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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Gavin Douglas's Eneados: Dialogue and Auctoritas

... bote God of hys mercy and grace hab ordeyned doubel remedy [for language differences]. On ys pat som man lurnep and knoweþ meny dyvers speches; and so bytwene strange men of þe whoche noþer understondep opereþ speche such a man may be mene and telle eyper what poper wol mene.

In this brief passage1 from his Dialogue between a Lord and a Clerk, John Trevisa (ca. 1342-1402) portrays the translator in terms that at first may seem unremarkable: a translator is someone who is able to help people of different tongues understand one another.2 But the portrait suggests far more than this. The multi-lingual person, Trevisa tells us, is one of God's ways of countering the "gret meschef pat volweþ now mankuynde"—speech diversity (the source of which being, of course, the building of the Tower of Babel [Gen. 11.1-9]); in effect, the translator's role is a divinely sanctioned one. More important, perhaps, is Trevisa's prominent figuring of the translator as a "mene," an intermediary, an exceedingly powerful role for the translator who, as Trevisa punningly implies, ultimately has control over what different people

1
"wol mene." This role is given further prominence shortly afterward, when Trevisa proposes a more complex picture of a reader moving among different languages. The clerk objects that if one understands Latin, there is no need for translation into English. The Lord replies:

"Y denye þys argument; for þey I cunne speke and rede and understonde Latyn, þer ys moche Latyn in þeus bokes of cronyks þat ðy can nocht understonde, noþer þou wipoute studyinge and avysement and lokyng of oper bokes. Also, þey hyt were nocht neodful vor me, hyt is neodful vor opere men þat understondeþ no Latyn."

(215-16)

Only the most linguistically skillful can manage Latin without "studyinge and avysement and lokyng of oper bokes," a reminder not only that Latin was often difficult even for the medieval "literate" but also of the profoundly intertextual model of reading to be grasped by us in our readings of the Middle Ages. And the model raises a question as well: if a Latin writer was an auctor, a figure of respect, admiration, trust, and ultimately cultural power, how ought we to conceive the role of the person moderating this dialogue among "dyvers tonges"? The pun on "mene" in the first section and this picture of consultation and "avysement" direct our attention to a connection between mediation and meaning, between communication and power, that I believe was a crucial interest for the Middle Scots poet-translator Gavin Douglas. For Douglas, this connection
reveals itself in—indeed, in my opinion, generates—his great translation of Virgil's *Aeneid*, the *Eneados*, revealing itself in his self-conscious attention in his text both to his role as an intermediary and to the ways in which that role can be "renegotiated" as the role of vernacular *auctor*.³

We can get a first glimpse of this negotiation by examining briefly two passages from Douglas's opening prologue.⁴ The first is Douglas's "protestatioun" (1 Prol. 104), wherein he begins by prominently referring to the *Eneados* as "my wark" (106) and admonishing his readers to "Consider it warly, reid oftar than anys— / Weill at a blenk sle poetry nocht tayn is" (107-8).⁵ The poet at once creates an implied audience in the text and effects a kind of unity with that audience, referring conspicuously to his work being in "Scottis" (as distinct from "Inglys") and "our tong" (118-19). Douglas retreats a bit from this claim for the poetic intricacy in his own text when he admits to the difficulty of translating Virgil and requests of his audience, "I pray you note me nocht at euery word" (126). As a third strategy, he even initiates an ongoing model of textual indeterminacy; Douglas insists that, no matter how much we study Virgil, "The rycht sentens perchance is fer to seik" (133). In this "protestacioun," very early in his poem, Douglas invokes on the one hand a responsive implied
audience, and on the other the inability of that audience to arrive at Virgil's "rycht sentens." The only hope for this audience and for us is, perhaps, our guiding "mene."

Near the end of the prologue to the first book of the Eneados we come upon our second introductory example, a passage that illustrates still more of the rhetorical strategies and interpretive concerns intrinsic to Douglas's work and one that it will pay to examine in some detail. In the course of recounting the disapproving view of Aeneas professed by "mastir Chauser," a view which Douglas regards as grossly misleading, the Scots poet asserts the most troubling consequence of Chaucer's interpretation—he has "gretly Virgill offendit" (1 Prol. 410)—and argues for his own understanding of Aeneas's character. I quote this passage in full:

Thus, wenyng allane Ene to haue reprevit,
He has gretly the prynce of poetis grevit,
For, as said is, Virgill dyd diligens
Bot spot of cryme, reproch or ony offens
Eneas for to loif and magnyfy,
And gif he grantis hym maynsworn fowlely,
Than all hys cuyr and crafty engyne gais guyte,
Hys twelf yheris laubouris war nocht worth a myte.
Certis Virgin schawys Ene dyd na thing (425)
From Dydo of Cartage at hys departyng
Bot quhilk the goddis commandit hym beforn,
And gif that thar command maid hym maynsworn,
That war repreif to thar diuinyte
And na reproch onto the said Enee.
Als in the first, quhar Ilioneus (431)
Speksis to the queyn Dido, says he nocht thus,
Thar curs by faite was set tyll Italy?
Thus mycht scho not pretend na iust caus quhy
Thocht Troianys eftir departis of Cartage,
Sen thai befor declaryt hir thar vayage.
Reid the ferd buke quhar Queyn Dido is wraith,  
Thar sal ye fynd Ene maid nevir aith,           (438)  
Promyt nor band with hir fortill abyde:  
Thus hym tobe maynsworn may nevir betyde,   
Nor nane onkyndes schew forto depart  
At the bydding of Iove with reuthfull hart,    
Sen the command of God obey suld all  
And vndir his charge na wrangwys deid may fall.  

(1 Prol. 417-44)

The poet's first concern in this passage is Virgilian authority. Douglas the would-be literary historian reminds us of the Roman poet's care in composing the Aeneid, his genius, his "diligens" in depicting Aeneas's character without fault. "Virgil" is constructed here as an authoritative persona that could not make a mistake—for the reader to suggest that he could, and in so doing undermine the coherence of the Aeneid, would simply leave the "pryme of poetis grevit," and destroy the artistic integrity of his work—an integrity which is as much a personal concern for Douglas, now that he is Virgil's translator, as it was for Virgil himself.

Douglas's own authority is the other concern here. For Douglas, Virgil's poetic intention is clear—how could it not be, tautologically speaking, since Virgil was such a brilliant poet? But his intention is not so clear as not to benefit from a bit of Douglas's (authoritative) explanation, as translator and interpreter, as well. Douglas offers two rather standard arguments for his defense of Aeneas and, by extension, of Virgil: (1) the Trojans were fated to leave
Carthage and therefore had no choice in the matter, and (2) Aeneas and his men never promised they would stay anyway. But in a more intriguing rhetorical move he very closely allies himself with Virgil's authoritative text by calling to our attention Ilioneus, Aeneas's comrade and spokesman, a role which in this passage Douglas is implicitly adopting for himself. At this moment Douglas is Aeneas's spokesman. Circling back to Virgilian authority, or rather, directly appropriating Virgilian textual authority for his own use, Douglas invokes the text itself—in particular a scene that includes a defense of Aeneas. Douglas points to the mention of the Trojans' fated course, but Ilioneus, addressing Dido, refers to his noble king as well:

\[
\text{rex erat Aeneas nobis, quo iustior alter}
\text{ nec pietate fuit, nec bello maior et armis.}
\]

(I.544-45)

To ws was kyng the worthy Eneas,
Ane iustar man in all the warld nane was,
Nor mair reuthfull, nor wisar into weir,
And mair valiant in dedis of armys seir

(I.8.89-92)

In Douglas's translation, which we presumably are meant (or at least invited) to turn to following the prologue-narrator's reference, *pietate* becomes "reuthfull," or "compassionate," and *maior* gets expanded to "mair valiant" and "wisar." "Worthy," though in part a metrical filler, further elaborates and underscores the praise of Aeneas
which we have already been told was one of Virgil's primary concerns. As does the subsequent reference to "Queyn Dido" and Book IV, the reference to Ilioneus's speech subtly reminds the audience of the close connection between Virgil's text and Douglas's.

Further rhetorical maneuvering comes into play when Douglas adds his own marginal notes to this passage in his own prologue. What we read is another voice—that is, a voice other than the prologue narrator's—a critical voice, which simultaneously gives the impression of objectivity and even-handedness even as it insists on and maintains the authority of Douglas's own text. The marginal note to line 425 reads:

This argument excusis nocht the tratory of Eneas na his manswerying, considering quhat is said heir afoir in the ii c. of this prolog, that is,

Iuno nor Venus goddes neuer war,
Mercur, Neptun, Mars nor Iupiter,
Of Forton eik, nor his necessite,
Sic thingis nocht attentik ar, wait we.
It folowis than that Eneas vroucht nocht be command of ony goddis, bot of his awyn fre wyl, be the permission of God . . . .

Naturally, the addition of interpretive commentary to his own prologue is an implicit claim for the authority of his text; like Virgil's own work, Douglas's is worthy of commentative explication, not to mention citation in interpretive counter-arguments. Moreover, what seems to arise is a kind of instability, wherein the explicative
voice for Virgil's text, recounting an apologia for Aeneas, is challenged by the explicative voice for Douglas's text, leading us to question the reliability of the prologue voice. A second note to the passage, however, seems to resolve the issue. It tersely states:

Heir he argouis better than befoir.

We are reassured. In the hands of a capable interpreter, and by implication a capable translator—a helpful "mene"—we can readily follow his suggestion (command?) and "Reid the ferd buke" (437), and thereby come to a conclusion already laid out for us—in the prologue—and already approved—in the marginal gloss. Douglas does more than offer an interpretation of Aeneas here; he actively attempts to forestall other interpretations by directing his readers' thoughts (and indeed their actions), and by circumscribing the boundaries of interpretive response.

These interrelations between the respective roles of translator and interpreter have received recent and substantial critical attention—but not with regard to the Eneados. Rita Copeland characterizes medieval vernacular translation as "a rhetorical enterprise embodying a process of reception and appropriation" (42). Surveying the connections between translation and interpretation, and between translation and rhetorical inventio, Copeland argues that:
The [medieval] translator aspires to penetrate the language of the original by acute understanding; but once opened through active understanding, the language of the original is expected to inform, to shape the translator's language, the values of that original language to flow into, to penetrate, the translator's native medium in an enactment of a process of linguistic reception. The translator thus performs an act of aggressive interpretation so as to lay open his language and usage to receive a formative influence.

Further, as Copeland remarks, taking Chaucer's Boece as her main example, translation is an "instructive exercise which enables a discovery and mastery of one's own language through fidelity to and contest with another language. . . . Boece, then, represents a model of translation as a testing out of meaning and language against textual authority" (44; 62). Any effort of poetic translation--authorial professions of humility and inadequacy, however profuse, notwithstanding--is at least implicitly an invitation to comparison, preferably favorable comparison, with the original. Two characteristics of the relationship between the original, authoritative text and the "upstart" vernacular translation thus arise. The original text simultaneously poses a threat--insofar as it can be a far too strict standard by which to measure the translation, and thereby serve as a guarantee for failure--and serves as an aid to the poetic power of the translation itself.
Moreover, inasmuch as the original text is canonical, the translated text inherently aspires to a "vernacular canonical status of [its] own" (Copeland, "Rhetoric and Vernacular Translation," 56).

Thus Copeland places translation securely within the realm of rhetorical *inventio*, and thereby constitutes it as a practice which by its nature is meant both to discover and to create anew the literary possibilities of one's own language:

This *inventional* model . . . can explain how medieval vernacular translations can radically differentiate themselves from the original texts, almost to the point of displacing or obscuring those texts, while at the same time serving those texts through verbal and substantive replication. This model can explain how, paradoxically, medieval translations can achieve the status of primary texts within the vernacular literary traditions, as they substitute themselves, through interpretive refiguration, for the original text.

(74-75)

The implications for our understanding of the *Eneados* are evident, particularly when we recall passages like the following at the end of Douglas's book:

Go, wlgar Virgill, to euerych churlych wight
Say, I avow thou art translatit rycht,
Beseyk all nobillys the corect and amend,
Beys not afferyt tocum in prysaris sycht;
The nedis nocht to aschame of the lycht,
For I haue brocht thy purpos to gud end:
Now salt thou with euery gentill Scot be kend,
And to onletterit folk be red on hight,
That erst was bot with clerkis comprehend.
Douglas envisioned (and, as I will argue below, took pains to create by means of his text) the widest possible audience for his work—namely, an audience made up of people who knew Virgil in Latin and those who did not, and, perhaps more importantly, people who could know Virgil in Latin and those who could not. Those who knew Virgil in the original were presumably the majority of the "prysaris," ready to judge the relative merits and shortcomings of the translation since, of course, "[t]ranslations can only be judged by people who do not need them" (Lefevere 7). Those with Latin who had not read (or read thoroughly) Virgil are a likely but often overlooked group of Douglas's readers; we might suppose that the "wlgar Virgill" might well obviate many reasons for them to turn to the Latin, thus reinforcing Douglas's translation as the canonical Virgil within the Scots culture. The "onletterit folk" here are at the greatest advantage and the greatest disadvantage, depending on one's point of view. Virgil is now within their grasp, but they are most subject to Douglas's interpretation of Virgil's text. Conceivably, however, they do have a great deal of individual interpretive power over Douglas's text, and one of the ways Douglas's discomfort with this situation is made manifest is in his reiteration, his insistence, here put in the "mouth" of his book, that the Aeneid has now been
"translatit rycht." In order to lay the groundwork for guiding his audience's interpretation of Virgil, Douglas must make sure that the "rightness"—not necessarily the word-for-word accuracy—of the translation itself need not be questioned. Not Virgil but "wllgar Virgill" will be known by "every gentill Scot"—indeed to all Scots, without qualification, if we are to believe Douglas's idealized picture: an extension of the audience which, like the translation of the Bible into the vernacular, threatens interpretive consistency and any prescribed correctness of understanding.

Thus we come to the problem of constructing and guiding readership and, along with it, another issue of crucial importance to a reading of the Eneados, the issue of poetic authority. Like translation, authority is at once an enabling and a restraining practice—and I use the word "practice" consciously, since authority, particularly in the case of Douglas, is a quality appropriated and constructed by the author and by the textual community of which he is a part—one that empowers the author but at the same time asks of him responsibility to some greater ideal. In Douglas's case, and underscoring the connection between translation and authority, this ideal would be fidelity to the text and sentence of Virgil. This dialectic of freedom and restraint is a powerful one in Douglas as in other writers of the
Middle Ages and Renaissance. As Jacqueline Miller writes, "the author often attempts to maintain a delicate balance between various untenable alternatives, and the resulting tensions imbue and often generate the work" (5). The self-effacing translator who recognizes the necessity of interpretation in translation and the power and (at least potential) authority that goes along with it; the writer constrained by his "bad, harsk spech and lewit barbour tong" (1 Prol. 21) who can exclaim at the end of his work "Throw owt the ile yclepit Albyon / Red sall I be, and sung with mony one" (Conclusio 12-13): the problem of vernacular poetic authority fuels these apparent contradictions, a problem which, I shall argue, Douglas as poet and translator addresses throughout his Eneados.

The concepts of author (auctor) and audience are touched on in the above paragraph, and they are integral parts of the problem of authority. "In a literary context," A. J. Minnis writes:

the term auctor denoted someone who was at once a writer and an authority, someone not merely to be read but also to be respected and believed. . . . The term . . . may profitably be regarded as an accolade bestowed upon a popular writer by those later scholars and writers who used extracts from his works as sententious statements or auctoritates, gave lectures on his works in the form of textual commentaries, or employed them as literary models.

(10)
In this sense, of course, the genuine auctor wrote in Latin, not the vernacular. The problem of being an auctor writing in the vernacular was a real one for writers of the fourteenth, fifteenth and, in Douglas's case, the early sixteenth centuries. As a vernacular writer, Douglas could not inherently claim the cultural status of auctor; his approach to the problem is to create the Eneados, a text which in effect "dramatiz(es) his emergence as a vernacular author" (Machan 195). The audience for whom this emergence is dramatized is critical to the success of Douglas's enterprise. The status of auctor and the importance of auctoritas are indeed cultural constructs, ascribed to writers and their works by an audience—or more troubling for a writer seeking this status, by different audiences for different reasons and in different ways; to put it simply, in Douglas's case, his audiences must "believe" his dramatization.

There exists, consequently, a necessary and dynamic cultural association between author, authority, and audience, an association which late medieval translation by its nature relied on, orchestrated, and changed. The critical metaphor, borrowed from the writings of Mikhail Bakhtin, which I propose to use to discuss this relationship between author, authority, and audience as it is played out in the Eneados is that of dialogism. Author, authority, and
audience exist in various dialogic relationships which themselves can be negotiated for particular purposes or toward particular ends. This dissertation represents an effort to delineate the various ways in which Gavin Douglas negotiates this dynamic, dialogic triad of author, authority, and audience in order to establish both his own status as a vernacular author and the cultural status of the Eneados as an authoritative text.\

A few words are now required about Bakhtin's concept of dialogism and its usefulness in talking about translation in general and Douglas's translation in particular. Bakhtin never discusses translation per se, and only very recently have Bakhtin's writings—I resist, as does Bakhtin, using the word "theories"—been applied to understanding the phenomena surrounding translation. Caryl Emerson asked in an article published several years ago "Does Bakhtin offer us a theory of translation?" and answered her own question, "In the widest sense, yes, inevitably: in essence translation is all man does" (23). In essence, Emerson's right. For Bakhtin, as Emerson puts it, "To understand another person at any given moment . . . is to come to terms with meaning on the boundary between one's own and another's language: to translate" (24). But it is important not to oversimplify this interaction; as Bakhtin writes, "One cannot understand understanding as a translation from the
other's language into one's own language" (Speech Genres 141). Understanding is itself a situation of dialogic interaction, and a translation, as a kind of dramatization of understanding or interpretation, operates on such boundaries, in this kind of dialogic mode. "The event of the life of the text . . . " Bakhtin insists, "always develops on the boundary between two consciousnesses, two subjects" (Speech Genres 106; emphasis in the original).

Behind these assertions lies the recognition that every "utterance," Bakhtin's fundamental unit of communication, exists as a response to preceding utterances: "Each utterance refutes, affirms, supplements, and relies on the others, presupposes them to be known, and somehow takes them into account" (Speech Genres 91). A translation, particularly a translation such as Douglas's Eneados, not only does these things but also makes use of, or manufactures poetic and cultural value from, the necessity of doing them. Closely related to Bakhtin's notion of the inherent responsiveness of the utterance, in fact dialogue's enabling precondition, is the concept of "heteroglossia," or multi-voicedness. As Bakhtin writes in The Dialogic Imagination:

Authorial speech, the speeches of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia can enter the novel; each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide
variety of their links and interrelationships (always more or less dialogized).

(263)21

The multi-voiced nature of the Eneados has been touched on already, and more analysis of the heteroglossic character of Douglas's text is offered in the following chapters. The point here is that Douglas's introduction, in both his prologues and his translation, of new voices into the Aeneid calls our attention to the fundamentally dialogic nature of translation.22 This dialogue is the means by which he attempts to create his own authoritative discourse, to renegotiate poetic authority in his own favor.

The Eneados is a vast work, far more massive in fact than the Aeneid itself: Douglas typically translates every line of Latin into approximately 2.5 lines of Scots, and includes verse prologues and envois, marginal commentary, a translation of Maphaeus Vegius's fifteenth-century Supplementum to the Aeneid, and innumerable translative expansions and explanations. In contrast to this immense body of primary material, comparatively little critical work has been produced on the Eneados. That work which has appeared tends to deal with very confined details, such as articles on individual prologues, or to amount to generalized "appreciations" (that often lean toward surveying where Douglas has "departed" from Virgil). One important exception to this rule has been Priscilla
Bawcutt's magisterial book on Gavin Douglas and his works (1976), a tremendous source of information but a book that, curiously, has seemed to mark almost the last word on Douglas rather than function as the springboard for further study. The most recent articles on the Eneados, those by Ruth Morse (1990) and A. E. C. Canitz (1991), respectively, suffer from being unable to offer a "way into" the whole of the poem without resorting to gross overgeneralizations about the translation and remaining more or less restricted by very traditional critical approaches and concerns. My interest in the intersection of translation and authority, along with the dialogic model of translated discourse that informs it, enables us to approach the Eneados in a way that allows for an inclusive view of the poem but that remains rooted in close textual analysis. Given my assertion of the dialogic nature of translation, however, I too could get lost in the Eneados's vastness, since conceivably every line could be analyzed as a double-voiced representation of the Aeneid. My answer to this potential problem is to focus on points in the text where Douglas most obviously makes dialogue and/or authority an issue—"seams" in the text that divulge its heteroglossic character, textual moments that dramatize most overtly Douglas's negotiation of the questions surrounding vernacular poetic authority. Chapter II is an examination of the prologues that discusses the
many ways Douglas constructs both overt and implied dialogues in his verse, setting up a kind of textual arena, founded on dialogue, within which his translation operates; in these prologues we can see most readily Douglas's use of multiple addressees and the manipulation of authority that goes along with it. The third chapter discusses the translation of the first book of the *Aeneid*, exploring multi-voiced, dialogic discourse in the translation and between the Virgilian text and Douglas's marginal commentary. In Chapter IV I focus on Douglas's translation of Maphaeus Vegius's *Supplementum*, in an effort to understand how Douglas deals with the authoritative challenge of another would-be *auctor* who has created his own (Latin) response to Virgil. A brief final chapter looks at the *Eneados*'s closing poems and attempts to summarize (but not finalize) my own dialogue with Gavin Douglas's *Eneados*. I believe this approach and organization offer an avenue around the problem of seeing an impenetrable boundary between "proloog" and "buke," of talking about the *Eneados* in a way that fragments the text unnecessarily and to its detriment, and of addressing Douglas's principal concern as a vernacular writer. The areas of the text chosen for examination are admittedly selective, but necessarily and propitiously so.
Finally, in writing about the dialogue which Gavin Douglas creates, orchestrates, and manipulates I am well aware also of the dialogue I am creating. In the Scots poet's fashion, I am orchestrating Douglas's voices, critics' voices, and my own voice--acting, in effect, as a "mene"--toward the end of articulating my encounter and interaction with the text. Douglas's *Eneados*, I argue, represents a kind of "hermeneutical dialogue" (Robinson xv) and this dissertation, I hope, is one as well. But as necessarily a constitutive participant in my own dialogue with Douglas's work, I of course hold no illusions about the "definitiveness" of my reading. Conceiving of Douglas's encounter with Virgil and our encounters with Douglas as fundamentally dialogic ought to encourage, I hope, further readings and re-readings of Douglas, as, in Bakhtin's word, an "unfinalizable" dialogue between Douglas, Virgil, and readers of Douglas continues, further enriched by further voices.
NOTES TO CHAPTER I


2. The Dialogue is to be found appended to Trevisa's English translation of Ranulf Higden's Polychronicon; the Latin version survives in over 100 manuscripts, while the dialogue is included in five of the fourteen surviving manuscripts of the translation (Burrow and Turville-Petre 213; see also Waldron). While there is no direct evidence Gavin Douglas knew the Dialogue or the translation, given the breadth of his reading and his interest in history, he may well have encountered it. On Douglas's historical concerns, see Bawcutt, Gavin Douglas (hereafter GD), 30-31.

3. My understanding and use of the term "negotiate" is informed by the recent work of Lee Patterson and Stephen Greenblatt, critics who, notwithstanding important differences in their respective approaches, share an interest in delineating the circulation and negotiation of cultural power in earlier English culture. I argue that Douglas is indeed involved in a project of "negotiating" in the Eneados--"dealing with" the matter of vernacular auctoritas, and "bringing about" or developing his own
auctoritas through his address of a very real cultural condition: the inferior status of the vernacular vis à vis the cultural authority of Latin. The verb also communicates the important image of ongoing discussion that I see as central to an understanding of the "dialogic" nature of translated discourse in general and of the Eneados in particular. I explain my use of "dialogism" further below.

4. This prologue (along with Douglas's other prologues to the Eneados) is discussed fully in Chapter 2.

5. All quotations from the Eneados are taken from David F. C. Coldwell's Scottish Text Society edition and cited by book (or prologue), chapter, and line number. I have normalized Coldwell's italics and final "s" throughout, modernized the letter yoah, and I have on occasion silently revised the punctuation.


7. I examine the importance of Douglas's ideas on pietas, and his use of marginal commentary in general, at greater length in Chapter 3.

8. Douglas's expansions of Virgil's Latin are well-documented, and other notable instances are discussed later. Many of these expansions can be traced to Douglas's source text, Ascensius's 1501 edition of Virgil with commentary,
but all the expansions are directly attributable to Douglas: an obvious point too often set aside in the rush to account for Douglas's "mistranslations." See in particular Bawcutt, \textit{Gavin Douglas} (hereafter GD), chapters 4 and 5, and Coldwell's chapter on "The Nature of the Translation" in volume IV of his edition.

9. Bawcutt examines the marginal commentary in GD 107-8 and 196-97. Douglas declares in his "Directioun" at the end of the \textit{Eneados}, "I haue alsso a schort comment compilyt / To expon strange histouris and termys wild" (141-42); as Bawcutt notes, "There is ample internal evidence that this Comment was composed by Douglas himself" (108)—in fact, she goes on to argue that in the earliest extant \textit{Eneados} manuscript (Cambridge Trinity College Gale O.3.12), dating from 1515, the commentary is in Douglas's own hand.

10. The following discussion, and my general understanding of medieval vernacular translative theory, are much indebted to Copeland's work. See her seminal book, \textit{Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages}, which, unfortunately, does not discuss Douglas. Ruth Morse's \textit{Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages} includes a helpful chapter on translation; \textit{The Medieval Translator: The Theory and Practice of Translation in the Middle Ages}, edited by Roger Ellis, is an important collection of recent essays on the subject. For more general work on and
different approaches to translation issues, see Steiner, Lefevere, Benjamin, and Robinson.

11. Compare R. A. Shoaf's comments on the nature of translation: "A translation, in one sense, is literally a missaying . . . . By extension--and by many poets' practice--it also 'misses' the meaning of the original. It violates the original. A translation violates a prior intention or purpose" (58).

12. As much as anything else, this concept of translation into the vernacular might be Douglas's greatest inheritance from his reading of Chaucer. No one doubts Chaucer's influence on Douglas, but the nature of that influence is often problematic, and too often simplified. As Bawcutt notes, along with actual borrowings, "Chaucer was important also to Douglas in ways less easy to define" (GD, 41). She considers in particular the "humorous projection of the narrator's personality in the Palice of Honour" and "the conversational vitality and remarkable range of tone in many of the Prologues" (41) to be of a Chaucerian nature; with regard to the Aeneid translation, she only suggests that Douglas "had most in mind" those poems treating Virgilian or Trojan matters (40). Walter Scheps, on the other hand, argues that each of the Middle Scots makars is influenced by "those aspects of Chaucer's genius which most nearly approximate his own . . . . [F]or Douglas in his
Eneyados, [Chaucer is] an expert metrist" ("Chaucer and the Middle Scots Poets," 46-47). Both views strike me as true but partial, missing the most provocative lessons which Douglas might have learned from Chaucer. In not only Boece, but in Troilus and Criseyde and The Legend of Good Women as well, despite Douglas's objections to Chaucer's handling of original material in these works, Douglas saw that a poet-translator working in the vernacular could handle classical material for his own ends (cf., along these lines, Copeland's arguments regarding Chaucerian translation and The Legend of Good Women in Rhetoric, 186-202). As I discuss below, a number of constitutive forces are at work on Douglas as poet-translator--the commentative tradition is arguably the most important of these forces, but the theory implied in Chaucer's work is certainly not the least.


14. In the "Directioun" at the end of his translation Douglas delineates his imagined audiences in more detail. As for those who could know, or even were learning, Virgil in Latin, it is interesting to note the passage in the "Directioun" that mentions Douglas's hoped-for use in "grammar sculys":

Ane othir proffit of our buke I mark,
That it salbe reput a neidfull wark
To thame wald Virgill to childryyn expone;

Ane othir proffit of our buke I mark,
That it salbe reput a neidfull wark
To thame wald Virgill to childryyn expone;
For quha lyst note my versys, one by one,
Sall fynd thanin hys sentens euery deill,
And al maste word by word, that wait I weill.

(41-6)

The image of the Eneados as an aid to the teaching and the
learning of the Aeneid, with Douglas's text as sometimes the
subservient trot, sometimes the "neidfull" reference work,
and sometimes the canonical exemplar of great Scots verse,
is in many ways an image of the negotation of poetic
authority that I believe to be central to the Eneados.

15. Two critical works have been of particular value
to me with regard to this topic, Jacqueline Miller, Poetic
License. Authority and Authorship in Medieval and
Renaissance Contexts (especially the Introduction and
Chapter I), and A. J. Minnis, Medieval Theory of Authorship.

16. Minnis is writing specifically about auctores,
mostly scriptural or ecclesiastical, of the twelfth to the
fourteenth centuries, but the essential characteristics of
the auctor are similar throughout the Middle Ages. Virgil
was doubtless an auctor, a writer to be respected, imitated
and explicated. Indeed, Douglas refers to Virgil as "myne
author" several times (e.g., 4 Prol., 92; 10 Prol., 155).
Here I do not mean to gloss over the "long-standing
ambivalence in the response of medieval Christians to
Virgil" (Bawcutt, GD, 71); in fact, as I will show, this
very ambivalence is part of what Douglas is counting on in establishing his own poetic authority with his readership.

17. Tim William Machan's article on Henryson's Moral Fables and the issue of authority notes not only Henryson's confrontation with this issue but Chaucer's as well—two authors of course essential to Douglas's conception of himself as a poet. With regard to Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde, Machan remarks that Chaucer "typically toys with the authorial posture at the same time he insists he is only a compiler or translator" (194). As we have seen, Douglas himself engages the issue, though in his case I would not say that he "toys with" the authorial role—he takes that role far too seriously to do so.

18. My focus on authority as a prime concern, even a motivating force, of the Eneados is unique in criticism on Douglas, which has by and large traditionally assumed, as Priscilla Bawcutt states, "Douglas's motives for translating Virgil . . . [are] a deep respect for the Aeneid, and a desire to communicate this to a wider audience" (GD 94). Only one critic has mentioned the word "dialogic" in relation to the Eneados; without at all examining the critical implications of the adjective, Ruth Morse refers in her recent essay to the marginal commentary in the first prologue and book as "dialogic" (113).
19. Perhaps the closest Bakhtin comes to addressing the problems surrounding translation is when he writes on "reported speech"; any translation is, after all, a form of indirect discourse, wherein the translator "reports" what someone (in another language) has "said." In *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, Bakhtin writes, "Reported speech is speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time also speech about speech, utterance about utterance" (115; emphasis here, as in the following quotations from Bakhtin's writings, in the original). Therefore, "what is expressed in the forms employed for reporting speech is an active relation of one message to another" (116). Similarly, in the essay "The Problem of Speech Genres" he insists that every utterance "must be regarded primarily as a response to preceding utterances of the given sphere"; it also anticipates future responses to itself and thus "is filled with dialogic overtones" (91-92). In sum, we learn from the writings of Mikhail Bakhtin and the "Bakhtin Circle" that reported speech, and by extension translated discourse, embodying as it does the "active relation of one message to another," is always dialogized. The reported utterance has its own autonomy but necessarily depends upon a prior utterance, which itself at once retains and loses its autonomy. "Dialogue" is an appropriate and useful metaphor for understanding this paradoxical status,
at once autonomous and contingent, of the reported utterance. Further discussion of the relationship between reported discourse and translation can be found in the opening pages of Chapter 3.

20. I mean the "utterance" as distinct from the sentence, the latter being for Bakhtin "a unit of language," the former a "unit of speech communication" (Speech Genres 73).

21. Needless to say, I do not mean to imply that Douglas's translation of the Aeneid constitutes a "novel": I mainly want to recognize that, inasmuch as the dialogization of any (particularly any authoritative) discourse undermines what Bakhtin characterizes as the centripetal forces of language, the Eneados is one example of the "novelization" of Virgil--an act of appropriation that occurred in different modes throughout the Middle Ages in any number of languages, e.g. the Old French Roman d'Eneas.

22. Douglas Robinson, in The Translator's Turn (1991), is to my knowledge the first and only writer to make use of the concept of dialogue as a metaphor for a new paradigm of translation. Concerned primarily with contemporary translation theory and practice, he insists that "instead of pretending that the translator constructs a stable one-to-one pattern of correspondence or equivalence between the
[source-language] and the [target-language] text (which proves to be ultimately impossible), we should recognize and, contextually, encourage the translator's poetic creativity" (xv). Robinson outlines different "tropics of translation" which translators may strategically employ: metonymy, synecdoche, metaphor, irony, hyperbole, metalepsis. Several of these--namely metaphor, irony, and hyperbole--are useful in discussing the Eneados, and I will refer back to them and deal with them more fully below. The novelty of Robinson's book is underscored when we recall that the classicist and translator D.E. Hill, in an article evasively entitled "What Sort of Translation of Virgil Do We Need?," could argue little more than ten years ago that "Good translation is a slow, painstaking exercise in which the characteristics of the translator should entirely vanish. . . . A translator needs not the inspiration of a poet but the discipline and craftsmanship of the master of verse composition" (184-5). Given the moralistic value judgements here, the condescension implicit in the term "exercise," and the distinction drawn between the valorized "poet" and the humble "translator," it is little wonder that Gavin Douglas's work is not the answer to Hill's titular question.

23. One other exception would be the work of critics such as Lois Ebin, who has made the most recent (and still
ultimately unconvincing) argument for understanding the thirteen prologues as a kind of whole unto themselves, illustrating the "growth" of the narrator.

24. Morse's article is easily the more insightful of the two; Canitz's essay, while careful in comparing Douglas's translation to Virgil's original, covers a good deal of ground covered by Bawcutt, and rests on an overly simplified strategy of matching Douglas's "theory" of translation, as supposedly laid out in the prologues, to the "practice" of the translation itself. (I have never been able to understand what Canitz, along with many other critics, have seen as Douglas's theory of translation as anything but a series of self-contradictions; consequently, I am more interested in investigating the effect of these internal inconsistencies rather than imposing some sort of unity on them.) Such a dichotomy leads to commonplace assertions about Douglas's betrayal of Virgil: "Despite his fidelity to Virgil's text in the final lines of Book XII, Douglas betrays Virgil after the end. Having censured Caxton for interpolating extraneous material from Baccaccio [sic] and other sources, Douglas cannot resist [!] incorporating Maphaeus's supplement" ("From Aeneid to Eneados" 97). Coldwell takes much the same tack and tone toward Douglas's work in the introduction to his critical edition of the translation.
CHAPTER II

Prologue and Dialogue in the *Eneados*

This chapter examines the use of dialogue in Douglas's original prologues in his *Eneados*. Dialogue, for my purposes, can be overt or implied; that is, I want to explain in this chapter the nature and function not only of explicitly dialogic passages, with more or less dramatized characters as interlocutors, but also of passages—and these are perhaps even more striking—wherein Douglas sets up a peculiarly dialogic rhetorical situation between his narrator, his various addressees, and his implied audiences. These implied audiences, often figures for Douglas's imagined readership, exist whenever Douglas creates listeners in his text who hear and can respond to the ongoing rhetorical dialogue within the prologues themselves.¹ In this second sort of passage dramatistic interaction is still, to be sure, at work, though the "drama" of voices and responses which Douglas "stages" is perhaps subtler than in overtly dialogic sections. In Bakhtin's view, dialogue is a fundamental quality of language, inasmuch as every utterance is characterized not only by the speaker but also by the responsiveness of the
addressee (Speech Genres, passim); in both kinds of dialogic exchange in the prologues Douglas foregrounds and manipulates this basic linguistic property, highlighting the nature of the addressee, often adopting the role of the addressee himself, with the ultimate effect of characterizing himself as a genuine auctor and establishing a kind of rhetorical power over his audience.

Gavin Douglas begins his Eneados by talking to Virgil. The opening prologue, which (as has been noted frequently by Douglas's critics) serves as a prologue and accessus not only to Book 1 but to the entire translation as well, opens with poetry of praise to Virgil—not just praise of Virgil, I stress, but praise addressed to him:

Laud, honour, praysyngis, thankis infynyte
To the and thy dulce ornat fresch endyte,
Maist reuerend Virgill, of Latyn poetis prynce,
Gem of engyne and flude of eloquens

(1 Prol. 1-4)

The first eighteen lines of this prologue are given over to this hyperbolic praise of Virgil, insisting on both his status as "Chosyn charbukkill" (7) and "Maister of masteris" (9), and that of his works, "Plesand, perfyte and feilabill in all degre" (13). We are of course impressed by the conventional nature of the rhetoric, but we ought to recognize as well the dramatic rhetorical situation Douglas is creating: his poem opens not with an address to the reader—although the Scots audience is certainly an implied
presence here—but with an address to Virgil, the author whose poem Douglas has translated and who is, as Douglas makes clear from the start and throughout, a real (albeit rhetorical) presence in Douglas's work. That Virgil is the originary auctor of Douglas's poem cannot be forgotten by his readers, and thus it cannot be ignored by Douglas himself. Consequently, he begins to construct a "Virgil" to his own advantage by means of an implied dialogue with the auctor.

The laudatory address continues, but it soon becomes clear that praise of Virgil is not Douglas's only goal, and it is not long before Douglas is engaged in a more direct dialogue with the Latin poet:

Quhy suld I than with dull forhed and vayn,
With rude engyne and barrand emptye brayn,
With bad, harsk spech and lewit barbour tong
Presume to write quhar thy sweit bell is rung
Or contyrfate sa precyus wordys deir?
Na, na, noth swa, but kneill quhen I thame heir.
For quhat compair betwix mydday and nycht?
Or quhat compair betwix myrknes and lycht?
Or quhat compar is betwix blak and quhyte?
Far grettar difference betwix my blunt endyte
And thy scharp sugurate sang Virgiliane,
Sa wysly wrocht with nevir a word invane.

(1 Prol. 19-30)

Douglas secures a fair amount of rhetorical capital in this passage, rather slyly cast in terms of Douglas's use of the modesty topos and of correctio in line 24 (cf. Bawcutt, GD 167). First, the importance of both Virgil himself and his "scharp sugurate sang" is underscored, bolstering the
serious (and challenging) nature of Douglas's project. Moreover, and despite his insistence to the contrary, Douglas does set himself on "equal footing" with his author, representing himself as able to engage in a discussion with him despite his ostensible inability to compose anything but a "blunt endyte." This fact will become increasingly important as Douglas constructs other dialogic relationships between himself and Virgil that require greater rhetorical power on his part. The point here is that not only is Douglas constructing a poetic persona, as Bawcutt and others have noted, but he is constructing Virgil as a literary persona as well, in this case (as will become clearer) a patient and approving listener, presumably pleased by his translator's praise. Indeed, the professed ability to recognize greatness, and to praise it suitably in verse, is a kind of implicit self-aggrandizement in itself. As is so often noted, Douglas's praise of Virgil and his insistence on his own inabilities are "conventional"; used by Douglas as distinct literary voices, however, they together allow the poet to begin constructing his own voice in a manner that will be of much use to him as his Eneados continues: a double-voiced discourse characterized by the glorification of Virgil's literary status and, simultaneously, the insinuation and establishment of the Scots poet's own. Virgil is one of a kind; Douglas, by re-imagining for his
audience Virgil's unique achievement, can begin to establish the singularity of his own poetic project.

This almost ludicrously depicted gulf between Virgil's grandeur and Douglas's ineptitude gives rise to a number of paradoxical statements as the opening address to Virgil continues. Douglas suggests he may as well give up: "Str for thys ignorant blabryng imperfyte / Besyde thy polyst termys redymyte" (33-4), implying that not only he but also his reader is engaged in a waste of time. "[T]hou art all and sum," he tells his Virgil, "quhat nedis more / Of Latyn poetis that sens was, or befor" (65). Douglas's "Virgil" here is a poetic monument, an all-encompassing auctor; there seems to be no point in reading any other poet, let alone in attempting to translate Virgil: he stands alone and complete. But this wellspring of poetic genius is also tacitly approving of Douglas's endeavor:

Yit with thy leif, Virgile, to follow the,
I wald into my rurall wlgar gross
Wryte sum savoring of thyne Eneados.

(42-4)

The Eneados exists with Virgil's invited stamp of approval. In something of a reversal of the discursive relations involved in the act of translation, what voice Virgil has in the first prologue is lent him by Douglas. Moreover, continuing to reinforce Virgil's literary stability (as when he insists in lines 73-4 ". . . na lovyngis ma do incres thy
fame, / Nor na reproche dymynew thy gud name"), Douglas at
the same time distances and distinguishes himself from
Virgil. Virgil has his Eneados ("thyne," 44), which leaves
open a space for Douglas's, an Eneados that eventually will
be constructed as culturally no less important or impressive
than the original.

What I have largely put aside to this point is the fact
that throughout this opening address to Virgil Douglas is
also addressing his readership, an address that the Scots
poet does not make explicit until line 79:

Bot sen I am compellit the to translait,
And not only of my curage, God wait,
Durst interpryd syk owtrageus foly,
Quhar I offend the les reprefe serve I;
And that ye knaw at quhais instans I tuke
Forto translait this maist excellent buke,
I meyn Virgillis volume maist excellent,
Set this my wark full febill be of rent,
At the request of a lord of renown
Of ancstry nobill and illustir baroun,
Fader of bukis, protectour to sciens and lair
My special gud Lord Henry, Lord Sanct Clair

(1 Prol. 75-86; emphasis added)
The shift from "the," Virgil, to "ye," the reader, is quick
but obvious (though critics have never made much of it);
here is Douglas's first distinct indication that he has, and
throughout the prologue has had, his Scots readers in mind
as an audience even though he has been ostensibly "talking"
to Virgil. In the course of a single sentence Douglas
directs his poetic "speech" from Virgil to his own audience,
but of course Virgil does not here leave the stage,
particularly not after the kind of introduction Douglas has given him (and given to his audience) heretofore. Dramatizing the very dialogic interrelationship on which his translation insists and relies, Douglas orchestrates a rhetorical situation wherein he is at once epideictic rhetor (for both Virgil and "Lord Henry, Lord Sanct Clair") and trusted expositor, carefully delineating the reasons behind his beginning this endeavor ("And that ye knaw at quhais instans I tuke . . .") and building his own authorial credibility in the process. Here Douglas's mediatary role first suggests itself as well. Douglas the poet, by means of his *Eneados*, is a powerful go-between in the Virgil/Middle Scots reader interrelationship; he casts himself as the natural voice of negotiation and reason, and strengthens this position as he continues in the first prologue to construct rhetorically both his audience and their expectations.

Douglas begins this rhetorical construction in three ways over the next eighteen lines. First he continues to praise his patron, Lord Henry Sinclair, whose instigation of the translation serves to legitimize it as well, preparing the audience for a noble literary endeavor. Second, at line 103, in the course of dedicating his book to Sinclair and immediately preceding his "protestatioun" (discussed in Chapter 1), Douglas mentions that this book is "Written in
the langage of Scottis natioun" ("our tong," he says inclusively at line 119), something of a statement of the obvious at this point that serves primarily to unite author and reader (and patron), and to suggest Douglas's interest in producing a self-consciously Scottish "buke." Third, and most striking, Douglas at this point introduces glosses on his own prologue, glosses which will continue through Book 1 of the translation. These glosses, of course, amount to a claim for authority in themselves: Douglas's writing is to be taken seriously, its profundity commanding explication. But they also serve to introduce a further voice into the text, another rhetorical tool for Douglas to use. As Ruth Morse remarks, speaking of commented texts generally,

This [marginal commentary] created an impression of dialogue, almost of simultaneity: the poet's voice with constant accompaniment. This dialogue was a constant discussion of how to read. For a text to acquire a commentary was a mark of seriousness . . . . [A]s long as the commentators survive the voice of the pedagogue is heard in the land, expounding, and, in his exposition, tacitly but powerfully insisting that these are the ways Virgil and Statius were and should continue to be read.

(Truth 24; 35-6)

Unlike Virgil, Douglas is able to appropriate the commentator's stance for himself, giving himself a further strategy for guiding interpretation even as he underscores his own authority.
Douglas glosses "innatyve" in line 97, and explains the reference to Ptolemy in line 100; both glosses serve not only to clarify the text but to tacitly remind the reader of the seriousness of Douglas's verse. When glossing lines 191-94,

\begin{verbatim}
Bot trastis weill, quha that ilke saxt buke knew,
Virgill tharin ane hie philosophour hym schew,
And vnder the clowdis of dyrk poecy
Hyd lyis thar mony notabill history,
\end{verbatim}

Douglas cryptically, and rather redundantly, reminds us that "Vnder derk poetrye is hid gret wisdome and lerning"—a remark, it would seem, equally applicable to Virgil and Douglas. But even more intriguing are Douglas's glosses in the first prologue that clarify not so much poetic content as poetic purpose. Lines 263-66, for example, read,

\begin{verbatim}
Quharfor, you gentill redaris, I besich
Traste on na wys at this my wark be sich,
Quhilk dyd my best, as the wyt mycht atteyn,
Virgillis versys to follow and no thing feyn.
\end{verbatim}

The note to 263 lets us know that this passage and what follows serve as an "Exhortatione to the Reder," an exhortation that turns into, as Douglas himself notes, an "Admonitione vnto vnlerned peopill, quhase rudnes can nocht onderstand Vyrgill" by line 283. Putting gloss and prologue together, the poet is constructing what amounts to a multi-voiced meta-commentary on both Virgil's poetry and his own. Douglas's verse comments on how Douglas's Virgil should be
read, while Douglas's prose comments on how Douglas's own verse (as well as Virgil's) should be read: the notes tell the reader how to understand the prologue, which tells us how to understand the translation, which (silently) tells us how to understand (that is, how Douglas understands) the Aeneid. The notes are, in fact, the voice of a reader, a voice to which the actual reader might modulate his own, a voice suggesting the act of reading and reacting, and mediating the reader's understanding of the prologue.\[9\]

Caught between these two notes, which are in the midst of Douglas's famous attack on Caxton, are the verse directions themselves, in which Douglas attempts to underscore further his authority in the mind of his audience.\[10\] Notably, he does so by insisting on his devoted service to and defense of his auctor Virgil. Douglas writes,

\begin{verbatim}
A twenty devill way fall hys wark atanys,  
Qihilk is na mair lyke Virgill, dar I lay,  
Than the nycht owle resemblis the papyngay.  
Yhe worthy noblys, redis my wark for thy  
And cast this other buke on syde far by,  
Qihilk vundir cullour of sum strange Franch wycht  
So Franchly leys, oneith twa wordis gais rycht.  
I nold yhe trast I said this for dispyte,  
For me lyst with nane Inglis bukis flyte,  
Na with na bogill nor browny to debait,  
Nowder ald gaistis nor spretis ded of lait,  
Nor na man will I lakkyn nor dispys  
My warkis till authoritys be sik wys,  
Bot twichyng Virgillis honour and reuerens,  
Quha ever contrary, I mon stand in defens.
\end{verbatim}

(1 Prol. 260-78)
Suddenly, in striking contrast to the prologue's opening lines, it is Caxton's work, not Douglas's, that bears no resemblance to Virgil's, and Douglas has rhetorically created for himself a clear, close connection to his auctor. Interestingly enough, Douglas defends his flyting with Caxton on the grounds that he is merely defending Virgil—particularly odd given Virgil's imperviousness to negative criticism that Douglas has insisted on earlier. In the reader's perception, though, Douglas is now an almost heroic figure, defending an author who is unable to defend himself, closely allied against misinterpreters like Caxton (and, for that matter, Chaucer). Douglas and his Virgil, the Virgil he has created for his audience, mutually support one another and, in truth, it is Douglas's Virgil that needs defending; Douglas must stand in defense of "Virgillis honour and reuerens" because his own poetic reputation rests so heavily first on Virgil's elevated status as a poet and second on Douglas's distinctive relationship to him, a relationship that is played out in the translation itself. Douglas characterizes this relationship in a particularly revealing passage, lines 297-302:

Quha is attachit ontill a staik, we se,
May go na fethir bot wreil about that tre:
Rycht so am I to Virgillis text ybund,
I may nocht fle les than my falt be fund,
For thocht I wald transcend and go besyde,
Hys wark remanys, my schame I may nocht hyde.
In part, these lines operate on the same rhetorical contrast between Virgil's brilliance and Douglas's inadequacy as the passages examined earlier; however, they also suggest how closely Douglas and Virgil are associated— in the Eneados, in fact, the two are inseparable. Virgil's "wark remanys," both as a literary artifact in its own right, apart from the Eneados, and as a part of the Eneados itself, as Douglas as inevitably "ybund" to it. Far from only being a standard of excellence to which Douglas's translation can never measure up, the Aeneid is the authoritative literary text to which Douglas's is anchored, from which Douglas can draw his own kind of auctoritas. We might compare lines 57-59 in this same prologue; Douglas, addressing Virgil, comments:

Of Helicon so drank thou dry the flude
That of thy copios fouth or plenitude
All mon purches drynk at thy sugurit tun.

Virgil is a source of poetic eloquence and poetic authority for Douglas, a source which Douglas is continually able to draw upon by maintaining an ongoing dialogue with his auctor and his author's text.

Douglas concludes his "Proloug of the First Buke" with a convoluted utterance incorporating prayers, invocations, apologies, and directions; as in previous passages, Virgil is invoked, as well as Douglas's Scots audience. Line 452 begins an address to Jesus Christ and to Mary, each of whom is asked to serve as muse to the poet:
Thou prynce of poetis, I the mercy cry,
I meyn thou Kyng of Kyngis, Lord Etern,
Thou be my muse, my gydar and laid stern,
Remittyng my trespas and every mys
Throu prayer of thy Moder, Queyn of Blys.
Afald godhed, ay lestyng but discrepans,
In personys thre, equale, of a substans,
On the I call, and Mary Virgyn myld—
Calliope nor payane goddis wild
May do to me na thing bot harm, I weyn:
In Criste is all my traste, and hevynnys queyn.
Thou, Virgyn Moder and Madyn, be my muse . . .

(452-63)

As Coldwell notes, the rejection of pagan inspiration is conventional enough; Lydgate, in the envoi to Book 2 of The Fall of Princes is perhaps Douglas's nearest English precursor in this regard. More important, though, is the way in which Douglas, even as he rejects the pagan discourse of epic invocation, conflates pagan—that is, Virgilian—and Christian discourses. Here Christ is the "prynce of poetis," whereas only shortly before, at line 418, Virgil is granted the same distinction. (We might remember also that in line 3 of the first prologue Virgil is "of Latyn poetis prynce.") Douglas forces himself into clarification ("I meyn," line 453) even as he asks Mary to be his muse in line 463—and this after Virgil has been constructed so carefully as, if not a muse, a significant source of poetic inspiration. Even Douglas's "rejection" of Calliope, the muse of epic poetry, is of necessity a qualified one: Douglas is after all engaged in the recomposition of an epic poem. His Christianity compels him to reject pagan
inspiration even as his fidelity to Virgil's text implicates him in precisely that way. Calliope and "payane goddis" may "do . . . na thing bot harm" to Douglas, but the poet goes on to invoke Christ as "that hevynly Orpheus" (469), Orpheus himself being the reputed son of Calliope. And this moreover comes in the context of Douglas emphasizing Christ as Son of Mary, whose "pappis quhite / fosterit that Prynce" (467-8).

Of course, Virgil as an addressee is never ignored for long, and Douglas soon invokes his name, addressing him immediately after mentioning "our Saluyour Ihesus":

Bot forthirmor, and lawar to discend
Forgef me, Virgill, gif I the offend.
Pardon thy scolar, suffir hym to ryme
Sen thou was bot ane mortal man sum tyme.

(471-4)

In stark contrast to the ornate, abstract characterization of Virgil that opens the prologue, the Latin poet, we are reminded, was "bot ane mortal man"; the audience is allowed to glimpse just how thoroughly Douglas has "humanized" his Virgil. Douglas is ostensibly the humble "scolar" who serves his master even as he is the Christian poet, having just invoked his own muse, who can speak to Virgil as "ane mortal" to another. Virgil is at once a source of inspiration and approval; he simultaneously stands above Douglas as an unachievable poetic goal and beneath as a constant foundation of authority and endorsement. Virgil,
Mary, Calliope, Christ—all are interwoven by Douglas as he negotiates poetic terrain both pagan and Christian, addressing in turn each of his "characters" even as he implicitly addresses his own audience, demonstrating his own rhetorical power in the very act of leading this dialogue.

Douglas addresses his imagined audiences directly as he finishes the first prologue (lines 479-504) and in doing so offers perhaps one of his most distinct pictures of the kind of dialogue he envisions and is constructing. Lines 479-82 serve as a good example:

> I schrnyk nocht anys correkkit for tobe
With ony wight grundit on cherite,
And glaidly wald I baith inquire and leir
And till ilke cunnand wight la to myne eyr.

The image of Douglas welcoming correction and criticism, indeed, gladly listening to it, underscores the author's stance of humility and fair-mindedness, to be sure. It also invites the audience to adopt a particularly attentive and discriminating stance toward Douglas's work. Paradoxically, however, the ultimate effect of this kind of rhetoric is mollifying; the posture of honesty the narrator adopts invites the critical audience to let down its guard--like the soothing voice of the commentator, it lets us know we are in good hands. In case, however, his point is too subtle, Douglas goes on to appropriate the very critical voices he has given license to, defusing the very ammunition he has offered to his readership:
Thocht sum wald swer that I the text haue vareit,
Or that I haue this volume quyte myscareit,
Or threpe playnly that I come nevir neir hand it,
Or at the wark is wers than evir I fand it,
Or yit argue Virgill stude weill befor,
As now war tyme to schift the werst our scor;
Else haue I said thar may be na compar
Betwix his versis and my stile wlgar.
All thocht he stant in Latyn maist perfyte,
Yit stude he nevir weill in our tung endyte
Les than it be by me now at this tyme.

(485-95)

Interestingly, one of Douglas's strategies to deflect
criticism is to refer to his own deference to Virgil earlier
in the prologue. Even more striking is the fence Douglas
allows himself to walk in the lines "Else haue I said thar
may be na compar / Betwix his versis and my stile wlgar."
Comparison with Virgil, however, is precisely what Douglas
wants--it is the only way to lend credence to his contention
that, before Douglas, Virgil "stude . . . nevir weill in our
tung endyte." By dialogically incorporating the voices of
the poet and the critic in this passage--a move made all the
more convincing by his use of the critic's voice in his own
glosses earlier in the prologue--Douglas at once invites and
closes off criticism, guiding readerly interpretation as
best he can toward his own ends.

Douglas goes on from here to a slightly different
rhetorical strategy, employing the ideologically significant
discourse of the Church (a ploy hinted at in line 480, when
Douglas opens his work to criticism by anyone "grundit on
cherite") to further suggest that much of the criticism to be levelled against him will be mistaken—indeed, within the context of this discourse, almost heretical:

Gyf I haue falyeit, baldly reprufe my ryme.
Bot first, I pray you, grape the mater cleyn,
Reproche me nocht quhill the wark be ourseyn.
Beis not ourstuduyus to spy a moyt in myne e,
That in your awyn a ferry boyt can nocht se,
And do to me as yhe wald be done to.

(496-501)

Douglas once again encourages correction—but only if the reader does "grape the mater cleyn," a phrase that suggests careful, considered reading in a particularly nebulous way.\(^\text{14}\) Again, this is a false invitation: criticism aimed at Douglas's work runs the double risk of being seen as the product not only of simple-mindedness or poor reading but also of uncharitability, as Douglas makes clear in his paraphrase of 7 Matthew 3 and 12.\(^\text{15}\) Douglas's final exhortation (really an admonition) to the reader depends upon the threatening ideology of ecclesiastical discourse; by implication, any reproach of Douglas could be founded on principles running counter to some of the most straightforward and memorable teachings of Christ.

I would like to move away from the opening prologue at this point to examine the dialogic tenor of some of the other prologues of the Eneados. The prologue to the fifth book is a useful place to start, as it takes up some of the strategies and concerns of Prologue 1 even as it extends
Douglas's poetic voices and strengthens his authoritative connections to Virgil. Employing a nine-line stanza as he does in Prologue 3, Douglas opens Prologue 5 with a meditation on earthly pleasure:

Gladys the grond the tendir florist greyn,
Byrdys the bewys and thir schawys scheyn,
The wery huntar to fynd hys happy pray,
The falconeyr rych ryver onto fleyn;
The clerk reiosys hys bukis our to seyn,
The luffar tobehald hys lady gay;
Yong folk thame schurtis with gam, solace and play;
Quhat maist delytyth or lykis euery wight,
Tharto steris thar curage day and nycht.

(5 Prol. 1-9)

Douglas here establishes an almost pastoral mood, but moves from there to employ a kind of proverbial diction in the second and third stanzas: "Quhou wald be thrifty courtyouris says few credis" (13); "Quhou mony hedis als feil consatis beyn" (16); "A blith spreit makis greyn and floryst age" (21). This proverbial style leads to the interpolation of a Virgilian proverb in the third stanza, in which, intriguingly, the poetic voices of Virgil and Douglas are strikingly intertwined:

Plesance and ioy richt hailsum and perfyte is,
So that the wys tharof in proverb wrytis,
"A blith spreit makis greyn and floryst age."
Myne author eyk in Bucolykis endytis,
"The yong enfant fyrst with lauchtir delytis
To knaw hys moder, quhen he is litil page;
Quha lauchis not," quod he, "in thar barnage,
Genyus the god delytyth not thar tabill,
Nor Iuno thame to kepe in bed is habill."

(19-27)
As in Prologue 1, Douglas here emphasizes the connection between himself and Virgil—indeed, between his own poetry and Virgil's, as he reminds us of his "author" and adopts Virgil's thoughts into what Douglas would consider his own poetry. The speech tag "quod he" in line 25 is notable in that by employing it Douglas, even as he is reconstructing the inseparability of his author and himself, is able to underscore the distinction between these two poetic voices for the reader.17

The third stanza opens the way for more praise of Virgil and his poetry, as Douglas reminds us, much as he did in Prologue 1, of the Latin poet's "hie wysdome and maist profound engyne" (28) and how "crafty wrocht hys wark is, lyne by lyne" (31). What Douglas stresses in particular, however, is how Virgil "altyrris hys style sa mony way" in order "To satyfy ilk wightis fantasy / Lyke as he had of euery thyng a feill, / And the willys of euery wight dyd feill." (33–8). The accent on Virgil's varying styles parallels the various styles Douglas has employed in his work to this point, most immediately of course in this very prologue, wherein Douglas has moved from pastoral to proverbial voices, from Virgil's voice to his own, surveying as he has different personal pleasures, different natural affinities, to which Virgil and Douglas are able to attune their respective poetry.
Pursuing further the simultaneous emphasis on and exemplification of poetic variety, Douglas contrasts once again Caxton's "fethil proys" (51) with the "sportis, myrthis and myrry plays / . . . Endyte by Virgil, and heir by me translate" (46-8). The parallel construction of Douglas's and Virgil's respective roles in the production of the *Eneados* serves only further to stigmatize Caxton's work as at best unnecessary and unimportant, at worst actively distorting and misleading (even immoral). Thus, as Douglas briefly re-engages Caxton in the discourse of flyting, the "matter" at hand, namely the upcoming Book 5, is in this formulation neither solely Virgil's nor Douglas's; Virgil composed, Douglas has translated, but the effort of the two together in presenting Book V of the *Eneados* is what is contrasted to Caxton and what is at this point to be enjoyed by the Scots reader. The metaphor Douglas uses to propound this idea is intriguing:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hys febil proys beyn mank and mutulate,} \\
\text{Bot my propyne com from the pres fute hait,} \\
\text{Onforlatit, not iawyn fra tun to tun,} \\
\text{In fresch sapour new from the berry run.}
\end{align*}
\]

(51-4)

Douglas's work is a "propyne," a word that can mean both "gift" and "tribute"; the Scots poet would surely like to have both this prologue and his *Eneados* as a whole be seen in just such a dual way. His work is a gift to his fellow Scots and to their own literary and cultural heritage, and
it is a tribute of sorts to Virgil. More interesting, perhaps, is the fact that in this metaphor the Aeneid becomes the "berry" newly pressed, the Eneados the gift/tribute of wine derived from it, something of notably greater value—and very different cultural use and significance—than the berry itself. One point is certainly the direct link again between Virgil and Douglas, as contrasted with Caxton and his translation of Virgil, "Quhilk that he says of Franch he dyd translait' (1 Prol., 141); but in a prologue that stresses the use and enjoyment of different worldly pursuits, not to mention different poetic styles, the reader cannot fail to notice the distinctions (as well as the connections) between a good grape and a good bottle of wine. Douglas insinuates here that the Eneados is in its own way more enjoyable reading than the Aeneid.

Douglas concludes Prologue 5, much as he does Prologue 1, with a rejection of pagan gods and a moralizing invocation to the Christian God. To be sure, such invocations always at least implicitly stress the differences between Douglas's discourse and Virgil's: we are never allowed to forget that, after all is said and done, Virgil is, for all his greatness, not a Christian poet. Moreover, the last two stanzas offer still another poetic "voice" in this rather brief but stylistically varied
prologue. On the whole, as I suggested earlier, the fifth prologue picks up many of the same themes and stylistic devices that the first prologue does. What we see in the later prologue, however, is these strategies employed more briefly and more deftly; having laid a good bit of rhetorical groundwork in earlier prologues, Douglas is able more readily to elicit (or attempt to elicit) audience responses, and to play with the audience's perception of him, of Virgil, and of their relationship, more comfortably. The point here is not that Douglas is moving towards a dialogic resolution, or even seeking to establish a single, definitive authorial voice of his own; rather, we see Douglas continually renegotiating dialogic relationships between different poetic voices and between himself, his audience, and Virgil, with the result being that the negotiation itself becomes the focus of the prologues. In short, as we can see from both the first and the fifth prologues, Douglas attempts to construct his poetic authority in the active construction and manipulation of dialogic rhetorical situations.

At this point it will be useful to examine several other instances of this manipulation in the prologues. I am postponing for the moment a discussion of the two dramatized dialogues—the dream-visions of Prologues 8 and 13—but will address them in time. Other prologues, however, pick up and
extend some of the textual strategies involved in Prologues 1 and 5, and ultimately work to make the dialogues of 8 and 13 as effective as they are. Prologue 3, despite its relative brevity, is a prime example.

The third prologue rhetorically works to divide the audience and thereby to consolidate authority. The opening stanzas—in this case, a nine-line stanza form used by Chaucer and Henryson, and by Douglas in The Palice of Honoure—are meant to suggest some of the adventure and wonder involved in the wanderings of Aeneas as depicted in Book III.20 In other words, they are meant to whet the reader's appetite for "The feirful stremys and costis wonyrful" and "Wild aventuris, monstreis and quent effrays" (3 Prol. 10, 12) of Virgil's book. Thus, as before, Douglas is attempting to guide his audience's reaction prior to their experience of the text itself. He quickly turns, however, to a more explicit characterization of his audience, remarking that, regarding such stories as the third book contains, "I dreid men clepe thame fablis now on days" (16) and voicing his frustration with misreaders: "Tharfor wald God I had thar erys to pull / Mysknawis the creid, and threpis otheris forvayis" (17-8). The sense here, as Coldwell notes, is not entirely clear. It is apparent, however, that Douglas is concerned primarily with audience understanding and misunderstanding, either of the
Aeneid or of other, even more important texts like "the creid." What is notable is how quickly the thrust of the discourse turns to argument and dispute ("threpis") and how Douglas deals with the audience and with Virgil when potential contention and correction are involved.

The third stanza presents some of Douglas's more vehement rhetoric:

Incays thai bark, I compt it nevir a myte;
Quha kan not hald thar peice ar fre to flyte;
Chide quhil thar hedis ryfe and hals worth hays—
Weyn thai to murdrys me with thar dispyte?
Or is it Virgill quham thame list to bakbyte?
His armour wald thai pers? Quhar is the place?
He dowtis na dynt of polax, swerd nor mace.
Quhat wenys thou, frend, the craw be worthyn quhite,
Suppos the holkis be all ourgrowyn thi face?

(19-27)

The criticism of those "fre to flyte" is here pictured as futile, first by Douglas's suggestion that there is nothing to be gained by it but a hoarse throat, and more powerfully by Douglas's invocation of Virgil in this passage. Having characterized his Virgil as such a dominant authorial figure in the first prologue, Douglas is able to march this character onto his stage for rhetorical reinforcement. The figures of Virgil and Douglas are brought together here with Douglas appropriating just the kind of invulnerable Virgilian authority he needs to close off potential criticism; his condescending address, "frend," in line 26 and the subsequent implication of the reader's foolishness
(should he choose to criticize Virgil) suggests the authorial security that this kind of rhetorical maneuvering gives Douglas. If we attack Douglas, Douglas suggests, we are really attacking Virgil—pointless and absurd; but if we praise Douglas, we praise both authorial figures. Douglas works hard to have things both ways.

What Douglas constructs is an implied readership pitted against itself, either for or against Douglas, made up of those who "kan not demying weill" versus those "gentill curtas redaris of gude yeill" (28-29). This audience, coupled with his authorial ally Virgil, enables Douglas's discourse in the prologue's final stanza:

By strange channellis, fronteris and forlandis,
Onkouth costis and mony wilsum strandis
Now goith our barge, for nowder howk nor craik
May heir bruke sail, for schald bankis and sandis.
From Harpyes fell and blynd Cyclopes handis
Be my laid star, virgyne moder but maik;
Thocht storm of temptatioun my schip oft schaik,
Fra swelth of Sylla and dyrk Caribdis bandis,
I meyn from hell,alue al go not to wraik.

(36-45)

The voyage of "our barge" here refers most literally to the story of the Aeneid itself, but the possessive pronoun suggests the cooperative effort of Douglas and Virgil in recreating that voyage. The audience, at least that audience favorably disposed toward Douglas, is implicated as well, accompanying the narrator not only through the upcoming third book but also through the "complicated
allegorizing mixed with puns" of the prologue's final lines (Coldwell 4.165). The strange and mysterious journey of Book III is linked with the seemingly mysterious interaction that has produced Douglas's text—a connection between Virgil and Douglas that the average reader (Douglas would like to suggest) cannot grasp. And it is finally, intimately tied into Douglas's Christianity. Discursively, the connections between Virgil and Douglas made in this prologue are powerful; theologically, the prologue ends emphasizing Douglas's connections to his readership. Douglas constructs himself as a go-between who can call on either source of rhetorical empowerment as needed.

Like the third prologue, Prologue 9 turns Christian discourse to Douglas's ends, as in his dialogue with his audience Douglas adopts almost all of his poetic personae—poet, critic, scholar, sage, Christian preacher—to further negotiate a favorable relationship with his audience. The prologue opens with a self-conscious display of metrical artistry:

Thir lusty warkis of hie nobilyte
Agilyte dyd wryte of worthy clerkis,
And tharin merkis wysdome, vtilityte,
Na vilyte, nor sic onthryfty sperkis;
Scurilyte is bot for doggis at barkis,
Quha tharto harkis fallys in fragilyte.

Honeste is the way to worthynes,
Vertu, doutles, the perfyte gait to blys;
Thou do na mys, and eschew idilnes,
Persew Prowes, hald na thing at is hys;
Be nocht rakles to say sone ya, I wys,
And syne of this the contrar wyrk expres.

Do tyll ilk wight as thou done to waldbe;
Be nevir sle and doubill, nor yit our lyght;
Oys not thy mycht abufe thyne awin degre,
Clym nevir our hie, nor yit to law thou lycht;
Wirk na malgre, thocht thou be nevir sa wyght,
Hald with the rycht, and pres the nevir to le.

(9 Prol. 1-18)

There can be no doubt that the interlocking rhyme scheme is meant to call attention to Douglas's versifying abilities. The *sentens* of the passage is explicitly Christian, particularly of course the paraphrase of Christ's commandment (Matthew 7.12; Luke 6.31) in line 13. Douglas is instructing his audience in two things: Christian principles of honesty, charity, and so forth, and his own poetic abilities; in doing so he is subtly able to remind his audience of his own power as both priest and *makar*. Even when he ostensibly puts aside the Christian moralizing ("Eneuch of this, ws nedis prech na mor," line 19) he turns more overtly to questions of poetry—namely, "The ryall style, clepyt heroycall" (21) and Horace's notion of suiting the style to the matter at hand (27-35). For Douglas, predictably perhaps, this notion quickly transforms more into a concern with audience than subject matter, focussing on "the way in which the poet's 'ryall' style directs the audience to his sentence" (Ebin, "Role of the Narrator" 359). The narrator further suggests, however, that not everyone is a suitable audience for Virgil:
The muse suld with the person aggre algait.
Stra forto spek of gayt to gentill wight;
A hund, a steid, mar langis for a knyght,
Quhamto efferis hant na rebald daill--
Thar suld na knycht reid bot a knychtly taill.

Douglas goes on to emphasize the *Aeneid*'s status as "the wark imperiall" (56) and its original audience, "the gret Octauyane" (57)—elitist sentiments that would seem not to accord with Douglas's promise to his "wlgar Virgill" that "Now salt thou with every gentill Scot be kend" (Exclamation 37, 43), much less his exhortation to "Thank me tharfor, masteris of grammar sculys" (Directioun 47). We must, however, understand Douglas's particular rhetorical purpose in Prologue 9: to construct a readership that understands and accepts the nobility of his enterprise and their participation in it. What reader would not want to see himself as part of Douglas's noble audience, regardless of his actual station in life? In fact, given Douglas's previous emphasis in lines 15-16 of the importance of degree and holding one's place, participation in the *Aeneid* can be understood as an offer to enter a world of nobility "decorously"—an ideological, and of course ultimately illusory, circumvention of degree.

Douglas, however, cannot encourage such audience cohesiveness without maintaining his own authorial position, and consequently he turns in the last section of the
prologue to invoke Virgil's greatness as well as principles of Christian forgiveness, both of which shield him from criticism even as they solicit it:

Gyf ocht be weill, thank Virgil and nocht me; Quhar ocht is bad, gays mys, or owt of gre, My lewytnes, I grant, hes all the wyte, Kouth not ensew hys ornat fresch endyte, Bot, with fuylhardy curage malapert, Schupe to enterprit, and dyd perchance pervert, Thys maist renownyt prynce of poetry-- Quhar I sa dyd mea culpa I cry. . . . Quhar I mysknaw myne errour, quha it fyndis For cheryte amendis it, gentil wight, Syne pardon me, sat sa far in my lycht, And I sal help to smor your falt, leif broder; Thus, vail que vail, ilk gude deid helpis other.

(69-76; 82-6)

The narrator returns to a reformulation of the "Do tyll ilk wight as thou done to waldb" sentiment in line 13, making criticism of his own work in effect contingent upon the critic's admission of a fault in himself. The "sermon" of the first three stanzas, seemingly unrelated to the rest of the prologue, is now shown to be necessary to Douglas, for only by establishing his authority in the voice of the preacher can he reinforce his authority in the voice of the poet. Or, to put it another way, there is a distinctly dialogic use of voices here: the voice of the preacher, in being cast in an especially difficult verse form, draws on the authority of the poet's voice, while the voice of the poet draws on the authority of the preaching voice used earlier in the prologue. The audience is dialogically
invoked in Douglas's effort simultaneously to unite that audience and stave off criticism from it, with Virgil, the "renownyt prynce of poetry," always the foundational auctoritas on which Douglas's own poetic authority is constructed.

Prologue 4, like Prologue 9, has a moralizing or sermonizing section preceding a section that more directly addresses the concerns—in the case of Prologue 4, the main character—of the following book. In terms of his manipulation of the dialogue with his author and audience, Douglas's main strategy in the fourth prologue seems to be to create a rhetorical audience or addressee to stand in the place of his actual readership, in a manner not unlike that of the first prologue, wherein Douglas, while ostensibly addressing Virgil, has his Scots audience firmly in mind at the same time. The rhetorical audience is initially at least "bricht Cytherea" (4 Prol. 1); Douglas poses a number of questions to Venus, but the questions are of course meant to enlighten morally his own readership about the dangers of sexual love:

Quhat is your fors bot feblyng of the strenth?
Your curyus thochtis quhat but musardry? . . .
Your sary ioys beynt bot ianglyng and iapys,
And your trew seruandis syly goddis apys.

(15-6; 20-1)

Eventually, however, the text modulates to address the reader more directly; but before doing so, it once again
invokes Virgilian authority as Douglas allies himself with Virgil, in this case his *Georgics*:

O Lord, quhat writis myne author of thi forsw
In hys Georgikis, quhou thyne ondantyt myght
Constrenys so sum tyme the stonyt hors
That, by the sent of a meyr far of syght,
He bradis brays onon, and takis the flyght.

(57-61)²³

Even in what is turning into a Christian moralization, predictably enough given the immanent story of Dido, Douglas is able to rely on Virgil's authorial status to lend weight to his argument. Douglas's sermon "takis flyght" in lines 85ff., as his direct address is not to Venus but unequivocally to his readership: "Lo, quhou Venus kan hir seruandis acquyte! / Lo, quhou hir passionys onbridillis al thar wyt!" (85-6). Once he addresses his audience directly, however, the poet begins to fragment that audience, characterizing its diversity and giving it a carefully circumscribed voice. "Thou auld hasard lichour, fy for schame," Douglas remarks in disgust (164); "Out on the, auld trat, agit wyfe, or dame" (166). The language of love is parodied by Douglas: "Faynt lufe . . . Grasles thou askis grace, and thus thou prayis: / 'Haue mercy, lady, haue reuth and sum piete!'" (142-45). "'In Venus covrt, sen born tharto I am, / My tyme weill sal I spend. Wenys thou not so?'" he has one of his characterized lovers ask (160-61).
And Douglas's parody becomes especially vitriolic in lines 186-93:

Of brokkaris and syk bawdry quhou suld I write,
Of quham the fylth styntis in Godis neys?
With Venus henwyffis quhat wys may I flyte,
That strakis thir wenschis hedis thame to ples?
'Douchtir, for thy lufe this man hes gret dyseys'
Quod the bysmeyr with the slekyt speche,
'Rew on hym, it is meryte hys pane to meys'.
Syk poyd makerellis for Lucifer beyn leche.

As elsewhere, we see here Douglas drawing into his prologue and orchestrating a series of voices in dialogue, characterizing his audience even as he attempts to instruct them. Moreover, Virgil the auctor is onstage here, as well as Douglas the preacher and poet, and an implied audience of pagan gods and Scots readers--some of them apparently far too promiscuous for Douglas's taste. Douglas eventually will bring a final character onto his rhetorical stage in this prologue, when in lines 215ff. he addresses the central character of Virgil's impending book, Dido.

Dido is particularly useful to Douglas here since she can be a figure to stand both for Virgil and for Douglas's readership, embodying two opposing poles of the authority/audience relationship that Douglas continually seeks to mediate. She is an example to be learned from and a pupil whom Douglas seeks to instruct--tragically too late, of course. Douglas laments to the character, "Allace, thy dolorus cays and hard myschance! / From blys to wo, fra sorow to fury rage" (222-3) and asks, "The dowbill wound,
Dido, to specify, / I meyn thyne amouris and thi funeral fait, / Quha may endyte, but teris, with eyn dry?" (215-7).
Douglas thus effectively incorporates Virgil's story into his prologue, using the figure of Dido as the ultimate exemplum for his sermon/tirade against sexual love. Douglas finishes the prologue by turning back and forth, from Dido to his own readership, tying together the voices of poet and priest:

Se, quhou blynd luffis inordinate desyre
Degradis honour, and resson doith exile!
Dido, of Cartage flour and lamp of Tyre,
Quhais hie renoun na strenth nor gift mycht fyle,
In hir faynt lust sa mait, within schort quhile,
That honest baith and gude fame war adew,
Syne for disdeyn, allace! hir selvyn slew.

O, quhat avalit thi brute and gloryus name,
Thi moblys, tresour and werkis infinyte,
This citeis beilding and thi ryal hame,
Thy realmys, conquest, weilfar and delyte?
To stynt al thing salue thine awyn appetite
So wes in lufe thi frawart destane—
Allace the quhile thou knew the strange Ene!

(250-63)

At once incorporating and interpreting Dido's story in his own fourth prologue, Douglas again is able to orchestrate a dialogue of voices and responses that furthers his authorial goals. He brings Virgil onstage, and Virgil's text into his own; he exercises rhetorical authority over Virgil's character and, by extension, his text, by putting the figure of Dido to new (if conventional) moral use. And, as in Prologue 9, he demonstrates for his own audience his ability
to negotiate the roles of poet and preacher by representing the authoritative, Virgilian story of Dido to his own ends.

This negotiation becomes most interesting when Prologue 4 becomes Book IV, with Douglas linking the poem's characters and his own narrative strategies even more intricately. Douglas translates the opening lines of *Aeneid* IV as follows:

Be this the queyn, throw hevy thoichtis onsound,
In euery vayn nurysys the greyn wound;
Smytyn so deip with the blynd fyre of lufe
Hir trublyt mynd gan fra all rest remufe.

The demonstrative pronoun in the first line is not to be found in the Latin, and it is, I would maintain, purposefully ambiguous at this point in the translation. It will help to have the Latin of the end of Book III and the beginning of Book IV before us:

```
sic pater Aeneas intentis omnibus unus
fata renarrabat divum cursusque docebat.
conticuit tandem factoque hic fine quievit.
at regina gravi iamdudum saucia cura
vulnus alit venis et caeco carpitur igni.
```

(III.716-8; IV.1-2)\textsuperscript{24}

The word *at*, along with the rest of the two descriptions, points to the contrasting states of mind of Dido and Aeneas. Douglas's translation inevitably involves this contrast as well, but Douglas's "this" suggests the queen's reaction is not only to Aeneas's "tayll" (III.10.126) but also to Douglas's prologue. It is as if the sermonizing address to
Dido, which Douglas uses in many of the fourth prologue's later stanzas, including the last, contributes to Dido's pain, reminding her of her own tragedy. Even the omission of any translation of iamduddum and the addition of "greyn" contribute to this perception. "Greyn" lends something of the sound of gravi to the passage, but far more importantly, it tells the reader the wound is fresh, as if Dido's emotional wound was not (or not just) opened long since by Aeneas's lengthy story, but quite recently by Douglas's sorrowful prologue. Douglas's use of the addressee in the prologue, coupled with a few slight but significant changes in the translation, directs his audience's attention to the very intricate (even intimate) dialogue the narrator is carrying on with Virgil's text and characters, and makes his own vernacular prologue all the more intrinsically a part of the authoritative Latin text of Virgil.  

Dido's reaction, Douglas deftly declares, is a response to his poetry. It would seem appropriate at this point to turn to other responses to and dialogues with Douglas, dialogues that are dramatized more explicitly than is Dido's subtle, inward reaction. Prologue 8 incorporates just such a dialogue. One of two prologues (the other being Prologue 13, which I discuss below) in the form of a dream-vision, the eighth prologue consists of a dialogue between a ranting "authority" and the dreamer-poet Douglas. Cast in
thirteen-line alliterative stanzas, a form often used for humorous and abusive verse (most notably in The Taill of Rauf Coilyear and Sir Richard Holland's Buke of the Howlat), the prologue offers a comic and combative perspective on questions of translation and authority. The narrator begins with a rhetorical question directed to his readership: "Of dreflyng and dremys quhat dow it to endyte?" This query, unanswered by Douglas and (of course) his reader, lends a pervasive indeterminacy to the prologue as a whole; the poem is a recounting of a dream-vision, and would by its very inclusion in the Eneados seem to be of sufficient importance and utility. David J. Parkinson offers an answer when he suggests the prologue is "an extended ironic occupatio on the relation of poetry to dream" (7); I would add that it is also an ironic negotiation of the relation between dialogue and authority.

The narrator quickly falls asleep and the "selcouth seg" who appears in line 4 is shouting by line 7, his rhetoric surprising both in its vehemence and its abruptness. The figure complains about a number of personal pursuits and social ills: "The lard langis efter land to leif to his ayr" (35); "The myllar mythis the multyr with a met skant" (40); "Sum schippart slais the lardis scheip and says he is a sanct" (44). The railer in this litany of contemporary evils even goes so far as to complain against
railers: "The ralyear raknys na wordis, bot ratlis furth ranys, / Full rude and royt ressons baith roundalis and ryme" (66-7). Again a rather comic element of indeterminacy is injected here; how seriously are we to take this particular railer if railers themselves are called into question? This indeterminacy is multiplied when we consider that Aeneas himself has a dream-vision of his own in the early part of Book VIII, in which he hears the stately voice of Tiberinus, the river-god of the Tiber; the truth of Aeneas's vision is stressed (ne uana putes haec fingere somnum, VIII.42), but, as we saw earlier, the reliability of dream-visions is questioned in Douglas's prologue. In presenting these two opposing views of the reliability of dreams by two different authoritative figures, Douglas initiates yet another implicit dialogue with his audience. The question quickly becomes, which view is right? The passage in the Aeneid has the weight of Virgil's authority; the prologue has the weight of Christian authority but is undermined by the comic nature of the prologue. Ultimately, there is no answer offered here. The ambiguity that this particular prologue insists on can only direct us to the authorial figure of Douglas, who has opened and orchestrated this line of inquiry in the first place, and who rests comfortably within this self-styled realm of interpretive indeterminacy.
The dramatized dialogue between the dreamer and the complainer still needs to be examined, for it is within this dialogue that the comic, even farcical nature of the prologue most clearly manifests itself. We first notice that, after an extended direct quotation of the complainer's speech, the narrator interrupts our "listening" by noting that the previous hundred or so lines were not addressed to him at all: "And as this leyd at the last lyggand me seys, / With a luke onlufsum he lent me sic wordis" (118-19). Apparently the dream-figure has been ranting all this time to himself, unaware of Douglas's "presence." The railer's spying of the dreamer initiates an abusive bout of accusatory name-calling:

'Quhat bern be thou in bed, with hed full of beys, Grathit lyke sum gnappar, and, as thi greis gurdis, Lurkand lyk a longeour?' Quod I: 'Lovn, thou leys. Ha wald thou feght?' Quod the freik: 'We haue bot few swordis. Thar is sic haist in this hed, I hope thou wald neys, That brawlys thus with this bost quhen bernys with the bourdis.' Quod I: 'Churle, ga chat the, and chyde with ane other.'

'Move the nocht," said he than, 'Gyf thou be a gentill man, Or ony curtasy can, Myne awyn leif brother.'

(120-30)

Here we see a comic representation of the dialogue with authority that the Eneados is so consistently based upon.
The humorous treatment of this dialogic relationship serves Douglas's authorial purposes insofar as it suggests the increasing comfort Douglas has with the concept of poetic authority. He is able to adopt the authorial stance for himself in the very act of playing with the whole notion of an authorial stance. For this reason the eighth prologue, taken on its own and in spite of its unusual alliterative form, is perhaps Douglas's most "Chaucerian" piece in the Eneados. But Douglas, unlike Chaucer, never questions or mocks authority so completely as to undermine the concept altogether; such a thorough-going deflation of authority would, of course, undermine the very goals he sets out to achieve in becoming the auctor of a Scots Aeneid.

Eventually the dreamer tells the ranting authority-figure "I lang to haue our buke done" (142): a serio-comic echo of the strategy of linking Virgil and himself that Douglas has often employed in the other prologues (and will employ again, in a different way, in the dream-dialogue of Prologue 13). The interlocutor responds "Thy buke is bot brybry" (144), suggesting on his part a comic unwillingness (the poet would hope) to accept Douglas's usual tactic and to recognize the importance of his poetic project. The textual lesson the railer promises to teach Douglas "to lys all thi pane" (145), a roll of apparently useless knowledge and jests, is in turn rejected by the dreamer, and he asks
for another lesson. At this point the dream-figure leads the dreamer to a hoard of coin, which the dreamer tries to gather up, only to awaken and find himself holding fistfuls of earth. The poet-narrator offers the final disclaimer of the whole scene; as he insists, "swevynnys ar for swengeouris that slummyrris nocht weill" (171). What is interesting, however, is that this disclaimer reads as a disavowal of not only the dream but of the prologue itself:

Thys was bot faynt fantasy, in faith, that I feill,
Nevir word of verite, bot all in waist went,
Throw roytnes and ravyng, that maid myne eyn reill,
Thus lysnyt I, as losanger, syk lewydnes to luke;
Bot, quhen I saw nane other bute,
I sprent spedely on fute,
And vndre a tre rute
Begouth this aucht buke.

(175-82)

Aligning himself with his audience ("Thus lysnyt I"), the poet insists on the "faynt fantasy" of the dream and, by implication, of the preceding text itself, which has included "Nevir word of verite." In a playful, only half-serious admission, he claims to have been a "losanger," a word that can mean both "sluggard" and "deceiver"; the author has been temporarily lazy about his work of translation, and, by means of the "trick" of the prologue, has implicated his audience in that laziness, managing in his dialogue with that audience to get them to "put off" the task at hand: reading the eighth book. Paradoxically, the
overt and dramatized dialogue in the eighth prologue functions in the last analysis as a ruse, a subterfuge that further enables the efficacy of the complex implied dialogue between author and audience that Douglas calls our attention to in the prologue's last stanza. Prologue 8 is a comic "interlude," to use David Parkinson's term, and a meditation on the motives for creating poetry, but it is foremost an example of Douglas's negotiation of his authorial role in relation to his audience and his audience's role in relation to figures of authority: a negotiation of the dynamics of dialogue.

We can get a sense of where Douglas is heading with this ongoing negotiation if we examine the verses at the end of Book XII wherein Douglas mentions his "pryncipall warkis," and moving from there to a consideration of Douglas's dialogue with the auctor Maphaeus Vegius in Prologue 13. Virgil's Aeneid has at this point been translated and, presumably, that translation has been read; Douglas is able to add the following lines:

Lo thus, followand the flowr of poetry,
The batellys and the man translait haue I;
Quhilk yoir ago in myne ondantit youth,
Onfructuus idylnes fleand, as I couth,
Of Lundeyes Lufe the Remeid dyd translait;
And syne off hie Honour the Palyce wrait:
'Quhen paill Aurora, with face lamentabill,
Hir russet mantill bordowrit all with sabill'.

Coldwell suggests that Douglas might be imitating Virgil's final lines in the Georgics, and the two passages do share
some concern regarding their respective poets' idle or undisciplined youth.\textsuperscript{31} The more conspicuous analogue, however, would seem to be the passage, probably not in reality Virgil's (though Douglas surely would have thought it so) that opens medieval editions of the \textit{Aeneid}:\textsuperscript{32}

\begin{quote}
Ille ego, qui quondam gracili modulatus avena carmen, et egressus silvis vicina coegi ut quamvis avido parerent arva colono, gratum opus agricolis, at nunc horrentia Martis arma virumque cano . . . .

I the ilk vmquhile that in the small ait Reid Tonyt my sang, syne fra the woddis yeid And feildis about taucht tobe obesand (Thocht he war gredy) to the bissy husband, Ane thankfull wark maid for the plewchmanis art, Bot now the horribill stern dedys of Mart, The batalys and the man I will discryve.

(1 Prol. 505-11)
\end{quote}

Not only do we have a conventional glance at earlier poetic work in both Scots passages, but we also see Douglas's translation of the opening \textit{Arma virumque cano} in each. "\textit{Cano}" is "discryve" for Douglas in the first passage (I discuss the very important implications of this choice in the next chapter); in the later passage, however, the Latin word is replaced by "translait," a switch that signals the intimate connection of voices, authors, and poetic "careers" that Douglas wants his readers to remember. The passage from the first prologue moves us into the translation itself, serving as a bridge between the voice of Douglas in line 504 ("Me thocht Virgill begouth on this maner") and the
voice of "Virgil" in line 505. The later passage, however, conveys closure—although, with Book XIII still to come, the sense of closure is not entirely accurate. Earlier Douglas's poetic voice had to modulate into Virgil's; now the two are linked almost inextricably, as Douglas not only translates/paraphrases Virgil's opening lines but also includes, like Virgil, allusions to his earlier works and even a quotation from his own *Palice of Honoure*. The auctoritas of Virgil and that of Douglas are combined in these lines, a combination that in part allows Douglas to pull off the dramatized dialogue with Maphaeus Vegius in Prologue 13 in the way that he does.

Maphaeus Vegius's extension of the *Aeneid*, completed in 1428, was by and large a success in his own time, appearing in most of the subsequent editions to Virgil including, of course, the one Douglas himself used.3 Ascensius, however, felt that the *Supplementum* was, as Douglas translates the thought, "to the text accordyng never a deill, / Mair than langis to the cart the fift quheill" (13 Prol. 117-8). But, as Charles S. Ross remarks, not all commentators were as critical as Douglas:

> Although other humanists had praised the work for its speeches and fine hexameters, and even called the author another Vergil ('alter Maro'), Douglas himself remarked that Vegio's 'stile be nocht to Virgill lyke.'

(215)
It is in the context of Douglas's self-construction as a kind of alter Maro himself in the prologues that we need to read Maphaeus Vegius as "another Virgil" to understand the dialogic interplay in the thirteenth prologue.

Like the opening prologue, the final prologue presents an encounter with literary authority and with a rhetorically represented, "responsive" audience. The difference now is that these roles are rather more confused, to humorous effect. The thirteenth prologue effectively dramatizes the dialogic conflation of author, audience, and authority as these three interact in translation—with Douglas, of course, getting in the last word. The prologue begins, appropriately enough at this late point in the translation, with a picture of the world and the poet readying "Eftir labour to tak the nychtis rest" (10). Douglas then moves on to a portrait of nightfall in what is frequently termed one of his "nature prologues," eventually telling us that he, as the dreamer, sat down and "On sleip I slaid" (75).

At this point a new "authority" enters, inquiring of the dreamer:

"Quhat dois thou heir
Vndyr my tre, and willyst me na gude?"
Me thocht I lurkit vp vnder my hude
To spy this ald, that was als stern of spech
As he had beyn ane medicyner or lech;
And weill persavit that hys weid was strange,
Tharto so ald, that it had not beyn change,
Be my consait, fully that fourty yeir,
For it was threidbair into placis seir;
Syde was this habyt, round, and closyng meit,
Douglas takes pains to present his dreamer-character's reaction to the strangeness of this other poet, most strikingly characterizing him as seemingly older, even dated—a notable contrast to Douglas's insistence on Virgil's timelessness in the first prologue. Even before the dialogue itself begins Douglas is preparing his readers for an encounter between author and authority very different from similar encounters in the prologues. Maphaeus is dramatized as immediately suspicious and reproachful, a characterization that at once puts the dreamer on the defensive and Douglas himself on the poetic offensive, suggesting that he enjoys a literary security that Maphaeus does not; the very act of playing with another poet's character grants Douglas a certain rhetorical power.

The dreamer does not initially recognize the other poet, and does not understand why this interlocutor accuses him of offending him. At this point, line 99, Maphaeus identifies himself; in fact, in Douglas's dramatization, he identifies himself as both auctor and audience:

'Knawis thou not Maphaeus Vegius, the poet,
That onto Virgillis lusty bukis sweit
The thretteyn buke ekit Eneadan?
I am the sammyn, and of the na thyng fayn,
That hes the tother twelf into thy tong
Translait of new, thai may be red and song
Our Albyon ile into your wlgar leid;
Bot to my buke yit lyst the tak na heid.'

(99-106)

Maphaeus at once trumpets his accomplishment, ironically enough given that his "thretteyn buke" has garnered him no recognition in this scene, and conveys his awareness of Douglas's accomplishment, in words that sound not unlike those of Douglas in Prologue 1 (cf. 1 Prol. 39-44; also, "Conclusio," 11). In other words, in the course of staking his own claim as auctor, Maphaeus plays the role of audience; his professed displeasure with Douglas is comically reduced in the process, not because the role of the audience is for Douglas unimportant but because this member of the Scots poet's implied audience refuses to accept his role passively.

Maphaeus's role as audience is underscored by Douglas's response to his charge, as Douglas offers an explanation for his "oversight" that discursively links the Italian auctor to readers not of Virgil, but of Douglas himself:

'Mastir,' I said, 'I heir weill quhat yhe say,
And in this cace of perdon I you pray,
Not that I haue you ony thing offendit,
Bot rathir that I haue my tyme mysspendit,
So lang on Virgillis volume forto stair,
And laid on syde full mony grave mater,
That, wald I now write in that trety mor,
Quhat suld folk deym bot all my tyme forlor?
Als, syndry haldis, fader, trastis me,
Your buke ekit but ony necessite,
As to the text accordyng neuer a deill,
Mair than langis to the cart the fift quheill.
Thus, sen yhe beyn a Cristyn man, at large
Douglas even goes on to cite Jerome and the Psalms to further buttress his argument; what we hear throughout this passage, in fact, is the voice of the commentator/poet offering, indeed insisting on, a particular interpretation of the situation. Douglas in effect denies the charge; more importantly, though, his patient if slightly condescending tone in lines 115-18, as he reiterates Ascensius's comment about the superfluity of Maphaeus's addition, rhetorically places Maphaeus in the role of the reader, and reinserts the commentary voice of earlier parts of the *Eneados* (notably the first prologue and book) in the context of dramatized dialogue. Instead of a Scots audience reading Douglas's translation, taking in the explanatory commentary and having Douglas attempt to guide their reactions, we see Maphaeus interacting with the dreamer-poet himself, forced to respond to a commentary tradition that has suddenly been turned against him. Douglas's further appeal to Maphaeus's Christianity, the implicit charge that it would be un-Christian to be offended at Douglas not including the thirteenth book, also sounds like some of Douglas's dialogic interaction with his implied readers and potential critics, as when in Prologue 1 he invites critical attention and correction but only from "ony wight grundit on cherite" (1
Prol. 480), and suggests that any genuinely charitable reader would not put forth such criticism in the first place. As the dreamer says here, "It may suffys Virgill is at ane end"—a comment that is meant to be silencing not just to the interlocutor Maphaeus but to the author Maphaeus as well, whose own response to Virgil, unlike Douglas's, can never "be" Virgil.

It is precisely because Douglas has, authorially speaking, nothing to lose and everything to gain that he can allow Maphaeus and his book into his ongoing dialogue with Virgil and his Scots audience; this is also the reason that what starts as verbal interplay can readily slide into comic slapstick in the same prologue. Maphaeus seems to turn the tables on Douglas by appropriating the very discursive strategies Douglas himself employs:

'And gif thou has afortyme gayn onrycht,
Followand sa lang Virgill, a gentile clerk,
Quhy schrynkis thou with my schort Cristyn wark?
For thocht it be bot poetry we say,
My buke and Virgillis morall beyn, bath tway.'

(138-42)

Douglas's own status as a good Christian is now called into question, but Douglas does not allow his audience to take it seriously. Maphaeus's argument quickly turns comically violent as he literally beats a translation (or a promise for one) out of the other poet:

'Thou salt deir by that evir thou Virgill knew.'
And, with that word, doun of the sete me drew,
Syne to me with hys club he maid a braid,
And twenty rowtis apon my riggyng laid,
Quhill, 'Deo, Deo, mercy,' dyd I cry,
And, be my rycht hand strekit vp inhy,
Hecht to translait his buke, in honour of God
And hys Apostolis twelf, in the numbir od.

(145-52)

From the perspective of dialogic interaction that this prologue forces upon us, the climactic beating in this scene seems all the more ridiculous, for it runs directly counter to the prevailing air of reasonableness, of give and take, that Douglas has sought to construct throughout his prologues, especially in his dialogues with Virgil and his audience. Maphaeus's riotous reaction leads to the translation of the thirteenth book, but it also represents the final deflation of the Italian poet as authorial competition for Douglas.36 Dialogue has been Douglas's foundation for authorial credibility, but it is a foundation from which Douglas's Maphaeus cannot operate. The dramatization becomes almost a parody of the dialogic translation, of the interplay of voices, that is Douglas's Eneados, with the joke ultimately being at Maphaeus Vegius's expense.

As if to contrast Maphaeus's failure at dialogue, as well as to contrast the impending night of the prologue's opening section, Douglas closes the thirteenth prologue with a medley of voices thematically tied to the labor of further translation:
Sone our the feildis schynys the lycht cleir, 
Welcum to pilgrym baith and lauborer; 
Tyte on hys hynys gaif the greif a cry, 
'Awaik on fut, go till our husbandry.' 
And the hyrd callis furth apon hys page, 
'Do dryve the catall to thar pasturage.' 
The hynys wife clepis vp Katheryn and Gill; 
'Ya, dame,' said thai, 'God wait, with a gude will.'

(169-76) 
The Scots people here represent not so much a community of readers--indeed, the peasantry is not an intended audience for Douglas's Eneados--but the picture does suggest a solidarity between poet and people, as the re-awakening of the dreamer's surroundings inspires him to work (183-6); in Douglas's mind, the peasants will never read the Eneados, much less understand it. But culturally and ideologically the Eneados is still their own, a Scots poem that participates (in its own hegemonic way) in the very chorus of voices that represents the "common weill" in this prologue. And ultimately it is this community that the poet "master Maphaeus" is not a part of. The prologue's last lines are of particular significance:

I wil compleit my promys schortly, thus 
Maid to the poet master Maphaeus, 
And mak vpwark heirof, and cloys our buke, 
That I may syne bot on grave materis luke: 
For, thocht hys stile be nocht to Virgill lyke, 
Full weill I wayt my text sall mony like, 
Sen eftir ane my tung is and my pen, 
Quhilk may suffys as for our wlgar men. 
Quha evir in Latyn hes the bruyt or glor, 
I speke na wers than I haue doyn befor: 
Lat clerkis ken the poetis different, 
And men onletterit to my wark tak tent.
The "our" of "our buke" here refers to Douglas, Virgil, even Maphaeus Vegius, and the Scots audience who now have their own Aeneid. But, for Douglas, the Eneados is ultimately "my wark." In what is perhaps Douglas's most striking and powerful claim for the vernacular, though one curiously overlooked by critics, the poet claims in effect that the vernacular can erase difference, creating something truly new even as it re-creates an original text. Maphaeus's style is nothing like Virgil's, but Douglas can still make it his own; together both styles can be incorporated into an Eneados to which "men onletterit" can pay their attention and, presumably, their respect. In this memorable dialogue-poem, the last of his original prologues, Douglas links speech and writing in its final passage in a way that suggests that his fame and poetic power, his place as an auctor, resides in his vernacular. The clerks can know the differences between Virgil and Vegius, but all Scots speakers will know and respect the work of Gavin Douglas.
NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. We can recognize such an implied audience, not at first overtly addressed by Douglas, in the opening lines of the first prologue (discussed below), in which Douglas is speaking to Virgil but is doing so with another audience in mind. See also my discussion below of the function of the notes to the prologue (40-41). Of course, an implied audience of this kind is evident throughout the text, not just in the prologues.

2. For a brief discussion of the prologues as accessūs, see Morse, "Gavin Douglas," p. 113. Bawcutt has noted Douglas's "mastery of talking in verse" is particularly evident in Prologue 1 (GD 166). She suggests as well that "From this Prologue and others . . . emerges a sense of the poet's personality: tough, humorous and argumentative" even as she implies this "portrait [of the poet] conforms to a stock persona" to one degree or another (GD 167). What she and other critics do not emphasize or even really explore, however, is the interplay of persona and implied audiences, the rhetorical/dramatistic interaction that Douglas sets up. Lois Ebin, in "The Role
of the Narrator in the Prologues to Gavin Douglas's *Eneados,* offers a sequential reading of all the prologues and their narrator (I would question her use of the singular here), arguing that the narrator's "activity establishes a movement from doubt and uncertainty to renewed creativity which complements the larger journey of Aeneas within the poem" (353). As I alluded to in the previous chapter, I find her case engaging but ultimately unconvincing, primarily because Ebin is so insistent that the identification here is only between the narrator and Aeneas, and not between the narrator (or, rather, the narrators) and Virgil himself.

3. Coldwell notes in his edition the "several conventions" in the opening passage, including aureate diction, praise of Virgil, and the modesty *topos.* We ought not to conclude, however, as Coldwell does, that in such rhetorical praise "no precise meaning is intended, or achieved" (4.144-5).

4. Virgil and his "sang" are not infrequently conflated in Douglas's prologues, suggesting the close rhetorical ties Douglas wished to construct between his auctor/addressee in the prologues and his great text that would be appropriated for the *Eneados* itself. Compare, for example, the following lines from Prologue 7:

The schot I closit, and drew inwart in hy,
Chyvirrand for cald, the sesson was so snell,
Schupe with hayt flambe to fleym the fresyng fell.
And, as I bownyt me to the fyre me by,
Baith vp and down the hows I dyd aspy,
And seand Virgill on a lettron stand,
To write onone I hynt a pen in hand,
Fortil perform the poet grave and sad . . .

(138-45)

"Virgill" refers most literally to the book on the "lettron stand," but Douglas makes no effort to insist it is only a book, particularly when he is about to "perform the poet." "Perform" here means "to complete, finish," and Douglas's image ultimately suggests that he is not merely completing a project of translation, but completing or bringing to fulfillment Virgil himself, inasmuch as Douglas is involved in an ongoing project to construct himself as an alter Virgil. Curiously, Bawcutt does not discuss this image in her study; as do most critics, she focusses almost exclusively on the extended nature description that makes up most of what Douglas calls a "drery preambill" (7 Prol. 166). See Bawcutt, GD, p. 180-86. Coldwell has no comment on these lines from the prologue.

5. I am referring here to Douglas's "name-dropping," which at once confers praise on the patron and reminds other readers of the original, noble audience for whom Douglas is
translating, though this rhetorical ennobling admittedly would seem to be rather overblown in the face of the actual reasons for the patronage of translations in the first place; as Richard Firth Green writes, "Translations, like numerous digests, anthologies, and compilations, were a convenience, short cuts to worldly wisdom for hard-working rulers" (152). With the increase in secular literacy men "evidently wished to read for themselves works which had previously been available only to clerks" (151); Douglas seems to be working within this social framework. See Poets and Princepleasers, pp. 149-66, for a general discussion of the upsurge of commissioned translations in the fifteenth century.

6. I will take up the discussion of the marginal glosses in Book I proper, and their dialogic relation to the translation itself, in Chapter 3.

7. Compare Douglas's remark, discussed in Chapter 1, "Weill at a blenk sle poetry nocht tayn is" (1 Prol. 108).

8. It is perhaps worth noting how Douglas adds lengthy and quite specific notes to his prologue near the point where he begins to talk particularly about the Scots language, glosses which seem designed to promote the reader's perception of the Eneados not merely as a masterpiece of Scots poetry, but also as a kind of "authority" on Middle Scots (as Douglas understood it).
Douglas's protracted and seemingly picayune discussions of "animal" and "homo," "genus" and "species," and of how such terms are to be understood in Scots--not to mention his insistence, as in lines 358ff., on the insufficiency of the Scots tongue for translating Virgil's Latin--testify as much as anything to Douglas's interest in being seen as an authority on both Latin and the vernacular.

9. Morse, in *Truth and Convention*, provides some thought-provoking commentary on these points; see especially pp. 231-35. Here in the notes, too, we see a fine example of Douglas's use of implied audiences.

10. Douglas's criticisms of Caxton's *Eneydos* center on Caxton's use of material not in Virgil and his omission of large sections of Virgil's narrative. See Bawcutt, *GD*, 80-3 for a discussion of this flyting passage. The best article on flyting in Middle Scots literature in general is Bawcutt's "The Art of Flyting." Jerome E. Singerman discusses Caxton's *Eneydos* and Douglas's attack on it in the fifth chapter of his book.

11. I discuss this point in a different way, with specific reference to the translation itself, in the opening pages of Chapter 3.

12. This image of the translated text as a kind of well-spring for *inventio* within vernacular poetic discourse is not uncommon; for a discussion of vernacular translation
as a source for rhetorical invention, as a way of expanding vernacular literary discourse, see Rita Copeland's *Rhetoric*, especially Chapter 7, "Translation as Rhetorical Invention: Chaucer and Gower." Copeland's passing remarks on Henryson's *Moral Fables* in her "Afterword" are instructive as well: "The text does not struggle to authorize itself against Latin academic writing; rather, it assimilates the Latin commentary into its own dominant system" (229).

Douglas's *Eneados* does much the same thing, particularly insofar as Douglas's prologues are themselves commentaries (although, importantly, commentaries constructed with their own poetic integrity and authority), and insofar as Douglas, as is well known, incorporates a great deal of the commentary tradition on the *Aeneid* into his own translation. For discussions of this last point, see Bawcutt, GD, chapters 4, 5, and 6, as well as the notes to Coldwell's edition of the *Eneados*, passim.

13. Virgil invokes Calliope by name only once in the *Aeneid*, in IX.525-28[9]:

_Vos, o Calliope, precor, aspirate canenti quas ibi tum ferro strages, quae funera Turnus ediderit, quem quisque uirum demiserit Orco, et mecum ingentis oras euoluite belli._

[et meministis enim, divae, et memorare potestis]
The final line of the passage is one available to Douglas but left out of most manuscripts and editions. Douglas translates the lines as follows:

Calliope, and O ye musys all,
Inspire me til endyte! On you I call
To schaw quhat slaughter and occisioun,
Quhou feel corpsis thar war bryntyt doun
By Turnus wapynnys and hys dartis fell,
Quham euery man kyllit and send to hell:
Help and assist to revolue heir with me
The extreme dangeris of that gret melle.
Yhe blissytyghtis, forsyth, ramembris weill
Sik thyngis, and quhar you lyst may reveill.

(IX.9.1-10)

14. Coldwell, in a note to this phrase, points out that "This suggests careful investigation, handling, probing, proceeding in a tentative way, and constitutes a demand for an analytic approach to poetry."


16. Ebin comments similarly in "The Role of the Narrator," p. 356, although still insisting on Virgil's
"style" in the singular, as well as Douglas's. As I will argue, I think the stylistic interplay of voices is more complex than Ebin presents it to be.

17. See the opening pages of Chapter 3 for further discussion of this particular passage.

18. The presumed tensions involved in a Christian poet translating a pagan work have led to several arguments for these tensions collectively constituting the running theme of the prologues in general. Lois Ebin, in both "The Role of the Narrator . . ." and Chapter 4 of Illuminator, Makar, Vates deals with this to some degree (see esp. pages 111ff.). Canitz presents perhaps the fullest argument along these lines, insisting that the prologues present both the friction and the gradual resolution between Douglas's conflicted principles as translator and churchman. Such arguments are useful insofar as they delineate more than one possible poetic perspective for Douglas; ultimately, however, they oversimplify the issues involved—not the least by insisting on Douglas's resolution of these perceived "conflicts"—and never seem to address the poetic value of these varying perspectives, the literary use to which they might be put, for Douglas himself. All is angst and adversity in "Douglas's struggle with two conflicting impulses," and Douglas is "his own severest judge and critic" (Canitz 3). And when Canitz asserts that Douglas
"thoroughly transvalues the Aeneid without being conscious of having made the slightest change" (3) she is simply wrong. For a different perspective on the same question, see Dearing's article, in which he argues that Douglas's Eneados is at once an allegory of the Christian prince and of the individual Christian soul; a refutation of Dearing, and a more convincing argument in this vein, can be found in Singerman, pp. 276ff.

19. See, for example, the moralizing on the notion that "erdly plesour endis oft with sorow" (5 Prol. 62) in Prologues 2 and 4. (Prologue 2 is discussed in some detail at the end of Chapter 3.)

20. See Bawcutt (GD 167) for a discussion of Prologue 3, particularly of the invocation to Cynthia in the prologue's opening lines.

21. Coldwell in his notes (4.225) raises the question of whether Douglas's reference to "myne authoris wordis" concerns Virgil (from the Georgics II) or Horace (Ars Poetica, 19ff., 156ff.). I am inclined to think it is Horace in this case, though for my purposes the very appeal to authority is more important than the specific authority referred to.

22. Bawcutt notes the same pattern in Prologues 10 and 11 (GD 173). I discuss Prologue 10 briefly below.
23. The reference is to Georgics III, passim, but see especially lines 266-83. Bawcutt discusses Douglas's admiration of the Georgics in GD, pp. 89-90.

24. For a brief discussion of this passage in Virgil, see Kenneth McLeish's article "Dido, Aeneas, and the Concept of Pietas," in McAuslan and Walcot, 136-7.

25. We might compare Douglas's division between Books I and II, and the intervening prologue, discussed in Chapter 3 below.

26. For a fine and recent explication of this prologue see David J. Parkinson, "Gavin Douglas's Interlude," Scottish Literary Journal 14 (1987), pp. 5-17, in which Parkinson argues that the prologue "dramatizes a crisis of commitment to the task" of translation (5).

27. This verse form is often used for comic scenes, scenes of verbal abuse, and so forth; for a discussion, see Parkinson, 6-7; Turville-Petre, The Alliterative Revival, 115-8; Felicity Riddy, "The Alliterative Revival," in The History of Scottish Literature Vol. 1: Origins to 1660, 39-54, esp. 50-51. Riddy also points out that there is a marked degree of self-consciousness in the Scottish alliterative poetic tradition from The Duke of the Howlat on toward Douglas's time (51), a self-consciousness certainly displayed in Prologue 8 and its management of dialogue.
28. I am indebted to Bawcutt's discussion of Prologue 8 in this analysis; see GD, p. 173. As the author summarizes, "Prologue VIII . . . forms a grotesque parody of the opening lines of book VIII" (173). She does not, however, consider the possibility that the questioning in the eighth prologue implicitly extends into the eighth book; in other words, Bawcutt does not point out the more dynamic and interpenetrating aspects of Douglas's dialogue with his "mystery authority" in the prologue and the authority of Virgil in the translation itself.

29. In contrast, Parkinson, cleverly reads line 142 as an implication that the dreamer and the railer are two halves of one poetic personality, "kindred parts of the poet himself" (11).

30. See the entry under "losengeour" in The Concise Scots Dictionary; Coldwell in his glossary only offers the meaning "sluggard."

31. Georgics IV.559-66:

Haec super aruorum cultu pecorumque canebam
et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum
fulminat Euphraten bello uicorque uolentis
per populos dat iura uiamque adfectat Olympo.
illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti,
carmina qui lusi pastorum audaxque iuenta,
Tityre, te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.

32. The quotation is taken from Williams' edition of the *Aeneid*, volume 1, p. 156-57. As Williams explains, the lines are cited by both Donatus and Servius as having been removed by Virgil's first editors.

33. For a summary of early opinions about Maphaeus's poem, see Kallendorf, *In Praise of Aeneas*, pp. 100-101. Charles S. Ross includes a summary of the work's inclusion in early editions of Virgil; see in particular pp. 222-26. Ross notes that often Maphaeus Vegius is not credited as the author by early printers. More on Douglas's use of Maphaeus's text and *auctoritas*, and on both Maphaeus and Douglas as "*alter Maro*'s," can be found in Chapter 4.

34. Bawcutt (GD 189-90) briefly discusses the parallels between this prologue and Robert Henryson's encounter with Aesop, his own *auctor*, in his Prologue to the Fable of the Lion and the Mouse. In noting the differences between the two prologues, Bawcutt interestingly calls "Maphaeus . . . Douglas's *alter ego*" (189). It would seem Maphaeus is always an "other." See Machan's article for a fuller discussion of Henryson, Aesop, and dream encounters with figures of authority.

35. For a discussion of Prologues 7, 12, and 13, the so-called "nature prologues," see Penelope Schott Starkey, "Gavin Douglas's *Eneados*: Dilemmas in the Nature
Prologues." Like Bawcutt (GD 190), she sees this prologue as "an elaborate and rather humorous justification for the inclusion of Book XIII itself" (93), with the meeting between Maphaeus and Douglas being "a comic perversion of the tradition of the 'reproachful beloved' or revered teacher returning to chide the sleeping poet. The encounter between writers has taken on the drama of dispute" (97).

36. The closest thing to a similarly overt distancing from Virgil on the part of Douglas can be found near the end of the tenth prologue. In the course of this "meditative and highly devout prologue" (Bawcutt, GD 173) Douglas quite predictably rejects classical paganism:

From the begynnyng and end be of my muse:
All other Iove and Phebus I refus.
Lat Virgill hald his mawmentis to him self;
I wirschip nowder ydoll, stok nor elf,
Thocht furth I write so as myne autour dois.

(151-5)

But as Bawcutt rightly notes, in constructing a bridge between the tenth prologue and tenth book, Douglas "employs terms which have highly Virgilian associations" (173-4); compare, for example, "the Fader of goddis and men" (10 Prol. 156, with diuum pater atque hominum rex (Aeneid X.2), and Douglas's assertion that the Christian God "haldis court our cristall hevynnis cleir" in line 166 with the concilium
Jupiter calls in the opening of the tenth book (Aeneid X.2). As he so often does, Douglas distinguishes himself from Virgil only in ways that cannot obstruct his claim as auctors; Douglas maintains close connections to Virgil, however, in literary terms.

37. Although he does not discuss Douglas at all, Kallendorf does make the argument that Maphaeus had a much better handle on Virgil's style than Douglas would give him credit for, particularly with regard to the use of direct discourse. See especially pp. 107-110 of his In Praise of Aeneas.
CHAPTER III
Translation and Authority in Book I of the Eneados

In his prologue to the fifth book of the Aeneid Douglas translates a brief passage from Virgil's Eclogues during the course of an argument for the salubrious nature of laughter and pleasure:

Myne author eyk in Bucolykis endytis,
'The yong enfant fyrst with lauchtir delytis
To knaw his moder, quhen he is litil page;
Quha lauchis not,' quod he, 'in thar barnage,
Genyus the god delytyth not thar tabill,
Nor Iuno thame to kepe in bed is habill.'

(22-7)

I discussed some of the dialogic implications of this passage in the previous chapter; now I would like to look at it from a somewhat different (but still dialogic) perspective. Douglas begins this rather loose translation with "Myne author . . . endytis," and inserts the speech tag "quod he" at line 25; these additions call our attention to two features of translation that I want to keep in view throughout the coming discussion of Douglas's translation of the Aeneid's opening book. The first is that any translated text has an implicit "he said" or "she said" accompanying it; that is, by its very nature translation can be
understood as a form of indirect, reported discourse. The second is that a translation is always a response to a previous text, and hence fundamentally dialogic; Douglas not only has given us a few lines from the *Eclogues*, but has done so for his own rhetorical purposes, purposes shaped in part by his own response to Virgil. In short, and in Bakhtin's terms, translation is a necessarily dialogic mode of writing. Translated discourse is at once reported and responsive discourse, recounted by the translator in reply to the source text—a relation of the original in relation to the original.

In this chapter I am working under the assumption (outlined fully in Chapter 1) that a translation is a kind of multi-voiced, dialogized discourse, an extended "reported utterance," and as such it dramatizes a hermeneutical dialogue between the original text, the translator, and the translator's pre-conceived audience(s).² In the first book of the *Eneados*, dialogic relationships exist between the voices in the first prologue and Book I, between the voices in the commentary and the translation, and between the poetic voices of Douglas and Virgil in the text of the translation itself. In effect, Virgil's literary voice is read in concert with the voices of Douglas as translator, poet, interpreter, and commentator. The orchestration of the inherently dialogic nature of translation—of the
dialogue among Douglas's narrators, his authorial text, and his Scots audience—is Douglas's means in *Eneados* I, and throughout his translation, of negotiating the problem of vernacular poetic authority that existed in the later Middle Ages and, ultimately, of bolstering his own status as a vernacular *auctor*. As I suggested in Chapter 1, Bakhtin's ideas concerning dialogic discourse assist us in recognizing and delineating this kind of poetic strategy.

We might begin analyzing Douglas's translation of the *Aeneid* by examining Virgil's opening line to his poem and Douglas's re-presentation of that text. The first line of the *Eneados* is striking, as the famous words *Arma uirumque cano* become "The batalis and the man I wil discrive." "Batalis" is a fair translation of *arma*, though certainly one that relies on the Latin's transferential rather than its primary meaning; Douglas's translation in this case moves our attention away from the tools of battle to the scene of battle itself, a movement that makes even more sense when we consider Douglas's choice of verbs here. "Wil discrive," in fact, seems a more curious substitution than "batalis"—surely *cano* poses few if any questions for the translator. But there is no singing, or, more loosely in all of *canere*’s figurative senses, no "sounding" involved in Douglas's verb form. What *is* emphasized, by the use of the future tense, is that which is to come: Douglas's imminent
translation, as distinct from Virgil's text of the past. Moreover, Douglas's use of "discribe," a word interesting in this context for having the Latin cognate scribere built into the Scots (and, of course, English) form, calls his audience's attention to the act of Douglas writing--a "performance" very different from that suggested by Virgil canens--as well as to the inherently reactive and responsive qualities of translation. What follows, Douglas implies, will be a reporting, a description of something witnessed: Virgil's text, and the events it describes, as "seen" by the translator. Indeed, each text is a reporting of sorts, Virgil's of what the Muse "tells" him, Douglas's of Virgil's. But they are of markedly different kinds. Douglas constructs his own poetic voice not only as a recreation of the Latin but also as a response to it, as he begins to remake the classical epic invocation both as it functions for Virgil and as he needs it for himself--a new convention for the discursive act of translation.

Two other textual voices impinge on this single line, engaging in the dialogue of this one translated passage. The first is the text's opening rubric: "The poet first proponyng his entent / Declaris Iunois wreth and mailtalent." The question arises, To whom does "the poet" refer? And the answer must be Virgil and Douglas, especially when we consider that the "entent" here is an
intention to "discrive" the battles and the man--to represent Virgil's narrative by means of Douglas's eloquence. Virgil's Latin does not overtly express intent; in fact, raising the issue of "entent" is itself an interpretive move that can only be made after the Aeneid (or at least this passage of it) has been read. While it may be true that Virgil is the only genuine poeta here, that Douglas is but a humble "makar," Douglas has constructed a discourse that allows no room for Virgil to be a poeta without himself being implicated in that status as well. The second voice is that of the commentator in Douglas's gloss to line 1--Douglas's own commentary constituting in Book I a voice (or really a series of voices) that dialogically reacts to and interacts with the poetic text just as it does in the prologue to the first book.8 The gloss to line 1 reads, "Virgille reherssis not Eneas naim, bot callis him 'the man' be excellens, as thocht he said 'the mast soueran man.'"9 As does the term "poet" above, this gloss simultaneously reflects on Virgil's writing and on Douglas's. By including a gloss, here and wherever he does so, Douglas strengthens his stance as learned commentator, and by glossing not the Latin but the Scots word, his word, bringing his own poetic text piecemeal into his commentative text, he reinforces his place as a producer of texts worth commenting on, a poeta and an auctor.10
Moreover, the gloss is really of the one word in Virgil's first half-line about which there can be no dispute with Douglas's translation: *virum*. There is no commentary on, no calling of the reader's attention to, what Douglas has changed. Douglas offers an interpretation of the word he and Virgil most obviously share, without offering clarification about what is more noticeably his own. Virgil is illuminated even as the mystery of translation is preserved.

The dialogue between commentary and text can also be read in Douglas's reproduction of Virgil's invocation to the muse:

O thou my muse, declare the causis quhy,
Quhat maieste offendit schaw quham by,
Or yit quharfor of goddis the drery queyn
Sa feil dangeris, sik travell maid susteyn
A worthy man fullilit of piete;
Is thare sik greif in hevynly myndis on hie?

(I.1.13-18)

To this most pervasive of epic conventions Douglas adds two glosses. The first, his comment on line 13, reads, "Musa in Grew signifies an inuentryce or inuention in our langgage, and of the ix Musis sum thing in my Palyce of Honour and be Mastir Robert Hendirson in New Orpheus." We hear Virgil's Latin word in the commentative voice of the Scots text, and it is by means of this gloss that Douglas is able to begin a dialogue with this Latin text and thus claim the invocation
in part for himself. Douglas's definition of "Musa" effectively appropriates the term for Scots; in the course of offering a seemingly straightforward definition of a word, the poet subtly insinuates that the "inuention" in the text is occurring not just in Latin but in Scots, "our langgage," as well. The reference to not only his own poetry but also the rather recent poem of Robert Henryson (another Scotsman reworking a classical story) underscores this concern with the vernacular and the poetic products of that vernacular that are at once poetic responses (and, in a real sense, definitional) as well as poetic "inventions" in their own right.

It is worth noting, too, that "Musa" is initially dealt with as a word, not as a narrative character or mythological figure (as the reference to other poetic texts might suggest) -- "Musa" "signifeis" something else. In contrast, the signifying in Virgil's own text regards not the Muse but rather the figure of Aeneas, who is *insignem pietate uirum* (10). Moving back to the Scots text, we read that for Douglas the hero is "fulfillit of piete" (17), another instance wherein we hear both the voice of Virgil and the explicit voice of Douglas together as the English cognate is used for *pietas* but Douglas's distinctive choice of words marks the passage. As suggested by *insignem*, the all-important quality of *pietas* is something that is emblematic,
so to speak, of Virgil's Aeneas, but it seems much more central and constitutive at this point in Douglas's representation of the hero. Of course, in Virgil's poem pietas will be more than a superficial characteristic of Aeneas, and Douglas's word choice suggests the response of a reader of the whole Aeneid, who would know Aeneas to be directed in all actions by pietas in the way that "fulfillit" might suggest. By choosing this word at this stage, though, Douglas is able not only to guide his audience's response to Aeneas—a positive response that Douglas is particularly interested in encouraging—but also to open a discursive space wherein two literary voices, Douglas's and Virgil's, can interact.12

The second gloss appears at line 14 and deals with Juno, the representation of whom I want to spend some time discussing. Rehearsing in the gloss the very words in line 14, "Quhat maieste offendit schaw quham by," Douglas writes:

"The poet inquieris quhat maieste or power offendyt of Iuno, quhilk is fenyeit to haf many poweris. She is clepit queyn of goddis, mastres and lady of realmys, prescident of byrthis, spous and sister of Iupiter, &c."

The commentary raises an issue here that the Latin text does not. Douglas seizes the opportunity to open the question of Juno's power even as he begins to dismiss it. Moreover, this comment seeks to define a mythological figure, but it does so in a way that curiously conflates the levels of
character and language. Her power is merely "fenyeit"; she is only "clepit" the queen of gods. In sum, Douglas stresses the artificiality of Juno. She is distinctly the creation of the makers of (in Henryson's words) "feinyeit fabils," her status based on what she is said to be. Like the translation itself, the commentary recreates Juno for the audience, acting in concert with the voices of the text to offer two distinct representations of Juno--one as character in the epic, one as mythological "idea" in the commentary--that interact with and interpret one another.13

This dialogic representation of Juno continues in a number of ways in both translation and commentary. For example, at line 20 Douglas stresses the anachronistic notion of Carthage as "Ennymy to Itail," an enmity suggested only indirectly in the Latin by the juxtaposition of the two place-names in line 13:

\begin{verbatim}
Vrbs antiqua fuit (Tyrii tenuere coloni)
Karthago, Italiam contra Tiberinaque longe ostia, diues opum studiisque asperrima belli (1.12-4)14
\end{verbatim}

Juno's favoring of Carthage amounts to a rejection of Italy and of Aeneas that Douglas's translation highlights. Juno tenditque fovetque (18), "intends and nurtures" Carthage to be capital of all peoples; Douglas translates here "this goddes ettilit . . . This realme to be superior and mastres / To all landis" (30-2), eliminating the connotations of
fondness, warmth, and attention implicit in *fovere*. The stress is solely on her intent regarding Carthage's power, not on her intent to help it to grow to power.

Douglas proceeds to encourage our negative reaction to Juno. When Juno is thinking and talking to herself about the threat of the Trojans and the danger to her reputation that their success would represent, Douglas responds to her with several additions to the Latin text. The *aeternum uulnus* (1.36) of Juno exists "till hir euerlastand schame" (I.1.66) and is "ay greyn" (67) in her breast, two expansions of the Latin text that underscore Juno's humiliation and the very personal nature of her embarrassment. Indeed, as Douglas tells us in another addition, she speaks to herself "in propir teyn" (68), "propir" suggesting that her anger is not only her own but also characteristic of her.¹⁵ Douglas's voice even enters into an implied dialogue with Juno's voice in the narrative, as when she questions who shall worship her if she is bested by the Trojans:

\[
\text{ast ego, quae diuum incedo regina Iouisque et soror et coniunx}
\]

(46-7)

\[
\text{Bot I, the quhilk am clepit of goddis queyn And onto Iove baith spous and sister scheyn}
\]

(81-2)
Juno's forceful reminder to herself and to Virgil's audience of her own status and power is undermined by Douglas's translation. The active verb form *incedo*, with all its vigor and martial connotations, is recast in the passive "am clepit," as Douglas's poetic voice (and, to a degree, his commentative voice— we will remember that Juno is "clepyt" queen of gods in Douglas's note to line 14) works in concert with Juno's (that is, Virgil's) own. Juno no longer walks as queen of gods; she is merely designated as such. Even the word "scheyn," included probably for meter and rhyme as much as anything else, emphasizes a superficial quality of the goddess—a quality tacitly questioned by the recently recounted story of the judgment of Paris—and is a far cry from the nobility of her actions and bearing suggested by the absent *incedo*. Douglas clarifies his own thinking on the matter with a gloss to line 82:

*Thoght in verite Iuno was bot ane woman, dochter of Saturn, sister and spows to Iupiter, King of Crete, yit quhen poetis namys hir swa, thai ondirstand sum tyme by Iuno the erth and the watir, and by Iupiter the ayr and the fyr; and for als mekyll as the ayr and the fyr is actyve, and the watyr and the erth patient, and that all corporall thyngis beyn engendrit therof, heirfoir bein thai clepit 'spowsis'. . . .*

Douglas's commentative text, itself a translative response to Book IX, chapter 1 of "Iohn Bocas in the Genealogy of gentille Goddis," turns "Juno" into a sign without an established referent, and thus creates an authorial
foundation for Douglas's own poetic interpolations and interpretations regarding Juno. Juno was a woman, but "Juno" as used by the poets can signify many things; the auctores are empowered to determine what the word might mean at any given time.

Thus the fictionality of Juno's divinity, itself underscored by the existence of a "true" story that can be opposed to it--she was, we are told, "in verite . . . bot ane woman"--leaves room not just for the symbolic use of the figure of Juno on the part of classical "poetis," but for the manipulation of the same figure by Douglas as well. As a poet in his own right, Douglas has as much prerogative as any other auctor to alter his own representation of Juno, either according to what other poets have done, or to what the commentary tradition deems appropriate, or to what he himself sees as proper. Accordingly, the representation and even the voice of Juno in these passages is often overtly colored by Douglas's perspective; indeed, at times Juno's voice is effectively subsumed by Douglas's, as in the passage where Juno asks Aeolus to destroy the Trojan ships. Virgil offers ten lines of direct address, but Douglas's narrator manages to interrupt this rather brief speech twice:

'Bot sen the fader of goddis euery one
And kyng of men gave the power,' quod sche,
'To meys the flude or rays with stormys hie,
Infors thi wyndis, synk all thar schippis infeir,
Or skattir widquhar into cunteis seir,
Warp all thar bodeis in the deip bedeyn.
I haue,' quod sche, 'lusy ladeis fourteyn,
Of quhame the fairest, clepit Diope,
In ferm wedlock I sal coniune to the
For this reward . . .

(I.2.28-37)\(^{19}\)

By including the speech tags "quod sche" Douglas accents his
own narratorial presence in the passage, highlighting as
well the reportorial stance he adopts in line 1 of this
book. The speech tags paradoxically insist on both the
translator's presence and his absence: they suggest that
these are not ("originally") the narrator's words even as
they remind us that what we have is a retelling in the
narrator's words. It is worth noting, too, that the
narrator breaks in at two critical points in Juno's
proposal: first during the praise she offers to Aeolus, and
then just as she initiates the "bribe," the offer of Deiopea
in exchange for the god's help. By doing this Douglas
reminds his audience (presumably unnecessarily) that he
would neither praise a pagan god nor stoop to such
pandering, thereby distancing his narrator from the
character—even as he suggests reportorial accuracy, thereby
linking his narrator closely to both character and auctor.
Douglas's representations of Juno's scenes in his early
chapters of Book I amount to a series of forums for his
ongoing negotiation of the role of translator into the role
of author.
For purposes of comparison and contrast with Douglas's Juno, we might fruitfully examine the poet's initial portrayal of Aeneas in Book I. Virgil's voice and Douglas's are in striking dialogue immediately before Aeneas appears, and continue to be so during the initial description of Aeneas. *Aeneid* 1.91, from the scene wherein Aeneas and his men are weathering the storm Juno has had sent, reads *praesentemque uiris intentant omnia mortem.* Douglas's translation of the line is:

> And euery thing mannasit the men to de,  
> Schawand the ded present tofor thar e.

(1.2. 67-8)²⁰

*Intentare* means "to threaten," but, as its very form would suggest, it has the sense of "to hold out threateningly," a connotation Douglas captures with "mannasit" and the addition "Schawand . . . tofor thar e." Even as we "hear" a bit of Virgil's voice in the English word "present," we hear Douglas's interpretive addition emphasizing the visual aspect of the scene for Aeneas and his men and for Douglas's own audience. In other words, Douglas once again stresses seeing and showing, underscoring here his own role as "presenter" of the action just as he does with "discrive" in this book's very first line.

Aeneas's appearance immediately following these lines is allotted both a gloss and a conspicuous translative substitution:
Belive Eneas membris schuk for cald
And murnand baith his handis vp did hald
Towart the sternys, with petuus voce thus gan say

(I.3.1-3)

Virgil simply says Aeneas spoke *talia uoce* (line 94), which necessarily directs our attention to the speech itself in order to understand what *talia* refers to. Douglas interprets for his audience first by substituting "petuus" for *talia*, offering in effect a one-word reading of the speech before we hear the speech itself.\(^2\) He bolsters his interpretation with an addition after Aeneas's speech is finished: Douglas tells us that the speech (again referred to by Virgil's narrator only as *talia* in line 102) was "al invane" (I.3.14). Prior to our hearing the speech, we are told by the translator's substitution that it will arouse pity; after the speech, we are reminded in an addition of its futility. In effect, Douglas's responses work alongside Virgil's text, guiding the audience's response by intimating how difficult Aeneas's task is and will be: even a markedly "petuus" speech by "the mast soueran man" cannot at this point move Aeneas's audience. In fact, Douglas is concerned enough about his own audience's interpretation of Aeneas that he includes an explanatory gloss on Aeneas's appearance at this point in the poem:

*Her fyrst namys Virgill Eneas. This cald, sais Seruyus, coym of dreid; nocht that Eneas dred the ded, bot this maner of ded; and alsso he that dredis na thyng, nor kan haf na dred, is not*
hardy, but fuyll hardy and beistly.

This comment is largely adopted, as Coldwell notes (4.152), from Ascensius's edition, although it reads as if it were to be attributed solely to the more authoritative name of Servius. As usual, Douglas is careful in this gloss to cast Aeneas as a flawless hero; however, Douglas's own commentary, that "Her fyrst namys Virgill Eneas," is more significant still, focussing our attention all the more on the presence of the translator. This scene is the first appearance of Aeneas, which would be obvious to anyone reading Douglas's translation and taking it as reasonably accurate; Douglas's comment on the "naming" of Aeneas, however, can be read, in its re-invoking of the very name of the Latin auctor, as evidence in itself of the accuracy of the translator. The name "Aeneas" suddenly appears, and so does the name "Virgil"--Douglas's audience is subtly reassured that Virgil has not actually named Aeneas heretofore, that Douglas is faithfully following Virgil in including his name only now. The commentative gloss on the auctor implicitly argues for the auctoritas of the translator.

Yet another example of the way poetry and commentary work together to secure our perception of Douglas as an auctor can be found in the Scots poet's recreation of the
Aeneid's first simile. Virgil describes the calming of the oceans by Neptune as follows:

```
ac ueluti magno in populo cum saepe coorta est
seditio saeuitque animis ignobile uulgus
iamque faces et saxa volant, furor arma ministrat;
tum, pietate grauem ac meritis si forte uirum quem
conspexere, silent arrectisque auribus astant;
ille regit dictis animos et pectora mulcet:
sic cunctus pelagi cecidit fragor . . .
```

(1.148—54)

Douglas's translation of this passage is somewhat unusual in that it contains roughly the same number of lines as Virgil's Latin:

```
And as ye se, oft amangis commonys fallis
Stryfe and debait in thar wod fulych ire,
Now fleys the stanys and now the broyndis of fyre
(Thar greif and fury mynysteris wapynnys plente),
Bot than percace gif thai behald or se
Sum man of gret autorite and efferis,
Thai ces and, all still standand, gevis him eris;
He wyth his wordis gan slaik thar mynd and swage.
On the sammyn wys fell all the seys rage.
```

(I.3.92-100)

Douglas begins this first simile with the addition "And as ye se," immediately reinforcing both the rhetorical distance between his audience and Virgil's text and the rhetorical proximity between his audience and his own text, employing the kind of address we have seen so often in the prologues and, along with it, the strategy of describing with which he opens Book I. The narrator is not merely translating a simile but unfolding a scene before his reader's eyes, becoming in effect an eyewitness to the Aeneid alongside his
audience. And even as he shrewdly stakes out his own poetic ground in his translation, Douglas adds an explanatory note; we should, he tells us, pay special attention to:

\[...\] Virgill in this comparison and symilytude, for therin and in syk lyke baris he the palm of lawd, as I haf said in my proheme. It is to be considderit alsso that our all this wark, he comparis batell tyll spayt or dyluge of watyr, or than to fyr, and to nocht ellis.

The commentative voice augments the authority of the poetic voice; calling attention to Virgil's poetic powers really directs our attention to Douglas's own. Douglas's abilities to recreate this poetry worthy of "the palm of lawd" are not-so-subtly argued for here. Conversely, the poetic voice lends credence to the commentative voice, as Douglas's citation of his own poetic prologue bolsters the auctoritas of the present comment on Virgil (as does, for that matter, his apparently extraneous note on Virgilian battle similes, by reminding his audience of his own comprehensive grasp of Virgil's story and poetic techniques).

Virgil's epic voice resonates through Douglas's lines in this simile, as when furor is transposed to "fury" and ministrat to "mynysteris," and even when silent arrectisique auribus adstant becomes "Thai ces and, all stil standand, gevis him eris." But through a surprising substitution Douglas's distinctive voice and concerns can once again be heard: pietate becomes "autorite," the first use of this word in the translation. In the Aeneid, Neptune's
metaphorical piétas in this simile stands in striking contrast to the furor of Juno represented by the storm itself, rationality and control as distinct from rage and chaos. In the Enéados, however, it is not the man of devotion or compassion who is able to foster unity in the multitudes, to quell conflicts or mediate disputes—it is the man of authority, the very quality that Douglas cultivates throughout his translation. Douglas reminds his audience to whom they ought to lend their ears: to the man whose "wordis" themselves, authoritative as they are, offer pacifying if ultimately unilateral guidance with regard to reactions to politics and, analogously, responses to texts. Douglas manages to link himself not just with Virgil but with Aeneas as well, by remaking piétas, Aeneas's distinguishing quality, into auctoritas, Virgil's, and tacitly claiming both for himself.27 He can do this precisely because he allows piétas, in its most general connotation referring to a sense of "duty," to become auctoritas. In the translation, Douglas's "duty" is to Virgil's text and his self-consciously faithful reproduction of it; of course, this piétas on the part of the translator is, as I have argued, the very source of the translator's poetic auctoritas.

This connection of piétas and auctoritas is brought out again in chapter 6 of Book I, this time not by Douglas's
poetic voice but by his commentative voice. The scene is Aeneas's address to the disguised Venus, which contains the famous self-identifying phrase, *sum pius Aeneas* (378). Douglas translates "Rewthfull Ene am I" (I.6.125), and his note to the line, incorporating Servius's explication of the passage, goes on at some length in explaining both the scene and the translation:

That Eneas heyr commendis his self, it is not to be tayn that he said this for arrogans bot forto schaw his styll, as a kyng or prince onknawin in an onkowth land may but repref rehers his estate and dygnite to mak him be tretyt as afferis. And als, becaus he trastyt he spak wyth a goddess, that scho suld nocht aschaym to remayn and talk wyth hym therfor; and becaus scho was a woman, he schew that he was a man of autorite, wyth guham thai nedis nocht ascham to speyk, for he was that man quhilk by the common voce was clepit Eneas full of pyete. And for that Virgill clepis hym swa all thro this buyk, and I interpret that term quhylys for 'rewth', quhils for 'devotion' and quhilis for 'pyete' and 'compassion' . . . .

(emphasis added)\(^{28}\)

In a work like the *Eneados*, in which, as I have argued, so much attention is paid both to dialogue and to audience perceptions, this address and the note accompanying it stand out. Douglas, like Servius and any number of commentators since, feels compelled to explain Aeneas's apparent arrogantia. Aeneas, Douglas insists, says this first to reveal his "styll"—his name and title but also his condition.\(^{29}\) Also, the remark is designed to garner him respect from someone whom he decides to treat and address as
a goddess, and it shows his "autorite" as well. In short, address reveals ethos, the very notion that Douglas has been putting to use so often in his direct addresses to his own audience, especially in the prologues, as he works to construct his own "autorite." In an association of pietas and auctoritas not unlike the kind we saw above, it is Aeneas's very claim to "rewthfulnes" that communicates his authority. Ultimately, this commentative interpretation of Aeneas's intentions serves to link the voice of the commentator with Aeneas himself. The assumptions and characterizations that Aeneas makes about his listener, and the words in which he chooses to address her, serve to establish his own auctoritas, just as Douglas's narrator's constructions of his own audience and his own ethos work to establish a poetic authority of Douglas's own.

Douglas makes yet another authoritative rhetorical move in this gloss. On the heels of his assertions regarding Aeneas's "pyete" and "autorite" Douglas invokes Virgil's nominal authority, as he so often does throughout the prologues, reminding us not only that this is the way Aeneas is but that this is the way Virgil says he is. Thereupon Douglas, in what seems to be a moment of genuine revelation, one that plays off of Aeneas's own revelation in this scene, admits his varying interpretations of the concept of pietas. What his audience normally cannot know, however, is when
pietas actually appears in Virgil's text. While at times "rewth," "devotion," "pyete," and "compassion" may all stand in for pietas, the Latin word itself is lost in a swirl of Scots that can only be clarified with a marginal gloss like the one Douglas creates here—in other words, that can only be clarified by recourse to the translator's authority. As this gloss concludes, Douglas's authority is confirmed in the very diction of the following pronouncement: "tharfor ye sall knaw that pyete is a vertw or gud deid by the quhilk we geif our dylligent and detfull lawbour to our natyve cuntre and onto thaim beyn coniony to vs in neyr degre."

Douglas here invokes and reinforces two distinct realms of knowledge, that of the translator and that of the audience; the intersection of these realms is negotiated in marginal glosses such as this one, wherein auctoritas can be not only maintained, but wielded. Moreover, Douglas manages to link himself not just with Virgil but with Aeneas as well, by remaking pietas, Aeneas's distinguishing quality, into auctoritas, Virgil's, and tacitly claiming both for himself. In the translation, Douglas claims his "duty" is to Virgil's text and the self-consciously faithful reproduction of it; the subtext of this gloss can be summarized as "sum pius Douglas," and the poet's revelation effectively demonstrates Douglas's literary authority. This pietas on the part of
the translator is the very source of his poetic auctoritas, of Douglas's assertion of his status as a vernacular auctor.

The interplay of dialogue and authority in the marginal glosses is perhaps most evident in some of the notes included in the densely-annotated fifth chapter of Douglas's Book 1. For example, Douglas appends an explanation to line 28, the point at which Venus mentions Antenor to Jupiter and narrates how that Trojan was allowed, unlike (to this point) Aeneas, to overcome adversity and misfortune in his wanderings. The commentary explains:

Becaus ther is mention of Anthenor, quham many, followand Gwydo De Columnis, haldis tratour, sum thing of him will I speyk, thocht it may suffis for his purgation that Virgill heir hayth namyt him, and almaste comparit him to the mast soueran Eneas, quhilk comparison na wys wald he haf maid for lak of Eneas, gif he had bein tratour.

Like Caxton and Chaucer in the first prologue, and Maphaeus Vegius in the thirteenth, Guido delle Colonne is here an authority that Douglas must subvert and refute. And he does so, in this case not only by summoning authorities against Guido, but, more importantly, by raising Guido's name in the specific context of his mistake about Antenor; Guido made Antenor a traitor, but in fact, the text implies, it is Guido delle Colonne himself who is the real traitor: he has unpardonably betrayed Virgil's text and intention. Antenor is actually innocent, so, confidently conjuring his own commentative voice, Douglas promises "sum thing of him
will I speyk." But Douglas, no textual traitor himself, speaks of Guido initially by recourse to Virgil and to his auctoritas; it is Virgil, after all, who "heir hayth namyt" Antenor, and that alone "may suffis for his purgation."

Even from Douglas's reverent pen, however, the auctoritas here is not solely Virgil's; Douglas bases his argument on his audience's understanding of Eneas as a figure "mast soueran," a view that, as we have seen, the Scots poet himself has encouraged in his translation and propounded in his commentary.

The dialogic effect of this note is even more evident as the commentator continues; Douglas also refutes Guido, and the common medieval perception of Antenor, by invoking the voice of Livy on the matter. Referring initially to Antenor, Douglas writes, "Bot to schaw his innocens, lat vs induce the mast nobill and famus historian and mylky flud of eloquens, gret Tytus Lyuius, quhilk of Anthenor and Eneas sais thir wordis in his beginning . . .," and goes on to quote Livy's text. Livy gets an introduction briefer but not unlike Virgil's in the opening prologue, who is "flude of eloquens" in line 4; the historian's nobility and fame effectively contrast with Guido's traitorous nature.

Moreover, the commentator's introduction plays upon the dialogic nature of the passage; addressing one audience, even rhetorically including them in his introduction ("lat
vs induce . . ."), the mediating voice seemingly leads Livy onto the stage and deferentially asks him to participate in the ongoing dialogue of voices in the text. And when we do hear the commentating voice again, it is in another direct address to Douglas's readership, asking them to draw their own conclusions about Guido:

Now I beseik yow, curtes redaris, considder gif this be punctis to traison, or rathar of honour, and wey the excellent awtorite of Virgill and Tytus Lyuius wyth your pevach and corrupt Gwido. Landinus sais als of this Anthenor that, for his sone Glaucus followit Paris, he depechit him of him, and for that sam caus, quhen he was aftyr slan by Agamenon, he maid na duyll for his ded.

Douglas specifically calls upon the readers' awareness of the authority of these writers, and his inclusion of Landino, authoritatively cited earlier in a note to I.3.100, seems an afterthought to tip further the scales to the side of the auctores and, notably, of Douglas. Like Livy before, the Scots audience is now called to active participation in the dialogue, as it has heard the debate and is now asked to "considdir" which side has won. But his dialogic balancing act slips a bit with "your pevach and corrupt Gwido," not because the insults are out of place--Guido is, after all, a traitor to Virgil and to his own readers--but because Douglas's literary elitism betrays him: the popular but "corrupt" text of Guido and the common reader is rhetorically associated with the "curtes redaris" whom
Douglas is addressing. Nevertheless, the gloss is, on the whole, carefully designed to draw upon a host of authoritative voices in dialogue, not the least of which by this point is Douglas's own.

We can hear the commentator's voice in still more prominent dialogue with the text of the *Aeneid* itself, and relying ever increasingly on its own *auctoritas*, in Douglas's note to I.5.102. Jupiter predicts and assures Venus of the eventual victory of the Trojans and, along with it, the inevitable glory of the Romans, especially as epitomized by their leader:

Cesar of nobill Troiane blude born salbe,
Qwhilk sal thempyre delait to the occiane see,
And to the sternys vpspring sal the fame
Of Iulius, that takyn haith hys name
From Iulus, thi nevo, the gret kyng,
As prince discend of his blude and ofspring

(99-104)

This would appear to be one of Douglas's freer translations, as Virgil's Latin reads simply:34

nascetur pulchra Trojanus origine Caesar,
imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet astris,
Iulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo.

The commentator in the translation changes *a magno* . . . *Iulo* to "From Iulus, thi nevo, the gret kyng," reminding his audience that Aeneas's son is Venus's nephew. And the verb *terminet* is replaced by the noticeably more expansive *delait* and *vpspring*, nearly a reversal of the sense of the Latin. In Virgil, Caesar will set limits to his empire and glory--
his power is underscored not only by the extent of his power but also by the very implication that only he himself can confine that power. In Douglas's verb, Caesar's empire is not "limited by" but "extended to," and it is not Caesar who regulates the extent of his fame: the fame itself "vpspringis" to the stars. But Douglas's most important addition to Virgil's text is the note to 102, which confers even more praise on Julius Caesar:

Of Iulius Cesar, whan I behald his Commentaireis, and the gret volum of Lucan, and wha of hym writis Swytoneus, I thynk bettyr hald styl my pen than wryt lytill of sa large a mater and sa excellent a prynce. Bot ye sall knaw that the principall entent of Virgill was to extoll the Romanys, and in specyal the famyllye or clan Iulyan, that coim from this Ascanyus, son of Eneas and Crevsa, otherwais callyt Iulus; becaus the empryour August Octavyan, quhamto he direkkit his wark, was of that hows and blud, and sistyr son to Cesar Iulyus.

The marginal commentary is intriguing because the commentative voice does not just gloss the text but overtly reacts to it. The authorities in this comment are little more than names dropped to display the commentator's own reading; by alluding to but not actually citing these texts, Douglas assures that Lucan's "gret volum" and the writings of "Swytoneus" are reserved as part of the commentator's experience, but not the reader's. The statesman Caesar, the epic poet Lucan, the historian Suetonius—the writings of these authorities, all dealing with the figure of Caesar
himself, are bound to Douglas's own writing, which, Douglas's deferrals notwithstanding, offers its own contribution to the history of Caesar and the explication of Virgil. In fact, there is no direct source for this gloss; the sole source of auctoritas is the translator-commentator's own knowledge. It is this sort of commentative confidence that leads to the kind of gloss we find in the opening of chapter 6, where the gloss does not explicate a specific line but acts as a reaction to the chapter as a whole:

In this cheptir ye haf that Eneas met his moder Venus in lyknes of a virgyn or a mayd, by the quhilk ye sall vndirstand that Venus is fenyeit to be modyr to Eneas becaws that Venus was in the ascendent and had domynation in the hevyn and tym of his natyvite; and for that the planet Venus was the signifiar of his byrth and had domination and speciall influens towart hym, therfor is scho fenyeit to be his mother; and thus it that poetis fenyelis bein full of secreyt ondyrstandyng ondyr a hyd sentens or fygur.

This reading of the chapter, occurring before the audience's own reading of the chapter, argues for the authority of the commentator, who is able to explicate the mysteries of poetry, as well as for the authority of Douglas the poet, who is able to translate the "secreyt ondyrstandyng" hidden in Virgil's poetry, to "vernacularize" the very source of that poetry's power. Douglas by this point is able to rely on his poetic and commentative authority without the crutch of citation and name-dropping; he has constructed a dialogue
of authoritative voices that now has its own momentum that can carry over into the other parts of the translation and into the appended prologues as well.

As a last examination of the dialogic relationship of translation and commentary in Book 1, it is worth looking at Jupiter's reply to his daughter Venus in chapter 5, a lengthy prophecy and promise that occasions a good deal of commentative explication on the part of Douglas. During the course of lines 257-96 (in the Latin), Virgil has Jupiter essentially summarize Roman history from Aeneas's success forward, foreshadowing the reign of Aeneas, Ascanius's building of the walls of Alba Longa, the coming of Romulus, and, eventually, the rule of Augustus Caesar. Here is the historical focal point of the Aeneid, an encapsulation that from the Roman dynastic point of view makes the story make sense; it is for this reason that the passage elicits such energetic responses from Douglas. Early in the speech, the translator offers two glosses that refer to the appended Book 13; the first gloss replies to Jupiter's assurance, "Eik thou salt rays abuf the sterrit sky / The manfull Eneas and hym deify," with Douglas remarking, "The deyfication of Eneas is eftyr, in the last c. of the xiii buyk." The second gloss reads, "Of the barganyng or batellis of this Eneas, her in dyuers bukis followand; and of the beldyng of his cyte and howlang his ryng endurit, in the last and
penult c. of the xiii buyk." Both glosses serve to legitimize the inclusion of the thirteenth book in the translation, arguing, in effect, for its necessity in completing the Aeneid's real story. Douglas refers to his own translation as the authoritative intertext for the explication of Jupiter's remarks.

A longer gloss, at line 81 of the translation, is even more illuminating. Douglas's long explanation of the story of Romulus, in summarizing the authoritative discourses of Livy, Boccaccio, and Augustine and then invoking their names, constitutes nothing less than a companion narrative to the story Jupiter is relating in Virgil's text. The parallel narratives play off one another ultimately to the end that they bolster the authority of the Scots text. At the mention of Romulus Virgil writes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{inde lupae fuluo nutricis tegmine laetus} \\
\text{Romulus excipiet gentem et Mauortia condet} \\
\text{moenia Romanosque suo de nomine dicet.}
\end{align*}
\]

(275-77)

Here is Douglas's verse translation:

Than with glitterand wolf skyn our his aray, 
Cled in his nurys talbert glaid and gay, 
Romulus sal the pepill ressaue and weld, 
And he the mercial wallis of Rome sal beld, 
And efter his name cal the pepill Romanys.

(I.5.79-83)

The text's gloss begins with Douglas's imperial "Of Romulus ye sall knaw" and narrates how "Amulyus" banished his
brother "Numytor," whose daughter Ilya was then made a "nun" in hopes that she would bear no children and, thus, no potential claimants to Amulyus's throne. We are told that, mysteriously, Ilya "consauyt and brocht furth twa childyr mayl," Romulus and Remus; Amulyus sends the children down the Tiber, whereupon they are found by a shepherd and "Acca his wyf, other wys callyt Lupa." Because she was known as Lupa, we are told, it came to be thought that the twins were nursed by a wolf. Douglas continues to relate the two foundlings' revenge on Amulyus, their foundation of the city, and the omens that led to the naming of the city of Rome. At this point, however, some authorial indeterminacy is introduced by Douglas. Referring to the slaying of Remus, Douglas writes:

... bot quhiddir it was for that debait, or for the goyng our the wallis, as otheris will say, Remus was slayn be Fabyus, chyftan of weyr to Romulus ... ... And quhou or quhy that he is callit Quyrites, and of his dowtsom end, and of the sonnis eclips the tym of his ded, and quhy he was repute a god, reid Titus Lyuius, Iohn Bocas in the last c. of the Genealogi of Godis in the ix buke, and Augustyn in the Cyte of God in the xv c. of the iii. buke. And sum thing heir eftir in the xiii c. of the vi buke and the x c. of the viii buyk.

The admission of uncertainty with regard to Remus's fate allows Douglas's audience a glimpse of the translator-commentator at work, sifting through various stories, judging the believability of different versions, deciding
which authoritative narratives will be appropriated and which will be noted with only "as otheris will say." When the names of the auctores themselves are finally mentioned in the note, it is within the context of a rhetorical occupatio that suggests that all the reader really needs to know is in the rather prolix gloss itself. In fact, the final line of the gloss recommends a reference noticeably more convenient than the others: the reader can look to the very text in front of him for answers to questions that might be raised here. Douglas's Eneados becomes an explicative authority for its own narratives.

I would like now to move to a different section of the text, and a correspondingly different kind of dialogue with auctoritas. Chapter 7 of Douglas's Book 1 enacts one of the more complex and intriguing dialogues between Latin and Scots, and between—perhaps more importantly—the figures in the narrative and the negotiations of poetic authority played out on the textual level. The chapter contains the descriptions of the pictures of past events, a "fully-developed ecphrasis," as Williams calls it (Aeneid I.192), along with some dialogue between Aeneas and Achates.38 I have argued that one of the roles Douglas adopts is that of witness to the text of the Aeneid, reporting the Latin as it were and in doing so giving a kind of authoritative account of Virgil's work; in this scene we read Aeneas figured as a
witness to Trojan history, and, interestingly, not primarily as an eyewitness (which he certainly was at one point) but as the "audience" for the collection of scenes depicted on the walls of the temple. The artworks recapitulate the history of the fall of Troy; viewing them, Aeneas relives the scene in his mind and revives the story for Virgil's audience.

Aeneas is enveloped in a cloud, so that "Amang the men he thrang, and nane hym saw" (I.7.41), his invisibility contrasting with the emphasis on the visual nature of the whole scene. The hero then spots the story of the fall of Troy depicted on the walls; Virgil describes Aeneas's initial reaction as follows:

uidet Iliacas ex ordine pugnas
bellaque iam fama totum uulgata per orbem,
Atridas Priamumque et saeuum ambobus Achillem.
constitit et lacrimans, "quis iam locus," inquit, "Achate,
quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?
en Priamus. sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi,
sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.
solue metus; feret haec aliquam tibi fama
salutem."
sic ait atque animum pictura pascit inani
multa gemens, largoque umectat flumine uultum.

(I.456-65)

Once again, Douglas's version serves as an interpretation of the scene that highlights the Scots poet's own authoritative role. For example, Virgil's *bellaque iam fama totum uulgata* per orbem (457) becomes "The famus batellis, wlgat throu the warld or this" (I.7.69). Douglas's translation of *uulgata*
manages at once to remain very literal, echoing the sound of the Latin, and also to create a pun that self-referentially points to the translated text, Douglas's "stile wlgar" mentioned in the first prologue (l. 492), his own "wlgar Virgill" (Excl. 37) that he will praise at the end of his work. The pun hinges on the very dichotomy that characterizes translated discourse—the text is at once the same as but nonetheless different from the original. Douglas toys with this paradox further as he expands per orbem to "throu the warld or this," invoking a distinction between Aeneas's world and Virgil's, and, implicitly, between Virgil's and Douglas's. The battles of Ilium were famous in the Latin world, and that fame will be further extended in the Scots world, by means of exactly the "wlgar" text the Scots reader would have before him.39

Douglas goes on to conflate "that world and this" as he changes constitit (459) to the present-tense "styntis" (72), and then, for quis iam locus . . . Achate, / quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?, has Aeneas ask "'Quhou now, quhilk place is this, my frend.'" (73). The demonstrative pronoun added in the translation more insistently places the scene before the reader's eyes, linking Aeneas and the audience. Aeneas, moreover, is also linked with the author (Virgil and/or Douglas) as the hero continues to describe the pictures to his companion Achates.
Virgil's *en Priamus* (461) becomes the emphatic "Allace, behold, se yondir Kyng Priam" (76), laying still more stress on the visual elements of the scene for the reader and reinforcing Douglas's self-appointed role as reporter of the Latin text (we recall once again "The batalis and the man I wil discrive," I.1.1). Perhaps most strikingly, Douglas brilliantly transforms *sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt* into "Thir lamentabyll takynnys passit befor / Our mortal myndis aucht to compassioun steir." "Lamentabyll takynnys" at once captures the sound and rhythm of the Latin line even as it adds something to the literal meaning only implicit in the original; indeed, the phrase further emphasizes the signs at once beheld and recounted by Aeneas in this passage. And, having recreated Aeneas as both an audience-figure and an author-figure in this scene, Douglas remakes *tangunt* into "aucht to compassion steir," suggesting the guiding force of the authorial-commentative voice that he has so often brought out in this first book. Aeneas's speech becomes not just a declamation of the pictures' effect but a summary of their intended and appropriate effect, a small but telling analogue to Douglas's role as translator-poet. Ironically, Douglas collapses the author-audience dichotomy in order to
assert (albeit implicitly) his own authorial status, to gain
greater control over the "picture" of the *Aeneid* that his
Scots audience actually sees.

As a final example of Douglas's dialogic manipulation
of his translated text, I would like to examine his
conclusion of Book I and the subsequent transition to Book
II of the *Aeneid*. The most notable change on Douglas's part
is his rearrangement of the translation of *Aeneid* II.1-13 as
*Eneados* I.12. Critics have tended to be either
dismissive of or perplexed by such departures from Virgilian
structure; Coldwell characterizes them as "minor textual
adjustments," while Bawcutt admits finding them "perhaps the
most puzzling feature of Douglas's translation" (I.54; GD
140). Careful attention, however, to the dialogic nature of
the voices in this section suggest a reason for Douglas's
alteration at the end of this book.

Virgil ends *Aeneid* I with Dido's fateful request, in
the form of direct discourse, for Aeneas to tell the story
of the fall of Troy and of his wanderings. Aeneas's
response, however, does not immediately open Book II;
rather, Virgil begins with the dramatic lines, *Conticvere
omnes intentique ora tenebant; inde toro pater Aeneas sic
orsus ab alto* (II.1-2). Clearly part of what Virgil is
doing is putting Aeneas in the position of the epic story-
teller, with Dido and the rest as audience-figures,
analogous to Virgil's own audience who themselves are waiting anxiously for Aeneas to begin. By means of his translation, Douglas makes his own connection between the figure of the hero and the figure of the poet, identifying himself all the more with the authoritative figure of Aeneas, who commands such rapt attention.

Chapter 12 of Eneados I translates Aeneid II.1-13; the lines serve as Aeneas's short preamble to the story of the last days of the war.42 Aeneas first mentions the "ontellabill sorow" (I.12.6) he has been asked to relive, and prefaces the tragedy of the impending tale with the rhetorical question:

Quhat Myrmydon or Gregion Dolopes  
Or knyght wageor to cruel Vlixes,  
Sik materis to rehers and yit to heir  
Mycht thame conteyn fra weping mony a teir?  

(11-14)43

Eneados I ends with the following address to Dido, which further underscores the tragedy of the story Aeneas is about to tell:

And now the hevin ourquhelmys the donk nycht,  
Quhen the declynyng of the sternys brycht  
To sleip and rest perswadis our appetite.  
Bot sen thou hast sic plesour and delyte  
To knaw our chancis and fal of Troy in weyr,  
And schortly the last end tharof wald heir,  
Albeit my spreit abhorris and doith grys  
Tharon forto remembir, and oftsyss  
Murnand eschewis tharfra with gret dyseys,  
Yit than I sal begyn yow forto pleys.  

(15-24)
Aeneas's conditional clause in Virgil posits Dido's *amor*, here something like "passionate longing," to hear the story of *Troiae supremum . . . laborem* (II.10-11); Douglas accentuates Aeneas's role as poet by remaking *amor* as "sic plesour and delyte" that an audience can derive from tale-telling. Indeed, even Aeneas's simple final word in these prefatory remarks, *incipiam* (II.13), is expanded to include this poet-figure's interest in pleasing his audience. In short, Douglas responds to Virgil's depiction of Aeneas as *poeta* and recasts this rearranged passage to draw a clear connection between himself and Aeneas.

This connection is extended when Douglas introduces another voice into the dialogue of his translation of this transition between books: the prologue to Book II. While Aeneas's "prologue" to the story he is about to tell stresses the tragic nature of the narrative, Prologue 2, on the heels of what has now become, thanks to Douglas's rearrangement, an introductory speech for that prologue, picks up and augments Aeneas's theme in Douglas's own voice:

*Dyrk beyn my muse with dolorus armony.*
*Melpomene, on the wald clerkis call*
*Fortill compyle this dedly tragedy*
*Twiching of Troy the subuersioun and fall;*
*Bot sen I follow the poete principall,*
*Quhat nedis purches fenyeit termys new?*
*God grant me grace hym dyngly to ensewi*

(2 Prol. 1-7)
The analogy between Douglas and Aeneas is expanded to include the connection between the Scots poet and Virgil, whose own words will be relied on to tell an "ontellabill" narrative. Even though the story of the "lamentabill realm of Troy" (I.12.8) has been told "with terys lamentabill" (2 Prol. 8) before, Douglas again claims authority (as he does in the first prologue) both by "followand Virgil" (2 Prol. 10) and by doing something new in the vernacular: "Ane othir wys now salt that bell berong / Than euer was tofor hard in our tong" (2 Prol. 11-12). There is no small irony in that Douglas claims authority by virtue of his accuracy in the midst of one of his most obvious changes to Virgil's text, the rearrangement of the first part of Book II; and there is perhaps no clearer example of the negotiation of authority that concerns Douglas, the maintenance of Virgilian auctoritas along with the assertion of his own right to rewrite. Just as striking is the extension and conflation of Virgil's-Aeneas's voice and Douglas's in the final stanza of the prologue:

Harkis, ladeis, your bewte was the caws;
Harkis, knychtis, the wod fury of Mart;
Wys men, attendis mony sorofull claws;
And, ye dyssavouris, reid heir your proper art;
And fynaly, to specify every part,
Heir verifeit is that proverbe teching so,
'All erdly glaidnes fynysith with wo.'

(2 Prol. 15-21)
Here Douglas's address to his implied audience of "ladeis" and "knychtis" echoes Aeneas's own address to his figural audience in the narrative. Douglas's moralizing, of course, broadens Aeneas's stated motive, to grant Dido's request and in doing so render "plesour and delyte" (I.12.18); as a dialogic response to Aeneas's introductory speech, the prologue implicitly warns against deriving too much pleasure from a story that is a "dedly tragedy" (2 Prol. 3) and ought to be (primarily, for Douglas) teaching a lesson about the ultimate end of all worldly pleasure.

In this chapter I have tried to suggest that the inherently dialogic discursive practices of translation and of commentary on an auctor can be re-created as a means for establishing poetic auctoritas. Douglas's substitutions, expansions, glosses, and rearrangements in Book I of the Eneados collectively constitute not only an interpretive matrix for the vernacular text but also a textual arena within which Douglas can continually re-negotiate a kind of poetic auctoritas for his own translation. The result of this "hermeneutic dialogue" I have been describing is Douglas's self-styled status as a vernacular auctor. The primary participant in this dialogue has thus far been Virgil; in the next chapter I want to look at in what ways Douglas creates, in his translation of Book XIII, a dialogue
with the other principal auctor in the Eneados: Maphaeus Vegius.
NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. *Eclogues*, IV.60-3: "Incipe, parue puer, risu cognoscere matrem / (matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses) / incipe, parue puer: qui non risere parenti, / nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili est."

2. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, Douglas Robinson's very recent book, *The Translator's Turn*, is the only book on translation theory that proposes a dialogic understanding of translation that is intriguing in that it argues for the rhetorical power of the translator and against conceiving of translation as a quest for equivalence and hence doomed to failure; Robinson, however, relies a good deal more on the dialogical theories of Martin Buber than those of Bakhtin, and does not take into account the range of Bakhtinian writings. I have borrowed the phrase "hermeneutical dialogue" from Robinson's book.

3. This problem is summarized neatly by Tim William Machan, who reminds us of the "specific cultural determinants of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century vernacular poetry which admitted authority and authorship as characteristics only of classical and ecclesiastical writers and texts. The term 'auctor' itself was reserved for
ancient poets, church fathers, and learned commentators, while a vernacular writer, whatever he may have thought of himself as an artist, was a 'makar'." (194). See also the discussions of authorship and authority by Minnis in *The Medieval Theory of Authorship*, esp. pp. 1-15, and by Miller in *Poetic License*. For the *auctor* as a role of vernacular translators, see Rita Copeland's discussion in *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages*, pp. 179-229; remembering that translation is always interpretation, we might note her perceptive observation that "It is through the disciplinary force of hermeneutics that the translator can discover—literally 'invent'—the ascendency of the vernacular" (197).

4. The social character of this project on Douglas's part should not be forgotten. At this point we might compare some of Raymond Williams' comments on authorship, since they remind us that Douglas's project, despite his concern with individual achievement in completing it, is unavoidably the product of a socio-literary intercourse of which he is only a part: "There is the relatively simple case of cultural creation by two or more individuals who are in active relation with each other, and whose work cannot be reduced to the mere sum of their separate individual contributions. This is so common in cultural history, in cases where it is clear that something new happens in the
very process of conscious co-operation, that it does not seem to present any serious difficulties. But it is from just this realization of a relatively well-known experience that the second and more difficult sense of a collective [authorial] subject is developed. This goes beyond conscious co-operation—collaboration—to effective social relations in which, even while individual projects are being pursued, what is being drawn on is trans-individual, not only in the sense of shared (initial) forms and experiences, but in the specifically creative sense of new responses and formation" (195).

5. For reference I offer the *Aeneid*'s first seven lines in Latin and in Scots:

Arma uirumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris
Italianam fato profugus Lauiniaque uenit
litora, multum ille et terris iactatus et alto
ui superum, saeuae memormem Iunonis ob iram,
multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem
inferretque deos Latio; genus unde Latinum
Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae.

(1.1-7)
The batalis and the man I wil discrive
Fra Troyis boundis first that fugitive
By fait to Ytail come and cost Lavyne,
Our land and sey katchit with mekil pyne
By forss of goddis abufe, from euerie steyd,  
Of cruell Iuno throu ald remembrit fede.  
Gret pane in batail sufferit he alsso  
Or he his goddis brocht in Latio  
And belt the cite fra quham, of nobill fame,  
The Latyne pepill takyn heth thar name,  
And eik the faderis, princis of Alba,  
Cam, and the wallaris of gret Rome alswa.

(I.1.1-11)

What is also striking about Douglas's translation of the first line is that it has failed to elicit any significant commentary from those writing on the translation. It is telling that critics invariably trot out and chuckle over the famous example of *laetitia exultans*, "[he] hoppit vp for ioy, he was so glaid" (XII.12.6), but never, when discussing Douglas's translative strategies, ask why he includes such a prominent and surprising substitution in the *Aeneid's very first line*.

6. For a discussion of "the Latin in the Scots," see Bawcutt, *GD*, chapter 5, esp. 119-20, and Gordon's article. Bawcutt reminds us quite rightly that "It is Ascensius, not only Virgil, who is responsible for many of the Latinate words in the *Eneados*" (119). "Discrive," however, is not an example of a particularly Latinate word or an instance of
aureate diction—quite the contrary—and Bawcutt does not mention this opening line as an example.

7. A. E. C. Canitz notes that "Douglas actually sees characters and situations with his mind's eye" (93) but does not explore to any extent the fact that Douglas wants his audience to see, that he casts himself as the presenter or reporter of the action, nor does she discuss this opening line. And though her discussion of Douglas's changes and narratorial intrusions does address how Douglas at times brings the Aeneid closer to his audience, and at times comes between the Aeneid and his audience, she never really discusses the poetic and authoritative role of textual mediator that Douglas constructs for himself. Indeed, she goes so far as to assert that "given the sovereign ease with which Douglas makes his changes, he probably would not even have regarded many of them as such" (97). But it is precisely this "sovereign ease" that needs to be explored and understood; Douglas's de facto sovereignty as translator over what "Virgil" the Scots audience gets is, along with his ongoing negotiation of that sovereign relationship, to a great extent the source of his auctoritas.

8. I should remind the reader here that the marginal commentary I will be referring to accompanies the first prologue and the first seven chapters of Book I in the Cambridge manuscript of the Eneados (the earliest extant
copy, with the text in the hand of Matthew Geddes, Douglas's secretary), and is almost surely Douglas's own; as he writes in his "Directioun" near the end of his work, "I haue alsso a schort comment compilyt / To expon strange histouris and termy wild" (141-2). At the very least the marginal glosses were approved by the poet. Cf. Bawcutt's brief discussion in GD, 107-8.

9. Coldwell notes Servius's gloss to this line, "Virum non dicet quem," but does not remark on Douglas's expansion of it. On Douglas's knowledge of Servius's commentaries, see Bawcutt, GD, 107-11 and esp. 122-4.

10. The self-referential nature of the commentary is often noteworthy, especially when Douglas juxtaposes Virgil's text and his own poetry, using both in the same explicative manner. Cf. Douglas's gloss to I.1.51 of his translation, in which he explains the figure of Ganymede and of Hebe, "doughter of Iuno and goddes of Youth": he tells the reader "Of the ravisyng of this Ganymede, ye haf benayth, in the v c. of the v buyk, and of this Hebe sum thyng in the prolog of the vij buyk." As we shall see, the emphasis Douglas places in this first gloss on Aeneas as the "mast soueran man" will become increasingly important as the translation and the commentary continue.

11. The Latin text reads, "Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso / quidue dolens regina deum tot uoluere
casus/ insignem pietate uirum, tot adire labores / impulerit. tantaene animis caelestibus irae?"

12. A good deal of analysis has been offered regarding Douglas's very positive representation of Aeneas. For various but related arguments along this line, see the articles by Dearing and Ebin, respectively, and Bawcutt, GD, 78-85.

13. Both glosses have their origin in Ascensius's commentary to Virgil's text. Ascensius writes, "Musa i. dea rerum occultarum inventrix" and, regarding Juno, "deorum regina, & soror & coniunx Iovis" (Coldwell 4.151). It is remarkable that, by appropriating (in part) the voice of Ascensius, which I hear as the voice of the Latin commentary tradition in general, Douglas is able to direct attention to the vernacular power of his own poetic text.

14. Williams, in his note to line 13 in his edition of the Aeneid, mentions this very juxtaposition and notes that "the thought of the Punic Wars would for a Roman reader underlie the whole section about Carthage" (1.159).

15. Here I am following Coldwell's gloss of "propir" in his edition.

16. See Blyth, 41-63, and Bawcutt, GD, 110-24, for discussions of Douglas's use of commentary within the translation. Both studies help to illuminate how Douglas uses commentary additions within the translation itself for
the purpose of explicating Virgil; unlike my argument, however, neither deals with the necessarily self-referential nature of this commentary, much less the dialogic relationship Douglas sets up between his commentative voices in his notes and his commentative additions in his translation.

17. Williams notes in his edition of Virgil, regarding *incedo*, that "the word contributes much to the majesty of the line" (1.164), and he includes Servius's comment as well: "proprie est nobilium personarum."

18. Douglas can and does do all these things despite his insistence on his fidelity to Virgil's text, a contention that by itself tends to receive too much attention in criticism on Douglas's poem. John Speirs, for example, remarks that Douglas's "endeavour--with medieval humility--is to submit to the authority of his text, to be faithful, to be accurate" (169); despite his valuable analysis of the "poetry" of the *Eneados*, Speirs does not see the *auctoritas* that Douglas appropriates to go along with it. The fact is, Douglas is careful in his prologues, the first in particular, to maintain both sides of a conventional dialectic of translation: he insists on fidelity to his source-text and, just as vigorously, on the impossibility of achieving it. Other critics note such apparent self-contradictions, but ascribe them either to
Douglas's indecisiveness or to his efforts to make Virgil "braid and plane" (1 Prol. 110), or choose to believe unquestioningly that Douglas really thought he was working in an "inferior" language—a language that, we should remember, was established at the court as well as in literature, that "could even be used in diplomacy between countries" and that enjoyed "official status and widespread use" (Agutter 24). But by insistently bringing this problem to his audience's attention Douglas in effect creates a governing model of indeterminacy for his own text that serves as the context for his own efforts to construct his auctoritas, allowing him at once to castigate the efforts of a Caxton even as he himself does what he wants as a translator, and all in an effort to produce a "wlgar Virgill" that is indeed "translatit rycht," but is done so on Douglas's own terms (Exclamatioun 37-8).

19. The Latin reads:

Aeole (namque tibi diuum pater atque hominum rex et mulcere dedit fluctus et tollere uento) ... incute uim uentis submersasque obrue puppis, aut age diuersos et dissice corpora ponto. sunt mihi bis septem praestanti corpore Nymphae, quarum quae forma pulcherrima Deiopea, conubio iungam stabili propriamque dicabo

(1.65-6; 69-73)
20. For Douglas, "every thing" means, as he says in line 66, "bath ayr, sey and hevin." Coldwell notes that Virgil offers only omnia, while Ascensius glosses omnia s. elementa ignis, aer et aqua (4.152). Douglas's translation does conflate the voices of Virgil and the commentary tradition, and there is a dialogic element to this conflation; however, I would argue that the really important dialogic lines are 67-8, because they reveal more distinctly Douglas interpreting as translator-poet and interacting with Virgil's narrative voice in the text. Coldwell offers no note on these lines. For a discussion of Douglas's simultaneous inclusion of Virgilian text and explanatory gloss, or "double translation" as Bawcutt calls it, along with other similar effects, see GD, 116-8.

21. Blyth has discussed this substitution, saying that ". . . Douglas' narrator tells the reader precisely how to respond to the picture of the hero shaking from the cold. Douglas' additions serve to interpret Virgil's poetry for the reader" (49). Blyth does not suggest, however, the ways in which Douglas's reading audience is figured in the text itself.

22. Cf. Bawcutt's remark: "Yet although some notes follow the wording of Ascensius very closely, Douglas at no point in the Comment mentions Ascensius, as if he perhaps
did not regard the name as sufficiently authoritative" (GD 108).

23. This interpretation was quite common in Douglas's time and noticeably differs, of course, from most modern readings of the character. For example, Cristoforo Landino, whom Douglas had read (he cites him by name in the note to I.3.100), says "In uno Aenea absolutum omnino atque ex omni parte perfectum virum finxit atque expressit, ut omnes illum nobis tanquam unicum exemplar ad vitam degendam proponeremus" (Cardini 1.215). In contrast, R. D. Williams notes in his edition that Aeneas's reactions in this scene "indicate his human frailty; the hero of the Aeneid is not sublimely strong or possessed of super-human resolution" (1.168). On Douglas's knowledge of Landino's writings, see Bawcutt, GD, 74-6 and 109-10.

24. Williams points out the peculiarity of this first simile in that "it illustrates the world of nature from the world of human behaviour. Much more often similes operate the other way around" (1.172). Cf. also Jasper Griffin who makes the same point and extends it by suggesting that Virgil "has reversed Homeric procedure. . . . With this first simile Virgil again shows the perceptive reader how his poem will combine Greek and Roman, traditional and original" (80-1). As will become clear, I am suggesting Douglas's strategy is analogous to Virgil's in this passage:
the Scots poet is combining Latin and Scots, the accepted with the novel, but distinctly for the purposes of constructing poetic authority. For discussions of Douglas's translations of Virgil's similes see Bawcutt, GD, 161-3, and Canitz, esp. 96.

25. Normally Douglas uses slightly more than two Scots lines for each line of Virgil's Latin.

26. Coldwell remarks that "It may be significant of Douglas's preoccupations that he calls attention to this political simile" but does not elaborate (4.153). For the political nature of Douglas's translation, see Dearing's article, along with Coldwell's introduction in his edition. Neither argument is totally convincing. As Bawcutt writes, "... I cannot find in ... passages cited by Dearing and Coldwell evidence that Douglas had a conscious political purpose in translating the Aeneid, or that he displays a special interest in Virgil's ideas on kingship and government" (125). I tend to agree with Bawcutt, and would reiterate that in my view Douglas's preoccupations are with the status and authority that can go along with the creation of vernacular poetry; however, Douglas's discursive strategies of constructing, negotiating, and maintaining literary auctoritas do, I believe, have suggestive analogues in the cultural and political context of early sixteenth-
century Scotland, a topic I plan to investigate further but that lies outside the scope of this study.

27. Compare Douglas's note on line 1.4.41: "Ye sall ondirstand Virgill in all partis of his prose, quhat maner or fasson he discrivis ony man at the begynnyng, sa continewys he of that samin person all thro, and Eneas in all his wark secludis from all vylle offyce; bot as twychand materris of pyety or devotion, thar labowris he euer wyth the first, as ye may se in the beginyng of the vi buke."

Virgil's consistency is Aeneas's, and both are implicitly Douglas's as well. (Coldwell, 4.153, notes that the thought is initially taken from Ascensius, who is quoting Donatus.)

28. Coldwell reprints part of Servius's commentary: "Non arrogantia, sed indicium est non enim scientibus sed nescientibus de se loquitur, vel ut heros loquitur" (4.155). Although not all the thoughts in this note, or in many of Douglas's notes, originate with Douglas, it need hardly be pointed out that it is Douglas who does choose to include certain commentative explanations, to leave others out, to attribute some to authorities but not others, to change commentaries to fit his interpretations or, as in this case, to run his own "original" commentary alongside the classical commentary of Servius. Very little in the Eneados, or in all medieval poetry for that matter, "originates" with the writer in question. It should be remembered that the notes
are another important means for Douglas to speak, to create a voice for himself, and, as with the prologues and the translation itself, they are all in a very real way ultimately his own.

29. The former sense is, according to The Concise Scots Dictionary, distinctly sixteenth-century (and distinctly Scots) and found in verb form (i.e., "to honour someone with a title), but the latter denotation, with "style" as a noun, is a late fifteenth-century one, likely still alive in 1513. Coldwell's gloss is "style, name and titles." I think Douglas sees Aeneas here as revealing his "condition," particularly when we recall that Douglas considers Aeneas "fulfillit of piete" (I.1.17).

30. Contrast this with C. S. Lewis's contention that "At worst, Douglas is a very honest translator and always lets you see how he is taking the Latin" (82). In fact, Douglas's narrators can be most duplicitous when they seem most honest.

31. Virgil has Venus say:

   Antenor potuit mediis elapsus Achiuis
   Illyricos penetrare sinus atque intima tutus
   regna Librunorum et fontem superare Timauui,
   unde per ora nouem uasto cum murmure montis
   it mare proruptum et pelago premit arua sonanti.
32. The popularity of Guido delle Colonne's *Historia Destructionis Troiae* is, as Bawcutt notes, attested by the fact that "at least three Middle English translations of his work were made," including of course Lydgate's *Troy Book*. Interestingly, the *Troy Book*, finished in 1420, was printed in 1513 at Henry VIII's request—the same year Douglas completed the *Eneados* (GD 79). Bawcutt discusses Douglas's gloss on Guido, pointing out quite rightly that Douglas is here trying to clear not only Antenor's name but Aeneas's as well, whose traitorous nature was also described by Guido (82). As Bawcutt says, "Douglas was certainly going counter to much contemporary Scottish opinion both in criticizing Guido, and in attempting to remove the label 'traitors of Troy' from Aeneas and Antenor" (82-3): all the more reason for Douglas to be concerned with his audience's perception of his own auctoritas in this passage.

33. Coldwell notes (4.154) that the passage is quoted by Ascensius. Here is an excellent example of how Douglas does not merely reproduce Ascensius's commentary, but uses it to enable himself to speak in yet another voice, for his own particular ends; he quotes Ascensius, but only after his commentator-narrator has brought Livy "onstage," and specifically within the context of his discrediting Guido.
delle Colonne. Douglas's translation of Livy reads: "It is well wyt that, Troy beand takin, in all the otheris Troianys cruelite was exersit, exceppand twa, Anthenor and Eneas, to quham the Grekis did na harm, bot abstenyt fra all power of batall as twichyng thaim, becaus of the rayson of hospitalite, for thai had beyn ther ald hostis, and all tymys thai war solistaris and warkkaris to rendyr Helen and to procur paice."

34. I offer this comment tentatively. Bawcutt, in "Gavin Douglas and the Text of Virgil," warns scholars about making too hasty judgements about Douglas's apparent inaccuracies because often he is following the text and/or commentary of Ascensius's 1501 edition of Virgil (211); however, neither Bawcutt in her articles and book, nor Coldwell in his edition's notes, remark about this passage, and unfortunately I am myself unable to consult the Latin edition Douglas used. Consequently, in this case I cannot be sure whether the apparently loose nature of the translation is explicable by reference to Ascensius. My main point about Douglas's marginal gloss to the passage, though, is tenable regardless.

35. I am aware that modern scholarship takes Caesar in this passage to mean Augustus Caesar, with Julius translating something like "a Julius"; cf. Williams 1.181, and H. R. Fairclough's note to line 288 in the Loeb Classics
edition. As Williams notes, Servius took Caesar to refer to Iulius, and Douglas seems to as well, taking Iulus as he apparently does to be a genitive coupled with famam in line 287.

36. Virgil's Latin reads, "sublimemque feres ad sidera caeli / magnanimum Aenean" (259-60).

37. In Chapter 2 I discussed the way Douglas implicitly argues, in his prologue to Book 13, for the inclusion of Maphaeus's addition by appropriating and subverting Maphaeus's authority even as he makes claims for the importance of an authoritative vernacularization of this thirteenth book. I offer a detailed examination of Douglas's dealings with Maphaeus and his text in Chapter 4.

38. For related comments on Douglas's use of ecphrasis, see John Norton-Smith's article on the Palis of Honoure.


40. We might compare Chaucer's depiction of Aeneas as an audience-figure in The Legend of Good Women, 1015ff. Rita Copeland discusses the Legend as a translation in Rhetoric, pp. 188-202.

41. As a conclusion to the ongoing dialogue of Book I and as the first transition from one Virgilian book to another, this rearranging has, I would submit, some special
import. It is not, however, Douglas's only such change; a similar shift can be found between *Eneados* V-VI, VI-VII, and VII-VIII. As Bawcutt notes, these changes "are found in all manuscripts of the *Eneados," and are presumably Douglas's own (GD 139-40).

42. Charles Blyth offers some speculations on why Douglas divides the books as he does, and his argument is especially interesting when he suggests that Aeneas's "prologue" to his narrative within the narrative does not serve as an effective introduction for a medieval tragedy, and thus Douglas must offer a "preferable introduction to his account of the fall of Troy," i.e. the second prologue (*The Knyghtlyke Stile* 181). I think, however, that Blyth insists on too much distinction between the two voices; I do not find "the emotion[s] expressed" in the "preamble" and the prologue to be very different from one another. Further, Blyth unfortunately does nothing with the very intriguing element of authorial competition implied by Douglas presenting a "preferable introduction." See *The Knyghtlyke Stile*, pp. 177-82.

43. Virgil's text reads, "quis talia fando / Myrmidonum Dolopumue aut duri miles Vlixi / temperet a lacrimis?" (II.6-8). R. D. Williams discusses briefly the relationship between the second book and Greek tragedy (2.214-16); however, he argues for not placing too much
emphasis on such similarities—an assessment Douglas would apparently not have agreed with.
CHAPTER IV

Alter Maro, Alter Maphaeus: Dialogics and Eneados XIII

Having seen how Douglas employs and exploits dialogic discourse in his translation of Virgilian text, we should now look to the ways in which Douglas deals with the Latin text of a very different auctor, Maphaeus Vegius's Supplementum to the Aeneid, Book XIII of the Eneados. As noted above, Maphaeus's poem garnered wide acclaim, and he became known as alter Maro; Douglas, who himself aims for literary fame as both a translator and a poet, casts himself as a kind of alter Maro as well. Consequently, Douglas must offer an interpretation of Maphaeus the auctor and his poem that at once justifies the inclusion of the thirteenth book in the Eneados and allows Douglas's work its own singularity and authority. The thirteenth prologue in part dramatizes the negotiation of this challenge; in Chapter 2 I argued that Douglas's prologue to Maphaeus's book serves not only as a means of negating any potential authorial conflict between Douglas and Maphaeus but also as a forum for Douglas's claims for the ascendancy of the vernacular. As Douglas tells his audience at the end of the prologue:

157
For, thocht hys stile be nocht to Virgill lyke,
Full weill I wayt my text sail mony like,
Sen eftir ane my tung is and my pen,
Quhill may suffys as for our wlgar men. . . .
Lat clerkis ken the poetis different,
And men onletterit to my wark tak tent.

(189-96)

Douglas implies that, while it is not at all an integral part of the Aeneid, Maphaeus's Supplementum will be made an integral part of the Eneados. Maphaeus Vegius meant to finish the Aeneid; ironically, however, Douglas's vernacularization is required to "finish" Maphaeus's book, and by extension the Aeneid as well. Only in Douglas's translation is Maphaeus's hermeneutic project--at once an allegorization and fulfillment of Virgil's text--really capable of being completed, and thus the Scots poet is at once able to legitimize its inclusion in his translation, to undermine Maphaeus's own authorial status, and tacitly to argue that an auctoritas of Douglas's kind is the only fitting complement to Virgil. ²

Given Douglas's conscious re-situation of Maphaeus's work within the context of the Eneados, we need to explore the ways this negotiation of authority is played out textually in the translation of Book XIII itself. I plan to concentrate primarily on those points in Book XIII at which Douglas constructs a "rift" between the Latin and Scots, moments at which we can perceive Douglas differentiating himself from Maphaeus. I want to argue that at these
moments in the text we can most readily discern Douglas constructing dialogic "textual events" that allow the Scots poet both to insert himself in the Virgil-Vegius dialogue that the thirteenth book presumes and to distinguish himself from both of these Latin auctores, both to his own authorial advantage.

Rather than begin with the opening of Book XIII, we can more profitably start out by examining certain passages from chapter 9 of the Supplementum. The chapter translates lines 490-535 of Maphaeus's text in some 118 lines--much more expansion than Douglas usually engages in. There are no speeches in this chapter, no direct discourse, rather unusual for Maphaeus's poem; Douglas, in effect, is translating only the words of "Maphaeus" himself, with no fictional third party to be considered. Consequently, Douglas's translative response to the Latin text is conspicuously playful. The translated text enacts a dialogue between Douglas and Maphaeus (or, more properly, their narrators), one on one.

This section of the Supplementum describes the wedding feast of Aeneas and Lavinia--one of Maphaeus's primary narrative concerns. The scene is set by Maphaeus succinctly:

Et iam tarda epulas fugientis tempora lucis poscebant; mox regali convivia luxu effundunt latosque alta intra tecta paratus.
Douglas's version runs to eleven lines, full of seemingly self-conscious prolixity and gratuitous expansion:

Be this it walxis layt towart the nycht, And fast declynyng gan the days lycht, The tyme requeryng, eftir the ald maner, To go to meyte and syt to the supper. Onon the bankat and the mangeory For fest ryall accordyng, by and by, With all habundans pertenyng to syk thyng, As well efferit in the hows of a kyn, With alkyn maner ordinans was maid Amyd the hallys heich, lang and braid, Apparalyt at all devys and array.

(XIII.9.1-11)

On the one hand, Douglas's additions seem an implicitly negative response to Maphaeus's description of the banquet scene: a really good poet would have gone into much more detail on this centerpiece wedding-feast. Douglas's passage, however, begins with a redundant couplet corresponding roughly to Maphaeus's first line, and moves from there to offer a series of additions that add little or nothing to our sense of the scene: "eftir the ald maner"; "alkyn maner ordinans was maid"; the feast-hall, "heich, lang and braid"; and so forth. The text at once calls for more detail and ironically fails to deliver. All of this might be easily dismissed as Douglas "nodding" but for two reasons. The first is another addition a few lines further on; Douglas, alluding to the "danteys and . . . metys seir," assures his audience "That all to rakkyn prolixit war to
heir" (XIII.9.15-16)—a phrase not in the Latin. The second is the addition of Douglas's line 30, wherein the Scots poet, again describing the feast, appends the phrase, "A paradys it was to se and heir." These lines put into question the supposedly stable relationship between source-text and Scots text, not because Douglas's expansions constitute poor translations but because these particular additions point to the ironic rhetorical "turn" Douglas is making away from his source-text. Douglas's "hyperbolic" version of Maphaeus's verses suggests the incompleteness of the original Latin, and, even though his method is more playful than serious, the effect is that the reader is asked to respond to this section of Eneados XIII as at once an accurate translation and a superior poem, an improvement over the original that paradoxically does not represent a profound change. Douglas is tacitly able to argue for both his skill as a translator and his place as a poetic auctor.

The second major amplification in the ninth chapter is the eighteen-line rendering of Supplementum lines 509-515 (XIII.9.46-64). The passage is interesting for our purposes because it is so much concerned with direct discourse, with allusive speeches that never actually surface in the text:

Postquam epulis compressa fames, traducere longam incipiunt fando et labentem fallere noctem, nunc duros Troiae casus gentesque Pelasgas, nunc fera Larurentis memorantes proelia pugnae, quo primum diffusae acies, quotela vicissim
pulsa loco, qui primus ovans invaserit agmen
fulmineumque ardens in equo madefecerit ensem.

Douglas uses what Bawcutt has termed "double translation" to slow down his version of the passage (GD 116-17); Maphaeus's fando becomes "commonyng and carpyng" (49), pugnae is translated "the fers bargan and the awfull fight" (54), the people tell stories to "mak schort and ourdryve" the night (51). Even Nunc in line 511 becomes both "Now" and "belyve" ("at once," XIII.9.52). Douglas's remaking of Maphaeus's quo and qui clauses compacts the pronouns into one line, giving us the "quhou and quhar, quhamby and be quhat kynd" of the battle (56). This expansive vagueness serves to highlight what is not in the Latin text—a description of storytelling that includes very little story. Both Douglas and Maphaeus "mak schort and ourdryve" both the evening and the narratives; Douglas crafts his version to imply all the more strongly what is being missed without actually filling in the lacunae of the Latin—in other words, while still remaining a faithful translator.

The final great expansion in this chapter is Douglas's translation of Supplementum 530-35, six lines which become nineteen lines in the Eneados and include Douglas's overt and ironic reference to "Myne author" (115). Maphaeus begins with a reference to the variety of speeches and stories told at the feast, and concludes with a description of the accompanying dances, relatively brief and to the
Douglas's additions are mainly more detailed depictions of the dancing, but with another instance of *occupatio* not at all found in the Latin:

\[
\text{Thai fut it so that lang war to devys}
\]

\[
\text{Thar hasty fair, thar revellyng and deray,}
\]

\[
\text{Thar morysis and syk ryot, quhil neir day.}
\]

(XIII.9.110-12)

Douglas's expansion suggests a disorder and uproar that is not to be found in Maphaeus's rather more solemn depiction of an all-night party. The translation offers a parallel to the storyline in hinting that to include a full description of the revelry would require (both the translator and the reader) spending as much time on the text as the characters did in "morysis and sik ryot." Moreover, the ironic *occupatio* intimates that in many ways Maphaeus does not offer us the best part of the story; details are lacking in the Latin, and Douglas at once offers his audience some and reminds us of how much more could be done. Thus, he is able to walk this by now familiar fence of adherence to and deviation from his original *auctor*.

This very trick is extended in the final six lines of the chapter, lines that have absolutely no parallel in the Latin; they amount to an obvious response to the text and address to the Scots poet's audience, and stage the ironic dialogue of the translation as well as any passage in Book XIII:
Bot forto tellyng quhou with torch lycht
Thai went to chailler and syne to bed at nycht,
Myne author list na mensioun thanof draw--
Na mair will I, for sik thingis beyn knaw;
All ar expert, eftir new mariaye,
On the first nycht quhat sulde be the subcharge.

(XIII.9.113-18)

In proposing a close to the scene that the original does not include, Douglas's version works as a textual example of an imaginative response to narrative, picking up where the wedding-feast spectacle leaves off and carrying it to its logical conclusion. More importantly, though, the conspicuous reference to another "author" signals the presence of the translator and distances him from his source, and further underscores the audience's perspective on Douglas as working faithfully on a text that, unfortunately, seems to have its own oversights. The narrator's reference to himself cues the audience to the fact that, although the source-text includes no such details, the translator could provide some if he wished; in other words, the translator has authorial rights and authoritative rule over the text presented here. Douglas will not describe the scene of the wedding bed not because it is not in his source, but rather, "for sik thingis beyn knaw." In a concise, ironically self-contradictory "supplementum" of his own, Douglas manages to argue for his own textual fidelity, editorial good sense, and poetic auctoritas."
Of course, Douglas has taken some pains to prepare his audience for this sort of expansion surrounding the wedding. In the previous chapter of the text, for example, we see the Scots poet extend his description of Aeneas for particular rhetorical and authoritative effect. The scene is the betrothal of Aeneas and Lavinia, in which Maphaeus describes the entrance of Aeneas before the throngs who are eager to witness the approach of the "Troian menye" (XIII.8.10), but most of all to glimpse the glorious Trojan prince:

Ante omnes magnum Aenean cupidoque notabant
altum animo genus et praestantem frontis honorem
quaesitamque alacres pacem atque optata quietis
munera laudabant.

(451-54)

Douglas's version of these lines has an obvious and, for Douglas, an important purpose: to offer a still more extended description of Aeneas, one that fits more conspicuously the image of the hero that Douglas has proffered in his translation of Virgil's text.

Bot specialy and first of all the laif
The gret capitan Enee notyt thai haue,
Attentfully behaldand euery wight
Hys stowt curage, hys byg statur and hycht,
And in thar mynd comprasyt hys kyn maste hie,
Hys plesand vissage and knychtly large bonte;
And, glaid and ioyfull, extoll and loif thai can
The gret apperans of gud in sik a man,
And sa fair gyftis and beleif, but les,
As thai desyrit, of finale rest and pes.

(XIII.8.11-20)
Douglas seems to recognize and exploit the use of the dramatic audience in this scene—a crowd of Latins who watch anxiously for Aeneas and figure the audience for the text itself, a readership also eager to behold the Trojan hero. Consequently, the audience in the story takes a much more active role in Douglas's scene than in the original. 

Notabant has been transformed into "notyt" but also extended to "Attentfully behaldand," incorporating a degree of concentration only intimated in the Latin; further, the audience "comprasyt" Aeneas—comprehended all that he was, mentally grasped or laid hold of his true character. The reading audience is implicitly asked to do the same thing, especially when the description of Aeneas is lengthened and mentions his "stowt curage, hys byg statur and hyght" and (an intriguing turn of phrase) "The gret apperans of gud in sik a man." Both the dramatic audience and the reading audience have much more to see, and what they see most clearly is Aeneas's goodness and nobility. The whole scene in Douglas's version goes farther toward portraying Aeneas as, to quote Douglas's gloss to the first line of the Eneados, "the mast soueran man."

We find this fuller vision of Aeneas in the simile immediately following these lines. Maphaeus compares Aeneas to the sun's arrival after a rainstorm; clarus Titan,
however, receives only two lines of description in the Supplementum:

Tunc, si clarus equos spatiose limine Titan laxet et aurato caelum splendore serenet, laetitia exundant et sese hortantur agrestes

(457-459)

Douglas, in contrast, draws out the part of the simile that refers to the hero, celebrating Aeneas's grandeur in the process:

Syne, gif brycht Tytan list do schaw hys face, And with swyft curs far furth a large space Doith each hys stedis and hys giltyn char, And kythis hys goldyn bemys in the ayr, Makand the hevynnys fair, cleir and scheyn, The weddir smowt, and firmament sereyn; The landwart hynys than, baith man and boy, For the soft sesson ourflowis full of ioy, And athir otheris gan exhort inhy To go to laubour of thar husbandry.

(XIII.8.25-34)

Again, the Supplementum is modified to accord all the more closely with Douglas's interest and style; we are reminded that, as Douglas says referring to Maphaeus, "thocht hys stile be nocht to Virgill lyke, / Full weill I wayt my text sall mony like, / Sen eftir ane my tung is and my pen" (13 Prol. 189-91). Douglas's interpretation and representation of Aeneas in Virgil's text plays out in his version of Maphaeus's. The corresponding claim to poetic auctoritas is clear: if the audience accepts the authority of a writer who has effectively guided them through the mysteries of the Aeneid, then there should be no reason not to grant
authoritative license to a writer working to "improve" the Supplementum. Douglas is ostensibly making Maphaeus more like Virgil, but in reality has already remade Virgil in his own image; Maphaeus's text is no closer to Virgil's text on account of its translation, only closer to Douglas's.

These lines, of course, all lead up to the report of the marriage itself, one of the two essential plot elements (along with the apotheosis of Aeneas) that Maphaeus wished to write as a logical completion to the Aeneid and the first dramatic climax of the Supplementum. Naturally, Douglas has a particular interest in his translation of this scene, because it represents one of Maphaeus's most prominent claims for authorship: Maphaeus feels it necessary to relate something that Virgil, unhappily, omitted, and in so doing Maphaeus asserts his own distinctiveness from the Roman auctor as well as the integrity of his own poem—the story of the Aeneid is incomplete without it. The wedding itself, as in so many of Maphaeus's descriptive passages, is related concisely:

Tum vero aeterno iunguntur foedera nexu connubii, multaque canunt cum laude hymenaeum
et laetam vocem per regia texta volutant.
Dehinc plausus fremitusque altum super aera mittunt.

(474-77)

The couple is joined and songs are sung; shouts of praise ring in the court and up to the skies. Maphaeus's version
is anything but fulsome. Douglas, on the other hand, offers a much more elaborate vision of the wedding celebration, beginning with a rhetorical addition that can only be read as gently comic in light of the Latin text:

\begin{verbatim}
Syne, to abbryge our mater, hand in hand
Thai war conjunct intill eternall band
Of matrimonye, and thos at all devys
Thar wedlok with honour, as was the gys,
Be menstrualys and herraldis of gret fame
Was playd and sung and throw the cowrt proclame.
Than ioyand myrth, with dansyng and deray,
Full mery noys and sovndis of gam and play
Abuf the bryght starnys hie vpwent,
That semyt forto pers the firmament,
And ioyus vocis ryngis furth alsso
Our all the palys ryall to and fro.
\end{verbatim}

(XIII.8.69-80)

Douglas's opening addition is deceptively simple; at first glance the translator is merely offering an ironic expansion of a painfully sketchy text. We need to ask, however, whose narrative voice speaks the telling phrase "to abbryge our mater"? Taking the voice to be Maphaeus's alone, a reader unfamiliar with the Latin would attribute the irony to the Italian poet himself—an illusive \textit{occupatio} that serves in fact to highlight the descriptive skills of the poet. And from this perspective, Douglas can claim the power of the translator who reproduces such descriptions in the vernacular. But ultimately the line—indeed, the entire passage—is dialogic response to Maphaeus's text that separates the two writers. This "abridgement" that is really an extension of the text allows Douglas to showcase
ekphrastic powers that Maphaeus seems not to have. 11 This distinct imagery of sound and celebration is extended when Maphaeus's phrase *plausus fremitusque* becomes Douglas's lines "Than ioy and myrth, with dansyng and deray, / Full mery noys and sovndis of game and play," even when these songs *altum super aera mittunt* are separated into "mery noys" that "Abuf the bryght sternys hie vpwent" and "ioyus vocis" that reverberate "Our all the palys ryall to and fro." Douglas continues to amplify this picture of court finery, with translative expansions that seem to range from redundancy to genuine elaboration. Moving from the "menstralys" to Aeneas's command to Achates to bring further gifts and ornaments to the celebration, Douglas turns Maphaeus's simple *Interea* (478) into "And syk ryot indurand amyd the pres" and has Aeneas "bad hym go belyve, but mair delay" (XIII.8.81, 84). In the vernacular *vestes intextas auro* (479-80) is remade "the rych robbys and array, / The fresch attyre and all the precyus wedis, / Wrocht craftely and weif of goldyn thredis" (XIII.8.85). 12 This "wedlok with honour" is sung "Be mensralys and herraldis of gret fame"—heralds that do not appear at all in the Latin and that play as figures of the versifying "herald" trumpeting this elaborate wedding scene to a Scots audience.

The final chapter of *Eneados* XIII relates Aeneas's apotheosis, the other element Maphaeus Vegius apparently
thought necessary to append to the *Aeneid*’s story. The bulk of it is taken up with two speeches—a dialogue actually—of Venus and Jupiter: Venus’s request that Aeneas be deified and Jupiter’s response. This is a complex scene from a dialogic standpoint. The chapter, as I have indicated, is structured around a dialogue; moreover, the scene is one of Maphaeus’s most overt responses to Virgil, as this last exchange echoes the prayer of Venus and reassurance of Jupiter found in *Aeneid* 1.229-96. Nevertheless, this part of the narrative is Maphaeus’s most distinctive addition to the Trojan history narrative. In short, the apotheosis and its dialogic prelude paradoxically serve both to link and to differentiate Virgil and Maphaeus. To further complicate this picture, we need to recognize how important a part direct discourse in dialogue plays in the latter half of the *Supplementum*. Craig Kallendorf’s comments are illuminating in this regard:

The first half of the *Supplement* is dominated by the corpse of Turnus, the symbol of disruption in the normal order of things. . . Once Turnus is buried, the power of virtue can begin to restore order. This reordering is done through speech, through discussion and compromise by men of good will. First Aeneas and Drances find common ground, then Latinus and Aeneas, and the pairing of speeches between former enemies is a formal reflection of this ordering process. The characters in the *Supplement* do talk a lot, but that is because, for Vegio, rhetoric restores what the sword destroys. With the appearance of the gods as speakers, this
process of reordering and closure is confirmed on another, higher level.

(123)

Kallendorf's remarks about discussion and compromise stand out in our examination of a dialogic Eneados. Eneados XIII, of course, begins with a pairing of voices: those of the dreamer Douglas and the poet Maphaeus in the thirteenth prologue. The prologue, however, presented a dialogue that degenerated into slapstick violence. The ending of the Eneados, if it is to accord both with Maphaeus's concerns in the Latin text and with Douglas's implicit terms of dialogic authorship, must present a discursive resolution for the purpose of its own kind of restoration of order.

Douglas achieves this resolution not so much through extensive translative expansions as through additions of his own narrative voice that are not far from the kind we saw in his reworking of certain parts of Aeneid I. The two-line introduction of Venus's speech, for example, is recast so as to heighten the reverence, indeed, the pietas, of Venus's request:

Tum medio Venus exsultans se immisit Olympo ante Iovem et complexa pedes sic ore locuta est:

(593-94)

Venus with this, all glaid and full of ioy,
Amyd the hevynly hald, rycht myld and moy,
Befor Iupiter down hir self set
And baith hir armys abowt hys feyt plet,
Enbrasand thame and kyssand reuerently;
Syne thus with voce expres scho said inhy:
Maphaeus's *Olympe* becomes "the hevynly hald," a remarkable addition in this context that suggests Douglas responding to the security and harmony of the entire scene. The reader is gazing into a kind of sanctuary, a place very much removed from worldly strife. Indeed, shortly after these lines Venus reminds Jupiter that "Onto the starnyt hevynly hald on hie / Thou promyst rays the maste douchty Enee" (XIII.11.21-22; emphasis added). Also contributing to this impression of harmony is Douglas's expanded description of Venus: she does not just speak, but clasps her father's feet with "baith hir armys," kissing them "reuerently." Douglas's Scots scene offers a reading of the Latin that accents the picture of the two figures entwined and united. Here is a place where Aeneas himself, *fato profugus* for so long, will soon come to rest and be at home.

Jupiter's reply receives its own augmentation, though here Douglas intersperses his own narrative voice over the course of Jupiter's (i.e. Maphaeus's) speech. The narrator's "he said," not in Maphaeus, interrupts the text at line 32, and "quod he," similarly absent from the Latin, appears at lines 45 and 58. Such interpolations here function to draw Douglas's presence more prominently into the text, while maintaining distinct voices in dialogue between Jupiter/Maphaeus and Douglas himself. Moreover,
Douglas introduces the speech with one of his characteristic "readings" before the fact: the god's verba (607) become "Thir profound wordis" at line 31. Douglas translates the vocative Cytherea as "'My deir douchtir Citherea,'" again emphasizing the scene's serenity. And Juno's consent to the apotheosis, in Latin expressed Iunone secunda (611), is rendered "And now I haue . . . / maid Iuno, as that full weill is kend, / Fortobecum frendly and favorabill" (XIII.11.40-44). The harmony of the scene parallels the "harmony" of the various voices, overt and implied, dialogically related in the text.

In composing a dialogized version of Virgil's epic, Douglas's triumph is in many ways to be found in the final lines of Book XIII. Here the Scots poet-translator manages to unify without conflating the dialogue of voices in his text. Maphaeus Vegius ends his Supplementum with the following lines (626-30):

```
Hunc corpus nati abluere et deferre sub undas, 
quicquid erat mortale, iubet. Dehinc laeta 
recentem 
facilermque animam secum super aera duxit, 
immisitque Aeneam astris, quem Iulia proles 
indigetem appellat templisque imponit honores.
```

Douglas does allow that Venus "maid do wesch" Aeneas so that "All that was mortale or corruptibill thyng / Gart do away," and therupon "bair it [Aeneas's soul] vp abuf the ayr full hie / Onto the hevyn" (XIII.11.70-75), but from this point
he makes several important changes. According to Douglas, Venus conveys Aeneas to heaven,

    quhar reuthfull Eneas
    Amyd the starnys chosyn has his place;
    Quham the famyll and kynrent Iulian
    Doith clepe and call amangis thame every ane
    Indigites, quhilk is alsmekill to say
    As god induellar, at thar sudiornys ay;
    And, in remembrans of this ilk turn,
    Thai gan hys templis wirschip and adorn.

(XIII.11.75-82)

As I noted before, the apotheosis is perhaps Maphaeus's most distinguished response to Virgil's text, and, in translating this textual reply to the *Aeneid*, Douglas is effectively fashioning a rejoinder to both Maphaeus and Virgil. Douglas inserts his voice by remaking the Italian poet's *Aeneam* as "reuthfull Eneas," recalling for the reader not only the *pietas* of the hero but also the fundamental role that that quality plays in Douglas's poetic answer to the *Aeneid*. As we saw in the previous chapter, the concept of *pietas* is one that is essential not only to understanding the hero but also to recognizing Douglas's construction of *auctoritas* as a translator. In Chapter 6 of Book I Douglas's conspicuous marginal note on the importance of the hero revealing himself to Venus as "Rewthfull Ene am I" (125) served as a principal site for Douglas's negotiation of authority. Here Douglas sets up a dialogic relation between his own first and last books, adding the portentous word "Rewthful" in an echo of his own text. Douglas translates the "spirit" of
Maphaeus accurately—after all, as much as anything it is Aeneas's unwavering *pietas* that warrants his deification—and manages to do so while inserting his own distinctive voice and recalling his own text's dialogic reply to Virgil.

Douglas's use of "chosyn" is striking. Corresponding directly to nothing in Maphaeus's Latin, the word seems to suggest that Aeneas himself has determined his own destiny, an idea that, despite the divine context of this part of the poem, accords well with the stress on *pietas*; Aeneas's prime virtue is most evident in his choice to follow his fate, to carry out his duty. Furthermore, "chosyn" picks up an idea that surfaces earlier in the chapter but that Douglas seems at first to ignore. At line 605 Maphaeus has Venus remind her father *Iamque optat matura polos Aeneia virtus*. Douglas translates the line "the vertuus thewys kynd / Of this reuthfull Eneas the requyr / Abuf the polys brycht to rays that syre" (XIII.11.26-28). The by now well-known word "reuthfull" shows up again here, an addition that takes on greater significance when reread after the "reuthfull Eneas" of line 75. Maphaeus's *optat*, however, is overlooked by Douglas in his quest to impress his own voice at this point in the text; but *fides* Douglas captures the notion of Aeneas's desire and choice with his later translatve addition. The effect is to allow the reader to see the translator-*auctor* toying with the text, rearranging with the
purpose of structuring an interplay of voices that at once change the text's meaning yet remain true to Maphaeus's sense.

In these last lines of Book XIII Douglas is clearly highlighting the "call and response" of Book XIII and the Supplementum, of the Latin and the Scots, offering his audience a glimpse of textual voices in prominent dialogue. This harmony of voices, analogous to the harmony of the scene between Venus and Jupiter, is most apparent in the final lines. Douglas brings Maphaeus's own word into the Scots text, telling his audience that the Julian "famyll" regards Aeneas as "Indigites" (cf. indigetem, 630), and then adding a final gloss: "quhilk is alsmekill to say / As god induellar" (XIII.11.79-80). For Douglas, whose thirteenth book has been an exercise in challenging and at times undermining Maphaeus's auctoritas, these lines represent a remarkable change. Douglas apparently has no Scots word for indigetem—his translation of Aeneid XII.794, "Amang the goddis a god indigites" (XII.13.11), suggests as much.\textsuperscript{16} But the accompanying gloss manages to remind the reader that the word is not entirely Douglas's, not entirely of the Scots tongue. Latin and Scots combine to underscore the responsive nature of the passage, to reveal that Eneados XIII does not exist without the Supplementum, to effect a harmony of languages and voices that might otherwise be
subsumed by Douglas's dialect. As we saw earlier, the prologue to the translation of the Supplementum ended by suggesting that the Scots vernacular "erases" difference, eliminates the variances between Maphaeus's and Virgil's respective verse styles. The translation itself, however, ends with Douglas bringing difference again to the fore, and implying that the supreme achievement of translation is not the loss of a voice but a unity of voices.

Thinking in terms of poetic auctoritas, we can perceive that Douglas's ultimate goal is of course to assert once again his poetic ability to construct voices in dialogue, and ultimately to bring various voices into accord. Douglas's authority in Book XIII is founded on his audience's recognition that they are reading a poet who wants to compose a genuine completion of the Aeneid: not Maphaeus's stylistically inferior supplement, but rather a responsive textual utterance that can answer both Virgil and Maphaeus comprehensively, and do so in large part by appropriating their literary voices and adding his own. Eneados XIII, in short, does something the Supplementum cannot do: consummate a (Scots) Aeneid that is its own kind of consummation. In doing so, the Book becomes not a betrayal of Virgil (Canitz, "From Aeneid to Eneados" 97), and error in critical judgment, or (as many critics would have us believe) a textual afterthought; rather, it is in
its own way the crowning achievement of Douglas's dialogic *Eneados*. 
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. As noted earlier, Maphaeus completed his poem in 1428. Bawcutt remarks that the work "was included not only in Ascensius's editions but in most other printed editions of Virgil from 1471 . . . until the middle of the seventeenth century" (GD 104). Similarly, Ross writes that by Douglas's time "almost every major edition of Vergil included Vegio's supplement" (217). (Ross's article, in many ways a wealth of information, is marred by his infelicitous dismissal of Douglas as "a book maker, not a critic taking care to do justice to his text" [222]). Regarding the various editions of Maphaeus's poem, see also Brinton, 29ff.

2. I do not mean to imply that Douglas's primary goal is to allegorize Virgil's Aeneid for his audience. Douglas does at times utilize allegory, or, more accurately, brings traditional and conventional allegorical interpretations to the fore, in both his translation and his prologues; however, as I have been arguing, he does so in the context of negotiating his own place as a vernacular auctor. It is more correct to view the Eneados as a fulfillment of the Aeneid, not least because Douglas, primarily by means of his
prologues, casts Virgil's text as an utterance awaiting the proper response, and the *Eneados* becomes the dialogic text that simultaneously incorporates both the initial text and its necessary rejoinder.

3. Bawcutt discusses this chapter briefly (*GD* 148-49), remarking most pointedly the Chaucerian influence on much of the translation of Book XIII. She asserts, "Just as [Douglas's] jocular tone towards Maphaeus Vegius differs from his reverent attitude to Virgil, so Douglas takes more liberties with the text of Maphaeus than with that of Virgil" (148). See also her article, "Gavin Douglas and Chaucer," esp. p. 417.

4. The poem's speeches have been the subject of some critical attention and controversy. Anna Cox Brinton characterizes the "excess of speeches" as "the greatest flaw" in the book's composition (4). Craig Kallendorf, on the other hand, argues that "much of the dramatic effect of the poem is conveyed through speech" (106). Likewise has Maphaeus's style come under scrutiny, particularly in comparison with Virgil's. While Brinton claims "it was second nature for Vegius to infuse Virgilian cadences into his own verse" (4), George E. Duckworth has shown that the thirteenth book "lacks the essential metrical features of the *Aeneid*" and insists that it is "erroneous to speak of the cadences of Vegius as 'Vergilian'" (cited in Schneider,
23). A stylistic analysis of what I would call the negotiation of authorship on \textit{Maphaeus}'s part, as he perhaps moves from closely imitating Virgil to distancing and distinguishing himself from his model, would be useful but lies rather outside the scope of this study; Kallendorf does do some of this work, but within the context of the book's epideictic "flavor," focussing primarily on the "general speech patterns in the \textit{Supplement}" (110).

5. All quotations from the \textit{Supplementum} are taken from Schneider's edition.

6. I have in mind here Douglas Robinson's tropic conception of translation activity outlined in \textit{The Translator's Turn}; see esp. Chapter 3.

7. Bawcutt discusses the passage in GD 148-49, and mentions that "the humorous \textit{occupatio}, the light irony, the reference to 'myne author', all are in Chaucer's manner" (149). Like other critics, Bawcutt recognizes a "Chaucerian" tone but does not explore the implications of this kind of textual "echo."

8. Maphaeus's text reads: \ldots Tum \textit{fremitus} laetaeque per atria voces / alta volant, strepitu ingenti tectum omne repletur. / Dant lucem flammae et lato splendore coruscant. / Consurgunt Phryges, et cithara resonante sequuntur / Ausonii et plusum ingeminant sequae aqmne toto / permiscent variantque pedes raptimque feruntur.
9. Textual situations like the one just described, and like those that I will go on to analyze in this chapter, serve as trenchant reminders that comments about Douglas that insist the poet "rejects the medieval view of the translator as one who culls narrative materials from other writers' works in order to retell them in his own manner, and instead emphasizes the translator's obligation to treat the text with the strictest fidelity" (Canitz, "From Aeneid to Eneados, 81) are, at best, overstated simplifications.

10. It is interesting to note that The Concise Scots Dictionary (ed. Mairi Robinson) defines "comprise" as "to comprehend, grasp mentally" from the late fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, and adds the sense of "appraise, value" from late sixteenth through the twentieth centuries. One could argue that evidence here in the Eneados suggests that Douglas in 1513 is using the word with both its earlier and later senses.

11. Douglas's descriptive powers have received some scholarly attention. See especially the articles by John Norton-Smith and Florence Ridley, and Bawcutt's comments on The Palace of Honour in GD, pp. 66-67.

12. Coldwell notes (4.261) that "Douglas frequently amplifies courtly scenes of this sort."
13. Kallendorf offers a survey of these "parallel passages in *In Praise of Aeneas*, pp. 124–25. All of them are in effect Maphaeus's references to Book 1 of the *Aeneid* and Jupiter's speeches therein. Kallendorf contends that the speech "function[s] to frame Aeneas' journeys by reminding the reader that human actions are guided by forces more powerful than men, yet parallel to them in moral responsibility" (126).

14. Coldwell glosses "hald" as "a place of protection or refuge."

15. Douglas has prepared his readership for this dialogic relationship in part by including notes in *Eneados* Book I that refer specifically to the *Supplementum*. Marginal commentary in *Eneados* I.5, wherein Douglas translates the original dialogue between Venus and Jupiter that so much of XIII.11 responds to, remarks that "The deyfication of Eneas is eftyr, in the last c. of the xiii buyk" (note to line 56) and "of the beldyng of his cyte and how lang his ryng endurit, in the last and penult c. of the xiii buyk" (note to line 61). Douglas's commentary, a kind of extension of Jupiter's voice at this point, parallels the god's speech and becomes its own kind of (textual) prophecy: a prophecy fulfilled not by Jupiter but by Douglas the translator in the *Eneados* itself.
16. Interestingly, the word appears in the context of the conciliatory dialogue between Jupiter and Juno that foreshadows Aeneas's ultimate fate: "Thou wait this self, and grantis thou wait, Enee / Is destinat onto the hevin to cum, / And fortobe clepit with all and sum / Amang the goddis a god indigites, / And by the fatis forto rest in pes" (XII.13.8-12; cf. Virgil, *indigetem Aenean scis ipsa et scire fateris / deberi caelo fatisque*). This linking of dialogue and reconciliation is not unlike that which we find at the end of Maphaeus's book. Moreover, Maphaeus, like Virgil, writes *indigetem* into his text as the first word in the line; Douglas scrupulously translates so as to follow this pattern. Most telling is the lack of explanatory gloss in Douglas's recasting of the Virgilian passage; he makes no attempt through XII.13 to distinguish narrative voices by incorporating explanatory commentary, the way he does in translating Maphaeus's lines. (Only the most numerologically-minded medievalist could make much of the fact that Douglas's inclusion of Virgil's *indigetem* appears at chapter 13, line 11, and his inclusion of Maphaeus's in Book 13, chapter 11.)
CONCLUSION

We cannot take leave of Douglas's *Eneados* without examining, however briefly, the ways Douglas takes leave of his *Eneados* audience. Appended to the translation are several pieces of verse in which, as Priscilla Bawcutt says, Douglas "bids farewell to Venus and Aeneas ("Be glaid, Ene, thy bell is hiely rong," Directioun 128), to Virgil himself, to his patron, to his readers, and even to his critics" (*GD* 169)---in other words, in which Douglas concludes his long and complex dialogue with the various implied audiences of the *Eneados*. The "Exclamatioun" is typical not only of this final material but of the kind of multi-voiced discourse found in the prologues of the *Eneados* as a whole:

```
Now throw the deip fast to the port I mark,
For heir is endyt the lang disparyt wark,
And Virgyll hes hys volum to me lent:
In sovir raid now ankyrrit is our bark.
We dowt na storm, our cabillys ar sa stark;
We have exchapyt full mony perrellus went.
Now God belovyt has syk grace tyl ws sent!
Sen Virgyll beys (wyd quhar in Latyn song)
Thus be my laubour red in owr wlgar tong.
```

(1-9)

Again we read Douglas closely connecting the figures of Virgil and himself, dramatically representing himself and his * ductor* as having * together* accomplished a treacherous nautical journey. And in this poem we still see Douglas
giving a voice to his critics even as he satirizes them, holding off criticism with a confident "Quha can do bettir, lat se quhar I forvayt; / Begyn of new; al thing is gud onassayt" (26-7): "Thai blaw owt, sayand in euerie manis face, / 'Lo, heir he failyeis, se thar he leys, luyk!"' (17-8). But the Exclamatioun's most notable dialogic address is in the envoi, wherein Douglas writes:

Go, wlgar Virgill, to euerie churlych wight
Say, I avow thou art translatit rycht,
Beseyk all nobillys the corect and amend,
Beys not afferyt tocum in prysaris sycht;
The nedis nocht to aschame of the lycht,
For I haue brocht thy purpos to gud end:
Now salt thou with euerie gentill Scot be kend,
And to onletterit folk be red on hight,
That erst was bot with clerkis comprehend.

(37-45)

The address is to his own translation, which is distinct and new, "wlgar," but still "Virgill." Douglas's own voice gives his work a voice, as he tells his book to assure its readers of the poet's guarantee of its own accuracy. Once again, Douglas invites criticism and correction only to forestall it by making the implied audience here the "onletterit folk" who, by implication, are unable to mount a significant attack on Douglas, and anyway ought to be thankful (the poet seems to suggest) that Douglas has accomplished this "egalitarian" effort on their behalf. We hear Douglas in dialogue here with his work and with Virgil, as well as with his audience, as he again circumscribes
their critical response by characterizing an audience that cannot rightly be critical. Consider the work, he tells some of his audience; consider the source of the criticism he tells others. Either way, Douglas and the *Eneados* ultimately transcend critique, just as does Virgil, of whom "na reproche" can "dymynew [the] gud name" (1 Prol., 74).

In contrast to the emphasis on "our bark" in the *Exclamationoun*, the "Conclusio" (which comes before the *Exclamationoun* in the manuscripts) in some ways places greater stress on the singularity of Douglas and his accomplishment. The "Conclusio" marks the end, as Douglas puts it, of "my wark," and the poem goes on to include one of Douglas's most overtly self-glorifying passages:

```
The bettir part of me salbe vpheld [after death]
Abufe the starnys perpetually to ryng,
And heir my naym remane but enparyng;
Throw owt the ile yclepit Albyon
Red sail I be, and sung with mony one.
```

(8-12)

Bawcutt suggests that "Douglas seems to have been one of the first to express in English what by the end of the sixteenth century had become a poetic commonplace: the assertion that a work of art can confer immortality" (*GD* 171). I do not think we can over-emphasize the Scots poet's correlation between poetry and ongoing fame; this passage is certainly as overt an indication as any of Douglas's wish to be read as not just a translator but as a vernacular *author* as well.
Yet he never goes so far as to associate *auctoritas* with autonomy. Even at this late point in the *Eneados* Douglas recognizes the place Virgil has in maintaining his fame: "Thus vp my pen and instrumentis full yor / On Virgillis post I fix for evirmor" (13-14). And he says he will turn away from (and apparently did turn away from) poetic pursuits: "My muse sal now be cleyn contemplatyve, / And solitar, as doith the byrd in cage" (16-17). What is interesting is the emphasis Douglas here puts on the solitary nature of his future enterprises—those unrelated to writing and to authorship; he is not merely turning away from translation or from poetic making, but from the social and dialogic character of just such endeavors. With "Adew, gallandis, I geif you all gud nycht" (23) Douglas begins to end (there is more verse yet to come) the conversation of the *Eneados*; the static nature of his new relationship to Virgil— the mute pen of the poet firmly fixed on "Virgillis post . . . for evirmor"—provides a striking contrast to the dynamic dialogue that takes place throughout the *Eneados*. But, fortunately, Douglas cannot end the dialogue with any kind of finality. Each new reader of the *Eneados* joins and extends the conversation. Just as the *Eneados* recreates a dialogue among Douglas, the *Aeneid*, Virgil, and all his other poetic addressees, so does each reading of the *Eneados*
itself renew, recreate and extend a dialogue that in many ways has only been initiated by Gavin Douglas.

I have argued that Douglas's work is best understood as a dialogue of literary and commentative voices. By creating and mediating this ongoing dialogue Douglas is able to negotiate a role for himself as more than a vernacular "makar" or a humble translator. Douglas's various interpretive voices collectively constitute not only an interpretive matrix for a vernacular Virgil but also a textual arena within which Douglas can negotiate the poetic auctoritas of his own translation. Douglas constructs a dialogic "meta-translation" that allows him to engage in a series of responses in and to his own vernacular; the result is Douglas's self-styled status as a vernacular auctor.
NOTES TO CONCLUSION

1. The complete rubric for the "Exclamatioun" calls the poem, made up of four stanzas plus an envoi, "Ane exclamatioun aganyst detractouris and oncurtas redaris that beyn our studyus, but occasioun, to note and spy owt faltis or offencis in this volum, or ony other thryfty warkys" (Coldwell, 4.192).

2. This rhetorical figure of the "bark" is a poetic commonplace, although Douglas does give it his distinctive "plural" twist; cf. Troilus and Criseyde II.1-7, Faerie Queene VI.12.1, Thebaid, XII.809; Purgatorio I.1-3, and, not unexpectedly, Georgics IV.116-7. Curtius, pp. 128-30, discusses the metaphor and offers further examples.

3. Bawcutt, GD 10-22, discusses Douglas's fortunes after 1513. For biographical material on the poet see also the introductions to Coldwell's and Small's editions.


