

V.S. Lectures, No.101

SOME PROBLEMS IN AENEID 7 - 12

Text of a lecture read to the Virgil Society.

20th March, 1971.

by R.G. Tanner, M.A.

At the eighty-first meeting of this society, Mr. F. Robertson gave members a lucid and judicious account of the difficulties surrounding the allegorical interpretations of Virgil's poetry. He there remarks: "Whatever special reasons we may have for believing the Eclogues to be largely allegorical, few of us would be willing to look on the Aeneid itself as a basically allegorical poem, as D.L. Drew has argued We accept the fact that the Aeneid contains a wealth of contemporary allusions, much of which is lost on us because of our lack of historical detail, but surely the subordination of the whole epic to a propagandist theme, as a glorification of Augustus in the person of Aeneas, does less than justice to Virgil. That is not how great epics are made."¹

Readers of my paper in the last issue of the Proceedings will realise that any allegorical features I might seek in the Aeneid would not necessarily tend to the glorification of Augustus in the person of Aeneas.² But before considering whether there is any connexion between contemporary events and a supposed allegorical intent in the Aeneid - its last six books especially - we should recall the influence of peripatetic literary criticism and theory in the Augustan age - a feature well established by Professor Charles Brink.

Aristotle regarded poetry as imitation of life, - or making imitations of life. In tragedy and epic such were imitations of good characters, and in comedy they were of bad ones. Lyric poetry receives less attention in the surviving fragments of Aristotle's Poetics, but the discussion of a passage from Simonides in Plato's Protagoras suggests that Plato's pupils would have regarded lyric as embodying gnomic wisdom, such as often is expressed by Pindar, for instance in the Eleventh Nemean Ode. But, to return to epic, if the making of an imitation of a good character was Virgil's aim, then his patron Maecenas would have shown him only one politically useful model, the princeps Augustus himself. Yet even if this be the chosen model, a Latin epic must integrate his praises with associations between earlier national poetry at Rome and the Trojan cycle on one hand and the Punic wars on the other.

Both Naevius and Ennius had devoted the greater part of their epics to the current or recent wars with Carthage, but they had chosen to begin from the Fall of Troy and Aeneas' coming to Italy. These traditions now had to be linked by Virgil with the origin and claims of the Julian gens. Now the alternative names Iulus/Ascanius provided for the son of Aeneas gave a useful suggestion of Homeric ancestry for the Caesars which Virgil decided to exploit by making this now familiar legend of Aeneas the foundation for his new pro-Augustan account of the tale of the Good Man to be imitated. On the other hand, it was not sufficient for Aeneas to be the ancestor of Octavian, for it must also be shown that the latter has absorbed at least some of the qualities of his precursor.

Furthermore, apart from linking Augustus with Rome's heroic past, there remained a compelling and urgent need to instil faith in the future and hope into a people who had endured civil wars almost continuously for the previous twenty years from 49 to 30 B.C., and of whom the older generation remembered other recent conflicts a few years earlier. The wars of Philippi and Actium must be made to seem sad preliminaries to a glorious future, and the precedent of a past parallel is thus important for creating confidence in the Augustan settlement. Thus the emphasis laid in Bks. 7-12 on the bitter and tragic wars of Aeneas in Italy, which yet proved a needful prelude to the foundation of Alba Longa and led to the divine establishment of Rome itself.

So far the most cautious sceptic about political implications in poetry might nod a reluctant but genuine assent. To my further proposition that Duckworth's firm reaffirmation of Conway's evidence for the parallelism of Aenid 1-6 and 7-12⁴ should be used to justify two different levels of parallel political allegory in the two halves of this epic, such a hearer would express firm if polite disbelief. Perhaps I should explain how this provocative proposition came to occur to me. I began with the material contained in Appendix 1, the prose sources - mainly Greek - for the story of Aeneas' escape from the sack of Troy.

The prose evidence is drawn from Diodorus Bk.7, the first book of the Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Photius' Epitome of Appian, the Epitomes of Dio Cassius, and the first book of Livy. All these narratives diverge consistently from Virgil in certain particulars. Diodorus claims that Aeneas rallied the resistance after the Greeks had entered Troy, and that later the Greeks had entered Troy, and that later the Greeks allowed the Trojans to depart under treaty, taking each man his own valuables. But when Aeneas chose to carry his father and his household gods the Greeks were so impressed that they granted a general safeconduct to all his followers. Two verse fragments from Naevius (Morel 5 and 7) suggest that the earlier Latin epic versions preserved this story, which is lacking in Virgil. Dionysius follows Hellanicus' account from the early 5th century B.C. He tells us that Aeneas held the citadel for a time, but sent out the women and children under escort and then evacuated the town in good order, taking in chariots his penates, his father, and his wife and children. After gathering all his people on Ida he made a treaty with the Greeks, and agreed to leave the Troad with all his people and their goods by a set date. He kept his word, but Ascanius his son returned and tried to resettle Troy. Here again our source differs from Virgil over the fate of Creusa and behaviour of Ascanius as well as accepting the notion of controlled evacuation and a treaty with the Greeks. Dionysius tells us that the carrying of Anchises from the city on Aeneas' shoulders comes from Sophocles' Laocoon, and that Menecrates of Xanthus alleges that Aeneas himself overthrew Priam and admitted the Greeks. Livy says that the Greeks spared Antenor and Aeneas because they had always favoured peace. Virgil's tale is quite distinct from Livy's, and the only touch which has a flavour of Menecrates is the use of Greek disguise (386-401).

Virgil's treatment of his sources was highly eclectic, as has now become apparent. Indeed there is sufficient distortion to make one suspect a purpose. Of particular significance are the two exhortations not to fight but to flee from Troy, first that given by Hector in the dream (289-97), and later by Venus after the vision of the Gods at work demolishing Troy (589-623). The loss of Creusa is

also significant. In short, the Aeneas of Aeneid II is more concerned to obey divine injunctions to abstain from warfare and show piety towards his father and son than to defend the Trojans; none the less, he fails to protect his wife. Perhaps problems in the career of Octavian are connected with this apparent distortion.

After Philippi Octavian had married Libo's daughter Scribonia, but divorced her in 39 B.C. after he renewed his alliance with Antony. By this act he ended the tie of kinship with Sextus Pompeius and was able to marry Livia in 38 B.C. Again, during the battle of Philippi Octavian avoided battle because of the prescient dreams of his physician as Velleius Paterculus tells us (2.70.1). Altogether then the conduct of the racial hero Aeneas in Virgil's second book offers a happy precedent for the actions of the public hero Augustus Caesar during and after Philippi. Both national exemplars are restrained from battle by divine intervention and lose their wives through circumstances beyond their control. If this coincidence is no accident, it may show a motive for these and other modifications made by Virgil in the legend of Aeneas. But Virgil is no mere political pamphleteer. The second book also shows a deep sensitivity to the tragedy, waste and horror of war which grew as much from the experience of the age as did our bitter post-war poetry of the twenties. Here the poem is not politically inspired; the poet speaks from his own and his people's hearts, and the book is typically Virgilian in its tenderness for the defenceless, whether it be the old king of Troy, the helpless Cassandra, or wives and young children.

With this warning against a totally political interpretation, we may suggest in Bk. II a parallel with the events between Caesar's murder and the war of Philippi, with Greeks for Republicans and Trojans for the Caesarians. The dressing of Coroebus and Aeneas' band in Greek guise refers to the period between September 44 B.C. and Mutina when Octavian appeared to ally himself with Cicero against Antonius. Again, no such treaty with the Greeks early in the sack as Naevius suggests is allowed because it was Antony not Octavian who had an accommodation with the 'Liberators' after the murder. The 'Julian Star' over Ida is the only hint of Philippi: to have included the story of Ascanius' return would have implied a reference to a victory which belonged to the now discredited Antony.

One of the sound points in Drew's thesis is the parallel between the storm in Aeneid 1 and Octavian's naval misfortunes against Pompeius in 38 and 36 B.C. No doubt the seafaring of Aeneid 111 is also linked with his operations against Pompeius. But, as I have suggested in another paper that in the Georgics the victories of Antonius were filched to adorn the triumph of Actium, it may be suspected that here also some of the deeds of Antonius are attributed to Aeneas-Octavian. The prophecy of Apollo at Delos (90-101) can be equated with the salutation of Antony as Dionysus on his arrival at Ephesus in 40 B.C., an occasion in my view which proved the cause of his extravagant Indian ambitions in which I choose to believe. The visit to Zacynthus, where Antony set up a naval base in 39 B.C., and the interview with the prophet Helenus and mention of the other new Troy in Italy (356-505) may refer to Antony's negotiations with the triumvir and High Priest Lepidus in 37 B.C., when Antony appeared off Tarentum (which is mentioned in 551) after Octavian's disaster at Scyllaeum (see 432 and 553).

The arrival of Aeneas in Carthage in Bk. 1 and his presence there till the end of Book 4 is a concession to the large Punic War sections which must have dominated

the Bellum Punicum of Naevius and the Origines of Ennius. But it is not wholly traditional. In so far as this episode was introduced, despite its total absence from the prose sources, for a political as well as a literary reason, then Dido is a Cleopatra-figure. Aeneas thus functions as an Antony rather than an Octavian, but his final refusal to treat with her and her suicide after his departure suggest Octavian's dealings with the Queen after Antony's death. Therefore Drew may be correct enough in identifying some of the features of Bk.5 with the Actian Games and the crisis with the veterans in 29 B.C. . Finally on this view Aeneid 6 celebrated the settlement of 27 B.C. and the new title Augustus as the fulfilment of a cosmic purpose for Rome and for Octavian.

This analysis suggests reasons for the distortion. Virgil had been moved, inspired or directed to write the Aeneid by Maecenas. As with the the revision of the Georgics, according to my theory, the composing of the first half of the Aeneid was conducted on the basis that Antonius would not be criticised by implication. The victory of Philippi is neglected entirely because it was so discreditable to Octavian, but some of the acts of Antony which were successful were attributed by the poet to his partner. The attribution to Aeneas of the equivalent of Antony's link with Cleopatra accepts the value of the Alexandrian connexion for Roman power until the divorce of Octavia (32 B.C.) after the Donations of 33 B.C. The actual victory of Actium is avoided because of the discredit of civil war, but its celebrations, effects and constitutional results appear to be mentioned (Bks. 5 and 6). One mystery remains: the odd use of the ivory gate of false dreams to return Aeneas to the world of men at the end of Bk.6. I suggest a revulsion of feeling was the cause. Aeneid 6 was completed after the death of Marcellus in 23 B.C. in the autumn. In that year Maecenas' brother-in-law Varro Murena was condemned for treason while consul and Maecenas lost influence with Augustus for alleged indiscretion in the matter.¹⁰ Granting then the closeness of the friendship between poet and minister, are we to guess that Virgil marked his displeasure by declaring that the glorious future Augustus hoped to found in his new role of 27 B.C. was but a false deceitful dream of freedom dignity and hope?

THE SOURCES OF THE LAST SIX BOOKS

From our analysis of Book 2 and its sources we have seen reasons for suspecting that a combination of the political needs of Maecenas and Augustus with the poet's own tenderness towards the helpless or for the pride of youth cut off before its prime induced an appreciable distortion of the received tale of Aeneas' departure from Troy. Before looking for similar factors at work in Books 7-12, we must recall that the second half of the Aeneid was deemed to furnish a Roman Iliad as the first half had constituted a Roman Odyssey. Therefore we must allow for the likelihood that desire to accommodate his plot and characters to those of the Iliad of Homer would lead Virgil to alter the received Hellenic and other accounts of Aeneas' settlement in Italy. Only after we allow for this factor can we safely look for allegorical identifications with recent history.

Armed with the summary offered by Appendix 111 we may consider the plot of the Iliad in relation to it. There is an obvious sense in which Aeneas is related to Pallas and Turnus as Achilles is to Patroclus and Hector, at least in Books 11 and 12. On the other hand Aeneas resembles Menelaus in the events of 12.277-429, and in the situation of Bk.7 respecting Lavinia's hand the relationship between Aeneas and Turnus resembles the rivalry of Menelaus and Paris for the possession of Helen as the ground of the Trojan War. There is a close analogy between the Catalogue of Iliad Bk.2 and

Aeneid 7,641-817. Again the embassy of Aeneas to Evander has features in common with the embassy of Odysseus and Ajax to Achilles. The shield of Aeneas treated in 8,370-453 and 608-731 is analogical with that of Achilles in Iliad 19, though less necessary to plot. The escapade of Nisus and Euryalus in 9,367-502 has some similarity with the Dolon and Rhesus exploit of Odysseus and Diomedes in Iliad 10. The Trojan ships turned to dolphins in 9,1-175 is a fairy-tale recasting of Iliad 8. Mezentius and Lausus have certain faint parallels with Aeneas and Sarpedon in the Iliad, but the circumstances are different. Latinus and Amata have a role like that of Priam and Hecuba in some ways, but unlike Hector, Turnus is a son-in-law in prospect and not a son to them. Again, Juturna is really on Turnus' side, but she plays the role of the deceitful Athena dressed as Hector's brother in the Iliad when she intervenes in the final battle with Aeneas. There is no incident in the Iliad like Aeneas' landing from the sea, and there is no equivalent to Camilla and her exploits. Finally, though Virgil's Trojans represent Homer's Greeks, the farewell between Aeneas and Ascanius in 12,430-467 is reminiscent of Hector leaving his son Astyanax on the wall of Troy in Iliad 6.

Despite many parallels and echoes, Aeneid 7-12 is no more a simple re-setting of the themes and characters and plot of the Iliad than Aeneid 1-6 is such a treatment of the Odyssey. Further, at different times Aeneas plays the roles of Agamemnon, Menelaus, Odysseus and Achilles - even occasionally of Hector, whom his character most recalls. Again Turnus functions as both Paris and Hector, whilst his temper recalls Achilles. Pallas represents Patroclus, but also does work worthy of Diomedes. This suggests that in any allegorical treatment of recent events a legendary character may represent more than one living person, and that more than one legendary figure may embody the same contemporary leader, a principle which could prove most significant.

If we now turn to the prose sources for our story of the Trojan landing in Italy in Appendix II and compare them with Appendix III we find further great and seemingly gratuitous modifications to that tradition. Clearly Virgil has taken great liberties, contrary to the Hellenic tradition, the defence of Ascanius' camp is made to precede the battle with Turnus. Again, in Bk.9 as well, Virgil makes Aeneas fight against Latinus' folk as well as the Rutuli, though the other sources make Latinus to be Aeneas' ally against the Rutuli. In Bk.10 Virgil makes Mezentius and Lausus exiles from Etruria, whilst other sources make Mezentius King in Caere. On the same principle Virgil in Bk.8 shows the army of Etruria supporting Aeneas under the unknown Tarchon, whilst in every other source the Etruscans aid the Rutuli against Aeneas. In Bk.10 Aeneas slays both Lausus and Mezentius, but other authorities state that Aeneas either perished or disappeared in a battle which Mezentius won. The whole episode of Pallas and Evander is missing from the prose account of the war, as also is Camilla's story in Bk.11. Finally, in Bk.12 Aeneas slays Turnus in single combat, whilst in the prose tradition Turnus and Latinus both perish and Aeneas survives in sole authority.

THE TALE OF AENEAS AND CONTEMPORARY POLITICS

Two figures have no part in the Homeric or the Hellenic traditions. These are Camilla and Juturna. As Drew observes, "if Aeneas is to represent Augustus, then Turnus must represent Antonius". Now at the end Turnus' own sister betrays him as the hostile Athena cheats Hector, driving his chariot from battle at a crucial moment (12,468-553). Later when they return to find Laurentum under siege he recognises

her in his despair (12.614-664). He then decides on single combat with Aeneas and dies. This strongly suggests Cleopatra's fatal flight from Actium, their last reconciliation, and Antony's defeat and death closing the *Bellum Alexandrinum*. With Camilla we may perhaps venture to equate the masterful first wife of Antonius, Fulvia, who held Perusium against Octavian.

If Turnus is to represent Antonius, then serious problems confront a poet who must incorporate the wars of Philippi and Actium upon the one canvas. At Philippi Octavian and Antony were partners - Aeneas and Turnus never were allies in any tradition. A solution to this difficulty may be found in the curious story of 10.605-688, where Juno entices Turnus on board an empty ship and casts it off, thus leaving Aeneas free to slay Mezentius and Lausus the Etruscan exiles who were Turnus' protégés. Seemingly these two represent Brutus and Cassius, for whom Antony had in fact procured senatorial commissions abroad when he was consul after the Ides of March, and whom he protected from violence when the Roman mob forced them to withdraw from the City. Moreover, here the poet has also impudently reversed history to flatter Augustus in his allegory. As Velleius tells us (2.70.1) it was Octavian-Aeneas who obeyed a dream warning and stayed in camp while Antony-Turnus marched out and won the victory of Philippi. Indeed, if we trust Pliny, N.H., 7,148, Agrippa and Maecenas did not afterwards deny that Octavian lurked in a marsh during the battle. Virgil here transfers this slight to Antony.

So far so good. But if this allegory is to be regarded seriously, more parallels should have affected the scheme. Achates is widely identified with Agrippa, but who are represented by Evander, Pallas or Tarchon? What of Latinus and Amata, or Nisus and Euryalus? An analysis of the politics of the wars of Mutina, Philippi, Perusia and Actium may explain all this.

When our hero Octavian-Aeneas reached Rome in April 44 B.C. he was in immediate conflict with Antony-Turnus over Caesar's estate. Now, being unwilling to recognise the consul Antonius as head of state and leader of Caesar's party, our poet must equate Latinus with another public figure, though perhaps also with the body of consular opinion in the Senate. The only possibility was Caesar's successor as Pontifex Maximus, his former Master of Horse, M.Aemilius Lepidus. Later, in 36 B.C. a son of his had married Servilia, daughter of P.Servilius. She had previously been betrothed to Octavian in the spring or summer of 43 B.C.: further, Syme suggests that Servilius himself may then have been young Caesar's intended consular colleague (R.R.182). So Latinus seems to combine elements of both Lepidus and P.Servilius Isauricus.

On this view, Lavinia could represent young Servilia who was first pledged to Octavian and finally married young Lepidus. Her mother, Junia, daughter of Silanus, was not prominent in politics; but her grandmother Servilia the elder, mother of Brutus by her first marriage and of Junia by her second, was a most influential figure in politics, and most suited to qualify as Amata if any one person should do so, although she was not the wife of Lepidus and was merely Servilius' mother-in-law. This difference is no more drastic than the undoubted one represented by making Turnus son-in-law elect of Latinus and Amata when Hector was the son of Priam and Hecuba.

Evander is a Greek, so, on the earlier analogy of Bks. 1-6 he would be a Republican. Cicero spoke Greek so fluently that Milo regarded him as his finest

pupil. Again, Evander is described as Romanae conditor arcis (8.313). After his suppression of Catiline Cicero received the title pater patriae, to which he alludes in his own poem on his consulship with the unhappy verse Offortunatam natam me consule Romam. So perhaps Cicero, now over sixty, is the pattern for Evander and at the same time for his young son Pallas. If Aeneas can play four Iliad parts, why should not Cicero play two Aeneid parts? Evander's remark that Pallas, mixtus matre Sabella, (8.510) would not be suitable to lead the Etruscans against Turnus may well refer to Samnite origins of Arpinum from which Cicero came to Rome as a wealthy local magnate but a political novus homo. Here Drew insists that Evander's Cacus is an analogue of Turnus and meant as an Antonius figure.¹² Yet he admits the claim of the Antonii to be descendants of Anthon son of Hercules. Cicero's consular colleague, another Antonius, was bribed to take the field for him against Catiline. So I suggest that if anything Cacus is an allegory of Catiline, put down by Cicero and Antonius Hybrida in the guise of Evander and Hercules.

Tarchon the Etruscan ruler has his parallel too. After his first march on November 10th 44 B.C., Octavian withdrew to Arretium (Appian, B.C., 3, 42, 174). As Syme explains (R.R.129) the family of Maecenas held quasi-dynastic power here, and his parallel with Tarchon explains quite a few distortions of the Hellenic tradition in the Aeneid. For Nisus and Euryalus who die gloriously for the Trojan cause but are betrayed by their greed and impetuosity may perhaps be read Hirtius and Pansa, their lack of appropriate youth or beauty being supplied by the winning grace of their martyrdom in conflict with Antony. Messapus survives right through the Aeneid, and thus it is hard to identify him with Sextus Pompeius who perished in 36 B.C. But as both are Neptunia proles he must be at least one of the values for Messapus on this scheme. Another partial equivalent could be L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, the admiral of the Liberators, who joined Antony at Brundisium and deserted at last just before Actium.

Of the rest, Achates is Agrippa, as all agree who take Drew's approach. Mnestheus is likely to be Tarius Rufus in Bk.12, but in the earlier phase he may represent Ventidius Bassus and Serestus may equate Salvidienus. Drances may well represent Antony's difficult and disloyal colleague L. Munatius Plancus. Virgil's original patron, Asinius Pollio, who stood aside at Perusium with his seven legions from Cisalpina and remained neutral but sympathetic to Antony may be embodied in the retired Greek (republican) hero Diomedes living amongst the Veneti. The schedule of Appendix IV suggests the kind of official version of the rise of Octavian which Virgil and Maecenas wished either to uphold or to sneer at.

CONCLUSION

Thus a consistent, if partisan, picture of history between B.C. 44 and B.C. 30 can be extracted from our presumed allegory. Though it has obvious distortions and is modified by the pattern of the Iliad and the inherited Trojan tradition as well as by political bias, it may still be a means of occasional corroborative evidence for some historical suggestions about this period. It is just possible that some incidental details given in the Aeneid about lesser figures in our presumed allegory which are not otherwise recorded may at times offer genuine additions to our knowledge.

The emphasis on Tarchon may show the influence of Maecenas, the poet's patron, who is known to have backed Marcellus against Agrippa for the role of successor to Augustus. Hence perhaps the equation of Marcellus with Ascanius at 12.430-40 and

the lament for his death at 6,833-7. We also have suggested that Servilia the younger is linked with Lavinia as the proper daughter of destiny for Rome. Is this a hint that, though Maecenas denounced her treason to Octavian after Actium, he was in fact already aware of it and willing to support the claims of the lady and her husband Lepidus Minor if Antonius had won at Actium? Octavian's friends in Italy might well have been obliged to choose between negotiation and execution. Republican sentiment is carefully conciliated, as in the 23 B.C. settlement. The evidence here is the glorification of Cicero in the persons of Evander and Pallas and of Hirtius and Pansa in the persons of Nisus and Euryalus - though in not being Greeks the last pair are not classed as true republicans, but as men obedient to the state like the propraetor Octavian.

Finally, Maecenas emerges from this analysis as a more independent and perhaps more sinister figure than the received accounts of the Augustan settlement might suggest. Virgil's poem is far more than a contemporary commentary in disguise, but a real and significant thread of allegory could be woven into its poetic texture.

1. Proceedings of the Virgil Soc. (6, 1966-67) - 'Allegorical Interpretations of Virgil.'
p.349?
2. "The Georgics & Mark Antony"
3. "Horace on Literary Criticism"
4. G.E. Duckworth: The Architecture of the Aeneid, AJP.75,1(297),1954,1-15.
5. D.L. Drew: "The Allegory of the Aeneid," Oxford, 1927, p.67.
6. C.A.H. X, p.33.
7. C.A.H. X, p.52.
8. C.A.H. X, p.59.
9. op.cit. p.73.
10. C.A.H. X.136.
11. Drew, op.cit, p.37.
12. Drew, op.cit, p.37.