

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## Die Entstehung Der Aeneis *Die Entstehung der Aeneis.* Von Alfred Gercke. Pp. 205. Berlin: Wiedmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. M. 6.

L. W. Hunter

The Classical Review / Volume 28 / Issue 07 / November 2014, pp 232 - 234

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00007903, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00007903](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00007903)

### How to cite this article:

L. W. Hunter (1914). The Classical Review, 28, pp 232-234 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00007903

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

Mr. Richards' *Platonica*. Hence the very careful and thoroughgoing examination of the whole subject which Mr. Hackforth offers in the volume before us fills a real gap, and deserves, if only on that account, a grateful welcome from all students of Classics. The most important of the more modern criticisms of the *Epistles* are those by Raeder, Ritter and R. Adam; and the present work is largely based on these, especially in regard to linguistic statistics. Mr. Hackforth's method is to deal with the *Epistles* one by one, giving a summary of the contents of each, and then passing on to consider critical questions as to linguistic affinities, date, objections to authenticity, etc. At the end of his opening chapter ('General Introduction,' p. 34) he thus states his conclusions: 'iii., vii. and viii. I believe to be Platonic beyond all reasonable doubt: iv. and xiii. show evidence of authenticity only next to these: ix., x. and xi. must be left doubtful, chiefly because of their brevity: while i., ii., v., vi., xii. are unquestionably spurious.' By far the most interesting of the letters is, of course, the seventh, and those who regard it as genuine will be glad to find Mr. Hackforth supporting their view; but I, for one, doubt whether I could ever persuade myself to father on Plato what I must still regard—*pace* Mr. Hackforth—as an intolerable *mischmasch*. And I should refuse to be bullied into changing my mind by such epithets as 'subjective' and 'sentimental.' None

the less, what Mr. Hackforth writes in explanation and defence of the 'philosophical digression'—as well as the other digressions—in *Ep.* vii., and his ingenious imaginations as to the state of mind of Dion's party in 353-2 B.C., deserve careful consideration and may even carry conviction to less prejudiced minds.

In dealing with *Ep.* vi. Mr. Hackforth makes the plausible suggestion that the writer is borrowing from the *Symposium*, and he tries to identify the two gods—Father and Son—with the *αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν* and Eros of that dialogue. The former identification is highly improbable, and ascribes to the writer 'a confused memory of the *Symposium*' of a quite preposterous kind. Raeder's identification of the two gods with the World-soul and the Demiurgus is much more probable, and there may be an echo of the *βασιλικὸς νοῦς* and the *ἀΐτιον* of *Phileb.* 30 D. E., especially as the *σπουδῆ-παιδιά* antithesis is also found in that context. In the course of his discussion Mr. Hackforth makes several interesting contributions to the textual criticism of the *Epistles*—amongst others, the plausible conjecture *ἐφ' ἑμῶντας* for *ἐπομῶντας* in the passage in *Ep.* vi. (323 D.) alluded to above. Useful collections of linguistic parallels, and a chronological table, are supplied in three Appendixes. It is a pity that the printing of the Greek is defaced by so many instances of faulty accentuation.

R. G. B.

#### DIE ENTSTEHUNG DER AENEIS.

*Die Entstehung der Aeneis.* Von ALFRED GERCKE. Pp. 205. Berlin: Wiedmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. M. 6.

PROFESSOR GERCKE has undertaken a careful and exhaustive examination of the *Aeneid* from the point of view of the analytical rather than the aesthetic critic. His results are reached almost entirely by a consideration of internal evidence; but in c. iv. entitled 'The External Evidence,' he makes exceed-

ingly skilful use of the scanty testimony we possess to support the conclusions to which his analysis has led him. This, as he himself admits, is a reversal of the usual order of procedure. But he maintains consistently the supreme value of analysis, and takes to task the 'Aesthetic' critics (more especially his immediate predecessor, Richard Heinze), for their sentimental and 'anti-vivisection' attitude. 'The critical knife must be wielded by the hand of the linguistic (philologisch) inter-

preter firmly and sternly without respect for sentiment' (p. 7). Professor Gercke has certainly been true to his own principles.

It is difficult to know where to begin in discussing a book which contains so many assertions on points of detail resting upon closely linked and interlocking chains of argument. Into detailed exposition or refutation this is not the place to enter; nor when examining a work on the strength of internal evidence is it possible to generalise broadly as to what is true or false. Everything must be taken in its context, and the appeal must necessarily lie to the judgment of the individual reader. But a summary of the main conclusions may possibly suggest a few remarks as to the methods employed.

The central point of Professor Gercke's thesis, as expounded in cc. iii. and iv., is that the last six books of the *Aeneid* ('the Roman Iliad') bear clear signs of having been composed earlier than the first six books ('the Roman Odyssey') but that we can trace an extensive 'Umarbeitung' of the later books to suit the poet's more mature conception of the story. Here he makes full use of the evidence of Suetonius in Donatus' life (§§ 30, 31) and Propertius (II. 34. 61-6) on the question of date. With regard to the latter passage (written, as is universally admitted, soon after Gallus' death in 26 B.C.), he points out, following Rothstein, that, though in *Lavinia litora* we have a verbal reminiscence of *Aen.* I. 2 (a prelude which stands apart from the body of the work), no reference at all is made to the wanderings of the first six books, but only to the battle of Actium, described in *Aen.* VIII. 675-713, to the wars of Trojan Aeneas, and the foundation of Lavinium, which is not included at all in the existing epic. It is a case where an *argumentum ex silentio* seems to be justified; for an admirer wishing to pick typical scenes from a more or less complete *Aeneid* could hardly have avoided all reference to Books I.-VI. The inference is that Books I.-VI. were not yet put into shape, but that Propertius has seen or heard something of the contents of Books VII.-XII.

This receives substantial confirmation when we consider the information in Donatus' life as to the gradual growth of the idea of a poem in Virgil's mind 'in quo, quod maxime studebat, Romanae simul urbis et Augusti origo contineretur,' and couple this with the evidence of *Georgics* III. 46-48 ('Mox tamen ardentis accingar dicere pugnas Caesaris') and Prop. II. 1. 42 ('Caesaris in Phrygios condere nomen avos,' etc.), we are surely justified in concluding that the form in which the *Aeneid* first took shape in Virgil's mind was that of a great historical poem, somewhat on the lines of Ennius, which began with the landing of Aeneas in Latium, and culminated in the triumphs of Caesar Augustus. But 'the old legendary history soon threw its chains about him and gradually took the shape of an independent epic. Even then he may still have thought of composing a complete epic cycle; but at the time when Propertius' elegy was written he had postponed, if not wholly given up, the idea of carrying the historical epic down to his own time and celebrating Augustus' victories' (p. 76). Still, that would explain the fact that the wars of Aeneas were already taking shape by 26 B.C., even though when Augustus wrote to Virgil about the same date (on the expedition against the Cantabri, 27-25 B.C.) to know 'how Aeneas was getting on,' Virgil answered, 'tanta inchoata res est, ut paene vitio mentis tantum opus ingressus mihi videar' (Macr. I. 24. 11). This is just the language of a man who is in the first stages of thinking out a great composition: and there is no doubt that Virgil's increasing devotion to philosophy, which he mentions in the same letter, had led him to reconsider his subject and choose as his new theme the character and destiny of a single man actuated by devotion to a divine purpose.

With this part of Professor Gercke's argument I find myself in complete agreement. For if we accept his account of the modification of Virgil's intentions, it is perfectly easy to understand why the subject-matter of Books VII.-XII. engaged his attention first, and not, as

*a priori* we might have expected, that of Books II., IV., and VI.; though it is quite probable that these were the first to be really finished (*cf.* Suetonius' phrase 'perfecta demum materia' in reference to the recitation of these books to Augustus in 23 B.C.).

In his treatment of the relation of the different books in detail to each other I feel that the writer is less convincing. As is inevitable, he devotes a good deal of attention to discussing the date of Book III., and finally decided it is 'jung und doch alt'—*i.e.* that it was written after the main portion of Books VII.-XII., but before Books I., II., IV., and VI. Here he stands midway between Nettleship and Heinze, the former of whom thinks it 'one of the earliest books which Virgil completed' (*Essay on Virgil's Life and Times*, p. 66), while the latter, on grounds which seem to me absolutely convincing, decides that it was added after at least two-thirds of the work was composed (*Virgil's Epische Technik*, p. 93). The unique characteristic of Book III. is, of course, the *gradual* revelation of Aeneas' destiny; this, according to Professor Gercke, is the earliest conception of the story; in Books VII.-XII., as originally drafted, and in Book III., Aeneas did not know what his 'fata' were. In Books I.-II., parts of IV., V., and VI. he is clearly conscious of his destiny; and this is a later development influenced by Stoicism. But the arguments for the priority of Book III. to Book II. (p. 32) seem to me very weak indeed, and involve the arbitrary separation of III. 500-505 from the rest of Aeneas' farewell to Helenus as a 'later addition,' for which there is not the slightest justification. This, indeed, is one of the dangers of the author's method; for he constantly has recourse to suppression of inconvenient passages and reconstruction of what Virgil 'must have originally written' in order to suit his own theories.

One of the most tantalising chapters is c. vi., in which he discusses the gradual development of the idea of the Stoic εἰμαρμένη in Virgil's mind as the poem grew. Here the arguments are

marshalled with great ingenuity; but the actual relation of Fate to Free-will, whether of gods or men, in Virgil's philosophy, is never fully considered. On the other hand, the exposition of the way in which the Νέκυια in Book VI. first took shape as a conjuration of the dead (Totenbeschwörung), on the model of the *Odyssey*, and only afterwards became a κατάβασις, is both acute and convincing (pp. 187-197); and on several other points, *e.g.* the character of Latinus, and the place taken by Apollo in the scheme of the *Aeneid*, there is much that deserves consideration in the views put forward.

To conclude, the book has the defects of its qualities. It is an interesting experiment conducted with great patience and considerable ingenuity, and one quite worth the making. But in view of the highly speculative nature of its arguments, and the lack of positive evidence, except where other authorities help us, we can hardly admit it to be more. If we remember the way in which Virgil went to work at the *Aeneid*, 'prout liberet quidque et nihil in ordinem arripiens,' with 'tibicines' to prop the incomplete parts of the edifice, we necessarily feel that all analysis in detail of the stages of composition must be largely in the nature of guesswork, depending in the last resort on subjective impressions and individual standards. Exactly how much consistency in detail we have a right to demand from the author of a great epic is a question that will never be agreed upon; but upon the whole it would appear from the book before us that the only sure advance in Virgilian criticism must lie along 'aesthetic' rather than 'analytical' lines; in other words, it must insist rather on starting from the essential unity of design in the *Aeneid* than on emphasising inconsistencies of detail which, however alluring the clues they provide to those determined to explore the labyrinth of a poet's workshop, do little to impair the breadth and singleness of the whole masterpiece.

L. W. HUNTER.

*New College, Oxford.*