NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

M.A. THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE SCHOOL OF
GRADUATE STUDIES
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

THE DEATH OF TURNUS IN THE AENEID

BY
MARIO ERASMO
UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF
DR. JOHN YARDLEY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

ISBN 0-315-60620-7

UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

I am no Homers Hero you all know
I profess not Generosity to a Foe
My Generosity is to my Friends
That for their Friendship I may make amends
The Generous to Enemies promotes their Ends
And becomes the Enemy & Betrayer of his Friends

William Blake

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

The death of Turnus and the abrupt ending of the Aeneid have led to a divergence of views in recent Vergilian scholarship on whether or not the episode and, by extension, the epic itself should be considered "pro-Augustan" or "anti-Augustan". The association which is often made between Aeneas and Augustus has determined, to a large extent, that any "political" interpretation of Book 12 must reconcile Aeneas' character with his killing of Turnus, and must assess the degree of sympathy with which his death is presented. In other words, an understanding of Turnus' death would seem to be dependent upon two considerations: firstly, the extent to which contemporary persons and elements, in particular Augustus' propaganda of imperial virtues, are reflected in Book 12 and, secondly, the relevance of Turnus' death to the structure of the poem as a whole.

Before these considerations can be examined, the biases of the terms "propaganda" and "Augustan", which have determined the direction in which Turnus' death has been approached, must be identified. The Latin verb *propagare* can mean to procreate in a

physical sense or to extend, enlarge, and spread in a figurative sense.[1] The negative connotations of the term "propaganda" today make a positive or neutral rendering of the term impossible, because of the ideological programmes of the Second World War and the subsequent Cold War. Consequently, the term should be used with extreme caution in reference to the literature produced under Augustus. Modern connotations may distort the actual circumstances affecting the creative process of a writer, and also the circumstances surrounding the dissemination of either thought or information.

What has resulted in Vergilian scholarship, particularly in studies of the Aeneid, is the tendency to regard Vergil's poetry as either "pro-Augustan" or "anti-Augustan" because of his relationship with Maecenas and Augustus. For example, S. Farron argues that the death of Turnus must be "anti-Augustan" since he does not find it either "pro-Augustan" or "pro-Roman" propaganda.[2] H.H. Scullard, on the other hand, finds that all is Roman and virtuous in the Aeneid, and therefore concludes that Vergil is an "evangelist" of Augustus and his rule.[3] These two examples illustrate the danger of viewing the Aeneid as a form of propaganda used to express a single "message" since this approach may preclude gradations between the two extremes, and prevent a reader from considering the poem in a more neutral light. A discussion of the relationship between Vergil and certain aspects

of Augustus' promotion of the Imperial virtues or qualities, which will be examined in Chapter 2, will clarify the extent to which this evidence may be used for an interpretation of Turnus' death.

The term "Augustan" also leads to misconceptions when applied to any art form, especially literature, created under Augustus. The political overtones of the term are difficult to suppress. For example, as with the expressions "Elizabethan" and "Victorian", "Augustan" might imply a direct correspondence between Vergil and the political aims and ideals associated with Augustus. The vagueness of the term also leads to ambiguity, for it at once refers to the period, to contemporaries of Augustus, and to the political and moral climate of the day. In order to avoid such ambiguity, the expression will not be used in the thesis.

It has been argued that the atmosphere in which Vergil wrote was restrictive because of the pressure exerted by Augustus for straightforward panegyric. Thus, F. Sforza, in an early article, claims: "Under Augustus a rigid censorship reigned over all literary productions. Authors were not always free to select their own subjects" (1935, p. 100).[4] Later he states that Vergil could not refuse to write the "Augusteid" when approached a second time by Augustus, since "The consequences of a fresh refusal might have been disagreeable. The example of Ovid was

there to tell how dear it cost to displease the master" (1935, p. 100). General points in Sforza's argument must be qualified. Firstly, and most obviously, Vergil could not have learnt from Ovid's example since Vergil died in 19 B.C. and Ovid was exiled in A.D. 8. Secondly, with regard to censorship, and Augustus' "selection of the poets' subjects", there is evidence in Horace to suggest that Augustus was not satisfied with the Aeneid. Horace, in the First Book of the Epistles, asks an officer on the staff of Tiberius on his Eastern campaign: *Quis sibi Res Gestas Augusti scribere sumit?* (1.3.7). It seems that after Vergil's death, Augustus' pressure to have his achievements glorified may have become more direct, but as Griffin states: "The question has almost a look of desperation or perhaps of levity" (Oxford, 1984, pp. 214, 215). Suetonius' description of Augustus' interest in literature reveals a desire for quality and not, as Sforza maintains, control:

> *Ingenia saeculi sui omnibus modis fovit. Recitantis et benigne et patienter audiit, nec tantum carmina et historias, sed et orationes et dialogos. Componi tamen aliquid de se nisi et serio et a praestantissimis offendebatur, admonebatque praetores ne paterentur nomen suum commissionibus obsolefieri* (Aug., 89.3).

A brief analysis of the social context of Vergil's relationship with Augustus will identify further misconceptions in Vergilian scholarship which result from a misunderstanding of the terms *patronus* and *amicus*. Since the aim of this thesis is

to examine "political" interpretations of Turnus' death, and not the broader topic of the social background of the Aeneid, a definition of these terms will suffice to demonstrate that an interpretation of Vergil's aims in writing the Aeneid cannot be inferred solely on the basis of Vergil's relationship with Augustus.

When the expression "literary patronage" is applied to ancient literature, one must always be aware that modern connotations may be introduced. The danger inherent in the modern sense of the term propaganda is stressed by Peter White: "Once patronage is conceived as a more or less deliberate policy of encouraging literature and art, it is readily seen as an instrument of broader schemes."[5] The concept of literary patronage recalls the patron-poet relationship of 18th century England and the obligations of poets laureate. It could be argued further that the concept of patronage recalls the system of political party patronage of writers which existed during Queen Anne's reign (cf. Lieder, 1951, p. 395). The creation of poems and pamphlets in support of either the Whigs or the Tories, depending on which party was in power, often ensured the writer the patronage of the party. The form of this patronage could be a government appointment, "to some pleasant office, under the government, that involved a good salary and very little work" (Lieder, p. 395). It is easy to see how such concepts of the

patronage system of 18th century England could affect the way ancient literary patronage is viewed.

Although the Latin term *patronus* is used in descriptions of certain social relationships throughout the late Republic and early Principate, there is nothing in the word to suggest that there existed the sort of relationship imposed by the system of patronage operating in more modern societies. *Patronus*, when it is not used in its technical legal sense, refers to a political figure who supports a *cliens* in return for political or public support. It is never used to describe a man who supports or encourages a poet (P. White, 1978, p. 79). Therefore, the concept of modern literary patronage introduces political connotations which are not suitable for the social context of the term in Latin. The words patron and patronage themselves should, therefore, be used with caution in discussions of Vergil, since modern connotations and social practices may introduce anachronistic elements which were foreign to the experiences and vocabulary of that author.

The Latin *amicus* is more flexible and informal than *patronus vis-à-vis* the types of relationships to which it can refer. Although intimacy may have been possible in a *patronus-cliens* relationship, it is more plausible in the more flexible relationship between *amici*, which may also have included some degree of intimacy between persons of unequal social position.[6]

This friendship, as it occurred in senatorial circles in the late Republic, may be a political or social alliance or even an ordinary private friendship.[7] The exchange of *beneficia* and *officia* was a usual feature of *amicitia* (cf. Cicero, *De Officiis*, 1.62; Seneca, *De Beneficiis*, 1.5.5), and Suetonius claims that Augustus honoured his *amici* by the standard *beneficium* of visiting them when they were ill (Aug. 53). With regard to the *amicitia* expected by the emperor, however, Millar warns that: "...'friendship' with the emperor involved a complex of undefined relationships, with privileges and dangers which were both essentially dependent on the character or passing whim of the emperor himself. In the early period, we can still see some traces of the pattern of mutual obligations which characterized *amicitia* in Roman society" (1977, pp. 111, 112). The "dangers" which Millar warns of actually were slow to evolve, and developed as Roman society moved from the Republic to the Principate. The "patronage" of the emperor is placed in the context of poetry by White: "...the literary relationships of the emperor seem no less distinct from those of other *principes viri* than their political and social relationships" (1978, p. 74).

Examples of *beneficia* and *officia* abound in the letters of Pliny, which shed light on the duties expected from and reciprocally granted to friends. For example, with respect to

monetary "favours". Pliny raised a friend's social position by giving him money (1:19), he freed a certain Calvina of the debts which her father owed to him (2:4), and gave a friend money for his daughter's dowry (6:32). With regard to social services, Pliny helped a friend with a property purchase (1:24), nominated a friend to a tribuneship (2:9), and sent a valued freedman abroad in search of better health (5:19). Radice says of *amicitia* that: "...for services rendered and kindness bestowed, the giver had every right to expect in return society's approbation and a suitable gratitude in the recipient." (1963, p. 23). This interpretation finds expression in Pliny's letter to Priscus: *Et tu occasiones obligandi me avidissime amplecteris, et ego nemini libentius debeo* (2.13, 1-2).

Although no evidence survives, there is no reason to assume that the relationship between Vergil and Augustus was markedly different from the relationship between Horace and Augustus. That the relationship between Vergil and Augustus should be approached from the notion of private friendship between *amici* is signalled by Horace who refers to Maecenas not as a *patronus* but as an *amicus* (*Sermones*, 1.6.66). It is important to note that although Horace praised Maecenas and Augustus and received financial support from them, it seems that his poetry was personal and he himself remained independent. Indeed, that he did not feel pressured by them to do whatever they asked is

demonstrated by his claim that he refused to visit Maecenas at the time he requested (Epist., 1.7). Suetonius also tells us that he declined Augustus' request that he become his private secretary and preserves the unperturbed reaction of Augustus: *Ac ne recusanti quidem aut suscensuit quicquam aut amicitiem suam ingerere desiit* (Vita Horatii, Loeb. p.486). Suetonius further claims that their "friendship" was fairly informal, as Augustus' playful statement confirms: *Neque enim si tu superbus amicitiam nostram sprevisti, ideo nos quoque* ἀνυπερηφανοῦμεν (Vita Horatii, Loeb.p. 486). Given this social context for Horace, it seems unlikely Vergil was "forced" to praise Augustus or that he was restricted artistically.

Martial claims that leisure time, provided by financial support, was needed by a poet to create poetry (1.107.3-8), but there is no suggestion that his *amicus* will be praised by him for giving him money. If the attitude of Martial towards some of his *amici* is any indication, money seems to have played a small role in terms of the praise the one expected and the other gave. In fact, Martial chides Rufus for not providing even the most basic gifts (6.82; 9.88), and another for not offering him due respect (10.15). Therefore, it would seem that the view that the Aeneid must be "pro-Augustan" since Augustus was the "patron" of Vergil cannot be substantiated simply on the basis of the regular gift-giving feature between *amici*. The probable informality of the

friendship between Augustus and the poets as illustrated by the example of Horace also argues for the artistic freedom of Vergil.

The above analyses of the social and "political" background to Vergil's writing of the Aeneid should eliminate any historical misconceptions or generalizations of linguistic terms which could hinder an objective approach to Turnus' death. A brief outline of this paper's scope and chapter contents will indicate how the problem of Turnus' death will be approached.

The present thesis will analyse, firstly, the death of Turnus with respect to those elements in Book 12 which may refer to contemporary events and persons, and, secondly, the relevance of Turnus' death to the poem as a whole. Chapter 1 will discuss the characters of Aeneas and Turnus from the point of view of Homeric precedents and possible references to either the character or historical role of Augustus and Antonius.

Chapter 2 will consider Turnus' death "externally" by examining the role of the Statesman's virtues in the propaganda of the late Republic, especially in the career of Julius Caesar. Possible allusions to contemporary events and Augustus' own propaganda of Statesman's virtues, in particular *pietas* and *clementia*, *vis-à-vis* the death of Turnus, will also be examined.

Chapter 3 will consider Turnus' death "internally" by returning the focus of his death to the poem itself, and examining whether or not Turnus' death serves a structural

purpose to the poem as a whole. An emphasis will be placed in chapter 3 on an analysis of literary precedents and the post-narrative of the poem in order that Turnus' death may be placed within a literary tradition. Apart from the brief analysis of *patronus* and *amicus* above, which identified the biases attached to these terms through modern connotations and contexts, the thesis will not be concerned with the broader problem of Vergil and "propaganda", but will concentrate only on those elements in Book 12 which are essential to a "political" interpretation of Turnus' death.

Chapter 1: The Identification of Aeneas and Augustus, Turnus and Antonius

The identification which is often made between Aeneas and Augustus has determined, to a large extent, that any "political" interpretation of Book 12 must reconcile Aeneas' character with his killing of Turnus. In order to address the problem of whether the ending of the Aeneid may be a criticism of Augustus, the characters of Aeneas and Turnus must be analysed with regard to literary precedents. If it can be demonstrated that there are elements in the characters of Aeneas and Turnus which are not found in the epic tradition then a reader must consider whether the identification which is made between Aeneas and Augustus and Turnus and Antonius is valid and whether it is used by Vergil to express a condemnation of Augustus.

Some recent critics of the Aeneid have examined the problem of the extent to which the character of Aeneas may "reflect" that of Augustus himself. As a result, discussions of Aeneas' character, which have centred upon possible allusions to Augustus, seem to be cautious with respect to the terms chosen to express the relationship between the two figures. Some scholars have argued that there is a direct correlation between the

character of Aeneas and Augustus. Thus Bloom: "Though no Achilles, Aeneas pragmatically is quite frightening, and really as benign as the Emperor Augustus, his contemporary model" (1987, p. 5). Pomathios also argues that Augustus served as a model for Aeneas: "...Énée rassemble en lui bien des traits, réels ou idealisés, du Prince" (1987, p. 243), a view shared by West, who considers Aeneas the "prototype" of Augustus (1974, p. 29). Gransden's view that the character of Aeneas is a "...prefiguration of Augustus at Actium" (1984, p. 206) seems to have been stated earlier by Quinn: "If the Aeneas of Book 4 suggested Julius Caesar or Mark Antony, the Aeneas of Book 12 points plainly to Augustus; and the portrait is hardly a flattering one" (1968, p. 54).

Another group of scholars also feels that there is some correlation between Aeneas and Augustus, but they express themselves in a less specific manner. Syme argues, "The poem is not an allegory: but no contemporary could fail to detect in Aeneas a foreshadowing of Augustus" (1939, pp. 462, 463). This view has been restated most recently by Cairns: "...the pair are only to be seen as analogues rather than equated. But any repeated attribute of Aeneas must to some extent have reflected on Augustus" (1989, p. 4). Camps has also suggested a parallel between certain elements of their characters : "It may be, therefore, that in outline, the character of Aeneas in the Aeneid

is in fact drawn from Virgil's conception of that of Octavian-Augustus" (1969, p. 143), a view shared by both Griffin, who calls Aeneas a "pattern" of Augustus (Oxford, 1984, p. 214), and Wistrand, who recognizes a "correspondence" between Aeneas and Augustus (1984, p. 195).

The association which is believed to exist between Turnus and Antonius seems to be based on two premises: firstly, since Aeneas is equated with Augustus, it follows that Turnus is to be equated with Antonius and, secondly, since Augustus was victorious at Actium, then the poem's ending must somehow allude to the elimination of Augustus' opponent (cf. Gransden, 1984, p. 206, and Otis, 1963, p. 317). Quinn has argued that the character of Turnus cannot be interpreted solely with reference to Antonius on the basis of perceived similarities between Aeneas and Augustus: "Any thoroughgoing equation between Aeneas and Augustus, or between the war through which Aeneas led his people and the civil war, is obviously impossible" (1968, p. 54).

Farron, however, suggests that Vergil intended the death of Turnus to be an overt criticism of the role played by Augustus in defeating Antonius: "So Aeneas' last act is the killing of a defenceless Italian after the war is over. This would have reminded the readers of nothing more than the savagery displayed by Octavian during the civil wars, especially the proscription" (1981, p. 103). Farron's argument that Vergil attempted to make

the poem's ending as brutal as possible through references to contemporary events cannot be accepted since he does not provide an adequate reason as to how the historical roles of Antonius and Augustus are reflected in Aeneas' killing of Turnus.

It is clear that there are in the Aeneid certain similarities between the figures of Aeneas and Augustus (cf. Wistrand, 1984, p. 195). Both have a divine parent, the life of both is projected as being devoted to the fulfilment of a divine mission, and both are destined to be gods in heaven (cf. Aen. 1.287 ff., and Georg. 1.24 ff.). Aeneas is the ancestor of the Julian race and the founder of the Roman nation; Augustus is the present descendant of Aeneas' line and as champion of the Roman state will issue in a new period of prosperity (cf. Aen. 6.792 ff., and Georg. 1.26 ff.). In addition to these similarities, there is also an epic layer to Aeneas' character, derived from Homer's Iliad and Odyssey. An examination of the epic features present in Aeneas' character must be made in order to discover unique traits, which are not found in the Homeric heroes, and to consider whether these traits in Aeneas' characterization may possibly allude to Augustus.

As an epic hero, Aeneas is modelled in the first half of the Aeneid upon Homer's Odysseus and Apollonius' Jason, and in the second upon Homer's Achilles. The narration of the first half of the Aeneid reinforces Aeneas' similarities with Odysseus through

continuous reference to the narration and dramatic action of the Odyssey: a feature of the poem which has been studied by Otis (1963. pp. 215 ff), and R.D. Williams (1963. p. 266 ff.). Whereas the sea voyages of Odysseus, and the similar sea perils faced by the crew of the Argo in Apollonius Rhodius, find parallels in Aeneas' wanderings after Troy's destruction. The mythological features in Books 1-6 recall the fantastic elements of the Odyssey, such as Aeolus (Aen. 1.50 ff; Od. 10.1 ff), Scylla (Aen. 1.200; Od. 12.85 ff.), the Cyclops (Aen. 1.201; Od. 9.106 ff.) and the Underworld (Aen. Book 6; Od. Book 11); the figure of Dido, in the romantic courtship scenes of Books 3 and 4, recalls Medea in Apollonius Rhodius (cf. most recently, Cairns, 1989, p. 134 ff.).

The final six Books of the Aeneid, with Aeneas' arrival at Latium and the war which ensues, are modelled upon the battle scenes and episodes of military valour of Homer's Iliad (cf. Otis, 1963, pp. 313 ff., Gransden, 1984, passim, and Cairns, 1989, 177 ff.). By placing the "Odyssey half" first and the "Iliad half" second, however, Vergil creates a narrative tension, through Aeneas' characterization, which may explain the harshness, perceived by some readers, of Turnus' death.

When the reader approaches the battle scenes in the Aeneid, he/she has not been prepared to recall either the war scenes of the Iliad or Aeneas' warrior past in which he was described as

the equal of Hector (Il. 6.77-79; 17.513; cf. Aen. 11.283-92) and second only to Achilles in military prowess (Il. 20.332-39), since in the first half of the poem Aeneas was portrayed as a man *curisque ingentibus aeger* (Aen. 1.208). In the words of Clausen, "...he seems to have become an efficient Homeric killer. We hardly recognize, in the fields of Latium, the man we knew, or thought we knew" (1987, p. 90).[1]

The literary parallels which a reader recognizes between the characters of Achilles and Aeneas are also evident between Achilles and Turnus. In Book 6, the Sybil warns Aeneas of the future menace of Turnus and refers to him as *alius Latio iam partus Achilles* (89). The equation of Turnus and Achilles is also made by Turnus himself: *hic etiam inventum Priamo narrabis Achillem* (9.742). It is only with Book 11, however, that the equation of Turnus and Hector is introduced and consistently sustained until the end of the poem (11.438). Also, from this point onwards, Achilles becomes ostensibly the model for Aeneas' characterization, a characterization which may also involve Augustus. In order to understand the significance of Vergil's borrowing from Homer in the episode of Turnus' death, it is necessary to undertake both an analysis of Aeneas' and Turnus' characters in light of Homeric precedents, and a discussion of the narrative parallels between Iliad, Book 22, in which Hector's death occurs, and Aeneid, Book 12.

In the Iliad, it is only after Patroclus' death that Achilles returns to the battlefield to avenge the death of his friend (Il. Book 19). After many acts of valour, Achilles finally confronts Hector in a duel and slays him (Il. Book 22). The mutilation of Hector's corpse and a scene of reconciliation between Achilles and Priam follow and the poem ends on a note of sadness for the suffering of man (Il. 24.529 ff.) (cf. Griffin, 1980, p. 39 ff.). Although he/she sympathizes with Hector, it never occurs to the reader to consider whether his death could have been avoided, or whether the poem could have ended any other way, as he/she does at the end of the Aeneid.

Different aims are present in Vergil's narration of Turnus' death. In contrast to the touching reconciliation scene between Priam and Achilles, "There is [in the Aeneid] no humane aftermath of the killing, in which Aeneas can come to terms, as Achilles does in the Iliad, with the survivors, the world, and himself" (Griffin, London, 1984, p. 124). On the one hand, the narrative demands that Aeneas pursue Turnus in order to avenge the death of Pallas and to follow the "heroic" example of Achilles; on the other, the narrative also demands that the reader accept Turnus' death with reluctance and see it as something as tragic as Hector's death (cf. Griffin, 1985, p. 195). After the killing of Turnus, there remains the feeling that his death "could" have been avoided and that he did not

'deserve" to die. The ancient commentator Servius has stressed the ambiguous moral position of Aeneas as he is about to slay Turnus: "From *pietas* he wants to spare him, from *pietas* he has to kill him, and both enhance his glory."[2]

Modern opinion has been divided on the question of the "moral correctness" of Aeneas' actions. Before discussing various views it should be noted that the nature of Aeneas' and Turnus' actions is presented in a morally ambiguous form, as Gordon Williams notes: "The moral dilemma on both sides is carefully presented in its most extreme form. Both men's acts are made perfectly understandable, but neither is morally unscathed...it is impossible to make a clear cut distinction between them" (1983, p. 92).

For the sake of convenience, the various arguments may be divided into schools of thought. The "pro-Aeneas" school argues that the poem ends with Aeneas as a moral victor, and that his killing of Turnus is sanctioned by Heaven: "Aeneas never is a mere soldier who must stick to the code of honor, but he is also, as the destined courier of the fated mission that will lead to Augustus' fated rule, a human being qualified as a judge (and even executioner)" (Stahl, 1981, p. 169; cf. Lyne, 1983, p. 198). This school also sees Aeneas as a moral victor who was fulfilling an obligation to Evander in killing Turnus: "But Turnus cannot be spared, however moving his appeal, for there is the pressing emotional debt that Aeneas owes

to Evander, a debt of gratitude originally, now become with Pallas' death a sacred obligation..." (Clausen, 1987, p. 100; cf. Gordon Williams, 1983, p. 223). Perhaps the clearest statement of the supposed moral superiority of Aeneas and moral deficiency of Turnus is that of Otis: "In one sense Aeneas is the 'good' opposite of the 'bad' Turnus: he is *pietas* and *humanitas* versus *impietas* and *violentia*" (1963, p. 392). This equation cannot, of course, be applied consistently to the actions of either character since it is too restrictive and seems to lose precision by its very conciseness.

The "pro-Turnus" school condemns Aeneas' brutality and sympathizes with the unfortunate Turnus: "This is what years of suffering and painful training in self-discipline in the service of a great ideal have come to: the vengeful slaying of a fallen enemy" says Little (1970, p. 74); Farron claims that "Vergil contrived to make Aeneas' killing of Turnus as harsh as possible" (1981, p. 97); Sforza that "The hatred of Virgil towards the prime ancestor of the despot of the day is so intense that it is practically impossible to find a passage, where Aeneas appears, that does not in some way indict him in dastardly, criminal or stupid actions" (1935, p. 106), and Griffin that "This death was necessary for the purposes of history, and it is a great heroic feat for Aeneas; but it also is a fearful waste, a noble Italian killed by Rome's founder when he could easily, it seems, have

been spared" (London, 1984, p. 124). With regard to Griffin's statement, it is true that Vergil sympathizes with Turnus as he had sympathized with Dido (Aen. Book 4), Nisus and Euryalus (Aen. 9.446 ff.), and Pallas (Aen. 11.59 ff.), but as West points out: "Virgil evinces a pity for the victims of fate, but this does not mean that he disapproves of its instruments" (1974, p. 29, n. 3)

The "pro-Turnus" school also claims that Pallas was responsible for his own death, not Turnus (cf. Little, 1970, p. 72), and opposes the view that Turnus deserved to die on account of the "impious sin" of despoiling the dead Pallas (cf. Camps, 1969, p. 39, and Little, 1970, p. 71), a view stated in its most extreme form by Clausen: "Turnus suffers, Virgil seems to imply, from a latent disposition to violence, a sickness of the soul" (1987, p. 90).

At this point, it should be made clear that Turnus does not die simply because he despoiled Pallas' corpse and took his baldric, as many scholars assume. Thus Lyne: "...here seems to be the centre of Turnus' offense" (1983, p. 193), and Otis, "...Turnus must pay for his past, for the violence that he has not even yet overcome (he still wears the belt of Pallas)..." (1963, p. 380).[3] Nor does Turnus die because he was a "bad king" (cf. Cairns, 1989, p. 67), consumed with love for Lavinia: "Thus, although a vice, Turnus' *amor* helps to soften his image near his end by aligning him with Dido, that other bad king who

nevertheless was much less vicious than Turnus" (Cairns, 1989, p. 76).

Gransden's assertion that Aeneas, through the death of Turnus, was avenging the death of Priam ("It transfers to the Latins the guilt of the Greeks on the last night of Troy" [1984, p. 201]) is patently unacceptable since nowhere in the poem does Vergil attribute a collective responsibility or guilt to the Latins for any crime committed by the Greeks. Turnus dies, rather, because he was wearing the baldric, which he had earned fairly, at the fatal moment when Aeneas was still grief-stricken over the death of Pallas and thus at a time when Aeneas was emotionally unprepared to forgive him (cf. Putnam, 1981, p. 154; Little, 1970, p. 71). This is not to say that Turnus' death was an accident but that Vergil arranged the order of events in Book 12 in a way that would ensure that the two characters met while Aeneas was still vulnerable emotionally. Turnus' admission, *'equidem merui; nec deprecor,' inquit/'utere sorte tua...'* (12.931-2), is not a recognition that he is guilty of any sin or at fault for any wrong. He merely states that he has accepted a contest to the death and that he is prepared to abide by the consequences (cf. R.D. Williams, 1987, p. 127).

The equation of Turnus with a "vice" is the result of the association which has been made between Aeneas and stoic virtues. It is argued that after Aeneas' trip to the Underworld in Book 6, he underwent a psychological change which transformed

him from a Homeric warrior to a civilized "reborn hero" (cf. Otis, 1963,p. 317). Thus Lyne argues that Aeneas exhibits stoic virtues in avenging the death of Pallas through his killing of Turnus: "He [Aeneas] and Turnus (he suggests rationally) should fight it out in a duel - the fairest, most expedient solution. Again, therefore, we have the stoic-imperial hero, with that added ingredient, a measured sympathy..." (1983, p. 193).

It could be argued, of course, that Aeneas' character after Book 6 is not consistently "stoic". Aeneas' behaviour on the battlefield, while it of necessity must be aggressive, nevertheless falls short of the "stoic" ideals of *clementia* and restraint, a topic which will be discussed in Chapter 2. For example, in Book 10, Aeneas' cruelty after he kills Tarquitus is expressed in his speech: *istic nunc, metuende, iace. non te optima mater/ condet humi patrioque onerabit membra sepulchro;/ altibus linquere feris aut gurgite mersum/ unda feret piscesque impasti volnera lambent* (557-560). One could also argue that the fury to which he submits himself in avenging the death of Pallas is also contrary to "stoic" principles, illustrated by his intention of sacrificing the prisoners whom he had taken alive at Pallas' burial (10.517 ff.), and by his ruthless fighting: *sic toto Aeneas desaevit in aequore victor,/ ut semel intepuit mucro* (10.569-570). According to Little: "The real acts of barbarism in the Aeneid are committed by Aeneas, not Turnus" (1970, p. 70).

This is also illustrated by Aeneas' inhumane treatment of Magus after his supplication: *galeam laeva tenet atque reflexa/ cervice orantis capulo tenus applicat ensem* (Aen. 10.535-536).

It has been pointed out that Aeneas undergoes a change of character which is typified by violence and that he is not referred to as *pius* in the second half of Book 12 (cf. Farron, 1981, p. 97). Vergil uses instead the adjectives *furens* and *violentus*, words associated with the "destructive passions of the civil wars" (Camps, 1969, p. 40), which he had formerly used to describe Turnus:

> Indeed, Aeneas at the end of the Aeneid changes in the opposite direction from Achilles. At first he is inclined to compassion, but then becomes '*furiis accensus et ira terribilis*'; and the last word to describe him is '*fervidus*' which is very emphatic at the beginning of a line and end of a sentence" (Farron, 1985, p. 26).

This association of *pietas* and ruthlessness (cf. Wistrand, 1984, p. 197) could perhaps have brought to the reader's mind Augustus' alleged cruelty at Perusia:

> *Perusia capta in plurimos animadvertit, orare veniam vel excusare se conantibus una voce occurrens moriendum esse. scribunt quidam trecentos ex dediticiis electos utriusque ordinis ad aram Divo Iulio exstructam Idibus Martiis hostiarum more mactatos* (Suet. Aug. 15.1).

The shift in Aeneas' character, from *pius* to *furens*, according to Farron, would imply that the true hero of Book 12, and consequently of the epic as a whole, is Turnus: "So Aeneas' last act is the killing of a defenceless Italian after the war is over. This would have reminded his readers of nothing more than

the savagery displayed by Octavian during the civil wars, especially the proscription" (1981, p. 103). Stahl, however, interprets Aeneas' fury in Book 12 and elsewhere positively, as an instrument of justice:

> One should explain Aeneas' wrath along these lines - rather, I say, than declare him to be in his creator's eyes an underdeveloped and uncivilized "Homeric" fighter or even see him as comparable to Turnus and to the negative characteristics that Virgil ascribes to Turnus' frenzy. Aeneas' order will always serve the Trojan-Julian cause, not an individualistic goal like the wrath of Turnus or Achilles (1981, p. 166).

As for the argument that Aeneas' *furor* reflects negatively upon Augustus, one must also remember that *furor* is a word associated with Turnus and that this would then have to be seen as a slur on Antonius, if the characters are to be viewed as completely analogous.

It has been argued that the political vocabulary of Cicero is reflected in Vergil's characterization of Turnus, an approach which has been taken most recently in Cairns's assessment of the relationship between Aeneas and Turnus: "Analogies with the propaganda of the Civil Wars and their aftermath abound" (1989, p. 123). Camps has argued that Vergil describes Turnus in language which is similar to that which Cicero had used against Antonius: "Not long before, Cicero had used repeatedly in his denunciation of Antony the same combination of terms that characterize Turnus in the Aeneid, *violentus* and *furens*, *furor* and *violentia*" (1969, p. 40).

In the Aeneid, the following words are associated with Turnus: *amens* (7.460; 12.622, etc.), *turbidus* (9.57; 10.648; 12.10, 671), *fervidus* (9.72; 12.325), *ardens* (9.760; 12.3, 71, 101, 325, 732), *furor, furens,* etc. (9.691, 760; 11.486, 901; 12.680), and *violentia, violentus* (10.151; 11.354, 376; 12.9, 45). *Furor* is also used by Vergil to account for the military tactical mistakes made by Turnus (9.730 ff., 9.760 ff.; 11.901; 12.324 ff.). While it is true that these words are used to describe Antonius in Cicero's Philippics, it is not clear whether Vergil intended any political nuance in his application of them to Turnus or whether he even intended any identification of Antonius and Turnus. As the following quotations illustrate, Cicero attempts to attribute a type of insanity to Antonius in order to weaken his prestige: *ut es violentus et furens* (2.68), *homo vehemens et violentus* (5.19), *ille furens* (5.23), *homo amentissimus...ut eius furorem ne...cohibere possemus* (5.37), *furori M. Antoni* (5.43), *novi hominis furorem, novi effrenatam violentam* (12.26), *and inde se quo furore, quo ardore ad urbem...rapiebat* (13.18). Vergil however, does not weaken Turnus' prestige but rather uses *furor* for plot development and characterization to evoke sympathy. This is best illustrated by Turnus' admission of the disaster which he has brought upon the Rutulians through his *furor*: *...neque me indecorem, germana, videbis/ amplius. hunc, oro, sine me furere ante furorem* (12. 679-80).

Clausen, too, has suggested a correlation between Vergil's description of Turnus and Cicero's description of Antonius (cf. 1987, p. 84 ff.). Cicero had used *audax* as a political term to describe the *audaces* who were hostile to the *boni*, the *audaces* who would subvert the established order by violence, men like Catiline, Clodius, Antonius, and Caesar: *oportere hominum audacium, euersorum rei publicae, sceleri legibus et iudiciis resistere* (Pro Sest. 86). Clausen suggests that Vergil, in his own use of *audax*, intended Cicero's concept of the term to be understood by contemporary readers: "That Virgil was aware of the political connotation of *audax*...is indicated by a singular fact: the occurrence of *euersor*, a word apparently invented by Cicero, in Aen. 12.545: *Priami regnorum euersor Achilles*" (1987, p. 85). This may be true, but Clausen's observation seems to overlook the fact that Turnus is apparently described as *audax* only three times during the battle scenes and never in Book 12: *audacis Rutuli ad muros* (7.409), *Irim de caelo misit Saturnia Iuno/audacem ad Turnum* (9.2-3), and *at non audaci Turno* (9.126). It would also be easy to forget in discussions of Turnus' *furor* and *audacia* that he is *pius* (10.617) and *insons* (630-1) according to Juno and noted for courage and sincerity (7.531 ff; 10.75; 7.469). The dangers of interpreting a character in general terms on the basis of a single dominant trait must be kept in mind in analyses of the negative aspects of both Aeneas and Turnus.

The Homeric element in the characters of Turnus and Aeneas dominates the narrative in Book 12. Between Turnus and Hector there are many similarities of action and psychology. With respect to action, Turnus and Hector both lose their weapons (Aen. 12.731 ff.; Il. 22.293 ff.); both are chased (Aen. 12.742 ff.; Il. 22.188 ff.); abandoned by the gods (Aen. 12.809 ff.; Il. 22.213); and forced to confront the protagonist in a duel (Aen. 12.188 ff.; Il. 22.306 ff.).[4] After an acceptance of their fate (Aen. 12.931 ff.; Il. 22.296 ff.), death itself follows (Aen. 12.951-52; Il. 22.361 ff.). In the description of their deaths, the image of the "reluctant" soul fleeing their bodies is common to both: Ὣς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντα τέλος θανάτοιο κάλυψε,/ ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ῥεθέων πταμένη Ἄϊδος δὲ βεβήκει/ὃν πότμον γοόωσα λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην (22.361-363), and *ast illi solvuntur frigore membra/vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras* (12.951-952).

With regard to psychological similarities between the two characters, they both feel a sense of shame (Aen. 12.655 ff.; Il. 22.104 ff.), and share a feeling of abandonment after being deserted by the gods (Aen. 12.895; Il. 22.303). Cairns's view that Turnus and Hector should not be considered as "analogues" because of Turnus' "...alienisation and his incomprehension of destiny [which] weaken his heroic and moral status" (1989, p. 123) is difficult to accept since it is precisely the sense of

abandonment and "incomprehension of destiny" which make their characters analogous and sympathetic, a view offered by Pöschl: "The closer Turnus is to the end, the more he grows in inner stature. The more he realizes that the gods are abandoning him, the stronger his resolution becomes to uphold his obligation to his glory to the end..." (1962, p. 111). Turnus and Hector also show an overriding disillusionment - a detachment from reality (Aen. 12.908 ff.; Il. 22.199 ff.). For example, Turnus is compared to a dream: *ac velut in somnis,...nequiquam avidos extendere cursus/ velle videmur et in mediis conatibus aegri/ succidimus;...sic Turno...* (Aen. 12.908-13). This recalls to the mind of the reader Achilles' pursuit of Hector: ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἐνείρῳ οὐ δύναται φεύγοντα διώκειν/ οὐδ' ἀρ' ὃ τὸν δύναται ὑποφεύγειν οὐδ' ὃ διώκειν/ ὣς ὃ τὸν οὐ δύνατο μάρψαι ποδίν, οὐδ' ὃς ἀλύξαι (Il. 22.199 ff.).

There are, however, certain differences between the two characters. Vergil seems to show more sympathy for the antagonist than did Homer. Whereas Hector had fled from Achilles to avoid a confrontation (Il. 22.137 ff.), Turnus fled from Aeneas to find his own sword (Aen. 12.742 ff.). The weakness which the gods instilled in Turnus is used to tragic effect (cf. Pöschl, 1962, p. 135), so that when Turnus falls before Aeneas, pity is aroused in the reader and expressed in the narrative through the groan of the Rutulians which is echoed by the hills

(Aen. 12.930 ff.). Unlike the Iliad, where the Greeks break into a *paean* upon the death of Hector (Il. 22.372 ff.), the Trojans in the Aeneid do not rejoice at the death of Turnus and at the grief of the Rutulians.

Vergil also presents the antagonist more sympathetically through similes and references to passages in Homer which evoke pathos. The simile of the swan and eagle, which was used in Book 9 to depict the aggressiveness of Turnus (Aen. 9.563-566), is now reversed to elicit sympathy for him (12.247-256), and does so by contrasting his outstanding beauty (7.55; 7.650; 7.783; and 10.446) with the tragedy of his death. The analysis of this simile by S. Harrison is worthy of full citation:

> This change in the depiction of Turnus is accompanied by a commensurate switch of sympathy towards him as he approaches his inevitable end. The reversal of the swan/eagle image is surely an illustration of the tragic *peripateia* of Turnus, who moves from proud aggressor to frightened and finally noble victim, and an index of the general movement of the poem (1985, p. 103).

This reversal in the emotional presentation of a character is also evident in Vergil's description of the character and death of Mezentius (Aen. Book 10, 794 ff.).[5]

The sympathetic manner in which Vergil presents Turnus at the end of Book 12 is also achieved through reminiscences of Priam's speech to Achilles in Turnus' address to Aeneas. When, at the point of death, Turnus asks Aeneas to pity his aged

father, ...*miseri te si qua parentis tangere cura potest, oro (fuit et tibi talis Anchises genitor) Dauni miserere senectae...* (Aen. 12.932-4).the narrative recalls the first words spoken by Priam to Achilles after the death of Hector: μνῆσαι πατρὸς σοῖο θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,/τηλίκου ὡς περ ἐγών, ὀλοῷ ἐπὶ γήραος οὐδῷ (Il. 24.486-7).

The large extent to which Aeneas and Turnus are influenced by Homer's Achilles and Hector makes less likely the view that they are representations of Augustus and Antonius respectively. It is possible, however, to see a similarity of historical roles between Vergil's characters and Augustus and Antonius. As mentioned earlier, the life of both is projected as being devoted to the fulfilment of a divine mission, both Aeneas and Augustus are the victors of an Italian war, and both are destined to be gods in heaven. As Wistrand points out: "Aeneas and Augustus are the same type of heroes, but not to be equated. They have similar historical roles, but that does not entail that they have the same personal qualities" (1984, p. 195). Likewise, in the case of Turnus and Antonius, both are the defeated parties of a civil war but their personalities are not similar. The sympathy with which Vergil presents the death of Turnus, and all those who died in the Aeneid: ...*tanton placuit concurrere motu,/ Iuppiter, aeterna gentis in pace futuras*? (12.503-504), cannot be transferred to Antonius.

This examination of the controversy concerning the association which is believed to exist between Augustus and Aeneas has emphasized that the association is ambivalent and one which can not be maintained throughout the poem. Augustus and Aeneas share a similar historical role, but as was just stated, this does not necessarily mean that they also share the same personality. With regard to the relationship which is believed to exist between Antonius and Turnus, it was found that the basis for this argument is generally a product of the perceived association between Augustus and Aeneas.

In the following chapter, the positive aspects of Aeneas' character will be discussed in the context of Augustus' propaganda of Imperial virtues in order that the overall presentation of Aeneas' character may be compared both with Augustus' claims and with contemporary perceptions of his character. Only after this historical approach is applied and Vergil's intentions clarified can the death of Turnus be analysed structurally for an evaluation of its importance to the poem as a whole.

Chapter 2. Aspects of Augustus' Propaganda of Imperial Virtues and the Death of Turnus

The examination in Chapter 1 of Aeneas' and Turnus' characters and their confrontation, from the point of view of Homeric precedents, has measured the extent to which these characters were shaped by literary tradition. The next step is to examine them in historical terms, and to consider Augustus' propaganda of imperial virtues, to identify any discrepancies between Augustus' projected image and the characterization of Aeneas. An analysis of the qualities *pietas* and *clementia* will clarify whether Aeneas should be considered either as a "type" of, or a criticism, of Augustus, or whether, as will be discussed in Chapter 3, the death of Turnus and the character of Aeneas should simply be regarded on a literary plane.

In *Res Gestae* (34), Augustus records the public honours which were conferred upon him by the state in recognition of his restoration of the Republic in 27 B.C. For this service, he received the name of Augustus, and the door-posts of his house were decorated with bay leaves, and the lintel with a civic

crown. Also, a golden shield was set in the Curia Julia which recognized, with an inscription, the valour, clemency, justice, and piety of Augustus (...*virtutis clementiaeque et iustitiae et pietatis causa*....[34.2]). A copy of this shield has been found at Arles and dates to 26 B.C., Augustus' eighth consulate.[1] The inscription on this shield attests to the importance which Augustus placed on these virtues:

> *SPQR IMP. CAES. DIVI F. AUGUSTO COS. VIII DEDIT CLUPEUM VIRTUTIS CLEMENTIAE IUSTITIAE PIETATIS ERGA DEOS PATRIAMQUE.*

Since these virtues were associated with Augustus in 27 B.C., it is important to see why they were attributed to him and how he may have used them for his own self-promotion.[2] These questions can be addressed by an examination of the usage of these qualities in the propaganda of the late Republic and their adoption, especially that of *clementia* and *pietas*, by Julius Caesar.

The concept of virtues being associated with a statesman was known at Rome at an early date, and these qualities were derived from those which Plato ascribed to the ideal statesman. Plato's canon σωφροσύνη, ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη and ὁσιότης was adapted by Cornificius who gave the terms Latin equivalents: *prudentia, iustitia, fortitudo,* and *modestia* (ad Her. 3.3).[3] Cicero, however, varied the virtues which he had separated into

"canons" at various points in his career: *prudentia, iustitia, fortitudo,* and *temperantia*; or *clementia, iustitia, benignitas, fides,* and *fortitudo*; or *fortitudo, temperantia, prudentia,* and *iustitia*.[4] The inclusion of certain of these virtues in the portrayal of historical figures is evident in Polybius' description of the elder Scipio: πρέπως χρῆσθαι καὶ μεγαλο-ψύχως τοῖς πράγμασι (15.17.4), and in Cicero's De Republica, where Scipio instructs his grandson to practise *iustitia* and *pietas* (6.16). According to Weinstock, at the same time that Cicero had made the statesman's virtues a popular theme in his speeches at Rome, Caesar himself used them in his struggle and when he had "won it they became of supreme importance" (1971, p. 229).

Contemporary evidence for the virtues which were ascribed to Julius Caesar in historical sources survives in Greek inscriptions from Pergamum. Statues erected in Caesar's honour were set up: εὐσέβειας ἕνεκα δικαιοσύνης, and πάσης ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐσέβειας πρός τε τοὺς θεοὺς τὴν πόλιν[5] The theme of piety in this second inscription recalls the *pietas* found on the Arles' shield: *pietas erga deos patriamque*.

In order to understand the significance of Augustus' adoption of those virtues mentioned on the *clupeus virtutis*, one should perhaps look at how certain qualities became associated with a statesman in the propaganda of the late Republic. A

survey of the virtues used to promote a public image by prominent figures will point to the political benefits which resulted from such a promotion at the time of Augustus' acceptance of the shield in 27 B.C.

Virtus in Rome was not initially associated with human perfection, as it is in Christian thought, but rather with manly behaviour in war (cf. Cic. Tusc. 2.43). It was especially associated with the historical figures of Romulus, A. Cornelius Cossus, and M. Claudius Marcellus (cf. Weinstock, p. 230). *Virtus* was also attributed to late Republican figures; Pompey was praised for his *virtus* (cf. Cic. Cat. 2.11) and Caesar's *virtus* was celebrated on many occasions. In 80 B.C., he received the oak wreath for the *virtus* he displayed in saving the life of a citizen in battle (Suet. Jul. 2). In 45 B.C., he received the oak wreath again for saving the lives of all the citizens and also the grass wreath for having liberated them (cf. App. BC. 2.106.441; Dio 44.4.5). Cicero praised Caesar in a manner similar to the one in which he praised Pompey: *tantus est enim splendor in laude vera...ut haec a virtute donata, cetera a Fortuna commodata esse videantur* (Marc. 19).

The attribute of *virtus* which appears on the Arles' shield was claimed by, or at least attributed to, Augustus with varying success. Augustus' claim that he was recognized for his valour (*Res Gestae*, 4.1) seems to have been treated with some scepticism

by his contemporaries. Charlesworth has argued that the "cowardice" of Augustus (cf. Suet. Aug. 10.4; 16.2) was an aspect of Antonius' propaganda against him.[6] Agrippa was responsible for his military successes, and Augustus' triple triumph in 27 B.C. exaggerated his actual contribution to the victories. It is for this reason that the depiction of the defeat of Antonius and Cleopatra which appears on Aeneas' shield (8.671 ff.) must be dignified through epic and mythological allusions and further removed from reality by a decadent East - virtuous West contrast, and the *iustitia* of his campaign.[7]

With respect to *iustitia*, the association of the term with Caesar, at first glance, may seem forced. As Weinstock says, "One would not perhaps postulate *iustitia* as one of Caesar's four virtues if it were not found on the golden shield of Augustus" (1971, p. 243). It is in the relationship of *iustitia* with war, however, that the virtue becomes important to an otherwise ambivalent association with Julius Caesar. The *bellum iustum* concept of warfare in Rome which is described by Livy: *ut omnes gentes sciant populum Romanum et suscipere iuste bella et finere* (30.16.9),[8] also refers to the way in which Caesar projected his conquest of Gaul: *populi Romani iustissimum esse in Gallia imperium* (BG, 1.45.3). *Iustitia* also played an important role in Caesar's propaganda during the Civil War and is reflected in his claim that whereas his opponents acted with *iniuria*, he himself would act with *iustitia* and *aequitas* (BG, 1.32.2-9).

The *iustitia* of Augustus was closely connected with his *pietas*, as *Res Gestae* 1.1-2 indicates, in that he had demonstrated *iustitia* mainly through the punishment of Caesar's murderers. Because of the close connection between *iustitia* and *pietas*, an analysis of its importance will appear below, in the examination of Augustus' *pietas*.

The two most important virtues in the propaganda of Caesar were *clementia* and *pietas*, both of which played a significant role in his own propaganda during the Civil War. Following his death, they were used in Augustus' subsequent campaign against Antony. In 45 B.C., the Senate voted to erect a temple in honour of Caesar's clemency (cf. Dio 44.6.4), and a coin which dates to 44 B.C. depicts the proposed temple with the legend *Clementiae Caesaris*.[9] In the Caesarian speeches of Cicero, which date to 46 and 45 B.C., Cicero attributes *clementia* to Caesar and uses the word more often than it had been used in all his other speeches put together (cf. Weinstock, 1971, p. 236). In fact, Weinstock has argued that Cicero introduced the word into the Roman political vocabulary (cf. 1971, p. 236 ff.).[10] It was Caesar who, at the beginning of the Civil War against Pompey, promoted the virtues of clemency and magnanimity, albeit with various synonyms, as the following passage of Cicero illustrates: *temptemus hoc modo...omnium voluntates recuperare et diuturna victoria uti, quoniam reliqui crudelitate odium effugere non*

potuerunt neque victoriam diutius tenere. praeter unum L. Sullam, quem imitaturus non sum, haec nova sit ratio vincendi, ut misericordia et liberalitate nos muniamus (Att. 9.7C.1).[11] An example of his clemency was also associated with Spain: *movebatur etiam misericordia civium, quos interficiendos videbat: quibus salvis...rem optinere malebat* (BC. 1.72.3), and *magnumque fructum suae pristinae lenitatis omnium iudicio Caesar ferebat* (BC. 1.74.7).

This declaration of mildness and generosity contrasted with the declaration of cruelty which Pompey directed towards his enemies.[12] Pompey's reputation for clemency, which he had gained earlier, in 63 B.C., through his pardoning of the Jews (Diod. Sic. 40.2), was no longer current, a fact which explains the success of Caesar's self-advertisement of clemency during the Civil War. Caesar further declared that no harm came to those who had sought his leniency: *ubi...passisque palmis proiecti ad terram flentes ab eo salutem petiverunt, consolatus consurgere iussit et pauca apud eos de lenitate sua locutus, quo minore essent timore, omnes conservavit* (BC. 3.98.2), and also claimed that he derived pleasure from his acts of clemency: τοῖς δὲ φίλοις Ῥώμην ἔγραφεν, ὅτι τῆς νίκης ἀπολαύοι τοῦτο μέγιστον καὶ ἥδιστον, τὸ σώζειν τινὰς ἀεὶ τῶν πεπολεμηκότων πολιτῶν αὐτῷ (Plut. Caes. 48.4). Because of these declarations about the clemency of Caesar and the use of the term in Cicero's speeches,

"clemency, in origin the virtue of the Roman State and its generals and exercised towards the defeated enemy, was now the virtue of an individual and exercised towards his fellow citizens" (Weinstock, 1971, p. 239).

The importance of *clementia* to the projected image of Julius Caesar may also be inferred from the frequency of the quality in the historical sources. During the Civil War against Pompey, Caesar was celebrated for his *clementia: Moderationem vero clementiamque cum in administratione tum in victoria belli civilis admirabilem exhibuit. Denuntiante Pompeio pro hostibus se habiturum qui rei publicae defuissent, ipse medios et neutrius partis suorum sibi numero futuros pronuntiavit* (Suet. Jul. 75.1). Caesar also displayed clemency by pardoning his former enemies and raising them higher than their former positions: *Denique tempore extremo etiam quibus nondum ignoverat, cunctis in Italiam redire permisit magistratusque et imperia capere; sed et statuas Luci Sullae atque Pompei a plebe disiectas reposuit...* (Suet. Jul. 75.4). Dio's account of Caesar's excessive lamentation at the sight of Pompey's head illustrates both the political benefit which could be gained for such an act, and the importance of clemency for Caesar's image (Dio 42.8.1-3).

As *Res Gestae* 3.1-2 indicates, Augustus also projected *clementia* as part of his image. Augustus wrote to the Senate in 42 on his way home from Philippi that he would act with the same

clemency as had his father: ὅθενπερ καὶ ὁ Καῖσαρ ... ἐπεθύμησε τῇ γερουσίᾳ θαρσεῖν τε αὐτῇ παρακελεύων, καὶ προθυμηθήσεσθαι πάντα καὶ πρᾴως καὶ φιλανθρώπως κατὰ τὸν πατέρα ποιήσειν. (Dio 48.3.6). Augustus' claim that ...*victorque omnibus veniam petentibus civibus perperci (Res Gestae* 3.1) resembles the use made of the quality by Cicero, as found in his Pro Marcello:

> ...*nulla est enim tanta vis quae non ferro et viribus debilitari frangique possit: animum vincere, iracundiam cohibere, victoriam temperare, adversarium nobilitate, ingenio, virtute praestantem non modo extollere iacentem, sed etiam amplificare eius pristinam dignitatem, haec qui facit, non ego eum cum summis viris comparo, sed simillimum deo iudico...* (3.8).[13]

Like his *pietas*, the *clementia* of Augustus has been variously interpreted. Dio, in describing the events of 42 B.C., states that Augustus claimed to be showing clemency in the tradition of his adoptive father (48.3.6), and that he was aware of the importance of this quality for his public image and relations with others (48.8.3-4). Appian claims that Augustus pardoned Crassus and others in order to acquire a reputation for clemency, but that afterwards he put them on the list of the proscribed (BC. 3.94). Seneca attributes the quality of mercy to Augustus, citing as an example his lenient treatment of Lepidus: *maluit enim illum honorem vocari quam spolium. Haec eum clementia ad salutem securitatemque perduxit (de Clementia.* 1.10.1-3).[14]

Augustus' role in the proscriptions belied his claims to clemency. Tacitus suggests that it was the excessive cruelty of Augustus during this period which accounted for his success: *nullo adversante, cum ferocissimi per acies aut proscriptione cecidissent, ceteri nobilium, quanto quis servitio promptior, opibus et honoribus extollerentur ac novis ex rebus aucti, tuta et praesentia quam vetera et periculosa mallent* (*Ann.* 1.2). In fact, Augustus' reputation for cruelty surpassed that of Antonius and Lepidus (Suet. Aug. 27.1).

Augustus' earlier cruel treatment of the defeated at Philippi and his sending of Brutus' head to Rome were recorded as acts of inhumanity (Suet. Aug. 13.1). Perhaps the most regrettable action of Augustus against his enemies was the destruction of Perusia. According to contemporary accounts, Augustus' "piety" towards Julius Caesar exceeded the normal expression of this virtue in his exclamations at Perusia and his supposed sacrifice of humans at the altar of Caesar: *Perusia capta in plurimos animadvertit, orare veniam vel excusare se conantibus una voce occurrens 'moriendum esse'. Scribunt quidam trecentos ex dediticiis electos utriusque ordinis ad aram Divo Iulio exstructam Idibus Martiis hostiarum more mactatos* (Suet. Aug. 15.1).[15] The destruction of fellow Italians in the civil war was also considered a stain on Augustus' youth (Seneca, *de Clementia*, 1.11.1-2).

The concept of *pietas* in the Republican period involved both the worship of the gods and devotion to one's parents and homeland (Cic. ND. 1.116; inv. 2.66; 2.161). It was also important *vis-à-vis* the Romans' conception of a just war, as discussed in relation to *iustitia*: *pium et iustum bellum* (Cic. inv. 2.70; Livy 3.25.3; 9.8.6, etc.). As such, it was a factor which contributed to the success of the Romans in the expansion of their borders during the Republican era. In the propaganda of the late Republic, the term had acquired a political significance for certain individuals, such as Julius Caesar, who could claim that it was through their own *pietas* that other individuals and the state derived benefits (cf. Weinstock, 1971, 255 ff.).

The first appearance of the theme of *pietas* occurs on a coin which dates to c. 107 B.C. On the obverse, a female head with the legend *Pietas* is depicted and, on the reverse, a man carries another man on his shoulder.[16] This alludes to the legend of the two youths from Catana who saved their parents from the lava after an eruption of Mount Aetna by carrying them on their shoulders. According to Pausanias (10.28.4), they had become a symbol of filial piety and they were represented on local coins.[17] A coin dating to 81 B.C. depicts *Pietas* and bears the name of Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius, who had acquired the *cognomen* for his success in having the Senate recall his exiled father. At the outbreak of the Civil War in 49/48 B.C., a coin

issued by Decimus Iunius Brutus Albinus depicted *the goddess Pietas* on the obverse, and two hands clasping a caduceus, symbols of concord and peace, on the reverse - concepts frustrated by the War.[18]

Julius Caesar, however, in 47 B.C., associated himself with *pietas* in a significant way by issuing a coin with a female head (probably Venus) on the obverse and with Anchises being carried by Aeneas, who holds the Palladium, on the reverse.[19] The link with the Aeneas legend and the important role played by *pietas* in that myth were exploited by Caesar who, in the following year, dedicated a temple to *Venus Genetrix*, the mother of Aeneas, the legendary mother of his own ancestry, and mythical ancestor of the Roman race. According to Weinstock, "It was he who built a temple for Venus as Genetrix, and who made Aeneas, his ancestor, a national hero and a symbol of piety: without his initiative Vergil could not have created his epic about "pius Aeneas" (1971, p. 254). Caesar, however, could not lay exclusive claim to the virtue of *pietas*. Sextus Pompey reproduced the goddess Pietas on his coins of 45/44 B.C., and also adopted the cognomen *Pius*.[20] Since this referred to his devotion to his father, it also meant taking vengeance for his death.

Besides these outward examples of his filial and religious piety, Caesar also exploited another form of *pietas* by which he could claim that his fellow citizens, and those foreign peoples

whom he conquered, owed *pietas* to him. This practice was based on the allegiance which a client, whether Roman or foreign, an individual or a community, owed to his patron, for which *fides* and not *pietas*, was the original term (cf. Weinstock, 1971, p. 256). Cicero, when he was recalled from exile in 57 B.C., claimed that he owed *pietas* to his supporters, especially Lentulus and Milo, for the role they played in having him recalled. His gratitude and obligations are expressed in his speeches: *pietate erga te* (fam. 1.1.1), *me pietas utilitasque cogit* (fam. 1.8.2), and *intellexit te perspicere meam in te pietatem. quid enim dicam benevolentiam, cum illud ipsum gravissimum et sanctissimum nomen pietatis levius mihi meritis erga me tuis esse videatur?* (fam. 1.9.1). It is possible, as Weinstock argues, that the extension of *pietas* to include private friendships was influenced by Cicero (1971, p. 256).

Through Cicero's example, Caesar could claim bonds of *fides* and *pietas* from people living in Gallia Cisalpina (cf. BG. 8.51.1), from the Gaul Ambiorix (BG. 5.27.7), and from the city Massilia, which owed similar *pietas* to Pompey at the time of the Civil War's outbreak: *paribus eorum beneficiis parem se quoque voluntatem tribuere debere et neutrum eorum contra alterum iuvare* (Caes. BG. 1.35.5). This form of respect acquired religious overtones in 49 B.C., when the *municipia* of Italy received him as a god (Cic. Att. 8.16.1). As for private individuals who owed

pietas to Caesar, the same loyalty which the provinces and towns owed to him, was also expected of them. In 49, Cicero admitted that he was bound to Caesar by *fides* and *pietas* (Att. 9.7B.1) and this same political patronage was also expected from Lepidus, Asinius Pollio (Cic. fam. 10.31.3) and L. Menatius Plancus (Cic. fam. 10.24.5). According to Weinstock, "The new *cognomen parens patriae* must have lent a particular importance to this bond of political *pietas*" (1971, p. 258).

The public honours accorded to Caesar also stress the *pietas* owed to him by Italy and the enormity of his prestige. Among other honours, Caesar was given the right to offer *spolia opima* (Dio 44.4.3), and two statues in his honour were set up on the *rostra* which recognized his roles as the saviour of the citizens and guardian of the city (Dio 44.4.5). Caesar was also offered the name Jupiter Julius and a decree was passed which ordered a temple to be consecrated to him and to his clemency (Dio 44.6.4).

The significance of the political level of *pietas* for an interpretation of the character of Aeneas is twofold: firstly, Latinus, as Aeneas' host, had every right to expect *fides* and *pietas* from him and not war as Juno makes clear: *Aenean hominum quisquam divumque subegit bella sequi aut hostem regi se inferre Latino?* (Aen. 10.65-66). Evander's understanding of Aeneas' obligations are expressed in the letter sent to Aeneas after the

death of Pallas: *dextera causa tua est. Turnum gnatoque patrique/ quam debere vides* (Aen. 11.178-9). On two occasions, Aeneas does not honour the obligations expected of a guest, friend or client. When he first arrives at Latium, he begins to survey the land and search for building materials before he has received permission from Latinus to do so (Aen. 7.157 ff.). Later, Aeneas deliberately disregards his obligations to Latinus by storming his palace and waging war against his former allies (Aen. 12.554 ff.).

Secondly, Aeneas owes the same *pietas* to the Rutulians and the Italians in general as he had displayed earlier for their physical country, when it was still a hoped-for resting place after his wanderings. In this scenario, Aeneas could have been expected to pardon Turnus since Latinus, Evander and Daunus in particular, and the Italians in general, were his patrons according to the "political friendships" nurtured by Cicero. Whether any of these examples of Aeneas' disregard for his duties bears direct relevance to Augustus' promotion of *pietas* will be discussed below, in the analysis of the moral "correctness" of Aeneas' killing of Turnus.

It is within the personal or rather private context of piety that Augustus was motivated to avenge the murder of Caesar, as stated in *Res Gestae* 2.1 and Suetonius: *Omnium bellorum initium et causam hinc sumpsit: nihil convenientius ducens quam necem avunculi vindicare tuerique acta...* (Suet. Aug. 10). Tacitus,

however, claims in rhetorical style that Augustus' *pietas* was variously interpreted. One group sympathized with Augustus:

> *Hi pietate erga parentem et necessitudine rei publicae, in qua nullus tunc legibus locus, ad arma civilia actum, quae neque parari possent neque haberi per bonas artis. Multa Antonio, dum interfectores patris ulciscereturi, multa Lepido concessisse (Ann.* 1.9)

while another condemned him for hypocrisy:

> *Dicebatur contra pietatem erga parentem et tempora rei publicae obtentui sumpta: ceterum cupidine dominandi concitos per largitionem veteranos, paratum ab adulescente privato exercitum, corruptas consulis legiones, simulatam Pompeianarum gratiam partium... (Ann.* 1.10).

In either view, the *pietas* of Augustus is shown through the application of ruthlessness and force.

Augustus further promoted his *pietas* through the founding of a new colony. After the battle of Philippi, Augustus founded "Pietas Julia Pola" to celebrate his victory over Caesar's assassins (Pliny, NH. 3.129). Augustus was not, however, the only person promoting *pietas* as a personal virtue during this period. M. Oppius in 43 was praised for the *pietas* shown to his father whom he carried out of Rome to protect him from the proscriptions, an act which was seen to be as *pius* as Aeneas' carrying of Anchises (App. BC. 4.41.172). In 41 B.C., Antonius issued a coin with the figure of *Pietas* which was probably intended to represent a claim of being Caesar's heir.[21] At about the same time, Antonius' brother Lucius adopted the

cognomen Pius either as an expression of devotion for his brother (Dio. 48.5.4), or as an expression of support for Antonius' claim to be Caesar's heir. Sextus Pompey again issued coins c. 42-38 B.C. with his *cognomen Pius* on the obverse and, on the reverse, a depiction of Neptune flanked on either side by those two "pious" brothers of Catana with their parents on their shoulders. This, according to Weinstock, was "a clear polemic against the Caesarian concept" (1971, p. 255).[22]

Dio, in fact, claims that during the Triumviral period, all three Triumvirs cultivated a sort of campaign in which they each tried to outdo each other in their *pietas* for Caesar: ταῦτά τε οὖν οὕτως οἱ ἄνδρες ἐκεῖνοι οἱ τρεῖς ἐποίουν, καὶ ἅμα καὶ τὸν Καίσαρα τὸν πρότερον ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἐσέμνυνον. (47.18.1). All three confirmed Caesar's acts through oaths and made them legally binding (Dio 47.18.3). It was voted that a shrine also be erected in the Forum where Caesar's body had been burned and that his image, together with a statue of Venus, be carried in the procession at the Circus games (Dio 47.18.4). The birthday of Caesar became a religious festival; those who refused to celebrate were judged accursed and, in the case of senators and their sons, were liable to pay a fine of one million sesterces (Dio 47.18.5). The date of his assassination was labelled an "unlucky" day and one on which the Senate could not meet (Dio 47.19.1). Dio also claims that Caesar received divine

honours: his image was not allowed to be carried in the funeral processions of his relatives, and his shrine could offer refugees inviolability (47.19.2-3).

Augustus' victories over Sextus Pompey and Antonius ensured that the greatest reputation of *pietas* now belonged to him exclusively. Just as Julius Caesar promoted his ties with Venus and Aeneas in 47 B.C., as discussed above, Augustus could claim, as Caesar's heir, to be the physical and moral descendant of Aeneas - the traditional exemplar of *pietas*. He could also claim, in the tradition of Caesar, that *pietas* was now owed to him from his fellow citizens and from the subject peoples of his empire (cf. Weinstock, 1971, p. 256), since it was he alone who vindicated the liberty of the Republic when it was oppressed by the tyranny of a faction (*Res Gestae*, 1.1).

Augustus continued to show his *pietas* through the public honours offered to Caesar (Dio 47.19.1) and through a number of public, monumental dedications. At Rome, a temple was dedicated by Augustus to the Deified Julius in 29 B.C.,[23] and the Curia Iulia or Julian Senate House (Dio 47.19.1) was also erected in his honour (Dio 44.5.1-2 and 51.22.1). Some time after the construction of the 'original' Pantheon by Agrippa in 27 B.C., a cult statue of Caesar was displayed (Dio 53.27.3).[24] The temple promised to Mars Ultor during the Philippi campaign against Caesar's assassins, which was completed in 2 B.C. but dedicated

much earlier in 42 B.C.[25] promoted Augustus' *pietas* towards Caesar (Suet. Aug. 29).

The opening chapters of the *Res Gestae* also call to mind the virtues mentioned on the shield from Arles: Chapter 1 alludes to the *iustitia* of Augustus' vengeance exacted from the murderers of Caesar for the safety of the state, a motif reinforced in 2.1 by the claim *iudiciis legitimis*. Chapter 2.1 also presents Augustus' vengeance of Caesar as *pietas*: Chapter 3.1 stresses his *clementia* as victor; and Chapter 4.1 acknowledges the public honours awarded to him for his *virtus*. Although the order in which these virtues appear is not the same as that in which they appear on the Arles' shield, their importance for the projected image of Augustus should not be underestimated (cf. Lacey, 1974, p.82, n.59).

As for Augustus' promotion of the motif of the *clupeus virtutis*, this appears as a frequent theme of coin types dating from 25-22 B.C.[26] That these virtues are projected as Augustus' moral justification for obtaining power is attested by the frequent coin-type of a flying Victory holding a wreath.[27] It is only after Augustus' reign that *pietas* and *clementia*, as Imperial virtues, are personified as goddesses, as is illustrated by a coin of Tiberius on which a portrait of Livia draped with a veil personifies the goddess *Pietas*.[28] *Pietas* also appears on coins of Caligula and Galba.[29] while *Clementia* appears on the coinage of Vitellius.[30]

In view of both Caesar's and Augustus' promotion of the Imperial virtues, in particular *pietas* and *clementia*, it would be reasonable to assume that Vergil would have incorporated these virtues in his characterization of Aeneas if, in fact, the character of Aeneas was meant to represent the character of Augustus. The speech of Aeneas addressed to Venus in Book 1 and Anchises' advice to Aeneas in Book 6 will serve as a starting point for an analysis of the moral "correctness" of Aeneas' killing of Turnus.

When Aeneas refers to himself as *pius Aeneas* and claims: *raptos qui ex hoste Penatis/classe veho mecum, fama super aethera notus* (1.378-379), the reader is reminded of the first ten lines of the poem, where the hardships of a man noted for piety (...*insignem pietate virum*... [1.10]) are introduced. *Pius* becomes the epithet most used to describe Aeneas (1.305, 1.544, 4.597-99, 6.403, etc.); not only is he dedicated to his son (*omnis in Ascanio cari stat cura parentis* [1.646]), but he is also dedicated to his father, whom he carried out of the burning Troy (2.707 ff.). The devotion which Augustus displayed to his adoptive father, as mentioned above, is reflected in the relationship between Aeneas and Anchises. In Book 12, however, Aeneas' slaying of Turnus also calls to mind Augustus' ruthless persecution of Caesar's murderers and his alleged lack of clemency.

As noted above (p. 24), that Aeneas is not called *pius* in the last half of Book 12 may be significant, if one is to understand Vergil's shift in emphasis from sympathy for Aeneas to sympathy for Turnus. It is this sympathy for Turnus which dominates the last half of Book 12 and which casts doubt upon the moral "correctness" of Aeneas' actions. In other words, if Aeneas was "correct" in avenging Pallas' death by killing Turnus, why does the reader consider Turnus' death a tragedy (cf. Jasper Griffin, London, 1984; S. Harrison, 1985, p. 103), and Aeneas' vengeance brutal (cf. Quinn, 1968, p. 279, Putnam, 1965, p. 193)? It would also be fair to ask why Aeneas disregards the advice which Anchises gave him in the Underworld: *(hae tibi erunt artes) pacique imponere morem,/parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* (6.852-853), or why Vergil includes an episode which may have an obvious bearing upon Augustus' claim to clemency (*Res Gestae*, 3.1-2).

That Aeneas was in a position to pardon Turnus and demonstrate clemency is explicit in the text. When he and Turnus come face to face in a duel, the latter is wounded and unarmed. In full view of the Rutulians (12.928-929), he shows that he has been defeated by stretching out his right hand in supplication: not for his life but for the return of his dead body to Daunus (cf. Iliad, 22.337-343):

> *ille humilis supplexque oculos dextramque precantem*

protendens "equidem merui, nec deprecor", inquit:
"utere sorte tua. miseri te si qua parentis
tangere cura potest, oro (fuit et tibi talis
Anchises genitor), Dauni miserere senectae
et me, seu corpus spoliatum lumine mavis,
redde meis. vicisti et victum tendere palmas
Ausonii videre: tua est Lavinia coniunx:
ulterius ne tende odiis" (12.930-938).

It is true that the text evokes Hector's death and that the reader knows that Turnus will die, but Aeneas' hesitation (*et iam iamque magis cunctantem flectere sermo/coeperat...* [12.940-941]) reminds the reader that Aeneas is not the same kind of hero as Achilles but one from whom civilization and order should result (cf. Otis, 1963, 2 ff.). If Aeneas is demonstrating his *pietas* by avenging Pallas' death, he is not taking into account his obligations to his hosts, the Rutulians and his future fellow countrymen. By withholding his pardon and refusing to show clemency for the sake of personal emotions, Aeneas places his future relations with the Italians at risk, as Lyne argues: " An impulsive act of revenge, however ethically defensible, is not the best way to lay the foundations of reconciliation and peace. To avenge dishonour is to inflict dishonour; vengeance may provoke vengeance in return" (1983, p. 201). Indeed, the text makes it clear that Turnus' death is politically unnecessary: he is no longer a rival for Lavinia's hand, and his status as an Italian prince could only have helped Aeneas in settling his Trojans in Italy by strengthening the bonds of kinship. In this

scenario. Aeneas would be accepting him as a sort of lesser partner, a relationship reminiscent of the way in which Priam regarded the family of Aeneas at Troy (Il. 13.460 ff.).

In considering "emotional" alternatives for Turnus' death which could have ended the poem on a positive note, with Aeneas as a morally attractive victor and Turnus as a glorious opponent, the death of Lausus may be cited. Lausus' act of *pietas* in protecting the fallen Mezentius, his father (10.815 ff.), was used by Vergil to reveal a sympathetic aspect of Aeneas' character, which could only have been triggered by death (cf. Putnam, 1981, 141 ff.). Aeneas' reaction to the dead body of Lausus demonstrates his emotional maturity: *at vero ut voltum vidit morientis et ora,/ora modis Anchisiades pallentia miris,/ingemuit miserans graviter dextramque tetendit/et mentem patriae strinxit pietatis imago* (10.821-824). By referring to Aeneas as Anchisiades, Vergil implies that he should have been more lenient to Lausus. Vergil's inclusion of *pietas* in relation to Lausus also recalls to Aeneas that *pietas* may also be present in the actions of others who are opposed to him, and that a death such as Lausus' is a tragic loss. Accordingly, it might have been appropriate for Aeneas to react in a similar fashion after the death of Turnus so that the poem could have ended more positively. Such an ending would have ensured Aeneas' status as a "moral victor", yet still preserved Turnus' heroic, glorious

death. The thematic and structural advantages, however, of accepting the ending in its present form will be discussed in the following chapter.

Vergil's description of the slaying also casts doubt upon the moral "correctness" of Aeneas' action. When he spots Pallas' baldric, Aeneas acts with *impius furor* and he is described as *furiis accensus et ira terribilis* (12.946-947). When he claims that it is Pallas and not himself killing Turnus, Vergil chooses the verb *immolat* (949; a term normally associated with the sacrifice of animals [31]). He uses this verb only two other times in his poetry: it describes Aeneas' killing of Haemonides (10.541), and the four sons of Sulmo whom he sacrifices on the grave of Pallas (10.519). At this point, the rumour of Augustus' alleged human sacrifice at Perusia might come to mind and the ambiguous "correctness" of his *pietas*. The last three lines of the poem that follow, in which Aeneas is *fervidus* (951), and Turnus' death is *indignata* (952), also stress the violence of the episode and the unsettling nature of the poem's ending. According to Quinn, "We must condemn the sudden rage that causes Aeneas to kill Turnus. The killing of Turnus cannot be justified: this is beyond doubt the judgement expected of us" (1968, p. 273). Putnam also condemns the rage of Aeneas: "It is Aeneas who loses - leaving Turnus victorious in his tragedy, submitting to the forces of violence and irrationality which

swirl around him, failing to incorporate the ideal standards proper for the achievement of the Empire" (1965, p. 193; cf. West, 1974, p. 29).

The question of whether this episode was intended to be a slight against Augustus cannot be avoided. It is necessary at this point, however, to consider whether a reader would be justified in stating that there is every reason for Aeneas to "submit [himself] to the forces of violence and irrationality". If it is possible to see in Aeneas' character a moral progression, then it is equally possible and realistic to expect Aeneas, as a human being, to advance very slowly upon the path of moral righteousness, if in fact this were the aim of Vergil's characterization. Lyne observes:

> Certainly I do not think that Aeneas "progresses" fundamentally as a man or hero: I do not think that the passion prone Aeneas in Books 1-6 becomes a determined and controlled Aeneas in Books 7-12. On the contrary, we see Aeneas displaying the same vulnerability to passionate emotion in the second half as in the first (1983, p. 202).

One result of this "human development" approach to Aeneas' character is to see his killing of Turnus as an event which would affect him profoundly and one which would help him to develop emotionally as a human being. Another important result of this approach is that it would also preserve the "tragedy" of Turnus' death.

Direct references to Augustus in the Aeneid, however, may be

analyzed with regard to the way in which Vergil describes him. Gordon Williams has pointed out that, in the Aeneid, Augustus is never praised by Vergil in his own voice.[32] In Book 1.289-96, he is praised by means of Jupiter; in Book 6.791-800, he is praised by Anchises; and in Book 8.722-28, Augustus is portrayed on the shield created by Vulcan. The importance of this is not that Vergil disassociates himself from any feelings for Augustus, but that, on the one side, panegyric is avoided and, on the other, an ambiguity results as to his personal feelings for the emperor. In the context of the Imperial virtues promoted by Augustus, one might well ask whether Vergil, through this episode, is commenting upon Augustus' lack of clemency while avenging Caesar's death or simply presenting a character who exhibits human inconsistencies.

Vergil attributes aspects of the Imperial virtues esteemed by Augustus to both Aeneas and Marcellus. Aeneas is described throughout most of the epic as *pius*, but it is to Marcellus that Vergil attributes virtuous qualities in a way which recalls Caesar's earlier image and propaganda:

> *nec puer Iliaca quisquam de gente Latinos*
> *in tantum spe tollet avos, nec Romula quondam*
> *ullo se tantum tellus iactabit alumno.*
> *heu pietas, heu prisca fides invictaque bello*
> *dextera! non illi se quisquam impune tulisset*
> *obvius armato, seu cum pedes iret in hostem*
> *seu spumantis equi foderat calcaribus armos*
> (6.875-881).

While it is to Marcellus that a direct eulogy is given (cf.

Wistrand, 1984, p.197). Augustus also receives indirect praise as his uncle and father-in-law. Although it could be argued from this that Vergil praises Augustus through Aeneas and Marcellus, and that Aeneas' lack of clemency at the end of the epic is made up for by Marcellus' virtues. This position, however, cannot be defended in light of the position of Turnus' death in the very last lines of the poem, and of the relative insignificance of the reference to Marcellus for the action of the poem as a whole. In fact, Erik Wistrand points out: "By alluding to a relationship between Aeneas' *pietas* and military prowess and the corresponding qualities of Augustus, the poet might even have risked provoking uncharitable comment" (1984, p. 197). It could also be argued that Vergil was not obliged to follow Homer's death of Hector; and that he could have ended the poem on a more positive note thereby presenting Aeneas as a morally mature hero, either through the demonstration of clemency to Turnus or through the description of a sense of regret on the part of Aeneas, as earlier in the episode of Lausus' death. If, in fact, Vergil intended to praise Augustus, one would expect a more positive ending with a description of Aeneas as a virtuous warrior.

This chapter has underlined the important role played by the statesman's virtues in the propaganda of the late Republic and the role of Caesar in promoting them. It was found that the trend to associate political acts with virtues was current when

Augustus was first coming into prominence before the death of Caesar. The analysis of Augustus' own promotion of these as Imperial virtues, in particular *pietas* and *clementia*, and of Aeneas' slaying of Turnus has indicated no more than the possibility that the historical role of Augustus and not his character is found in Aeneas and that any ongoing attempt to reconcile the two is impossible. The examination has still left unanswered, however, the question why Vergil chose to end Book 12 with Turnus' death, and to close with a relatively pessimistic note in a poem which celebrates the founding of Rome. In the following chapter, Turnus' death will be examined with an emphasis on structural considerations such as the role of the gods, the "meaning" of the Aeneid, and the relation of Book 12 to the poem as a whole.

Chapter 3: Structural Analysis of Aeneid, Book 12

In the preceding chapters, the death of Turnus has been analysed mainly from the point of view of Vergil's characterization of Aeneas and Turnus, and possible allusions to Augustus and Antonius. It remains to place this episode in the context of the poem as a whole in order that Turnus' death may be explained as part of the poem's overall theme. In the present chapter, the ending of the Aeneid will be examined with reference to the way the gods on the divine level of the poem influence the actions of the heroes on the human level. This examination will consider, firstly, the importance of the divine level for Turnus' death, through a comparison with the Iliad, and, secondly, the Latin literary precedents for such an ending known to Vergil, which may help to explain the impact of Turnus' death.

Throughout the Aeneid, there is a strong relationship between the actions of Aeneas and the will of the gods. The gods do not command Aeneas to follow their will, but they do expect him to obey as a mark of his *pietas*. With regard to the poem's ending, the extent to which the gods are responsible for Aeneas'

actions is a question which Vergil leaves unanswered. Two recent views of the role of the gods and of the *pietas* of Aeneas will serve to introduce an analysis of Book 12 and an examination of the relationship between the divine level and the actions of Aeneas. First, there is the view of Griffin:

> In the second half of the Aeneid there is a vital tension between the divine mission and justification of Aeneas, and the terrible fact that these are Italians and an Italian prince whom he must kill... (1984, p. 213).

and secondly, the view of R.D. Williams:

> Thematically Turnus plays in the last four books the part which Dido played in the first four. He represents opposition to the Roman mission; he is an obstacle to the divine will; he becomes involved in a net of circumstances from which, because of traits in his personality, he cannot or will not escape (1987, p. 119).

Both of these passages include a number of controversial points concerning Aeneas' role and his relationship with the gods. The mission to which Griffin refers is the founding of the future Roman race. While the gods expect Aeneas to comply, they do not command the deaths which he causes. This relationship between "duty" and Aeneas' killing of Turnus is understood by Pomathios: "Son devoir, a lui le fils plein de piété, est de priver un père de son fils [Turnus], comme ce devoir l'y a déjà conduit aussi bien envers son ennemi Mézance qu'envers son allié Évandre, au nom des necessités de la guerre et de l'édification de la cité future" (1984, p. 210).

When R.D. Williams states that Turnus is an "obstacle to the divine will", he suggests that it is because of Aeneas' duty to the gods that his killing of Turnus becomes an act of *pietas* required of the hero. This would only be true, however, if one sees Turnus simply as an obstacle or threat to the mission which was described to Aeneas in Book 2, and if one sees Aeneas as no more than an "instrument of Heaven" (cf. Syme, 1939, p. 462).[1] Such views, however, undermine the level on which the human characters of the poem operate in that they deny to both Aeneas and Turnus the measure of freedom allowed to the characters of the Aeneid in terms of their ability to act within the dictates of Fate.

Since one aspect of Aeneas' *pietas* is his respect for the gods, through his observation of their wishes, it is necessary at this point to give a brief account of the "mission" described to Aeneas, on the night of Troy's destruction, in Book 2. In order that he himself and the household gods of Troy might be preserved, the will of the Olympians is revealed to Aeneas on three separate occasions, through supernatural visits by Hector, Venus, and Creusa. Hector appears to Aeneas in a dream and informs him that he must leave Troy immediately with the images of Troy's gods: *'Heu! fuge, nate dea, teque his!' ait, 'eripe flammis./...sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia Penatis: hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quaere./magna pererrato statues quae denique ponto'* (Aen. 2. 289-295). Venus later confirms the

message given by Hector by revealing to Aeneas the gods' destruction of Troy (Aen. 2. 604 ff). It is only with Creusa's message, however, that Aeneas' mission is explicitly stated:

> *longa tibi exsilia, et vastum maris aequor arandum:*
> *et terram Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva*
> *inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Thybris.*
> *illic res laetae regnumque et regia coniunx*
> *parta tibi* (780-784).

Creusa does not however, mention the wars which occupy the second half of the poem, and it is not clear whether Aeneas ever enjoyed the happiness she predicted. In Book 4, Mercury commands Aeneas to leave Carthage and mentions Italy and Rome (275), but it is not until Aeneas visits Anchises in the Underworld that he is informed of the wars that await him: *exin bella viro memorat quae deinde gerenda* (890), and is given instructions concerning his future relationship with the Italians: *Laurentisque docet populos urbemque Latini,/et quo quemque modo fugiatque feratque laborem* (891-892).[2] There is no mention, however, of Turnus, whom Aeneas knows only from the Sybil's statement *alius Latio iam partus Achilles* (6.89), or of Turnus' death.

It is in Book 12 that the gods decide the fate of Turnus and it is only here that this fate is finally made known to him. The departure of Juturna, his sister and divine helper, on the battlefield indicates to Turnus that he has been abandoned by the gods (12.914 ff.). In other words, on the divine level, only Turnus' death, or rather Aeneas' victory, is predicted. There is

no mention or revelation of the manner in which Turnus must die. Jupiter's speech to the gods in Book 10 does not clarify the extent to which men are responsible for their own actions or that to which Jupiter himself controls Fate: *sua cuique exorsa laborem/fortunamque ferent. rex Iuppiter omnibus idem:/fata viam invenient* (111-113). The gods in the Aeneid co-exist with Fate, and Jupiter himself is always identified with the ordinances of Fate. It would seem, then, that Jupiter allows certain events or actions of men to take place "alongside" his own decrees, but that these actions could never replace, in the end, the outcome of his decrees. Camps analyses well the role of Fate in the Aeneid and deftly explains the ambiguous relationship between the will of the gods and the free will of men:

> What Fate ordains is rigid and cannot be changed by power of god or prayer of man. But the texture, so to speak, of the ordinances of Fate is loose: much remains undetermined by it, and what is determined by it may sometimes be postponed though not averted (1969, p. 42).

The episode of Jupiter's weighing of the scales of Fate and the reconciliation of Jupiter and Juno are central to the action of Book 12 and recall the meeting of the gods and Zeus' balance scene in the Iliad, Book 22.

In the Iliad, a meeting of the gods (22.177 ff.) precedes Zeus' balancing of the scales of Fate (22.208 ff). This episode is essential to the action of the narrative; the balance scene

both predicts and precipitates the death of Hector. Before Zeus weighed the fate of each man, the action of Book 22 was inconclusive: Achilles pursuing could not catch Hector and Hector fleeing could not escape (22.188 ff.). It is only after Hector's side of the balance falls that Apollo deserts him (22.213 ff.) and Athena descends from Olympus to help Achilles defeat him (22.214 ff.). Dramatic irony can be seen in the duel of Achilles and Hector. Although Hector has been foresaken by the gods at line 212 he does not learn this until line 296 (cf. West, 1974, p. 23). The final confrontation of Achilles and Hector makes manifest the universality of death and futility of man's attempts to avert it (cf. Griffin, 1980, p. 163). When the fallen Hector warns Achilles of his own approaching death, Achilles replies: τέθναθι· κῆρα δ' ἐγὼ τότε δέξομαι ὁππότε κεν Ζεὺς/Ζεὺς ἐθέλῃ τελέσαι ἠδ' ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι (22.365-366). The emotional impact of this speech depends upon the reader's recollection of Hector's earlier ignorance concerning the nature of Fate, as revealed in his speech to Patroclus: Πατρόκλειες τί νύ μοι μαντεύεαι αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον;/τίς δ' οἶδ' εἴ κ' Ἀχιλῆος Θέτιδος πάις ἠυκόμοιο/φθήῃ ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ τυπεὶς ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσαι; (16.859-861).

A different process is at work in the Aeneid. Whereas the meeting of the gods preceded Zeus' balance scene in the Iliad, Jupiter's balance scene (12.725 ff.) takes place before his

reconciliation with Juno (12.791 ff.). Vergil does not inform the reader of the outcome of the weighing, and in fact could not have done so without destroying the narrative sequence of the book (cf. West, 1974, p. 123).

In contrast to the Iliad, where Apollo deserts Hector after Zeus' balance scene, Juno, in the Aeneid, expressly states to Jupiter that she has known what the outcome of the duel must be and that she has already forsaken Turnus: *Ista quidem quia nota mihi tua, magne, voluntas./Iuppiter, et Turnum et terras invita reliqui...* (12.808-9). Juno then makes a series of demands which will end her hostility towards the Trojans:

> *...cum iam leges et foedera iungent,*
> *ne vetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos*
> *neu Troas fieri iubeas Teucrosque vocari*
> *aut vocem mutare viros aut vertere vestem,*
> *sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula reges,*
> *sit Romana potens Itala virtute propago;*
> *occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia*
> (12.822-828).

On the divine level, Juno's gaining of the requests made in exchange for the death of Turnus appeases the wrath with which the poem began. Ring-composition is used by Vergil to confirm the importance of Juno for the action of the poem. For example, in Book 1, Juno complains: *et quisquam numen Iunonis adorat?/praeterea aut supplex aris imponet honorem?* (48 ff.), and after 12 books, her complaint is addressed by Jupiter who

assures her that the future Romans will honour her above all other races: *nec gens ulla tuos aeque celebrabit honores* (840).

The significance of Jupiter's reconciliation with Juno and its effect on the death of Turnus have been variously assessed. West views their meeting as a successful element in the poem: "The terms of this matrimonial reconciliation are the conclusion of the argument of the Aeneid and the climax of the poem...The death of Turnus that follows is the necessary consequence of the political settlement, the personal coda to the national epic" (1974, p. 24), and again, "This political purpose is an important element in the Aeneid, and wholly foreign to the Iliad. It accounts for Virgil's postponement of the conversation of the gods to form the climax and grand conclusion of the poem" (p.25).

Farron, however, argues that the poem should have ended with the final conversation between Jupiter and Juno, if the ending was not intended to reflect negatively upon Aeneas (1982, p. 140). West and Farron seem to agree that Turnus had to die as history demanded and that the divine solution of the duel between Aeneas and Turnus is acceptable. In other words, Turnus' death is justifiable on the divine level because of the future benefits Juno will receive from the Romans. This solution, however, would explain the death of Turnus only as the price of Juno's selfish whims rather than the result of Pallas' death and Aeneas' subsequent grief- human elements which Vergil considers as

important as divine ones, as exemplified by his sympathetic treatment of Dido in the Underworld in Book 6.

On the human level, Vergil again uses ring-composition to create an antithesis between Aeneas and Turnus, not only in Book 12, but in the poem as a whole (cf. E.L. Harrison, 1976, p. 103). A contrast between expectation and reality places the two characters in a sort of role reversal: Turnus, at line 16 of Book 12, claims that he will vindicate the Italians from the charge of cowardice by killing Aeneas with his sword: *et solus ferro crimen commune refellam* (12.16) but, at the end of the book, he himself is killed by the sword of Aeneas (950).

With regard to the epic as a whole, the two characters are again presented in an antithetical relationship. In Book 1, the first glimpse of Aeneas occurs when he is on his ship during the storm and Vergil describes him thus: *extemplo Aeneae solvuntur frigore membra* (92). This same expression *solvuntur frigore membra* appears again at the second last line of the poem where it describes the death of Turnus: *...ast illi solvuntur frigore membra...* (951). The temporary shock of Aeneas and his potential death on board his ship which open the poem are replaced in the last few lines by the actual death of Turnus.

On both the divine and human levels of the poem, a "justification" for Turnus' death, as discussed above, can be found. In order to address further those "political"

interpretations discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, which deny any structural or thematic importance to the episode of Turnus' death, an examination of the Aeneid's "meaning" will be undertaken. This will take the form of a discussion of the literary precedents for such an abrupt ending and the "post-narrative" of the poem.

Vergil's purpose in writing the Aeneid has been variously interpreted. Sforza, with his typical hatred of Augustus, sums up Vergil's poem as: "...the most virulent libel ever written against Rome and its rule..." (1935, p. 102). More recently, Otis has seen the Aeneid as a product of various antitheses: "Only the Aeneid aspired to be both heroic and civilized, both remote and contemporary, both Homeric and Augustan" (1963, pp. 2, 3). According to R.D. Williams, "The purpose of the Aeneid...was essentially an exploration of varying and sometimes contrasting aspects of human experience" (1967, p. 40). Camps has identified three themes in the Aeneid: firstly, the founding of Rome (*tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem*, 1.33), secondly, the figure of Aeneas, and thirdly, "The poet's sense, pervading his work, of the unhappy mystery of the ways of the higher powers with man: tantaene animus caelestibus irae?, 1.11" (1969, p. 51). Gordon Williams's analysis of the poem's meaning is non-committal. For example, he initially claims, "It is easy to sense that many complex ideas are there expressed, but indirectly

and in such a way that they bear no clear relevance to Augustan ideology" (1983, p. 234). Later he is reluctant to identify what these ideas are with regard to both Augustan ideology and the poem's meaning as a whole: "It is, in fact, very hard to say what the ideas of the Aeneid are, and some violence and oversimplification are done to the text just by attempting to do so" (1983, p. 236). Griffin offers an interpretation of the poem's theme, which is similar to that of Camps: "The central tension of the Aeneid...is that between the triumphant destiny of Rome and the personal unhappiness of its founding hero Aeneas" (London, 1984, p. 122). The recent view of Bloom explains what the Aeneid is not about but falls short of explaining what in fact it is about: "The Aeneid is a poem that attempts to compel itself to the grandeur of Augustan vistas, but its genius has little to do with Augustus and at last little to do even with Aeneas" (1987, p. 8).

The above citations demonstrate that the Aeneid has been interpreted as a poem which concerns Aeneas and the founding of Rome, and that the poem can be interpreted independently of any reference to Augustus. The role of Turnus for such interpretations also reflects upon Aeneas in that Turnus' death, just like Dido's earlier in the poem, was a tangible example of the difficult task of founding the Roman Empire. In this light, Vergil's sympathetic treatment of Turnus' death, as discussed in

Chapter 1, would ensure that the cost of founding Rome would be measured in terms of human unhappiness and suffering.[3]

It has been suggested recently that the "message" of the Aeneid is delivered by two voices - a public and a private one. R.D. Williams has associated the public voice with "...Rome's mission to pacify and civilize the world..." (1967, p. 40) and the private voice with "...a world transcending the mortal condition of the human scene" (1967, p. 41). Lyne, however, suggests the presence of an epic voice, which corresponds to Williams's "public voice": "...those who seek a fundamentally sound, imperial poem need not be disappointed or disturbed; the epic voice is there to speak to those with such positive expectations" (1987, p. 2). In contrast to this epic voice are "further voices" which "...intrude other material and opinions, and these may be disturbing even shocking. Further voices add to, comment upon, question and occasionally subvert the implications of the epic voice" (1987, p. 2). Although these "voices" would efficiently categorize all those elements of the poem which a reader may find disturbing or puzzling, the use of various voices to explain the poem might encourage one to categorize ideas into a system that was foreign to the intentions of Vergil. At the risk of offering an artistic "impression" of the poem, to explain all emotion and events in terms of two voices, which may separate various levels of an episode into

different categories, might be to reduce the number of different levels present in a passage and to lessen the emotional impact of Vergil's narrative technique. Passages like the deaths of Nisus and Euryalus and Aeneas' killing of Turnus include a host of ideas and emotions which should not be considered only from the point of view of two voices and conformity to a literary theory.

The death of Turnus may also be explained as an essential element to the emotional experiences of Aeneas. If the Aeneid is a poem about the trials of Aeneas and the founding of Rome, then the episode of Turnus' death, where Aeneas is forced to choose between vengeance and clemency, is an important element of his mental and physical experience, and reflects the descriptions of confusion and suffering which appear throughout the poem. The impact of the ending on the rest of the poem has been analysed by Griffin:

> The Aeneid...ends with a violent discord. Virgil cannot have intended to write a poem in thirteen or fourteen Books; Book 12 is the longest in the Aeneid; it is not a mark of incompleteness that it ends where it does. The effect, haunting, complex, and in harmony with the rest of the poem, is deliberate (1986, p. 102).[4]

The gloomy storm scene which opens the epic is echoed in the gloomy, violent death of Turnus where the last word of the poem reinforces the murkiness and obscurity of much of the epic: *ast illi solvuntur frigore membra/vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras* (12.951-952).

Since Vergil did not follow Homer in his choice of an ending, Latin literary precedents may explain Vergil's decision to end the poem with Turnus' death. Homer may have been an example of what to avoid and Lucretius of what to imitate in a dramatic ending. As discussed in Chapter Two, both the Iliad and the Odyssey attempt to reintegrate the hero into society and the world at large. In the Iliad, after Hector's death, the narrative tension revolves around Achilles' impending death and his acceptance of Fate. Although Hector's corpse is used as a catalyst to ensure that the meeting between Achilles and Priam can take place, some of Hector's heroic grandeur is lost in the reconciliation scene which ends the epic. He is no longer a warrior on the battlefield but a pathetic figure lying in straw who will return to Troy for the last time in a wagon rather than in a chariot. It seems that Homer could have increased the dramatic force of the epic by ending the poem on the battlefield or with the scene at the end of Book 22 in which Andromache together with the Trojan women bewail Hector's death and where Andromache throws her headdress - a symbol of her marriage - now become useless with Hector's death (22.468 ff.).

Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*, however, could have suggested to Vergil how to end his poem on a dramatic and somewhat pessimistic note. The *De Rerum Natura* ends with a vivid account of the Athenian plague in Book 6 and adds tension to the poem by

suggesting that death may not be as harmless, or may not be approached as fearlessly, as was suggested throughout the poem (1.102 ff.; 2.37 ff.; 3.31 ff.; and, *nil igitur mors est ad nos...* [3.830]; etc.). The sombre ending leaves the reader with an unsettling feeling as though he may have misunderstood the poem's meaning. The frequency of unpleasant descriptions of the plague victims in the last few lines of Book 6: *languida semanimo cum corpore membra videres/ horrida paedore et pannis cooperta perire/ corporis inluvie, pelli super ossibus una,/ ulceribus taetris prope iam sordeque sepulta* (1268-1271)[5], and the final words of Lucretius ensure a dramatic, pessimistic ending:

> *nec mos ille sepulturae remanebat in urbe,*
> *quo prius hic populus semper consuerat humari:*
> *perturbatus enim totus trepidabat, et unus*
> *quisque suum pro re (compostum) maestus humabat.*
> *multaque (res) subita et paupertas horrida suasit.*
> *namque suos consanguineos aliena rogorum*
> *insuper exstructa ingenti clamore locabant*
> *subdebantque faces, multo cum sanguine saepe*
> *rixantes potius quam corpora desererentur* (1278-1286).

This sort of ending whereby a scene involving death may confuse a reader's earlier impression of a poem finds a parallel in the Aeneid. The various interpretations of the ending's effect upon an understanding of the poem, as discussed in this paper, indicate that a similar narrative technique seems to have been used by Vergil. While it would be unnecessary to list all those passages in the Aeneid which imitate passages in Lucretius,

it is important to demonstrate that linguistic echoes are present in the last quarter of Book 12 which show that Vergil had in mind the ending of the *De Rerum Natura*.

According to Cyril Bailey, the *mussabat* of line 1179 of *De Rerum Natura*, Book 6 (*...mussabat tacito medicina timore*) is used by Vergil in 12.657: *mussat rex ipse Latinus...*[6] The sense of a silence due to fear in both of these passages, as defined by Lewis and Short, is unique in Latin literature.[7] Other linguistic echoes between Lucretius and Aeneid Book 12, which confirm Vergil's debt to him, apply directly to descriptions of Turnus and his imminent death. At *De Rerum Natura* 6.1214 the delusion which accompanies plague is described by Lucretius (*neque se possent cognoscere ut ipsi*) and is used by Vergil to describe the sense of delusion and despair felt by Turnus: *sed neque currentem se nec cognoscit euntem* (12.903). Lucretius' description of the loss of physical sensation due to fear: *multaque praeterea languentia membra per artus solvunt* (6.797-8) becomes in Vergil, a means of describing the troubled emotional state of Turnus at 12.867 (*illi membra novus solvit formidine torpor*) and finally, his body at the point of death: *...solvuntur illi frigore membra* (12.951). The recollection of Aeneas' mental state at 1.92 (*solvuntur frigore membra*), through ring composition, completes the reversal to the roles played by each character in the poem.

As with Lucretius, Catullus 64 could have suggested to Vergil a way of ending the Aeneid on a tragic and pessimistic note by concluding with an episode which seems to contrast the earlier optimism of the poem. Earlier in his writing career, Vergil borrowed elements from this poem for his Orpheus-Eurydice epyllion in Book Four of the Georgics. In the Aeneid, linguistic parallels with Catullus 64 occur at Book 2. 626-631 (cf. 64. 105-11), Book 4. 316, 365 and 657-8 (cf. 64. 141, 154 and 171-2 respectively), Book 5. 270 (cf. 64. 101), and Book 8. 389 (cf. 64. 90). It is important to consider therefore, whether the ending of Catullus 64 could also have influenced his handling of Turnus' death.[8]

Catullus' description of the festive wedding of Peleus and Thetis is contrasted with the sad tale of Theseus and Ariadne on the quilt (64.50 ff.). A tension is achieved at the end of the epyllion through the contrast drawn between "heroes of old" and the "old days", and the impious, destructive breed of men which exists in the present day (64.397 ff.). The final 12 lines of the poem end the poem itself on a note of pessimism and sadness:

> sed postquam tellus scelere est imbuta nefando
> iustitiamque omnes cupida de mente fugarunt,
> perfudere manus fraterno sanguine fratres,
> destitit extinctos gnatus lugere parentes,
> optavit genitor primaeui funera nati,
> liber ut innuptae poteretur flore novercae,
> ignaro mater substernens se impia nato
> impia non verita est divos scelerare penates,
> omnia fanda nefanda malo permixta furore

> iustificam nobis mentem auertere deorum.
> quare nec talis dignantur uisere coetus,
> nec se contingi patiuntur lumine claro
> (64.397-408).

Linguistic similarities between Catullus 64 and the Aeneid Book 12 will confirm, as in the above analysis of similarities between Lucretius and Aeneid Book 12, that Vergil also had the ending of Catullus 64 in mind when he was writing the episode of Turnus' death. The verb *volitare* at Catullus 64.251 (*at parte ex alia florens volitabat Iacchus*) is present at Aeneid 12.125-6: *mediis in milibus ipsi, / ductores auro volitant ostroque superbi* (cf. Fordyce, 1968, p. 306). Catullus' use of *facito ut* at 64.231 finds a parallel in Vergil's *facito...sis memor* (12.438; cf. Fordyce, 1968, p. 305). One may also compare Catullus 64.405: *fanda nefanda* with Vergil's similar *digna indigna* at line 12.811 (cf. R.D. Williams, 1973, p. 495).

An important aspect of the Aeneid's ending is the uncertain future of Aeneas. Griffin has emphasized the future unhappiness of Aeneas in his analysis of the poem's post-narrative: "...personally unhappy and deprived of everything he values, ending the poem with the knowledge that he has killed Dido and Turnus, that he has failed to save Pallas, that he will not live to see the Rome for which he has done and suffered so much..." (Oxford, 1984, p. 213).

Other considerations of the Aeneid's post-narrative also indicate the superiority of the poem's abrupt ending. Since the

tragedy of Turnus' death had been expressed already by Vergil, there was no need to include subsequent episodes which would have lessened its impact. Apparently, Vergil did not consider it necessary to increase parallels with the Iliad with respect to the characters of Aeneas and Turnus, and those of Achilles and Hector. It could be argued for example, that a scene with Daunus rolling in dirt and a later scene of his reconciliation with Aeneas, which would have paralleled the emotional scene between Achilles and Priam, would have ended the poem on an anticlimactic note. As discussed above, Aeneas is a different kind of hero from Achilles, and the poem's emphasis on his difficult task of founding Rome may have convinced Vergil not to include a discussion on the mortality of man.

It has been suggested that the abrupt ending of the poem also relieves Vergil of the responsibility of describing awkward episodes or rather of resolving tensions caused by Turnus' death. Griffin has analysed the post-narrative in terms of the structural benefits achieved by ending the poem abruptly:

> It is not possible to imagine the first meeting of Aeneas and Lavinia, when he has killed Turnus and her mother has hanged herself in despair: it could not be written by Virgil, and reflection on that impossibility was probably one of the factors in his eventual decision to end the epic abruptly with Turnus' death (London, 1984, p. 132).

It would be difficult to prove, however, given the structural and thematic importance of the Aeneid's ending, that Vergil was

reluctant or, rather, intimidated to continue writing the epic as a result of any poetic or structural difficulties caused by Turnus' death.

Through an analysis of the overall structure and meaning of the Aeneid, this chapter has demonstrated two things: firstly, that Turnus' death can be justified without it being seen as a criticism or comment upon Augustus and, secondly, that the impact of the poem's ending is actually enhanced by Turnus' death. Both characters receive a share of the reader's sympathy at the end of the poem and an interpretation of the post-narrative in terms of Aeneas' future in Italy is to a large extent dependent upon this sympathy. Vergil's use of his literary models - Homer, Lucretius, and Catullus - has ensured that the ending which he gave his poem is one which would evoke the strongest emotional reaction from the reader.

Conclusion

The analysis of Turnus' death in this thesis has assessed the relation between Vergil's creativity and the extent to which Augustus may be represented in the character of Aeneas. A brief summary of the approach taken, and the result achieved, through various lines of enquiry, will review the principal points of the controversy of Turnus' death.

In the Introduction, terms which have not always been identified in analyses of the Aeneid's ending were defined. It was found that such general terms as "Augustan", "propaganda", and "patronage" could introduce overtones into interpretations of the poem's ending which may not be appropriate to the historical background of the Aeneid's composition. The examination of Vergil's relationship to Augustus, through the example of Horace, demonstrated that assumptions which are made solely on the basis of the "patronage" which Vergil received from Maecenas and Augustus cannot be be accepted as evidence for "political" interpretations of the poem.

In Chapter 1, the opposing schools of thought concerning

Turnus' death and the moral "correctness" of Aeneas' actions in Book 12 were introduced. In order to separate the literary and historical aspects of the characters of Aeneas and Turnus, and to consider any possible allusions to Augustus and Antonius, Homer's Iliad and Odyssey were examined for similarities between the characters Achilles and Aeneas, and between Hector and Turnus. Aspects of the characters of Aeneas and Turnus not found in Homer served as a point of departure for a discussion of the extent to which contemporary references or rather allusions could be read into the poem. An analysis of the controversy of the association which has been identified between Augustus and Aeneas emphasized that the association was ambivalent and one which could not be maintained throughout the poem. Augustus and Aeneas share a similar historical role, but this does not necessarily mean that they should also share the same personality. With regard to the relationship which is believed to exist between Antonius and Turnus, it was found that the evidence for such an association was unsatisfactory, and that the basis for the argument itself was usually a product of the perceived association between Augustus and Aeneas.

In Chapter 2, both the character of Aeneas and the death of Turnus were examined with respect to the propagation of the Statesman's or the Imperial virtues in the late Republic. Since Julius Caesar played a large role in shaping the virtues

eventually promoted by Augustus, a heavy emphasis was placed upon the way in which he was perceived and imitated. It was found that the statesman's virtues of *pietas* and *clementia* played a larger role than *iustitia* and *virtus* in the propaganda of both Caesar and Augustus. The view that these virtues, when applied to the character of Aeneas, whether positively or negatively, should reflect to some extent upon the image of Augustus or should indicate Vergil's "feelings" for Augustus was analysed. An examination of the problems associated with an historical interpretation of Turnus' death suggested that the ending should be placed in the context of the meaning and structure of the poem as a whole.

A structural analysis of Book 12 and the importance of this structure for the poem as a whole was undertaken in Chapter 3. Precedents from earlier endings in Latin literature, namely Lucretius and Catullus, were analysed in order to assess the dramatic impact which the placement of Turnus' death in Book 12 achieves. It was argued that the placement and narration of Turnus' death was essential to the structure of the Aeneid and the characterization of Aeneas. In other words, the episode of the death of Turnus reinforces the principle theme of the poem: the difficult task of founding the Roman nation and the emotionally and physically demanding role played by Aeneas, a character with human weaknesses and inconsistencies, in fulfilling this task.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1 See C.H.V. Sutherland's, "The Purpose of Roman Imperial Coin Types", Revue Numismatique 25 (1983), 74 ff. for a discussion of the term's application in the context of Imperial coin propaganda. In future citations of critical works, only the author's name and the date of publication will be given in parenthesis in the body of the text for all works listed in full in the Bibliography. References to the Aeneid will be taken from the revised Loeb edition, trans. H.R. Fairclough (1986). References to Homer's Iliad will be taken from the Loeb edition, trans. A.T. Murray (1925: reprint 1985).

2 S. Farron, "The Death of Turnus Viewed in the Perspective of its Historical Background", AC 24 (1981), p. 100.

3 H.H. Scullard, From the Gracchi to Nero (London, 1959, reprint in 1982), p. 236.

4 F. Sforza, "The Problem of Virgil", CR 49 (1935), pp. 97-108. Both the unique interpretations of Sforza and the recent interest in this article (cf. R.D. Williams, 1967, p. 29) necessitate the inclusion of Sforza's views in discussions which will appear throughout this paper.

5 P. White, "*Amicitia* and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome", JRS 68 (1978), p. 75.

6 R. Saller, Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire (Cambridge, 1982), pp. 11-15, and P. White, op. cit., p. 82.

7 F. Millar, The Emperor in the Roman World (London, 1977), p. 111.

NOTES

CHAPTER 1:

1 It is arguable that a careful reading of the first six books of the Aeneid, in particular Book 2, does in fact prepare the reader for the more martial aspects of Aeneas' character which appear in the latter half of the poem. The fall of Troy in Book 2 being the only scene in this first half of the poem by which Vergil had the opportunity to lay the groundwork, so to speak, for Aeneas the warrior, it is here that the reader might expect to find a conscious foreshadowing of that character's later battlefield actions. This, however is not the case. In the first place, Aeneas is not in Book 2 a characteristic Homeric warrior moved by blind rage, rather his actions are characterized by a certain amount of indecision, of thought and rethought.

In addition, from a structural point of view, almost entirely lacking in Book 2 is the Homeric device of the *monomachia*, used extensively by Vergil in the latter half of the Aeneid. In fact, there occurs only one such scene in all of Book 2 (533-53) and although Aeneas is not directly involved, it serves to strengthen the notion that his character undergoes something of a change towards the end of the poem.

The scene here referred to is that in which Neoptolemus kills Priam. Vergil's description of this tragic event, put into the mouth of Aeneas himself, seems to emphasize the brutality of Neoptolemus' act. In the reported speech of Priam, it is explicitly stated that Neoptolemus' behaviour is contrary to the concept of *pietas* (2. 535-8). The death blow is described thus: *implicuitque* (sc. Neoptolemus) *comam laeva, dextraque coruscum/ extulit ac lateri capulo tenus abdidit ensem* (552-3).

Given this, Vergil must certainly have intended his readers to be somewhat shocked, when in Book 10, the description of Aeneas' killing of Magus precisely echoes this passage: *sic fatus* (sc. Aeneas) *galeam laeva tenet atque reflexa,/ cervice orantis capulo tenus applicat ensem* (10. 535-6). Thus Aeneas' behaviour is equated with the sort of impious behaviour which resulted in the death of his own king and perhaps symbolically, the fall of his city. It is possibly a discredit to the poet to suggest that he has not in sublimely subtle fashion signalled to the reader a rather drastic change in the character of his hero.

2 Servius, Servii grammatici in Vergilii Aeneidos Commentarius., on Book 12, lines 940 ff.

3 cf. The view of Camps: [The despoliation of Falisci]"...is not to be construed as brutal or arrogant' (1969, p. 39).

4 cf. R.D. Williams, 1987, pp. 19 ff.

5 cf. Basson, 1984, and Putnam, 1981: "Though Mezentius despises the gods, publicly abrogating an important form of pietas, he gains at the end a measure of our sympathy", p. 141.

NOTES

CHAPTER 2

1 W.K. Lacey, "Octavian in the Senate, January 27 B.C.", JRS 64 (1974), p. 181, n. 51. = Ehrenberg, V., and A.H.M. Jones, Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, (EJ), Second Edition (Oxford, 1955, reprint 1976), 22.

2 I do not consider these virtues a "canon", nor do I agree with Andrew Wallace-Hadrill that neither these particular virtues, known as the "imperial virtues" (as opposed to the Socratic philosophic virtues of kings, such as Bravery, Temperance, Justice, and Wisdom), nor the *"clupeus virtutis"* motif "played no authoritative role in spreading belief in them". ("The Emperor and his Virtues", Historia 30 (1981), p. 307.) The copy of the shield at Arles and the occurrence of the motif on coins argue against him.

3 cf., Plato, Rep. 4.428 a; Protag. 349 d; Lach. 199 d; Men. 78 d; etc.

4 cf., Cicero, de inv. 2.159; de or. 2.343; fin. 5.67 respectively.

5 For the first group: Cagnat, IGRRP (Paris, 1964), 4.305. For the second group; ibid. 4.306.

6 See, "Some Fragments of the Propaganda of Mark Antony" CQ 27 (1933), 173-7, for a discussion of Antony's propaganda against Augustus.

7 In the Aeneid, Vergil never praises Augustus' valour in his own voice (cf. Gordon Williams, 1983, 241 ff.) and as at Georgics, Book 1.498 ff., Augustus' military achievements are presented in a fantastic exotic manner.

8 cf., Cicero, leg. 3.9; rep. 3.34; off. 1.35.

9 Weinstock, (1971), pl. 17.15.

10 For an analysis of the term *clementia*, see J. Hellegouarc'h, Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république (Paris, 1963), pp. 261-263.

11 Compare with Caesar's declaration of clemency at Rome: Dio. 41.15.4: 16.4.

12 cf. Cicero. Att. 8.16.2: 9.7.3: 9.10.6: 10.7.1.

13 cf.. Cicero. *de Clementia*. I.II.1 and the importance of clemency in Seneca. *de Clementia*. 1.5.5: 2.3.1 and 2.4.1 for the moral virtue of clemency.

14 cf.. Propertius. 2.16.42.

15 cf.. Dio. 48.14.3-6.

16 Weinstock. (1971). pl. 19.9.

17 Sydenham. (1952). 122: pl. 21.750.

18 Sydenham. (1952). 158: Weinstock. (1971). pl. 19.12.

19 Weinstock. (1971). pl. 19.13.

20 Weinstock. (1971). pl. 19.14-15: EJ 1: 2: 5.

21 Weinstock. (1971). pl. 19. 17-18.

22 Sydenham. (1952). 210: Weinstock. (1971). pl. 20.1.

23 D.S. Robertson. Greek and Roman Architecture. Second Edition (Cambridge. 1929. reprint 1986). p. 340.

24 D.S. Robertson. op. cit.. p. 340.

25 D.S. Robertson. op. cit., p. 246 for the date of the original Pantheon Temple dedicated by M. Agrippa.

26 H. Mattingly and H. Sydenham. Roman Imperial Coins (RIC). Vol. 1 (London. 1923. reprint 1968). p. 83. It may be useful to cite Millar's misgivings of using the term propaganda in relation to coin type selection: "The term 'propaganda', often used of coin types and legends. seems to me unhelpful; we know neither who decided these matters nor what reactions they evoked. What we have is once again a set of visible and incontrovertible examples of how people construed the world in which they lived; or to put it another way, of the symbols which they thought it appropriate to display publicly." (1984). p. 45.

27 For coins showing *clupeus virtutis*, see RIC, op. cit., p. 83, nos. 243, 244 (pl. 2, 27), 245; p. 84, nos. 246, 250, 251, 257, 258, 259, 260 (pl. 2, 28), 261, 262; p. 85, no. 270; p. 86, nos. 291, 298, 299, 300, 301, 305, 306. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill's reasons for doubting that the coins showing *clupeus virtutis* did not result from the shield are not convincing (op. cit., p. 307 ff.). As a propaganda motif, the shield corresponds to Augustus' projection of *pietas* and *clementia* from 42 B.C. onwards. For further analyses concerning coin-type selection: C.H.V. Sutherland, "The purpose of Roman Imperial Coin Types", Revue Numismatique 25 (1983) 73 ff., C.H.V. Sutherland, "Roman Imperial Type Selection: The Degree of Immediacy", Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau 65 (1986), 105 ff., Christopher T.H.R. Ehrhardt, "Roman Coin Types and the Roman Public", J. Fur N.G. 34 (1984), 41-53, Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, "Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus", JRS 76 (1986), 66-87, J. Rufus Fears, "The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology", ANRW 2.17.2 (1981), 827-948.

28 Harold Mattingly, Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum (BMCRE), vol. 1 (London, 1923, republished 1965), p. 133, no. 98 (pl. 24, #7) = RIC, p. 106, no. 24 (pl. 6, 108), and dates from 14-21 A.D.

29 For Caligula, see BMCRE (op. cit.), p. 153, no. 41 (pl. 28, 26); for Galba, BMCRE, p. 358, no. 259 (pl. 59, 1).

30 *Clementia* appears on the following coins of Vitellius: BMCRE, p. 384, no. 78 (pl. 61, 13); p. 388, no. 98.

31 Oxford Latin Dictionary, Vol.II, (Oxford, 1968), pp. 837-838.

32 Gordon Williams, Technique and Ideas in the Aeneid (New Haven, 1983), 241 ff.

NOTES

CHAPTER 3

1 cf. Gordon Williams (1983), p. 233.

2 cf. David West: "The War in Latium is amongst other things the prototype of the Social War (91-87 B.C.) in which Rome asserted her hegemony over Italy" (1974), p. 22.

3 cf. Griffin: "[Aeneas] is presented by Virgil in a light which brings out both the triumph and the cost of Empire" (Oxford, 1984), p. 213.

4 cf. Pöschl (1962), 104 ff., for a discussion of the structural patterns of the even and odd numbered Books in the Aeneid in support of the "completeness" of the poem.

5 The OCT text of Cyril Bailey (Oxford, 1900, reprinted 1982) is cited here and in the following citation.

6 cf. Cyril Bailey, op. cit., Volume 3, p. 1731.

7 cf. Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, A Latin Dictionary, (Oxford, 1879, reprint 1987), pp. 1179-80.

8 cf. C. Segal, "Orpheus and the Fourth *Georgic*: Vergil on nature and civilization", AJP 87 (1966), 307-326. In the following citations from Catullus 64, the OCT text of R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1958, reprinted 1984) will be cited.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ANCIENT SOURCES

Apollonius Rhodius. *Argonautica*. OCT. ed., Hermann Fränkel (Oxford, 1961).

Appian. *Bella Civilia*. LCL. text and transl., Horace White (Harvard, 1912).

Augustus. *Monumentum Ancyranum*. edd., V. Ehrenberg and A.H.M. Jones (Oxford, 1949).

Caesar. *Bellum Civile*. OCT. ed., R. du Pontet (Oxford, 1900, reprinted 1969).

. *Bellum Gallicum*. OCT. ed., R. du Pontet (Oxford, 1900, reprinted 1969).

Cassius Dio. LCL. text and transl., Earnest Cary. (Harvard, 1914, reprinted, 1954).

Catullus. *Carmina*. OCT. ed., R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1958, reprinted 1984).

Cicero. *Ad Atticum*. OCT. ed., D.R. Shackleton Bailey (Oxford, 1961).

. *Ad Familiares*. OCT. ed., L.C. Purser (Oxford, 1901, reprinted 1964).

. *Ad Herennium*. LCL. text and transl., Harry Caplan (Harvard, 1954, reprinted 1968).

. *De Inventione*. LCL. text and transl., H.M. Hubbell (Harvard, 1949).

. *De Natura Deorum*. LCL. text and transl., H. Rackham (Harvard, 1933, reprinted 1956).

. *De Officiis*. OCT. ed., P. Fedeli (Oxford, 1965).

. *De Re Publica*. LCL. text and transl., Clinton Walker Keyes (Harvard, 1928, reprint 1952).

. *In Catilinam*. OCT. ed., A.C. Clark (Oxford, 1905, reprinted 1965).

. *Philippicae*. OCT. ed., A.C. Clark (Oxford, 1901, reprinted 1963).

. *Pro Marcello*. OCT. ed., A.C. Clark (Oxford, 1901, reprinted 1963).

. *Pro Sestio*. OCT. ed., W. Peterson (Oxford, 1911, reprinted 1966).

. *Tusc.*, LCL. text and transl., J.E. King (Harvard, 1927, reprinted 1950).

Diodorus Siculus. LCL. text and transl., C.H. Oldfather (Harvard, 1933, reprinted 1946).

Homer. *Ilias*. OCT. edd., David B. Monro and Thomas W. Allen (Oxford, 1902, reprinted 1966).

. LCL. text and transl., A.T. Murray (Harvard, 1925, reprinted 1985).

. *Odyssea*. OCT. ed., Thomas W. Allen (Oxford, 1908, reprinted 1967).

. LCL. text and transl., A.T. Murray (Harvard, 1919, reprinted 1984).

Horace. *Carmina, Epodi, Epistulae, Sermones*. OCT. edited with commentary, E.C. Wickham, (Oxford, 1904).

. *Carmina/Epodi*. LCL. text and transl.. C.E. Bennett (Harvard, 1914, reprinted 1968).
. *Epistulae/Sermones*. LCL. text and transl.. H. Rushton Fairclough (Harvard, 1926, reprinted 1968).
Livy. *Ab Urbe Condita*. OCT. edd.. R. Seymour Conway and S. Keymer Johnson (Oxford, 1914).
Lucretius. *De Rerum Natura*. OCT. ed.. Cyril Bailey (Oxford, 1982 reprint).
. LCL. text and transl.. W.H.D. Rouse (Harvard, 1924, reprinted 1975).
Martial, *Epigrammata*. OCT. ed.. W.M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1903, reprinted 1977).
. LCL. text and transl.. Walter C.A. Kerr (Harvard, 1919).
Pausanias, Description of Greece. LCL. text and transl.. W.H.S. Jones (Harvard, 1918, reprint 1954).
Plato. *Laches*. OCT. ed.. J. Burnet (Oxford, 1903, reprinted 1954).
. *Meno*. OCT. ed.. J. Burnet (Oxford, 1903, reprinted 1954).
. *Protagoras*. OCT. ed.. J. Burnet (Oxford, 1903, reprinted 1954).
. *Respublica*. OCT. ed.. J. Burnet (Oxford 1902, reprinted 1967).
Pliny. *Naturalis Historia*. LCL. text and transl.. H. Rackham (Harvard, 1938, reprinted 1958).
Pliny, *Epistulae*. LCL. text and transl.. William Melmoth, revised by W.M.L. Hutchison (Harvard, 1915, reprinted 1963).
Plutarch. *Caesar*. LCL. text and transl.. Bernadotte Perrin (Harvard, 1914).
Polybius. History.. LCL. text and transl.. W.R. Paton (Harvard, 1922, reprinted 1954).
Seneca. *De Beneficiis*. LCL. text and transl.. John W. Basore (Harvard, 1935, reprinted 1958).
. *De Clementia*. LCL. text and transl.. John W. Basore (Harvard, 1928, reprinted 1958).
Suetonius. *Julius Caesar*. LCL. text and transl.. J.C. Rolfe (Harvard, 1913, reprinted 1970).
. *Augustus*. LCL. text and transl.. J.C. Rolfe (Harvard, 1913, reprinted 1970).
. *Vita Horatii*. LCL. text and transl.. J.C. Rolfe (Harvard, 1913, reprinted 1970).
Tacitus. *Annales*. OCT. ed.. C.D. Fisher (Oxford, 1906, reprinted 1966).
. LCL. text and transl.. John Jackson (Harvard, 1937, reprinted 1970).
Vergil. *Georgicon*. OCT. ed.. R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969).
. LCL. text and transl.. H.R. Fairclough (Harvard, 1916, reprinted 1986).
. *Aeneidos*. OCT. ed.. R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969).
. LCL. text and transl.. H.R. Fairclough (Harvard, 1916, reprinted 1986).
. The Aeneid of Virgil. edited with Introduction and Notes. R.D. Williams (Glasgow, 1972).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alföldi, A., "The Main Aspects of Political Propaganda on the coinage of the Roman Republic", Essays in Roman Coinage presented to Harold Mattingly (Oxford, 1956).

Anderson, W.S., "Vergil's Second *Iliad*," TAPA 88 (1957), 17-30.

. The Art of the *Aeneid* (Englewood Cliffs, 1969).

Bailey, Cyril, Lucretius: De Rerum Natura (Oxford, 1947).

Basson, W.P., "Vergil's Mezentius: a pivotal personality," Acta Classica 27 (1984), 57-70.

Bloom, H., ed., Virgil's Aeneid (New York, 1987).

Bono, B.J., "The Dido Episode", in H. Bloom, ed., Virgil's Aeneid, (New York, 1987), 103-126.

Born, L.K., "The Perfect Prince according to the Latin Panegyrists", AJP 55 (1934), 20-35.

Bowra, C.M., "Aeneas and the Stoic Ideal", G&R 3 (1933-34), 8-21.

Boyle, A.J., "The Meaning of the *Aeneid*: a critical inquiry", Ramus 1 (1972), 63-90.

Briggs Jr., W.W., "Virgil and the Hellenistic epic", ANRW, 2.31.2 (1981), 948-84.

Brunt, P.A., "*Amicitia* in the Late Republic", PCPS XI (1965), 1 ff.

. "Stoicism and the principate", PBSR 43 (1975), 7-35.

Burnell, Peter, "The Death of Turnus and Roman Morality", G&R 34 (1987), 187-201.

Cagnat, R., *et alii*, Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas Pertinentes (IGRRP) (Paris, 1964).

Cairns, Francis, Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry, (Edinburgh, 1972).

. "Concord in the *Aeneid* of Virgil", Klio 67 (1985), 210-215.

. Virgil's Augustan Epic (Cambridge, 1989).

Camps, W.A., An Introduction to Virgil's *Aeneid* (Oxford, 1969).

Charlesworth, M.P., "Some Fragments of the Propaganda of Mark Antony", CQ 27 (1933), 172-7.

. "The Virtues of a Roman Emperor", Proceedings of the British Academy 23 (1937), 105 ff.

Clausen, W., Virgil's *Aeneid* and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry (Berkeley, 1987).

Coleman, R.G.G., "Gallus, the *Bucolics* and the Ending of the Fourth *Georgic*", AJP 83 (1962).

. Vergil: *Eclogues* (Cambridge, 1977).

Collard, C., "Medea and Dido", Prometheus (1975), 131-51.

Coulter, C., "Caesar's Clemency", CJ 26 (1931), 513-525.

Crawford, M.H., "Numismatics and History", Essays in Roman Coinage presented to Harold Mattingly (Oxford, 1956).

Crawford, M.H., "Roman Imperial Coin Types and the Formation of Public Opinion" in C.N.L. Brooke *et alii* (edd.), Studies in Numismatic Method Presented to P. Grierson (London, 1983).
Dickie, M., " The Speech of Numanus Remulus (*Aeneid* 9, 598-620)" in Francis Cairns, ed., Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, 1985. (Liverpool, 1985), 165-222.
DuQuesnay, I.M. le M., "Vergil's Fourth *Eclogue*", in Francis Cairns, ed., Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, 1976 (Liverpool, 1976), 25-99.
Ehrenberg, Victor and A.H.M. Jones, Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius (2nd ed.) (Oxford, 1955).
Ehrhardt, Christopher T.H.R., "Roman Coin Types and the Roman Public", J. fur N.G. 34 (1984) 41-53.
Ernout, Alfred and Léon Robin, Lucrèce, De Rerum Natura: Commentaire Exegétique et Critique (Paris, 1962).
Farron, S., "The Death of Turnus Viewed in the Perspective of its Historical Background", Acta Classica 24 (1981), 97-106.
. "The Abruptness of the end of the *Aeneid*", Acta Classica 25 (1982), 136-141.
. "Aeneas' Human Sacrifice", Acta Classica 28 (1985), 21-33.
Fears, J.R., "The cult of virtues and Roman imperial ideology", ANRW 2.17.2 (1981), 827-948.
Feeney, D., "The Taciturnity of Aeneas", CQ 33 (1983), 204-19.
Fordyce, C.J., Catullus: Commentary (Oxford, 1968).
Galinsky, G.K., "Vergil's *Romanitas* and his adaption of Greek heroes", ANRW 2.31.2 (1981), 985-1010.
Garnsey, P., and R. Saller, The Early Principate: Augustus to Trajan (Oxford, 1982).
Giangrande, G., "*Arte Allusiva*: and Alexandrian epic poetry", CQ 17 (1967), 85-97.
Goodenough, E.R., "The political philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship", YCIS 1 (1928), 55-102.
Gosling, A., "The political level of the Aeneid", Akroterion XX (1975), 42-45.
Gransden, K.W., Virgil's *Iliad*, (Cambridge, 1984).
, " War and Peace", in H. Bloom, ed., Virgil's *Aeneid* (New York, 1987), 127-148.
Greene, T., "Virgil's Style", in H. Bloom, ed., Virgil's *Aeneid* (New York, 1987), 31-56.
Griffin, Jasper, "Homeric Pathos and Objectivity", CQ 26 (1976), 161-187.
. "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer", JHS 97 (1977).
. Homer on Life and Death (Oxford, 1980).
. The Mirror of Myth (London, 1984).
. "Augustus and the Poets: '*Caesar qui cogere posset*', in F. Millar and E. Segal edd., Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects (Oxford, 1984).
. Latin Poets and Roman Life (London, 1985).
. Virgil (Oxford, 1986).

Grimal, P., Virgile ou la seconde naissance de Rome (Paris, 1985).
Haarhoff, T.J., "The Element of Propaganda in Vergil", Acta Classica XI (1968), 125-128.
Hardie, P.R., "Cosmological Patterns in the *Aeneid*", in Francis Cairns, ed., Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar ,1985 (Liverpool, 1985), 85-98.
. Virgil's *Aeneid*: Cosmos and Imperium (Oxford, 1986).
Harrison, E.L., "The Structure of the *Aeneid*: Observations on the Links Between the Books", ANRW 2.31.1 (1980), 359-93.
. "Structure and Meaning in Vergil's *Aeneid*", in Francis Cairns, ed., Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, 1976 (Liverpool, 1976).
. "Vergil and the Homeric Tradition", in Francis Cairns, ed., Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, 1983 (Liverpool, 1983).
Harrison, S.J., "Vergilian Similes: Some Connections", in Francis Cairns, ed., Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, 1985 (Liverpool, 1985), 99-108.
. "Augustus, the Poets and the *Spolia Opima*", CQ 39 (1989), 408-414.
Hellegouarc'h, J., Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la république (Paris, 1963).
Jenkyns, R., "Pathos, Tragedy and Hope in the Aeneid", JRS 75 (1985), 60-77.
Jocelyn, H.D., "Ancient scholarship and Virgil's use of republican Latin Poetry", CQ 14 (1964), 280-95.
Johnson, W.R., "Depths and Surfaces", in H. Bloom, ed., Virgil's *Aeneid* (New York, 1987), 75-102.
Jones, A.H.M., Augustus (London, 1970, reprint 1985).
. The Roman Economy (Oxford, 1974).
Lacey, W.K., "Octavian in the Senate, January 27 B.C.", JRS 64 (1974), 176-184.
Levick, B., "Propaganda and the Imperial Coinage", Antichthon 16 (1982), 104-116.
Lieder, Paul Robert, etc., edd., British Poetry and Prose (Boston, 1951).
Little, D.A., "The Death of Turnus and the Pessimism of the *Aeneid*", Australian Universities Modern Language Association Journal, 33 (1970), 67-76.
Lyne, R.O.A.M., "Lavinia's Blush: Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.64-70", G&R (1983), 188-203.
. "Vergil and the Politics of War", CQ 33 (1983), 188-203.
. Further Voices in Vergil's *Aeneid* (Oxford, 1987).
Mackay, L.A., "Hero and theme in the Aeneid", TAPA 94 (1963), 157-166.

Mattingly, Harold, Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum (BMCRE) (London, 1923; reprint 1965).
. Roman Coins: From the Earliest Times to the Fall of the Western Empire (London, 1928; revised 1960).
Mattingly, Harold, and C.H.V. Sutherland, Roman Imperial Coinage (RIC) (London, 1923; reprint 1968).
Merguet, H., Lexicon zu Vergilius (Hildesheim, 1969).
Millar, Fergus, "Triumvirate and Principate", JRS 63 (1973), 50-67.
. The Emperor in the Roman World (London, 1977).
. "State and Subject: The Impact of Monarchy", in Fergus Millar and Erich Segal (edd.) Caesar Augustus: Seven Aspects (Oxford, 1984), 37-60.
Murray, O., "Philodemus on the Good King according to Homer", JRS 55 (1960), 161-82.
Murray, R.J., "The Attitude of the Augustan poets towards 'rex' and related words", CJ 60 (1964-5), 241-6.
Nisbet, R.G.M., "*Aeneas Imperator*: Roman generalship in an epic context", PVS 17 (1978-80) 50-61.
Otis, Brooks, Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry (Oxford, 1963).
. "A New Study of the *Georgics*," Phoenix 26 (1972), 40-62.
Oxford Latin Dictionary (Oxford, 1968).
Parry, A., "The Two Voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*", in H. Bloom, ed., Virgil's *Aeneid* (New York, 1987), 57-74.
Perret, J., Virgile (Paris, 1959).
. "Optimisme et tragedie dans l'*Eneide*", R.E.L. 45 (1967), 342-62.
Picone, G., "Su alcuni elementi della realtà politica nell'*Eneide*", Pan 1 (1973), 51-58.
Pomathios, J.L., Le pouvoir politique et sa representation dans l'*Eneide* de Virgile. Collection Latomus 199 (Brussels, 1987).
Poschl, V., The Art of the Aeneid. Translated by G. Seligson, (Ann Arbor, 1962).
. "Aeneas", in H. Bloom, ed., Virgil's *Aeneid* (New York, 1987), 9-30.
Preshous, J.D.M., "Apollonius Rhodius and Virgil", PVS 4 (1964-5), 1-17.
Putnam, M.J., The Poetry of the *Aeneid* (Cambridge, Mass., 1965).
. Virgil's Poem of the Earth: Studies in the *Georgics* (Princeton, 1979).
. "*Pius* Aeneas and the Metamorphosis of Lausus", Arethusa 14 (1981), 139-158.
Quinn, K., Virgil's *Aeneid*: A Critical Description (London, 1968).
. Catullus: The Poems, Edited with Introduction, Revised Text and Commentary (London, 1976).
Rawson, E., "Caesar's heritage: Hellenistic Kings and their Roman equals", JRS 65 (1975), 148-59.

Rawson, E., "Scipio, Laelius, Furius and the ancestral religion", JRS 63 (1973), 161-74.
Reinhold, M., "The Unhero Aeneas", C&M XXVII (1966), 195-207.
Robertson, D.S., Greek and Roman Architecture: Second Edition (Cambridge, 1929; reprint 1986).
Saller, R., Personal Patronage under the Early Empire (Cambridge, 1982).
Schiebe, M.W., "The Saturn of the *Aeneid* - tradition or innovation?" Vergilius 32 (1986), 43-60.
Scott, K., "The Political Propaganda of 44-30 B.C.", Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, 11 (1933), 7-49.
Scullard, H.H., From the Gracchi to Nero (London, 1959, reprint 1982).
Segal, C., "Orpheus and the Fourth *Georgic*: Vergil on nature and civilization", AJP 87 (1966), 307-326.
Sforza, F., "The Problem of Virgil", CR 49 (1935), 97-108.
Small, S., "The Arms of Turnus, *Aeneid* VII.783-792", TAPA 90 (1959), 243-52.
Stahl, H.P., "Aeneas - an 'unheroic' hero", Arethusa 14 (1981), 157-77.
Starr, C., "Virgil's Acceptance of Octavian", AJP 76 (1955), 34-46.
Steiner, G., "A tale of three cities", Encounter May (1984).
Sutherland, C.H.V., "The Purpose of Roman Imperial Coin Types", Revue Numismatique 25 (1983), 73-82.
. "Roman Imperial Type-Selection: The Degree of Immediacy", Revue Belge de Numismatique 65 (1986), 105-109.
. Roman History and Coinage 44 BC-AD 69 (Oxford, 1987).
Sydenham, The Coinage of the Roman Republic (London, 1952).
Syme, R., The Roman Revolution (Oxford, 1939, reprint 1987).
Thomas, R.F., "From '*Recusatio*' to Commitment: The Evolution of the Vergilian Programme", in Francis Cairns, ed., Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, 1976 (Liverpool, 1976), 61-74.
Thornton, A.H., "The last scene of the Aeneid", G&R 22 (1953), 82-84.
Todd, R.W., "Lavinia blushed", Vergilius 26 (1980), 27-33.
Wallace-Hadrill, A., "The Emperor and his Virtues", Historia 30 (1981) 298-323.
. "*Civilis Princeps*: between citizen and king", JRS 72 (1982), 32-48.
. "Image and Authority in the Coinage of Augustus", JRS 76 (1986), 66-87.
Weinstock, S., "*Pax* and the '*Ara Pacis*', JRS 50 (1960), 44-58.
. Divus Julius (Oxford, 1971).
Wells, C., The Roman Empire (Glasgow, 1984).
West, D., "The Deaths of Hector and Turnus", G&R 21 (1974), 21-31.

West, D., and T. Woodman, edd., Creative Imitation and Latin Literature (London, 1979).
White, P., "*Amicitia* and the Profession of Poetry in Early Imperial Rome", JRS 68 (1978), 74-92.
. "Julius Caesar in Augustan Rome", Phoenix 42 (1988) 334-356.
Wilkinson, J.P., "The Intention of Virgil's *Georgics*", G&R 12 (1950), 19-28.
. "Review of B. Otis', 'Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry'", CR 79 (1965), 182-5.
Williams, Gordon, "Poetry in the moral climate of Augustan Rome", JRS 52 (1962), 28-46.
. Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford, 1968).
. "Phases in Political Patronage of Literature in Rome", in B.K. Gold, ed., Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome (Austin, 1982), 3-27.
. Technique and Ideas in the *Aeneid* (New Haven, 1983).
Williams, R.D., "Virgil and the *Odyssey*", Phoenix 17 (1963) 266-74.
. "The Purpose of the *Aeneid*", Antichthon 1 (1967), 29-41.
. The Aeneid of Virgil, Books 1-12 (in two volumes) Edited, with Introduction and Notes (Glasgow, 1973).
. Virgil: The *Eclogues* and *Georgics* (New York, 1979).
. The *Aeneid* (London, 1987).
Wiltshire, S.F., "Virgil's Aeneid: Poetry and the Public Realm", in Virgilian Bimilennary Lectures (1982), 118-44.
Wirszubski, C., *Libertas* as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Empire (Cambridge, 1950, reprint 1970).
. "*Audaces*: A Study in Political Phraseology", JRS 51 (1961), 12-22.
Wiseman, T.P., "Legendary Genealogies in late republican Rome", G&R 21 (1974), 153-64.
Wistrand, E., "Aeneas and Augustus in the *Aeneid*", Eranos 82 (1984), 195-8.
Woodman, T., and D. West, edd., Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus (Cambridge, 1984).