

An Emendation of the First Book of Vergil's *Aeneid* by the Poet Arituneus Mizuno

ARITSUNE MIZUNO

In the history of the Latin Poetry no poet has ever attempted what I attempt here. This is partly because there have been probably since the 5th century after Christ, very few, or possibly no one, who could recite Latin poems correctly or 'quantitatively' (those verses are prosodically called 'quantitative' which are based on the syllabic quantity); partly because readers continued seeing in *Aeneid* only what Vergil meant as a poetical thinker, and took little care for the aesthetical level of its music, which was apprehensible only when correctly recited. Being however one of such a few reciters of Latin Poetry who have quite recently and for the first time been born anywhere in the whole world since the collapse of the Roman Empire, I evaluate *Aeneid* always heeding in what sense it can be called a musical work, always concerned with how elaborate it is as such. I hardly trust what has very often been said of 'Vergil's musical art', as though it were divinely splendid, by many past Latinists, whose Latin pronunciation I have many reasons to mistrust entirely. And to my deep regret Vergil's musical art is, it's true to say, too rough, too crude, too seriously wounded to be cured by means of an ordinary remedy. *Aeneid*, if desirous to keep its high esteem, should be rewritten, with its noble sense untouched, with the sense of almost all its words unaltered—difficult as such a preservation of the

meaning is —, only by making its rhythm smoother, lighter and wittier. This is in fact nothing but an ‘Ovidianization’ of *Aeneid*, as it were, which is just that kind of conversion of one style into its contrary which might seem to common people to be among the most difficult procedures. It is only a poet who can fulfil this task, these mysterious requirements. Of things mysterious nothing is possible but the mere enumeration of the poet’s achievements such as are seen in his present work, namely :

- (1) Vergil elides a great deal of important and significant words (256 words in all). Such excessive and heavy elisions I have succeeded in reducing to no more than 10. I have also entirely eliminated the inellegant elisions of ‘-ne’, ‘-ue’, ‘siue’, ‘iam’, ‘nam’, ‘tam’, ‘tu’ and all the other pronouns. The other small words I have elided, strictly restraining myself, are as follows: ‘-que’ (67 times), ‘neque’ (3 times), ‘atque’ (16 times), ‘namque’ (twice), ‘ante’ (once). I assert that such a consciousness of one’s own skill in versification might be searched for in Vergil in vain. — Besides, the fairly ubiquitous doctrine, so far as I can hitherto see, is not altogether true: namely, that the 2nd-foot diaeresis, whether there is an elision just here or not, has turned out to be characteristic of *Aeneid*’s metre.
- (2) Dactyls, as far as possible, were preferred to spondees, which I generally strove to reject. My way of word selection and word disposition, as well as the above-mentioned smoothness of the verses on account of the utmost paucity of elisions, has naturally resulted in making the poem quite similar to the Ovidian famous epic: hence a marvellous metamorphosis of a Vergilian into an Ovidian, as I anticipatively pointed out.

Therefore, while in Vergil's *Aeneid* (Book I) the average number of dactyls in every line is 2.73, in my emended *Aeneid* it comes to as high as to 3.45 : thus my new poem contains at least no fewer dactyls than Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (e.g. the story of 'Iphis' written in this epic contains 3.29 dactyls on an average). Nay, in many other aspects *my Aeneid* has evidently got more of the Ovidian character than Ovid's own *Metamorphoses* : furthermore, although it keeps in some of the Vergilian traces clearly uneffacted, it is yet, on the whole, far from being a Vergilian poem. Cf. the Table II and the Table III on pp. 14 — 16. — Consequently, Vergil's celebrated *Aeneid*, though sparingly besprinkled with exquisite lines (about 50 lines at best scattered in the whole that consists of more than 750 lines), really ought to be regarded as nothing but an overestimated work of the Classical Latin Poetry during its maturation process. However, its high esteem still awaits some ingenious emendator. Its cry for succour, which (alas !) has been uttered in isolation too long, could not be heard by mortals for long.

In short, which *Aeneid* will people after 5,000 years read with more delight and applause, Vergil's or mine ?

CORRIGENDA (正 誤 表)

(I) ubi scribitur Latine (ラテン語本文で)

p. 14, l. 5: leuioremque (non: leuioremque)

p. 24, l. 24: in-sti-tutis (non: ins-ti-tutis)

p. 27, l. 17: Maronis (non: Maronem)

(II) in summario Anglice scripto (英文要約で)

p. 8, l. 10: collapse (non: collaspe)

p. 9, l. 10: inelegant (non: ineligant)

ARITVNEVS MIZVNO

水 野 有 庸