

FROM SERVIUS TO ADVANCED PLACEMENT: THE ANFRACTUOUS PATH OF THE HELEN EPISODE IN *AENEID* 2

STEVEN R. PERKINS
North Central High School
Indianapolis, Indiana

*Iamque adeo super unus eram, cum limina Vestae
servantem et tacitam secreta in sede latentem
Tyndarida aspicio; dant claram incendia lucem
erranti passimque oculos per cuncta ferenti. 570
Illa sibi infestos eversa ob Pergama Teucros
et Danaum poenam et deserti coniugis iras
praemetuens, Troiae et patriae communis Erinys,
abdiderat sese atque aris invisā sedebat.
exarsere ignes animo; subit ira cadentem 575
ulcisci patriam et sceleratas sumere poenas.
“Scilicet haec Spartam incolumis patriasque Mycenae
aspiciet, partoque ibit regina triumpho?
Coniugiumque domumque patris natosque videbit
Iliadum turba et Phrygiis comitata ministris? 580
Occiderit ferro Priamus? Troia arserit igni?
Dardanum totiens sudarit sanguine litus?
Non ita. Namque etsi nullum memorabile nomen
feminea in poena est, habet haec victoria laudem;
Exstinxisse nefas tamen et sumpsisse merentis 585
laudabor poenas, animumque explesse iuvabit
ultricies -famam et cineres satiasset meorum.”
Talia iactabam et furiata mente ferebar...*

Aeneid 2.568–88

These lines of the *Aeneid* have been fraught with controversy since at least the fifth century when Servius wrote that they had been removed from Vergil's text by his literary executors Varius and Tucca. Questions of their authorship and placement in the text have exercised modern philologists from the 1800s to the present, and it can reasonably be said that the problems surrounding these lines have not and never will be solved. As Austin wrote, these lines form “an exasperating Tummelplatz for students of Virgil.” He goes on to quote Wiechmann from 1876, *qua de re viri docti iam pridem inter se certarunt semperque, ni fallor, certabunt* (Austin, 187). Although claiming to have the answer to the questions surrounding this passage, Goold admits that, “the road which leads from the enunciation of the thesis to the final Q.E.D. of the proof is long and winding, typical less of the unswerving advance of a Euclidean theorem than of the anfractuousness of a drunkard's homeward path” (Goold, 101). The purpose of the present article is not so much to attempt a solution, but rather to outline the arguments and approaches to the questions, and perhaps to engage in a bit of Wiechmann's *certamen*. In so doing, it is hoped that the secondary teacher, especially of the Advanced Placement syllabus that includes this passage, may find a way to introduce to students the methods used to establish the text they study.

Let us begin with some background. In the 1969 Oxford text of Mynors, this passage is bracketed and the *apparatus criticus*

notes, ‘*hos versus*’ teste Servio in *vita Vergiliana* ‘constat esse detractos’, scilicet a Tucca et Vario, quos oblevisse eosdem narrat D.Serv. ad v.566; tradunt codd. Serviani, inter Vergilianos perpauci; in *textum receperunt editores inde ab ed. Romana anni 1473* (Mynors, 144). Upon Vergil's death, Augustus assigned the task of preparing the *Aeneid* for publication to Vergil's friends, Varius and Tucca. We know this from the fifth century scholiast Servius, who said, *Augustus vero, ne tantum opus periret, Tuccam et Varium hac lege iussit emendare, ut superflua demerent, nihil adderent tamen...* (Serv. *Aen.* 1). It should be noted that anyone who studies the textual tradition of Vergil will soon become involved in Servian scholarship and investigation of the two traditions of Servius and Servius auctus, also called Servius Danielis. For the purposes of this paper, we shall refer to all Servian texts by the single name of Servius.

Servius then speaks of two passages to illustrate the kind of work that Varius and Tucca were supposed to do. The first is a passage that has come to be referred to as *ille ego qui* and runs thus.

*Ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena
carmen, et egressus silvis vicina coegi
ut quamvis avido parent arva colono,
gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Martis*

The second passage has come to be referred to as the Helen Episode (hereafter HE) and runs in the Mynors Oxford edition as cited above. According to Servius in his commentary on Book 2.592, Varius and Tucca deleted this passage for two reasons: *nam et turpe est viro forti contra feminam irasci, et contrarium est Helenam in domo Priami fuisse illi rei, quae in sexto dicitur, quia in domo est inventa Deiphobi, postquam ex summa arce vocaverat Graecos* (Servius *Aen.* 2.592).

Questions arise about this passage because there is no reference to the HE prior to Servius in the 5th century, and the credibility of Servius has been called into question. Austin, while accepting Vergilian authorship, nevertheless refutes Servius' grounds for deletion. “Servius' grounds for the deletion are worthless. The first [i.e. that it is unbecoming of a hero to have such anger against a woman] is a patent paraphrase of 583–4, and does not merit serious consideration. As for the second, Virgil was not so woolly-minded that he could not see the contradiction with 6.511ff. himself, nor so pedantic as to think it mattered. If Varius and Tucca removed the lines, they cannot have done it for the reasons given by Servius” (Austin, 186).

Servius is also discredited by modern scholars because he did not cite his sources. Donatus also referenced the *ille ego qui* lines, but attributed his source to a first-century grammarian named Nisus (Donatus, *Vit. Verg.* 42). Servius cites both the *ille ego qui* lines and the HE, but lists no source for either. As a result, Goold and Murgia dismiss him as unreliable. Writes Goold, “No teacher who habitually censors and even doctors the information he purveys can be set up as a tribunal to whom a final appeal can be made.

We cannot take his words at face value” (Goold, 136). Murgia agrees and, focusing on the fact that the HE is linked with the *ille ego qui* lines, pronounces them spurious on the grounds that they “are in bad company” (Murgia, 1971, 206). Horsfall is the most damning. After noting references in Quintillian and Gellius to ancient manuscripts of Vergil, he makes the sweeping statement, “We should not imagine that Roman scholars, 150 years after Virgil’s death, were honest and competent palaeographers, able to date mss. by proper and balanced criteria” (Horsfall, 5). Turning his attention specifically to Servius, he writes, “It should...have been generally recognized, long ago, that Servius is not a scrupulous and reliable source.... It has long been clear...that a note in Servius about the posthumous editing of the *Aeneid* serves not to guarantee, but rather to cast doubt upon the details of the HE and its alleged preservation. Let us be quite clear: the HE is of the highest quality, but its textual credentials are deplorable and Servius’ credibility in such matters is negligible” (Horsfall, 6, 10, 11).

The entire puzzle surrounding the HE hinges on the credibility of Servius. The most savage criticism, however, seems designed to convince by bluster. It is the mark of civilized jurisprudence that a person is considered innocent until proven guilty. The contemporary view of Servius has pronounced sentence before the defendant has even ascended the dock. It may be practice to discredit the prostitute who testifies in a murder trial, but a life of crime does not necessarily entail that the person is lying.

Nonetheless, much analysis to prove or disprove Vergilian authorship of the HE has ensued. That analysis has focused on narrative analysis (Does the HE fit within the overall design of the *Aeneid*?), lexical analysis (Would Vergil have used certain words?), syntactical analysis (Are certain expressions good Latin grammar?), stylistic analysis (Is the HE stylistically consistent with the rest of the poem?), and metrical analysis (Are the metrical particularities Vergilian?) We shall now address each of these in turn.

The earliest objection to this passage on the grounds of the narrative arises in Servius, although he did not claim non-Vergilian authorship. As stated above, it was his contention that Varius and Tucca were justified in removing the passage because it violated the heroic quality of Aeneas to have him contemplating the killing of a woman and because it was inconsistent with the location of Helen in Book 6, although he does not say that these were in fact the reasons that influenced Varius and Tucca.

Fairclough refutes the second of these charges by suggesting that such a contradiction is to be expected given that, according to Suetonius, Vergil did not work on the *Aeneid* in chronological order, but rather approached different scenes as the muse inspired. Horsfall likewise dismisses this objection on the grounds that there are many such inconsistencies throughout the poem. While removal of inconsistencies might have been a guiding principle for the editorial work of Varius and Tucca, given that Vergil died with the *Aeneid* unfinished, no inconsistency short of something as gross as the hero’s committing suicide on Troy’s final night is reasonable evidence against Vergilian authorship.

Both Fairclough and Horsfall find Servius’ first quibble equally problematic. Fairclough acknowledges that Heinze had claimed that Vergil would not even have allowed his hero to think of killing a defenseless woman at an altar, especially after having just witnessed the impiety of Priam’s slaughter at an altar by Pyrrhus. Fairclough rebuts this by pointing out that Aeneas did not actually carry through his plan to kill Helen and that it is unreasonable to

hold him to a standard of sainthood in which a pious hero would not even contemplate such an act.

This position, however, tries to maintain too uniform an idea for the character of Aeneas, attempting to preserve some degree of the sainthood Fairclough claims to deny. Aeneas would have seen the slaughter of Priam at the altar as impious not only because it was a murder taking place in a sacred location, but because it was Priam the king and his own father-in-law being killed. He would have had no compunction about similarly “sacrificing” a Greek. Aeneas was not, per Keats’ “plain sailor man,” a priest. There is a gritty realism to the poem in keeping with much of Roman art. In this, Horsfall agrees: “During the fall of Troy, it is plain that Aeneas is prey to anger and mental confusion; this is perfectly credible, and excellent characterisation. If the hero sometimes does not behave like a practising philosopher or perfect gentleman, that...does not matter much” (Horsfall, 12).

Moving beyond the objections put forth by Servius, Goold sees three challenges to Vergilian authorship in the content of the HE. First, he finds it implausible that someone from the roof could see inside the temple of Vesta to the altar where Helen had hidden herself. Second, he finds it illogical for Venus to persuade Aeneas against murdering Helen by saying it is the gods and not Helen who are responsible for destroying Troy (601–03). Third, he finds it incoherent that Venus should refer to the beauty of Helen when there has been no mention of beauty in the HE.

This last is no serious objection. Beauty is Helen’s hallmark. A person talking about Superman need not make a statement about his strength for someone else to respond with a comment about the Man of Steel’s power. As for the supposed illogic of Venus’ response, her argument is actually quite sound. The gods are indeed destroying Troy, and Aeneas knows that Troy is doomed. What is the point, then, in murdering this woman? Finally, it is a hyper-literalism that asks how someone on the palace roof could see inside the temple of Vesta. In Aeneas’ opening scene in Book 1, his ship is bucking like a mustang in the midst of a terrific storm, yet we accept that he stands on the deck and delivers an impassioned speech instead of shouting a brief word of vulgarity and helping the men to batten down the hatches.

Murgia (2003) attempts to find a proof for non-Vergilian authorship in the fact that the whole passage, especially lines 583–86, are inconsistent with Vergil’s plan for the *Aeneid*. “These lines portray Aeneas as acting with the motivation of a shame-culture hero of traditional epic, with praise and blame the main motivation for action. But Virgil’s Aeneas operates with an internal standard of conduct, his dedication to being *pious*. It is normally conflict between two types of *pietas* that tests Aeneas” (Murgia, 2003, 406–07).

Aeneas is not so monolithic a character as all that. To suggest that he is not part of the so-called “shame-culture” of traditional epic is to suggest that he is not part of the Trojan War and that Vergil is completely reinventing the epic of his day, much as a modern, revisionist historian might write a novel of the Old West to portray a prior age as ideally tolerant. Aeneas has just watched Polites being slaughtered at the altar before the faces of his parents and old King Priam himself being butchered. He has already strapped on his armor to fight and is now thinking of the horrors of war that may be besetting his family. He is in the epicenter of traditional warrior thought.

In an elaborate footnote to the above citation, Murgia expands on the notion that such a focus on glory does not fit in Book 2.

He sees in the HE an *impius furor*, since slaying Helen would satisfy no recognized obligation of *pietas*.

This argument makes little sense in the light of line 576, which clearly equates the exacting of punishment from Helen with avenging his country. *Patria et dei et familiae* constitute the triune object of Aeneas' *pietas*. Furthermore, both Jupiter and Mercury make explicit references to the motivation of glory in 4.232 and 4.272. Aeneas, while uniquely motivated by *pietas*, does not ignore matters of *gloria*.

Not all analyses of content, however, have been directed toward refuting Servius or denying Vergilian authorship of the HE. Beginning with Servius, it has been observed that sudden reference to Helen in 601 makes little sense if some mention of Helen had not just been made. On this point both Fairclough and Austin agree. Austin goes further by pointing out that the *cum* clause of 589 makes no sense without some passage preceding. Likewise, he observes that the *continuit* of Venus in 593 and her reference to *indomitas iras* in 594 are incoherent without the HE. This is true also, he notes, of her admonition that Aeneas think of his family in 596, given his thoughts about his family in 560ff. Goold (Table 3, 158) summarizes a theory advanced by Henry and Korte that the first version of Book 2 went straight from 567 to 624, but that upon reflection of how passive his hero looked, Vergil may have written an addition of which the HE was a part.

We can conclude that from a perspective of narrative analysis, it is clear Book 2 is incomplete without the HE. Such analysis is ultimately inconclusive, however, regarding the authorship of the HE or its reason for omission if Vergilian.

Turning now to lexical issues, certain words in the HE have sparked much discussion, most notably *praemetuens* in 573 and the second word of 587. Norden had observed that *praemetuens* occurs only here in Vergil, but Shipley well refutes this as any evidence of non-Vergilian authorship. He notes that of 37 words prefixed by *prae* in the Vergilian corpus, more than half either do not appear in the *Aeneid* or appear only once. This leads him to conclude that "the single occurrence of *praemetuens*...is not at all surprising, and there is no more reason for calling in question the authenticity of the passage because of this word than there is for calling in question *Aen.* IV, 297 because the word *praesensit* is found nowhere else in Vergil" (Shipley, 183).

Shipley's argument *contra* Norden is picked up by Horsfall *contra* Goold regarding *satiasse* in 587. If one is of the Norden/Goold camp, then much literature that we have would of necessity be excised on the grounds that a *hapax* equates with spuriousness. Reasoning from the Shipley/Horsfall side of things, we can allow for the possibility that we cannot be certain regarding what an author would or would not have chosen and can accept a *hapax* as proving nothing necessarily about authorship.

Returning to *praemetuens*, Goold finds the word problematic because the notion of "pre-fear" is tautologous, since all fear is anticipatory. He goes on to refute those, like Shipley, who would defend Vergilian authorship on the grounds that Lucretius uses the word in 3.1019. Goold argues that the Lucretian passage is famous and therefore good grounds for a forger to find his vocabulary. By bringing in the Lucretius passage, however, Goold offers the grounds for refuting his own argument that *praemetuens* is tautologous. If the word were too illogical for Vergil to have used, it would have been the same for Lucretius, whose use of it is unquestioned.

The most challenging lexical problem has been the reading of line 587. For the second word readings of *famam*, *famae*, and *flammae* have been advanced. Fairclough finds the Servian manuscripts with *famam* to be corrupt and accepts without further discussion *flammae*, a tenth century emendation. Austin declares that the line is likely irremediable. He dismisses the genitives *famae* and *flammae* on the grounds that there is no example in extant Latin for such usage (more on this later). He ultimately yields to the conclusion of Nettleship that there may have been a lacuna prior to 587 and that the reading of *ultricus famam*, while unintelligible in the current text, related to a lost passage.

This, however, can be easily refuted. If *ultricus famam* is unintelligible by reason of reference to a lost passage, then it would have been unintelligible to Servius, yet he makes no reference to any difficulty. If it is unintelligible, it can only be by reason of scribal error, thus eliminating any need to hypothesize a *lacuna* or a lost passage.

Issues surrounding the reading of 587 are closely linked to syntactical matters, and it is to this we turn next. Renehan begins by agreeing with Murgia that *ultricus flammae* is the correct reading, but is careful to note, "The first duty of anyone who supports *flammae* here is to make perfectly clear from that outset that, in so doing, he is defending not a genuinely transmitted *lectio*, but a *coniectura* found in a tenth-century Servian MS (N)..." (Renehan, 197). Given this, he acknowledges that the primary objection to *flammae* rests in what is perceived to be an impossibility of syntax, namely that there is no other attested use of *explere* with the genitive.

Renehan begins by challenging this objection on the grounds that it supposes poets never innovate. "[A] fundamental premise in this objection [is] that poets in general and Latin poets in particular do not effect variety. In fact, the reverse is the truth. That good Latin poets consciously strove to fashion new creations within the tradition of their inherited poetic diction is common knowledge" (Renehan, 198).

While this is true, Renehan makes an even more compelling argument from analogy. "The existence of the construction *explere c. abl.* is in itself no argument against the possibility of *explere c. gen.*, if it can be shown that this latter construction is unobjectionable syntax. Before *explere c. gen.* was pronounced 'impossible' solely on the grounds that it is attested only once (I leave to the reader's imagination the consequences of extending that principle systematically to all extant Greek and Latin [cf. Shipley and Goold above]), a much more fundamental question should have been asked: what is there inherent in the meaning of this particular compound of *-pleo* which would isolate it syntactically from other compounds of *-pleo* and prevent it from governing the genitive? The answer is, nothing" (Renehan, 198). From here he gives examples of other compounds of *-pleo* governing the genitive in other authors. He concludes, "Such instances could be multiplied many times over, but these should suffice to show that the syntactical singularities cannot be condemned as impossible..." (Renehan, 199).

Horsfall agrees with Renehan (and with Murgia (1971), who had dismissed any objection to *explere c. gen.* with the example of *impleo* and the genitive in *Aeneid* 1.215). He cites the same example as Murgia (1971) and goes on to note that "to criticise the passage because other instances of this compound + genitive are lacking in Virgil...is to deny entirely, and absurdly, the force of analogy in linguistic invention" (Horsfall, 19). He adds that the

image of *ultricus flammae* picks up the psychological sense of *ignes* from 575.

Further syntactical discussion has focused on *sceleratas poenas* (576), *patris* (579), *habet haec victoria* (584), *merentis poenas* (585–86), and a *cum* clause (589). Two of these, *sceleratas poenas* and *merentis poenas*, seem linked in their difficulty. One reading of 576 has *sceleratae*, and it is a question whether *merentis* is genitive or accusative. With regard to *merentis*, Austin follows Peerlkamp, who observed *poenas alicuius sumere vix Latinum est* (Peerlkamp, 142) and concludes that the accusative reading is the correct one, another example of transferred epithet and parallel to *sceleratas poenas*. Goold agrees. A Servian ms. had given the clearly incorrect *ignis* for *ignes* in 575. Goold attributes this to an overly enthusiastic copyist who, knowing that third declension *i*-stems can have an accusative plural in *-is*, mistakenly applied the principle to the nominative in 575. From this he concludes that *merentis* must also be an accusative plural.

Murgia (1971), on the other hand, finds it going too far to transfer the wickedness of the person being punished to the punishment itself. He also sees two instances of a similar difficulty in the space of so few lines to indicate the intentional style of a poet, but one who is not Vergil. “Particularly in *sceleratas poenas*, the poet leaves clues of an imitator striving to duplicate Virgil’s boldness of expression” (Murgia, 1971, 214).

Case difficulties also affect the reading of line 579, which contains either three or four elements depending on whether *patris* is genitive or accusative. If the genitive reading is correct, there are three elements, consisting of husband, home of her father, and children. If the accusative is correct, then it is a stand-in for *parentes*, making four elements. Austin rejects the accusative on the grounds that, while a frequent synonym for *parentes* in inscriptions, there is no clear evidence in literary Latin for such usage. Furthermore, he sees a parallel for the reading of three elements in 2.137–38 in which Sinon yearns for *patriam*, *natos*, and *parentem*.

As has already been discussed, arguments against unique usage avail little. Goold disagrees with Austin and accepts the accusative reading since the rhythm of the line, two sets of two elements with a conjunction in each set, has Vergilian parallels. Murgia (1971) agrees with Goold, adding that the four specific elements of father, wife, home, and child that come to Aeneas’ mind in 559–63 are paralleled here. He also notes that the accusative reading may be an example of using the plural for the singular, a common enough device, and that as a synonym for *parentes*, *patres* has parallels in Sanskrit and Greek. In addition to accepting the accusative, he rejects the genitive reading on the basis that such an image would indicate a woman returning to the home of her father after a divorce, not in triumph as indicated in the HE. He finds support for this with Penelope in the *Odyssey*, Book 2, and with heroines such as Medea and Ariadne. Horsfall agrees with Murgia (1971). He finds support within the *Aeneid* itself, pointing to 1.95, *ante ora patrum*, where it is clear that the word has a broader meaning.

The problem of line 584 also involves syntactical reasoning to solve a textual issue. Some Servian mss. give *habet haec victoria*, but others show *nec habet victoria*. Austin follows Fraenkel in rejecting the latter in favor of the former, partly on the grounds that *haec* is necessary to emphasize this particular victory over Helen that Aeneas is contemplating. This reading, however, forces an interpretation of *tamen* in 585 that is, as Austin admits,

uncomfortable. “*Tamen* belongs primarily to *habet*, and its force extends to *laudabor*” (192).

This wrenches all reasonable sense of *tamen* beyond bearing. Goold, aware of this, refutes Austin by pointing out the simple and likely path of scribal error. “The words *nec habet* became by the slightest of changes *hec habet* of which *habet haec* is a further corruption, representing metrical adjustment” (Goold, 144). Murgia (1971) likewise concludes for *nec habet*, citing the structural balance and rhetorical amplification that the author is attempting throughout the passage.

The final major syntactical problem actually lies outside the HE, but has implications for it. The *cum* clause in 589 lacks an antecedent. Goold and Horsfall agree its presence indicates that something was removed, but Goold denies that it could have been the HE. He begins by supposing that the original sequence of lines ran 564, 565, 566, 624, 625, etc., with lines 589–623 perhaps written separately or in the margin. That these lines are not in their finished state is clear from the half-lines at 614 and 623. He acknowledges that this, too, is strange, for it would still involve Vergil’s writing of a *cum* clause without an antecedent. Goold suggests there must have been some other passage preceding 589 and finds it untenable that the HE could have been that passage. “If Varius judged that this section of the poem had not attained a satisfactory coherence, what possessed him to include the incomplete speech of Venus (half-line at 614) and the incomplete conclusion (half-line at 623) and to exclude the completed Helen scene—and, furthermore, cut it off in the middle of a sentence? If he decided that he had to excise a whole passage, the perfect solution stared him in the face: omit all the marginal verses and retain the earlier sequence...565, 566, 624, 625, etc. But the evidence, namely the retention of half a sentence at 589 and half-lines at 614 and 623, supports the view that in exercising his editorial prerogative he did not willingly part with a single word” (Goold, 161).

There is, of course, one solution to this that does not require hypothesizing the existence of a completely unknown passage. The HE provides a perfect antecedent to the *cum* clause and could have been excised, not for internal incoherence, but for the reasons that Servius suggested. It may not have been what Vergil wanted for his main character, and it does contradict the location of Helen in Book 6.

From the lexical and syntactical perspectives, we turn next to stylistic analysis. The distinctiveness of Vergilian style provides a litmus test that some have applied to the HE in an attempt to determine authorship. Fairclough, for example, finds the passage perfectly Vergilian and would not question it were it not for the fact that none of the earliest manuscripts contain these lines and that Servius says they were deleted by Varius and Tucca. For illustration he points out the parallel between the HE and its following lines and the opening of the *Odyssey*, Book 20, in which Odysseus considers killing the maids who had consorted with the suitors, only to be stopped by Athena. Fairclough draws attention to the fact that both heroes meditate the slaying of women, both soliloquize, both fail to carry out their murderous intent, and both are reminded of three things by a deity. Athena reminds Odysseus of home, wife, and child. Venus reminds Aeneas of father, wife, and son. From this he concludes, “The parallel is fairly complete, and the conclusion seems irresistible that as this Homeric scene must have been in the mind of him who composed the Helen-episode, as

well as the succeeding lines, the whole of the passage involved, the doubtful and undoubted lines alike, must be the work of one and the same poet, viz., Vergil himself" (Fairclough, 227).

Austin applies the test of style to one of the disputed phrases discussed above, *sceleratas poenas* in 576. As noted, he sees this as an example of transferred epithet and concludes that this particular expression is a Vergilian invention and not the work of a lesser poet. He is, however, bothered by the excessively repetitious vocabulary of these lines. Consider forms of *sedes/sedeo* (569, 574), *aspicio* (569, 578), *fero* (570, 588), *poena* (572, 576, 584, 587), *ira* (572, 575), *patria* (573, 576, 577), (*ex*)*ardeo* (575, 581), *ignis* (576, 581), *animus* (576, 586), *ulciscor/ultrix* (576, 587), *sumo* (576, 585), and *laus/laudo* (585, 586). Nevertheless, Austin concludes that there are enough Vergilian touches in word arrangement, alliteration, and assonance to warrant claiming his authorship.

In contrast, Goold sees the very repetition of vocabulary pointed out by Austin as evidence that it could not have been Vergil who wrote these lines. He further finds it suspicious that the vocabulary of the HE echoes ten, well-known passages of the *Aeneid*, which he lists (Goold, 145–46), concluding that if this suggestion could "be hardened into proof, non-Vergilian authorship would necessarily be proved also" (Goold, 146). Since Goold admits, however, that this is not proof, and indeed it could instead be used to prove consistency of theme, this argument can reasonably be dismissed.

Horsfall, on the other hand, finds the argument persuasive. To him this lack of invention and innovation suggests a "brilliantly meticulous warming-over of ingredients whose familiarity emerges more and more clearly from close study. The result seems almost ponderously, excessively Virgilian..." (Horsfall, 18). Once again, this proves nothing regarding authorship. If this passage was merely a *tibicen*, it is not unreasonable to think that Vergil leaned on the tried and true as a sketch of what the passage could become.

In addition to his favorable view of Goold's argument, Horsfall also advances his own interpretation of this lexical repetitiveness. "These lines are tremendous stuff, but at the same time rather breathless and claustrophobic: lexical and thematic repetition is used immoderately and there is little trace here of the restraint and economy of Virgil at his majestic best" (Horsfall, 18). This could be a persuasive argument were it not for Horsfall's own refutation of it. He had earlier said, "Virgil had not yet mastered the complexities of simultaneous narrative when he wrote *Aeneid* 2; he would learn...from reading the historians" (Horsfall, 12–13). By his own account, this book is not Vergil's majestic best. If that is the case, then why fault the HE for what is not majestically and optimally Vergilian?

Murgia (1971) also sees the repetitiveness of the vocabulary as excessive, but interprets it as hyper-Vergilian rather than un-Vergilian. He writes, "The main difference between our poet and Virgil is not so much genius as taste. He has been able to imitate anomalies of Virgilian style, but has been unable to duplicate Virgilian restraint. The result is a super-Virgil..." (Murgia, 1971, 216). This, of course, is persuasive only if we are already convinced that Vergil did not write the passage. The lack of restraint may simply have been a feature that would have caused Vergil to mark it for deletion.

Not all stylistic analysis has been applied to the issue of repetitive vocabulary. Murgia (1971), for example, decides in

favor of reading *flammae* in 587 on the grounds that it forms a ring composition. It starts in lines 575–76 with

*exarsere ignes animo; subit ira cadentem
ulcisci patriam*

and ends in 586–87 with

*animumque explesse iuvabit
ultrix flammae.*

Murgia (2003) also goes to some lengths to prove that the HE was composed after Vergil's time by showing that it is less well integrated into its surrounding text than a similar passage in Lucan. He operates on the principle that "of two related passages, the one in which shared diction is less well integrated with its context is the imitation" (Murgia, 2003, 411–12). Although he admits that this principle is far from certain, conceding that, "Even if the inferiority of the one passage can be agreed upon, this in no way necessarily entails its posterity," he nevertheless pursues this line of reasoning (Murgia, 2003, 412).

The parallel Lucan scene is from *Pharsalia* 10 in which Cleopatra leads a triumph. Murgia (2003) attacks the parallelism on the grounds that Helen lacked anything resembling the *imperium* that would have entitled her to a triumph. He also finds fault with the description of the triumph itself, arguing that, while a *turba* is often seen accompanying a triumph, it is with reference to the soldiers of the victor.

This, however, is to read too much into the HE. Line 578 merely says *partoque ibit regina triumpho*. It does not say that Helen will lead the triumph. This would have fallen to her kingly husband (*coniugium*, 579). She is simply going along in it, although it is a triumph for which she is responsible. As for *turba*, consider line 580, *Iliadum turba et Phrygiis comitata ministris*. Compare this with *Aeneid* 1.497 in which Dido processes *magna iuvenum stipante caterva*. There is no reason to suppose Helen's *turba* as anything other than the human spoils of war, pressed into service as her attendants (*ministris*). Murgia (2003) himself acknowledges this possible interpretation in note 35, but claims *comitata* is the wrong word to use here. All in all, this is placing far too much weight on a literal interpretation of a triumph. *Comitata* is the perfect word since the captives are *ministri*.

We come at last to a metrical discussion of the HE, a discussion that has focused almost entirely on a perceived excessive incidence of elision at the penthemimeral caesura. Among English language scholars, Shipley has given this the most careful analysis. After acknowledging that he had formerly agreed with German scholars Thilo, Leo, Heinze, and Norden that the HE was an interpolation largely on the grounds of excessive elision at the caesura, he concludes the opposite, but for the same reason. He begins by noting that there are 285 examples of elision with *et* at the penthemimeral caesura. This occurs once every 33 lines. Given this ratio for the entire poem, an occurrence of 3 in 22, or a ratio of 1 in 7 for the HE seems disproportionately high.

He observes, however, that examples of such elision tend to occur in groups and that the question must be whether there are multiple examples of this type of elision in close proximity. He draws our attention to three instances of elision with *et* at the penthemimeral caesura in 3.188–222 and three more instances in 12.757–71.

Although one of the examples in this latter group involves *ut*, it falls within the parameters of the discussion. Given the ratios of the phenomenon in these groups, Shipley concludes that the apparently excessive caesural elision in the HE is not unique.

Furthermore, Shipley notes that in the 400 lines of which the HE is the center, there are similarly high ratios for this kind of elision. It occurs at a rate of 1 in 4 for lines 401–12, 1 in 5 for lines 475–95, and 1 in 8 for lines 749–80. Even if we omit the HE, the ratio for this kind of elision in the second half of Book 2 is 1 in 25, a ratio higher than in any other book. Says Shipley, “*The Helen passage conforms in this particular feature to the technique of the 400 lines of which it is the center* [italics original]. If it was written by an interpolator, he was familiar with details of technique, which have for the most part escaped the notice of modern scholars” (Shipley, 182). This leads him to conclude, “As a result, I am satisfied that the apparent metrical peculiarities not only do not prove un-Virgilian authorship, but on the contrary, are strong evidence in favor of the hypothesis that the passage was originally drafted by Virgil in its present form, but was omitted by Varius and Tucca, his literary executors, in accordance with the poet’s known wishes in the matter” (Shipley, 173). Austin agrees with Shipley, but without further discussion. Horsfall, like Shipley, notes that metrical phenomena, such as this type of elision, tend to occur in groups, but says nothing more.

Goold and Murgia (1971), on the other hand, find the excessive elision at the penthemimeral caesura evidence of an imitator working too hard to capture a known feature of an author. Murgia writes, “In seeking to produce a Virgilian passage, the poet has gone too far” (Murgia, 1971, 215).

Despite these varied approaches to analysis, we are perhaps no closer to solving the difficulties surrounding the HE. In the last century alone, we find that Fairclough and Shipley conclude for Vergilian authorship and take the Servian account of its deletion as correct. Austin also accepts the HE as Vergilian, but denies that it was removed for the reasons Servius claimed. Goold, Murgia, Renehan, and Horsfall all reject Vergilian authorship.

As for the broader audience of the *Aeneid*, it is safe to say that the HE has passed into popular acceptance. Most, if not all, English translations, beginning with Gavin Douglas in 1513, including even the execrable rendering by Stanyhurst, and continuing through the most recent by Frederick Ahl in 2007, preserve it. Only two, Fagles and Ahl, indicate challenges to its authenticity in their notes. In art we see the scene depicted by Challiou, Ferrari, and Sablet.

It is no surprise that a supporter of authenticity like Fairclough would say that the passage should be included in editions of Book 2. Murgia (1971) would be happy to keep it, if it could be conclusively shown to be Vergilian. Even Renehan, who believes with Murgia and others that these lines are not Vergilian, notes that they “have been printed in the text of Vergil for centuries and will continue to be so printed. This is as it should be, provided that their spurious character be signaled by the conventional square brackets” (Renehan, 197).

After careful study of the relevant literature, I am inclined to say that the lines are Vergilian and that they were removed by Varius and Tucca as Servius said. If we extend to Servius the same consideration that we would to a criminal on trial, *viz.* that the *onus probandi* lies with the prosecution, we cannot conclude otherwise. None of the arguments advanced thus far sufficiently proves a lack of authenticity for these lines.

In conclusion, I would offer a few words as to how the HE can be a profitable study for high school students. One of the key elements in the International Baccalaureate diploma programme is the Theory of Knowledge course. It guides students to see the challenges that arise from how we know what we know in various areas and to seek the strongest possible ways of knowing. Whether or not a school offers the IB diploma, or even AP Latin for that matter, students can, through a look at the narrative, lexical, syntactical, stylistic, and metrical analyses of the Helen Episode, gain an understanding of the tools that philologists use to establish a text. They can begin to see that the *Aeneid* does not exist in a pristine autograph from Vergil, but that the version in their textbook is the result of years, centuries even, of professional study. It may be argued that there is little time for such discussion, especially in an IB or AP classroom. Indeed, Goold acknowledges this. “An elementary teacher, to reach in due season the end of his curriculum, must every hour turn a Nelson eye to serious problems and refrain from pursuing truth beyond the charted boundaries of the textbook” (Goold, 115). I would argue that the true *magister* can never be so bound, but must, along with the students, pursue the truth, no matter how anfractuous the path.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Austin, R.G. “Virgil, *Aeneid* 2.567–88.” *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series 11.2 (1961): 185–98.
- Fairclough, H.R. “The Helen Episode in Vergil’s *Aeneid* II.” *Classical Philology* 1.3 (1906): 221–30.
- Goold, G.P. “Servius and the Helen Episode.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74 (1970): 101–68.
- Heinze, Richard. *Virgils epische Technik*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1903.
- Henry, James. *Aeneida*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1873.
- Horsfall, N. “Fraud as Scholarship: The Helen Episode and the *Appendix Vergiliana*.” *Illinois Classical Studies* 31/32 (2006–2007): 1–27.
- Korte, Alfred. “Zum zweiten Buch von Vergils *Aeneis*.” *Hermes* 51 (1916): 145–50.
- Leo, Fridericus. *Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1895.
- Murgia, C.E. “More on the Helen Episode.” *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 4 (1971): 203–17.
- Murgia, C.E. “The Date of the Helen Episode.” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 101 (2003): 405–26.
- Mynors, R.A.B. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Norden, Eduard. *Aeneis Buch VI*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1903.
- Peerlkamp, P. H. *Aeneidos Libri I–VI*. Leiden: H.W. Hazenberg & Co., 1843.
- Renehan, R. “Pseudo-Vergil’s *Ultrix Flamma*: A Problem in Linguistic Probabilities.” *Classical Philology* 15.3 (1973): 197–02.
- Shipley, F.W. “The Virgilian Authorship of the Helen Episode.” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 56 (1925): 172–84.
- Thilo, Georg and Hermann Hagen. *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii: Aeneidos librorum I–V commentarii*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1878.

Steve Perkins teaches Latin at North Central High School in Indianapolis, Indiana. He is the author of numerous articles and books, including *Latin for Dummies* and *Achilles in Rome: The Latin Iliad of Baebius Italicus*. You can find out more about his work as a Roman re-enactor at www.romanpersonas.com. He is grateful to the anonymous reviewer for helpful comments and to his 2012–2013 A.P. students for their insightful discussion of the HE.