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ABSTRACT

In translating the Aeneid as faithfully as possible, Gavin Douglas saw himself as an innovator, breaking with the tradition of adaptation and instead presenting a faithful literary translation. In the Prologues to his Eneados Douglas discusses his theoretical principles, comments on the work of his predecessors in the transmission of Virgil in English, and raises issues pertinent to the contents of the Books of the Aeneid. However, the Prologues also reflect Douglas's perception of a conflict between his religious and artistic impulses, and show his gradual resolution of this conflict inherent in his dual role as critical artist and churchman.

By placing Douglas's Prologues in the context of prologues by other medieval writers, Chapter I shows that Douglas's new approach to faithful literary translation is matched by his independence in the employment of conventional literary devices, which he revitalizes by using them in a meaningful way rather than applying them because custom so dictates. Chapter II focuses on the narrator in his various and divergent roles, especially those of the poet and priest; while these two roles initially seem to make conflicting demands on the translator-narrator, he eventually resolves the conflict and recognizes a sublime harmony between divine and human artistry. Chapter III examines Douglas's practice of translation in light of his own theory; even though Douglas tends to "modernize" Virgil, he produces a genuine translation in which his avowed aims are largely realized. Chapter IV focuses on the connexions of the individual Prologues with their respective Books and demonstrates that even though the translation itself is generally accurate, the interpolation of the
Prologues with their re-interpretation of common archetypes as foreshadowings of Christian doctrine causes a radical transvaluing of the Aeneid as a Christian allegory. Chapter V shows that there is not only a linkage between the Prologues and Books, but that the Prologues are also connected to each other by the narrator's search for a theologically acceptable yet also artistically satisfying re-creation of a non-Christian work. Aeneas and the translator-narrator are thus engaged in parallel quests during which they have to overcome physical obstacles and resolve inner conflicts before they can reach their final destinations.
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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Gower, <em>Confessio Amantis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.E.T.S.(e.s.)</td>
<td>Early English Text Society (extra series)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.O.S.T.</td>
<td><em>Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>Lydgate, <em>The Fall of Princes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>Chaucer, <em>The House of Fame</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGW</td>
<td>Chaucer, <em>The Legend of Good Women</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Middle English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Henryson, <em>The Morall Fabillis of Esope the Phrygian</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.E.D.</td>
<td><em>Oxford English Dictionary</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td>Chaucer, <em>The Parliament of Fowls</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>Douglas, <em>The Palice of Honour</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Lydgate, <em>The Troy Book</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;C</td>
<td>Chaucer, <em>Trolus and Criseyde</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Henryson, <em>The Testament of Cresseid</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS</td>
<td>Scottish Text Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

In the course of the Prologues to his *Eneados*, Gavin Douglas refers several times to "grave matters" which delayed the progress of his translation of Virgil's *Aeneid* into 'Scottis,' yet he still completed the entire work in a mere eighteen months. On the other hand, he also finds that his work of writing the *Eneados* had occupied him for all too long a while, thus diverting his attention from more important business.1 These two contrasting perspectives regarding the propriety of devoting his time to a poetic enterprise are in many ways typical of the conflicts which characterize this writer and his longest work. Douglas in his various roles is frequently at odds with himself, but the tension which results from the often conflicting claims of his diverse roles and viewpoints heightens the vitality of his poetry and gives it increased energy and vigour.

In speaking of Douglas's "haunting consciousness that a man is not made a bishop in order to translate Virgil," C.S. Lewis indicated one of the fundamental conflicts troubling Douglas the poet.2 Douglas's vocation, on the one hand, and his literary enterprise, on the other, involve him in a conflict of interests, for the one demands that he place his skill in the service of his faith by using his artistic talents profitably to teach the doctrines of Christianity and to celebrate his Lord, whose creative act is the model to be "imitated" by the creative activity of the poet; the other interest, however, leads him to expend his time and energy on the translation of a pagan writer's work, and thus on what might be regarded as a dissemination of heresy and superstition. Paradoxically, it is precisely his training as a scholastic theologian
which must have made the undertaking of the Aeneid translation particularly attractive to Douglas. Time and time again, he stresses that accuracy and precision are among the main principles guiding his work, and he does not veil his indignation at William Caxton, one of his predecessors in the transmission of the Aeneid, for having failed to pay attention to these fundamentals of translation. At the same time, the demand for accuracy in the translation also identifies Douglas as immersed in a new current—new, at least, in the context of the British Isles—namely, that of Renaissance humanism. Unlike Caxton, Chaucer, and others who have retold the Aeneas story in their own ways yet claim to be following Virgil, Douglas endeavours actually to reproduce the Aeneid itself. This implies that he sees himself (and wishes to be seen by others) not only as a poet but also as a literary scholar. While Douglas the poet struggles with what he perceives to be the inadequacy of his native tongue to reflect the style of the original, Douglas the scholar consults the accumulated Virgilian commentaries, in addition to his own linguistic taste and inventiveness, to select the one word—or sometimes two or even three words—which comes closest to Virgil's in meaning, connotations, and even sound quality.

Moreover, Douglas is not satisfied with translating Virgil as closely as his skill and his medium will allow; he also renders a precise account of his theoretical principles and methods, defends the particular enterprise, and, indeed, justifies the writing of secular poetry per se. The foremost among his principles is the demand for utmost accuracy, which includes precision in technical aspects, such as word choice and retention of the proportions of the work, as well as the faithful rendering of the
original author's philosophical stance, even if this stance may not accord with the translator's own preferences. Douglas consequently chides Chaucer for having misrepresented Aeneas as a perjurer whereas Virgil had portrayed him as faultless. Nonetheless, Douglas does not perceive any clash between this postulate of total accuracy and his own practice of re-interpreting the *Aeneid* as a Christian allegory which may serve as a mirror for princes and as a guidebook for the average believer. For Douglas, this kind of "practical application" seems to have come naturally; not once does he seek to defend it. On the contrary, he takes it for granted that this approach is fully justified and points to Virgil's description of the underworld as evidence that Virgil himself was an unconscious spokesman for still unrevealed Christian doctrine. Freely "modernizing" Virgil in other respects too, Douglas shows his lack of any sense of the historical distance between Virgil's time and his own. While Douglas can be extremely faithful to the letter of Virgil's text and while he is well aware that he is breaking new ground with his scholarly approach to the craft of translation, he nonetheless thoroughly transvalues the *Aeneid* without being conscious of having made the slightest change.

Although Douglas is fully committed to making the *Aeneid* accessible to his own countrymen, lettered and unlettered alike, he is acutely conscious of the objections which might be raised against his undertaking. In fact, the series of the thirteen Prologues, integrated into the translation, provides ample evidence that he himself is in this respect his own severest judge and critic. The Prologues document Douglas's struggle with two conflicting impulses: on the one side, his scholarly and
artistic interests urge him to use all his poetic skill and learned resourcefulness to preserve the integrity of Virgil’s work in reproducing it for a new audience with a different linguistic and cultural background; on the other side, his moral and religious impulses warn him that he is engaged in a questionable pursuit when he appears to promulgate the existence and active agency of pagan deities. However, the Prologues also show the gradual resolution of this conflict and, eventually, the sublime harmony between the poet’s religious and artistic concerns. In this respect, Douglas’s progress mirrors that of Aeneas, who also has to overcome severe psychological and physical obstacles before he can give his Trojans their new homeland. These two journeys of the poet-translator and of the hero of the work are linked to each other not only by means of a general parallelism in the development of the two series of the Prologues and the Books, but also by means of intricate connexions between the individual Prologues and the Books which they introduce; thematic or structural elements in the Prologues often adumbrate those found in the Books and link the narrator’s inner state with events in Aeneas’ career.

This linkage of the Prologues with their respective Books and of the two series with each other has, however, only recently been recognized. From the late nineteenth century until the 1960’s, editors and compilers as well as literary critics have emphasized the so-called ‘Nature’ Prologues (VII, XII, and XIII) in their anthologies and discussions. Although these three Prologues, set in December, May, and June respectively, unite descriptions of the seasonal landscape with short sketches of the poet himself in various states of creativity, critics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century commonly regarded these
Prologues as pure nature poetry. Agnes Mure Mackenzie, for example, claimed in 1933 that "Douglas is the first poet in any form of the language deliberately to paint wild weather—indeed to paint landscape on a considerable scale—for its own sake, to find the aesthetic pleasure in it as such, not merely as the appropriate setting for some thrill of adventure among wildness. He is thus a figure of cardinal importance in the development of all nature-poetry, not only in English." While the 'Nature' Prologues were, and still are, almost universally lauded, most of the other Prologues used to receive only cursory mention; David F.C. Coldwell, Douglas’s last and on the whole rather unsympathetic editor, even went so far as to suggest that Douglas had thriftily salvaged poems written for other occasions and "draped them on the Aeneid because no more suitable one occurred." Despite its shortcomings, the publication of Coldwell’s edition made the Aeneado accessible again, resulting in a new wave of critical appraisals. While scholars such as John Speirs and Kurt Wittig had discussed Douglas primarily as a Scottish poet, critics writing in the 1970’s and 1980’s have read Douglas as a poet to be approached as one would approach Chaucer or Lydgate. In 1973, Elizabeth Salter and Derek Pearsall, for example, placed Douglas in the more international context of art in general and drew attention to the striking similarities between his seasonal descriptions and the depictions of outdoor scenes by Flemish landscape painters and by the Continental illuminators of Calendars and Books of Hours, thus questioning the previously standard argument that Douglas’s descriptions were based on direct, first-hand observation of nature, especially Scottish nature in Prologue VII. Three years later, in 1976, the first (and, so far, the
only) book-length study of Douglas and his work appeared in print: Priscilla Bawcutt's *Gavin Douglas: A Critical Study*, which contains several chapters on the *Eneados*, including one entirely devoted to the Prologues. Bawcutt's book is truly a pioneer work, in which she brings her full scholarship to bear on her subject, breaking with conventional views and providing a comprehensive and entirely new discussion based on painstaking research and extensive knowledge not only of Douglas and his own work but also of his sources and intellectual environment. Writing in 1979, Lois Ebin was the first scholar to consider all thirteen Prologues and, in addition, to relate them to each other. In 1981 and 1982, Alicia K. Nitecki again singled out the three so-called 'Nature' Prologues, but demonstrated that the landscape descriptions in these Prologues derive from literary sources more than from direct observation and that they do not exist for their own sake but serve as images of the poet-translator's inner state as he grapples with the problems involved in the translation of Virgil's work. Three years later again, Professor Ian S. Ross argued that the Prologues and Books of the *Eneados* are linked to each other by "patterns of comparison and contrast" and should be taken as a unified 'long poem.' Most recently, David J. Parkinson has provided the first extensive discussion of the alliterative Prologue VIII, surely the most difficult and most puzzling of all Douglas's Prologues. Other articles published in the last twenty to twenty-five years have been concerned with a variety of other aspects of the *Eneados*, especially the translation itself. Although there has been a marked increase in the liveliness and quality of the critical discussion following the publication of Bawcutt's trend-setting book, the quantity of published
material on the Eneados is still very small—Lydgate, Henryson, Dunbar, and even Gower have received far more attention from critics and publishers.16

The present study focuses primarily on the thirteen Prologues to the Eneados and examines them from a variety of angles. Chapter I contextualizes Douglas's Prologues by comparing them with prologues by other medieval writers, especially Chaucer and Lydgate, and by placing Douglas's use of certain literary conventions in the context of the literary tradition. It shows that Douglas's independence in choosing a new, scholarly approach to the craft of translation is matched by a comparable independence in his employment of standard devices and topoi, which he endows with new vitality by availing himself of them in a meaningful way rather than applying them because custom dictates them. Chapter I further seeks to demonstrate Douglas's independence as a critical artist, whose poetic expression is characterized by a high degree of consciousness regarding his source and his poetic and linguistic materials. Chapter II focuses on the narrator of the Prologues as he steps before his audience in a variety of divergent roles, especially those of the emancipated artist and of the churchman bound by the demands of his faith and vocation. While these two roles of poet and priest initially seem to make conflicting demands on Douglas the translator, he eventually resolves the conflict and joins these and other roles in the supreme harmony of the final Prologues. Chapter III treats aspects of the translation itself in conjunction with the principles theoretically set forth especially in Prologue I, where Douglas emphasizes the need for a poet-translator to be faithful and accurate in his translation and to
respect the integrity and inviolability of his source. This chapter examines Douglas’s practice of translation in light of his own theory and demonstrates the means by which he achieves his avowed aims. Even though Douglas takes occasional liberties in "modernizing" Virgil, he produces a genuine translation of a classic, not the kind of adaptation which had previously been customary. However, while Douglas the translator meets his own demand of fidelity to the source, Douglas the poet-narrator feels free to intersperse the Books of the Aeneid with the series of the Prologues—his own, original compositions—thus compromising the continuity of Virgil’s text and influencing the audience’s interpretation of the epic by prefacing each Book with his own comments. Chapter IV examines this relationship between the individual Prologues and their respective Books, and seeks to demonstrate that even though the translation itself is generally accurate, the interpolation of the Prologues causes a radical transvaluing of the Aeneid as a Christian allegory. Chapter V attempts to demonstrate that the Prologues are not only linked to the Books which they introduce, but that they are also connected to each other in a series parallel to that of the Books. The structural parallelism between the two series of the Prologues and Books suggests a parallelism between the quest of Aeneas and that of the narrator. Aeneas’ physical and psychological journey is mirrored by the progress of the poet-translator, who also ventures into new territory and eventually accomplishes his enormous task; in the process, he not only resolves the conflicts discussed in chapter III but also achieves his goal of producing a work which is both a genuine translation and a poem in its own right, and which furthermore extends the range of the poet-
translator's national language just as Aeneas' quest for the new homeland lays the foundations for the reburgeoning of Trojan power.

In this dissertation, then, I hope to make a threefold contribution to the study of Gavin Douglas's *Eneados*: I shall seek to demonstrate Douglas's conscious independence in his application of conventional devices within his Prologues, reflecting the independence in his entire approach to translation; secondly, by examining the translation itself and by exploring the linkage between the translation and the Prologues, I expect to show that even though Douglas's practice generally accords with his theory, his integration of the Prologues leads to a re-interpretation of the *Aeneid* as a Christian allegory; and, lastly, by analyzing the various roles of the narrator and by linking the narrator's progress with that of Aeneas as suggested by the uninterrupted parallelism of the two series of Prologues and Books, I shall attempt to establish the conscious parallelism between the double journey of Aeneas and the similar double progress of the poet-translator.
Notes

1 Quotations from Douglas's *Eneados* are taken from Virgil's *Aeneid* Translated into Scottish Verse by Gavin Douglas, Bishop of Dunkeld, ed. David F.C. Coldwell, 4 vols., STS 25, 27, 28, 30 (Edinburgh & London: Blackwell, 1957-64). References are given in the form 'I, i, 1' (i.e., Book I, chapter i, line 1). The various short pieces of writing following the translation of the thirteenth Book are referred to as 'Conclusion' (vol. IV, p.187), 'Direction' (vol. IV, pp.188-91), 'Exclamation' (vol. IV, pp.192-93), and 'Time, Space and Date' (vol. IV, pp.194-95). In quoting from Coldwell's edition, I have silently removed his italics; all italics which appear in the quotations from the *Eneados* are my own, used to emphasize certain words, phrases or usages, as appropriate.

Douglas refers to his language as 'Scottis' in I, Prol., 118. In Prologue VII, he mentions the delay which had occurred because other matters had occupied him:

I hynt a pen in hand,
Fortil perform the poet grave and sad,
Quham sa fer furth or than begun I had.

For byssynes, quhilk occurrit on cace,
Ourvoluyt I this volume, lay a space.

(VII, Prol., 144-49)

In Prologue XIII, after promising Maphaeus Vegius to translate the thirteenth Book, Douglas the narrator hurries back to his writing:

And mak vpwark heirof, and cloyss our buke,
That I may syne bot on grave materis luke.

(XIII, Prol., 187-88)

2 C.S. Lewis, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), p.87. The observation is valid even though Douglas was not actually made Bishop of Dunkeld until 1516, three years after the completion of the *Eneados*.


Chapter I - New Uses of Established Conventions

When Gavin Douglas began his translation of Virgil's *Aeneid*, there already existed an extensive corpus of works in English based on Virgil's epic. Indeed, as Prologue I of the *Eneados* testifies, Douglas was well acquainted with some of them, for he criticizes them on a variety of grounds. But the very fact that he uses a prologue as the vehicle for his criticism shows that he regarded another tradition as fully established too, namely that of the prologue form as a means for the writer to set forth the theoretical underpinnings of his work, to clarify his critical perspective, to set the tone for the ensuing work, to focus the reader's attention and to shape the reader's expectations regarding the main part of the work—in a word, to make some announcement with respect to the nature of the undertaking and with regard to the position of the writer himself. The particulars of the nature, terms, and chief purposes of this announcement may vary from prologue to prologue and from writer to writer, but the tradition of making it by means of this device has by the early sixteenth century become thoroughly conventional. Within English literature, the prologue has been used by Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate; closer to home, in Scottish literature, Henryson has used it; further afield, Douglas has encountered it in Boccaccio, whom he so often quotes and refers to; it is used in the vernacular literatures as well as in Latin, in entirely secular works written for the entertainment of lay audiences as well as in scholastic works. Indeed, one of the most astonishing aspects of the device of the prologue is its extreme versatility and flexibility in terms of both its form and structure and its function and purpose. Douglas's *Eneados* itself provides ample
evidence of the multifarious uses of the form, for no two of its thirteen Prologues are alike, yet all are supported by a long tradition which stretches back through medieval writing ultimately to classical forms, reshaped and adapted in the course of centuries to fulfil new and different tasks.

When Douglas prefaces every single Book of his *Eneados* with its own, separate Prologue, he is nonetheless doing something quite extraordinary. For although prologues are common enough in Middle English literature, an unbroken series of prologues for every main section of a work are rare. Even Chaucer, whom Douglas hails as ‘principal poet but peir’ (I, Prol., 339), does not keep up the practice he began in the *Canterbury Tales* of having each Tale begin with a prologue. Half a century later, in the 1430’s, Lydgate also uses a series of prologues in his *Fall of Princes*, which is in many ways comparable to Douglas’s own monumental work, yet Lydgate, too, breaks the series so that only five out of the nine Books of the *Fall* are preceded by a Prologue. Lydgate’s *Fall* Prologues also do not show the extreme variety of Douglas’s, either in form and structure or in content and tone. In this respect, Chaucer’s development of the form in the *Canterbury* Prologues approximates the versatility of the device in Douglas’s work much more closely, but here the range of function and purpose is narrower than it is in the *Eneados* Prologues. Douglas thus stretches the range of the Prologue form and pushes its limits beyond what had previously been done.

Nevertheless, one of the similarities between Chaucer’s Prologues in the *Canterbury Tales* and Douglas’s Prologues in the *Eneados* provides a good point of comparison. In the General Prologue, Chaucer introduces the
various pilgrims assembled at the Tabard Inn and then tells his audience that he will

telle of oure viage
And al the remenaunt of oure pilgrimage.
But first I pray yow, of youre curteisye,
That ye n'arette it nat my vileynye,
Thogh that I pleynly speke in this mateere,
To telle yow hir wordes and hir cheere,
Ne though I speke hir wordes proprely.
For this ye knowen al so wel as I,
Whoso shal telle a tale after a man,
He moot reherce as ny as evere he kan
Everich a word, if it be in his charge,
Al speke he never so rudeliche and large,
Or ellis he moot telle his tale untrewe,
Or feyne thyng, or fynde wordes newe.
He may nat spare, althogh he were his brother;
He moot as wel seye o word as another.

(I (A) 723-38)¹

In other words, Chaucer proposes a twofold approach: first, he will report the pilgrimage with its story-telling as it happens, that is, he will show his audience the pilgrimage in progress, as something that is developing and taking shape under his reader’s eyes, not as an event which lies in the past and is completed; and second, he will use the language of his characters, that is, he will set the tales down in styles chosen for their appropriateness to the individual narrators and thus be faithful to his "exemplars." In both aspects, Douglas’s approach is similar. He, too, shows us not only a journey—Aeneas’ double progress, a physical one from the ruins of Troy to the banks of the Tiber, and a psychological one from being the fugitive Trojan to having become the model man and prince—but he shows it to us while it is still in the making, giving us glimpses of the process of his own creative work in translating the tale of Aeneas’ journey and thus involving us in the creative process, as opposed to
presenting us with the finished, completed product. In the progress, Douglas, too, makes very precise statements regarding his word choice, style, critical approach, and other theoretical issues involved in a work in which accuracy and faithfulness are the avowed yet often taxing goals. As Chaucer had made his statements near the opening of his work, so Douglas, too, uses the first of his Prologues to propound his critical framework, while later adding further details to the discussion as they arise. Indeed, the issue of the critical approach occupies almost all of Prologues I, II, III, V, and IX, and parts of Prologues VIII, XII, and XIII, as well as most of the end matter following Book XIII, where Douglas treats his pen like a votive offering to a saint:

Thus vp my pen and instrumentis full for
On Virgillis post I fix for evirmor, (Conclusion, 13-4)

thus putting the classical exordial **topos** of dedication or "consecration" to new use. After the rising morning sun had welcomed the pilgrim on the last leg of his pilgrimage (XIII, Prol., 169-70), the pilgrimage of the translation here becomes complete, and Douglas's pledge to Virgil

\[ \text{thus with thy leif, Virgile, to follow the,} \\
\text{I wald into my rural wigar gross} \\
\text{Wryte sum savoryng of thyne Eneados} \]

(I, Prol., 42-3)

is finally redeemed. But the journey has been an arduous one, forcing the translator to give careful and intense consideration to his methods and even requiring him from time to time to make a great effort to overcome a certain weariness in order to carry on with his toilsome
Part I: The Largely Neglected Prologues

At the beginning of the work Douglas seems to be full of zest and enthusiasm. He starts his first Prologue with a long apostrophe to Virgil, on whom he heaps the most extravagant yet quite sincere praises. What Douglas singles out in Virgil's work above all is the Mantuan's combination of ingenuity and eloquence which makes his

\[
\text{crafty warkis curyus} \\
\text{Sa quyk, lusty and maist sentencyus,} \\
Plesand, perfyte and feilabill in all degre, \\
\ldots \\
\text{Surmontyng fer all other maner endyte,} \\
\ldots \\
\text{Sa wysly wrocht with nevir a word invane.} \\
\text{(I, Prol., 11-3,16,30)}
\]

In contrast, Douglas deplores his own lack of these qualities:

\[
\text{Quhy suld I than with dull forhed and vayn,} \\
\text{With rude engyne and barrand emptye brayn,} \\
\text{With bad, harsk spech and lewit barbour tong} \\
\text{Presume to write quhar thy sweit bell is rung.} \\
\text{(I, Prol., 19-22)}
\]

This contrast indicates what is important for Douglas: verse must satisfy both in terms of its intellectual aspects and on account of the melodiousness of its sounds and richness of its texture, and the poet must be 'crafty' or skilful in eloquence so that his verse will please both mind and emotion--it must be both 'sentencyus' and 'feilabill.' These qualities are partly to be achieved through skilful composition, partly through selectivity and precision in word choice; other criteria are a
certain poetical quality ('sang poetical'; IX, Prol., 55) and a general freshness of expression, which includes both vividness and originality ('fresch sapour new from the berry run'; V, Prol., 54; also IX, Prol., 55 and 72). Yet these aimed-for qualities pose particular problems for Douglas who sees himself as writing in a 'lewit barbour tong' which does not command the 'polyst termys redymyte' (I, Prol., 34) available in Virgil's Latin.

But even though the difficulties inherent in the project are great, Douglas remains unabashed. He takes the time-honoured stance of humility before the 'Maister of masteris' (I, Prol., 9),

For quhat compair betwix mydday and nycht?  
Or quhat compair betwix myrknes and lycht?  
Or quhat compar is betwix blak and quhyte?  
(I, Prol., 25-7)

and includes the traditional topos of the protestation of his own incapacity

My waverand wyt, my cunnyng febill at all,  
My mynd mysty, thir may nocht myss a fall—  
(I, Prol., 31-2).

Yet the correctio in the very next line already indicates Douglas's impatience not only with his own limitations but also with the conventional self-effacement of the translator and humble follower; altering his tone, he exclaims,

Stra for thys ignorant blabryng imperfyte  
Besyde thy polyst termys redymyte.  
(I, Prol., 33-4)
The conventional terms of humility have become stale, and the attitude they are meant to express is inadequate for one who has set himself the task of not merely translating but re-creating the work of this master of poetry—even in using traditional topoi Douglas aims at freshness. How independent Douglas’s attitude indeed is—despite his deep admiration for Virgil—will become clear if Douglas’s stance is compared with Lydgate’s abject self-degradation vis-a-vis Boccaccio:

And theih my stile nakid be and bare,  
In rethorik myn auctour for to sue, 
Yit fro the trouthe shal I nat remue, 

But on the substance bi good leiser abide  
Afftir myn auctour lik as I may atteyne,  
And for my part sette eloquence aside,  

... 

But, o alas! who shal be my muse,  
Or onto whom shal I for helpe calle?  
Calliope my callyng will refuse,  
And on Pernaso here worthi sustren alle;  
Thei will ther sugre tempre with no galle.  

(Fall of Princes, I, Prol., 229-43)

Although both poets protest their own lack of ability and lament the insufficiency of their language to reflect the effects of their Latin exemplars precisely or even adequately, the attitudes of the two translators are worlds apart. What Lydgate perceives as a given limitation in which he has no choice but acquiesce,

Seyn howh that Ynglyssh in ryme hath skarsety,  

(FP IX, 3312)

Douglas takes as a challenge on which his powers of innovation and creativity can thrive:
Nor jit sa cleyn all sudron I refuss,
Bot sum word I pronounce as nyghtbouris doys:
Lyke as in Latyn beyn Grew termys sum,
So me behufyt quhilum or than be dum
Sum bastard Latyn, French or Inglys oyss
Quhar scant was Scottis--I had nane other choys.
Nocht for our tong is in the selwyn skant
Bot for that I the fowth of langage want.

(I, Prol., 113-20)

Apart from announcing his intention of borrowing words or pronunciations, which he sometimes needs 'to lykly my ryme' (I, Prol., 124), Douglas here also raises the issue of linguistic accuracy in his translation. What he strives for is the 'fowth' of language, and the more varied his resources are, the more likely is this fund of possibilities to provide him with exactly the right word or phrase for the particular context. Douglas borrows freely from other languages, not only French, Latin and Greek, but also Dutch and Flemish. In addition, his vocabulary includes words drawn from Scandinavian stock, native colloquialisms made literary by their use in the Eneados, alliterative collocations, and aureate neologisms newly coined for the occasion. This copiousness of vocabulary and the variety in the level of diction make it possible, at least theoretically, to emulate Virgil's linguistic effects, and thus to satisfy his "ambition to raise his own language to an equal pitch of eloquence;"² it is the breadth of Douglas's resources which allows him to choose terms not only for their denotations but also for their connotations, associations, sound qualities, and etymological connexions. The varied vocabulary thus serves his demand for accuracy and fidelity in even the more subtle stylistic aspects of the translation. Linguistic borrowing and, if need be, even invention are integral parts of Douglas's stated methodology, whose goal it is to capture as much as possible of Virgil's texture, tone, and verbal
effects. While succeeding translators could previously have fallen back on Lydgate's statement that 'Ynglyssh . . . hath skarsety', Douglas develops and comments on methods to overcome such 'skarsety.' The discussion of linguistic difficulties perceived by the translator as objective rather than subjective limitations had already become a new exordial topos itself, but Douglas's innovation is to discuss and demonstrate the means to meet such challenges.

Another method in striving for fidelity in recreating the Aeneid is to aim at the utmost accuracy in retaining the 'sentence' in its original balance and proportions. In his flyting with Caxton (I, Prol., 137-282), Douglas indignantly charges the earlier writer with having translated the Aeneid at second hand, from a French recension, rather than directly from the original Latin (I, Prol., 141); in consequence, there are serious distortions in the texture of the verse (I, Prol., 147-52), and confusions in the locations and characters stemming from misspellings of place names and proper names (I, Prol., 221-48), besides perversions of parts of the plot (I, Prol., 155-67). However, important as they are, these are minor charges compared with the two major ones, namely that Caxton has, by means of undue abbreviations and considerable omissions, distorted the structural balance and proportions of Virgil's work (I, Prol., 154-56, 168-76, 249-59), and that he utterly fails to understand the significance of the pagan gods and of the underworld. Douglas also accuses Caxton of failing to perceive that 'vnder the clowdis of dyrk poecy / Hyd lyis thar mony notabil history' (I, Prol., 194-95). In consequence of this deplorable lack of perception and sympathetic understanding, Caxton calls Book VI 'fenjeit and nocht forto beleif' (I, Prol., 179), being thus
inconsistent, since other parts of his translation also contain the gods as agents. A translation that fails to show an understanding of central passages setting forth the framework of the original author's views which in turn inform the entire rest of the work, a translation that entirely omits one quarter of the original, reduces another half to one-sixth its length and expands one-twelth to become one half, a translation that on top of all this is so inaccurate that it is 'no mair lyke [the Aeneid] than the devill and Sanct Austyne' (I, Prol., 143), such a translation cannot but incur Douglas's wrath. But in censuring Caxton, Douglas also advances his own principles of translation, namely faithfulness to all aspects of the original, from accuracy in the spelling of names all the way to a sympathetic comprehension and interpretation of the original author's philosophic stance, which itself must be reflected in the translation.

In a second passage of criticism, Douglas directs his attention to Chaucer, the 'principal poet but peir' (I, Prol., 339), who, however, 'standis beneth Virgill in gre' (I, Prol., 407). Even more so than in his criticism of Caxton, he uses the charge he brings against Chaucer's treatment of the Dido story in the Legend of Good Women as a means to launch his discussion of the impossibility and, indeed, the undesirability of word-for-word translation. When Douglas gently criticizes Chaucer for claiming that 'he couth follow word by word Virgill' (I, Prol., 345), he is actually not quite just to the elder poet. At the opening of the Dido Legend, Chaucer writes,
Glorye and honour, Virgil Mantoan,  
Be to thy name! and I shal, as I can,  
Folwe thy lanterne, as thow gost byforn,  

...  
In Naso and Eneydos wol I take  
The tenor, ...  

(LGW, 924-29; italics mine)

Far from claiming to write a literal translation, Chaucer explicitly 
disclaims such an ability and is content with following 'the tenor' not of 
Virgil's work only, but of both Virgil's and Ovid's handling of the story 
of Dido. Nonetheless, the point serves Douglas well to begin his argument 
against literal translation, in which he provides examples to support his 
thesis that different languages often have no exact equivalents, and even 
if words with the same denotations may be found, the connotations of such 
words will not be the same, so that it is often necessary to use 
circumlocutions or other collocations in order at least to approximate the 
import of the original word or phrase. In addition, there are the 
prosodic problems of having to find pairs of rhyming words to end the 
'Scottis' couplets and of writing in a language with far fewer 
inflectional endings than Latin has. And, of course, there are those of 

our tungis penuryte,  
I meyn into compar of fair Latyn  
That knawyn is maste perfite langage fyne.  

(I, Prol., 380-82)

Apart from his observations on the lack of exact equivalents in the two 
languages, Douglas also seems to be conscious, at least in part, of the 
problems connected with the transference of a literary work from one 
culture into another. When he writes,
he appears to be alluding to the difficulty which the translator faces in trying to make graphic and even to make thinkable what is originally outside the audience’s range of cultural experience and perception. On the basis of his own observation and on the additional authority of St. Gregory and Horace (I, Prol., 395-402), Douglas therefore rejects slavish adherence to the letter of the original in favour of capturing what he perceives to be the spirit, the tone, the atmosphere, the idea—in short, the ‘sentence’ of the work.

He also accuses Chaucer of having misrepresented Aeneas as a perjuror, thus doing violence to Virgil’s systematic and consistent portrayal of the hero as one who is without ‘spot of cryme, reproch or ony offens’ (I, Prol., 420). Since Chaucer is not concerned with the whole of the Aeneid, however, but only with one small part, Douglas graciously and tongue-in-cheek will ‘excuss Chauser fra all maner repruffis’ (I, Prol., 446) on the grounds that Chaucer ‘was evir (God wait) all womanis frend’ (I, Prol., 449).

In using the Prologue as a platform for his criticism of Caxton and Chaucer and thence developing his own principles as a translator, Douglas may be recalling not only Chaucer himself but also Lydgate. In the Prologue to his Troy Book, Lydgate discusses the reliability of the available sources, criticizing some for partiality (essentially the same charge which Douglas brings against Chaucer), some for omissions and extreme brevity (one of Douglas’s charges against Caxton), and some for lack of accuracy. Others he accuses of perverting the story altogether
While Lydgate's evaluation of the works of his predecessors is of a rather general character and may not always be based on first-hand acquaintance with the individual works so criticized, it already shows the rudiments of a critical evaluation of other treatments of the same topic, a process which Douglas develops much further. Compared with Lydgate's criticism, Douglas's is far more detailed and informed, far more probing, and altogether far more sophisticated. Yet when Lydgate, at the end of the Troy Prologue, praises Guido delle Colonne on the twin grounds of accuracy of transmission and mastery of the 'sovereign style' (Troy Book, Prol., 354-74), he distinctly foreshadows Douglas's two main concerns of accuracy and style, although Douglas is, of course, concerned with textual rather than historical accuracy. However, on this issue too, Lydgate elsewhere anticipates Douglas's stance; in the final Envoy to his Danse Macabre, Lydgate comments,

> Out of the French I drough it of entent,  
 Not word by word but folowing in substaunce,

(665-6)

an issue which Douglas addresses at much greater length and with much greater awareness of its complexity.

In other Prologues Douglas frequently makes reference to the difficulty, the length, and the occasional tediousness of his labour, depicting himself as resharpening his pen, dragging himself out of bed on a cold winter morning, and forcing himself back to his writing desk; Prologues V and IX, however, like Prologue I, are almost entirely devoted to discussions of a particular problem of the translator, namely that of
recapturing the style and tone of the original. Both these prologues make substantial contributions to the development of Douglas's theory of translation, in that both of them contain analytical discussions of style, thus expounding further aspects of the theoretical foundations of Douglas's approach to a faithful translation. In using not just one, but a series of prologues for the gradual refinement of the critical basis of his translation, Douglas may again be harking back to John Lydgate, who also employed a series of prologues in his *Fall of Princes* to consider various aspects and definitions of Fortune. But while Lydgate is content with adding one aspect and one definition to the next without even reacting to their often mutually contradictory nature, Douglas gradually builds up a theory of translation, progressing in finesse every time he touches the issue and relating his theoretical discourse to the practical undertaking in progress, while now and then seasoning it with a dash of humour, usually at his own expense.

By the time Douglas approaches Prologue V, he has translated Virgil's description of the Trojans' arrival at Carthage, exhausted after their long and arduous voyage, apprehensive for their shipwrecked comrades, and then relieved at finding hospitality in Dido's city and palace; Douglas has also translated Aeneas' account of the destruction of Troy, of the loss of his wife, friends and comrades, and of his own narrow escape, as well as his narrative of the voyage full of dangers and further partings from friends; and he has recreated the poignantly brief time of love and happiness between Dido and Aeneas, closing with Aeneas' departure and even taking a sympathetic stance in portraying Dido's despair and suicide. After these first four books with all their variety in subjects and moods,
and while now preparing for the translation of Book V with its funeral games, Douglas has tasted enough of Virgil’s ‘craft’ to know that

He altyrris hys style sa mony way,
Now dreid, now stryfe, now lufe, now wa, now play,
Langeir in murnyng, now in melody,
To satyfy ilk wightis fantasy;
Lyke as he had of euery thyng a feill,
And the willys of every wight dyd feill.
(V, Prol., 33-8)

It is a difficult task to recapture the nuances of so varied a style in another language and to recreate the same moods, tones, feelings, atmospheres with words which have different connotations and different sound qualities. Virgil’s extreme stylistic range and his flexibility of diction thus create a threefold problem for the sensitive translator: he has to follow Virgil both into the minds and hearts of his characters, who experience these thoughts and feelings; he must be able to gauge and direct the emotional and intellectual reaction of his audience, in whom the style must create an appropriate response; and he also has to recognize the means by which the particular effect was originally achieved in order to be able to find analogous means in his different medium to create a similar effect in an audience with a different cultural background. This difficulty is severe enough for Douglas to exclaim that the

hie wysdome and maist profund engyne
Of myne author Virgile, poete dyvyne,
To comprehend, makis me almaist forvay.
(V, Prol., 28-30)

However, having called for grace not on Bacchus, nor on Proserpina, nor on
Victoria, but on God, Douglas is ready to begin the next Book, dealing with the funeral games for Anchises, a sacred occasion simultaneously sad and joyful.

A discussion of style, though at much greater length, also occupies most of Prologue IX; again, Douglas offers further refinements in his literary theory. From admiring Virgil's stylistic range and variety, Douglas now turns to considering style in relation to subject matter and audience, especially the patron; the manner of writing, he says, must accord with both. After having just translated the account of Aeneas' new armour, culminating in a detailed description of the shield on which Vulcan has depicted the course of Roman history up to the Pax Romana succeeding Augustus' triumph over all opponents, and before turning to the next Book, which relates Nisus and Euryalus' heroic sally and Turnus' single-handed fight inside the Trojan encampment, Douglas appropriately chooses 'the ryall style, clepyt heroycall' (IX, Prol., 21), which he later also refers to as 'the knychtlyke stile' (IX, Prol., 31), as an example to illustrate his discussion regarding the necessity for the form of an epic to suit both content and primary audience. This royal or heroic style should be characterized by nobility of diction, with each word carrying weight. It also demands gravity in its rhetorical techniques; jokes and frivolous or even loose language are out of place here (IX, Prol., 24-5), although in other contexts they may be perfectly appropriate; indeed, in other contexts Douglas himself employs them freely, for example in the rough comedy in Prologue XIII and also at the end of Prologue IX itself, where he pokes fun at himself for possibly being too enamoured of the product of his own labours. However, gravity
and weightiness alone do not suffice as criteria for the heroic style; the royal style should also be aesthetically pleasing, in accordance with the ethically pleasing, noble content. And, it may be inferred from Douglas’s frequent commendatory comments on Virgil’s ‘fresch endyte’ here (IX, Prol., 55) and elsewhere, the heroic style—just like any other—should show originality, transcending conventional formulae and standard collocations and using new ways to evoke vivid images, a quality which Douglas is confident he, in contrast to Caxton, has captured (V, Prol., 49-54). Furthermore, the royal style is not confined to the narration and depiction of heroic deeds and other subjects which are almost by their very nature associated with knightly conduct and concerns. If a work is written for a noble patron, then the royal style can, according to ‘myne authour,’ also be used for entirely neutral subjects. But, Douglas adds, the more elevated aspects of such subjects would be of greater intrinsic interest to a noble audience than the more lowly ones, and thus it behoves the writer to make careful distinctions to select only elevated aspects of neutral subjects for treatment in this most sovereign of styles, so that nothing trifling will be allowed to disrupt the threefold harmony between form, content and recipient or audience (IX, Prol., 27-40). 7

This postulate had of course long been observed in practice, but here it is actually stated in a most succinct fashion:

we aucht tak tent
That baith accord, and bene conuenient,
The man, the sentence, and the knychtylke stile.
(IX, Prol., 29-31)

Whether Douglas’s Prologues in fact "represent the beginnings of literary
criticism," as Kurt Wittig so unconditionally claims, is questionable, but within the literature of the Middle Ages in Britain Douglas’s analytical approach to poetry is certainly a sign of great independence. Some of the critical issues he discusses had been approached by Chaucer and Lydgate too, although far less systematically and, in Lydgate’s case, also much more diffusely.

Douglas shows a corresponding degree of independence in his numerous requests and even commands that his readers read attentively (Time, Space and Date, 23) and that they ‘reid oftar than anys’ (I, Prol., 107), indeed that they ‘reid, reid agane, this volume, mair than twyss’ (VI, Prol., 12), in order to comprehend the work’s subtleties before beginning to criticize it. It hardly even seems to occur to Douglas that there may be grounds for any justified criticism at all: his references to potential critics tend to be derogatory and dismissive. Even when he, at the very close, asks Henry Lord Sinclair to defend the work against possible attacks, they are a priori assumed to come from ‘corruppit tungis violens’ who ‘can nocht amend, and hit a falt wald spy’ (Direction, 12-13). When Douglas does on occasion use one of the conventional humility topoi of incapacity, the context immediately belies it as no more than a pose which Douglas knows a writer is expected to strike, but which he does not seriously consider fitting for himself. The self-assurance he shows vis-à-vis his audience at large is also reflected in his stance vis-à-vis his patron and kinsman, whom he addresses in terms of equality, both in Prologue I and in the end matter. And furthermore, it also informs his estimate of the future of his ‘wlgar Virgill’: the work is to be nothing less than immortal, and by being so will confer immortality on Douglas’s
name, too. One and a quarter centuries earlier, Chaucer had been sufficiently concerned for the integrity and accurate transmission of his work to insert an appropriate comment into the Envoy to his *Troilus and Criseyde* (V, 1793-96) and to write "Chaucers Wordes unto Adam, His Owne Scriveyn," admonishing careless Adam to pay proper attention to his task so that the work might be preserved uncorrupt. Lydgate, too, had considered the issue of the preservation of a writer's work and its immortalizing effect on the writer's name, citing Virgil, Seneca, Persius and others as examples of continued renown based on their work (*Fall of Princes*, IV, Prol., 50-70), although he is far from making such a claim for himself. Douglas, however, has no such qualms; for him it is a matter of course that his *Eneados* will neither be destroyed by force nor forgotten in the process of time (Conclusion, 1-4), and he is equally certain that after his death,

heir my naym remane, but emparynge;
Throw owt the ile yclepit Albyon
Red sall I be, . . .

(Conclusion, 10-12)

Such a degree of confidence in the immortalizing power of one's own poetry is unparalleled among the works of other major writers of Middle English or Middle Scottish literature.12

Douglas's critical and philosophical independence, however, is rather less evident in those Prologues in which he treats moral and theological issues; there, he is an exponent of traditional, accepted doctrine, as accords with his vocation and his position within the Church hierarchy. To this group of Prologues belong those prefacing Books IV, X, and XI, defining Christian love, explaining the nature of the Trinity, and
expounding Christian fortitude respectively; connected with this group are also two other Prologues, namely Prologue VI, which justifies the use of myth in poetry and defends Virgil as a ‘philosophour naturall’ (1.38) and ‘ane hie theolog sentencyus’ (1.75) who foreshadowed Christian doctrine, and Prologue VIII, which presents conventional social criticism in the form of a dream vision, but also implies that such a stock lament on the theme o tempora, o mores is not particularly fruitful.

Prologue VI constitutes a link between those Prologues in which Douglas is chiefly the critical artist developing his theory and methods and those in which he is the churchman preaching to his congregation of readers. In representing Virgil as one whose work foreshadows the basic tenets of Christian teaching, Douglas is firmly rooted in a long tradition of Christian exegesis; he cites St. Augustine of Hippo as an authority for this interpretation (11.61-4) and refers to Ascensius’ comparison of Virgil to the Apostles (11.73-4). The first few stanzas of this Prologue, however, are interesting from a literary point of view: here, Douglas recapitulates one of the tacit agreements between writer and audience fundamental to the very being of literature as opposed to historiography, namely that literature does not purport to be an accurate recording of historical fact, but that, while it is concerned with human nature and human experience, the specifics of the literary work spring from the intellect and imagination. Robert Henryson had already made a very similar point in the opening lines of the Prologue to his Morall Fabillis of Esop the Phrygian:
The writer therefore does not represent the world in its observable, recordable details, but represents a world—in Sidney's words,

A perfect picture I say, for he yieldeth to the powers of the mind an image of that whereof the philosopher bestoweth but a wordish description, which doth neither strike, pierce, nor possess the sight of the soul so much as that other doth.14

Literature, including the Aeneid and the Eneados, is not 'ful of leys or aid ydolatryis' (1.10), but represents that which is abstract and general in terms and images which are concrete and specific as a method for aiding the audience's perception and comprehension by involving the senses rather than relying on purely cognitive understanding. For Virgil, the specific means to this end was myth; for Douglas, and for the medieval mind in general, it is allegory, especially Christian allegory, so that Virgil's underworld, for instance, is but another image of Christian afterlife, differing from the Christian image in form but not in substance. Douglas is asking his readers not to be deterred by the unfamiliar method and not to close their minds to it, but to make the transference from myth to allegory, and by explaining the details of Book VI in Christian allegorical terms, he facilitates this step from the image itself to the idea which, for him, the image represents.

While Prologue VI is in the main a Christian re-interpretation of Virgil, Prologues IV, X and XI consist of unambiguous sermons on Christian themes; leaving the occasional references to Aeneas and Dido in Prologues
IV and XI aside, these Prologues can be paralleled, at least in their details, by any number of medieval sermons. Indeed, Prologue X is almost a complete service by itself, beginning with a glorification of God the Creator and of the beauty and perfection of His Creation (11.1-15), followed by a sermon explicating the nature of the Trinity (11.16-85), using the conventional analogies of man's tripartite soul and of the flame which radiates light and heat without decreasing in light and heat itself; very similar analogies are also used in *Piers Plowman* (B-text, Passus XVII, 137-279) to explain the paradox of tri-unity. After the long sermon, Douglas admonishes his audience not to strive vainly to understand God by means of reason, but simply to have faith (11.86-100); he then goes on to a prayer recalling God's compassion despite man's disobedience, giving thanks for the mercies of the Incarnation, the Redemption, the Harrowing of Hell, and the Eucharist, and asking for Grace (11.101-50); and he ends with a Creed (11.151-75), formally closing with 'Amen.'

Prologues IV and XI are structurally less strict and less complete, consisting only of the sermon itself. Both these Prologues take their themes from the Books they preface—Prologue IV, love; Prologue XI, fortitude—and treat them from a Christian perspective. Prologue IV, a sermon against *luxuria*, progresses from *exempla* of the destructiveness of "inordinate love"—that is, erotic love—and from negative and positive definitions of human love to the topic of love towards God, while Prologue XI advances from *exempla* of the lawful use of force— that is, the use of force based on right—and a definition of secular fortitude, which among nobles must be tempered by magnanimity, to one of the Christian fortitude which is necessary to withstand the temptations of the flesh, of the
world, and of the powers of darkness, but which is insufficient without Grace, again illustrated with *exempla*. In both these Prologues, the transition from the sermon to the subsequent Book is expressly made, in the one case by reference to Dido, who in her inordinate love—and worse, in her 'fulych lust' (1.228)—has herself brought on her 'dowbill wound' (1.215), a phrase recalling Troilus' 'double sorwe' at the opening of *Troilus and Criseyde*, and who becomes proof of the dictum that "Temporal joy endis wyth wo and pane" (1.221), and in the other case by reference to Aeneas, whose prowess is enobled by magnanimity and who, as a type of pre-Christian hero already possessing certain Christian virtues, can sustain the dangers of the voyage and of the conquest and can defeat Turnus, who in contrast to Aeneas has to rely on secular fortitude only. In both Prologues, the last stanza is devoted to admonishing the reader to 'Ensew vertu, and eschew every vice' (XI, Prol., 195), especially the particular virtue and the particular vice just discussed in the sermon itself.

In Prologue VIII, Douglas is less concerned with vices and virtues in a strictly religious sense, but places them into a social context, so that the largest part of this Prologue becomes a criticism of contemporaneous society and its mores. This entire Prologue is written in rhyming alliterative long lines, with a wheel at the end of each 13-line stanza. The social criticism, contained in a dream vision written in this particular verse form, is strongly reminiscent of that in, for instance, the Prologue to *Piers Plowman*, where the members of the clergy, incidentally, are also singled out for particularly detailed criticism. However, there is a twist: the social criticism is presented by a
‘selcouth seg [. . .] / Swownand as he swelt wald, sowpyt in syte’ (11.4-5) whom the translator-narrator sees in a dream he dreams ‘in Lent this last nycht’ (1.2) and who does not notice the dreamer’s presence until 1.118 while all the while talking to himself. Then the dream figure accuses the poet-dreamer of being an idler and wasting his time writing a worthless book. He gives him a scroll to read instead, which the dreamer, however, finds but gibberish and doggerel about the motions of the parts of the universe. Finally, the dream figure takes the dreamer to a dike where a treasure lies buried, and digs up coin after coin, but when the dreamer-narrator wakes up, the hoard of pennies has vanished, and after some unsuccessful searching, he rebukes himself for having given credence to such vain fantasy.

While Douglas the narrator is eager to brush the dream vision aside as soon as he finds himself disappointed in his hope to rediscover the vanished treasure, Douglas the poet seems to take a slightly different stance towards it. For one thing, the subsequent Book begins with Aeneas having a prophetic dream in which a god appears and which actually comes true, an oraculum concerning the destiny of Rome. The dreamer of the Prologue, on the other hand, has had a dream which seemed to promise the effortless acquisition of worldly goods, a promise in which he is only too eager to believe, thus showing himself to be no better than those criticized by the dream figure. Having vainly mistaken his dream for a visio, a type of dream comparable to Aeneas’ oraculum, he is after his fruitless search equally eager to blame the vanity of dreams in general rather than his own vanity and acquisitiveness for his embarrassment. Besides, the narrator had earlier pointed out that this dream occurred in
Lent, a period when his thoughts should have been focused on things spiritual rather than material or, as the dream figure claims, secular books. On the other hand, the dream figure is described as 'selcouth,' and while his criticism of society may be sound and is certainly quite conventional, it cannot but be ineffective, since he is not addressing an audience when he makes his speech and indeed only becomes aware of Douglas's presence after over a hundred lines. In addition, the scroll he presents to Douglas is practically unintelligible, while his criticism of Douglas's translation resembles that of the 'detractouris,' who perceive in it only lies and superstitions. However, the dream figure's response to the dreamer's request to teach him 'ane other lesson' (1.158) has its effect: the initial vexation which follows the fruitless search in the temporary pursuit of a worldly dream of material gain also leads the dreamer back to his translation-in-progress, reinforced in his confidence in "poetry as containing a wisdom greater than conventional knowledge and being more valuable than the wealth of the world."17

Part 2: The Special Problem of the 'Nature' Prologues

Poetry at its purest is what has long been regarded as predominant in the third group of Prologues, the so-called Nature Prologues, although even here Douglas retains the two issues of greatest concern so far: at the end of Prologue VII, the Winter Prologue, he portrays the weariness of the translator who has only reached the half-way point and who feels the yoke lying heavily on his neck (1.150) as he continues with his task on an icy winter morning; and in Prologue XIII, the June Prologue, he argues with Maphaeus Vegius about the relevance of Maphaeus' thirteenth Book, but
eventually has to yield to Maphaeus' strongest argument--main force. In Prologue XII, the May Prologue, all nature seems to celebrate as the birds react to the rising sun with a hymn to the Lord of Light, while man alone dishonours the wholesomeness and festive spirit of this regenerative season with "bawdry" (1.210) and "schamefull play" (1.225); at the end of this Prologue, Douglas again portrays himself with pen in hand, ready to begin the next Book.

Of the thirteen Prologues, only these three 'Nature Prologues' have been frequently discussed and often included in anthologies, but until recently, the emphasis in these discussions was on Douglas's presumed close observation of nature in Scotland. For more than a century, the chief argument put forward by commentators was that in these three Prologues, Douglas--unlike his predecessors--described what he could actually see, that is, that his descriptions of nature in the various seasons and at the various times of the day were determined by genuine observation of the details of the weather, of the vegetation, of animal life, and of man's seasonal pursuits in the real environment of the harsh, but nonetheless charming, Scottish landscape. This view was expressed in 1887 by John Veitch, who is full of admiration for these "pictures and words taken directly from the aspects of the Lowland hills--that is, the lower heights--and from the designations peculiar almost to the valleys of the Tweed and the Yarrow--at least to the southern district of Scotland." Although the Scottish nationalism resonating in these lines gave rise to a renewed interest in Scottish literature, it also clouded genuinely critical judgement and instead facilitated reveries betraying romantic nostalgia and wistfulness. Even Kurt Wittig is still
sufficiently influenced by the Scottish nationalists' mode of perception to find that "apart from a passing reference to Boreas and Eolus the whole of the winter poem (Prol. VII) is founded solely on Scottish experience" and that the "scene [in Prologues XII and XIII] is decidedly Scottish." More recently, however, John Speirs observed strong influences of Provençal and Italian poetry as well as echoes of Virgil's *Georgics* in the May and June Prologues, and Elizabeth Salter and Derek Pearsall have shown the parallelism between Douglas's word paintings and the landscape tradition in art, particularly in calendar paintings. Further invalidating the claim that Douglas wrote primarily from direct, first-hand experience of the seasons of Scotland, Alicia Nitecki shows that many of the details in Prologue VII, while certainly observable in a Scottish winter, have strong parallels in "the common stock of religious writings, in particular [... the literature on the subject of Doomsday]--with which Douglas as churchman was doubtless no less familiar than with nature through the seasons.

What has often been overlooked in the argument for or against Douglas's originality and realism, however, is that these three Prologues do not only form a group among themselves, connected by the common topic of landscape description at different seasons, but that they are also parts of the larger series of the thirteen Prologues in which Douglas the writer comes to terms with issues related to translation and to literature in general. Far from being realistic nature poems "in which landscape is depicted solely for its own sake," as Wittig asserts, or which "take landscape in itself and for itself as a subject," as Agnes Mure MacKenzie maintains, the landscape descriptions in these three Prologues are
carefully balanced against the two issues of the relations between God and His Creation and between the writer and his work.  

Prologue VII, the Winter Prologue, harmonizes in its theme with the movement of the Aeneid. It follows Aeneas' descent into the underworld, the realm of the shades—as Douglas himself points out, 'thys proloug smellis new cum furth of hell' (1.163)—and precedes the account of the grim wars in Latium in the subsequent Book. Appropriately, the environment at this dead time of the year looks as if it were

> on the sward a symylitude of hell,  
> Reducyng to our mynd, in every sted,  
> Gousty schaddois of eild and grisly ded.

(Prol. VII, 44-6)

Except for the autobiographical sketch at the end, this Prologue consists almost entirely of images of death, mortality and lifelessness at the time of the winter solstice, with the cold, leaden sun having just entered Capricorn and being about to rise over a colourless, lifeless landscape where the sky is 'ourcast with rokis blak' (1.36) and 'the grond fadyt' (1.37), where 'Bewte was lost, and barrand schew the landis' (1.41), where even the ferns have withered and where 'Bank, bra and boddum blanchit wolx and bar' (1.57), where the 'grond stud barrant, widderit, dosk or gray' (1.63), and where the 'smale byrdis' (1.69) and the 'silly scheip and thar litil hyrd gromys' (1.77) have to seek shelter and hide from the onslaught of winter in order to survive 'this congelit sesson scharp and chill' (1.86). The planets and constellations, too, appear in their most inhospitable aspects, Mars provoking strife, Orion bringing rain and gales, and cold Saturn causing disease and 'mortal pestilens' (1.31).
Under their influence, the created order on earth is reversed, and the elements seem to revert to Chaos: dry land and water mix—'The soil ysowpit into watir wak' (1.35); and light and darkness are no longer distinct from one another—

Thik drumly skuggis dyrknyt so the hevyn,
Dym skyis oft furth warpit feirfull levyn,
Flaggis of fire, and mony felloun flaw,
Scharpe soppys of sleit and of the snypand snav.

(VII, Prol., 47-50)

The "mixture of violent and extreme weathers" in the preceding lines, Alicia Nitecki points out, "recalls not so much a Scottish winter day as the **Cursor Mundi** where the same combination of snow and lightning forms the penultimate token of Doom." Other images of disorder, such as those of the streams washing their banks away, of the terrible uproar at sea, and of rivers running red, are also signs which both in the Bible itself and in medieval apocalyptic writing herald Judgement Day. After the transition from the bleak and barren landscape to Douglas's chamber in the city, the bird call which Douglas hears before falling asleep is the 'elrich screke' (1.108) of the owl, traditionally regarded as a harbinger of death and twice used as such by Virgil himself in the **Aeneid**.

However, apart from religious texts, Douglas also had an array of literary sources to call on for his description of the winter landscape. The heavily alliterative diction in Prologue VII suggests that Douglas had other alliterative winter descriptions in mind, among which those in **Sir Gawain and the Green Knight** offer classic parallels. Here, clouds also cover the sky and the 'wylde wederez' (1.2000) makes life outdoors almost impossible:
Clowdes kesten kenly pe colde to pe erpe,
Wyth nyxe innoghe of pe norpe, pe naked to tene;
pe snawe snitered ful snart, pat snayped pe wylde;
pe werbelande wynde wapped fro pe nyxe,
And drof vche dale ful of dryftes ful grete.

(11.2001-5)\textsuperscript{28}

Here too, the angle of vision shifts from the landscape to Gawain in his chamber, shivering from cold and being reminded by the cockcrow of the inexorable passage of time as his appointed hour draws nearer:

\textit{pe leude lystened ful wel pat le\textsuperscript{3} in his bedde, pa\textsuperscript{j} he lowkez his liddez, ful lyttel he slepes; Bi vch kok pa\textsuperscript{t} crue he knwe wel pe steuen.}

(11.2006-8)

Henryson's brief winter description in "The Preaching of the Swallow" likewise emphasizes the barrenness of the land, hostile to all forms of life:

\textit{Than flouris fair faidit with froist man fall, 
And birdis blyith changeis thair noitis sweit
In styl\textsuperscript{l} muming, neir slane with snaw and sleit.}

(Morall Fabillis, 1696-98)

An even closer parallel, however, is provided by Dunbar's poem "In Winter." Dunbar's opening description of the depressing winter weather,

\textit{In to thir dirk and drublie dayis 
Quhone sabill all the hevin arrayis, 
With mystie vapouris, cluddis and skyis, 
Nature all curage me denyis
Off sangis, ballatis and of playis.}

Quhone that the nycht dois lenthin houris
With wind, with haill and havy schouris,

(11.1-7)\textsuperscript{29}

seems to be recalled in some of Douglas's lines, but the analogy goes
beyond verbal echoes. Both writers use the setting of the long winter night as an image for the temporary suspension of their creative powers. However, in the *House of Fame* with its date of 10 December and its barren desert landscape representing a wasteland of the creative imagination, Chaucer had already experimented with images similar to those more fully developed by Douglas in his Winter Prologue. Even though Prologue VII is much indebted to the alliterative and northern traditions, it is Chaucer who provides the source for one of the most moving images conveying the severity of the season. In his lines

The silly scheip and thar litil hyrd gromys  
Lurkis vndre le of bankis, woddis and bromys;  
(VII, Prol., 77-8)

Douglas undoubtedly recalls Chaucer’s

thise lytel herde-gromes,  
That kepen bestis in the bromes.  
(HF, 1225-26)

All these images of barrenness and destruction, moreover, are the exact opposite of those in traditional spring openings and descriptions of the *locus amoenus*. In the spring opening, the sun has entered Aries or Taurus, and the weather is pleasantly warm or soft rain is nourishing plant growth; at the opening of Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*, Zephyrus ‘with his sweete breeth’ brings warmth, not Boreas cold, as in the Winter Prologue. But Henryson had already altered this pleasant opening in order to fit ‘Ane doolie sessoun to ane cairfull dyte’, the *Testament of Cresseid*. Henryson’s portrait of Saturn (*TC*, 151-68) seems to be recalled in Douglas’s brief sketch of the same planet as well as in some of the
details of Douglas's blighted winter landscape. This landscape is an inversion of the locus amoenus with its clear, murmuring brook and soft, fresh meadow overspread with flowers of various colours and shaded by a tree in whose lush foliage birds are singing of love and regeneration.

Like the narrator in a dream vision, Douglas also falls asleep, but instead of merely having a dream which might give temporary relief from insomnia and its accompanying restlessness, upon waking up Douglas turns to the work he had neglected for too long a while, his translation of Virgil, and with it to the permanence and lasting inspiration of literature. In the autobiographical sketch at the end of the Prologue, Douglas portrays himself as overcoming his personal low-point:

And, as I bownyt me to the fyre me by,
Baith vp and down the howss I dyd aspy,
And seand Virgill on a letrton stand,
To write onone I hynt a pen in hand,
Fortil perform the poet grave and sad,
Quham sa fer furth or than begun I had,
And wolx ennoyt sum deill in my hart
Thar restit oncompletit sa gret a part.
And to my self I said: "In gud effect
Thou mon draw furth, the 30k lyis on thy nek."
Within my mynde compasyng thocht I so,
Na thing is done quhil ocht remanys ado;
For byssynes, quhilk occurrit on cace,
Ourvoluyt I this volume, lay a space;
And, thocht I wery was, me list not tyre,
Full laith to leif our wark swa in the myre,
Or jít to stynt for bitter storm or rane.

(11.141-57)

This personal low-point coincides with the descent of the sun towards the winter solstice just as the lifeless, dark, and cold world outside mirrors Aeneas' descent into the underworld. But at the end of Book VI Aeneas had re-emerged into the world of light and life, just as Douglas at the end of Prologue VII picks up his pen again and resumes his creative work,
banishing the wasteland from his mind, and just as the sun by Prologue XII, the May Prologue, will have taken the shadow of death off the landscape and will be welcomed by the chorus of birds in their hymn to the Lord of Light, that is, not merely the sun, but God the Creator. For Douglas, literary creation with its permanence is thus a powerfully life-affirming activity. As he does again at the end of Prologue VIII, Douglas turns from a hostile and threatening outside world filled with images of death and prognostications of doom, to the permanence of literature which creates its own life and posits its own values and which triumphs by its permanence. Douglas sees himself as more than a writer—he is a 'makar,' a creator.

Prologue XII, the May Prologue, is an almost exact mirror image of Prologue VII: everything is reversed. Here the sky is clear, with Dyonea, the morning star Venus, driving the last of the stars away, with Cynthia, the moon, sinking into the sea, and with Mars and Saturn, the two planets which had been dominant in Winter, withdrawing as Aurora opens the windows of her hall, piercing the sable night sky with light and spreading colour over the earth. When Phoebus himself approaches in all his imperial majesty, there is

The new cullour alychtnyng all the landis.

(1.59)

From the first couplet onwards, this Prologue is full of movement and activity, full of groups of beings each participating in the communal yet spontaneous response to the sun, whereas activity had ceased in the Winter Prologue and all beings were isolated from each other. There the verbs
were usually static and cast in the passive voice (laggerit leylis, blanchit woix, stude stripyt), indicating only the result of an action on those acted upon and portraying the beings on earth as helpless objects rather than agents themselves, whereas the verbs in the May Prologue are action verbs, usually in the active voice (sprang, lappys, furthspred, oppynnyt, spreht) or in the form of present participles (oursprendand, strekand) emphasizing activity in progress. The predominantly end-stopped lines of the Winter Prologue, giving a sense of paralysis, are here replaced by lines with feminine endings, conveying a feeling of such life and fullness that it can hardly be contained. The diction, too, is remarkably changed, with the strongly alliterative tempered by the densely aureate, associated with the Golden Age and with perfection generally. Light and colour, and with them, life, soon permeate the landscape, and images of rebirth and regeneration replace those of death and mortality. However, the May Prologue is no closer to realism than the Winter Prologue. The colours are not those of nature, but those of heraldry (11.22, 107), the natural phenomena are described in terms taken from astronomy, astrology, and ultimately myth, that is, literature, and the images crowning the initial description are taken from art:

The swardit soyll enbrovd with selcouth hewys
Oursprendand leyvis of naturis tapestreis
(11.65, 102)

This kind of landscape recalls other literary works, such as Pearl, but also the art of manuscript illumination, particularly of the hortus conclusus with its flower-studded turf and of calendar and hour-book illustrations, complete with the 'Towris, turettis, kyrnells, pynnaclys
of kyrkis, castellis and ilke fair cite’ (11.69-70) which in such illuminations often grace the horizon.

As he does in the Winter Prologue, Douglas turns from the initial description of inanimate nature, though here already infused with life by means of personification, to animate nature, first to the new growth in Flora’s realm and from there to the domestic and wild animals, all seen together with their young (11.175-86). All of nature, animate and inanimate alike, responds to the beneficent influence of the sun with renewed activity, creativity, and procreation, just as it does in response to ‘the yonge sonne’ at the opening of Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales— even the ‘Towris, turettis’ etc. (1.69) regenerate themselves by creating ‘thar awyn vmbrage’ (1.72), their shadow images on the ground. At the same time, all animate nature does obeisance to Phoebus as he emerges from ‘hys palyce ryall’ (1.35) in all the splendour of ‘hys regale hie magnificens’ (1.43): Flora spreads her flowers ‘Vnder the feit of Phebus suljart steid’ (1.64), and the flowers themselves ‘Submittis thar hedis’ (1.96) to him and exude their fragrance ‘Forgane the cummyn of this prynce potent’ (1.141). Only among mankind are there those whose activities are discordant with the celebration and glorification of the bringer of life and light; while some, quite properly, celebrate May with ‘caralyng’ (1.195) and courtship, others ‘hant bawdry’ (1.210) and place themselves in discordant opposition to the creative spirit by misusing their sexuality which is given them ‘Childir to engendir [. . .], and not invane’ (IV, Prol., 98); these also flee the light—after the initial rendezvous at night, one promises to ‘quynch the lycht’ (1.222) for the other’s ‘schamefull play’ (1.225). However, Douglas allows himself no
more than a quick side glance at this single disharmonious element in the
paradisal garden (1.149) before focusing his attention again on the
general celebration which culminates in a hymn of the birds similar to
that at the end of Chaucer's *Parliament of Fowls*. As Chaucer's birds
welcome the arrival of the regenerative season, so Douglas's birds sing a
hymn to the life-giving sun and, by implication, to its Creator. Just as
Douglas had earlier made the transference from Orpheus to Christ, 'that
hevynly Orpheus' (I, Prol., 469), so here the hymn is ultimately addressed
to God Himself, the Creator of that 'lamp of day' (1.252).

Having heard the birds' song, Douglas the poet is unable to remain in
bed any longer and is irritated when the dove's call suggests to 'come
hydder to wow' (1.298): this kind of creative activity is not for the
'clerk'--he has a different one in mind, and it being still too early to
emulate nature in its homage by worshipping during the celebration of mass
(1.304), Douglas takes up his pen and begins the final book of the *Aeneid.*
By translating this twelfth Book, he not only places himself in harmony
with nature's creative process, but also reflects the exact stage at which
he has just observed nature to be: not at the point of completion, but
during one of the final moments in the active process by which completion
is approached. At the end of Book XII, this completion is reached.
There, Aeneas has won Italy and thus fulfilled his destiny, and Douglas in
his recreation of Virgil's work has reached the end of his task, signing
off with a little riddle on his name.

However, even though the translation of Virgil's work itself has come
to an end, there still remains the thirteenth Book, an addition to the
*Aeneid* by the fifteenth-century humanist Maphaeus Vegius describing the
wedding of Aeneas and Lavinia and the eventual apotheosis of Aeneas, thus letting the Aeneid end on a happy note rather than with the gruesome slaughter of war and the death of Turnus at the hand of Aeneas. This thirteenth Book was usually included in late fifteenth and sixteenth-century editions of the Aeneid, but Douglas appears to have been in two minds about his own inclusion of a non-Virgilian addition in a translation in which he promises to be faithful to the great model. Prologue XIII, the June Prologue with its central dream vision in which Maphaeus Vegius appears to Douglas and rather forcefully persuades the still doubtful poet to translate his Book too, thus constitutes an elaborate justification for the inclusion of Book XIII.

Dream visions tend to occur to poets when they sit under trees in beautiful, peaceful places, especially in late spring when the weather is mild; June is a rare time for such an occurrence, but not unheard of—Robert Henryson’s "Taill of the Lyoun and the Mous," the seventh of his thirteen Morall Fabillis of Esope the Phrygian, is set ‘In middis of lune, that ioly sweit seasoun’ (1.1321), and it also contains a dream vision with a structurally exactly parallel meeting between the poet-translator and the author of the original. Evening is also not a usual time for poets to be outside and have dream visions, but here it is eminently appropriate. The evening setting of the June Prologue suits the sense of fulfilment and completion, Douglas having finished translating the final Book of Virgil’s work. It signals the time of rest after the work is done, a time to lay down the pen and go for a walk in a natural environment which, unlike that of the May Prologue, has now actually reached the precise point of maturity—the fields ‘replenyst stud’ (1.6).
In portraying himself at the beginning of this Prologue as taking an after-dinner walk in the country, Douglas describes an altogether serenely idyllic rather than realistic scene. The falling cadences of the mostly end-stopped lines mirror the sense of the close of day and of the world lying down 'to slepe, and restis' (1.55). Almost all motion is downward: the sun 'rollis doun' (1.18), dew--characteristically described as 'beryall droppis' (1.26) and 'cristal knoppis or smal siluer bedis' (1.28)--'begynnys doun to scaill' (1.22), the sun 'was...declyne' (1.24), the day has begun to 'declyne' (1.30), fog 'fallis' (1.31), and even the lark 'discendis from the skyis hycht' (1.34), and as nature lies down for the night, the light fails and the landscape gradually darkens. Sounds also become quieter and eventually cease altogether, so that the nightingale's song only emphasizes the surrounding stillness. Douglas, in harmony with his environment, sits down among some sedge and, in the stillness of the night, looks up to the constellations, which send down their beams of light. Like all living creatures around him, he soon falls asleep, lulled by the exquisite song of the nightingale, who is the only one still awake. But as before, this verisimilitude should not be interpreted as a sign of realism or even direct observation; on the contrary, the evening setting is a time-honoured convention, which Virgil himself has followed in letting three of his Eclogues end with evening scenes (II, IX, X). The approach of night, according to Curtius, is also the only antique concluding topos still used in the Middle Ages. The use of the evening setting thus emphasizes that the work Douglas had set out to do is done, and that what follows is not properly a part either of the task or of the piece of literature, but an extraneous, inorganic
When Maphaeus in the dream vision demands that Douglas add the thirteenth Book to the *Eneados*, he consequently needs powerful arguments to persuade him. Such dream interviews, in which a poet is asked or occasionally forced to write a certain work, are a stock device in medieval writing. Douglas the dreamer himself refers to Jerome's interview with King David forbidding Jerome to continue reading pagan literature (11.122-26); Boccaccio, in his *De casibus virorum illustrium*, has such an interview with Petrarch, who persuades him to continue the work; Lydgate, in his *Fall of Princes*, similarly receives encouragement from Boccaccio; Chaucer is in a dream vision ordered by Cupid to write the *Legend of Good Women*; and Henryson has a meeting with Aesop in a dream in which Aesop tells him a fable which Henryson writes down after waking up. The contrast between Henryson's dream interview with Aesop in "The Taill of the Lyoun and the Mous" and Douglas's formally parallel interview with Maphaeus, however, is striking. Aesop has dignity, appearing in impressive garments, greeting Henryson with courteous authority, and being in turn treated by the younger poet with the reverence of a pupil. Maphaeus, on the other hand, is a travesty of the traditional authority figure in the *oraculum*: he appears in odd, threadbare clothes but wears a laurel crown, he rebukes Douglas for sitting under a laurel tree which Maphaeus claims as his own, and instead of returning Douglas's polite greeting, he instantly finds fault with him for not translating his Book too. In his defence, Douglas advances partly straightforward, partly facetious arguments, namely that he has already spent too much time on the work, that Maphaeus' addition is about as necessary to the *Aeneid* as the appendage.
fifth wheel to the cart (1.118), and that a continuation of the work would place him in a position analogous to that of Jerome. But Maphaeus has ready answers to these arguments: the analogy with Jerome is false, for Maphaeus is a Christian, not a pagan writer, and in this respect has the advantage even over Virgil, and besides, Maphaeus' work is just as 'morall' (1.142) as Virgil's—essentially Douglas's own argument developed in Prologue VI. When these refutations, augmented by a vague threat, fail to sway Douglas, Maphaeus resorts to force, giving Douglas twenty blows with his club, until he agrees to spend the requested fortnight on the thirteenth Book, wryly rationalizing the decision on the basis that the number of Books will then accord with that of Christ and the twelve Apostles—a thrust which Maphaeus, however, takes as rather a fine compliment.

This comedy of coercion over, Douglas wakes up to the new dawn, when the previous evening's gradual cessation of activity is replaced by a renewal of busy-ness and now upward movement. Lucifer, the morning star, is the last of the stars still to be seen, just as Hesperus had previously been the first. The lark now rises to greet the new morning, and the new light overspreads the fields, replacing the dim shadows of the evening. Human activity and human voices now also fill the landscape, the reeve calling the labourers to work, the cowherd telling his boy to drive the cattle to pasture, and the henwife calling up 'Katheryn and Gill' (1.175) who willingly comply with the summons. All these utterances have a colloquial ring to them, but no more so than the comments made by the goose and the duck in Chaucer's *Parliament of Fowls*, so that in this respect, too, it cannot be argued that Douglas's lines are necessarily a
direct result of keen observation of the everyday world around him. Finally the morning haze lifts and the birds sing their morning song, again minstrel-fashion. All this new activity and industry is suffused with energy—it all happens so quickly that one is hardly aware of a process of change from night to day, but only perceives the almost instantaneous results of the change. Douglas, too, will begin his work immediately, basically so as to get it out of the way to make room for ‘grave materis’ (1.188).

Douglas’s ambivalence with respect to the thirteenth Book is, thus, far from properly resolved. He is still keenly aware that Maphaeus’ style is quite unlike Virgil’s, and bearing in mind what Douglas has had to say about style in Prologues V and IX, this argument is a weighty one; but market considerations of popular appeal carry the day:

> Full weill I wayt my text sail mony like,  
> Sen eftir ane my tung is and my pen,  
> Quhilk may suffyss as for our wilgar men,

(XIII, Prol., 190-92)

never mind that ‘clerkis’ will be able to tell the difference. Douglas, knowing that more is not necessarily better, nevertheless bows to tradition and adds the fifth wheel to the cart.

In his series of Prologues, Douglas is thus concerned with two main issues, which he approaches from ever new angles. The one issue is literary, the other religious, and both are combined in his own person, for as a ‘clerk’ he is both poet and priest. But the two concerns are even more intimately connected, as becomes apparent in Prologues VII, XII, and XIII, for which the label ‘Nature Prologues’ is clearly no longer
appropriate: both issues are concerned with creative activity, but while the Creator demands faith and obedience and while His methods of Creation are beyond human understanding, those of the 'makar' can be analyzed, criticized, discussed, developed and defined. As a 'makar,' Douglas explores ever new versions of making use of old conventions to create new effects, and of knowing and using what is traditional, but doing it with the independence of one who creates rather than merely reproduces. The twin issues, however, also posit problems which are even more severe than those of writing and (re-)creating literature. As a Christian and a priest, Douglas is exhorted to 'despise the world' and to resist the temptations of pride, but as a poet he strives for an immortal reputation derived from his poetry. This split between submission to the contemptus mundi doctrine, on the one hand, and confidence in the right of the poet to claim lasting renown, on the other hand, comes to the fore in Prologues VIII and XIII, where Douglas's attitude is at best ambivalent.
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Chapter II - The Narrator

The twin issues of Christian truth and literary endeavour, which in so many different guises form the main topics of the series of Prologues, also inform the stances Douglas takes as the narrator of these Prologues. He is both the theologian who preaches on the respective consequences of vice and virtue (Prol. IV) or who expounds the indivisibility of the Trinity (Prol. X), and the poet who is anxious that not only Virgil's but also his own text be treated with respect. These two roles, however, are not separated by a void which would make it possible to assign the persona of the narrator at any given time clearly to either the one or the other of these two positions. On the contrary, the many other roles which Douglas momentarily assumes close the fissure and join these two divergent roles so that they do not represent opposing impulses but are simply the extreme ends of a single spectrum. At times, Douglas's two concerns of priest and poet join in such supreme harmony that poetry like that in the May Prologue results, but such an intense unification of the two roles is rare; more commonly, the middle ground is taken up by the urbane Scotsman whose language and imagery are strongly influenced by his environment and who enjoys a bit of flyting whenever opportunity offers, by the scholar of both Classical secular and medieval religious literature, by the connoisseur of contemporaneous courtly poetry, by the critical translator whose goal it is to do justice to both the style and the content of his text, by the literary critic who formulates a theory of translation and a defence of poetry, and by the man who, tiring of his enormous task, prays to his Maker for strength and eventually heaves a sigh of relief when the last word is translated. Diverse as these personae may seem, they--like
the Prologue forms—are deeply rooted in a literary tradition which provides Douglas sometimes with direct models, sometimes with less immediate influences, and which he reshapes to serve his own purposes.

At the beginning of the first Prologue, Douglas steps before his audience in the role of the translator of a great work and admirer of a great poet, without, however, portraying himself as that poet’s humble follower. He shows his self-assurance even in his effusive celebration of Virgil, for he singles out very specific qualities and virtues of Virgil’s poetry for praise rather than losing himself in indiscriminate adulation. Despite the conventional genuflection to the great model indicated in the topical protestations of incapacity, Douglas makes it quite clear that Virgil’s epic is not an object of undifferentiated adoration for him, but a work for which he has ‘naturall lufe and frendely affectioun’ (I, Prol., 36)—terms which suggest comparability rather than gradation, and thus confidence rather than meekness vis-à-vis the honoured predecessor. This confidence is also reflected in Douglas’s pledge to Virgil,

And that thy facund sentence mycht be song
In our langage alsweill as Latyn tong--
Alsweill? na, na, impossibill war, per de--
Jit with thy leif, Virgile, to follow the,
I wald into my rurall wilgar gross
Wryte sum savoryng of thyne Eneados.

(I, Prol., 39-44)

The first aim here is too high, and Douglas quickly corrects himself—as he had already stressed earlier, he finds that the two languages are just not capable of comparison. Yet Douglas has no doubt that he will in spite of these external limitations have ‘craft’ enough to retain the flavour of the original.
Douglas displays a similar self-confidence in his address to his patron, 'My speciall gud Lord Henry, Lord Sanct Clair' (I, Prol., 86), who was both his friend and kinsman. Judging by Douglas's attitude, Henry Lord Sinclair's 'request' (I. 83) for a translation of a classical work seems to have really been just that—if even that—but certainly not a demand or even command; Sinclair 'prayt' (I. 88) him to translate the Aeneid, and is in turn commended for his courtesy and other chivalric virtues, and last—and thus most—for his love of books:

Bukis to recollect, to reid and se,
Haiss gret delyte as euer had Ptholome.
(I, Prol., 99-100)

Douglas here speaks about a man who is his social and intellectual equal, and he will not let the "regulation tone of humility towards a patron or master" interfere with this equality, but turns the conventional formula of submission into a statement of personal friendship for the recipient of the work. Lydgate's dedication of his Fall of Princes to another bibliophile, Humphrey Duke of Gloucester, provides the opposite end of the spectrum; having sung Gloucester's praises in the preceding fifty-seven lines, Lydgate portrays himself as entirely unworthy of the commission, indeed practically incapable of fulfilling it, but nonetheless willing to attempt it, though only with the greatest trepidations:

He gaff to me in comaundement,
As hym semen it was riht weel sittyng,
That i shulde, afftir my cunning,
This book translate, hym to do plesaunce,

...
And with support off his magnificence,  
Vndir the wyngis off his correccioun,  
Thouh that I haue lak off eloquence,  
I shal procede in this translacioun,  
Fro me auoidyng al presumpcioun,  
Lowli submyttyng eueri hour & space  
Mi reud language to my lordis grace.  

(PF, I, Prol., 430-41)

Lydgate’s anxious humility cannot be explained only by reference to the  
difference in status between himself and his patron; he more than follows  
the requirements of the conventional dedication—he expands them. Virgil  
had also spoken of a patron’s command as the cause for writing the  
Georgics, a work which Douglas often refers to; but Virgil, in contrast,  
gives all of two lines to the request topos:

interea Dryadum silvas saltusque sequamur  
intactos, tua, Maecenas, haud mollia iussa.  
te sine nil altum mens incohat: en age, segnis  
rumpe moras; . . .  

(Georgics, III, 40-3)²

Both Lydgate and Douglas, despite differences in their tone, are at pains  
to emphasize that the patron’s request and not ‘presumpcioun’ on their own  
part was the primary cause for their translations. Douglas stresses that  
he undertook the work for the sake of Sinclair’s ‘tendir request and  
amyte’ (Direction, 74),

And not only of my curage, God wait,  
Durst interpryss syk owtrageus foly.  

(I, Prol., 76-7)

Robert Henryson uses the same gesture of humility in the Prologue to his  
Morall Fabillis in justifying his translation as having been written
Nocht of my self, for vane presumptioun,
Bot be request and precept of ane lord,
Of quhome the name it neidis not record.

With Henryson's patron remaining nameless, the use of the request _topos_ seems all the more a gesture.³ For Douglas, it certainly is just that, for he later avows other and stronger reasons for having written the translation of Virgil's work. While the schoolmaster of Dunfermline does not actually say that his translation of Aesop's fables was connected with their almost universal use in schools to teach Latin to beginners and to provide rhetorical exercises for more advanced students,⁴ the provost of St Giles' is confident that his _Eneados_

```
salbe reput a neidfull wark
To thame wald Virgill to childryn expone;

Thank me tharfor, masteris of grammar sculis,
Quhar je syt techand on zour benkis and stulys.
```

(Direction, 42-8)

But even more important is that the _Eneados_ will make Virgil accessible to those who delight in literature but who have no Latin or not enough of it to read the original with ease and thus with pleasure; indeed, the translation might even be read out to those who are altogether illiterate (Exclamation, 43-5). This goal is akin to the _topos_ which Curtius sums up in the injunction "'The possession of knowledge makes it a duty to impart it'"---a favourite _topos_ among medieval writers, who had not only classical but also scriptural authority for it.⁵ For Douglas, it must have gained additional appeal by also supporting the humanist aim of the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge, preferably _ex fontibus_.

Having shown considerable independence in his attitude towards his
'auctour' and his patron, Douglas takes the same stance vis-à-vis his literary models. Caxton, of course, is almost beneath contempt, but even Chaucer, while acknowledged as Douglas’s 'mastir' (I, Prol., 410), does not escape criticism. Douglas regards Chaucer as the 'principal poet but peir' although 'beneth Virgill in gre' (I, Prol., 339, 407), and his admiration is based on a thorough knowledge of Chaucer’s work. In particular, he knows Chaucer’s courtly works extremely well and often alludes to them with verbal, structural and prosodic echoes and quotes whole lines or couplets. But Chaucer’s influence on Douglas’s work goes beyond mere imitation or reworking of lines and well-turned phrases; Douglas is also most responsive to Chaucer’s techniques for achieving the lively speaking voice of a narrator endowed with individual characteristics. The rhetorical device of correctio, one of Chaucer’s hallmarks, serves Douglas’s purposes particularly well, not only in that it creates an effect of immediacy, of a man thinking to himself and sometimes even arguing with himself over the best way of expressing an idea, but also in that it accommodates Douglas’s need to find exactly the right word—and to let his audience know that this and no other is the right one—in the pursuit of that precision which he outlines in his 'protestatioun' in Prologue I. The effect of a vivacious and alert narrator is further enhanced by Douglas’s Chaucerian range and flexibility in tone of voice. In his praise of Chaucer, for instance, he begins with a formal, eulogizing apostrophe, which, however, is immediately qualified by the concessive 'thoght' (I, Prol., 339-46); and after the discussion of the lack of English equivalents for certain Latin terms, Douglas begins his substantive criticism of Chaucer with a half-ironic though still
respectful 'I say nocht this of Chauser for offens' (I, Prol., 405) before modulating his tone to one of affectionate and indulgent irony in making allowances for the acknowledged master’s weaknesses:

Bot sikkyrly of resson me behufis
Excuss Chauser fra all maner repruffis
In lovyng of thir ladeis lyly quhite
He set on Virgill and Eneas this wyte,
For he was evir (God wait) all womanis frend.
(I, Prol., 445-49)

If Douglas can gently mock Chaucer, he has also learned Chaucer’s humorous self-mockery. Prologue XIII, although structurally more directly indebted to Henryson, seems to derive its tone from Chaucer’s *House of Fame*, where the reticent Geoffrey is manhandled by the sententious Eagle and willy-nilly provided with material to write about, just as Douglas’s dreamer, despite his facetious protests, finds himself pressed by a sham authority-figure into writing more than he had intended. After this *tour de force* of Chaucerian self-irony, Douglas modulates his tone once more and returns in the end-matter to the more serious yet just as lively quasi-dialogue with his ‘auctour’, with his patron, and with his readers and critics which has, since the very beginning of the first Prologue, been a mode of discourse characteristic of this sceptical, independent, and disputatious narrator.  

For all Douglas has learned from Chaucer in terms of technique and phrasing, he nonetheless does not regard the ‘mastir’ as infallible, but feels free to criticise him. Henryson likewise, while admiring Chaucer and using his work as a springboard, reserves the right to question the master:
Both writers display "a sceptical independence of judgment" which itself is truly Chaucerian. For Douglas, however, it is less a question of truth than one of method. In Douglas’s eyes, Chaucer’s handling of the Virgilian story of Dido and Aeneas does not constitute a translation; indeed, it violates Virgil’s overall design of the epic. Douglas no longer sees himself as a medieval story-teller whose function it is to adapt and retell narrative material out of its original context in order to entertain or edify his audience; on the contrary, he regards himself as a poet in the new, Renaissance meaning of the word. Poetry, for Douglas, has "intrinsic beauty and lasting value" which demand that it be transmitted in its integrity. While Chaucer at the end of the *Troilus* pleaded with the scribes not to corrupt his text (V, 1793-99), he yet felt at liberty to reshape another writer’s work; Douglas, however, prides himself in the accuracy with which he has recreated Virgil’s work, although he is far less concerned with such precision when he comes to translate Maphaeus Vegius’ thirteenth Book to which he attributes little, if any, literary value and which he includes in deference to established convention but against his own better judgement. This independence of judgement, together with Douglas’s certainty that he is making a contribution to art rather than merely serving his readers by entertaining them, explains the narrator’s self-assured, at times even haughty attitude.

Given this independent and self-assured stance vis-à-vis his 'auctour,' his patron, and his mentor, Douglas not surprisingly shows none
of the conventional humility either when it comes to addressing his audience at large. Even though he bids his 'wlgar Virgill' to

Beseyk all nobilys the corect and amend,

(Exclamation, 39)

he repeatedly warns his readers not to be too hasty with their criticism, but to 'reid oftar than anys' (I, Prol., 107), for 'at a blenk sle poetry nocht tayn is' (I, Prol., 108). Lydgate again provides the opposite attitude in inviting all and sundry to make whatever changes they please in the Troy Book which he ends by telling his 'litel bok,'

And who-so-euere in pe fynde offence,
Be nat to bold for no presumpcioun—
Pi silfe enarme ay in pacience,
And pe submitte to her correccioun.

... Ageynes hem pin errour nat diffende,
But humblely with-drawe & go a-bak,
Requerynge hem al THAT is mys to amende.

(TB, V, Lenvoye, 96-107)

Having spent far more time on the Troy Book than Douglas was to spend on the Eneados, and—judging by his desperate pleas to Gloucester for financial relief—having undergone far greater anxiety over it, too, Lydgate is self-effacing to a fault. In the Fall of Princes even more than in the Troy Book, he prostrates himself not merely before his patron and before those readers on whose discriminating judgement he can rely, but before all his readers. Douglas in contrast invites only 'all nobilys' to make corrections, but even this request is surrounded by enough warnings not to criticize the work unless one is equal to a comparable task (e.g., I, Prol., 478; Direction, 111-14) that only the
most brazen of readers can possibly take it for more than the merest suggestion of a bow to convention. On the other hand, Douglas is most susceptible to Chaucer’s apprehensive lines,

So prey I God that non myswrite the,  
Ne the mysmetre for defaute of tonge,  

(T&C, V, 1795-96)

but transforms this apprehension into a forceful request, addressed not only to copyists but to the audience generally:

He writaris all, and gentill redaris eyk,  
Offendis nocht my volum, I beseik,  
Bot redis leill, and tak gud tent in tyme.  
He nother maggill nor mysmetyr my ryme,  
Nor alter not my wordis, I ȝou pray.  

(Time, Space & Date, 21-5)

Similarly, Chaucer’s address to his Troilus as ‘litel bok’, a phrase which Lydgate had taken ad absurdum in reference to his 36,393 lines long Fall of Princes, becomes ‘wilgar Virgill’ when Douglas speaks of his work. This difference is more than a mere variation in the phrasing: It expresses a radical change in attitude. There is not even any pretence that the work may be but a trifle; on the contrary, by styling his work ‘wilgar Virgill,’ Douglas asserts that the Eneados equals the Aeneid, and that Virgil remains Virgil no matter whether read in Latin or in ‘Scottis’. It is a high claim, but Douglas has made it before, in Prologue I:

All thocht he [Virgil] stant in Latyn maist perfyte,  
Jit stude he nevir weill in our tung endyte  
Less than it be by me now at this tyme.  

(I, Prol., 493-95)
He is certain that the soundness of his theoretical principles together with his success in putting them into practice will warrant this claim.

Being almost aggressively defensive when he addresses the ‘detractouris and oncurtass redaris that beyn our studyus’ (Exclamation, title), Douglas, on the other hand, treats ‘every gentill Scot’ (Exclamation, 43) respectfully though certainly not humbly. He expects his readers to be about as well-read as he is himself and to be able to follow his theoretical discussions, even when he deals with subtle differences in Latin semantics. At the same time, however, such expositions contain an implied justification of Douglas’s claim to fame as a translator and writer, since he here shows himself as one who is fully conscious of his art and who has chosen each word and phrase with great deliberation. Often he lifts phrases or even complete lines or couplets from Chaucer’s courtly works, presumably fully expecting his audience to recognize the allusion, given that he also seems to presuppose in his readers a sufficient familiarity with Chaucer for them to be able to follow his criticism of Chaucer’s approach to Virgil. The points made in his criticism of Chaucer and in the flying with Caxton in Prologue I as well as the defence of poetry in Prologue VI and the theoretical discussions of style in Prologues V and IX certainly demand a sophisticated audience, but such an audience would in turn also appreciate the sophistication of the narrator of these Prologues, so that these expository and argumentative passages serve to consolidate the implicit claim of the narrator’s persona to be at least the polite readers’ equal, if not their better, based on his status as a conscious artist who no longer sees himself in the role of a "deferential entertainer, his
audience's humble servant," but who has assimilated Boccaccio's definition of poets as "men of great learning, endowed with a sort of divine intelligence and skill, [. . .] the rarest of men." Not only does Douglas display the range of his erudition in allusions to and borrowings from Chaucer's work, but he also exhibits a thorough acquaintance with the works of Lydgate, Henryson and Dunbar as well as with works from the alliterative tradition. In addition, he shows himself versed in the writings of the best-known Roman poets, such as Virgil and Ovid, as well as the standard curriculum authors, such as Livy, Lucan, Suetonius, and Statius, and the late Roman writer Macrobius; however, he also cites much less known authors, such as Varro and even the then only recently rediscovered Catullus, whose wryness seems to have been congenial to Douglas. Furthermore, he knows and uses the Virgilian commentators from the fourth-century Servius to Jodocus Badius Ascensius and the Italian humanists Lorenzo Valla and Cristoforo Landino, and refers to Guido delle Colonne and frequently quotes from Boccaccio, thus intimating his familiarity with a wide range of literature and, indeed, establishing himself as a literary scholar, intending that his own work be regarded as that of an authority in the field, who bases his critical judgement on detailed knowledge of and extensive experience with the known literature of all periods.

Notwithstanding this cosmopolitan aura, Douglas also endows his narrator with a distinctly Scottish identity. In his 'protestatioun' to the 'beaw schirris' (I, Prol., 105), Douglas speaks with pride of his 'awyn langage' which he 'lernyt quhen [he] was page' (II, 111-12), namely the Scots as spoken and read in courtly society. Although he finds it
needful to use 'Sum bastard Latyn, French or Inglys' in supplementing his native language 'Quhar scant was Scottis' (ll. 117-18), he immediately corrects himself and insists that when he uses foreign terms and pronunciations it is 'Nocht for our tong is in the selwyn skant' (l. 119). However, it is not only the language itself which identifies the narrator as a Scotsman; the points of reference, too, are at times unmistakably Scottish. Thus, each of the burning ships in the Trojan camp has a 'payntyt targe' (V, xi, 122); Acestes' newly founded city has 'merkattis' and a 'fair' where 'all the hedismen gadderis' (V, xii, 174-75); when the souls of the dead ask Charon to ferry them across the Styx, it 'costis thame not a grote' (VI, v, 72); Pluto dwells in a 'chymmys' (VI, x, 6); and Anchises, having first mistaken Crete for the Trojans' ancestral home, then recognizes 'of our clan the dowbill stok' (III, iii, 62). The imagery of Prologue VII, the Winter Prologue, too, while indebted to Chaucer's and Henryson's works for some of the lines and images and further traceable to the literature of Doomsday,¹³ has its equivalents in the Scottish landscape at that season--certainly more so than in the southern English environment which the English Chaucerians might have seen; indeed, as I have discussed in chapter I, the equivalents are close enough to have misled generations of critics into believing that these images were based purely on direct observation of nature.¹⁴ At the same time, Douglas also draws heavily on the northern literary tradition. He pays Robert Henryson a tacit compliment by adapting the structure of Henryson's Prologue to "The Taill of the Lyoun and the Mous" to suit his own purposes in Prologue XIII and by abbreviating Henryson's planet portraits in the winter opening of the Testament of Cresseid for use in
Prologue VII. Douglas also makes use of the northern alliterative tradition in describing the fierceness of the weather in the Winter Prologue in standard alliterative collocations and in writing the whole of Prologue VIII in alliterative long lines, a form which had long before Dunbar come to be associated with social satire and invective. In criticizing Caxton in Prologue I, Douglas also holds with the Scottish tradition of the literary 'flyting', which, while possibly influenced by Latin and Provençal invective poetry, rests on the "practice of satire by Gaelic bards, in both Ireland and Scotland" and is in Dunbar’s "Flyting of Dunbar and Kennedie" explicitly associated with such ‘baird[s]’ (11. 17-8, 49, 120). This eristic mode seems to have been not uncongenial to Douglas, for, as Priscilla Bawcutt remarks, he was "a man who enjoyed debate and was always ready for a dispute, in life as in literature."

The polemical tone also comes to the fore in Douglas’s rather brash treatment of potential backbiters and 'detractouris.' Just as he is anxious to preserve Virgil’s work in its proper proportions and to keep its style and substance intact, so he is also most concerned that his own text be treated with the regard due to the first ‘scholarly’ translation of the work and--one might add--with the respect owed to a Douglas, whose family was one of the first in the realm and who himself had high and not unjustified ambitions for a rise to one of the highest positions in the Scottish Church hierarchy. Despite his anxiety that 'oncurtass redaris' may mar his text and fail to appreciate its subtleties, Douglas not merely hopes but is certain that the Eneados will procure immortal fame for him:
Douglas here echoes almost word for word the final lines of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*:

> Iamque opus exegi, quod nec Iovis ira nec ignis nec poterit ferrum nec edax abolere vetustas. cum volet, illa dies, quae nil nisi corporis huius ius habet, incerti spatium mihi finiat aevi: parte tamen meliore mei super alta perennis astra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile nostrum, quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris, ore legar populi, perque omnia saecula fama, siquid habent veri vatum praesagia, vivam.

>(XV, 871-79)"}

In the epilogue to Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, it is Troilus, not Chaucer, whose

> lighte goost ful blisfully is went
  Up to the holughnesse of the eighthe spere,

>(V, 1808-9)

but Douglas's narrator with supreme self-confidence foresees being himself placed among the stars of the literary heaven, thus anticipating an exaltation which parallels the apotheosis of Aeneas in *Maphaeus* directly preceding thirteenth Book as well as the ascension envisaged for Augustus at the end of the final book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (XV, 868-70).

The striving for the exaltation of the self, however, stands in stark contrast to the narrator's preaching of theologically sound dogma elsewhere, including the doctrine of *contemptus mundi*. In the Prologues
concerned with religious topics, but particularly Prologues X and XI, the narrator largely loses his individuality, and while he speaks with great authority, he recedes into a stylistic anonymity which is comparable to that prevailing in the majority of medieval religious lyrics. Imagery is here almost entirely absent, except insofar as it helps to make abstract concepts more easily intelligible without, however, affecting the senses and emotions. Line-filling tags, such as 'traste me' (I, Prol., 319) or 'suythly as I weyn' (I, Prol., 369), doublets, alliterative pairs, intensifying phrases and similar devices which create the effect of an individual speaking voice also occur only with extreme infrequency. Furthermore, the elsewhere strong Chaucerian influence on the narrator is reduced to one or two echoes of Chaucer's phrasing, although it resurfaces at the end of Prologue IV, where the narrator lashes out against erotic love. The narrator of these Prologues is generally austere and impersonal; even when he directly addresses the reader as 'Frend' (X, Prol., 86), this address does not lead to the usual lively quasi-dialogue but to a stern lesson.

Nonetheless, three of the most typical traits of the narrator are discernible even in these Prologues: he adheres to the principle of striving for utmost accuracy and precision in word choice, as he had discussed in Prologue I, and he cannot let go of any opportunity to become argumentative, yet even here he shows a remarkable range in the modulations of his speaking voice. Gerald Kinneavy has drawn attention to the unusual "precision and distinction of diction which Douglas employs to describe the creative power of the Father" in the "orthodox and even conventional theological teaching regarding the Trinity" in Prologue X:
Not makis, creatis, bot engendris . . .

(X, Prol., 43)

In contrast to this linearly forward-moving tricolon crescendo, Douglas elsewhere uses the back-tracking device of correctio, as for example in his initial compliment to Virgil:

But sair I dreid forto disteyn the quyte
Throu my corruppit cadens imperfyte--
Disteyn the? nay forsuyth, that may I nocht.

(I, Prol., 45-7)

Here, too, a precise point is being made, namely that Virgil's art is so great that even the rougher diction of the translator cannot discolour it. Yet the different devices used in the above two passages create completely different effects. In the one, a learned theologian lectures authoritatively on a fundamental dogma of Christianity, whereas in the other, a wily poet displays his art in slyly declaring that he, in contrast to his source, lacks art, thus complimenting the original author while still asserting his own worth in an accomplished rhetorical flourish.

The second trait, the narrator's disputatiousness, marks particularly Prologues IV and XI. In the last three stanzas following the sermon on Christian fortitude in Prologue XI, the narrator turns from the expository and discursive modes to addressing the universal sinner in the reader. Here, imperatives, exclamations, and rhetorical questions outnumber statements as the narrator thunders at the reader and shakes and shames the members of his congregation into an awareness that laxity will not suffice, but that strength, courage, and constant struggle are required
in the attempt to win the heavenly kingdom. In Prologue IV, in contrast, the narrator begins with a long apostrophe to Venus as Cytherea and denounces the disastrous effects of her powerful influence before defining love in exclusively Christian terms and relegating all erotic love to the level of lust and animal passion. Having completed the discussion and defined his terms, the narrator changes his tone from that of stern formal discourse to one of flying, taking his cue from the terminology of courtly love, which he undercuts and discredits in a series of rhetorical questions addressed to the individual reader, who is presumed to have approved of or even to have himself used these terms. The narrator thus speaks authoritatively from a morally superior position, yet when he advances from extramarital affairs to prostitution, he is no longer simply castigating from above those among the readers who have done 'Venus warkis' (1. 168), but portrays himself as personally exasperated with 'syk bawdry' (1. 186); in a single stanza,

Of brokkaris and syk bawdry quhou suld I write,
Of quham the fylth stynkis in Godis neyss?
With Venus henwyffis quhat wyss may I flyte,
That strakis thir wenschis hedis thame to pi ess?
"Douchtir, for thy lufe this man hes gret dyseyss,"
Quod the bysmeyr with the sleykt speche,
"Rew on hym, it is meryte hys pane to meyss".
Syk poyd makerellis for Lucifer byn leche.

(IV, Prol., 186-93)

rhetorical questions on a variation of the inexpressibility **topos**, the use of the first-person pronoun, direct speech affecting and aping the bawd's manner, and a most succinct final statement all work together to create an effect of rapid, colloquial speech and produce an impression of the narrator's personal indignation.
The third trait, the narrator's range in the modulations of his speaking voice, is also present in Prologues IV and XI, but is especially striking in Prologue X. After the sermon on the Trinity, the narrator's tone of voice changes from authoritative to submissive as he addresses his Maker in prayer and re-affirms his obedience to the First Commandment regardless of the references to pagan deities in his work. These three short stanzas (ll. 146-60), interpolated between a brief meditation on the Passion and a final Creed, stand out from their surroundings by the intensely personal and pleading tone of the prayer, which is concerned exactly with the dilemma which Douglas had theoretically discussed in Prologue VI. There, the use of pagan myth had been treated as an abstract, literary concern, and Douglas had defended its use in the course of his criticism of Caxton in Prologue I as perfectly compatible with the didactic purpose of writing:

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—
For so the poeiti be the crafty curys
In similitudes and vndir quent figuris
The suythfast materis to hyde and to constreyn;
All is nocht fals, traste weill, in cave thai feyn.

(I, Prol., 191-98)

In Prologue X, however, Douglas seems to feel compelled not merely to reject the charge of idolatry but explicitly to abjure it. Yet it is clear that the affirmation of faith in the Christian God alone is also made with an eye to hostile critics, for the narrator modulates his earnest tone of formal supplication to end this section on a note of wry barnyard humour:
Is nane bot thou, the Fader of goddis and men,
Omnipotent eternal love I ken;
Only the, helpy Fader, thar is nane other:
I compt not of thir paygane goddis a fudder,
Quhais power may nocht help a haitand hen.

(X, Prol., 156-60)

The contrast between the impotence of the pagan gods and the omnipotence of the 'helpy Fader' is here so absurdly overdrawn that even the most adept fault-finders would only heap ridicule on themselves if they maintained the charge which Douglas's narrator here so adroitly averts. After yet one further modulation in his tone, the narrator completes Prologue X in a personal voice which is uncharacteristically quiet and subdued.24

Having re-affirmed his faith, the narrator in Prologue XI uses the hero of his literary work to exemplify his theological teaching, thus re-asserting the union between the theological and literary concerns of his work already discussed in Prologue VI. This done, he transcends this predominantly intellectual awareness of the union and harmonizes both the religious and the artistic issues in the supreme achievement of Prologue XII, the May Prologue, where the integration of these twin concerns leads to their true unification, not only intellectually recognized, but intimately felt and known.

The ascent to this height, however, has not been easy: in the process, Douglas has shown his narrator first full of energy, but soon tiring and weary from the sheer enormousness of his task. No matter how realistic and how credible the image of the narrator worn out by his labour may be, it is also a standard pose adopted by other writers before Douglas; Curtius, in fact, lists the weariness topos as one of the
classical concluding *topoi.* Boccaccio had already portrayed himself in that attitude in the *proemium* to the Books of his *De casibus virorum illustrium*, and Lydgate reproduces these tableaux of the weary Boccaccio in the Prologues to Books III and VIII as well as in the opening of Book VII of his *Fall of Princes*. But Douglas’s narrator knows how to overcome his fatigue even without a visit from Petrarch. Sometimes, it is sheer dogged determination which makes him continue, as at the end of Prologue VII after the daunting vision of the surrounding frigid bleakness:

> And, thocht I wery was, me list not tyre.  
> Full laith to leif our wark swa in the myre,  
> Or ȝit to stynt for bitter storm or rane  

(VII, Prol., 155-57)

or also in Prologue VIII, after the 'selcouth seg' with his long harangue has become tedious:

> "I lang to haue our buke done,  
> I tel) the my part."

(VIII, Prol., 142-43)

More often, however, the narrator invokes God or Mary and calls on them for help, guidance, and strength:

> God grant me grace hym [Virgil] dyngly to ensew!  

(II, Prol., 7)

And again:

> 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, salue al go not to wraik.  

(iii, Prol., 41-5)
Or even:

Hornyt Lady, pail Cynthia, not brycht,
Thy strange wentis to write God grant me slycht,
Twiching the thryd buke of Eneadon.

Douglas thus invokes God and Mary where other poets would have called on the Muses or appropriate gods or goddesses, whom Douglas also mentions in his invocations but immediately rejects:

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 fengeit termys new?
God grant me grace hym dyngly to ensew!

While other writers call on Melpomene to help them with the 'tragedy' of the fall of Troy, Douglas has no need for her; as long as his own God will consent to give Douglas the means, Virgil's text itself will give enough guidance. Just as the invocation of the Muses and other deities is a stock figure of prologues and other beginnings, so their rejection had by Douglas's time also already become a conventional device. But Douglas goes one step further and links this convention with the traditional Christian exegesis of Virgil, with the result that he can invoke Mary in the guise of the Sibyl for guidance in his work:

To follow Virgil in this dyrk poyse
Convoy me, Sibil, that I ga nocht wrang.

Thow art our Sibill, Crystis moder deir.
Such calls for divine guidance, however, are far less frequent in the second half of the series of Prologues, where theological issues predominate over literary ones, and where Douglas eventually, in Prologue XII, harmonizes the two concerns. At the end of Prologue XII, the May Prologue, the struggle is over and the supplications are no longer necessary, not simply because the translation of Virgil’s work is completed, but because the concerns of the secular poet and of the Christian no longer oppose each other since the sympathetic relationship between the Act of Creation and the creation of literature, between the Creator and the ‘makar’, is now perceived. In Prologue I, Douglas still needed to explain the metaphors used to indicate this correlation:

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,

On the I call, and Mary Virgyn myld--

Albeit my sang to thy hie maieste
Accords nocht, git condiscend to my write,
For the sweit liqour of thy pappis quhite
Fosterit that Prynce, that hevynly Orpheus,
Grond of all gude, our Saluyour Ihesus.

(I, Prol., 452-70)

By the end of the work, however, these ingeniously conceived metaphors have moved beyond the level of purely intellectual cognition and are, instead, fully internalized and known, rather than only thought, by the narrator of Prologue XII so that he joyfully receives the intuitive inspiration sent forth by the Sun and thus by God, an equation for which Douglas has not only literary but also scriptural authority.\textsuperscript{27} This equation between the sun and its Creator is then no longer in need of
interpretation, but is so thoroughly embedded in his consciousness, indeed in his being, that no rational process needs to intervene between sensual perception and instinctive realization. On the contrary, the divine inspiration, for which he had pleaded earlier, now manifests itself in lyrically sublime poetry; instead of having to be laboriously justified, literary endeavour is now a fitting preparation for the celebration of Mass, after the literally enlightening vision of the Sun has cleared away the mists from the May landscape as well as from the narrator's perception and cognition.
Notes


2 "Meantime let us pursue the Dryads' woods and virgin glades--no easy behest of thine, Maecenas. Apart from thee, my mind essays no lofty theme; arise then, break through slow delays!"

3 James Kinsley argues that the Morall Fabillis are likely to have been "written to serve the purposes of some powerful politician who had good reason for remaining anonymous."


5 Curtius, p.87. Matthew 5:15 and 25:18: The parables of the light which must not be hidden under the bushel, and of the talent which must not be buried.

6 Priscilla Bawcutt, "Douglas and Surrey," pp.406-18, shows the range of Douglas's paraphrases and quotations of lines and phrases taken from Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde, Knight's Tale, Legend of Good Women, Complaint of Mars, House of Fame, and Parliament of Fowls, but also less frequent allusions to or reminiscences of the Canterbury Tales, especially the General Prologue, the Franklin's Tale and the Squire's Tale.

7 In the preceding paragraph, I am indebted to Bawcutt, "Gavin Douglas and Chaucer," Review of English Studies, n.s. 21, (1970), 404-6, 417-18, 421.

8 A.C. Spearing, Medieval to Renaissance, p.110.

9 Spearing, Medieval to Renaissance, p.5.

10 Spearing, Medieval to Renaissance, p.22.

11 Boccaccio on Poetry, quoted after Spearing, Medieval to Renaissance, p.6.

1954, p.344, comments on "the remarkably high level of [Douglas’s] scholarship."


17 Bawcutt, Gavin Douglas, p.2.

18 For biographical information on Douglas, see Bawcutt, Gavin Douglas, pp.1-22.

19 "And now my work is done, which neither the wrath of Jove, nor fire, nor sword, nor the gnawing tooth of time shall ever be able to undo. When it will, let that day come which has no power save over this mortal frame, and end the span of my uncertain years. Still in my better part I shall be borne immortal far beyond the lofty stars and I shall have an undying name. Wherever Rome’s power extends over the conquered world, I shall have mention on men’s lips, and, if the prophecies of bards have any truth, through all the ages shall I live in fame."


20 Rosemary Woolf observes that likewise Dunbar’s religious poems are those in which Dunbar’s individual voice is least noticeable; The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), p.5.


23 According to Curtius, the inexpressibility topos derives from panegyric oratory, in which "the orator ‘finds no words’ which can fitly praise the person celebrated" (European Literature, p.159). Douglas here turns the topos into a rhetorical question in vituperation of the "indescribable" immorality of panders.

24 Joan Hughes and W.S. Ramson, Poetry of the Stewart Court (Canberra: Australian National Univ. Press, 1982), pp.49-51, also hear a number of very distinct speaking voices in Prologue X, namely, one "of reasoning" (11.1-85), one "of general thanksgiving" (11.86-140), and one "of personal supplication."

25 Curtius, p.90.
26 Spearing, Medieval to Renaissance, pp. 23-5, points out that Chaucer's invocation of the Muses in the proem to Book II of his House of Fame is the first use of this device within English poetry.

27 Langland refers to Christ dying on the Cross as "pe lord of lyf & of ligte", Piers Plowman, B-text, XVIII, 59.

Psalm 84:11: "For the LORD God is a sun and a shield . . ."; Rev. 1:16: "and his [the Son of man's] countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength."

28 When Douglas writes that it is 'or tyme of mess' (XII, Prol., 304), he seems to be playing on the two meanings "a meal" and "Mass."
Chapter III -- The Translation

In the course of the thirteen Prologues to his *Eneados*, Douglas specifies very precisely what he regards as the task of the translator. He 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. While vividness and originality are still important to Douglas, his understanding of their proper application is new: it is not the task of the translator to produce an original rendering of well-known materials and to reshape them in such a way that the product becomes distinctly his own, but to be original in the use and even in the creation of resources which will enable him to reproduce the text as faithfully and as accurately as is possible in another language, recapturing the 'freshness' of the original for a new audience with a different linguistic and cultural background. The translator's claim to fame thus does not rest on the extent to which he has created his own version of the story material, but on the degree to which he has re-created the original author's text in all its aspects, from isolated stylistic effects to the philosophy and the overall design underlying the entire work. In proposing a theory of translation based on the postulate of accuracy and fidelity, Douglas separates himself from Chaucer and other medieval adapters, and adopts the humanist view of genuine translation with its stress on the integrity and inviolability of the text.

This kind of translation, as Douglas implies in his criticism of Caxton in Prologue I, ought not only to be accurate in specific details, but must also faithfully reproduce the proportions of the work. The
translator is not at liberty to abbreviate or even omit some parts while expanding others depending on his own interest, but must retain the design governing the sequence and proportions of the individual parts in the original. While Douglas censures Caxton on the grounds of having distorted the scheme and balance of the *Aeneid*, he might have brought the same charge against Chaucer, who had reworked the *Aeneid* material twice, in the *House of Fame* and in the *Legend of Good Women*, both times emphasizing Virgil's Book IV while condensing the rest to the bare minimum of the plot line. In the *Legend of Good Women* Chaucer is, in accordance with Alceste's command to write 'a gloryous legende / Of goode women, maydenes and wyves' (*LGW*, Prol. G 473-74), interested in the *Aeneid* only insofar as it concerns Dido and thus retells only Books I to IV, devoting almost half the total number of lines of the "Legend of Dido" to the adaptation of Book IV itself. In the description of Venus' temple in the *House of Fame*, Chaucer paraphrases the complete *Aeneid*, including Ovid's reference to Aeneas' wedding and his account of Aeneas' apotheosis, in 325 lines (*HF*, 143-467), out of which total he takes 126 lines to render Virgil's Book IV alone while he compresses the contents of the succeeding Books and of Ovid's continuation into thirty-five lines (*HF*, 433-67). While Chaucer reproduces Virgil's opening lines *verbatim*, he does not pretend, as Douglas claims, to be actually translating; indeed, he even inserts an explicit disclaimer into the inscription which the dreamer-narrator finds in Venus' temple:
"I wol now singen, yif I kan,
The armes, and also the man
That first cam, thurgh his destinee,
Fugityf of Troy contree,
In Itayle, with ful moche pyne
Unto the strondes of Lavyne."

(HF, 142-48; italics mine)

Although Chaucer changes the proportions of the Aeneid—he will not translate 'word for word Virgile' because that 'wolde lasten al to longe while' (LGW, 1002-3)—he is at least not guilty of Caxton's other offence of having translated at second hand rather than having gone ad fontem, as Douglas in the spirit of humanism demands a translator must do.

However, Douglas finds Chaucer guilty of a different transgression. In depicting Aeneas as false to Dido and as having broken his oath to her, Chaucer has, as Douglas says, 'gretly Virgill offendit' (I, Prol., 410). Virgil portrays Aeneas as a man who, being reminded by Mercury of his mission to found Rome, places his divinely ordained task above his own or any other person's wishes and who tries to depart secretly so as not to endanger the success of his mission; but while retaining the individual narrative elements, Chaucer altogether changes Aeneas' character in letting him use Mercury's visit as a mere pretext for a departure which has less honourable causes. In Chaucer's portrayal Aeneas is thus not motivated by pietas but by self-interest. In addition, Chaucer's Aeneas swears an un-Virgilian oath of eternal faithfulness to Dido (LGW, 1234), and leaves Carthage even though Dido is with child (LGW, 1323) and even though he has caused her to be in danger of imminent attack by the neighbouring lords. In Chaucer's adaptation Aeneas has thus become a most callous perjurer who is ready to sacrifice Dido for the momentary satisfaction of his own pleasure. Virgil, in contrast, is concerned to
portray Aeneas as sacrificing all human desires, including his own, in following the ethically highest of motivations in order to obey the commands of fate, thus becoming the innocent cause of Dido’s death as the gods use him as their tool. What Douglas criticizes in Chaucer’s retelling is that in isolating the Dido and Aeneas story and seeing it from Dido’s point of view Chaucer may have given it more spice, but has altered the character of ‘pius’ Aeneas so much that Aeneas can no longer emerge as the model man and model prince whom the Renaissance came to see in Virgil’s hero as he is gradually further and further refined by the trials which his destiny has in store for him; in Chaucer’s adaptation Aeneas loses his larger-than-life stature as a hero and becomes all too human. Seen from the perspective of the Aeneid as a whole, Chaucer’s changes in Aeneas’ behaviour and motivation amount to a distortion of Aeneas’ character and, in consequence, to a subversion of Virgil’s design for Aeneas’ development and growth as a hero and as the progenitor of the Roman imperial line.

Douglas’s own practice concerning faithfulness to Virgil in terms of character portrayal generally matches his theoretical precepts, but while accusing others of having distorted the proportions of the original work, Douglas himself is not entirely innocent in this respect, either. In translating Virgil’s hexameter lines into decasyllabic couplets he greatly increases the total number of lines; on the average the ratio is approximately one Latin line to just over one ‘Scottis’ couplet, but the ratio in the individual Books varies: in Book I Douglas renders Virgil’s 756 lines in only 661 couplets, but in Book X, for instance, he expands the original 908 lines to 1108 couplets; Book X is thus proportionately
more than one-third longer than Book I. Many of Douglas’s expansions and additions are caused by the demands of his different metre\(^1\)—as he charmingly admits, he occasionally needs some padding ‘to lykly my ryme’ (I, Prol., 124). Often, these small additions simply consist of line-filling tags such as ‘I gess’, ‘but dowt’, ‘but dreid’, ‘but less’, ‘I wiss’, ‘al and sum’, ‘sans faill’, and ‘schortlie to conclude’. At other times, Douglas completes lines by using doublets, for instance, ‘to fle and to depart’, ‘fame and gude renown’, ‘trewth and verite’, ‘eneuch and sufficient’, and ‘habitatiioun and residens’, whose chiefly metrical function becomes all too obvious when they are linked with ‘or’ instead of ‘and’, as in ‘depart or ga / Furth’, ‘grund or erth’, ‘helmstok or gubernakil of tre’, and ‘bowellis or entralis’.\(^2\) In addition to being useful for metrical purposes, such pairs of synonyms seem to accommodate Douglas’s desire for ‘the fowth of langage’ (I, Prol., 120), although they also tend to sound somewhat pedantic and schoolmasterly; in this respect Douglas seems at times more dedicated to satisfying the needs of the ‘masteris of grammar sculys’ who ‘wald Virgill to childryn expone’ (Direction, 47 & 43) than to approximating Virgil’s densely packed style as closely as possible.

Other additions, too, seem to have been made for the benefit of an unlearned audience unacquainted with the world of Augustan Rome. As Douglas says, ‘Sum tyme the text mon haue ane expositioun’ (I, Prol., 347), and thus he regularly explains references, terms and names with which he could assume his audience to be unfamiliar. Such expansions may take up less than a line, as in
myrthus, the tre funerale (III, i, 47)

the loch Cameryna, (III, x, 89)

but at other times, such explanatory additions may occupy an entire line or more:

Avernus the well,
Quhilk lowch is situate at the mouth of hell. (IV, ix, 81-2)

Syryvs, the frawart star,
Quhilk clepit is the syng canicular. (III, ii, 149-50)

This practice becomes intrusive when, for example, the ghost of Hector in the midst of his instructions to Aeneas, while Troy is burning, takes the time to explain to him what the Penates are:

In thi keping committis Troy but less
Hir kyndly goddis clepit Penates. (II, v, 83-4)

However, as Priscilla Bawcutt shows, the desire to help the reader is not the only cause for such interpolations. Both explanations and doublets are often suggested by the Latin glosses which by the early sixteenth century usually accompanied Virgil's text—and Douglas seems to have been unable to resist the temptation to display his scholarship. In the notes to Book I Douglas frequently cites Cristoforo Landino and explicitly quotes Servius, for example in explaining the etymology of the verb 'oppetere' as 'with mouth to seek or byte the erd' (note to I, Prol., 350), which he subsequently also uses in his translation (I, iii, 6; Aeneid, I, 96). Here as in many other cases, Douglas silently
incorporates the commentators’ glosses into the text. When he, for instance, writes

By multitude and nowmyr apon wss set
All jeid to wraik

(II, vii, 109-10)

he is translating not only Virgil but also Ascensius, who glosses "numero: idest multitudine ingruitum." 

Douglas does, however, not depend on Virgilian commentators alone in order to find the right word or phrase; on the contrary, he also seems to coin entirely new words and to make colloquial expressions literary. Some of the onomatopoeic words, such as verbs mimicking birdcalls or nouns imitating the sound of water or the noise of clashing weapons, are likely to have already existed in colloquial usage and to have now for the first time been used in literature. But the same is less probable for Douglas’s aureate terms; words such as ‘coniugall’, ‘contegwyte’, ‘deambulatour’, ‘etheryall’, ‘frenettelical’, ‘malivolous’, ‘producear’, and ‘redymyte’ seem rather to be Douglas’s own creations. According to the evidence provided by O.E.D. and D.O.S.T., none of these terms are recorded prior to their usage by Douglas. In creating such neologisms Douglas shows himself entirely attuned to the "idea of the poet as the refiner and enricher of his native and national language [, which] is central to Renaissance thought about poetry." Having praised Virgil’s ‘flude of eloquens’ and Chaucer’s ‘Mylky fontane’ (I, Prol., 4 & 342), Douglas tries to emulate both his models so that the perceived poverty of the ‘Scottis’ language might be turned into ‘fowth’, not only through an increased copiousness of vocabulary, for which he also draws on French, Latin and
Greek as well as Norse, Dutch and Flemish, but also by means of added variety in the registers of diction, which range from the extremely colloquial to the most aureate.

The use of the colloquial element becomes particularly pronounced in the short un-Virgilian utterances which Douglas frequently puts into the mouths of his characters. In the translation of Book V, for example, Douglas increases the excitement of the various races of the funeral games by making the spectators and the participants call to one another where Virgil only indicates that there is much shouting. Virgil's general expressions

\[
\text{tum plausu fremituque virum studiisque faventum} \\
\text{consonat omne nemus, . . .} \\
(V, 148-49)
\]

\[
\text{consurgunt nautae et magno clamore morantur} \\
(V, 207)
\]

\[
\text{Sergestum brevibusque vadis frustraque vocantem} \\
\text{auxilia . . .} \\
(V, 221-22)
\]

\[
\text{tum vero ingeminat clamor, cunctique sequentem} \\
\text{instigant studiis, resonatque fragoribus aether.} \\
(V, 227-28)
\]

\[
\text{signum clamore paratis} \\
\text{Epytides longe dedit insonuitque flagello.} \\
(V, 578-79)
\]

become far more specific in Douglas's translation and addition:

The egyrness of thar frendis thame beheld,  
Schowtand "Row fast", all the woddis resoundis.  
(V, iii, 86-7)
In each case Douglas particularizes the character's utterance and thereby reduces the distance between characters and readers by giving the audience the action as if it were unfiltered by the narrator's consciousness. By supplying the words of the shout in direct speech, Douglas increases the narrative's immediacy and vigour and "actualizes" the happenings. The result is often a change in tone and mood, intensifying the noise and bustle in the scene reported.

Douglas also tends towards a similar concretization regarding the characters' emotions. Where Virgil has a character sigh, Douglas not only reports the sigh itself but also specifies its kind and cause; where Virgil leaves it to the reader to imagine the precise mixture of emotions expressed by the character, Douglas often removes any vagueness or ambiguity, thus forcing his own interpretation and his own emotional
response on his audience and preventing his readers from effecting their independent imaginative apprehension of the character’s state of mind. When Dido at the beginning of Book IV lets Anna see her state of mind regarding Aeneas and reproaches herself for betraying the memory of her first husband, Virgil’s Dido alludes most delicately to the possibility of an alliance with Aeneas:

\[\text{si non pertaesum thalami taedaeque fuisset,} \]
\[\text{huic uni forsan potui succumbere culpae.}\]

(IV, 18-9)

Using the relatively broad term ‘culpa,’ whose meaning in classical Latin can be as weak as ‘error’ or ‘weakness,’ Dido vainly tries to gloss over the perceived impropriety of her feelings. Douglas’s Dido, in contrast, is far less tender in her word choice and spells out precisely what is on her mind:

War not also to me is displeasant
Genyvs chalmyr or matrymone to hant;
Perchans I mycht be venquist in this rage,
Throu this a cryme of secund mariaye.

(IV, i, 37-40)

In her later denunciation of Aeneas after she has heard that he is preparing for his departure, Dido does not just ask, "num lumina flexit?" (IV, 369), but finds a cause, too:

Quhiddir gif he steryt his eyn, as ocht hym alyt?

(IV, vii, 16)

Afterwards Aeneas is depicted not only "multa gemens" (IV, 395), but "Bewalyng mekill hyr sorow and distress" (IV, vii, 67). When Aeneas meets Dido again in the underworld, he swears by the stars, by those above and
by "si qua fides tellure sub ima est" (VI, 459), but Douglas lets Aeneas swear more specifically

By all the starnys schynys abone our hed,
And be the goddis abone, to the I swer,
And be the faith and lawte, gif ony heir
Trewth may be fund deip vndir erd . . .

(VI, vii, 70-3)

In this last case Douglas's particularization helps to bring about a slight change in the scene, especially as regards the portrayal of Aeneas. Whereas Virgil appears to have equal sympathy for Dido and Aeneas, Douglas, while being more sympathetic towards both, seems to have special compassion for Aeneas, who in consequence appears warmer and more tender than he does in the Aeneid. The individual changes are slight, but their cumulative effect is considerable. Near the beginning of his speech Aeneas asks, "funeris heu! tibi causa fui?" (VI, 458), but Douglas, as he often does elsewhere too, treats the questions as a statement—"Allace, I was the causar of thy ded!" (VI, vii, 69)—and thus as a remorseful self-accusation. In Aeneas' appeal to Dido not to turn away, Douglas inserts 'so sone' and changes the possessive pronoun from plural to singular,

... teque aspectu ne subtrahe nostro. (VI, 465)

Withdraw the not sa sone furth of my sight! (VI, vii, 86)

thus making the scene much more intimately personal and letting Aeneas ask for a much smaller favour: he knows that Dido will leave, and he only asks her not to leave just yet. An insertion in the preceding line also serves to increase the impression of Aeneas' tenderness and compassion towards
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Dido: Douglas changes the neutral imperative "siste gradum" (VI, 465) into a loving plea, "Abide, thou gentil wight" (VI, vii, 85). And finally, in the last line of Aeneas' speech, Douglas translates "quod te adloquor" (VI, 466) as 'that with the speke I may' (VI, vii, 88); although the substitution of 'with' for 'ad-' is in itself only a minute change, the effect is no longer that of a one-sided address to which Dido is expected only to listen, but that of a desire for mutual communication, so that Aeneas' request is no longer a demand that he be heard, but a plea that both he and Dido be on speaking terms once more. Even when she turns away—not "inimica" (VI, 472), but 'aggrevit' (VI, vii, 100)—Aeneas is not "casu concussus iniquo" (VI, 475), but 'perplexit of hir sorry case' (VI, vii, 105). By inserting the pronoun Douglas has again removed Virgil's ambiguity, making Aeneas feel only compassion for Dido and her pain, and excluding the possibility of Aeneas' feeling hurt himself by the apparent haughtiness with which Dido tries to protect her deeply injured feelings. No matter whether one agrees with John Speirs's judgement that "Douglas' rendering [of this meeting] disappoints," it is certain that Douglas's version is sufficiently different from Virgil's to create a changed image of the two characters.

Such extreme instances of tendentious translation, however, are rare in the Eneados. Douglas is usually much more faithful to Virgil, not only in his word choice and phrasing, but also in the distribution of his sympathies. Two factors may have influenced the translation of the above passage in Aeneas' favour. First, throughout the Eneados, particularly in Prologues I and IV, Douglas has been at pains to exonerate Aeneas from the standard medieval charge of having been a traitor to Dido by breaking an
oath which Virgil, however, never makes him give. The portrayal of Aeneas as "maynsworn fowlely' (I, Prol., 422) is precisely the point on which Douglas criticizes Chaucer as having 'gretly Virgill offendit' (I, Prol., 410); in his advocacy of Aeneas Douglas here tends towards the opposite pole. A second influence seems to stem from the larger cultural environment, especially the Christian duty to forgive those who ask forgiveness with a contrite heart. Such Christian overtones are occasionally present elsewhere in the translation too, although Douglas appears consciously to avoid a Christianization of the translation itself and to confine the expression of Christian views to the Prologues. Nonetheless, when Aeneas explains to Dido in Book IV that he leaves not of his own choice but at the command of the gods, Douglas twice translates 'sponte' as 'fre will' (IV, vi, 121 & 160). Dido here appears perhaps a little less restrainedly dignified and a little more emotional than in Virgil, mainly because of frequent interpolations of the line-filling 'allace!' into her speeches; she also seems a little more bitter, for after Dido has addressed Aeneas as her 'gest', no longer her 'spowss', Douglas gives her the un-Virgilian line

My gest, ha God! quhou al thyng now invane is,
(IV, vi, 85)

making her echo the sentiment of the vanity of the world familiar from medieval religious lyrics. Otherwise, however, the translation of Book IV is extremely close to the original. Having based his censure of Chaucer and Caxton chiefly on their handling of this Book, Douglas is likely to have taken particular care to ensure that his own translation of the same
passage would be above criticism.

Book IV, however, also provides typical examples of the cultural transference which Douglas according to his pronouncements in Prologue I considers part of the translator’s task. Given that Douglas’s primary audience consisted of courtly readers, who could not be assumed to be acquainted with the customs and the geography and mythology of the ancient world beyond what is regularly mentioned in English, Scottish and French vernacular literature, Douglas incorporates explanatory notes into the text of the translation, identifying, for example, the geographical or topographical features mentioned by Virgil:

that horribill mont, Cawcasus hait (IV, vii, 9)

in the wod Hyrcany. (IV, vii, 12)

If Virgil uses a kenning or other periphrastic expression for a god or person, Douglas also provides the proper name:

Saturnys son, hie Jupiter (IV, vii, 21)

to An, hir deir systir, (IV, viii, 102)

and he replaces the less standard names of gods, peoples, and places with their more usual ones:

patrique Lyaeo (IV, 58) : and to Bachus part also (IV, ii, 13)

Lenaeum libat honorem (IV, 207) : Offeryng . . . the honour of Bachus (IV, v, 64)

Libycae gentes (IV, 320) : the pepill of Affrik (IV, vi, 77)
nec . . . pigebit Elissae (IV, 335) : Dido to hald in . . . memory (IV, vi, 109)

Pergama (IV, 344) : Priamus palyce (IV, vi, 126)

Ausonia (IV, 349) : Itale (IV, vi, 138)

Similarly, throughout the *Eneados*, Douglas almost invariably avoids the various names, such as Achivi, Argivi, Argolici, Danai and Pelasgi, and Dardanides, Phryges and Teucri, which Virgil uses for the Greeks and the Trojans respectively. But Douglas is also not above adding an uncalled-for piece of his own learning if the occasion arises and prosody allows, so that

... summoque ulularunt vertice Nymphae (IV, 168)

becomes

And on the hillys hie toppis, but less,
Sat murnand nymphis, *hait Oreades*. (IV, iv, 81-2)

When Douglas uses phrases such as "quhik hait . . ." or "quhilk clepyng we . . .", he defeats his own purpose. Interpolated explanations like the following do not produce the greater immediacy which he elsewhere achieves, but only distance the *Aeneid* further from his audience; having summarized the metamorphosis of king Picus into a woodpecker, the narrator adds,

 clepit a Speicht with ws,
Quhilk in Latyn hait Pycus Marcyus, (VII, iii, 91-2)
and speaking of the 'gammys Circenses', he explains,

Quhilk iustynng or than turnament cleip we.

(VIII, x, 96)

Such explanations particularly draw attention to themselves when they occur in the speeches of Virgilian characters; then, the absurd situation arises in which pre-Roman characters explain to each other what certain things are called in Middle Scots. Anchises, addressing Aeneas, hopes that Jupiter

with his fyry levin me omberauch,
That we intill our langage clepe fyreflauch,

(II, x, 155-56)

and Evander tells Aeneas about the 'nymphis and fawnys' in the surrounding woods,

Quhilk fairfolkis, or than elvys, clepyng we.

(VIII, vi, 7)

Although the purpose of such explanatory interpolations is to help non-expert readers bridge the gap between Virgil's and their own cultural environment and experience, these explanations often have exactly the opposite effect. Even if it could be assumed that the reader was expected to place unseen "square brackets" around such passages and regard them as authorial glosses to be read in a different tone of voice, the running commentary only emphasizes the presence of these cultural differences, for the translator's intrusion brings the flow of the speech or of the narrative to an abrupt halt, and it only resumes after the scholarly translator has, first, pointed out the existence of a possible obstacle in
the reader's progress and, second, pedantically and ostentatiously explained it away instead of relying on the reader to form some image of his own, however incomplete it may be. Too much attention to details in such cases spoils the possibly less accurate, but certainly more unified and more spontaneously conceived impression in the reader's mind.

While such explanatory notes are woven into the text chiefly in order to assist the non-scholarly reader, the translator's remarks on Trojan, Carthaginian and Ausonian rites appear to serve a different purpose. Here the translator seems to be at least as much the theologian, who is anxious to preserve his congregation of readers from heretical usages, as he is the humanist, whose main objective is to render an accurate translation of a work from classical antiquity. It has been argued that Douglas "diminishes" the sacred rites which Virgil depicts in the work. At times he does, as when he downplays the religious significance of the 'pueri . . . innuptaeque puellae' who 'sacra canunt' (II, 238-39) as they surround the Trojan horse, which has been newly brought into the city. Douglas's image of 'childer and madis ýng / Syngand karrellis and dansand in a ryng' (II, iv, 69-70) removes the "possible Vestal virginity" of the girls and "compromises somewhat the effect of Virgil's awe-inspiring mysteries," but these lines are preceded by a passage in which Douglas's expansion of Virgil's lines, now expressed in Christian terminology, gives the activities an increased holiness. Virgil's general 'ducendum ad sedes simulacrum orandaque divae / numina conclamant' (II, 232-33) gains further religious seriousness in Douglas's translation because Douglas characteristically specifies the individual actions, and thus indicates the duration, of the supplication:
Onto the hallowit sted bryng in,' thai cry,  
'The gret fygur! And lat wss sacryfy 
The haly goddes, and magnyfy hyr mycht 
With orysonys and offerandis day and nycht!'  

(II, iv, 57-60)

However, instead of substituting Christian terms of divine service as he does here, Douglas more commonly tends to take a slightly patronizing attitude towards the sacred rites of the Trojans and other characters. When Virgil describes characters involved in religious rituals, Douglas almost always adds a comment like 'on thar gyss' (IV, viii, 107) or even 'on thar payane gyss' (IV, vi, 43). The effect of these intrusions by the narrator is again a distancing of the narrative from the audience and an abrupt interruption of the narrative flow, for the reader is each time reminded that the characters belong to a different time and culture, and to an inferior culture at that, for in all their purported objectivity these remarks sound condescending, implying a certain degree of pity for those who have not yet seen the light of Christianity but are still caught in their pagan error without having reached the high degree of consciousness which Douglas in Prologue VI attributes to Virgil himself. The narrator, however, outdoes himself when he has Dido invoke Proserpina 'by our gentile lawys' (IV, xi, 50) just before uttering her curse. Dido is here anachronistically cognizant of her own pre-Christian paganism. On the other hand, Dido's libation preceding the first banquet for Aeneas is completely Christianized in Douglas's translation of 'in mensam libavit honorem' (I, 736) as 'the cowpe with the rich wyne / Apon the burd scho blyssit' (I, xi, 85-6).

Such anachronisms generally do not cause Douglas any concern. On the
contrary, Douglas tends to conjecture the purposes of unfamiliar customs and cultural symbols and usually tries to find cultural equivalents for Roman usages which would have no immediately obvious meaning for a late-medieval Scottish audience. His practice of cross-cultural translation, including additions and explanatory substitutions, accords exactly with his theoretical statements in Prologue I, especially that

Weill at a blenk sle poetry nocht tayn is,
And hit forsuyth I set my bissy pane
As that I couth to mak it braid and plane.

(I, Prol., 108-10)

For the 'thalami taedaeque' (the 'bridal bed and bridal torches'; IV, 18) of which Dido used to think herself weary, Douglas substitutes 'Genyvs chalmyr' (IV, i, 38) and later for 'taedas' alone (IV, 339) 'the band of mariage' (IV, vi, 117); Mercury is bidden to descend not 'claro . . . Olympo' (IV, 268) but simply 'throw the skyis' (IV, v, 173); instead of adorning her first husband's temple with 'velleribus niveis' ('snowy fleeces'; IV, 459), Dido in the Eneados dresses it in 'snaw white bendis, carpettis and ensens' (IV, viii, 106); praying in front of the altar by the pyre, Dido stands not 'unum exuta pedem vincis' (IV, 518), but with 'Hir ta fute bayr' (IV, ix, 91); and when Anna later wipes the blood from Dido's wound, Douglas imaginatively pictures the situation and lets her use the part of her garment which is both softest and nearest to hand as she bends over her sister, changing Virgil's general 'veste' (IV, 687) to specifically 'hir wympil' (IV, xii, 88), thereby giving the action even greater tenderness.

When Douglas speaks of Anna's wimple and lets Dido admit that she has changed her mind about Genius' chamber, what he sees with his mind's eye
are not a Carthaginian queen and her sister, but two courtly ladies of late-medieval Scotland, fully conversant with courtly vernacular literature such as the *Roman de la rose* or Gower’s *Confessio Amantis*. Again, when Douglas envisions the captains in the boat races in Book V, they and their ships are somewhat transformed; in translating ‘ipsique in puppibus auro / ductores longe effulgent ostroque decori’ (V, 132-33) as ‘The patronys in eftcastellis, fresch and gay, / Stude, al in gold and purpour schynand brycht’ (V, iii, 58-9), Douglas not only makes the ship captains shed their iridescent and statuesque quality and brings them to life as real human beings, but he also places them at the stern of real medieval cogs, whose rigging he had already described in the storm scene in I, ii, 53-60 (I, 84-7). Similarly, before meeting Aeneas outside Carthage, Venus adopts a much more thorough disguise in the *Eneados* than she does in the *Aeneid*; Virgil’s Venus remains a goddess pretending to be a Tyrian huntress, but Douglas’s Venus becomes a Tyrian country girl, looking like a ‘stowt wenche’ (I, vi, 20) whose simple ‘skyrt’ is sensibly ‘kiltit til hir bair kne’ (I, vi, 27) while the flowing robes of Virgil’s Venus, although gathered in a knot, proclaim the goddess in disguise (‘nuda genu nodoque sinus collecta fluentis’ I, 320). And when Douglas comes to translate Turnus’ siege of the Trojan camp during Aeneas’ absence, he adds enough concrete detail to Virgil’s description to evoke a vivid image of a fortified city assaulted and defended by medieval armies. In Douglas’s translation the Trojan camp gains ‘fowcy dichis’ (IX, ii, 24) and ‘boss turettis’ (IX, ii, 30), and the assaulting forces under Turnus approach it ‘with browdyn baneris gay’ (IX, ii, 45) not mentioned by Virgil. While these added details are essentially anachronisms, their
presence increases the vividness and intensity of Douglas’s translation and makes his images far more dynamic and vibrant than the original ones. In all these cases Douglas actually sees the characters and situations with his mind’s eye, and not surprisingly he pictures them in the only manner available to his concrete experience. In John Speirs’s words, "the civilized Roman world presents no challenge to Douglas’ medieval Christian world; he simply does not recognize it as different and alien." He still lacks the historical sense of the past and the new Renaissance "sense of the historical distance and difference inherent in classical texts," with the result that he can freely "modernize" Virgil while still remaining faithful to the letter of the text. In the process, the Trojans, Carthaginians and Ausonians, whom Virgil had brought forward into imperial Rome, now make a second leap in space and time to adapt to a late-medieval Scottish milieu. Even though they still follow ‘thar (payane) gyss’, they conform to what Douglas and his audience know from first-hand experience or at least from hearsay.

Just as Douglas sees characters and situations before he translates any particular passage, so he also hears the accompanying sounds. In this respect too, his translation is far more concrete and specific than Virgil’s original. The first lines of the description of Aeolus’ cave provide a typical example. The force of the winds is already indicated in Virgil’s repeated voiced and unvoiced sibilants and labio-dental fricatives,

\[
\text{hic vasto rex Aeolus antro} \\
\text{luctantis ventos tempestatesque sonoras} \\
\text{imperio premit}
\] (I, 52-4)
but Douglas increases the noise by replacing Virgil’s relatively abstract and colourless adjectives and verbs with more specific and descriptive ones, expressing vast forces barely held in check:

quhar Eolus the king
In gowsty cavys the wyndis lowde quhissilling
And braithly tempestis by his power refrenys
In bandis hard schet in presoun constrenys.

(I, ii, 5-8)

In the description of the subsequent storm at sea, in which a part of Aeneas’ company is shipwrecked, Douglas again increases the fearsome tumult of the storm, adding concrete, expressive details as he relies on Virgil’s text as well as on his own imaginative faculty and on descriptions of tempests in alliterative poetry in creating the image of a ship in a storm. Virgil’s lines

incubuere mari totumque a sedibus imis
una Eurusque Notusque ruunt creberque procellis
Africus et vastos volvunt ad litora fluctus;
insequitur clamorque virum stridorque rudentum

(I, 84-7)

express much less force, uproar and danger than Douglas’s

Thai ombeset the seys bustuusly,
Qhill fra the deip till every cost fast by
The huge wallis weltris apon hie,
Rollit at anys with storm of wyndis thre,

Sone efter this, of men the clamour rayss,
The takillis graslis, cabillis can fret and frays.

(I, ii, 53-60)

By substituting specific, technical terms (‘takellis’ and ‘cabillis’) for a generic one (‘rudentes’) and by specifying the exact sound in detail
'graslis' and 'fret') as well as picturing the result ('frays') indicated by those sounds, Douglas brings the *Aeneid* down to the level of every-day life, making it more human and less heroic by removing Virgil's "blurred images," which give epic grandeur and dignity to the characters and their actions. Later, Douglas concretizes Virgil's general indications of Aeneas' commands on how to act during his absence. While Aeneas merely warns the Trojans 'si qua interea fortuna fuisset, / neu struere auderent aciem neu credere campo' (IX, 41-2), in Douglas's translation these abstract instructions become concrete and specific; here Eneas

    Gaif thame command, gif thai assalgeit wer
    Or hys returnyng, be hard fortoun of weir,
    That thai ne suld in batale thame array,
    Nor in the plane thar ennemys assay.

    (IX, ii, 17-20)

Douglas's particularization is, of course, logically correct, but there should be no need for Aeneas to give his Trojans such specific commands: the larger-than-life heroes in his forces know without being told, but Douglas reduces them to a company of pressed men who do not know what to do unless they have been given precise instructions. The same with Camilla. While Virgil tells the reader that Camilla's bow 'sonat' against her 'arma Dianae' (XI, 652), Douglas realistically and unpretentiously translates,

    Apon hir schulder the giltyn bow Turcas,
    With Dyanys arowys clatterand in hyr cayss,

    (XI, xiii, 11-12)

giving her contemporary weapons, finding a reason for the noise, and specifying the exact sound, thus creating a much fuller, clearer and more
detailed image which any reader can immediately reconstruct, but giving up the delicate subtlety with which Virgil builds Camilla’s stature—Diana’s weapons sound like kitchen knives.

On the other hand, Douglas’s battle descriptions are on the verge of gaining additional force and vigour from the influence of alliterative heroic poetry, which modifies his word choice and his rhythms. In this respect Douglas’s sigh

Quha is attachit ontill a staik, we se,
May go na fethir bot wreil about that tre
(I, Prol., 297-98)

rings more true than in any other. If Douglas had translated the battle scenes passage by passage rather than ‘al maste word by word’ (Direction, 46), the alliterative idiom might have asserted itself even in the pentameter lines and infused the narrative with an energy which might have made up for the loss of Virgil’s smooth suppleness. But having to conform as closely as possible to Virgil’s structure and phrasing, Douglas cannot fully exploit this latent resource. Virgil’s epic similes, especially, leave the impression of being wholly inorganic parts when they re-appear in Douglas’s translation, for in translation they break the arc of the narrative and hamper its flight, becoming undesirable elements which interrupt rather than extend the particular image because they are alien to their new, almost alliterative surroundings. In the scenes describing storms at sea, however, Douglas uses alliteration freely and exploits its characteristic potential for onomatopoeia. Onomatopoeic alliteration, together with his habit of specifying and concretizing, makes Douglas’s sea far more real than Virgil’s. "Aeneas’s boat becomes a ‘ballingare’
(originally a whaling ship) and the booms, masts, and rigging are rearranged to make sense, rather than left in disarray in order to terrify. But in consequence, the perspective changes. Virgil's tempest is seen from the point of view of one of the horrified mariners, who hears the sound of the breaking oars and has just enough time to take in the general view of the disaster before he is engulfed by the water:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{stridens Aquilone procella} \\
\text{velum adversa ferit, flunctusque ad sidera tollit;} \\
\text{franguntur remi; tum prora avertit et undis} \\
\text{dat latus; insequitur cumulo praeruptus aquae mons.} \\
\text{hi summo in fluctu pendent; his unda dehiscens} \\
\text{terram inter fluctus aperit; furit aestus harenis.}
\end{align*}
\]

(I, 102-7)

Douglas's storm, in contrast, is narrated by an objective, disinterested outsider who has time to observe and record every individual stage of this fascinating shipwreck and who enjoys making the most of its description:

A blastrand bub out from the north brayng
Gan our the forschip in the baksaill dyng,
And to the sternys vp the flude gan cast.
The aris, hechis and the takillis brast,
The schippis stevin frawart hyr went gan wryth,
And turnyt hir braid syde to the wallis swyth.
Heich as a hill the iaw of watir brak
And in ane hepe cam on thame with a swak.
Sum hesit hoverand on the wallis hycht,
And sum the sowchand sey so law gart leyht
Thame semyt the erd oppynnyt amyd the flude--
The stour vp bullyrrit sand as it war wode.

(I, iii, 15-26)

Douglas has tidied up the wreckage even while describing the disaster; but the result of his visual and acoustic precision is that the impression created in this scene is radically changed.

Douglas would have justified all his various ways of subtly changing
the texture of Virgil’s work by reference to his desire ‘to mak it braid and plane’ (I, Prol., 110), for ‘Sum tyme the text mon haue ane expositioun’ (I, Prol., 347); and he would have pointed out that ‘Scottis’ is after all a ‘bad, harsk spech and lewit barbour tong’ and ‘rurall wilgar gross’ (I, Prol., 21 & 43) incapable of the subtleties of Virgil’s elegant and polished Latin. Indeed, given the sovereign ease with which Douglas makes his changes, he probably would not even have regarded many of them as such. However, Douglas is not therefore incapable of literal translation; on the contrary, he often, though only briefly, imitates Virgil’s sentence structure and, if possible, even his word order. But rarely is Douglas’s version as close to Virgil’s original as in the translation of the scene with which the epic closes. Aeneas has just recognized Pallas’ baldric on Turnus’ shoulder:

"tune hinc spollis inducte meorum eripiare mihi? Pallas te hoc volnere, Pallas immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit," hoc dicens ferrum adverso sub pectore condit fervidus. ast illi solvuntur frigore membra vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras. (XII, 947-52)

"Sail thou eschape me of this sted away, Cled with the spulge of my frendis deir? Pallas, Pallas, with this wond rycht heir Of the ane offerand to the goddys makkis, And of thy wikkit blude punytioun takkis." And sayand thus, full ferss, with all hys mayn, Law in hys breist or cost, lay hym forgayn, Hys swerd hess hyd full hait; and tharwithall The caled of deth dissoluyt hys membris all. The spreit of lyfe fled murnand with a grone And with disdeyn vnder dyrk erth is goyn. (XII, xiv, 144-54)

Even though Douglas is here obviously trying to follow the text as closely
as possible, his habits of double translation ('full ferss' and 'with all hys mayn' for 'fervidus'; 'in hys breist or cost' for 'sub pectore'; 'murnand' and 'with a grone' for 'cum gemitu') and of explanatory translation ('vnder dyrk erth' for 'sub umbras'; 'the spreit of lyfe' for 'vita') assert themselves. Nonetheless, the passage is essentially left as it is—Turnus' death scene is not touched up with specific, concrete details: Douglas, for once, refrains. And by refraining from adding anything, he retains the starkness of this slaying. However, while Virgil's text ends just at the point where the Trojans' struggle to fulfil their destiny has reached completion, Douglas adds Maphaeus' thirteenth Book, with the result that the reader is taken from the final, oppressive scene of unrelieved slaughter into the festive atmosphere of Aeneas' wedding and eventually to his apotheosis. Despite his fidelity to Virgil's text in the final lines of Book XII, Douglas forsakes Virgil after the end. Just as he interpolates translations of the commentators' glosses into his text, so he incorporates Maphaeus' supplement—"'because it was there.'"
Notes

1 C.S. Lewis, English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, p.85, comments that "one of the things that test a translator’s quality is that mass of small additions which metre inevitably demands. Priscilla Bawcutt, "Douglas and Surrey," pp.52-67, shows that Surrey in his only slightly later translation of Aeneid II and IV manages to retain Virgil’s tautness and economy by avoiding the various line-filling devices, particularly the doublets, which Douglas uses freely. Surrey’s use of blank verse, however, frees him from the need to find rhyme words—a need which for Douglas occasionally poses great problems, as when he has Iuno cry "'Ho!'" (III, vi, 52) because he has to find a word which rhymes with ‘luno’ in the preceding line; this particular instance, together with several others, is discussed by Hans Käsmann, "Gavin Douglas’ Aeneis-Ubersetzung," p.175.

2 Hans Käsmann lists further examples of such pairs of synonyms in his article "Gavin Douglas’ Aeneis-Ubersetzung," pp.175-6. Priscilla Bawcutt, Gavin Douglas, p.124, points out that synonym pairs linked with ‘or’ often derive from discrepancies among the commentators or even from indecisions in a single commentary, where alternative glosses are given in an ‘aut . . . aut’ construction.

3 The then new scholarly habit of annotating a text is taken to an absurd extreme in the note purporting to elucidate ‘the iugement of Parys’ (I, i, 45): "The iugement of Paris is common to all knawis the sege of Troy."

4 Bawcutt, "Douglas and Surrey," p.64.

5 Bawcutt, Gavin Douglas, pp.158, 162.

6 Spearing, Medieval to Renaissance, p.61.


8 Other instances occur at III, vi, 192-93 (III, 454) and IV, vi, 38 (IV, 299).

9 Tillyard, The English Epic, pp.340-41, provides a detailed analysis of the small additions and changes with which Douglas increases the immediacy of the action in VIII, ix, 113-24 (the departure of the Arcadian cavalry from Evander’s settlement; VIII, 592-96).

10 Douglas also lets characters answer their own rhetorical questions, e.g. IV, vii, 18. In the quoted case, however, Douglas’s edition of Virgil may well have been differently punctuated; Virgil’s sentence can be taken as both question or exclamation. Priscilla J.


12 Even though Douglas's Aeneas does not make a vow of eternal faithfulness to Dido, the influence of this tradition seems to have been strong enough to cause Douglas to bow to convention and, in a half-line which has no equivalent in the Aeneid, let Dido accuse Aeneas of having broken his oath (IV, vii, 42).

13 John Speirs, "The Scots 'Aeneid','" p. 178, argues that Douglas "views [the Dido and Aeneas story] as a medieval Christian moralist, for whom human love must always be subordinate to obedience to the divine will. This may not be exactly what Virgil meant by pietas, [...] but it is the medieval Christian equivalent or development from it."


15 ibid.


17 Spearing, Medieval to Renaissance, p.13.

18 Käsmann, "Gavin Douglas' Aeneis-Übersetzung," p.170, however, argues that "Belege für die Mediaevalisierung der Aeneis halten einer genauerer Überprüfung nicht stand," and maintains that the text itself remains unaffected by the medieval concepts which Douglas introduces in the Prologues and that translations such as 'nun' for 'sacerdos' are caused by gaps in the ME vocabulary rather than by any "spezifisch mittelalterliche Blindheit" on Douglas's part.

19 The expression is taken from W.R. Johnson, Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1976), p.75. Johnson, however, uses the expression particularly to distinguish the "deliberate blurring" in Virgil's epic similes from the "clarity of picture" in Homer's (p.55).


Chapter IV -- The Linkage between the Prologues and Books

Douglas endeavours to be faithful to Virgil in translating the *Aeneid*, and he even expounds his own critical theory of translation, yet he does what no modern translator would dare: he intersperses the translation of Virgil’s work with his own, original compositions—the Prologues. In each of the thirteen Prologues he comments in one way or another on the subsequent and sometimes also on the preceding Book, but the Prologues do more than just fulfil the function of translator’s notes. Read in sequence with the Books of the *Aeneid* rather than in isolation as individual poems, the Prologues offer a guide to the *Aeneid*, yet they also substantially change the experience of reading it. For one thing, the interpolation of the Prologues means that the continuity of the epic is sacrificed, since the Books are separated from each other, each now being introduced and commented on by its individual Prologue. And secondly, Douglas’s comments in the Prologues colour the contents of the Books, draw the reader’s attention to certain issues and raise pertinent questions, with the result that the Books appear in a new light—no longer Virgil, but Virgil seen through Douglas’s eyes. At the same time, the Prologues provide a theoretical apparatus in which Douglas discusses his principles and methods, and debates the value of poetry and justifies the role of the literary artist. The relationships of the Prologues to their respective Books are complex and at first reading sometimes obscure, but Douglas himself admonishes his readers to ‘Reid, reid agane, this volume, mair than twyss’ (VI, Prol., 12), and closer scrutiny indeed reveals astonishingly subtle links between the Prologues and the Books to which they pertain.
The first Prologue fulfils the function of a general preface to the entire *Eneados*. It contains the preliminary matters of the praise of Virgil, the dedication of the work, and the author’s apology for errors and blunders. It also serves as a platform for Douglas to give an account of his principles and methods and to review the work of his predecessors at translating Virgil. In addition, Douglas offers a first preview of his interpretation of the role of Aeneas as the model prince. Prologue I thus consists of a general introduction, addressing matters which relate to the work as a whole rather than specifically to Book I.

The second Prologue, however, is already clearly focused on the particular Book which it precedes, and the colouring mentioned above is already evident. It is the shortest Prologue in the entire series, consisting of only three stanzas of rime-royal, the verse form which Chaucer had used for his Troy story. In the first stanza Douglas toys with the idea of invoking Melpomene, the dark Muse appropriate for the narration of the ‘dedly tragedy’ (l. 3) of the fall of Troy, but he immediately rejects this idea: Virgil himself will give guidance, and divine Grace will give Douglas the power to follow where Virgil leads, so that ‘fenjeit termys new’ (l. 6), that is, the fanciful invocation of a non-existent Muse, are not necessary. The second stanza harks back to the first Prologue and the issue of faithful translation, promising new standards in the translation of Virgil into English. In the third stanza, however, Douglas points the lesson to be drawn from the ensuing Book. In each individual point Douglas takes his cue directly from Virgil’s own text. When he reminds the ladies among the audience that it was a woman’s beauty that ultimately caused the fall of Troy—‘Harkis, ladeis, jour
bewte was the causs (l. 15)—he gives a condensed, though somewhat slanted, version of Aeneas’ thoughts at seeing Helen hiding at Vesta’s altar (II, 567-82),

illa sibi infestos eversa ob Pergama Teucros et Danaum poenam et deserti coniugis iras praemetuens, Trolae et patriae communis Erinys, abdiderat sese atque aris invisa sedebat.

exarsere animo; . . .

'scilit haec Spartam incolumis patriasque Mycenas aspiciet partoque ibit regina triumpho,

(II, 571-78)

though he ignores Venus’ explicit denial ‘non tibi Tyndaridis facies invisa Lacaenae / culpatusve Paris’ (II, 601-2). Next addressing the ‘knychtis’ and reminding them that the frenzy of war is madness, placing a man outside the circle of rational beings—‘Harkis, knychtis, the wod fury of Mars’ (l. 16)—Douglas recalls Aeneas’ image of ‘Mar[s] indomit[us]’ (II, 440), which encapsulates the horror of the panic and of the impulsive, unpremeditated fighting during the assault on Priam’s stronghold when all ratiocination is suspended and action is guided by reflex rather than reason.

sic animis iuvenum furor additus. Inde, lupi ceu raptores atra in nebula, quos improba ventris exestit caecos rabies catulique relict

faucibus expectant siccis, per tela, per hostis vadimus haud dubiam in mortem mediaeque tenemus urbis iter; nox atra cava circumvolat umbra.

quies cladem illius noctis, quis funera fando explicet aut possit lacrimis aequare labores?

(II, 355-62)

Having pointed his finger at the particular vices to which the knights and the ladies are supposed to be prone, Douglas finds proof in Book II for
the general lesson that 'All erdly glaidness fynysith with wo' (1. 21),
which has a partial Virgilian counterpart in Aeneas' reflections on
Priam's fortunes:

haec finis Priami fatorum; hic exitus illum
sorte tullit, Trolam incensam et prolapsa videntem
Pergama, tot quondam populis terrisque superbum
regnatorem Asiae. iacet ingens litore truncus,
avolsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus.
(II, 554-58)

Yet Aeneas' thoughts have none of the moralizing quality of Douglas's
'proverbe.' There is no question in the Latin lines of restitution, of
'erdly glaidness' having to be paid for with 'wo,' and there is no
suggestion that such a reversal of fortune is inevitable. The pessimistic
interpretation of Priam's (and the Trojans') fate as a fall stands in the
Fall of Princes tradition of the stern and pitiless justice of Lady
Fortune and evokes none of the horror and consternation at the
unfathomable fate of the fatherly king which Aeneas feels at watching the
slaughter of Priam. By presenting Book II in the context of such
moralizing precepts, Douglas reinterprets Aeneas' narration of the
destruction of Troy as a moral lesson told for the instruction of the
reader rather than an account of Aeneas' sorrows and hardships told in the
interest of feeding Dido's love and sympathy or even for the sake of
establishing the morally impeccable character of the legendary progenitor
of the Roman imperial line.

Prologue III is concerned with more general matters again, touching
the work of the translator rather than offering a specific introduction to
the particular Book. However, even this Prologue is linked with its Book
by means of thematic connexions. Preceding the account of Aeneas'
sea-wanderings from Troy to Thrace, Delos, Crete, Epirus, Italy, Sicily, and eventually to Carthage, Prologue III opens with an apostrophe to Cynthia, the goddess of the moon who controls the sea's ebb and flow and is hallowed by 'Schipmen and pilgrmys' (l. 5), to both of which categories Aeneas can be said to belong. But even though Cynthia has power to rule the waters, she needs to borrow her light from the sun.

Hornyt Lady, pail Cynthia, not brycht,  
Qhilk from thi broder borrowis al thi lycht,  
Rewlare of passage and ways mony one,  
Maistres of stremys, and glaidar of the nyght,  
(III, Prol., 1-4)

just as the Eneados shines with light borrowed from Virgil's work, although it is Douglas who controls the flow of the 'Scottis' verse. In the first Prologue, Douglas had already expressed this notion—

So lamp of day thou [Virgil] art and schynand son  
All otheris on forss mon thar lycht beg or borrow;  
...  
Thow Phebus lighthnar of the planetis all--  
(I, Prol., 60-3)

and it was clearly in Douglas's mind here again, for having made the connexion between the invocation of Cynthia and the content of Book III, Douglas immediately alludes to the respective positions of the original author and the translator vis-à-vis the critics: Virgil is so far above criticism that he cannot be hurt by it, and Douglas, who 'follow[s] Virgill in sentens' (l. 33), does not care about it. Disdaining to enter an argument with such fault-finders, Douglas freely admits that he is unacquainted with many of Virgil's place names and may therefore have made occasional errors in this respect. His comment that 'Few knawis all thir
costis sa far hens' (l. 34) contains a particularly sly barb: not even the
wise Anchises knew 'all thir costis' and, one may assume, most of the
critics have no more specific knowledge, either. In borrowing an image
directly from Book III and using it in his own defence, Douglas turns the
tables on his attackers. In the final lines of Prologue III, however,
Douglas begins to use a method of interpretation which he is going to
develop much further in subsequent Prologues, namely, the allegorization
of mythical and mythological beings, here Scylla and Charybdis, whom he
uses as a figure of hell:

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, salue al go not to wraik.
(III, Prol., 41-5)

In praying to the Virgin for guidance to help him escape this double
danger, he likens himself to the 'Schipmen and pilgrymys' as well as to
Aeneas, who can only avoid Scylla and Charybdis because of the divine
guidance given by the seer Helenus (III, 410-32). Although the Christian
allegorical interpretation is here only hinted at, it already serves to
give Aeneas' ordeals at sea a colouring not only of personal trials which
test and strengthen his character and his leadership qualities, but also
of temptations in which his moral and religious strength are tested. This
kind of colouring progressively increases in subsequent Prologues, until
Aeneas eventually becomes a type of Christ in Prologue XI.

A similar but much more forceful reinterpretation takes place in
Prologue IV. The verse form itself is already significant. It is again
rime royal, and surely every courtly reader in Douglas’s audience would have remembered the first few words of Chaucer’s Troilus: ‘The double sorwe’ caused by love. This allusion implicit in the chosen form provides one of the themes for this Prologue, that is, that love which is based on erotic passion will inevitably lead to pain, misery, and loss. Dido exemplifies this precept, and Book IV becomes an extended exemplum to be added to the list of the tales of others, including those of Solomon, Samson, Aristotle, Alexander, Hercules and many others more.

From the initial denunciation of Venus and Cupid, Douglas turns to a definition of proper love as warmth, that is, a love which is neither excessive, and turning into heat, nor deficient, and becoming coldness. In using this simile, Douglas foreshadows the fire imagery running through Book IV in the description of Dido’s emotional state, but he extends the range of meaning supported by this image, defining as cold the state of not being touched by any kind of love at all, and describing as warm the perfect state in which love is charity rather than erotic love. Having equated proper love with caritas, Douglas alludes in a series of puns to the supreme instance of love, divine Grace, and contrasts the sincere plea for Grace and Mercy with the worldly lover’s request to his lady to ‘haue mercy’ (1. 145):

Faynt lufe, but grace, for all thi fengeit layis,
Thy wantoun willis ar verray vanye; 
Grasless thou askis grace, and thus thou prayis:
"Haue mercy, lady, haue reuth and sum piete!"
And scho, reuthless, agane rewys on the:
Heir is na paramouris fund, bot all haitrent,
Quhar nowthir to weill nor resson tak thai tent.
This juxtaposition of rightful love, namely, love which is directed towards God, and erotic passion bordering on luxuria relies for its impact on the similarity between the formulas used in the invocation of Mary as the Queen of Mercy and their re-application in the idiom of courtly love. The implication of the irreconcilability of these two concepts of love amounts to an unqualified denunciation of fine amour, which is in the following eight stanzas expressly linked with adultery and prostitution, for even the pander and the bawd employ its euphemisms:

"Doughtir, for thy lufe this man hes gret dyseyss,"
Quod the bysmeyr with the slekyt speche,
"Rew on hym, it is meryt hys pane to meyss."

In this context Dido's love must appear not only unwise but positively sinful, although Douglas refrains from labelling it as such. Yet when he explicitly refers to Dido at the end of Prologue IV, Douglas's condemnation of earthly love as 'fowle delyte' (1. 113) is still fresh in the reader's mind. Still, Douglas's assessment of Dido's case seems comparatively restrained: 'Throw fulych lust' she has brought about her 'awyn ondoyng' (1. 228), and her 'honeste baith and gude fame' (1. 255) fall victim to her 'blynd luffis inordinate desyre' (1. 250); she is another one in the long line of princes fallen from high to low degree, and she is also an exemplum for the adage that 'Temporal ioy endis wyth wo and pane' (1. 221). Very little, however, is said about Aeneas' part in the affair. By making Dido alone responsible for her own tragedy, Douglas
removes the burden from Aeneas' shoulders which medieval tradition had heaped on him. He is no longer the perjured seducer but the innocent means by which Dido works her own downfall. Dido thus appears to deserve her fate, while Aeneas, more by omission than by explicit comment, is portrayed as blameless in her death and unblemished by it. Douglas has thus prepared the ground for a new and very different reading of Book IV.

Prologue V, composed for the most part in the same stanza form as Prologue III, is again comparatively loosely linked to its Book. The first three stanzas catalogue all manner of people responding to Nature's new growth in spring by doing what gives each the most pleasure. These lines capture the variety of possible responses and the joy and new hope inherent in the new beginning, which Douglas sums up in the adage that "A blith spreit makis greyn and floryst age" (1. 21). Book V finds Aeneas' company in a similar mood. The initial two-thirds of the Book picture the Trojans engaged in a variety of heroic athletic pursuits in the course of the funeral games for Anchises with which they hope to mark the end of their seven years' wandering before setting out on the last leg of their journey to Italy, their promised but as yet elusive land of destiny. When they leave Acestes' country at the end of Book V, they are ready to make a new beginning, having just refreshed themselves and proven their mettle. Even the subsequent calamity inflicted by Juno, the partial burning of the fleet, only serves to strengthen the company further, in that only those with the strongest commitment choose and are chosen to continue the voyage and lay the foundations for the new Troy. On the eve of their entry into Italy, all omens seem hopeful for the success of their mission and for the reburgeoning of Trojan power in a new land. The spring scene briefly
encapsulated in Douglas’s very first line is thus an apt metaphor indicating the hopeful and joyous mood in which the Trojans set out for Italy.

If Douglas the poet has so far celebrated the endless variety of human responses to new beginnings and the ‘Plesance and ioy’ (l. 19) to be found in them, in the second three stanzas of Prologue V Douglas the translator finds that the variety and flexibility of Virgil’s style are almost too much of a good thing for himself. Yet while ‘The clerk reiosys hys bukis our to seyn’ (l. 5), Douglas the critical translator and scholar always enjoys a little flying, particularly with Caxton, whose prose in Book V and elsewhere he finds ‘mank and mutulate’ (l. 51), while his own

propyne com from the press fute hait,
Onforlatit, not iawyn fra tun to tun,
In fresch sapour new from the berry run.

(V, Prol., 52-4)

Douglas here uses a further image of freshness and rebirth, this time shifting from the regeneration of Nature and from the renewal of Troy’s dominion to his own new approach to translation. In contrast to his predecessors, he breaks with the tradition of recension and goes back directly to the original source, thus making a new beginning in the art of translation. Douglas’s motion is not unlike that of the Trojans, who are also seeking out their forefathers’ original homeland in Hesperia in order to found the new Troy, having discovered in the meantime that none of the intermediate stations, such as Crete in particular, will suffice as a basis for the realm yet to be reborn. Just as Book V ends with Venus’ appeal to Neptune to prosper Aeneas’ enterprise, so Douglas concludes
Prologue V with a prayer, rejecting Bacchus, Proserpina and Victoria, the divinities associated with the various aspects of the funeral games, and calling instead on his own Lord with the plea to grant him the ability to forego such earthly pleasure as might jeopardize his eternal happiness:

Sen erdly plesour endis oft with sorow, we se,
As in this buke nane exemplys je want,
Lord, our prottectour to all trastis in the,
Bot quham na thing is worthy nor pyssant,
To ws thy grace and als gret mercy grant,
So forto wend by temporal blythness
That our eternale ioy be nocht the less!

(V, Prol., 62-8)

Prologue V thus serves to introduce Book V, but it is also an opportunity for the translator to make further refinements in his statements regarding the act of critical translation.

Prologue VI, even more so than Prologues II and IV, is again a "reader’s guide" to the Book it precedes. Douglas here asks his readers not to dismiss Book VI as containing ‘bot iapis, / . . . leys or ald ydolatryis’ (II. 9-10), but to penetrate ‘the clowdis of dyrk poecy’ (I, Prol., 193) to find the underlying ‘suythfast materis’ (I, Prol., 197). Using an occupatio topos as his introduction—‘Wald thou I suId this buke to the declare, / Quhilk war impossibil til expreme at schort?’ (II. 25-6)—Douglas presents a full-scale exposition of the parallelism between Virgil’s underworld and the Christian afterlife, correlating Tartarus with Hell and the Elysian Fields with Heaven, and finding space, too, for a Purgatory and a Limbo in Hades. As for the vices for which, as Aeneas is told, Tartarus is the price, Douglas finds that they are the same as ‘the synnys capital’ (I. 41). Lest any reader find this reading far-fetched, Douglas cites Servius, Augustine and Ascensius as authorities for his
interpretation. Furthermore, he even finds evidence in Virgil's reference to the *anima mundi* (VI, 724-32), that Virgil espoused the concept of one God the Father or, in another aspect, of one God the Creator. Virgil's other gods—'hevinly wightis' (1. 83)—in Douglas's reading become 'hevinly sspiretis' and 'angellis' (11. 82, 84), and Sibyl, who is 'a maid of goddis secret preve' (1. 138), is equated with Mary, while Pluto, the 'Prynce in that dolorus den of wo and pane' (1. 151), becomes Satan in Douglas's interpretation. However, although Virgil was 'ane hie theolog sentencyus' (1. 75) anticipating many of the doctrines of Christianity, he 'was na Cristyn man, per De' (1. 78), so that it is not surprising that he occasionally "erred," as in his tenet of the transmigration of the souls. Central as this concept is to the development of the latter part of Book VI, Douglas devotes only four lines to its refutation (11. 129-32), pointing out too that it is not altogether dissimilar from the Catholic concept of the reunification of body and soul after Doomsday.

Even though Douglas offers a close interpretation of Book VI, he nonetheless shifts the focus away from the high-point which the entire Book leads up to. Virgil's Book VI falls into three almost equally long, but progressively important parts: the preparations for the descent into the underworld (VI, 1-263); Aeneas' entry into the underworld and his journey through the neutral regions of neither punishment nor joy (including his meeting with Dido in the Mourning Fields, and a glance at Tartarus in passing) (VI, 264-636); and, finally, the meeting of Aeneas with Anchises in the Blissful Groves, where Anchises foretells the glory of the Roman Empire (VI, 637-901). Douglas's Prologue, however, concentrates almost exclusively on the middle section, relegating
Anchises' prophecies to a mere four lines of benevolent criticism:

I say nocht all his [Virgil's] warkis beyn perfyte,
Nor that sawlys turnys in othir bodeys agane
Thocht we traste, and may preif be haly write,
Oure sawle and body sal anys togiddir remane.

(VI, Prol., 129-32)

By emphasizing one part at the expense of the other two, Douglas determines what the reader is to regard as important in Book VI. In Douglas's opinion, the prime concern of the Book is to show "Eftir thar deth, in quhat plyte saulis sal stand' (VI, Prol., 37), but this seems to be at variance with Virgil's design, in which the focal point of the Book is the rise of Rome. Douglas's reading does suggest a sense of awe and wonder, though not at the destined glory of the Roman Empire, but at the strength of Christian Truth, able to assert itself in a pagan writer even prior to its revelation. Douglas's Prologue thus reinterprets Book VI, drawing the reader's attention away from the already discredited final third and presenting the middle third as a foreshadowing of the conditions following the Last Judgement.

Prologue VII, the 'tristis prologus' which 'smellis new cum furth of hell' (ll. 162a, 163), being the numerical centre of the work, is closely connected with both the preceding and the subsequent Book. Apart from the thematic links with Book VI, verbal echoes also establish a close continuity between Virgil's vision of the realm of the shades and Douglas's image of the hell-like winter landscape. At the same time, the chaos in nature foreshadows the turmoil caused by Juno in Book VII. At Juno's instigation, Alecto rises from her hellish dwelling place to overturn the peaceful and beneficent rule of Latinus; her aspect
terrifies, and her influence frenzies the characters who come in contact with her. She turns the world upside-down, provoking the populace to disregard the ruler, goading the queen and her matrons to set themselves against the decrees of the sage, divinely-guided king, and lashing Turnus on to rebel against his overlord and to go to war despite his liege's express command to the contrary. The images of unnatural disorder, death and violence in Douglas's 'draery preambill' (VII, Prol., 166) anticipate the upheaval in Latium where political and social bonds and even divine ordinances are temporarily overturned and where war is soon to demand its victims. Douglas's winter night constitutes an "objective correlative" to the benightedness of the Laurentines as their adherence to Latinus' calm and reasonable rule is suspended under Alecto's influence and as clarity of vision fails them. The hostility of the cold season, which makes even bare survival precarious, corresponds to the shattering of Latinus' and the Trojan embassy's mutual offering of peace and particularly of Latinus' request for a marriage between Lavinia and Aeneas. In both scenarios beneficent growth and fruitful development are cut off, blighted, and actively suppressed. Nonetheless, the winter solstice is also a turning point, and the harsh period directly following it will eventually be superseded by a time of renewed growth during which the image of man 'jok[ing] our pleuch agane' (l. 158) will be more than a metaphor; so, too, the Trojans have the assurance that after the period of war, death and destruction a time of flourishing development will begin. For Douglas the translator, for the beings mentioned in the Prologue, and for the inhabitants of Ausonia, native and foreign alike, this crisis already holds the promise of fulfilment following a period of intense
trial and hardship, and in this the images of the Prologue and of the Book correspond in harsh harmony.

Prologue VIII, a tour de force in alliterative writing in which a hostile dream figure presents conventional social criticism and reproaches the dreamer-narrator for wasting his time on the writing of poetry, has variously been called "a most alien interpolation" and "a piece of comic relief to the heroic subject matter of the Aeneid [. . .], a grotesque parody of the opening lines of book VIII." Although this Prologue also serves other functions as discussed in chapters I and II, in terms of the linkage between Prologue and Book, Coldwell's statement that Prologue VIII, "on the distortion of the true polis, is a foil to the idealized state of the noble Evander" seems to come closest to the truth. While the dream-vision form links this Prologue to the first part of Book VIII, where the god of the river Tiber appears to Aeneas in an oraculum, the dislocated, chaotic state of society criticized by the 'selcouth seg' (1. 4) contrasts sharply with the harmonious, law-abiding and devout ways of Evander's nation described in the main part of the Book. Even though Evander emphasizes that the Golden Age under Saturn is past, by contrast to the utter social turmoil depicted in the Prologue, Evander's own state nonetheless appears ideal, with the one exception of the smouldering hostility towards the Rutulians. Indeed, almost every statement made in the dream-figure's harangue can be paired with its opposite in Virgil's description of Evander's Arcadia. As a result, the juxtaposition of the two images of society enforces reflection on what is and what should be; it urges the audience to consider the alternatives and to make a moral and social choice. As Douglas implies in Prologue IX, preaching is
ineffective, however, and the diatribe of the 'selcouth seg' consequently
has much less of an impact than does the portrayal in the following Book
of a well-governed, harmonious society in action, whose image Douglas
presents as an alternative to the 'mysery' (l. 101) which his speaker
perceives in contemporaneous Scotland. Prologue VIII thus is less a
"grotesque parody" than an exposé of the social, political and moral
travesty which may yet go by the name of society.

Prologue IX is again a less direct introduction to the subsequent
Book. Book IX contains the first sustained battle scenes, especially
Nisus and Euryalus' heroic sortie and Turnus' single-handed combat inside
the Trojan camp. In both these passages, Virgil emphasizes the high
heroism of the three young warriors. However, no less important are
Euryalus' speech demonstrating filial piety and Ascanius' speech
exemplifying magnanimous governance. In his Prologue, Douglas takes up
the theme of high-minded conduct--both knightly and royal--and transforms
it into an exposé on the kind of style which alone can do justice to this
subject matter. The discussion of the 'knychtlyke stile' (IX, Prol., 31),
however, is itself preceded by three highly embellished six-line stanzas
on the virtues of honesty and judicious moderation:

Thir lusty warkis of hie nobilyte
Agilyte dyd wryte of worthy clerkis,
And tharin merkis wysdome, vtilyte,
Na vilyte, nor sic onthryfty sperkis;
Scurilyte is bot for doggis at barkis,
Quha tharto hark is fallys in fragilyte.
Honeste is the way to worthyness,
Vertu, doutless, the perfyte gait to blyss;
Thou do na myss, and eschew idilness,
Persew prowes, hald na thing at is hys;
Be nocht rakless to say sone ȝa, I wyss,
And syne of this the contrar wyrk express.
Critics have occasionally commented on a lack of cohesion between the two stylistically very different parts of Prologue IX, or have ignored the first three stanzas altogether and treated the Prologue as if it consisted of the longer couplet section only. Lois Ebin, however, points to an important connexion when she writes,

Like Henryson, who had suggested in his Fabillis that poetic style was a more effective response to the ills of the time than 'haly preiching,' Douglas implies by his contrast between moral and 'ryall' styles in Prologue IX a similar choice of a poetic medium rather than an explicitly moral one as 'bute.'

When Douglas abruptly breaks off after the first three stanzas and continues the Prologue in a different verse form, he explicitly rejects the previous manner of writing, but he also implies a rejection of the poetic style in which it is phrased. His transitional line, 'Eneuch of this, ws nedis prech na mor' (l. 19), makes it clear that Douglas finds the moralizing tone ineffective, and that if any didacticism is intended, it had better be merely implied in the harmony between subject matter and style, both of which together must also be appropriate to the intended recipient of the work. By switching to plain couplets, Douglas also rejects the extremely ornate style of the preceding three stanzas; the complex rhyme scheme of final and internal, feminine and masculine rhymes,
and the florid word choice and laboured word order draw attention to themselves and thereby make the communication of moral concepts ineffective. Moreover, it goes counter to the idea of "magnanymyte" (XI, Prol., 35) exemplified in Book IX and discussed in Prologue XI as an essential feature of true knighthood, for as soon as heroism or other high-mindedness becomes as self-conscious as is the style of the opening stanzas of Prologue IX, it becomes ostentatious and loses precisely the quality which gave it nobility in the first place. The kind of verbal "agilyte" (1. 2) demonstrated in the stanzaic section thus disregards appropriateness and degree, for while it certainly avoids "scurilyte" and "lowuss langage" (ll. 5, 25), it seems to "Clym [. . . ] our hie" (1. 16) and is therefore lacking in "grauyte" (1. 26).

Read in conjunction, both sections of the Prologue thus make the same point: the form of writing must harmonize with its content and its addressee; without such harmony, "Full litill it wald delyte" (1. 36). In using the "ryall style, clepyt heroycall" (1. 21) as an example to illustrate his discussion, Douglas implicitly draws attention to the distinguishing qualities which the audience may expect to find in the actions and speeches narrated in the Book that follows. If preaching is ineffective—as the ranting of the "selcouth seg" in Prologue VIII has sufficiently demonstrated—teaching by example may be better suited to achieving the virtues called for in the opening stanzas. Book IX thus becomes a subject lesson in morally unimpeachable conduct, to be presented in the kind of style to which the audience is most likely to respond favourably.

Prologue X, principally a sermon on the Trinity, offers a strong
Christian reinterpretation of the Book that follows and implies the refutation of the Olympian gods, which Douglas had denied himself in Prologue VI: To achieve this effect Douglas here relies exclusively on a juxtaposition of the concepts developed in the Prologue and the scenes presented in the Book. Book X opens with Jupiter convening a council of the gods and commanding them to desist from their active discord and from further contravention of his ordinances. But neither Juno nor Venus is ready to yield her position, and other deities continue to take sides, so that Jupiter has to take the awesome path of an oath invoking Styx in order to quell the discord and enforce his decree that neither side in the Latian war shall be favoured, but that Fate shall take its course. While the gods are forced to submit to Jupiter’s command, he himself is also bound by Fate, having power only to delay but not to alter it. From here on, the focus of the Book shifts from Olympus down to the Trojan camp and the seashore, where Trojans and Ausonians are locked in a battle which is the direct result of the discord among the gods and which moves even them to pity (X, 758-59). Douglas’s Prologue, in contrast, stresses unity and love and, resulting from them, peace. In his learned discourse on the Trinity, he emphasizes time and again the co-eternal, co-eval, co-equal, and inseparable nature of this tri-unity. Unlike Jupiter, who has to resort to force to make the Olympian gods submit to his supremacy, the Trinity emanates love, grants man free will, and even after man’s disobedience seeks to restore unity, harmony and love through the offer of Grace, another form of love.

While the first part of both Prologue and Book is thus occupied with the characteristics of Christian and pagan divine relationships, the
second part glorifies the love which is prepared for self-sacrifice in order to redeem its object. I.S. Ross speaks of Book X as "in part an anthem for the doomed heroic youths Lausus and Pallas," both of whom sacrifice their lives, the one to save that of his father Mezentius, and the other to avert disaster from the routed Trojan and Arcadian forces. Personified in these two young heroes are the highest public and private Roman virtues. Just as Aeneas is in Prologue XI made a type of Christ in leading his people home to the 'fatale cuntre of behest' (XI, Prol., 178), so Pallas and Lausus are types of Christ in placing the supreme virtues of their value system above their own lives. Douglas's meditation on the Incarnation and the Passion is thus a counterpart to Virgil's "anthem," yet it also stresses their essential difference: while 'A drop had bene sufficient of [Christ's] blude / A thousand warldis to haue redemyt...' (X, Prol., 132-33), the sacrifices of Pallas and Lausus have no redemptive capacity or only a very limited one. After Pallas' death Aeneas still has to exert his utmost power to keep Turnus and his forces at bay, and after Lausus is slain, the wounded Mezentius returns for a desperate duel with Aeneas, not wanting to live after his son has died. While Douglas had in Prologue VI still been able to allegorize Virgil's pantheon, in Prologue X he literally rejects Virgil's 'mawmentis' (l. 153), whose strife causes discord on earth and demands the price of such fruitless sacrifices. He reapplies Virgil's phrase 'divum pater atque hominum rex' (X, 2) to his own God, 'the Fader of goddis and men' (l. 156), who also 'haldis court our cristall hevynnys cleir' (l. 166; cf. X, 1-5), but in whose realm there is 'Concord for ever,' and hence 'myrth, rest and endles blyss, / [...] all wilfair, eyss and euerlestand ioy' (l. 171, 174). Book X thus
becomes an illustration of the state of man ruled by 'ydoll, stok [or] elf' (l. 154) without divine 'luf and cheryte' (l. 126).

Prologue XI, discussing true chivalry, follows the same basic pattern as Prologue IV, transforming the following Book into a moral lesson. Douglas again takes his cue from the contents of the subsequent Book, but also from the preceding one, each of which consists to approximately half its length of a narration of the battles fought on the plain outside Latinus’ city. It is striking, however, that while Aeneas is the main hero of the combats in Book X, he is not shown fighting at all in Book XI. On the contrary, Book XI shows Aeneas as statesman and guardian of his people, while the battle scenes centre on Volscan Camilla. Coldwell’s statement that Prologue XI "joins the praise of true knighthood, or spiritual chivalry, to Vergil’s fiercest fighting," thus seems to miss the point, considering too that the rage of battle is no less intense in Books IX, X and XII. When Douglas focuses on Aeneas in the final three stanzas of the Prologue, what he stresses is not so much Aeneas’ outstanding heroism on the battle field and during other times of danger but rather Aeneas’ moral qualities, namely, that he knows to ‘Ensew vertu, and eschew evey vyce’ (l. 195) even though he is one of the ‘paganys ald’ (l. 194) who did not have the promise of ‘the kynryk ay lestyng’ (l. 183). Since Books VII to XII have a tendency to be remembered as one long battle account, it will be useful to recall here that Book XI opens at daybreak with Aeneas fulfilling his public duty to the gods even though he would have preferred first to honour his fallen friends and comrades by giving them burial. While still engaged in the sacred rites of Mars, he addresses the chieftains of his forces, trying to renew their courage,
their hope of victory, and their faith in the benevolence of the gods. Immediately thereafter, he takes great care to honour the dead Pallas and to arrange a fitting, even lavish procession to have Pallas' body taken home to Evander. Only then, after the duties owed to the gods and to the ally are discharged, does Aeneas turn to the burial rites for the Trojans' own dead. He is, however, interrupted by envoys from Latinus, asking for a truce to enable the Latins to bury their even greater number of dead. 'Bonus Aeneas,' 'hýnyd, curtass and gud,' grants their request (XI, 106-7; XI, iii, 13) and addresses the enemy envoys with consideration and sympathy, causing aged Drances, the head of the embassy, to wonder aloud whether Aeneas' 'gret gentryce and sa iust equyte, / Or [his] gret fors and labour bellical' (XI, iii, 60-1) are more to be admired ('iustitiaene prius mirer belline laborum?' XI, 126). After this act of magnanimous caritas on the part of Aeneas, the focus of Book XI shifts away from Aeneas to Evander, Latinus and finally Camilla, and Aeneas is scarcely even mentioned again until the final lines, which prepare for the clash between Aeneas and Turnus in Book XII.

Aeneas' charity, piety and justice, and his, on the whole, morally and ethically unimpeachable conduct are the features which are stressed here, after his heroism and warlike qualities have been demonstrated in the preceding Book. In the Prologue, Douglas uses the same pattern: martial prowess alone is not enough--it must be used only in the pursuit of justice, and it must be tempered by 'magnanymyte' (XI, Prol., 35). Beyond that, Aeneas is also made an exemplum for the Christian soldier, in quest for 'hys fatale cunctre of behest' (1. 178). If Aeneas can cultivate the above qualities in order to gain his destined 'temporall ryng' (1.
182), how much more ought even the ordinary Christian be ready to practise justice, magnanimity, charity and virtue in general in order to gain 'the kynryk ay lestynge,' which 'was hecht till Abraham and hys seyd' (11. 183, 199). Prologue XI thus offers a spiritual key to the subsequent Book, reinterpreting it as a Christian allegory.

Prologue XII, the joyous Prologue which Douglas himself calls a 'lusty crafty preambill' and which he entitles "perle of May" (1. 307), must at first reading seem entirely unconnected with the following Book, relating the final, bloody struggles in which Aeneas wins the battle for Italy. However, even though the atmosphere of the Prologue contrasts most sharply with that of the Book, the two parts are connected by strong thematic and structural links. As I have proposed earlier, Prologue XII is essentially a hymn to the Sun and to its Creator, celebrating the triumph (1. 275) of the Lord of Light and showing all nature doing obeisance to its Lord. Knowing that they lack the power to prolong their wintry influence, the hostile planets flee from the presence of the rising Sun, whose beneficent rule brings rebirth and harmony on a cosmic plane. If Prologue VII, with its images of disorder, barrenness and death, introduces not merely Book VII but the entire Iliadic half of the Aeneid, then Prologue XII, filled with images of unity, renewed vitality and regeneration, heralds the end of the wars and anticipates the subsequent peace under Italy's new ruler. The Sun is the Prologue's counterpart to Aeneas, who in Book X, on his return from Evander's city, had been associated with the sun in the magnificent image of Aeneas standing at the stern of his ship with his 'clipeum . . . ardentem' (X, 261-62) catching the rays of the sun at dawn. The hasty withdrawal of
Orion and the other planets and creatures of night at the emergence of the Sun in the opening lines of Prologue XII parallels the rout of the Rutulians and Turnus' terrified flight from Aeneas, whose triumph over Turnus and ultimately over war itself is as predestined as is the triumph of the Sun over night and winter. After the destruction of the original Troy, after the ordeals of the Trojans' wanderings across the sea, and after the death-dealing wars in Latium, Aeneas' victory over Turnus brings the pre-ordained beginning of the reburgeoning of the Trojan empire, soon to be merged with the Latins. Whereas Prologue VII, the Winter Prologue, used the winter solstice as an image of the crisis point in the working-out of the Trojans' destiny, Prologue XII is based on the theme of spring—not summer—as an image of a new beginning rather than completion. Prologue XII thus looks beyond Book XII's stark final scene of the killing of Turnus, and gives an indication of what is to come after the barren, deadly and hellish night of the war is over.

In Book VII the initial peace agreement between Aeneas and Latinus was broken by the Latins as a direct result of the actions of Alecto, in Virgil's version the daughter of Night (VII, 331) and of Pluto (VII, 327), whom Douglas in Prologue VI equates with Satan; in Book XII Alecto appears again, this time transformed into an owl, causing Turnus to be paralysed with horror. The owl is also the only animal mentioned in the opening lines of Prologue XII (11. 11-12) as hiding instead of rejoicing at the approach of the sun, which here represents its Creator as well as the Lord of Light, the Son, with whom Aeneas has been associated since Prologue XI, where Aeneas became a type of Christ. Aeneas' victory is thus reinterpreted by Douglas as a metaphor for the inevitable victory of light.
and goodness over the powers of death and destruction; indeed, one might even go so far as to argue that since Aeneas in Douglas's reading is a prototype of the model Christian soldier, who of his free will stands firm against the onslaughts of the Flesh, the World, and the Devil (XI, Prol., 81-104), his triumph over Turnus, whose opposition stems from infernal influences personified in Alecto, represents the final victory of Good over Evil preceding Eternity. In any case, the Prologue certainly lessens the starkness of the Book's last scene and transforms it from an image of avenging retribution into one of triumphant victory.

Prologue XIII, with its dream interview with Maphaeus Vegius, lies on a different plane altogether. Here Douglas allows himself the comedy which he had so far rejected as inappropriate to the work in progress (IX, Prol.). This comedy, however, goes deeper than is usually assumed, and Douglas is even more under-handed in his joke at Maphaeus' expense than is usually recognized.

The Prologue's setting of the summer evening, as all nature lies down to sleep and rest, indicates the final completion of the work in hand. But Douglas is not yet permitted to lay down his pen, for Maphaeus Vegius forcefully demands that Douglas add a translation of Maphaeus' own 'schort Cristyn wark' (1.140), pointing out that such an undertaking would be far more meritorious than the entire translation of the poem of Virgil, who was after all but 'a gentile clerk' (1.139). After Prologues II-XII have offered a systematic reinterpretation of the Aeneid along Christian lines, this argument obviously cannot fail to amuse Douglas, both in the dream and in waking life. Douglas's facetiously phrased promise 'to translait [Maphaeus'] buke, in honour of God / And hys
Apostolis twelf, in the numbir od’ (11. 151-52) is not only a fine and learned thrust directed at Maphaeus’ vanity, but it also undercut the argument that secular literature has less value than patently religious writing. Considering Virgil ‘ane hie theolog sentencyus’ (VI, Prol., 75), Douglas has worked out the Christian reading which he believes the *Aeneid* supports, but he knows too that the ‘Cristyn’ writer who composed Book XIII had no such subtext in mind for his sequel; indeed, Maphaeus’ claim rests solely on the Christianity of the man, not on any religious or didactic character of the work itself. Not knowing just how Christian Virgil’s work has become as a result of Douglas’s interpolation of the Prologues, Maphaeus does not recognize that his own writing simply fails to approach the same level of high seriousness. Douglas’s joke is thus for insiders—those who have followed his advice to ‘Reid, reid agane, this volume, mair than twyss’ (VI, Prol., 12). At the same time, Prologue XIII sets a new tone for the reading of the remainder of the *Eneados*. The concentration and close attention which Douglas had so far deemed absolutely necessary are no longer required; instead, the rest of the work may be read at face value, and although Douglas promises to translate Maphaeus’ work in a style consistent with the preceding twelve Books, he explicitly deflates all claims for the value which the supplement might have—literary, religious, or otherwise—and makes it plain that he includes the thirteenth Book only willy-nilly in order not to run afoul of popular taste and public demand. Prologue XIII thus makes it perfectly clear that, as far as Douglas is concerned, the Scottish *Aeneid* is complete at the end of Book XII, and even though the *Eneados* continues, Book XIII does not properly belong to the text. While offering a partial
justification for including the sequel, Prologue XIII is also an extremely
tactful way of telling the more perceptive and sophisticated readers not
to bother reading on.
Notes

1 Ross, "'Proloug' and 'Buke'," p.399.


5 Priscilla Bawcutt deals with Prologue IX in just two sentences, finding that there are "signs of earlier work being used in Prologue IX, where the first eighteen lines form a separate moralizing section in a different metre from the rest of the Prologue. Line 19 [ ... ] effects the transition to a critical passage related to the book that follows." (Gavin Douglas, p.164). I. S. Ross briefly comments on the stanzaic initial section and suggests that there is no connexion between it and the second part of the Prologue: "The main theme [of the stanzaic part] is praise of virtue but Douglas does not wish to sustain this." ("'Proloug' and 'Buke'," p.401.) Coldwell, in his checklist of the Prologues, omits any mention of the initial section and finds that Prologue IX, "in which Douglas turns on his critics, echoes Turnus' attack on the Trojans," thus suggesting a parallelism between the re-creator of the fortunes of Aeneas, on the one hand, and Aeneas' foremost opponent, on the other. (Coldwell, vol. I, p.88.)


7 Coldwell's misconception that "the complicated interlocking rime-scheme [is] so intricate that the sense is sacrificed to it" proves the point. (Coldwell, vol. I, p. 225, note on IX, Prol., 1-18.) Watt, Douglas’s Aeneid, p.111, describes the complex rhyme scheme as "a kind of weaving rhyme" which, "like the swing of a pendulum," links the internal rhyme word with the tail rhyme word of the preceding line.

8 Ross, "'Proloug' and 'Buke'," p.402.

Chapter V -- The Double Progress

While there are strong links between the individual Prologues and the Books which they introduce, the Prologues of the *Eneados* are also linked to each other. Read as a series by themselves—that is, in isolation from the Books—the Prologues offer glimpses at the progress of the translator at work, his personal responses to the work, his artistic problems, his feeling of conflict between his artistic pursuit and his religious calling, his temporary fatigue, and his final triumph when the work is completed. In several places in the Prologues and end-matter, Douglas likens the work of translating the *Aeneid* to a perilous voyage which, in the final Exclamation, is said to have come to an end, with the ship now safely anchored in the harbour.¹ The metaphor suggests that Douglas sees a correspondence between his own progress and Aeneas' voyage from the ruins of Troy, through many dangers, to the banks of the Tiber: both journeys are quests—the one for the 'fatale cuntre of behest' (XI, Prol., 178), the other for a new, critical approach to translation; when the two journeys are completed, the outcome of each is an entirely new creation—the founding of a new nation, and a defence of poetry together with a theory of translation accompanied by its practical application. As Aeneas leaves Troy behind in search of Rome, so Douglas casts off the tradition of the medieval treatments of the Troy legend and turns to the new vision of Renaissance humanism in developing the principles on which his work is based.

In the Renaissance view, Aeneas' progress, however, also has a second aspect. He is seen to develop into a model prince and—what is more—into the good man *per se*, who has been tested and, strengthened by hardship and
suffering, has emerged victorious from his trials. Douglas's narrator, as Lois Ebin has observed, undergoes a similar tempering as he wrestles with the problems associated with the faithful rendering of a work of the highest excellence from one medium into another, and with the problems involved in being a Christian poet translating a pagan work. Eventually the narrator, too, emerges equal to his trials—so much so that he can easily sustain the slapstick comedy of the thirteenth Prologue.

The series of Prologues, like the series of Books, falls into two distinct parts. Prologues I to V show the narrator full of uncertainty, struggling with his artistic problems and searching for answers to the questions he poses in the first Prologue. In these first five Prologues, the conflict between Douglas's artistic and moral impulses—that is, the conflict inherent in his dual role as 'clerk,' both priest and poet—is presented from ever new angles. In these Prologues artistic and religious themes and topics alternate and intertwine; discussions of artistic goals and poetic style and technique are set off against considerations of moral and religious issues, with little actual continuity from one Prologue to the next. Another sign of the narrator's struggling uncertainty is that invocations of God and Mary for guidance in the work are frequent here—the narrator seems to be crying out for help with a task which is not only difficult in itself, but which is also felt to be somewhat inappropriate for a provost. While Douglas is keenly aware of the cultural importance of Virgil's work, he is also acutely conscious of the objections which can be raised by his critics as well as by his own conscience, namely, that the Aeneid can be regarded as a work in which a pagan writer glorifies the pursuit of worldly ends—the conquest of a temporal realm, guided by non-
Christian deities and conducted with, to the medieval mind, at times questionable ethics. Douglas, too, celebrates earthly pleasures—in Prologue V, for example—but never without being conscious of their transitoriness, which he expresses in his repeated warnings that earthly joy will end in woe, and that indulgence in earthly joys will endanger one's chance of attaining eternal bliss. These problems and conflicts inherent in Douglas's quest are reflected, too, in the narrator's allusion to the long interruption which had delayed the progress of his work, and which was partly a consequence of having more pressing matters to attend to (VII, Prol., 153-4), and partly, one may assume, a result of the poet's inner conflict which had left him stranded in the artistic wasteland reflected in the Winter Prologue. After the struggles of the first five Prologues, the narrator finds a partial solution to his ethical dilemma in Prologue VI, where he achieves a theoretical integration of his artistic and moral concerns by presenting a Christian allegorical reading of the Aeneid. Prologue VII further resolves the conflicts, with the result that at the end of this Prologue the narrator finally emerges from his own inner hell, ready to begin the second half of the translation with renewed creative energy based on a newly found inner equilibrium and harmony. As Book VI constitutes the turning point in the Aeneid, so the two Prologues surrounding it show the two parts of the juncture in the narrator's progress. In both journeys, the quest itself is now over, and the descent into the underworld and the parallel exposure to the wasteland of the poetic imagination respectively bring a vision which gives direction to the second part. Both Aeneas and the narrator of the Prologues can now turn from the quest to the conquest, that is, to the active accomplishment
of their tasks. Prologues VIII to XIII become increasingly complex in their designs and in their incorporation of, and allusions to, previously employed motifs, themes, forms, and issues, strengthening and emphasizing their continuity and internal linkage. Moreover, the now almost total absence of invocations of God and Mary for support and aid in the creative process indicates that the narrator has reached a new confidence both in his own artistic powers and in the legitimacy of his work. With the conflicts resolved and the main work successfully completed, the narrator achieves a masterpiece of unification in the thirteenth Prologue, which combines formal, structural and thematic elements from almost all preceding Prologues, but gives them a new turn by presenting them in a comic mode.

The general movement of the Prologues thus anticipates and follows that of the Books, but the parallelism in the progress of Aeneas and of the narrator also extends to the level of individual Prologues and Books; even in the detailed steps, both series advance in harmony with one another.

At the beginning of Book I, Aeneas is shipwrecked at an unknown coast, having already traversed the sea in an uncertain search for his destined homeland and knowing that the quest is far from complete and that further hardships await him; at the end of the Book, Venus’ scheme of a love affair between Dido and Aeneas involves him in the additional conflict between his private wishes and his public function. The first Prologue shows Douglas responding to Virgil’s portrayal of Aeneas’ crisis by setting out the problems of his own in his artistic search for a new approach to faithful translation. Douglas’s problems are no less severe
than Aeneas’, and he, too, tackles them with undaunted courage. There is
first the issue of Virgil’s excellence, which cannot be adequately
reflected in the Scottish translation, partly because Virgil’s poetic and
stylistic elegance far outstrips Douglas’s own skills as a poet, as
Douglas freely admits in the initial apostrophe to Virgil:

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.
My waverand wyt, my cunnyng febilla at all,
My mynd mysty, thir may nocht myss a fall—
(I, Prol., 25-32)

Besides, the sophistication of the Latin language is felt to be far
superior to that of Douglas’s own vernacular:

And that thy [Virgil’s] facund sentence mycht be song
In our langage alsweill as Latyn tong—
Alsweill? na, na, impossibill war, per de—
3it with thy leif, Virgile, to follow the,
I wald into my rurall wlgar gross
Wryte sum savoryng of thyne Eneados.
(I, Prol., 39-44)

Then there is the problem of Virgil’s difficulty: many passages of his
work are so ‘sle’ (I, Prol., 108) and ‘mysty’ (VI, Prol., 166; Direction,
105) that even great scholars have found it hard to penetrate the ‘clowdis
of dyrk poecy’ (I, Prol., 193) which sometimes obscure the meaning:

The worthy clerk hecht Lawrens of the Vaill,
Amang Latynys a gret patron sans faill,
Grantis quhen twelf sheris he had beyn diligent
To study Virgill, skant knew quhat he ment.
Than thou or I, my frend, quhen we best weyn
To haue Virgile red, understand and seyn,
The rycht sentens perchance is fer to seik.
(I, Prol., 127-33)

Furthermore, there is the general problem that the value of poetry per se is not recognized, and that the poet still has to defend his work if he aims for goals higher than edification and entertainment:

For so the poetis be the crafty curys
In similitudes and vndir quent figuris
The suythfast materis to hyde and to constreyn;
All is nocht fals, traste weill, in cace thai feyn.
Thar art is so to mak thar warkis fair.
(I, Prol., 195-99)

And last, there are the problems peculiar to translation, especially the translator’s being bound by the original and being thus prevented from giving free rein to his own creativity in composition if he wishes to produce a faithful rendering of the original text:

I knew quhat payn was to follow hym fut hait
Albeit thou think my sayng intricate.
Traste weill to follow a fixt sentens or mater
Is mair practike, deficill and far strater,
Thocht thyne engyne beyn eleuate and hie,
Than forto write all ways at liberte.

Quha is attachit ontill a staik, we se,
May go na fethir bot wreil about that tre.
(I, Prol., 287-98)

Particularly the last two issues, the recognition of the inherent merit of literature and the dedication to translation rather than re-telling, are new departures from the accepted literary norm. As I have discussed earlier, Douglas is in both these instances distancing himself from medieval standards and is instead embracing still new Renaissance concepts of the poet as an artist rather than an entertainer and of the translator.
as a scholar rather than a story-teller. Both these issues are still so new and relatively unencountered within Middle Scots (and Middle English) literature that Douglas will come back to them several more times in the course of his Prologues. Here, in Prologue I, which is more a preface to the entire work than an introduction to Book I, Douglas introduces the concepts of the inherent artistic merit of poetry and of fidelity in translation, to be returned to and to be refined in further discussions later on, particularly in Prologues VI and IX, where he offers a defence of poetry and an analytical discussion of style. Like Aeneas, Douglas finds himself exploring new territory, while being forced by the circumstances to rely almost exclusively on his own devices.

In the second, extremely brief Prologue, Douglas focuses on the issue of fidelity in translation: he needs no inspiration from the Muses since he is closely following Virgil's own text rather than attempting to compose his own version of the account of the siege and fall of Troy. Douglas is perfectly conscious that he is breaking new ground with this approach; indeed, he is certain that his method will constitute an improvement over preceding versions of the Virgilian material:

Bot followand Virgil, gif my wit war abill,
Ane othir wyss now salt that bell berong
Than euer was tofor hard in our tong.

(II, Prol., 10-12)

In announcing this new departure, however, Douglas also follows Virgil in another way. In Book II, Aeneas recounts his turning away from the burning Troy to seek a new country for his company of followers. Virgil here rejects the type of epic hero who is so dedicated to the concept of personal glory that he must continue to fight till either victory or
death, and instead he lets Aeneas cast off the old and begin a regenerating search for the new.\(^7\) In the medieval tradition, which favoured heroes such as Hector, Aeneas' sensible flight from the Greek massacre and his departure from the ruined Troy, as well as his earlier attempt (together with Antenor) to negotiate the lifting of the Greek siege,\(^8\) had brought him the reputation of a traitor, an aspersion which Douglas has already been at pains to refute in Prologue I. Like Virgil and his protagonist, Douglas also takes a courageous step in a new direction, knowing very well that he--like Aeneas--will not escape censure. Nonetheless, old concepts assert themselves at the end of this Prologue, where Douglas reverts to the notion of the predominantly didactic value of literature and turns Book II into an exemplum in support of the adage that 'All erdly glaidness fynysith with wo' (1.21).

Preceding the Book which relates Aeneas and Anchises' unsuccessful attempts to find the elusive land of the forefathers promised in Apollo's oracle, Prologue III employs the theme of uncertainty and error in the quest for the best possible translation. Cynthia, the goddess of the ever-changing moon and sea, is invoked as patroness of this Prologue, although Douglas's two pleas for guidance in his work are actually directed to God (1.8) and Mary (11.41-5). Douglas is here seeking help with three problems. First, his knowledge of the exact geography of Aeneas' voyage is as imperfect as is Anchises' knowledge of the precise location of the Trojans' land of origin, and Douglas is therefore conscious of the likelihood that his translation will contain errors, which, however, should not detract from the general quality of the work:
And gentill curtass redaris of gude geill,
I sow beseik to gevin aduertenss;
This text is full of storys every deill,
Realmys and landis, quharof I haue na feill
Bot as I follow Virgill in sentens;
Few knawis all thir costis sa far hens;
To pike thame vp perchance your eyn suld reill—
Thus aucth thar nane blame me for smal offens.
(III, Prol., 29-36)

On the literal level, there is thus a perfect parallelism between Aeneas’
trying to identify the destination of his voyage and the narrator’s
attempt to follow him imaginatively on the voyage. The second problem
addressed in this Prologue is that of the spiritual conflicts and
stumbling blocks, both in the larger journey of life,

Wild aventuris, monstreis and quent effrays—
Of onkowth dangeris this nixt buke hail is full;
Nyce Laborynth, quhar Mynotawr the bull
Was kepte, had nevir sa feil cahuttis and ways.
I dreid men clepe thame fablis now on days;
Tharfor wald God I had thar erys to pull
Mysknawis the creid, and threpis otheris forvayls,
(III, Prol., 12-18)

and in the narrator’s present quest for a theologically acceptable
translation of a pagan work:

By strange channelis, 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.
(III, Prol., 37-42)

As the final stanza (ll. 37-45) makes clear, such an undertaking still has
its risks, and Mary’s help is needed to preserve ‘our barge’ (I.39) from
the spiritual dangers to which both translator and audience are exposed in
a work which takes pagan deities not as convenient literary metaphors and symbols but as actual gods and goddesses with power over man's life and soul. The third problem, an artistic one, is connected with both the first and the second. Douglas fears that his readers might not see beyond the literal level of meaning of Aeneas' journey in Book III and that they might consequently dismiss the adventures encountered during the voyage as deliberate falsehood and lies—"I dreid men clepe thame fablis now on days" (III, Prol., 16)—instead of interpreting the 'feirful stremys and costis wondyrfull' (1.10) and 'strange channellis, fronteris and forlandis' (1.37), where 'monstreis' (1.12) and other 'onkowth dangeris' (1.13) await the unwary voyager, as imaginative renderings of the human condition. In identifying this problem, Prologue III elaborates on the same point made in Prologue I and foreshadows Prologue VI with its defence of poetry. In the third Prologue and Book, both the narrator and Aeneas are barely cognizant of the nature of their problem, but by the end of the sixth Prologue and Book both have found solutions, with Aeneas being able to advance towards a realization of his vision of the future Rome, and with the translator having formulated his poetic theory in which he, among other things, justifies the use of myth as a legitimate literary vehicle, which enables him subsequently to integrate his religious and artistic concerns.

Book IV finds Aeneas temporarily abandoning his public function as leader of the Trojans for the sake of his private attachment to Dido. The fourth Prologue, too, shows the narrator less occupied with artistic issues, which have so far been the prime concern of the Prologue discussions, and instead presents him as almost exclusively interested in
the religious and moral questions raised by Book IV in the mind of a Christian reader and theologian. Thus, the hero of the Aeneid and the narrator of the Prologues both turn away, for a while, from their main objectives and pursue interests which are, or seem, contrary to the attainment of their goals: the sojourn in Carthage delays and even appears to jeopardize the fulfilment of the Trojans’ destiny, and the narrator’s moral concerns involve him in a conflict of interests when he comes to translate Book IV, in which he, as translator, has to apply the same standards of fidelity to the original as elsewhere, but whose contents he, in his role as churchman, cannot condone. While Douglas cannot censure Aeneas without impairing Aeneas’ character as the model prince, his disapproval of the episode is more than obvious in the Prologue’s final comments on Dido’s conduct:

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

(IV, Prol., 250-56)

There is no question that these lines also imply a reflection on Aeneas, who is, after all, one of the ‘strangeris of onkouth natioun’ (1.267), of whom ladies are advised to beware.9

The fifth Prologue and Book, however, show both the hero and his narrator firmly focused on their main tasks again. Having finished the translation of Book IV with its, to him, so morally offensive content, Douglas seems to rejoice in the prospect of translating Book V. The Prologue reflects the purification and regeneration which the Trojans
undergo in the celebration of the funeral games for Anchises and in the selection of a smaller, more determined company, following the near-disaster of the burning of the fleet. After they had been idle at Carthage for a year, Aeneas’ followers rejoice in their renewed activity, which will bring them both physically and spiritually closer to their destination. This mood also communicates itself to the narrator, who now celebrates the wholesome regeneration accompanying the arrival of spring, when all nature and mankind are in a festive mood, following a strongly life-affirming impulse and drawing new strength and vitality from it. Having modulated his theme from the harmonious diversity of the manifestations of joy at the arrival of spring to the stylistic range and emotional flexibility with which Virgil captures the variety of human feelings and activities in the Aeneid, the narrator asserts that he himself is aiming for a renewal which parallels that brought by spring and that soon to be undergone by Aeneas’ company:

Now harkis sportis, myrthlis and myrry plays,  
Ful gudly pastans on mony syndry ways,  
Endyte by Virgil, and heir by me translate,  
Quhilk William Caxton knew nevir al hys days,  
For, as I sayd tofor, that man forvays;  

(V, Prol., 46-50)

indeed, he feels a member of the select group who are chosen to continue the journey and search for the final destination. Caxton had virtually destroyed Virgil’s text in ‘Hys febil proyss’ which ‘beyn mank and mutulate’ (V, Prol., 51); Caxton ‘forvays’ (1.50) just as much as the Trojan women had erred in almost destroying their fleet. But Caxton, too, is left behind in the continuing tradition of Virgilian translation, for
only the purest will be good enough, both in the search for the old and new homeland and in the quest for a satisfactory rendering of the elusively difficult texture of Virgil’s work. Douglas thus implies a very high claim for himself in the phrasing of the contrast between his own work and Caxton’s:

For, as I sayd tofor, that man [Caxton] forvays;
Hys febil proyss beyn mank and mutulate,
Bot my propyne com from the press fute hait,
Onforlatit, not iawyn fra tun to tun,
In fresch sapour new from the berry run.

(V, Prol., 50-4)

In making his ‘propyne,’ his offering of new, untampered wine, to Virgil, Douglas seems to allude to the libation of "clear wine" (‘vina liquentia’ V, 776) which Aeneas pours into the sea in sacrifice to Neptune just before resuming the voyage. Aeneas and the translator-narrator are thus in parallel positions: Aeneas needs Neptune’s protection on the voyage, but by means of the voyage he makes possible the survival of the Penates, which had been entrusted to him by the ghost of Hector; similarly, the translator requires the assistance of Virgil, his patron-saint, to whom he here makes his offering and on whose post he later affixes his pen as a votive offering (Conclusion, 13-14), but whose survival in English would have been doubtful if it were not for faithful followers such as Douglas himself in contrast to Caxton. In consequence, the double progress can continue—both Aeneas’ to Italy, and Virgil’s in English. However, even though following Virgil as closely as possible may protect the translator from artistic hazards, he still appears to have doubts regarding the moral and religious implications of his undertaking:
Sen erdly plesour endis oft with sorow, we se,
As in this buke nane exemplys je want,
Lord, our protectour to all trastis in the,
Bot quham na thing is worthy nor pyssant,
To ws thy grace and als gret mercy grant,
So forto wend by temporal blythness
That our eternale ioy be nocht the less!

(V, Prol., 62-8)

For the narrator the sailing is still as rough as it is for Aeneas, who, at the end of Book V, loses his helmsman Palinurus in the calm sea off the shore of Italy, just before reaching the treacherous cliffs of the Sirens. For the narrator, the question is still whether the pursuit of artistic excellence detached from explicitly religious goals will not imperil his soul’s attainment of eternal bliss.

In Prologue VI, however, the narrator succeeds in integrating his artistic and his moral concerns. Stripping the Aeneid of the apparatus of myth, he argues that Virgil’s "teachings" accord in almost every point with Christian doctrine. In stressing the doctrinal correctness of Virgil’s work and in emphasizing its high didactic value, Douglas defends himself against his critics’ charge that he is perpetuating ‘Vayn superstitionys aganyst our richt beleve’ (1.22); simultaneously, he also assuages his own conscience with regard to the question which had still troubled him at the end of the previous Prologue. In explaining Virgil’s use of myth as a wrapping for his didactic aims, Douglas seems to be developing an idea which is fairly new even to himself. When he criticized Caxton, in Prologue I, for omitting Book VI because it is ‘fenjeit and nocht forto beleif’ (I, Prol., 179), he wrote:

Sa is all Virgill perchans, for by hys leif
Iuno nor Venus goddesssis neuer wer,
In this passage from Prologue I, Douglas had already developed the general outline of the argument he is now using in Prologue VI, but he had clearly not yet worked out the details, for he adds, influenced presumably by the medieval legend of Virgil as a sorcerer:

Quha wait gyf he [Aeneas] in visioun thydder went
By art magike, socery or enchantment,
And with hys fader sawle dyd speke and meyt,
Or in the lyknes with sum other spreit,
Lyke as the spreit of Samuell, I gess,
Raysit to Kyng Saul was by the Phitones?
I will nocht say all Virgill beyn als trew
Bot at syk thyngis ar possibill this I schew,
Als in tha days war ma illusionys
By dewillich warkis and coniurations
Than now thar beyn, . . .

(I, Prol., 207-17)

At that point Douglas was still perplexed by the question how he might on a literal level explain Aeneas' descent into the underworld, but when he writes Prologue VI he has come to recognize this issue as irrelevant. The important question is not how Aeneas gets into the underworld but why Virgil introduces this episode at all, and to this question Douglas finds his own answer in Prologue VI. In explaining to his readers that Virgil's Book VI is a disguised vision of the Christian afterlife, Douglas also comes to terms with this troubling Book himself. He is thus in a position parallel to those of both Anchises and Aeneas, both explaining and
comprehending. However, while Aeneas is strengthened by his vision of the future of Rome and while he passes through the ivory gate in a spirit of renewed certainty and confidence though well aware of the hardships yet to come, the narrator has not yet found the golden bough which will allow him, too, to ascend from the 'dym dongooun' (VI, Prol., 165) into which his dilemma has cast him. Even after his elaborate reinterpretation of Book VI as an allegory foreshadowing Christian doctrine, the narrator still feels the need to appeal to Mary for help:

```
The dym dongooun of Ditis till assailje,
Or in the lyknes this mysty poetry,
Help me, Mare; for certis, vail que vailje,
War at Pluto, I sal hym hunt of sty.
```

(VI, Prol., 165-68)

Having in Prologue VI achieved a theoretical though not yet a total integration of his artistic and religious impulses, in Prologue VII the narrator advances further in the process from a purely cognitive comprehension to the higher level of thorough knowing which corresponds to Aeneas' enlightenment. In the first part of Prologue VII, the narrator finds himself in a dark and hostile environment where conflicting forces—'Flaggis of fire, and mony felloun flaw, / Scharpe soppy of sleit and of the snypand snaw' (11.49-50)—contend for supremacy and simultaneously threaten to extinguish life itself, just as the conflict within himself had compromised the progress of his creative work. However, the barren winter landscape and the calamitous disorder in nature only spur man on to greater providence in sustaining life, so that even under the harsh conditions of winter, life can continue:
The narrator's vision of the winter landscape thus ends on a hopeful note. Images of the Nativity—the shepherds; the mule and ox in the stable; the life-sustaining force of providence (human or divine)—hint at the continuation and, indeed, regeneration which will succeed the barrenness and death-like conditions of the winter landscape outside and of the inner state of the narrator himself. In unison with these examples of human and divine ways to ensure continuance, in the following autobiographical sketch the narrator returns to his 'lettron' (1.143) and 'hynt a pen in hand, / Fortil perform the poet grave and sad, / Quham sa fer furth or than begun I had' (11.144-6). As Alicia Nitecki observes, "Through [the shepherds'] governance, 'Fed tuskyt barys and fat swyne in sty, / Sustenyt war' (82). Through Douglas' governance the collective culture is preserved against time, decay, destruction." At the same time, Douglas finally resolves the dilemma of his moral and artistic impulses in establishing the correspondence between the Creator and the 'makar' by indicating the parallelism between the regeneration resulting from the Incarnation and the renewed life given to one of the pinnacles of the "collective culture" by re-creating it in another language and thus extending its vitality into a further cultural sub-group. In subsequent Prologues, this correspondence between God the Father (or God the Creator) and the literary artist is going to be developed further, but here the
initial perception of the existence of such a parallelism is already enough to allow the narrator to escape from his inner wasteland and to continue 'our wark' (1.156) after it had been left 'in the myre' (1.156) for a considerable time.

If Douglas's dating of some of the Prologues is to be taken at face value, the resolution of the inner conflict causes his work to proceed at a much faster pace from here on. Prologue V begins with a spring setting; then more than half a year elapses before Prologue VII is written, set on 'the thrird morn' in Capricorn (VII, Prol., 7-8), that is, Christmas Eve 1512; Prologue VIII follows in Lent, which in 1513 fell particularly early, covering the second half of February and most of March; soon afterwards, in May and late June 1513, Prologues XII and XIII are written, while the entire work is completed on 22 July, 'the fest of Mary Magdelan,' 1513 (Time, Space & Date, 2-4), just eighteen months after its inception (Time, Space & Date, 12). In other words, writing the first six Prologues and Books took Douglas almost an entire year, from January to early December 1512, while he composed the remaining seven Prologues and Books in only seven months. Once he has found a solution to the problem of the perceived clash between his artistic and scholarly interests and his religious calling, the narrator experiences the same renewal of his powers as does Aeneas in consequence of the interview with Anchises in Book VI. Both are now ready to complete the home-coming—Aeneas in order to resurrect Troy in Rome, and the translator-narrator in order to restore Virgil and his text in English.

In the eighth Prologue and Book, the narrator and Aeneas each have a dream vision, which in very different ways confirm their purposes and
strengthen their commitment. Whereas Aeneas' dream is an unambiguous oraculum in which the benevolent river god Tiberinus gives clear directions for action and prophesies positive events, the narrator's visio is disturbing, with a hostile dream figure mocking the dreamer's ambitions and questioning the value of his undertaking. Nonetheless, both dreams increase the dreamers' chances of success. In consequence of the oraculum Aeneas finds new allies among the Arcadians and Etruscans, and the dreamer-narrator is confirmed in his belief in the inherent value of literature as a good which transcends considerations of the material world. At the end of Book VIII, Aeneas sees the course of Roman history depicted on his new shield, not knowing the world shown in this work of Vulcan's art, but rejoicing in its sight and being buoyed by its implied promise. Douglas ends the Prologue with an analogous idea, namely, that art, in this case literature, is the only available remedy, both for the ills of the world and for the dreamer's personal troubles:

quhen I saw nane other bute,
   I sprent spedely on fute,
And vndre a tre rute
   Begouth this aucht buke.

(VIII, Prol., 179-82)

The eighth Prologue and Book thus come at a critical juncture, completing the process begun in the sixth Prologue and Book. Both Aeneas and the narrator are now poised for the conquest, having gone through the enlightening process of cognitive preparation in Book VI and Prologues VI and VII and taking the first practical steps (in Prologue VIII and the surrounding Books VII and VIII) towards the fulfilment of their tasks.

Prologue IX confirms this view of literature as the only cure for a
corrupt world. While the initial three stanzas extol virtue and honesty, Douglas soon rejects such explicit moralizing—"Eneuch of this, ws nedis prech na mor' (1.19)—as no more effective than the ranting of the 'selcouth seg,' the dream figure in Prologue VIII. In contrast to the 'seg,' who displayed a total disregard for both his audience and his method, the narrator now analyzes literary style in relation to subject matter and audience. Since I have already discussed the implications of the shift from the stanzaic to the couplet section at greater length in chapter IV, it will here suffice to say that in his discussion of the 'ryall style, clepyt heroycall' (1.21), Douglas develops a method towards an effective communication of ethical values which leaves both previously demonstrated methods far behind. The conclusion to be drawn from Douglas's expose on style is that if a writer harmonizes his style and subject matter with his intended audience, then the values he wishes to convey are likely to be received and the work of literature can function as a 'bute,' thus further legitimizing the role of the literary artist about which Douglas clearly no longer has any doubts.

However, Prologue IX not only develops a point raised in Prologue VIII, but also opens the discussion of a larger group of topics. While Virgil uses Books IX to XII to show the war in Latium from a wide range of angles and viewpoints as well as to display the many outstanding qualities of Aeneas in his various capacities as statesman, ambassador, negotiator, religious leader, general, warrior, parent, friend and ally, Douglas offers an examination of various aspects of the "making" of poetry in the accompanying Prologues. Apart from considering subject matter, style and purpose, these Prologues also redefine the translator-narrator's
From the discussion of literary appropriateness, harmony and unity in Prologue IX, the narrator proceeds in Prologue X to a consideration of the artist's need for divine inspiration. In contrast to the apprehensive tone of his earlier pleas for divine guidance, he now no longer perceives any spiritual danger in his work. On the contrary, having in Prologue VII tentatively implied a parallelism between the Creator and the 'makar,' the narrator now celebrates the beauty, order, harmony and diversity of Creation in terms which suggest that he looks at nature as if it were a work of art—a series of miniatures in a Book of Hours, for example, which depict nature at different seasons and at different times of day. The narrator's earlier images of God the Father as the 'prync of poetis' (I, Prol., 452) and of Christ as 'that hevynly Orpheus' (I, Prol., 469) are here re-applied to God the Creator as the supreme artist, whose Creation is informed by His own perfection and by the harmony of the Tri-unity. In this Prologue Douglas draws new strength from his meditation on the mystery of divine love, but it also becomes perfectly clear to him that all art must be inspired by the artist's desire for harmony with his Creator. Even though the translator-narrator will continue to follow the letter of Virgil's text, he will do so in a different spirit and to a different purpose than his 'autour' (1.155). That such an adaptation is possible without changing the surface texture of the work, Douglas demonstrates in "re-applying to the Christian God phrases and epithets which Virgil had used of Jupiter" at the beginning of the directly following tenth Book.

In Prologue XI, Douglas's reinterpretation of the Aeneid according to
Christian principles becomes, in consequence, more overt than ever before. The whole of the *Aeneid* is here transformed into an allegory of the struggle which the Christian faces every day. The believer, just like the truly chivalrous warrior, must apply the four cardinal virtues in his daily battle against the temptations of the Flesh, the World and the 'aduersar principall' (1. 97); his conduct, like that of the knight in war, must be based on justice (11. 17-24) and must be characterized by fortitude (1. 33), which itself must lack neither prudence (11. 37-8) nor temperance (11. 41-44). However, in order to succeed in his struggle, the believer also requires the three theological virtues, which are here referred to in metaphors taken from the military sphere appropriate to the context of the ongoing account of the wars in Latium. The Christian must

Rayss hie the targe of faith vp in [his] hand,  
On hed the halsum helm of hoip onlace,  
In cheryte [his] body all embrace  

(XI, Prol., 101-3)

Equipped with the shield of faith, the helmet of Hope, and the corslet of Charity, he only needs the additional sword of devotion (1. 104) to defend himself against the onslaughts of the Adversary.

Given this kind of introduction, Aeneas' protracted battle in Latium must come to be seen by the reader as analogous with his own continuous spiritual warfare, with the result that at least the succeeding Books XI and XII will be read on both the literal and the allegorical level. This interpretation is further strengthened by the opening scene of Book XI, where Aeneas is shown in his capacity as a devout religious leader, discharging first his duty to the gods, albeit after his 'payane gyss,' before he attends to his other, civic and military concerns. However,
while Aeneas is on one level the allegorical equivalent of the struggling Christian, he is on another level also the allegorical equivalent of Christ, for it is Aeneas who leads his select company of faithful followers across the water to their promised homeland. The final three stanzas, with their parallelism between the 'temporal ryng' (1. 182) which Aeneas strives to win and 'the kynryk ay lestyng' (1. 183) and their juxtaposition of the Trojans' 'fatale cuntre of behest' (1. 178) with 'that realm . . ./ The quhilk was hecht till Abraham and hys seyd' (1. 199), link Aeneas' leading the Trojans to Ausonia with Moses' leading the Israelites to the Promised Land and thus, in line with the typological reading of the Old Testament, with Christ's making it again possible for man to reach 'that realm . . ./ The quhilk was hecht till Abraham and hys seyd' (11.198-9). What the narrator had theoretically indicated in Prologue X becomes practical fact in Prologue XI: the subject of the Aeneid is now proper Christian conduct and no longer the justification and celebration of the Roman Julian line leading up to Augustus; the work has become a kind of "Pilgrim's Progress," holding Aeneas up as a spiritual model for the Christian reader to follow.

Having thus re-examined his style, reconsidered his source of inspiration and redefined his purpose and subject matter, the narrator begins Prologue XII in an entirely new spirit, freed from the strain which the unresolved conflict between his artistic and moral leanings had previously placed on him. As he had done in Prologues VI and VII, the narrator repeats in Prologue XI the insights won in Prologue X but presents them in an imaginatively transformed manner, praising his Maker in poetic images rather than in theological discourse. Indeed, after the
redirection in style, purpose, and subject matter, and the recognition of what is for him the only acceptable source of inspiration, the narrator now perceives the two impulses of art and religion to be in such harmony that the writing of secular poetry can proceed with the priest’s blessing:

I irkyt of my bed, and mycht not ly,
Bot gan me blyss, syne in my wedis dress,
And, for it was ayr morow, or tyme of mess,
I hynt a scriptour and my pen furth tuke,
Syne thus begouth of Virgill the twelt buke.

(XII, Prol., 302-6)

Given the doubtlessly intended pun in 'mess' on "a meal" and "Mass," the writing of secular poetry may now even be regarded as an entirely appropriate preparation for Mass, as long as it is in harmony with the Christian faith. Prologue XII thus constitutes an application of the issues explicitly raised in Prologues VIII and theoretically considered in Prologues IX to XI. Having come to terms with the problems he faced as an artist, the narrator presents an autobiographical sketch again, depicting himself as a man who rejoices in the purity of the May morning and who draws from that scene the inspiration which will allow him to bring his long labour to its completion. At the end of Prologue XII, the poet-translator’s recognition of the harmony between art and Creation has renewed his creative energy so that he is eager to translate Virgil’s final Book. Different as they are, the twelfth Prologue and Book both end with a victory: that of Aeneas over his opponent and over war itself, and that of the narrator over his disruptive inner conflicts; but given the reinterpretation of the *Aeneid* provided in Prologue XI, both these victories are directly based on the triumph of the Son celebrated in the
main part of Prologue XII as the triumph of the sun over darkness.

Completing the series, Prologue XIII combines thematic, structural and formal elements from most of the preceding Prologues in a masterpiece of unification. Framed by a counterpart to the preceding two season descriptions in Prologues VII and XII, the central section of Prologue XIII repeats the dream-vision form already employed in Prologue VIII, but redirects the satiric thrust from the social to the literary sphere. Thematically, this central section recalls the discussions of the value of secular poetry in Prologues I, III, VI, and IX, and provides definitive answers to the questions and uncertainties which had troubled the narrator in Prologues III, V and VII. The thirteenth Prologue thus serves as a capstone, completing and further heightening the structure. What still remains to be done—the translation of Maphaeus’ supplement—will occupy the dreamer-narrator for but a short fortnight. By the end of Prologue XIII, the poet-translator has essentially finished his work; for Douglas as for Aeneas, the struggle is over, and the battle won. As Lois Ebin observes,

the two struggles, the effort of the poet to produce a worthy poem and the journey of Aeneas to fulfill his destiny and found Rome, define different aspects of the quest for honor and virtue which Douglas introduces in the Palace of Honour as the highest goal of man in the world [PH, 1972-2007]. [...] In its consideration of the relation of the poet’s activity to his conflicts as a Christian, the narrator’s examination of the good poet and the value of poetry in the thirteen prologues become [sic] the artistic counterpart of Eneas’ realization of the good man.16

Aeneas has not only found the elusive homeland and, by fighting a war to
end war, won Latium for a new nation, but he himself has grown from a mere hero into a good man, who is commended for his caritas and pietas, and into a model prince, who has to endure the loss of his king, his home, his wife, his friends and comrades, his father and, finally, his lover, while guiding his people and nurturing the new nation. In a parallel double quest, Douglas has not only recreated the whole of Virgil’s Aeneid in ‘Scottis,’ which he had to temper in such a way that it would become elastic and flexible enough to follow Virgil’s verse, but he has also defined and justified his stance as a poet and translator and defended the value of literature as art.
Notes

1 III, Prol., 37-45, and Exclamation, 1-6; a related image occurs in the Direction (11.104-5), where Douglas compares his labour to wading through the deep sea shrouded in mist.

2 Ebin, "The Role of the Narrator," p.353.

3 In the first half, the narrator invokes God four times (I, Prol., 452-59; II, Prol., 7; III, Prol., 8; V, Prol., 60-68) and Mary three times (I, Prol., 459-70; III, Prol., 42; VI, Prol., 167), whereas in the second half, he only invokes God once, in X, Prol., 146-50.

4 However, this problem is a perennial one; at the end of the sixteenth century, Sidney still argued the same point in his Defence of Poetry.

5 Coldwell’s statement that Douglas claims he “would have done better if he had not been limited by the existing text” seems to misinterpret Douglas’s lines (Selections from Gavin Douglas, p.xv). Far from viewing Virgil’s text as a hindrance as Coldwell implies, Douglas points out that an accurate translator must exercise great discipline and restraint in order to be true to the original.

6 I certainly do not mean to suggest that Chaucer, for example, was not a conscious artist or saw himself as merely a court entertainer. The distinction is rather that Chaucer does not need to emphasize his artistry, while Douglas very emphatically wishes to be seen by others as a conscious artist. Chaucer seems to take his art for granted, whereas Douglas makes it an issue.


8 In Gower’s account of this incident (CA, I, 1077-1128), Aeneas and Antenor’s treachery consists of accepting “yiftes grete / Of gold” (11.1100-1) in return for persuading Priam to agree to a peace treaty which they know to be false. According to Lydgate, however, Aeneas and Anchises (together with Antenor) are so eager to save their own lives that they at length persuade Priam to agree to a false peace treaty in which the Greeks promise to lift the siege in return for nearly all the gold and treasure of Troy. Antenor alone later hands over the Palladion to the Greeks in order to take revenge for his banishment from Troy which Aeneas had procured (TB, IV, 4531-5832).

9 Chaucer is far more outspoken in his criticism of Aeneas, accusing him of unnatural treachery (HF, 293-95), of falsehood (LGW, 1234-36), of fickleness (LGW, 1285-87), and of jilting Dido for Lavinia (LGW, 1326-30). Gower, on the other hand, includes the Dido-and-Aeneas story in his Confessio Amantis as an exemplum illustrating the vice of Sloth in love (CA, IV, 77-146). There is no mention of treachery; Aeneas is only
criticized for being 'slow' (l.137).

10 Penelope Schott Starkey, "Gavin Douglas's Eneados: Dilemmas in the Nature Prologues," Studies in Scottish Literature, II (1973/74), 87, interprets the Y-formation of the cranes, which the narrator sees at the end of Prologue VII, as his golden bough.


12 This date, however, seems unrealistic, since Douglas as provost of the important collegiate church of St Giles, Edinburgh, would have been unlikely to have had time and leisure for writing poetry just before a busy day as Christmas.

13 In 1513, Easter fell on 27 March, so that Lent would have begun on 16 February.

14 Ebin, "The Role of the Narrator," pp.358, 360.


16 Ebin, "The Role of the Narrator," p.363.
Conclusion

Having translated the last word of the thirteenth Book, Douglas seems to find it difficult to take his leave of the work which had occupied him for the preceding year and a half. In four additional passages of verse, the Conclusion, the Direction, the Exclamation against Detractors, and the section entitled Time, Space and Date, Douglas reviews his position as a poet, translator and scholar. He writes as a man who is anxious that his work be properly appreciated and who fears, more than anything else, that it might be tampered with. His envoy, addressed to the book itself, sums up Douglas’s attitude towards his work:

Go, wligar Virgill, to evey 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 evey gentill Scot be kend,  
And to onletterit folk be red on hight,  
That erst was bot with clerkis comprehend.  

(Exclamation, 37-45)

Virgil remains Virgil, regardless of whether he be read in the original Latin or in Douglas’s ‘wligar’ translation—there is not the slightest doubt in Douglas’s mind that he has done justice to his ‘autour,’ and he is certain that the courtesy which he extends to his courtly readers will not be mistaken for anything but a formula; critics, on the other hand, whom he more commonly calls fault-finders or backbiters, will have no reasonable cause for complaint, for Douglas is sure that he has served Virgil well and that his own work constitutes a highly meritorious achievement. This claim is partly based on the quality of the
translation, and partly on the increased accessibility of the *Aeneid* resulting from its translation into 'Scottis.' While only trained scholars had previously been able to read Virgil and, it is understood, to profit from such a reading, the work is now available to all, lettered and unlettered, lay and learned alike. At least theoretically, there are thus no longer any limits to where Virgil, now 'wlgar,' might 'go.' Indeed, while the above passage refers exclusively to a Scottish audience, Douglas elsewhere envisions an even wider one:

Throw owt the ile yclepit Albyon  
Red sall I be, and sung with mony one.  

(Conclusion, 11-12)

These two lines also bring Douglas's conviction of the durability of his own fame into even clearer focus.

To a large extent, Douglas is justified in his claim to lasting renown. He has created a genuine translation, not an adaptation, of an outstanding work of classical antiquity. Judged by any standards, the quality of this translation is high, not only because of its general accuracy, but also because of its own merits as a work of literature. It is true that Douglas occasionally alters the flavour of Virgilian passages, especially those which describe vigorous action, but changes of this kind are due to a particular perception of Virgil rather than to any lack of competence on the part of the translator. Douglas simply does not seem to have been aware of any essential difference between the civilization of imperial Rome and that of early sixteenth-century Scotland. As a result, he often makes specific what Virgil leaves vague or ambiguous, he actualizes and concretizes what Virgil leaves remote and
abstract, and he "modernizes" and "Scotticizes" what seems archaic or alien in Virgil.

A more serious intervention is that he also Christianizes Virgil, but this difference in the underlying philosophy rarely affects the translation itself. On the contrary, since Douglas sees Virgil not only as a poet of peerless excellence but also as a sage philosopher and theologian foreshadowing Christian doctrine, he treats Virgil's work with the greatest respect and regards its integrity as inviolable. While the religious rites described in the epic often gain intensity in Douglas's translation, they are not consciously transformed into Christian rituals. However, although the translation of the Books of the *Aeneid* remains largely unaffected by the translator's religious and moral stance, the series of Prologues introducing the individual Books presents a reading of the work as a Christian allegory. In this re-interpretation, Aeneas not only appears as the good man and model prince, but he also represents the Christian believer in his continuous struggle against the powers of darkness, and he furthermore comes to be a type of Christ Himself, leading his people home to the land promised by divine revelation. The series of the Prologues thus transvalues the *Aeneid* by re-interpreting its common archetypes as foreshadowings of Christian teaching.

While the Prologues in one respect constitute a "reader's guide" to the *Aeneid*, they also serve as a platform for Douglas to expound his theoretical approach to the genre of translation, to discuss the principles and methods which he intends to apply in his own translation of the particular work, and to examine the shortcomings of earlier treatments of the *Aeneid* in English. Douglas's main guiding principle is the demand
for utmost accuracy in every respect, from precision in the word choice all the way to fidelity in the rendering of the philosophical and ideological position of the original author as it is reflected in the work itself. This demand, however, involves Douglas in a contradiction in which his two roles as poet-scholar and as churchman seem to make mutually exclusive claims, for the Christian in Douglas is exhorted to place his artistic talents in the service of his faith, while the scholar wishes to be as accurate as possible in making the work of Virgil, although a pagan writer, accessible to the widest audience. In the first half of the series, Douglas still seems to labour under the perception of a clash between these two impulses, but in a process parallel to the tempering which Aeneas undergoes as a result of his trials and sufferings, the narrator also gradually resolves the seeming conflict and emerges strengthened in the awareness that the two roles of the poet and priest can be complementary even when the poet’s material is non-Christian. While the Books narrate Aeneas’ double journey—the physical one from the ruined Troy to the site of the future Rome, and the psychological one in which his private and public virtues are tested and strengthened—the Prologues reflect this movement in a similar progress of the narrator and poet-translator, who also undertakes a successful quest, in this case for a new approach to translation; like Aeneas, the narrator also resolves the conflicts inherent in his dual role and in the process lays the theoretical foundations for his undertaking by examining its value and its methods. In the course of this parallel progress, both Aeneas and the narrator of the Prologues have been tempered and emerge victorious from their trials.
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