



Widmer, Matthias (2017) *Virgil after Dryden: Eighteenth-century English translations of the Aeneid*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/8109/>

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten:Theses
<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/>
theses@gl.a.ac.uk

Virgil after Dryden: Eighteenth-Century English Translations of the *Aeneid*

Matthias Widmer

Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

School of Critical Studies
College of Arts
University of Glasgow

September 2016

©Matthias Widmer, 2016

Abstract

John Dryden's 1697 translation of Virgil's *Aeneid* is often seen as the pinnacle of an English tradition that read the Roman poet in primarily political terms and sought to relate his epic to contemporary matters of state. The present thesis takes a different approach by examining Dryden's influence on his eighteenth-century successors to determine, on the one hand, what they hoped to accomplish by retranslating the same original and, on the other hand, why none of them was able to match his success. Dryden's impact as a stylistic (rather than an ideological) model was balanced not only against a newly emphasised ideal of literalism but also against a whole range of other creative forces that posed at least an implicit challenge to his cultural dominance. Chapter 1 demonstrates Dryden's systematic refinement of the couplet form he inherited from his predecessors and draws on his theoretical writings to suggest how it can be seen as a key aspect of his particular approach to Virgil. Chapter 2 discusses Joseph Trapp's blank verse *Aeneid* and its debt to Dryden's couplet version; I will show that the translator's borrowings from the precursor text run directly counter to his declared ambitions to remain faithful to Virgil. Chapter 3 focusses on Christopher Pitt, the Virgil translator who came closest to paralleling Dryden's popular acclaim; encouraged by fellow men of letters, Pitt published his translation in gradually revised instalments that reflect Dryden's growing influence over time. Alexander Strahan, the subject of Chapter 4, aligned himself with a parallel tradition of Miltonic renderings by absorbing numerous expressions from *Paradise Lost* into his blank verse translation of the *Aeneid* and frequently used them to foreground thematic connections between the two epics; however, his revisions, too, show him moving closer to Dryden as time went by. James Beresford, discussed in Chapter 5, stands out among the other Miltonic translators by virtue of giving his borrowings in quotation marks – a practice that will be illuminated in connection with the multidisciplinary work of the artist Henry Fuseli and the equally Miltonic Homer translation that William Cowper composed under the latter's supervision. Chapter 6, finally, offers an analysis of William Wordsworth's failed attempt at translating the *Aeneid*. Given that he was one of the key reformers of English poetry, Wordsworth's return to the traditional couplet form at a later stage in his career is surprising, as is the fact that his style became more Drydenian the further he proceeded.

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
1. Dryden and the Couplet Tradition.....	22
2. ‘An Undertaking of Another Kind’: Joseph Trapp	51
3. ‘Scarce Any Thing Even of Emulation’: Christopher Pitt	86
4. ‘The Only True Method of Succeeding’: Alexander Strahan	108
5. James Beresford, Henry Fuseli, and William Cowper	142
6. Wordsworth’s Fragmentary <i>Aeneid</i>	161
Conclusion	193
Bibliography.....	195

Acknowledgments

I owe a great debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Stuart Gillespie, who encouraged me to pursue a PhD and continued to have faith in my abilities even at times when I doubted myself; without his expert advice and patience, this project could not have been completed. Equally important was the help of my co-supervisor, Dr Katherine Heavey, who has always lent me a sympathetic ear and deserves special thanks for proofreading my entire thesis. In addition, I was fortunate enough to benefit from the extensive knowledge of Dr Donald Mackenzie, who took the time to guide me through the first steps of the research process before his retirement. Prof. Nigel Leask and Dr David Shuttleton also provided some much-appreciated feedback at different points along the way, and the quality of the final product was further improved by the helpful comments and suggestions I received from my examiners, Prof. David Hopkins and Dr Matthew Sangster. Last but not least, I would like to thank my parents, Fritz and Christine, for their loving support over all these years.

Introduction

John Dryden's *Aeneis* is arguably the pinnacle of English Virgil translation. Published in 1697, it formed part of the complete *Works of Virgil*, a project that Pope praised as 'the most noble and spirited Translation I know in any Language', and Sir Walter Scott was still singing its praises a hundred years later: 'of all the classical translations we can boast, none is so acceptable to the class of readers, to whom the learned languages are a clasped book and a sealed fountain'.¹ Even today, a critic like Colin Burrow feels confident in recommending Dryden's Virgil out of the many available versions from which an Anglophone audience may choose: 'his is the only English translation to take fire from the delicious friction between the translator's concerns and those of his original.'² Commentators who have asked how the translation fits into the succession of English *Aeneids* have tended to look exclusively, even teleologically, at Dryden's predecessors,³ whereas his reception by subsequent translators continues to be somewhat neglected. The present study sets out to remedy this situation through a detailed analysis of five English translations that emerged during the course of the eighteenth century.

Politics vs. Poetics

To understand Dryden's influence on those who followed him in translating Virgil's epic, we must consider the possibility that they responded to his work in ways that differ from our own. Modern scholars like to emphasise the political and ideological dimension of the *Aeneis*, which lies in its capacity to highlight parallels and differences between the respective circumstances of author and translator as the latter may have seen them. Since each poet had lived through a period of civil unrest that profoundly shaped his country's sense of nationhood, the subject of Aeneas's divinely ordained but arduous journey to Italy and the bloody foundation of Rome had a certain topicality for both of them; to the extent that it provided the two men with a mythical analogue of their own situation, the concerns reflected in the Latin poem remained equally prevalent in the novel climate of the target culture. According to William Frost, the editor of Dryden's *Works of Virgil*, 'it was probably

¹ Alexander Pope, *The Iliad of Homer*, 6 vols (London, 1715-20), I, sig. F2^v; Sir Walter Scott, ed., *The Works of John Dryden*, 2nd edn, 18 vols (Edinburgh, 1821), I, 520.

² Colin Burrow, 'Virgil in English Translation', in *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. by Charles Martindale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 21-37 (p. 36). Further references are given after quotations in the text.

³ A good example of this tendency to which I will return in Chapter 1 is Leslie Proudfoot, *Dryden's 'Aeneid' and Its Seventeenth Century Predecessors* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1960).

inevitable that his Virgil [...] would be read not simply as the restatement, or representation, of ancient materials, but also as a comment on current events and recent time'.⁴

To be sure, Dryden himself encourages such a reading with the particular account of Roman history that he offers in the Dedication of the *Æneis*, which attempts to contextualise the epic as both an endorsement and an indirect admonition of the emperor Augustus. In his summary, the political turmoil leading up to the moment of composition appears to recall England's immediate past and thus seemingly allows the translator to identify with Virgil:

Such was the Reformation of the Government by both Parties. The Senate and the Commons were the two Bases on which it stood; and the two Champions of either Faction, each destroy'd the Foundations of the other side: So the Fabrique of consequence must fall betwixt them: And Tyranny must be built upon their Ruines. This comes of altering Fundamental Laws and Constitutions[.] [...] Thus the Roman People were grosly gull'd twice or thrice over and as often enslav'd in one Century, and under the same pretence of Reformation. (*Works*, v, 279-80)

As Steven Zwicker observes of this passage, 'Dryden takes Roman history as his subject, but the language argues the Jacobite reading of the Glorious Revolution'.⁵ He believes that the references to English politics would have been impossible to miss, for 'The subversion of government under the pretense of reform, the use of arms under the guise of public consent, [and] the tyranny consequent on altering fundamental laws and constitutions' were all prominent talking points of the late seventeenth century (p. 182).

The analogy could go only so far, however. Dryden may be projecting his personal sentiments onto the Roman poet when he asserts that the latter 'was still of Republican principles in his Heart' (*Works*, v, 280), but, on the other hand, his portrayal of Virgil also serves as a reminder that his own position as a Catholic Tory during the 1690s was rather more precarious than that of his author, who 'held his Paternal Estate from the Bounty of the Conqueror, by whom he was likewise enrich'd, esteem'd and cherish'd' (*Works*, v, 281). Such patronage contrasts with Dryden's fall from grace after the Glorious Revolu-

⁴ John Dryden, *The Works of John Dryden*, 20 vols (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956-2000), v-vi: *The Works of Virgil in English*, ed. by William Frost (1987), p. 871. Unless otherwise stated, all further references are to this edition (hereafter *Works*).

⁵ Steven N. Zwicker, *Politics and Language in Dryden's Poetry: The Arts of Disguise* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984), p. 66. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

tion, which saw him lose the posts of Poet Laureate and Historiographer Royal, and while the *Aeneid* is said to reflect Virgil's reluctant acceptance of the new regime under Augustus, the translator, Frost observes, stubbornly refused to dedicate his version of the epic to William III (*Works*, VI, 876). A 'Postscript to the Reader' makes the point explicit: 'What Virgil wrote in the vigour of his Age, in Plenty and at Ease, I have undertaken to Translate in my Declining Years: struggling with Wants, oppress'd with Sickness, curb'd in my Genius, lyable to be misconstrued in all I write' (*Works*, VI, 807).

Alluding to the current state of English affairs, Dryden draws comparisons with Trojan as well as with Roman history. He construes Aeneas as an example designed to instruct Augustus on the dangerously unstable nature of elective kingship and thereby raises doubts about the legitimacy of William's rule:

Aeneas cou'd not pretend to be *Priam's* Heir in a Lineal Succession: [...] *Aeneas* had only Married *Creusa*, *Priam's* Daughter, and by her could have no Title, while any of the Male Issue were remaining. In this case, the Poet gave him the next Title, which is, that of an elective King. The remaining *Trojans* chose him to lead them forth, and settle them in some Foreign Country. [...] Our Poet, who all this while had *Augustus* in his Eye, had no desire he should seem to succeed by any right of Inheritance, deriv'd from *Julius Caesar*; such a Title being but one degree remov'd from Conquest. For what was introduc'd by force, by force may be remov'd. (*Works*, V, 283-84)

Again, 'The language in which Dryden casts Virgil's deliberation over the character of Aeneas's sovereignty and the nature of Caesar's role is strikingly appropriate to the debate over the revolutionary settlement' (Zwicker, p. 186). William's supporters were eager to dispel the idea that he had gained his title through conquest or election rather than through lineal descent, but any attempt to establish the Dutchman as their rightful king by inheritance was bound to be met with opposition as long as there was hope that James II might eventually return from exile. Dryden hints at this reality when he touches upon Aeneas's relationship with Latinus, the paragon of royal virtue:

He is describ'd a just and a gracious Prince; solicitous for the Welfare of his People; always Consulting with his Senate to promote the common Good. We find him at the head of them, when he enters into the Council-Hall: Speaking first, but still demanding their Advice, and steering by it as far as the Iniquity of the Times wou'd suffer him. And this is the proper Character of a King by Inheritance, who is born a Father of his Country. *Aeneas*, tho' he Married the Heiress of the Crown, yet claim'd no Title to it during the Life of his Father-in-Law. (*Works*, V, 284)

The contrast between Aeneas and William is unmistakable, for the latter seized power while his father-in-law was still alive.

Nor is the translation itself short of political resonances. We need look no further than Dryden's rendering of Virgil's opening sentence:

Arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris
 Italiam fato profugus Laviniaque venit
 litora – multum ille et terris iactatus et alto
 vi superum, saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram,
 multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem
 inferretque deos Latio; genus unde Latinum
 Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae.⁶

Arms, and the Man I sing, who forc'd by Fate,
 And haughty *Juno*'s unrelenting Hate,
 Expell'd and exil'd, left the *Trojan* Shoar:
 Long Labours, both by Sea and Land he bore,
 And in the doubtful War, before he won
 The *Latian* Realm, and built the destined Town:
 His banish'd Gods restor'd to Rites Divine,
 And setl'd sure Succession in his Line:
 From whence the Race of *Alban* Fathers come,
 And the long Glories of Majestick *Rome*.
 (*Works*, v, 343, l. 1-10)

Paul Hammond notes that 'Line 8 is entirely Dryden's addition, suggesting an allusion to the displacement of James II and his line from the English throne, and inviting us to imagine that displacement undone'.⁷ Likewise, the translator's version of Tartarus in Book VI features an interpolated reference to those 'who Brothers better Claim disown, | Expel their Parents, and usurp the Throne' (*Works*, v, 556, VI. 824-25) – aimed at condemning Queen Mary for the betrayal of her father and his infant son – and the same passage evokes William by means of the un-Virgilian adjective 'foreign' in the description of those who 'To Tyrants [...] have their Country sold, | Imposing Foreign Lords, for Foreign Gold' (*Works*, v, 556, VI. 845-46). Along with the argument of the Dedication, examples of this type lend

⁶ Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid, Appendix Vergiliana*, with an English translation by H. Rushton Fairclough, rev. by G. P. Goold, 2 vols, The Loeb Classical Library, 63-64 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999-2000), I, 262, l. 1-7. Since no single text of Virgil could represent what every eighteenth-century translator used, I have decided to follow the text and line numbering of the Loeb edition throughout. However, my quotations have been checked against Carolus Ruæus (Charles de la Rue), *Publii Virgilii Maronis Opera*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1687) – a standard edition that would have been available to all of the translators discussed in this study; except where stated, there are no significant differences from the modern Latin text.

⁷ Paul Hammond, *Dryden and the Traces of Classical Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 232.

credibility to the theory that Dryden intended his *Aeneis* as a prolonged reflection on contemporary matters of state.

Important though these observations may be for our understanding of the translator's motivation, they do little to explain the longevity of his Virgil. In fact, a rendering so deeply entrenched in the constitutional crises of its time could reasonably be expected to become obsolete as soon as the English political climate had changed or stabilised itself. Nevertheless, critics seem to have developed a particular interest in – if not an outright preference for – translations of the *Aeneid* that emerged from circumstances analogous to Dryden's and used the source text for the advancement of similar ideological agendas. Burrow notes that 'Virgil tends to be adopted into English by poets who need the consolation of his authority or the sustaining dream of his imperial vision' (p. 21) and that 'The act of translating Virgil gives English writers the sense of writing an empire even if they could not themselves participate in one' (p. 23); in his view, the personal experience of hardship is a prerequisite for a successful rendering of the Roman poet, Dryden being the last in a series of non-establishment translators:

Virgil's translators need adversity to alert them to the painful worth of a Virgilian prophetic future, and to the complexities of the *Aeneid*'s embedded politics; and Dryden's Virgil is the greatest offspring of the line of resistant Virgils composed by displaced writers. (p. 28)

With regard to the eighteenth century, however, Burrow notices a trend towards 'disentangling Virgil from the political and spiritual battles of the translator's own times'; versions of the *Aeneid* produced after 1700 lack the sense of urgency he admires in earlier renderings and thus cannot help but appear inferior: 'The Virgil who could voice the dislocation of an embattled royalist, or who could speak like a friend to an expropriated Catholic, died, and in his place came the Virgil of dons, parsons, and schoolmasters' (p. 31).

More recently, Tanya Caldwell has located Dryden's translation at the heart of a general process by which poets' feeling for the historic, civic, and moral function of ancient literature gave way to predominantly aesthetic concerns. The decreasing applicability of classical ideals to present-day realities, Caldwell argues, resulted in new forms of writing that undermined the traditional hierarchy of genres and placed modern voices on equal footing with those of the past. While she seems to agree with Burrow that, 'Ostensibly, [...] Virgilian Augustanism was [...] a cultural constant that helped English writers and

audiences to endure [...] the blows of history’, she also perceives a ‘deep-seated scepticism working against this neoclassicism, probably even before the 1650s, but certainly from the Interregnum onward’.⁸ At any rate, her findings confirm a definite shift in the Roman poet’s reception around 1700: ‘Where Virgil’s chief attraction to seventeenth-century England lay in the political import of his poetry, particularly the *Aeneid*, his politics were all but ignored in the eighteenth century’ (p. 144). Thus, both critics suggest that the Latin epic began to lose some of its relevance once it could no longer serve as a mirror for current events on the national scene.

Without denying the reprioritisation of aesthetics over politics that characterises English Virgilianism during the long eighteenth century, we have reason to ask whether this development is necessarily tantamount to a ‘decline’ of classical authority. Even with renderings that originated in an earlier period and still adhere to the Augustan tradition, an exclusive focus on Virgil’s ideological utility runs the risk of missing or misrepresenting other factors that were just as instrumental in drawing translators to his work. Although neither Burrow nor Caldwell is guilty of taking such an approach, its limitations can be illustrated through a closer look at one of Dryden’s predecessors, Sir John Denham, whose 1656 *Destruction of Troy: An Essay Upon the Second Book of Virgil’s Æneis* is commonly interpreted as an oblique political statement by a Caroline sympathiser responding to Cromwell’s oppressive Protectorate. The title page of the translation informs readers that it was ‘Written in the year, 1636’; Lawrence Venuti attaches great importance to the temporal gap between composition and publication:

‘Written in 1636’ it functions partly as a nostalgic glance back towards less troubled times for royal hegemony and partly as strategic cultural move in the present, wherein Denham plans to develop a royalist aesthetic in translation to be implemented now and in the future, when hegemony is regained.⁹

However, Venuti’s claim that ‘Denham’s intention to enlist translation in a royalist cultural politics is visible both in his selection of the foreign text and in the discursive strategies he adopted in his version’ (p.41) is qualified by the actual features of the 1636 text. Of course, the fall of Troy and the death of Priamus could readily be turned into allusions to the provisional end of English monarchy and to the decapitation of Charles I, respectively, but

⁸ Tanya M. Caldwell, *Virgil Made English: The Decline of Classical Authority* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 9. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

⁹ Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 36. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

these parallels had only become apparent in retrospect, and Denham reworked his fragment from a much longer translation of *Aeneid* II-IV that is preserved in Lucy Hutchinson's commonplace book; if the later return to Book II was politically motivated, one wonders what inspired Denham to translate almost half of the epic in the first place. Moreover, Venuti seems to be contradicting himself with his suggestion that Denham aimed 'to reformulate the free approach [towards translation] practiced in Caroline aristocratic culture at its height, during the 1620s and 1630s', for what the translator had actually produced during that time shows 'a tendency to follow the Latin word order, in some cases quite closely' (p. 47); again, the characteristics of the text that are deemed most essential and culturally relevant did not manifest themselves until 1656. Venuti thus neglects the initial impulse towards translation by prioritising the final result.

In Dryden's case, no less than in Denham's, a purely political reading would be too reductive. Despite the partisan historiography of the translator's Dedication, there is a critical consensus that the *Aeneis* itself never descends into straightforward allegory. An example I have already cited should suffice to make this clear: when Dryden describes Aeneas's status as that of an elected king, he is implicitly (and unfavourably) comparing him to the usurper William, yet the first sentence of the translation suggests an alternative link with the exiled James, as Virgil's hero is said to have 'setl'd sure Succession in his Line'; as both outcast and invader, the Trojan prince can stand in for either of the two monarchs depending on which perspective one chooses to adopt. Virgil's capacity to function as a mouthpiece for Stuart propaganda was obviously restricted; in contrast to Denham and most other seventeenth-century translators, Dryden met the challenge of rendering his epic in its entirety, and while individual episodes may have lent themselves to an analogical treatment, the sheer length of the source text must have made it difficult to establish a consistent framework of reference that brought the narrative as a whole into correspondence with the political situation in 1690s England. At least on the surface, it seems implausible that Dryden took the trouble to translate several thousand lines merely for the sake of inserting a few topical allusions; if all he wanted was to express his unwavering loyalty to the Jacobite cause, he probably could have found a more economical way to do so.

More importantly, the public anticipation of – and reaction to – Dryden's Virgil indicates that he managed to appeal equally to those who did not share his personal convictions. From a commercial point of view, a thoroughly propagandistic interpretation of the

Aeneid would have been unwise because it might have deterred potential readers; Dryden's opportunism and willingness to look beyond ideological differences is evidenced by his unlikely alliance with the bookseller Jacob Tonson (his diametrical opposite in political terms) and by their joint success in attracting a large number of subscribers from diverse backgrounds. John Barnard calls attention to the unifying effect of the venture:

the *Virgil* spoke to and for a wide variety of constituencies in terms of age, politics, social and professional standing, religion, and gender. [...] Dryden, Tonson, and their subscribers all believed that the translation united the nation in an aesthetic realm which transcended the fractious and unstable actualities of 1697.¹⁰

This feat suggests that Dryden's fame as a translator during the following decades rested on more than an occasional triangulation of English, Roman, and Trojan history; thus, instead of expecting later translations of the *Aeneid* to emulate this particular dimension of his work, we should judge them by the same standards that a contemporary readership would have applied.

Modes and Metaphors of Translation

How did Dryden's 'aesthetic' as a translator (to use Barnard's word) compare with that of his successors? As well as a declining interest in the usefulness of ancient precedents, Caldwell observes a fundamental change from a freer to a more literal way of rendering the classics:

For Dryden and other seventeenth-century theorists, the major task of the translator was to invoke the spirit of the original in updated material. The eighteenth-century tendency to see the Ancients as an exotic "other" resulted in a reversal of this theory: the translator's goal in presenting a work from an alien time, place, and language was to achieve a rendition as close to the original as English would allow. The letter rather than the spirit was to be recreated (p. 154)

If 'serious eighteenth-century efforts to render Virgil English [...] were essentially scholarly' (Caldwell, p. 167) and by concentrating on the 'letter' abandoned the Roman poet's 'spirit', this might help to explain the high standing of Dryden's *Æneis* as the supposedly last 'poetic' translation of the epic by a fellow countryman.

¹⁰ John Barnard, 'Dryden, Tonson, and the Patrons of *The Works of Virgil* (1697)', in *John Dryden: Tercentenary Essays*, ed. by Paul Hammond and David Hopkins (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 174-239 (pp. 200-01).

Indeed, even exceptions to the literalist trend seem to have offered little in the way of stylistic innovation. Caldwell notes that ‘Despite the insistence on faithfulness to the letter [...], the most eminent translators of the period felt compelled to adapt Virgil’s poetry, using Dryden as guide’ (p. 185). An unpublished doctoral thesis by Betty Smith Adams – the only full-length study on the subject of Dryden’s eighteenth-century Virgilian successors – supports this analysis of the poet’s impact:

The persistence of Dryden’s influence for more than a hundred years was largely due to the fact that the most competent poets among his successors shared his principles of poetics and of translation[.] [...] The translators of Vergil neither led nor participated in a revolt against the poetic diction of John Dryden.¹¹

Caldwell and Adams paint a fairly homogenous picture of English Virgil translation in the eighteenth century. Based on their account, it would appear that Dryden’s cultural dominance went completely unchallenged.

Like the emphasis placed on Virgil’s politics, however, these generalisations reflect our modern ideas about the translator’s activity just as much as they describe those of Dryden’s age. Matthew Reynolds points out that theories of translation to this day tend to arrange texts along a one-dimensional scale between polar opposites that are variously labelled ‘faithful’ and ‘free’, ‘formally equivalent’ and ‘dynamically equivalent’, ‘of the letter’ and ‘of the spirit’, ‘overt’ and ‘covert’, or ‘foreignising’ and ‘domesticating’; irrespective of their particular traits, all translations are understood as variants of a single process that encompasses these polarities.¹² Caldwell seems to fall into the same line of thinking when she represents eighteenth-century renderings of Virgil as oscillating between, on the one hand, the pursuit of a literalist policy and, on the other hand, a compulsion to follow Dryden. Reynolds, however, dismisses such binary models as oversimplifications and instead proposes to look at the unique ways in which some translators come to interact with their respective originals:

Translators [...] can find themselves [...] face to face with doubles of themselves, elements in the source which can become metaphors of the imaginative work they are engaged in. Such doubles may supply self-images which translators adopt; or they may

¹¹ Betty Smith Adams, ‘Dryden’s Translation of Vergil and its Eighteenth-Century Successors’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, 1970), p. 143.

¹² Matthew Reynolds, *The Poetry of Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 37. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

harmonize or clash with figures that are already implicit in the translators' own practice. (p. 54)

Reynolds concedes that 'many brilliant poetic translations [...] are not [...] amenable to being read in th[is] way' (p. 54). Nevertheless, his individualist approach is promising because it allows for the possibility that abstract categories such as 'literal' and 'free' may each comprise a number of different responses elicited by the same work. Even in the absence of any clearly discernible 'doubles' in the source text, translators cannot simply be assigned to one of two camps, and superficial similarities in their practice must not blind us to the subtle nuances that set them apart. If Dryden's successors turned to him for guidance, we should want to know exactly when, why, and how this happened; conversely, if some of them strove to be more faithful to Virgil's letter, their stated goal need not imply an identical outcome in each case.

Still, the fact that English versions of the *Aeneid* overall continued to rely on Dryden remains significant in view of the poet's frequently noted use of his own predecessors, for such a methodological alignment not only bridges the alleged gulf between seventeenth- and eighteenth-century attitudes towards translation, but it also raises larger questions about the dynamics of tradition and intertextuality. Offering an argument similar to Reynolds's but with a special focus on Augustan culture, Paul Davis sets out to explore the 'relationship between English poets and translation itself as a distinctive mode of imaginative conduct'.¹³ In order to separate translators' rapport with their originals from the many related types of intertextual engagement that were flourishing at the time, Davis does not apply a rigid theoretical definition but rather refers to 'what they saw themselves as doing in particular cases' (p. 6). While he, too, centres his discussion around conceptual metaphors for the translation process, however, he 'extend[s] the sense of "metaphor" to cover the various forms of association, whether assimilative or contrastive, which the subjects of [his] case studies discerned between translation and other poetic modes' (p. 12), which suggests that a completely isolated treatment may not be possible, after all.

Dryden's *Aeneis* is often seen as something of a compensatory effort; his Dedication, thinks James Anderson Winn, betrays the poet's 'disappointment in his own failure to

¹³ Paul Davis, *Translation and the Poet's Life: The Ethics of Translating in English Culture, 1646-1726* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 3. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

write an original epic, and his pride in having translated one'.¹⁴ As we shall see in Chapter 1, no small part of this crowning achievement in Dryden's career is owing to his unprecedented awareness of literary history and to his consultation and effective absorption of earlier renderings; for those who succeeded him and accepted his view, the unilateral correspondence with the source text could likewise open up into a set of multiple connections with intervening works – both original and translated – that had been spawned by it in the past and belonged to the same overarching tradition. To the extent that Virgil translation became a substitute for genuine heroic poetry, it could contribute to the evolution of that genre and potentially share in the prestige enjoyed by the most eminent representatives of the preceding centuries. Thus, the afterlife of Dryden's *Aeneis* has a direct bearing on the place of epic in English literature.

Influence, Rivalry, and Retranslation

When talking about the multifaceted phenomena of authorial transmission and indebtedness, some critics resort to the use of metaphorical language in their turn. Of particular interest for our purposes is the seminal theory proposed by Harold Bloom, who describes poets' relationship with their precursors in terms of Oedipal resistance and conceptualises influence as a source of anxiety rather than of inspiration:

Poetic Influence – when it involves two strong, authentic poets, – always proceeds by a misreading of the prior poet, an act of creative correction that is actually and necessarily a misinterpretation. The history of fruitful poetic influence, which is to say the main tradition of Western poetry since the Renaissance, is a history of anxiety and self-saving caricature, of distortion, of perverse, willful revisionism without which modern poetry as such could not exist.¹⁵

The validity and universal applicability of this model has rightly been called into question.¹⁶ Dryden and his contemporaries, to be sure, deliberately looked to the examples of ancient Greece and Rome in order to fuel their creativity. Nor does it seem as if Bloom is speaking with translation on his mind when he specifies that the anxiety of influence 'in-

¹⁴ James Anderson Winn, *John Dryden and his World* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987), p.486.

¹⁵ Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, 2nd edn (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 30.

¹⁶ See, for example, Earl Miner, 'Introduction: Borrowed Plumage, Varied Umbrage', in *Literary Transmission and Authority: Dryden and Other Writers*, ed. by Earl Miner and Jennifer Brady (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 1-26 (p. 7); Philip Hardie, *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*, Roman Literature and its Contexts (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 116-19.

volves two strong, authentic poets'; presumably, he is concerned with original composition. On the other hand, one can see how a similarly agonistic 'misreading' might provide the impetus for a poet's decision to translate a work that has been rendered before, and how the ensuing struggle with his translator-predecessor(s) might, in fact, be all the more acute because of their shared responsibility to the author of the source text. Perhaps no two creative works are as commensurable as two renderings of a poem into the same target language. Such instances of retranslation may entail 'corrections' in the very concrete and obvious sense of moving closer to the letter and/or spirit of the original; even if the issue of fidelity is left out of the equation, the source text remains a common reference point that invites comparisons not only with every subsequent rendering but also between those renderings themselves. As a result, we are always tempted to argue that one translation is objectively 'better' than – rather than just different from – another, and translators, much more so than regular authors, appear to face a constant danger of being overshadowed or displaced. From a Bloomian perspective, retranslation gains a distinctly competitive dimension.

This way of looking at the matter may help us resolve a fundamental paradox of Virgilian translation in eighteenth-century England. If, as Frost suggests, 'For the generation of Pope (born 1688) and Richardson (born 1689), it is hardly too much to say that [...] Dryden's *Virgil was Virgil*',¹⁷ then it would seem to follow that later attempts at translating the Roman poet could claim to do him justice only in so far as they managed to incorporate Dryden; since the ultimate and most ideal retranslation would, in theory, simply reproduce the latter's text, however, it is surprising that any serious attempt should have been made at all. Caldwell's assertion that the supposed decline of classical authority created a demand for greater literalness and heavily annotated editions implies that there was only a finite amount of complementary work left to be done once 'the accomplishment of the translator – the native English writer – ha[d] eclipsed that of the ancient' (p. 141), and these tasks, she would have us believe, fell into the purview of scholars rather than poets. However, her narrative is at odds with reality, for instead of deterring future translators, Dryden's *Virgil* appears to have encouraged a considerable number of further renderings, and new versions of the *Aeneid*, in particular, began to proliferate in the early decades of

¹⁷ William Frost, *John Dryden: Dramatist, Satirist, Translator*, AMS Studies in the Seventeenth Century, 3 (New York: AMS Press, 1988), p. 142.

the century.¹⁸ This was part of a wider phenomenon: statistical analysis of contemporary translation activity suggests that, after an initial heyday in the Renaissance, the beginning of the period between 1660 and 1790 can be regarded as an ‘era of “second” translation’¹⁹ during which many of the major classical authors were rendered afresh or in other cases translated for the first time; in a next phase, these efforts, too, were then followed by even more renderings of the same originals. The actual numbers thus contradict Caldwell’s thesis that Dryden’s success as a translator correlated with a ‘gradual alienation of the classics’ (p. 138). It seems unlikely that the vast output of publications was generated solely by a desire to produce ever more literal versions of the works in question, and their simultaneous currency is difficult to reconcile with the idea that any particular translation should have been considered definitive for very long. Retranslations of the *Aeneid* must have posed at least an implicit challenge to Dryden’s status as the leading voice of English Virgilianism. Their conformity to his celebrated *Æneis*, where it occurred, may be more than a sign of unequivocal reverence; it may also reflect the suppression of a contrary impulse to deviate from the established model, and such deviation is itself indicative of other external forces that were likewise operating on the texts. In what follows, I hope to demonstrate that, underneath their façade of conservatism, eighteenth-century translations of Virgil provided an exceptionally fertile ground for the interplay of competing poetic influences; as vehicles for experimentation, these successors of Dryden’s *Æneis* contain a range of creative energies that undermined his authority to a greater or lesser degree even though none of them was able to permanently displace him.

The five translators selected for this study – Joseph Trapp, Christopher Pitt, Alexander Strahan, James Beresford, and William Wordsworth²⁰ – all exemplify the mechanisms of influence and intertextuality in one or several ways, and each of their respective translations will be the subject of an individual chapter. In some cases, Dryden’s succes-

¹⁸ For an extensive list of these publications, see Stuart Gillespie, ‘Translations from Greek and Latin Classics, Part 2: 1701–1800: A Revised Bibliography’, *Translation and Literature*, 18 (2009), 181–224 (pp. 220–23).

¹⁹ Stuart Gillespie, ‘The Developing Corpus of Literary Translation’, in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), III: 1660–1790, ed. by Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins, pp. 123–46 (p. 130).

²⁰ In choosing my examples, I have decided to focus on writers who, like Dryden, translated Virgil’s epic in its entirety (with the exception of Wordsworth, whose fragmentary translation constitutes a particularly strong and direct response to Dryden’s). However, the present discussion by no means covers all of the complete English versions of the *Aeneid* published between the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth; a number of texts that fall into this category – such as the translations by Robert Andrews, in blank verse (1766), and Charles Symmons, in heroic couplets (1817) – have been omitted from consideration either because they were less easily accessible, or because they would not lend themselves to the kind of intertextual analysis that is undertaken here.

sors openly pitted their versions of the *Aeneid* against his and formulated specific plans to surpass him, which means we can see how well they managed to escape his impact simply by holding them to their own standards. Even when a translator had no explicit quarrel with the precursor text, however, it is sometimes possible to infer a struggle for innovation from the peculiar circumstances under which he published his own rendering, as it was not uncommon for translations to appear in increments and to undergo multiple revisions before adopting their final shape. The feedback that preliminary trial segments received from the translators' immediate circle of friends, moreover, reveals an important social component of the translation process, for it could inform their further development and guide them into new directions. Most of the evidence I have compiled takes the form of verbal parallels between two or more texts; these borrowings are arguably more primitive examples of influence than those discussed by Bloom, but, on the other hand, they allow us to pinpoint with absolute precision when a translator was consulting or remembering Dryden and when he found his inspiration elsewhere.

The evolution of English Virgil translation after Dryden is closely tied to the growing stature of another major literary figure: Milton. As a champion of blank verse, he reinvigorated a parallel tradition to Dryden's heroic couplet and thus offered a handy alternative for those who wished to distance themselves from the esteemed translator. Three of our five Virgilians belong into this group, and while all of them accepted blank verse with enthusiasm, the results of their respective endeavours show varying degrees of indebtedness; by analysing these three cases in chronological order, I will not simply retell the old story of Milton's increasing influence on English versification in general but rather highlight his specific relation to the Roman master as it came to be perceived by scholars and translators. Likewise, the sequence in which our sample texts appeared suggests that the movement from couplet to blank verse was not as linear as it might seem. To properly assess the characteristics of each form and their effects on translators' practice, I will first revisit Dryden's engagement with the seventeenth-century tradition before moving on to his eighteenth-century successors.

Accordingly, Chapter 1 establishes Dryden's integrative use of his predecessors as a key function of his particular approach to Virgil. The translator's achievement at the end of his career should not be seen as an isolated effort but rather as a continuation of his earlier involvement in Tonson's miscellanies. Based on the critical essays that he published

before 1697, we can adopt a perspective that closes the conceptual gap between renderings of classical texts and other, supposedly more creative forms of writing; translation in the Drydenian sense thus appears as an inclusive category that comes close to being coextensive with literary tradition itself. At least part of the singular difficulties that the translator experienced in rendering the *Aeneid* seem to be a result of his adherence to the closed heroic couplet form he inherited from John Denham, Edmund Waller, and others who had undertaken the same task in the past. However, a focus on verbal parallels with these preceding versions can easily distract from any advancements in the way the medium is being deployed. I will demonstrate that Dryden consistently refined the materials he appropriated and that he thereby helped to develop the characteristic features of the heroic couplet, setting a new standard for future practitioners of the form. This aspect of the translation process will give us an idea of what to look for in Dryden's successors, whose renderings may feature similar intertextual links.

Chapter 2 examines Joseph Trapp's blank verse *Aeneid* and its debt to Dryden's couplet version. Not only does the translator's preface echo and build upon thoughts that his predecessor had expressed in the Dedication of his own rendering, but the translation itself features a striking number of lexical elements that also appear in the corresponding passages of Dryden's *Aeneis* and often occupy the same metrical position. As we shall see, this derivativeness runs directly counter to Trapp's declared ambition to attain a greater degree of literalism. Moreover, it suggests the limited use he made of the verse form that Milton had employed with such dexterity; in so far as many of his borrowings from Dryden occur right before or after a line break, Trapp seems to work under the constraints of a couplet translator fixated on writing self-contained pentameter units and, as a result, misses the potential for these individual units to be organised into a harmonious superstructure. Even if he helped to pave the way for an alternative treatment of Virgil in translation, he was only partially successful in dissociating himself from his precursor.

Chapter 3 focusses on Christopher Pitt, the Virgil translator who came closest to paralleling Dryden's popular acclaim. Considering their historical and formal proximity (Pitt, too, was writing in heroic couplets), we are justified in wondering how he hoped to improve upon his illustrious predecessor and to what extent he managed to reach his goal. Evidently, the enterprise would not have come to fruition without the support of prominent literati such as William Benson, Joseph Spence, and, most importantly, Alexander Pope;

having read what started out as an experimental rendering of *Aeneid* I, these men encouraged Pitt to translate the rest of the epic. The resulting text reflects a steadily growing discourse about English versification, drawing on the latest critical appraisals of Virgil's artistry and implementing some of the newly codified rules of how it should be emulated in a native idiom. Nevertheless, Dryden's influence was inescapable and even seems to have gained strength over time. The gradual appearance of Pitt's *Aeneid* in print allows us to distinguish several compositional stages and thus makes it possible to observe his progress as a translator, for he kept going back to the already published parts of his work in order to revise them. Contrary to what one would expect, however, the first instalment of the text – some three hundred lines that were included in a miscellany and have not yet received any scholarly attention – diverges significantly further from Dryden's *Æneis* than all the later versions, suggesting an initial degree of autonomy that was sacrificed in the attempt to surpass the most eminent poet of the previous generation.

The subject of Chapter 4 is Alexander Strahan, whose life-long veneration of Milton constitutes a driving force behind his decision to render the *Aeneid* into blank verse. We shall find that Strahan's translation abounds in Miltonic phraseology, as he absorbed numerous expressions from *Paradise Lost* and frequently used them to foreground thematic connections between the two epics. Of particular interest in this regard are borrowed phrases that serve to translate specific points in Virgil to which Milton himself had been alluding. While the translator's diction thus reinforced the broader cultural association between the two poets, however, he seems less interested in emulating the nuances of Milton's prosody. As was the case with Pitt's translation, moreover, the incremental publication and simultaneous revision of the text indicates that it was moving in the direction of Dryden, approximating not only the formal regularity of the latter's couplets but also his choice of words.

James Beresford's blank verse translation, discussed in Chapter 5, stands out among the other Miltonic Virgils by virtue of its typography. While the translator follows Strahan in borrowing phrases from *Paradise Lost* and inserting them into the framework of his text, he gives them in quotation marks and thus makes his indebtedness explicit. On the one hand, this transparency can be seen as a solution to the problem of how to reconcile Milton's influence with the conflicting ideal of literalness, as the visual aid enables readers to identify those parts of the translation that have little or no basis in the Latin original it-

self but rather serve to pay homage to the English poet. On the other hand, the resulting fissures in the surface of the text create an effect not unlike that of the deliberately exaggerated features that contemporary artists such as Henry Fuseli displayed in their paintings. A polyglot as well as a painter, Fuseli also happened to be involved in revising William Cowper's translation of Homer, which in turn provided the inspiration for Beresford's Virgil; the connection between the three men will give us an opportunity to explore the metaphorical interchangeability of their respective disciplines, especially because Fuseli's Burkean aesthetic seemed to directly call for quotations from Milton to enrich the subjects of classical poetry.

Chapter 6 offers an analysis of William Wordsworth's approach to translating the *Aeneid*. This little-known project did not proceed beyond Book III of Virgil's epic and mostly survives in manuscript; only a small portion was published during the translator's lifetime. Given that he was one of the key reformers of English poetry, Wordsworth's return to the traditional couplet form at a later stage in his career presents a fascinating conundrum; despite his outspoken opposition to Dryden and Pope, he apparently could not help but follow in their footsteps when it came to rendering an ancient epic. Once again, extensive revisions of the text bear witness to a multiplicity of creative forces that needed to be balanced against each other, but while it has been noticed that Wordsworth, too, became more Drydenian the farther he advanced with his translation, he owes an equally large debt to the blank verse tradition represented by Trapp, and his selective acknowledgement of these influences may give us an idea of the particular self-image he was trying to cultivate. As we shall see, the peculiar conservatism – and ultimate failure – of Wordsworth's *Aeneid* is partly due to the criticism he received from Samuel Taylor Coleridge, who cared little for his friend's supposed innovations and steadily brought him closer to the model he was trying to overcome.

1. Dryden and the Couplet Tradition

While Dryden's *Aeneis* enjoyed wide popularity in its own time, modern scholarship has long been somewhat sceptical of the poet's achievement and tends to see it as a means of compensating for higher literary ambitions that had to remain unfulfilled. Mark Van Doren, who initiated the reappraisal of Dryden at the beginning of the last century, doubts that he would have been able to compose an original epic: 'much as Dryden revered the institution of the heroic poem, he had not the power to illuminate and interpret heroic motives. [...] Dryden's narrative sphere [...] was the sphere of the episode or the tale.'¹ Writing several decades later, Judith Sloman concurs with this view: 'Dryden said much about his desire to write an epic [...]; yet he deflected that impulse into [...] translation.'² Sloman, too, thinks that Dryden primarily excels at translating shorter poems and stories, whose arrangement in supposedly integrated collections resists the finality of heroic poetry (p. 54); consequently, the poet fails to provide a consistent and unified perspective when he is faced with the challenge of translating the *Aeneid*: 'Dryden seems to fragment the poem, allowing separate sections to elicit whatever response seems appropriate for that section' (p. 131).

Indeed, the tone of Dryden's Dedication seems to invite such a critical view. In contrast to the self-assurance with which he presented earlier renderings, here the translator admits that his latest project caused him a great deal of trouble: 'tis one thing to take pains on a Fragment, and Translate it perfectly; and another thing to have the weight of a whole Author on my shoulders' (*Works*, v, 325-26). Since he 'found the difficulty of Translation growing [...] in every succeeding Book' of the *Aeneid* (*Works*, v, 333), Dryden has come to describe his relationship to Virgil as one of servitude:

We [translators] are bound to our Author's Sense[.] [...] Slaves we are; and labour on another Man's Plantation; we dress the Vine-yard, but the Wine is the Owners: If the Soil be sometimes Barren, then we are sure of being scourg'd: If it be fruitful, and our Care succeeds, we are not thank'd; for the proud Reader will only say, the poor drudge has done his duty. But this is nothing to what follows; for being oblig'd to make his Sense intelligible, we are forc'd to untune our own Verses, that we may give his meaning to the Reader. He who Invents is Master of his Thoughts and Words: He can turn and vary them as he pleases, 'till he renders them harmonious. But the wretched Translator has no such privilege: For being ty'd to the Thoughts, he must make what

¹ Mark Van Doren, *The Poetry of John Dryden* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920), p. 261.

² Judith Sloman, *Dryden: The Poetics of Translation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), p. 6. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

Musick he can in the Expression. And for this reason it cannot always be so sweet as that of the Original. (*Works*, v, 334)

Statements of this kind are likely to predispose readers towards suspicions about both the quality of Dryden's *Virgil* and the value of translations in general.³

However, it is possible to re-evaluate the Dedication of the *Æneis* by situating it more firmly in the context of the larger imaginative outlook that Dryden had developed over the years. As the foremost poet of his age, he was also a pioneer in literary criticism, and his translations, in particular, are prefixed with detailed methodological reflections on his practice. While these introductory essays may not amount to a perfectly coherent body of theory, they do hold a key to assessing the precise nature of his crowning achievement, which goes far beyond our commonplace understanding of the process by which a single text is usually rendered from one language into another. For Dryden and his contemporaries, translation and original composition were not separate disciplines but rather overlapping modes of interaction with the literature of the past. As I will show, this loose conceptualisation informs all of the prefatory writings that accompany his poetic translations before 1697, and despite maintaining a semblance of terminological consistency, he strategically exploits it in order to emphasise, on the one hand, the creative aspect of his own productivity and, on the other, the derivative components of the originals themselves; read in conjunction, the individual pieces come close to equating translation with literary tradition as a whole. Since Dryden's idea of tradition is one of perpetual growth and improvement, it qualifies the feelings of inferiority and secondariness that afflict the translator of *Virgil*. Suggesting a collaborative exchange with contemporaries as well as with the poets of previous generations, his critical discourse not only transcends the binary outlook of most theoretical models but also offers a powerful metaphor for the activities in which he has been shown to engage; most importantly, it may serve to account for his heavy indebtedness to earlier English translations, a feature that is prone to make modern readers feel uncomfortable and somewhat less appreciative of the *Æneis*. I would argue that Dryden's copious borrowings from these texts are not an instance of opportunistic plagiarism but rather an integral part both of his specific approach to *Virgil* and of his broader programmatic goal to refine the poetry of his nation. As such, they naturally lead us to a discussion of the formal criterion that links Dryden to his predecessors and defines the tradition with

³ The implications of the slavery image are discussed at great length in Paul Davis, *Translation and the Poet's Life: The Ethics of Translating in English Culture, 1646-1726* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 152-88. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

which future translators had to engage: the decision, that is, to write in closed heroic couplets.

At the beginning of his career as a translator, Dryden wrote a Preface to *Ovid's Epistles* (1680) – a version of the *Heroides* by several hands – in which he famously introduces a typology of translational methods:

All Translation I suppose may be reduced to these three heads: First, that of Metaphrase, or turning an Authour word by word, and Line by Line, from one Language into another. [...] The second way is that of Paraphrase, or Translation with Latitude, where the Authour is kept in view by the Translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly follow'd as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not alter'd. [...] The third way is that of Imitation, where the Translator (if now he has not lost that Name) assumes the liberty not only to vary from the words and sence, but to forsake them both as he sees occasion: and taking only some general hints from the Original, to run division on the ground-work, as he pleases.⁴

This differentiation between various degrees of literalness and freedom is arguably Dryden's most important contribution to English translation theory; in fact, he partly derives his categories from preceding discussions by Sir John Denham and Abraham Cowley. Although Dryden himself chooses the middle path of paraphrase, it is the third head, 'imitation', that becomes the main focus of the Preface and thus commands our attention. Historically, the various connotations of this word have allowed it to be used in a number of different contexts; the specific sense in which it is applied here – 'a method of translating looser than paraphrase, in which modern examples and illustrations are used for ancient, or domestick for foreign' (*OED* 3) – does indeed seem to have originated with Cowley, whose *Pindaric Odes* (1656) are the earliest entry cited in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, and its uncommonness may be inferred from the fact that the editors have chosen to simply quote the definition recorded by Samuel Johnson.

However, Dryden's usage of the term does not just convey this rare and highly specialised meaning but also evokes the verb 'imitate' in the more general sense of 'to do or try to do after the manner of' (*OED* 1). With regard to the correspondence between Denham and Cowley, he elaborates on the above outline:

⁴ John Dryden, Preface to *Ovid's Epistles*, in *Works*, 1: *Poems 1649-1680*, ed. by Edward Niles Hooker and H. T. Swedenberg, Jr. (1956), pp. 109-19 (pp. 114-15).

I take Imitation of an Authour in their sense to be an Endeavour of a later Poet to write like one who has written before him on the same Subject: that is, not to Translate his words, or to be Confin'd to his Sense, but only to set him as a Pattern, and to write, as he supposes, that Authour would have done, had he liv'd in our Age, and in our Country. (*Works*, I, 116)

Already we can observe how Dryden's labels begin to shift; engaging in a process of imitation, the hypothetical 'translator' really has 'lost that name' and is now referred to as a 'poet' himself. Furthermore, the status of the resulting composition appears ambiguous due to its relative independence; while Cowley's way of translating Pindar is justified by the latter's notorious obscurity, the same method would be entirely unsuitable for rendering 'any [of the] regular intelligible Authours' into English:

if *Virgil* or *Ovid* [...] be thus us'd, 'tis no longer to be call'd their work, when neither the thoughts nor words are drawn from the Original: but instead of them there is something new produc'd, which is almost the creation of another hand. (*Works*, I, 117)

In defining 'imitation' as 'almost the creation of another hand', Dryden deemphasises the connection to the source text that every translation is supposed to maintain; a rendering of this kind begins to look like an original work in its own right.

It is difficult to distinguish Dryden's concept of free translation from the larger humanist ideal of writing well, which was rooted in classical rhetoric and held that stylistic perfection must be achieved by imitating the finest examples of the past. Petrarch formulates the principle in a letter to Boccaccio:

An imitator must take care to write something similar yet not identical to the original[.] [...] We must thus see to it that if there is something similar, there is also a great deal that is dissimilar, and that the similar be elusive and unable to be extricated except in silent meditation, for the resemblance is to be felt rather than expressed. Thus we may appropriate another's ideas as well as his coloring but we must abstain from his actual words; for, with the former, resemblance remains hidden, and with the latter it is glaring, the former creates poets, the second apes.⁵

Renaissance humanists believed that an author could embrace the influence of his predecessors without sacrificing his own poetic voice; 'originality was not seen as requiring an avoidance of imitation, but rather imitation of a more sophisticated nature' – a view that

⁵ Francesco Petrarca, *Letters on Familiar Matters: Rerum familiarum libri XVII-XXIV*, trans. by Aldo S. Bernardo (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985), XXIII, 19 (p. 301-02).

continued to inform literary productivity until the second half of the eighteenth century.⁶ Since Dryden is concerned with the particular discipline of translation, one would assume that his understanding of ‘imitation’ entails a closer correspondence between original and copy than the way of composing that Petrarch has in mind. In fact, however, their respective arguments point to the contrary, for whereas the Italian prescribes that ‘we may appropriate [...] ideas [...] but [...] must abstain from [...] actual words’, an imitator according to Dryden follows ‘neither the thoughts nor words’ of his source, which suggests an even greater degree of remoteness. ‘Imitation’ in the Drydenian sense can thus be regarded as an inclusive category that covers a wide range of emulative practices; rather than separating translation from these activities, the Preface to *Ovid’s Epistles* places them on a continuum.

Indeed, the *Heroides* themselves seem to be treated within the same analytical framework as texts translated from another language. When Dryden criticises Ovid for an occasional lack of realism, he does so in terms that anticipate his discussion of translational strategies later on:

where the Characters were lower, [...] he has kept close to Nature in drawing his Images after a Country Life, though perhaps he has Romaniz’d his *Grecian Dames* too much, and made them speak sometimes as if they had been born in the City of *Rome*, and under the Empire of *Augustus*. (*Works*, I, 114)

The complaint that Ovid ‘has Romaniz’d his *Grecian Dames* too much, and made them speak sometimes as if they had been born in the City of *Rome*, and under the Empire of *Augustus*’ sounds conspicuously similar to what Dryden is going to say about the ‘Endeavour of a later Poet to write like one who has written before him [...] and to write, as he supposes, that Authour would have done, had he liv’d in our Age, and in our Country’. The representation of ‘nature’ is another meaning seventeenth-century readers would have associated with the word ‘imitate’; given the echo in Dryden’s phrasing, this connotation of producing an ‘artificial likeness’ (*OED* 2) could also be read into the references to ‘imitation’ as one of the three roads open to translators, especially as both cases involve a demand for greater faithfulness. While Ovid’s ‘images’ are accidentally inauthentic, imitations in the latter sense are categorically so, but since such specimens of translation exist on a spectrum with more literal renderings, the parallel still stands. Like translators who

⁶ Gavin Alexander, ed., *Sidney’s ‘The Defence of Poesy’ and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism* (London: Penguin, 2004), p. xxxiii.

forsake their authors' thoughts and words in order to approximate a contemporary idiom, the Roman poet domesticates his mythological personae by assimilating their mode of expression to a culture that is geographically and temporally removed from the world they inhabit. In this respect, too, translation comes to resemble original composition.

Regardless of Dryden's objections to the imitative way of translating and his ostensible preference for the paraphrastic approach, these rich semantic associations highlight the scope for creativity that his new task afforded him, which ultimately seems to override any theoretical consideration of the translator's need to be accurate. Even after giving his opinion that 'Imitation and verbal Version are [...] two Extrems, which ought to be avoided' (*Works*, I, 118), Dryden does not completely deny the validity of the former alternative where the 'regular intelligible Authours' are concerned, as can be seen from his concluding remarks on the contents of the volume he is introducing:

the Reader will here find most of the Translations, with some little Latitude or variation from the Authours Sence: That of *Oenone to Paris*, is in Mr. *Cowleys* way of Imitation only. I was desir'd to say that the Authour who is of the *Fair Sex*, understood not *Latine*. But if she does not, I am afraid she has given us occasion to be asham'd who do. (*Works*, I, 119)

The female translator is Aphra Behn, whose proficiency in Latin may well have been higher than is stated here.⁷ Dryden might be playing down Behn's knowledge of the source language in order to defend her version of 'Oenone to Paris', which is indeed much freer than any of the other renderings assembled in the collection (Brown, p. 116). However, the claim that she gives her male peers 'occasion to be asham'd' runs counter to an assertion he made at an earlier point in the Preface: 'No man is capable of Translating Poetry, who [...] is not a Master both of his Authours Language, and of his own' (*Works*, I, 118). Singling out the most liberally rendered contribution to *Ovid's Epistles* for special praise, Dryden lowers the high standards he has only just set himself.

Moreover, his nomenclature is at variance with that used by Behn, who explicitly calls her translation a 'Paraphrase'.⁸ The discrepancy could be a careless mistake resulting from the impromptu nature of the Preface; prolegomenal matters like this were often com-

⁷ Sarah Annes Brown, 'Women Translators', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), III: 1660-1790, ed. by Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins, pp. 111-20 (p. 115). Further references are given after quotations in the text.

⁸ John Dryden, and others, *Ovid's Epistles, Translated by Several Hands* (London, 1680), p. 97.

posed at very short notice and after the materials of a book had already been gathered and arranged for publication. On the other hand, 'Oenone to Paris' is the only epistle that refers back to Dryden's classificatory system by including a designation in its title; as such, it is particularly liable to be read in the light of the prefatory taxonomy. Whether intentional or not, the inconsistent application of Dryden's categories has the effect of blurring the distinction between paraphrase and imitation and thus leaves readers wondering just how much literal exactitude they can expect from him.

In fact, Dryden not only elevates Behn above the practitioners of the paraphrastic method but also claims some of her artistic licence for his own rendering of Ovid. By the time he reaches the end of the Preface, the clearly defined middle path has been all but abandoned:

For my own part I am ready to acknowledge that I have transgress'd the Rules which I have given; and taken more liberty than a just Translation will allow. But so many Gentlemen whose Wit and Learning are all well known, being Joyn'd in it, I doubt not but that their Excellencies will make you ample Satisfaction for my Errours. (*Works*, I, 119)

The translator's alleged ideal to the contrary, he would seem to distinguish himself from other members of his profession by exercising a greater degree of creative freedom. Throughout the Preface, Dryden's versatile terminology has served to hint at the close affinity between translation and his usual mode of versification.

This rhetorical blend of literary disciplines is further developed in the Preface to *Sylvae* (1685), the volume of miscellany poems that comprises Dryden's earliest translations from Virgil. Whereas Dryden had previously suggested a view of translated poems as original works in their own right, he now approaches the subject from the opposite direction; exploiting the ambiguity of the verb 'imitate', he casually mentions the derivative elements in his own non-translational work:

I cannot without some indignation, look on an ill Copy of an excellent Original: Much less can I behold with patience *Virgil*, *Homer*, and some others, whose beauties I have been endeavouring all my Life to imitate, so abus'd, as I may say to their Faces by a botching Interpreter.⁹

⁹ John Dryden, Preface to *Sylvae*, in *Works*, III: *Poems 1685-1692*, ed. by Earl Miner (1969), pp. 3-18 (p. 4).

The discussion of ‘botching Interpreter[s]’ runs smoothly into an aside on authorial invention. In order to fashion an image of himself as a competent translator, Dryden refers to his long-time emulative interaction with the classics. Far from being a retrospective exaggeration, his claim is confirmed by the 1667 introductory account of *Annus Mirabilis*:

Virgil [...] has been my Master in this Poem: [...] my Images are many of them copied from him, and the rest are imitations of him. My expressions also are as near as the Idioms of the two Languages would admit of in translation. [...] In some places, where either the fancy, or the words, were his, or any others, I have noted it in the Margin, that I might not seem a Plagiary: in others I have neglected it, to avoid as well the tediousness, as the affectation of doing it too often.¹⁰

Even at this early stage, Dryden uses the terms ‘translation’ and ‘imitation’ indiscriminately when talking about his activity. The two statements of 1667 and 1685 thus complement each other: *Annus Mirabilis*, we are led to believe, is in part a rendering of Virgil that prepared Dryden for his future assignment; harking back to the beginning of his career, he suggests that, in some sense, he has been translating the Roman poet all along.

Dryden extends this perspective to the authors whom he sought to render for *Sylvae* and who, rather than being treated as originals, seem to have drawn on their own predecessors in their turn. Virgil’s borrowings from Lucretius are a case in point:

Lucretius [...] left an easie task to *Virgil*; who as he succeeded him in time, so he Copy’d his excellencies: for the method of the *Georgicks* is plainly deriv’d from him. *Lucretius* had chosen a Subject naturally crabbed; he therefore adorn’d it with Poetical descriptions, and Precepts of Morality, in the beginning and ending of his Books, which [...] *Virgil* has imitated with great success[.] [...] The turn of his Verse he has likewise follow’d, in those places which *Lucretius* has most labour’d, and some of his very Lines he has transplanted into his own Works, without much variation. (*Works*, III, 9-10)

The procedures described here do not differ substantially from the way Virgil had been imitated in *Annus Mirabilis*; ‘Copy[ing]’ Lucretius’s ‘excellencies’, following the ‘turn of his Verse’, and ‘transplant[ing]’ his lines into his own compositions, Dryden’s ‘Master’ is just as much at risk of ‘seem[ing] a Plagiary’ as the English poet himself.

¹⁰ John Dryden, *Annus Mirabilis*, in *Works*, I, 47-105 (pp. 55-56).

While Virgil shared a language with Lucretius, his relationship with Theocritus is even more similar to that between a translator and his source. Dryden's analysis links both of them to the Englishman Spenser:

That which distinguishes *Theocritus* from all other Poets, both *Greek* and *Latin*, and which raises him even above *Virgil* in his *Eclogues*, is the inimitable tenderness of his passions; and the natural expression of them in words so becoming of a Pastoral. [...] Even his *Dorick* Dialect has an incomparable sweetness in its Clownishness[.] [...] This was impossible for *Virgil* to imitate; because the severity of the *Roman* Language denied him that advantage. *Spencer* has endeavour'd it in his *Shepherds Calendar*; but neither will it succeed in English, for which reason I forbore to attempt it. (*Works*, III, 15)

There is again a seamless transition from the domain of mere artistic inspiration to the domain of literal reproduction as the failed imitators of Theocritus are mentioned in the same breath as the translator proper. The perceived limitations of Virgil's copy are less to do with his own poetic skills or the particular style of his forerunner than with the fact that the latter was writing in Greek. Like Spenser in *The Shepherdes Calender*, the Roman poet faced the challenge of adapting the 'beauties' and 'excellencies' of his model to the peculiarities of a different language; even though neither author aspired to an exact replica of their common source, they experienced the same linguistic barrier that the translator of Theocritus would have to overcome in *Sylvae*. By thus aligning himself with two supposedly original writers, Dryden suggests that their productions, too, are to some extent translations.

Through its strong overall emphasis on derivativeness, the Preface to *Sylvae* continues to undermine the dichotomy between renderings of foreign texts and 'creations of another hand' that Dryden had already relativised in *Ovid's Epistles*. The poets he translated for the volume display similar levels of indebtedness to their respective antecedents: 'the method of the *Georgicks* is plainly deriv'd from [...] *Lucretius*', Virgil's *Eclogues* do not reach 'the inimitable tenderness of [Theocritus's] passions; and the natural expression of them in words so becoming of a Pastoral', but they seem to have been inspired by it, and Horace, too, 'imitate[s] *Pindar* [...] in his most elevated flights, and in the sudden changes of his Subject with almost imperceptible connexions' (*Works*, III, 16). The implicit message that every act of composition is more or less subject to multilingual influences of earlier writings reinforces the inclusiveness of Dryden's conceptual category; 'imitation' is no

longer just the most liberal form of translation but becomes inseparable from the notion of creativity itself.

The translator's next introductory essay shows that such creative impulses cross genres as well as languages. *The Satires of Decimus Junius Juvenalis: Together with the Satires of Aulus Persius Flaccus* (1692) are prefixed with a lengthy 'Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire' that leaves ample room for digressions that lend additional support to the connectedness of all literature past and present. The affinity between different genres becomes evident when Dryden touches upon Boileau's *Le Lutrin*, a work at the intersection of satire and epic:

Boileau [...] writes it in the French Heroique Verse, and calls it an Heroique Poem: His Subject is Trivial, but his Verse is Noble. I doubt not but he had *Virgil* in his Eye, for we find many admirable Imitations of him, and some *Parodies*; [...] This, I think [...] to be the most Beautiful, and most Noble kind of Satire. Here is the Majesty of the Heroique, finely mix'd with the Venom of the other; and raising the Delight which otherwise wou'd be flat and vulgar, by the Sublimity of the Expression.¹¹

While the Preface to *Ovid's Epistles* had defined the ideal way of rendering an author as a method by which 'his words are not so strictly follow'd as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not alter'd' (*Works*, I, 114), Dryden describes Boileau as 'Translat[ing] [*Virgil*], keeping to the Words, but altering the Sense' (*Works*, IV, 83). Evidently, the verb 'translate', used here in connection with an original act of composition, is not simply a quasi-synonym for the conceptually related 'imitate', as that would imply that the Frenchman 'var[ies] from the words and sence' while 'taking only some general hints from the Original' (*Works*, I, 115); rather than a less literal translation, the complete reversal of the earlier definition suggests a different kind of literalness altogether – one that preserves the Roman poet's words in a recognisable form but simultaneously gives them a new function. The shifting connotations of Dryden's vocabulary reflect the extent to which he has come to equate translation with the mechanisms of literary tradition as a whole.

The 'Discourse of Satire' not only connects authors from different periods and observes affinities between their respective genres, but it also adds a synchronic dimension to Dryden's concept of imitation. Despite looking at classical works for inspiration, he asserts that 'good Sense is the same in all or most Ages; and course of Time rather improves Na-

¹¹ John Dryden, 'Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire', in *Works*, IV: *Poems 1693-1696*, ed. by A. B. Chambers and William Frost (1974), pp. 3-90 (pp. 83-84).

ture, than impairs her. [...] Another *Homer*, and another *Virgil* may possibly arise from those very Causes which produc'd the first' (*Works*, IV, 11). The 'causes' he names relate to the intellectual climate of certain eras:

some particular Ages have been more happy than others in the production of Great Men, in all sorts of Arts and Sciences: As that of *Euripides*, *Sophocles*, *Aristophanes*, and the rest for Stage-Poetry amongst the *Greeks*: That of *Augustus*, for Heroick, Lyrick, Dramatick, Elegiaque, and indeed all sorts of Poetry; in the Persons of *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Varius*, *Ovid*, and many others. [...] A Famous Age in Modern Times, for Learning in every kind, was that of *Lorenzo de Medici*, and his Son *Leo* the Tenth: Wherein Painting was reviv'd, and Poetry flourish'd, and the *Greek* Language was restor'd. [...] in such an Age 'tis possible some Great Genius may arise, to equal any of the Antients; abating only for the language. For great Contemporaries whet and cultivate each other: And mutual Borrowing, and Commerce, makes the Common Riches of Learning. (*Works*, IV, 11-12)

Great minds tend to emerge in groups. The unique genius of each individual increases proportionally to the number of learned men who 'whet and cultivate each other' in pursuit of the same goal. Dryden sees a possibility for the progress and refinement of literature, but what he says about Juvenal's indebtedness to Horace suggests that it can only be realised collectively: 'no Art, or Science, is at once begun and perfected, but that it must pass first through many hands, and even through several Ages' (*Works*, IV, 73).

The notion of gradual artistic advancement also applies to the discipline of translation. Dryden and the other contributors to *The Satires of Juvenal* embrace a policy that deviates from the ideal middle path outlined in *Ovid's Epistles*: 'The common way which we have taken, is not a Literal Translation, but a kind of Paraphrase; or somewhat which is yet more loose, betwixt a Paraphrase and Imitation' (*Works*, IV, 87). While he retains his tripartite classification scheme, Dryden now openly leans towards the more permissive end of the translation spectrum. He seems to be driven less by his commitment to Juvenal himself than by a desire to improve upon the way the latter had been rendered in the past:

We make our Authour at least appear in a Poetique Dress. We have actually made him more Sounding, and more Elegant, than he was before in *English*: And have endeavour'd to make him speak that kind of *English*, which he wou'd have spoken had he liv'd in *England*, and had Written to this Age. (*Works*, IV, 89)

Dryden's phrasing recalls the earlier definition of imitation as a translator's 'Endeavour [...] to write like one who has written before him [...] and to write, as he supposes, that

Authour would have done, had he liv'd in our Age, and in our Country' (*Works*, I, 116), but in addition to the emphasis on linguistic currency there is a novel concern for aesthetic enhancement. Retranslations, it would seem, are allowed to take liberties with their source material in order to make it 'more Sounding, and more Elegant, than [...] before'.

This view is more fully articulated in the subsequent Dedication of *Examen Poeticum* (1693), the third part of the Tonson miscellany poems. Dryden takes great pride in the renderings from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* that he has contributed to the volume: 'they appear to me the best of all my Endeavours in this kind.'¹² Having copied the distinctive 'Character' of his original to a fault, he further distances himself from 'the other extream, of a literal, and Close Translation, where the Poet is confin'd so streightly to his Author's Words, that he wants elbow-room, to express his Elegancies' (*Works*, IV, 370). As an example of such a literalist approach, he mentions George Sandys's early seventeenth-century translation:

see, [...] what is become of *Ovid's* Poetry, in his Version; whether it be not all [...] evaporated. But this proceeded from the wrong Judgement of the Age in which he Liv'd: They neither knew good Verse, nor lov'd it; they were Scholars 'tis true, but they were Pedants. And for a just Reward of their Pedantick pains, all their Translations want to be Translated, into *English*. (*Works*, IV, 370)

Again, Dryden is not only contrasting different levels of fidelity but also defining separate stages in the development of English verse. By virtue of his discursive relegation to another time period, Sandys appears just as historically remote as Ovid himself, and the poetic idiom of his generation starts to look like a foreign language that 'want[s] to be translated' along with that of the Latin original. Dryden's narrative of steady cultural progress legitimises the comparatively looser rendering he projects to his readers and fashions a (provisional) culmination point for all previous incarnations of the source text.

Given the increasingly libertine attitude in his treatment of the classics prior to 1697, the ambivalence that informs the Dedication of Dryden's *Aeneis* appears all the more paradoxical. Here he not only announces a return to a paraphrastic (if not literal) mode of translation but goes so far as to question whether Virgil can be successfully translated at all:

¹² John Dryden, Dedication of *Examen Poeticum*, in *Works*, IV, 363-75 (p. 369).

I thought fit to steer betwixt the two Extrems, of Paraphrase, and literal Translation: To keep as near my Authour as I cou'd, without losing all his Graces, the most Eminent of which, are in the Beauty of his words: And those words, I must add, are always Figurative. Such of these as wou'd retain their Elegance in our Tongue, I have endeavour'd to graff on it; but most of them are of necessity to be lost, because they will not shine in any but their own. (*Works*, v, 330)

Whereas earlier prefaces had suggested the essential kinship of translations and original compositions, moreover, Dryden now seems to draw a clear distinction between the two:

'Tis one thing to Copy, and another thing to imitate from Nature. [...] They who Copy one of *Raphael's* Pieces, imitate but him, for his own Work is their Original. They Translate him as I do *Virgil*; and fall as short of him as I of *Virgil*. (*Works*, v, 305)

The analogy with copying a work of art ostensibly undermines any potential for creativity that Dryden might have ascribed to his practice. As Davis observes, 'while the poet engaged in 'original' composition, imitating Nature, is at one remove from her, the translator, imitating an imitation, is at two' (p. 228). Compared to a poet (or a painter), the translator can only perform a secondary function, which makes it difficult to treat their respective roles as equivalent vehicles for the expression of literary genius.

Yet even these self-deprecatory statements are not entirely devoid of ambiguity. If Dryden thinks he 'falls short' of Virgil in his translation, he is still toying with the idea of emulating him in an original epic:

by reading Homer, Virgil was taught to imitate his Invention: That is, to imitate like him; which is no more, than if a Painter studies *Raphael*, that he might learn to design after his manner. And thus I might imitate *Virgil*, if I were capable of writing an Heroick Poem, and yet the Invention be my own: But I shou'd endeavour to avoid a servile Copying. I would not give the same Story under other Names: With the same Characters, in the same Order, and with the same Sequel: For every common Reader to find me out at the first sight for a Plagiary. (*Works*, v, 307)

Of course, Dryden's admission that he is ultimately '[in]capable of writing an Heroick Poem' confirms Van Doren's doubts about the full extent of his creative faculties; however, the mere prospect of doing so carries a suggestion of the translator's attempt to gain independence from his author, for the hypothetical 'endeavour to avoid a servile Copying' appears to be the exact opposite of what his current job demands of him. Once again, this impression results from the polyvalence of the terms employed: in the first case, 'copying' forms a binary with 'imitat[ing] from Nature', and 'They who Copy one of *Raphael's*

Pieces' are likened to translators, but in the later instance the word refers to 'giv[ing] the same Story under other Names' and is thus somewhat synonymous with literary 'imitation' in the broader humanist sense. Despite the strong feelings of frustration that characterise certain parts of the Dedication, Dryden's discursive manoeuvre thus follows the established pattern of the previous paratexts as it erodes the categorical difference between the two processes of translation and original composition; by declaring that his practice as a translator lacks the necessary 'servility', he does not so much admit failure as subtly encourage readers to think of the *Aeneis* as an approximation of the epic project he had long envisaged but never executed.

In the end, Dryden does seem to suggest that translations can acquire the same cultural significance as the originals on which they are based. His difficulties in rendering Virgil are due to the latter's unprecedented level of sophistication, which in turn reflects the intellectually stimulating atmosphere of Augustan Rome:

Virgil [...] flourish'd in an Age when his Language was brought to its last perfection, for which it was particularly owing to him and *Horace*. [...] those two Friends had consulted each others Judgment, wherein they should endeavour to excel, and they seem to have pitch'd on Propriety of Thought, Elegance of Words, and Harmony of Numbers. (*Works*, v, 318)

In the 'Discourse of Satire', Dryden had already formulated the idea that literary progress is achieved through mutual exchange between 'great Contemporaries'; Virgil and Horace exemplify this principle, as they could not have excelled without 'consult[ing] each others Judgment'. But the translator, too, claims credit for such linguistic refinement when justifying his use of Latin loan words:

I Trade both with the Living and the Dead, for the enrichment of our Native Language. [...] if I find any Elegant Word in a Classick Author, I propose it to be Naturaliz'd, by using it my self: and if the Publick approves of it, the Bill passes. (*Works*, v, 336)

Just as the Roman poets had helped to bring Latin 'to its last perfection', so Dryden contributes to the 'enrichment of [his] Native Language' by trading both with his ancient fore-runners and with his immediate contemporaries.

From the preceding survey of Dryden's critical writings on translation, it becomes clear that his model is too unstable to be considered a proper theory by today's standards. Evidently, the translator's actual practice cannot be adequately explained in terms of his own abstract categories, which are no sooner introduced than expanded as Dryden repeatedly insinuates an analogy between his current discipline and more autonomous modes of writing. According to Reynolds, the tripartite classificatory scheme laid out in the Preface to *Ovid's Epistles* is informed by a central metaphor of 'opening' that had its roots in early modern debates about how to translate and interpret the Bible; the word 'paraphrase', specifically, had been fraught with ambiguities since the days of the Reformation:

Translation is inevitably an 'opening' in that it makes the original easier to understand. But for Bible texts, especially, this is a cause of anxiety: if a text is opened it is changed. Translators could quiet this worry [...] by sticking as close as possible to their sources. But, in that case, their translations were felt to be incomplete unless they were further opened by 'expounyng' or 'paraphrase'. These kinds of writing were felt to be different from translation; but it also seemed that they were [...] what fully brought the meaning across.¹³

Dryden's category of 'paraphrase' retains some tension despite his attempt to define it as 'Translation with Latitude, where the Authour is kept in view by the Translator, [...] but his words are not so strictly follow'd as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplified, but not alter'd' (*Works*, I, 114). As we have seen, this ideal balance starts shifting towards the liberal extreme of 'imitation' even within the short span of a few pages; Reynolds bases his argument on the same observation:

Like many [...] translators of the Bible[,] [...] Dryden [...] was committed to the idea that translation could capture something called 'the sense' which was 'inviolable'. But, again like many of the Bible translators, he saw that this category was impossible to sustain. Actual writing will always spill over its boundaries, bringing in something more, or something other. (p. 91)

The concerns surrounding the idea of 'opening' the source text, manifest as early as 1680, may complement and modify the translator's image of himself as a slave in the Dedication of the *Aeneis*.

One way in which Dryden 'opened' Virgil and brought in something more was by drawing on the interpretive energies he discovered elsewhere. Reynolds observes that his

¹³ Matthew Reynolds, *The Poetry of Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 85. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

practice was guided by explanatory notes in the editions of the classics that were at his disposal (p. 92). J. McG. Bottkol was the first to give him due credit for consulting these materials: ‘The influence of the commentators is apparent on every page of Dryden’s work, and it is by far the most copious source of his expansions of the original.’ For Virgil, he mostly relied on Carolus Ruaeus’s ‘Delphin’ edition, which supplemented the Latin text with an *Interpretatio* or running prose paraphrase in addition to the commentary.¹⁴ Bottkol reconstructs his working method as follows:

he sat with a favorite edition open before him [...], read the original carefully, often the Latin prose *Interpretatio*, and invariably studied the accompanying annotations. When he came to a difficult or disputed passage, he repeatedly turned to other editors, studied and compared their varying opinions, and then chose to follow one authority or another or even to make a new interpretation for himself. (p. 243)

The original in this picture has proliferated and split up into three separate entities – poem, commentary, and *Interpretatio* – that combine to determine the outcome of the translation process. Dryden’s scholarly conscientiousness thus prompted him to engage with multiple intermediate texts as well as responding directly his author.

The number of these secondary sources increases even further if the impact of previous Virgil translations is taken into account. Critics have long recognised Dryden’s indebtedness to earlier English renderings, from which he ‘often took rhymes, stray phrases, even whole lines and passages’ (Bottkol, p. 243). William Frost mentions twenty or so translations of the *Aeneid* (both partial and complete) whose textual parallels with Dryden’s version suggest that he saw or might have seen them (*Works*, VI, 862-63). A thorough study of his seventeenth-century predecessors has been undertaken by Leslie Proudfoot, who notes that the tendency to borrow was itself nothing new: ‘in consulting the earlier translators and taking for his own a good deal that was theirs, he is following a long-established precedent’; comparing different versions of *Aeneid*, Book IV, Proudfoot repeatedly finds it ‘difficult to be sure which author was Dryden’s immediate model in a particular line or couplet because two or three of the earlier men share the same rhyme or the same phrases’.¹⁵

¹⁴ ‘Dryden’s Latin Scholarship’, *MP*, 40 (1943), 241-254 (p. 242). Further references are given after quotations in the text.

¹⁵ Leslie Proudfoot, *Dryden’s ‘Aeneid’ and Its Seventeenth Century Predecessors* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1960), p. 97. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

Nevertheless, the sheer amount of borrowed materials in Dryden's *Aeneis* sets him apart from his forerunners and may not be easily excusable from a modern point of view. Proudfoot defends the recourse to previous renderings on the grounds that this 'perpetual consultation and weighing of texts' only served to make the translation process more laborious and did not actually save Dryden any time, but he takes issue with the poet's failure to fully admit his debt (p. 267). Indeed, the Dedication of the *Aeneis* merely refers to four other Englishmen who had produced translations from Virgil's epic, and while Dryden expresses his admiration for Sir John Denham, Edmund Waller, and Abraham Cowley – 'tis the utmost of my Ambition to be thought their Equal, or not to be much inferiour to them, and some others of the Living' (*Works*, v, 325) – Richard Maitland, fourth Earl of Lauderdale, is the only one who is explicitly acknowledged to have contributed to his project: 'having his Manuscript in my hands, I consulted it as often as I doubted of my Author's sense. For no Man understood *Virgil* better than that Learned Noble Man' (*Works*, v, 336-37).¹⁶ Even this is an understatement, however. In fact, Dryden made such ample use of Lauderdale's text that his borrowings can hardly be attributed to an ignorance of the Latin: the first edition of the precursor's complete Virgil translation, published posthumously in 1709, shares over 550 similar lines and nearly 800 rhyme word pairs with Dryden's *Aeneis* alone, prompting Frost's suggestion that the latter might justifiably be called 'the Dryden-Lauderdale' (*Works*, vi, 866-67).¹⁷ Dryden's borrowings are thus much more extensive than his humble tribute in the Dedication would lead one to assume; Proudfoot cannot help but perceive the lack of disclosure as morally reprehensible: 'There is simply no defence against a charge of plagiarism from Lauderdale' (p. 169). Ironically, the translator's fears of being found out for a 'Plagiary' appear to have come true, at least as far as this twentieth-century critic is concerned.

In the light of the present discussion, on the other hand, it seems plausible that Dryden did not feel any particular need to declare or justify what he was doing simply because of how naturally it followed from the views he had expressed on other occasions. The absorption of earlier renderings is not only consistent with the idea of 'opening' the

¹⁶ A series of articles by Margaret Boddy explores the relation between Dryden and Lauderdale and shows that their translations reflect a shared political allegiance. See Boddy, 'Contemporary Allusions in Lauderdale's *Aeneid*', *N&Q*, 9 (1962), 386-88; 'Dryden-Lauderdale Relationships, Some Bibliographical Notes and a Suggestion', *Philological Quarterly*, 42 (1963), 267-72; 'The Manuscripts and Printed Editions of the Translation of Virgil Made by Richard Maitland, Fourth Earl of Lauderdale, and the Connexion with Dryden', *N&Q*, 12 (1965), 144-150. See also Frost's commentary in *Works*, vi, 866-70.

¹⁷ Frost points out, however, that this influence was not unidirectional; since Dryden and Lauderdale were exchanging manuscripts of their respective translations in the 1690s, it is not always clear who borrowed from whom (*Works*, vi, 868).

Latin original, but it also illustrates the workings of tradition – synchronic as well as diachronic – as they are described in the ‘Discourse of Satire’; the exchange with Lauderdale, specifically, proves that ‘great Contemporaries whet and cultivate each other’. Since this phenomenon is said to manifest itself in varying degrees throughout the ages, passing over certain generations of poets while blessing others, it makes sense that it should gain special force in a translation of Virgil, the author whom Dryden credits with bringing the Latin language to its ‘last perfection’. Granted, the wholesale appropriation of entire lines is a more extreme case of intertextuality than anything we encounter in the Roman himself, but it does not seem quite so outrageous if we treat it as a function of the same policy that calls for the importation of loan words and thus requires the translator to ‘Trade both with the Living and the Dead’. Bordering on collaborative authorship, moreover, Dryden’s integrative use of his predecessors recalls the complex social and professional networks that lie behind the publication of some of the major translation projects of the time. As part of his own involvement in Tonson’s series of poetical miscellanies and *The Satires of Juvenal*, he had taken on the role of a de facto editor,¹⁸ and in so far as this entailed revising the work of his fellow contributors, it would have prepared him for the later challenge of collating and sifting through the pre-existing renderings of a different original. Against the background of Dryden’s literary career, his *Æneis* appears as yet another translation ‘by several hands’, the result of a collective endeavour to produce the best possible Virgil in English.

The selection and painstaking amalgamation of supporting texts is intrinsically connected to metre. Frost’s statistical analysis reveals that ‘Of Dryden’s numerous English predecessors, [...] the most important were clearly those who wrote during or just before the Restoration and in verse at least resembling Dryden’s achieved Augustan couplet’ (*Works*, VI, 862-63). While poems with rhyming pairs of decasyllabic lines had been around since Chaucer, the characteristically closed heroic couplet employed in Dryden’s *Æneis* did not emerge until the end of the sixteenth century; William Bowman Piper locates its origins in early modern attempts to reproduce the effects of the Latin elegiac distich,¹⁹ and he identifies rhyme as the decisive factor behind the form’s subsequent rise in popularity:

¹⁸ Stuart Gillespie and Penelope Wilson, ‘The Publishing and Readership of Translation’, in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), III: 1660-1790, ed. by Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins, pp. 38-51 (pp. 40-41).

¹⁹ William Bowman Piper, *The Heroic Couplet* (Cleveland, OH: The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1969), pp. 3-5. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

the use of rhyme to define lines and, of course, couplets endowed the body of the English decasyllabic line with a rhythmic freedom and flexibility lacking in the classical pentameter line. [...] Rhyme, which furnishes a one-syllable metrical break, allowed English poets to define their materials as neatly and precisely as the Latin poets had done with the elaborate metrical mechanics of the elegiac distich and yet permitted them to retain the flexibility of their lines and couplets. This flexibility allowed English poets, first, to bend their lines and couplets in response to the individual qualities of their subject matter in its details and, second, to weld their lines and couplets into larger, more comprehensive spans. Thus rhyme made it possible for English poets to turn the closed couplet, which would begin as an imitation of a narrowly neat and pretty Latin form, into an instrument of major poetic utterance. (p. 30)

The couplet was, of course, Dryden's accustomed mode of versification. When it came to rendering the *Aeneid*, however, its formal limitations posed a serious obstacle:

he who can write well in Rhime, may write better in Blank Verse. Rhime is certainly a constraint even to the best Poets, and those who make it with most ease; though perhaps I have as little reason to complain of that hardship as any Man. [...] What it adds to sweetness, it takes away from sense; and he who loses the least by it, may be call'd a gainer: it often makes us swerve from an Author's meaning. (*Works*, v, 324)

Since Dryden goes on to complain, on behalf of all translators, that 'We are bound to our Author's Sense' (*Works*, v, 334) and then again refers to 'the inconvenience of Rhyme' (*Works*, v, 339), it seems likely that prosodic considerations helped to generate the imagery of servitude that pervades his Dedication. Given Dryden's declared 'Ambition [...] not to be much inferiour to' his predecessors, he may have felt not just the 'weight of a whole Author' but the weight of the entire native tradition with which he had aligned himself by virtue of his decision to render Virgil in closed heroic couplets.

Consequently, the translation process goes hand in hand with an evolution of this verse form. As the most salient feature of the couplet, rhyme can easily become the centre of attention if Dryden's borrowings are subjected to critical scrutiny; in his commentary on the *Aeneis*, for example, Frost not only lists all the corresponding rhyme pairs of earlier renderings but also records for each pair whether the words occur in the same or in reverse order, yet he fails to quote the lines under discussion and, as a result, loses sight of what happens to the rest of the verse that Dryden adapts and incorporates into the fabric of his translation. The closed couplet has other key attributes that lend themselves to a comparative analysis; as Piper observes, it is regularly organised into a hierarchy of mid- and end-line pauses that define four metrical segments of roughly equal length and thus facilitate a type of rhetoric characterised by inversion, parallelism, and antithesis (pp. 6-10). Proudfoot

draws attention to ‘Dryden’s penchant for balance within the couplet or the line’ (p. 37) and notes that ‘it is not always distinguishable from forms of that internal balance to which the development of the couplet was in any case tending’; however, he considers parallelism a ‘recurrent weakness of Dryden’s style’ that persists partly because ‘the couplet as a metrical unit which it is often desirable to make self-complete would sometimes require the sense of the Latin to be padded out’ (p. 252).

Of course, the usual approach to studying any poem in translation will judge the translator’s choice of metre and his use of stylistic devices based on how accurately they reflect the qualities of the original; but this is not the only way of looking at the matter. Reynolds remarks in passing that ‘the need to write couplets fuels the tendency to “open” the source’ (p. 106), an observation that agrees with Proudfoot’s but reframes the supposed flaw as yet another aspect of the central image from which the translation is said to derive its impetus. Assuming that Dryden intended to preserve the beauties of his predecessors as well as those of Virgil himself, we may use the borrowings in the *Aeneis* as a measure of his success in accomplishing this programmatic task; thus, they can be examined outside of the unilateral relationship between source text and translation and become an interesting subject in their own right. For the remainder of the present chapter, I would like to discuss in detail some of the lexical congruencies that betray the influence of earlier couplet translators and show the extent to which they anticipated the characteristic features that the form would acquire in Dryden’s hands; this should simultaneously give us an insight into the poet’s genuine contribution to the tradition he inherited. Like Proudfoot, I shall limit myself to examples from different renderings of *Aeneid*, Book IV.

Indeed, a brief comparison suggests that, rather than blindly copying the work of his predecessors, Dryden consistently improved their patterns of parallelism and antithesis as he encountered them. When borrowing a couplet from Lauderdale’s version, for instance, he turns it into something more rigidly organised:

Beasts of all kind, the party-colour’d Fowl
Which haunt in Copses and the crystal Pool.²⁰
(Lauderdale)

²⁰ Richard Maitland, Earl of Lauderdale, *The Works of Virgil* (London, 1709), p. 167, iv. 579-80. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

The Flocks and Herds, and party-colour'd Fowl,
 Which haunt the Woods, or swim the weedy Pool.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 476, iv. 763-64)

In both cases, each half of the couplet juxtaposes two elements that belong to the same syntactical category – noun phrases in the first lines, verb phrases in the second – but Dryden's initial pairing is more prominent by virtue of the coordinating conjunction 'and', which creates a stronger medial caesura than Lauderdale's asyndeton. Moreover, each noun phrase functions as the subject of a corresponding predicate in the second line, but whereas Lauderdale's 'Beasts' and 'Fowl' are both depicted as 'haunt[ing]', Dryden assigns his 'Flocks and Herds' and 'Fowl' not only separate objects but also separate verbs, thereby achieving a perfect parallelism between the two halves of each line as well as between the two lines of the couplet.

Likewise, the following lines appear to be indebted to John Lewkenor, another precursor:

Nor Sleep nor Ease the Furious Queen can find,
 Sleep fled her Eyes, as Quiet fled her mind.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 476, iv. 769-70)

But miserable *Dido*'s troubled Mind
 Admits no Sleep, nor any Rest can find.²¹
 (Lewkenor)

Again, it is possible to observe the refinement of a pre-existing balance in the second half of the couplet: for Lewkenor's verb phrases Dryden substitutes two complete clauses that each fill out one half of the line; the repetition of the verb 'find' and the reversal of the original chiasmus enhance the parallelism between them. In addition, they are linked to the preceding line through the near-anaphoric recurrence of the word 'Sleep' and the alliterative echoing of 'Ease' and 'Queen' in 'Eyes' and 'Quiet', respectively; the identical sequence of sounds creates a sort of phonetic parallelism between the two halves of the couplet.

²¹ John Lewkenor, 'The Fourth Book of Virgil in English', in *Metellus His Dialogues the First Part* (London, 1693), pp. 85-131 (p.118). Further references are given after quotations in the text.

A neat example of an improved antithesis can be found in the description of how Dido and Aeneas spend their night-time:

These Thoughts she brooded in her anxious Breast.
On Board, the *Trojan* found more easie rest.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 477, IV. 799-800)

Here Dryden had two possible models, Waller and Denham:

Such thoughts torment the Queen's enraged breast,
While the Dardanian does securely rest.²²
(Waller)

Such sorrows boil in her enraged breast
Aeneas now aboard to pleasing rest.²³
(Denham)

All three couplets display a sharp contrast between Dido in the first and Aeneas in the second line; on the face of it, Waller's would seem to be the most effective because he even connects the two halves through the adversative conjunction 'while'. Dryden, however, trumps his predecessors by turning Denham's 'aboard' into a prepositional phrase and moving it to the beginning of the second line, where it is in immediate proximity to the prepositional phrase 'in her anxious breast' (likewise adapted from Denham) with which the first line ends. The two halves of the couplet thus mirror each other; the syntactical components of the juxtaposed clauses are arranged in a chiasmic structure that heightens the antithesis.

Another couplet could have been inspired by several of Dryden's seventeenth-century predecessors:

Aurora now had left her Saffron Bed,
And beams of early Light the Heav'ns o'respread
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 478, IV. 839-40)

²² Edmund Waller and Sidney Godolphin, *The Passion of Dido for Aeneas* (London, 1658), sig. E4^r, IV. 561-62. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

²³ John Denham, 'Aeneid: The 1636 Version', in *Early Augustan Virgil: Denham, Godolphin, and Waller*, ed. by Robin Sowerby (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2010), pp. 32-117 (p. 70, IV. 620-21). Further references are given after quotations in the text.

Aurora now left *Tithon's* saffron Bed,
 And with new Light the rosie Morn o'erspread
 (Lauderdale, p. 169, IV. 637-38)

Aurora now had left *Tithonus* bed,
 And o're the world her blushing Raies did spread.²⁴
 (Denham)

Aurora now left *Tithons* broidered bed,
 And first with fresh faire light earth overspread.²⁵
 (Vicars)

And now *Aurora* with fresh beams had spread
 The earth, leaving *Tythoni*us saffron bed.²⁶
 (Ogilby)

But now *Aurore* leaving her Scarlet Bed,
 New Light began upon the Earth to spread.
 (Lewkenor, p. 121)

Dryden retains the 'Light' in Lauderdale's, Vicars's, and Lewkenor's second lines, but rather than using it as an object or in the instrumental case, he makes it the subject of an independent clause that parallels the first half of the couplet, which once more results in a greater balance than any of the other versions achieve at this point.

Since the striving for balance entails a respect for metrical boundaries and for end-line pauses, in particular, practitioners of the closed couplet form are reluctant to use enjambment unless they can mitigate its loosening effect by some counteracting element of stability (Piper, pp. 9-10). Dryden is no exception to this rule and even modifies the enjambed lines that he appropriates for his *Aeneis*:

Thou Sun, whose lustre all things here below
 Surveys; and *Iuno* conscious of my woe.
 (Denham, p. 139, IV. 185-86)

²⁴ John Denham, 'The Passion of Dido for Aeneas', in *Poems and Translations with the Sophy* (London, 1668), pp. 128-44 (p. 138, IV. 161-62). Line numbers have been supplemented from Sowerby, *Early Augustan Virgil*, pp. 32-117. Further references are given after quotations in the text. The 1636 version cited above only existed in manuscript, but it features closer parallels to Book IV of the *Aeneis* than this revised and published excerpt, so there is some possibility that Dryden might have seen it. Cf. Frost's commentary in *Works*, VI, 866, n. 150. On the differences between the two versions, cf. Sowerby, pp. 145-60. Unless otherwise stated, all references are to the 1668 text.

²⁵ John Vicars, *The XII Aeneids of Virgil* (London, 1632), p. 111. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

²⁶ John Ogilby, *The Works of Publius Virgilius Maro* (London, 1649), p. 92. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

Thou Sun, who view'st at once the World below,
 Thou *Juno*, Guardian of the Nuptial Vow.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 479, iv. 872-73)

Dryden amends Denham's couplet, relegating the verb to the first line and thereby synchronising the two addresses; the parallelism is intensified through the anaphora of 'Thou' and the syntactic equivalence of the relative clause and the apposition in the first and in the second line, respectively. A similar thing happens later on:

My conscious Foe my Funeral fire shall view
 From Sea, and may that Omen him pursue.
 (Deham, p. 142, iv. 227-28)

These Flames, from far, may the false Trojan view;
 These boding Omens his base flight pursue.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 481, iv. 948-49)

Here it is the prepositional phrase that is transposed to the first half of the couplet; again, anaphora yokes the two lines together.

In the case of the following couplet, the interpolation of a relative clause strengthens the pause at the end of the preceding line:

But when she saw *Aeneas* Garments spread
 Upon the too well known and fatal Bed;
 (Lauderdale, p. 171, iv. 711-12)

But when she view'd the Garments loosely spread,
 Which once he wore, and saw the conscious Bed.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 481, iv. 931-32)

Likewise, the prepositional phrase introducing the second half of Sir Robert Howard's couplet wanders to the beginning of Dryden's first line and is replaced by a verb phrase that functions as the second item in a tripartite list of actions:

Sharers in time delay'd, her selfe then cast
 Upon the bed, and thus she spoke her last.²⁷
 (Howard)

²⁷ Sir Robert Howard, 'The Fourth Book of Virgill', in *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1696), pp. 141-169 (p. 166).

Then on the Couch her trembling body cast,
 Repress'd the ready Tears, and spoke her last.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 481, iv. 934-35)

The examples I have cited show that Dryden was far from treating earlier couplet translations of the *Aeneid* as mere treasure troves of rhyme words; they provided a stylistic model worthy of being replicated alongside the elegancies of Virgil's epic. Nor did he simply assimilate these texts; the slight but constant adjustment of individual lines suggests his effort to optimise their parallelistic and antithetical structures.

In spite of the rhetorical heightening that is taking place during the importation of borrowed elements into the *Aeneis*, however, Dryden's syntax would still appear to be slightly more natural than that of earlier translators. While his rendering of Book IV abounds in the use of parallelism and antithesis, there is evidence that he rather avoided the third practice associated with the closed heroic couplet: inversion. Unlike enjambment, inversion intensifies both medial caesurae and end-line pauses; hence, it inevitably decelerates the flow of the verse (Piper, p. 15). Dryden seems to moderate the more extreme cases of this phenomenon; in borrowing lines and couplets from his predecessors, he repeatedly disposes of inverted elements or reorganises them so as to achieve a more regular word order. For example, the obtrusive adjective at the beginning of the following lines has been removed in Dryden's version; the same image is now expressed by means of a transitive verb that parallels the action in the other half of the couplet:

Still were the Billows of the raging Floods,
 No Winds disturb'd the Silence of the Woods.
 (Lauderdale, p. 167, iv. 575-76)

The Winds no longer whisper through the Woods,
 Nor murm'ring Tides disturb the gentle Floods.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 476, iv. 759-760)

The next line went through a similar process before becoming part of the *Aeneis*,

The Stars with Silence in their Orbs went round.
 (Lauderdale, p. 167, iv. 578)

The Stars in silent order mov'd around.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 476, iv. 761)

Dryden has reduced Lauderdale's two prepositional phrases to one and thus diminished the intervening material between subject and verb.

The refinement of a parallelism in Lewkenor has already been touched upon; in the same couplet, Dryden also moves the subject of 'can find' closer to the line ending and thereby eases the tension of the suspended verb:

But miserable *Dido*'s troubled Mind
Admits no Sleep, nor any Rest can find.
(Lewkenor, p. 118)

Nor Sleep nor Ease the Furious Queen can find,
Sleep fled her Eyes, as Quiet fled her mind.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 476, iv. 769-70)

By making 'Sleep' in the second line a subject and getting rid of the verb 'Admit', moreover, the translator corrects the original enjambment. In the following couplet, he takes several revisionary measures:

And those who scarce I could persuade from *Tyre*,
Shall [I] again to try the Sea desire?
(Ogilby, 1649, p. 91)

Will they again Embark at my desire,
Once more sustain the Seas, and quit their second *Tyre*?
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 477, iv. 787-88)

The object in the source has been turned into the subject of the sentence and now occupies its opening position more naturally. The original subject has all but vanished; the four verbs relating to it – 'could', 'persuade', 'Shall', and 'desire' – have been condensed into the single prepositional phrase 'at my desire'. By the simple expedient of using 'desire' as a noun rather than as a verb, Dryden has thus managed both to preserve it as a rhyme word and to relieve the stress caused by its suspension to the line end.

Another case that has already been mentioned is the antithesis in the following lines:

Such thoughts torment the Queen's intruded breast,
While the Dardanian does securely rest
(Waller, sig. E4^r, iv. 561-62)

These Thoughts she brooded in her anxious Breast.
 On Board, the *Trojan* found more easie rest.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 477, IV. 799-800)

Dryden's couplet is perfectly symmetrical not only because of the prepositional phrases immediately before and after the line break but also because of the two objects at the beginning of the first and the end of the second half. Although this involves the initial use of an inversion, the effect is not so disruptive as to separate the subject from the verb; Dryden uses the full contrastive force of a chiasmus without sacrificing the syntactical clarity of the sentence. Furthermore, he improves upon Waller's couplet by again using a rhyme word – 'rest' – in the nominal rather than in the verbal form, which allows him to get rid of the auxiliary 'does' in the second line. The poet's practice of simplifying compound tenses can also be observed in his amendment of the following lines:

Sweet ornaments, whiles Gods and fates did please,
 Embrace this soule, me from these sorrows ease.
 (Vicars, p. 114)

Sweet Spoyls, whil'st God and Destiny did please
 Receive this Soul, and me of Sorrow ease.²⁸
 (Ogilby)

Dear Pledges of my Love, while Heav'n so pleas'd,
 Receive a Soul, of Mortal Anguish eas'd:
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 481, IV. 936-37)²⁹

Again, the syntax of the source material has been naturalised.

Sometimes Dryden even corrects an inversion at the expense of losing a rhyme word:

Our Seas, our Shores, our Armies theirs oppose.
 (Denham, p. 141, IV. 209)

Our Arms, our Seas, our Shores, oppos'd to theirs.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 480, IV. 903)

²⁸ John Ogilby, *The Works of Publius Virgilius Maro* (London, 1654), p. 286. Although criticising Ogilby's translation in the Dedication of the *Aeneis*, Dryden evidently drew on both this and the 1649 version; see Frost's commentary in *Works*, VI, 856.

²⁹ Cf. Proudfoot, pp. 82, 88, 237-39.

While the verb in this particular case has been turned into an adjective, it can also adopt the function of a participial phrase:

And dying *Dido*'s Name call'd out aloud.
(Lauderdale, p. 172, IV. 739)

And calling on *Elisa*'s Name aloud.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 483, IV. 968)

Each time, the transposition away from the line ending resolves the original suspension of the verb and thus leads to a smoother movement of the line. All of these modifications exemplify the translator's incessant endeavour both to use the rhetorical possibilities of the heroic couplet to their fullest and to adapt the form to the exigencies of Virgil's epic, thus confirming Proudfoot's impression that his 'verse [...] is easy to read; it gets on with the story; it is always [...] "harmonious"; it can be very forceful, and it can be very pointed' (p. 257).

Dryden's *Aeneis* concludes not only his lifelong engagement with the author of the *Aeneid* but also the couplet's ascendancy as the primary medium of English Virgil translation. As has been suggested, both of these coinciding developments involve an 'opening' of sorts. While translating the complete Virgilian oeuvre proved to be a much more arduous undertaking than the individual pieces and fragments rendered for Tonson's poetical miscellanies, the imagery of servitude in the Dedication of the *Aeneis* should not be taken to relate to the Roman poet alone: the consultation of earlier renderings is just as integral to Dryden's understanding of his own practice, and the debt he owes to these texts far exceeds the one-dimensional polarity between author and translator that we have come to accept. If the use of rhyming couplets constrained him, the form's inbuilt rhetoric simultaneously encouraged an expansion of the Latin original; Dryden's frequent borrowings may seem derivative, yet to the extent that he refined the design of his predecessors, he did not simply align himself with the existing tradition but effectively subsumed it. Regardless of what critics might think, there is evidence of a sustained artistic effort that gives coherence to his *Aeneis*.

However, the very finality of the project had implications for the future of Virgil's epic. If Dryden's version is the summation of the best couplet renderings of the seventeenth-century, then his successors must have felt the weight of this tradition with even

greater acuteness, for it had now crystallised into a single monolith against which they would have to measure themselves. The *Æneis*, although duly celebrated, left little room for improvement, at least on a technical level, and thus may have indirectly helped to stimulate the search for alternative verse forms. As we are about to see, these forces found an outlet early on in the eighteenth century with the translation of the *Aeneid* by Joseph Trapp.

2. 'An Undertaking of Another Kind': Joseph Trapp

Joseph Trapp (1679–1747) became a fellow of Wadham College, Oxford, in 1703. By that time, he had already contributed to verse collections that commemorated the duke of Gloucester and William III; his Turkish tragedy, *Abramulè, or, Love and Empire* premiered at Lincoln's Inn Fields the following year and received lasting critical acclaim. He was appointed as the first professor of poetry at Oxford in 1708 and held the chair until 1718; his lectures, which mainly dealt with the poets of antiquity, were published as *Praelectiones Poeticae* (3 vols., 1711-19) and later reissued in translation (1742). During his lifetime, however, Trapp was mostly known as a political writer and churchman. A long-standing friend of the high-church champion Dr Henry Sacheverell, he assisted him at his trial before the House of Lords in 1710, took over his lectureship in the parish of Newington, Surrey, defended him in several pamphlets, and eventually inherited the greater part of his library. As a Tory propagandist, he became chaplain to the lord chancellor of Ireland, Sir Constantine Phipps (1711), and Henry St John, 1st Viscount Bolingbroke (1712). After the accession of George I, Trapp focussed on his ecclesiastical career, obtaining the lectureship of St Olave Jewry and St Martin, Ironmonger Lane, as well as that of St Martin-in-the-Fields. He held the rectory of Dauntsey, Wiltshire, from 1714 to 1722 and then went on to become vicar of the London parishes of Christ Church Greyfriars and St Leonard, Foster Lane; in 1733, moreover, he was presented to the rectory of Harlington, Middlesex. In 1728, the University of Oxford awarded Trapp the degree of DD by diploma for two anti-Catholic tracts.¹

Trapp's English version of the *Aeneid* appeared in two volumes between 1718 and 1720; a translation of Virgil's complete works, supplemented with notes, followed in 1731 and ran through several editions. This marks an important shift away from the dominant tradition of English Virgil translation in closed heroic couplets and towards the increasingly popular alternative of blank verse as the Drydenian model began to be superseded by Milton's *Paradise Lost* – or so it would seem. Despite the fierce criticism he levels at his predecessor, Trapp is quick to dismiss the idea that the two of them were in direct competition: 'I desire that Mine, being in a different sort of Verse, may be considered as an Under-

¹ Richard Sharp, 'Joseph Trapp', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/27666?docPos=1>> [accessed 29 August 2016]

taking of *another kind*, rather than as an Attempt to *excel His*'.² Nevertheless, both Trapp's theoretical rationale and the translation itself are, as we shall see, heavily indebted to Dryden's *Aeneis*, and the particular nature of this debt may serve to illustrate not only the workings of poetic influence but also the degree to which a translator's methodology is dictated by his choice of verse form.

Although Trapp differentiates himself from Dryden by aspiring to be more literal, he can only formulate his goal in terms that the latter had helped to establish. According to the translator's preface, earlier approaches suffered from a tendency to take too many liberties with the source text; his predecessors 'have been so averse from the Folly of rendering Word for Word, that they have ran into the other Extreme; and their translations are commonly so very licentious, that they can scarce be called so much as Paraphrases'. (I, p. xxxvi). In his summary dismissal of these texts, Trapp seems to hold them to the standard of literalness that Dryden had defined as 'Paraphrase, [...] where the Authour is kept in view by the Translator, so as never to be lost, but his words are not so strictly follow'd as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplyfied, but not alter'd' (*Works*, I, 114), the implication being that his own ideal of translation would entail a still closer adherence to the letter of the original. At a later point in the preface, Trapp reiterates and elaborates upon this initial observation with reference to Dryden's *Aeneis*:

Mr. *Dryden*'s is, in many Parts, a noble and spirited Translation; and yet I cannot, upon the Whole, think it a good one; [...] besides his often grossly mistaking his Author's Sense; as a Translator, he is extremely licentious. Whatever he alledges to the contrary [...]; he makes no Scruple of adding, or retrenching, as his Turn is best served by either. In many Places, where he shines most as a Poet, he is least a Translator; And where you most admire Mr. *Dryden*, you see least of *Virgil*. (I, pp. xlix-l)

The last sentence expresses a thought that Dryden himself had anticipated in the Preface to *Ovid's Epistles* regarding those who choose the imitative mode of translating: 'Imitation of an Authour is the most advantagious way for a Translator to shew himself, but the greatest wrong which can be done to the Memory and Reputation of the dead' (*Works*, I, 117). When it came to rendering the *Aeneid*, as we have seen, Dryden no longer considered imitation even as an option to be avoided but instead endeavoured to 'steer betwixt the two Extrems, of Paraphrase, and literal Translation' (*Works*, v, 330). The extent to which these statements were on Trapp's mind remains unclear, but their lingering presence suggests

² Joseph Trapp, *The Aeneis of Virgil, Translated into Blank Verse*, 2 vols (London, 1718-1720), I, p. lv. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

that, rather than disagreeing with his predecessor about what an English translation of Virgil should look like, he may have been insinuating his superior ability to produce such a text as well as Dryden's ultimate failure to abide by his self-imposed principles.

While previous translators had refrained from 'rendering Word for Word', Trapp adopts precisely such a method. Even if absolute literalism is impossible, he aims at a lexical equivalence between original and copy:

I have not added, or omitted very many Words: Many indeed are varied; the Sense of the Substantive in the Latin, being often transferred to the Adjective in the English; and so on the Reverse: with a great Number of such like Instances, which it is needless to mention. Yet many Lines are translated Word for Word. (I, p. xxxvi)

The words 'are varied', but their total number appears to be roughly the same. The kind of faithfulness that Trapp proposes seems to be based on a heightened awareness of abstract linguistic properties and the ways they can function as substitutes for one another; we do not find Dryden talking about the translation process in terms of grammatical categories like 'substantive' or 'adjective'.

If the opening of the *Aeneid* may serve as an example, then Trapp has given an accurate description of his own practice:

Arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris
 Italiam fato profugus Laviniaque venit
 litora – multum ille et terris iactatus et alto
 vi superum, saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram,
 multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem
 inferretque deos Latio; genus unde Latinum
 Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae.

(I. 1-7)

Arms, and the Man I sing, who first from *Troy*
 Came to th' *Italian*, and *Lavinian* Shores,
 Exil'd by Fate; Much toss'd on Land, and Sea,
 By Pow'r Divine, and cruel *Juno*'s Rage.
 Much too in War he suffer'd; 'till he rear'd
 A City, and to *Latium* brought his Gods:
 Whence sprung the *Latin* Progeny, the Kings
 Of *Alba*, and the Walls of Tow'ring *Rome*.

(Trapp, I, 1-2, I. 1-8)

Trapp requires a mere eight decasyllables to render Virgil's seven hexameters. Not only does he translate the words of the original without making any substantial additions or retrenchments, but he also preserves their syntactical order as well as he can and often manages to place them in the same metrical position. The first line of the Latin text and its English counterpart are each composed of an object ('Arma virumque' – 'Arms, and the Man'), a subject and predicate ('cano' – 'I sing'), a relative pronoun ('qui' – 'who'), an adjective ('primus' – 'first'), and a prepositional phrase ('ab oris [Troiae]' – 'from *Troy*'). The participial construction 'Much toss'd on Land, and Sea' occupies the latter part of Trapp's third line and thus runs parallel to Virgil's 'multum ille et terris iactatus et alto' (I. 3). Similarly, the Roman poet and his translator begin their respective fourth lines with an ablative ('vi') and a corresponding prepositional phrase ('By Pow'r'), both of which are followed by a possessive ('saevae [...] Iunonis' – 'cruel *Juno*'s') and a noun ('iram' – 'Rage'). The next line in the English version – 'Much too in War he suffer'd; 'till he rear'd' – exactly reproduces the sequence of 'multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet' (I. 5). Likewise, Virgil's 'Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae' (I. 7) has an almost perfect equivalent in Trapp's 'Of *Alba*, and the Walls of Tow'ring *Rome*'; the two proper nouns in the genitive case make this alignment particularly noticeable.

Other elements of the original only undergo a minor shift in Trapp's translation. '[L]itora' at the beginning of Virgil's third line wanders back and appears as 'Shores' before the line break, whereas 'urbem' (I. 5) relinquishes its end-line position to become the head of Trapp's line 'A City, and to *Latium* brought his Gods' (here the sentence structure of the source text remains intact even though its metrical boundaries are being ignored). Neither rearrangement loses any of the stress that Virgil lays on these words, and in their combined effect, they virtually cancel each other out. Moreover, there are indeed cases in which the 'Sense of the Substantive in the Latin' is 'transferred to the Adjective in the English', and vice versa: Trapp completely drops 'oris' (I. 1) and turns the matching adjective 'Troiae' into the noun '*Troy*'; it is this simple expedient that allows him to replicate the rest of the line with such accuracy. On the other hand, he transforms the substantive 'Italiam' (I. 2) into an adjective that belongs to 'litora' (I. 3) and thus yokes it together with 'Lavinia': 'th' *Italian*, and *Lavinian* Shores'. Again, this assimilation occurs in the interest of metrical economy, as a verbatim rendering could probably not be contained in a single string of ten syllables (e.g., 'Came to *Italy*, and the *Lavinian* Shores'). No less elegant is Trapp's substitution of the adjective 'Divine' in his own fifth line for Virgil's genitive

‘superum’ (‘of the gods’) in I. 5. Overall, the first two sentences of his translation meet the self-imposed demand for literalness.

Part of this fidelity is achieved by the rejection of heroic couplets in favour of blank verse. As Dryden had already pointed out in the Dedication of his *Aeneis*, ‘Rhime is certainly a constraint even to the best Poets, and those who make it with most ease; [...] What it adds to sweetness, it takes away from sense; and [...] it often makes us swerve from an Author’s meaning’ (*Works*, v, 324). Trapp’s own preface also includes a comment on the distorting impact of the couplet form: ‘the Fetters of Rhime often cramp the Expression, and spoil the Verse, and so you can both translate more closely, and also more fully express the Spirit of your Author, without it, than with it’ (I, p. xl). Again, he may have subconsciously picked up on an observation made by his predecessor.

A few specimens of the two translations suffice to demonstrate the relative advantages afforded by blank verse. The last part of Virgil’s opening paragraph, for example, takes up the same number of syllables in both renderings, yet Dryden captures less of the sense of the original:

genus unde Latinum
Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae.
(I. 6-7)

From whence the Race of *Alban* Fathers come,
And the long Glories of Majestick *Rome*.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 343, I. 9-10)

Whence sprung the *Latin* Progeny, the Kings
Of *Alba*, and the Walls of Tow’ring *Rome*.
(Trapp, I, 2, I. 7-8)

Since the Latin is elliptical, it becomes necessary to supplement a verb in English. Dryden chooses ‘come’ and makes it rhyme with ‘*Rome*’, thus mirroring the final position of ‘*Romae*’. However, the rest of the sentence then has to be constructed around the verb at the end of the first line, and here the translator runs into trouble: Virgil’s three items cannot be evenly divided between the two halves of the couplet; thus, Dryden conflates ‘genus [...] Latinum’ and ‘Albanique patres’ into ‘the Race of *Alban* Fathers’ and fills his second line with a lofty expansion – ‘the long Glories of Majestick *Rome*’. Trapp, by contrast, does not depend on a rhyme word and can allow himself to put his verb in a peripheral

spot. Additionally, blank verse is also much more permissive of enjambments than heroic couplets, which enables him to split ‘Albanique patres’ along the line break and – as we have seen – results in a carbon copy of the genitives at the beginning and end of Virgil’s I. 7.

Time and again, Dryden is forced to rearrange the word order of the source text where Trapp maintains it with exactness. Dido’s passion for Aeneas is a case in point:

illum absens absentem auditque videtque
(IV. 83)

Absent, her absent Heroe sees and hears;
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 455, IV. 119)

Him absent, absent still she hears, and sees.
(Trapp, I, 151, IV. 115)

Like Trapp, Dryden approximates the polyptoton of ‘absens absentem’, but the sensory verbs have been swapped to create a rhyme with ‘bears’ in the following line. A similar thing happens to the description of Mezentius’s weapons:

procul aerea ramis
dependet galea et prato gravia arma quiescunt.
(X. 835-36)

A Bough his Brazen Helmet did sustain,
His heavier Arms lay scatter’d on the Plain.
(Dryden, VI, 714, X. 1189-90)

His brazen Helmet at a distance hung;
And on the Mead his pond’rous Armour lay.
(Trapp, II, 685, X. 1108-09)

Dryden and Trapp each use two lines for Virgil’s one and a half, and they both place the first verb in front of rather than after the line break. However, while Trapp translates ‘dependet’ literally as ‘hung’, his predecessor offers not just a near synonym but a change of perspective, as the ablative ‘ramis’ is turned into the subject of the clause and the focus shifts from the hanging helmet to the ‘Bough’ that ‘sustain[s]’ it; to make the rhyme work, moreover, Dryden has to add the expletive ‘did’. The plant is completely absent from Trapp’s version, but on the other hand, he does a better job of duplicating the Virgilian syntax, for he gives us ‘And on the Mead his pond'rous Armour lay’ for the Latin ‘et prato

gravia arma quiescunt'. Incidentally, despite the couplet's propensity for internal balance, it is interesting to see that the two blank verse lines display a greater degree of parallelism by virtue of ending in finite verbs.

Apart from its aptness as a medium for rendering the *Aeneid* into English, blank verse also facilitated the cultivation of a particular style. Trapp claims that it is '*in it self better*' and 'not only more Majestick, and Sublime, but more Musical, and Harmonious' than the heroic couplet and other rhyming formats (I, p. xl), and he provides a detailed list of its beauties:

placing the Verb after the Accusative Case; and the Adjective after the Substantive; [...] [is] more frequent in Blank Verse, than in Rhime. This Turn of Expression likewise is agreeable to the Practice of the Ancients; and even in our own Language adds much to the Grandeur, and Majesty of the Poem, if it be wrought with Care, and Judgment. As does also the judicious interspersing [...] of *antique* Words, and of such as, being derived from *Latin*, retain the Air of That Language: Both which have a better Effect in Blank Verse, than in Rhime; by Reason of a certain Majestick Stiffness, which becomes the one, more than the other. (I, pp. xli-xlii)

It is Miltonic blank verse, specifically, that Trapp is describing here. The author of *Paradise Lost* was, of course, largely responsible for repopularising the form after its initial heyday in the Renaissance, and for expanding its use beyond the realm of drama.³ As is well known, Milton's prefatory note explicitly compares the verse of his epic to 'that of Homer in Greek, and of Virgil in Latin' and dismisses rhyme as 'the invention of a barbarous age' that English poets have embraced 'much to their own vexation, hindrance, and constraint'; blank verse, he argues, can restore heroic poetry to its 'ancient liberty' by dispensing with 'the troublesome and modern bondage of rhyming'.⁴ If the desire for utmost literalness was not enough, this perceived proximity to the metres of ancient Greece and Rome would have given Trapp another valid reason to abandon the native tradition of

³ On Milton's reception and his lasting cultural impact, see, for example, Raymond Dexter Havens, *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*, 2nd edn (New York: Faber & Faber, 1961); Dustin Griffin, *Regaining Paradise: Milton and the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Nicholas von Maltzahn, 'Milton's Readers', in *The Cambridge Companion to Milton*, ed. by Dennis Danielson, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 236-52; Kay Gillard Stevenson, 'Reading Milton, 1674-1800', in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. by Thomas N. Corns (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 447-62; Lucy Newlyn, *Paradise Lost and the Romantic Reader* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Jonathon Shears, *The Romantic Legacy of Paradise Lost: Reading against the Grain* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009); William Kolbrener, 'Reception', in *The Cambridge Companion to Paradise Lost*, ed. by Louis Schwartz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 195-210. Several of these works will be referred to in later chapters.

⁴ John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. by Alastair Fowler, 2nd edn (Harlow: Pearson-Longman, 2007), pp. 54-55. All further references are to this edition of the text (hereafter *PL*) and given after quotations in the text.

translating Virgil into closed couplets; indeed, he quotes a passage from *Paradise Lost* to illustrate his argument, and Milton recurs as a reference point throughout the preface.

While ‘placing the Verb after the Accusative Case; and the Adjective after the Substantive’ came much more naturally to Roman authors due to the greater syntactical flexibility of their language, this practice is particularly characteristic of the style in which Virgil composed his epic, and it is thence that we can trace its influence on *Paradise Lost*. K. W. Grandsen argues that ‘Milton’s “Latin” inversions [...] should be regarded as essentially imitative of the *Aeneid*: it should not be supposed that they are an essential feature of all Latin poetry (they are much less common in Ovid or in [...] Catullus)’.⁵ Janette Richardson concurs: ‘The peculiarities of syntax in *Paradise Lost* so closely parallel the grammatical movement of the *Aeneid* as to suggest that Milton was deliberately attempting to write Virgilian English.’⁶ As Grandsen points out (p. 292), the similarities with Virgil’s way of structuring sentences, and the contrast with Dryden’s, become evident from the opening of Milton’s Book v, which seems to have been inspired by two lines in *Aeneid* IV:

Et iam prima novo spargebat lumine terras
Tithoni croceum linquens Aurora cubile.
(IV. 584-85)

Now Morn her rosy steps in the eastern clime
Advancing, sowed the earth with orient pearl,
(*PL*, v. 1-2)

Aurora now had left her Saffron Bed,
And beams of early Light the Heav’ns o’respread,
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 478, IV. 839-40)

Virgil withholds ‘Aurora’, the subject of ‘spargebat’, until the second line, and Milton does the same with ‘Advancing’, the participle belonging to ‘Morn’. By comparison, Dryden opts for a more vernacular word order; incidentally, this choice is consistent with his habit, discussed in Chapter 1, of streamlining the fragments he borrowed from his predecessors. It would appear that Milton’s success in emulating ‘the Practice of the Ancients’ provided an ideal model for translators who sought to redirect the course of English Virgilianism.

⁵ K. W. Grandsen, ‘*Paradise Lost* and the *Aeneid*’, *EinC*, 17 (1967), 281-303 (p. 295). Further references are given after quotations in the text.

⁶ Janette Richardson, ‘Virgil and Milton Once Again’, *Comparative Literature*, 14 (1962), 321-31 (p. 323).

Consequently, permutations of the subject-verb-object order and post-positive adjectives feature heavily in Trapp's translation. Most of them, to be sure, directly result from the policy of rendering the original word for word; thus in Book I, when Aeolus expresses his gratitude to Juno:

tu mihi quodcumque hoc regni, tu scepra Iovemque
concilias,
(I. 78-79)

You this my Kingdom, and *Jove's* Favour give,
(Trapp, I, 6, I. 94)

These airy Kingdoms, and this wide Command,
Are all the Presents of your bounteous Hand:
Yours is my Sov'raign's Grace,
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 346, I. 114-16)

Like Virgil, Trapp separates the subject ('tu' – 'You') from its verb ('concilias' – 'give') and positions them at the beginning and end of the clause, respectively. However, he only carries across two of the three intervening accusative objects; 'scepra' remains untranslated, probably because of its quasi-synonymy with 'regni'. Moreover, the jarring cluster of pronouns ('You this my') indicates the shortcomings of the translator's attempt to reconstruct Virgil's syntactical skeleton. Dryden, by contrast, expands upon the source text, but he also produces something less artificial in the process, turning the first two objects into the nominative and replacing 'Tu [...] concilias' with the predicative 'Presents of your bounteous Hand'. Trapp completely misses the mimetic quality of 'quodcumque hoc regni', whose spondaic weight suggests the spaciousness of Aeolus's realm; Dryden's extension achieves a comparable effect by reducing the lexical density of the line and allowing its individual elements to breathe.

On rare occasions, Trapp's syntax is even further removed from ordinary English than that of Virgil himself. The nightfall in Book IV exemplifies this phenomenon:

 lumenque obscura vicissim
luna premit
(IV. 80-81)

When in her turn the Moon obscure withdraws
Her Light,
(Trapp, I, 151, IV. 111-12)

when *Phæbe's* paler Light
 Withdraws
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 455, IV. 115-16)

It is easy to see why Trapp decided to reallocate the initial accusative 'lumen'; on the other hand, the adjective 'obscura' and the noun 'luna' would look perfectly natural if their original sequence were retained, and yet they have switched places in his translation. While the change can be partly attributed to the English pentameter and its alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables, Dryden's periphrastic method again offers a way of circumventing the problem: he welds the subject and object together to form a single phrase – '*Phæbe's* paler Light' – and thus makes 'obscura' modify 'lumen' rather than 'luna'; the verb 'withdraws' (which Trapp seems to have borrowed) is used in an absolute sense. Judging by this brief comparison, the Latinate syntax clearly helped the blank verse rendering to stand out from its couplet predecessor.

In accordance with his prefatory remarks, moreover, Trapp's version also abounds in '*antique* Words [...] derived from *Latin*'. After recommending blank verse for its capacity to showcase such diction, the translator draws attention to the deficiencies of his native tongue and claims to have overcome them:

It is a known Fault in our Language, that it is too much crouded with *Monosyllables*: [...] the fewer we have of them, the better it is. I believe there are as few of them in this Translation as in any *English* Poem of equal Length. (I, p. xlvi)

Here, too, Dryden had preceded him. In the Dedication of the *Æneis*, he defends his own use of Latinisms through a similar complaint about the impoverished state of English: 'Poetry requires Ornament, and that is not to be had from our Old *Teuton* Monosyllables; therefore if I find any Elegant Word in a Classick Author, I propose it to be Naturaliz'd, by using it my self' (*Works*, v, 336).⁷ The avoidance of monosyllables is another idea he bequeathed to his successor.

Trapp, however, takes this rule to a whole new level. Not only does he render most of Virgil's elements and arrange them in roughly the same order, but he also seems to

⁷ Dryden had already expressed this sentiment in the Dedication of *Troilus and Cressida* (1679), which features an even more damning comment regarding the inferiority of English words: 'We are full of Monosyllables, and those clog'd with consonants, and our pronounciation is effeminate; all which are enemies to a sounding language.' See *Works*, XIII: *Plays*, ed. by Maximillian E. Novak (1984), pp. 219-24 (p. 223).

translate them with their cognates whenever possible. The following line is from Juno's speech near the beginning of Book I:

et quisquam numen Iunonis **adorat**
(I. 48)

And who will *Juno's* Deity **adore**
(Trapp, I, 4, I. 57)

What Nations now to *Juno's* Pow'r will pray,
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 345, I. 74)

Despite Dryden's promise, he contents himself with using the monosyllabic 'pray' for Virgil's 'adorat', whereas Trapp chooses the related word 'adore'; the fact that he places it in the same end-line position should hardly come as a surprise by now.

Dido's address to Anna in Book IV comprises a sentence that is even more conspicuous in its reliance on cognates:

degeneres animos timor **arguit**.
(IV. 13)

Unmanly Fear
Argues degen'rate Souls:
(Trapp, I, 146, IV. 18-19)

Fear ever **argues** a **degenerate** kind,
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 451, IV. 17)

In this case, Trapp and Dryden are equally Latinate; however, the first edition of the latter's *Aeneis* reads 'Fear never harbours in a Noble Mind' – a version that does not yet include the words derived from 'degeneres' and 'arguit'.⁸ The reading accepted by *Works* is that of the second edition (1698), which could arguably have inspired Trapp. On the other hand, the same book features a hunting scene whose textual variants suggest that Dryden abandoned an initial cognate when revising his translation:

aut fulvum **descendere** monte leonem.
(IV. 159)

⁸ For this and the next example, compare the textual notes in *Works*, VI, 1156.

Or see the tawny Lyon downward bend
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 459, IV. 230)

Or tawny Lion from the Hills **descend**.
(Trapp, I, 156, IV. 210)

Dryden had originally written ‘Or see the Lyon from the Hills descend’, thus anticipating Trapp’s use of the disyllable at the end of the line. It is difficult to determine whether or not these parallels are the result of a direct influence, but even if Trapp consulted both editions of the precursor text, his local preferences for one over the other reflect a more consistent Latinity than either of them displays individually. Later in Book IV, we find the line with which Dido implores Aeneas not to leave her:

per **conubia** nostra, per inceptos **hymenaeos**,
(IV. 316)

by our **connubial** Rites,
And **Hymenéal** Loves but yet begun;
(Trapp, I, 166, IV. 409-10)

Now by those holy Vows, so late begun,
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 467, IV. 454)

Dryden contracts Virgil’s ‘conubia nostra’ and ‘hymenaeos’ to ‘holy Vows’; in Trapp, the terms keep their exotic appearance and, by virtue of being polysyllables, convey a greater sense of grandeur.

While these cognates stand out due to the obvious familial link with the words they translate, others are less immediately identifiable as relatives of their Latin equivalents. To draw on one further example from Book IV:

suadentque cadentia sidera somnos,
(IV. 81)

and setting Stars **persuade** to Sleep:
(Trapp, I, 151, IV. 112)

and falling Stars to Sleep invite,
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 455, IV. 115-16)

Both versions are perfectly faithful to the original, and Dryden’s use of ‘invite’, albeit prompted by the exigencies of rhyme, accords with the Latinizing programme laid out in

his Dedication. Still, Trapp manages to follow Virgil more closely by deriving the English verb ‘persuade’ from the Latin ‘(per)suadere’. In sum, his etymological astuteness appears to exceed even that of his predecessor.

What has been said so far might suggest that Trapp was aware of Dryden’s critical writings and extrapolated his aesthetic from the ideas he found there while simultaneously distancing himself from the predecessor’s actual practice in the *Aeneis*. In fact, however, there are numerous textual parallels between the two translations; their frequency points to an influence that runs far deeper than the superficial difference in poetic form would lead one to suspect. When Dryden is at his most literal, for instance, Trapp’s lines often look almost exactly the same as his. Book I has Aeneas make the following promise to his mother in disguise:

multa tibi ante aras nostra cadet hostia dextra.
(I. 334)

And offer’d Victims at your Altars fall.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 359, l. 460)

Our Victims shall before your Altars fall.
(Trapp, I, 21, l. 399)

Both translators render ‘hostia’ as ‘Victims’ and place the verb ‘fall’ at the end of the line; also, both leave ‘multa’ untranslated and turn the dative ‘tibi’ into a possessive pronoun. Even more similar are the two versions of Venus’s subsequent address to Cupid:

“Nate, meae vires, mea magna potentia, solus,
(I. 664)

My Son, my strength, whose mighty Pow’r alone
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 373, l. 937)

My Son, my Strength, my mighty Pow’r alone,
(Trapp, I, 41, l. 796)

Each rendering accurately reproduces the organisation of Virgil’s hexameter without adding or omitting anything; apart from the initial ‘My’, every English word corresponds to exactly one word in the Latin original. Trapp only departs from Dryden in his decision to translate ‘mea’ with its literal equivalent ‘my’ rather than with the relative pronoun

‘whose’. Likewise, Iopas’s performance towards the close of Book I looks nearly the same in both translations:

cithara crinitus Iopas
personat aurata, docuit quem maximus Atlas.
(I. 740-41)

Iopas brought
His golden Lyre, and sung what ancient *Atlas* taught:
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 376, I. 1038-39)

When curl’d *Iöpas* tun’d
His golden Lyre, and sung what *Atlas* taught;
(Trapp, I, 46, I. 897-98)

Trapp disposes of the adjective ‘ancient’ and thus cuts Dryden’s Alexandrine down to a regular pentameter line that is otherwise identical; through their placement right before the line break, the preceding subject and verb match their counterparts in the earlier translation.

Book IV contains several phrases and clauses whose English versions differ from each other by virtue of only a single word. Here is Dido furiously comparing Aeneas to the offspring of wild animals:

Hyrcaenaeque admorunt ubera tigres.
(IV. 367)

And rough *Hyrceanian* Tygers gave thee suck.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 469, IV. 525)

And fierce *Hyrceanian* Tygers gave thee suck.
(Trapp, I, 169, IV. 481)

The matching translation of ‘admorunt ubera’ as ‘gave thee suck’ is particularly suggestive of Trapp’s indebtedness to Dryden. Some 100 lines later, we encounter a description of the marble temple that Dido has erected in honour of her dead husband:

velleribus niveis et festa fronde revinctum
(IV. 459)

With snowy Fleeces, and with Garlands crown’d:
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 473, IV. 666)

With snowy Fleeces, and fresh Garlands crown'd.
(Trapp, I, 176, IV. 612)

Again, Trapp slightly improves the literalness of Dryden's translation by replacing one of his words; in this case, 'fresh' is substituted for 'with' and serves as the structural analogue of the Latin adjective 'festus'. Another example of this kind is Dido's curse that Aeneas should fail in his mission and die a premature death:

sed cadat ante diem mediaque inhumatus harena.
(IV. 620)

And lye unbury'd on the barren Sand.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 480, IV. 892)

And lie unbury'd on the common Sand.
(Trapp, I, 186, IV. 827)

Once more, the two English versions are not only almost identical to each other but also roughly imitate the distribution of Virgil's syntactical elements, as the verb drifts towards the beginning of the line and the locative stands at its end.

A comparison between Dryden's and Trapp's respective translations of Book x reveals further instances of close renderings that are practically identical. Juno bewails Turnus's impending demise in these words:

nunc manet insontem gravis exitus
(X. 630)

Now speedy Death attends the guiltless Youth,
(Dryden, *Works*, VI, 705, X. 892)

Now a hard Fate attends the guiltless Youth;
(Trapp, II, 671, X. 838)

The verb 'manet' is rendered as 'attends' in each case, and both translators extract the noun 'Youth' from Virgil's substantivized adjective 'insontem'. One of the ensuing battle scenes depicts Mezentius launching an attack against Acron:

sic ruit in densos alacer Mezentius hostis.
(X. 729)

So proud *Mezentius* rushes on his Foes,
(Dryden, *Works*, IV, 709, X. 1026)

So glad *Mezentius* rushes on the Foes;
(Trapp, II, 677, X. 965)

As we have almost come to expect, the English versions mirror the metrical arrangement of the words in the source text, with ‘sic’/‘So’ appearing at the head of the line and ‘hostis’/‘Foes’ marking its closure.

For a perfect match between two renderings of the same Latin material, one can turn to the following lines in Book IV:

At pius Aeneas, quamquam lenire dolentem
solando cupit et dictis avertere curas,
(IV. 393-94)

But good *Aeneas*, tho’ he much desir’d
To give that Pity, which her Grief requir’d,
(Dryden, *Works*, V, 470, IV. 568-69)

But good *Aeneas*, tho’ he much desir’d
By comforting to ease her Grief,
(Trapp, I, 171, IV. 518-19)

It seems that Trapp copied the first half of Dryden’s couplet verbatim and then complemented it with his own translation of ‘lenire dolentem | solando’. Even if we allow for a certain degree of coincidence, these examples qualify the aforementioned accusations of licentiousness by proving that the earlier translator could be just as literal as his epigone.

In addition to lines whose identical appearance might potentially have resulted from a common endeavour to remain faithful to Virgil’s original, the two translations display many correspondences that are less likely to have been suggested by the source text itself. Juno’s request for Aeolus’s help is a case in point:

ad quem tum Iuno supplex his vocibus usa est:
(I. 64)

To whom the suppliant Queen her Pray’rs addrest,
And thus the tenour of her Suit express’d.
(Dryden, *Works*, V, 346, I. 95-96)

To whom then *Juno* thus with suppliant Words
Her Suit address'd.

(Trapp, I, 5, l. 77-78)

While Dryden's 'address't' and 'Suit' do communicate the semantic import of the original, neither word is strictly required by the Latin text. Trapp's use of the same vocabulary thus catches the eye, as does the Drydenian expansion that he echoes when translating the Tyrians' reception of Ascanius at a later point:

mirantur Iulum
flagrantisque dei vultus simulataque verba
(l. 709-10)

But view the beauteous Boy with more amaze:
His Rosy-colour'd Cheeks, his radiant Eyes,
His Motions, Voice, and Shape, and all the God's disguise.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 375, l. 991-93)

Admire *Iulus* in the God disguis'd,
His glowing Looks, and well dissembled Words,
(Trapp, I, 44, l. 849-50)

Although less redundant, the second version still depends on a loose phrase that looks as if it was gained by taking Dryden's line ending 'God's disguise' and giving it a little morphological twist.

In Book IV, Iarbas implores his father Jupiter to thwart Dido's liaison with Aeneas:

rpto potitur: nos munera templis
quippe tuis ferimus famamque fovemus inanem."
(IV. 217-18)

He takes the Spoil, enjoys the Princely Dame;
And I, rejected I, adore an empty Name.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 462, IV. 318-19)

Enjoys the Prize; while we with Gifts supply
Your Temples, and maintain an empty Name.
(Trapp, I, 159, IV. 283-84)

The English line pairs are fairly discrete, except for the fact that both translate 'famam' as 'Name' – an idiosyncratic solution at which Trapp probably did not arrive on his own.

Likewise, his rendering of Dido's reaction to Aeneas starts with a half-line that he could have borrowed from Dryden:

Talia dicentem iam dudum aversa tuetur,
(IV. 362)

Thus, while he spoke, already She began,
With sparkling Eyes, to view the guilty Man:
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 469, IV. 518-19)

Thus while he spoke, she silently intent
Ey'd him averse;
(Trapp, I, 169, IV. 473-74)

It is hard to believe that Trapp had no alternative but to use 'Thus, while he spoke' for 'Talia dicentem', and the description of Aeneas during the Trojans' hasty departure from Carthage also shows signs of derivativeness:

strictoque ferit retinacula ferro.
(IV. 580)

His thund'ring Arm divides the many twisted Cord:
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 478, IV. 834)

and with his thundring Arm
Divides the Cables:
(Trapp, I, 184, IV. 774-75)

In his free translation of Virgil's 'stricto [...] ferro' ('drawn blade') as 'thundring Arm', Trapp evidently followed Dryden; an identical rendering by chance seems highly implausible. To give one final example from Book IV, the two versions of Dido's curse betray a similar connection:

nec, cum se sub leges pacis iniquae
tradiderit, regno aut optata luce fruatur,
(IV. 618-19)

And when, at length, the cruell War shall cease;
On hard Conditions may he buy his Peace.
Nor let him then enjoy supreme Command;
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 480, IV. 888-90)

At last on hard Conditions forc'd to sue
 For Peace, his Kingdom let him ne'er enjoy,
 (Trapp, I, 186, IV. 824-25)

Dryden and Trapp both render 'leges' as 'hard conditions'; again, their translations are too remote from the source text for this parallel to be accidental.

Trapp's version of Book x is equally rich in borrowings from his predecessor. One need only look at how he translates Juno's rhetorical question:

aut ego tela dedi fovique Cupidine bella?
 (x. 93)

Was I the Cause of Mischief, or the Man,
 Whose lawless Lust the fatal War began?
 (Dryden, *Works*, VI, 683, x. 139-40)

Did I give him Arms?
 Or with his lawless Lust foment the War?
 (Trapp, II, 636, x. 131-32)

The adjective 'lawless' is completely un-Virgilian, yet Trapp could not resist the charm of Dryden's alliteration and incorporated it into his own translation, thus violating the self-imposed rule to render the original word for word. He also takes some liberties with the motivational speech that Turnus gives to the Rutulians:

nunc magna referto
 facta, patrum laudes.
 (x. 281-82)

And emulate in Arms your Fathers Fame.
 (Dryden, *Works*, VI, 690, x. 395)

Now emulate your great Forefathers' Fame,
 And imitate their Actions.
 (Trapp, II, 648, x. 376-77)

Appropriately enough, 'laudes' finds an equivalent in 'Fame'. The verb 'emulate', on the other hand, goes one step beyond the Latin 'referto'; Dryden's Turnus is asking his men to repeat the deeds of their ancestors rather than to simply remember them. Trapp in his turn not only absorbs these elements but also adds the conceptually linked word 'imitate'. The

reference to Lausus's martial prowess further exemplifies the impact of the earlier translator:

Lausus
pars ingens belli,
(x. 426-27)

Lausus, no small portion of the War,
(Dryden, *Works*, VI, 696, X. 601)

Lausus, no small Portion of the War,
(Trapp, II, 657, X. 564)

Trapp copies Dryden down to his very use of the litotes 'no small' for Virgil's adjective 'ingens'. Another correspondence can be observed between the two versions of Aeneas killing the priest Haemonides:

immolat ingentique umbra tegit,
(x. 541)

Sent him an Off'ring to the Shades below.
(Dryden, *Works*, VI, 701, X. 754)

And sends him to the Shades below:
(Trapp, II, 665, X. 717)

The Latin does not say anything about 'send[ing]'; this verb appears to have entered Trapp's translation via Dryden's intermediary rendering, as does the adverb 'below'. Shortly afterwards, the havoc wrought by Aeneas spawns a similarly creative expansion of a thought:

sic toto Aeneas desaevit in aequore victor
ut semel intepuit mucro.
(x. 569-70)

With Strength like his the *Trojan* Heroe stood,
And soon the Fields with falling Corps were strow'd,
When once his Fauchion found the Taste of Blood.
(Dryden, *Works*, VI, 703, X. 799-801)

Like him o'er all the Field *Aeneas* storm'd
Victor, when once his Steel grew warm with Blood.
(Trapp, II, 667, X. 754-55)

There is no explicit mention of ‘Blood’ in Virgil. Trapp adopts the word that Dryden has inferred from the context and thus once more permits himself to be influenced by the predecessor whose liberal method he ostensibly criticised. This constant recourse to the 1697 *Aeneis* goes against the translator’s professed literalism and gives the lie to his prefatory claims of autonomy; despite the difference between couplet and blank verse, Trapp’s is not, essentially, ‘an Undertaking of *another kind*’.

Moreover, the borrowings from Dryden tend to receive the same treatment as the words and phrases of the source text itself in that they are often left in their respective metrical positions. Trapp’s Book I features a whole series of examples that illustrate this characteristic. To begin with, let us consider Juno’s partiality for Carthage and its inhabitants:

hic currus fuit, hoc regnum dea gentibus esse,
si qua fata sinant, iam tum tenditque fovetque.
(I. 17-18)

Here stood her Chariot, here, if Heav’n were kind,
The Seat of awful Empire she design’d.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 344, l. 25-26)

Here lay her Arms,
And Chariot: This ev’n Then, would Fate permit,
For Universal Empire she design’d.
(Trapp, I, 2, l. 19-21)

‘Empire’ matches ‘regnum’ both semantically and by virtue of occupying a central spot between the third and fourth foot of the English pentameter. Trapp appropriates the effect of twofold equivalence that he discovers in Dryden, along with the rest of the latter’s half-line. He makes a similar move when translating Neptune’s reprimand of the winds released by Aeolus:

non illi imperium pelagi saevumque tridentem,
sed mihi sorte datum.
(I. 138-39)

The Realms of Ocean and the Fields of Air
Are mine, not his; by fatal Lot to me
The liquid Empire fell, and Trident of the Sea.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 348-49, l. 196-98)

To Me, not Him, the Empire of the Main,
And awful Trident fell:

(Trapp, I, 9, l. 164-65)

The participle ‘datum’ is rendered with the finite verb ‘fell’, which each translator places on the sixth syllable of his last line. Apart from this one point of congruity, their versions do not bear much of a resemblance; like its Latin counterpart, however, the word functions to mark a medial caesura, which seems to be the main reason why it also appears in the later translation. Trapp thus replicates Dryden’s rhythm as well as part of his lexis.

It becomes clear from the other instances in Book I that such microscopic alignments occur even where the two English renderings deviate from Virgil’s metrical structure. The element in question usually stands at the end of a line. After being cast ashore, Aeneas keeps a lookout for his comrades:

Anthea si quem
iactatum vento videat Phrygiasque biremis,
aut Capyn, aut celsis in puppibus arma Caici.

(I. 181-83)

If *Capys* thence, or *Antheus* he cou’d spy;
Or see the Streamers of *Caicus* fly.

(Dryden, *Works*, v, 350, l. 257-58)

If *Antheus*, or the *Phrygian* Gallies there
Toss’d by the Wind, or *Capys* he might spy,
Or on the lofty deck *Caicus*’ Arms.

(Trapp, I, 12, l. 215-17)

Dryden translates ‘videat’ as ‘might spy’ and shifts the verb out of its mid-line position. Trapp, whose lexical distribution here is quite unlike that of his predecessor, nevertheless uses the latter’s rhyme word ‘spy’ to finish one of his own lines. The compositional process repeats itself in the translation of Dido’s escape from Tyre:

his commota fugam Dido sociosque parabat.

(I. 360)

Admonish’d thus, and seiz’d with mortal fright,
The queen provides Companions of her flight:

(Dryden, *Works*, v, 360, l. 495-96)

Dido o'ersway'd by this, provides for Flight,
Prepares her Friends:

(Trapp, I, 23, l. 429-30)

The noun 'flight' corresponds to 'fugam' and closes the second half of Dryden's couplet so as to rhyme with 'fright'. Again, Trapp inserts the word into an analogous metrical slot rather than trying to imitate the organisation of the Latin verse.

While this could arguably be dismissed as mere coincidence, a direct influence is less easy to deny if we compare how the Trojan prince introduces himself to Dido in each of the two translations:

sum pius Aeneas, raptos qui ex hoste penates
classe veho mecum, fama super aethera notus;

(I. 378-79)

The Good *Aeneas* am I call'd, a Name,
While Fortune favour'd, not unknown to Fame:
My household Gods, Companions of my Woes,
With pious Care I rescu'd from our Foes.

(Dryden, *Works*, v, 360, l. 521-24)

I am the good *Aeneas*, known by Fame
Above the Heav'ns; who rescu'd from the Foe,
And carry in my Ships our Country Gods.

(Trapp, I, 24, l. 452-54)

Trapp agrees with Dryden in two of his three line endings; the identical rendering of 'raptos' as 'rescu'd', especially, suggests his indebtedness to the precursor version. A slightly more complex case is the moment at which Aeneas recognises Venus:

"quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis
ludis imaginibus?"

(I. 407-08)

Unkind and cruel, to deceive your Son
In borrow'd Shapes, and his Embrace to shun:

(Dryden, *Works*, v, 361, l. 564-65)

And why so oft
With borrow'd shapes do You too mock your Son,
Ah! Cruel?

(Trapp, I, 26, l. 487-89)

Trapp takes the phrases ‘your Son’ and ‘borrow’d shapes’ from the first and second half of Dryden’s couplet, respectively, and fuses them into a single line, but without changing their original placement; the words remain in exactly the same metrical positions as before.

Larger chunks of verbal material are borrowed to render Aeneas’s admiration for the Carthaginian settlement:

“o fortunati, quorum iam moenia surgunt!”
Aeneas ait et fastigia suspicit urbis.
(I. 437-38)

Thrice happy you, whose Walls already rise;
Aeneas said; and view’d, with lifted Eyes,
Their lofty Tow’rs;
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 363, I. 610-12)

O happy These, whose Walls already rise!
Said the brave Prince, and looking up survey’d
The lofty turrets:
(Trapp, I, 27, I. 522-24)

Granted, ‘whose Walls already rise’ is so close a translation of ‘quorum iam moenia surgunt’ that Trapp would be hard pressed to improve on it, and by forming the latter part of a line out of this relative clause Dryden has reconstructed Virgil’s hexameter quite perfectly. On the other hand, ‘lofty Tow’rs’ does not readily present itself as a solution for ‘fastigia [...] urbis’, yet this phrase, too, is absorbed with only minor alterations; Trapp uses the diminutive ‘turret’ and replaces the possessive ‘Their’ with the simple article ‘The’, but the components still make up the first half of a decasyllable. One should also note that both translators leave a space of one line between these metrical building blocks. Another parallel emerges when Dido offers her assistance in the search for the missing Trojans:

equidem per litora certos
dimittam et Libyae lustrare extrema iubebo,
(I. 576-77)

My People shall, by my Command, explore
The Ports and Creeks of ev’ry winding shore;
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 368, I. 808-09)

Nay, I will send
 To search the Coasts of Libya, and explore
 It's utmost Bounds;
 (Trapp, I, 36, I. 690-92)

Once more, an identically rendered element is positioned in accordance with Dryden's *Æneis* while the rest of the Latin original turns into something dissimilar; 'explore' translates 'lustrare' and becomes the last word of Trapp's second line.

A few examples from Book IV may complement this list of simultaneous correspondences in vocabulary and metre. The first is Anna's visualisation of the political alliance that would result from her sister's marriage to Aeneas:

Punica se quantis attollet gloria rebus!
 (IV. 49)

How will your Empire spread, your City rise
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 453, IV. 64)

to what a Height
 Of Greatness will the *Punic* Glory rise!
 (Trapp, I, 149, IV. 66-67)

Trapp follows Dryden by translating the reflexive 'se [...] attollet' as 'rise' and by putting it at the end of a line. He is equally indebted to his predecessor for the account of Fame:

gaudens, et pariter facta atque infecta canebat:
 (IV. 190)

Things done relates, not done she feigns; and mingles Truth with Lyes.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 461, IV. 271)

Pleas'd with her Task, and mingles truth with Lies.
 (Trapp, I, 158, IV. 248)

Dryden's rare fourteener is redundant because the two parts before and after the caesura each translate all of Virgil's 'pariter facta atque infecta canebat'; in borrowing the last three feet, interestingly, Trapp settles for the less literal version. He executes the same manoeuvre when Orestes makes an appearance in Dido's dream:

ultricesque sedent in limine Dirae.
(IV. 473)

The furies guard the Door; and intercept his flight.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 473, IV. 687)

revengeful fiends
Sit in the Doors, and intercept his Flight.
(Trapp, I, 177, IV. 630-31)

Four iambic feet are drawn directly from Dryden's Alexandrine; Trapp merely adds two monosyllables in front of them. What gives this conformity between the translators prominence is the fact that 'intercept his flight' has no Latin equivalent in the source text. A third local alignment takes place during the portrayal of resting animals at night:

lenibant curas et corda oblita laborum.
(IV. 528)

Forgetting the past Labours of the day.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 476, IV. 766)

Forget their cares, and lose the Toils of Day.
(Trapp, I, 180, IV. 703)

Besides copying the rhyme word 'day', Trapp also recycles the verb with which Dryden opens his line; the only thing that differentiates him is the change of inflection. As in some of the previous instances, the primary focus of derivation seems to lie on phrases that occur around metrical junctures, whereas new material is used to fill the intervening gaps.

These acts of appropriation also extend to the second half of Dryden's translation, as four passages in Book x demonstrate. The first describes a pensive Aeneas:

hic magnus sedet Aeneas secumque volutat
eventus belli varios,
(x.159-60)

Under their grateful Shade *Aeneas* sate
Revolving Wars Events, and various Fate.
(Dryden, *Works*, VI, 685, x. 235-36)

Here great *Aeneas* sits; and in his Breast
Revolves the various Hazards of the War:
(Trapp, II, 640, x. 220-21)

The choice of ‘revolve’ must have been prompted by its etymological connection to ‘volutat’. Trapp, like Dryden, pushes the word over the end of his first line and thus gives it an initial position; as was the case with ‘Forgetting’ and ‘Forget’ in the last example, the difference between the two is only morphological. An influence also manifests itself when Aeneas encounters the nymphs that used to be his ships before Cybele transformed them:

quot prius aeratae steterant ad litora prorae.
agnoscunt longe regem lustrantque choreis;
(x. 223-24)

As rode before tall Vessels on the Deep.
They know him from afar; and, in a Ring,
Inclose the Ship that bore the *Trojan* King.
(Dryden, *Works*, VI, 687-88, x. 315-17)

As stood before tall Vessels on the Beach.
They know their Prince from far; and in a Ring
Inclose him round:
(Trapp, II, 644, x. 303-05)

Rather than availing himself of a word that either precedes or follows a line break, Trapp on this occasion reproduces the entire enjambment of ‘in a Ring, | Inclose’. Moreover, the substitution of ‘stood’ for ‘rode’ and ‘Beach’ for ‘Deep’ cannot distract from the lexical and syntactical congruence between the translators’ respective first lines, and to replace ‘him from afar’ with ‘their Prince from far’ is a modification hardly worth mentioning. The next passage contains an epic simile describing the phantom image of Aeneas that Juno has created to lure Turnus away from the battlefield:

morte obita qualis fama est volitare figuras
aut quae sopitos deludunt somnia sensus.
(x. 641-42)

(Thus haunting Ghosts appear to waking Sight,
Or dreadful Visions in our Dreams by Night.)
(Dryden, *Works*, VI, 706, x. 908-09)

Such Figures, as ’tis said, departed Ghosts
Flutt’ring assume; or mimic Dreams by Night.
(Trapp, II, 672, x. 853-54)

‘Dreams by Night’ is yet another line ending that Trapp adopts despite its distance from the Latin original, which does not support the use of Dryden’s rhyme word. Finally, we have Mezentius talking to his horse:

neque enim, fortissime, credo,
iussa aliena pati et dominos dignabere Teucros.”
(x. 865-66)

For after such a Lord, I rest secure,
Thou wilt no foreign Reins, or *Trojan* Load endure.
(Dryden, *Works*, vi, 716, x. 1239-40)

For, gen’rous Beast, thou wilt, I rest assur’d,
No forreign Lord, or *Trojan* Burthen bear.
(Trapp, ii, 687, x. 1147-48)

Semantically and metrically, ‘I rest secure’ corresponds to the much simpler ‘credo’. Trapp makes this phrase his own, but even though he exchanges the last word, a phonetical link to Dryden remains as ‘assur’d’ and ‘secure’ produce a curious kind of intertextual assonance. The earlier version is thus always kept in view during the process of rendering the *Aeneid* into English; the translator may consider it too licentious and formally restrained, yet instead of correcting these perceived flaws, he actually emulates them through the rhyme words that he gains from his predecessor, which had been partially dictated by the structure of the heroic couplet itself and, as a result, often constitute breaches of literal fidelity to Virgil’s epic.

If a translator takes recourse to a pre-existing translation of his original in order to look for guidance or avoid mistakes, we naturally expect him to focus on the lexical items that correspond to whichever word or sentence he is trying to render at the moment. In all of the above cases, Trapp’s indebtedness to Dryden is obvious because the two of them use the same phrase at the same point in the translation process. However, Trapp can also be seen to engage in a subtler form of borrowing when he takes one of Dryden’s expressions but relates it to a different element of the source text. This happens repeatedly in Book I, for example after Neptune’s rebuke of the East and West Wind:

Sic ait, et dicto citius tumida aequora placat
 collectasque fugat nubes solemque reducit.
 [...]

 et vastas aperit syrtis et temperat aequor
 (I. 142-46)

He spoke: And while he spoke, he smooth'd the Sea,
 Dispell'd the Darkness, and restor'd the Day:
 [...]

 And opes the Deep, and spreads the moving sands;
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 349, I. 203-09)

So spoke the god; and sooner than He spoke,
 Appeas'd the Tossing of the Waves, dispell'd
 The clouds collected, and restor'd the Sun.
 [...]

 Levels the Banks of sand, and smooths the Sea,
 (Trapp, I, 10, I. 169-75)

While both translators render 'fugat' as 'dispell'd', the line ending 'smooth'd the Sea' changes its referent, matching 'aequora placat' in Dryden's version and 'temperat aequor' in Trapp's. These Latin phrases are several lines apart; usually, however, a shift in signification affects words that stand in close proximity to one another, as Aeneas's speech to his fellows instantiates:

per varios casus, per tot discrimina rerum
 tendimus in Latium,
 (I. 204-05)

Through various Hazards, and Events we move
 To *Latium*,
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 351, I. 285-86)

Thro' various Toils,
 Thro' all these Hazards we to *Latium* steer;
 (Trapp, I, 13, I. 240-41)

In each case, 'Hazards' translates one of two quasi-synonymous terms; Dryden uses it for 'casus', Trapp for 'discrimina rerum'. Such a parallel also materialises when Ilioneus, seeking asylum, receives an answer from the queen of Carthage:

Tum breviter Dido vultum demissa profatur:
 "solvite corde metum, Teucrici, secludite curas.
 res dura et regni novitas
 (I. 561-63)

The modest Queen a while, with down-cast Eyes,
 Ponder'd the Speech; then briefly thus replies.
Trojans dismiss your Fears: my cruel Fate,
 And doubts attending an unsettled State,
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 368, l. 788-91)

Dido with downcast Looks in brief replies.
Trojans, dismiss your Doubts, seclude your Cares:
 My difficult Affairs, and infant State
 (Trapp, I, 35, l. 672-74)

As well as 'replies', 'dismiss', and 'State' (which are again left in their respective metrical spots), Trapp copies the noun 'doubts' that Dryden introduces as an expansion upon 'regni novitas', but he specifically connects it with 'metum' in the preceding line. Sometimes a word only needs to switch its grammatical function to represent another part of the original; Book IV's depiction of Dido's hunting attire is illustrative in this regard:

crines nodantur in aurum,
 aurea purpuream subnectit fibula vestem.
 (IV. 138-39)

Her flowing Hair, a Golden Caul restrains;
 A golden Clasp, the *Tyrian* Robe sustains.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 459, IV. 198-99)?

Her Tresses in a golden Knot confin'd;
 A golden Buckle clasps her purple Robe.
 (Trapp, I, 154, IV. 184-85)

Trapp turns Dryden's 'Clasp' into a verb that translates 'subnectit' rather than 'fibula'. To cite one further example, the rendering of Orodoes's death in Book X involves the shared usage of a verb for different purposes:

olli dura quies oculos et ferreus urget
 somnus, in aeternam clauduntur lumina noctem.
 (X. 745-46)

A hov'ring Mist came swimming o're his sight,
 And seal'd his Eyes in everlasting Night.
 (Dryden, *Works*, VI, 710, X. 1050-51)

And iron Slumber seals his heavy Eyes,
 And closes them in everlasting Night.
 (Trapp, II, 679, X. 986-87)

Dryden's 'seal'd' renders 'clauduntur', whereas Trapp's 'seals' corresponds to 'urget'; the congruity between their versions would be negligible if it were not for the additional half-line 'in everlasting Night' that the two translators have in common. Combined with the more substantial borrowings discussed above, these lexical details prove that, all prefatory assertions to the contrary, the blank verse *Aeneid* is deeply influenced by its couplet precursor.

Perhaps the mode of analysis adopted so far does not do justice to Trapp's achievement, however, for by focussing on the minutiae of metrical composition, one can easily lose sight of the larger movement and overall effect of his verse. Judging by the preface, he regarded this as a particular opportunity for excellence; rhymed decasyllables like those of his predecessors may seem preferable if they are scrutinised on an individual basis, but in greater quantities they fall short of the forcefulness and elegance that he ascribes to his own favourite form:

You may pick out more Lines, which, singly considered, look mean, and low, from a Poem in Blank Verse, than from one in Rhime: supposing them to be in other respects equal. Take the Lines singly by themselves, or in Couplets; and more in Blank Verse shall be less strong, and smooth, than in Rhime: But then take a considerable Number together; and Blank Verse shall have the Advantage in both Regards. (I, p. xliii)

Sadly, the main body of the text does not really live up to the translator's promise, as certain passages suffer from a lack of clarity due to their overly Latinate word order. The meal cooked by Aeneas's shipwrecked crew in Book I is a case in point:

tum Cererem corruptam undis Cerealiaque arma
expediunt fessi rerum, frugesque receptas
et torrere parant flammis et frangere saxo.
(I. 177-79)

Then tir'd with Toil, Provision marr'd and dank,
And Instruments of *Ceres* they produce;
Corn rescu'd from the Wreck they then prepare
To grind with Stones, and bake upon the Fire.
(Trapp, I, 12, I. 209-12)

The *Trojans*, dropping wet, or stand around
 The chearful blaze, or lye along the Ground:
 Some dry their Corn infected with the Brine,
 Then grind with Marbles, and prepare to dine.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 350, l. 251-54)

Trapp's first two lines are all but incomprehensible. Putting the adjective phrase 'tir'd with Toil' at the beginning of the sentence and suspending the subject and verb to the end of the second line, he makes it difficult to recognise 'Provision marr'd and dank, | And Instruments of *Ceres*' as the accusative objects that they are; 'Toil' clashes with the adjacent noun 'Provision', and the sequence of 'they then prepare' in the third line sounds equally awkward. Dryden's couplets, by contrast, impress with their neat parallelisms and even distribution of verbs. Likewise, the slavish adherence to Virgilian syntax becomes a problem when Trapp goes about rendering Ilioneus's plea for help:

rex erat Aeneas nobis, quo iustior alter
 nec pietate fuit, nec bello maior et armis.
 quem si fata virum servant, si vescitur aura
 aetheria neque adhuc crudelibus occubat umbris,
 non metus, officio nec te certasse priorem
 paeniteat.
 (I. 544-49)

Aeneas was our Prince; than whom more just
 Was none, nor more renown'd in War, and Arms.
 Whom if the Fates preserve, if vital Air
 He breaths, nor mingles with the sullen Shades;
 No more of Fear: nor shall you e'er repent
 Of having first oblig'd:
 (Trapp, I, 34, l. 651-56)

Aeneas was our Prince, a juster Lord,
 Or nobler Warriour, never drew a Sword:
 Observant of the Right, religious of his Word.
 If yet he lives, and draws this vital Air:
 Nor we his Friends of Safety shall despair;
 Nor you, great Queen, these Offices repent,
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 367, l. 767-772)

No matter how accurately they mirror the inverted elements of the original, relative constructions such as 'than whom more just' or 'Whom if the Fates' simply do not work in English. One also wishes that Trapp had made some effort to interpret the elliptical 'non metus' as opposed to merely reproducing it; his predecessor devotes an entire line to this clause and uses anaphora to balance it against the first half of the ensuing couplet. Thus,

neither extract from the blank verse translation bears comparison with the 1697 *Aeneis*; even collectively, Trapp's pentameters fail to reach (let alone surpass) the strength and smoothness of Dryden's.

The nature of the borrowed phrases from the earlier version points to a possible explanation for this failure. If the translator is right about a poem being more than the sum of its parts, then his literalism would seem counterproductive because it predisposes him to a micro- rather than a macro-level focus on the source text; a word-for-word rendering does not necessarily imply an awareness of the work as a whole. That Trapp rarely saw beyond the line he was translating at the moment is indicated by his appropriation of so many of Dryden's rhyme words; since he has a habit of copying those feet that mark transitions between decasyllabic units, his perspective appears to concentrate on metrical boundaries and thus to neglect the overarching structure of Virgil's paragraphs. Unless a conscious effort is made to organise it into longer segments, blank verse will not automatically look more coherent than heroic couplets. Jove's dialogue with Venus in Book I shows just how close the two forms can get to each other on some occasions:

Olli subridens hominum sator atque deorum
 vultu, quo caelum tempestatesque seremat,
 oscula libavit natae, dehinc talia fatur:
(I. 254-56)

To whom, the Father of th' immortal Race,
 Smiling with that serene indulgent Face,
 With which he drives the Clouds, and clears the Skies:
 First gave a holy Kiss, then thus replies.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 353-55, I. 346-49)

Smiling on Her, the Sire of Men and Gods,
 With that smooth Look which clears the stormy Sky,
 His Daughter gently kiss'd, and thus reply'd.
(Trapp, I, 16, I. 303-05)

Trapp stops short of replicating the rhyme between 'Skies' and 'replies'; the only thing that differentiates his line endings from Dryden's is their inflection. Given the frequency with which the translators coincide in places where one would expect them to be most at variance, the later rendering hardly delivers the revolutionary formal innovations that its preface announces. In addition to undermining attempts at faithfulness to the Latin original,

Dryden's influence thus interferes with the advancement in versification proposed by his successor.

In conclusion, one may hypothesise about the cause of this surprising indebtedness. Why did Trapp, whose declared goal it was to engage in an 'Undertaking of *another kind*', feel the need to consult the couplet translation at all? Theoretically, the novelty of his approach would certainly have justified an independent and uncompetitive coexistence of the two texts. On account of its extreme reverence for the letter of the *Aeneid*, Trapp's version might have lent itself to educational purposes; replicating Virgil's syntax and using cognates whenever possible, it could still function as an ideal crib for school boys today. However, this is not all that the translator envisaged for his creation:

A work of This Nature is to be regarded in Two different Views; both as a *Poem*, and as a *Translated Poem*. In the one, all Persons of good Sense, and a true Taste of Poetry, are Judges of it; tho' they are skilled in no Language, but their Own. In the other, those only are so; who besides the Qualification just mentioned, are familiarly acquainted with the Original. [...] The Unlearned are affected like Those, who see the Picture of One whose Character they admire; but whose Person they never saw: The Learned, like Those who see the Picture of one whom they love, and admire; and with whom they are intimately acquainted. [...] Delightful therefore it is to compare the Version with the Original: Through the whole Course of which Comparison, we discover many retired Beauties in the Author himself, which we never before observed. [...] Therefore, the better we understand a Poet, the more we love and admire him; the more Pleasure we conceive in reading him well translated: [...] he who says he values no Translation of this, or that Poem, because he understands the Original, has indeed no true Relish, that is, in effect, no *true Understanding of Either*. (I, p. xxxix)

Trapp occupies an interesting middle position between the scholarly and the aesthetic viewpoint; while his idea of translation is to illuminate the *Aeneid* by recreating the enjoyment that its first audience would have experienced, the result still ought to offer something more; not only will a good rendering of the ancient epic be able to stand on its own and satisfy readers who have no possibility to compare it to the source text, but Trapp suggests that even those with perfect fluency in Latin will be able to benefit from such a translation for their understanding and appreciation of the original. Despite objecting to the licentiousness of previous versions, the translator clearly aimed to produce a surplus of poetic value, and although he thought himself sufficiently equipped to carry across Virgil's meaning, he may have required the help of a more accomplished versifier to mould it into an attractive shape.

Trapp's case thus bears out Caldwell's assertion that 'Despite the insistence on faithfulness to the letter in eighteenth-century translation theory, [...] the most eminent translators of the period felt compelled to adapt Virgil's poetry, using Dryden as guide' (p. 185), but it also highlights the potential consequences this could have for the success of blank verse as a medium in subsequent English *Aeneids*. The focus on Dryden's rhyme words, especially, suggests the continuing appeal of self-contained line pairs as opposed to the larger syntactic movements of the Latin original; evidently, the couplet had not yet run its course, and the next chapter will show that there was at least one major attempt to parallel Dryden's achievement in his own favourite verse form. Moreover, Trapp's reliance on blank verse is as much a tribute to *Paradise Lost* as it is a reflection of his desire to be literal; the translator kept not one but two English poets in view. Indeed, David Fairer suggests that the point of Trapp's translation may have been to place Milton in the company of Homer and Virgil as the creator of 'an epic poem that was both national and universal', and the same motivation might lie behind a commercially unsuccessful rendering of *Paradise Lost* into Latin hexameters that Trapp went on to publish at his own expense.⁹ As we shall see, this kind of Miltonolatry would bear much more interesting fruit in the decades to come.

⁹ David Fairer, 'Creating a National Poetry: The Tradition of Spenser and Milton', in *The Cambridge Companion to Eighteenth-Century Poetry*, ed. by John Sitter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 177-201 (p. 184).

3. 'Scarce Any Thing Even of Emulation': Christopher Pitt

Christopher Pitt (1699-1748) was arguably the most popular of Dryden's eighteenth-century successors. He seems to have excelled at translation from a young age, submitting a metrical version of Lucan's *Pharsalia* to the examiners at New College, Oxford, before being elected as a scholar in 1719.¹ After an experimental attempt at Book I (1728), Pitt's complete translation of the *Aeneid* appeared in 1740 and was reprinted several times: first separately (1743), then as part of Joseph Warton's bilingual *Works of Virgil* (1753, 1778, 1790), and finally in a few later compilations of poetry. Its impact can be gauged from the comparison with Dryden's *Aeneis* that Samuel Johnson offers in his entry on Pitt in *The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets*; praising them as 'the two best translations that perhaps were ever produced by one nation of the same author', Johnson goes on to specify their respective merits:

If the two versions are compared, perhaps the result would be, that Dryden leads the reader forward by his general vigour and sprightliness, and Pitt often stops him to contemplate the excellence of a single couplet; that Dryden's faults are forgotten in the hurry of delight, and that Pitt's beauties are neglected in the languor of a cold and listless perusal; that Pitt pleases the criticks, and Dryden the people, that Pitt is quoted, and Dryden read. (IV, 95)

This assessment gives us cause to wonder whether Pitt himself had any hope of improving upon his esteemed predecessor, especially as he followed Dryden in employing the heroic couplet, and whether there was anything new about his 'beauties' that made them particularly appealing to fellow men of letters (if not to the reading public at large). The late eighteenth-century juxtaposition of the two English *Aeneids* invites us to compare them more closely.

As we shall see, not only did Pitt manage to please quite a few critics before he had even finished his translation, but their positive response appears to have been a driving force behind the project's completion. The translator's social and professional connections provide one means of understanding his work, which emerges from lively theoretical discussion and draws on the latest contributions to literary criticism. Especially valuable evidence of external influences can be obtained by tracing the gradual appearance of the text in print, as Pitt continued to revise the already published segments before reincorporating

¹ Samuel Johnson, *The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets: With Critical Observations on their Works*, ed. by Roger Lonsdale, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006), IV, 94.

them into the whole. These modifications differentiate individual stages of the creative process and thus allow us to observe how his priorities changed and developed over time, revealing, on the one hand, an impulse towards emancipation from his precursor and, on the other, the limitations of any couplet translation composed after Dryden's *Aeneis*.

Pitt's success has been attributed to the exposure he received through Warton's massive 1753 publication in four volumes. Caldwell calls this edition a 'mammoth "Virgil"' (p. 141) and cites its multiple appendices to support her claim that 'serious eighteenth-century efforts to render Virgil English [...] were essentially scholarly' (p. 167). The supplementary materials, she argues, strip the Roman poet of his authority and thus have an alienating effect: 'Rather than pointing up Virgil's significance to English letters, [...] the scholarly discourses included here [...] seek to unravel the historical circumstances disguised in the more puzzling episodes' (p. 168). Similarly, Mark Thackeray, one of the few critics to perform a more detailed analysis of the Warton-Pitt Virgil and its underlying aesthetic, stresses the influence of Pope's Homer, which had set a precedent for the use of explanatory notes to present details that a translator of Dryden's generation would rather have embodied in the text of the translation itself.² Thackeray sees such annotations as an integral part of eighteenth-century versions of the classics, for they 'substantially augment the possibilities of a translation, by reaffirming – or indeed creating – points of focus' (p. 333).

However, Pitt's contribution started out as a relatively humble affair and was only posthumously included in Warton's edition. In order to fully understand the translator's motivation for rendering the *Aeneid*, we need to consider the preliminary sketches as well as the finalised version. In contrast to the detailed theoretical reflections that accompany the renderings by Dryden and Trapp, unfortunately, the published text itself outlines neither Pitt's objectives nor how he conceived of his task; the 'Notes' at the back of the 1728 *Essay on Virgil's Aeneid* merely close with a brief statement of his intention to avoid 'low and vulgar Expressions, and technical Terms, and Deviations from the Original',³ and the short preface to the 1740 rendering declares that he did not 'pretend to rival Mr. Dryden in this Translation. [...] There was Nothing, I am sure, of Envy in it; and scarce any thing

² Mark Thackeray, 'Christopher Pitt, Joseph Warton, and Virgil', *RES*, 43 (1992), 329-46 (p. 332). Further references are given after quotations in the text.

³ Christopher Pitt, *An Essay on Virgil's Aeneid: Being a Translation of the First Book* (London, 1728), p. 70. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

even of Emulation'.⁴ For the purpose of studying the translator's methodology, we would naturally like to learn a bit more about the means (however limited) by which this emulation was to be accomplished.

To gain a clearer notion of what Pitt may have been aiming for, one can turn to the reactions of prominent contemporaries who praised the translator while his work was still in progress. Warton informs us in the dedication of his *Virgil* that 'Mr. Pope [...] regarded Mr. Pitt's as an excellent translation',⁵ and Joseph Spence enclosed a bay leaf from the Roman poet's grave with the letter he sent Pitt when visiting Naples in 1732: 'I [...] ask you very sensibly and gravely, why you don't go on in doing justice to the gentleman.'⁶ But easily the most eloquent of his supporters was William Benson, to whom Pitt's early Book I, the 1728 *Essay on Virgil's Aeneid*, is dedicated with the following words:

I had never presum'd to make any Attempt on Virgil, after so great a Man as Mr. Dryden; but I undertook this small Performance at the Request of some very learned and ingenious Friends, and particularly of a worthy Gentleman, [...] who was pleased to write to me on this Occasion, in Terms that I cannot repeat without Vanity. To him, therefore, I desire to dedicate this my first Attempt on the *Aeneid* [...] And if I gain no Reputation by this Performance, yet I shall think myself sufficiently honour'd with the Friendship and Acquaintance, of so learned and polite a Gentleman as Mr. Benson. (p. 71)

Benson is perhaps best remembered today for the ridicule he received in Pope's *Dunciad*. Having succeeded Christopher Wren as Surveyor of the King's Works in 1718, he embarrassed himself by falsely reporting that the chamber of the House of Lords was in imminent danger of collapse, which may have been part of a scheme to tear down both Houses of Parliament and replace them with a new palace (*DNB*). After his dismissal from office, Benson engaged in translation and literary criticism. His *Virgil's Husbandry* (1724) is introduced with a direct attack on Dryden's version of the *Georgics*: 'no Author ever did greater Injustice to another in every respect possible, than the *English* Poet has done the *Roman* on this Occasion.'⁷ But whereas Benson chastised his translator-predecessor for 'the exceeding Badness of [his] Versification' (p. xxiii), he was firmly convinced that Vir-

⁴ Christopher Pitt, *The Aeneid of Virgil*, 2 vols (London, 1740), I, vii. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

⁵ Joseph Warton and Christopher Pitt, *The Works of Virgil: In Latin and English*, 4 vols. (London, 1753), I, xvii. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

⁶ Joseph Spence, *Letters from the Grand Tour*, ed. by Slava Klima (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1975), p. 109.

⁷ William Benson, *Virgil's Husbandry; or, An Essay on the Georgicks: Being the Second Book Translated into English Verse* (London, 1724), p. i. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

gil's *Aeneid* had found an English equivalent in Milton's *Paradise Lost*. This belief led him to co-finance William Dobson's translation of Milton's epic into Latin, to erect a monument to Milton in Westminster Abbey, and to compose *Letters Concerning Poetical Translations, and Virgil's and Milton's Arts of Verse* (1739), an assembly of short pieces designed to point out the stylistic parallels between the two poets.

Benson's treatise is relevant to our discussion in more than one respect. First of all, it provides some little-known details about the genesis of Pitt's English *Aeneid*. Comparing what would appear to be the two earliest versions of the text, Benson claims that the translator had 'published the first among some Miscellany Poems several Years since, the latter in his four Books of the *Aeneid* about two Years ago'.⁸ This statement is inconsistent with the publication history of the work as we know it, for there is no suggestion among scholars that any part appeared prior to 1728. But Benson is correct: in his biographical sketch of Pitt in the *Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, Robin Sowerby mentions Pitt's 1727 collection of *Poems and Translations* apropos of his metrical renderings of the Psalms,⁹ but he does not note that the same volume also includes 'Part of the First *Aeneid* of Virgil translated' – a prototype some 200 lines long which was the starting point for all following versions. While the beginning of this translation differs from the 1728 *Essay*, the complete *Aeneid* of 1740, and the Warton/Pitt composite edition of 1753, it closely corresponds to the first opening passage given by Benson, who thus seems to have read the translation in its original state. (Incidentally, this 200-line segment also made its way into the first edition of the multi-volume *Works of the English Poets* to which Johnson contributed his biographical *Prefaces* near the end of the century). A comparison with Pitt's earliest rendering of Virgil in *Poems and Translations* shows that the text in subsequent editions has been substantially revised.¹⁰

More importantly, Benson's study can be read as an implicit list of guidelines for English translations of Virgil. We may analyse the two translations with regard to how

⁸ William Benson, *Letters Concerning Poetical Translations, and Virgil's and Milton's Arts of Verse* (London, 1739; repr. Menston: The Scolar Press, 1973), p. 3. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

⁹ Robin Sowerby, 'Pitt, Christopher (1699-1748)', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), III: 1660-1790, ed. by Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins, p. 539. See Christopher Pitt, 'Part of the First *Aeneid* of Virgil Translated', in *Poems and Translations* (London, 1727), pp. 177-89 (p. 177). Further references are given after quotations in the text.

¹⁰ As regards Benson's reference to 'four Books of the *Aeneid*' published 'about two Years ago', this rare volume is extant (ESTC N65898); Benson is mistaken about the publication date, however, for the translation appeared in 1736, the same year he wrote his letter (p. 5).

well they emulate the ‘principal Excellencies’ (p.18) that Benson ascribes to Virgil and Milton; in what follows, four of these virtues will serve as the basis for a close comparison: syntactic inversions, varying metrical pauses, representative harmony or onomatopoeia, and alliteration.

The *Letters* contrast Virgil’s versification with that of Homer by characterising them respectively (and conventionally) as ‘majestic’ and ‘rapid’ – attributes that Benson connects with syntax and rhetoric. ‘The Stile is *rapid*’, he writes, ‘when several Relatives, each at the head of a separate Sentence, are governed by one Antecedent, or several Verbs by one Nominative Case, to the close of the Period’ (p. 2); conversely, the use of inversions and parentheses ‘occasions *Delay*; and *Delay* [...] is the Property of *Majesty*’ (p. 3). Benson juxtaposes the 1727 and 1728 openings of Pitt’s translation precisely in order to illustrate this stylistic difference:

“Arms and the Man I sing; the first who driv’n
 “From *Trojan* Shores, the Fugitive of Heav’n,
 “Came to th’ *Italian* and *Lavinian* Coast;—

“Arms and the Man I sing, the first who bore
 “His Course to Latium from the Trojan Shore.—

Benson’s comment on this juxtaposition runs as follows:

The first Translation is exact in every respect: You have in it the Suspence and Majesty of *Virgil*. The second is a good Translation, though not at all like *Virgil*, but exactly like Homer: There is no Hesitation, but the Verse and the Matter hurry on together as fast as possible. (Benson, p. 4)

Benson does not seem to care for the local revision that Pitt made between 1727 and 1728, but his generally favourable opinion of the initial publication may well have been a key factor in the translator’s decision to expand the project at all.

Of course, a single example does not allow judgments about the translation as a whole. The altered opening passage notwithstanding, some parts of the 1728 text demonstrably conform to Benson’s definition of Virgilian ‘majesty’ and thus suggest a more far-reaching overlap between Pitt’s agenda and his own. Thackeray gives the translator credit for ‘reflecting in his work a series of distinctive developments originated by critics and poets after 1700’, and he cites the depiction of Aeneas at the end of Book I as a measure of

‘the extent to which the characteristics of Miltonic syntax had been adapted to break down the structures which had typified Dryden’s work’ (p. 335):

The Trojan Chief appear’d in open sight,
August in Visage, and serenely bright.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 369, l. 824-25)

Radiant, in open View, Æneas stood,
In Form and Looks, majestic as a God.
(Pitt, 1728, p. 47, l. 791-92)

As Thackeray observes with reference to Pitt’s first line, ‘The displacement of the verb [...] results in a memorable cadence’ that is strikingly different from the ‘simple regularity’ of Dryden’s version (p. 336). Since Benson himself identifies such inversions of the natural word order as a cause of ‘delay’, we can reasonably assume that he would have regarded Pitt’s rendering as more ‘majestic’ than Dryden’s.

There is evidence that this trend towards syntactic deferral continued to inform Pitt’s practice as he proceeded with the translation of the epic. Thackeray even adopts Benson’s terminology when he calls attention to the ‘majestically realized’ portrait of Atlas, whom Book IV describes from Mercury’s point of view (p. 338); again, a side-by-side reading of Pitt and Dryden testifies to the distance between the two:

Thus arm’d, on Wings of Winds sublimely rode
Through heaps of opening Clouds the flying God.
From far huge Atlas’ rocky Sides he spies,
Atlas, whose Head supports the starry Skies:
Beat by the Winds and driving Rains, he shrowds
His shady Forehead in surrounding Clouds;
(Pitt, 1740, I, 157-158, IV. 360-65)

Thus arm’d, the God begins his Airy Race;
And drives the racking Clouds along the liquid Space:
Now sees the Tops of Atlas, as he flies;
Whose brawny Back supports the starry Skies:
Atlas, whose Head with Piny Forests crown’d,
Is beaten by the Winds; with foggy Vapours bound.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 463, IV. 360-65)

Analysing Pitt’s first couplet in isolation, Thackeray points out that ‘The appearance of the subject [...] at the very end of it, and a vocabulary so strongly suggestive of agitated movement through a vast emptiness, result in an interpretation far removed from Dryden’s’

(p. 339). Here, too, one could make a case for the superiority (or at least the greater memorability) of the eighteenth-century translation based on its captivating sentence structure. This and the previous excerpts arguably do suggest a pattern that must have looked attractive to Benson and those who shared his reasons for admiring Virgil; moreover, they confirm Johnson's impression, articulated several decades later, that 'Dryden leads the reader forward', whereas 'Pitt often stops him to contemplate the excellence of a single couplet'.

Still, it would be difficult to prove that Pitt managed to create a greater overall feeling of 'delay' than any of his predecessors, especially since inversion (and hence retardation) is among the common features of the closed heroic couplet discussed by Piper (pp. 10-15). Despite Dryden's aforementioned tendency to anglicise the syntax of earlier seventeenth-century translators while borrowing from them, he was perfectly capable of employing the rhetorical device in his *Aeneis*, as the description of the storm at the beginning of Book I demonstrates:

Loud Peals of Thunder from the Poles ensue,
Then flashing Fires the transient Light renew:
The Face of things a frightful Image bears,
And present Death in various Forms appears.
Struck with unusual Fright, the Trojan Chief,
With lifted Hands and Eyes, invokes Relief.
And thrice, and four times happy those, he cry'd,
That under *Ilian* Walls before their Parents dy'd.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 347, l. 131-8)

The four halves of the first two couplets each form an independent clause in which the subject ('Loud Peals of Thunder', 'flashing Fires', 'The Face of things', 'present Death') is directly followed by either an object or a prepositional phrase, while all the verbs ('ensue', 'renew', 'bears', 'appears') are suspended to the end of their respective lines. The prepositional phrase 'With lifted Hands and Eyes' in the second half of the third couplet intervenes between the predicate of the main clause ('invokes') and its subject ('the Trojan Chief') in the preceding line; similarly, the final line consists of a subordinate clause whose relative pronoun and verb are separated by the two prepositional phrases 'under *Ilian* Walls' and 'before their Parents'. Inversions thus abound in Dryden's rendering of the passage. In fact, if Benson's criterion is applied to the corresponding lines in the 1727 miscellany, then Pitt's version falls somewhat short by comparison:

Night hovers o'er the Deeps; the Day retires;
 The Heav'ns shine thick with Momentary Fires;
 Loud Thunders shake the Poles; from every Place
 Grim Death appear'd, and glar'd in every Face.
 Congeal'd with Fear, the *Trojan* Hero stands,
 He groans, and spreads to Heav'n his lifted Hands:
 Thrice happy those, whose Fate it was to fall,
 (Exclaims the Chief) beneath the *Trojan* Wall.
 (1727, p. 184)

Pitt increases the number of independent clauses and largely avoids inverting his syntactical elements, which results in a swifter movement of the verse and thus in a comparative lack of suspense. Not only do the verbs closely follow their subjects; a single subject sometimes takes several verbs (as in the fourth and sixth line) – a feature that Benson associates with Homer rather than with Virgil. If these couplets can be regarded as representative, then, Pitt does not seem to reach the standard of ‘majesty’ defined by his friend.

Likewise, the ‘continual varying of the Pause’, another excellency with which Benson credits Virgil and Milton (pp. 18-21; pp. 39-41), does not suffice as a distinguishing characteristic that would set Pitt’s translation apart from those of his predecessors. Even though Benson correctly observes that – at least in the case of couplets – caesurae in iambic pentameters most often occur after the fourth syllable (p. 39; see Piper, p. 8), no talented versifier would fail to vary the position. A triplet from Dryden’s *Aeneis* displays the poet’s customary attention to metrical variety:

Their Fury falls: || He skims the liquid Plains,
 High on his Chariot, || and with loosen'd Reins,
 Majestick moves along, || and awful Peace maintains.
 (*Works*, v, 349, l. 223-25)

The subtle shift of the caesura by one half-foot both anticipates and amplifies the lengthening effect of the final alexandrine, with its break after six syllables. Pitt, too, is far from monotonous in his placement of medial caesurae:

And curb the Tempest, || or to loose the Rein.
 Whom thus the Queen address'd; || Since mighty *Jove*,
 The King of Men, || and Sire of Gods above,
 Has given Thee, || *Aeolus*, the pow'r to raise
 Storms at thy Sov'reign Will, || or smooth the Seas;
 (1727, p. 182)

Only the third of and fourth of these lines follow the conventional positioning described by Benson, and Pitt achieves a neat contrast by framing them with two lines whose caesurae occur after the sixth syllable. Judging by these specimens of their poetry, neither translator clearly surpasses the other in the way he handles his mid-line pauses.

A third and more promising touchstone of excellence is the 'adapting of the Sound to the Sense' that Benson discovers in Virgil and Milton (p. 18; pp. 21-24; pp. 42-44). This 'doctrine of imitative harmony', as Robin Sowerby calls it, was evidently of some concern to Pitt.¹¹ The latter's 1728 translation of Book I includes a note on the text in which he justifies his 'Use of the *Alexandrian* Line [...] to express the Length, the Vastness, the Rapidity, or Slowness of an Image, according to the establish'd Rule of making *the Sound an Echo to the Sense*' (p. 65). The currency of the principle is not only explicitly asserted but also implicitly suggested by the italic typeface; Pope's *Essay on Criticism* had made it into an aphorism: 'The *Sound* must seem an *Eccho* to the *Sense*'.¹² Moreover, Pitt must have felt a special affinity with one of its earlier exponents, the humanist bishop Marcus Hieronymus Vida, whose *De Arte Poetica* (1527), written in Latin hexameters, mediated the classical theory and practice of versification and extolled Virgil as the embodiment of stylistic perfection. Basil Kennett had anonymously published an edition of Vida in 1701, and Pope played a seminal role in his revival by honouring him towards the end of the *Essay*.¹³ However, it was Pitt who produced the first English translation of the *Poetica* in 1725; here he re-encountered the doctrine preached by Pope, albeit in a different metaphorical guise:

To all, proportion'd *terms* he must dispense,
 And make the *sound* a picture of the *sense*;¹⁴

¹¹ Robin Sowerby, *The Augustan Art of Poetry: Augustan Translation of the Classics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 56-57.

¹² Alexander Pope, *An Essay on Criticism* (London, 1711), p. 22. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

¹³ See David Hopkins and I. D. MacKillop, "'Immortal Vida" and Basil Kennett', *RES*, 27 (1976), 137-47 (pp. 137-38).

¹⁴ Christopher Pitt, *Vida's Art of Poetry: Translated into English Verse* (London, 1725), p. 103.

Communicating Vida's teachings to a wider audience and subsequently restating them in his own version of the *Aeneid*, the translator ensured that these lessons still had some relevance for the native literary culture. Pitt's and Benson's sustained interest in aural mimesis goes hand in hand with an acknowledgment of Virgilian authority and thus runs counter to the 'antiquarian outlook' that Caldwell ascribes to Warton, who, she claims, 'recognizes [...] that Virgil was the product of a particular place and time, not the source of [...] great poetry that should be followed (as Pope suggests in his *Essay on Criticism*) by would-be English poets' (p. 168). At least on an aesthetic level, the Roman retained an exemplary function.

Consequently, the realisation of this principle also looks quite similar in each case. Evoking Virgil's Camilla as an epitome of fast movement, Pope deploys an alexandrine to convey the impression of speed:

Not so, when swift *Camilla* scours the Plain,
Flies o'er th' unbending Corn, and skims along the Main.
(*Essay on Criticism*, p. 23)

Pitt's note on the use of alexandrines refers to a passage in which the same device serves to suggest the depth from which Aeolus's winds lift up the sea:

Earth, in their Course, with giddy Whirls they sweep;
Rush to the Seas, and bare the Bosom of the Deep:
(1728, p. 10, l. 113-14)

Interestingly, it appears that the idea of metrically representing Virgil's meaning at this point only occurred to the translator as an afterthought, for the 1727 text does not yet feature a longer line:

Earth in their Course with giddy Whirls they sweep,
Then plow the Seas, and bare the inmost Deep.
(1727, p. 184)

It is tempting to suspect Benson's influence behind the corrective measure, but one need not resort to such speculation to show that he, Pitt, and Pope were in close alignment with each other, practically as well as theoretically.

There is, of course, no shortage of examples that illustrate Dryden's conformity to the 'establish'd Rule' reiterated by his three eighteenth-century epigones, and, like them, he seems to have associated it with Virgil, specifically. In the Preface to *Sylvae*, he points out how the Roman poet's 'verse is everywhere sounding the very thing in your ears, whose sense it bears' (*Works*, III, 6), and, as Van Doren opines, 'His own *Virgil* is nothing more or less than an extensive proving-ground for imitative harmony[,] [...] a huge temple of sound' (p. 82). When Pope mentions Camilla, he is not just thinking of her appearance in *Aeneid* VII but recalling Dryden's particular translation (Van Doren, p. 84; Sowerby, p. 57):

Mix'd with the first, the fierce Virago fought,
Sustain'd the Toils of Arms, the Danger sought:
Outstrip'd the Winds in speed upon the Plain,
Flew o're the Fields, nor hurt the bearded Grain:
She swept the Seas, and as she skim'd along,
Her flying Feet unbath'd on Billows hung.
(*Works*, VI, 606, VII. 1098-1103)

As a test of how well Pitt's mastery of representative versification holds up against that of his predecessor, we may juxtapose the complete 1740 translation with two passages in Dryden's *Aeneis* that modern critics have singled out for special notice in this regard, both of which happen to describe snakes. Proudfoot draws attention to the episode of Laocoon in Book II (p. 255):

Two Serpents, rank'd abreast, the Seas divide,
And smoothly sweep along the swelling Tide.
[...]
And on the sounding Shoar the flying Billows force.
[...]
Their nimble Tongues they brandish'd as they came,
And lick'd their hissing Jaws, that sputter'd Flame.
[...]
Twice round his waste their winding Volumes rowl'd,
And twice about his grasping Throat they fold.
The Priest thus doubly choak'd, their Crests divide,
And tow'ring o're his Head, in Triumph ride.
With both his Hands he labours at the Knots;
His Holy Fillets the blue Venom blots:
His roaring fills the flitting Air around.
Thus, when an Oxe receives a glancing Wound,
He breaks his Bands, the fatal Altar flies,
And with loud Bellowings breaks the yielding Skies.
(*Works*, V, 386-87, II. 270-71, 275, 278-79, 286-95)

Proudfoot comments on Dryden's 'attempt to convey a gliding motion' with the line 'And smoothly sweep along the swelling Tide', the 'Noise, speed and disturbance' suggested by the alexandrine 'And on the sounding Shoar the flying Billows force', the onomatopoeia in the couplet 'Their nimble Tongues they brandish'd as they came, | And lick'd their hissing Jaws, that sputter'd Flame', and the climactic 'crescendo of noise' reached by means of Laocoon's shouting and the final simile (p. 256). Let us see if we can find similar properties in Pitt's version of the passage:

When, horrid to relate! two Serpents glide
 And roll incumbent on the glassy Tide,
 Advancing to the Shore; their Spires they raise
 Fold above Fold, in many a tow'ring Maze.
 Beneath their burnish'd Breast the Waters glow,
 Their crimson Crests inflame the Deeps below;
 O'er the vast Flood, extended long and wide,
 Their curling Backs lay floating on the Tide;
 Lash'd to a Foam the boiling Billows roar,
 And now the dreadful Monsters reach'd the Shore;
 Their hissing Tongues they darted, as they came,
 And their red Eye-balls shot a sanguine Flame.
 [...]
 Twice round his Waist, and round his Neck they rear
 Their winding Head, and hiss aloft in Air.
 His sacred Wreaths the livid Poisons stain,
 And, while he labours at the Knots in vain,
 Stung to the Soul, he bellows with the Pain.
 So, when the Ax has glanc'd upon his Skull,
 Breaks from the Shrine, and roars the wounded Bull.
 (1740, I, 59-60, II. 276-87, 296-302)

Pitt's 'And roll incumbent on the glassy Tide' is not quite as successful as Dryden's 'And smoothly sweep along the swelling Tide'; on the other hand, 'Lash'd to a Foam the boiling Billows roar' comes close to surpassing the impetuosity of 'And on the sounding Shoar the flying Billows force' despite being a regular line. Then again, Pitt's serpents 'hiss', but they do not 'lick' or 'sputter' like Dryden's, and while he, too, depicts Laocoon and his bovine analogue as 'bellowing' and 'roaring', the repetition of the verb 'break' and its combination with 'skies' gives the earlier translation a slight edge.

The second passage is the moment in Book v when Aeneas sees a snake emerging from his father's tomb; Dryden's creature, says Van Doren, 'moves with a writhing splendor' (p. 83):

His hugy Bulk on sev'n high Volumes roll'd;
 Blue was his breadth of Back, but streak'd with scaly Gold:
 Thus riding on his Curls, he seem'd to pass
 A rowling Fire along; and singe the Grass.
 [...]
 Betwixt the rising Altars, and around,
 The sacred Monster shot along the Ground;
 With harmless play amidst the Bowls he pass'd;
 And with his lolling Tongue assay'd the Taste:
 Thus fed with Holy Food, the wond'rous Guest
 Within the hollow Tomb retir'd to rest.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, p. 490, v. 113-16, 119-24)

Fittingly enough, the alexandrine 'Blue was his breadth of Back, but streak'd with scaly Gold' intimates the size of the serpentine body, and a series of disyllabic prepositions – 'betwixt', 'along', 'amidst', 'within' – creates the impression that several spots on the ground are being occupied simultaneously as it slithers from one place to the next. Pitt achieves a comparable result:

An azure Serpent rose, in Scales that flam'd with Gold:
 [...]
 Pleas'd round the Altars and the Tomb to wind,
 His glittering Length of Volumes trails behind.
 The Chief in deep Amaze suspended hung,
 While through the Bowls the Serpent glides along;
 Tastes all the Food, then softly slides away,
 Seeks the dark Tomb, and quits the sacred Prey;
 (1740, I, 192, v. 110, 113-18)

Pitt's alexandrine, 'An azure Serpent rose, in Scales that flam'd with Gold', runs parallel to Dryden's and uses the same rhyme word; rather than suggesting the animal's physical proportions, however, the line forms part of a triplet that effectively enacts its emergence in front of Aeneas's (and, by extension, the reader's) eyes. An especially felicitous instance of metrical representation, moreover, is the way the snake winds around the altars while 'His glittering Length of Volumes trails behind'; this string of words itself looks like the tail that is slowly gliding by, with the preposition 'behind' appropriately placed at the end. By contrast, Dryden's monosyllabic verb 'shot' evokes a speedier progression and thus

takes away from the overall gracefulness of the movement he is portraying. Here, then, Pitt seems to have the upper hand.

Naturally, such a brief assessment does not suffice to conclusively determine which of the two translators was more adept at making the sound of his verse an echo to Virgil's sense, but even so, Pitt may have gained some additional confidence from the rare occasions on which he found an opportunity to improve upon his acclaimed precursor. Since he went out of his way to annotate the lines that describe the Aeolean winds in Book I, for instance, it is worth comparing them with Dryden's version of the same passage, which lacks the mimetic element we have seen:

Earth, in their Course, with giddy Whirls they sweep;
Rush to the Seas, and bare the Bosom of the Deep:
(Pitt, 1728, p. 10, l. 113-14)

Then settling on the Sea, the Surges sweep;
Raise liquid Mountains, and disclose the deep.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 347, l. 124-25)

Dryden provided Pitt with the rhyme words 'sweep' and 'deep', but his own couplet fails to reflect the spatial dimension that the latter captures in his metre; indeed, the perfectly balanced halves of the last line almost seem to undermine the portrayal of the maritime disturbance at the semantic level. Pitt's dynamic alternative – whose medial caesura after the fourth syllable causes the second half-line to be twice as long as the first – makes for a much better representation of what is being told. Although far from being an innovation, aural mimesis thus came to be applied with greater deliberateness in certain places where its possibilities had been left unexplored by Dryden; Pitt's conscious use of the technique at the outset of the translation process qualifies the later prefatory assertion that 'There was [...] scarce any thing even of Emulation' in his design.'

Providing a fourth and somewhat related criterion for evaluating poetry, Virgil's and Milton's use of alliteration is discussed at great length in Benson's *Letters* (pp. 30-32; pp. 50-57). According to an anecdote that Robert Shiels relates in his 'Life of Pitt', Benson praised the translator for cultivating the same virtue, which suggests how important it was to him: 'He once took an opportunity, in conversation with Mr. Pitt, to magnify that beauty [alliteration], and to compliment him upon it. Mr. Pitt thought this article far less consider-

able than Mr. Benson did.’¹⁵ Pitt’s apparent indifference should not distract from the role such ornamentation plays in enriching his work; Pope’s example of Camilla would seem to have inspired the rendering of an analogous illustration in Vida, which acquires an onomatopoeic quality on account of its sibilants:

‘This swiftly flies, and smoothly skims away’
(p. 104).

The same alliterating words were later absorbed into the first draft of Pitt’s English *Aeneid*, where they lend colour to the description of Neptune:

Then mounted on the Radiant Car He rides
Swift o’er the Seas, and smoothly skims the Tides
(p. 189)

At the beginning of his third *Letter*, Benson makes a passing comment on the Latin line to which the above couplet corresponds:

it is not easy to conceive how much may depend on a single Letter, very often the whole Harmony of a Line; and on this Account we have vast Obligations to *Pierius*; to him we owe this fine Verse, and many others.

“*Atq; rotis summas levibus pellabitur undas.*—
All the common Editions read *perlabitur*; which is horrid to the ear. (p. 18)

For the 1728 publication, the translator amended his rendering of the line to something that is both closer to its literal meaning and imitative of its liquid sounds:

And wheels along the Level of the Tides.
(p. 15, l. 201)

This is one of several new alliterations that appear in the revised text and indicate the extent to which Pitt, too, became increasingly aware of the ‘beauty’ Benson found so admirable. In some cases, adjusting the verse merely involved the substitution of one word for another:

¹⁵ Robert Shiels, ‘The Revd. Mr Christopher Pitt’, in *Lives of the Poets of Great-Britain and Ireland*, ed. by Theophilus Cibber (London, 1753), v, 298-307 (p. 299).

For *Greece* at *Troy*; nor was her Wrath resign'd
(p. 179)

For Greece **with** *Troy*; nor was her Wrath resign'd
(p. 5, l. 34)¹⁶

The Heav'ns shine thick with Momentary Fires
(p. 184)

The Heav'ns **flash** thick with momentary Fires
(p. 10, l. 121)

Where *Hector* sunk beneath *Achilles'* Spear
(p. 185)

Where Hector **fell**, by **fierce** *Achilles'*s Spear
(p. 11, l. 134)

Bid him his Rocks, your gloomy Dungeons, keep
(p. 188)

Bid him his Rocks, your **darksome** Dungeons, keep
(p. 14, l. 190)

Other examples entail larger changes and rearrangements of the existing material:

Bare to the Fury of the working Tide
(p. 185)

Bare to the working **Waves**, and roaring Tide
(p. 11, l. 141)

On such a pious Prince, such endless Woes
(p. 177)

On such a pious Prince a **Weight** of Woes
(p. 4, l. 14)

Then plow the Seas, and bare the inmost Deep
(p. 184)

Rush to the Seas, and bare the **Bosom** of the Deep
(p. 10, l. 114)

The most conspicuous alliterations include the first words of the lines in which they occur:

The Fates, I find, may baffle *Juno's* Aims
(p. 180)

Belike, the Fates may baffle *Juno's* Aims
(p. 6, l. 52)

¹⁶ Here and in the remainder of this paragraph, emphasis has been added to highlight Pitt's amendments and the resulting alliterations.

Has given Thee, *Æolus*, the pow'r to raise
(p. 182)

Gives thee, **great** *Æolus*, the Pow'r to raise
(p. 8. l. 90)

Add Rage to all thy Winds; o'erwhelm their Ships
(p. 183)

Wing all thy furious Winds; o'erwhelm their Ships
(p. 9, l. 96)

Finally, even such a minute detail as an altered syllable may serve to produce an alliterative configuration:

Does your high Birth inspire this lawless Pride
(p. 187)

Does your high Birth inspire this **boundless** Pride
(p. 13, l. 181)

Once again, Pitt's practice accords with Benson's preferences. These emendations may not be the immediate result of the encounter recorded in Shiels's 'Life', but they do give the impression that the translator came round to his friend's way of thinking.

It goes without saying that alliteration in and of itself, no matter how skilfully manipulated, could add little to the existing paradigm of English Virgilianism. Dryden's command of this basic tool is obvious and requires no demonstration; one need only look at lines like 'And on the sounding Shoar the flying Billows force' or 'Blue was his breadth of Back, but streak'd with scaly Gold' in the above excerpts to appreciate how much it contributes to the music of his *Æneis*. As was the case with the other formal criteria we have been discussing, Pitt's refinements are noteworthy not because of any perceived deficiency in his predecessor but because of the simultaneously expressed interest on the part of his contemporaries. All things considered, the translator's responsiveness to current literary trends appears to have made him the perfect candidate to produce an English *Aeneid* after the latest fashion. Whatever unifying vision may have come to inform the project by the time of its completion, the evidence compiled here suggests that the first stage of its development was greatly fuelled by a mainstream critical concern for stylistic polish; insignificant though it may seem, the attention bestowed upon 'beauties' such as syntactic inversions, metrical pauses, aural mimesis, and alliteration goes some way towards explaining Johnson's verdict 'that Pitt pleases the criticks, and Dryden the people'.

Nevertheless, the most decisive factor in composing a new translation of the *Aeneid* remained Dryden himself. Pitt's notes on the 1728 text openly tell us that he 'us'd a few of Mr. Dryden's Rhimes and Expressions, where he adheres closely to the Sense of Virgil' (p. 70). Some of these borrowings occur in places where the 1727 version is markedly different, which suggests that the translator had initially taken a more independent approach to the Latin epic. The opening lines in Pitt's 1727 miscellany, Dryden's *Aeneis*, and Pitt's 1728 *Essay on Virgil's Aeneid* are a case in point:

Arms and the Man I sing, the first who driv'n
 By Fate from *Troy*, the Fugitive of Heav'n,
 On Land and Sea by Toils and Tempests tost,
 Came to the *Latian* and *Lavinian* Coast;
 Forc'd by the Gods incessant Wars to wage,
 And urg'd by *Juno*'s unrelenting Rage;
 E're he could raise his Town, and fix the Gods
 He brought from *Troy* in *Italy*'s Abodes;
 Hence our fam'd *Latian* Line, and Senates come,
 Hence rose the lofty Walls and Tow'rs of *Rome*.
 (Pitt, 1727, p. 177)

Arms, and the Man I sing, who, forc'd by Fate,
 And haughty *Juno*'s unrelenting Hate,
 Expell'd and exil'd, left the *Trojan* Shoar:
 Long Labours, both by Sea and Land he bore,
 And in the doubtful War, before he won
 The *Latian* Realm, and built the destin'd Town:
 His banish'd Gods restor'd to Rites Divine,
 And setl'd sure Succession in his Line:
 From whence the Race of *Alban* Fathers come,
 And the long Glories of Majestick *Rome*.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 343)

Arms and the Man I sing, the first who bore
 His Course to Latium, from the *Trojan* Shore;
 By Fate expell'd, on Land and Ocean tost,
 Before he reach'd the fair *Lavinian* Coast.
 Doom'd by the Gods a Length of Wars to wage,
 And urg'd by *Juno*'s unrelenting Rage;
 E're the brave Hero rais'd, in these Abodes,
 His destin'd Walls, and fix'd his wand'ring Gods.
 Hence the fam'd *Latian* Line, and Senates come,
 The Towr's and Triumphs of Imperial *Rome*.
 (Pitt, 1728, pp. 3-4)

As now becomes clear, the change from a 'majestick' to a 'rapid' style that Benson observes between Pitt's two translations is, in fact, due to the influence of Dryden, whose line

endings ‘*Trojan Shoar*’ and ‘bore’ intrude into the first couplet of the 1728 text; the original rhyme word ‘driv’n’ is replaced with Dryden’s ‘expell’d’ and transposed to the beginning of the third line. Any creative impulse that Pitt may have received from Benson was thus overridden, at least locally, by a growing sense of obligation towards his predecessor. To the extent that the translation becomes more Drydenian, moreover, its literalness decreases. Pitt borrows the adjective ‘destin’d’ from Dryden’s fifth line and incorporates it into the second half of his penultimate couplet. Far from his ‘adher[ing] closely to the Sense of Virgil’, this has no Latin equivalent, for neither the Roman poet’s ‘town’ (‘*urbem*’, I. 5) nor his ‘walls’ (‘*moenia*’, I. 7) are given such an attribute. The same is true of the phrase ‘*Tow’rs and Triumphs of Imperial Rome*’ in the last line of Pitt’s revised version, which is an abstraction inspired by Dryden’s ‘*Glories of Majestick Rome*’. Ironically, Pitt substitutes this for his earlier attempt ‘the lofty Walls and Tow’rs of *Rome*’, a much more faithful rendering of Virgil’s ‘*altae moenia Romae*’.

Dryden’s vocabulary also infiltrates Pitt’s 1728 translation at several other points. Here are the three versions of Virgil’s ‘*tot adire labores*’ (I. 10):

By such a Round of Toils so long distrest:
(Pitt, 1727, p. 178)

Expos’d to Wants, and hurry’d into Wars!
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 344, I. 16)

Expos’d to Dangers, and with Toils opprest?
(Pitt, 1728, p. 4, I. 15)

Both Dryden and Pitt expand the Latin original, but it was not until 1728 that the first words of their respective lines became identical. Another textual parallel is created through the translator’s changing responses to Virgil’s ‘*venturum excidio Libyae; sic volvere Parcas*’ (I. 22):

Ordain’d by Fate her *Libya* to subdue
(Pitt, 1727, p. 178)

Her *Carthage* ruin, and her Tow’rs deface
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 344, I. 30)

By Fate design’d her *Carthage* to subdue
(Pitt, 1728, p. 5, I. 30)

‘*Libya*’ has become ‘*Carthage*’; again, the later conformity with Dryden entails a departure from an early literal translation rather than a closer approximation to the ‘Sense of Virgil’.

Even with minor corrections that leave the meaning unaltered, one can often guess what prompted them, as in the case of the verb Pitt uses to render ‘*sceptra tenens mollitque animos et temperat iras*’ (I. 57):

He waves his Scepter, and controuls their Rage:
(Pitt, 1727, p. 181)

And shakes his Scepter, and their Rage commands:
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 345, I. 85)

He shakes his Sceptre, and controuls their Rage;
(Pitt, 1728, p. 8, I. 79)

Indeed, Pitt seems to echo Dryden almost in spite of himself. When revising the following description of Neptune, he not only borrows the main elements of Dryden’s second line but also uses them to turn his own couplet into a triplet, even though one of his notes objects that this expedient of varying the basic rhyme scheme is ‘*practis’d* [...] too frequently by Mr. Dryden’ (p. 65):

Lifts his high Head serenely o’er the Flood;
Where wide disperst the *Trojan* Fleet he spies,
Prest by the Storms and Terrors of the Skies
(Pitt, 1727, p. 187)

He reard his awful Head above the Main:
Serene in Majesty, then rowl’d his Eyes
Around the Space of Earth, and Sea, and Skies.
He saw the *Trojan* Fleet dispers’d, distress’d
By stormy Winds and wintry Heav’n oppress’d.
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 348, I. 179-83)

Lifts his high Head above the stormy Flood,
Majestic and serene; he rolls his Eyes;
And scatter’d wide the *Trojan* Navy spies,
Opprest by Waves below, by Thunders from the Skies.
(Pitt, 1728, p. 13, I. 174-77)

So persistent was Dryden’s effect on Pitt that he continued to move his translation into line with Dryden’s even after the publication of his fuller *Æneid* of 1728. Pitt’s com-

plete version, published in 1740, includes an adjustment of the participle that appears in the line corresponding to ‘iudicium Paridis spretaeque iniuria formae’ (l. 27):

Her injur’d Form, and Paris’ Judgment, roll
(Pitt, 1728, p. 5, l. 36)

Of partial *Paris*, and her Form disdain’d
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 344, l. 39)

Her Form disdain’d, and Paris Judgment, roll
(Pitt, 1740, l. 3, l. 36)

The 1740 edition also features a borrowed adjective that is not yet present in 1728:

Mean time great Neptune from beneath the Main
(Pitt, p. 13, l. 169)

Mean time Imperial Neptune heard the Sound
(Dryden, *Works*, v, 348, l. 176)

Mean time th’ Imperial Monarch of the Main
(Pitt, 1740, l. 9, l. 169)

The numerous shifts towards Dryden’s phraseology may be miniscule, but they seem to indicate that, rather than achieving a greater degree of independence as his experience grew, Pitt became more susceptible to the authority of his predecessor the further he progressed with his own work.

These findings would appear to corroborate the results of Adams’s study, which shows that ‘Of all the eighteenth-century translators of Vergil, Pitt expressed the most unqualified admiration for Dryden, and he did not scruple to make use of what he considered to be Dryden’s best passages’.¹⁷ To be sure, Pitt never evinced any desire to escape Dryden’s influence; in this, he differs from Trapp, whose project grew out of dissatisfaction with the licentiousness of the couplet *Aeneis*, and whose borrowings from Dryden ran directly counter to his own declared goals. Pitt’s ideal of stylistic elegance, shared by contemporaries like Benson and Pope, is not substantially different from Dryden’s; indeed, the relative popularity of his translation may have been due to their formal resemblance rather than to anything new he had to offer, whereas less successful translations of the Latin epic

¹⁷ Betty Smith Adams, ‘Dryden’s Translation of Vergil and its Eighteenth-Century Successors’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, 1970), p. 87.

may have fallen into oblivion precisely because they deviated too far from the general taste of the age. It would thus be a mistake to conceive of the translator's relationship to his predecessor as competitive or agonistic.

Nevertheless, the step-by-step publication of Pitt's text is interesting for the way it illustrates the multiple and collective forces under which he operated. The 1727 sample of Book I, in particular, offers a point of comparison that has gone wholly unrecognised but highlights significant changes in subsequent instalments. Critics who focus on Pitt's indebtedness to Dryden alone will miss the preliminary phase of experimentation that preceded his submission to the latter's influence; equally important, at least during this early stage, were stimuli he received from his immediate surroundings, while the later revisions seem to betray an increasing readiness to follow in the footsteps of the most prominent English Virgil translator of his time. Even if Pitt's praise of Dryden is taken at face value, the fact that his first draft looks so much less Drydenian than the final product shows how deeply the predecessor affected the range of creative possibilities open to those who followed him in translating the *Aeneid*. As the last chapter has made clear, on the other hand, Milton had, of course, already opened up a new avenue for Virgil translators, and Benson's *Letters*, although appreciative of Pitt, suggest that the influence of this blank verse champion only increased over the course of the eighteenth century. Undermining Dryden's position as the closest English counterpart to the Roman poet, the association between Virgil and Milton would soon gain further prominence with new translations of the *Aeneid* by Alexander Strahan and James Beresford.

4. 'The Only True Method of Succeeding': Alexander Strahan

Alexander Strahan was the third eighteenth-century translator to render the entire *Aeneid* into blank verse. While his background is more obscure than that of Trapp or Pitt, the text he delivered stands out by virtue of its strong Miltonic flavour. Strahan goes one step further than most blank verse translators by adopting not only the form but also some of the phraseology of Milton's English epic, thus forging an intricate intertextual linkage. The verbal parallels that result from these numerous borrowings warrant closer examination, for not only do they allow us to see thematic links between the *Aeneid* and *Paradise Lost* from the point of view of Strahan and his contemporaries, they also reflect the growing appreciation of Milton's genius that was taking place at the time and found a particular expression in academic scholarship. On the other hand, however, the translator's emulative practice still does not quite replicate the prosodic complexity of *Paradise Lost* but rather shows signs of an enduring preference for the smoother and more regular pentameter lines of the couplet tradition.

Again, adjustments made during the course of the translation process reveal the limited extent to which Strahan succeeded in emancipating himself from Dryden. As I will show, the fact that neither he nor Pitt managed to transcend their famous precursor in the long run correlates with the way each of their translations swerved from its original design once the first fragments had been conceived. In Strahan's case, too, the translator was balancing multiple influences against each other and eventually suppressed some of his most daring and innovative ideas so as to maintain a degree of conformity with the Drydenian model.

Like Pitt's couplet translation, Strahan's project was published gradually and received support from a number of personal acquaintances, who not only urged its completion but actively helped to bring it about. The pilot version of Book I that appeared in 1739 claims to be a continuation of an 'Essay [...] wr[itten] above twenty Years ago, [...] without any Design or Intent of carrying it on any farther' but deemed 'not altogether unworthy of seeing the Light' when Strahan 'accidentally shew'd it' to his friends.¹ The second stage (1753) comprised Books I-VI, which had been revised by their dedicatee, the poet Isaac

¹ Alexander Strahan, *The First Aeneid of Virgil, Translated into Blank Verse* (London, 1739), pp. v-vii. All further references are given after quotations in the text.

Hawkins Browne, and included commendatory verses by one Reverend Layng.² Browne had made a name for himself as the author of parodies and would soon publish his major work, a Latin poem on the immortality of the soul, but there do not appear to be any records of Layng.³ Later on, Strahan's project also attracted the Scottish-born poet and playwright David Mallet, a prominent literary figure with connections in Paris as well as in London, who apparently looked over most of the full text before it was published in 1767 (Mallet himself died in 1765⁴); likewise, William Dobson (about whom not much is known apart from the fact that Benson commissioned him to translate *Paradise Lost* into Latin) is credited with contributing the translation of Books X and XII to Strahan's final version.⁵

Whereas Pitt's version draws on the authority of Dryden and Pope, however, Strahan seems to have taken his main inspiration from *Paradise Lost*. The 1753 publication comes with a preface in which he admits to 'having been from my earliest youth, so captivated with Milton, that I prefer'd him infinitely to all our *English Poets*' (sig. A3^v). An additional catalyst was the predecessors who had already tried to render the *Aeneid* in a similarly Miltonic vein: apart from Trapp, there was also Nicholas Brady, an Irish Protestant clergyman whose translation in four volumes appeared between 1714 and 1726 but received little attention even in its own day. Strahan acknowledges that he 'was previously encouraged [...] by the Attempts of these two Gentlemen, which shewed that Milton's manner, under proper restrictions, was the only true Method of succeeding in a translation of Virgil' (1753, sig. A3^v).

Milton's influence on Strahan is evident from the very beginning of the 1739 text, whose first lines attract attention by unnecessarily departing from the syntax of the original:

Arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris
 Italiam fato profugus Laviniaque venit
 litora

(I. 1-3)

² Alexander Strahan, *The First Six Books of Virgil's Aeneid, Translated into Blank Verse* (London, 1753), sigs. A2^f, a2^v-a4^f. All further references are given after quotations in the text.

³ J. M. Scott, 'Isaac Hawkins Browne', rev. by W. B. Hutchings, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/3677?docPos=1>> [accessed 29 August 2016]

⁴ James Sambrook, 'David Mallet', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/17888?docPos=1>> [accessed 29 August 2016]

⁵ Alexander Strahan, *The Aeneid of Virgil, Translated into Blank Verse*, 2 vols (London, 1767), I, sig. c1^v.

Arms and the Hero who from *Trojan* Shores,
 Compell'd by Fate and Exile, first explor'd
 Th' *Italian* Soil, and touch'd *Lavinian* Strands
 I sing;

(Strahan, 1739, p. 1, l. 1-4)

Although it would not be uncommon for Virgil to suspend the main verb of a sentence, he does not do so with 'cano', and neither do any of the translators prior to Strahan. The decision to place the English equivalent 'I sing' at the head of the fourth line thus seems unexpected; it is, of course, an emulation of Milton's celebrated invocation of the Muse, in which the verb 'sing' is held back for a full five lines:

Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
 Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
 Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
 With loss of Eden, till one greater man
 Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
 Sing heavenly Muse,⁶

Commenting on the sublimity of this passage, Christopher Ricks points out how its 'word-order quite literally encompasses the huge themes' of *Paradise Lost*, and Thomas Newton, Milton's eighteenth-century editor, makes the same observation: 'the subject of the poem is the very first thing offer'd to us, and precedes the verb with which it is connected.'⁷ Given his outspoken admiration for Milton, the translator must have been so impressed by this particular effect that he copied it even at the expense of accurately reproducing the structure of Virgil's sentence.

Strahan's debts to Milton become more obvious still as he goes on. His 1739 translation of Book I repeatedly borrows elements from *Paradise Lost* to render parts of the Virgilian source material. Descriptions of characters are especially prone to be modified in this way; Juno's rage, for example, takes on distinctly Satanic traits:

⁶ John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, ed. by Alastair Fowler, 2nd edn (Harlow: Pearson-Longman, 2007), pp. 56-58, l. 1-6. All further references are to this edition of the text (hereafter *PL*) and given after quotations in the text.

⁷ Christopher Ricks, *Milton's Grand Style* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 28; John Milton, *Paradise Lost: A Poem, in Twelve Books*, a new edition, with notes of various authors, by Thomas Newton, 2 vols (London, 1749), I, 5.

manet alta mente repostum
iudicium Paridis spretaeque inuria formae,
(I. 26-27)

deep in her Mind was fix'd
Th' Award of Paris, and Resentment high
From Sense of injur'd Beauty,
(Strahan, 1739, p. 3, l. 35-37)

Yet not for those
Nor what the potent victor in his rage
Can else inflict, do I repent or change,
Though changed in outward lustre, that fixed mind
And high disdain, from sense of injured merit,
(*PL*, I. 94-98)

By replacing the last word of Milton's line with 'Beauty', Strahan has turned the phrase 'And high disdain, from sense of injured merit' into a serviceable translation of 'spretaeque inuria formae'; the substitution of 'Resentment' for 'disdain' and the switched position of 'high' should be attributed to metrical expediency rather than literal exactitude (the adjective, indeed, has no Latin counterpart at all). Moreover, Milton's collocation of 'fixed' and 'mind' in the preceding line probably triggered Strahan's rendering of 'repostum' with the former word.

Before we look at any further examples, we might want to consider the reasons for creating a verbal parallel like this and the implications it can have for a translation of Virgil. Where such links exist between individual translators, I have so far been labelling them more or less indiscriminately as 'echoes', 'borrowings', and 'appropriations'. In the case of *Paradise Lost*, however, a slightly more codified terminology may be required in order to ascertain whether readers would have noticed the connection (a possibility that does not suggest itself with Trapp's and Pitt's use of Dryden), and if so, whether Milton's influence affected their understanding of the source text. Particularly useful for this purpose is the discussion by William M. Porter, which focusses on Milton's own relationship with the classics and thus allows us to tackle the question from two sides. In his attempt to categorise different forms of literary intertextuality, Porter distinguishes between 'the mere *appropriation* of a word, line, or passage from a source without regard for its context there, or at least without any intent that the appropriation should call the source to the reader's mind' and deliberate '*references*' to another work of literature. As an instance of appropriation, he cites Belial's mention of God's 'red right hand' (*PL*, II. 174), which may have

been inspired by the phrase ‘rubente dextera’ in one of Horace’s odes but does not, in Porter’s opinion, ‘stand out as one of the jewels of Milton’s emulation of the ancients’ and thus seems unlikely to have had any particular importance to him.⁸

References can be further divided into subcategories, one of which is ‘the *echo* of a specific line or passage [...] that does not involve a deeply or precisely significant relation between the meaning of the source in its context and the meaning of the present passage in its context’ (p. 23); this happens, for example, in the following lines from *Paradise Lost*, Book I:

He now prepared
To speak; whereat their doubled ranks they bend
From wing to wing, and half enclose him round
With all his peers: attention held them mute.
(*PL*, I. 615-18)

As Porter points out, Milton’s description of Satan echoes the opening words of the second book of the *Aeneid* – ‘Conticuere omnes intentique ora tenebant’ (II. 1) – but ‘There is no elaborate correspondence between Satan’s address to the fallen angels and Aeneas’s two-book narrative to the Carthaginians’ (p. 28).

In contrast to echo, a second type of reference, ‘*borrowing*’, occurs when ‘the contexts of the later passage and its target are analogous’ (p. 26). Here, too, Porter is able to draw on *Paradise Lost* for his illustrations (p. 29). Milton relates how Satan, ‘extended long and large | Lay floating many a rood’ (*PL*, I. 195-96) and in doing so borrows from Virgil’s image of Tityos stretched over nine full acres: ‘per tota novem cui iugera corpus’ (VI. 596). Likewise, the phrase ‘Titanian, or Earth-born’ (*PL*, I. 198) borrows from Virgil’s ‘genus antiquum Terrae, Titania pubes’ (VI. 580), and the ‘sylvan scene’ (IV. 140) of Paradise is taken from the background of shimmering woods – ‘silvis scaena coruscis’ (I. 164) – that greets Aeneas and his followers upon their arrival in Africa.

Moreover, ‘*allusion*’, according to Porter, differs from all of these associations in that it ‘is not really a by-product of the poem’s creation’ but rather ‘a relationship that is an intended aspect of the poem as an *interpretandum*, a “thing to be interpreted”’; according-

⁸ William M. Porter, *Reading the Classics and Paradise Lost* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), pp. 21-22. Further references are given after quotations in the text; the italics are Porter’s.

ly, ‘The study of it does not involve piercing through the text in order to uncover what lies behind it. It involves, rather, the recognition of what the surface of the text is doing’ (p. 32). Since Strahan’s choice of words in the above case may be designed to highlight a correspondence between Juno and Satan, it is worth noting that Milton himself allusively connects his devil with the Roman goddess when he has him repeat the rhetorical question that Virgil asks at the beginning of the *Aeneid*:

tantaene animis caelestibus irae?
(I. 11)

Or is it envy, and can envy dwell
In heavenly breasts?
(*PL*, IX. 729-730)

Satan gives Eve a spurious explanation for the divine decree that forbids her and Adam to eat of the Tree of Knowledge, but he is ironically self-referential in imputing to God his own motives of ‘envy and revenge’ (*PL*, I. 35). Milton thus draws an implicit analogy between the supernatural beings that he and Virgil cast as the main antagonists in their respective epics. At the same time, however, he also points to a few significant differences. For one thing, the question serves to reassert the poet’s own religious beliefs vis-à-vis the false superstitions of the ancients: pagan deities feel envy; the Christian God does not. In Book IX of *Paradise Lost*, moreover, Satan is no longer even on the same plane of existence as Juno, for whereas the latter retains her ‘heavenly’ status throughout the course of Virgil’s narrative, the fallen angel has irredeemably forfeited his.⁹ In view of their complex interplay with the *Aeneid*, Milton’s lines seem to fit neatly into Porter’s category of the ‘critical allusion’, which operates through contrasts as well as through comparisons: ‘it associates the passage and its target in a strong and normally rather obvious manner, and simultaneously it prevents the association from being total – often to the point of allowing the association to develop into direct conflict’ (p. 33).

Strahan’s translation does not quite reach the same level of complexity. Although there is a possibility that he simply appropriated the phrase ‘fixed mind | And high disdain, from sense of injured merit’, the translator’s prefatory declarations suggest that he would have wanted his readers to recognise its Miltonic provenance. Strahan’s use of these words

⁹ See Wolfgang E. H. Rudat, ‘Milton’s Satan and Virgil’s Juno: The “Perverseness” of Disobedience in *Paradise Lost*’, *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Reforme*, 3 (1979), 77-82 (pp. 77-78).

could have been prompted by the intertextual link that Milton had established with ‘can envy dwell | In heavenly breasts?’, but since they are taken from a passage in which the devil openly states his motivation and thereby exposes the vengeful nature of his personality, the identification of Satan with Juno appears much less ambiguous than in *Paradise Lost*. The translator heightens the pre-existing analogy without reproducing the contrastive effect that results from Milton’s engagement with the *Aeneid*; thus, we are probably dealing with something stronger than an echo yet weaker than a fully-fledged allusion (to use Porter’s classification).

While Satan shares the pride and vengefulness of Virgil’s goddess, his predicament and his role as leader also make him a double for Aeneas. The speech that the Trojan prince delivers to his men upon arriving in Libya is matched by the Prince of Hell’s initial address to Beëlzebub; a comparison of the framing narratives suggests how closely connected the two scenes must have been in the translator’s imagination:

Talia voce refert, curisque ingentibus aeger
spem vultu simulat, premit altum corde dolorem.
(I. 208-09)

He thus aloud, tho’ rack’d with deep Despair;
Hope in his Countenance he feigns, but Grief,
Conceal’d with Pain, possess’d his inmost Soul.
(Strahan, 1739, pp. 15-16, I. 272-74)

So spake the apostate angel, though in pain,
Vaunting aloud, but racked with deep despair:
(*PL*, I. 125-26)

Giving ‘Talia voce refert, curisque ingentibus aeger’ as ‘He thus aloud, tho’ rack’d with deep Despair’, Strahan copies almost an entire line from Milton; only the conjunction ‘but’ has been exchanged. This parallel, too, may or may not imply a response to an allusion crafted by the English poet himself. The passage in *Paradise Lost* gives a twist to the Virgilian source material that is similar to Satan’s question about divine envy; pointing out how each address deals with ‘themes of destiny and perseverance’, Philip Cardinale notes that there is nevertheless a crucial difference between them: ‘where Aeneas urges faith in divine providence, Satan exhorts divine vengeance. Milton thus empowers Satan with the political acumen of Virgil’s hero, but at a subtler level reminds the reader that Satan lacks

Aeneas's defining trait, piety.'¹⁰ If Strahan picked up on the connection and borrowed Milton's vocabulary because of it, however, the result can once again only serve to emphasise the analogousness of the characters' personal circumstances and behaviour; since Aeneas feels the same 'deep Despair' as Satan, the two of them become almost interchangeable.

In much the same way, the two characters resemble each other when losing their composure. Aeneas's reaction to the temple of Juno and its representations of the Trojan War echoes Satan's dismay at the sorry sight of his minions:

Sic ait, atque animum pictura pascit inani
 multa gemens, largoque umectat flumine vultum.
 (I. 464-65)

He said, his Words
 Deep interwove with Sighs, his Visage bath'd
 With copious Floods of Tears,
 (Strahan, 1739, p. 34, I. 628-30)

Tears such as angels weep, burst forth: at last
 Words interwove with sighs found out their way.
 (PL, I. 620-21)

The un-Virgilian weaving metaphor in Strahan's translation of 'Sic ait [...] multa gemens' would be reason enough to suspect the underlying presence of Milton's lines, and since he ended up with a nearly identical choice and arrangement of words (positioning 'interwove with sighs' congruously to its twin in the other text), there can be no doubt that his readers were meant to recall this particular episode.

The affinity between the protagonists is further reinforced by references to their Odyssean journeys. Behind Dido's sympathetic interest in Aeneas's background, we hear Satan boasting about his victory once he has returned from Eden:

"quis te, nate dea, per tanta pericula casus
 insequitur?
 (I. 615-16)

Then thus she spake: What cruel Destiny,
 O Goddess born! thro' such Adventures hard
 Pursues thee still?
 (Strahan, 1739, p. 45, I. 845-47)

¹⁰ Philip Cardinale, 'Satan as Aeneas: An Allusion to Virgil in *Paradise Lost*', *N&Q*, 50 (2003), 183.

now possess,
 As lords, a spacious world, to our native heaven
 Little inferior, by my adventure hard
 With peril great achieved.

(*PL*, x. 466-69)

Surprisingly, Strahan uses ‘adventure hard’ instead of the more literal ‘peril great’ for ‘tanta pericula’; if the cognate in the second phrase activated the translator’s memory, its lexical surroundings may also have suggested an alternative that he considered preferable. Again, by virtue of their placement at the end of a line, the words accord with Milton’s metrical organisation as well as reproducing his vocabulary.

In addition to his ties with Juno and Aeneas, Satan’s deceitfulness simultaneously aligns him with several of the other characters in Virgil’s Book I, which also elicited a considerable number of borrowings during the translation process. Venus, for instance, enhances her son’s appearance when he first reveals himself to the Queen of Carthage; Strahan’s version of this moment abounds with Miltonisms:

restitit Aeneas claraque in luce refulsit,
 os umerosque deo similis; namque ipsa decoram
 caesariem nato genetrix lumenque iuventae
 purpureum et laetos oculis adflarat honores;

(I. 588-91)

Æneas stood
 Reveal’d to Sight, and seem’d, in clearer Day,
 In Countenance and Stature as a God:
 For o’er her Son the Goddess had diffus’d
 Radiance divine, excelling human Form;
 His Hair flow’d down in Curls; his Visage smil’d
 Celestial blooming Youth; his Eyes shot forth
 A beamy Brightness,

(Strahan, 1739, p. 43, I. 803-10)

Their visages and stature as of gods,

(*PL*, I. 570)

godlike shapes and forms
 Excelling human, princely dignities

(*PL*, I. 358-59)

And now as stripling cherub he appears,
 Not of the prime, yet such as in his face
 Youth smiled celestial, and to every limb
 Suitable grace diffused, so well he feigned;
(PL, III, 636-39)

The image of Aeneas ‘In Countenance and Stature as a God’ might conceivably be informed by the ‘visages and stature as of gods’ that Milton gives his rebel angels; if so, Strahan has merely substituted a synonym for one of the nouns. As a rendering of ‘os umerosque deo similis’, this line is still fairly close to the original. However, the same cannot be said of ‘Radiancè divine, excelling human Form’, which has absolutely no basis in the source text but appears to be a reworking of ‘godlike shape and forms | Excelling human’, another attribute of Milton’s demons. The adjective ‘Celestial’ does not correspond to any of the Latin elements, either, and along with the rest of ‘his Visage smil’d | Celestial blooming Youth’, it evokes Satan’s disguise as ‘stripling cherub [...] in [whose] ‘face | Youth smiled celestial’. If not for the influence of *Paradise Lost*, one wonders why the translator would have embellished ‘lumenque iuventae | purpureum’ the way he did; nor can we exclude the possibility that the lines he remembered from the English poem played a part in his decision to translate ‘adflarat’ as ‘diffus’d’.

Likewise, Venus’s plan to ignite Dido’s passion for Aeneas is formulated in terms recalling the concern that the Son of God expresses about Satan’s design to ruin Man:

quocirca capere ante dolis et cingere flamma
 reginam meditor,
(I. 673-74)

Therefore the Queen by Fraud to circumvent,
 And wrap in Flames I meditate,
(Strahan, 1739, p. 49, I. 923-24)

For should man finally be lost, should man
 Thy creature late so loved, thy youngest son
 Fall circumvented thus by fraud, though joined
 With his own folly?
(PL, III. 150-53)

Milton anticipated Strahan’s collocation of ‘fraud’ and ‘circumvent’. The use of the polysyllable for ‘capere’, in particular, seems too peculiar to have occurred independently; a more satisfying explanation would be that this verb was associatively yoked together with

the noun that came to render ‘dolus’. The depiction of Cupid posing as Ascanius in front of the Tyrian people features another duplicated pairing of lexemes; the precedent is again Satan’s cherubic camouflage:

mirantur Iulum
flagrantisque dei vultus simulataque verba
(I. 709-10)

But more admire the Boy, the Words well feign’d,
And radiant Count’nance of the God conceal’d.
(Strahan, 1739, p. 52, I. 976-77)

in his face
Youth smiled celestial, and to every limb
Suitable grace diffused, so well he feigned;
(*PL*, III. 637-39)

Lacking a direct equivalent in the source text, the adverb ‘well’ presumably entered the English version by virtue of its Miltonic combination with ‘feigned’, the word that Strahan uses to translate ‘simulata’; this verb mirrors the end-line position of its counterpart in *Paradise Lost* at the same time as it reflects Virgil’s metrical structure.

Dido’s infatuation with the little impostor at her banquet completes the motif of deception. Here Satan may have served as a model for both the queen, who is reminiscent of the snake enthralled by Eve’s beauty, and Cupid, who brings to mind Milton’s God as he instructs his messenger to warn Adam:

haec oculis, haec pectore toto
haeret et interdum gremio fovet, inscia Dido,
insideat quantus miserae deus.
(I. 717-19)

She with her Eyes and all her Senses fix’d
Insatiate gazes, then with Ardour clasps
Close to the yielding Whiteness of her Breast.
Unhappy Queen! nor conscious of the God,
Whose potent Fraudulence now plots thy Fall.
(Strahan, 1739, p. 52, I. 987-91)

I approach thee thus, and gaze
Insatiate,
(*PL*, IX. 535-36)

tell him withal
 His danger, and from whom, what enemy
 Late fallen himself from heaven, is plotting now
 The fall of others from like state of bliss;
 (PL, v. 238-41)

Since ‘Insatiate gazes’ does not relate to anything in Virgil, it makes sense to assume that Milton provided the phrase (especially considering the identical placement of the verb), and while the whole of Strahan’s last line is an expansion, his specific collocation of ‘plots’ and ‘Fall’ could potentially derive from the same source.

Just as the representation of Satan helped to shape more than one Virgilian character in translation, so Strahan often finds multiple Miltonic counterparts for these individual characters from the *Aeneid*. Aeneas not only parallels the Devil but also bears an occasional resemblance to Adam. In the latter’s reaction to Eve’s mistake, we see a prototype of the sudden dread that seizes the Trojan hero during the storm created by Aeolus:

extemplo Aeneae solvuntur frigore membra;
 (I. 92)

A Horror chill Æneas’ Joints relax’d:
 (Strahan, 1739, p. 8, I. 127)

On the other side, Adam, soon as he heard
 The fatal trespass done by Eve, amazed,
 Astonied stood and blank, while horror chill
 Ran through his veins, and all his joints relaxed;
 (PL, IX. 888-91)

To be sure, ‘Joints relax’d’ translates ‘solvuntur [...] membra’ accurately enough, but in conjunction with ‘Horror chill’ these words reproduce a conspicuously large part of Milton’s vocabulary and thus point to the episode in *Paradise Lost* as a source of inspiration. Another thing that Aeneas and Adam have in common is the dual prospect of hardship and success; Venus’s fear for her son subtly emulates Michael’s prediction of the future:

hoc equidem occasum Troiae tristisque ruinas
 solabar, fatis contraria fata repondens;
 (I. 238-39)

sin absumpta salus, et te, pater optime Teucrum,
pontus habet Libyae
(I. 555-56)

But if for Thee no Safety, Last and Best
Of *Trojans!* Thee if *Libyan* Seas o'erwhelm,
(Strahan, 1739, p. 40, I. 755-56)

O fairest of creation, last and best
Of all God's works,
(*PL*, IX. 896-97)

The matching end-line position of 'Last and Best' suggests that Strahan appropriated Milton's twofold superlative in order to amplify Virgil's 'optime'. Here, too, the verbal and metrical agreement could be intended as a means of underscoring a perceived similarity in the subject matter of the two narratives, for each author employs the reverential words in the context of a speech that articulates feelings of loss and uncertainty. Establishing a connection between these moments, the translator aligns them on a formal level.

References to the Son of God are echoed at various points throughout Strahan's version of *Aeneid* I. To mention but one example that also pertains to Virgil's protagonist, Aeneas's promise of ever-lasting gratitude to Dido is informed by the sudden narratorial laudation in Milton's third book:

semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt,
quae me cumque vocant terrae."
(I. 609-10)

your bright Idea, Name
And Honour shall for ever dear remain,
(Toss'd on what Sea, or on what Region thrown)
And be the copious Matter of my Praise.
(Strahan, 1739, p. 44, I. 835-38)

Hail, Son of God, saviour of men, thy name
Shall be the copious matter of my song
(*PL*, III. 412-13)

In 'Shall be the copious matter of my song', Strahan had a ready-made embellishment that could be adjusted to his purposes; he replaces 'song' with 'Praise' and thereby expands Virgil's 'laudesque' into an entire line, which gains further prominence because of its

Nor more, but turning round, her Neck
 Like polish'd Ivory resplendent shone,
 Ting'd with Celestial rosy Red; her Locks
 Ambrosial breath'd Odours divine; the Robe
 Descended with Majestic Train; her Walk
 Smooth gliding without Step, now manifest
 A Deity declar'd.

(Strahan, 1739, pp. 29-30, l. 539-45)

To whom the angel with a smile that glowed
 Celestial rosy red, love's proper hue,
 Answered.

(*PL*, VIII. 618-20)

So saying, by the hand he took me raised,
 And over fields and waters, as in air
 Smooth sliding without step, last led me up

(*PL*, VIII. 300-02)

With 'rosy red', the translator more than does justice to Virgil's 'rosea'; the redundancy of these words alone indicates that he did not simply reproduce them by accident, and the preceding adjective 'Celestial' is an even clearer sign of their Miltonic provenance. 'Smooth gliding without Step' has likewise been derived from the native epic despite the absence of any corresponding lexemes in the source text; except for the substitution of a single consonant ('sliding' becomes 'gliding'), the phrase remains completely unaltered.

Strahan copies the belligerence as well as the beauty of Milton's angels. The ekphrasis of the images on Juno's temple brings Aeneas's martial prowess into alignment with Gabriel's feats during the war in Heaven:

se quoque principibus permixtum agnovit Achivis,

(I. 488)

Himself he likewise knew
 Amidst the *Greeks*, piercing their deep Array,
 (Strahan, 1739, p. 36, l. 663-64)

Meanwhile in other parts like deeds deserved
 Memorial, where the might of Gabriel fought,
 And with fierce ensigns pierced the deep array
 Of Moloch furious king,

(*PL*, VI. 354-57)

Another example of circular influence – whereby a Miltonic allusion to Virgil finds its way back into Strahan’s English version of the *Aeneid* – occurs at the beginning of Venus’s speech to Cupid, which replicates the exchange between God and the Son as well as hinting at the archangel’s rebellion against his creator:

‘Nate, meae vires, mea magna potentia, solus,
nate, patris summi qui tela Typhoëa temnis,
(I. 664-65)

O Son! my Strength, and my effectual Might!
Son, who alone the dreaded Shafts of Jove,
Of Heaven’s Omnipotent dar’st to despise:
(Strahan, 1739, p. 48, I. 911-13)

Son of my bosom, Son who art alone
My word, my wisdom, and effectual might,
(*PL*, III. 169-70)

Who durst defy the omnipotent to arms.
(*PL*, I. 49)

The emphatic repetition of the vocative ‘nate’/‘Son’, the placement of ‘solus’/‘alone’ at the end of a line, the semantic correspondence between ‘magna potentia’ and ‘effectual might’ – all of this suggests that Milton was echoing Virgil in his turn and consequently attracted a borrowing on the part of the translator.¹³ Again, Strahan could read the Roman poet through the refractive prism of an English epic that had itself entered into dialogue with the latter’s work.

Apart from the Miltonic characters reverberating through his version of the *Aeneid*, Strahan also draws on *Paradise Lost* to enrich Virgil’s descriptions of nature. Juno’s complaint about Minerva destroying the Argive fleet is a case in point, as it runs parallel to the empyrean perspective of Chaos before creation:

ipsa Iovis rapidum iaculata e nubibus ignem
disiecitque rates evertitque aequora ventis;
(I. 42-43)

¹³ *PL*, p. 177. Cf. John M. Steadman, ‘Milton, Virgil, and St. Jerome (*Paradise Lost*, III, 168-170)’, *N&Q*, 6 (1959), 368-69.

She from the Clouds, could lance with potent Arm
 Jove's dreaded Thunder, scatter wide his Ships,
 And from th' Abyss upturn with furious Winds
 The surging Waves:

(Strahan, 1739, p. 4, l. 58-61)

They viewed the vast immeasurable abyss
 Outrageous as a sea, dark, wasteful, wild,
 Up from the bottom turned by furious winds
 And surging waves:

(*PL*, VII. 211-14)

The attributes 'furious' and 'surging' are nowhere to be found in the Latin original. Placing them in front of 'wind' and 'waves', respectively, the translator produces a close replica of the enjambment 'furious winds | And surging waves'; again, he not only absorbs the words but also follows their metrical arrangement. This conformity appears all the more sharply because the verb translating 'evertit' occupies the third foot of the first line and thus mirrors Milton's 'turned'.

A similar enhancement of natural forces happens shortly afterwards when Strahan renders the lines describing the consequences that would ensue if Aeolus did not keep his winds in check. The passage recalls Satan's prospective journey and thereby continues the foregoing evocation of Chaos:

ni faciat, maria ac terras caelumque profundum
 quippe ferant rapidi secum verrantque per auras.

(I. 58-59)

Lest they, in wild Confusion, Earth and Seas,
 And Heav'n with all her number'd Stars should blend,
 And sweep together thro' the void Immense.

(Strahan, 1739, p. 5, l. 80-82)

I go
 This uncouth errand sole, and one for all
 Myself expose, with lonely steps to tread
 The unfounded deep, and through the void immense
 To search with wandering quest a place foretold

(*PL*, II. 826-30)

The borrowed 'void immense' translates Virgil's much simpler 'auras' ('air'). Since the phrase is headed by the preposition 'through' in both texts, they end up featuring identical half-lines whose congruence cannot be easily ignored.

In his version of Neptune calming the sea, the translator takes recourse to the Miltonic representation of Chaos for a third time. The constraints imposed upon the elements suggest an associative link with the cosmic structure created by God:

levat ipse tridenti
et vastas aperit syrtis et temperat aequor
(I. 145-46)

Himself
With Trident rais'd assists the shatter'd Fleet,
Opens the Quick-sands vast, and loud Misrule
Of Ocean strait controuls;
(Strahan, 1739, p. 11, I. 190-93)

for as earth, so he the world
Built on circumfluous waters calm, in wide
Crystalline ocean, and the loud misrule
Of Chaos far removed,
(*PL*, VII. 271-72)

It is possible that Strahan appropriated the line ending 'loud misrule' to complement his choice of the English verb 'controuls' for 'temperat'. Once more, the lack of a Virgilian equivalent and the metrical distribution of the same words in *Paradise Lost* testify to the persistence of Milton's influence, as do the corresponding genitives 'Of Chaos' and 'Of Ocean'.

The moment at which Jupiter looks down upon Earth represents another point of contact between the cosmologies that inform the two epics. Here the translation echoes the view afforded to Satan at the close of Milton's Book II as well as Raphael's account of Genesis in Book VII:

Et iam finis erat, cum Iuppiter aethere summo
despiciens mare velivolum terrasque iacentis
litoraue
(I. 223-25)

They ended now, when Jupiter surveying,
From th' Emphyrean pure, this pendant World
Of Earth, and Ocean circumfus'd, the Shores,
(Strahan, 1739, p. 17, I. 293-95)

Weighs his spread wings, at leisure to behold
 Far off the empyreal heaven, extended wide
 [...]
 And fast by hanging in a golden chain
 This pendent world, in bigness as a star
 Of smallest magnitude close by the moon.
 (*PL*, II. 1046-53)

among these the seat of men,
 Earth with her nether ocean circumfused,
 Their pleasant dwelling place.
 (*PL*, VII. 623-25)

Strahan's 'pendant' and 'circumfus'd' look like stylised Latinisms designed to render matching cognates in the source text; however, neither of their respective counterparts ('iacentis' and 'velivolum') strictly necessitates the word with which is translated (indeed, 'circumfus'd' seems quite off the mark), and the particular collocation with 'World' and 'Ocean' suggests their true origin.

The translator forges a less straightforward connection from Virgil's bee simile, which in his version approximates Eve's concern about how to efficiently perform the task assigned to herself and her husband:

fervet opus redolentque thymo fragrantia mella.
 (I. 436)

the Work with Labour glows,
 And strong of Thyme the fragrant Honey smells.
 (Strahan, 1739, p. 32, I. 587-88)

till more hands
 Aid us, the work under our labour grows,
 Luxurious by restraint;
 (*PL*, IX. 207-09)

Strahan renders 'fervet opus' somewhat redundantly as 'the Work with Labour glows'. While this phrase appears to be adapted from Milton's 'the work under our labour grows', the indebtedness is difficult to explain in terms of thematic equivalence alone. By virtue of their prelapsarian activities, Adam and Eve can be said to share – to a certain degree – the industriousness of the Virgilian bees (which are being compared to the Carthaginians in their turn), and any mention of flowers might have sufficed to remind the translator of the vegetation in Eden, but a stronger correspondence arises from the natural rendering of 'fer-

vet' with 'glows' and the phonetic similarity between that word and Milton's 'grows', which in itself could have prompted Strahan to further align the passages. As was the case with the minimal pair of 'sliding' and 'gliding' discussed above, the two verbs differ only in a single consonant.

Images of the heavenly spheres in *Paradise Lost* also had a palpable effect on the translation of the *Aeneid*. As Ilioneus tells Dido about the storm that intercepted the Trojans on their voyage to Italy, he uses a vocabulary reminiscent of the nightfall on earth witnessed by Satan:

cum subito adsurgens fluctu nimbosus Orion
in vada caeca tulit
(I. 535-36)

When sudden rising in th' ascending Scale
Of Heav'n, Orion, arm'd with Tempests black,
On latent *Syrtes* drove us,
(Strahan, 1739, p. 39, I. 728-30)

the sun
Declined was hasting now with prone career
To the Ocean Isles, and in the ascending scale
Of heaven the stars that usher evening rose:
(*PL*, IV. 352-55)

The participle 'adsurgens' literally translates to 'rising'; 'in th' ascending Scale | Of Heav'n', on the other hand, cannot be traced back to any of the Latin elements. Yet again, one of Milton's enjambments has been seamlessly woven into the fabric of Strahan's text so as to achieve a colourful expansion.

The translator supplements Virgil's scenery with contours of both actual and metaphorical stars. On account of their nightly illumination, the halls of Dido's palace bear a distinct resemblance to the interiors of Pandaemonium:

dependent lychni laquearibus aureis
incensi et noctem flammis funalia vincunt.
(I. 726-27)

Down from the golden Ceiling Starry Lamps
Depending, yielded Light as from a Sky.
(Strahan, 1739, p. 53, I. 1001-02)

from the archèd roof
 Pendent by subtle magic many a row
 Of starry lamps and blazing cressets fed
 With naphtha and asphaltus yielded light
 As from a sky.

(*PL*, I. 726-30)

Through the characterisation of the ‘Lamps’ as ‘Starry’ and the added detail of their ‘yield[ing] Light as from a Sky’, Strahan’s language gains a figurative quality that is altogether absent from the Latin original. Unlike other examples, however, this Miltonic embellishment takes place at the expense of the Roman poet himself, whose ‘et noctem flammis funalia vincunt’ remains untranslated.

Likewise, the English version of Iopas’s song seems to include a minor borrowing from the answer to Eve’s question as to why the orbs in the sky shine at night:

hic canit errantem lunam solisque labores,
 unde hominum genus et pecudes, unde imber et ignes,
 Arcturum pluviasque Hyadas geminosque Triones;
(I. 742-44)

The Moon’s erratic Course, the Speed immense
 And Labours of the Sun; to what first Cause
 Or Man or Brute their Being owe; from whence
 Thunder and Rain; of Constellations bright
 The various Influence, Arcturus’ Storms,
 The Watry Hyades, and Polar Star:
(Strahan, 1739, p. 54, I. 1022-27)

Lest total darkness should by night regain
 Her old possession, and extinguish life
 In nature and all things, which these soft fires
 Not only enlighten, but with kindly heat
 Of various influence foment and warm,
(*PL*, IV. 665-69)

Adding to the list of topics treated by Virgil’s singer, the phrase ‘of Constellations bright | The various Influence’ has stolen in between the words translating ‘imber et ignes’ and ‘Arcturum’. To be sure, it is only the part after the line break that also occurs in Milton, and even that is not duplicated without undergoing a slight modification, but the common interest in astronomical matters temporarily unites the characters from the translation and

the original poem, thus lending at least some plausibility to the assumption that they are related.

From the preceding analysis, it would appear Strahan was under Milton's spell like perhaps no other translator of Virgil before him. By comparison with his fellow Miltonist Trapp, who balances a devotee's admiration against a scholar's critical judgment and never indulges in expressions of unqualified praise, he seems much more enthusiastic about adopting *Paradise Lost* as a model for his *Aeneid*. Yet the crucial difference between the two translators lies not only in the degree but also in the concrete manifestation of the influence to which they are subjected. Judging by the samples of his versification that we have seen, Trapp contents himself with imitating general features such as Milton's syntax and use of Latinisms, which primarily serve to facilitate a more literal rendering of the source text and are thus a means to an end rather than end in itself; he does not seem to reproduce any particular phrases from the vernacular epic – certainly not in any logical or systematic way that would connect the works by foregrounding shared themes and motifs. Strahan, on the other hand, fashions an intertextual linkage of precisely this kind; the abundance of Miltonisms in his first draft of *Aeneid I* repeatedly challenge readers to identify points of contact with *Paradise Lost*. Granted, these borrowed materials vary in their relevance for the episodes they come to adorn; some of them are arguably more generic and do not depend on a precise contextual equivalence (in keeping with Porter's categorisation, we might call these 'echoes'), whereas others closely correspond to Virgil's diction and thus potentially reflect an awareness of Milton's own engagement with and emulation of the Roman poet. Nor can we be sure how deliberately the translator inserted the verbal residues of his favourite author; in some cases, the process of absorption may well have been subliminal. At any rate, the resulting text is more than a mere exercise in Miltonolatry; much like eighteenth-century editorial efforts to uncover the Virgilian influences behind *Paradise Lost*, it conveys a sense of continuity that utterly jars with Caldwell's assertions about the fading cultural capital of the classics. Strahan's dual focus on the Latin original and its native successor bridges any hypothetical divide between past and present that his contemporaries may have felt.¹⁴

¹⁴ Such a dual perspective is far from new but has precedents in antiquity itself. Establishing a typology of reference based on Virgil's own *Georgics*, Richard F. Thomas coins the term 'window reference' to describe a similar phenomenon that 'consists of the very close adaptation of a model, noticeably interrupted in order to allow reference back to the source of that model: the intermediate model thus serves as a sort of window onto the ultimate source, whose version is otherwise not visible'. See Thomas, 'Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference', *HSCP*, 90 (1986), 171-98 (p. 188). The key difference in Strahan's case is that,

Naturally, one would expect such heavy indebtedness to correlate with Strahan's handling of his metre. Raymond Dexter Havens observes that eighteenth-century practitioners of blank verse influenced by Milton frequently failed to live up to his great example:

Many writers published as 'imitations of Milton' productions that show no traces of the prosody of *Paradise Lost* but are either unrimed [sic] couplets or prose cut into ten-foot lengths; [...] Even poets who were willing to follow Milton slavishly did not often succeed in maintaining through many successive lines the fundamental feature of his prosody, the substitution of the free musical paragraph for the line as the unit of verse. They had been writing separate lines for so long that they could not rid themselves of the habit.¹⁵

In view of the last chapter, this account of original versifiers is equally applicable to Trapp, who gives the impression of translating Virgil line by line and without any consideration for macroscopic patterns, and whose borrowings from Dryden tend to involve words that the latter used to demarcate metrical boundaries. By contrast, Strahan's practice might go further than other imitative efforts in recreating the cadences of *Paradise Lost* since the translator not only copies Milton's phrases but often places them in the same metrical position. It would not come as a surprise if the resulting translation managed to appear Miltonic in its rhythm as well as in its lexis. A prefatory comment on the 1753 text evinces Strahan's intention to improve upon the prosody of his immediate forerunner: 'I have kept as close to my Author as the late Doctor Trapp, in respect to his Sense, but have taken a little more Compass, for the sake of Harmony' (sig. A4^v). Given that the Miltonisms he introduces typically entail some sort of deviation from Virgil's literal meaning, we have reason to ask whether (and how) they contribute to this prosodic refinement and whether the final product possesses anything of the subtly modulated blank verse of *Paradise Lost*.

There are cases in which the Miltonic phraseology energises the flow of Strahan's pentameters by virtue of being positioned against the normative iambic beat. The English poet habitually varies the alternating sequence of unstressed and stressed syllables in order to highlight the action of his story, and every now and then his influence on the translator

since we are dealing with a translation, the ultimate source is known from the start and functions to evoke the intermediate model rather than vice versa.

¹⁵ Raymond Dexter Havens, *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*, 2nd edn (New York: Faber & Faber, 1961), p. 55.

engenders an analogous symbiosis between form and content. Take the portrayal of Aeneas as he is overwhelmed with pictures of the Trojan War, for instance:

He said, his Words
Deep interwove with Sighs,
(Strahan, 1739, p. 34, l. 628-29)

Words interwove with sighs found out their way.
(*PL*, l. 621)

The combination of an inverted first foot and the heavy polysyllable ‘interwove’ has a lengthening effect that mimics the character’s momentary speechlessness. A similar delay is caused by the prophetic line whose verbatim extraction from Milton we have already noted:

With Earth’s wide Bounds, his Glory with the Heav’ns,
(Strahan, 1739, p. 21, l. 380)

Each of the three words in ‘Earth’s wide Bounds’ carries a stress; their cumulative weight aptly symbolises the scope of the Roman Empire and thus matches their semantic import. The added reference to Venus’s gait likewise provides an example of metrical iconicity:

her Walk
Smooth gliding without Step,
(Strahan, 1739, pp. 29-30, l. 543-44)

as in air
Smooth sliding without step,
(*PL*, VIII. 301-02)

A spondee at the head of the line is followed by three unstressed syllables; ‘without’ loses something of its accent due to the beat that falls on the contiguous half-foot ‘step’, which marks a medial caesura. This uneven emphasis might aim to represent the motions of the goddess herself, intimating a buoyant passage from one spot to the next. Quite the opposite happens to a line informed by the description of celestial combat:

Heroic Virgin, who so arm’d, yet dar’d
The manly Hero in fierce Hosting meet.
(Strahan, 1739, p. 36, l. 671-72)

angel should with angel war,
And in fierce hosting meet,
(*PL*, VI. 92-93)

The two adjacent stresses of ‘fierce hosting’ create a retardation that runs parallel to the clash of conflicting forces on the narrative level. Here, too, Strahan seems to have made good use of the phrase he borrowed, processing not only its decorousness but also its rhythmic functionality.

These invigorating modulations are the exception, however. More often than not, the translator either picks elements whose original position strengthens – rather than counters – the regularity of Milton’s blank verse to begin with, or he rearranges them in such a way that their natural accents coincide with the beats of a basic pentameter line. Juno’s Satanic pride exemplifies the latter phenomenon:

deep in her Mind was fix’d
Th’ Award of Paris, and Resentment high
From Sense of injur’d Beauty, th’ odious Race,
(Strahan, 1739, p. 3, I. 35-37)

that fixed mind
And high disdain, from sense of injured merit,
(*PL*, I, 96-98)

As John Creaser points out, feminine endings like ‘merit’ are a rarity in *Paradise Lost* and specifically underscore ‘acts of disobedience and illegitimate aspiration’.¹⁶ This nuance is lost on Strahan, who substitutes the metrically equivalent ‘Beauty’ but shifts the whole accompanying prepositional phrase backwards until the formerly hypercatalectic syllable comes to rest on the first half of the fourth foot.

The lines describing Minerva’s destruction of the Greek ships are no less symptomatic of the translator’s tendency to rectify the beat of his model:

And from th’ Abyss upturn with furious Winds
The surging Waves:
(Strahan, 1739, p. 4, I. 60-61)

¹⁶ John Creaser, ‘The Line in *Paradise Lost*’, in *The Cambridge Companion to Paradise Lost*, ed. by Louis Schwartz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 81-93 (p. 88).

Up from the bottom turned by furious winds
And surging waves:

(*PL*, VII. 213-14)

While not exactly a borrowing of extraneous verbiage, ‘And from th’ Abyss upturn’ is positionally congruous to and has the same semantic valence as ‘Up from the bottom turned’, which allows them to be directly compared. Once again, Milton’s rhythm and syntax fulfil an expressive purpose. He effectively brings out the turmoil of the waters by inverting both the first iambic foot of the pentameter and the customary order of the words it conveys; the hyperbaton separates the two parts of a phrasal verb that hold the segment together and endow it with a nervous flexibility. Strahan, on the other hand, cancels the poet’s aesthetic choices even as he emulates him, sacrificing the kinetic tension in favour of a more streamlined movement that is somewhat at odds with the subject of nautical disasters.

The slightest reconfigurations can be enough to assimilate Milton’s vocabulary to the comparatively rigid metre of the English *Aeneid*. When rendering Venus’s disquiet about the future of her beloved Trojans, the translator makes a small adjustment to the adjective he derives from *Paradise Lost*:

the Waste of *Troy*
I bore consol’d, with prosp’rous, adverse Fates
I pois’d.

(Strahan, 1739, p. 18, l. 312-14)

equally inured
By moderation either state to bear,
Prosperous or adverse: so shalt thou lead

(*PL*, XI. 361-64)

By way of syncopation, Milton’s dactyl ‘Prosperous’ is reduced to the trochaic ‘prosp’rous’, which more readily lends itself to being embedded into the chain of recurrent strong and weak beats. Establishing a contrast with ‘adverse’, Strahan exploits the metrical ambiguity of that word and stresses the first rather than the second of its syllables; as a result, he ends up with two building blocks of equal length and accentual distribution that form a single uninterrupted string. However, this means he loses the delicate imbalance in Milton’s arrangement, the pace of which accelerates after the initial stress of ‘Prosperous’ but is then checked by the resistance of ‘or’ and the iambically weighed ‘adverse’, thus encoding the antithesis between good and ill fortune in the rhythmical structure of the verse.

By the same token, such a disciplinary impetus would also explain why Strahan inverts the word order of the phrase he borrows to translate Aeneas's plea to his departing mother:

Why not allow
Hand to join Hand, and Converse sweet indulge
(Strahan, 1739, p. 30, l. 538-39)

How can I live without thee, how forgo
Thy sweet converse and love so dearly joined,
(*PL*, IX. 908-09)

With 'sweet converse', Milton uses two consecutive stresses that make the second foot of his line a trochee, whereas Strahan's copy has the noun precede the adjective and thus arrives at an offbeat on the middle of the three syllables. To be sure, the inverted first foot in 'Hand to join Hand' prevents the translator's pentameter from blindly adhering to an abstract prosodic pattern of duple alternation, but nevertheless, his overall handling of materials quarried from the native epic seems to reflect, if not an unresponsiveness to the infinite variability of Miltonic blank verse, then at least a certain reluctance to absorb its vibrant rhythms as well as its phraseological aroma.

Moreover, this propensity for metrical regulation appears to grow stronger in the 1753 version of Books I-VI, which includes several revisions of the previously published text. Compare the two translations of Juno's address to the ruler of the winds:

"Aeole, namque tibi divum pater atque hominum rex
(I. 65)

Thou Æolus, to whom the Supreme King,
Great Sire of Gods and Men,
(Strahan, 1739, p. 6, l. 89-90)

Thou Æolus, to whom the King Supreme,
Great Sire of Gods and Men,
(Strahan, 1753, p. 5, l. 89-90)

And sat as princes, whom the supreme king
(*PL*, I. 735)

As an epithet of the Christian God, ‘súpreme king’ adequately renders part of Jupiter’s corresponding sobriquet ‘divum pater atque hominum rex’, and its identical end-line position further intimates the associative connection through which Strahan obtained it. Supporting Alastair Fowler’s observation that the stress on ‘sú’ was not uncommon (*PL*, p. 105), Thomas N. Corns is able to show how the last four syllables of this and the next two lines in *Paradise Lost* depend on normative scansion to counterpoise the shifting caesuras of a foregoing verse paragraph and thereby ‘reassert the underlying metrical structure’.¹⁷ However, the ‘harsh’ first-syllable accent found an early critic in Milton’s eighteenth-century editor Richard Bentley, who would emend the phrase to ‘King suprême’ on the grounds that this is the usual way in which the poet stresses the adjective.¹⁸ Even if we allow that either word order may theoretically be brought into accord with the rising duple rhythm of the pentameter, the simultaneous occurrence of ‘supreme’ in both its trochaic and its iambic variation within the same textual framework (amongst numerous other things, of course) helps to make readers’ experience of the poem less predictable, requiring them to actualise each of the potential alternatives at different points and thus increasing their alertness to the prosodic malleability of individual elements. The noun-adjective sequence Bentley proposes would eliminate the ambiguous dimension of the word by achieving uniformity between all its local usages. Interestingly, Strahan’s revised version of the Miltonic phrase agrees with this amendment. While it is possible to scan ‘Supreme King’ not only as an ordinary last foot and a half but also as an aberration with one unstressed and two stressed syllables, ‘King Supreme’ unequivocally reinforces the basic rhythmical pattern of the metre; moreover, the latter word order is also by far the most likely to be found in couplet verse. By creating a more emphatic line ending, Strahan’s second-thought preference for the noun-adjective arrangement thus brings him ever so slightly closer to the rhyming tradition that Milton had rejected.

Another factor that contributes to the impression of greater metrical integrity is the translator’s treatment of the hemistich in Ilioneus’s report to Dido, a feature whose original prominence has vanished by 1753:

hic cursus fuit . . .
 cum subito adsurgens fluctu nimbosus Orion
 (l. 534-35)

¹⁷ Thomas N. Corns, ‘Milton’s English’, in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. by Thomas N. Corns (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 90-106 (pp. 91-92).

¹⁸ Richard Bentley, ed., *Milton’s Paradise Lost: A New Edition* (London, 1732), p. 33.

Thither our Course we steer'd.
 When sudden rising in th' ascending Scale
 (Strahan, 1739, p. 39, l. 727-28)

Our Course we thither steer'd. When suddenly
 Orion rising in th' ascending Scale
 (Strahan, 1753, p. 32, l. 723-24)

Allured his eye: thither his course he bends
 (*PL*, III. 573)

In addition to shuffling the syntax so as to dispose of the inverted first foot 'Thither', Strahan closes the gap at the end of the line by moving the head of the next decasyllabic unit upwards. Structurally, the final position of the adverb 'suddenly' and the following enjambment compensate for the loss of a new paragraph that describes an unexpected turn of events; yet the superior faithfulness of the initial rendering cannot be denied. Looking at Strahan's imitation and subsequent rejection of the half-line as a poetic device, we see his versification gravitate towards the standard set by the couplet translations of his predecessors, and Dryden's *Aeneis* in particular.

This development is most apparent in the revised opening lines of the poem, which no longer display the syntactical licentiousness of 1739:

Arms and the Hero who from Trojan Shores,
 Compell'd by Fate and Exile, first explor'd
 Th' Italian Soil, and touch'd Lavinian Strands
 I sing; after long Toils, and Perils great
 By Land and Seas sustain'd; the Will of Heav'n:
 So Juno's Rage Implacable constrain'd:
 (Strahan, 1739, p. 1, l. 1-6)

Arms, and the Man I Sing, from Trojan Shores
 Who first, condemn'd by Fate to wander, came
 To Italy, and the Lavinian Strands;
 After long Toil sustain'd, and Perils great
 By Land and Sea; forc'd by Celestial Powers,
 And cruel Juno's unrelenting Rage.
 (Strahan, 1753, p. 1, l. 1-6)

Arms, and the Man I sing, who, forc'd by Fate,
 And haughty Juno's unrelenting Hate,
 Expell'd and exil'd, left the Trojan Shoar:
 Long Labours, both by Sea and Land he bore,
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 343, l. 1-4)

The un-Virgilian suspension of the main verb has been corrected; 'I sing' now comes right after the words translating 'arma virumque' and thus mirrors the placement of the Latin 'cano'. Rather than creatively interpreting 'virum' as 'Hero', moreover, Strahan newly renders it with the literal equivalent 'Man'. Of course, these seem like obvious choices anyone would make, and as such they need not have resulted from the consultation of earlier translators. However, the difference between the two compositional stages goes beyond improvements that merely bring Strahan's version closer to the source text. A juxtaposition with Dryden suggests the extent to which the latter's vocabulary, specifically, began to infiltrate the language of the blank verse *Aeneid*: for one thing, the phrase 'forc'd by Fate' may have prompted the translator to replace 'the Will of Heav'n' in his early draft with 'forc'd by Celestial Powers', and even more conspicuous is the use of the adjective 'unrelenting', which derives from the second half of the same couplet and functions as a substitute for 'Implacable'. In fact, the entire line 'So Juno's Rage Implacable constrain'd' has turned into a carbon copy of Dryden's 'And haughty Juno's unrelenting Hate', whose syntactic organisation remains unchanged despite minor lexical discrepancies. Weighed against the numerous Miltonisms in Strahan's work and their significance for (re)creating a distinctive style, this secondary point of contact might appear negligible, yet given his routine of amending the rhythmically aberrant materials that he borrows, it serves to further illustrate the limitations imposed upon the practice of an eighteenth-century translator who tried to break with the established convention of presenting Virgil in closed heroic couplets.

The revision of the 1739 essay also strengthens the parallel with the genesis of Christopher Pitt's translation, for not only did he and Strahan both start out by publishing a partial rendering of the *Aeneid* before they undertook the complete epic, but in each case the first attempt proves to be more unique and autonomous than the finished product. While the embryonic state of the texts betrays an ambition towards novelty, this innovatory drive is noticeably curbed during the course of their evolution, which reflects a gradual acknowledgment of the preceding efforts made by others and a perceived need to build on them. In Milton, the blank verse translator found a personal model that offered an alternative to the inhibiting constraints of the couplet, but even though he made ample use of *Paradise Lost* from the very beginning, his emulative activity mainly focussed on the poem's diction rather than its metrical dynamics, and the later modifications confirm how

much of an impact the traditional form and its most famous practitioner still had on him. For Strahan, as well as for Pitt, Dryden was inescapable. Nevertheless, Milton's influence seems to have increased since the days of Trapp and now forms an opposing force that is almost as strong as that of the established couplet version. As the next chapter will show, borrowings like Strahan's played an even more prominent role in one of the blank verse translations that followed his.

5. James Beresford, Henry Fuseli, and William Cowper

James Beresford (1764–1840) became a fellow of Merton Collge, Oxford, in 1798 and was made rector of Kibworth Beauchamp, Leicestershire, in 1812. His original works include *The Miseries of Human Life* (1806-1807) as well as religious books attacking Calvinism.¹ Before these by no means well-known publications of his later life he had published, in 1794, a version of the *Aeneid* which attracted some attention at the time, and which can be connected with a far more major contemporary translation, certainly the best-known classical translation of the 1790s: William Cowper's Homer of 1791. Following Cowper's example, the preface to Beresford's translation rejects rhyme in favour of blank verse: 'in assigning the pre-eminence to the latter, he has made a determination to which if not my experience, certainly my feelings and my judgment, very heartily subscribe.'² While this Virgil translation is in alignment with the Miltonolatry we have been observing in the renderings by Trapp and Strahan, it also reflects a progression towards an ever more explicit imposition of Miltonic material onto Virgil, for whereas Trapp had referenced *Paradise Lost* as a stylistic ideal in his preface, and Strahan had directly echoed the epic in the body of the translation itself, Beresford goes further still by openly acknowledging such echoes with the aid of visual signals and thus grants readers full insight into his compositional technique. The way the translator and his contemporaries thought about his task takes us back to the metaphor of painting that Dryden had employed in his critical discourse on translation; in the context of Virgil's larger cultural impact, we find that the conceptual analogy between the two spheres could be exploited both ways and likewise lent itself to discussions about art. The multidisciplinary work of Henry Fuseli, specifically, exemplifies how ideas of the sublime came to inform new adaptations of the classics across different media, for this Swiss expatriate not only contributed to Virgil's and Milton's reception in England by painting scenes from the *Aeneid* and *Paradise Lost*, but he also revised Cowper's Homer for publication and later wrote a review of Beresford's translation for a journal published by their mutual friend, Joseph Johnson. The link between Beresford, Fuseli, and Cowper will shed further light on the widespread currency of Milton's diction.

¹ [Anon.], 'James Beresford', rev. by H. C. G. Matthew, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.lib.gla.ac.uk/view/article/2194?docPos=1>> [accessed 29 August 2016]

² James Beresford, *The Aeneid of Virgil, Translated into Blank Verse* (London, 1794), p. vi. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

Beresford's translation policy appears to be consistent with earlier endeavours to render the *Aeneid* into English. In his preface, he commits himself to a literalist approach that seemingly prioritises exactitude over artistic license:

It seems to have been wholly overlooked by the bulk of our Translators, that the great principle which should actuate them, is a wish to extend and perpetuate their Author's renown; and this [...] can only be effected by the closest imitation which it is in their power to produce. Whoever, then, considers himself as free, at one time, to force upon his Author thoughts and words in which he has no property; at another to rob him of those which are his own, is unqualified for the trust he has undertaken, since he is not, what it is alone his business to be, a faithful Representer. (p. vii)

The view articulated here confirms the statements made by Beresford's predecessors, most of whom, as we have seen, paid at least lip service to the goal of accuracy and insisted on the need to refrain from misrepresenting Virgil whenever it could be avoided; by this point in our survey, we would expect nothing less from a translator writing in the same tradition. Equally unexceptional is the realisation that minor liberties must occasionally be taken in order to stay faithful to the spirit (if not to the letter) of the original:

If [...] I have ever *changed* or *added*, though but a single word, [...] it has uniformly been my endeavour that the added or substituted term should give some idea which, if not contained in the words of the Author, was evidently in his mind; so that its insertion might rather assist, than counteract, the intended impression. But these instances of deviation were required, and occur, so very sparingly in the course of the present performance, that I shall, perhaps, be deemed ostentatiously honest in having thought it necessary to confess them. (pp. xi-xii)

The distinction between the two layers of Virgil's 'words' and his 'mind' recalls Dryden's ideal middle path of paraphrase, whereby an author's 'words are not so strictly follow'd as his sense, and that too is admitted to be amplyfied, but not alter'd' (*Works*, I, 114). Beresford thus reiterates theoretical tenets that had existed at least since the end of the preceding century (even if they had not always been heeded).

What differentiates Beresford from previous Virgil translators is the use of typography as a means of indicating which parts of his version are inspired by *Paradise Lost* rather than immediately based on the text of the *Aeneid*. Like Strahan, Beresford inserts vestiges of Milton's phraseology into his translation, and although their number is much smaller than in Strahan's case, they are all the more noticeable by virtue of being given in quotation marks. The earliest example concerns the rocks against which some of the Trojan

ships are hurled during the storm in Book I; the lines look back to God's creation of the mountains:

saxa vocant Itali, mediis quae fluctibus, Aras,
dorsum immane mari summo
(I. 109-10)

Rocks ambush'd in mid ocean: altars these
Th' Ausonians name: "their broad bare backs they heave"
Emergent o'er the summit of the flood.
(Beresford, p. 6, I. 145-47)

Immediately, the mountains huge appear
Emergent, and their broad bare backs upheave
Into the clouds, their tops ascend the sky;
(*PL*, VII. 285-87)

Beresford's choice of 'their broad bare backs upheave' is somewhat justified by the phrase 'dorsum immane' ('huge ridge') in Virgil, but his punctuation makes it clear that the immediate origins of these words lie elsewhere; in this regard, he really is 'ostentatiously honest' about deviating from the source text. Given the affinity with Strahan's practice, we may return to Porter's analysis and try to explain the phenomenon in terms of the categories defined in the last chapter. While the conspicuousness of the translator's orthographical measure makes it difficult to think of the quoted material as anything other than a deliberate reference to *Paradise Lost*, the thematic link between the two passages is tenuous at best and thus rules out the likelihood of a 'borrowing' prompted by analogous contexts (let alone the subtler niceties of allusion); it seems, then, that the words should best be classified as an echo.

Similarly, the translator uses Miltonic language when rendering Ilioneus's plea for Dido's hospitality; the phrase in quotation marks is taken from Adam's reconciliation with Eve after the fall:

non metus, officio nec te certasse priorem
paeniteat.
(I. 548-49)

No fears alarm us, nor shalt thou repent
First to have "striv'n in offices of love."
(Beresford, p. 27, I. 731-32)

But rise, let us no more contend, nor blame
 Each other, blamed enough elsewhere, but strive
 In offices of love, how we may light'n
 Each other's burden in our share of woe;
(PL, x. 958-61)

Beresford interprets the simple 'service' ('officio') requested in the original as 'offices of love'. The opportunity to employ a cognate no doubt helped to trigger his memory of Milton, yet the local applicability of the expression from *Paradise Lost* is questionable, for the word 'love', characterising the emotional bond of the first couple, seems to lend an un-Virgilian degree of intimacy to the formal encounter between Trojans and Carthaginians. Rather than signalling a less-than-literal translation of an idea that is implicitly there in the Latin, the quotation marks again serve to introduce an echo of a passage with no obvious relevance to the source material.

Beresford draws another superficial connection between Virgil's and Milton's characters near the beginning of his version of Book IV. Dido is described as performing rituals and praying to the gods; in appearance, she resembles Eve addressing Adam:

ipsa tenens dextra pateram pulcherrima Dido
 candentis vaccae media inter cornua fundit
(IV. 60-61)

Dido herself, "with perfect beauty adorn'd,"
 Holding a chalice, the religious wine
 Between a snow-white heifer's horn out-pours;
(Beresford, p. 124, IV. 80-82)

To whom thus Eve with perfect beauty adorned.
(PL, IV. 634)

The superlative 'pulcherrima' warrants a rendering along the lines of 'with perfect beauty adorned'. Despite being unobtrusive in itself, this phrase attracts as much attention as the other borrowings we have just seen (all of which are highlighted through the same typographical format) and thus forms part of a larger intertextual entwinement between the English *Aeneid* and *Paradise Lost*.

That we are dealing with echoes rather than contextually dependent borrowings becomes especially evident from the fact that the translator is not above using the same Miltonic elements twice in order to render different portions of the source text. Virgil reworks

his own account of Dido's sleeplessness by having Mercury inform Aeneas about her resolve to die; in translation, both passages recall Adam's despairing reaction to the future suffering of mankind that he is shown in Book X of *Paradise Lost*:

accipit; ingeminant curae, rursusque resurgens
saevit amor, magnoque irarum fluctuat aestu.
(IV. 531-32)

Her cares redouble; rousing up anew,
Again love rages, and she fluctuates vague
"Amidst a troubled sea of passions tost."
(Beresford, p. 147, IV. 23-25)

illa dolos dirumque nefas in pectore versat,
certa mori, variosque irarum concitat aestus.
(IV. 563-64)

She, fix'd to die, turns o'er within her breast
Snares, machinations dire, and fluctuates vague
"Amidst a troubled sea of passions tost."
(Beresford, p. 148, IV. 167-69)

these were from without
The growing miseries, which Adam saw
Already in part, though hid in gloomiest shade,
To sorrow abandoned, but worse felt within,
And in a troubled sea of passion tossed,
Thus to disburden sought with sad complaint.
(*PL*, X. 714-19)

The recurring nouns 'ira' and 'aestus' must have prompted Beresford to repeat the phrase that he had quoted only a few lines earlier; his indifference to the minor variation in Virgil's choice of words suggests that the reference to Milton is more of an end in itself than a means of elucidating the Latin original.³

Indeed, the translator reaches quite far to find components of the English poet's vocabulary that might feasibly be used to supplement his rendering of the *Aeneid*. It is only by a considerable stretch of the imagination that one would expect readers to connect the Cretan labyrinth in Virgil's Book V with Milton's fallen angels and their misguided attempts at philosophising:

³ The translator's choice would seem justified, however, if he was following Ruaeus (or a text deriving from Ruaeus), who gives IV. 564 as 'certa mori, varioque irarum fluctuat aestu' – a variant reading that reduplicates the line ending of IV. 532 ('saevit amor, magnoque irarum fluctuat aestu'); of course, there is no way of ascertaining what Latin edition Beresford used, so we are left with a slight uncertainty at this point.

ut quondam Creta fertur Labyrinthus in alta
 parietibus textum caecis iter ancipitemque
 mille viis habuisse dolum, qua signa sequendi
 frangeret indeprentus et inremeabilis error:
 (v. 588-91)

As once of old, in Creta's lofty isle,
 (So fame records,) the Labyrinth enclos'd
 A path, with walls of blind meand'rings wove,
 A snare, perplex with thousand various ways,
 "That find no end in wand'ring mazes lost."
 (Beresford, p. 184-85, v. 768-72)

Others apart sat on a hill retired,
 In thoughts more elevate, and reasoned high
 Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,
 Fixed fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute,
 And found no end, in wandering mazes lost.
 (PL, II. 557-61)

As he incorporates Milton's 'wandering mazes' into the Virgilian simile, Beresford takes the metaphor in a literal sense and thus demonstrates once more his willingness to forge lexical correspondences even where the situational context does not allow for the construction of thematic parallels between the two epics.

Only one of Beresford's quotations qualifies as a borrowing according to Porter's definition of the term. As we have seen with Strahan's reuse of the quasi-translated *Aeneid* fragments that he and his contemporaries detected in *Paradise Lost*, intertextual links to the English epic could also result from emulative aspirations on the part of Milton. Beresford's version, too, features an instance of circular influence; Virgil's picture of the Tartarean gates in Book VI served as inspiration for the gates separating Hell and Chaos in Milton's cosmology, whose description is in turn quoted by the translator of the Latin original:

tum demum horrisono stridentes cardine sacrae
 panduntur portae.
 (VI. 573-74)

Then at the last are open'd wide to view
 "With impetuous recoil and jarring sound
 Th' infernal doors, and on their hinges grate
 Harsh thunder."

(Beresford, p. 226, vi. 756-60)

on a sudden open fly
 With impetuous recoil and jarring sound
 The infernal doors, and on their hinges grate
 Harsh thunder,

(*PL*, II. 879-82)

The passage in *Paradise Lost* closely corresponds to what Milton's poetic ancestor conceived: the 'jarring sound' ('horrisono') of 'doors' that 'on their hinges grate' ('stridentis cardine [...] portae') has been preserved in its entirety, and the added details are of the kind that enhances rather than falsifies the meaning of the source text. As was the case with the examples in Strahan, moreover, this particular connection had already been recorded by earlier editors and translators: in addition to Hume's and Newton's respective annotations on *Paradise Lost*, Joseph Davidson's prose version of the *Aeneid* also points out Milton's indebtedness to Virgil.⁴ On this occasion, at least, the translator was perfectly justified in employing the English poem as a model.

Looking for opportunities to evoke Milton within the framework of Virgil's epic, Beresford could equally have benefited from the labour of predecessors in pursuit of the same goal. Strahan would appear to suggest himself as an obvious secondary source due to the similarity of his practice; given how freely translators of the period copied each other's work, it is perhaps surprising that he shares relatively few of his Miltonisms with Beresford and that the two of them use the same Miltonic phrases to render different sections of the *Aeneid*. The war among Milton's angels furnishes a metaphor that Beresford implants into the scene depicting the conflict incited by Alecto, whereas Strahan applies it to the later account of the clash between the Trojans and the Rutulians:

long time in even scale
 The battle hung;

(*PL*, vi. 245-46)

⁴ Patrick Hume, *Annotations on Milton's Paradise Lost* (London, 1695), p. 86; John Milton, *Paradise Lost: A Poem, in Twelve Books*, a new edition, with notes of various authors, by Thomas Newton, 2 vols (London, 1749), I, 143; Joseph Davidson, *The Works of Virgil Translated into English Prose*, 2 vols (London, 1743), II, 374.

Atque ea per campos aequo dum Marte geruntur,
 promissi dea facta potens, ubi sanguine bellum
 imbuit et primae commisit funera pugnae,
 deserit Hesperiam

(VII. 540-43)

“While thus in equal scale the battle hung,”
 The Deity of Hell, her promis’d aid
 Now giv’n, when she had dipp’d the war in blood,
 And the first fight with mingled deaths embroil’d,
 Hesperia leaves;

(Beresford, p. 269, VII. 738-42)

Iam gravis aequabat luctus et mutua Mavors
 funera; caedebant pariter pariterque ruebant
 victores victique, neque his fuga nota neque illis.

(X. 755-57)

And now the god of war in equal scale
 Pois’d the conflicting parties, fate with fate,
 Victors with vanquish’d; both sides fought and fell
 With equal rage: and these, and those alike
 No thought would harbour of retreat or flight.

(Strahan, 1767, II, 121, X. 913-17)

Neither translation reproduces Milton’s exact words (Beresford’s quotation marks notwithstanding), but the common origin of the ‘scale’ image is unmistakable, especially because it has no literal equivalent anywhere in the Latin text. However, Beresford makes a bolder move than Strahan by absorbing enough verbal substance to fill an entire line.

Analogously, each translator finds a unique application for the phrase with which Milton describes Satan’s forced address to the other fallen rebels. In Strahan’s version, as we have seen, it modifies the effect of the Junonian temple on Aeneas; in Beresford, it functions to express the shock that Evander experiences upon seeing the body of his dead son:

Thrice he assayed, and thrice in spite of scorn
 Tears such as angels weep, burst forth: at last
 Words interwove with sighs found out their way.

(*PL*, I. 619-21)

Sic ait, atque animum picture pascit inani
 multa gemens, largoque umectat flumine vultum.

(I. 464-65)

He said, his Words
 Deep interwove with Sighs, his Visage bath'd
 With copious Floods of Tears, but sooth'd his Mind
 In mournful Pleasure, o'er the pictur'd Scene.
 (Strahan, 1767, I, 19-20, I. 623-26)

feretro Pallanta reposito
 procubuit super atque haeret lacrimansque gemensque,
 et via vix tandem voci laxata dolore est:
 (XI. 149-51)

the bier set down,
 O'er Pallas prone he lies, to the pale corse
 Clinging with sobs and groans; and scarce, at last,
 "Words interwove with sighs" from grief broke way:
 (Beresford, p. 412, XI. 204-07)

Again, Beresford's debt is more conspicuous than Strahan's, for not only does he enclose the borrowed phrase in quotation marks, but he also mirrors the metrical position that Milton had assigned it. Here, too, the translator manages to give new purpose to the Miltonic passage that inspired his predecessor.

It will be asked what exactly Beresford hoped to accomplish by highlighting these echoes and how he balanced them against the authentically Virgilian elements of his translation. There is a possibility that the typographical features of the text had been designed to raise readers' awareness of the rich literary tradition from which it emerged. Due to the use of quotation marks, the references to *Paradise Lost* appear more prominently than if they were standing by themselves, which both confirms the trend of Miltonolatry we have observed among eighteenth-century translators of Virgil and takes their efforts to the next level. However, one senses that this type of homage was starting to turn into a rather perfunctory exercise. The total amount of borrowed wordage in Beresford is negligible by comparison with Strahan, and while the latter had at least responded to some of the genuinely allusive ties between Milton and Virgil, Beresford no longer seems to accommodate the English poet in an organic way. Even if the quoted phrases do correspond to the meaning of the Latin original, the punctuation visually separates them from the rest of the text and thus betrays their status as alien elements. Of course, the full disclosure of his Miltonisms is consistent with the translator's literalist policy, but it also raises larger questions about the relative cultural standing of *Paradise Lost* and the classics towards the end of the eighteenth century.

Chapter 1 suggested how the process of translation can be informed by certain key metaphors that give it a distinctive character and explain the numerous stylistic choices leading up to its completion. In keeping with this approach, we may try to see Milton's intrusion, as it were, into the *Aeneid* as an expression of Beresford's particular self-portrayal and search for analogous views among his contemporaries. In a prefatory remark, the translator defines his activity by drawing a comparison with the domain of plastic arts:

I consider myself (to borrow an allusion from a Sister-art) as one engaging to make a Cast from some celebrated ancient Statue[.] [...] In executing this task, though I necessarily use materials differing in texture from those employed by my master, I am not on this account excused or prevented from furnishing a very minute representation of those circumstances wherein resides the principal charm of my Prototype – the form, proportions, grace, and the character. I fear, indeed, that, in like manner as the most perfect Cast from a statue will, by certain abrupt joinings and raggednesses of surface not common to it with its Original, betray itself as a copy, and will, moreover, discover to a scientific eye a difference and inferiority furtively pervading the whole, though too general to be specified, too subtle to be arrested, – so, with respect to the most perfect translation, [...] I fear that the vestiges of imitation are never so absolutely effaced as to elude a master's eye, though discernible in various degrees according to the skill and care of the Translator. (pp. ix-x)

There are several parallels between Beresford's metaphor and Dryden's superficially modest attitude in the Dedication of the *Aeneis*, which had likewise compared translation to the reproduction of an original work of art: 'They who Copy one of *Raphael's* Pieces, [...] Translate him as I do *Virgil*; and fall as short of him as I of *Virgil*' (*Works*, v, 305). Beresford's focus on statues rather than paintings may imply a greater degree of faithfulness, but he, too, seems to be under no illusion about the secondary nature of the result and feels anxiety over the inevitable occurrence of 'certain abrupt joinings and raggednesses of surface' that will give it away. In the context of the present discussion, the idea of cracks and fissures is suggestive because it allows associations with the disruptive potential of the translator's quotations from Milton; did Beresford, faced with the impossibility of a perfect replica, decide to substantiate his analogy by making the 'vestiges of imitation' explicit instead of trying to hide them?

Interestingly, the image of producing a cast caught the attention of an early reviewer who thought it wholly unsuitable. This curious complaint forms part of an article that appeared in the *Analytical Review*, a periodical published by Thomas Christie and Joseph

Johnson (the latter of whom was also the publisher of Beresford's *Aeneid*), and it suggests that Beresford was still a bit overambitious with regard to the level of accuracy he ascribed to his practice:

Mr. B., in some places of his preface, talks of *imitation*, whilst in others he compares himself to one who makes a *cast from some celebrated ancient statue*: But, if the first of these expressions, unless it be erroneously used for *copying*, convey too lax an idea for translation in its genuine sense, the second, we apprehend, is altogether inapplicable to it. To make a cast is a mechanical operation, in which no one can fail who has served his time to the business; which business any one can learn, who has eyes, hands, and a common degree of attention: the figure that issues from the mould is not a copy, is not an imitation, it is the same on which the form was made, and all the difference consists in a difference of materials, and a few, almost imperceptible sutures. [...] And is this the case of a translator? Can he, who should, for instance, understand the roman language as well as Virgil, and his own as well as he ought, take it upon himself to say, that by transfusing the latin poem into modern verse, he will produce as palpable a duplicate of Virgil, as an attentive moulder must from a form of any given statue? The absurdity of such an assertion will be obvious, till taste can be taught like a trade, language admit of fusion like metal and plaister, or it's divarication [...] be reducible to a gentle seam. Mr. B., sensible of such incongruity, is under the necessity of being at variance with himself, and admitting of a kind of optional, now 'literal,' now 'lax' fidelity – a heresy against the moulder's process, that might be expected from one who appears so little versed in it.⁵

As it happens, the author of the review was none other than the famous artist Henry Fuseli.⁶ A Swiss émigré and close friend of Joseph Johnson, Fuseli is now mainly known for his paintings, most notable among them *The Nightmare*, but by the time he wrote these lines his thorough knowledge of Latin and Greek had also made him an indispensable assistant in William Cowper's endeavour to translate the Homeric epics. As we shall see, the activities in which he engaged were mutually informative and may serve to illuminate the above statements.

James King provides one of the most extensive accounts of Fuseli's contribution to Cowper's *Homer*.⁷ Cowper, too, belonged to Johnson's circle; upon receiving the first specimen of his work in January 1786, the bookseller showed it to Fuseli, who made several corrections to the text before it was returned to the translator. On Johnson's recom-

⁵ Henry Fuseli, 'The *Aeneid* of Virgil, Translated into Blank Verse by James Beresford', *Analytical Review*, 20 (October 1794), 113-22 (p. 114), original emphasis. All further references are given after quotations in the text.

⁶ For a full list of Fuseli's contributions to the *Analytical Review*, see Eudo C. Mason, *The Mind of Henry Fuseli: Selections from his Writings* (Frome: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951), pp. 356-58.

⁷ James King, 'An Unlikely Alliance: Fuseli as Revisor of Cowper's *Homer*', *Neophilologus*, 67 (1983), 468-79. All further references are given after quotations in the text.

mendation, the collaboration between the two men continued in the same fashion, possibly even until 1789; they never met in person. Cowper felt ambivalent about Fuseli's involvement from the start, however; despite appreciating the advice he received, he was often driven to the point of exasperation by the demands of his fastidious revisor, who did not hold back with criticism and has left us a manuscript with detailed remarks on the drafts that were sent to him. Nevertheless, Fuseli's final verdict, articulated in another piece for the *Analytical Review*, was largely positive: 'Mr. C. [...] must be allowed to have given us more of Homer, and added less of his own, than all his predecessors.'⁸

Much like the later review of Beresford's Virgil, Fuseli's discussion of Cowper's Homer reflects an interest in the extent to which different art forms can function as metaphors for one another. Touching upon the singular merits of the Grecian poet, he finds an opportunity to revisit the old conceptual analogy between poetry and painting:

he, and he alone, contrived to create the image he described, limb by limb, part by part, before our eyes, connecting it with his plot, and making it the offspring of action and time, the two great mediums of poetry. [...] Poetic imitation [...] is progressive, and less occupied with the *surface* of the object than its *action*; hence all comparisons between the poet's and the painter's manners, ought to be made with an eye to the respective end and limits of either art. (pp. 4-5, original emphasis)

If Fuseli seems eager to differentiate verbal from pictorial representation on the grounds that the former is more dynamic, however, he could not help being compared to a poet himself. The emphasis on actions rather than surfaces appears to have had implications for his own painterly practice, the mixed reception of which is exemplified by an anonymous assessment in the *Public Advertiser*:

Pictures are, or ought to be, a representation of natural objects, delineated with taste and precision. Mr. *Fuseli* gives us the human figure, from the recollection of its form, and not from the form itself; he seems to paint every thing from fancy, which renders his works almost incomprehensible, and leaves no criterion to judge of them by, but the imagination. This I conceive to be an attempt of the painter to express what lies more within the reach of the poet.⁹

Indeed, the Swiss artist almost invited such a comparison when he first tried to gain recognition on the London scene. Interestingly enough, these efforts began with the exhibition of

⁸ Henry Fuseli, 'The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer, Translated into English Blank Verse by W. Cowper', *Analytical Review*, 15 (January 1793), 1-16 (p. 2). All further references are given after quotations in the text.

⁹ Anon., 'Exhibition of the Royal Academy', *Public Advertiser*, 22 May 1786.

Dido on the Funeral Pyre at the Royal Academy in 1781 and thus involved a work that was itself an adaptation of Virgilian material. Under the pseudonym ‘Ensis’, Fuseli or one of his supporters sent three critical letters to the editor of the *London Courant* in order to generate publicity for the painting.¹⁰ This form of (self-)promotion – known as ‘puffery’ – was fairly common at the time; however, the third letter, published on 28 May, might be particularly significant, for not only does it equate the poet’s task with that of the painter, but it also suggests how the two relate to translation:

Whoever has compared the Latin poet with his translators, will soon pronounce that such a scene can no more be the result of the vain stutter, the palliatives, the prolixity of *Caro*, or of *Dryden*, than the *Dido* of every other artist [...] can be the result of the original.¹¹

While a painting based on a translation is inferior to a painting based on an original in the same way that the translation itself is inferior to the text it reproduces, the argument presented here simultaneously aligns painters with translators, as both groups draw their inspiration from the same source.

Fuseli was not the only one to perceive this essential derivativeness of the visual arts. As Paul Duro points out with regard eighteenth-century history painting, ‘its goals are [...] identical to those of the higher genres of poetry, but [...] While poetry was at the origin of classical history and myth, history painting had no option but to imitate poetry’.¹² When Fuseli suggested that his own *Dido* could surpass that of any ‘other artist’, he was specifically – and literally! – juxtaposing it with a work by his former mentor, Joshua Reynolds, that depicted the same scene and was hanging on the opposite wall at the Royal Gallery. Reynolds, too, argued that ‘The Painter’s theme is generally supplied by the Poet or Historian’ and that ‘action is the principal requisite in a subject for History-painting’.¹³ Similarly to Fuseli, moreover, he may have been positing an affinity with the discipline of translation when he asserted that a painter ‘is bound to follow the ideas which he has received, and to translate them [...] into another art’ (p. 107).

¹⁰ See David A. Brenneman, ‘Self-Promotion and the Sublime: Fuseli’s *Dido on the Funeral Pyre*’, *HLQ*, 62 (1999), 68-87 (p. 83). Further references are given after quotations in the text.

¹¹ Ensis (pseud.), ‘*Dido*, by Mr Fuseli’, *London Courant*, 28 May 1781. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

¹² Paul Duro, ‘Observations on the Burkean Sublime’, *Word & Image*, 29 (2013), 40-58 (pp. 47-48). Further references are given after quotations in the text.

¹³ Sir Joshua Reynolds, *The Works of Sir Joshua Reynolds*, ed. by Edmond Malone, 3 vols (London, 1798), III, 104. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

Nevertheless, the two artists differ considerably in their treatment of Dido. David A. Brenneman observes that ‘Reynolds’s approach to the subject rests on a rather conventional academic combination of naturalistic representation, formulaic facial expressions, and baroque painterly effects’, whereas ‘Fuseli’s picture is in certain parts sloppily executed [...] and it exaggerates the scale and the shape of the limp and seemingly boneless bodies of his protagonists as well as the size of such objects as Aeneas’s sword’ (p. 82). Ultimately, the aesthetic ideal underlying Fuseli’s reasoning is that formulated by Edmund Burke in his *Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful* (1757), which held that physical beauty did not necessarily depend on correct proportions:

You may assign any proportions you please to every part of the human body; and I undertake that a painter shall religiously observe them all, and notwithstanding produce if he pleases, a very ugly figure. The same painter shall considerably deviate from these proportions, and produce a very beautiful one.¹⁴

The debate about how closely a given model should be imitated in order to achieve the desired effect has an obvious bearing on the translator’s task. If Reynolds’s and Fuseli’s paintings were translations of sorts, then we might call their respective methodologies ‘literal’ and ‘free’. In the light of the latter artist’s career and intellectual background, it is possible to reassess his objections to the metaphor that Beresford employs in his preface. From Fuseli’s point of view, the ideal of translation as a cast may be not only illusory but undesirable, for it suggests a mechanistic process that requires no real talent; no doubt a translation aspiring to something like his own Dido would have seemed preferable.

As far as the translators’ actual practice was concerned, moreover, borrowings from Milton may well have formed part of the same Burkean aesthetic. While Fuseli’s review does not address Beresford’s use of *Paradise Lost* as an auxiliary source, his surviving notes on the draft version of Cowper’s *Iliad* either commend passages if they are already modelled after the English epic, or they actively encourage the imitation of Miltonic precedents that might serve to render elements of Homer’s text. A case in point is the following double negative from the published translation of Book II, which probably remained unaltered precisely because it had won the revisor’s approval:

¹⁴ Edmund Burke, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, 4th edn (London, 1764), p. 176.

She spake, nor did Minerva not comply,¹⁵

Fuseli comments that this ‘is in my opinion, well said’,¹⁶ and he supports his verdict by quoting a similar double negative from Milton:

Turchestan born; nor could his eye not ken
(*PL*, XI. 396)

While this is not quite a borrowing, Milton’s authority would have sanctioned the phrase quite regardless of what the Greek original looks like. When Fuseli does point out the literal inaccuracy of a phrase inspired by the English poet, his statement appears to be an observation rather than a condemnation, making him sound almost forgiving: ‘the line from Milton the Translator could not withstand, though he might doubt whether Homer meant to convey its sense’ (no page number). The lines that Fuseli quotes are from Homer’s and Milton’s eleventh and ninth books, respectively:

Three heads erecting on one neck, the heads
(Cowper, I, p. 268, XI. 46)

With burnished neck of verdant gold, erect
(*PL*, IX. 501)

On other occasions, Cowper needed to have his model pointed out to him. Referring to Book II, Fuseli objects that ‘an expression similar to the “showers of barbaric pearl & gold” in Milton is prosed “wealth | boundless and like an overflowing flood”’, which to him suggests that ‘the Translator too readily submits to the importunities of impatient Blank verse’ (no page number). Cowper added an angry note – ‘I do not account it prose’ – upon receiving the manuscript, but he nevertheless complied and amended his translation to something more reminiscent of the line in *Paradise Lost*:

And shower’d abundant riches on them all.
(Cowper, I, 57, II. 819)

Showers on her kings barbaric pearl and gold,
(*PL*, II. 4)

¹⁵ William Cowper, *The Iliad and Odyssey of Homer, Translated into English Blank Verse*, 2 vols (London, 1791), I, 36, II. 194. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

¹⁶ Henry Fuseli, ‘Remarks on William Cowper’s Translation of Homer’s *Iliad*’, New Haven, CT, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, Osborn MS c210, no signatures or pagination. For a detailed description of the manuscript, see King, p. 472.

Even where Fuseli's criticism turned out to be milder, it was heeded all the same. In Book v of the *Iliad*, Homer compares the dust covering the Greek soldiers to chaff; judging by the remark it prompted, Cowper's initial rendering of the passage still left a lot to be desired: 'though I cannot call this simile translated, yet I cannot wish it altered. it is perspicuous and rurally simple, though it has neither the dignity nor the comprehension of the greek' (no page number). Fuseli deplores the absence of 'the most striking image of the season', one that is 'closely imitated by Milton' (no page number); not only does he direct Cowper towards the relevant lines, but he goes out of his way to highlight their key components, most of which also appear in the finalised version of the translator's text:

As flies the chaff wide scatter'd by the wind
 O'er all the consecrated floor, what time
 Ripe Ceres with brisk airs her golden grain
 Ventilates, whitening with it's husk the ground;
 (Cowper, I, 128, v. 591-94)

as thick as when a field
 Of Ceres ripe for harvest waving bends
 Her bearded grove of ears, which way the wind
Sways them; the careful ploughman doubting stands
 Lest on the threshing floor his hopeful sheaves
 Prove chaff.
 (PL, IV. 980-84, emphasis Fuseli's)

Evidently, the lines immediately preceding Milton's simile proved useful when it came to rendering Homer's description of a skirmish in Book XI:

enclosed
 The hero with a ring, hemming around
 Their own destruction.
 (Cowper, I, 283, XI. 501-03)

and began to hem him round
 With ported spears,
 (PL, IV. 979-80)

Again, it was Fuseli who alerted the translator to the fact that 'Milton seems to have had an eye on this passage' (no page number).

At one point, the revisor adduces two examples from *Paradise Lost* that, in his own estimation, do not reach the same level of sublimity as the Homeric original but apparently still provide the nearest approximation of what he expects from Cowper. The latter eventually settled for the following version of Ajax's comparison to the god of war in Book VII:

As huge Mars
 To battle moves the sons of men between
 Whom Jove with heart-devouring thirst inspires
 Of war, so mov'd huge Ajax to the fight,
 Tow'r of the Greeks, dilating with a smile
 His martial features terrible;
 (Cowper, I, 176, VII. 243-48)

There is no way of telling how much these lines have changed from the translator's first draft, but Fuseli remarked that 'on such passages as this, I wish the Translator would exert every power of his mind & Fancy – but what language can express [it]?' (no page number). While he admits that 'Milton touch'd those chords', he thinks that 'Homers figure is a figure of Beauty as well as Terrour – the figure of Milton is a figure of Horrour alone' (no page number), which does not stop him from reproducing those lines, however:

and Death
 Grinned horrible a ghastly smile
 (PL, II. 845-46)
 So scented the grim feature, and upturned
 His nostril wide into the murky air,
 (PL, x. 279-80)

In all of the above cases, the extent to which Cowper adopted Fuseli's suggestions is less important than the fact that the latter repeatedly referred to Milton as a stylistic exemplar; far from being incompatible with a faithful rendering of Homer's epic, lexical borrowings from the English poet have come to be regarded as highly advisable, which is apparent, for instance, in Fuseli's recommendation that the constant mention of 'the Ajaces' should be varied by occasionally substituting the Miltonic epithet 'Turchestan born' (no page number). The most open expression of this attitude, however, can be found among the remarks on the translator's version of Book XV: 'if an essential Beauty may be obtained by admitting an obsolete mode, I am not the man to cavil at it. if the present passage has gained by adopting a pretended licence of Milton, what else it must have wanted, of Energy, I acquiesce' (no page number). Even so exacting a critic as Fuseli was not immune to

the charm that had led previous blank verse translators off the path of strict literalness. Indeed, while Milton's influence on the translator's original compositions is well documented,¹⁷ it could only have been reinforced by the Swiss painter's involvement in his translation of Homer.

Although Cowper's borrowings from Milton are neither as unmodified nor as openly declared as Beresford's, there is one instance in which the English *Iliad* anticipates the use of typography to demarcate foreign materials. The line in question comes from another titan of English literature, Shakespeare, whose *Hamlet* features a classical allusion that was obviously attractive for a translator of Homer:

Stood Agamemnon "with an eye like Jove's,
To threaten or command,"
(Cowper, I, 49, ll. 574-75)

An Eye like Mars, to threaten or command
(Shakespeare)¹⁸

Fuseli had not suggested this particular borrowing, but his comment is uncharacteristically enthusiastic: 'never was Shakespeare more happily applied than here' (no page number). In view of such high praise, the editorial decision to put the phrase in quotation marks might be interpreted as a way of enhancing the reading experience, and the same goes for the items of Miltonic phraseology that Beresford inserted into his translation of the *Aeneid*.

The collaboration between Johnson, Cowper, Beresford, and Fuseli had still further results. Johnson and Fuseli at one point issued a proposal for a new and illustrated edition of Milton's works. This project, which was to be supervised by Cowper, did not come to fruition due to the latter's declining health, but Fuseli would go on to produce a large Milton Gallery, whose exhibition catalogue – much like the translations of the classics examined here – included quotations from the English poet's works and thereby created an additional and complementary focal point for the spectator.¹⁹ Yet even if the decorative use of Miltonisms became a common practice across different artistic media, Beresford's transla-

¹⁷ See Dustin Griffin, *Regaining Paradise: Milton and the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), pp. 217-28; Lucy Newlyn, *Paradise Lost and the Romantic Reader*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 22-53.

¹⁸ William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. by Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, *The Arden Shakespeare: Third Series* (London: Thomson Learning, 2006), III. 4. 55.

¹⁹ Luisa Calè, 'A Visual Interface for the Act of Reading', *Comparative Critical Studies*, 1 (2004), 97-118.

tion shows that it had its limits; by comparison with Strahan, we have seen a decrease in both the quantity and the quality of the local connections between the Latin and the English epic. Miltonic blank verse may have been the new standard of Virgil translation, but so far no practitioner of the form had managed to parallel Dryden's achievement, which might explain why the next attempt by a major poet involved a temporary – and highly unexpected – return to the couplet.

6. Wordsworth's Fragmentary *Aeneid*

William Wordsworth was the most important literary figure to venture a translation of the *Aeneid* since the publication of Dryden's *Works of Virgil*. Critics have drawn attention to the affinities between the Mantuan and the English poet: both wrote in the aftermath of great political upheavals (the Roman civil wars and the French Revolution, respectively), both believed in man's bond with nature and the essential morality of the universe, and both were deeply patriotic.¹ But no less significant are the parallels between Wordsworth and his translator predecessor, for, like Dryden, he took on the task of rendering the Latin epic at a relatively advanced stage of his career – composition probably began in late summer, 1823² – when he had already risen to fame. In addition, this project, too, was not the translator's first act of intertextual engagement with the source material; 'Laodamia', a poem originally published in 1815, draws on the themes of *Aeneid* VI (especially ll. 673-59 and 724-51)³ and thus shows a Virgilian influence comparable to that in *Annus Mirabilis*.

Not only did the two translations originate under similar circumstances, but they are connected by virtue of Wordsworth's outspoken opposition to the most acclaimed English poets of the preceding age and their mediation of the classics. As early as 1805, he disparaged Dryden's achievement in a letter to Walter Scott:

Dryden had neither a tender heart nor a lofty sense of moral dignity: where his language is poetically impassioned it is mostly upon unpleasing subjects; such as the follies, vice, and crimes of classes of men or of individuals. That this cannot be the language of the imagination must have necessarily followed from this, that there is not a single image from Nature in the whole body of his works; and in his translation from Vergil whenever Vergil can be fairly said to have had his *eye* upon his object, Dryden always spoils the passage.⁴

The general criticism of Dryden's merits leads to an attack on his competence as a translator of Virgil, specifically, and while Wordsworth might have intended to separate the rendering of a foreign author from the other items that make up 'the whole body of his works',

¹ A. J. Raymer, 'Virgil and Wordsworth: The Poetry of Romanticism', *Greece & Rome*, 9 (October 1939), 13-25 (p. 15).

² William Wordsworth, *Translations of Chaucer and Virgil*, ed. by Bruce E. Graver, The Cornell Wordsworth (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), p. 156. Further references to this edition (*Translations*) are given after quotations in the text.

³ Carole Anne Taylor, 'Wordsworth's Vergil: "Laodamia" and the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*', *Vergilius*, 26 (1980), 39-47 (p. 42).

⁴ William Wordsworth, *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. by Ernest de Sélincourt, 2nd edn, rev. by Chester L. Shaver, 8 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), I, 641 (7 November 1805). Further references to this edition (*Letters*) are given after quotations in the text.

it seems more likely that he mentions this particular text because it best exemplifies the characteristic shortcomings he is discussing. Analogously, a second letter to the same recipient states his opinion on Pope's version of the Homeric epics:

I have a very high admiration of the talents both of Dryden and Pope, and ultimately, as from all good writers of whatever kind, their Country will be benefitted greatly by their labours. But thus far I think their writings have done more harm than good. It will require yet half a century completely to carry off the poison of Pope's Homer. (18 January 1808; *Letters*, II, 191)

Again, the negative assessment of a poetic ancestor closes with a condemnation of his translational practice. The association of Dryden and Pope with Virgil and Homer, respectively, indicates the extent to which their reputation had come to rest on translations of ancient epics; consequently, it was these monumental renderings that needed to be displaced in order for English poetry to progress and mature. 'Pope's Homer' – and, by implication, Dryden's *Aeneid* – epitomise the entire neoclassical tradition that Wordsworth is trying to leave behind.

The enterprise was not crowned with success, however. Wordsworth translated less than three books of the *Aeneid* before abandoning his design, and except for a small portion that appeared in a contemporary journal, the text remained unpublished until the middle of the twentieth century (Graver, *Translations*, p. 155). This turn of events has been attributed to the poet's decision to use heroic couplets – a surprising move given his earlier contributions to the advancement of blank verse and his distaste for the rhyming translations by Dryden and Pope.⁵ It is arguably a testament to the lasting impact of these men that even such a vicious detractor as Wordsworth, writing a hundred years later, would occasionally depart from his own customary mode of expression and opt for the medium in which they had demonstrated their mastery; as I will show, the translator's choice can be illuminated by referring to the letters he was exchanging at the time, which do suggest a certain degree of alignment with his neoclassical predecessors.

Nevertheless, Wordsworth's *Aeneid* is interesting because it exemplifies more clearly and directly some of the mechanisms we have observed in the production of earlier Virgil translations. The genesis of the text is documented by a number of surviving manuscripts that show extensive revisions over time and thus allow us to engage in what Sally

⁵ Kevin F. Doherty, 'On Wordsworth's *Aeneid*', *Classical World*, 54 (1961), 213-17 (p. 217).

Bushell has labelled ‘compositional criticism’, i.e., the study of ‘repeated words, deletions, aborted passages or lines’ as ‘an active part of the creative process’ through which ‘the poet gradually refines the nature of his communication and understands it for himself’.⁶ These microscopic changes reflect the translator’s steps with greater immediacy than does the incremental publication of, say, Pitt’s or Strahan’s respective versions. Moreover, while those renderings merely hint at the potential influence of other men of letters and leave it open to speculation what their specific feedback might have looked like, the comments that Wordsworth received from his friend and fellow poet Samuel Taylor Coleridge are still extant, providing not only concrete evidence of the latter’s involvement in the translation process (limited though it may have been) but also a rare opportunity to hear him articulate his own opinion of Virgil. Handwritten drafts and exchanges possess an intimacy that is absent from published works and their prefatory paratexts, which at best manage to faintly suggest the author’s laborious search for words; the polished surface of the final product bears no trace of the trials and tribulations entailed in its development. During the initial stage of composition, creative impulses flow unobstructed and have yet to be channelled into something readers will recognise as belonging to a distinctive voice; by studying these bursts of raw energy and the subsequently imposed layers of refinement through which they were filtered, one gains an understanding of the multiple pressures – external as well as internal – that guided the creator’s activity, regardless of whether the work in question is a translation or an original piece of writing.

Before we can examine Wordsworth’s *Aeneid* itself, it is necessary to explain the circumstances of its origin and to give a brief account of the different manuscripts in which the text has come down to us.⁷ Wordsworth first translated the opening of Book III as a trial segment and by the end of August 1823 had begun to systematically work his way through Book I. These sketches of the third and first book appear in a leather-bound folio written in more than one hand designated DC MS. 89. While most of them are in Mary Wordsworth’s hand, lines 96-100 of Book I were evidently entered by the Rev. Samuel Tillbrooke, bursar of Peterhouse, Cambridge, who was visiting Wordsworth at Rydal Mount around that time and encouraged him to continue with his project. With Mary, Dor-

⁶ Sally Bushell, ‘Wordsworthian Composition: The Micro-“Prelude”’, *Studies in Romanticism*, 44 (2005), 399-421 (p. 403).

⁷ The following information is summarised from Bruce Graver’s introduction to the Cornell edition of Wordsworth’s translation, pp. 155-74. For a more detailed description and partial reproduction of the manuscripts, see pp. xx-xxi and pp. 331-557 in the same volume. The manuscripts are referenced in accordance with their Dove Cottage archive numbers.

othy, and Dora Wordsworth alternating in the role of amanuensis, Book I was completed by November 9, 1823, which we know from one of the poet's letters to his patron William Lowther, first earl of Lonsdale. The translation of Book II progressed more slowly and involved a greater number of corrections; again, the entries in MS. 89 are mainly in Mary's autograph. Upon the completion of Book II, she and her sister-in-law respectively copied the text into DC MS. 101A, a handmade notebook, and DC MS. 101B, two stamped notebooks in wrappers (one notebook per book of the *Aeneid*); on 23 January, 1824, the latter fair copy was sent to Lord Lonsdale. In the meantime, Wordsworth hastily proceeded to translate Book III, composing some 832 lines by mid-February; MS. 89 contains drafts from which Mary produced DC MS. 101C, a fair copy in a bound exercise book.

At this point, however, Lonsdale put a damper on the whole operation by expressing his disapproval of the sample he had seen. Faced with the uncertainty of public support and the loss of a potential dedicatee, Wordsworth aborted his plan to translate all twelve books of the *Aeneid*. Nevertheless, in April 1824 he solicited Coleridge's advice on how to improve the flaws that Lonsdale had observed. This critical input took the form of marginal notes in the MS. 101B copy of Book I (which the poet lent to his friend after receiving it back) and a detailed commentary on two folded sheets of letter paper, DC MS. 101D. Yet the tone of Coleridge's remarks was sometimes harsh, and Wordsworth only used them as the basis for a few temporary changes in MS. 101A. The fair copy manuscripts, 101B and 101C, were then passed on to several other friends but could probably not be retrieved until November 1825 because the poet lost track of them.

The next stage of the translation process marks a return to Book III, a partial copy of which appears in MS. 101A, written almost entirely in Dorothy's hand; we do not know whether it predates the recovery of 101C, for it features readings that differ both from that manuscript and from the latest amendments of MS. 89, but a transcription in late 1826 or early 1827 seems more likely. Towards the end of the summer of 1827, Wordsworth's nephew Christopher, Jr., assisted him in revising a passage of Book II. Drafts from MS. 101A were entered between the corresponding lines in the second notebook of MS. 101B, which was then dismantled and interleaved; Christopher copied the revisions onto facing interleaves, and Dorothy made a pasteover. Wordsworth's nephew soon left the Lake District to start his second year at Trinity College, Cambridge, taking the manuscript with him in the hope of getting it published.

This goal was eventually realised in 1832, when an extract from Book I – lines 901-end – appeared in the second number of *The Philological Museum*, a classics journal founded by the Cambridge scholar Julius Charles Hare. The latter had paid a visit to Rydal Mount in the summer of the previous year and on that occasion may have requested a submission that would boost his new periodical. The publication was based on the text of MS. 101A; a note in Dorothy's journal on December 9, 1831, testifies to her preparation of a revised fair copy (which does not survive, however). There was thus a period of eight years between the first conception of Wordsworth's *Aeneid* and its final appearance in print; the overall picture emerging from his various drafts is an exceedingly complex one, reflecting a prolonged intellectual engagement with the source material and a continuous refinement of the translation he was producing (albeit interrupted by breaks of several months or years at a time). The manuscripts, photographically reproduced in the Cornell edition of the text, promise to give us a fuller understanding of the kind of dynamic evolution that could only be reconstructed with much speculation if we were looking at a finished work of literature.

A good starting point for analysing the individual steps of this process is Wordsworth's correspondence with Lonsdale between late 1823 and early 1824, in which the poet goes to great lengths to explain and defend his translational policy.⁸ The rationale behind the uncharacteristic couplet form becomes somewhat clearer from the following statement:

the versification [...] will not be found much to the taste of those whose ear is exclusively accommodated to the regularity of Popes Homer. I have run the couplets freely into each other, much more even than Dryden has done. This variety seems to me to be called for, if any thing of the movement of the Virgilian versification be transferable to our rhyme Poetry; and independent of this consideration, long Narratives in couplets with the sense closed at the end of each, are to me very wearisome- (23 January 1824; *Translations*, p. 563)

While Wordsworth makes a concession to 'Popes Homer' as an embodiment of the old standard, he has found a means of innovation by opening the closed heroic couplet. Still, one wonders whether blank verse would not have allowed for at least a similar degree of metrical 'variety', especially since it had long been an acceptable alternative and an approved means of conveying the Virgilian 'movement' in English.

⁸ These letters, too, can be found in the appendix to the Cornell edition, pp. 561-67.

As the subsequent letter suggests, Wordsworth adhered to the couplet not only because of its importance in the recent native tradition but also because of its alleged potential to bridge the historical and cultural distance to the source text he was translating:

Pentameters, where the sense has a close, of some sort, at every two lines, may be rendered in regularly closed couplets; but Hexameters, (especially the Virgilian, that run the lines into each other for a great length) can not. – I have long been persuaded that Milton formed his blank verse, upon the model of the *Georgics* and the *Æneid*, and I am so much struck with this resemblance, that I should have attempted Virgil in blank verse; had I not been persuaded, that no antient Author can be with advantaged be so rendered. Their religion, their warfare, their course of action & feeling, are too remote from modern interest to allow it. We require every possible help and attraction of sound in our language to smooth the way for the admission of things so remote from our present concerns- (5 February 1824; *Translations*, p. 563-64)

In contrast to his predecessors, Wordsworth associates the heroic couplet not so much with the metre as with the subject matter of Virgil's epic; it is the ancient 'course of action & feeling' – rather than the features of the Latin hexameter line – that makes rhyme a necessity. Despite playing a central role in the genealogy of English *Aeneids*, the couplet had never been credited with such a familiarising effect; Wordsworth seems to be the first to argue that this medium itself could help readers to appreciate the poem's content.

Surprisingly enough, this argument is consistent with the way Pope had justified his general preference for couplets over blank verse. Joseph Spence records the relevant statement in one of his *Anecdotes*:

I have nothing to say for rhyme, but that I doubt whether a poem can support itself without it in our language, unless it be stiffened with such strange words as are like to destroy our language itself.

The high style that is affected so much in blank verse would not have been borne even in Milton, had not his subject turned so much on such strange out-of-the-world things as it does.⁹

Pope and Wordsworth both care about the accessibility of their work, aspiring to remain poetical without alienating their audience. Rhyme in and of itself supports this delicate balance by ensuring that a poem will be read as such and by automatically endowing it with an emotive quality. While Wordsworth may deplore the lack of imagination he diagnoses in his neoclassical precursor, he cannot help but acknowledge the latter's formal brilliance,

⁹ Joseph Spence, *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men*, ed. by James M. Osborn, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), I, 173 (recorded June 1739).

as his backhanded compliment in the 1800 preface to *Lyrical Ballads* attests: ‘We see that Pope by the power of verse alone, has contrived to render the plainest common sense interesting, and even frequently to invest it with the appearance of passion.’¹⁰ The partial agreement between their stylistic theorisations not only exposes Wordsworth as a descendant of the literary figure he so despised, but it also reinforces the idea that translation and original composition should be placed on a continuum rather than being treated in isolation. The fundamental problem of how to convert emotions into measures is the same, be they the product of one’s own or another author’s sensibility.

Regarding poetic diction, on the other hand, the second letter to Lonsdale indicates a point of continuity between Wordsworth’s approach to translating the *Aeneid* and his reformatory programme in *Lyrical Ballads*. The preface to the latter work had called for the shedding of extraneous ornament and instead placed a strong emphasis on naturalness and simplicity, criticising ‘Poets, who [...] separate themselves from the sympathies of men, and indulge in arbitrary and capricious habits of expression in order to furnish food for the fickle tastes and fickle appetites of their own creation’ (*LB*, p. 744). Wordsworth’s aversion to stylish mannerisms and his steady focus on elementary principles correlate with the idea of preserving Virgil in an unadulterated form. Writing to Lonsdale, Wordsworth recommends that a translator should be as literal as possible, although not without a few caveats:

My own notion of translation is, then that it cannot be too literal, provided three faults be avoided, baldness, in which I include all that takes from dignity; and strangeness or uncouthness including harshness; and lastly, attempts to convey meanings which as they cannot be given but by languid circumlocutions cannot in fact be said to be given at all. (5 February 1824; *Translations*, p. 564, original emphasis)

By the time he undertook to translate Virgil’s epic, to be sure, Dryden’s standard of literalness was somewhat higher than in the Preface to *Ovid’s Epistles*, which had promoted the paraphrastic mode as a compromise to avoid the dual pitfalls of a too servile metaphor on the one hand and an excessively loose imitation on the other; yet the Dedication of the *Aeneis* is still suggestive of this sort of binary thinking and thus gives the impression that a comparatively large number of liberties were taken during the translation process:

¹⁰ William Wordsworth, *Lyrical Ballads, and Other Poems, 1797-1800*, ed. by James Butler and Karen Green, The Cornell Wordsworth (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992), pp. 757. Further references to this edition (*LB*) are given after quotations in the text.

I thought fit to steer betwixt the two Extrems, of Paraphrase, and literal Translation: To keep as near my Authour as I cou'd, without losing all his Graces, the most Eminent of which, are in the Beauty of his words: And those words, I must add, are always Figurative. Such of these as wou'd retain their Elegance in our Tongue, I have endeavour'd to graff on it; but most of them are of necessity to be lost, because they will not shine in any but their own. (*Works*, v, 330)

Even if the two translators agree that some loss of Virgilian beauty is inevitable, Dryden's middle path between two polar opposites seems to entail fewer limitations than Wordsworth's narrow list of exceptions to a general rule. By pursuing a more literalist methodology, the latter poet clearly differentiates himself from his predecessor.

Despite the importance he attaches to directness and perspicuity, however, Wordsworth did not intend to completely eschew verbal adornments in his translation. Judging by the exchange with Lonsdale, he struggled to convey the phrasing as well as the meaning of the source text. It is not enough for a translator to simply refrain from uncouth or undignified expressions; he must also observe the unique aesthetic merits of his author – instead of covering him in false splendours:

It was my wish and labour that my Translation should have far more of the genuine ornaments of Virgil than my predecessors. Dryden has been very careless of these, and profuse of his own, which seem to me very rarely to harmonize with those of virgil [*sic*]. [...] I feel it however to be too probable, that my Translation, [may *del*] is deficient in ornament, because I must unavoidably have lost many of Virgil's, and have never without reluctance attempted a compensation of my own. (5 February 1824; *Translations*, pp. 565-66, original emphasis)

In a third letter, Wordsworth elaborates upon this point, defining the characteristics of the Roman poet's versification and the extent of their translatability into English:

Dr Johnson has justly remarked that Dryden had little talent for the Pathetic, and the tenderness of Vergil seems to me to escape him. – Vergil's style is an inimitable mixture of the elaborately ornate, and the majestically plain & touching. The former quality is much more difficult to reach [in our language *del*] than the latter, in which whoever fails must fail through want of ability, and not through the imperfection of our language. (17 February 1824; *Translations*, p. 567)

The above statements qualify Dryden's claim that he is forced to write in an idiom 'so much inferior to the Latin' (*Works*, v, 333). Wordsworth does not accept the alleged defectiveness of English as an excuse for his predecessor's failure to capture 'the majestically plain & touching' aspects of Virgil's style (a mistake he thinks can only be attributed to

incompetence and an erroneous poetic ideal), but he, too, admits to grappling with the ‘elaborately ornate’ components of this ‘inimitable mixture’.

Wordsworth defends his work not on absolute but on relative grounds, quoting from Dryden’s seventeenth-century version to show that, by comparison, he has at least done a better job than this predecessor. One of the passages that earn his disapproval is Aeneas’s address to the ghost of Hector in Book II:

“o lux Dardaniae, spes o fidissima Teucrum,
 quae tantae tenuere morae? quibus Hector ab oris
 exspectate venis? ut te post multa tuorum
 funera, post varios hominumque urbisque labores
 defessi aspiciamus! quae causa indigna serenos
 foedavit vultus? aut cur haec vulnera cerno?”

(II. 281-86)

O Light of *Trojans*, and Support of Troy,
 Thy Father’s Champion, and thy Country’s Joy!
 O, long expected by thy Friends! from whence
 Art thou so late return’d for our Defence?
 Do we behold thee, weary’d as we are,
 With length of Labours, and with Toils of War?
 After so many Fun’rals of thy own,
 Art thou restor’d to thy declining Town?
 But say, what Wounds are these? What new Disgrace
 Deforms the Manly Features of thy Face?

(*Works*, v, 390, II. 367-76)

While he considers this ‘not an unfavourable specimen of Dryden’s way of treating the solemnly pathetic passages’, Wordsworth opines that ‘here is nothing of the cadence of the original, and little of its spirit – The second Verse is not in the original, and ought not to have been in Dryden’ (5 February 1824; *Translations*, p. 565, original emphasis). We cannot be entirely sure what the poet means by Virgilian ‘spirit’ or which criteria he applies to measure such an elusive quality, but his criticism of Dryden’s cadences is easily verifiable. Graver draws attention to the discrepancy between the Latin hexameters – characterised as they are by heavy spondees, strong mid-line pauses, enjambment, and gradually lengthening sentences – and the English couplets, which display the typical closure and are mostly comprised of lines that have no more than four stressed syllables.¹¹

¹¹ Bruce Graver, ‘Wordsworth and the Language of Epic: The Translation of the *Aeneid*’, *SP*, 83 (Summer 1986), 261-85 (pp. 267-68). Further references are given after quotations in the text.

Interestingly, Wordsworth's own version of this speech underwent a total of eight revisions before December 1827, which makes it by far the most highly developed part of his translation (Graver, *Translations*, p. 161). In their chronological sequence, the main stages of composition reflect a progressively closer approximation of the movement, the semantic import, and (to some extent) even the sound of Virgil's verse:

O Light of the Dardan realms! most faithful stay
 Of Trojans why such lingerings of delay!
 Where hast thou tarried? Hector, from what coast
 Comest thou, long-wished for? that so many lost
 Friends, followers, Countrymen such travails borne
 By Warriors, by the city, we outworn
 Behold thee? Why this undeserved disgrace?
 And the serene composure of that face
 Why And why keeps every wound its ghastly place?
 (DC MS. 89, sig. 168^r; *Translations*, pp. 469-70, II. 379-87)¹²

“O Light of Dardan Realms! Most faithful Stay
 “To Trojan courage! why these lingerings of delay?
 “Where hast thou tarried, Hector? From what coast
 “Com'st thou, long wish'd-for? That so many lost –
 “Thy kinsmen or thy friends – such travail borne,
 “By this afflicted City – we outworn,
 “Behold thee! Why this undeserv'd disgrace?
 “Who thus defil'd with wounds that honor'd face?
 (DC MS. 101B, Notebook 2, sig. 8^v; *Translations*, p. 547, II. 379-87)

“O Light of Dardan Realms! Most faithful Stay
 “To Trojan courage, why these lingerings of delay?
 “Where hast thou tarried, Hector? From what coast
 “Coms't thou, long-look'd for? After thousands lost –
 “Thy kinsmen or thy friends – such travail borne
 “By desolated Troy, how tir'd and worn
 “Are we, who thus behold thee! how forlorn!
 “These gashes whence? this undeserv'd disgrace?
 “Who thus defiled that calm majestic face?”
 (*Translations*, p. 226, II. 379-87)

The earliest tentative rendering in MS. 89 already improves upon Dryden's prosody. The pause after 'Where hast thou tarried' perfectly matches the medial caesura in 'quae tantae tenere morae? quibus Hector ab oris', and the subsequent enjambment 'Hector, from what coast | Comest thou, long-wished for' is a carbon copy of the Latin 'quibus Hector ab oris |

¹² My transcription follows that of the Cornell edition but only reproduces the base text of the manuscripts, without any of the deletions and interlinear revisions; since the latter were usually adopted into the next respective version of the text, they do not need to be given again.

exspectate venis'. Wordsworth's couplets really do run into each other, as the lines building up to 'Behold thee' demonstrate; while Dryden places this same phrase in a similar metrical position and likewise manages to endow it with the caesural function of 'aspicimus', he uses it to begin a new sentence and thereby loses Virgil's syntactical energy. MS. 101B, the fair copy shown to Lonsdale, contains additional prosodic refinements. By replacing 'Trojans' with 'Trojan courage', Wordsworth expands his second line into an alexandrine that further intimates the spondaic weight of the original; the stronger mid-line pauses after 'friends' and 'City' have a comparable effect.

With regard to Virgil's sense, too, the translation becomes more faithful over time. Although Wordsworth achieves neither the succinctness nor the metrical correspondence of Dryden's 'of thy own', his interpretative rendering of 'tuorum' gains in concision as 'Friends, followers, Countrymen' – a tricolon recalling Shakespeare's Mark Antony – gives way to the simpler 'Thy kinsmen or thy friends' and the emphasis shifts from a shared civic allegiance to the familial bond between speaker and addressee. Through the introduction of 'courage', similarly, the translator not only adjusts his metre but also arrives at a fuller (if somewhat redundant) version of 'spes o fidissima Teucrum'. The tendency towards literalness continues to increase in the reading text of the Cornell edition, which is based on the amendments that Wordsworth made with the assistance of his nephew.¹³ The new compound 'long-look'd for' brings out the visual connotation of 'exspectate' in a way that 'long-wished for' does not, and whereas the two final questions, 'quae causa indigna serenos | foedavit vultus?' and 'aut cur haec vulnera cerno?', were at first blended into the single line 'Who thus defil'd with wounds that honor'd face?', they now receive separate translations (albeit in reverse order) with 'Who thus defiled that calm majestic face?' and 'These gashes whence?', respectively.

Finally, Wordsworth takes great pains to reproduce the phonetic qualities of his original.¹⁴ The English monosyllable 'Stay' and its Latin counterpart 'spes' both begin with a sibilant, 'tarried' comprises the same 't' and 'r' sounds as 'tenuere', 'travail borne' echoes 'labores', and 'undeserved disgrace' retains all the consonants of 'indigna serenos'; in the last three cases, moreover, the translation simultaneously mirrors the placement of the words within Virgil's hexameter line. It does not always require a lot of effort to create

¹³ Even this is not the last stage of revision, however. Graver takes note of a letter to Christopher Wordsworth from late November 1827 that includes instructions for further corrections of the manuscript he had taken with him (*Translations*, p. 170, p. 226).

¹⁴ My discussion of this point builds on Graver's argument in 'Language of Epic', p. 272.

this kind of resemblance: rendering ‘lux Dardaniae’ as ‘Light of Dardan Realms’, the translator simply keeps the proper name where Dryden opts for the looser ‘light of Trojans’. On the whole, Wordsworth’s initial conception and tireless revision of the passage thus seems to be consistent with the programme laid out in his letters to Lonsdale; the resources of the target language are being exploited to the fullest in order to imitate ‘the genuine ornaments of Virgil’.

It is easy to overstate the novelty and thoroughness of this approach, however. Stuart Gillespie observes that ‘The further Wordsworth’s three completed Books move forward, the more Drydenian the diction becomes’. Given how earlier translators had also failed in their attempts to distance themselves from Dryden, such a process of assimilation should come as no big surprise, but perhaps we can modify Gillespie’s view that it took place, ‘very evidently, in spite of the author’s own intentions’.¹⁵ What appears to be materialising as the composition progresses is rather a growing tension between two separate and ultimately irreconcilable goals: to be like Virgil and to be unlike Dryden. Occasionally, the latter’s practice conforms exactly to Wordsworth’s aesthetic agenda, which may account for at least some of the borrowed phraseology that ended up being absorbed into the successor version. Even in the present example, Dryden can take part of the credit for the expression ‘undeserved disgrace’ and its phonetic equivalence with ‘indigna serenos’ because he supplied the rhyme words of the final couplet. Thus, not only is Wordsworth’s translation less innovative than he claims, but one of his most felicitous choices of vocabulary directly builds upon that of his poetic ancestor.

On the other hand, it almost seems as if the translator deliberately missed certain opportunities to adopt a Drydenian phrase even though doing so would have enhanced the self-defined literalness of his English *Aeneid*. Despite Wordsworth’s particular commitment to recreating the auditory experience of the source text, Dryden’s version of the above passage carries across just as many vowels and consonants from the Latin – often in places where the later translation falls short of its objective: ‘long expected’ renders ‘exspectate’ with an elegance that neither ‘long-wished for’ nor ‘long-look’d for’ can hope to parallel, ‘Labours’ is still a tad closer to ‘labores’ than ‘travail borne’, and ‘After so many Fun’rals of thy own’, in addition to giving nothing but the sense of ‘post multa tuorum | funera’, also preserves the sound of the last word. While the shared rhyme of ‘dis-

¹⁵ Stuart Gillespie, *English Translation and Classical Reception: Towards a New Literary History* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), p. 153.

grace' with 'face' suggests that Wordsworth's primary concern for phonetic authenticity caused him to follow Dryden when the latter had found a way of replicating the physical properties of Virgil's language, the translator's avoidance of these cognates (which must have presented themselves as an obvious solution) points to a contrary and equally strong impulse to move as far away from the diction of his predecessor as possible.

Even more revealing are the multiple manuscript revisions, for they show Wordsworth abandoning several ideas that would have contributed to the overall effectiveness of his translation but also lessened its individuality. Phonetically as well as metrically, 'Warriors' in MS. 89 (*Translations*, p. 469, ll. 384) corresponds to the Virgilian adjective 'varios'; considering that it has no literal equivalent in the source text, however, the use of this word may have been partly prompted by the phrase 'Toils of War' that Dryden expanded from 'labores'. If so, then Wordsworth's second-thought decision to scrap it could be specifically aimed at minimising his debt to the precursor version. The same purpose might underlie the poet's changing treatment of 'vulnera': to any English translator, the preliminary rendering with 'wounds' would probably seem to be the most natural option, and for Wordsworth it must have had the added benefit of echoing the first syllable of its Latin counterpart; nevertheless, he eventually revised 'wounds' to 'gashes' and thereby sacrificed another chance to make his translation sound like the original. Although there is nothing distinctly Drydenian about the rejected element, it appears in the couplet that is already indebted to Dryden for its rhyme words, so the translator conceivably exchanged it because he came to see these lines as too derivative and felt the need give them a more unique look.

In the end, we do not know Wordsworth's motives with absolute certainty, but the problem can be circumvented by taking Bushell's advice to 'mak[e] use of the [...] concept of "intention" not so much in terms of "what the author intended" as through intentional acts on the manuscript page' (p. 401). Quite irrespective of his stated ambitions, the minor and seemingly insignificant amendments that Wordsworth made during the course of rendering the *Aeneid* tell a story of their own; their gradual deviance from Virgil's sound at this point clashes conspicuously with the translator's usual practice of phonetic imitation, yet with each act of revision the text not only loses a bit of its auditory appeal but also becomes slightly less similar to Dryden's version. If Wordsworth began to rely more heavily on his predecessor after completing Book I, he thus still appears to have checked himself

and put up some localised resistance to the latter's influence – even at the cost of neglecting his own principles of translation. It might be argued that this sort of behaviour borders on overcompensation, for neither of the two lexical items that are introduced and then deleted seems likely to have struck readers as a straightforward borrowing; the fact that the poet did not eschew them in the first place is a mark of how far his philological instinct accords with the taste of preceding translators. Wordsworth's provisional choices and their cancellation say as much about the eighteenth-century roots of his personal standards as they do about his emancipatory drive to cut them off.

Nor did the poet limit himself to drawing on a single predecessor. Wordsworth's use of heroic couplets, amongst other factors, has helped to spark a fair amount of critical interest in his relation to Dryden, specifically;¹⁶ what has been largely overlooked, by contrast, is the potential influence of the blank verse translators whose activity spanned the decades separating these two literary giants from each other. Despite the different poetic format, aspirations for literalness are, as we have seen, articulated with regular frequency in the prefaces to contemporary blank verse renderings of the *Aeneid*; to the extent that Wordsworth inherited them, he was also shown a means by which they could be realised. He may not have always followed his inclination to copy Virgil's exact sound patterns or taken advantage of every available opportunity to employ a cognate, but the large number of such echoes in the finalised version of his *Aeneid* is undeniable and remains one of its most salient features. Moreover, Graver notices the same Latinising traits in the poet's earlier translations from Horace and from the *Georgics*.¹⁷ However, this aspect of the text is again less innovative than Graver makes it out to be; his 1986 article on Wordsworth's epic language compares it favourably with the diction of Dryden and Pitt, but almost all of the examples he adduces to assert its superiority have a precedent in one of the earlier blank verse translations. A case in point is the rendering of 'et dulci distendunt nectare cellas' (I. 433), where Beresford anticipates Wordsworth's cognate 'distend':

And with pure nectar every cell distend;
(Wordsworth, *Translations*, p. 200, I. 587)

¹⁶ In addition to the articles by Graver and Doherty cited above, see Willard Spiegelman, 'Wordsworth's *Aeneid*', *Comparative Literature*, 26 (1974), 97-109 (pp. 97-103).

¹⁷ Bruce Graver, 'Wordsworth and the Romantic Art of Translation', *Wordsworth Circle*, 17 (1986), 169-74 (p. 172); 'Wordsworth's Georgic Beginnings', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 33 (1991), 137-59 (p. 147).

and their waxen cells
Distend with luscious nectar,
(Beresford, p. 22, l. 579-80)

While the identical phraseology does not suffice as conclusive evidence of a direct indebtedness, it does suggest that attempts to preserve Virgil's sound through cognates existed well before Wordsworth developed his method of translating the Roman poet into English.

In fact, we have already encountered the most scrupulous practitioner of this technique, Joseph Trapp, and it is to his blank verse *Aeneid* that Wordsworth seems to owe a particular debt. Graver makes much of the word 'murmur' and its recurrence in Wordsworth's translation as an equivalent for the Latin 'murmure' ('Language of Epic', pp. 270-72), yet in two out of the three instances that he cites, Trapp had used it too – the first time when rendering the description of the winds entrapped in Aeolus's cave:

illi indignantes magno cum murmure montis
circum claustra fremunt;
(l. 55-56)

Loud, loud the mountain murmurs as they wreak
Their scorn upon the barriers
(Wordsworth, *Translations*, p. 183, l. 70-71)

They roar, and murmur round the Mountain's sides,
Indignant:
(Trapp, l. 5, l. 66-67)

If the success of a Virgil translation were to be measured by the degree of its Latinity alone, then Trapp's version of these lines would clearly come out on top, for he retains not only the sound of 'murmure' but also that of 'indignantes'. The second example is Venus's reference to the river Timavus:

unde per ora novem vasto cum murmure montis
it mare proruptum.
(l. 245-46)

whence the murmuring Mountain
"A nine-mouth'd channel to the torrent yields,
(Wordsworth, *Translations*, p. 191, l. 332-33)

whence thro' nine Mouths he rolls,
 (The Mountain murm'ring loud) himself a Sea,
 (Trapp, I, 16, I. 292-93)

Granted, it is perfectly possible that Wordsworth chose the cognate independently in each case; on one occasion, however, his own and Trapp's usage of this word coincide even without being etymologically tied to anything in the source text, which conveys a much stronger sense of the link between them. The lines in question form part of the counsel that Aeneas receives from Helenus:

inconsulti abeunt sedemque odere Sibyllae.
 hic tibi ne qua morae fuerint dispendia tanti,
 quamvis increpitent socii
 (III. 452-54)

“And they, who sought for knowledge, thus beguil'd
 “Of her predictions, from her Cave depart,
 “And quit the Sibyl with a murmuring heart.
 “But thou, albeit ill-dispos'd to wait,
 “And prizing moments at their highest rate,
 “Though Followers chide,
 (Wordsworth, *Translations*, p. 264, III. 624-29)

The Votaries
 Depart untaught, and curse the Sibyl's Cave.
 But let no Loss sustain'd by your Delay,
 However great, deter you: Tho' your Friends
 Impatient murmur,
 (Trapp, I, 128, III. 576-80)

Wordsworth and Trapp use 'murmur' to translate 'odere' and 'increpitent', respectively. Despite corresponding to different lexemes in the original, the verb seems too idiosyncratic to accidentally appear in two separate versions of such a narrowly defined passage, for not only is it completely unwarranted by Virgil's phonemes, but both translators are actually weakening the meaning of the Latin as a result of their decision to use it; 'curse' and 'chide' are undoubtedly the preferable alternatives. By the looks of it, it was Trapp, rather than the Roman poet himself, who prescribed what Wordsworth's *Aeneid* should sound like here.

The parallels between the two translations do not end with their deployment of cognates. Another portion of Wordsworth's text that Graver singles out for special praise is Aeneas's report of how he and his followers first set eyes on Italy ('Language of Epic', p.

272-73). As far as couplet versions go, Wordsworth may well be more accurate than earlier translators of these lines, but once the blank verse tradition is taken into account, it becomes evident that Trapp again preceded him in his stylistic choices:

iamque rubescebat stellis Aurora fugatis,
 cum procul obscuros colles humilemque videmus
 Italiam. Italiam primus conclamat Achates,
 Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant.
 (III. 521-24)

Now, when Aurora redden'd in a sky
 From which the Stars had vanish'd, we descry
 The low faint hills of distant Italy.
 "Italia!" shouts Achates: round and round
 Italia flies with grateful rebound,
 From all who see the coast, or hear the happy sound.
 (Wordsworth, *Translations*, p. 267, III. 721-26)

And now the Morning redden'd, and the Stars
 Retreated; when at distance we beheld
 The Hills obscure, and low *Italian* Plains.
Italia first *Achates* cries aloud,
Italia all our Crew with joyful Shouts
 Salute.
 (Trapp, I, 132, III. 659-64)

Trapp does not reproduce the proper name 'Aurora' like Wordsworth, but he, too, maintains the characteristic repetition of 'Italiam' and uses the Latin form of the word while doing so; approximating Virgil's metrical organisation, moreover, the arrangement of the three elements is the same in each case, which further suggests that Wordsworth was borrowing from his predecessor.

Their translations similarly converge in 'redde'n'd' – 'the most exact English equivalent of "rubescebat," and a choice which retains the implicit sense of blushing as well as the initial "r" sound' (Graver, 'Language of Epic', p. 273). Appropriate though it may be, Wordsworth was not reinventing the wheel with this verb, either; ironically enough, it also occurs in the sonnet by Thomas Gray that had been the butt of his criticism in the 1800 preface to *Lyrical Ballads*:

In vain to me the smiling mornings shine,
 And reddening Phœbus lifts his golden fire:
 The birds in vain their amorous descant join,
 Or cheerful fields resume their green attire:
 These ears alas! for other notes repine;
A different object do these eyes require;
My lonely anguish melts no heart but mine;
And in my breast the imperfect joys expire;
 Yet Morning smiles the busy race to cheer,
 And new-born pleasure brings to happier men;
 The fields to all their wonted tribute bear;
 To warm their little loves the birds complain.
I fruitless mourn to him that cannot hear
And weep the more because I weep in vain.

(*LB*, p. 749)

The italics are Wordsworth's and serve to highlight 'the only part of this Sonnet which is of any value' (*LB*, p. 749), contrasting its simple style with the supposedly over-elaborate language of the rest. Of course, one must not accuse the poet of being inconsistent if he later took recourse to the kind of vocabulary that is denounced at this point; Wordsworth was attempting something quite different in his *Aeneid* than in his collection of original pieces, and besides, the word 'redde[n]' on its own could hardly be regarded as representative of the outdated poetic diction to which he objected. Geoffrey Tillotson points out, however, that Gray himself 'speaks by means of quotations from others', regurgitating the stock phrases of springtime descriptions only to dismiss them as incompatible with the personal sorrow he is experiencing.¹⁸ Far from blindly conforming to the prevalent customs of his day, this rejection implies a high degree of self-awareness on Gray's part; long before Wordsworth, he must have already perceived the increasingly commonplace ring of expressions such as 'reddening Phœbus' and felt the need to restrict their usage to the proper occasion. Those phrases that are Virgilian in origin would obviously lend themselves to translations from the Roman poet's oeuvre, but their wider currency also indicates the breadth of his influence on native versification in general and shows how much of the contemporary translator's task was, in fact, being performed by regular poets. This lends an additional dimension to the truism that different renderings of the same source text will inevitably bear a certain resemblance to each other: in a culture whose literary output is positively suffused with the presence of a few classical authors, every new translation will be equally similar to a number of non-translated texts, too. Thus, even if Wordsworth really had been more rigorously literal in his approach to the *Aeneid* than all of his predeces-

¹⁸ Geoffrey Tillotson, *Augustan Studies* (London: Athlone Press, 1961), p. 88. Further references are given after quotations in the text.

sors, the result would still not have been able to avoid sounding like a good deal of the English verse that had been composed during the course of the eighteenth century.

Assuming Wordsworth eventually backed down from his initial position on the usefulness of a poetic diction that noticeably differs from the language of prose, he was still reluctant to admit to any external stimuli that inspired this change. In Graver's defence, most of the above parallels with Trapp, as well as several others, have since been included in the appendix of the Cornell edition (although the list is by no means exhaustive), where they appear next to potential borrowings from Dryden, Pitt, and Ogilby. Judging by the relative quantity of these materials, Trapp's impact evidently rivalled that of the couplet translators. That it has gone unnoticed for so long might be to do with an 'Advertisement' Wordsworth placed at the head of MS. 101B; here the poet explicitly mentions some of the pre-existing versions on which he had drawn:

It is proper to premise that the first Couplet of this Translation is adopted from Pitt – as are likewise two Couplets in the second Book; & three or four lines, in different parts, are taken from Dryden. A few expressions will also be found, which, following the Original closely are the same as the preceding Translators have unavoidably employed. (*Translations*, p. 181)

As has been shown, Wordsworth borrowed a lot more than 'three or four lines' from Dryden, but this statement is at least proof that he does not completely refuse to credit the latter's contribution; by contrast, it is left unclear whether Trapp falls into the category of 'the preceding Translators' with whom the poet also has 'a few expressions' in common, and at any rate we are meant to believe that this shared phraseology is a consequence of 'following the Original closely' rather than of consciously appropriating the work of others who had done so in the past. Wordsworth's selective acknowledgment of his sources invites a comparison with Dryden's own paratextual referencing of the translations he consulted – specifically his solitary footnote in Book II, which declares that the line 'A headless Carcass, and a nameless thing' was 'taken from Sir John Denham' (*Works*, v, 403), and the section of his Dedication in which he owns to receiving help from Lauderdale (v, 336-37). Each statement functions as something of a diversionary tactic that obfuscates the actual scale of the translators' indebtedness to their respective predecessors and distracts from all the unnamed versions whose influence left a similar mark on the final product. Wordsworth's omission of Trapp can tell us something about the particular self-image he was trying to cultivate; by withholding the blank verse rendering among the list of used texts, he

further reinforces his alignment with the representatives of the couplet tradition, who thus appear as the only real competitors for the title of the definitive English *Aeneid*. Making fidelity to the letter his main criterion, Wordsworth may have sensed that he could not significantly improve upon Trapp's literalness and for this reason deliberately pitted himself against those precursors whom he saw as lacking in that regard. Even more so than Dryden, the blank verse translator seems to have constituted an influence that needed to be suppressed.

But regardless of how comprehensively Wordsworth studied and incorporated the work of earlier Virgil translators, his efforts did not yield the desired results. The apologetic tone in which he addresses Lonsdale rather suggests that the latter had voiced a few objections after reading his draft of Books I and II, and while there is no way of ascertaining why exactly the translation failed to gain the patron's favour, we know for a fact that Coleridge took issue with its diction. The surviving comments on Book I, included in the critical apparatus of the Cornell edition, expressly criticise the Latinate style that was supposed to be Wordsworth's greatest asset: 'There are unenglishisms here & there in this translation of which I remember no instance in your own poems' (*Translations*, p. 190). Coleridge, who had high hopes for his friend, apparently could not bear to see him wasting time and potential on a project whose completion, by its very nature, promised but a fraction of the fame he would achieve with the original compositions that had yet to be written. At best, such an endeavour offered the prospect of moderate success; at worst, its outcome might spoil the reputation to which Wordsworth was entitled: 'You have convinced me of the necessary injury which a Language must sustain by rhyme translations of narrative poems of great length. [...] Were it only for this reason, that it would interfere with your claim to a Regenerator & Jealous Guardian of our Language, I should dissuade the publication' (p. 197).

In the light of the preceding discussion, it is noteworthy that some of the passages that attracted Coleridge's criticism may have been written in direct emulation of Trapp. The storm scene, for instance, features a description of sailors whose vessel is tossed around by the waves:

hi summo in fluctu pendent; his unda dehiscens
 terram inter fluctus aperit;

(I. 106-07)

Those hang aloft, as if in air; to these
 Earth is disclosed between the boiling seas.
 (Wordsworth, *Translations*, p. 185, l. 137-38)

These hang upon a Surge; to Those the Deep
 Yawning discloses Earth between the Waves:
 (Trapp, I, 8, l. 126-27)

The verb ‘disclose’ for ‘aperit’ is a strong indicator that Wordsworth was following Trapp when he rendered these lines. His translation did not necessarily benefit from the borrowing, however; Coleridge finds fault with the demonstrative pronouns: ‘Those & these occasion [a] [...] perplexity.’ Although both translators are fairly literal in their choice and arrangement of words, one feels inclined to agree that something more expansive is needed in order to make Virgil’s Latin accessible. Possibly due to the influence of the predecessor version, Wordsworth seems to have forgotten about his self-imposed rule to temper lexical fidelity with an avoidance of ‘strangeness or uncouthness’.

This impression is confirmed by another example that occurs a few lines later and describes Neptune taking notice of the maritime uproar:

Interea magno misceri murmure pontum
 emissamque hiemem sensit Neptunus et imis
 stagna refusa vadis, graviter commotus;
 (l. 124-26)

Meanwhile, what strife disturb’d the roaring sea
 And for what outrages the storm was free,
 Troubling the Ocean to its inmost caves,
 Neptune perceiv’d – incensed;
 (Wordsworth, *Translations*, p. 186, l. 162-65)

Mean-while the Noise and Tumult of the Main
Neptune perceives, the Bottom of the Deep
 Turn’d upwards, and the Storm’s licentious Rage.
 Highly provok’d,
 (Trapp, I, 9, l. 147-50)

Here it is not so much the vocabulary as the metrical organisation that aligns Wordsworth with his predecessor. The shared phrase ‘Neptune perceiv’d’ would look like a coincidence if it did not simultaneously occupy an identical spot at the beginning of a line; Wordsworth’s earliest rendering in MS. 89, moreover, reads ‘Was known by Neptune’ (*Transla-*

tions, p. 423), suggesting a decisive and deliberate change in the direction of the blank verse *Aeneid*. Syntactically, however, the two versions are slightly different, for Trapp places his subject and verb after the first of Virgil's three objects (exchanging the positions of 'emissamque hiemem' and 'imis stagna refusa vadis' in the process), whereas Wordsworth delays his until the very end of the sentence. The latter translator thus ends up with a more extreme suspension than even the Roman poet himself, who inserts 'sensit Neptunus' in between the second and third object. In English, this structure arguably impairs the clarity of the meaning, which is what prompted Coleridge's comment: 'Neptune perc. incensed – I can scarcely read, as part of a sentence. It seems to my ear as if I was repeating single words.' To further illustrate Wordsworth's particular affinity with Trapp, one can turn to the much simpler alternative of Dryden for comparison:

Mean time Imperial Neptune heard the Sound
Of raging Billows breaking on the Ground:
Displeas'd,

(*Works*, v, 348, l. 176-78)

Dryden does leave out quite a few details, but he also produces a more natural word order than either of his two successors; at least with regard to syntax, this neoclassical couplet translator comes closest to writing in the language of prose. Again, the contrast throws into relief a kinship that goes beyond any superficial consideration of poetic formats (and may in fact be obscured by it); for all Wordsworth's borrowings from Dryden, he just as often depended on Trapp to guide him in his translation of the *Aeneid*.

Yet if the poet inherited the bad elements of his versification, the good aspects are no less derivative. Coleridge interweaves his objections with a modicum of praise; one of the few positive comments relates to the grove that accommodates the temple of Juno:

Lucus in urbe fuit media, laetissimus umbrae,
(l. 441)

Within the Town, a central Grove display'd
Its ample texture of delightful shade.
(*Translations*, p. 200, l. 598-99)

'From this [i.e., the first] line', says Coleridge, 'the Translation greatly & very markedly improves [...] the metre has bone & muscle'. Ironically, however, the couplet appears almost verbatim in Pitt, where Wordsworth must have found it:

Amid the Town, a stately Grove display'd
 A cooling Shelter, and delightful Shade.
 (Pitt, 1727, p. 36, l. 588-89)

Coleridge is talking about prosody rather than diction, and his admiration for the first half of the couplet might be ascribed to its (un)remarkable regularity and perpetuation of traditional standards: the separation of prepositional phrase and main clause results in a medial caesura after the fourth syllable, and by using the verb of the sentence as a rhyme word, the translators place a strong emphasis on the end of the line as well as creating an enjambement that drives the verse forward. As the opening of a new paragraph, such a configuration is particularly effective because it operates both on a local and on a suprastructural level; 'display'd' is complemented not only by the immediate object in the next line but also by the ensuing depiction of the temple as a whole.

Given that Coleridge applauded one of the least original parts of the translation, we may suspect a streak of conservatism in his aesthetic judgment. A subsequent remark provides additional evidence that he was not altogether happy with the way Wordsworth had run his couplets into each other; the lines being criticised belong to Ilioneus's characterisation of Aeneas:

rex erat Aeneas nobis, quo iustior alter
 nec pietate fuit, nec bello maior et armis.
 quem si fata virum servant, si vescitur aura
 aetheria neque adhuc crudelibus occubat umbris,
 (l. 544-47)

"A man to no one second in the care
 "Of justice, nor in piety and war,
 "Ruled over us; if yet Æneas treads
 "On earth, nor has been summon'd to the shades,
 (*Translations*, p. 205, l. 745-48)

Coleridge makes only a tentative suggestion, but it still stands out as running counter to the prosodic ideal that informed the composition of the text: 'care, war, treads, shades – rather too confluent?' While he does not express an outright preference for the closed couplet style of Dryden and Pitt, one cannot help but think that he was implicitly questioning his friend's ability to surpass their versions.

This feedback had important long-term consequences for the publication history of Wordsworth's *Aeneid*. Accompanying the commentary itself was a letter in which the exasperated Coleridge voiced his doubts about the feasibility of writing a verse translation that does Virgil justice:

Since Milton I know of no Poet, with so many felicities & unforgettable Lines & stanzas as you – and to read therefore page after page without a single brilliant note, depresses me – & I grow peevish with you for having wasted your time on a work so very much below you, that you can not stoop & take. Finally, my conviction is: that you undertook an impossibility: and that there is no medium between a prose Version, and one on the avowed principle of Compensation in the widest sense--/ i.e. manner, Genius, total effect. (*Translations*, p. 571)

Wordsworth took this to heart, for when he eventually published part of his translation in *The Philological Museum*, he sent a quasi-apologetic note to the editors of the journal and explained why he had given up on rendering the epic in its entirety:

Your letter reminding me of an expectation I some time since held out to you of allowing some specimens of my translation from the *Æneid* to be printed in the Philological Museum was not very acceptable: for I had abandoned the thought of ever sending into the world any part of that experiment, – for it was nothing more, – an experiment begun for amusement, and I now think a less fortunate one than when I first named it to you. Having been displeased in modern translations with the addition of incongruous matter, I began to translate with a resolve to keep clear of that fault, by adding nothing; but I became convinced that a spirited translation can scarcely be accomplished in the English language without admitting a principle of compensation. On this point however I do not wish to insist, and merely send the following passage, taken at random, from a wish to comply with your request. (*Translations*, p. 580)

The penultimate sentence, in particular, seems to recall Coleridge's words. Contrary to his own assertion, moreover, the excerpt that Wordsworth submitted for publication (l. 901-1040) was not 'taken at random' but rather specifically selected because it had won his friend's approval: 'Generally', Coleridge observes in one of his notes on Book I, 'the latter part is done with great spirit' (*Translations*, p. 212).

More important still are the revisions that the translator made before submitting the text, which likewise reflect the input he had received a decade earlier. Despite commending the passage in MS. 101B, Coleridge saw room for improvement; what bothered him were the couplets translating Cupid's deception of Dido:

insidat quantus miserae deus. at memor ille
 matris Acidaliae paulatim abolere Sychaeum
 incipit et vivo temptat praevertere amore
 iam pridem resides animos desuetaque corda.
 (l. 719-22)

How great a God deceives her. He, to please
 His Acidalian Mother, by degrees
 Would sap Sichæus, studious to remove
 The dead by influx of a living love,
 Through a subsided spirit dispossess'd
 Of amorous passion, through a torpid breast.
 (*Translations*, pp. 211-12, l. 988-93)

According to Coleridge, ‘the [...] lines [...] are obscure & run obstructedly’ (*Translations*, p. 212), and he could also do without ‘That through twice repeated’. Once again, however, these perceived shortcomings are partly the result of Wordsworth’s emulative practice; a comparative analysis reveals that Trapp had a distinct influence on the way he picked his rhyme words and used them for the construction of enjambments:

nor thinks how great a God she bears.
 He, mindful of his Mother, by degrees
 Begins t’ expunge Sichæus from her Breast,
 And with a living Flame to prepossess
 Her Heart, long listless, and unus’d to Love.
 (Trapp, l, 44, l. 860-64)

The phrase ‘by degrees’ is one possible translation of ‘paulatim’, but by no means the only one, and the fact that both translators place it at the end of a line makes it hard to deny Wordsworth’s indebtedness. The true giveaway, however, is the materials he absorbed into his final couplet. When discussing Trapp, we saw how the blank verse translator occasionally comes close to writing in couplets himself and even manages to appropriate Dryden’s rhyme words simply by slightly altering their grammatical shape. Here we encounter the opposite phenomenon, as Wordsworth turns Trapp’s finite verb ‘prepossess’ into the adjective ‘dispossess’d’ and thus achieves a rhyme with ‘breast’.

To be sure, Trapp’s syntax at this point is not nearly as convoluted as Wordsworth’s, but by deciding to work in the same sequence of line endings, the latter may have unwittingly limited the range of creative options that would have allowed him to render the original in a more intelligible fashion. At any rate, the borrowed elements are largely ab-

sent from the published version of 1832; instead we find that Wordsworth has become more similar to Dryden:

what Guest,
 How dire a God she drew so near her Breast.
 But he, not mindless of his Mother's Pray'r,
 Works in the pliant Bosom of the Fair;
 And moulds her Heart anew, and blots her former Care.
 The dead is to the living Love resign'd,
 And all *Æneas* enters in her Mind.
 (Dryden, *Works*, v, 376, l. 1004-10)

How great a god, incumbent on her breast,
 Would fill it with his spirit. He, to please
 His Acidalian Mother, by degrees
 Blots out Sichæus, studious to remove
 The dead, by influx of a living love,
 By stealthy entrance of a perilous guest
 Troubling a heart that had been long at rest.
 (Wordsworth, *Translations*, p. 582, l. 988-94)

Wordsworth still uses 'breast' as a rhyme word, but in accordance with Dryden's text he has transposed it to the beginning of the passage, producing a line that strongly resembles what his predecessor had written. Analogously, Dryden's un-Virgilian 'Guest' replaces 'dispossess'd' in Wordsworth's penultimate line; the end pause that follows the monosyllabic noun is more pronounced than that after the trisyllabic adjective, so it helps to stabilise the frame of the couplet. In addition, Dryden's influence seems to have triggered the substitution of 'Blots out' for 'Would sap', and it can also be felt behind the newly introduced word 'entrance' (which equally lacks a literal counterpart in the Latin).

Overall, then, Wordsworth responded to Coleridge's criticism of the passage by exchanging one underlying secondary source with another, lowering the echoes of Trapp while making room for further particles of Drydenian phraseology. Locally speaking, these modifications do not amount to much and hardly leave the translator's lines any less 'obscure' than they were before, but given how consistent his friend had been in apportioning praise and blame throughout the rest of the commentary, we can see them as part of a bigger picture. Whatever innovatory strategy Wordsworth may have pursued with his borrowings from Trapp's blank verse translation, they seem to have fallen on deaf ears, and other segments of his own rendering were able to make a favourable impression only in so far as they either abided by the long-established rules of closed couplet composition or directly

drew on their most prominent exponents. Intentionally or not, Coleridge was gently nudging Wordsworth into conformity with Dryden – the very translator from whom his friend had been trying to dissociate himself. Considering the chronology of events, this is not to suggest that Coleridge had anything to do with the increasing proportion of borrowed materials in Books II and III of Wordsworth's *Aeneid*; the manuscript he saw contained a fair copy of the former, and the latter had already been drafted by the time Wordsworth heard back from him. Nor should we hold the poet responsible for the premature termination of the project, as Wordsworth did not seek his advice until after making the resolution not to go through with it. Nevertheless, it is telling that the translator would return to Dryden in his attempt to correct the flaws that had been pointed out to him. Despite the ostensible difference between their respective agendas, this 'Regenerator & Jealous Guardian' of the English language was no more capable of ignoring the famous model than the various eighteenth-century writers who had kept its legacy alive, and if he still believed himself to be independent from the dominant tradition, then Coleridge's reaction must have had a sobering effect that undermined his confidence when it came to presenting the translation to the public.

Indeed, the conservatism of Wordsworth's *Aeneid* goes even deeper than that. So far, we have been focussing on the translator's indebtedness to a few individuals who had previously undertaken to render the same source text and could be consulted whenever he was in need of a suitable phrase or rhyme word. As time went by, however, Wordsworth's practice also became more neoclassical in other respects – a development that culminates in, and is thus best exemplified by, his version of Book III. It bears repeating that, once the fair copies of Book I and II had been drafted and sent to Lonsdale, this part of the translation was composed with great haste due to the poet's imminent leave for Coleorton, where he visited Sir George and Lady Beaumont in February 1824 (*Translations*, p. 160). Potentially, these constraining circumstances could imply a relative carelessness and lack of attention to detail, but on the other hand, they might also have led to an expression of instinctive preferences that had yet to be filtered through the programmatic lens of poetic innovation (and sometimes still persisted after several stages of revision).

For one thing, Wordsworth repeatedly introduces rhetorical devices that we have seen to be characteristic of the closed heroic couplet. A case in point is the Trojans' sighting of Italy discussed above:

iamque rubescebat stellis Aurora fugatis,
 cum procul obscuros colles humilemque videmus
 Italiam. Italiam primus conclamat Achates,
 Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant.

(III. 521-24)

Now, when Aurora redder'd in a sky
 From which the Stars had vanish'd, we descry
 The low faint hills of distant Italy.
 "Italia!" shouts Achates: round and round
 Italia flies with grateful rebound,
 From all who see the coast, or hear the happy sound.

(*Translations*, p. 267, III. 721-26)

The final alexandrine has no Latin equivalent but rather serves to round off the scene by juxtaposing its visual and acoustic stimuli in a single antithesis; the medial caesura divides the line into perfectly parallel halves of equal length.

A similar structure concludes Helenus's account of the natural forces that created the channel between Scylla and Charybdis:

haec loca vi quondam et vasta convulsa ruina
 (tantum aevi longinqua valet mutare vetustas)
 dissiluisse ferunt, cum protinus utraque tellus
 una foret; venit medio vi pontus et undis
 Hesperium Siculo latus abscidit, arvaeque et urbes
 litore diductas angusto interluit aestu.

(III. 414-19)

"Tis said, when heaving Earth of yore was rent,
 "This ground forsook the Hesperian Continent:
 "Nor doubt, that power to work such change might lie
 "Within the grasp of dark Antiquity.
 "Then flow'd the sea between, and, where the force
 "Of roaring waves establish'd the divorce,
 "Still, through the Straits, the narrow waters boil,
 "Dissevering Town from Town, and soil from soil.

(*Translations*, p. 262, III. 577-84)

Although Wordsworth is quite faithful to Virgil's literal meaning in these lines, he takes a few liberties with the geographical proper nouns, moving 'Hesperium' near the head of the verse paragraph and dropping 'Siculo' altogether. Moreover, the Roman poet uses 'arvae' and 'urbes' only once, whereas his translator doubles the number of the corresponding

words ‘soil’ and ‘town’ and groups them into a sequence of two syntactically analogous pairs that occupy the better part of the last line. Again, such neat balances are nowhere to be found in the Latin original, but neither do they seem particularly representative of Wordsworth’s own poetic voice; stylistically, they rather look like specimens of the coolly analytical abstraction and lucid communication we would expect from neoclassical practitioners of the couplet form. In his ‘Discourse of Satire’, for instance, Dryden recalls how he was first told to copy ‘the Beautiful Turns of Words and Thoughts’ that Waller and Denham had used in their poetry (*Works*, IV, 84), and Wordsworth’s ‘Dissevering Town from Town, and soil from soil’ very much appears to continue this tradition.

Verbal elements are also duplicated during the translation of Andromache’s speech:

me famulo famulamque Heleno transmisit habendam.
(III. 329)

“And me to Trojan Helenus he gave –
“Captive to Captive – if not Slave to Slave.
(*Translations*, p. 259, III. 468-69)

Here Virgil himself employs a turn on ‘famulus’, yet Wordsworth effectively translates it twice and mirrors the variant renderings along the axis of the medial caesura in his second line. As was the case with the aforementioned examples, the translator’s imposition of structural symmetries brings the text closer to the Augustan standard he had nominally opposed. Even without a specific precedent in any of the eighteenth-century versions, these parallelisms and antitheses reflect a frame of mind that still espouses the literary ideals of the previous age, perhaps in spite of itself, and they clearly interfere with the declared goal of lexical fidelity. While Wordsworth attempted to reinvigorate the closed couplet by loosening its fetters, he was not wholly successful at containing the artificial rhetoric that was encoded in the verse form he inherited from his predecessors.

Finally, Book III features some of the most egregious examples of the type of diction Wordsworth purported to avoid. It should be evident by now that, right from the start, the poet made ample use of phrases that qualify as ‘languid circumlocutions’ and thus violate his self-defined principles of translation; Coleridge suggests as much with comments like ‘Shall Empire hold her place = regnabitur?’ (*Translations*, p. 192) and ‘Vertice = from the exalted region of her head?’ (p. 199). These embellishments, however, are still recog-

nisably connected to the semantic units upon which they expand; the same cannot be said about the part of Helenus's prophecy in which he predicts the divine omen that Aeneas will receive:

cum tibi sollicito secreti ad fluminis undam
litoreis ingens inventa sub ilicibus sus
triginta capitum fetus enixa iacebit,
(III. 389-91)

“When, anxiously reflecting, thou shalt find
“A bulky Female of the bristly Kind
“On a sequester'd river's margin laid,
“Where Ilex branches do the ground oershade;
“With thirty Young-ones couch'd in that Recess,
(*Translations*, p. 261, III. 545-49)

Virgil's 'huge sow' ('ingens [...] sus') becomes 'A bulky Female of the bristly Kind'. Instead of openly naming the animal, the translator opts for a periphrasis based on the normative formula 'covering + group word' that Tillotson infers from his study of Augustan poetics (p. 74). If this seems inept, Wordsworth should not have to take all the blame, as he was obviously inspired by Pitt's version of the same lines:

When, lost in Contemplation deep, you find
A large white Mother of the bristly Kind,
(Pitt, 1740, p. 120, III. 520-21)

While the phrase can thus be regarded as yet another borrowing passed on from one English *Aeneid* to the next, it also raises more general questions about the evolution of style and decorum over the course of the eighteenth century, for in choosing his words, Pitt was himself looking back to Pope's *Odyssey*:

here are seen
Twelve herds of goats that graze our utmost green;
To native pastors is their charge assign'd,
And mine the care to feed the bristly kind:¹⁹

Given the genre of their respective source texts, all three translators may have desired an avoidance of 'low' vocabulary as far as it was achievable; moreover, the identical end-line position of 'bristly kind' suggests that it also offered a preferable rhyme word. But there

¹⁹ Alexander Pope, *The Odyssey of Homer*, 5 vols (London, 1725-26), III, 303-04, XIV. 125-28.

are still further reasons for the use of such formulaic language, even though they were not equally compelling in each case. With regard to Pope's *Windsor Forest* and Thomson's *Seasons*, Tillotson observes that both poets mention 'fish and birds whenever they want to' and only resort to circumlocutions 'when fish or birds are being thought of as distinct in their appearance from other groups of creatures' (p. 21). The passage in the *Odyssey* shows something of the same quasi-scientific classification as it differentiates between herds of goats and herds of swine; here the choice of an abstract phrase is justified and works to great effect. By contrast, Virgil's lines refer to a particular creature of symbolic significance and thus appear weaker in translation than in their Latin original. It looks as if neither Pitt nor Wordsworth paid much heed to the specific context of the words they were rendering but simply settled for an expression that could be broadly associated with the 'high' style of epic.

Of course, this and similar decisions are not quite as easily excused in a poet who intends to go against the grain of established conventions. Not only was Wordsworth eventually infected with the 'poison of Pope's Homer' via the intermediary of Pitt's Virgil, but he remained oblivious to the nuances of neoclassical diction in the hands of a competent versifier and, as a result, ended up producing a poor imitation of the poetic idiom he had formerly rejected. The misuse of stock phraseology, amongst other things we have seen, betrays the translator's superficial understanding of the tradition to which his version of the *Aeneid* was contributing. Like Dryden, Wordsworth drew extensively on previous renderings, yet he did not always exercise the same critical judgment and was rather less discriminating in the selection of materials that he deemed suitable for absorption. By comparison with how his predecessor had handled his sources, one also gets the impression that the borrowed items did not undergo much refinement during the process of being integrated into the new text; more often than not, their primary function appears to lie in the provision of sounding rhyme words that made it easier for the translator to write in the unaccustomed medium of heroic couplets. To be fair, Wordsworth faced the problem of negotiating a greater and more diverse set of stylistic options and expectations than his precursor; the blank verse translations that had emerged since the publication of Dryden's *Aeneis* constituted at least one additional thread of Virgilian reception that needed to be taken into account. Competing for dominance over the translator's practice, these various influences rarely coalesced with each other and thus failed to form an organic whole, and neither was Wordsworth able to make any significant innovations that had not been tried before. All

things considered, the enterprise proves to be a somewhat belated addition to a body of texts whose formal criteria left hardly any room for creative exploration.

Conclusion

The evidence presented in these pages shows that Dryden's *Aeneis* not only subsumed a good deal of the preceding efforts to carry Virgil over to England but also shaped the face of English Virgilianism for the next hundred years. Despite the declining political relevance of his epic, the Roman poet continued to attract new writers who tried their hands at translating the *Aeneid*, and if the attempt of so great a figure as Wordsworth is any indication, then Dryden's influence may have played an important role in making this seemingly inferior task a touchstone of poetic excellence. While the frequently stated goal of greater literalness suggests a paradigm shift in the tradition by promising to redirect the focus onto the Latin original itself, Dryden's successors were no less reliant on secondary sources than their famous model; as the cases of Trapp and Pitt demonstrate, they often appear at their least faithful precisely in those places where they decide to follow Dryden. Nor did the choice of blank verse always lead to an increase in fidelity; Strahan's and Beresford's lexical parallels with *Paradise Lost* – though sometimes warranted by one of Milton's own allusions to Virgil – usually come at the cost of misrepresenting (or rather amplifying) the Roman poet's meaning. To the extent that they not only borrowed from the acclaimed couplet version but also adopted the method by which it had been composed, the texts we have been discussing point to an essential continuity between seventeenth- and eighteenth-century practices (if not theories) of translation.

Although the persistence of Dryden's influence is undeniable, however, a closer examination reveals that it occasionally operated in surprising ways and did not take full effect until after a translator had finished the first partial draft of his rendering. The experimental nature and gradual publication of some translation projects allow us to trace the series of revisionary measures through which they evolved, and here we can observe a phenomenon that would seem to substantiate, on a microscopic level, the agonistic principle posited by Harold Bloom. Instead of a strong poet gaining independence from this precursor, however, we find that the translators in question start out strong but invariably end up making certain concessions to the Drydenian precedent; time and again, an initial impulse towards novelty is suppressed in favour of a local alignment with the dominant English Virgil. Both Pitt and Strahan follow this pattern, and Wordsworth's indebtedness to Dryden, already known among literary critics, neatly confirms it. To be sure, one should not overemphasise the degree of resistance that eighteenth-century translators offered to

Dryden's example; nevertheless, many of them appear to have copied him in spite of their declared intention to pursue a different path, and the resulting impression of conformism may obscure a range of creative possibilities that existed but simply went unexplored. Indeed, our analysis has shown that Dryden's was far from the only influence to which contemporary translators were exposed. The biggest competitor, needless to say, was Milton's *Paradise Lost*, whose status as a native equivalent of the *Aeneid* only became more obvious as time went by. Virgil translation could contribute to the English poet's reputation by highlighting the extent to which he himself had succeeded in emulating the classics; in this regard, Strahan's and Beresford's endeavours complemented the work of scholars such as Newton and Hume.

Finally, we have discovered, as if by accident, that there is a distinctly interpersonal – almost collaborative – aspect to many of these texts, as translators corresponded with fellow men of letters and incorporated the suggestions they received. While the details of Pitt's exchange with Benson remain unclear, it is evident that he would not have expanded his miscellany publication without the latter's support. Cowper and Fuseli exemplify a more goal-oriented and businesslike dynamic with their collaboration on Homer. Particularly noteworthy, however, is the impact that Coleridge's comments had on the development of Wordsworth's *Aeneid*; even if it had been possible for the translator to ignore Dryden's looming presence, his friend subtly reinforced the neoclassical ideal that Dryden had helped to establish. Some eighteenth-century translations like Pope's *Odyssey* were, of course, full-scale collaborations. But it may be that informal support and cooperation by friends and acquaintances was considerably more common, and influential, among translators of the period than has previously been recognised. Perhaps future research will be able to address this more fully.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Alexander, Gavin ed., *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism* (London: Penguin, 2004)
- Anon., 'Exhibition of the Royal Academy', *Public Advertiser*, 22 May 1786
- Benson, William, *Letters Concerning Poetical Translations, and Virgil's and Milton's Arts of Verse* (London, 1739; repr. Menston: The Scholar Press, 1973)
- , *Virgil's Husbandry; or, An Essay on the Georgicks: Being the Second Book Translated into English Verse* (London, 1724)
- Beresford, James, *The Æneid of Virgil, Translated into Blank Verse* (London, 1794)
- Burke, Edmund, *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, 4th edn (London, 1764)
- Cowper, William, *The Iliad and Odyssey of Homer, Translated into English Blank Verse*, 2 vols (London, 1791)
- Davidson, Joseph, *The Works of Virgil Translated into English Prose*, 2 vols (London, 1743)
- Denham, Sir John, 'Aeneid: The 1636 Version', in *Early Augustan Virgil: Translations by Denham, Godolphin, and Waller*, ed. by Robin Sowerby (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2010), pp. 32-117
- , 'The Passion of Dido for Aeneas', in *Poems and Translations with the Sophy* (London, 1668), pp. 128-44
- Dryden, John, *The Works of John Dryden*, 20 vols (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956-2000)
- , *Annus Mirabilis*, in *The Works of John Dryden* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956-2000), I: *Poems 1649-1680*, ed. by Edward Niles Hooker and H. T. Swedenberg, Jr (1956), pp. 47-105.
- , Dedication of *Examen Poeticum; Being the Third Part of Miscellany Poems*, in *The Works of John Dryden* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956-2000), IV: *Poems 1693-1696*, ed. by A. B. Chambers and William Frost (1974), pp. 363-75
- , Dedication of *Troilus and Cressida; or, Truth Found Too Late*, in *The Works of John Dryden* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956-2000), XIII: *Plays*, ed. by Maximillian E. Novak (1984), pp. 219-24

- , ‘Discourse Concerning the Original and Progress of Satire’, in *The Works of John Dryden* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956-2000), IV, 3-90
- , and others, *Ovid’s Epistles, Translated by Several Hands* (London, 1680)
- , Preface to *Ovid’s Epistles*, in *The Works of John Dryden* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956-2000), I, 109-19
- , Preface to *Sylvae: or, the Second Part of Poetical Miscellanies*, in *The Works of John Dryden*, 20 vols (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956-2000), III: *Poems 1685-1692*, ed. by Earl Miner (1969), pp. 3-18
- , *The Works of Virgil in English*, in *The Works of John Dryden* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956-2000), V-VI, ed. by William Frost (1987)
- Ensis (pseud.), ‘Dido, by Mr Fuseli’, *London Courant*, 28 May 1781
- Fuseli, Henry, ‘The *Aeneid* of Virgil, Translated into Blank Verse by James Beresford’, *Analytical Review*, 20 (October 1794), 113-22
- , ‘The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer, Translated into English Blank Verse by W. Cowper’, *Analytical Review*, 15 (January 1793), 1-16
- , ‘Remarks on William Cowper’s Translation of Homer’s *Iliad*’, New Haven, CT, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University, Osborn MS c210
- Howard, Sir Robert, ‘The Fourth Book of Virgil: Of the Loves of Dido and Aeneas’, in *Poems on Several Occasions* (London, 1696), pp. 141-69
- Hume, Patrick, *Annotations on Milton’s Paradise Lost* (London, 1695)
- Johnson, Samuel, *The Lives of the Most Eminent English Poets: With Critical Observations on their Works*, ed. by Roger Lonsdale, 5 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2006)
- Lewkenor, John, ‘The Fourth Book of Virgil in English,’ in *Metellus His Dialogues the First Part* (London, 1693), pp. 85-131
- Maitland, Richard, Earl of Lauderdale, *The Works of Virgil, Translated into English Verse: By the Right Honourable Richard, Late Earl of Lauderdale* (London, 1709)
- , *The Works of Virgil, Translated into English Verse: By the Right Honourable Richard, Late Earl of Lauderdale*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (London, [1716(?)])
- Milton, John, *Paradise Lost*, ed. Alastair Fowler, 2nd edn (Harlow: Pearson-Longman, 2007)
- , *Paradise Lost: A Poem, in Twelve Books*, a new edition, with notes of various authors, by Thomas Newton, 2 vols (London, 1749)
- , *Milton’s Paradise Lost: A New Edition*, ed. by Richard Bentley (London, 1732)

- Ogilby, John, *The Works of Publius Virgilius Maro* (London, 1649)
- , *The Works of Publius Virgilius Maro Translated, Adorn'd with Sculpture, and Illustrated with Annotations* (London, 1654)
- Petrarca, Francesco, *Letters on Familiar Matters: Rerum familiarum libri XVII-XXIV*, trans. by Aldo S. Bernardo (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985)
- Pitt, Christopher, *The Æneid of Virgil*, 2 vols (London, 1740)
- , *An Essay on Virgil's Æneid: Being a Translation of the First Book* (London, 1728)
- , 'Part of the First Æneid of Virgil Translated', in *Poems and Translations* (London, 1727), pp. 177-89
- , *Vida's Art of Poetry: Translated into English Verse* (London, 1725)
- , and Joseph Warton, *The Works of Virgil: In Latin and English*, 4 vols. (London, 1753)
- Pope, Alexander, *An Essay on Criticism* (London, 1711)
- , *The Iliad of Homer*, 6 vols (London, 1715-20)
- , *The Odyssey of Homer*, 5 vols (London, 1725-26)
- Reynolds, Sir Joshua, *The Works of Sir Joshua Reynolds*, ed. by Edmond Malone, 3 vols (London, 1798)
- Scott, Sir Walter, ed., *The Works of John Dryden*, 2nd edn, 18 vols (Edinburgh, 1821)
- Shakespeare, William, *Hamlet*, ed. by Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, The Arden Shakespeare: Third Series (London: Thomson Learning, 2006)
- Shiels, Robert, 'The Revd. Mr Christopher Pitt', in *Lives of the Poets of Great-Britain and Ireland*, ed. by Theophilus Cibber, (London, 1753), v, 298-307
- Spence, Joseph, *Letters from the Grand Tour*, ed. by Slava Klima (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1975)
- , *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men*, ed. by James M. Osborn, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), I, 173.
- Strahan, Alexander, *The Æneid of Virgil, Translated into Blank Verse*, 2 vols (London, 1767)
- , *The First Æneid of Virgil, Translated into Blank Verse* (London, 1739)
- , *The First Six Books of Virgil's Æneid, Translated into Blank Verse* (London, 1753)
- Trapp, Joseph, *The Æneis of Virgil, Translated into Blank Verse*, 2 vols (London, 1718-1720)
- Vicars, John, *The XII 'Aeneids' of Virgil, the Most Renowned Laureat-Prince of Latine-Poets: Translated into English Deca-Syllables* (London, 1632)

- Virgil, *Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid, Appendix Vergiliana*, with an English translation by H. Rushton Fairclough, rev. by G. P. Goold, 2 vols, The Loeb Classical Library, 63-64 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999-2000)
- , *L'opere di Virgilio Montano*, ed. by Giovanni Fabrini (Venice, 1672)
- , *Publii Virgilii Maronis Bucolicorum, eclogae X, Georgicorum, libri III, Aeneidos, libri XII*, ed. by Maurus Servius Honoratus (Paris, 1600)
- , *Publii Virgilii Maronis Opera*, ed. by Carolus Ruaeus, 2nd edn (Paris, 1687)
- , *Publii Virgilii Maronis opera cum annotationibus*, ed. by Johannes Min-Ellius (Rotterdam, 1666)
- , *Publii Virgilii Maronis opera cum notis*, ed. by Thomas Farnaby (Amsterdam, 1642)
- Waller, Edmund, and Sidney Godolphin, *The Passion of Dido for Aeneas As It Is Incomparably Express in the Fourth Book of Virgil* (London, 1658)
- Wordsworth, William, *The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth*, ed. by Ernest de Sélincourt, 2nd edn, rev. by Chester L. Shaver, 8 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967)
- , *Lyrical Ballads, and Other Poems, 1797-1800*, ed. by James Butler and Karen Green, The Cornell Wordsworth (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992)
- , *Translations of Chaucer and Virgil*, ed. by Bruce E. Graver, The Cornell Wordsworth (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998)

Secondary Sources

- Adams, Betty Smith, 'Dryden's Translation of Vergil and its Eighteenth-Century Successors' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, 1970)
- Adams, Percy G., 'Pope's Concern with Assonance', *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 9 (1968), 493-502
- Aden, John M, ed., *The Critical Opinions of John Dryden: A Dictionary* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 1963)
- Allison, Alexander Ward, *Toward an Augustan Poetic: Edmund Waller's "Reform" of English Poetry* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1962)
- Armstrong, Richard H., 'Classical Translations of the Classics: The Dynamics of Literary Tradition in Retranslating Epic Poetry' in *Translation and the Classics: Identity as Change in the History of Culture*, ed. by Alexandra Lianeri and Vanda Zajko, Classical Presences (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 169-202

- Attridge, Derek, *The Rhythms of English Poetry* (London: Longman, 1982)
- Barnard, John, 'Dryden, Tonson, and the Patrons of *The Works of Virgil*', in *John Dryden: Tercentenary Essays*, ed. by Paul Hammond and David Hopkins (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 174-239
- Bate, W. Jackson, *The Burden of the Past and the English Poet* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970)
- Bell, Robert H., 'Dryden's *Aeneid* as English Augustan Epic', *Criticism*, 19 (1977), 34-50
- Blessington, Francis C., *Paradise Lost and the Classical Epic* (Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979)
- Bloom, Harold, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, 2nd edn (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- Boddy, Margaret, 'Contemporary Allusions in Lauderdale's *Aeneid*', *N&Q*, 9 (1962), 386-88
- , 'Dryden-Lauderdale Relationships, Some Bibliographical Notes and a Suggestion', *Philological Quarterly*, 42 (1963), 267-72
- , 'The Manuscripts and Printed Editions of the Translation of Virgil Made by Richard Maitland, Fourth Earl of Lauderdale, and the Connexion with Dryden', *N&Q*, 12 (1965), 144-150
- Bottkol, J. McG., 'Dryden's Latin Scholarship', *MP*, 40 (1943), 241-254
- Bredvold, Louis I., 'The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden', in *Dryden: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. by Bernard N. Schilling, Twentieth Century Views (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963), pp. 17-30
- Brenneman, David A., 'Self-Promotion and the Sublime: Fuseli's Dido on the Funeral Pyre', *HLQ*, 62 (1999), 68-87
- Brooks, Harold F., 'The "Imitation" in English Poetry, Especially in Formal Satire, before the Age of Pope', *RES*, 25 (1949), 124-40
- Brower, Reuben A., 'An Allusion to Europe: Dryden and Poetic Tradition', in *Dryden: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. by Bernard N. Schilling, Twentieth Century Views (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963), pp. 43-54
- , 'Dryden's Epic Manner and Virgil', *PMLA*, 55 (1940), 119-38
- Brown, Sarah Annes, 'Women Translators', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), III: 1660-1790, ed. by Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins, pp. 111-20

- Brown, Wallace Cable, *The Triumph of Form: A Study of the Later Masters of the Heroic Couplet* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1948)
- Budick, Sanford, 'Chiasmus and the Making of Literary Tradition: The Case of Wordsworth and "The Days of Dryden and Pope"', *ELH*, 60 (1993), 961-87
- Burrow, Colin, 'Virgil in English Translation', in *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. by Charles Martindale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 21-37
- Bush, Douglas, 'Virgil and Milton', *Classical Journal*, 47 (1952), 178-82, 203-04
- Bushell, Sally, 'Wordsworthian Composition: The Micro-"Prelude"', *Studies in Romanticism*, 44 (2005), 399-421
- Butler, George F., 'The Wrath of Aeneas and the Triumph of the Son: Virgil's Aegaeon and *Paradise Lost*', *Comparative Literature Studies*, 34 (1997), 103-18
- Bywaters, David, 'Historicism Gone Awry: Recent Work on John Dryden', *HLQ*, 63 (2000), 245-255
- Calè, Luisa, 'A Visual Interface for the Act of Reading', *Comparative Critical Studies*, 1 (2004), 97-118
- Caldwell, Tanya, *Virgil Made English: The Decline of Classical Authority* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008)
- Cardinale, Philip, 'Satan as Aeneas: An Allusion to Virgil in *Paradise Lost*', *N&Q*, 50 (2003), 183
- Chernaik, Warren L., *The Poetry of Limitation: A Study of Edmund Waller* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1968)
- Corns, Thomas N., 'Milton's English', in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. by Thomas N. Corns (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 90-106
- Creaser, John, 'The Line in *Paradise Lost*', in *The Cambridge Companion to Paradise Lost*, ed. by Louis Schwartz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 81-93
- D'Addario, Christopher, 'Dryden and the Historiography of Exile: Milton and Virgil in Dryden's Late Period', *HLQ*, 67 (2004), 553-72
- Davis, Paul, *Translation and the Poet's Life: The Ethics of Translating in English Culture, 1646-1726* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Doherty, Kevin F., 'On Wordsworth's *Aeneid*', *Classical World*, 54 (1961), 213-17
- Duro, Paul, 'Observations on the Burkean Sublime', *Word & Image*, 29 (2013), 40-58

- Eliot, T. S. 'John Dryden', in *Dryden: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. by Bernard N. Schilling, Twentieth Century Views (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963), pp. 8-16
- Fairclough, Henry Rushton, 'The Influence of Virgil upon the Forms of English Verse', *Classical Journal*, 26 (1930), 74-94
- Fairer, David, 'Creating a National Poetry: The Tradition of Spenser and Milton', in *The Cambridge Companion to Eighteenth-Century Poetry*, ed. by John Sitter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 177-201
- Fallon, Stephen M., 'Satan's Return to Hell: Milton's Concealed Dialogue with Homer and Virgil', *Milton Quarterly*, 18 (1984), 78-81
- Farmer, John David, 'Henry Fuseli, Milton and English Romanticism', *Bulletin of the Art Institute of Chicago (1973-1982)*, 68.4 (1974), 14-19
- Fitzgerald, Robert, 'Dryden's *Aeneid*', *Arion*, 2.3 (1963), 17-31
- France, Peter, ed., *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- Frost, William, *Dryden and the Art of Translation*, Yale Studies in English, 1 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1955)
- , *John Dryden: Dramatist, Satirist, Translator*, AMS Studies in the Seventeenth Century, 3 (New York: AMS Press, 1988)
- Fujimura, Thomas H., 'Dryden's Poetics: The Expressive Values in Poetry', *JEGP*, 74 (1975), 195-208
- Gelber, Michael Werth, *The Just and the Lively: The Literary Criticism of John Dryden* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999).
- Gillespie, Stuart, 'A Checklist of Restoration English Translations and Adaptations of Classical Greek and Latin Poetry, 1660-1700', *Translation and Literature*, 1 (1992), 52-67.
- , 'The Developing Corpus of Literary Translation', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), III: 1660-1790, ed. by Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins, pp. 123-46
- , *English Translation and Classical Reception: Towards a New Literary History* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011)
- , ed., *John Dryden, Classicist and Translator* (= *Translation and Literature*, 10 (2001))

- , ‘Literary Afterlives: Metempsychosis from Ennius to Jorge Luis Borges’, in *Classical Literary Careers and Their Reception*, ed. by Philip Hardie and Helen Moore (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 209-25
- , and Penelope Wilson, ‘The Publishing and Readership of Translation’, in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), III: 1660-1790, ed. by Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins, pp. 38-51
- Grandsen, K. W., ‘Paradise Lost and the Aeneid’, *EinC*, 17 (1967), 281-303
- Graver, Bruce, ‘Wordsworth and the Language of Epic: The Translation of the Aeneid’, *SP*, 83 (1986), 261-85
- , ‘Wordsworth and the Romantic Art of Translation’, *Wordsworth Circle*, 17 (1986), 169-74
- , ‘Wordsworth’s Georgic Beginnings’, *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 33 (1991), 137-59
- Griffin, Dustin, ‘Milton and the Decline of Epic in the Eighteenth Century’, *New Literary History*, 14 (1982), 143-54
- , *Regaining Paradise: Milton and the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)
- Hammond, Paul, *Dryden and the Traces of Classical Rome* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)
- Hardie, Philip, *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*, Roman Literature and its Contexts (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993)
- Hardwick, Lorna, *Reception Studies*, New Surveys in the Classics, 33 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003)
- Harrison, T. W., ‘English Virgil: The Aeneid in the XVIII Century’, *Philologica Pragensia*, 10 (1967), 1-11, 80-91
- Havelock, Eric A., ‘The Aeneid and Its Translators’, *Hudson Review*, 27 (1974), 338-70
- Havens, Raymond Dexter *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*, 2nd edn (New York: Faber & Faber, 1961)
- Hayes, Julie Candler, *Translation, Subjectivity, and Culture in France and England, 1600-1800* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009)
- Hodgson, John A., ‘“Was it for This . . . ?”: Wordsworth’s Virgilian Questionings’, *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*, 33 (1991), 125-36
- Hopkins, David, *Conversing with Antiquity: English Poets and the Classics, from Shakespeare to Pope* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)

- , and Pat Rogers, 'The Translator's Trade', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), III: 1660-1790, ed. by Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins, pp. 81-95
- , and I. D. MacKillop, "'Immortal Vida" and Basil Kennett', *RES*, 27 (1976), 137-47
- Horsman, E. A., 'Dryden's French Borrowings', *RES*, n.s., 1 (1950), 346-51
- Hughes, Ted, 'Myths, Metres, Rhythms', in *Winter Pollen: Occasional Prose*, ed. by William Scammel (London: Faber and Faber, 1994)
- Irwin, David, 'Fuseli's Milton Gallery: Unpublished Letters', *Burlington Magazine*, 101 (1959), 436-37, 439-40
- Jensen, H. James, *A Glossary of John Dryden's Critical Terms* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969)
- Kennedy, Duncan F., 'Virgilian Epic', in *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. by Charles Martindale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 145-54
- King, James, 'An Unlikely Alliance: Fuseli as Revisor of Cowper's Homer', *Neophilologus*, 67 (1983), 468-79
- Kolbrener, William, 'Reception', in *The Cambridge Companion to Paradise Lost*, ed. by Louis Schwartz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 195-210
- Lefevere, André, 'Translated Literature: Towards an Integrated Theory', *Bulletin of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, 14.1 (1981), 68-78
- Levine, Joseph M., 'Bentley's Milton: Philology and Criticism in Eighteenth-Century England', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 50 (1989), 549-68
- Love, Harold, 'The Art of Adaptation: Some Restoration Treatments of Ovid', in *Poetry and Drama 1570-1700: Essays in Honour of Harold F. Brooks*, ed. by Antony Coleman and Antony Hammond (London: Methuen, 1981)
- Lynch, Jack, 'Betwixt Two Ages Cast: Milton, Johnson, and the English Renaissance', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 61 (2000), 397-413
- Mason, Eudo C., *The Mind of Henry Fuseli: Selections from his Writings* (Frome: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1951)
- Mason, John Robert, 'To Milton through Dryden and Pope; or, God Man, and Nature: *Paradise Lost* Regained?' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 1986)
- Matthew, H. C. G., and Brian Harrison, eds., *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004-)

- Miner, Earl W, 'Introduction: Borrowed Plumage, Varied Umbrage', in *Literary Transmission and Authority: Dryden and Other Writers*, ed. by Earl Miner and Jennifer Brady (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 1-26
- Morgan, Edwin: 'Dryden's Drudging', in *Dryden: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. by Bernard N. Schilling, Twentieth Century Views (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963), pp. 55-70
- Morton, Richard, "'Bringing Virgil over into Britain": John Dryden Refigures *Aeneid* 1-5', *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture*, 27 (1998), 147-67
- Newlyn, Lucy, *Paradise Lost and the Romantic Reader* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)
- Norton-Smith, John, 'Virgil's Influence on Milton's Similes', in *Virgil in a Cultural Tradition: Essays to Celebrate the Bimillennium*, ed. by Richard A. Cardwell and Janet Hamilton, University of Nottingham Monographs in the Humanities, 4 (Nottingham: University of Nottingham, 1986), 106-14
- Orgel, Stephen, 'The Renaissance Artist as Plagiarist', *ELH*, 48 (1981), 476-95
- Osborn, James M., *John Dryden: Some Biographical Facts and Problems* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940)
- Piper, William Bowman, *The Heroic Couplet* (Cleveland, OH: The Press of Case Western Reserve University, 1969)
- Pop, Andrei, 'Henry Fuseli: Greek Tragedy and Cultural Pluralism', *Art Bulletin*, 94 (2012), 78-98
- Porter, William M., *Reading the Classics and Paradise Lost* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993)
- Power, Henry, 'The *Aeneid* in the Age of Milton', in *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and Its Tradition*, ed. by Joseph Farrell and Michael C. J. Putnam (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010)
- Proudfoot, Leslie, *Dryden's 'Aeneid' and Its Seventeenth Century Predecessors* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1960)
- Putnam, Michael C. J., 'The *Aeneid* and *Paradise Lost*: Ends and Conclusions', *Literary Imagination*, 8 (2006): 387-410
- Quint, David, *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993)
- Raymer, A. J., 'Virgil and Wordsworth: The Poetry of Romanticism', *Greece & Rome*, 9 (October 1939), 13-25

- Reynolds, Matthew, *The Poetry of Translation: From Chaucer and Petrarch to Homer and Logue* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Richardson, Janette, 'Virgil and Milton Once Again', *Comparative Literature*, 14 (1962), 321-31
- Ricks, Christopher, *Milton's Grand Style* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963)
- Riley, Edgar H., 'Milton's Tribute to Virgil', *SP*, 26 (1929), 155-65
- Roe, Nicholas, 'Wordsworth, Milton, and the Politics of Poetic Influence', *Yearbook of English Studies*, 19 (1989), 112-26
- Rosenberg, D. M., *Oaten Reeds and Trumpets: Pastoral and Epic in Virgil, Spenser, and Milton* (London: Associated University Presses, 1981)
- Rounce, Adam, 'Housing the Alien: Translation in the Long Eighteenth Century', *MP*, 105 (2007), 326-36
- Rudat, Wolfgang E. H., 'Milton's Satan and Virgil's Juno: The "Perverseness" of Disobedience in *Paradise Lost*', *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Reforme*, 3 (1979), 77-82
- Ryskamp, Charles, 'Cowper's Ambition: Two Documents': *Yale University Library Gazette*, 34 (1960), 152-62
- Sanders, Julie, *Adaptation and Appropriation, The New Critical Idiom* (London: Routledge, 2006)
- Shears, Jonathon, *The Romantic Legacy of Paradise Lost: Reading against the Grain* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009)
- Sherbo, Arthur, 'Dryden and the Fourth Earl of Lauderdale', *Studies in Bibliography*, 39 (1986), 199-210
- , 'Dryden as a Cambridge Editor', *Studies in Bibliography*, 38 (1985), 251-61
- Skouen, Tina, 'The Vocal Wit of John Dryden', *Rhetorica*, 24 (2006), 371-402
- Sloman, Judith, *Dryden: The Poetics of Translation*, prepared for publication by Anne McWhir (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985)
- Sowerby, Robin, *The Augustan Art of Poetry: Augustan Translation of the Classics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)
- , 'Pitt, Christopher (1699-1748)', in *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), III: 1660-1790, ed. by Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins, p. 539
- Spiegelman, Willard, 'Wordsworth's *Aeneid*', *Comparative Literature*, 26 (1974), 97-109

- Steadman, John M., 'Milton, Virgil, and St. Jerome (*Paradise Lost*, III, 168-170)', *N&Q*, 6 (1959), 368-69
- Steiner, Thomas R., *English Translation Theory, 1650-1800* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1975)
- , and Suzanne Langer, 'Precursors to Dryden: English and French Theories of Translation in the Seventeenth Century', *Comparative Literature Studies*, 7 (1970), 50-81
- Stevenson, Kay Gillard, 'Reading Milton, 1674-1800', in *A Companion to Milton*, ed. by Thomas N. Corns (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), pp. 447-62
- Stewart, Susan, 'The Pickpocket: A Study in Tradition and Allusion', *MLN*, 95 (1980), 1127-54
- Struever, Nancy S., 'Translation as Taste', *Eighteenth Century*, 22 (1981), 32-46
- Swedenberg, H. T., Jr, 'Rules and English Critics of the Epic, 1650-1800', *SP*, 35 (1938), 566-87
- Taylor, Carole Anne, 'Wordsworth's Vergil: "Laodamia" and the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*', *Vergilius*, 26 (1980), 39-47
- Thackeray, Mark, 'Christopher Pitt, Joseph Warton, and Virgil', *RES*, 43 (1992), 329-46
- Thale, Mary, 'Dryden's Critical Vocabulary: The Imitation of Nature', *Papers on Language and Literature*, 2 (1966), 315-26
- , 'Dryden's Unwritten Epic', *Papers on Language and Literature*, 5 (1969) 423-33
- Thomas, Richard F., 'Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference', *HSCP*, 90 (1986), 171-98
- , *Virgil and the Augustan Reception* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- Tillotson, Geoffrey, *Augustan Studies* (London: Athlone Press, 1961)
- Tomlinson, Charles, *Poetry and Metamorphosis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983)
- Van Doren, Mark, *The Poetry of John Dryden* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920)
- Venuti, Lawrence, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd edn (Routledge: London, 2008)
- von Maltzahn, Nicholas, 'Milton's Readers', in *The Cambridge Companion to Milton*, ed. by Dennis Danielson, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 236-52
- Wallerstein, Ruth, 'The Development of the Rhetoric and Metre of the Heroic Couplet, Especially in 1625-1645', *PMLA*, 50 (1935), 166-209
- Wasserman, Earl R., 'The Return of the Enjambed Couplet', *ELH*, 7 (1940), 239-52

- Weinbrot, Howard D., “‘An Ambition to Excell’: The Aesthetics of Emulation in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries’, *HLQ*, 48 (1985), 121-39
- , ‘Translation and Parody: Towards the Genealogy of the Augustan Imitation’, *ELH*, 33 (1966), 434-47
- Weinfield, Henry, *The Blank-Verse Tradition from Milton to Stevens: Freethinking and the Crisis of Modernity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
- West, Michael, ‘Dryden’s Ambivalence as a Translator of Heroic Themes’, *HLQ*, 36 (1973), 347-66
- Wheatley, David, ‘Arcs of Movement: The Heroic Couplet’, in *A Companion to Poetic Genre*, ed. by Erik Martiny, Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture, 77 (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), pp. 263-76
- Williamson, George, ‘The Rhetorical Pattern of Neo-Classical Wit’, *MP*, 33 (1935), 55-81
- Winn, James Anderson, *John Dryden and His World* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987)
- Zetzel, James E. G., ‘Re-Creating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian Past’, *Critical Inquiry*, 10 (1983), 83-105
- Zwicker, Steven N., *Politics and Language in Dryden’s Poetry: The Arts of Disguise* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984)