Aeneid* to be used historically as a book of reference, as it was for many centuries, rendered almost Biblical by the legions who turned to it for answers. Although the work is over two thousand years old, it is by no means relegated exclusively to the status of a "schoolroom text" as some critics, perhaps too hastily, suggest, sealing its fate by the power of academic canonization.

To me the work is personal and relevant. I see similar struggles endured by people in the world around me as those borne by the characters who live in this ancient text. The years that divide author and modern reader serve only to sharpen the gleaming blade that exists in Virgil's poetry. Virgil's work sought and still seeks,

with more acuity and precision than most contemporary work, to answer questions that are still unanswered and no less ardently pursued. The modern and continual relevance of a work as ancient as this makes it all the more remarkable, for it has traversed such distance and remained not only intact but somehow perpetually renewed. It is for this reason, this continual relevance, that I believe the *Aeneid*, itself, has a transcendent quality either in a specific aspect or as a result of the amalgamation of specific aspects, the particular or comprising aspects being either inherent to the substance of the work, itself, as if it were fated to be transcendent, or else as a result of the timing of its creation thus conferring upon it some sort of predisposed astrological guidance.

As an additional result of the continual relevance of the work, critics and scholars recognize Virgil's work as having a sort of transcendent appeal to authors and readers; the most obvious example of which being the frequency with which it is translated, and by whom: those translators being a veritable plethora of people unable to be broadly categorized by any defining mark of interest or origin. It is in part due to the oft-spoken reiteration of Virgil's longevity and veritable transcendence that many embark upon the task of translating Virgil. Because he is seen as being able to transcend the Literary canon, he is chased after by those who seek a certain kind of immortality; this being, of course, the closest thing to a universal and equalizing characteristic of the human condition. It is important to wonder, though, about the role, in regards to Virgil's more modern reception and relevance, of the actual constant *reiteration*, so ubiquitous that it has become a necessary addition to Virgil's own literary-canon- baggage. Does this assurance of

longevity and significance make his work even more likely to be resurrected during literary lulls or during times of general national or worldwide waywardness, malaise, or digression?

As a result of this deification of Virgil, whose vestmental layers seem to infinitely regress, and a borderline fetishization of his work in literary forums, his beautifully crafted characters have fallen to the wayside in terms of their significance and value as objects in themselves.

It is partially out of a sense of duty to challenge the treatment of such characters, but mostly because out of an undeniable and patho-tic propensity, that I seek to approach the characters, mostly Dido and Aeneas, not as historical figures within an antiquated and stagnant (canonized) text, but as relevant representations, dynamic human impressions, intelligent beings. Although their historically recent marginalization does strengthen my resolve and provide something of a reassuring incentive for my approach of them as significant and dynamic characters within the context of the book and not the literary/ academic canon, my motivation is not so noble or valorous. My emotions have sway over me, and it is they that are deeply affected and drive me to resolve. I read The *Aeneid* for the first time out of curiosity and at leisure. It was, to me, the antitheses of a "schoolroom text," it was a book that I read out of my own interest and largely without any background knowledge or preconceived ideas. All of the research that I have done regarding this book, all of the thinking and writing of my own, have been spurred by a true love for the work, itself, not as an academic text, but as a personal and relative entity. Thus, my impressions of the characters' trials have never been marginalized to better focus

on their respective statuses within, and impacts upon, the collective literary canon. Instead, I interpret their actions and subjectivities within the context of the book, in a literary context, but with the knowledge of one well versed in the realm of Classics and, as expected, educated in the postmodern tradition within which the academic conception of the "canon" resides.

While I see the characters as very much alive and human, the status of the work as a whole within the Classical, Academic, and Literary canon, and as it has existed in society through to the present, must be taken into consideration. For its continuous significance, I will not neglect to examine the various contexts through which the work has been received, its historical significance, and, most importantly for my purposes, its continual rebirth through translation.

It must, at all costs, be remembered that the *Aeneid* was written in Latin, and that the language and *situ* in which it was created play a vital role in its existence and conception. Most readers of the work encounter it via a translated form. It is absolutely imperative that we recognize that translations are not interchangeable with the original. Even the semantics of language herein present a problem as we are not so much accessing the original through or "by way" of a translation, but are more realistically coming into contact with a translation *of* an original. The translation will, ideally, be in some ways a reconstitution of the essence, as interpreted by the translator, of the original, and will likely follow a storyline comparable to that of the original, but will be a translation always, and not the original. The original is the only original, and translations are always translations. It is central to my conception of the translation that it can never be "transparent," or

"faithful," as translations of the *Aeneid*, in a disproportionate relation to other translated works profess to be. A translation is not a copy of the original, it is not the original in a different language. It is a reworking of the material, as internalized by the translator/writer and thus necessarily employs exclusively the faculties of the translator (and not the author of the original) and thus is a product of the translator. It is also necessary to acknowledge that the original language, Latin, is now purely academic or symbolically significant and not so much practical or encountered in every-day communication, and so there really aren't any, or maybe very few, "native readers" around today.

Even so, there still is the inherent distance between the work and a modern Latin-reader (as opposed to the distance between the work and a non-Latin-reader) due to changes in time and reception. There is, of course, even the distance of subjectivity between the work and an ancient, Latin-speaking reader who lived during Virgil's time. This last distance, though, is one of an equalizing nature as it is inherent in every experience.

So, an integral piece of this project is to examine the difficulties (political, social, academic and personal) and general nuances and intricacies that translation, itself, presents upon an original work. Being somewhat proficient in Latin, I attempt to interact with the original whenever possible for comparative purposes when examining and conversing with works of translation.

Although there is no such thing as the ever-gleaming ideal of a "transparent translation," the appeal of Virgil is so strong as to seem to promise metaphysical rewards to translators, and many have fallen pray to the belief that the work, itself,

is transcendent in that it is so pure and universal that transparent translation is possible and even morally necessary.

This appeal of the *Aeneid* is something else that I seek to examine. Quite consistently, it has remained not only relevant but treasured and revered. Two thousand years in heavy rotation is long enough to make it truly a piece of the fabric of human understanding and reference, and even of the human experience. But, it is not relevant just because it has been around for so long. On the contrary, it has been around for so long because it is somehow consistently, and even transcendently (transcending the constricts of time) relevant.

Why is the *Aeneid* so enduring? The *Aeneid* is enduring both because of the cosmological structure of the world of the poem, and because of the patho-tic quality of the characters, especially Dido, casualty of fate, and her trials as a result of her involvement with Aeneas- the man pious enough to submit himself to a fated life.

The emotional impact of Dido's story is understated or ignored in most of the modern criticism that I have read. This leads me to believe that some critics do not want to admit the impact that a canonized work, especially one that seems to in some ways simultaneously signify and defy the very canon, can have on the emotions. They seem, perhaps, wary of approaching or accepting the sticky, amorphous, and decidedly un-academic topic of emotion. It is clear to me, however, that emotional appeal is the single most important aspect of any work of literature, not least of all of the *Aeneid*. This is not to say that emotions are divorced from other faculties of understanding; on the contrary, they are often a barometer of underlying unity, symmetry, and truth, which can more easily be dissected by non-emotional

faculties. Nevertheless, emotional appeal is of undeniable significance. What makes anything popular or enduring if not some sort of directly causal visceral response? I also understand the "danger" as a female[1] of emphasizing this quality in a work penned by a man so manly that the spelling of his name was possibly changed to emphasize his manliness (Vergil to Vir-gil[2]) but, nevertheless, I stand by the assertion that the very real and successful appeal to the emotions made by this book does not only serve to anchor the story in the minds and hearts of readers, but is necessary in order to illustrate with urgency and high stakes an endeavor most successful with a reader's investment, the complications of Aeneas' state, as well as the structure of the world within which he and Dido function.

As for the world of the *Aeneid*, itself, its structure can be examined through different lenses, ie. different philosophies, in order to be better understood. What is clear at first reading is that the world is self-contained, ruled by a general hierarchy within which Gods and fate play a part, and that it is composed of a veritable mishmash of recognizable philosophies as to be vaguely familiar, to feel inherently "true," and yet to be unique and in-attributable.

Finally, in order to analyze the content of the *Aeneid* to be able to better understand the structure of the world of that Epic and the importance of pathos and personal investment of readership in the work, I endeavor to engage upon close readings of both the original Latin and of translations by Allen Mandelbaum and

---

[1] And, believe me, I understand not wanting even a little bit to fall into the hole of smug superiority that smacks of misogyny, advanced in a misplaced effort to gain superiority or respect by fellow females such as Sarah Ruden, self proclaimed 'first woman to translate Vergil,' emphasis on the 'Ver.'

[2] 'Vir' meaning 'man' in Latin

John Dryden. Through these readings, I will attempt to show the characteristics of a successful translation, read: Dryden's, which internalizes the spirit of the original and re-appropriates, by use of the author's own sensibility and subjective arsenal, an English re-working that necessarily bears the hallmark and *cura* of the translator.

What I present here will begin with an analysis of Dryden's translation and the difference illustrated therein between translation and summary, as well as the philosophy of the process of translation, as can be gleaned from an analysis of the differences between summary and translation. Next, we will look to Dryden's translation and observe its nuances, specifically in its portrayal of Dido in relation to other portrayals including the one crafted by Virgil, himself. We will compare Dryden's translation to that of Allen Mandelbaum, move forward to interact with critical insight into translations of the *Aeneid* throughout the ages, the cosmology of the world of the *Aeneid*, and the nature of the work as it relates specifically to the process of translation. From there, we will examine the various approaches to translation, analyze the role of pathos in the *Aeneid,* evaluate the philosophy and structure of the work, and consider the cosmology of the world of the *Aeneid* in its relation to another ancient text. Finally, we will look at the various characterizations of Aeneas and follow an explication of Dido and her fate within and outside of the text.

Chapter 1- Translation, Color, and Dryden

In Dryden's translation of the *Aeneid*, there is a summary of events before each Book. The fact that the action is outlined before the verse commences provides insight into the essence of the translation; the summary is a clear elucidation of a perception of events as they occur in the original. The events are stated objectively, but in the breakdown of the proposed objective summary, there are hints as to the flavor of the interpretation. For each interpretation, as I will continue to argue, has its own "flavor" as imparted by the translator, and there is no such thing as the elusive transparent translation.

The summaries, as noted fleetingly in the introduction of the book, are not authored by Dryden, himself, but rather by a 24-year old Joseph Addison (b. 1672). That the summaries were composed by someone other than Dryden suggests that there is much more to *The Aeneid* than a summary of its events; the verse, itself, is for story- telling purposes but is also a work of art and scholarly labor. That there is a summary illuminates this division; there is the verse by Virgil as translated by Dryden, and there is also the plot of the story, outlined by a nearly anonymous young man. Though they overlap, there is a distinction. It is also interesting to note that the summary-writer is not credited predominantly. Rather, his name is

mentioned almost as an afterthought- tacked onto the very end of the prefatory notes. Why does he not get recognition? That he does not suggests to me a consensus within the world of classics that the *essence* of a work remains immutable even through the changes in form, from one language to another, enough so that it can be summarized without the essence being lost. Addison is not notable because his work merely puts into words the obvious, what is apparent. This insight is valuable when considering the role of the translator and the nature of translation. Further insight into his individual perception of the work, as gleaned by Dryden's translation, perhaps, can be found by looking at the content of the summary notes.

The summary states "Dido… makes use of her own and her sister's entreaties" (Dryden 93).[3] "Makes use" seems to imply some degree of subversive manipulation. Are we to believe, then, that Addison sees Dido as conniving? That his sympathies lie with Aeneas? When summarizing a work that was not written in English, as in translating, word choice is so very important as the words are solely relied upon to lead the reader to perception and understanding of something they have not read. Later, he says that Dido in falling in love "discovers all the variety of passions" (Dry. 93). This paints Dido as "every woman" (Dry. 93). She is a citizen of the world, a woman who is no different from others in that, for her as well as for other women, there are to be found in love a set "variety of passions," a universal "variety of passions." After, she is called "a neglected lover" (Dry. 93), as if to say that her autonomy can be exchanged for a platitude, as if her personal experience is one that places her in a world of shadows and essences- she has come into contact with a

[3] Dryden, John. 1997. 93

certain *kind* of previously categorized experience. “When nothing would prevail upon him, she contrives her own death” (Dry. 93). The cause and effect construction here makes her actions, undertaken of anguish and desperation, seem premeditated contrivances.

John Dryden’s care of Dido is pointedly more sensitive and expansive not just than Addison’s brief summaries but even than Virgil’s treatment of her. From the beginning of Book IV, the differences are evident. In this part of the story, Dido is falling in love with Aeneas. Dryden’s version: “The hero’s valor, acts, and birth, inspire/ her soul with love, and fan the secret fire” (Dry. 4. 3). Virgil’s Latin: *Multa viri virtus animo multusque recursat/ Gentis honos* (Aen. 4.3).[4]

First, in line 3, comes the word “birth.” Critic RG Austin translates the passage *gentis honos* (Aen. 4.3) into “the glories of his line,”[5] while Dryden renders it, “the hero’s valor, acts and birth” (Dry. 4.3). The word “birth” draws a more direct connection between this instance of Dido’s private admittance to her sister, Anna, of love, and her later public, beseeching cries which hold the same sentiment when directed to the object of her love, Aeneas. In the latter case, she rues the barrenness of her love for Aeneas, that no child had been born of it. S*i quis mihi parvulus aula luderet Aeneas* (Aen. 4. 328-329), as translated by Austin, “if only I had in my home a playing baby Aeneas” (Aus. 103). Here, in line 3, she commends his lineage as one of the factors that make him desirable to her. But by drawing attention to the reference to lineage with the word “birth,” Dryden’s translation alerts us to the possibility that

[4] Austin 1973, 1. Passages of Virgil’s poetry on the Latin will be henceforth cited (Aen. vv). Also, all lines refer to Book 4 unless otherwise specified.

[5] Austin, RG. 1973, 26

we are witnessing a sort of psychological slip in which Dido unwittingly reveals her desire for children, later the absence of which is one of the most tragic elements of her abandonment. Thus, by choosing the word "birth," Dryden achieves the set-up for a beautiful and tragic symmetry later to be realized.

The fact that Dryden's translation is in verse cannot be overlooked and the importance of this structure cannot be overstated. By rendering Virgil's Latin into poetic, rhyming English (heroic couplets), the structure and meter become essential guidelines for the language. The language must exist within a new structure that has been necessarily manipulated, and the original meaning cannot not be compromised, the patho-tic effect must not be lost, the immensity of the work must remain intact, and all the while the word choice is reduced to those words that can fit together to form that combination of words that fit the meter. The words have to fit together as pieces in a puzzle; none can exist without consideration of the larger structure. The individual words and phrases need to be carefully chosen and constructed so that maximum impact and meaning are imparted with utmost consideration for space and structure- no words can be wasted, extreme thought must go into each choice.

Furthermore, it is necessary that the translator have faith that the tools available to him, these being pre-existing words and his own imposed structure, are sufficient. It is essential that he believes in the possibility of re-capturing the power and subtle nuance of the original work, he must believe that the characters over which he labors, with nothing but a mental impression and the Latin before him by way of guidelines, will come to life and resemble those that existed in the minds of ancient readers, or at least in his own. He must have faith that these things are

possible, and that they are possible in English, in verse, and within a structure of rhyme. He must have faith that the language can accommodate the ideas.

In Dryden's verse, we see the word "purple," "when the purple morn had chased away /the dewy shadows, and restored the day" (Dry. 4.7-8).
This is the first of many times that it appears in Book 4.[6] There is an overwhelming presence of color in Dryden's translation that is not in the Latin. Alongside purple, variations of gold appear frequently. The frequency of this coloration makes it something of a hallmark of Dryden's translation. The ubiquitous color in Dryden's version causes the translation to be more vibrant and memorable than others. The use of color puts the reader into direct contact with the imagery of the story. It is as if an arrow is shot from the scene into the breast of the reader, suddenly traversing the expanse of distance and time inherent in such a work as this, set, written, and translated in times distant from that of any modern reader. The invocation of purple, specifically, as well as gold serves to keep a constant reminder of the regality and richness of both Dido and Aeneas. So regal and rich are they that even the morning sky echoes their height and fullness in the form of color. The visual nature of the word "purple" means that an image is conjured as soon as the word is read; the presence of the color makes the world of Dryden's translation of Virgil's work less foreign and more familiar. The reader can look up from the book and see examples

---

[6] Purple appears in Dryden's Book 4 in lines 7, 165, 192, 384, 658, 817, and 951. For purposes of comparison for the color purple only, the color does not appear in Virgil's original in the corresponding passages of Dryden's line 7, 165, 658, 817, or 951. Out of the above seven instances of the color purple in Dryden's verse, corresponding mentions in Virgil's original only occur in two, at corresponding passages to Dryden's 192 and 384, Virgil's 262 and 134. In both cases of Virgil's invocations, he is referring to the color of a garment.

of the same purple in his world. Color is something that both endures and is also a form of standard currency. In addition, the proliferation of the color in Dryden's verse ties Dido and Aeneas more closely to their world, as in the above case where a color associated with Dido is apparent in the sunrise.

Certain word choices give the work a distinctive flavor. For instance, in Dryden's line 7-8, "when the purple morn had chased away/the dewy shadows, and restored the day." The word "restored" is interesting as it keeps the focus on the day, in particular, and also serves to personify it. By saying that the "purple morn" "restored the day," Dryden is implying that night is not equivalent to day, but rather is a perhaps less desirable state. The day has been injured by the onset of night, and the "purple morn" is as a healing force, there to restore the day to its rightful brightness.

Similarly on Dryden's line 6, when talking of Dido's love for Aeneas, "his words, his looks, imprinted on her heart/ improve the passion, and increase the smart" (Dry. 4. 5-6). Improve implies to a modern reader that the passion is somehow insufficient. In Dryden's use, however, the word is used similarly to the way it would be when talking about the purity of a precious metal, such as gold, another color often used in both Virgil and Dryden's verse. With every thought of Aeneas, the word implies, Dido's love is more lustrous, pure, and beautiful. This has a connection to the word *lustraba*t (Aen. 4.6) in the original Latin during the passage that describes the dawn, *postera Phoebea lustrabat lampade terras* (Aen. 4.6). As said by Warde Fowler *lustrabat* is "one of the most beautiful and most

untranslatable words in the language."[7] In Austin's words, "it is primarily a religious term, used of a ritual purification procession."[8] Also in this word, "the idea of illuminating is implicit: the advancing dawn purifies the world." Says Fowler, "it is necessary to *feel* the word."[9] Dryden's lines 9-10 read, "her sister first with early care she sought/and thus in mournful accents eased her thought" (Dry. 4. 9-10)

Here, Dido seeks out her sister, Anna, as the one to whom she first gives voice to her feelings. In the Latin, the lines are *cum sic unanimam adloquitur male sana sororem* (Aen. 4.8). And a word-for word translation of Virgil's line, "and thus, beside herself, addressed her sister, the soul of her soul."[10]

The two are very different in terms of focus. A stark translation of the Latin seems to focus on Anna, with the word *unanimam*, "soul of her soul," and the phrase *male sana,* "beside herself," both instances indicating that Anna is naturally the one to whom Dido turns in times of distress. In the words of Austin at the word, *sororem*, "Anna has not been mentioned before, but Dido's action in seeking her out is so natural and touching that one almost expects to find her."[11] In Dryden's translation, we feel a focus on Dido rather than on Anna. Instead of choosing to emphasize Dido's fractured state of mind, the fact that she is said in the Latin to be "beside herself," Dryden's verse seems to give Dido a greater sense of autonomy. She is not groping desperately for aid, as she could be seen to be in a stark translation. Rather, she seems to be in control of her thoughts and actions, seeking Anna not with

---

[7] Austin, RG. 1973, 27
[8] Austin, RG. 1973, 27
[9] Austin, RG. 1973, 27
[10] Author's trans.
[11] Austin, RG. 1973, 28

desperation but "early care," which seems to imply a care that is gentle and full like the nature of the budding morning previously described. Similarly, she does not thrust her anguish upon Anna. Rather, she "eases" her thought out of her own mind and into the space between her and her sister.

There is a deliberation and control that is evoked in the word, "ease[d]." Her "accents" are "mournful," yes, but they are not cries or pleas; they are accents, gentle and measured. An "accent" is, in the words of the OED, both a "distinctive visual emphasis; contrast of colour or light; a touch of colour or light which brings the features of a structure into relief or provides a contrast in a composition or colour scheme." And "the way in which anything is said or sung; a style of pronunciation, a manner of utterance, a tone or quality of voice; a character of sound; a musical or quasi-musical intonation of the voice; a modulation or modification of the voice expressing feeling" (OED) [12]. The invocation of color and light is a sub-connotation that makes the word all the more perfect for this place in the verse, wherein reference to light and color surrounds it. Thus, Dido's voice is said to be in such a tone that it conveys her "mournful[ness]," but she still eases her thoughts out into the open with a deliberateness and patience that assures the reader of her presence of mind and autonomy.

As will become more clear throughout this chapter, Dryden's treatment of Dido makes her shape in the mind of an English speaker correspond to the care that Virgil might have conferred in writing her; she is vibrant, beautiful, and autonomous.

---

[12] *Oxford English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Web. 16 Apr 2012.

There is nothing pitiful in her, and this makes her eventual anguish all the more tragic. I remained faithful to Aeneas while reading the prose translation of David West; I pitied Dido but I did not bitterly regret her death. After reading Dryden's verse, I am not as sympathetic towards Aeneas. Dido is Dryden's vibrant hero, brutally decimated by an unworthy foe, Aeneas, the callous pawn of fate. In the larger picture, empathy for Dido is essential because it underscores the difficulty of the path towards the founding of Rome.

Duncan Kennedy in his piece "Modern Receptions and Their Interpretive Implications," [13] reiterates the fact that the *Aeneid* is, from the beginning, about the end. From the prophetic utterings and the benefit of historical hindsight, we know what the end result of Aeneas' quest will be from the moment we embark upon the journey. What has been accomplished cannot be undone, the certain specific end is inevitable. Dido, he says, does not exist within this framework; rather, she is a casualty of it. By virtue of being a part of the narrative, she does have a place in the framework, but her brush with Aeneas is incidental and almost tangential to the trajectory of the story. Looking at the *Aeneid* as a transcription of true events, a self-contained world and not a constructed narrative, as Kennedy seems to do in his piece, Dido's life is on a course of its own. She is, in fact, on her own path "to the stars" before she crosses paths with Aeneas. She is so independent and self-reliant, and yet is taken with Aeneas so violently and fatally, that she is a true casualty not unlike Catullus' flower, touched by a passing plow (Catullus 23-24) [14].

---

[13] Martindale 1997, 145.

[14] Catullus, "Poem XI," vv.23-24

Dido seems to find validation for her feelings in the imposing presence of Aeneas. It is as if she can't help but be drawn to him (she is, after all, shot by Cupid's arrow). She seems to say as much in Dryden's verse, "his worth, his actions, and majestic air/ a man descended from the gods declare" (Dry. 4. 16), and Virgil's prose, *genus esse deorum* (Aen. 4.12).

Perhaps Dido even feels that Aeneas' divine lineage indicates that he is fated for her, sent to her from above. That he is descended from the gods sets him apart from other men and surely adds to the allure of his presence. This line also sets up a poignant and beautiful contrast to the later words spoken by Dido in reference to Aeneas' true lineage, the lineage that he shows himself to have not by his birth but by his actions, cold and hard, as if descended from stone (Aen. 4.367).

One of the most moving passages of Book IV is during Dido's confession, which reads much like a soliloquy, of her love for Aeneas and the conflicting feelings that surround this admission. In the Latin, Dido refers to her sister by name on two occasions, once on line 9 and again on line 20. In Dryden's translation, however, these addresses do not appear. Because of this, the tone of the section is less like a dialogue and more like a monologue. We do not have reminders of Anna's presence, as we do in the Latin. This allows us to see Dido as a more self-reliant character; she is working through her thoughts in the presence of her sister, but she is not in explicit conversation with her. It seems then that this is one example of the way that Dryden's Dido is more overtly stable and independent than Virgil's, who invokes the name of her sister numerous times and is characterized as *male sana* (Aen. 4.8),

"beside herself," and of a mind that has "lost its health."[15] It is clear that, in her fragile state, Virgil's Dido calls upon Anna out of dire need and borderline desperation, as Anna is her *unanimam* (Aen. 4.8) "soul of her soul," and the one to which she can turn when her own mind is not sound.

Dryden, in removing the invocations and making Dido's speech more of a self-exploratory soliloquy, lets the reader see Dido as a strong individual, not subject to pejorative conditions stereotypically regarded as specifically female such as mental instability and emotional frailty. No, Dryden's Dido is a strong person, and a leader first and foremost. She is painfully aware of the judgments to be made upon her swelling change of heart, so much in fact that she is the first to criticize and even scorn herself. It is through this self-scorn that we understand her unwillingness to accept these feelings, and also the strength that they must have to be able to remain, unbidden, in one as steadfast as Dido.

Dido's tears first appear, "gushing from her eyes" (Dry. 4.40), at the end of her soliloquy. The tears follow a fierce admonition of herself, in which Dido vows that before she will "Break the plighted faith I gave" (Dry. 4.37), and pursue new love with Aeneas, she should be subject to all types of tortures and be "condemned with ghosts in endless night to lie" (Dry. 4.36). That the tears appear here, and not before, indicates that they are, at least partially, from frustration with herself. She does not want to fall in love because she feels a sense of duty, she feels that she must remain faithful to the memory of her late husband. This crippling, frustrating sense of duty conflicts with the overwhelming feelings she has for Aeneas.

---

[15] Austin, RG. 1973, 27

Here, a parallel must not be overlooked. While Aeneas is driven by a sense of duty and a fated prophecy to leave Dido and ultimately lay down the foundations of Rome, Dido is compelled in the opposite direction. She has high aspirations to "reach the stars" (Aen. 4.322) through her work and also a will to remain true to her convictions, mainly her strong belief that she must remain faithful to her late husband. It is conceivable that all of this could have been accomplished except that there is direct interference, an interception and redirection that occurs when Cupid, disguised as Ascanius, causes Dido to fall in love with Aeneas. Dido, in that her fate becomes the subject of a direct godly intervention for the purpose of Aeneas' fate, is a casualty of both love and war in the fullest sense of the word. Her emotions are manipulated so that they overpower her every other sense, she is compelled to love one who is necessarily unwilling and, perhaps, unable to be hers. The gods deliberately manipulate her into feelings that lead to her own destruction. The feelings that she develops for Aeneas, one who is ordered by a higher power to forfeit his own desires for the ultimate reward of glory and immortality, are, as they have been ordained by a higher power, just as strong as his convictions to leave.

I do not know if all divine interventions are created equally. That is, while Dido was struck by love for Aeneas, (certainly an intervention) her feelings overpower her to the point of suicide. Aeneas, chosen by the Gods to lay the foundations of Rome, seems more of a pawn, moved by exhortations and threats, than consumed by emotion and an inner conviction to carry out the will of the Gods. He is certainly dutiful, and does quell his own desires in order to carry out the job he is fated to perform, most evident in Virgil's characterization of him as an oak, with a

hard exterior and silent tears, but he does at times forget about his duty which prompts not one but two warnings from Jove via Mercury that the job must be done. It seems to me as if Aeneas is placed upon a boat guided by the Gods and that his part in the completion of the journey is that he remains sitting on it (the boat). Dido on the other hand is driven to passion by the godly intervention and is propelled to extinction by the love sparked within her.

Anna intervenes as soon as Dido is stopped by the onset of her tears. This shows their close connection- Anna picks up where Dido leaves off. Anna's inundations make even more clear to the reader the nature of her relationship with Dido. Anna clearly has Dido's best interest in mind; she urges her to live for the joys of life and not let herself live "without the joys of mother or of wife" (Dry. 4.45). Anna says, "think you these tears, this pompous train of woe/are known or valued by the ghosts below?" (Dry. 4.46-47).

This specific heroic couplet sounds similar to the sentiment expressed in Andrew Marvell's "To His Coy Mistress," (Marvell 25-30) which was written some fifty years before Dryden's verse. This similarity is one example of the way in which a translation can be influenced by the time period in which it is produced. This couplet, however, does differ from the famous lines of Marvell's poem, "thy beauty shall no more be found/ nor, in thy marble vault, shall sound/my echoing song: then worms shall try/that long preserved virginity/ and your quaint honor turn to dust/ and into ashes all my lust" (Marvell 25-30). Both Anna's admonitions and the sentiment in Marvell's lines allude to the fleeting nature of life and the importance of living for the living, so to speak. In Marvell's poem, however, the speaker reminds

the listener that her life is finite, and in doing so encourages her to take a chance on him. Anna in her words to Dido reminds her that *other* lives are finite and that Sychaeus, being dead, cannot appreciate or even know of the sacrifices that Dido is making in his honor.

Closely following, there is perhaps another literary allusion. “I grant, that, while your sorrows yet were green/ it well became a woman, and a queen, /the vows of Tyrian princes to neglect/ to scorn Iarbus and his love reject” (Dry. 4.48-51).

It is by no means unusual to see references to color in Dryden’s translation. On the contrary, there are innumerable references to specific colors throughout Book IV, most commonly purple and gold, which signify royalty and privilege. This is a rare departure, however, from the ubiquitous gold and purple and immediately brings to mind another mention of the color green, famous in classical studies. This instance is in Sappho’s poem 31. Not all translations of Fragment 31 include the word “green,” but most do and, in Robert Lowell’s translation the color is most vibrantly represented in the last stanza, “I shiver. A dead whiteness spreads over/ my body, trickling pinpricks of sweat./I am greener than the greenest green grass/ I die!” (Lowell 13-16).[16] As Lowell recognizes, there is so much possibility in the color green. There is the green of saplings. This kind of young green seems to be to what Dryden refers with his use of the color when illustrating Dido’s sorrows. There is also, along with youth, a connotation of vibrancy, vitality, life. Green is the color of nature and thus the natural color of life. In Lowell’s translation of Sappho’s fragment 31, the closeness between life and death is shown. There is a bountiful emergence of

[16] "Sappho: Poem of Jealousy." vv 13-16

green, “greener than the greenest green grass,” and then, separated by just a dash, “I die!” It is shown, then, the truth that the most vibrant green of life is often realized just before or in conjunction with death. Thus, while green is aligned closely with life, its overwhelming vibrancy means that it is associated, too, with death. There is further evidence for this reading in a later passage of Book IV wherein Dido is preparing her deathbed, “and every baleful green denoting death” (Dry. 4.732).

This color is then fitting for Dryden’s passage. Dryden is showing us that Dido’s sorrows were once young and fresh, brightly felt because of her inexperience with life. We have, as well, a foreshadowing of new “green sorrows” that will cause Dido to feel her life so powerfully that she will be able to bear it no longer.

In Dryden’s translation of the *Aeneid*, there is, in fact, a distinct vividness that permeates the story and colors the events so that they are able to be directly encoded into the mind and memory of the reader. Each color is an instant association- brilliant flashes of color become hallmarks in the memory that make the subject of the verse easy to recall, so vivid as to be impossible to forget.

In every way the language of the writing is vivid, full, alive. Always the language favors physical description and the frequent invocation of specific colors, often absent in the Latin, to create a unique, universally accessible, non-time specific vividness in the mind of the reader. With each subsequent mention of color the mental painting that advances along with the reading becomes more dimensional, full, lifelike. In addition, the frequent brush strokes attune the mind of the reader to pick up on other, more subtle indications of color, accent, and depth throughout the verse.

In the segment of Dryden's verse before Aeneas and Dido consummate their union, there are a multitude of vivid, colorful words that drive the image deeply into the mind,

> Preferring Juno's power (for Juno ties
> The nuptial knot and makes the marriage joys),
> The beauteous queen before her alter stands
> And holds the golden goblet in her hands.
> A milk-white heifer she with flowers adorns,
> And pours the ruddy wine betwixt her horns;
> And, while the priests with prayer the Gods invoke,
> She feeds their alters with the Sabaean smoke;
> With hourly care the sacrifice renews,
> And anxiously the panting entrails views (Dry. 4.79-88).

There is the characterization of the queen as "beauteous" (81) the "golden goblet" (82), the "milk-white heifer" (83), the flowers that adorn the alabaster coat, the "ruddy wine" (84), the "Sabaean smoke" (86). Then there is the indication of repetition, "with hourly care the sacrifice renews" (87). This entire scene thus repeats and is intensified. Lastly, there are the "panting entrails" (88), which, in the reader's primed state of mind, are surely a vivid purple and red.

For contrast, we can compare this portion of Dryden's translation to the corresponding lines in that of Allen Mandelbaum's translation, c. 1972.

> They slaughter chosen sheep, as is the custom,
> And offer them to Ceres, the lawgiver,

To Phoebus, Father Bacchus, and –above all- 80

To Juno, guardian of marriage. Lovely

Dido holds the cup in her right hand;

She pours the offering herself, midway

Between the milk-white heifer's horns. She studies

Slit breasts of beasts and reads their throbbing guts. (Man. 78-85)[17]

There is "lovely" (81) Dido, "the offering" (83), the same "milk-white heifer" (84), "throbbing guts" (85). Mandelbaum's translation, in comparison to Dryden's, is much sharper, more angular, pointy and almost ungainly with sharp appendages jutting out, bent elbows and knobby knees. The language does not flow and swirl and dance, nor does it paint a colorful mental image. It is awkward and stilted and it reads, plainly, like an attempted "faithful translation," not imbued with spirit as an interpretive translation might be, as Dryden's is- an interpretation, an appropriation, a re-figuration of material treasured, internalized, respun.

Insight into the Mandelbaum translation is gleaned with a look to the preface of his work:

"I have tried to impress what Macrobius heard and Dante learned on this translation, to embody both the grave tread and the speed and angularity Virgil can summon, the asymmetrical thrust of a mind on the move, I have tried to annul what too many readers of Virgil in modern translations have taken to be his: the flat and unvarious, and the loss of shape and energy where the end of the line is inert-

[17] Allen Mandelbaum, 1971. 85

neither reinforced nor resisted- and the mass of sound becomes amorphous and anonymous" (Man. xiv).

And this haunting phrase that tormented Mandelbaum and initially dissuaded him from tackling the translation: "If you take from Virgil his diction and metre, what do you leave him?" (Man. ix)

Mandelbaum seems to have forgotten a cardinal rule of creative work- it is futile to embody. One can emulate, but to try to embody is futile. Mandelbaum does not try to obfuscate his aim. He states clearly that his goal is to "embody both the grave tread and the speed and angularity Virgil can summon" (Man. xiv). He is fixated on producing that fabled, ever-sought "faithful translation." Down to Virgil's innate spirit and style, Mandelbaum wishes to embody, to channel, to reproduce. In so doing, Mandelbaum is effectively trying to *be* Virgil- to write with his style and sensibility, but for the English-speaker's ear. He does not realize that such things as style and sensibility cannot be divorced from the mind from which they originate, nor are they mutable or transferrable.

Chapter 2- Taking on the Critics

In his essay, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," philosopher Walter Benjamin emphasizes that the aura or essence of the original, in this case Virgil's original Latin *Aeneid,* can never be transmuted because it is rooted in the original's (Virgil's) time and space. Efforts to transmute the aura while removing from the object (the original) everything but perceived meaning are futile. Even if one sets out to translate faithfully by substituting each Latin word with its English equivalent, the complications that would arise in terms of grammar and word choice alone would surely cause the meaning to be compromised if not lost entirely.[18] The aura is not just in the words, it is a part of the thing, itself. To try to translate "faithfully" is thus impossible on many levels. Successful endeavors, in that they are moving and pleasant to read, are a result of carefully crafted poetry or prose in which the translator endeavors to evoke a response similar to that which he or she experiences when coming into contact with the original. Thus, the original must be of prime inspiration, but the translation must be also a result of a liberal use of the writer/translator's own talent. Dryden's product, because it is inspired by Virgil but decidedly of Dryden, is infinitely more enduring and pleasant to read than

[18] Benjamin 1936, Part III&IX

endeavors such as Mandelbaum's, which stubbornly try to carry, like water in cupped hands, the essence of Virgil's original into a faithful English translation.

It cannot be denied that there is but one Virgil, as there is but one Mandelbaum, one Dryden. It is fruitless to rob the body and mind of creativity and to try, instead, to shape them into a conduit for another. Every reading is an interpretation, and every interpretation is different. What better proof of the "right way" to translate then in the longevity of Dryden's translation? Where writers such as Mandelbaum try to imitate (always a losing game because when the goal is to produce something which already exists, the only possible outcome is a lesser one), Dryden chose to re-appropriate. Instead of trying to faithfully transcribe from one language to another, Dryden internalized the passions of the work and set to repaint them in a palette of his own. Such a work does not need to stay close to an original and count as faults any departure. Rather, Dryden's work has freedom to soar, dependent only upon Dryden's own sensibilities by which Virgil's original has been internalized in a way specific to Dryden.

The source of Mandelbaum's main concern when starting his translation was, "If you take from Virgil his diction and meter, what do you leave him?" (Mandelbaum ix) and with this he set himself up for complications. One *cannot* take away, in any sense of the word, Virgil's diction and meter. Additionally, translation need not be a paring down. When it is most successful, it is an expansion or elaboration. If you approach the task of translating as the process of taking from an author his diction and meter, then all that *can* be left are words. Words, orphaned, out of context, and strung together in a necessary, ungainly way. If you try to imitate,

then, Latin's meter, you have only a clunky, anachronous, meter that does not enhance the words but acts as a placeholder for what is not there. Try then to imitate Virgil's diction, and what is before you is a collection of out-of-context words, a clunky, anachronous meter, and a feeble imitation of a style not meant to be separated from meter and vocabulary. Instead of trying to salvage style, meter, and diction, a successful translation picks up on the intentions behind the language, the passions that drive the characters, the interweaving of themes, the conflict between fate and free will, past and future, present and eternity. The beauty of the scene, the life in the words.

In many respects, Dryden's work shows itself to be superior to the more modern Mandelbaum translation, though both are irrevocably tied to Virgil's original. Take, for instance, this passage:

> Poenorum exspectant, ostroque insignis et auro
> stat sonipes ac frena ferox spumantia mandit.
> tandem progreditur magna stipante caterva
> Sidoniam picto chlamydem circumdata limbo;
> cui pharetra ex auro, crines nodantur in aurum,
> aurea purpuream subnectit fibula vestem.
> nec non et Phrygii comites et laetus Iulus
> incedunt. ipse ante alios pulcherrimus omnis
> infert se socium Aeneas atque agmina iungit.
> qualis ubi hibernam Lyciam Xanthique fluenta
> deserit ac Delum maternam invisit Apollo

instauratque choros, mixtique altaria circum
Cretesque Dryopesque fremunt pictique Agathyrsi:
ipse iugis Cynthi graditur mollique fluentem
fronde permit crinem fingens atque implicat auro,
tela sonant umeris: haud illo segnior ibat
Aeneas, tantum egregio decus enitet ore. (Aen. 4.134-150)

The above lines are re-worked by Dryden to read:

The rosy morn was risen from the main;
And horns and hounds awake the princely train:
They issue early through the city gate,
Where the more wakeful huntsmen ready wait,
With nets, and toils, and darts, beside the force
Of Spartan dogs, and swift Massylian horse.
The Tyrian peers and officers of state,
For the slow queen, in antichambers wait:
Her lofty courser, in the court below
(Who his majestic rider seems to know),
proud of his purple trappings, paws to the ground;
and champs the golden bit, and spreads the foam around.
The queen at length appears: on either hand,
The brawny guards in martial order stand.
A flowered cymar with golden fringe she wore,

And at her back a golden quiver bore;
Her flowing hair a golden caul restrains;
A golden clasp the Tyrian robe sustains.
Then young Ascanius, with a sprightly grace
Leads on the Trojan youth to view the chase.
But far above the rest in beauty shines
The great Aeneas, when the troop he joins;
Like fair Apollo, when he leaves the frost
Of wintry Xanthus, and the Lycian coast;
When to his native Delos he resorts,
Ordains the dances, and renews the sports;
Where painted Scythians, mixed with Cretan bands,
Before the joyful alters join their hands:
Himself, on Cynthus walking, sees below
The merry madness of the sacred show.
Green wreaths of bays his length of hair enclose;
A golden fillet binds his awful brows;
His quiver sounds.- Not less the prince is seen
In manly presence, or in lofty mien. (Dry. 4.182-215)

The word *sonipes* (Aen. 4.135), as pointed out by Austin, "suggests the ring of the hoofs as the horse paws the ground."[19] Also, the alliteration and assonance of the

[19] Austin, RG. 1973, 63

words *spumantia mandit* in the same line "suggest the noise of the horse's jaws."[20] Both of these observations of onomatopoeia are essential to appreciating Dryden's own re-working of the passage. Similarly to what Virgil does with his use of sound-imitating constructions, Dryden accomplishes the feat of mimicking sense perception, with his trademark- the use of color. In the couplet, "proud of his purple trappings, paws to the ground;/ and champs the golden bit, and spreads the foam around" (Dry. 192-193), Dryden makes the bit golden while both colors are mentioned in the original Latin as colors of the horse's robes. The vibrancy here allows us to feel like we are present, witnessing the scene. There is also alliteration in Dryden's line 192, this joins the action to the emotion to the color and allows them to be intertwined. The pride, the purple, the pawing, are all of the same essence. Thus, the color purple becomes all the more powerful as it is here aligned with emotion as well as action.

While the second line of the couplet in Virgil's original can be literally translated to read "there stands her steed, and proudly champs the foaming bit" (Aus. 63), Dryden implies pride by making the bit golden. With his addition of color we are able to see the pride of Dido's kingdom- even the horse's bit, meant to be covered in spit, is opulent. The "champ'ing" (193) of the "golden" (193) bit somehow further heightens the goldness of it, not unlike the sensory experience of the "sharp glittering tip" of Cupid's golden arrow in Ovid's tales (Ovid 1.470). Although Dryden takes some liberties with color here, this is one of the most colorful passages altogether in the Latin. In lines 138-39, a literal translation of the Latin may read

[20] Austin, RG. 1973, 63

"she [Dido] has a quiver of gold, her hair is knotted into a gold clasp, golden is the brooch that underfastens her purple dress" (Aus. 63). Dryden adds to this also "A flowered cymar with golden fringe" (196), as well as the colors in the aforementioned couplet for an effect of overwhelming brilliance; shining gold and deep purple everywhere. Dido, in fact, seems to be made of gold as it accommodates her every need, making even function opulent.

What we later learn, of course, is that even Dido's hair is the color of gold. *nondum illi flavum Proserpina vertice crinem/abstulerat* (Aen. 4.698-699). This is remarkable for the time period and, although not unprecedented, definitely rare. From this passage, it seems possible that her hair color is meant to further reflect her ethereal composition- that she is quite literally meant for the stars and, thus, all the more tragic in her eventual fall. Later in the passage, slightly beyond what is transcribed, are the words *fulvum… leonem* (Aen. 159) in a description of a lion. *Fulvum* means either "tawny" or "yellow." Dryden chooses to translate this bit as "a tawny lion" (Dry. Line 230), but Mandelbaum does something interesting when he calls it "golden" (Man. Line 212). While Dryden doesn't specify the color of the hair that Proserpina (Aen. 698-699) cuts from Dido's head, Virgil specifies that it is yellow (Aen. 698). Mandelbaum, however, calls it golden (Man. 212). The fact that he chooses to make both her hair and the mighty lion gold means that they both become instantly related to the opulence of the kingdom, and also that they both become similar to one another. Dido's hair color is suddenly otherworldly and rare, and she is also suddenly compared to a lion- the most beautiful and powerful animal

of the kingdom. It seems, then, that although Mandelbaum doesn't often take liberties with color in his translation, he certainly recognizes the power of it.

Mandelbaum's translation of the long passage above, L134-150 in the Latin, is as follows:

> …But while the chieftains
> of Carthage wait at Dido's threshold, she
> still lingers in her room. Her splendid stallion,
> in gold and purple, prances, proudly champing
> his foaming bit. At last the queen appears
> among the mighty crowd; upon her shoulders
> she wears a robe of Sidion with embroidered
> borders. Her quiver is of gold, her hair
> has knots and ties of gold, a golden clasp
> holds fast her purple cloak. Her Trojan comrades
> and glad Ascanius advance behind her.
> Aeneas, who is handsome past all others,
> himself approaches now to join her, linking
> his hunting band to hers. Just as Apollo,
> when in the winter he abandons Lycia
> and Xanthus' streams to visit his maternal
> Delos, where he renews the dances- Cretans,
> Dryopians, and painted Agathyrsi,
> mingling around the alters, shout- advances

upon the mountain ridges of high Cynthus
and binds his flowing hair with gentle leaves
and braids its strands with intertwining gold;
his arrows clatter on his shoulder: no
less graceful is Aeneas as he goes;
an equal beauty fills his splendid face.

Mandelbaum does not start his lines with capital letters. This is a stylistic choice that both confers a "no-frills," "faithful" approach, and directly emulates the traditional Latin approach. The absence of rhyme also distinguishes Mandelbaum's translation from Dryden's. While Dryden takes enough liberties with the Latin text to be able to mold an English rendering into the form-constraints of poetry, Mandelbaum opts to translate in a more word-for-word fashion.

The introductions of Aeneas also vary. Mandelbaum introduces Aeneas in this passage on line 188; "Aeneas, who is handsome past all others, himself approaches now to join her, linking his hunting band to hers." Mandelbaum's Aeneas is "handsome past all others." While we understand from this that Aeneas is the handsomest of all, the placement of this assertion, after the dazzling description of Dido's beauty, is in Mandelbaum's prose slightly undermined by the word, "handsome" which, in the modern reader's lexicon, relates more often to masculine beauty. Thus, there is less tension inherent in the description of Aeneas, brief and pointed as it is, than there might be if another (unisex) word were used. In other words, what we understand here is simply that Aeneas is "handsome past all others."

In the Latin, Aeneas is *pulcherrimus* (Aen. 141). While *pulcherrimus* is indeed the masculine form of the word that means "beautiful," a more direct comparison between the appearance of Dido and that of Aeneas is made in the Latin than expressed by Mandelbaum with his use of the word "handsome" (Man.188). In the Latin, Aeneas is *pulcherimus* (the most beautiful of all) while Dido is *pulcherrima* (Aen. 60 "forma *pulcherrima* Dido"). It is interesting to note that this description is given to Dido, at line 60, as she performs the rites that she hopes will draw Aeneas to her. Is she then made beautiful by her desire for Aeneas? Is he the shining beacon that can onto others confer lustre?

So, in the Latin a direct comparison, by use of gendered forms of the same word, is drawn between the appearance of Aeneas and Dido. While in the Mandelbaum translation we are lead to understand that Aeneas is "handsome past all others" (188), in the Latin we see clearly that Aeneas is more beautiful, specifically, even than Dido. The impact of this assertion is even more profound as it is so simply put, *ipse ante alios pulcherrimus omnis* (Aen.141), and as it is thus so definitive. The assertion and the plain manner in which it is asserted is all the more profound in that it follows an extended description of Dido's beauty and majesty-compelling in part by the heightened effect of lush fabrics and metals which, in comparison to Aeneas' simply stated superiority, seem futile and affected. Dido, by the assertion alone, is effectively diminished. It is shown that Aeneas is superior and favored by fate.

Although Mandelbaum does translate truthfully in showing *pulcherrimus* to mean "handsome," a vital tension apparent in the Latin is not conveyed with the use

of this word. In order to convey an original tension, the words need not be translated individually, but must be seen in all their glory as means to reach an end. That end must be internalized in the constitution of the translator and construction of the translation, and the means thus assembled in the way thought best to be able to transmit that end. Individual words in the Latin original all hold allusions and connotations that must be considered; they are part of a more complex tapestry, the nature of which must be internalized before a reworking of it, by the use of new threads, may be woven.

I do not mean to imply that it is an easy task to take on the role of translator. Indeed, it is so complex and difficult a job to preserve nuance and tension, while producing body of work coherent and pleasant to one who has never read the Latin and approaches the translation as his or her only experience with Virgil's epic, all the while "weaving with new threads" a tapestry that produces a similar effect on the reader of English as would the original upon another reader, the latter's message having been internalized. It so difficult that to have even one version that meets all of the aspirations is a success for humanity.

It is my belief that in the aforementioned passage, as well as in many others, the spirit of the original is best represented in Dryden's work. Colin Burrow in his article "Virgil in English Translation,"[21] offers some elucidation on the subject of translation and its inherent complications.

---

[21] Martindale 1997, 21

Burrow's article states the two guiding axioms or "irreconcilable tendencies[22]" of Virgilian translation: that Virgil is a poet of "divided loyalties, whose poems cannot completely align themselves with the empire of Rome" (21), and that in a "perfect translation" of Virgil, the translator would be "invisible" (21). In accordance with his observations, it seems that works of Virgil are as clay to successive generations- to be modeled and shaped at the will of the translator. The act of translation is embarked upon in order to verify the individual who is translating; the act itself is a means for the translator to cement for himself a place in the canon of literary history, while worth and agency can be expressed through the imposition of nuanced meaning in the individual translation. Thus, the *act* of translation is one that verifies or validates the individual, while the *particulars* of choice impressed by the translator into the work are a definitive expression of agency.

It is almost immediately clear that, because one of the main reasons for translation (as expressed by Burrow) is the expression of agency, the idea of an "invisible translator" is a fallacy. Burrow states,

> Virgil tends to be adopted into English by poets who need the consolation of his (Virgil's) authority or the sustaining dream of his imperial vision.[23]

Implicit in this statement is the belief that Virgil is somehow super-mortal, (an image of Virgil in a superhero costume comes to mind emblazoned "SUPER VIR…gil") as if Virgil's presence in the literary canon transcends the canon, itself.

---

[22] Martindale 1997, 21
[23] Martindale 1997, 21.

Less outrageous than the idea that Virgil is somehow super-mortal is the notion that his *ideas* transcend placement in history-specific time. In continuation of the perceived Superman- transcendent quality of Virgil, Burrow states:

> Chaucer, like many a medieval [and, dare I say modern] reader of the *Aeneid*, is overwhelmed by the pathetic tale of Dido, which comes to dominate his paraphrase. The strength of his pity for Dido enables him to forget that his poem has a source in Virgil ("non other auctour alegge I") and to present himself as the author of the poem.[24]

Burrow presents this easy ownership of the work as being a result of its seemingly universal quality, as well as the power that the work is believed to possess to politically empower individual translators. I believe that the political power of the work, as perceived by translators, is due to the emotional power of the work. The *Aeneid* deeply engages the emotions of the reader. The value of such pathos to the modern reader is understated in all of the commentary I have encountered. There is intrinsic value, I believe, in emotional engagement in that it can allow a reader to experience both deep emotional and spiritual epiphanies that can be enlightening and thus enhance the quality of existence. This value is rarely commented upon although it undoubtedly plays an essential part in the endurance of this work and its near continuous presence throughout the ages.

Douglas and Chaucer are mentioned as having two of the strongest responses to the pathos of the *Aeneid*. In their translations, they each demonstrated their own

---

[24] Martindale 1997, 22.

agency in choosing to emphasize certain aspects by strengthening certain words. I do not doubt that Burrow is correct in saying that Douglas' translation was skewed with the idea of attaining a sort of literary immortality, an eye for the stars, perhaps, through flattery of the ruling monarch in both aspects of the translation and the dedication, but I think that the nature of the work specifically encourages internalization which can thus organically result in translations that are unique to the interpretations of or emotional effects upon the translators. In an interesting psycho-anthropological turn, Burrow states:

> Cultures which are uneasy about their own status are more likely to produce translations than those who are confident about the strength of their native literature… [in terms of individuals,] the act of translating Virgil gives English writers the sense of writing an empire even if they could not themselves participate in one.[25]

Like grabbing for the tail of a comet, people gravitate to the greatness of the *Aeneid*. The hope for vicarious magnitude drives them to translation. This seems cynical and discounts any possible noble ambition. It is reiterated that each translation reflects the personal experiences of the translator or even of the time -as the work once went through a phase of Christian flavored translations. This says to me that the work is so full of truth and beauty that people can't help but internalize and appropriate it. Burrow points out that Stanyhurst tried to forcefully conquer The *Aeneid* by "naturaliz[ing] in English the effects of Virgil's hexameters."[26] The failure of this endeavor is evidence that the meter (form) is subservient to the greater

[25] Martindale 1997, 23
[26] Martindale 1997, 25.

meaning and message of the poem, which can be compromised by imposed constraints of form. From this we learn that the essence of the work is not necessarily attached to a specific, original form, or at least that the formal and stylistic hallmarks of the Latin cannot be successfully appropriated, tacked onto, a translator's re-working and so the work is best re-presented as an internalized reworking of the original.

Taking this into account along with the fact that "current" events surrounding the individual translator are influential upon reception, the ideas themselves within the work are strong enough that the *Aeneid* always resists "the simplicities of an imposed ideology."[27] In addition, the text is virtually exempt from attempts at moralization as it is perfectly idealistic and self-contained in the world of the work. The mishmash of philosophies and ideologies within it serve to produce something without a definitive stamp- what results is an original patho-tic story that is both strong and insular enough to be universal.

Burrow points out that, after 1700, the translator's duty was made a moral one.[28] This required a perceived faithfulness (impossible to attain as it necessitates an invisible translator). This approach, in my opinion, circumvents the beauty of the text, as it has, along with a vital structure, an inherent propensity for elasticity and interpretation. Thus, *inspired* readings and translations are essential as much of the strength and endurance of the story can be attributed to its patho-tic quality. To

[27] Martindale 1997, 37.
[28] Martindale 1997, 31.

emphasize the futility of an attempted "faithful translation," Burrow remarks that even rigid translations bore hallmarks of Milton and thus were traceable.[29]

An observation on the part of Burrow regarding a trend, the nature of which I find to be disheartening, is that which categorizes The *Aeneid* in the "current" literary canon as domain of the "schoolroom," a recently christened "schoolroom text" (34), one whose criticism now tends to lean toward the realm of parody. This is depressing to me as I view the work as one that is indispensible, not as a jumping off point for critics and proponents of sematic and logic games, but as a work of literature to be enjoyed by even the non-academic individual. The original attraction of the work is to me its timeless, narrative strands of love and duty, the story, itself, the poetic structure, the truth within it felt by many a reader. Although we have again the problem of which translation to read, the original alluring qualities of the book remain and prove still to be enduring.

One of the most interesting things about Burrow's article is the observation that modern versions of the book do not have anywhere about them acknowledgements that they are translations. The translator cannot be invisible, especially in the case of a work as strong and significant as The *Aeneid*. In a breathtaking turn of events, the "ultimate transparency" of the translator has turned into implicit authorship. By not acknowledging that they are translators, translators become so "invisible" as translators that they become authors! This revelation seems to me a full circle completion that accomplishes the originally professed goal

[29] Martindale 1997, 31

of translating as an attempt to hold a piece of the empire. In ceasing to call themselves translators, the translators appoint themselves creator of the empire.

> Virgil's status makes translators feel that they should suppress their own presence in order to allow his voice to emerge, despite the intentions, Virgil appeals to those who have a desire to reinsert themselves.[30]

Through these observations, I believe that Burrow's two "irreconcilable" conditions can be brought together, at last.

In comparison to Mandelbaum's translation, Dryden's verse translation of the portion of the text regarding Aeneas' beauty reads "but far above the rest in beauty shines/ the great Aeneas, when the troop he joins" (Dry. 202-203).

Just the word "but" alerts us the inherent comparison. Suddenly, all of the beauty described before (including Dido's, characterized by an excess of gold) is placed beside the beauty of Aeneas, and deemed inferior. Additionally, Dryden's excessive use of gold in the passage suddenly takes on a new significance. Now, we feel more than ever as if Dido's finery is not noble and lofty, but futile and affected. Dido is remarkable in the passage for her gold accessories while Aeneas is remarkable and superior just by virtue of his own being. Suddenly, the effort is apparent in Dido's beauty. Aeneas does not need to try, he is.

---

[30] Martindale 1997, 36.

There are also some interesting differences in the way in which Aeneas' proximity to Dido is described. In Dryden's verse "but far above the rest in beauty shines /the great Aeneas, when the troop he joins" (202-203).

Aeneas' superior beauty is shown as he "joins" "the troop." In Mandelbaum's prose, "Aeneas linking his hunting band to hers" (Man. 189-190). Both joinings seem somewhat incidental. Both use the word "join," but Mandelbaum goes further to reiterate the "linking" of the two. While a joining implies erasing a division, linking alludes to a bond created between two separate entities. In addition, the word "join" comes from the Latin word "conjungo" which means "marriage."

Chapter 3- Cosmology, Pathos, Philosophy, the Hermetic Texts, and Dido

Susanna Braund writes about the issue of the philosophy and cosmic structure of the *Aeneid* in her piece called "Virgil and the cosmos: religious and philosophical ideas."[31] The intentions of the paper are clear, and the process seems to be more "traditional" than "postmodern" in that easily identifiable features of Virgil's work are examined at a depth not so deep as to be anxiety-inducing. Perhaps the most questionable aspect of the paper is the fact that it is built largely upon the argument that Virgil cannot, in good conscience, be "pegged" to a specific philosophical allegiance, as scholars and even lay-readers are wont to try to do, and yet the essay is ended with the statement "Virgil's prime allegiance is to Italy and to Rome."[32] If the lengthy and thorough illustrations of the veritable impossibility, and even moral dubiousness of trying to positively identify Virgil with a pre-existing faction of philosophy and religion were drawn in order to assert that the mistake was really just in the proposed field (geographical as opposed to philosophical) as the starkness and placement of the concluding assertion might lead the reader to believe, then both the proposition and the rebuttal are drained of essential vitality.

---

[31] Martindale 1997, 204.
[32] Martindale 1997, 221.

It is possible, I suppose, that the process of identifying someone with a region is less problematic than placing him or his work within an intellectual or spiritual realm. However, the language of the concluding sentence, particularly in the word "allegiance" (221), which conjures at once allusions to politics, military, and the fidelity of the soul, mirrors the language of the argument proclaiming the "limited usefulness" (206) of such labels. It is also possible that the analysis up until the proposed evidence of the concluding assertion is valid and that Braund fell prey to the propensity of critics and, again, lay-readers alike, to mire their interpretations of Virgil and his work in something tangible as the void of universality is always gaping close by. Because, in the words of Braund, herself, "[the] whole issue of interpreting Virgil as an adherent or even an advocate of particular philosophical or religious views is closely bound up with the reception of Virgil in different places and different eras" (206).

Braund thus seems to contradict herself in first saying that Virgil cannot be "pegged" and then seemingly mediating this view by saying that he can, in fact, be pegged, but that previous attempts were simply not broad enough in scope to be valid. "Roman" or, even better, "Italian" is valid because it potentially encompasses all of the religion and philosophy to which Virgil was exposed. Obviously this shift from first claiming the infeasibility of the endeavor to identify and then making such identification preferable with adjustments to the proposed "scope" is problematic. It does, however, serve to highlight the inevitable inconsistencies that arise, even within criticism, when dealing with Virgil; inconsistencies and confusions that can be attributed to the mythic cloud that the suffuses the author and his work due to

the historical ubiquitous -ness of both, and the deep attachments that are formed around the work; attachments that serve both to challenge impartiality and augment further the perceived mythic nature of the author and his work.

One of the main topics of Braund's article is the unpacking of Virgil's cosmos, which comprises Gods and humans and nature. Before going into the nature of these cosmos, Braund points out that the philosophical flavor of Virgil's views have never been examined to the extent that they are "explicitly the subject of any single, entire book" (204). The suggestion seems to be, then, that if Virgil's own views can be identified then the nature of the cosmos within his works can be more fully understood. The issue here is that the work is essentially impossible to identify; it resists attempts to be aligned to any one particular vein of perceptual guidelines. Would Virgil's work be more explicit somehow if his own beliefs were shown to be more rooted in one vein of philosophy?

In traditional, non-literary cosmology, Alan Sandage, who is considered to be the father of cosmology after Hubble, famously said that modern cosmology is too concerned with the question of "why." Cosmology can only be explained in terms of "how"- there is no "why" to be sought because we would be unable to process any answer as it falls under the realm of a divine knowledge and is not meant for human understanding. This insight can be applied to many branches of inquiry. The question of "why" can be discussed philosophically, but can never really be answered in a way so that there will be no more questions. Similarly, Braund dances around the idea, one with which I agree, that the reason for Virgil's work and the

mystery of its significance cannot be enumerated even if his supposed, agreed upon views were more clear.

As it stands, it is extremely difficult to put the events and actions of the characters in the world of the book into one modern philosophical context. The philosophy seems to be unique to the world of the book and the mishmash of established philosophies, which results in traditionally non-denominational ethics with echoes of traditional ethics and philosophy, in general but not in specifics, produces a world that feels like it is not specifically and explicitly tethered to our world but, rather, echoes many aspects of it while remaining insular and self-contained. It is this combination of familiar and foreign that contributes to the universal quality of the work; it is at once familiar to all and, at the same time, fantastical and self-contained.

In fact, the philosophy of the world of the work is so difficult to identify that the pertaining analytical literature does not take on the task of parsing it out it in relationship to "our" world, but rather resigns itself to working within the established framework and is "subsumed in discussions of character" (204), trying to exemplify, for instance, stoic dimensions of Aeneas' conduct.

Braund states that religion and philosophy in Virgil cannot be separated, as it would be "artificial from any perspective, ancient or modern." This is because

> When we consider 'religion' and 'philosophy' in Virgil, we are always talking about how Virgil grapples with and articulates the origins, workings and *telos* (purpose) of the world and the way in which human beings fit into that world, particularly in their behavior as

> individuals and as members of communities towards other individuals and communities. In other words, Gods and morality are inextricably linked.[33]

Every society tries to explain through the origins and workings of the world as well as the way that human beings fit into the world. All branches of philosophy try to do just this. One of the employments of philosophy is as a lens through which other works can be viewed in order to better understand them. In the case of the *Aeneid*, there is a constant effort to find a lens through which the work can be fully understood. In my research, I have never come across mention of a lens that was able to completely put the work into focus. It could be that no modern historians or critics have been able to compare the cosmic structure of Virgil's *Aeneid* to any existing branch of philosophy because they have not looked far back enough.

There is a collection of texts that were written by the ancient Egyptians. They fit under the modern heading of "philosophical" because they deal with occult science, philosophy, and, most importantly, a specific doctrine and view of the word. These are called Hermetic Texts, and they hold the key to understanding the world of Virgil's *Aeneid*. According *Hermetic and Alchemical Writings of Paracelsus* by Edward Waite[34], the essential philosophical Hermetic texts have six main categories:

1) The Fragment a Hermetica, which is quite literally fragments of Hermetic writings quoted by other authors over a wide period of time

---

[33] Martindale 1997, 205.

[34] Although I understand that Waite is not current or particularly 'scholarly,' I find him interesting and refer to his work here mainly for the purpose of his translations of the original texts.

2) The Asclepius, also called the "Perfect Sermon" from roughly the second or third century CE
3) The "Nag Hammadi codex," a set of Coptic books containing three Hermetic works, from around 350 CE
4) The Stobaei Hermetica, more fragments, compiled around 500 CE
5) The Definitions of Hermes Trismegistus for Asclepius, late sixth century CE
6) The Corpus Hermeticum, fifteen books of Hermes, probably from the second or third century CE

These are all dated hundreds of years after Virgil wrote the *Aeneid*. However, the origins of the texts are much older and the general assumption is that "the Hermetic body of work was based on ancient knowledge of Egypt, widely regarded as the storehouse of antique wisdom" (Waite). One of the main tenets of the Hermetic world view "focuses on the nature of the cosmos and mankind, especially the dual nature of reality (lower physical reality versus the higher divine reality), and of the rule of Fate over the lives of men and how it may be overcome, (Waite)"

The specifics of the cosmological structure as understood by the body of the Hermetic texts are key to understanding the ontological construction of the world in Virgil's Aeneid, and are as follows: The world is separated into two parts, the higher world of God, made up of the lighter elements such as air and fire, and the heavy world of man, made up of earth and water. This is called Hermetic dualism. The creatures of the lower world (men) were not initially given reason by God, they live their lives "reason-less; for He did not extend the Reason to them" (Mead, Poemandres, 9). Thus, reason only belongs to the "higher" levels of reality and the creatures that there dwell. So, "reason" is a member of the "higher" world of God

and is intrinsically unknown to humans except in that it is known to exist as an unattainable form (similar to Plato's forms and shadows).

In the *Aeneid*, the 'how' of the world is more clearly demonstrated than the 'why'. We know how the world in the book functions inasmuch as we are able to witness interactions between Gods and men and interactions amongst both. The question of why is sought out by many readers and scholars. To truly answer the question, we cannot just define terms with other terms. The goal is to reach a truth. It is my belief that a truth can be found in these Hermetic texts, as they seem to be a model for the world that Virgil constructs as a stage for the events of the epic. This world is an essential part of the work as, besides being an account of the mythological beginnings of Rome, the unique inter-workings and constitution of the structure of the world set it apart from all other historical accounts and facilitate profound tension, whether within Aeneas regarding his fate and free will, or surrounding Aeneas' relationship to Dido, fated to fail but still begun and resulting in true casualty of spirit.

It is the particulars of the infrastructure of the world of the book and the questions that arise: the question of who is in charge, of why a fated path exists, the intricacies of the dynamic between humans and Gods, the disparity between what is known and unknown, unable to be known, spoken and unable to be spoken, that inform the tensions of the story and allow the world to make sense within itself, to be of a veritable construction. What informs, in turn, this very infrastructure is wisdom that seems to have its origins or echoes in the writings of ancient Egypt, writings which were written to explain the world and, thus, have a basis in our own

world as seen by ancient Egyptians. Many of the truths that they saw and incorporated into their model of understanding can be found in Virgil's poetic world and, thus, the philosophy behind the world of the *Aeneid* is found in an examination of Hermetic philosophy.

According to Hermetic writings, the primal form of nature is the antithesis of light (or knowledge), thus, darkness. So, we understand that human origin is of darkness, the antithesis of light and knowledge (knowledge known only as it is the necessary unknown component to known). Logos, however, which is known as a Holy Word, is sent down onto nature and, along with it, seven celestial rulers descend to rule over different areas of matter. Thus, though the upper world and lower world are separate and the upper is the origin of the Holy Word, Logos pervades upon nature (ostensibly so that members of the lower world can recognize the Holy Word if they come into contact with it). After man is created, the story goes, he aspires to be like the Gods and desires the ability to create. This wish is granted in some capacity; he is given creative power and limited influence upon matter, but he "also must descend through the seven levels of reality controlled by the seven [celestial rulers of matter that correspond to seven planets in celestial spheres of reality] all the way to the lowest level of matter, and he takes on a characteristic of each celestial level as he passes through. In so doing, he comes under the influence of those spheres and their rulers, and this is the origin of the control Fate will have on the lives of humans, and the foundation of astrology" (Waite).

From this alone, we see that the structure of truth is manifested in a physical hierarchy. Essential to this hierarchy is the existence of an ultimate truth. This truth

is associated with upper regions, fire and air, and is called the Holy Word. The truth consists of language that is Holy; divine declarations. The planets (a representation of the physical world) are tied to the hierarchy of metaphysical truth because they are associated with physical levels of reality. Because man is ordained into the world of reason by his passage through these levels, and because he takes on, through his contact with them, essential elements of the celestial levels (truths), we see already that this world as outlined in the Hermetic texts, a seeming model for Virgil's, is not purely metaphysical but is rather a tapestry that is made up of both the metaphysical the physical. Man, nature, and the Holy Word (an embodiment of the idea of truth) are all intertwined. The interconnectedness of the philosophy means that the physical world is in close proximity to the metaphysical world. Human life is grounded in earth and water, distinct from the realm of air and fire, but the upper world is tangible and grounded in that it manifests itself, physically, by being entwined with celestial bodies.

Truth and form are interconnected and, thus, an added element of truth is added to the philosophy itself because words aren't just being defined by other words; in some cases, ideas are being defined by a physical manifestation of themselves, and the subsequent ideas and manifestations are interwoven. The world is all inclusive in that even the unknowable, the domain of the upper regions, is associated with something that can be found in the physical world, the elements of air and fire, and the upper world has a place in the structure of the universe even though it is not readily accessible to natural members of the lower world. In the structure outlined in the Hermetic Texts, it is said that "Men call their ruling Fate"

(Mead, Poemandres, 11). With this we have some insight into the world of Virgil and the interworking of God and men. Fate, then, is the name that men call that which directs them. The undeniable force within the structure that rules is called fate. Even more clearly, "higher reality is more mental, and has reason and power; lower reality is physical, has no reason and is ruled by Fate. The human race has been bound to the control of the celestial spheres." Those are the rules of the world. That is the "how."

According to a character in the texts, Poemander, the process can be reversed. Once the physical body has died, human beings can re-ascend through the levels of reality: "When the material body is to be dissolved, first thou sirrenderest the body by itself unto the work of change, and thys the form thou hadst doth vanish… the body's senses next pass back into their sources becoming separate, and resurrect as energies; and passion and desire withdraw unto that nature which is void of reason, and thus it is that man doth speed his way thereafter upwards through the harmony (Mead, Poemandres, 24-25). As he ascends through the spheres, man sloughs off human vices: the ability to wax and wane, the cunning of evil, the deception of covetousness, overbearing boastfulness, audacity and rashness, the desire for wealth, and the malicious lie. After all this, he is able to enter the Physis of the Ogdiad, the eighth level of reality. Above this level, only one remains. This last and highest level of reality is where the ultimate Intellect dwells, and it is called the Ennead.

It seems unlikely that the similarity between "Ennead" and "Aeneid" is pure coincidence and the possible connection is something that I am eager to further

explore. While the obvious connection between the *Aeneid* and the Hermetic texts is, to me, fascinating, and worthy of further exploration, there is not enough space in this specific exploration to follow the course through to a satisfying conclusion. One of the things that is made apparent by he similarities in cosmological perception of both the *Aeneid* and the Hermetic texts is the possible existence of something profoundly specific to the human experience, and, by extension, possible evidence of a universal human experience. Kant tells us in his Critique that unification is man's highest aim, and I surely fall within that tradition in seeking unity here. It is my hope, really, that something eternal and ubiquitous does exist. If nowhere else, the similarities between the *Aeneid* and the almost equally ancient Hermetic Texts seem to show tantalizing glimmers of unity in the area of philosophy known as aesthetics; how the collective humanity visualizes ad manifests abstraction.

Generally, nature provides aesthetic ideals. In the case of the cosmology of the world in the *Aeneid* as well as in the Hermetic texts, which manifest themselves in physical architectonics, nature does provide an ideal in that the layers of atmosphere are appropriated to divide levels of form, but the structure of both worlds (in the *Aeneid* and Hermetic texts) mirror natural structures of our own world less so because nature provides an ideal, and moreso because the idea behind the cosmological structure of both worlds (in Hermetic texts and the *Aeneid*) is somehow maybe universal and ideal, and thus matches up with the ideal physical structure of nature. If this is true, then the existence of two examples so close so close to one another seem to constitute enough evidence to support it.

Similarities between Virgil's architectonic of the world of the *Aeneid* and the proposed essential, aeteological, and primary structure of the universe within the Hermetic texts suggests a unity in this area of human conception. We cannot forget that the *Aeneid* was used as a reference book for many years, while the Hermetic texts were meant to explain the world and provide answers. That both, so similar in their internal construction of the world, were used for answers, one originally intended more for the purpose than the other, implies further the existence of a truth, alluring and ever-sought, sensed by ardent seekers, bundled up in the structure.

Much of the *Aeneid's* cosmology can be satisfyingly understood through a variety of philosophical lenses. While one cannot always assert that Virgil's cosmology draws from specific philosophies, it is certain that even the ones developed after Virgil's time can be used to draw Virgil's cosmology into many a different focus.

The specific physical/metaphysical structure of the world in the *Aeneid*, however, is astonishingly similar to the ideal one presented in the Hermetic texts. What is refreshing about the world in the Hermetic texts is that it is anchored in form. This, alone, makes it an obvious candidate for comparison to Virgil's world of the *Aeneid*. Philosophy rooted in form provides a sort of existential relief as it is, in effect, tethered as opposed to existing purely in abstraction. The cosmological makeup of the world in the *Aeneid* is deeply philosophical, meta-physically complex, integral to the experiences and interactions of the characters and, in a broader sense,

imperative in creating a distinctive and memorable entity. We can look to the specifics of the structure of this world for insight into the nature of the work.

In fact, as believed by Goethe and other Kantian-influenced naturalists of the 1800s, form is more solid and reliable than any analysis, naming, or definition. Each of the former only can attempt to approach the thing. There is no substitute for the significance of the thing. The form that philosophy takes in this example produces a tethering effect on the entire work. It is a method of rooting abstraction not dissimilar to Dryden's own technique of rooting emotion and the non-physical in color.

That the particular manifestation of this "tether" (extension and impression of abstraction) is so similar to another, produced possibly but maybe not of a relative proximity of time, implies, if nothing else, a profound allegiance of perception within humanity, and also a possible degree of universality, significant no matter how small, in humanity.

Although Goethe might disapprove, let's delve into the structure of the world of the *Aeneid*. There are definite levels of perception and existence within the world of the *Aeneid*, which are rooted in a physical hierarchy of players. The mortal realm is characterized by physical morality, although existence as shades of the underworld follows death. Even in the underworld, though, mortals do not continue to "live" because the physical plane of reality, the form in which humans take shape, is essential to the classification as "alive" and "human." In the underworld, thus, people exist, but more so as a negative impression of something that has existed, retained as a catalogue of the world, a metaphysical inventory, shadows left on a

wall after a nuclear blast. They are reminders of lives lived and evidence a perception that time is not so much successive as it is linear and ever-compounding upon freshly made pasts.

In the *Aeneid* mortals are prone to death, always in search of evidence of their own fates, only marginally in control of their own actions but not in control of their own destinies. Auxiliary to the Gods, they strive to achieve immortality. Humans can be descendants of the Gods.

Gods live in a high space. They can fly and, thus, physically transcend the more base tethers of form, they feel emotions, they are, it seems to me, conduits or intermediary mediums through which flows a "divine mind," for they at once know an outcome, and, and the same instant, push actively for or against its fulfillment.

In the case of the *Aeneid*, the dynamic among beings of all levels is central to the strength of the story. The greatest casualty of a fate enforced by the gods and accepted by pious Aeneas is Dido. She has, until now, perhaps not received sufficient attention in this paper. Her entanglement with Aeneas, however, is to me the most compelling component of Virgil's work and especially Dryden's rendering as it is achingly futile and perfectly devastating. There is something grotesque about the annihilation of a very strong person because so much violence is needed to still a robust body or a strong spirit. Dido is very strong, and her gradual death is all the more grotesque and disturbing that it is brought about not by force, not in a physical fight of any kind, but through something much more elusive and insidious. Fate causes her heart to turn against itself- her feelings cause her to self-destruct. She is strong and willful but entirely unprepared to defend herself against the scheme of

the Gods, or the very love that the Gods deliberately instilled in her for Aeneas (Juno instructs Cupid in book 1 to take the shape of Aeneas' son, Ascanius, and "Thyself a boy, assume a boy's dissembled face;/That when, amidst the fervour of the feast,/ The Tyrian hugs and fonds thee on her breast,/ And with sweet kisses in her arms constrains,/ Thou mayest infuse thy venom in her veins" Dry. 1.960-964).

If I could analyze the entire Book 4 in this paper, I would just so that my readers could be enticed into looking upon Dryden's poetry. The beauty of the work it is undermined by analysis, but it remains gracious enough to willingly submit. What follows will be an analysis of two contrasting parts of Book 4, sections that show the contrast between Dido's state and that of Aeneas. I want to show, mainly, that Dido is not "crazy" for being tormented to the point of suicide. Rather, she is *driven crazy* by factors outside of herself (mainly, the scheming of the gods).

Dryden's line 596-97, "All-powerful Love! What changes canst thou cause/ In human hearts, subjected to thy laws." Love can surely cause changes in the human hearts subjected to its cause. But "all-powerful Love" is like the genetically engineered variety- grown by the gods and distilled to its essence; this love to which Dido is subjected wreaks havoc upon her. Dido is a true casualty of fate in that she is utterly annihilated, in a slow and painful way, as a result of her entanglement in it.

Dido, in a state of utter torment and anguish, speaks a tirade against the Gods when she learns that Aeneas plans to steal away from her, taking with him her peace of mind and prospects of immortality.

Why should I fawn? What have I worse to fear?

Did he once look, or lend a listening ear,

Sighed when I sobbed, or shed one kindly tear?
All, symptoms of a base ungrateful mind,
So foul, that which is worse, 'tis hard to find.
Of man's injustice why should I complain?
The gods, and Jove himself, behold in vain
Triumphant treason: yet no thunder flies;
Nor Juno views my wrongs with equal eyes:
Faithless is earth, and faithless are the skies!
Justice is fled, and truth is now no more!
I saved the shipwrecked exile on my shore:
With needful food his hungry Trojans fed:
I took the traitor to my throne and bed.
Fool that I was! 'tis little to repeat
The rest: I stored and rigged his ruined fleet.
I rave, I rave! A god's command he pleads,
And makes heaven accessory to his deeds.
Now Lycian lots, and now the Delian god,
Now Hermes is employed from Jove's abode,
To warn him hence; as if the peaceful state
Of heavenly powers were touched with human fate! (Dry. 526-547)

In this passage, Dido angrily laments the injustice of the gods. She sees that they have used her as a pawn in their game to advance Aeneas. In this passage, as in others, she is overflowing with passion and torment but has enough control over

her words to express herself clearly and powerfully. This is a reminder to the reader that she is a true leader. She is fierce, well spoken, and intelligent. She is not pathetic. The tragedy comes of her strength, strength that is wounded to self-destruction. She is strong and willful, utterly wronged. Although she chastises herself for falling for him in the first place, here Dido places the burden of her destruction entirely on Aeneas for his compliance with the conspiracy of the gods. She is spirited and not meant for such manipulation, she is self-possessed even in times of incredible duress, she is persistent and forthright, she possesses great strength, she is not a willing object of fate.

In the beginning of her speech, Dido recalls Aeneas' behavior when their relationship was the best. She remembers his coldness towards her and his lack of empathy. A worse man than him, she says, would be hard to find. This anger comes only after earnest pleading and attempts to reach his heart. At this point, Dido is angry and frustrated. Gods and men have been against her and now she is aware of the plot. "The gods, and Jove himself, behold in vain/ Triumphant treason: yet no thunder flies" (Dry. 532-533).

Aeneas, in leaving her and claiming that her love for him is unreciprocated, her expectations unjust, commits a kind of "triumphant treason" (533) because the gods sanction his infractions. Jove and all the rest watch from their perches at Dido's unjust treatment, but no one comes to her aid; there are no thunderbolts, objects thrown from the higher reaches to the middle realm, meant to traverse the barrier between god and man, warnings to signal moral breaches. The rules do not apply to Aeneas and his actions; Dido's treatment goes unpunished. Everything is against

Dido. Aeneas has done wrong by her, but he implicates heaven. “Faithless is earth, and faithless are the skies!/ Justice is fled, and truth is now no more!” (Dry. 535-536).

Here, Dido has lost all faith in her world. It may be this that truly drives her to her death. She has lost faith in justice, truth and beauty. She has been utterly wronged. Later, closely following her tirade, “Abruptly here she stops; then turns away/ Her loathing eyes, and shuns the sight of day” (Dry. 562). Dido here has given up, seeing that she cannot win, that she is bereft. She stops abruptly, as if she suddenly realizes the futility of trying to persuade either Aeneas of the Gods who rule her fate. Her eyes are loathing, disdainful of everything in their sight. Suddenly, her world loses meaning. Even the sight of day is loathsome to her now. With this ultimate betrayal of fate and Aeneas, she no longer trusts in the world or finds comfort in living. “The wretched Queen, pursued by cruel fate/Begins at length the light of heaven to hate” (653). The last part of Dido’s tirade illuminates her perspective on the cosmology of the world, on her and Aeneas’ separate fates. Dryden’s lines,

> I rave, I rave! A god’s command he pleads,
> And makes heaven accessory to his deeds.
> Now Lycian lots, and now the Delian god,
> Now Hermes is employed from Jove’s abode,
> To warn him hence; as if the peaceful state
> Of heavenly powers were touched with human fate! (542-547).

To Dido, Aeneas shirks both love and honor. He is committing the highest treason and, worse, his actions are being sanctioned by the Gods. She calls the gods out by name, especially the most directly intervening, Hermes and Jove, as if challenging them to come forth from behind their cloudy shields and confront her. Although she is wracked with pain from a love inflicted upon her by the Gods, "Despair, and rage, and love, divide her heart;/Despair and rage had some, but love the greater part" (Dryden 772). The gods do not engage with her and prefer to stand by until the storm passes, so to speak. They know that her emotions are dangerous and threaten to undermine Aeneas' fated course. Mercury, in fact, has to visit Aeneas for a second time to usher him to go. As his argument, Mercury paints Dido as a pesky, crazy woman.

> She harbours in her heart a furious hate
> (and thou shalt find the dire effects too late),
> Fixed on revenge, and obstinate to die.-
> Haste swiftly hence, while thou hast power to fly!
> …
> Who knows what hazards thy delay may bring?
> Woman's a various and a changeful thing. (Dryden 810-819)

In Hermes' message there is no acknowledgement of the pain that leads Dido to want to die, only a characterization of obstinacy, as if her death were a political move and something ignoble and calculated. Mercury paints Aeneas' fate as being a shared goal (of Aeneas and the gods) and Dido as being threatening to it, not in an emotional capacity but rather in a potentially physical one. At once Mercury de-

emphasizes Aeneas' propensity to be influenced by emotion, therefore priming him for the mindset of "men have to do what they have to do" and also paints Dido as unappealing and almost dangerous, but mostly just irritating. The danger is potentially eminent as the gods know that Aeneas may be thinking twice about his decision to leave, but Mercury frames the potential "hazards" of delay as being specific to feminine wiles and, thus, undermines their potency.

Back to the end of the tirade:

> I rave, I rave! A god's command he pleads,
> And makes heaven accessory to his deeds.
> Now Lycian lots, and now the Delian god,
> Now Hermes is employed from Jove's abode, 545
> To warn him hence; as if the peaceful state
> Of heavenly powers were touched with human fate! (542-547)

When Dido says "I rave, I rave!" she seems to be anticipating the response of those not on her side to her words. This is in ironic contrast to the next part of her speech, "…A god's command he pleads,/ And makes heaven accessory to his deeds" (542-543).

The effect here is that we see the insanity of the situation. Dido is "raving" (542) for feeling wronged, and yet Aeneas is perfectly sane when he claims that his actions are right because he is backed by the Gods. Justice has been completely inverted from Dido's point of view, and we see this clearly by the juxtaposition of claims. Aeneas is the center of the universe, it seems, in that all of the powers configure to support his advancement. Even Hermes is at Aeneas' disposal as his

personal messenger. This is astounding to Dido; she is suddenly bereft on all sides, conspired against by not only Aeneas, but by the greater fabric of the universe, which devotes itself to his advancement.

In all of the above examples, I analyzed Dryden's translation and not the original Latin text. Dryden's translation is effusively sympathetic to Dido. Dryden portrays her as the central focus of this part of the story, the one with the most conflict and the most tragic situation. This cannot be said, however, for Virgil's original Latin text. Following, I will compare passages of the Latin with Dryden's English to show the shift in sympathies between each work, to show that Dryden's rendering is, in fact, slightly unusual in that it portrays Dido with so much care.

It seems to me that Dryden favors Dido while Virgil's sympathies lie more with Aeneas. While I see Aeneas as less deserving of this sympathy because of his hostility towards Dido, critic and translator RG Austin argues for leniency toward Aeneas and cites his deep inner conflict, not indifference, as the cause of his behavior. Aeneas' speech near the middle of Book 4 is the closest that he comes to giving an explanation to Dido regarding his plans to leave her. His speech ends with the words *Italiam non sponte sequor* (Aen. 361). This basically means, "I do not follow my free will to Italy."[35] Austin translates it as "I go to Italy, against all my heart" (Aus. 105). While Dryden renders it, "Forced by my fate, I leave your happy land" (Dry. 517). So, while Dryden emphasizes the fated aspect of Aeneas' actions, he does not indicate (in this line, anyway) an overt emotional conflict of interest.

---

[35] Author's translation.

Earlier, in line 482, Dryden indicates a "heaving in his heart," but even that is mediated by a somewhat ambivalent reference to "Jove's command" (481).

It is unclear, then, whether Dryden's Aeneas has a true fissure within himself marking a clear divide between his will and his fate while Virgil's words can be easily interpreted, as they are overtly by Austin, to indicate a decided conflict of interest between Aeneas' fate and own personal free will. In the case of Austin's translation, Aeneas is sympathetic suddenly because he references his own heart. This aligns him with Dido, suggesting that they have each been put in different situations, but that their lots are similar in that they are equally helpless to alter the fate that they have been cast.

Austin in his commentary quotes critic T.E. Page as saying "not all Virgil's art can make the figure of Aeneas here appear other than despicable."[36] This is a view that I tend to agree with after having read Dryden's rendering, but it is one against which Austin argues, "[Page's comment] is to ignore all the undertones of the speech… It is unfair, and it is untrue."[37] Austin maintains that Aeneas' coldness is not out of animosity or indifference but in line with his logical way of reacting to situations in comparison to Dido's emotional response. It is also, he says, a classically Roman way of reacting to conflict. Austin says, "He [Aeneas] does not disguise the dark and brutal truth, that she [Dido] has deceived herself, he has not deceived her."[38] Austin continues on to suggest that Aeneas' rigid tone was adopted to prevent his own "break down." Austin, "It is no fault of Virgil's that the harsh

---

[36] Austin, RG. 1973, 105
[37] Austin, RG. 1973, 105
[38] Austin, RG. 1973, 105

conflict between duty and desire is what it is… it is our pity that we should give him [Aeneas], not our scorn."[39]

Aeneas certainly is up against a wall when it comes to his fate, but he takes responsibility for it because he seems to internalize it and make it his own will. He does not outwardly hesitate when ordered by Jove via Mercury to leave Dido. In fact, he is instantly petrified and set on going. As soon as Mercury delivers his message and flies away, Aeneas has a violent reaction. The knowledge of his fate was internalized but suppressed and, upon being reminded of it, his entire physical being is petrified by the power of the resurgent force.

tali Cyllenuis ore locutus
mortalis visus medio sermone reliquit
et procul in tenuem ex oculis evanuit auram.
At vero Aeneas aspectu obmutuit amens,
arrectaeque horrore comae et vox faucibus haesit. 280
ardet abire fuga dulcisque relinquere terras,
attonitus tanto monitu imperioque deorum. (Aen. 276-282)

Below, a translation of the above passage by David West:

No sooner had these words passed the lips of the Cyllenian god than he disappeared from mortal view and faded far into the insubstantial air. But the sight of him left Aeneas dumb and senseless. His hair stood on end with horror and the voice stuck in his throat. He longed to be away and leave behind him this land he had found so sweet. The

[39] Austin, RG. 1973, 106

> warning, the command from the gods, had struck him like a thunderbolt" (West 77).

All at once, three things happen in quick succession and almost simultaneously: Mercury finishes speaking, Mercury disappears, Aeneas is petrified. The message is so powerful that *as soon as it's spoken* Aeneas is affected. Aeneas is left *obmutuit amens* (279), "speechless and out of his senses."[40] Like the way his senses are confounded when Anna pleads with him on Dido's behalf, here Aeneas is left completely disoriented, unable to perceive the outside world, able to feel nothing but the numbing reverberations that result from the massive impact of the message delivered by Mercury. In the same way that Catullus is able to hear nothing but the ringing of his own ears (Catullus 51, 7-12), or Sappho is made blind and dumb by the presence or even the intimation of the beloved (Sappho 9-12), here Aeneas is incapacitated by the overwhelming force of the message relayed to him. So profoundly does the message affect him that his body is made useless and he is as if *attonitus* (282), "thunderstruck." The symbolism here is apparent once we remember that Zeus' powers include dominion over thunder and that the hurling of thunderbolts is something that he is wont to do. So Aeneas is left bereft of discerning senses and feels the residual firebrand of a thunderbolt. After the visit, Aeneas' own tools of perception are wiped out and all that resides there is an intimation of Godly power.

The "warning that strikes like a thunderbolt" is really more than a "warning" if we look to the Latin. The word *monitu* (282), which by West is translated as

---

[40] Author's trans

"warning," means at once "admonition, or warning" but also "oracle or omen" (Lewis). This other connotation cements the "warning" as being an extension of the prophecy that Aeneas is fated to fulfill. Zeus' message, carried and delivered by Mercury, is not just a warning or admonition (although it is both of those) but is also a nudge in the direction of the fated path. The message is an *active* admonition as it deliberately redirects Aeneas' course into alignment with that which has been prophesized and must be fulfilled. No sooner than it is delivered, Aeneas' own will is changed. Suddenly, he *ardet abire fuga dulcisque relinquere terras* (281), "burned to go away and flee the land he had once found so sweet."[41] The word *ardet* (281) is the kind of burning that is often associated with passionate love and the parallel that this word casts by its placement here is of great significance: with the same intensity of the burning love that he may have once felt for Dido, and which she certainly feels for him, Aeneas now wishes to be far away from Carthage. Because of Aeneas' piety, his willingness to accept his fate, he is the perfect vessel for the Gods. He adheres to their will above all others, and for this Dido cannot forgive him.

Although Austin is far more proficient in Latin and in Virgil's work than am I, I do not agree with Austin's point of view in saying that Dido is more responsible than Aeneas for her being deceived. It is entirely clear to me that Dido is not at fault for her situation. She, as we have established, was used and discarded by the gods in order to advance Aeneas. Her love for him, even, was masterminded and caused by the actions of the gods. I could concede that Dido is in a similar position as Aeneas in that they are both being manipulated, to some degree, by fate. However, there is a

---

[41] Author's trans.

glaring difference between their respective experiences: “pious” Aeneas knew of and accepted his fate. Although he struggled at times with the implications of his cooperation, he was an informed participant. The instant after each reminder from Mercury, Aeneas sprung into action. Dido, on the other hand, was purely and unjustly used and without her own knowledge or assent. Furthermore, Aeneas was able to accept his fate because it promised immortality and fame for himself and his descendants. Dido’s entanglement with fate and the gods promised no such thing. In contrast, her involvement with Aeneas took away her only chance of immortality *qua sola sidera adibam* (Aen. 4.322).

There is one more stark difference between interpretations of Virgil’s Latin that we will explore, this one on the topic of the marriage between Dido and Aeneas. Originally, Venus sends Cupid to Carthage to make Dido fall in love with Aeneas to keep him (Aeneas) from harm. Venus hopes that by aligning Dido with Aeneas, she (Venus) will be able to usurp control of the queen from Juno and thus lessen the possibility that Aeneas is further tormented.

As soon as Cupid enters the palace disguised as Ascanius and meets Dido, Dido’s love for Aeneas is born.

Praecipue infelix, pesti devota futurae,

expleri mentem nequit ardescitque tuendo

Phoenissa, et pariter puero donisque movetur, (Aen. Book 1, 712)

> But most of all the unfortunate Dido, doomed to be the victim of a plague that was yet to come, could not have her fill of gazing, and as she gazed, moved by the boy as much as by the gifts, the fire within her grew. (Austin).

Dido is doomed or fated to endure pain and, ultimately, death as a result of her unrequited love for Aeneas. Her love has been ordained by Venus and ensured by Cupid. She is sacrificed for the sake of Aeneas and, eventually, Rome. Her feelings of love are true and deeply felt, but they are pushed into being by the work of the gods. Venus sends Cupid to Carthage for the express reason of kindling love in the breast of Dido. Dido's love acts as a buffer for Aeneas from Juno's hurtful intentions.

Later, Juno claims to concede to Venus and suggests that Dido and Aeneas marry. Venus sees this is a ploy to raise Carthage to greater power but agrees because it keeps her in control of the union. While *Ardet amans Dido traxitque per ossa furorem* (Aen.101), "Dido is ablaze with love and has drawn her passion through and through her frame" (Austin 53), feeling her passion so acutely and deeply that it penetrates her very bones, the next stage of the union is plotted. *Diffugient comites et nocte tegentur opaca:/ speluncam Dido dux et Troianus eandem devenient* (Aen. 123), "Their companions will scatter for shelter and be enwrapped in impenetrable darkness; but Dido and the hero of Troy will reach a cave together" (Austin 57). It is masterminded by the two Gods and carried out with the accuracy that can come only from something that has been preordained. From this point on, Dido begins her descent. *ille dies primus leti primusque malorum/ causa fuit* (Aen. 169), "that day in the beginning was the cause of death, that day in the beginning was the cause of sorrow" (Austin 69).

It is clear, then, that the "marriage" was arranged. Even though Dido herself only calls it a "marriage" to legitimize their union,

No longer made a secret of her love,

But called it marriage; by that specious name

To veil the crime, and sanctify the shame. (Dryden 248),

Aeneas, himself, never seems to object to acting as a unit with Dido and upon being visited by Mercury is even seen wearing all sorts of fineries, gifts from Dido, and working on rebuilding her city. It seems then that Aeneas was in perfect accordance with Dido, leading her to believe by actions if not words that he returned her feelings. This was the case until the moment he was reminded to leave. For this reason, I maintain that he deceived her and that Dido had reason to believe in his fidelity to her.

In the portion of Aeneas' speech regarding marriage, he seems cruel and flippant in Dryden's rendering,

I never hoped a secret flight from hence

Much less pretended to the lawful claim

Of sacred nuptials, or a husband's name (Dryden 488-490),

In Dryden's version, Aeneas is saying that he never hoped to leave undetected. This could be interpreted as being more insulting than anything as it is like he's saying that he never wanted to steal away and thus save her the pain of watching him go. It is as if he is saying that Dido's feelings did not matter enough for him to try to protect them, and her outrage and hurt are unwarranted because her feelings for him are unreciprocated and unprecedented. Referring to the lawful claim as

something "pretended" is another insult, suggesting that Dido is of unsound mind to pretend that they were married. Earlier, however, Dryden's verse intimates that Aeneas and Dido are in accordance with one another. In Dryden's verse,

> The lustful pair in lawless pleasure drowned
>
> Lost in their loves, insensible of shame
>
> And both forgetful of their better fame. (323-325)

So it is clear in Dryden's rendering that Dido's expectations of Aeneas are not unfounded, since they are shown here in lines 323-325 to be in a shared circumstance.

Austin renders the same portion of Aeneas' speech, "It was no bridegroom's torch that I ever held before me, it was no bond of this kind to which I came" (Austin 103).

Here, Aeneas is straight forward and unemotional, but not insulting. He is stating the facts: that they were never legally married. He does not insinuate, however, as he seems to in Dryden's version, that Dido is deranged on some level for acting as if they were. The Latin of this section is *…nec coniugis umquam/ Praetendi taedas aut haec in foedera veni* (Aen. 338), which can be roughly translated to mean, "never did I hold out the marriage torch, nor agree to enter into marriage."[42]

It is clear then that Virgil's Latin can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Dryden seems to give Dido the most sympathy and, thus, readers of his rendering might see Dido in a more empathetic way. Austin maintains about this section that it shows "in Dido, desire could always deceive duty, in Aeneas, desire could never win

---

[42] Author's trans

the last battle."[43] I value Austin's commentary but I disagree with him in this instance. Yes, Dido and Aeneas are similar in that they are both ruled by fate, but Austin characterizes Dido here as if it is one of her characteristics that her emotions (desire) come before duty. We saw in the beginning of Book 4 her struggle against her burgeoning feelings.[44] It is clear to me that her instincts were to ignore them. She is a powerful leader, strong and smart. It is not a character flaw but a curse put deliberately upon her by the gods that causes her to be so singularly minded in her desire. Compounding her monomania is the skewed nature of the cosmos; she is astounded at the injustice of the fact that all assistance and support goes to Aeneas and leaves her, used up, a discarded vessel. Aeneas puts duty before desire, yes, but it is partially because he has been fated to do so and partially because he is promised great reward by accepting his fate. Possible immortality is a clear winner when pit against the fleeting promise of desire. Dido, herself, may not have forgone immortality it if she hadn't been up against the power of a fated love.

---

[43] Austin, RG. 1973,108

[44] *Sed mihi vel tellus optem prius ima dehiscat/vel pater omnipotens abigat me fulmine ad umbras/pallentis umbras Erebo noctemque profundam/ante, pudor, quam te volio aut tua iura resolvo* (Aen.4.24-27). "but I would make this my earnest prayer, either that earth may soon yawn open to its depths for me, or that the Father (who can do all things) may blast me with his bolt and hurl me to the world of shadows, to the pale-glimmering shadows in Hell, to the pit of the night, sooner than that I do hurt my conscience or loosen its binding laws" (Austin 31).

Conclusion

I hope that I have shown the complexities of translation both from the perspective of the translator and the greater academic or literary canon, and I hope that I have shown the privileged position of the *Aeneid* specifically within this canon. In a more metaphysical sense, I hope that I have coherently explored at best a small portion of the cosmological, philosophical, and otherwise inherent structure of the world inside the *Aeneid*. Lastly, I wish with early care to have illuminated the inner subjectivities, upon which depend some of the greater overarching themes of the work, of Aeneas but mostly Dido who, to me, has become a casualty of fate both inside and outside the confines of the book.

Dido is so often misunderstood, her anguish mistaken for rage, (Dryden line 772, "Despair, and rage, and love, divide her heart;/Despair and rage had some, but love the greater part.") her utter torment taken out of context, seen as a character flaw rather than the result of a long and uninvited despair. She is sometimes remembered for her tatters instead of her beauty (Dryden's line 434 "Frantic with fear, impatient of the wound/and impotent of mind, she roves the city round."), her broken-ness instead of her strength. It is, in fact, her sturdiness, heartiness, power, that gives significance to her final dissolution. Her fall is profound and though she struggles to fight, her strength is matched. The annihilation of Dido represents a force utterly violent and destructive, unaware of its effect on individual lives. This is the force to which she must succumb. This is fate.

Dido's insanity, torment, death, is not of her own doing. All are illustrations of the comparative power of fate, of which Dido is the ultimate casualty. It is my belief that because writing about Dido often considers her only in her last, utterly wrecked state, she has become a casualty of academia as well as of Fate. If I could, I would like to write about Dido more than I have here.

***

With many avenues left to explore and only a brief tract covered of a seemingly endless expanse, we are left with many considerations. We have analyzed Dryden's re-rendering of Virgil's original, compared it to the original and other translations, considered the political and philosophical implications of translation, evaluated the cosmology and philosophy of the world of the *Aeneid,* and weighed the value of pathos within the work. This critical eye is required for a true analysis of the work. However, I do not wish to present the world and characters of the work as if they are stagnant or purely symbolic. The most valuable thing to me about the *Aeneid* is that it is dynamic, vibrant, alive. Dido and Aeneas are characters dear to me, and I analyze them with the knowledge that they submit gracefully to analysis but are not *meant* to be analyzed with a cold, gunmetal eye. The value of the work can be inferred through analysis, but really goes beyond it. This work, the *Aeneid*, brought catharsis, transcendence, immersion to me. It has a continuous value not only as a canonized work with a cemented place at the helm of academia, but as the fruit of a magnificent labor. It is a breathtaking piece of art and literature. Although it must, for academic purposes, be here critically analyzed, its patho-tic quality, its

propensity to affect readers emotionally, its ability to burrow itself, for technical reasons previously explored and metaphysical reasons that are better felt, is its most apparent source of power and, whether or not acknowledged by the greater academia, is the reason that it flourishes today.

The *Aeneid* is a seminal work in the creative fruits of humanity. Through it, modern readers become part of a tradition with its roots firmly planted thousands of years ago. To me, the greatest translation is by John Dryden. It is my hope that people will read it for more than the awe that its name can confer. Philosopher Walter Benjamin said about creative works, "The instant the criterion of authenticity ceases to be applicable to artistic production, the total function of art is reversed. Instead of being based on ritual, it begins to be based on another practice – politics. Works of art are received and valued on different planes. Two polar types stand out; with one, the accent is on the cult value; with the other, on the exhibition value of the work"[45]

I would like for this work, The *Aeneid*, to be valued for more than its exhibition value. I would like Dido to be appreciated and loved as more than a cult figure, reduced to a certain tidy history, and a set of characteristics. The *Aeneid* is a dynamic, vibrant work that is deeply fulfilling when read in earnest; my love for it is deep and ever growing.

[45] Benjamin 1936, Part IV

Bibliography

Austin, RG. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. IV. London: University Press, Oxford, 1973. Print.

Benjamin, Walter. "Berkowitz - Educational Pages." *Berkowitz - Educational Pages*. N.p., n.d. Web. 23 Apr. 2012. <http://www.berk edu.com/VisualStudies/readingList/06b_benjamin-work%20of%20art%20in%20the%20age%20of%20mechanical%20reproduction.pdf >.

Catullus. "XI." *Catullus the Complete Poems.* Trans. Guy Lee. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990. Print.

Dryden, John. *Virgil's Aeneid.* London: Wordsworth Editions Ltd, 1997. Print.

Lewis, CT. *Elementary Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1889. Print.

Mandelbaum, Allen. *Virgil's Aeneid*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971. Print.

Martindale, Charles, ed. *Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1997. Print.

Marvell, Andrew. "To His Coy Mistress." 1650.

Mead, George Robert Stow. *Studies in Hellenistic theosophy and gnosis: being a translation of the extant sermons and fragments of the Trismegistic literature with Prolegomena, commentaries and notes, by G. R. S. Mead,...*. London: J. M. Watkins, 1964. Print.

Ovid, *Apollo and Daphne*. < http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Daphne_and_Apollo>

Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Web. 16 Apr 2012.

Sappho. "Fragment 31." *If Not, Winter: Fragments of Sappho*. Anne Carson. Knopf, 2002. Print.

"Sappho: Poem of Jealousy." *Bureau of Public Secrets*. Bureau of Public Secrets, n.d. Web. 19 Apr 2012. <http://www.bopsecrets.org/gateway/passages/sappho.htm>.

Waite, Arthur. *Hermetic and Alchemical Writings of Paracelcus*. 1. Chicago: de Laurence, Scott & co, 1910. Print.

West, David Alexander. *The Aeneid*. London, England: Penguin Books, 1990. Print.